UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 109—PART 19

DECEMBER 13, 1963, TO DECEMBER 30, 1963
(PAGES 24451 TO 25696)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1963

J
11
.R
V.101
[illegible]

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore, Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Immanuel, God with us, again by Thy grace the journeying months have brought us near to the shining glory of the holy night.

Amid the tumult and terror of man's inhumanity to man, we hear anew the tidings of the angels' song and the music that is not of earth. Amid all the bitterness and ill will of these days, we are grateful for the gentle, balmy climate of the Christmastide. May an understanding sympathy that knows no boundaries of border or breed or birth, find lodging even in hearts now hardened by cynicism.

In this happy season of thinking of others and of gathering around the family hearths, save us from a festivity that knows nothing of receptivity, and from decoration that forgets dedication. May the holly of this joyous time enshrine the holy, and its crimson beads be but emblems of the myrrh of sacrifice, the gift of contrite hearts. Hasten the day when the mighty melody above a little eastern town, "Peace to Men of Good Will," shall be the divine harmony of all earth's myriad tongues.

We ask it in the name of the Bethlehem Babe. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on December 11, 1963, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1243) to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H R. 8720) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 9009) to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate the conference report on H.R. 7885, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Further debate is limited to 2 hours, with the time equally divided and controlled, to be followed by a vote at not later than 2 p.m. today on the question of agreeing to the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 12, 1963, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Committee on Foreign Relations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is under control.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday and last evening the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I made two major speeches on the floor of the Senate, in opposition to the conference report, and urging its rejection. Nevertheless, those who read the newspapers this morning would not know that the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon spoke yesterday against the conference report. However, that is typical of the journalistic concealment policies of the American Pravda press and is very typical of the abuse of the precious constitutional principle of freedom of the press that the American press, by and large, is constantly committing.

I know the wire service representatives will say they sent out stories, but that something happened to them "upstairs." The wire services did send out some of my remarks, so I assume that what happened did happen "upstairs."

It is too bad that I happen to be involved in this particular matter; but this treatment is also received by other Senators. The sad fact is that this instance is but another example of the situation in which the American press relates to the American people only what the press wishes them to read; and that is typical of the Pravda press in Russia.

However, Mr. President, these two major speeches contain a very great deal of factual material in strong opposition to and criticism of the conference report; in fact, these two speeches have set forth about all the statements which those of us who are in opposition to the conference report care to make; and the speeches appear in the Congressional Record.

So I await with great interest the defense of the conference report by the chairman of the committee.

I yield back the remainder of the time assigned to me. I suggest that unless some Senator who wishes to defend the conference report wishes to speak at this time, there now be a quorum call, with the proviso that the time required for it not be charged to the time available under the agreement, to either side, until a proponent of the conference report appears in the Chamber, to defend the report.

Mr. President, I wish to supplement my comments about the concealment practices of the American press by saying that my remarks apply particularly to the newspaper known as the Washington Post, of Washington, D.C., which purports to print all the news, and to another paper of propaganda in the United States—the one known as the New York Times.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 2 minutes.

IMPORTS OF LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee are holding hearings to determine the effects of imports of livestock and livestock products into the United States and to gain information that will be helpful in future negotiations with other countries on our import and export policies.

Some excellent presentations have been made. One of the most knowledgeable persons, and one who is a tireless champion of our American producers, is U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, of the great State of Wyoming. Having been Governors of adjoining Western States, Senator Simpson and I have found that there is no better way to learn firsthand the problems of a State than to be its Chief Executive.

Senator Simpson introduced proposed legislation, S. 557, which I cosponsored, to increase tariffs on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas. He also appeared and presented to the Tariff Commission and the Committee a statement which indicates the serious situation existing in the livestock industry at present and the effects on the livestock economy of recent accelerated imports of livestock and meat products. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the statement by Senator Simpson be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Milward L. Simpson, U.S. Senator, Before the U.S. Tariff Commission, December 10, 1963

I want to thank you for the opportunity of appearing here this morning. I come before the Commission as a representative of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, the Wyoming Wool Growers Association, and the State of Wyoming.

Mr. Dean T. Prosser of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association was to be here, but he is unable to appear. I ask that his statement be made a part of the record and considered as a vital portion of the case against the inclusion of beef and beef products on the preliminary negotiation list.

Mr. Prosser's statement clearly demonstrates the importance of the beef industry to the State of Wyoming. He points to the damaging effect that the excessive beef imports are having on our Wyoming cattlemen and asks that no steps be taken which would further reduce the little protection that we do have.

Today I appear before this Commission in opposition to the proposed reduction in tariff on livestock commodities and particularly the reduction in tariffs on beef and beef products.

The need of America and the need of the livestock men of this great Nation is not to reduce tariffs on beef imports but rather to establish quotas and increase the tariffs on the excessive quantities of beef shipped into this country.

Today our livestock industry finds itself in a precarious position due to the excessive beef imports which are shipped into this country. The Foreign Agriculture Service Division of the Department of Agriculture has informed me that the beef and veal imports increased 41 percent in 1962 over 1961. And, further, that the imports during January through August 1963, were 22 percent above the same months of 1962. This clearly demonstrates that the problem is becoming more acute rather than diminishing or leveling off.

These beef imports are not filling a need which our suppliers cannot satisfy; but, rather, they are competing with our domestic suppliers, and they are capturing a substantial portion of the market.

In 1960 the per capita civilian consumption of beef and veal in the United States was 91.4 pounds. Four and four-tenths pounds of the consumed beef was imported meat. In 1962 the per capita consumption was 95.4 pounds and 8 pounds of that total was imported beef. Thus, total meat consumption increased 4.3 percent while the consumption of imported beef increased 81.8 percent.

With over 11 percent of our consumed beef, or about 1½ billion pounds, coming from foreign lands, it is easy to see that in a free market, such as our livestock market is, beef imports do have a direct relationship to the prices obtained by our American cattlemen.

Recently the fat cattle market slid better than $5 per hundredweight, and as a result of this catastrophe, the feeder markets have also declined from $3 to $6 per hundredweight. One of the reasons for this drop in prices was that beef imports can be sold here in the States 5 to 10 cents a pound cheaper than beef can be produced and marketed by our American livestock men.

A substantial portion of the imported beef is of a manufacturing or processing quality. In fact, about 40 percent of the processing beef consumed in America is imported. It is argued by some that the imported processing beef does not affect the price of our cattle. This is a fallacious argument. The Department of Agriculture has often reported that beef is its own worst competitor. Consequently, when cow beef or processing beef, 40 percent of which is imported, competes with fed beef for the consumer's dollar, cow prices have a direct effect on fat cattle prices and vice versa. To wit, if our American people are eating frankfurters and bologna made from cheap imported processing beef, they will not be buying our domestically raised beef, and our prices will be driven down.

I believe that current levels of imports are having an extremely adverse economic impact on our cattle industry and that further reductions in the present existing tariff would prove catastrophic to the major source of income for the ranchers and farmers of this country.

Both the Wyoming Stock Growers Association and the American National Cattlemen's Association are asking for a quota system. I feel that this is needed if we are to secure a permanent and successful cattle industry in America.

The President of these United States has the authority to establish a quota system. I urge and recommend that instead of the removal or reduction of the present tariffs that the administration act under the law in negotiating agreements with foreign governments in an effort to limit the export to the United States of livestock commodities.

In January of this year I introduced in the U.S. Senate a bill which would curb the excessive beef imports. It would establish an annual quota equal to the average annual quantity of beef imported during the preceding 5-year period. The beef imports making up this quota would be taxed at the present rate. Imports coming into this country in addition to this quota would be subject to an additional duty. The bill has widespread support. It is cosponsored by Senators Mechem, Young of North Dakota, Jordan of Idaho, Bennett, Tower, McGee, Goldwater, Dominick, Allott, and Curtis.

There is a drastic need for relief, and it is my hope that the President will act under his authority to establish a quota system. If he should refuse to do this, legislation will be needed to establish the system.

Gentlemen, I have spoken mainly of the beef industry, but the sheep industry is in the same precarious position. Imports of lamb and mutton continue to threaten the existence of our domestic sheep industry. Further tariff reductions would only cause additional economic distress for survival.

Poundage of dressed lamb imports has increased 89 percent during the first 9 months of 1963 compared to the same period in 1962. They were up 1,000 percent as compared to the same period in 1957. Poundage of dressed mutton imports is up 7,264 percent during the first 9 months of 1963 as compared to the same period in 1957.

Present low tariffs on live lamb and on dressed lamb and mutton do not meet differences in costs of production here and abroad. Additional reductions in duties at this time would further aggravate the present serious economic situation of the domestic sheep industry.

Protection is needed—not a reduction in tariffs. I urge you to strike from the list of commodities subject to a reduction in tariffs, beef, beef products, lamb and mutton.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the problems facing the livestock industry under existing conditions are of concern to all Americans, consumers as well as producers. The U.S. News & World Report of December 16, 1963, carries an article of general interest, entitled, "A Farm Problem That Closely Concerns the

New President." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FARM PROBLEM THAT CLOSELY CONCERNS THE NEW PRESIDENT

(NOTE.—Farm troubles—declining cattle prices, wheat surpluses, cotton subsidies—may get more attention now. That's the hope of cattlemen and other farmers. President Johnson is a rancher and cattleman himself. He knows personally what it's like to sell cattle at low prices. One of the hottest issues: rising imports of foreign beef.)

OMAHA, NEBR.—There is one important U.S. business that now is depressed—the cattle business.

It just happens that cattle raising is the business in which President Lyndon B. Johnson is engaged on his ranch in Texas. The President is reported recently to have used strong language about the price he received for a batch of cattle.

Here in Omaha, on the Nation's largest cattle market, prices are down as much as 25 percent from a year ago for the kind of choice fat cattle that provide the most popular cuts of beef.

There is trouble, too, for the cattlemen on the ranges of the West and Southwest who raise the calves that go into feed lots on their way to dinner tables.

Cattlemen in the past have shied away from controls and subsidies. They are asking none now.

What cattlemen do want is a curb on the flood of imported beef that they hold is helping drive down prices they receive.

DISSATISFIED CONSUMERS

Cattlemen are irritated, too, because consumers are complaining about the high cost of beef, despite the sharply lower prices for cattle. Latest official figures show that while the average retail price of a pound of beef has dropped 6 cents in the past year, the farmer's share of that price has dropped nearly 10 cents.

Until now, the men who raise cattle on the range and those who fatten them in feed lots have received short shrift in Washington. Officials of the Department of Agriculture have brushed off complaints about rising beef imports.

The feeling now is that President Johnson, as one who understands the cattle business, will be more inclined to listen to cattlemen's complaints.

Other segments of the farming industry, too, are watching Washington for signs of the new President's attitude toward agriculture.

Throughout the Wheat Belt and the Cotton Belt, there is strong sentiment for new farm programs.

A GLUT OF WHEAT?

Wheatgrowers, last May, voted down a plan advanced by Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman to apply rigid Government controls over all phases of their business from planting to marketing. Had the plan been accepted, the wheat price would have been supported at a relatively high level.

Mr. Freeman accepted the farmers' verdict. Now, with no compulsory production control, the result could be a huge wheat crop and much lower prices unless the present drought in parts of the winter wheat belt persists and spreads. Many growers of wheat hope that President Johnson will ask Congress to provide a voluntary control plan for wheat in 1964, as well as reasonably good price support for those who wish to cooperate.

A SUBSIDY PLAN

As for cotton, the House, on December 4, approved a new plan. This plan provides a subsidy payment to enable U.S. textile mills to buy American cotton at a price competitive with that at which it is now sold to foreign textile mills in the world market.

Many in the Senate favor a somewhat different approach to the cotton problem. It will be President Johnson's aim to find a compromise that is acceptable to both the Senate and the House.

At the moment, however, cattlemen feel that it is their industry that most urgently needs attention.

Early in December, cattle prices were still dropping, and latest available figures showed the flood of imported beef rising to an all-time high.

In the Omaha stockyards, low prices and beef imports were the prime topic of conversation. Farmer after farmer told of heavy losses.

FOR A YEAR'S WORK: A LOSS

A Nebraska farmer related this experience, which stockyard officials said was typical: A year ago, in November 1962, he bought 75 beef calves that weighed an average of 400 pounds apiece. After feeding them a year, he sold them on November 17 weighing an average of 1,117 pounds apiece. These fat cattle topped the market that day at $23.50 a hundredweight. The farmer lost $35 a head, and that figure included no allowance for his labor.

Over all, prices for fattened cattle have dropped steadily for a year. The kind of choice cattle that brought $29 a hundredweight in Omaha a year ago brought barely $22 early in December of this year.

The price decline for fattened cattle has been reflected on the ranges where calves are raised and sold to cattle feeders for fattening. On the average, prices for these "feeders" have been down by $2 to $4 a hundredweight.

In Denver, an official of the American National Cattlemen's Association reports that ranchers who got from $30 to $32 a hundredweight for calves in 1962, have been selling calves for $24 to $26 a hundredweight in 1963.

Secretary Freeman holds that the major factor depressing prices has been the large number of cattle coming to market. He says that 90 percent of the imported beef is of lower grades used for hamburger and low-priced cuts, and that there has been little or no price decline for cull beef cows and other kinds of cattle that supply the cheaper grades of beef in the United States.

Experts in the cattle business agree that heavy marketings of cattle have been a major factor in price declines. They disagree, however, with Mr. Freeman's view that beef imports have not been a factor. They are urging that quotas be set for imported beef, which now are subject to only a small tariff.

Fred W. Gilmore, president of the Omaha stockyards, points out that an estimated 30 percent of meat from U.S. cattle winds up as ground beef or hamburger. Thus, in his opinion, beef imported in the volume now coming into the United States does compete directly with American beef.

"FALL GUY"?

Says Mr. Gilmore: "If we expect to sell abroad, we must be willing to accept their produce in return. My only point is: Why should the livestock producer be the fall guy? For every dollar of beef or veal we export, beef and veal imports equal $25."

Cushman S. Radebaugh, president of the Cattlemen's Association, states: "Foreign beef shipped here during the past year literally displaced more than 3 million animals which could have grazed American grasses and eaten well into the huge grain surplus."

Official figures show that in 1957 total imports of beef and veal came to 616 million pounds and equaled 4 percent of total U.S. production. This year, it's estimated that total imports will be close to 2 billion pounds, or more than three times the 1957 level, and equal to 11 percent of U.S. production.

In Australia, where exports of beef to the United States jumped from 17 million pounds in 1958 to 445 million pounds in 1962, a farm paper noted that a delegation of American cattlemen had asked the Australian Government to cut down on the flow of beef to the United States.

Commented the Australian paper: "Contrast this with what would happen in Australia if our markets were depressed and we suspected that imports were the reason. More than likely we would have a delegation on the first plane to Canberra [the capital] and down would go the chopper in the form of a prohibitive tariff or an arbitrary control of imports."

In the view of U.S. cattlemen, it's time for their Government to do something. They are looking to the cattleman in the White House to lend an ear to their story.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this time I suggest that there be a quorum call, with the understanding that the time required for it not be charged to the time available to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] from the time available on the conference report.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to express my keen disappointment in the action of the conferees in striking from the conference report one-half of section 105 of the Senate bill, which dealt with the problem of controlling population growth.

Senators will recall the Senate provision stated on page 21 of the report of the managers on the part of the House:

> Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into the problems of controlling population growth and to provide technical and other assistance to cooperating countries in carrying out programs of population control.

The report of the managers on the part of the House states that the managers agreed to a modification of the

Senate provision so that it would include the first part of the Senate amendment. The conferees, however, struck out the second part of the Senate amendment, which would have authorized the provision of technical and other assistance to cooperating countries in carrying out programs of population control.

The second part of section 105—that is, the part which the conferees struck out at the insistence of the House—was a valuable provision and should have been retained.

Senators will recall that this year, for the first time, the Senate took formal cognizance of the existence of the population problem, not only in the United States, but all over the world. I have had occasion frequently to advert to the problem, and so has the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] took the initiative in inserting section 105 into the Senate version of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. So far as I know, there was no objection either in the Foreign Relations Committee or on the floor of the Senate to section 105, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] had steered the bill through committee and through floor action.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I had occasion to point out that the attitude of the Catholic Church toward measures of population control has drastically altered.

Dr. John Rock has published, with substantial support from the Catholic Church, of which he is a devout member, a book entitled "The Time Has Come." The burden of the book is that the time has come to speak out on the critical problem of population control. A number of other eminent Catholics, including Monsignor O'Brien of Notre Dame University, have spoken out on the same subject.

There is now developing a consensus among all religious bodies and thoughtful citizens of the need for the Government to take a good, hard look at problems of population control, particularly in underdeveloped countries.

I regret, therefore, that the House conferees were unwilling to accept the provision which passed the Senate without objection. I am glad, however, that the conference report recommends the expenditure of funds to conduct research into the problem of controlling population growth. I would hope that the Administrator of the program would construe this provision very broadly indeed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. MORSE. I yield the Senator 1 more minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I reiterate my hope that the Administrator of the program will construe the authorization retained in the conference report very broadly and that in the next fiscal year we shall see a real breakthrough in efforts to establish, through programs of research, a meaningful series of methods for investigating through statistical data, and for creating through planning programs population control which can begin to make an impact on the quite frightening problem of population growth which confronts the whole world.

I point out that two of every three human beings will go to bed hungry tonight and that an unlimited birth rate is perhaps the single most serious obstacle to bringing to those two of every three people an adequate diet and an opportunity for a healthy and useful life.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 3 minutes.

PHASING OUT UNNECESSARY MONEY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, President Johnson by telephone and typed directives has ordered Government departments, including the Defense Department and all Government agencies, to report immediately further cuts made in employment and spending plans. He is demanding that the Defense Department, now costing American taxpayers approximately $1 billion each week, eliminate unnecessary spending and cut redtape. The generals and admirals are squealing.

This Nation has achieved an overkill capacity with 3,500 major delivery vehicles capable of deluging the Soviet Union with nuclear missiles. In addition we have a superfluity of manned bombers, each of which is capable of carrying a nuclear bomb with explosive killing capacity equal to all the bombs dropped in World War II by the Allies and Germans. Were the Soviet Union to unleash an attempted nuclear Pearl Harbor without warning, there is no possibility that in one strike, two strikes or more, they could destroy anything but a fraction of our missile bases, manned bombers, and very few of our Polaris submarines, each one of which fires 16 missiles with nuclear warheads. We have the competence to deliver 22 billion tons of TNT equivalent. In fact, the United States has 7 tons of TNT equivalent for each person on this planet. Talk about overkill. Yet, General Wheeler and other top brass still want more. Our President knows the facts that we have the competence to destroy every city in the Soviet Union by a factor at least 1,000 times overkill. Even were half of our atomic warhead delivery vehicles to be destroyed or miss their target in the Soviet Union, our overkill would be horrifying to any enemy.

Unnecessary spending has been discouraging to our taxpayers who now rejoice over our President's firmness and determination to cut and cut more. Secretary of Defense McNamara responded by ordering closing of many military installations including the Army depot in Port Clinton, Ohio, which must be phased out by January 1967. "Phased out" is Pentagonese for closing. Some Congressmen who have proclaimed themselves "watchdogs of the Treasury" are yelping the loudest when the economy ax is poised over their districts. Lord Byron, many years ago, wrote:

> Tis sweet to hear the watchdogs honest bark
> Bay deep-mouth'd welcome as we draw near
> home.

Some Congressmen who brag about their record favoring governmental economy now seem to be yelping the loudest when military installations within their districts are affected by President Johnson's cutback.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committe of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 seconds and ask for the attention of my good friend the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

I want my friend the majority leader to know I am waiting with bated breath and great curiosity the rationalizations for the conference report from its proponents. Since I have now consumed nearly 30 minutes of my time, I wonder if they would oblige me with their first defense of this monstrosity.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am interested in the extemporaneous remarks of the Senator from Oregon. Yesterday he talked about not taking people off the hook. Today I notice he is putting the "bait" on his breath rather than on the hook.

I do not really understand the full logic of the Senator's arguments. I shall take 2 or 3 minutes on the conference report, which Senators will be called to vote upon in the near future.

As one of the conferees, I freely admit that the proposal is far from perfect legislation. There are some things in it to which I feel almost any Senator could find objection. There are also things left out of it which I am sure any Senator could find reason to support.

We must realize that only about 3 weeks remain of the present year, and that the provisions of the conference report will apply only for the following 6 months. It is my opinion that during the 6 months the Congress and the executive branch of our Government should get busy to work out a revision not only of our foreign aid program, but also of the entire Foreign Service, and our relationships with other countries.

I believe the Senator from Oregon has performed a real service, although perhaps he exasperated some of us at times during the length of time he took to perform that service. The Senator has performed a real service by pointing out glaring weaknesses in the program as it exists at the present time.

As I have said, we should pay attention to revising our foreign relations operations generally. I have received complaints from Ambassadors. One of them resigned because he was humiliated by other agencies of Government which perhaps did not have direct supervision over him. He was bypassed in undertaking to carry out a program about which he knew more than those who bypassed him knew.

He is not the only ambassador who has been humiliated by having to say, "I can't say yes or no, I can't say maybe, until I talk with Washington," and perhaps get an authorization from somebody who does not know much about the matter being discussed.

There have been other occasions when persons on lower levels, to whom the State Department has insisted on giving the title of ambassador, have been sent to foreign countries. We have seen ambassadors reduced to the level of clerkships; and we have seen clerks elevated to the role of ambassadors.

A great deal of work needs to be done. I feel, as I know many of my colleagues do, that we are only looking for trouble when we try to force our image on every country in the world with which we have relationships and which we are trying to help in some way or another.

Let the Senate approve the conference report. It has only 6 months to run. Then let us go to work on a more thorough revision of our foreign aid program—I do not say "review"; I am through using the word "review."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to do so, I wish to yield myself 2 minutes to take up certain measures on the calendar to which there is no objection. This is a most unusual procedure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will that be on the time of the proponents of the conference report?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. It is very interesting, I should observe.

REPORT TO CONGRESS BY COMMISSION ON DISPOSITION OF ALCATRAZ ISLAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 753, Senate bill 2364.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2364) to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a Federal commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island", approved October 16, 1963 (77 Stat. 247), is amended by striking out "December 31, 1963" and inserting "six months after the date on which all the members of the Commission have been appointed".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 772), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island should have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to the Congress.

STATEMENT

The Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island was established by Public Law 88–138 (77 Stat. 247, approved October 16, 1963). Section 4 of the act provides that the Commission shall submit a report to the Congress not later than December 31, 1963.

The December 31, 1963, date does not allow sufficient time for the organization of the Commission and the preparation of its report. The bill amends the act to provide that the report shall be submitted not later than 6 months after the date on which all the members of the Commission have been appointed.

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

Attached and made a part of this report is a letter dated December 6, 1963, from the General Services Administration, and a letter dated December 9, 1963, from the Department of Justice, on a similar House bill, H.R. 9341.

REMOVAL OF REQUIREMENT OF ALIEN TO MAKE DECLARATION OF INTENTION TO BECOME CITIZEN BEFORE ENLISTMENT OF APPOINTMENT TO RESERVE COMPONENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 756, House bill 3005.

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 3005) to amend sections 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the requirement that an alien must make a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States before he may be enlisted or appointed in a Reserve component was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 775), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would authorize enlistments in the Reserve components by persons who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

EXPLANATION

Sections 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code, prescribe qualifications for enlistment and appointment in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces. Among the qualifications for enlistment or appointment is that the person must have made a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States or he must have previously served in the Armed Forces.

Before enactment of Public Law 87–143, similar requirements of a legal declaration of intention to become a citizen were imposed on aliens desiring to enlist in the Regular Army or the Regular Air Force. Public Law 87–143 repealed the requirement for declaration of intention to become a citizen as it applied to persons desiring to enlist in the Army or the Air Force. After enactment of that act the Army and the Air Force have enlisted persons who could furnish proof of lawful admission to the United States for permanent residency. This bill would conform the qualifications for enlistment or appointment in the Reserve components to those applicable to enlistment in the Regular Army or the Regular Air Force.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 eliminated the requirement for the "declaration of intent" as a prerequisite to naturalization and made such a declaration an optional decision without any bearing whatever on the alien's eligibility to become a citizen of the United States.

An alien cannot now be enlisted in the Reserve components if he has not filed a declaration of intent to become a citizen. However, this same alien may enlist in the Regular components or he may be inducted under the Universal Military Training and Service Act and sent overseas. But while overseas he is ineligible to apply for officer candidate school or for a direct Reserve appointment with concurrent active duty because he has not filed a "declaration of intent," and he may not file one unless he does so while physically present in the United States.

This bill would remove the requirement for declaring an intent to become a citizen and requires instead proof of lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence. Thus otherwise qualified aliens would be permitted to become members of the Reserve components under the same conditions as those prescribed for enlistment in the Regular components.

TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES PERFORMED UNDER INCORRECT ORDERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 757, House bill 4338.

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 4338) to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances for travel performed under orders that are canceled, revoked, or modified, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the opposition ought to take some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair meant to say 56 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. What was the decision of the majority leader?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thought the Senator from Oregon ought to take some of the remaining time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am waiting for one of my beloved and able colleagues to come to the floor to speak for 15 minutes against the monstrous conference report. It is interesting that the only defense I have heard against it so far is that it will expire in 6 months.

I wonder if the proponents of the conference report would be willing to divide the amount authorized, and, instead of the agency getting $3.6 billion, in a further fleecing of the American taxpayer, cut the amount, on the basis that it has only 6 more months to go, because the pipelines are full. If we stop giving foreign aid a dime, the pipelines are full of hundreds of millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money. We would not have to give foreign aid a cent.

It is a most interesting argument in defense of the conference report that we ought to adopt it because there are only 6 more months to go. The proponents do not want a review; they want a revision. It is the same old story as in the committee report. The committee report made our case. Now, in the last couple of hours of debate on the terrible conference report, the proponents of the report do not want a review; they want a revision. It is about time. It is long overdue. I should think they would be willing to come to an agreement that foreign aid be cut back $3 billion and give $600 million—$100 million a month for the next 6 months. That is too much, but I might be willing to agree to that. I would not agree to anything more.

Therefore, I shall vote against the conference report.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] and the Senator from Oregon made their case yesterday. There have been no comments from the proponents of the conference report concerning the devastating reports of the Comptroller General of the United States, an agent of the Congress, who, in report after report, as found on his on-the-spot checks, said he found waste of hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers in the foreign aid program.

Now, in the dying moments of the debate, we are told by the proponents of the report that it ought to be revised. I think it ought to be stopped—s-t-o-p-p-e-d. It ought to be stopped. We ought to bring the whole fiasco to an end and stop deceiving the American people into believing that foreign aid, as it is now conducted, is of some benefit to this Republic. We ought to stop waving the flag behind the desk of the Presiding Officer into tatters with the old, fallacious lie that it is cheaper to keep men from foreign countries in uniform with American taxpayers' dollars than to put American boys in uniform and on foreign shores.

The undeniable fact is that the so-called foreign armies are no defense to the United States. Go to Korea. Go to Taiwan. Go to any place else in the world where we are supporting foreign armies. They are not protecting American security. Take the Pacific, for example. The U.S. 7th Fleet, the U.S. air armada, the thousands of American boys whom we have stationed in the Pacific, are the ones who are protecting American security. Yet the proponents wave the flag and give the American people the false impression that the forces in foreign countries would be of help to us in time of war. We would have to spend more American taxpayers' money for them and, at the same time, spend the billions of dollars required for full mobilization of the United States. We ought to cut it out. We ought to take a look at the foreign aid program, as I have said over and over in the debate, and start anew, on the basis of new conditions, new requirements, new restrictions. We ought to say to foreign countries, "If you want foreign aid on the basis of this kind of arrangement, come and ask for it. Commit yourself to these requirements and we will have a new type of foreign aid, which will take in only 50 of you. Only 50 of you—not 107—will be able to dip your hands into the U.S. Treasury.

Such a program would be based upon proved need. That means that Great Britain is out; France is out; Canada is out; Portugal is out; the Lowlands are out; Norway is out. Why in the world are the American taxpayers subsidizing those countries? Why in the world should the American taxpayers be building infrastructure in France?

This development in this country is a shocking thing. I am shocked by the developments in Congress and in the executive branch of the Government. We owe it not only to our people, but we owe it also to the security of this Republic, to end foreign aid and to begin again.

I am delighted that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has come into the Chamber.

I now take my seat in great curiosity and with more than bated breath to listen to the defense of the shocking, inexcusable conference report on foreign aid, by which it is proposed to continue to take from the American people hundreds of millions of dollars that ought to be saved for them.

I insert in the Congressional Record at this point an article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. There was one thing in this morning's Washington Post that amounted to something. The article points to some abject poverty in the United States. We would give away $3,600 million in foreign aid. But, if we try to do something for the underdeveloped areas of America, for the poverty stricken people of America, we are confronted with the great economy drive argument.

Charity begins at home. It is about time that Congress took a look at the needs of the American people and appropriated some money for the benefit of underdeveloped areas of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that this enlightening and shocking story of poverty in the United States be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 13, 1963]

Twenty-six Million Others Have Bare Essentials: 1 Out of 10 Americans Lives in Abject Poverty, Study Reveals

(By Eve Edstrom)

Twenty million Americans—about 1 out of 10—exist in such "abject poverty" that they must do without bare necessities.

Another 26 million—which adds up to almost one out of four Americans—live at "minimum adequacy" levels.

These are the conservative estimates upon which the National Policy Committee on pockets of poverty focused yesterday at the opening of a 2-day session here.

Its meetings come at a time when the Johnson administration is considering programs to eradicate mass poverty in affluent America.

The committee, which includes such distinguished political economists as Harvard's Seymour Harris, warned that "even with a more affluent America," the number of poor will increase substantially during the next two decades unless remedial steps are taken.

Furthermore, the committee released material drawn from a 2-year study which emphasizes that poverty will not be done away with "by policies aimed at bringing about full employment."

This is because today's impoverished families sit outside of the marketplace, their lot is not the direct result of inadequate economic growth rates because they are not part of the economic structure.

"Their poverty is the result of special circumstances rather than of the rate * * * of economic activity," it was stated.

In setting forth the "special circumstances," the committee put forth a formula for not being poor, as well as for being poor.

To not be poor, it was stated, one must be a white northern city resident between the ages of 25 and 45 who is married with no more than two children, who has attained as much education as possible, and who is in good physical and mental health.

The surest way to be poor is to be nonwhite, live in a rural area, and be a female who is over 65 and is the head of a household.

In the above circumstances, 84 out of every 100 of these nonwhite rural families live at lower than subsistence levels.

Actually, the committee emphasizes that all nonwhites, whether they live in the city or on the farm, all families headed by young or old females, all residents of rural areas and the South, and all persons over 65 have high-risk poverty rates.

AGED MAKE SOME PROGRESS

However, in the last decade and because of social security, the aged have made the most progress in moving out of the "abject poverty" state.

Another poverty prone segment of the population involves the young—male family heads between the ages of 14 and 25—and their numbers are increasing.

"The honor of being called family head bestowed too soon brings with it a greater likelihood of poverty, particularly since 1957," it was said. "For most, low income is no momentary detour but the foreshadowing of a life of poverty.

"Their situation is worsening and * * * the problem of the young in contemporary America typifies the problem of the poor: submerged like an iceberg."

Poverty also attacks those with less than 8 years of education and families which have more than 6 children under 18.

Such groups now comprise a "new class of Americans—those split off from our affluent society," said James G. Patton, chairman of the 38-member national policy committee.

"They constitute a shocking paradox in American life. When the economy dips their plight worsens but when it rises they benefit little if at all."

This is why programs must be developed to tackle the special problems of the underprivileged, in addition to programs to stimulate the economy, he said.

Poverty can be eradicated by the year 2000, Patton said, but only if the United States embarks on new or expanded educational, housing, public works, medicare conservation corps, and food stamp programs.

Patton, who also is president of the National Farmers Union, said he and other committee members had consulted with the late President Kennedy on ways to eliminate poverty and will consult with President Johnson after firm recommendations are adopted.

The committee, founded 2 years ago by the Farmers Educational Foundation, includes former President Truman and foremost economists, scientists, sociologists, business and professional leaders from every region of the country.

Much of the committee's data on poverty is based on a study which economist Oscar Ornati directed for the 20th Century Fund. It will be published next spring.

LESS THAN $2,500 INCOME

In explaining his economic groupings, Ornati stated that families of four, with income of less than $2,500 annually, were placed in the "abject poverty" group. Families of four, with annual incomes of less than $4,500, were included in " minimum adequacy" group.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor for the time being. Does the Senator from Arkansas wish to speak at this time, or shall I yield to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to speak now.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I cannot help but express disappointment at the bill as it comes before the Senate from committee of conference. It seems to me that our conferees merely bowed down to the House managers and struck from the bill practically every amendment of any consequence which was adopted by the Senate after 3 weeks of debate.

One of the amendments stricken dealt with the $200 million in the investment guarantee fund. In the present bill, as it will be debated by the Senate, there is a fund of $270 million known as the investment guarantee fund.

When the investment guarantee fund was first set up in 1948, the law required that reserves of 100 percent be maintained. Over the years the law was amended and reserve requirements were steadily decreased.

In 1961, when the Attorney General was requested to render an opinion with regard to the necessity for reserves in the Development Loan Fund, he advised that in connection with guarantees made under the Development Loan Fund and the investment guarantee fund, reserves were not necessary because the guarantee contracts were backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government.

In fact, in the bill before us, the law has been changed regarding the reserve requirement. It provides that in accord with the Attorney General's opinion guarantee contracts are now unequivocally backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government.

In view of this fact, when this bill was considered on the floor of the Senate I offered an amendment to reduce the reserves of $270 million presently existing in the guarantee fund by rescinding the $200 million borrowing authority. This amendment was adopted by the Senate, but unfortunately it was deleted in conference.

The investment guarantee fund has been in existence for over 15 years, and during this time the total losses of the fund have amounted to only $667,000. In view of this experience, it would appear that the $70 million that would have remained in the reserve, had my amendment been retained by the conferees, would have been more than adequate to take care of the losses that might have been sustained in any one future year. In fact, in the justifications presented by the Agency to the Senate Appropriations Committee on the foreign aid bill for fiscal year 1964, it was admitted that the $270 million presently in the reserve is far in excess of need.

That is why I cannot understand the action of the conferees in permitting my amendment to be stricken from the bill.

As I pointed out in the debate, which took place 3 or 4 weeks ago, efforts are even now being made by our administration to use a part of this fund for purposes other than guarantees for private investors.

As I pointed out, if the $200 million item were stricken, there would still remain $70 million, which would be more than adequate, to provide for losses.

However, our conferees receded on this amendment. I do not know what was behind their withdrawal. However, I understand that some of the big bankers were fearful that if borrowing authority were rescinded they would not feel so secure in making loans and investments abroad.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I will yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield myself such time as I will take to ask the question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well; I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This question arose in conference. The Senator has made it quite clear that either way there is absolutely no effect upon the appropriation of money authorized by the bill. The House merely took the position, in accord with what the Senator has said, that since the Government is unquestionably liable for the amount, striking the notes which would be redeemed by the amendment would have no substantial effect. It was thought that psychologically, if the amount were struck out fears might be raised in the minds of some people who are not as thoroughly aware of the way it operates as the Senator from Louisiana and others are.

This proposal was considered to be a useless gesture. I personally thought it would be all right to keep it in the bill. The House objected. As often happens, the conferees on the part of the House insisted on their position. I did not envision any substantive damage that might be done; in fact, I do not believe it does any damage to our financial obligations, or does damage in any other way. It is strictly a bookkeeping operation. I believe the Senator has explained it that way. If the notes issued by the Treasury were redeemed, we would be liable. If a catastrophe occurred which would impose an obligation on this country to repay, we would have to do it under present understandings. So, Mr. President, it is purely a bookkeeping gesture. It did not seem like the kind of issue that we should fight to the death to sustain and thereby hold up the conference report. That is about all there was to it.

Mr. ELLENDER. At least, the administration would have had to return to Congress for the appropriations if my amendment prevailed. I do not know of any time when Congress failed to appropriate money to pay just bills. The conference report would take control away from Congress; and my fear, as I said in the original debate, is that sooner or later, if that money remains available, it will come to be used for purposes other than paying off losses on guarantee contracts. As I stated during the debate on the bill, the House has already attempted to use some of this money for other purposes. Fortunately, the attempt did not succeed. But if such a large sum of money remains available in the reserve, the chances are that some day it will be used for other purposes.

During the course of the extensive debate on the bill, the Senate adopted amendments which were offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado, which closed to the executive branch a method of financing development loans that has been much criticized by the Congress.

In sections 204 and 253 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, it has been provided that payments made by borrowers of development loans and on Alliance for Progress loans could be reloaned to borrowers without congressional act. These provisions permitted the executive department to bypass the Appropriations Committees of Congress in the funding of its loan program.

If the junior Senator from Colorado had not offered amendments which in effect require that these loan repayments be reappropriated before they could be used again and thus close the "revolving door," I would have offered such amendments myself when the foreign aid bill was originally considered by the Senate.

It is most unfortunate that the conferees saw fit to lessen Congress' control of expenditures in this program by deleting the amendments of the junior Senator from Colorado.

I am a realist, however, and I know that at this late hour in the session there is no chance of reversing the action taken by the conferees, but I wish to point out that unless the "revolving door" financing provision is deleted from next year's foreign aid bill, I will do all in my power to have it stricken when the bill is considered in the Senate next year.

The conferees yielded on another very important amendment.

During the very first week of the great debate on foreign aid which occurred last month, the Senate adopted an amendment sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, which deleted from the bill the $1,500 million of authorization for the Development Loan Fund for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

In advocating this amendment, the senior Senator from Oregon pointed out that it was absolutely essential for his amendment to be adopted, since it would put the Agency for International Development on notice that Congress was displeased with the foreign aid program as presently constituted, and that if this program were to continue, a completely new approach would be necessary for fiscal year 1965. The amendment was adopted by the Senate because of this reason.

The action of the conferees in effect, then, would express approval of the program as presently set up. I do not believe this is truly the will of Congress. I do not believe we are helping the program by perpetuating this continuing authority for the Development Loan Fund. I am surprised that the Senate conferees yielded on this amendment.

I think they were wrong to do so.

I must iterate that I deeply regret that the Senate conferees were unable to retain more of the Senate amendments when the Foreign Aid Authorization Act, as approved and passed by the Senate, was taken to conference with Members of the House. I am sure that each of those amendments, if they had prevailed, would have done a great deal to strengthen our foreign aid program. Certainly their adoption indicated that the aid administrators had better look to their laurels and begin a businesslike review of the program for the coming fiscal year.

I was particularly disappointed to note the changes which occurred in the amendment, sponsored by me, designed to limit military aid to African countries to not more than $25 million in any fiscal year. The text of that amendment, as adopted by the Senate, is as follows:

> SEC. 512. RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY AID TO AFRICA.—(a) The value of grant programs of defense articles for African countries, pursuant to any authority contained in this part other than section 507, in any fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 1964, shall not exceed $25,000,000.
>
> (b) Internal security requirement shall not, unless the President determines otherwise and promptly reports such determination to the Senate Committee of Foreign Relations and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, be the basis for military assistance programs for African countries.

Now the foreign aid authorization bill, as it came to the Senate from the House, also included a section dealing with aid to African countries. It provided that military aid could be given only for internal security requirements, and for public works, or civic action programs authorized by section 505(b) of the act. I have some arguments with the latter section, but I am completely opposed to allowing "internal security requirements" be the basis for the granting of military aid. This is exactly what I was striving to avoid. These three words "internal security requirements" are to blame for a large part of the current situation in Latin America. Once we get a military aid program off the ground in Africa, it will not be long before our friends to the south of us appear to be living in the utmost peace and prosperity by comparison.

I remind the Senate that my amendment placed an annual ceiling of $25 million on grant programs of defense articles for African countries. It also prohibited assistance for internal security requirements unless the President determined otherwise.

Reading from page 24 of the conference report, I find that the committee of conference accepted a compromise between the two versions; that is, between the House and Senate language relating to military aid to African countries. In my view, it is not very much of a compromise, because the impact of my amendment has been dissipated completely.

The compromise language states that grant programs of defense articles for African countries for fiscal year 1964 shall not exceed $25 million. Notice that the limiting figure applies only to fiscal year 1964. Nothing is said of future fiscal years, and it is the future that we must look to in the present. Action should be taken now to make as sure as possible that a tight lid is clamped, and kept closed, on the military aid program as it applies to Africa. Bear in mind that Africa is a new continent, so far as our military aid programs are concerned. I am certain that our military missions, if not kept reined in, will make sure that it grows up very rapidly until it becomes like so many other areas which are struggling under the armies built up and maintained by the American taxpayer.

The language adopted by the conference committee provides that grant military assistance may be furnished to African countries only for internal security unless the President determines otherwise. That is a far cry from my original language, adopted by the Senate, which stated very plainly that:

> Internal security requirements shall not, unless the President determines otherwise * * * be the basis for military assistance programs for African countries.

The committee of conference reversed that language; its intent is negated completely.

The danger in this matter lies in the definition of "internal security." When do armaments provided for "internal security" become the agents for external aggression? As I pointed out in my African report, I discovered our country had spent over $600,000 to train paratroopers for the newly emerging and desperately poor country of Mali. By what definition I asked, and I again ask, by what definition can the training of paratroops be justified as internal security? There cannot, of course, be any valid answer.

But beyond this, consider the injustice we are doing these newly independent nations, and their people, by encouraging their governments to build up large military forces which must be maintained, at least someday, by taxes on the native population. We are doing them a grave wrong, and apparently are doing it, with our eyes wide open and of our own free will.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **ELLENDER**. I yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. On my time. I do not quite understand the Senator. The conference report retains $25 million.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. Yes, but it is effective for only 1 year. And it is not necessary to secure the prior approval of the President. The military authorities can continue to use the money if they decide it is necessary to be used for internal security. It would not require positive action by the President. The President is only required to act if the aid is given for some reason other than internal security or civic action.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. I am puzzled by the point the Senator from Louisiana is making. The language reads:

> SEC. 512. RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY AID TO AFRICA.—No military assistance shall be furnished on a grant basis to any country in Africa, except for internal security requirements or for programs described in section 505(b) of this chapter, unless the President determines otherwise and promptly reports such determination to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. That is similar to to the language I placed in the bill.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. It is still in the report.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. But it has been changed.

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. I thought I was reading from the conference report, on page 7. Perhaps I did not read it correctly; but I used to read correctly in the old days. What is the Senator from Louisiana reading from? The language of the conference report reads:

> SEC. 512. RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY AID TO AFRICA.—No military assistance shall be furnished on a grant basis to any country in Africa, except for internal security requirements or for programs described in section 505(b) of this chapter, unless the President determines otherwise and promptly reports such determination to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The value of grant programs of defense articles for African countries in fiscal year 1964, pursuant to any authority contained in this part other than section 507, shall not exceed $25,000,000.

I do not understand what the Senator from Louisiana is complaining about.

Mr. **ELLENDER**. My amendment, deleted in the conference, reads as follows:

> SEC. 512. RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY AID TO AFRICA.—(a) The value of grant programs of defense articles for African countries, pursuant to any authority contained in this part other than section 507, in any fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 1964, shall not exceed $25,000,000.
>
> (b) Internal security requirement shall not, unless the President determines otherwise and promptly reports such determination to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Speaker of the House of

Representatives, be the basis for military assistance programs for African countries.

The conference committee action would require no positive action by the President, and that is where the trouble is.

The conference committee has allowed the military authorities to do as they please. They may alone determine the requirements. Military missions exist in many countries of the world. If my memory serves me correctly, there are only six or seven military missions in Africa, although I do not remember the exact number. Those missions abroad continually send recommendations to the Department of Defense, in Washington. I have even known of places—such as Pakistan, Afghanistan, or India—where the military missions have said that a certain amount of money was needed to supply the needs of a certain number of soldiers.

Then the host country will say, "That may be true, but we cannot afford that much."

The reply is "Do what you can, and we will do the rest."

Let us consider the case of Mali, which I have already presented. We spent $600,000 in Mali, to train paratroopers. But anyone with commonsense knows that paratroopers are not necessary in order to protect the citizens of Mali. That training was requested in order to make possible some action against the neighbors of Mali.

There is also the case of Somali, to which we have furnished much aid. When that country asked us for weapons, we said, after conferring with the British and the Italians, "We think we can furnish you with about $17 million in hardware."

They replied, "Oh, no; that is not enough. Russia will give us $26 or $30 million. So we do not want yours." Now they will be getting that equipment from Russia while continuing to receive economic aid from us. Is that for internal security purposes? No; it is to enable Somali to take over part of Kenya. Somali is getting ready to annex a considerable part of Kenya, because Somali says that in that area there are more Somalis than Kenyans.

Such situations will continue; and if we let these countries have more military equipment than is necesary for their own police forces, we can expect trouble in the future.

It will be recalled that we tried to assist Pakistan, and the result was to make the Afghans angry with us. Today, we are trying to help India, and the result is that we have the Pakistanis angry with us. So I say we must limit our military assistance to the amounts required solely for domestic police forces as such needs are determined and reported by the President.

That was my objective in connection with this amendment. I thought it was necessary to apply some brake on the amount of military equipment to be given by the United States to the African countries, inasmuch as ultimately much of it may be used by them beyond their own borders, in order to annex or take over other areas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. We are helping Pakistan, are we not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Louisiana agree that when we are helping Pakistan, we are also aiding Red China?

Mr. ELLENDER. That seems to be the case, particularly if the programs now envisioned go into effect. I understand that Pakistan is now flirting with Red China, and that Chou En-lai is going there. Why he will visit there, I do not know; but undoubtedly it will not be merely to have a good time. Surely, he must have some ulterior motive. But despite the flirtation with Red China, we are furnishing Pakistan, too, with much economic aid and other aid. I do not know what the motive is but it may be that these countries are learning lessons from Western Europe. I well remember that when Schumann of France and others were up for election in Western Europe, at a time when we were giving their countries aid, they said, "You had better give us more aid, or the big Russian bear will catch us." So we gave them far more than had been anticipated by those who voted for the Marshall Plan.

However, there is not time now to discuss more instances of this sort.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time remains available to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. MORSE. How much time does the Senator from Louisiana wish to have?

Mr. ELLENDER. Five minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 5 more minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 more minutes.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Has any adequate explanation been given of our folly in Cambodia, into which we have poured several hundred million dollars, only to find that not only has that money been wasted, and also that the military aid and arms we have provided Cambodia will be turned against us by Red China. Is a similar situation developing in connection with Pakistan?

Mr. ELLENDER. We never seem to learn. Many of those weapons are used against our friends, and there is no doubt that we shall come to regret that we have given much of our money and much military equipment to Cambodia and other countries.

So I am giving this warning to the Senate. The situation I have described has developed in the Far East and in almost all other parts of the world; yet we do not seem to learn from experience.

Mr. GRUENING. Perhaps my question should be addressed to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee; possibly he has the explanation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot yield to him at this time.

Mr. GRUENING. I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I requested the adoption of another amendment, and I spoke at length on it. It was an amendment to Public Law 480. I think the House committee went far afield by including in its version of the bill the provisions which dealt with Public Law 480,

May I call the attention of Senators to page 20 of my 1960 report on foreign operations of our Government, where I devote a section to what appears to be administrative abuses and inept business transactions with foreign governments, which result in financial losses to our country that can run into billions of dollars and also cause a serious and unnecessary drain on the U.S. dollar.

As you know, under the Public Law 480 program, we sell surplus agricultural products to foreign countries and accept payment in the currencies of these countries to be used for loans and grants to develop the economic resources of such countries and to defray expenses of U.S. programs in such countries. The United States subsidizes these exports, through private channels, by paying the difference between the U.S. price of the commodity at dockside and its price on the world market.

The exporter receives U.S. dollars but the commodities are paid for in the currency of the importing country. The currency is deposited in a U.S. Treasury account in a bank of the importing country to be allocated and used in accordance with the provisions and objectives of the Act and the provisions of the special sales agreement negotiated in connection with each sale or series of sales.

Under title I, alone, agreements for sale of agricultural commodities from 1955 to June 30, 1960, totaled an estimated $6.8 billion CCC cost. It can readily be seen that this is big business and that if properly handled, this program could go a long way not only toward assisting, through loans, the economic development of foreign countries, but in defraying the expense of U.S. programs overseas. However, I found that in many of these sales an unrealistic exchange rate, bearing little relation to the commercial market rate of exchange, was used in generating the foreign currencies from these sales.

For example, I selected 12 sales made to 4 countries which I visited; namely, Spain, Poland, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. These sales, the agreements on which were entered into between 1955 and 1959, generated foreign currencies the dollar equivalent of which was $857 million plus. However, if these sales had been made at the commercial market rates of exchange, prevailing at the approximate time of the sales, these 12 sales should have generated approximately $1,488 million, or $631 million more than was realized. A schedule on page 21 of my report reflects some of the details on the particular sales.

I have been unable to obtain any intelligent justification as to why such unrealistic exchange rates were used in the sales of these commodities to the great financial loss to the United States. The shocking thing about these transactions is that while the cost of subsidizing these commodities at the world market price is reported, in detail, to the Congress by CCC, no mention can be found anywhere of the losses sustained by accepting an import exchange rate well below the commercial rate prevailing at the time of the sale.

The acceptance of such arbitrary exchange rates is not unique to the agreements in the countries I have cited. There are at least 12 countries where sales agreements were entered into and a special import exchange rate was used which was substantially different from the commercial market rate of exchange prevailing at the time. In many countries where we accepted such import rates, which were less than the going rate of exchange, we are spending U.S. dollars to buy foreign currencies to pay for U.S. programs.

Actually, this is only one type of a series of unbusinesslike practices and administrative abuses growing out of these commodity sales, which are supposed to be carried on in a businesslike manner, but which result in huge dollar losses to the United States. For example, although in a number of countries that portion of the sales proceeds which is to be loaned to the foreign government is placed in a special account in a bank of that country and loan agreements are signed, the money is not actually borrowed and it lies idle, not bearing interest and depreciating to the extent that the country's currency may depreciate in relation to the dollar.

Further, it is not uncommon that although a Public Law 480 commodity sale may have generated only a portion of the proceeds it should have, because of the acceptance of an unrealistic exchange rate, the loan agreement calls for a different rate, which is more favorable to the borrower and further shrinks the proceeds of the sale. Further, many of these loan agreements provide that they can be repaid in U.S. dollars or in the currency of the foreign country, but the incentive for paying in dollars is only 1-percent reduction in the interest rate. Also most of these loan agreements can be changed at any time without the knowledge of the Treasury or the Congress and, too frequently, they appear to deteriorate into something resembling a gift rather than a loan.

In the sale of surplus commodities under Public Law 480, an interdepartmental committee, consisting of representatives of the various U.S. Government agencies which have an interest in, or will be users of, a portion of the sales proceeds, determine the percentage of such portion that will be used for the various purposes in the importing country. These committees are sometimes referred to as "buzzard" committees.

From some of the contracts which have been negotiated, it might appear that instead of the United States negotiating in its own interest, each agency was trying to obtain the largest possible percentage of the sales receipts for its own use, while the State Department seemingly was trying to obtain all it could for the foreign country involved, and one can only wonder who was present representing our Government and the taxpayer.

As a result, it might appear that particular agencies are allocated funds far in excess of their real or immediate needs, which funds are then frozen in bank accounts in the foreign countries involved and are subject to depreciation through the inflation of the currency of such countries, while, at the same time, the U.S. Treasury is going into the commercial market to buy currencies of these same countries with U.S. hard dollars, to operate its other programs.

We cannot expect to do business on such a basis without going bankrupt. We can afford to make gifts to peoples of underprivileged countries, or when a disaster occurs in some foreign land, but when we permit our business transactions with foreign countries, even though one of the objectives is the economic development of such countries, our transactions should be on a business basis. Otherwise, we are not only suffering huge losses, but we are gaining the disrespect of the people with whom we are dealing.

In my opinion, the practices which I have outlined present a fantastic picture of waste and irresponsibility which can amount to billions of dollars of losses to the United States.

In this connection and on the basis of these facts, to correct such abuses, I introduced an amendment to Public Law 488—section 101(f)—which was approved August 8, 1961, and which required this country, in making Public Law 480, title I sales, to obtain, under such agreements, rates of exchange which were not less favorable than the rates at which U.S. Government agencies could buy currencies from the U.S. disbursing officers in the respective countries.

This amendment, for the most part, stopped this practice. The House foreign aid authorization bill, section 402(a), changed section 101(f) of Public Law 480 so as to require only that the United States obtain the highest rates of exchange legally obtainable. This amendment would not only permit the relaxing of the terms of the sales agreements with respect to the rate of exchange; it would also permit U.S. Government agencies conducting programs with foreign currencies to purchase such currencies at rates other than those at which the commodities were sold.

House Report No. 646, at page 48, gives this as the only substantial reason for this amendment, and states that the Government agencies would like to get the currencies at realistic rates of exchange from the U.S. Treasury. Nothing is said as to why the U.S. Government should not get realistic rates when the commodities are sold—and, Mr. President, let no one tell you that these unfavorable rates we received for these sales resulted from a desire to get rid of the commodities. They resulted from political or giveaway considerations dictated by the State Department or the foreign-assistance groups.

Perhaps I can shed more light on this amendment by going into a little more detail. It is my understanding that in two countries—namely, Indonesia and Poland—the purpose of the Ellender amendment was defeated—although I do not know on what authority—by fixing the official rates of exchange between these two countries and the United States at arbitrarily low rates to correspond with the collection rates received in the Public Law 480 sales. This, of course, did not please the agencies downtown which had a need for foreign currencies, because when they came up for an appropriation from Congress for construction or other program purposes in certain foeign countries, they wanted to receive their full dollar's worth. In this regard, we cannot blame them; but why should we not also get our dollar's worth in making these Public Law 480 sales?

It probably was not surprising that at the hearings on the State Department appropriation bill this year, representatives of the Foreign Buildings Operations of the State Department, which uses substantial foreign currencies, complained:

> The recent Ellender amendment to Public Law 480 had the effect of requiring this program to purchase Public Law 480 Polish zlotys at the rate of 24 to $1 instead of the previous rate of 55 to $1, which overnight multiplied the cost by a 2.3 factor.

It was pointed out that this was not at all the result of the so-called Ellender amendment, but was due to the action of the executive department in accepting an arbitrarily low exchange rate in connection with Public Law 480 commodity sales to Poland. Inasmuch as the witnesses indicated that they had received their impression from the Treasury Department, there was addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, by the subcommittee chairman, a letter, dated September 12, 1963, which, in substance requested advice as to why such an arbitrarily low exchange rate had been established.

By letter of October 11, 1963, from the Secretary, after an explanation to the effect that 24 zlotys to $1 was the best rate the U.S. negotiators could get in negotiating the sales to Poland, it was pointed out that any of the sales proceeds which the United States did not use, would, by the terms of the agreement, be repaid by Poland in dollars, after a specified number of years, at the same rate, and that as the disbursing officer's sales to the U.S. agencies were also at 24 to $1, no loss to the U.S. Government was involved. In other words, it was simply bypassing the law. Accordingly, why is there any need to change section 101(f), if we are not losing money under it now, provided Poland lives up to its agreement and we do not decide later to give Poland most of the proceeds? Why should we change the law so that we shall begin to lose money on such transactions? Again, let me point out that we did not have to make the sales to Poland at substantially less than half of the world market price; and, accordingly, the decision to make these sales had to be a purely political determination, and in the interest of foreign aid. Incidentally, it is my understanding that the Treasury Department reportedly was unable to advise the committee what a realistic exchange rate between the United States and Poland would be at the present time; but if we ask any traveler who recently has been in Poland, he will tell us that, except from the U.S. disbursing officer and from official Polish banks, one can obtain throughout Poland 75 zlotys to $1, and nobody asks any questions.

I think the facts that I have given show ample reason why an amendment such as this should not be attached to the foreign aid authorization act, and I urged my colleagues attending the conference with the House on this bill not to recede to the House position on section 402(a) of H.R. 7885.

Notwithstanding my plea for the deletion of the House amendment, the Senate conferees agreed to the House.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that the agencies in attempting to obtain some shortsighted selfish gains for themselves and their employees abroad by this House amendment, have really outsmarted the U.S. Government. The language of the House amendment reads as follows:

> (f) Obtain rates of exchange applicable to the sale of commodities under such agreements which are not less favorable than the highest of exchange rates legally obtainable from the Government or agencies thereof in the respective countries.

I emphasize "highest" and "legally obtainable." The highest legally obtainable rate in most multiple rate countries would be the tourist rate, which would be much higher than the so-called official rate or commercial rate for imports. As I interpret it, this amendment would make Public Law 480 agreements nonnegotiable in the very countries where our agencies want to get away from the Ellender amendment.

A good example is Brazil, where the rate of exchange in the community banks down there is about 1,200 cruzeiros to $1. This is the highest legally obtainable rate. Do you think the Brazilians are going to give us 1,200 cruzeiros to the dollar in purchasing our wheat and other agricultural commodities?

I do not want to hold up this bill, but I am giving fair warning to the agencies that the action they have taken by getting the House amendment adopted and deleting the so-called Ellender amendment is unconscionable. Until we have had a chance to review Public Law 480 in all of its facets and ramifications next year, I would hope, in fact I urge them, to continue the former policy under the Ellender amendment in the best interest of the American taxpayers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] in regard to this question to Mr. Dillon and the reply of Secretary Dillon in which he has pointed out that I was right.

There being no objection, the letter and reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 12, 1963.

Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On August 29, 1963, in connection with appropriations hearings dealing with the Foreign Buildings Operations of the State Department and the use of foreign currencies, it was developed that the Department had inserted in its fiscal year 1964 justifications for funds that "The recent Ellender amendment to Public Law 480 had the effect of requiring this program to purchase Public Law 480 Polish zlotys at a rate of 24 to $1 instead of the previous rate of 55 to $1. Overnight, this multiplied costs by a 2.3 factor."

It was pointed out to the witness that the Ellender amendment[1] only required that in negotiating title I, Public Law 480 sales agreements, the President shall "obtain rates of exchange applicable to the sales of commodities under such agreements which are not less favorable than the rates at which U.S. Government agencies can buy currencies from the U.S. disbursing officers in the respective countries." When the witness was asked who had made the interpretation of this amendment, the reply was that the interpretation had been made by the Treasury Department.

There was further discussion as to the validity of the Treasury interpretation and as to why U.S. agencies received only 24 zlotys to $1, when the regular rate was 55 to $1.

As chairman of the subcommittee handling appropriations for the State Department, I have been requested to ask you why this interpretation had been placed upon the law by your Department. I should also like to know at what rate of exchange agricultural commodities are being sold to Poland, and further, if the rate set by the Treasury is responsible for other Government agencies receiving less Polish currency for the dollar than the regular rate of 55 to $1. If this is the case, it is further requested that you apprise the various agencies concerned that this is not the fault of the Ellender amendment, but results from an executive decision.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1963.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Thank you for your letter of September 12, inquiring about the rate of exchange applied to the sale of agricultural commodities to Poland and also asking "if the rate set by the Treasury is responsible for other Government agencies receiving less Polish currency for the dollar than the regular rate of 55 to $1."

The rate of 55 zlotys to the dollar was a rate used solely within the U.S. Government but not used in dealings with the Polish Government or with exchange dealers. It was determined by the Treasury Department to be a reasonable rate, in view of the relative level of prices in Poland and the United States in 1954, and was utilized by the U.S. disbursing officer for sales of zlotys available under the Surplus Property Agreement of April 22, 1946, and later from title I sales to U.S. agencies and to authorized U.S. Government personnel.

As of February 11, 1957, the Polish Government announced establishment of an official rate of exchange at 24 zlotys to $1 for tourist and certain other invisible transactions and this remains the highest rate of exchange officially established by the Government. The U.S. disbursing officer continued to use the 55 to $1 rate, however, until it became necessary to observe the maximum official rate of 24 to $1 on December 15, 1961, as a result of discussions arising from negotiation of a new Public Law 480 sales agreement.

The U.S. negotiators had attempted during some 5 months of negotiations to obtain agreement to the rate of 55 to $1 for the Public Law 480, title I agreement signed on December 15, 1961. The Polish representatives remained adamant, however, and said they could not agree to a rate higher than 24 to $1 because of what they deemed overriding political considerations, and because it would be against Polish law. U.S. agencies were, therefore, confronted with a choice between accepting the more appreciated exchange rate, or concluding no Public Law 480, title I agreement with Poland. It was decided that the overall interest of the United States would be served by conclusion of the agreement with a 24 to $1 exchange rate.

Since 1957, the Public Law 480 agreements with Poland provide that, to the extent that the zlotys are not used by the United States, they will be repurchased by Poland with dollars at this same rate over a specified period of years in the future. Since relatively few of the zlotys are being used, the bulk of them will be subject to this provision and, to the extent that the zlotys are repurchased, no loss to the U.S. Government will result.

If a case arises where the negotiators of Public Law 480, title I sales agreements are unable to obtain a deposit rate as high as the rate at which U.S. Government agencies could otherwise buy local currencies in the market with dollars, the Treasury Department has regarded the Ellender amendment as requiring a conformity between the deposit rate that is obtained and the rate used by U.S. disbursing officers in making sales to U.S. agencies. The 24 zlotys to $1 is the highest deposit rate which the negotiators of the sales agreement with Poland were able to obtain and it is currently in force. The rate for disbursing officer sales to U.S. agencies is also 24 zlotys to $1. You will appreciate that what is a less favorable rate than formerly, from the buying agencies' point of view, is a more favorable rate from the point of view of Commodity Credit Corporation whose local currency is being sold; and that, therefore, there is no loss to the U.S. Government on the zlotys used by the U.S. Government agencies concerned.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am glad to note that the junior Senator from Wyoming, Senator MCGEE, in his report on "Personnel Administration and Operations of Agency for International Development" has endorsed the so-called Ellender amendment to Public Law 480.

I would also like to call attention to an amendment that was adopted by the Senate and retained in conference. I make particular reference to the Senate amendment which added a new subsection (b) to section 612 of the Foreign Assistance Act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell U.S.-owned foreign currencies to U.S. citizens for travel or other purposes.

Mr. President, this is a good amendment but it contains an error which I will correct when Public Law 480 is reviewed and rewritten next year. The error made is in connection with the dispositions of receipts. The amendment provides that the receipts from these sales will go into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. However, the receipts should be returned to the Commodity Credit Corporation instead of the

---

[1] Sec. 101(f), Public Law 480.

Treasury. As I have stated I will correct this oversight when Public Law 480 is rewritten next year.

I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from his report printed in the Record and other material that I have on the amendment.

For the reasons I have advanced, I urge the Senate to reject the conference report.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts From McGee Report

The Public Law 480 programs administered overseas by AID, although receiving much more attention currently than under predecessor agencies, are still understaffed and are not receiving nearly the attention necessary to realize their full potential. These foreign agriculture programs, which have aggregrated approximately $19 billion (U.S. costs), have been sold short almost from their inception in 1954. They simply have not received the same treatment as those programs for which the administering agencies (AID and predecessor organization) have had to come to Congress for direct appropriations; for example:

Prior to the so-called Ellender amendment, agricultural sales at world market prices for foreign currencies (under title I) were made at unrealistically low foreign exchange rates, which admittedly resulted in rates below world market prices of approximately $700 million.

The loans to foreign governments of currencies generated by title I agricultural commodity sales generally have not been given the attention which dollar loans from direct appropriations have received.

Outright grants of these sales proceeds to foreign countries have, at times, been made in little short of a cavalier manner and, at times, under circumstances difficult to understand. Althought the law requires congressional sanction of such grants, except in cases where the President determines it would be inappropriate or inconsistent with the purposes of the act, all such grants (approximately $1½ billion) have been made by the "exception" route, and, at times, have amounted to as much as 37½ percent of total sales proceeds.

There appears to have been a widespread misconception that as the commodities, the sales of which generated these currencies, were surplus to the needs of the United States, less value should be attached to these currencies. This has resulted in excessive concessions to some countries to the great detraction of this most important and valuable foreign assistance program.

The argument that is was necessary to make the concessions which were made in Public Law 480 title I sales in order to consummate such sales, does not hold water; first, because under the regular concessions permitted by the law—of subsidizing the commodities to world market prices, of accepting local currencies in payment, of financing much of the ocean freight, or loaning a large percentage of the proceeds back to the purchasing country, and of using the remainder of the proceeds in the country—make such sales competitive practically anywhere, and second, because the greatest concessions in the form of loans and grants back to the recipient countries were made in those countries which were the least able to purchase such commodities in the open market.

Dependency Schools Abroad To Be Administered by the Secretary of State

In considering the foreign aid authorization act of 1964, the House, in addition to the amendments it made to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, also included a number of amendments to other laws.

It is not my intent to dwell on each of these amendments, but I would like to point out that it is bad legislative practice to amend other laws in this particular controversial legislation. I have already illustrated the evils that are inherent in this practice in the statement I made to the Senate in connection with the amendment of section 101(f) of Public Law 480.

At this time I would like merely to bring to the attention of the Senate some far-reaching legislation that was included in the bill by the House, stricken by the Senate, but finally incorporated into the measure because the conferees of the Senate yielded to the House. The particular amendment to which I have reference is an amendment to the Foreign Service Act of 1946, amending section 1081 thereof and providing as follows: "The Secretary [of State] * * * is authorized in such manner as he deems appropriate and under such regulations as he may prescribe to establish, operate, and maintain primary schools and school dormitories and related educational facilities for primary and secondary schools outside the United States or to make grants of funds for such purposes or otherwise provide for such educational facilities. * * * The Foreign Service Building Act of 1926, as amended * * * may be utilized by the Secretary in providing assistance for educational facilities. Assistance may include but shall not be limited to hiring, transporting, and payment of teachers and other necessary personnel."

I wonder if this legislation would have been adopted at this time if it had been made subject to the complete scrutiny of the Congress. Does the Congress want the Secretary of State to operate dependency schools abroad? Is the Congress aware of the ultimate cost of this program? I heard no discussion regarding this legislation on the floor. I know nothing about its ultimate cost, and I am confident that the majority of Senators here today lack such knowledge.

This practice of amending other laws through the medium of the foreign aid bill must be stopped. There is a real deception inherent in getting Congress to focus its attention on foreign aid and then slipping in amendments to other laws, very often with far-reaching consequences. I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for keeping the foreign aid bill a clean bill, to include only legislation on foreign assistance, and not amendments to the Foreign Service Act, Public Law 480, and what have you.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that I have 10 minutes left on the conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes remain to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] the fact that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] wishes to ask him some questions. I wonder whether the Senator from Arkansas would yield to the Senator from Iowa a few minutes of the time available to him, inasmuch as I should like to reserve the 10 minutes I have left for final rebuttal.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am ready to yield some time.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield 5 minutes of his time to the Senator from Iowa so that he may ask his questions?

Mr. MILLER. I say to the Senator from Oregon that I believe I can say all I need to say in 2 minutes, but I should like to leave some time, of course, to the Senator from Arkansas to respond to one or two questions that I do not believe will take much time.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa to start with, and I hope the Senator from Arkansas will yield him more time.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Oregon. On page 63 of the bill, as passed by the Senate, is a new section which was added by virtue of an amendment which would have provided a ceiling of $5 million annually for the U.S. shares of the contributions to the Food and Agriculture Organization. This amendment would have meant that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the United States could spend up to $5 million for its share of the contributions to the work of the FAO.

The FAO operates on a calendar year basis. For the calendar year ending December 31, 1964, the United States will be committed to $5.7 million; so that after next June 30, in the fiscal year 1965 budget, we could well appropriate the money necessary to make up the difference between the $5 million limitation contained in the bill as passed by the Senate and the $5.7 million to which we are obligated under the budget now approved for the FAO.

Our own budget experts in the U.S. delegation to the FAO conference advocated a $36.7 million budget for the biennium, which would have required a $5.3 million as the U.S. share of the contributions. However, the Director General of FAO had recommended a $39.7 million budget, which was finally reduced $900,000 to $38.8 million for the biennium. This will entail the $5.7 million contribution by the United States.

I regret to say that the $5 million ceiling item was deleted by the conference committee, and I can find nothing in the conference report about it. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he would please explain why to the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes to respond to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller].

As the Senator has already stated, the limitation of $5 million was in place of the former limitation or a percentage. We now contribute 32.2 percent of the FAO budget, as the Senator knows.

I believe he attended the conference. As the Senator has already pointed out, the $5 million would have required, we believe, a default in the obligation we heretofore have had in contributing 32.2 percent of the budget as accepted.

The House had no such limitation. We had the $5 million put in by the Senator from Iowa. We thought, as a practical matter, that we did not wish to take arbitrary action at this late date which might put us in the position of defaulting on what had been our previous agreement as to our percentage of the total. Heretofore we have operated on the general principle that in relation to most of the international organizations we would like to approximate that one-third. That is approximately what our contribution is to the basic operation of the United Nations as opposed to certain specific operations, such as UNICEF, the labor organization, and so on. The proposal approximates the general principle of one-third of the amount. I believe that on other occasions the Senate has followed this principle in an effort to increase the contribution of other Members rather than appropriate specific amounts in dollars.

We have tried it both ways in the past. Usually we have come back to the percentage basis of computation.

I do not feel very strongly about the question. The House did. It had no such limitation. It said that the proposal would be unworkable.

We cannot anticipate what the programs will be from year to year. If we should put an arbitrary limit on it, we might run into difficulty. It does not allow for any expansion of the budget. It is believed that the maintenance of the percentage limitation is the more flexible and the more workable way to limit our contribution. That is about all I can say.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield for another question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLER. I recognize the desirability of flexibility which the percentage formula provides. However, it seems that our budget experts on our delegation should have some backing by Congress. When our budget experts, after a great amount of time, come forward with a proposed budget of $36.7 million, which would entail $5.3 million a year as our share of our contribution, they should receive a little more consideration than they did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand the reasoning of the Senator from Iowa. Even that figure is above the specific limitation of $5 million proposed.

Mr. MILLER. Perhaps the Senator did not hear me when I pointed out that since the FAO is on a calendar year basis, the $5.3 million would cover the entire calendar year of 1964; whereas the bill which the Senate is considering runs only through June 30, 1964, so there would be ample time in the 1965 budget to make up that $300,000 difference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know what else to say. I believe it is unnecessary to deal with these relatively small items and make special appropriations. If the Senator wishes, he could lower the percentage. I would be in favor of lowering the percentage so that we would not have to deal with individual items.

Mr. President, I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I support the conference report. I am happy that in my service in the Senate I have supported the concept of foreign aid. There are many people in the country who believe that the foreign aid program should be ended. It is evident from the actions of Congress this year that there are not many who believe that funds should not be cut. As I said in recent weeks, I have not felt, in this debate, that they should not be cut. I voted for cuts. Although I support the concept of foreign aid, I believe we do not have sufficient information to know whether the program is as effective as it should be.

What I say today is not in derogation of the work of the committee, because I am sure that members of the Foreign Relations Committee know more about the program than do we who are not its members, as interested as we are in it. I believe that this year, for the first time in many years, there has been a comprehensive and effective debate upon foreign aid.

I do not wish to belabor this subject, though it is of great interest to me. I wish to speak briefly to a point I raised in the debate.

I offered an amendment which was adopted by the Senate, the purpose of which was to establish, at the direction of the President, certain committees to be made up both of persons outside Government service and in Government service, to make searching examinations and reports on our foreign aid program in various areas of the world, such as southeast Asia, the Middle East, Africa, Latin America, and, if necessary, specific countries.

My purpose in offering the amendment was to suggest that the work of the Clay Committee should be extended. The Clay Committee and its report in respect to foreign aid have had a greater impact upon Congress, and indeed upon the country, than any other report ever made.

My purpose was to extend that work, to determine whether, in specific areas or in certain countries which receive the greater portion of our aid, 15 or 16 receive one-half of our economic aid, the program is effective, because if cuts are to be made, they will be applied generally to the program and will fall upon the just as well as the unjust.

The conference in effect struck the amendment which I offered, though not wholly. I believe the recommendation would permit the President to order such studies if he felt them to be proper. I note, also, that an amendment has been added which I believe is similar in intent to the one I offered. Section 102(f) reads:

> No assistance shall be furnished under this title for a project unless the President determines that such project will promote the economic development of the requesting country, taking into account the current human and material resource requirements of that country and the relationship between the ultimate objectives of the project and the overall economic development of the country, and that such project specifically provides for appropriate participation by private enterprise.

A great part of that language was in the amendment I offered.

I know the President of the United States is a man of good, solid, practical judgment. I say that not only from a general estimate of him, but also because of my memory of the report he made to us on foreign aid in various countries after he had made one of his first trips around the world, at which time he reviewed, in very practical terms, to 50 or 60 of us in the Foreign Relations Committee room, what he thought was the effectiveness of the program in various countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 more minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield the Senator 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my only purpose in speaking today is to say that I hope the President will extend the work of the Clay Committee. I hope he will establish what he believes to be proper committees, to be made up of some men in Government service and some men of great ability outside of Government service, to make a report to the Congress and to the people regarding the effectiveness of this program.

I say, most respectfully, that no such information is available to us today. There have been five agencies since the Marshall plan. There have been 11 administrators. The reports which have come to us have not given us information about specific countries.

There is a division in the Foreign Relations Committee. There is a division in the Appropriations Committee. The Clay Committee has been the first committee able to give any kind of comprehensive report on the total program. I hope that similar committees will be established to give comprehensive reports on various countries. Unless this occurs, there will continue to be an ineffective program in many countries of the world and eventually—perhaps in a short time—this program will not survive. That is my reason for urging that we obtain the fullest information, because I believe the program should survive where it is effective. Many others believe the same.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a speech entitled "Foreign Aid" by Hon. Eugene R. Black, former President of the World Bank. In this speech he makes many of the points I make, although his authority is greater than mine.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID

(Text of an address by Eugene R. Black, former President of the World Bank, director of the Chase Manhattan Bank, before the New York Chamber of Commerce, New York City, N.Y., on November 12, 1963)

Mr. Champion, gentlemen, when I retired from the World Bank last January, I solemnly resolved that I would retire from making public speeches at the same time. For the first 40 or 50 years of my life I got along very well without making any public speeches, and, on leaving the World Bank I had hoped to return to this comfortable state of affairs. But I didn't figure on George Champion's insidious persuasiveness. He undermined my good resolutions, and he did so by appealing to the all-too-obvious need for those of us once connected with that business called foreign aid to speak out occasionally, to remind people that there is a problem, a very important problem, and that we have to learn to live with the problem just as surely as every new June bride has to learn to live with her mother-in-law.

The open season on foreign aid in Congress is exceptionally late and violent this year; the Appropriations Committees still have to reach their separate verdicts and the House-Senate conference, as usual, will have a job of compromising to do. In these circumstances, I do not want anything I say here to be interpreted as a lack of support of foreign aid. I believe in foreign aid. More important in the present circumstances, I think David Bell, the man charged with making the Agency for International Development work well, deserves from Congress a chance to show his mettle. Working with Mr. Bell on the Clay Committee, I was very impressed with his grasp of the complexities of his job and with the toughness of his mind.

In fact, if I could wish Mr. Bell one thing, I would wish him a clear-cut contract for at least 5 years in order that he might have a decent opportunity to put into effect some of the changes I know he wants to make. In the 15 years since the beginning of the Marshall plan we have had the ECA, the TCA, the MSA, the FOA, the ICA and now AID. There have been 11 different foreign aid administrators, including Mr. Bell. That's an average tenure in office of less than 18 months. For a business that can't by its nature succeed in the short run, that is a formula for ineffectiveness if ever there was one.

I would also wish him some relief from his constant, and for long periods, total preoccupation with congressional reviews. Foreign aid is the only major program in the Federal budget which, in addition to the normal and necessary reviews of the Appropriations Committees, has to be authorized all over again each year in the House and Senate. In addition to that part of the foreign aid budget concerned with what I would call economic development, there is a large military aid budget which Mr. Bell must defend, yet which logically belongs in the regular military budget because after all, an important justification for giving arms and other forms of military support to foreign nations is that we thereby economize on our own military commitments and expenditures. Aid must absorb an enormous and I think quite unnecessary administrative overhead because it has four congressional hurdles to clear anew each year, and a bill to defend which covers an unnecessarily wide variety of subjects. Mr. Bell deserves to be relieved of some of these chores, which for so much of the year effectively prevent him from doing the job that he was hired to do.

I do hope Mr. Bell has a chance to do the job I think he can do; I do not want anything I say here to be interpreted as opposing the pending legislation, or in favor of substantial cuts in the amount requested. But I do not hesitate to say that I think the way our Government has administered foreign aid in the past has been seriously remiss in several important respects. In fact, I think it is clear now that there is a large consensus on this score in Congress, in AID itself and among interested outsiders like my colleagues on the Clay Committee.

The recent report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reflected this growing consensus in several important respects. First, the committee stressed the need to introduce more stability into the administration of foreign aid; second, the committee underscored the importance of persuading other nations, particularly former beneficiaries of the Marshall plan, to carry more of the financial burden. Finally, and I think most important, the committee made an appeal for more attention to the quality of the assistance that we give. Let me for a few minutes give my own variations on these three themes.

The Senators said that they were "unenthusiastic about aid programs * * * whose major purpose is to provide an alternative to Soviet bloc aid." Now here I think they put their fingers on one of the prime causes of instability in the administration of foreign aid in the past and of public disillusionment with foreign aid in the present. I have frequently argued that we ought to be very skeptical about crediting or debiting foreign aid for dramatic changes in the political atmosphere. It has been my experience that foreign aid has rarely gotten us anywhere in the short run. Foreign aid can be—should be—a most effective agent against communism in the long run by encouraging those policies and practices in other nations which lead to lasting economic growth. But it cannot be effective if it is turned on and off like a faucet in response to unreasonable political expectations.

I have been most interested of late to see how the Russians themselves appear to be painfully discovering the fact that foreign aid is not a very useful weapon for political skirmishes. I have over the years confidently predicted that the Soviets would find foreign aid an unrewarding business from the point of view of their political interests. Now it would seem that they are beginning to think so too.

The Soviets have a vested interest in everybody else's troubles. Buttressed by their naive belief in communism as the wave of the future, they are out to create political and economic instability as a prelude to communism. To them foreign aid is definitely a temporary business, designed to secure windfall economic and political profits.

Let's take a look at the record. No doubt some will regard Cuba as their shining success. But Russian foreign aid did not create Castro or bring him to power. Russian foreign aid only came after he was in power. The question is, "Will Russian foreign aid keep Castro in power?" This must be an embarrassing question to the Soviets; Cuba's bill which the Soviets have to pay is currently running at $1.5 million a day. Perhaps $2 billion worth of ruble aid has already gone to Cuba. Recent evidence in the newspapers suggest that the Soviets are very unhappy at this continuing drain. It would seem that the Soviets face the choice of reducing the drain by assuming ever more directly the functions of the Cuban Government or of gradually backing away. Cuba, after all, is a relatively rich country, and this the Soviets know. Russian foreign aid to Cuba is almost certain to be a temporary business and so far it has clearly not been a very successful business.

What about the other countries to which the Russians have sent foreign aid in search of windfall profits? The list includes India, Afghanistan, Ceylon, Nepal, and Burma in south Asia; Syria, Iraq, and Egypt in the Middle East; Mali, Guinea, Ethiopia, Ghana, and Somalia in Africa; Cambodia and Indonesia in the Far East; and Brazil and Argentina in Latin America. These are the countries to which the Soviets have given or lent each $50 million or more which is hardly a large sum by the standards of U.S. aid, or, as a matter of fact, by World Bank standards. What about the windfall profits achieved?

In Iraq, a major recipient of Soviet aid, the Communist-backed prime minister, Kassem, lacked staying power, he was assassinated, and the Communist Party was outlawed under the succeeding regime. In Egypt, despite the Aswan Dam and considerable military assistance, the Communist Party remains outlawed—and the Egyptian Government last year decided to adhere to the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) the bulwark of the West's multilateral trading system. India, despite a billion dollars in Soviet aid, remains the world's largest working democracy and is clearly not alined with the Communists.

If the Soviets have failed to show much in the way of windfall profits out of their foreign aid, their often obviously temporary and troublemaking interest in the business has been brought home forcibly to many countries. Burma has experienced the ill effects of having its rice shipped to Russia and resold on the world market; Egypt has had the same experience with its cotton. Guinea, until recently exclusively dependent on Soviet bloc aid, has learned what it is to wait while promised Soviet delivery dates slip by and, in company with other countries, has experienced the illusion of the Soviet terms of aid, which are characteristically low in interest charges and high in the price of the goods shipped. Also, the goods have frequently been quite inferior, and there have been lots of difficulties with spare parts.

Our own foreign aid program has been similarly unsuccessful insofar as it has been used as an instrument for bartering against the Communists for the favor of the governments of the underdeveloped countries or for short-term political advantage in those countries. Foreign aid just is not suitable as a means of inoculating governments against communism or bringing about instant conversions from that political religion. Yet despite Mr. Bell's several references to the long-term problems to which foreign aid must be addressed, we still hear promises of economic and political windfall profits held out as arguments for increasing or maintaining the level of foreign aid. And recently these arguments have taken a new twist; we now hear urgent pleas to stop foreign aid when a coup d'etat is staged in a country we have been helping, and a less tolerant ruler replaces a more tolerant one, and I'm afraid that here again we are pursuing unreasonable political expectations in the name of foreign aid.

Instead of trying to identify foreign aid with unrealistic political expectations, we ought to have been identifying it with high priority development projects—projects which are well engineered, well planned financially and which promise to produce things these countries want and need to earn their way in the world. Foreign aid in these countries ought to be identified with fiscal policies which offer some hope that local savings will flow into serious developments and not flee the country or disappear in inflation. Foreign aid ought to be identified, not with promises by countries of what they may do in the future, but with the first tangible steps toward action necessary to make economic growth a reality. Foreign aid ought to be identified with tax collection, not tax evasion; it ought to be identified with a healthy investment climate for foreign capital and not with the expropriation of foreign properties.

Here again there is a growing consensus, shared by the Senate committee and I know by Mr. Bell himself, that the major trouble with our foreign aid programs in the past has been too much concern over quantity and packaging, and too little concern over the quality of the product itself. I have said that a lot of the labels we have put on the foreign aid package in the past have been seriously misleading. I might add that I think there has been too much excitement over the quantities involved. Foreign aid has always been a stimulant to American exports; it is more directly now a stimulant than ever before. The Senate committee estimated that only 10 percent of current foreign aid expenditures represent a drain on the balance of payments. In view of this I cannot get very excited about the argument that foreign aid is a serious drain on our balance of payments.

I can and do get concerned over the fact that in the past we have been trying to spend more foreign aid than we have been able to administer effectively. We have been most reluctant to demand the conditions necessary to make aid effective in terms of economic development. We have settled for promises when we should have waited for action to justify our support. We have not developed that standard of project selection and preparation which should be the very hallmark of our work. In general we have succeeded in identifying foreign aid with large amounts of money, but not with large numbers of projects and programs which are building economic strength into the countries we are trying to help. Fortunately there has been concern in AID about these shortcomings as recent changes indicate.

Congress has tried in some cases to build into the foreign aid legislation some of the necessary conditions which should govern foreign aid if it is to be effective in terms of economic growth. There is for example the Hickenlooper amendment which would bar aid to countries which expropriate American property without prompt and adequate compensation. As a matter of fact, there is a new amendment to the Hickenlooper amendment which is being discussed now. That amendment goes even further than the original one and says that if any contracts or concessions are canceled by a foreign government, that no aid should be given to the country that canceled these contracts or concessions until adequate compensation has been paid, and paid in convertible currency. I'd like to say I am highly in favor of the Hickenlooper amendment and his new one. Congress has also opposed using foreign aid to support government-owned industries. I certainly favor this legislative limitation. In both cases the climate for private investment is at stake. Not only should we, as a matter of course, use our aid in every way possible to improve the climate for our own and other foreign private investments; we should also avoid encouraging the governments of these new nations to expand their operations into areas where other forms of finance and enterprise can be encouraged. There is no government now receiving foreign aid which does not have more now on its administrative plate than it can digest. So, to condone with or aid the acquisition of foreign industrial properties or to use aid to foster government-owned industries cannot, in my opinion, be justified in the name of promoting economic growth.

But most of the conditions which should govern foreign aid if it is to be effective cannot be legislated. As a matter of fact, attempts to do so would only compound further the already very difficult administrative problem which the AID Administrator faces. The tests of success in any foreign aid program are easy to state in generalities: Is the program identified with high priority projects which are producing a higher standard of living? Is the Agency insisting on reasonable fiscal policies as a prior condition for its help? Does the program encourage reforms needed for economic growth? But there is no way that Congress, through legislation, can insure that any foreign aid program will pass these tests. In spite of the fact that whole libraries of books have been written attempting to define some fiscal policies, there is in practice no substitute for careful and mature personal judgment in deciding when fiscal conditions are ripe for aid and when they are not. Nor is there any reliable substitute for personal judgment when it comes to choosing among projects—when it comes to deciding what is of high priority and what is not. Our Congress cannot legislate reforms for other nations; they have to be negotiated. So, on all of these counts the AID Administrator's lot is not an easy one. He must adopt standards, deliberately; he must set conditions, consciously; and he must do these things without leaving the legitimate preserve of economic development and wandering into the purely political preserve.

Since the line between these two preserves is often very unclear, anybody who undertakes to administer foreign aid is, by definition, living dangerously. I have always thought that an international organization could offer certain protections which are particularly valuable in the administration of foreign aid—provided, that is, that the international organization is like the World Bank or the Monetary Fund, itself governed by financial principles and not simply an organization to allow a lot of recipient nations to divide up the contributions of a few donor nations. I think, as a matter of fact I know, it is somewhat easier for an international organization to ask for, to demand, and to receive the assurances and conditions necessary for effective aid without being accused of undue interference in the international affairs of the recipient countries or of trying to get some political advantage. I was therefore interested to see the Senate Foreign Relations Committee pick up this argument and lend its own endorsement in its recent report. I personally believe that the balance between bilateral and multilateral aid should be redressed in favor of multilateral aid. I would even make a guess that it will be redressed as time goes on. And as it becomes more evident that foreign aid can only be effective if it is identified with projects and programs that are in fact producing lasting economic wealth.

I do not look for or recommend any radical shift away from bilateral aid in favor of multilateral aid, but I do look for a gradual shift. I don't think bilateral aid can ever be completely free from the political pressures of the moment; to some extent it is bound to be wasted in efforts to put out political fires. In the long run, I think foreign aid will come to be accepted most readily where it is administered by organizations, like the World Bank and the Monetary Fund organizations whose primary objective is economic development and not to gain some political or commercial benefits.

But the problems besetting our foreign aid program are not basically institutional. Whether foreign aid is administered internationally, regionally or bilaterally, the important thing is the quality of the product—the conditions asked and the standards set.

I'd like to leave you with these three thoughts:

Some say that if the threat of communism were to disappear tomorrow, Congress would immediately cut off all foreign aid. I think this is a cynical argument. We don't need foreign aid because the Communists make it necessary. We malign the power and impact of our own heritage when we couple foreign aid with the twists and turns of Communist policy. We give foreign aid because it is both imperative and unavoidable that we participate in the development of those countries which, largely because of their many-sided encounters with Western civilization, are desperately seeking some escape from their poverty. We have foreign aid because the achievements of our way of life in the past have made it a matter of self-respect in other nations to ameliorate their mass poverty. The presence or absence of the threat of communism in no way alters this fact. If we are to remain a great nation in the Western tradition—if we are to remain true not just to our humanitarian tradition, not just to our economic precepts which are built on the fact that prosperity flourishes only when the maximum number of people and nations share in it—if we are to remain true to our own heritage and if we are to accept the responsibilities history has thrust on us, then we will continue foreign aid.

Second, I would like to suggest that we approach Congress in this direct way, and stop pretending that foreign aid is a sure cure for the political ills that plague us at the moment. Foreign aid should be presented to Congress as a means of promoting economic growth and nothing else. It should be presented in terms of projects designed to produce real wealth. It should be presented in response to actions, not promises, on the part of other countries which are seriously interested in economic growth. It should be presented, not as a bribe for other nations to reform, but as an investment in other nations where reforms are already underway. Do this and I suggest the political benefits will come as natural byproducts. Can we not say of our own experience that it is by concentrating on economic development that we have most successfully ameliorated our own political problems? Should we not say of foreign aid that economic development is what we are after in the realistic hope that it will yield political byproducts consistent with our own security and prosperity? We've tried putting the political byproducts first, now I think we should try putting economic development first.

Finally, I agree with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that more effort and thought should be given to ways and means of internationalizing our aid effort. The challenge of development in Asia, Africa and Latin America affects all Western nations because all Western nations have contributed so much to the kind of world we live in today—a world divided increasingly by the gap in wealth between those who have practiced economic development and those who are only just now learning how. It makes political sense, but more important it makes economic sense to pool the resources and talents of the Western nations in organizations which have no other purpose than promoting development. This is the best way, I submit, to gain acceptance for the conditions which must be met before foreign aid can do its work.

The question, then, is not: "Should we continue foreign aid?" Of course we should and we can afford every penny which is administered effectively. The question is: "How can we improve the quality of the product?" Foreign aid is one business where it should be a matter of pride to produce a quality product. And if we insist on this I predict that the growing opposition to foreign aid by Congress and others will disappear as it should.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I support the conference report. The only reason for taking time to speak is that the report carries out, in a very important respect, such a forecast for the future as to deserve to be marked significantly in this debate.

There seems to be a general feeling, which I share, that the foreign aid program, if it is to last—and I believe it must last, as an essential offensive against communism in the world and as an essential offensive for freedom in the world—must have a new direction, a new concept, and a new technique.

Very clearly, as always happens, what is coming is forecast by what is. To me the most significant aspect of the report for the future, though it is not by any means the most important provision in an absolute sense, is the establishment of an advisory committee on private enterprise, which is now contained in the report and can be found at page 8.

The language provides that the advisory committee, which will meet frequently—a working committee meeting every month—shall furnish information as to exactly how the private enterprise system is being utilized. I emphasize that this does not mean only private enterprise as we generally think of it, as business and profitmaking concerns, but includes, as is set forth, "labor and professional," "universities and foundations," and "persons with extensive experience in government," who are now out of government. They will chart the way in which the foreign aid program can be carried on by private enterprise.

I predict that beginning with the fiscal year 1965, and in the years after that, the foreign aid program of the United States will be extensively carried on under contract with business, and nonprofit private enterprise organizations will be intimately woven in with consortiums of business concerns which at one and the same time will be pursuing manufacturing and other activities directly and with partners in underdeveloped areas and will be carrying out Government programs for training, technical assistance, and other activities in the most economical way.

I believe that the absolute dollar amount to be spent can be materially cut in respect to the entire conduct of this Government, and yet I believe the program can be carried on with infinitely more efficiency and greater fidelity to the real purposes—the encouragement of freedom and the encouragement of private enterprise—if we readapt the program completely along those lines.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that the American people may be interested in investing in a foreign aid corporation very much along the lines of the Communications Satellite Corp., now in the process of development, as an additional way in which the massive sums required—which are required in credit as well as in money and in technical assistance as well as in more tangible resources—may be invested in this effort.

At one and the same time that foreign aid appropriations in a governmental sense may be reduced, the aggregate amount utilized for foreign aid must be materially increased. The only way to accomplish that is to harness the private enterprise system.

Finally, the insistence in the proposed legislation upon the absolute indispensability of participation by other nations, especially the European nations, is a major point of emphasis. This must be the primary thrust of American foreign policy in the foreign aid field.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I are trying to work on this problem with a great Latin American investment company. The unity and the consortium of foreign private enterprise—notably in Europe and Japan—with American private enterprise, in partnership with Latin American private enterprise, such as the company we are endeavoring to have succeed, and with private enterprise in other areas—whether it be Africa, Asia, or the Middle East—will be the ultimate answer to the problem.

I emphasize this forecast for the future. The United States is becoming much more hardheaded about the program. That is clearly shown by the amendment a number of Senators sponsored along with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] concerning President Nasser.

The country is also becoming more hardheaded about the utilization of the totality of its resources, including private enterprise, for the purpose of making the program a success. I predict that will be the program of the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me one-half a minute?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, some persons who are vitally interested in this program would like to see the transfer of funds from development research to supporting assistance because they feel it could be better carried on. I ask the chairman of the committee if that cannot be done under existing law, and also if there is anything in the conference report that would prevent it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is clear authority to take that money from any source in part 1, from supporting assistance or from grants.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the chairman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In view of the amount involved, it would be perfectly proper to put it into supporting assistance.

Mr. President, I commend to the Senate the adoption of the conference foreign aid bill for 1963. It is, in my judgment, a fair and reasonable compromise between the original Senate and House bills, between which there were many differences and conflicting provisions.

There is much in the conference bill which may be displeasing to Members of the Senate. I myself am by no means satisfied with every detail of the compromise bill.

In introducing the presentation of the bill as it came from the committee, I made quite clear in my statement that I was not satisfied with the present form of the program, and recommended certain additional changes in my initial statement. I still think the program needs revising, but I do not recommend that it be completely mutilated, or that the power to administer efficiently be destroyed.

There is nothing alarming or shocking about this. It is in the nature of any compromise that no one can be satisfied with it in all its particulars. The important point is that an accommodation has been reached that includes many of the preferences of each House and that on the whole should be satisfactory to both Houses.

The conference bill has been criticized for what is said to be too high an authorization. I am at a loss to understand the basis of this criticism. It will be recalled that the administration originally asked for an authorization of $4.9 billion and then, after the Clay Report, reduced its request to $4.5 billion. The Foreign Relations Committee reduced this amount by $300 million and the Senate reduced it by another $500 million to a total authorization of slightly more than $3.7 billion. The conference bill reduces this figure by over $100 million to a total authorization of less than $3.6 billion. I do not see how the Senate conferees could have reduced this amount further without putting themselves in clear violation of the will and intent of the Senate.

The conference bill has been criticized on the ground that certain policy provisions included by the Senate have been omitted or altered. This is perfectly true. It is also true that certain provisions of the House bill have been omitted in deference to the wishes of the Senate. This, as no one needs to be reminded, is the normal and traditional procedure of conferences between the two Houses.

Major provisions of the Senate bill which were not in the House bill were retained by the conference. Among these are the following: A provision for research into problems of population growth; a provision for assistance to Latin American cooperatives; restrictions on military assistance to Latin America; restrictions on military assistance to Africa.

I am still at a loss to know exactly what the Senator from Louisiana was complaining about. I thought, and still believe, as I read this restriction, that it is in accord with his argument. In any case, there is a restriction of a rather strict limitation on military assistance to Africa.

There is a provision for the sale of foreign currencies to U.S. citizens for travel or other purposes; an expansion of the Hickenlooper amendment regarding the expropriation of U.S. property to cover the nullification of contracts with American citizens and providing for the evaluation of claims by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission; a ban on assistance to economically developed nations; a provision encouraging the participation of private enterprise in the technical assistance program; the inclusion of fish in the list of commodities available for sale under the provisions of Public Law 480; and finally, the restoration of the President's authority to grant most-favored-nation trade treatment to Poland and Yugoslavia.

The conference bill is a fair and reasonable compromise between the House and Senate bills. It cannot be entirely satisfactory to every Member of each body or to either body as a whole. It represents a consensus of the wishes of the two Houses, which is precisely what a conference bill is supposed to do. As the senior Senator from Oregon noted in his speech to the Senate yesterday on this bill, "after all, in the legislative process it is necessary to count noses."

That is exactly what was done in conference. Under the circumstances, I believe the compromise is a very fair one, and does not depart in any material way from the usual processes that have been followed in the past with regard to conferences between the two bodies.

A moment ago the Senator from Alaska asked a question, and wished to know if I would comment on Cambodia. Our experience in Cambodia was most unfortunate. It is unfortunate that the Dyna-Soar project was abandoned because, according to the press it was a false start. It cost only $400 million. I regret that fact. I suppose the Secretary of Defense would say, "We were mistaken in that particular undertaking." Perhaps we were mistaken on Cambodia.

I remind the Senator that Mr. Sihanouk, head of that country, has his own views. I do not know what the Senator from Alaska thinks we should do—whether we should stay in there, go over there and take it over; or whether he thinks we should have gone in the first place. It may well be that we should not have interested ourselves in that country; but at the time we did, it was the policy of the then administration, and Congress, as is usually the case on matters of foreign policy, to recognize the primacy of the Executive, under our Constitution, in these matters, and to follow those suggestions as a matter of policy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

THE COOPERATIVE MOVEMENT IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier in the foreign aid debate, I referred briefly to the role which the cooperative movement is playing in the development of Latin America. I mentioned that I offered an amendment to the existing aid bill to assist in the development of an Inter-American cooperative finance system, an amendment which was accepted by the Foreign Relations Committee. This bill, with one modification, was passed by the Senate.

A significant breakthrough in expanding the self-help, private enterprise feature of our assistance program in Latin America is made by new provisions included in H.R. 7885 which authorizes the President to:

> Assist in promoting the organization, implementation and growth of the cooperative movement in Latin America as a fundamental measure toward strengthening of democratic institutions and practices and economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress.

This was the amendment I introduced 2 years ago, to encourage giving further attention to the cooperative movement in this hemisphere.

There are today nearly 6 million people in Latin America who are already members of more than 16,000 cooperatives. These cooperatives are urban and rural. They deal in credit and fishing. They are trying to provide housing and transportation. In short, they include people from every walk of life. The charter of Punta del Este and the inauguration of the Alliance for Progress are offering new hope and new expectations among these people and among the millions who are not yet a part of any institution or system which permits them to participate in their own economic development and the economic development of their countries. A strong integrated cooperative movement offers one of the finest means through which a significant segment of these masses can organize their own institutions to permit them to participate economically and which, incidentally, will teach them the value of a private enterprise system and the value of practicing democracy. It gives them a stake in the stability of their own government since they will, for the first time, own something which can be lost.

To make the cooperative program more effective, I proposed and the Senate recommended the local currency be made available to suport the establishment of an Inter-American cooperative finance institution. The report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee states clearly the views of the Senate:

> The committee has long been impressed with the constructive role which cooperatives can play, not only in promoting economic growth, but also in contributing to the democratic development contemplated by the Alliance for Progress. In order to give special emphasis to the importance which the committee assigns to the role of cooperatives, special provision is made in this bill for the use of certain foreign currencies available to the United States in Latin America to assist the cooperative movement.
>
> First, a new subsection is added to section 251 of the act, which contains the general authority for the Alliance for Progress. This new subsection provides that the President "shall, when appropriate, assist in promoting the organization, implementation, and growth of the cooperative movement in Latin America as a fundamental measure toward the strengthening of democratic institutions and practices and economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress."
>
> Second, a new provision is inserted in section 253 of the act, which relates to Alliance for Progress fiscal provisions, to make foreign currencies available for this purpose. The foreign currencies involved are those which have accrued as a result of loans which are repayable in foreign currencies. Most of these loans were made by the Development Loan Fund between 1958 and 1961. Since the latter date, all development loans have been repayable in dollars. However, as a result of earlier development loans, the United States now has about $7 million in Latin American currencies. This amount is expected to increase, as a result of repayments, to about $60 million over the next 5 years. The President is authorized to reserve up to $25 million of these currencies in any fiscal year, for loans to cooperatives. These funds will be available for this purpose without regard to section 612 of the act, or of any other act which makes foreign currencies available only as specified in appropriations acts.
>
> The foreign currencies to which this amendment applies can be used not only for loans to individual cooperatives but also to provide seed capital, should that prove desirable, to a central inter-American cooperative finance institution for relending.

In the debate in the Senate, one sentence was struck out—that which would make local currency available without going through the appropriations process.

I would like to make it clear that the Senate has not changed its mind in regard to the priority which cooperatives should enjoy under our aid program. In the distribution of local currency which may become available, it is the intention of the Senate that the inter-American cooperative finance institution shall have the highest priority.

Mr. President, I make this statement because I realize that priorities are established on the availability and use of so-called foreign currencies. I can think of nothing more valuable than to promote reform in the agrarian or agricultural areas of Latin America. A rural development program or agrarian reform program is utterly worthless unless it is possible to have supervised credit. That credit usually comes from a cooperative movement. The only way in which poor people in rural areas have an opportunity to improve their lot in life is through a cooperative institution. It is no longer a matter of an individual farmer having his own individual plot of land. We are now faced with the fact that the choice is between cooperation and collectivism. We do not want collectivism; therefore, by having individual ownerships pooled through cooperatives such as we have known in the United States, and as are known in Scandinavian countries, much can be done to lift the standard of living in the rural sections of Latin America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would put clear emphasis upon the Alliance for Progress program, in particular. The tendency is to look upon the program primarily as a capital development program. It seems to me that greater emphasis must be placed upon the human needs, the social needs—the needs of the people in those areas.

Capital development is important, but if we can develop a reasonably stable political environment, private capital development will fulfill much of the need that is now being filled by public capital.

I hope there will be no diminution in our desire to see to it that the Alliance for Progress, in particular, will work in the fields of education, health, community development, and the improvement of transportation, particularly with reference to farm-to-market-type roads, communication, and telecommunication; and that, above all, we will see to it that the needs of the young people in vocational training and technical training fields are satisfied.

In many programs entirely too much emphasis is placed upon the sheer financial aspects, and not enough upon the social aspects. Therefore I hope that there will be a more rapid processing of projects. The delay is intolerable. I have spoken about this situation on many occasions. I understand the administration will make some reorganization of the foreign aid program, particularly with reference to the Alliance for Progress. I hope, if it does so, it will give more authority in the field, to the mission directors and those on the spot doing the job, rather than requiring clearance on a project through 25 different desk operations. Twenty-five of them will not do a better job than two or three. If a decision cannot be made in the field, and on one or two levels higher than that, the decision will never be made, at least not satisfactorily. To have it go through 25 desks is nothing but nonsense.

Finally, I know that in the conference report the House managers made a statement to this effect:

> The House managers believe that if excess currencies become available in Latin America in some subsequent period in significant amounts, the reservation of such currencies authorized by this provision, as well as any other reservation of foreign currencies for future use, should be reexamined in order to evaluate the relationship of such reserved currencies to current U.S. requirements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to make it clear that that is the view of the House, not the view of the Senate. Certainly it is not the view of the Senator from Minnesota. There will be excess foreign currencies in Latin America. Those currencies ought to be utilized for programs that give direct benefits to the people who need these programs the most. Too much attention is being given to people who need little help and are getting much, and far too little attention is being given to people who need much help and are being given little.

I saw yesterday in the public works bill an instance of this, when the people of Minnesota were denied a part in the accelerated public works program. I do not like it, and I intend to make a point of it for the record.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am shocked, disappointed, and saddened. I have been waiting with bated breath and great expectation and high anticipation for the ultimate defense of this monstrosity. I thought that at some time during the debate in the weeks that have been given to it, something might have been said which would make sense in defense of this shocking waste of taxpayer dollars.

I have listened in vain. I feel somewhat like the little boy who had waited for a long time for his Dutch uncle to take him to the theater. He had been told what a great play he would see.

Finally he got into the theater, with all its glamour—something like this Chamber—and discovered that it was a Greek tragedy, with the players speaking Greek.

I feel that that is what I have been listening to in defense of the bill.

Let the record speak for itself.

I ask unanimous consent that at the end of my remarks in opposition to the concurrent conference report on foreign aid there be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD these items from the New Republic.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Republic, Nov. 23, 1963]

AID BUT NOT COMFORT

The President is of the opinion that "this is the worst attack on foreign aid we've seen since the Marshall plan," but the administration invited attack before the battle began. First, Mr. Kennedy appointed a Commission headed by General Clay which he must have known would not be disposed either to firmly endorse the President's original request for $4.9 billion (it was trimmed to $4.5 billion in the Clay report), or come up with any radically new approach that took into realistic account the urgent and growing needs of developing nations over the next decade. Then in the Senate, almost before debate had opened on the President's foreign aid request, Senators MANSFIELD and FULBRIGHT, Senator DIRKSEN concurring, volunteered to cut it by $385 million. From then on, it was every man for himself. At one point, Senator ANDERSON rose to ask what the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. FULBRIGHT, really thought of the bill. Liberals like FRANK CHURCH and ERNEST GRUENING, neither of whom is up for reelection for another 5 years, teamed up with budget balancers and America-firsters like BARRY GOLDWATER to hack away. Not Senators MANSFIELD and DIRKSEN, but the Oregon maverick WAYNE MORSE took charge. Anti-Kennedy southerners, many of whom had heretofore voted for the program, now took pleasure in slicing a bit here and a bit there. What Senator LONG of Louisiana termed the most ridiculous piece of amending legislation in his experience was approved—"no assistance shall be furnished under this act to any country which has extended or hereafter extends its jurisdiction for fishing purposes over any area of the high seas beyond 3 miles from the coastline of such country." The Chilean, Ecuadoran and Peruvian peasants who will be hurt by this are in no position to compete with the tuna fishermen of California and Washington, represented by Senators KUCHEL and MAGNUSON; the crabmen of Alaska, backed by Senators GRUENING and BARTLETT; or Senator TOWER's Texas shrimpers—whose collective difficulties with foreign boundary makers led to the amendment's adoption. Senator PROXMIRE gave the show away when he stated in support of his own amendment to deprive the President of any discretion in giving assistance to Yugoslavia (adopted, and unadopted 24 hours later): "I honestly believe that the vast majority of people in Yugoslavia do not approve of this dictator. Certainly the people who have come to Wisconsin from Yugoslavia have nothing good to say about him."

Foreign aid, it is always said, has no constituency and is therefore especially vulnerable. Yet Congressmen say privately that the hostility of their constituents this year is very little, if any, greater than in the past. Nor can one explain the abandon with which internationally minded Senators have been trying to write a new bill on the floor of the Senate on the grounds that something is wrong with the program. Many things may be wrong with it, but they will not be righted this way.

Who is to blame? To a large extent, the very leaders who clearly see the importance of foreign aid. It has been presented by them for the past decade not as a continuing obligation of the rich to the poor, which it is, but as "a weapon maintaining the influence of the United States," as the President said on November 14, or as good for American business. Congress then steps in and decides to cut off funds to countries where U.S. influence has waned or which restrict U.S. fishing rights. And if, as its salesmen have been saying for so long, aid is a weapon against communism, why give it to Poland or Yugoslavia? The appeal that has been muted is the appeal to conscience. The Government has been and still is willing to cast its bread upon the waters, for we have wheat in embarrassing and expensive surplus, but thereafter the discussion is in terms of mutual backscratching. A magnanimous enterprise is reduced finally to a slush fund.

[From the New Republic, Nov. 30, 1963]

THE AID PROGRAM—A SENATORIAL DISSENT

The New Republic's lead editorial last week entitled "Aid but Not Comfort" missed completely the significance of the 3-week debate in the Senate on the foreign aid authorization bill. The editorial gave the impression that a small band of willful, liberal Senators imposed their will upon the majority of the Senators in order to protect local interests in their home States. Then you sounded slightly bewildered in trying to explain the Senate's actions despite the alleged lack of increased hostility to the foreign aid program as expressed in letters received from home.

What has happened in the last decade is that when the friends of foreign aid complained about the program's operations, they were told to suppress their criticisms lest they lend aid and comfort to the program's opponents. They were told that if they would but vote for increased authorizations and appropriations the deficiencies would be remedied. This has gone on year after year, but the changes in the program, repeatedly promised, have not been made. Every few years a bone is thrown to the complaining friends of the program by renaming it.

This year the suppressed emotions of the friends of foreign aid exploded on the floor of the Senate.

Fifty-seven Senators (of the 86 voting) voted for Senator KUCHEL's amendment on the arrest of U.S. fishermen in the belief that it was ludicrous for the United States to continue paying Ecuador $152 million a year while that country continued to use the naval vessels given them as part of our Latin American military aid program to arrest U.S. fishermen 200 miles off the coast of Ecuador. (The wording of the amendment in the New Republic was not correct.)

Sixty-five Senators (of the 78 voting) voted for my antiaggressor amendment because they felt strongly that it made no sense to continue to pour $224 million per year into Egypt (nearly $1 billion to date) while that country continued to spend approximately the same amount waging aggressive wars in Yemen and continued to purchase offensive Communist weapons, including ground-to-ground missiles, submarines, jet fighter planes, to carry out its repeatedly announced intention of waging war against Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Israel, and Morocco.

The Senate itself, by a voice without dissent, agreed to add my amendment cutting off military aid to Latin America in view of the repeated instances where that aid has been used by military juntas to overthrow constitutionally elected governments.

Seventy-eight Senators (of the 80 voting) joined Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER in his amendment to authorize the President to appoint committees to "review, evaluate, and make recommendations respecting foreign aid programs."

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in its report on the bill, had itself, in no uncertain terms, pointed out the need for changes in the program, but failed to reflect its beliefs in the bill it reported.

The admission by the majority and minority leaders, almost at the beginning of the debate, that the total could be trimmed an additional $385 million cast doubt on the validity of all authorization requests, especially since high administration officials, a few short weeks before, had pleaded with members of the Foreign Relations Committee that the higher figure was absolutely essential for our security.

After the vote on the final passage of the bill in the Senate, a State Department employee was overheard to remark that the Department had done remarkably well since it had padded its request by $1 billion just to take care of congressional cuts.

The fact is that the program has had too much money and has been profligate in its use of the vast sums appropriated, oftentimes hurting rather than helping the countries aided.

One reason for the faulty analysis by the New Republic may well be that there has been an almost complete blackout of news about the program. Recently I completed a lengthy study of the foreign aid program in 10 Middle Eastern and African countries for the Senate Committee on Government Operations. My findings were contained in a printed report (472 pages) which, for the first time, went into the program in those countries in depth. Yet the press and periodicals contained very little, if any, mention of those findings. That report demonstrated with facts and figures how too much U.S. aid could hurt rather than help the economy of a country. The more recent example of Colombia being unable to spend our aid is another instance of the same prodigality.

In addition to our giving certain countries more money than they can absorb, we are giving AID dollars to countries which are not really interested in economic development or are not ready for the type of economic development they need to undertake.

Why should we continue to give aid to the rich European countries, which our aid has rehabilitated, to the tune of $899.1 million in fiscal year 1963? Japan belongs in that same category.

Should we continue to pour our dollars (140 million of them in fiscal year 1963) into Indonesia so that Sukarno can destroy Malaysia while his domestic economy goes from bad to worse?

How long are we to continue to sink $172 million a year into Brazil which continues to break its promises of economic reform?

How long should the United States agree to send over $156 million a year to Argentina while it permits its chaotic politics to disrupt any worthwhile efforts at economic development?

Our Greek, Lebanon, and Israel programs are supposedly stopped. Should not, therefore, the foreign aid tab be less by the amount ($200 million) they received in fiscal year 1963?

Just adding the amounts of aid to the countries named—without naming others which are indifferent to their own best interests—we reach a total of over $1.5 billion by which the grant and loan authorizations can be cut. A $2.5 billion appropriation would be entirely adequate apart from the fact that $6.5 billion in the foreign aid pipeline are unspent and available.

The astounding fact is that our aid now goes to 107 countries around the world. In some of these countries our AID program is large—in others it is small. Money is the new weapon of diplomacy. No funds can be spent from the Treasury unless it has been appropriated by the Congress. That is what the Constitution provides. In appropriating funds, the Congress must state the purposes for which they may be spent. The administrators of all programs—both foreign and domestic—would, of course, like to have a blank check. But we do have a government of checks and balances. Congress cannot delegate its duties to the Executive any more than the Executive can shift its duties to the Congress.

What has happened during previous years is that the Congress has not fulfilled its duties with respect to the foreign aid program. The loud shrieks of anguish heard on Capitol Hill and echoed in much unperceptive newspaper and magazine comment concerning the recent foreign aid debate really reflect the realization that the Senate was seeking for the first time to regain that control over the foreign aid program which it should have exercised all along, and by doing so has substantially improved the program.

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate.

[From the New Republic, Nov. 30, 1963]

PROGRESS FOR WHOM?

Senator GRUENING's statement to the New Republic in this issue reflects a spreading pessimism in high as well as low places about Latin America. The Alliance for Progress seems not much of an alliance, and not much progress can be reported either. The Organization of American States, in the words of a distinguished Bolivian author and diplomat, Fernando Diez de Medina, "has demonstrated its bureaucratic paralysis. It acts sporadically. It reflects the thinking in Washington rather than the thinking in Latin America." AID injections to prevent political infection are increased, and the patient gets sicker. The hoped-for healing effects of new investment are canceled out by the low prices of basic commodities Latin America has to trade, and by a population that at present rates will give that continent a half-billion people by the end of this century. Long-term economic development requires confidence in the future. But there is little of that. Latin Americans have sent more than $11 billion overseas since the end of World War II. One military coup succeeds another. In his speech to the Inter-American Press Association last week, President Kennedy recited once more the sad statistics of poverty and repeated the ritual warning, surely wearisome by now to Latin Americans, that Communists must keep out. But it was tired stuff.

The United States has offered $1 billion a year to buy reform (also known as "modernization"). But who will judge which reforms, where, and how speedily accomplished? The administration says the Latin Americans must answer that question. It does not really mean that, however; obviously the Latins cannot decide for themselves how money from American taxpayers is to be used; too much of it would go into unwise public works, or into very wise private pockets. For their part, most South American governments resent interference from the north, but they also resent noninterference which takes the form of no help. There is another paradox. Although the administration is urging more private investment in Latin America, it acknowledges the sovereign right of any government to expropriate these investments so long as just compensation is given. Not only does the prospect of just compensation add nothing to the attractiveness of private investment abroad, but as the government of President Illia in the Argentine is demonstrating, that very investment is a club with which a government can beat further concessions out of the United States. Argentina has replied to protests at her cancellation of oil contracts with American business firms by threatening to seize other American properties if the United States takes retaliatory action. Mr. Illia perhaps thinks that he can go far before U.S. aid is withdrawn, for by permitting us to help them, the Latins offer us an excuse to provide more employment at home. Of $1.8 billion given to date to Latin America under the Alliance, 80 percent has gone to buy goods and services in the United States.

In 1961, the administration announced plans to spend $260 million to finance the development of the wretched northeast section of Brazil. Almost none of that money has been spent. (It takes about 2 years to get AID approval for a project; it is always manna mañana.) AID officials refused to grant Peru funds to buy picks and shovels for Indian workers; that's against regulations, not a sound business proposition—picks and shovels could be lost or stolen.

As for the importance of constitutional government in this hemisphere, the President at one point in his address last week may have invited new coups. That is the meaning certain groups in Latin America, fearful of a "leftist" takeover, will read into his words: "The American States must be ready to come to the aid of any government requesting aid to prevent a takeover linked to the policies of foreign communism rather than to an internal desire for change." Nor will it soon be forgotten in South America that the leaders of recent military coups were trained and equipped by the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall vote against the conference report.

First, in the bill which was passed by the Senate there was a provision to the effect that no aid was to be granted under the act to any country which contemplated using money in establishing a Government-operated enterprise in competition with private enterprise, unless it clearly appeared that private enterprise was not adequately doing the job.

That provision in the Senate bill has been stricken.

I do not believe that our country can give money for the purpose of socializing countries around the world without eventually endangering the security of our own Nation.

Second, the bill which passed the Senate prohibited the granting of any aid, of any type, under the act to Communist countries. That provision has been stricken.

Third, in the Senate committee the Mundt-Lausche amendment was adopted, providing that when loans are made they shall bear interest at not less than 2 percent a year, beginning in the 5th year, and that they shall have an amortization period of not more than 35 years.

The Mundt-Lausche amendment was diluted in committee. Our amendment initially provided a rate of 2 percent from the date the obligation began. The dilution by the committee has been aggravated by the dilution by the conferees. There are other reasons why I shall vote against the conference report, but these three I definitely state.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I join in the expression of disappointment just expressed by the Senator from Ohio. I, too, shall vote against the conference report. I deeply deplore the backtracking which was done on our constructive work in raising interest rates on foreign aid loans to a more realistic figure.

I take the remainder of the time yielded to me to call the attention of the Senate to a rather astonishing development from the standpoint of our trade concessions to Red Russia and her slavish satellites. Many Senators and taxpayers will be shocked to learn that on December 11 the Department of Commerce announced that it had granted a license to sell and ship wheat to East Germany, a Communist country whose government we do not even recognize. The announcement is eloquently silent as to whether the credit guarantees the American taxpayer is expected to extend on Red purchases generally will be made available to a government which we deny exists. I shall try to ascertain those factors and discuss them later. If Export-Import Bank credit is to be extended to East Germany it will indeed be a curious procedure in view of our nonrecognition of Communist East Germany and our opposition to the Berlin Wall it has erected as a barrier to normal East-West city relations..

This action demonstrates the importance of the issues of S. 2310, which would have prohibited extension of American public credit to communist countries. These issues remain undecided in this body. All we decided by the rollcall vote on November 26 was to defer the decision, by laying the bill on the table. The basic issues are as vital and significant today as they were then.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Grain Sale Prospect Up; East Zone to Get Wheat," written by Frank C. Porter, and published in the Washington Post of December 11, 1963; and an article entitled "$3.2 Million Export of Wheat to East Germany Authorized," written by William M. Blair, and published in the New York Times of December 11, 1963.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 11, 1963]

GRAIN SALE PROSPECT UP; EAST ZONE TO GET WHEAT

(By Frank C. Porter)

Prospects for wheat sales to the Soviet Union brightened yesterday. At the same time, the Department of Commerce licensed the shipment of $3.2 million of wheat to East Germany.

Under Secretary of Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., emerged from a meeting with shipowner groups and announced that U.S.-flag vessels are expected to be fully employed on other business for the next 6 or 7 months.

In reversing the ban against shipment of subsidized commodities behind the Iron Curtain, the administration decreed that 50 percent of wheat commitments must be carried in domestic bottoms where available.

But operators of U.S. tramps and tankers charge at least $3 a ton more on Soviet routes than do foreign shipowners. The Russians have balked at paying this higher delivered price.

Not so the Hungarians, who have purchased some $15 million worth of U.S. wheat. But on the second shipment of 100,000 tons, the domestic seller sought a waiver of the shipping preference.

Last week the Commerce Department granted it, ruling that U.S. ships were then completely tied up with food for peace, other foreign aid and oil cargoes.

National Maritime Union President Joseph Curran promptly fired off a blast, insisting that the ships were available, and that specifications and orders had been "jockeyed"—a protest that he subsequently softened.

But representatives of the American Maritime Association and the American Tramp Shipowners' Association said after their meeting with Roosevelt yesterday that they support the waiver and agree with administration policy.

Roosevelt also said the Department is seeking reaction from the shipping trade on the draft for a proposed tightening of waiver procedures. The draft would require applicants to solicit all U.S. shipowners before seeking a waiver. It would also require traders to seek domestic bottoms on a 30-day-availability basis.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 11, 1963]

$3.2 MILLION EXPORT OF WHEAT TO EAST GERMANY AUTHORIZED

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, December 10.—An export license for the sale of $3.2 million worth of wheat to East Germany was issued today by the Commerce Department.

This will be the first agricultural commodity sale made to a Soviet bloc country since November 21 and the first since negotiations with the Soviet Union for the sale of $250 million worth of wheat became stalled.

The American seller of the wheat, believed to be about 1.5 million bushels, was not named.

The Department announcement came as representatives of the U.S. tramp shipping industry conferred with Under Secretary Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., on what both sides labeled a "misunderstanding" over cargo preference on part of a shipment of wheat to Hungary.

Tramp ship operators and maritime labor unions protested the waiver granted to Cargill, Inc., to permit the grain concern to ship 91,000 tons of a 100,000-ton commitment of wheat sold to Hungary on foreign-flag vessels.

The Maritime Administration waived the requirement that 50 percent of the shipment must be carried in U.S.-flag vessels because Cargill reported it was able to obtain ships for only 9,000 tons.

In public statements, Mr. Roosevelt and the tramp ship representatives pictured the conference as having cleared up the "misunderstanding." But privately both sides appeared to agree that only future developments would tell whether the matter had been settled.

After the meeting the Maritime Administration announced, in effect, that it would get out of the shipbroker business. In the future, it said, exporters or grain dealers must show if American vessels are available for shipments to Communist countries.

The Maritime Administration said it was circulating a proposal that applications from grain dealers for waiver of the 50-percent cargo preference provision must be accompanied by certification that the dealers had canvassed all possibilities.

This canvass would include publication of the shipping requirements in a daily ship news outlet, with the shipping industry allowed 30 days to reply.

If the grain dealer then applied for a waiver, the Maritime Administration will publish the application in a shipping news daily and allow 5 days for protests. After this the waiver will be granted.

The proposal, circulated for comment by dealers and the shipping industry, also noted that the Government's guideline on rates for U.S. ships in the 15,600- to 30,000-ton class would apply.

This limits the waivers to larger vessels on which the Government has reduced cargo rates by 20 percent to promote the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union. The Russians had complained of the U.S. rates, which are higher than foreign-flag charter rates.

Smaller vessels, including 10,000-ton Liberty ships, are still under the higher rates applicable to foreign aid shipments of farm commodities under Public Law 480, the surplus disposal statute.

Max Harrison, president of the American Maritime Association, said after the conference that "we're in accord with the program" and wished to "help the administration carry out its program."

"We have no problem with the administration," he said.

Mr. Roosevelt said both the labor union representatives, with whom he met yesterday, and ship management "fully support the program."

It is obvious, he said, that the sale of wheat to Communist countries and sales under Public Law 480 "will keep the American merchant marine fully occupied for the next 7 months."

"We do not want to grant waivers," he said, adding that waivers would be granted "only when a seller fully documents his case that American ships are not available."

In the Cargill case he said, the lack of American ships, including Liberty vessels, was "documented to the satisfaction of labor and management." Earlier, the American Maritime Association and the labor unions—the National Maritime Union and the Seafarers International Union—had contended that U.S.-flag vessels were available.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to that great leader of the opposition, the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Senate, when it was debating the foreign aid bill, vastly improved it. Although it was far from satisfactory, I felt obliged to vote for it, for the Senate had accepted two of my amendments, and others which I had supported. And feeling that the bill had been improved and favoring foreign aid, I voted for it. Most of that improvement has been undone in conference. I spelled out that undoing fully in a long speech yesterday. I shall therefore be obliged to vote against accepting the conference report.

It is shocking to think how these errors—these wasteful practices, these subsidizations of unworthy governments, these giveaways to curry a dictator's favor, these ill-considered projects—continue. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in answer to a question as to why we had committed follies in Cambodia—$300 million worth and the arms and military training we have given the Cambodians now will be used to help Red China—pointed out that we make mistakes at home, such as in the case of the Dyna-Soar.

The point is that we continue to make the same mistakes in the foreign aid program over and over again. Year after year, we have pointed out the folly of providing military aid to countries that either misuse it for purposes other than mutual security or which could not use it effectively if war came. Yet we keep right on doing it.

Apart from the gross errors in the foreign aid program, which I cited in 3 weeks of debate last month and particularly in my remarks yesterday, I point out also that if we consider the program country by country, and eliminate the countries that should not have foreign aid, we could reduce the present authorization by $2 billion. Those are plain facts.

Consider the new and prosperous countries of Europe, countries made prosperous by our past lavish aid. They are still getting it and should not. Consider Japan in the same category. Consider Taiwan, that little island which has now received $4,500,000 in every form of economic and military aid from us, but which will be defended, if it ever needs defense, by our 7th Fleet.

Consider aggressor nations such as Egypt and Indonesia, which are waging costly wars or preparing to wage them with the funds we supply them to help their presumably undernourished and unemployed people. Go through the gamut of countries, including the newly independent, into which we rush immediately with our aid, including colonies of mother countries, and into which we have rushed our aid even before they are set free.

The minute a new nation is spawned, we rush in without even knowing what it needs, if indeed it is our obligation to take care of it. Why do we feel compelled to rush in and assist a former colony all over again, the very minute its independence is announced, when we scarce know what would best serve our objectives? Why do we not let the old colonial powers carry over this obligation? We do not require them to contribute their share. We have given aid to British Honduras, British Guiana, and Dutch Guiana while they were still colonies. How can the powers whose colonies they are, be expected ever to assume their responsibilities in assisting our aid programs to the underdeveloped nations seriously when we insist on playing Lady Bountiful in their own bailiwicks?

There is one other aspect I wish to stress. While the debate has been taking place, and with no interruption in the flow of our AID dollars abroad, the domestic aid program, the accelerated public works program which would put our mounting numbers of unemployed Americans to work, is starving for lack of funds. An ad hoc committee appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Public Works has been holding hearings this week. Before that committee have appeared Governors, mayors, and State officials to tell of the vast number of useful projects which are processed, approved and ready to go but for which there are no funds. The accelerated public works fund of $900 million—which has done splendid work while it lasted has long since run dry and there will be no replenishment for months.

The contrast between what we do not do for the people at home and what we insist on doing for people abroad is shocking. Such a practice—such a double standard—must stop.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, over the years, it has been my feeling that the cause of American freedom and American liberty and their perpetuation would be enhanced, in the never-ending struggle with international communism, by a program under which we would be of assistance, economic and military, to the friendly nations, which desire to maintain their freedom and which would stand with the free nations of the West in opposing the onslaughts of communism in any fashion.

I have supported the foreign aid program. It has not been easy. I wish to reexpress today my bitterness at the cavalier fashion in which the conferees dealt with an amendment I sponsored in the Senate and which was approved by the Senate by a 2 to 1 vote. I wish also to express my supreme dissatisfaction with some of the other amendments which were torn out of the bill as it left the Senate by the conferees of the House and the Senate.

However, I do not care to tear down the temple merely because of a great and inexcusable error which was committed in conference.

Nevertheless, with considerable pain, I shall support the conference report today.

I voice the hope of one humble American that the Government of the United States will stand by the rights of its citizens in the use of the open seas. I express the hope, too, that when a foreign aid bill comes before the Senate again, next year, it will be presented in a far more acceptable fashion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the question of the adoption of the conference report, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLSON (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. If the senior Senator from New Hampshire were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] would vote nay.

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is absent on official duty.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 26, as follows:

[No. 268 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Fulbright
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—26

Beall
Bennett
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Curtis
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Gruening
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
Mechem
Morse
Mundt
Russell
Simpson
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—13

Carlson
Cotton
Dominick
Edmondson
Engle
Goldwater
Gore
Hruska
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Robertson
Talmadge
Walters

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of December 10, 1963, pp. 24268–24273, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that time for debate on the conference report be limited to 15 minutes to a side, with the rule of germaneness to apply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Idaho.

DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS ON DEPOSIT TO THE CREDIT OF THE KOOTENAI TRIBE OR BAND OF INDIANS, IDAHO

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2139) to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians of the State of Idaho that were appropriated by the Act of September 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 830), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket 154, and the interest thereon, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed per capita to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to the Federal or State income tax.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the purpose of S. 2139 is to provide for the distribution of an award to the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians by the Indian Claims Commission. The Senate passed S. 2139 on October 22, 1963.

The House has amended the bill by striking the word "approved." In its report No. 903, accompanying the companion bill H.R. 8527, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs explained its amendment as follows:

> H.R. 8527 was amended to provide that the judgment funds may be used only for programs jointly authorized by the tribal governing body and the Secretary of the Interior. In a number of cases on other Indian reservations similar funds have been expended for programs authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary. Instances have been cited wherein recipients have willfully violated the spirit of family planning by purchasing furnishings or equipment for resale at ridiculously low prices. It is hoped that reported loopholes in the present system of using family funds to purchase items which are readily disposed of for cash can be closed.

As the sponsor of S. 2139 in the Senate, the House amendment is satisfactory to me and to other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to S. 2139.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

ADULT INDIAN VOCATIONAL TRAINING

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1868) to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating to adult Indian vocational training, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act relating to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations", approved August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986; 25 U.S.C. 309), is amended (1) by inserting in the first sentence thereof immediately after "twenty-four months," the following: "and, for nurses' training, for periods that do not exceed thirty-six months," and (2) by striking out the period at the end of the last sentence in such section and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "or with any school of nursing offering a three-year course of study leading to a diploma in nursing which is accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Secretary.".
>
> (b) Section 2 of said Act of August 3, 1956, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:
>
> "SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this Act the sum of $12,000,000 for each fiscal year, and not to exceed $1,500,000 of such sum shall be available for administrative purposes.".

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, S. 1868, as passed by the Senate on August 28, 1963, amended the act of September 22, 1961, entitled "An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations," by increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated for the program from $7,500,000 to $12 million annually and by increasing the portion of this amount that may be used for administering the program from $1 million to $1,500,000.

The House has amended the Senate bill by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting new language that would enable Indian students to enroll in a nurse training program at accredited schools for 36-month periods. All other vocational training programs would continue to be limited to 24 months. The purpose in extending the time for the training of nurses is to allow them sufficient time to earn certificates as registered nurses. The Public Health Service endorses this proposal, and it is expected that a sizable number of students will take advantage of the extended training period provided by this legislation. The House did not change the authorized appropriations for vocational training, which is increased to $12 million annually.

As the sponsor of S. 1868 in the Senate, the House amendment is satisfactory to me and to other members of the Committe on Interior and Insular Affairs. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to S. 1868.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am most pleased to present to the Senate the conference report on H.R. 4955 of which part A is the Vocational Education Act of 1963; part B is the extension and amendment of the National Defense Education Act; and part C is the extension of the federally impacted areas legislation Public Laws 815 and 874.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the text of the conference report and the statement of managers on the part of the House relating to this act, together with a table which sets forth on a State-by-State basis the estimated distribution of the funds under section 2 of the conference bill.

There being no objection, the excerpts, statements, and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1025)
>
> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:
>
> "PART A—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
>
> *"Declaration of purpose*
>
> "SECTION 1. It is the purpose of this part to authorize Federal grants to States to assist them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs of vocational education, and to provide part-time employment for youths who need the earnings from such employment to continue their vocational training on a full-time basis, so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State—those in high school, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps—will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and

which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training.

"Authorization of appropriations

"Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $60,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $118,500,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $177,500,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter, $225,000,000, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this part.

"Allotments to States

"Sec. 3. (a) Ninety per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the number of persons in the various age groups needing vocational education and the per capita income in the respective States as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year—

"(1) An amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged fifteen to nineteen, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(2) An amount which bears the same ratio to 20 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty to twenty-four, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(3) An amount which bears the same ratio to 15 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty-five to sixty-five, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(4) An amount which bears the same ratio to 5 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the sum of the amounts allotted to the State under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) for such year bears to the sum of the amounts allotted to all the States under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) for such year.

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which is less than $10,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States under such subsection, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

"(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under section 5 shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use under the approved plan of such State for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

"(d)(1) The 'allotment ratio' for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .40 or more than .60, and (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .60.

"(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and September 30 of the preceding fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this part. Allotment ratios shall be computed on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes for a State and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Commerce.

"(3) The term 'per capita income' for a State or for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for any fiscal year, means the total personal income for such State, and for all such States, respectively, in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year, divided by the population of such State, and of all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

"(4) The total population and the population of particular age groups of a State or of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"Uses of Federal funds

"Sec. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), a State's allotment under section 3 may be used, in accordance with its approved State plan, for any or all of the following purposes:

"(1) Vocational education for persons attending high school;

"(2) Vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market;

"(3) Vocational education for persons (other than persons who are receiving training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-415), the Area Redevelopment Act (Public Law 87-27), or the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-794)) who have already entered the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment;

"(4) Vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program;

"(5) Construction of area vocational education school facilities;

"(6) Ancillary services and activities to assure quality in all vocational education programs, such as teacher training and supervision, program evaluation, special demonstration and experimental programs, development of instructional materials, and State administration and leadership, including periodic evaluation of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities.

"(b) At least 33⅓ per centum of each State's allotment for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1968, and at least 25 per centum of each State's allotment for any subsequent fiscal year shall be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) or (5), or both, of subsection (a), and at least 3 per centum of each State's allotment shall be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (6) of subsection (a), except that the Commissioner may, upon request of a State, permit such State to use a smaller percentage of its allotment for any year for the purposes specified above if he determines that such smaller percentage will adequately meet such purposes in such State.

"(c) Ten per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner to make grants to colleges and universities and other public or nonprofit private agencies and institutions, to State boards, and with the approval of the appropriate State board, to local educational agencies, to pay part of the cost of research and training programs and of experimental, developmental, or pilot programs developed by such institutions, boards, or agencies, and designed to meet the special vocational education needs of youths, particularly youths in economically depressed communities who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education programs.

"State plans

"Sec. 5. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments of Federal funds under this part shall submit through its State board to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

"(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the State plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies; and, if such State board does not include as members persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor in the State, and a person or persons representative of junior colleges, technical institutes, or other institutions of higher education which provide programs of technical or vocational training meeting the definition of vocational education in section 8(1) of this Act, provides for the designation or creation of a State advisory council which shall include such persons, to consult with the State board in carrying out the State plan;

"(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in allocating each such allotment among the various uses set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 4(a), and in allocating Federal funds to local educational agencies in the State, which policies and procedures insure that due consideration will be given to the results of periodic evaluations of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities, and to the relative vocational education needs of all groups in all communities in the State, and that Federal funds made available under this part will be so used as to supplement, and, to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State or local funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the uses set forth in section 4(a) so that all persons in all communities of the State will as soon as possible have ready access to vocational training suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit therefrom, and in no case supplant such State or local funds;

"(3) provides minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, directors, and others having responsibilities under the State plan;

"(4) provides for entering into cooperative arrangements with the system of public employment offices in the State, approved by the State board and by the State head of such system, looking toward such offices making available to the State board and local educational agencies occupational information regarding reasonable prospects of employment in the community and elsewhere, and toward consideration of such information by such board and agencies in providing vocational guidance and counseling to students and prospective students and in determining the occupations for which persons are to be trained; and looking toward guidance and counseling personnel of the State board and local educational agencies making available to public employment offices information regarding the occupational qualifications of persons leaving or completing vocational education courses or schools, and toward consideration of such information by such offices in the occupational guidance and placement of such persons;

"(5) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this part;

"(6) provides assurance that the requirements of section 7 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this part; and

"(7) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve a State plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), and shall not finally disapprove a State plan except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State board designated pursuant to paragraph (1) of such subsection.

"(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board administering a State plan approved under subsection (b), finds that—

"(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

"(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State board that no further payments will be made to the State under this part (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under this part (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"(d) A State board which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (b) or (c) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the Commissioner may modify or set aside his action. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 6. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall be paid on condition that there shall be expended for such year, in accordance with the State plan approved under section 5 or the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, or both, an amount in State or local funds, or both, which at least equals the amount expended for vocational education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts.

"(b) Subject to the limitations in section 4(b), the portion of a State's allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each succeeding year, allocated under the approved State plan for each of the purposes set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying one-half of the State's expenditures under such plan for such year for each such purpose.

"(c) The portion of a State's allotment for any fiscal year allocated under the approved State plan for the purpose set forth in paragraph (5) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying not to exceed one-half of the cost of construction of each area vocational education school facility project.

"(d) Payments of Federal funds allotted to a State under section 3 to States which have State plans approved under section 5 (as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds so allotted.

"Labor standards

"SEC. 7. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this part shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"Definitions

"SEC. 8. For the purposes of this part—

"(1) The term 'vocational education' means vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes (including field or laboratory work incidental thereto) under public supervision and control or under contract with a State board or local educational agency, and is conducted as part of a program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment as semiskilled or skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations (including any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment in business and office occupations, and any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment which may be assisted by Federal funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, but excluding any program to fit individuals for employment in occupations which the Commissioner determines, and specifies in regulations, to be generally considered professional or as requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree). Such term includes vocational guidance and counseling in connection with such training, instruction related to the occupation for which the student is being trained or necessary for him to benefit from such training, the training of persons engaged as, or preparing to become vocational education teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors for such training, travel of students and vocational education personnel, and the acquisition and maintenance and repair of instructional supplies, teaching aids and equipment, but does not include the construction or initial equipment of buildings or the acquisition or rental of land.

"(2) The term 'area vocational education school' means—

"(A) a specialized high school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational education to persons who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

"(B) a department of a high school exclusively or principally used for providing vocational education in no less than five different occupational fields to persons who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

"(C) a technical or vocational school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational education to persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

"(D) the department or division of a junior college or community college or university which provides vocational education in no less than five different occupational fields, under the supervision of the State Board, leading to immediate employment but not leading to a baccalaureate degree,

if it is available to all residents of the State of an area of the State designated and approved by the State board, and if, in the case of a school, department, or division described in (C) or (D), it admits as regular students both persons who have completed high school and persons who have left high school.

"(3) The term 'school facilities' means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment) and interests in land on which such facilities are constructed. Such term shall not include any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

"(4) The term 'construction' includes construction of new buildings and expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and includes site grading and improvement and architect fees.

"(5) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(6) The term 'State' includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"(7) The term 'State board' means the State board designated or created pursuant to section 5 of the Smith-Hughes Act (that is the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28)) to secure to the State the benefits of that Act.

"(8) The term 'local educational agency' means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, or any other public educational institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a vocational education program.

"(9) The term 'high school' does not include any grade beyond grade 12.

"(10) The term 'Vocational Education Act of 1946' means titles I, II, and III of the Act of June 8, 1936, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg).

"(11) The term 'supplementary vocational education Acts' means section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U.S.C. 30) (relating to vocational education in Puerto Rico), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 31–33) (relating to vocational education in the Virgin Islands), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U.S.C. 34) (relating to vocational education in Guam).

"Advisory Committee on Vocational Education

"SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on Vocational Education (hereinafter referred to as the 'Advisory Committee'), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, one representative each of the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor, and twelve members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary'). Such twelve members shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public, and not more than six of such members shall be professional educators. The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than twice a year.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, the Vocational Education Act of 1946, and supplementary vocational education Acts, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans under section 5 and the approval of projects under section 4(c) and section 14.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Amendments to George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Acts

"SEC. 10. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in title I, II, or III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg), or in the Smith-Hughes Act (that is, the Act approved February 23, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28)), or in supplementary vocational education Acts—

"(a) any portion of any amount allotted (or apportioned) to any State for any purpose under such titles, Act, or Acts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, or for any fiscal year thereafter, may be transferred to and combined with one or more of the other allotments (or apportionments) of such State for such fiscal year under such titles, Act, or Acts, or under section 3 of this part and used for the purposes for which, and subject to the conditions under which, such other allotment (or apportionment) may be used, if the State board requests, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, that such portion be transferred and shows to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that transfer of such portion in the manner requested will promote the purpose of this part;

"(b) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for agriculture may be used for vocational education in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects, whether or not such occupation involves work of the farm or of the farm home, and such education may be provided without directed or supervised practice on a farm;

"(c)(1) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for home economics may be used for vocational education to fit individuals for gainful employment in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects;

"(2) at least 10 per centum of any amount so allotted (or apportioned) to a State for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1965, may be used only for vocational education to fit persons for gainful employment in occupations involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects, or transferred to another allotment under subsection (a), or both.

"(d) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for distributive occupations may be used for vocational education for any person over fourteen years of age who has entered upon or is preparing to enter upon such an occupation, and such education need not be provided in part-time or evening schools;

"(e) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for trade and industrial occupations may be used for preemployment schools and classes organized to fit for gainful employment in such occupations persons over fourteen years of age who are in school, and operated for less than nine months per year and less than thirty hours per week and without the requirement that a minimum of 50 per centum of the time be given to practical work on a useful or productive basis, if such preemployment schools and classes are for single-skilled or semi-skilled occupations which do not require training or work of such duration or nature; and less than one-third of any amounts so allotted (or apportioned) need be applied to part-time schools or classes for workers who have entered upon employment.

"Extension of practical nurse training and area vocational education programs

"SEC. 11. (a)(1) Section 201 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15aa) is amended by striking out 'of the next eight fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'succeeding fiscal year'.

"(2) Subsection (c) of section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out 'of the next seven fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'succeeding fiscal year'.

"(b) Section 301 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 15aaa) is amended by striking out 'of the five suceeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'succeeding fiscal year'.

"Periodic review of vocational education programs and laws

"SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary shall, during 1966, appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education for the purpose of reviewing the administration of the vocational education programs for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this Act and other vocational education Acts and making recommendations for improvement of such administration, and reviewing the status of and making recommendations with respect to such vocational education programs and the Acts under which funds are so appropriated.

"(b) The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twelve persons who shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public.

"(c) The Council is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

"(d) The Council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this part and other vocational education Acts) to the Secretary, such report to be submitted not later than January 1, 1968, after which date such Council shall cease to exist. The Secretary shall transmit such report to the President and the Congress.

"(e) The Secretary shall also from time to time thereafter (but at intervals of not more than five years) appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education, with the same functions and constituted in the same manner as prescribed for the Advisory Council in the preceding subsections of this section. Each Council so appointed shall report its findings and recommendations, as prescribed in subsection (d), not later than July 1 of the second year after the year in which it is appointed, after which date such Council shall cease to exist.

"(f) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

"Work-study program for vocational education students

"SEC. 13. (a)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 15 and determined to be for the purposes of this section for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums so determined for such year as the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of the State, in the preceding fiscal year bears to the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of all of the States in such preceding year.

"(2) The amount of any State's allotment under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under subsection (b) shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under paragraph (1) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this paragraph during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment for such year.

"(b) To be eligible to participate in this section, a State must have in effect a plan approved under section 5 and must submit through its State board to the Commissioner a supplement to such plan (hereinafter referred to as a 'supplementary plan'), in such detail as the Commissioner determines necessary, which—

"(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the supplementary plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies;

"(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in approving work-study programs, under which policies and procedures funds paid to the State from its allotment under subsection (a) will be expended solely for the payment of compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs which meet the requirements of subsection (c), except that not to exceed 1 per centum of any such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is the greater, may be used to pay the cost of developing the State's supplementary plan and the cost of administering such supplementary plan after its approval under this section;

"(3) sets forth principles for determining the priority to be accorded applications from local educational agencies for work-study programs, which principles shall give preference to applications submitted by local educational agencies serving communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or who are unemployed, and provides for undertaking such programs, insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

"(4) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this section;

"(5) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, a work-study program shall—

"(1) be administered by the local educational agency and made reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all youths in the area served by such agency who are able to meet the requirements of paragraph (2);

"(2) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who (A) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student in a vocational education program which meets the standards prescribed by the State board and the local educational agency for vocational education programs assisted under the preceding sections of this part, or in the case of a student already enrolled in such a program, is in good standing and in full-time attendance, (B) is in need of the earnings from such employment to commence or continue his vocational education program, and (C) is at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the commencement of his employment, and is capable, in the opinion of the appropriate school authorities, of maintaining good standing in his vocational education program while employed under the work-study program;

"(3) provide that no student shall be employed under such work-study program for more than fifteen hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session, or for compensation which exceeds $45 in any month or $350 in any academic year or its equivalent, unless the student is attending a school which is not within reasonable commuting distance from his home, in which case his compensation may not exceed $60 in any month or $500 in any academic year or its equivalent;

"(4) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be for the local educational agency or for some other public agency or institution;

"(5) provide that, in each fiscal year during which such program remains in effect, such agency shall expend (from sources other than payments from Federal funds under this section) for the employment of its students (whether or not in employment eligible for assistance under this section) an amount that is not less than its average annual expenditure for work-study programs of a similar character during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which its work-study program under this section is approved.

"(d) Subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 5 (pertaining to the approval of State plans, the withholding of Federal payments in case of noncomformity after approval, and judicial review of the Commissioner's final actions in disapproving a State plan or withholding payments) shall be applicable to the Commissioner's actions with respect to supplementary plans under this section.

"(e) From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the Commissioner shall pay to such State an amount equal to the amount expended for compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs under the State's supplementary plan approved under this section, plus an amount, not to exceed 1 per centum of such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is the greater, expended for the development of the State's supplementary plan and for the administration of such plan after its approval by the Commissioner. From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the next succeeding fiscal year, such payment shall equal 75 per centum of the amount so expended. No State shall receive payments under this section for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under subsection (a) for such fiscal year.

"(f) Such payments (adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds allotted under subsection (a).

"(g) Students employed in work-study programs under this section shall not by reason of such employment be deemed employees of the United States, or their service Federal service, for any purpose.

"Residential vocational education schools

"SEC. 14. For the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of residential vocational education schools for certain youths of high school age, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants, out of sums appropriated pursuant to section — to State boards, to colleges and universities, and with the approval of the appropriate State board, to public educational agencies, organizations, or institutions for the construction, equipment, and operation of residential schools to provide vocational education (including room, board, and other necessities) for youths, at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the time of enrollment, who need full-time study on a residential basis in order to benefit fully from such education. In making such grants, the Commissioner shall give special consideration to the needs of large urban areas having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed and shall seek to attain, as nearly as practicable in the light of the purposes of this section, an equitable geographical distribution of such schools.

"Authorization for sections 13 and 14

"SEC. 15. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of sections 13 and 14, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year. The Commissioner shall determine the portion of such sums for each such year which is to be used for the purposes of each such section.

"Federal control

"SEC. 16. Nothing contained in this part shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

"Short title

"SEC. 17. This part may be cited as the 'Vocational Education Act of 1963'.

"PART B—EXTENSION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

"Amendments to title I—General provisions

"SEC. 21. (a) Section 103(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'American Samoa,' after 'Guam,' each time it appears therein.

"(b) Subsections (g) and (h) of such section 103 are amended by inserting 'or, if such school is not in any State, as determined by the Commissioner' after the words 'as determined under State law' wherever such words appear in such subsections.

"(c) Subsection (l) of such section 103 is amended by striking out 'does not include' and inserting in lieu thereof 'includes' and by inserting before the period ', except that no such school or institution shall be eligible to receive any grant, loan, or other payment under this Act'.

"(d) Subsection (k) of such section 103 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof ', or any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school'.

"Amendments to title II—Loans to students in institutions of higher education

"SEC. 22. (a) The first sentence of section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for the two succeeding fiscal years, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1964, to continue or complete their education' and inserting in lieu thereof '$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and the next fiscal year, $125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and $135,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the next three fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for school years ending prior to July 1, 1965, to continue or complete their education'.

"(b) Section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out '1964' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"(c) Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, section 203 (b) of such Act is amended by striking out

'$250,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$800,000'.

"(d)(1) Subparagraph (2)(A)(i) of subsection (b) of section 205 of such Act is amended by inserting 'or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner' after 'at an institution of higher education'.

"(2) Subparagraph (3) of such subsection is amended by inserting 'or in an elementary or secondary school overseas of the Armed Forces of the United States' after 'State'.

"(3) The amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall apply to any loan (under an agreement under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act only with the consent of the institution which made the loan. The amendment made by paragraph (2) of this subsection shall apply with respect to service as a teacher (described in such section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) performed during academic years beginning after the enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made before or after such enactment.

"(e) Section 206 of such Act is amended by striking out '1968' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1969'.

"Amendments to title III—Financial assistance for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction

"Sec. 23. (a) Section 301 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

"(b)(1) The third sentence of subsection (a)(2) of section 302 of such Act is amended by striking out 'the four fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1964' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the five fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1965'.

"(2) Effective with respect to allotments under section 302 or section 305 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, such section 302 is further amended by striking out subsection (a)(4) and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or section 305(a), for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and section 305(a), respectively, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or section 305(a), as the case may be, for such year.'

"(c) Section 303(a)(1)(A) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting 'and published' after 'printed', and (2) by inserting 'of test grading equipment for such schools and specialized equipment for audiovisual libraries serving such schools, and' after 'or both, and'.

"(d) The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 304 of such Act is amended by striking out 'four succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'five succeeding fiscal years'.

"Amendments to title IV—National defense fellowships

"Sec. 24. (a) Section 402 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

"(b) Such section is further amended by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 402.', and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this section but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine'.

"(c) Subsection (b) of section 404 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition.'

"Amendment to title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing

"Sec. 25. (a) Section 501 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof '$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and $17,500,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the succeeding fiscal year'.

"(b)(1) Effective with respect to allotments under section 502 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, the third sentence of such section is amended by striking out '$20,000' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$50,000'.

"(2) Effective with respect to allotments under such section 502 for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, such section 502 is further amended by inserting '(a)' after 'Sec. 502.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 501 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.'

"(c)(1) Subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 503 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) a program for testing students who are not below grade 7 in the public elementary or secondary schools of such State, and if authorized by law in corresponding grades in other elementary or secondary schools in such State, to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program; and'.

"(2) Subparagraph (2) of subsection (a) of such section 503 is amended by striking out 'public secondary schools' and inserting in lieu thereof 'public elementary or secondary schools', and by inserting 'who are not below grade 7' after 'students' in clause (A) thereof.

"(d)(1) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of such Act is amended by striking out 'four succeeding fiscal years', and inserting in lieu thereof 'five succeeding fiscal years', and by inserting before the semicolon ', including amounts expended under the State plan for State supervisory or related services in public elementary or secondary schools in the fields of guidance, counseling, and testing, and for administration of the State plan'.

"(2) The first sentence of subsection (b) of such section 504 is amended by striking out 'the cost of testing students in any one or more secondary schools', and inserting in lieu thereof 'the cost of testing students, who are not below grade 7, in any one or more elementary or secondary schools', and by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

"(e)(1) Section 511 of such Act is amended to strike out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and to insert in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

"(2) Such section is further amended to insert 'who are not below grade 7 in elementary or' after 'students', and to insert 'elementary or' after 'counseling or guidance in a public'.

"Amendments to title VI—Language development

"Sec. 26. (a) Section 601 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '1964' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"(b) Section 611 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years', and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'As used in this section "modern foreign language" includes English when taught to persons for whom English is a second language.'.

"Amendments to title VII—Research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes

"Sec. 27. (a) Section 701 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'printed and published materials,' after 'motion pictures,' and after 'auditory aids,'.

"(b) Section 731 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'printed and published materials,' after 'motion pictures,' wherever appearing therein.

"(c) Section 761 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'printed and published materials,' after 'motion pictures,' wherever appearing therein.

"(d) Section 763 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

"Amendments to title X—Miscellaneous provisions

"Sec. 28. (a) Section 1008 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting 'American Samoa,' after 'Guam,'.

"(b) Section 1009(a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'five succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six succeeding fiscal years'.

"PART C—FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

"Amendments to Public Law 815

"SEC. 31. (a) The first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by striking out '1963' and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended by striking out '1963' each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"(c) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out '1960–1961' and inserting in lieu thereof '1962–1963'.

"Amendments to Public Law 874

"SEC. 32. Sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), are each amended by striking out '1963' each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '1965'.

"Effective dates

"SEC. 33. The amendments made by sections 31 and 32 shall be effective July 1, 1963."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
PHIL M. LANDRUM,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN H. DENT,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WAYNE MORSE,
LISTER HILL,
PAT MCNAMARA,
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR.,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
WINSTON L. PROUTY,
JACOB K. JAVITS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Declaration of purpose: The declaration of purpose contained in the House bill and the Senate amendment were identical except for a provision in the Senate amendment which reflected the addition by the Senate amendment of a program to provide part-time employment for certain youths. The substitute agreed to in conference retains the Senate provision in light of the action of the conferees with respect to such Senate program.

Authorization of appropriations: The sums authorized to be appropriated by the House bill and the Senate amendment for the purpose of making grants under this part and sums agreed to in conference are as follows: For the fiscal year 1964, the House bill authorized to be appropriated $45,000,000, and the Senate amendment authorized $108,000,000. The substitute agreed to in conference authorizes $60,000,000 for such fiscal year. For the fiscal year 1965, the House bill authorized to be appropriated $90,000,000, and the Senate amendment authorized $153,000,000. The substitute agreed to in conference authorizes $118,500,000. For the fiscal year 1966, the House bill authorized to be appropriated $135,000,000, and the Senate amendment authorized $198,000,000. The substitute agreed to in conference authorizes $177,500,000. For the fiscal year 1967 and each fiscal year thereafter, the House bill authorized to be appropriated $180,000,000, and the Senate amendment authorized $243,000,000. The substitute agreed to in conference authorizes $225,000,000.

Allotment to States: The House bill provided that 95 percent of the annual appropriation should be allotted among the States, and the Senate amendment provided that 85 percent of the annual appropriation should be so allotted and accordingly deleted the amount of allotment prescribed in section 3(a)(4) (prescribing an amount which bears the same ratio to 10 percent of the annual appropriation as the sum of all the allotments to a State based on age groups bears to such sum for all the States). The substitute agreed to in conference provides that 90 percent of the annual appropriation shall be allotted among the States and accordingly retains the amount of allotment prescribed in section 3(a)(4).

The allotment formula in the House bill was based on the number of persons in various age groups needing vocational education, and the Senate amendment inserted the factor of per capita income (expressed in terms of an allotment ratio) into the formula and added provisions for determining per capita income and allotment ratios which were to be not less than 0.25 or more than 0.75. The Senate formula, based on both population and per capita income, and the corollary provisions relating to per capita income and allotment ratios are adopted by the substitute with a change in the limits on allotment ratios to a minimum of 0.40 and a maximum of 0.60.

USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

1. Expenditures for construction: As a corollary to its expanded definition of area vocational education school facilities, the Senate amendment limited expenditure for construction of certain of such facilities to 10 percent of a State's allotment. The House bill contained no comparable limitation. The substitute agreed to in conference deletes such limitation and adopts the language of the House bill.

2. Teacher training: The House bill provided that expenditures made for the training of teachers could be used only for inservice teacher training, while under the Senate amendment expenditures could be made for all types of teacher training. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

3. Required expenditures for vocational training of certain youth and construction: The House bill required that at least 25 percent of a State's allotment be used for the vocational training of youths who have left or graduated from high school or for construction of area vocational education school facilities, or both. The Senate amendment increased this percentage for the first 4 fiscal years to 40 percent. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the percentage figure of 33⅓ for the first 4 fiscal years and provides for 25 percent of such allotment to be so available for each of the subsequent fiscal years.

4. Percentage of annual appropriation available for research and pilot programs: The House bill provided that 5 percent of the annual appropriation was to be used by the Commissioner to make grants for research and pilot programs. The Senate amendment increased such percentage to 15 percent. The conference substitute fixed 10 percent of such appropriation as the amount to be used for grants by the Commissioner.

The substitute agreed to in conference adopts a provision of the Senate amendment to make it clear that the Commissioner can make grants to colleges and universities independently of the State boards.

The House bill provided that the Commissioner could make grants to colleges, universities, and other public or nonprofit private agencies or institutions as well as State boards, and the Senate amendment limited such grants to colleges and universities and State boards. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the provision of the House bill.

The House bill provided that the cost of certain research and pilot programs could be paid by such grants, and the Senate amendment included the cost of leadership training programs. The substitute agreed to in conference includes the cost of training programs as well as the cost of such research and pilot programs.

The Senate amendment provided that the pilot programs aided by grants from the Commissioner should be directed at the needs of communities with substantial numbers of school dropouts and unemployed youths. The House bill did not provide such a direction, and the substitute agreed to in conference deletes such direction.

State plans: The language of the Senate amendment and the House bill are identical except that the Senate amendment included a statement that the Federal funds were to be made available so that ready access to vocational training will be provided as soon as possible to all persons in all communities of the State. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

Labor standards: The language of the House bill and the Senate amendment were identical except for a technical amendment, made by the Senate amendment, with respect to the Contract Work Hours Standards Act which is adopted in the substitute agreed to in conference.

DEFINITIONS

1. Vocational education: The definition of vocational education contained in the House bill and the Senate amendment were identical except that the Senate amendment made clear the inclusion of the training of semiskilled workers, included instructions related to the occupation for which a student is being trained, and deleted the requirement that teacher training be limited to inservice training of teachers. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

2. Area vocational education school: The House bill defines the term "area vocational education school" as a school principally used for vocational training which admits as regular students both persons who have left or completed high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market. The House bill and the Senate amendment require that the training provided by area vocational education schools be available to all residents of a State or a designated area thereof. However, the Senate amendment in an expanded definition enlarged the term from schools principally used for vocational training to: (a) specialized high schools used exclusively or principally for vocational training; (b) departments or other units of a high school; (c) technical or vocational schools used exclusively or principally for vocational training; and (d) departments or other units of junior colleges, community colleges, or universities. Further, the requirement of availability for full-time study was attached to the schools or departments described in (a), (b), and (c) above, and the requirement relating to the training of both persons who have left or completed high school was attached to the school described in (c) above. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the definition contained in the Senate amendment except that (1) only departments of high schools and only departments or divisions of junior colleges, community colleges, and universities are included in the definition, (2) departments of high schools must be used exclusively or principally for providing vocational training

in no less than five different occupational fields, and departments or divisions of junior colleges, community colleges, and universities must also provide such vocation training, and (3) the requirement as to whom the school must admit applies only to the schools described in (c) and (d) above.

Advisory Committee on Vocational Education: The House bill and Senate amendment are identical except that the Senate amendment provided that the advisory committee was to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to the approval of pilot projects aided by grants from the Commissioner of Education and with respect to the program to provide residential vocational education schools. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the language of the Senate.

Amendments to George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Acts: The House bill and the Senate amendment were identical, except that in providing a broader use of funds allotted for training in home economics, the House bill required that at least 25 percent of the funds so allotted be used for training of persons to fit them for gainful employment in occupations involving knowledge and skill in home economics subjects or be transferred to another allotment, or both. The Senate amendment did not contain such a requirement. The substitute agreed to in conference retains the requirement but reduces to 10 percent the percentage of the funds allotted that must be so expended.

Work study programs for vocational education students and residential vocational education schools: The Senate amendment made provision for a 5-year program, with an initial authorization of $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1964, to enable local educational agencies to provide part-time employment in public schools and other public agencies to students in full-time attendance in vocational education courses. The bill as it passed the House contained no comparable provision. Further, the Senate amendment made provision for a 5-year program, with an initial authorization of $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1964, to demonstrate the feasibility of providing residential schools, particularly in large urban areas with school dropouts and unemployed youths, to provide vocational training to youths who need full-time study on a residential basis to benefits from such training. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts both programs for 4 fiscal years starting with fiscal year 1965. The conference substitute, in section 15, authorizes an appropriation for both of these programs in the following amounts: $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1965, $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1966, and $35,000,000 for the next 2 succeeding fiscal years. The Commissioner of Education is directed to determine the portion of such sums for each such year which is to be used for the purposes of either program.

In providing authorizations at this level the House conferees expressed the unanimous belief that the District of Columbia metropolitan area should be given the highest priority in the establishment and construction of a residential vocational education school, which belief was concurred in by the Senate conferees in the light of the conference agreement which excluded the District of Columbia as a participant in Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress.

EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The Senate amendment, in part B, provided for a 3-year extension of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 beyond June 30, 1964, its present expiration date, and included a number of amendments. The House bill contained no comparable provision, since this was being considered in committee as a separate piece of legislation. The substitute agreed upon in conference provides for a 1-year extension, to June 30, 1965, with certain amendments. The following statement describes the provision of the Senate amendment and the action recommended with respect thereto by the committee of conference.

Title I—General Provisions: The Senate amendment—

(1) extended the coverage of the act to American Samoa,

(2) permitted teachers in federally operated schools to receive benefits under the act,

(3) extended the benefits of the act to schools, such as laboratory schools and State schools for the deaf, which are under the administrative control and direction of any public institution or agency, even though not considered a part of a local public school system.

The substitute agreed upon in conference includes these provisions.

Title II—Student Loans: Title II of the act, due to expire at the end of fiscal year 1964, was extended by the Senate amendment for a period of 3 years. The conference substitute extends this title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also increased the amounts authorized to be appropriated for this title for fiscal years 1964 to $125,000,000 and established an authorization for fiscal year 1965 of $135,000,000. The conference agreement adopts these provisions of the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) raised the institutional loan ceiling from $250,000 to $800,000.

(2) extended the moratorium on the running of interest and repayment of principal on loans while student borrowers are continuing their higher education, to cover periods during which the borrower attends an approved institution of higher education located outside the United States, and

(3) extended the forgiveness feature, under which up to one-half of a student loan is canceled for service as a public elementary school teacher at the rate of 10 percent for each year of such service, so that such feature would cover teachers in elementary or secondary oversea schools of the Armed Forces.

The conference substitute includes these three changes.

Title III—Science, Mathematics, and Modern Foreign Language Instruction: The Senate amendment extended the provisions of this title for 3 additional years. The conference substitute extends the title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) authorized the Commissioner of Education to reallocate to other States any unneeded State allotments.

(2) broadened the categories of equipment and materials which may be purchased with funds made available by the title to include test-grading equipment, equipment used in connection with audiovisual libraries, and certain published materials such as charts, and maps, all of which are now excluded, and

(3) made certain technical changes in the provisions governing the promulgation of allotment ratios.

The conference substitute includes these first two changes, and, in lieu of the third amendment, provides for the use of the allotment ratio promulgated in 1959 for the distribution of title III funds for 1965.

Title IV—National Defense Fellowships: The Senate amendment extended this title, which provides for a program of graduate fellowships for 3 additional years. The conference substitute extends the title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) authorized the Commissioner of Education to reward any graduate fellowship under the act which is vacated before the expiration date of the period for which the fellowship originally was awarded, provides such rewarded fellowship cannot exceed the time period of the original award, and

(2) provided for the payment to institutions of higher education of a flat sum of $2,500 per year, less tuition charged the fellow, to cover the cost of educating fellowship recipients under the act. This payment would be substituted for the variable payment provided under existing law for this purpose.

The conference substitute adopts these two provisions.

Title V—Guidance, Counseling, and Testing: The Senate amendment extended this title for 3 additional years. The conference substitute extends the title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) increased the annual authorization of appropriation for grants to the State educational agencies by $2,500,000, from $15,000,000 per year to $17,500,000 per year,

(2) extended the guidance and counseling program to all seventh and eighth grades,

(3) authorized the Commissioner of Education to reallot to other States any portion of a State's allotment under this title which is not used,

(4) increased the minimum State allotment from $20,000 to $50,000 under this title,

(5) excluded support of any program of clinical or psychiatric experimental testing.

The conference substitute adopts only the first four of these changes.

Title VI—Language Development: The Senate amendment extended this title for 3 additional years. The conference substitute extends the title for only 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1965.

The Senate amendment also authorized institutes for the training of teachers of pupils for whom English is a second language. The conference substitute includes this change.

Title VII—Research and Experimentation in More Effective Utilization of Television, Radio, Motion Pictures, and Related Media for Educational Purposes: The Senate amendment extended this title for 3 additional years and authorized support of research and experimentation in the use of printed and published materials. The conference substitute includes the latter of these changes, but extends the title for only 1 year, that is, until June 30, 1965.

Title X—Miscellaneous Provisions: The Senate amendment provided for a 3-year extension of this title. The conference substitute extends this title for only 1 year, that is, until June 30, 1965.

FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

The Senate amendment, in part C, amended Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to extend the temporary provisions of both laws for 3 years—that is, until June 30, 1966. The substitute agreed upon in conference extends these laws for only 2 years.

The Senate amendment also—

(1) extended the laws to the District of Columbia,

(2) provided that property which is sold by the United States would continue to be considered Federal property for 1 year, and

(3) provided for a comprehensive study of these laws.

The conference substitute does not include any of these provisions.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
PHIL M. LANDRUM,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN H. DENT,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Estimated distribution of funds for vocational education, conference report, H.R. 4955, fiscal years 1964–67 [1]

State	State amount, 1964	State amount, 1965	State amount, 1966	State amount, 1967
United States and outlying parts	$54, 000, 000	$106, 650, 000	$159, 750, 000	$202, 500, 000
50 States and District of Columbia	52, 906, 612	104, 492, 582	156, 518, 423	198, 403, 635
Alabama	1, 268, 414	2, 505, 166	3, 752, 464	4, 756, 645
Alaska	63, 180	124, 783	186, 911	236, 930
Arizona	438, 040	865, 145	1, 295, 892	1, 642, 680
Arkansas	669, 939	1, 323, 155	1, 981, 941	2, 512, 320
California	3, 654, 428	7, 217, 634	10, 811, 226	13, 704, 370
Colorado	505, 768	998, 910	1, 496, 258	1, 896, 665
Connecticut	558, 543	1, 103, 143	1, 652, 387	2, 094, 575
Delaware	100, 897	199, 275	298, 492	378, 370
Florida	1, 556, 079	3, 073, 316	4, 603, 490	5, 835, 410
Georgia	1, 546, 666	3, 054, 725	4, 575, 642	5, 800, 110
Hawaii	212, 849	420, 385	629, 691	798, 200
Idaho	247, 058	487, 949	730, 894	926, 485
Illinois	2, 312, 227	4, 566, 737	6, 840, 472	8, 671, 020
Indiana	1, 407, 891	2, 780, 639	4, 165, 093	5, 279, 695
Iowa	857, 805	1, 694, 197	2, 537, 721	3, 216, 830
Kansas	677, 784	1, 338, 650	2, 005, 150	2, 541, 740
Kentucky	1, 163, 400	2, 297, 760	3, 441, 792	4, 362, 835
Louisiana	1, 214, 104	2, 397, 903	3, 591, 795	4, 552, 980
Maine	342, 715	676, 875	1, 013, 884	1, 285, 205
Maryland	839, 073	1, 657, 201	2, 482, 306	3, 146, 585
Massachusetts	1, 270, 573	2, 509, 430	3, 758, 850	4, 764, 740
Michigan	2, 184, 647	4, 314, 761	6, 463, 039	8, 192, 585
Minnesota	1, 051, 318	2, 076, 394	3, 110, 210	3, 942, 520
Mississippi	860, 873	1, 700, 256	2, 546, 798	3, 228, 335
Missouri	1, 248, 904	2, 466, 633	3, 694, 745	4, 683, 480
Montana	218, 496	431, 538	646, 396	819, 375
Nebraska	$424, 284	$837, 977	$1, 255, 197	$1, 591, 095
Nevada	66, 284	130, 914	196, 094	248, 570
New Hampshire	187, 582	370, 481	554, 940	703, 445
New Jersey	1, 321, 132	2, 609, 286	3, 908, 424	4, 954, 340
New Mexico	357, 590	706, 255	1, 057, 892	1, 340, 990
New York	3, 691, 084	7, 290, 030	10, 919, 666	13, 841, 830
North Carolina	1, 863, 731	3, 680, 939	5, 513, 643	6, 989, 125
North Dakota	235, 587	465, 294	696, 960	883, 470
Ohio	2, 633, 317	5, 200, 902	7, 790, 381	9, 875, 130
Oklahoma	843, 440	1, 665, 826	2, 495, 224	3, 162, 960
Oregon	505, 574	998, 528	1, 495, 686	1, 895, 940
Pennsylvania	3, 180, 644	6, 281, 893	9, 409, 587	11, 927, 645
Rhode Island	260, 056	513, 621	769, 348	975, 230
South Carolina	1, 010, 796	1, 996, 362	2, 990, 331	3, 790, 560
South Dakota	240, 650	475, 293	711, 937	902, 455
Tennessee	1, 374, 089	2, 713, 879	4, 065, 093	5, 152, 935
Texas	3, 327, 550	6, 572, 039	9, 844, 194	12, 478, 555
Utah	327, 996	647, 805	970, 341	1, 230, 010
Vermont	138, 908	274, 349	410, 944	520, 915
Virginia	1, 508, 984	2, 980, 301	4, 464, 164	5, 658, 800
Washington	801, 227	1, 582, 454	2, 370, 343	3, 004, 660
West Virginia	700, 045	1, 382, 616	2, 071, 007	2, 625, 220
Wisconsin	1, 155, 150	2, 281, 465	3, 417, 384	4, 331, 895
Wyoming	95, 294	188, 210	281, 917	357, 360
District of Columbia	183, 947	363, 303	544, 187	689, 815
American Samoa	10, 000	17, 685	26, 491	33, 580
Canal Zone	------------	------------	------------	------------
Guam	27, 119	53, 562	80, 230	101, 700
Puerto Rico	1, 043, 256	2, 060, 470	3, 086, 358	3, 912, 285
Virgin Islands	13, 013	25, 701	38, 498	48, 800

[1] Authorizations of $60,000,000, $118,500,000, $177,500,000, and $225,000,000 for the years 1964–67, respectively. 10 percent of each authorization reserved for grants by the Commissioner of Education. State distribution is based on product of (1) the Federal allotment percentages with limits of 40 percent and 60 percent based on average per capita income for 1959, 1960 and 1961, and (2) the State population (a) aged 15 to 19, (b) aged 20 to 24, (c) aged 25 to 65, plus a distribution on the basis of the total amount received by the State under (a), (b), and (c), above, with a minimum of $10,000.

COST OF H.R. 4955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first, I should like to stress that the new vocational education program is a permanent program. The work-study and residential school parts of part A are, however, 4-year limited programs. Part B of the bill, which contains the National Defense Education Act extension beyond its current expiration date of June 30, 1964, to June 30, 1965, is a 1-year extension of that program, and part C of the bill relating to extension of impacted areas legislation from its current expiration date of June 30, 1963, to June 30, 1965, is a 2-year extension of the laws.

I underline these points, Mr. President, so that Senators will understand the import of the cost figures on each part of the bill which I shall now place into the RECORD:

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1964	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967
Vocational education [1]	60. 0	163. 5	247. 5	280
National Defense Education Act	40. 0	279. 6	-------	-------
Public Laws 815 and 874	252. 8	274. 8	-------	-------
Total	352. 8	717. 9	247. 5	28
Grand total, 4 years		1. 598. 2		

[1] Includes work-study, residential schools, and the conversion to permanent programs of the practical nurse training and area vocational education programs. The work-study and residential school programs start in operation in fiscal year 1965.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMPROMISE

As a matter of legislative history on the bill and as chairman of the Senate conferees and as chairman of the conference committee, I wish to direct the attention of Senators to that portion of the House managers' report which states:

> In providing authorization at this level the House conferees expressed the unanimous belief that the District of Columbia metropolitan area should be given the highest priority in the establishment and construction of a residential vocational education school, which belief was concurred in by the Senate conferees in the light of the conference agreement, which excluded the District of Columbia as a participant in Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress.

I wish to indicate to the Senate that the Senate conferees concur fully in this statement. We assured the House conferees we would make this legislative history at this time.

It is a deep source of regret to me, as a member of the Senate District Committee, that we were unable to obtain an agreement to include the District of Columbia this year within the purview of the impacted areas legislation. I was quite candid in conference in indicating that it was my intention to continue to strive to obtain the benefits of the impacted areas laws for the District. We were, however, in a parliamentary situation whereby by yielding on this point, we could accomplish, through the postponement of our objective, a tangible benefit to the metropolitan area of the District through locating in this metropolitan area a residential vocational school.

We were informed that such a school would need to have provided $1 million for the first year, $5 million for the second year, and $2 million a year approximately thereafter for its construction, operation, and maintenance. Establishment of a school of this type in the metropolitan area of the Nation's Capital, in my judgment, will provide the young people of the District serviced by it with an immediate and tangible benefit of lasting value.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT EXTENSION

As a conferee I was naturally disappointed that we were unable to obtain, as in the Senate version, the full 3 year extension of the National Defense Education Act titles, which have demonstrated their value to many areas of American educational endeavor. I am confident, however, that the record made under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 will fully justify its further future expansion and extension.

As chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I give my pledge that I will do everything in my power to give prompt consideration to legislation emerging from the other body affecting the National Defense Education Act next session and I have indicated, that, in my judgement, the Senate Labor Committee will also seek to legislate further modifications and amendments to the act designed to strengthen it.

Mr. President, I should like to dwell on the legislative history of this bill to cover two additional points.

LEADERSHIP TRAINING

I should like to refer to section 4(c) where 10 percent of the sums appropriated are, for each fiscal year, reserved to the Commissioner of Education to make grants to colleges and universities and other public or nonprofit private agencies and institutions, to State boards, and with the approval of the State board, to local educational agencies, to pay for the costs of research and training programs and of experimental, developmental or pilot programs developed by such institutions, boards and agencies, etc.

In the version of the bill passed by the Senate, in this section preceding the word "training" there was the word "leadership." In agreeing to drop from the language of the bill the term "leadership," the Senate conferees did so under the understanding that the word "training" could be broadly construed to include all types of program operations training, including management, administrative or State leadership training.

The point I wish to make is that, in our view, the Commissioner of Education is to be permitted, under this section, to make grants for the carrying on of short-term institutes which could be attended by a number of prominent vocational educators drawn from various States for the purposes of exchanging program information and the disseminating and interpretation of research findings.

HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

Section 10(c)(2) of the bill, as it came from conference and as it is before the Senate, contains one other compromise, which, although it was resisted during four tough bargaining sessions, finally had to be made. Ten percent of the present home economics money, or about $800,000 a year nationally, must be used in providing home economics training to fit young people for gainful employment. The House bill required that 25 percent of the existing money be used, and to get the conference bill we accepted the concept but at a 10-percent figure.

We wish to make it clear that the 10 percent applies to the State allotment only, however, and it need not mean that it has to be applied in each school. We understand that perhaps this change in the present program can be absorbed in urban areas, if the State so desires, leaving the rural schools untouched.

TRIBUTES TO SENATORS AND STAFF

In closing, Mr. President, again I wish to express to each of my colleagues on the Senate side in these difficult negotiations my deep and sincere appreciation for the support they have given me in accomplishing our objective of bringing back to the Senate a conscionable compromise fully deserving Senate support. The other day, I paid tribute, by name, to a number of my colleagues. On this occasion I wish particularly to thank the very distinguished and able Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], the equally able and distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], and West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and my wonderful friend from Michigan [Mr. McNamara].

I again wish to emphasize that the signing of the conference report would never have come to pass, had I not received unfailing cooperation from my great chairman, Senator Hill, and from our Republican colleagues, Senators Javits and Prouty. Unfortunately, Senator Goldwater could not be present at all our deliberations, but his very capable staff assistants, Minority Counsel Michael J. Bernstein and Associate Minority Counsel Raymond D. Hurley were very helpful to us.

Technical assistance from the Office of Education, provided through Dr. Peter Muirhead and his associates, Dr. Samuel Halperin and Mr. Gordon Ambach, and particularly the statistical work of Mr. Kenneth Simon and his associates, was invaluable to the conferees in reaching our compromise agreements.

I have already expressed my appreciation to Mr. Stewart McClure, chief clerk of the committee, and to Mr. Charles Lee, professional staff member of the subcommittee, for their help to us in the conference proceedings.

I am particularly indebted to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] for having made available to me in this conference the services of Mr. Donald Baker, legislative counsel for the Labor Subcommittee who in the last conference meetings stepped into the breach created when the counsel of the full committee, Mr. Jack Forsythe, became ill.

Mr. President, I know I speak for each of my colleagues when I say that we are all deeply appreciative of the sterling work of Mr. Forsythe and that we wish him a speedy recovery.

In concluding, Mr. President, I wish to say that in my judgment the conference compromise is sound legislation which has accepted, in principle, vitally important parts of the President's June 19 message and that its enactment and operation will materially strengthen in the decades ahead our great educational system in this country. It deserves and should have the support of the Senate.

Mr. RANDOLPH rose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from West Virginia would like to ask me a question.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Under the provisions of H.R. 4955, section 8, part (1), as agreed to by the conferees, could the State of West Virginia or the State of Oregon or any other State enter into a contract with a private school to provide vocational education?

Mr. MORSE. The answer is "yes."

The bill provides that "vocational education" means vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes under public supervision and control or under contract with a State board or local educational agency. Thus, a State board or local educational agency may arrange for vocational or technical training or retraining under contract with a private school insofar as the Federal law is concerned.

I should like to note, however, that this bill is designed to assist the States in strengthening, improving, and expanding their existing programs of vocational education so that persons of all ages and all communities might have the opportunity to obtain training suited to their needs and interests and their ability to benefit from such training. The matter of whether any arrangement for training or retraining under this bill should be made under contract with a private school in a particular State will, of course, be determined by, or under policy established by the State board of vocational education.

I wish to stress that, because we have been careful to protect the State prerogatives throughout the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I appreciate the clarification and the assurance given by the Senator from Oregon. Before taking my seat, I wish to state that not only is the Senate fortunate, but also the Congress and the country are fortunate to have the leadership of the Senator from Oregon as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, in bringing to fruition this most important measure.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. I paid a very deserved tribute to the Senator's help in my earlier remarks.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to thank my good friend, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], for his help and for his strong effort to keep in this bill my amendment to provide a 1-year grace period during which communities would continue to receive federally impacted area funds at the existing level, when the Federal Government sells its facilities to a private company.

He and his fellow Senate conferees did their best, I know, and I understand it was not until the final stages of the conference that they receded because of the necessity to do so in order to insure congressional approval of the bill this year.

Certainly I do not quarrel with this decision. H.R. 4955 is too important a bill to hold up because agreement cannot be reached on one or two amendments which relate to only one aspect of the legislation.

Because H.R. 4955 would greatly expand our vocational education effort, extend the National Defense Education Act, and also extend for 2 years Federal assistance to school districts with a large number of Federal employees living and working in them, I think it is probably the most important education bill we have considered this year.

Congress has not distinguished itself this year in the number of important bills approved and I have been critical of our record. But I think we can point with pride to the record we have made in the field of education.

Earlier this week we gave final approval to a program of aid to higher education. And already on the statute books is the program of assistance for the construction of medical, dental, and other health professions teaching facilities.

So the vocational education bill is our third major education bill and I certainly have no intention of holding up final congressional approval.

I regret that my amendment is no longer in the bill, since its passage would have benefited Groton and about 20 other towns in southeastern Connecticut.

A difficult problem was created in these communities when the Federal Government sold some facilities to the Electric Boat Co. Even though workers continued to perform the same tasks as before, the fact that they work for a private company rather than the Federal Government means that they are not counted as previously in connection with allotting funds to the school districts.

And this situation was made unusually severe because the sale of the property took place during the school year, after the school budget and plans for the year had been adopted.

In terms of dollars, approval would have meant approximately $250,000 for Groton and about $100,000 for the other towns affected by the sale. This is a substantial amount of money for any small school district to lose. And it has been lost because of the lapse of time between the sale of the property and the payment of taxes by the private company.

My amendment would have bridged this gap, not only for the communities in Connecticut but also those in any other State where a similar situation develops.

This is a definite weakness in the two impacted areas programs, as the Senator from Oregon knows, and I hope he will have an opportunity to look into this and other impacted areas problems next year.

The announcement this week that a number of military installations will be closed down emphasizes the need for a thorough study of both Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. Perhaps the areas that will be affected by the closing of these installations will need help similar to what we have tried to provide for my State, to ease somewhat the transition period.

The able Senator from Oregon knows much more about this subject than I, however, and I am not trying to advise him on how to do the job that he has been doing so well for a number of years now.

Mostly, in speaking today, I wanted to thank him for his efforts. I know I speak for thousands of my constituents in southeastern Connecticut when I say that we are grateful to him for trying to help out.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DODD. I also wish to join the Senator from West Virginia in the very properly stated compliments to the Senator from Oregon for his outstanding work on this legislation.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much. We did our best. We tried to split the amendments, when we saw we could not get both. We tried to secure your language on Public Law 874. We ran into an adamant position on the part of the House. The House conferees would not accept even this. We did our best. I am sorry we failed the Senator. It was not because we did not try.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator stated that the program will be permanent as to the area vocational schools defined in section 8 of the bill, but that the residential vocational school program is for 4 years only.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know how the area vocational schools to be provided under the bill would differ from those under the program we now have for vocational education throughout the United States, on a matching basis?

Mr. MORSE. The curriculum could be considerably enlarged. We are expanding the program under the bill, so that such schools could train students in many more skills than under the existing programs. That is an important difference. With respect to home economics subjects, for example, we can expand the training of young women into commercial fields of home economics in convalescent care establishments or motel operation. Under the new definition typing, filing, and other business work can now be offered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would this new work be carried on in the vocational schools which have been operated on a matching basis by the States with Federal funds?

Mr. MORSE. The new programs will not need to be matched in fiscal year 1964, unless the State wishes them in that year to be devoted to construction of the area vocational schools. If the State plans to use the 1964 funds for construction, then the Federal money must be matched. Funds in fiscal year 1965 and thereafter must be matched on a 50–50 basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. The residential schools, as I understand, will be constructed entirely with Federal funds.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. They will be in the nature of boarding schools.

Mr. MORSE. They will be residential. That does not mean the schools will be prevented from permitting so-called day students.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. The primary object will be to take in students from various parts of the State and permit them to board at the school if they so desire.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, particularly from the urban areas of high unemployment in this age group. I wish to stress that we are dealing with a category of young people of the ages of 15 to 21 years who, by the thousands, come from crowded slums where the home environment, if it can be called a home, makes it impossible for them to obtain an education. Many of them almost literally live on the streets since they have no other place to go. They constitute a great educational challenge because of their economic and social problems. By enrolling them into the residential schools we can help them to salvage themselves for gainful employment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Insofar as those residential schools are concerned, will they be on a matching basis in any way, or will the Federal Government bear the entire expense?

Mr. MORSE. The Federal grants will be given to the State boards or to colleges and universities, to construct and operate these schools. The funds will be administered by the State boards or these other local agencies I have mentioned, though they will be Federal funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. No area vocational schools will be constructed entirely from Federal funds—only the residential schools?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. The area vocational school construction is on a matching basis. The residential school is all Federal grant funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. How many residential schools would be provided for over the period of 4 years?

Mr. MORSE. We are authorizing funds for a program which could, as an experiment, establish not more than five residential schools. We estimate for each a cost of about $1 million planning money, $5 million for construction, and $2 million for operation and maintenance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I have the attention of Senators? I should like to request an extension of the time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, if no Senator desires to speak in opposition, the 15 minutes allotted to the opposition are available.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to answer the Senator from Louisiana further.

We really are not specifying the number of schools. We are only saying that not more than five can be built under the amount of money we would allow. We would allow over the 4-year period $60 million for this purpose. It would not be possible to build more than five schools.

We are making a legislative record, without earmarking the funds in the bill, because it would be subject to a point of order in the House if we earmarked them; that the first one of these residential schools, under the bill, should be in the District of Columbia.

Mr. ELLENDER. As to these five schools, the funds necessary to construct them will be furnished by the Federal Government?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the operation will be furnished by the Federal Government? Teachers and all the equipment will be paid for by the Federal Government?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; but they will be administered by the State school boards.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wanted to make the differentiation in this new program of vocational education. As I understand, for these experimental schools all the money will be put up by the Federal Government.

Mr. MORSE. That is right.

Mr. ELLENDER. However, they will be operated under the jurisdiction of the school board under which the school may be constructed.

Mr. MORSE. The State board, the local school board with the approval of the State board, or by the college or university to which the grant is given.

Mr. ELLENDER. All students who boarded there would be boarded at the expense of the Federal Government.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, indirectly through the grant money to the operator of the establishment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes. There are two points about the bill that should be clarified for the legislative record. There are two provisions for training. One provision is contained in section 4(a)(6), which relates to activities of the States. One provision is contained in subsection (c) of section 4, which relates to activities of the Commissioner.

Is it the understanding of the Senator in charge of the conference report on the floor that the Commissioner could administer his relationship to both provisions together—in short, that he may, within the confines of one program, bring about discharge of the responsibility under the allotment for training, as well as the training activities which would be financed under section 6?

Mr. MORSE. The answer is "yes."

Mr. JAVITS. The work-study programs contained in section 13, for both residential and nonresidential students, was one of the very difficult points for settlement by the conference. It was settled by providing a lump sum for the use of the program, provided that it should be experimental and be conducted by the administrator.

I wish to impress on my colleagues that when we said "experimental," we meant experimental. We said there would be no expectation of building a new hierarchy of people or functions or institutions which we would be compelled to continue because we had so much in it, whether it worked or not. We said that the purpose was to find out what was the best plan. If it was ascertained in less than 4 years, that was fine; the Department would make the recommendation. But the purpose was to determine what was the best program.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. We also stressed that the money should be spent for the benefit of the students, and that none of the money should be spent to build up unnecessary administrative cost. As the Senator has pointed out, these are experimental programs with a time ceiling of 4 years.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator. This was one of the hardest fought conferences that I have ever participated in, or have seen.

It would be most unfair to conclude action without paying tribute to my beloved colleague [Mr. MORSE], who carried it through not only with consummate skill, but often against his convictions, in order to bring about results. The people of the country owe him a great debt in that regard.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who joined us in conference, did great good. There were times when he had to subordinate his deep convictions in order to arrive at a result, which was accomplished both on the Senate side and the House side.

Mr. MORSE. I have already stated my appreciation for the great support of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] on the bill. Without their support there would have been no bill. This particular subject was really a compromise. It was only through the ingenuity and skill of the Senator from New York in suggesting the common funding of the two programs and the wonderful cooperation of the Senator from Vermont in resolving the area vocational school definitions problem that we were able to arrive at the point of agreement which made it possible to have a bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon.

I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator from New York.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent. He asked me to place a statement in the RECORD relative to the Goldwater amendment, which was dropped in conference.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on that subject, prepared by the Senator from Arizona.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER ON THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4955

The conference report on vocational education now before this body stands as a testament to the vigorous, resolute, and tireless efforts at the bargaining table of the Senate conferees, headed by my good friend and colleague, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

I think it would be helpful to review briefly the course of the vocational education bill through the legislative mill culminating in the conference report now under discussion. H.R. 4955, as passed by the House on August 6, authorized a total of $630 million over the first 5 years for expanding and upgrading vocational education. When the bill reached the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee it underwent major surgery and in lieu of reporting out the House-approved bill, the committee adopted a substitute containing the following important elements:

1. A permanent program expanding and upgrading vocational education at a cost of $945 million over the first 5 years (in contrast to the $630 million approved by the House);

2. A 5-year program of grants for the construction of residential vocational education schools costing $180 million;

3. A 5-year program of grants for work study for vocational education students totaling $310 million;

4. A 3-year extension of the National Defense Education Act together with certain amendments; and

5. A 3-year extension of Public Laws 815-874 (Federal Impacted Areas Act).

In this form, the Senate, on October 8, passed H.R. 4955 with a total authorization of $1.645 billion for new programs.

On November 8, after several unproductive meetings, Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, chairman of the House conferees, addressed a memorandum to Senator MORSE, chairman of the conference, stating the position of the House conferees on the disagreements existing between the Senate and House versions of H.R. 4955. In general, the House conferees agreed to a compromise figure for vocational education, a deletion of the residential schools and work-study programs, a 1-year extension of the National Defense Education Act, and a 2-year extension of Public Laws 815 and 874. In response to this memorandum, Senator MORSE, on December 3, countered with a statement outlining the position of the Senate conferees. The Senate conferees, while offering slight concessions here and there, stood firm, with one exception, for every part of the substitute approved by the Labor Committee and adopted by the Senate.

The only feature of the Senate proposal on which the Senate conferees were willing to recede was contained in the amendments to the National Defense Education Act. The Morse memorandum of December 3 stated, "A 3-year extension of the National Defense Education Act titles is proposed with Senate amendments in all titles adopted, except the testing restriction in title V which would be dropped."

This amendment, which the Senate conferees were so willing to drop, prohibited the use of any funds appropriated for guidance, counseling and testing under title V of the National Defense Education Act, "for the conduct of any test, or the asking of any questions in connection therewith, which is designed to elicit information dealing with the personality, environment, home life, parental or family relationships, economic status, or sociological or psychological problems of the pupil tested." This amendment has now been referred to as the Goldwater amendment, inasmuch as I offered a similar amendment to a bill amending the National Defense Education Act 2 years ago, although I had nothing to do with its inclusion in the Senate bill on this occasion. As a matter of fact, my amendment of 2 years ago would have prohibited personal and psychological testing of school children only without prior parental consent and therefore was not as restrictive as the Senate amendment to H.R. 4955.

Up to the time of the Morse memorandum to the House conferees, there had been no discussion in the conference concerning the so-called Goldwater amendment. To my knowledge, there had not been any indication on the part of the House conferees that this amendment was not acceptable.

It is strange indeed that the Senate conferees were so eager to sacrifice one of their own proposals, especially in view of the fact that there had been no demand made by the other side for its deletion. It is even stranger when it is realized that the testing amendment, which was approved unanimously by the committee majority, was included in the committee substitute on their initiative, not mine, and was substantially identical to the amendment I had offered in 1961 and which the same majority had then rejected.

There is no doubt in my mind that an impartial observer, comparing the House bill with the Senate substitute, will come to the conclusion that the Senate conferees were victorious over their House counterparts in all major conference battles with the exception of the testing amendment, and there, strangely enough, the battle was never joined because even before the House had the opportunity to accept or reject, the Senate conferees forsook the battle and gave up the fight without a shot being fired.

Once again I wish to pay tribute to the Senate conferees for the magnificent job they did in carrying out the will of the Senate on vocational education. My only regret is that the same dogged determination exhibited by them in behalf of the other provisions of the Senate bill could not have been employed to rescue the testing amendment from the cutting room floor to which it was so disdainfully assigned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, although the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] was not present, he was more helpful than many may realize. His representative, Mr. Bernstein, was present.

Although the Senator from Arizona had made it clear that he would vote against the bill, as to the Goldwater amendment, on which the Senate conferees receded, I wish only to say that the regulations of the Federal authorities do not permit Federal financing of the type of test the Senator from Arizona sought to prevent in S. 2345 of the 87th Congress. Furthermore, the States have the authority to conduct the testing they wish to conduct with their own funds. Therefore, the States themselves could ban such tests if they so desire but they could not be prevented by Federal action from financing such tests as they find helpful in their local and State-supported testing programs.

We believe we have a good compromise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement dated November 4, 1963, issued by the Office of Education relating to this question, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON PURPOSES, IMPLEMENTATION, AND PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF TITLE V–A, NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Title V–A of the National Defense Education Act authorizes grants to State educational agencies to assist them to establish and maintain programs of guidance, counseling, and testing. States participate under this part of National Defense Education Act in accordance with a State plan approved by the Commissioner of Education which sets forth—

1. a program for testing students in the public secondary schools, and if authorized by law in other secondary schools, of such State to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program; and

2. a program of guidance and counseling in the public secondary schools of such State (A) to advise students of courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, and (B) to encourage students with outstanding aptitudes and ability to complete their secondary school education, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions.

Programs under State plans are conducted under administrative policies and interpretations, promulgated on the advice of the General Counsel, which assure that the intent of the act is carried out. These policies specify that "testing" as used in the act means the use of only those tests which measure abilities from which aptitudes for the individual's educational development validly may be inferred. Further clarification of testing acceptable under the act is made in a policy bulletin which states:

"The purposes of section 503(a) of the act and the regulations would preclude expenditures for tests, scales, inventories, or other devices for the collection of information relative to the student's social, moral, spiritual, or family values, relationships, or adjustments. Consequently, there can be no Federal financial participation, either under National Defense Education Act testing or National Defense Education Act guidance and counseling programs, in the costs of information collecting devices designed for the above purposes and commonly referred to as:

"1. Personality tests, inventories, or checklists.

"2. Personal or social adjustment tests, inventories, or checklists.

"3. Projective techniques."

H.R. 4955, as passed by the Senate on October 8, amends subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 503 of the National Defense Education Act to read as follows:

"(1) a program for testing students who are not below grade 7 in the public elementary or secondary schools of such State, and if authorized by law in corresponding grades to other elementary or secondary schools in such State, to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program: *Provided*, That no such program shall provide for the conduct of any test, or the asking of any question in connection therewith, which is designed to elicit information dealing with the personality, environment, home life, parental or family relationships, economic status, or sociological or psychological problems of the pupil tested."

In clarification of this language, the committee report on H.R. 4955 (S. Rept. No. 553, Oct. 1, 1963), page 19, reads as follows:

"While the testing program is being extended to the seventh and eighth grades, the committee has added a provision to assure that this program will be concerned with academic achievement and intelligence tests, thus excluding specifically clinical or psychiatric experimental tests."

In the light of this committee commentary and our own interpretation of the proposed amendment we wish to make it clear that the only change in the existing testing program which would be effectuated by enactment of the amendment is that all seventh and eighth grade students, whether in public elementary or secondary schools, would be eligible to participate in the testing program. So-called personality tests, now excluded by our policy interpretations from financial participation under the National Defense Education Act testing program would continue to be excluded, now by virtue of the amended statute. Aptitude and achievement tests, now eligible for purchase under the program, would continue to be supported. The guidance and counseling portions in section 503(a)(2) would also be unaffected since the proposed amendment clearly applies only to the testing programs carried on under section 503(a)(1) of the act. Further, the type of tests excluded from Federal financial participation may, of course, be used by the States and local educational agencies in testing programs other than those supported under title V–A of the National Defense Education Act. Finally, we understand that the proposed amendment, which precludes Federal payment for the conduct of certain specified tests, "or the asking of any question in connection therewith," refers only to questions contained in tests administered under the act. The amendment imposes no restrictions upon the questions asked by guidance counselors in their interview situations with students who are being advised with a view toward the selection of "courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes and skills" or who are being encouraged "to complete their secondary school education, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions."

Thus, as we review the potential impact of the proposed amendment upon the guidance, counseling and testing programs supported under title V–A, we conclude that existing State plan programs would continue to operate as they presently do under the administrative interpretations of the Department.

However, notwithstanding his conclusion, it seems highly desirable that the proposed statutory prohibition—a prohibition not contained in the administration's legislative program outlined in S. 580—of types of tests and questions be deleted in the pending bill, H.R. 4955. This recommendation is based upon numerous communications addressed to the Department, the majority of which reveal widespread alarm and confusion as to the intent and effect—actual and potential—of the proposed amendment. For example, it has been stated by leading educational and psychological authorities that the proposed amendment would greatly inhibit much-needed educational research into such areas as the role of sociological and psychological factors in determining educational achievement or failure to achieve.

In view of the fact that (1) the instant amendment does not produce an effect beyond that now brought about by our policy interpretations, (2) has been widely construed as congressional condemnation and restriction of the existing title V–A programs, and (3) could, in the opinion of responsible educational leaders, result in impairment of the vital functions of research in improving educational quality and opportunity, we would strongly recommend deletion of the proposed statutory prohibitions in section 503(a)(1).

Mr. MORSE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for their kind references to me. The Senator from Oregon has been our leader on this vocational education bill. His patience, courage, and skill are in large measure the chief reason we are about to enact a significant piece of legislation. He deserves the highest praise from all people of the country who are really interested in this greatly needed and highly desirable program. In this endeavor the Senator from New York was a valued and skillful ally. Mr. President, I believe the compromise reached by the conferees is much better than either the House or Senate version of the bill. True, there are some provisions in the compromise with which I am not entirely sympathetic, but overall, it is an excellent proposal.

Vermont is the winner under the vocational education program agreed upon in conference.

The formula by which funds are distributed to the States will be based on per capita income rather than population and that makes all the difference in the world to Vermont.

At my suggestion the original House-passed bill, which had a population formula, was amended in the Senate to take into account per capita income. There was a hard protracted fight about the issue in the Senate-House conference but we won out in the end.

The table I shall read shows how much money Vermont will get under the per capita income formula approved by the conference and how Vermont would have been penalized under the House formula.

	Conference report	House formula	Difference
1964	$138, 908	$119, 931	$18, 977
1965	274, 349	236, 863	37, 486
1966	410, 944	354, 795	56, 149
1967	520, 915	449, 740	71, 175
Aggregate	1, 345, 116	1, 161, 329	183, 787

Vermont won out also on the matter of area vocational schools. The State wishes to use and expand existing regular high school facilities for its vocational schools that will be set up to serve various regions of Vermont. Such a plan would have been ineligible for assistance under the House bill but my amendment to take care of the problem was accepted by the Senate-House conference with a minor technical change.

In addition, the conference accepted my proposal, previously approved in the Senate, that training be given for semiskilled as well as skilled occupations.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Senate-House conference increased the amounts authorized for student loans and this should help many Vermont students who are in need of financial aid.

There has already been made available to Vermont $333,587 for student aid during the current fiscal year. The bill would increase that allotment by approximately $130,000.

The bill would authorize for fiscal 1965 an allotment to Vermont of $500,380 for student loans.

Even with these proposed increases all of Vermont's needs will not be met. I understand that approximately $650,000 is the amount that could be utilized.

Science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in Vermont will be eligible for aid to the extent of $211,067 for fiscal 1965 if the full amount authorized is appropriated.

The bill would also help Vermont guidance counseling and testing activities. It increases the State's allotment from $20,000 to $50,000.

Many of the changes I have spoken of which benefit Vermont were achieved over the vigorous objections of the wealthy more heavily populated States. Adjustments were made, however, in other portions of the bill to take special account of their problems. I refer to the work study and residential school provisions.

Each week new machines and new production methods take away jobs from 35,000 people. There is a technological revolution going on and we cannot stop it even if we were backward enough to want to do so.

This bill takes account of that revolution and of the fact that over the next 5 years we must create over 16 million new jobs. If we fail to accomplish this objective unemployment will rise to more than 7 percent of the labor force.

When I addressed the Vermont Legislature on March 28, 1963, I spoke about the need to provide education and jobs for a new age.

The bill we are about to approve is an important step toward the solution of this challenging problem.

In closing may I say a word or two about our staff lieutenants who paved the way toward a sound and well-written bill. Charlie Lee of the majority staff of the committee has been an endless fount of information and reliable guidance. Our minority staff members, Ray Hurley and Mike Bernstein, especially, have been of great help at all times, and I am grateful for their outstanding assistance.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in consideration of this conference report, I call attention to the new part of the National Defense Education Act program on the educational system of Montana during the last 5 years. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIVE-YEAR REPORT ON PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT—STATE OF MONTANA

The National Defense Education Act authorizes Federal assistance for student loans and graduate fellowships, for technical education, for the expansion of guidance, counseling, and testing of students, for the strengthening of education in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, for the improvement of communications media for educational purposes, and for strengthening educational statistical services.

Enacted originally for a 4-year period, the National Defense Education Act was extended by the Congress last year for an additional 2 years. As the programs under the act go into their sixth year of operation, the Office of Education reported these achievements:

STUDENT LOANS

About 2,000 students in nine colleges and universities borrowed approximately $1,308,767 under the student loan program in Montana.

GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS

Awards were made to 59 graduate students for study at Montana State College and Montana State University. About one-half of the $674,787 so far expended or obligated under this program has gone to the fellows for stipends and allowances; the remainder to participating graduate schools, to help cover the costs of the programs in which these scholars are studying.

During the 1963 fiscal year, 12 students received awards for study beginning in 1963–64. These fellows are enrolled in five new or expanded graduate programs at Montana State College and Montana State University.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Approximately 194 new technicians have completed training in Montana under the area vocational program of the National Defense Education Act. This program is designed to help meet the demand for highly skilled manpower in electronics, drafting and design, instrumentation, industrial chemistry, and other technical fields.

Four hundred sixty-nine youths and adults were enrolled during the school year 1962–63, of whom 198 were students in 2- and 3-year preparatory programs, and 271 were working adults in upgrading and refresher courses. These estimated numbers represent an increase of 53 over enrollments for the previous school year.

The number of participating institutions has increased from 2 in 1959 to 11 in 1963.

The Federal Government has contributed about $41.3 million to this program for salaries and equipment, of which $96,308 went to the State of Montana. States and communities on a national average have overmatched Federal dollars by about two to one. Montana has contributed $104,496 to the National Defense Education Act training since 1959.

GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING

Federal grants totaling approximately $257,000 for local guidance programs made possible a significant increase in the State total of full-time school counselors. The number has risen from 39 in 1958, to 57 in 1963. During this same period, from 1959 to 1963, more than 315,000 scholastic aptitude and achievement tests were given with the help of Federal funds, to public secondary school students and 1,389 to nonpublic secondary school students.

By the end of the summer of 1963, more than 120 secondary school counselors and teachers preparing to be counselors had attended 5 special institutes to improve their capabilities in counseling and guidance at a cost of $206,000.

SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

During the 5-year period, about $884,000 in Federal funds has been paid to Montana on a 50-50 matching basis for strengthening instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in public elementary and high schools. In addition, loans totaling approximately $8,700 have been made to private elementary and secondary schools.

Language laboratories in public secondary schools have increased from none in 1958 to 32 at the end of the 1963 fiscal year. During the same period, more than 1,500 local public school projects have been approved for the acquisition or remodeling of equipment and materials for instruction in these subjects.

Montana now employs two specialists supervisors in these subjects at the State agency level as contrasted with none before the act was passed.

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (FIRST TIME 1960)

Over 260 elementary and secondary school language teachers had attended 5 modern foreign language institutes by the end of the summer of 1963. About $394,102 has been obligated since 1960 for this activity, including $87,859 for an institute conducted during the summer of 1963 at Montana State College, enrolling 60 secondary school teachers of German.

IMPROVEMENT OF STATISTICAL SERVICES

Montana has received $139,746 under title X since the beginning of the program. In 1963 the State received $50,000, the maximum limit for any State. With the aid of Federal funds the Montana Department of Public Instruction has developed a system of automatic data processing. Steps have been taken to begin processing of teacher certification data by developing a master file from existing certification records. Plans are underway to cordinate classroom unit assistance data and instruction data. Procedures for State reimbursement for schoolbus transportation are presently handled with the new equipment.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BILL, ENLARGEMENT AND EXTENSION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT ARE GREAT FORWARD STEPS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we are approaching the end of a congressional session which has seen more different legislation beneficial to education enacted than any other single session in our history. In this 1st session of the 88th Congress, we have passed the first Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the higher education construction bill, and now are approaching final congressional action on the so-called vocational education bill of 1963, which also includes extensions and broadening of the National Defense Education Act and the aid to federally impacted school districts. This is a mighty record of accomplishment in this the 1st session of the 88th Congress. This progress can be credited to the two leaders of our Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in education and health matters: the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], whose dedication and skill and tact and patience have kept the legislative gears grinding away. They have written a whole new chapter in the history of the advancement of American education this year.

We have before us the conference report on H.R. 4955, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, which is basically the same bill as passed by the Senate October 8. Not much of substance has been lost in conference with the House; as a conferee on the bill I can testify to the skill with which the Senator from Oregon has worked to this result.

This program is still a major addition to this country's vocational education programs. It will provide great impetus toward providing our economy with the skilled individuals it needs, while helping individuals attain space age skills that are in demand. Essential provisions of the Senate bill were retained that allow experimental programs in new federally built residential vocational schools and in new experimental work-study programs. The overall cost of the program was reduced somewhat in the conference, but not its authorization of new ways of approaching our vocational education needs.

A 2-year extension of Public Laws 815 and 874 is authorized by the bill. This is not so long as the 3-year period I had wished, but it will allow the many school districts so vitally affected by this program to plan ahead for a period.

The National Defense Education Act extension will be of tremendous value. The improvements in the National Defense Education Act that the Senate bill called for were retained in the conference. Under this bill there will be a substantial increase in the student loans available, an increase clearly called for by student needs. The increase in dollar amount is more than 33⅓ percent over last year. Under this enlarged loan authorization—up to $125 million a year—250,000 students a year will be able to stay in college who would not otherwise be there. Study courses have been broadened in some respects, and the amount authorized to be loaned in one installation has been raised to workable size.

This has been a long hard year in Washington. One consolation we may take from the year is the record Congress has made in education legislation; there we have been a "do something" Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to speak, I am prepared to yield back my time.

Mr. MORSE. I am prepared to yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the conference report has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is absent on official duty.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 4, as follows:

[No. 269 Leg.]

YEAS—82

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—4

Curtis
Eastland
Thurmond
Tower

NOT VOTING—14

Cotton
Dominick
Edmondson
Engle
Goldwater
Gore
Hruska
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
Robertson
Talmadge
Walters

So the report was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Reserve training," for the fiscal year 1964, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Retired pay," for the fiscal year 1964, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Operating expenses," for the fiscal year 1964, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONDOLENCE ON DEATH OF THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a telegram from the President of the Senate of Belgium, expressing condolence on the death of President John F. Kennedy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a tribute to the late President Kennedy, offered in the National Assembly of Ghana on November 26, 1963 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON OVERPRICING OF MODIFICATION KITS UNDER CONTRACT WITH GENERAL INSTRUMENT CORP.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overpricing of modification kits for interrogator sets under fixed-price contract with General Instrument Corp., Newark, N.J., Department of the Army, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON HIGH COSTS PERTAINING TO ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN SITES FOR SELECTED LOW-RENT HOUSING PROJECTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the high costs pertaining to acquisition of sites for selected low-rent housing projects in the eight-State area administered by the New York Regional Office, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON OFFICE OF DEFENSE LENDING, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Second National Conference on Public Health Training

A letter from the Assistant Surgeon General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Second National Conference on Public Health Training, August 19–22, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two resolutions adopted by the Town Council of Buckley, and the Buckley Chamber of Commerce, both in the State of Washington, favoring the inclusion of funds for the Port of Tacoma project in the public works appropriation bill; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, Buffalo, N.Y., favoring the designation of November 22 as a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 2214. A bill to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association (Rept. No. 779); and

H.R. 7406. An act to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 777).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 6756. An act to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 778).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 2384. A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1958 (72 Stat. 700), relating to the exploration program for discovery of new minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jackson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2385. A bill to permit States, in the administration of State plans for medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to titles I or XVI of the Social Security Act, to cooperate with volunteer nonprofit health insurance groups or associations for the purpose of facilitating coverage by such health insurance of individuals who might also be eligible for medical assistance for the aged; to the Committee on Finance; and

S. 2386. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2387. A bill for the relief of Jacques Maseri and his wife, Adela Maseri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. Cannon):

S. 2388. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

EXPLORATION PROGRAM FOR DISCOVERY OF NEW MINERALS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a proposed bill submitted and recommended by the Department of the Interior to amend the act of August 21, 1958, relating to the exploration program for discovery of new minerals and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of the Interior in explanation of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The committee has already received suggested amendments to this proposal. The bill as introduced will be considered only as a draft on which hearings can be held. Efforts will be made to report a measure which is in the best interests of the mining industry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2384) to amend the act of August 21, 1958 (72 Stat. 700), relating to the exploration program for discovery of new minerals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Jackson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. Jackson is as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., December 5, 1963.

Hon. Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President pro tempore: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of August 21, 1958 (72 Stat. 700), relating to the exploration program for discovery of new minerals, and for other purposes.

It is recommended that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and that it be enacted.

The present exploration program authorized under the act of August 21, 1958 (72 Stat. 700), has now been in operation for several years. As a result of the experience gained during this period, we are proposing amendments in order to carry out two objectives: (1) to make the program more effective; and (2) to make it easier to administer.

The proposed legislation amends the existing law in the following respects:

1. It changes the method of providing assistance for exploration and related development loans.

Under existing law assistance is provided by a loan program which provides for repayment of the loan, plus interect, only out of 5 percent of the gross proceeds from the production in the area described in the contract, for a period not exceeding 25 years. The proposed change would convert this method to a program analagous to a joint venture where: (1) the United States and the applicant pay equal amount of the exploration and related development costs, and (2) the U.S. shares in the profits by receiving periodic royalty payments, for a mandatory period of 25 years, of 5 percent of the gross proceeds from the production in the area specified in the contract, subject to a refund of any amount in excess of 50 percent of the net operating profits, determined at the end of each taxable year. Since there will be no loan there will be no interest. This change also eliminates any need for the present requirement that the applicant must furnish evidence that funds from commercial sources are unavailable on reasonable terms.

The bill contains an expanded definition of "related development" and that term is carefully defined. The whole concept of the change is to provide liberalization of the program.

Justification: While the present program has provided incentive, its effectiveness has been reduced considerably by an interest charge that at times has been 6½ percent. This rate of interest added to operator costs acts as a deterrent to long-range projects which necessarily carry a high risk element and keeps many operators from participating in the program because it represents a fixed claim on a goodly part of the potential profit for many ventures. On the other hand there is no opportunity for the Government, when participating in the financing of these necessarily risky ventures to share more fully in the profits of highly successful enterprises. Elimination of this interest charge and its replacement by a concept analagous to a joint venture, plus expansion of the definition "related development" would be more suitable in the area of minerals exploration, and should provide greater incentive for far more operators to participate in the program.

2. It raises the single contract limitation from $250,000 to $500,000.

Justification: The present $250,000 limitation prevents the Office of Minerals Exploration program from being responsive to modern-day needs. Practically all of the low-cost, surface mineral occurrences have long since been found. This means that nearly all of the future ore discoveries of significant size will be found below the surface. To find them will require expensive geophysical and geochemical surveys to indicate favorable areas for surface drilling, which alone is an expensive item. If drilling be successful, it is usually followed by very expensive shaft sinking, drifting, and crosscutting, the overall cost of which increases geometrically with increased depth. In many cases, single exploration projects involve millions of dollars. Raising the limit will get a project to the stage where normal financial arrangements can be made.

3. The term "exploration" is redefined and the term "related development" is newly defined.

Justification: There is no clear-cut authority for exploration by air under the present act. As revised, the authority is expressly set forth. The new definition of "related development" will permit liberalization of the program.

4. It provides for annual rather than semiannual reports to the Congress.

The estimated cost and personnel data required by 5 U.S.C. 642a are not enclosed because no determination has been made that such costs will exceed $1 million for each of the first 5 years. If such determination is made we will furnish the required data at a later date.

This report was prepared in collaboration with the Treasury Department and is endorsed by them.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

Stewart Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to amend the Social Security Act, and I ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2385) to permit States, in the administration of State plans for medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to titles I or XVI of the Social Security Act, to cooperate with volunteer nonprofit health insurance groups or associations for the purpose of facilitating coverage by such health insurance of individuals who might also be eligible for medical assistance for the aged, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this bill would amend present law to make it possible, but not mandatory, for any State in its medical assistance for the aged program to allow older persons to have the full benefits of both prepaid health insurance and medical assistance for the aged.

This is accomplished by allowing an otherwise eligible aged person to obtain for himself health insurance supplementing the benefits available to him under his State's medical assistance for the aged program, with the assurance that those benefits will not thereby be reduced.

Under existing provisions of titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act, if an aged person has resources in excess of those exempted by his State for his ordinary living costs—no matter how small those additional resources may be—his medical-assistance-for-the-aged benefits otherwise payable are reduced by the amount of such excess. Furthermore, if he has health insurance, his medical assistance for the aged benefits are also reduced by the amount of his insurance coverage for the same health needs.

The result of these provisions is that every medical assistance for the aged recipient has his resources reduced to the minimum necessary for ordinary living expenses. This is true even if he attempts to protect his other income and assets by paying health insurance premiums so as to be able to meet medical care costs not covered by medical assistance for the aged without depleting his resources.

This bill would permit any State that so desires to allow a person to have health insurance to cover health care costs not paid under that State's medical assistance for the aged program. The combination of medical assistance and health insurance would enable aged persons to have better health care than would be possible under either system separately.

At present, a person whose hospital bill is $500 and who has $300 of resources in excess of those exempted by his State to meet his ordinary living expenses, must pay the first $300 of the hospital bill himself; medical assistance for the aged pays the remaining $200. If he tries to protect his $300 to meet other needs by buying health insurance of that amount, he is no better off; the health insurance benefits are added to his $300 excess resource and he is not considered eligible for any part of the $500 hospital bill. In fact, only if his hospital bill were more than $600 would any part of it be paid by medical assistance for the aged.

Under this bill a person who has a $500 hospital bill and who has $300 of excess resources could obtain $300 worth of health insurance coverage without losing any of his medical assistance for the aged benefits. The $300 payable out of his own resources would be met by the insurance benefits; the remaining $200 would be paid by medical assistance for the aged.

The aged person would be able to obtain needed medical care without depletion of his resources, or he could use his resources to pay for medical care needed which is not covered by his State's medical assistance for the aged program.

The bill would further the objective of existing legislation of increasing the dignity afforded to older citizens who are not eligible for public assistance, but who are unable to pay the full cost of their medical care. It encourages self-help in the finest American tradition. It allows a four-way partnership between the Federal Government, the individual State government, the citizen, and our great health insurance enterprises.

HAZARDOUS PAY FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which amends the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay for Government employees in certain areas.

Existing law permits the payment to certain categories of Federal employees of pay differentials or premium compensation for periods of work which they are required to perform under unusually hazardous conditions. These employees include a number employed by the Public Health Service, certain military personnel, and wage board personnel of various departments and agencies. For example, wage board employees of the Departments of the Army and the Air Force are paid up to twice their basic hourly rate for work performed at heights of 100 feet without the benefit of scaffolding or other adequate safety measures.

Extra compensation may be provided Classification Act employees through the regular position classification process when the unusual physical hardship or hazard is inherent in the position when it regularly recurs, and when it it performed for a substantial part of the working time. However, there does not now exist for Classification Act employees any means of providing adequate compensation for this purpose where the unusual hardship or hazard occurs at such irregular or intermittent intervals that it does not constitute a regular part of the job for position classification purposes.

Legislation is needed to correct this inequity. This proposal authorizes the U.S. Civil Service Commission to establish a schedule of pay differentials for Classification Act employees for irregular or intermittent duty involving unusual physical hardship or hazard. The differentials will be paid to the employees for any period in which they are subjected to these conditions while not usually involved in carrying out the duties of their positions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2386) to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER PROJECT, NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], I introduce, for proper reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, this project is vitally needed to relieve a critical water supply situation in the area, to protect and conserve the dwindling ground water resources in Clark County, Nev., and to provide the firm additional supply of municipal and industrial water as required to serve a rapidly increasing population, as well as to provide for the optimum development of the natural resources of the southern Nevada area.

This section of Nevada has experienced a rapid increase in population since the early 1940's, and for most of the past decade, this growth has been and continues to be phenomenal. A favorable climate, availability of large areas of undeveloped land, a strategic location in relation to the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, the Nevada atomic test site, plus activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have all contributed to this development. The rapid growth of the area is best exemplified by the fact that the population has increased from an approximate 50,000 people in 1950 to 141,400 people in 1960. The estimated population, presently, is 215,000. A projection of future growth indicates that over 300,000 people will be in need of water in this area by 1970, and that by the year 2000, over one-half million will call it home.

So great is the local interest in this project that the State of Nevada, at the last session of its legislature, designated the Colorado River Commission of Nevada as the State agency to contract with the United States for the repayment of project costs, and to operate and maintain the project when construction is completed. It has the active support of the Nevada congressional delegation, the State of Nevada through its Governor, the Honorable Grant Sawyer, the department of conservation and natural resources, the Eldorado Valley Advisory Board, the Clark County Commissioners, the Southern Nevada Industrial Foundation, and all of the municipalities and city groups located therein.

Previous activity on this proposal had been delayed pending the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Arizona against California to which Nevada was a party. This decision, among other things, allocated to the State of Nevada 300,000 acre feet of the waters of the Colorado River. It is these waters that will be utilized through the distribution system provided for in the bill.

The major problems faced by the project area are those associated with the availability of water and the need to bolster the economic base as the foundation for continued economic health and future growth. An increased water supply must be made available for the expanding population, or industrial growth will not be able to continue, and the heavy investment of the Federal Government in the Nellis Air Force Base, the atomic energy test site, and the NASA project will be seriously hampered.

At present, the principal source of water in this area is the underground artesian basin, supplemented by a small amount of water pumped from Lake Mead. Withdrawals from the ground water basin have for several years exceeded the safe-yield with a resulting critical depletion of the underground waters. The Nellis Air Force Base, which relies entirely on water from wells drilled in the basin, is faced with an especially critical situation. Water supply for fire protection is inadequate during the summer months, and a constant patrol has been necessary to enforce water conservation measures.

The magnitude of the problem to service the entire area has been recognized by the State and local interests, and all are agreed that the proper solution requires the development of a single comprehensive master plan for supplying additional water to meet the needs of the entire area. This project is the answer to that need.

In addition, I would like to point out that the entire cost of the project will be repaid to the Government with interest over a 50-year period, normally used for this type of development.

It should also be called to the attention of the Senate that this project is a part of the Southwest Pacific water plan, recently proposed by Secretary Udall as a solution to the overall problem facing the fastest growing section of the United States.

This project, like the central Arizona project, in Arizona, and the Dixie project, in Utah, need not wait action on the complete plan. While they are integral portions of the Secretary's proposal, they can be authorized and constructed individually without in any way interfering with the complete plan slated for long-term action.

The report of the Secretary outlining the Pacific Southwest water plan has been submitted to the States in the river basin and the interested Federal agencies as required by the Flood Control Act of 1944. The 90-day review period expired on December 5, and there is no reason why the Congress cannot proceed to consider all or any portion of the proposal.

Because of the demonstrated need for the authorization of the southern Nevada water project without delay, I urge the committee to proceed immediately to favorably consider the matter, and thereafter the Senate of the United States take affirmative action to authorize this project.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2388) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 361)

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—ADDITIONAL CONFEREE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the request of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] be added to the conferees on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, H.R. 7431.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORT DURING RECESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be allowed to file a report, while the Senate is in recess, on Executive N, the Chamizal Treaty with Mexico.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNUAL REPORT OF MINORITY LEADER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD and also as a Senate document the annual report of the minority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANNUAL REPORT OF REPUBLICAN SENATE AND HOUSE JOINT LEADERSHIP

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document the annual report of the Republican Senate and House joint leadership.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANNUAL REPORT OF MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD and also as a Senate document the annual report of the majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PATRICK J. OWENS—WINNER OF JOURNALISTIC AWARDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, perhaps the most coveted award in the field of journalism is the Nieman Fellowship. The winner gets $10,000 and spends a year of independent study at Harvard University.

Another top journalistic prize is the Sidney Hillman Foundation Award given for editorial excellence.

Yet another mark of recognition is the citation for excellence in reporting by the American Political Science Association.

A winner of any one of these can be proud of his achievement. But anyone who can claim a clean sweep can indeed be proud. I am pleased to point out to my colleagues in the Senate that an ex-Montanan, Patrick J. Owens, accomplished this extraordinary feat in a single year.

Owens, who is only 34, is presently editor of the Pine Bluff Commercial newspaper in Pine Bluff, Ark. Prior to joining that paper in 1961—the year in which he won the awards—he had a varied journalistic career in Montana, in the Army and elsewhere. He was born in Libby and grew up in Kalispell, Mont. He worked in western Montana on a variety of jobs, including construction work at the Hungry Horse Dam, reporting on the Kalispell Daily Inter-Lake and announcing on a Libby radio station. He also worked in journalism in Panama, in the State of Washington and in Chicago. In 1959, he moved to Arkansas where he covered the school integration crisis in Little Rock for the Arkansas Gazette.

Pat Owens is to be commended for the versatility and excellence of his journalistic career, and for the way in which he has brought honor upon himself and his profession—and, I might add, honor to his home State of Montana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point an article from the Pine Bluff Commercial of November 24, 1963, describing Mr. Owens' career in more detail.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Pat Owens, Executive Editor, Is Award-Winning Journalist

Patrick J. Owens, 34, executive editor of the Pine Bluff Commercial, came to the newspaper in January of 1961 and his work that year won three major awards.

The awards were the American Political Science Association citation for excellence in reporting; the Sidney Hillman Foundation $500 prize award; and a Nieman Foundation fellowship, one of the highest awards journalism has to offer.

He was born August 5, 1929, at Libby, Mont. His father died when he was 5, and his mother moved to Kalispell, Mont., where Owens grew up.

After graduating in 1947 from Flathead County High School at Kalispell, Owens attended Montana State University for 3 months. While he was in high school, he worked for the Flathead Monitor and the Times-Monitor, both weeklies.

In July of 1948, Owens enlisted in the Army. He was editor of the weekly Caribbean Army News for several months while stationed in Panama.

During his stay in Panama, Owens worked on the cable desk of the Star and Herald of Panama City. He was released from active duty with the Army in 1950.

He then worked on the construction of the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, where he also had worked before entering the Army. He was a form stripper and then an oiler at a rock crusher and at a concrete mixing plant.

In September 1951, he was recalled into the Army and spent a year at Oakland Naval Hospital in the Army Liaison Section, doing public relations and clerical work. He was discharged a corporal.

He went to Chicago and became assistant editor of Grain and Feed Journals, a trade magazine. He then worked in Chicago and New York for Radio Reports, a "clipping service of the air," as he describes it. His job was to listen to the radio and make notes and transcriptions of broadcasts for clients of the firm.

Owens returned to Libby to radio station KLCB, a 250-watt station, whose transmitter was located on a smokestack.

"I had every job in the place before I was through," Owens said.

In February 1954, Owens went to work for the Daily Inter-Lake of Kalispell, where he stayed a year and 3 months. Next he went to the Columbia Basin News at Tri-Cities (Pasco-Kennewick-Richland), Wash. He was successively regional editor, city editor, and news editor. His boss was Melvin B. Voorhees, who had created quite a stir during the Korean war when he published a book "Korean Tales," that had not undergone Army censorship. Voorhees, a lieutenant colonel, was the 8th Army censor.

It was here that Owens hired a reporter, Ruth Marvin, who was later to become Mrs. Patrick J. Owens.

Owens was a political columnist for the paper and wrote many of its editorials. He also conducted a program on which public issues were debated and discussed on KTRX–TV.

When Columbia Basin News changed ownership in January of 1959, Owens quit. He went to the Arkansas Gazette the same month. He helped cover the later phases of the integration crisis, including the Labor Day dynamitings of 1959 and the reopening of the Little Rock high schools that year.

He became interested in the Pine Bluff Commercial because of Edmond Wroe Freeman III and Armistead Council Freeman and their aspirations for the newspaper, he said. "I wanted to be part of what they were trying to do."

He was editor of the editorial page before he went to Harvard to study for a year, in the fall of 1962, on his Nieman award. When he returned, he was named executive editor.

As executive editor, he supervises the editorial department of the newspaper and continues to oversee the editorial page.

He says of the Commercial: "The direction in which we're trying to evolve is toward a newspaper more immediate, more interesting in things people are interested in. Mostly, newspapers are deadly dull. They need better writing, and to be more concerned."

TRIBUTE TO LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Mr. Talmage S. Wilcher, chairman of the Americanism Committee of the Virginia State Elks Association, delivered a tribute to the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy in connection with the Know Your America Week. The ceremonies were held at the Arlington-Fairfax Lodge of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks on November 30 and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wilcher's tribute be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech of Talmage S. Wilcher, General Chairman for Northern Virginia, Know Your America Week Committee, and Virginia State Chairman, Elks Association of Virginia (Americanism Committee), Delivered at a Special Memorial Service for Brother John F. Kennedy, at the End of Know Your America Week Program at New Elks Home, Arlington-Fairfax Lodge, November 30, 1963

Chairman Herman C. Anderson, distinguished guests, Monsignor Heller, Reverend Smith, Rabbi Golinken, it is with a sad heart that I attempt to address you all on this most solemn occasion, the martyrdom of our great leader and President. First I must say that I am a Republican. But John F. Kennedy was my President too. Now I have another President. He is a Democrat, but he is my President also.

We in America stand as a unit, that is why America is great; as Americans, we stand as a whole, regardless of creed, color, religion, or political preference. Our State Elks association, our great lodge, the All American Conference To Combat Communism, the National Council of Citizenship, are fighting a battle for all of us, to save our country from the specter of communism, hate, greed, selfness, ignorance, and fanaticism. We are fighting to save our children from hate, ignorance, and the little-thinking people who would destroy us. If we give them the chance, there is no future for any one of us.

The Elks is not a one-man organization, it is not an exclusive club for the benefit of a few, it is not an organization to satisfy the egomaniacal expression of ignorant, selfish men. It is not an organization that caters to a few to the detriment of the whole. We have a mission. That mission is positive Americanism. The inculcation and exemplification of American manhood, with brotherly love, of justice, charity, and fidelity.

Without a mission, little men fail. While on the other hand men with a vision can and will prevail over ignorance. Let's get it straight: we, the people of the United States, can truthfully say: I am proud to take those ringing words for my own, proud to be a part of a great hope, a great confidence that man is and of right, ought to be free.

I am an American, free to work, free to build, free to speak, free to worship. I have faith in America because I know that America is right, because I believe in freedom, because I accept and enjoy the tremendous responsibility and great blessings of America for myself, my family, and my nine precious grandchildren, and their offspring to come. I am proud of America. Millions have lived for it. Millions have sacrificed for it. Millions have died for it, including our beloved brother, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States. In the light of those very sacrifices, I am proud to say that for me and my family we are dedicated Americans. In conclusion let me say and repeat the great poet who is unnamed:

"God give us men. A time like this demands strong minds, ready hands, men whom the lust of office cannot buy, men who have honor and men who will not lie. Tall men, sun-crowned men who live above the public fog in private duty and in public thinking, for while the rabble with their thumbworn creeds, their large possessions and little deeds. Lo freedom weeps, while wrong rules the lands and waiting justice sleeps. God give us men. Men of dependable character, men of sterling worth, then all the wrongs of men shall be redressed and right over might shall rule the earth. God give us men."

In these final hours, of a great planned celebration, when all the world seemed to turn upside down, in minds of men, in the hearts of the young, in the schools, in the churches, in the business places, the frustrations, the tears, the sorrow, let us not forget there is a lonely, widowed mother, with her two young and beautiful children. Because a maniac, with hate in his heart, killed a man, her husband, a President, a father.

AUTOMATION AND EDUCATION FOR EMPLOYMENT: A VITAL LINK

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, none of our country's major domestic problems stands alone. There is a vital interrelationship among the problems of automation, unemployment, job training, and civil rights, for instance. Any step which relieves one of these problems relieves the other three at the same time.

Admittedly there is no easy answer to these complex problems. But education of one sort or another is certainly involved in dealing with all of them.

I have been particularly concerned with the need for education in the fields of job training and automation and have introduced legislation during this session dealing with both these problems.

Although the bill providing for expanding vocational education which was passed by the Senate was not the one which I introduced, nevertheless it provided essentially for the increased emphasis which I advocated, and I was happy to support it.

I might say at this point that I use the term "vocational education" with some reluctance, because I am afraid it has acquired an unwarranted stigma in some quarters. I prefer to call it "education for employment," or simply job training. In today's economy this field must be thought of as including not only individuals preparing for their first jobs but those who are being retrained for new jobs.

We are doing something more in this field none too soon. It is my hope that what we have done will spur the country as a whole to move forward vigorously in preparing our youth and adults for jobs.

I am sorry that we have not shown similar energy in meeting the automation problem. It is one which will continue to grow. The White House Conference on Automation which is provided for in my bill, S. 185, would do a great deal to spread information and generate ideas. I would hope that early in the new year we may see something done on this bill.

In connection with these remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a column by Sylvia Porter which appeared in yesterday's Wilmington (Del.) Morning News. It is entitled "Coming—Cradle-to-Grave Schooling."

COMING—CRADLE-TO-GRAVE SCHOOLING

(By Sylvia Porter)

"Picture the event in 1994: The doorbell rings—no—the electronic impulse arbitron in the leisure room vibrates and flashes on the all-purpose screen the bulky image of the third degree robot officer. Third degree Robotoffs call in person for two kinds of violators only: scofflaws who hang their hovercraft too close to TV aerials (difficult to avoid because they are invisible); or for those who, ignoring the hourly subliminal warnings, have not pressed their TV school buttons for 3 days running.

"Secunda, gum-chewing 12-year-old daughter of the house, goes to the door to argue—'and I've done all my homework for the next year, too.'

"Metallically but clearly, the truant officer (for it is none other than he) says, 'But I am here for your mother.' "

With this imaginative introduction, Milton R. Stern, an assistant dean at New York University, submits his solution to the growing problem of leisure time in the United States—cradle-to-grave classes.

As certain as automation, says he, is adult education for everybody and he even suggests seriously that cradle-to-grave classes "may soon become compulsory."

That automation is creating an explosive problem of nonwork in this country is undeniable. The U.S. Government estimates rising output per man-hour, due to automation, is now eliminating a minimum of 200,000 factory jobs a year. A leading manufacturer of automation equipment, John L. Snyder, Jr., of U.S. Industries, Inc., says flatly this is "a gross underestimate of the real situation."

Snyder declares automation is eliminating 2 million jobs a year not only through direct displacement of workers but also through the "silent firings" of workers who would have been employed had their jobs not been wiped out.

This, of course, is the great force behind the accelerated drive for a shorter workweek—and union leaders openly admit they are fighting for shorter hours than their members really want.

This is the key reason for the development of the extended vacation—dramatized by the 13-week sabbatical recently initiated in the steel and can industries and certain to spread in coming years.

This always has been the factor behind featherbedding which is work in name only.

At the same time, as reported yesterday, nonwork is one of the fastest growing "occupations" in the United States. Our nonwork population is up to 7.3 million, triple the total in 1949, and this group receives $100 billion a year, or one-fifth of our entire personal income.

In the past only the wealthy have had the burden of too much leisure and too few interests to enjoy the leisure. Now it's becoming the curse of millions who have been accustomed to filling most of their days with time-consuming tasks and who are utterly unprepared for nonwork.

Since extended leisure time is inevitable, what's the answer? It's not more golf, more gardening, more fishing, bowling or TV-watching. These pleasures can become tortures if there is little else.

The answer is a step-up in education of the American adult, as well as the young, to prepare all of us to reach a higher plateau of literacy in every sphere—economic, political, social, cultural.

The stage already is being set for this. Closed-circuit TV in the classroom suggests what is to come. The voluntary return to classes of adults across the Nation to learn new aptitudes and hobbies indicates how far we have moved from the popular image of night school. The campaigns launched by farsighted union, business and community leaders to spur adult education during vacation and off hours telegraph what is on the way.

The dimensions of our future adult education cannot even be guessed, but this is sure: we are a remarkably ignorant people and we have a long, long way to go before we can claim otherwise.

One reason Stern's seemingly eccentric prophecy impresses me is that subconsciously I came to it for myself long ago. Whenever I've been asked what I'll do when I get off this rat race of a daily column, my immediate answer has been:

"I'm going back to school to learn and to teach." I've already arrived where Stern says our country is heading.

POEM IN TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I have been deeply moved by the messages I have received on the death of our late President. So many of them express our feelings poignantly and eloquently. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a poem of beautiful simplicity which came to me from Bloomfield, Conn.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN ONE G-D

One man is dead.
I did not know him; I never saw him.
His death has hurt me.

One shot has killed him.
I did not see it or even hear it.
His death has frightened me.

One man has killed him.
I do not hate him.
His deed has stunned me.

One woman has no husband.
I do not know her.
Her tragedy is mine.

One girl and boy have lost a father.
I need no pity.
My pity is with them.

One country has lost a President.
I love this country—it is mine.
Its loss is my loss.

One tear turned into many.
I cried for him.
His death perplexed me.

One man will be remembered.
I see the flag at half-mast.
His memory lives.

One belief is not ruined.
I know our faith will save us.
His G-d is my G-d.

—JUDITH ANNE WRIGHT.

BLOOMFIELD, CONN.

PROSPECTIVE CLOSING OF MILITARY BASES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the attention of the Senate has been directed to the impact on the local economies of 16 States as a result of the recent announcement of the Secretary of Defense that 33 military bases are scheduled for closing during the next 3 years. This word is accompanied by the announcement of the Studebaker Corp. that it would move its production facilities for cars from South Bend to a Canadian city.

Those directly affected are understandably concerned. Yet, I would stress that these decisions need not be fatal to the communities involved and, in fact, may in some respects be blessings in disguise.

For those communities which must face the problem of readjustment I would like to point to the experience of the city of Wichita. For many years Boeing has been the major employer in south central Kansas and specifically in the city of Wichita. In early 1958, Boeing employed 35,000 people at its Wichita plant. As a result of the decision of the Department of Defense to discontinue the purchase of B-47's and B-52's which were assembled at that location, the work force has been reduced by 17,000. This represents 15 percent of the labor force of the city of Wichita.

Naturally, this reduction in force created innumerable difficulties for individuals and for the community as a whole. The immediate effect was to cause the unemployment rate to exceed 6 percent and steps were taken by the Federal Government to declare the area a "distressed area" since, by definition, it was an "area of substantial labor surplus." Interestingly enough, the city balked at this effort and contended that it did not want to be defined as a distressed area, preferred to seek contracts and business on a competitive basis and only wanted assurance that it would not be denied contracts simply because it was not a distressed area.

The community then set about organizing itself to meet its problems. Business leaders formed a metropolitan area council composed of 40 to 50 executives of the major industries in the area. This group worked with the city and other governmental units to assure that local governmental policies complemented business policies aimed at expansion of existing industries and the attraction of new ones. The city of Wichita, for example, modified its annexation and tax policies to strengthen existing industries and encourage new ones.

A nonprofit organization called the Wichita Area Development, Inc., was organized to assemble risk capital for existing and new industries.

The city has issued over $1 million in bonds to assist in the development of industrial facilities which has resulted in the attraction of at least one major employer.

As a result of these efforts, the unemployment rate in Sedgwick County which includes metropolitan Wichita was down to 3.5 percent of the labor force in September. It averaged 4 percent for all of 1962 while the nationwide unemployment rate was running very close to 6 percent. Other indicators such as bank clearings and issuance of building permits are climbing to near record level.

I point out this effort of a local community in my State because I am certain that as we press for tighter budgets and more restricted Federal spending, more and more communities are going to face problems similar to those which will result from the anonuncements this week. Wichita is an example of what can be done when a community is determined to face the problem and make the best use of its own resources.

I request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article in the Wall Street Journal of December 13 describing the Wichita program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH BEND, FACING PULLOUT BY STUDEBAKER, URGED TO TAKE HEART FROM WICHITA LESSON

(By Michael G. Gartner)

WICHITA, KANS.—Here's some local advice for civic leaders in South Bend, Ind.:

"Sit back, regroup your forces and take stock of the situation. You may discover Studebaker's huge layoffs to be a blessing in disguise."

This advice comes from a city hit with substantial layoffs in the past 6 years yet now booming as never before. In fact, Wichita was hit harder than South Bend. Between 1958 and 1960, about 15 percent of the labor force was laid off in this city of 265,000, a higher rate than the 6 to 7 percent slated to be laid off in South Bend, a city of 150,000.

Earlier this week, Studebaker Corp. announced that it would end production of cars in the United States and that it probably would lay off more than 6,000 employees at its South Bend works.

"People thought we were going to fold up and die" when Boeing Co., Wichita's largest employer, began substantial employment cuts as defense work dwindled in 1958, says one Wichita businessman. "It was anything but that. The people were shocked for a short while but then everyone cooperated and pretty much ever since then we've never had it so good," even though Boeing's Wichita employment now is down to 18,200 from more than 35,000 at the end of 1957.

FACE UP TO PROBLEMS

"Those people in South Bend shouldn't get discouraged," says Gordon Evans, president and chief executive officer of Kansas Gas & Electric Co. "They should admit they have problems, face up to them and go from there. That's what we did."

South Bend officials already have begun to act. Mayor Frank J. Bruggner appointed a 42-man special committee of businessmen and community leaders to help bring in new industry to offset the $50 million annual payroll loss. One hope of the community is that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will locate its proposed $50 million research center in South Bend. However, eight other cities also are fighting for the Government installation.

South Bend's quick action to soften the impact of Studebaker's decision is reminiscent of several steps taken by this booming city since the first Boeing employment cuts were made in 1958.

Local citizens last winter formed Wichita Area Development, Inc., a nonprofit affiliate of the chamber of commerce, organized to create venture risk capital and make it available to existing and new industry. The organization has a $350,000 capital base and hopes to expand this. It is considering several applications and expects to approve some shortly.

BONDS ISSUED

Last year, the city issued $1.2 million in industrial revenue bonds to finance a 96,000-square-foot factory for Lear Jet Corp., a new company employing 450 people and expected to employ 1,200 by midsummer. Lear Jet has started construction of a 100,000-square-foot addition, which will be financed by a $750,000 bond issue expected to be issued shortly. Under such financing, the city issues the bonds to private investors and the interest and retirement costs are paid through rental income from the factory. Lear considered 35 cities for its plant before choosing Wichita.

In 1960, business leaders formed a metropolitan council, which consists of 40 or 50 chief executives of Wichita industry and which, according to Mr. Evans, "keeps everybody working together." Among other things, the council has helped solve a longstanding tax and annexation feud between the city and about a dozen industries north of here; a compromise was reached when the industries agreed to annexation and the city agreed to a reduced tax rate for them.

In addition, civic leaders stepped up their work with existing companies. They began keeping in closer touch on city and company matters, and even helped bring in new sales, which created jobs. One executive says Beech Aircraft Corp. and Cessna Aircraft Co. have sold several airplanes as a result of leads from local businessmen.

Wichita also benefited from what one businessman calls the healthy and helpful attitudes of Boeing and the International Association of Machinists. Both cooperated in helping the unemployed find jobs elsewhere, and "there were no strikes or strike threats," one local resident adds.

The United Auto Workers Union Wednesday added its efforts to the South Bend situation by urging Chrysler Corp. to build a car assembly plant there. Chrysler, which plans a plant in the area of Belvidere, Ill., had no immediate comment.

Although civic leaders here urge South Bend to follow Wichita's example in coping with the sudden employment curtailment, they concede that hard times can be expected in the immediate future. In Wichita, the unemployment rate shot up above 6 percent in the first quarter of 1961 and the Federal Government attempted to officially declare the city a distressed area since it was, by Government definition, an "area of substantial labor surplus."

But city officials fought off the attempt, asking only that local industry not be denied defense contracts when its bids were competitive simply because it wasn't a distressed area.

Other economic indicators were off briefly, but the city recovered quickly. The unemployment rate in Sedgwick County, which is mainly Metropolitan Wichita, was 3.5 percent of the labor force in September, down from the average of 4 percent throughout 1962 and 5.4 percent in 1961. In contrast, the nationwide unemployment rate in November was 5.9 percent.

Also in September, the county issued 1,030 building permits for structures valued at $1,858,828, up from 443 permits issued a year earlier for $1,206,904 of facilities. Bank clearings in the month climbed to $153,462,023 from $130,249,336 the year before and retail sales in August—the latest month for which figures are available—rose to $41,712,070 from $36,343,744 a year earlier. These figures are all records or near records and are continuing to climb, officials say.

The gains are coming despite continued drops in Boeing employment. The current force of 18,200 is more than 3,500 below average employment at Boeing for 1962.

LINE PLANS FARE CUT TO AID DISPLACED STUDEBAKER STAFF

CHICAGO.—The Chicago South Shore & South Bend Railroad plans to introduce cut-rate fares for points between South Bend, Ind., and Chicago to aid displaced Studebaker Corp. employes, Will C. Coliton, South Shore president, said.

The railroad will establish three new commuter-ticket classifications at reduced rates to help the workers find jobs and commute to them in other communities, Mr. Coliton said. Earlier this week Studebaker announced it will close its South Bend automobile manufacturing plant, which employs about 6,000 people.

The new classifications will be tickets good for 44 or 54 rides in 1 calendar month and a 10-ride ticket good for 1 year from the date of purchase. Rates on the current 25-ride tickets good for 1 year and straight one-way fares won't be changed, the railroad said.

Mr. Coliton said the line expects to receive approval from the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Public Service Commission of Indiana by December 27 so the monthly tickets can be sold for January.

The average rate reduction can't be calculated, he said, because reductions are based on a formula that varies with the number of rides, time limit and mileage.

As one example, the rate for a 54-ride monthly ticket between South Bend and Chicago, a distance of roughly 90 miles, will be $74.42, or $1.38 a ride. This compares with the present year-long, 25-ride ticket rate of $72.03, or $2.88 a trip. The straight one-way fare is $3.96.

THE ENEMY ON THE LEFT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Williamson, W. Va., Daily News, in a recent editorial, reminds us that the real danger in America today is the danger of forgetting who the real enemy is that has been attacking this Nation and its basic principles over the past 15 years: communism. The man who dared to murder our President and the man who planted rockets in Cuba aimed at our shores were inspired by the same leftist fanaticism which aims at our total destruction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the Williamson Daily News be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL ENEMY

So much attention has been focused on the far-right extremist groups and their activities in the United States over the last couple of years that at times we have all but lost sight of the ever-present danger caused by the militant subversive far left.

Almost in an instant after President Kennedy's assassination there arose national suspicions wanting to link the crime with the radical right wing. This, in our way of thinking, is the most revealing aspect to come out of the tragedy which upset the entire Nation. Unknowingly, we as a people in these United States had become blinded to the greatest enemy our way of life has ever known. We are referring to communism and all its leftist affiliates, the cause for worldwide insecurity for so many years.

Isn't it so that it was communism which divided the world into the free and the slave nations?

Isn't it true that there would be no cold war if it were not for communism?

Isn't it a fact that communism murdered thousands of persons in Hungary because they wanted to live as free men?

Did we not fight a strange war in Korea costing thousands of American lives because of communism?

Did we not hear the leader of Communist Russia boastfully state that he would "bury us"?

Is our memory so short as to forget the conspiracy between Soviet Russia and Castro's Cuba which placed threatening weapons of destruction only 90 miles off the shores of the United States?

Repeatedly have we not found enemy agents working in our very midst attempting to undermine this country's security?

Is it not so that millions and millions of dollars are being drained from the American people in order to provide a deterrent against aggression threatened by the Red forces?

The list could be continued almost endlessly. However, the most compelling reason why we should come back to our senses can be found in the most shocking recent event which has caused this national concern. The man who was charged with the slaying of President Kennedy had his sympathies not with the rightwing extremists but instead with communism, according to the evidence revealed to date. He had gone so far as to write in 1959: "I affirm that my allegiance is to the Soviet Socialist Republic."

We hold no brief whatsoever for the rightwing fanatics and their stirring up of hatreds, but at the same time our most serious cause for alarm is found in the way the American people have become lulled into a false sense of security by their diminishing alertness to the threat of communism.

These are among us in this country, even in communities the size of Williamson, those dangerous elements who sympathize with the Communist conspiracy. At all times they are scheming and plotting ways of extending their sphere of influence. They have had an easier time of late because their devious movements have all but been overshadowed by the indignation against the activities of the rightwingers.

The real harm done by the rightist extremists now can be seen. Their fanatical ravings against the left, instead of spotlighting the menace of communism, only did the reverse. It is high time that we got our feet back on the ground in this country, both in high and low places, and recognize once more the true enemies of our great Republic.

CURING THE CAPITAL DRAIN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times in support of a capital issues committee.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times Dec. 13, 1963]

CURING THE CAPITAL DRAIN

In defending the administration's proposed tax on American purchases of foreign securities, Under Secretary of the Treasury Robert V. Roosa observes that buying of foreign stocks and bonds during the first 6 months of 1963 involved so big an outflow that it threatened the status of the dollar. A continuation of this drain, he implies, would have brought a crisis.

But Mr. Roosa's treatment, which involves a tariff on capital, does not seem to us to be the most effective cure. It will encourage a new drain through loopholes especially designed to avoid paying the tax. It may invite an outflow of funds by corporations making direct investments in foreign countries, which would not be subject to any new levies. It could injure traditional trading relationships. Worst of all, there is a real risk that the proposed temporary tax will remain permanently on the books, which might undermine Wall Street's position as the leading international capital market.

We continue to hold that a governmental capital-issues committee to pass on foreign issues would be a far better means of stemming the outflow than the thinly disguised form of control provided by the proposed tax. Under a committee system, a distinction can be made between issues that are in the national interest (where the bulk of funds is spent in the United States, for example, or where the proceeds will contribute to the development of a foreign economy) and those that are not. By permitting the marketplace to set the cost and terms on approved issues, it would avoid the setting up of an artificial pricing system.

A committee would not be a painless remedy. No form of control can be. But while a committee is as repugnant as the proposed tax, it is not likely to create as many new drains and distortions. Furthermore, experience with controls over consumer and mortgage credit suggests that a committee to control the capital outflow would be abolished as soon as its job is done.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have spoken repeatedly on this problem during the past few months. I want to reiterate my firm belief that the interest equalization tax is not in our own best interest. A capital issues committee, a measure that I support, even though it represents a measure of control over capital flows, is necessitated by the seriousness of the situation confronting the United States as a result of our continued balance-of-payments deficit. It is a measure which would be effective, flexible and truly temporary.

I also ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times of December 10 entitled, "Roosa Defends Foreign Securities Tax Plan and Assails Wall Street Executives Who Oppose It" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 10, 1963]

ROOSA DEFENDS FOREIGN SECURITIES TAX PLAN AND ASSAILS WALL STREET EXECUTIVES WHO OPPOSE IT: TREASURY OFFICIAL AND OTHER SPEAKERS WARN THAT DRAIN ON DOLLAR IS NOT ENDED

(By Edward Cowan)

Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury, vigorously defended yesterday the administration's proposed tax on the purchase of foreign securities and rebuked Wall Street critics of the proposal.

Mr. Roosa, normally mild-mannered, spoke with flashes of feeling before some 200 leading businessmen and financiers. The occasion was a panel discussion of the United States' international payments deficit sponsored by the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce.

The meeting was held in the Americana Hotel, as was a banquet addressed by Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

In a direct slap at critics of the tax, some of whom sat in the audience, Mr. Roosa said financial executives "whose main job has been to wear the hair shirt for those who want to do more than their resources allow" have been unwilling to "wear the hair shirt when necessary;" that is, to accept the proposed tax and its expected restrictive impact on foreign financing in the New York money market.

DRASTIC CHANGE REJECTED

The problem of finding the best way to curb the flow of investment dollars to foreign countries "can't be picked off in an hour in an armchair at the club," Mr. Roosa asserted.

"This tax will become law," he declared. It is time, he said, "for the investment community to accept it in the spirit in which it was proposed, the need to preserve the dollar itself." The proposal was advanced last July by President Kennedy, Mr. Roosa said, "in a situation that was tumbling out of control" because of a "cascading increase" in foreign borrowing in this country.

Mr. Roosa, Mr. Martin, and Alfred Hayes, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York all cautioned that the sharp reversal in the net outflow of dollars in the third quarter of the year should not be construed as signaling an end to the dollar drain problem. "It remains to be seen whether we are continuing to do as well," said Mr. Hayes.

A fourth panelist, Edward M. Bernstein, a consultant to central banks, said there was "no need for a revolutionary change in the world monetary system."

But, he said, there should be evolutionary change in two directions: integration of national currency reserves with those of the International Monetary Fund and greater use of currencies such as the French franc, the German mark, the Italian lira and the Dutch guilder as foreign exchange reserves of other countries.

Mr. Martin disclosed that within a few hours of the assassination of President Kennedy on November 22 the Federal Reserve increased by 50 percent two of its standby agreements for reciprocal exchanges of currency.

It was understood that the increases were with the Swiss National Bank and the Bank for International Settlements, with whom the Federal Reserve had "swap" arrangements, as they are called, of $100 million each.

Swiss francs were one of the currencies offered for sale by the Federal Reserve within minutes of the assassination in a move to head off any panic or speculative sale of dollars for other currencies. The Bank for International Settlements is a quasi-official international institution in Basel, Switzerland.

Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., another panelist, expressed concern that the tax on foreign securities would lead to other interferences with free market forces. "Too seldom is any form of control lightened or eliminated," he said. "The diagnosis is usually that the medicine is all right, you just need more of it."

SUGGESTION BY BLOUGH

Mr. Blough suggested that the remedy for the dollar drain lay in domestic policies, especially tax reduction and a freeze or cutback in Government spending. Both in his formal presentation and in reply to a reporter's question afterward, Mr. Blough hedged on whether he favored passage or defeat of the tax proposal.

It appeared that, having clashed with the Kennedy administration over steel prices in 1962, he wanted to avoid head-on opposition to one of its major legislative proposals.

The proposed tax would fall on Americans who lend money to foreigners for more than 3 years except banks, and on purchases of foreign stocks.

It would be graduated on debt, depending on its term, up to 15 percent. That would be the rate on all foreign stock purchases. The Treasury has said that the result would be to increase the effective rate of interest paid by foreign borrowers by one percentage point, for example, from 5½ to 6½ percent. The bill was approved last week by the House Ways and Means Committee.

COMMUNIST STRATEGY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the problem of Communist infiltration, subversion, and other tactics presents a continuing challenge to the United States and other free nations. It exists in Latin America and it is present also in southeast Asia. The Middle East and Africa are other regions in which international communism is actively seeking to establish itself. For us to play a vital role in preventing the growth and expansion of communism, all Americans must have a real understanding of the ways in which communism operates.

Because of the great importance I place upon a proper understanding of Communist tactics and methods, and the ways in which they can be combated, I am calling attention to an unusual book entitled "The Strategy of Deception," published by Farrar, Straus & Co. This is a collection of essays which exposes the strategy of communism not only in the United States but also in India, Italy, Spain, Great Britain, Burma, and other countries. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the publisher's description of "The Strategy of Deception: A Study in Worldwide Communist Tactics."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STRATEGY OF DECEPTION: A STUDY IN WORLDWIDE COMMUNIST TACTICS

(Edited by Jeane J. Kirkpatrick)

In this book distinguished scholars and political leaders from seven nations show how Communist parties attempt to capture power in countries outside of the U.S.S.R. The subject is a familiar one, but it is not well understood by those unprepared for the deception, obfuscation and other methods of Communist infighting.

The chapters in this book describe Communist parties on the operational level; communism in action. The authors demonstrate how Communists, acting in the name of amorphous, sweeping, economic and historical forces, ignore these "laws" whenever convenient. They show the way in which Communists have redefined for practical purposes the class struggle so as to make it mean the struggle of Communists and non-Communists. They show how Communists bill themselves as the vanguard of the proletariat in nations with no proletariat, no capitalists, and no industry. (In Africa, a Communist party will exploit a tribal conflict as a struggle against the "bourgeoisie.") They show that communism grows not by an intrinsic "revolutionary" appeal, but by its ability to obscure its aims and identify itself with other groups, goals and popular symbols. The French Communists, Mrs. Kirkpatrick points out, have attempted to capture Victor Hugo, and the American Communists have staked a claim to Tom Paine and Abraham Lincoln. The Communists, it is demonstrated, are masters of realpolitik, and should be the enemy and the adversary, rather than the bogeyman, of freedom-loving people and their political leaders.

The editor, Mrs. Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, is presently a member of the political science faculty at Trinity College, senior analyst in Operations and Policy Research, Inc., Washington, D.C., and a consultant for various Government agencies.

DANGER TO THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET—EEC

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, press reports during the past several days indicate grave tensions within the European Common Market, some even suggesting that the European Common Market is in danger.

The breakup of the European Common Market would be a major setback to the free world's foreign policy even though we too have had our problems with the EEC. It would possibly kill for the time the "Kennedy round" of the worldwide trade talks under the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade now scheduled for next year. The implications for our business community would be vast.

The creation of the European Economic Community represents a culmination of a highly successful postwar effort of the Atlantic Community to rebuild Western Europe and to support forces pressing for European economic integration. The success of this effort has made Western Europe a new and major force in the world struggle for freedom, both in economic and political terms. Any breakdown in the EEC over the question of a common farm policy would represent a major weakening of free Europe and weaken our common endeavor to expand world trade and to provide maximum economic assistance to the developing countries of the free world. U.S. trade and political partnership with a unified Europe built around the Common Market must remain a keystone of our policy.

I urge the administration to leave no stone unturned in an effort to settle differences between the United States and the EEC in the best long-term interests of both, and to use all its available resources, diplomatic, political, as well as economic to impress on all concerned that the necessity for Western unity and economic strength overrides any differences they may have over farm policy.

I ask unanimous consent that a series of articles from the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal dealing with this subject be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 13, 1963]

COMMON MARKET FIGHTS FOR LIFE—PARIS WON'T CONCEDE GERMAN APPROACH

(By Henry Giniger)

PARIS, December 12.—France will hold West Germany responsible for a breakup of the European Common Market if there is no agreement on outstanding farm questions by the end of the year.

According to qualified French sources, there can be no link or synchronization between settlement of the Common Market's farm problems and the settlement of a unified Common Market position toward the forthcoming tariff cutting negotiations with the United States.

The outright rejection of the West German thesis that the two questions be settled together was made clear at the same time as French insistence that the commitments made by the six nations be respected.

This commitment, in the French view, is that by the end of the year, give or take a few days, regulations governing the production and sale of rice, beef, and dairy products will be drawn up together with financial regulations concerning imports of these products from countries outside the Economic Community.

If the deadline is not respected, then France with the four partners supporting her—Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—will note that West Germany has not respected its commitments, according to informed sources.

As far as France is concerned, the Common Market will therefore be unable to continue. The farm question, in the opinion of the French Government, is of fundamental importance.

Although only three products are concerned in the negotiation now underway in Brussels, a settlement on them will mean the first concrete step toward a common agricultural policy, 6 years after the Treaty of Rome, setting up the Community, was signed.

It is explained here that France accepted a Common Market in industrial products at considerable sacrifice since she felt her industry was not really competitive with West Germany's.

France made the sacrifice, according to official thinking, because of the prospect that the six nations would extend the market to farm products, as provided for in the treaty. In this field France is in a strong position to export to and to compete with her partners.

What President de Gaulle will say at a news conference he will hold in January will depend on what happens in Brussels—headquarters of the Common Market—between now and the end of the year. It was recalled that last January he took the initiative of breaking up the talks with Britain on her entry into the community.

BLAME IS SHIFTED

This time the eventual blame on a breakup of the community is being placed in advance on West German heads. Officials here professed to be confident that finally the West Germans would cooperate.

Puzzlement as well as irritation continued to be expressed about Bonn's insistence on a detailed discussion of the tariff bargaining talks with the United States—the Kennedy Round. French sources said the Government was not opposed to such talks, or even to drawing up a declaration of principles concerning the Common Market's position on the matter.

But the question was asked here as to why there was a need to draw up a detailed position now when the United States had not one of its own, and had not even begun prescribed tariff hearings with U.S. industry.

Moreover, doubt is being expressed here on whether the scheduled date for the formal opening of the negotiations within the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in Geneva now can be respected by the United States.

The various comments in Paris betrayed a continued lack of enthusiasm by France for the trade talks or for any substantial concessions to the United States. The crisis that has developed appeared to resolve itself into a test of wills between Bonn and Paris.

The issue concerning the Kennedy Round that has to be settled concerns disparities between European tariffs and U.S. tariffs.

The United States has sought equal reductions in tariffs by both sides but has accepted the European thesis that in some cases U.S. tariffs are so much higher than European ones that an equal reduction would leave a disparity to Europe's disadvantage.

The question that the Common Market countries has to decide is how much disparity there is and how many products it concerns.

The West Germans are pushing for as liberal an attitude toward tariff-cutting as possible while the French have been decidedly more cautious on the ground that the Common Market exists first of all for the benefit of its own members and secondarily for the benefit of outsiders.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 13, 1963]

BONN SAYS DISPUTE IS BARGAINING

(By Arthur J. Olsen)

BONN, December 12.—Chancellor Ludwig Erhard said today that West Germany's clash with France over Common Market agricultural policy was not a quarrel but only hard bargaining between friends.

Speaking before students at Heidelberg University, the Chancellor conceded that present negotiations in Brussels on common farm prices for the six-nation community were hard.

"But there is no question of a quarrel," he said. "There will be no quarrels between friends."

Dr. Erhard's remarks appeared calculated to ease the atmosphere of crisis prevailing in Bonn over a French demand that the ruling Council of Ministers of the Common Market agree by December 31 on price regulations for meat, rice, and dairy products.

The regulations could mean price cuts for West German producers, particularly in the dairy industry.

An overnight redrafting of the proposed dairy products regulation, to take cognizance of German insistence on maintaining a subsidized dairy industry, also was favorably received here. Officials said the amendment would not solve all problems but it represented a spirit of reasonable negotiation.

The Bonn Government, hard pressed by its high-cost farming industry, has been playing for time. It insists that France commit herself to a liberal policy on next year's tariff negotiations with the United States simultaneously with the introduction of unified meat, rice, and dairy prices.

A government spokesman asserted yesterday that West Germany would not submit to unacceptable demands by December 31, a deadline insisted upon by Edgard Pisani, the French Minister of Agriculture.

FRENCH EXPLAIN VIEWPOINT

While that statement was being issued, the French Ambassador, Roland de Margerie, was conferring with Dr. Erhard. The French envoy reportedly honed some of the rough edges off Mr. Pisani's remarks in Brussels.

In political quarters here, nevertheless, there is earnest debate whether President de Gaulle is prepared to see the 6-year-old Common Market—West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—break up if his demands are not met.

Christian Democratic Parliamentary leaders emerged from a closed discussion of the situation with optimistic comments. Informants said their hopes were based on the judgment that France would have too much to lose in wrecking the economic community.

But it was privately conceded that in view of President de Gaulle's ruthless veto of Britain's bid for membership in the community last January, such a resolute decision by President de Gaulle was not beyond question.

FARM INTERESTS IRKED

Spokesmen for West German farming interests were in a fighting mood.

Minister of Agriculture Werner Schwarz said in an interview that "the way to a Common Market must not be paved with unilateral German sacrifices."

Mr. Schwarz, whose absence at this week's ministerial meeting in Brussels gave Mr. Pisani the opportunity to charge that Bonn was not taking the problem seriously, said that West Germany had and would continue to fulfill treaty commitments. But that could not mean that it would dance to the tune of individual treaty partners, he said.

Detlev Struve, a Christian Democratic farm expert in Parliament, demanded that the Government base its position in Brussels on maintenance of present prices and subsidies for West German dairy products.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 13, 1963]

WASHINGTON REJECTS IDEA OF A BREAKUP

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, December 12.—In a situation remarkably similar to that of exactly a year ago, this Capital instinctively refuses to accept the position that a cornerstone of its foreign policy and international economic policy could be about to crumble.

Last year the "impossibility" was the rejection of British entry into the European Common Market. Washington was no doubt genuine in its optimism, but it was wrong.

This year what is deemed equally unthinkable and impossible is the end of the Common Market itself, as a result of the crisis that now is developing in Brussels.

Officials were saying today that the administration is relaxed, that the dispute in Brussels between France and West Germany is a war of nerves, and that in the end the crisis will be resolved.

Once again, there is no doubt that this view is genuine, and it purports to be based on reports from embassies abroad. But once again it could be wrong. Some intelligent observers here and elsewhere are not ruling out at all the possibility that the Common Market could be finished inside of a few months.

The view is based on the seriousness of the opposing views of France and Germany. On the surface the issue is mainly agriculture, and that issue is real enough. But at bottom the trouble is over the whole concept of the political organization of Western Europe. It is the sort of showdown in which French President de Gaulle could very well go to the brink.

The pessimistic view is also based in part on the unpredictability of President de Gaulle.

This element in the situation is admitted by U.S. officials, even those who are optimistic. General de Gaulle is so unpredictable on some occasions and so much a personal maker of policy, that last year at this time his own ministers did not know what he would do about the question of British entry into the economic bloc.

If the Common Market crumbles, it is widely felt here, the result will not be anything so drastic as war or even serious economic disruption of the West. But some major strands of American idealism and of American policy will become unraveled, certainly for a while to come—"Atlantic partnership," the objective of European union and, possibly, the Kennedy round of sweeping tariff reductions in the Atlantic world.

Official Washington is unwilling to contemplate these possibilities, as it was unwilling to contemplate British rejection a year ago.

For example, a meeting yesterday of officials most concerned with the "Kennedy Round," it is reliably reported, did not even discuss the internal Common Market crisis.

Those with long memories recalled that a year ago American officials refused even to discuss what could or should be done if British entry into the Common Market were rejected.

Running through the official assessment here and through that of many Americans who are not officials but who are interested, is the belief that the Common Market is so economically useful, if not essential, to France and to the other member nations that none would dare to go over the brink and break it up.

There is a parallel theme that European union is "historically inevitable."

These have been accepted truths here for so long that they are almost impossible to give up. To some extent they are shared in Western Europe, but by no means universally. They may not be true at all.

It is at least open to question, for example, how much the existence of the Common Market has contributed to the remarkable economic performance of the Western European countries in the last decade. A number of Frenchmen, including some in authority, are persuaded that France could get along very well without the Common Market, and that it could also continue to pursue a fairly liberal foreign trade policy.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 13, 1963]

BREAKUP IN EUROPE? DIPLOMATS FEAR FRANCE MEANS THREAT TO QUIT THE COMMON MARKET: THEY SEE OTHER FIVE JOINING BRITISH-LED BLOC, A FRANCE ISOLATED IN TRADE, POLITICS

(By Ray Vicker)

BRUSSELS.—What happens if the European Common Market breaks up?

Diplomats here still insist the odds are they won't have to answer that question. But a new crisis in the Common Market's crisis-ridden life is forcing them to ask it, in all seriousness. Briefly, the six nations of the European Economic Community, as the Common Market is formally named, are hung up in a French-German deadlock over farm policy. French President de Gaulle, with the support of his Cabinet, is threatening to take France out of EEC if a common farm policy isn't wrapped up by December 31. And worried diplomats suspect he isn't kidding.

Collapse of EEC, say sources here, would change the economic and diplomatic map of Europe. The seven-country European Free Trade Association, now led by Britain, would pick up five ex-Common Market nations as new members, they think. France, they say, would be isolated politically and in trade relations.

Such changes would force American statesmen to draw up a new "grand design" with a Johnson rather than a Kennedy flavor for United States-European relations. The Kennedy "grand design," of U.S. trade and political partnership with a unified Europe built around the Common Market, had already been dealt a heavy blow by General de Gaulle's January veto of Britain's bid to join EEC, but it was not quite dead.

DEATH OF "KENNEDY ROUND"?

The implications for U.S. business would be vast, too. Breakup of the Common Market would kill the "Kennedy round" of worldwide tariff-cutting talks under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), now scheduled for next year. Some other tariff-cutting plan might be launched as soon as the European nations sorted themselves out into a new pattern of economic alliances, but this would take time.

The 1,000-odd U.S. companies with European operations would experience widely different effects. Those with plants in England would gain almost the same advantage they would have if Britain had succeeded in joining EEC—namely, low-tariff access to the five continental nations that might join EFTA. But U.S. companies operating in France would find themselves isolated in a market of 46.5 million people rather than one of 175 million—the population of today's Common Market.

It's this threat of French isolation that leads most diplomats to hope some way will be found to keep the Common Market together. They insist that France, beset by inflationary troubles at home, is in no position to cut itself adrift from an economic bloc whose operations have benefited it as much as any of the other members (Germany, Italy, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg).

Since the Common Market was founded on January 1, 1958, gross national product of its members has risen 24 percent, industrial production 37 percent, and trade between members 100 percent, with France sharing fully in the gains. EEC has accomplished this by leveling trade barriers among its members and taking various steps to integrate their economies. Tariffs within the bloc are only 40 percent as high as they were at its formation, and the EEC has gone two-thirds of the way toward erecting a common tariff wall against the rest of the world. It also has done various things to create a unified capital and labor market.

FARM TROUBLES

But while progress has been rapid on the industrial front, EEC has encountered nothing but difficulty trying to unify the farm economies of its members. And it's this trouble that now threatens to break up the bloc.

All Common Market countries have been protecting their farmers in various ways; throughout EEC some $400 million a year now goes into subsidies, price supports and other payments to milk and dairy farmers alone.

But Germany's farmers are the most protected and least efficient. So Germany has opposed creation of an agricultural Common Market—which would mean free movement of farm products across national borders under a single price system—except in stages too slow to please its EEC partners. France, in contrast, has been pressing insistently for a Common Market in farm goods, largely because it wants a sales outlet in Germany for the food surpluses produced by its more efficient farmers.

EXTREME CONSEQUENCES

Things now have come to a head at a marathon Brussels meeting of the Common Market's Council of Ministers. French Agriculture Minister Edgard Pisani walked out of the meeting early this week, threatening "extreme consequences" if a common farm policy isn't agreed on by December 31. He's coming back now, under "very firm instructions" from General de Gaulle to see that this deadline is met. General de Gaulle himself had threatened earlier to break up the Common Market if farm problems aren't solved, and Wednesday he got the backing of his Cabinet.

On the same day, however, the West German Cabinet, meeting in Bonn, defiantly declared it won't accept December 31 as a deadline for a common farm policy. Indeed, it said Germany will sign no agreement calling for common prices for beef, dairy products and rice until the EEC countries agree on their policy for the "Kennedy round" of tariff-slashing talks (largely involving industrial products); these talks with the United States and the rest of the world are scheduled to begin in Geneva next May.

The deadlock reflects a trend that may continue to bother the Common Market even if it somehow surmounts the present crisis. Since France's veto of Britain's bid for EEC membership, each country has tended to push its pet policies rather than compromising on a common policy benefiting all.

Thus France is pressing particularly hard for a common farm policy. But Germany—now the world's second largest exporting nation behind the United States—is most interested in freer industrial trade with the rest of the world, and thus in preparations for the GATT tariff-cutting talks. France, more protectionist in the industrial area, is lukewarm toward those talks, though officials pay lipservice to the idea of worldwide tariff cuts; Germany retorts, in effect, that as long as France drags its feet on formation of a policy toward those talks that would benefit Germany, France can't have the common farm policy it wants.

In this, Germany has some support from other EEC members, who are bitter about the French ultimatum on farm policy, since they too feel France has been obstructing Common Market unification in other fields. "When France vetoed British entry into the Common Market, the community spirit received a critical blow," says one official of the EEC Commission, the Common Market's administrative body. "Ever since, each member has been unwilling to surrender any national interests for the good of the group."

It's still possible, of course, that some way will be found around this deadlock, or that France will back down on its ultimatum. Within France, worried voices are predicting disaster if the Common Market breaks up.

Enterprise, a weekly Paris business magazine, recently featured interviews with eight prominent French industrialists on what would happen if EEC collapses. Their conclusion: Such an event would set French industry back several years, result in production declines, and would "inevitably provoke an economic crisis."

Maurice Jordan, vice president of S.A. des Automobiles Peugeot, French automaker, says that only the Common Market has made it possible for French firms to "resist the dangers" of having American companies take over Europe's economy. He adds: "Disappearance of the Community would give the Americans a free hand in Europe of the Six."

But diplomats here aren't betting General de Gaulle won't carry through on his ultimatum. They note gloomily that he has scheduled an important press conference for January—just as he did a year ago when he was preparing to break the news of his veto of Britain's EEC membership bid.

"We are worried," admits one EEC Commission official in a crowded hall of Brussels' Palais du Congres, where the EEC Council of Ministers is now meeting. "This threat of French Agriculture Minister Pisani certainly doesn't sound like a tactical debating maneuver."

If General de Gaulle breaks up the Common Market, reports already are circulating in Paris that he will immediately put forth a proposal for creation of a European free trade area embracing EFTA and the ex-Common Market countries.

France's EEC partners, however, show no interest in this idea. Says a Dutch official in The Hague: "Europe already has a free trade area in EFTA. If we must surrender EEC, why accept some de Gaulle creation when we already have a going concern which is free of his disruptive influence?"

Another Dutch Government official in Brussels says he is sure EEC will survive the present threat, but adds that "if it doesn't, I predict we will be the first Common Market country to join EFTA." He adds that Belgium and Luxembourg probably would come along, and that if they did it would be difficult for Germany and Italy to remain out.

EFTA currently consists of Britain, Portugal, Switzerland, Norway, Austria, Denmark, and Sweden. Like EEC, it is cutting tariffs among its members on industrial goods, with the aim of abolishing them in a few more years, and has made about as much progress in this regard as the Common Market.

EFTA, however, is not seeking to establish a unified market in agriculture, a fact that might make it easy for any disgruntled Common Market countries—France excepted—to seek admission. It also leaves each nation free to set its own tariff against the rest of the world, and has no schemes for economic integration like EEC's proposed common transport and fuel policies.

Ironically, when Britain was negotiating to join EEC, it once seemed that EFTA would dissolve and in effect be swallowed by the Common Market, with its other members also joining EEC or becoming associate members. If EFTA should now instead swallow EEC, this would achieve some of the same aims of European economic unity and creation of a giant market—with, of course, two major exceptions; the 12 nations would be united in a much looser framework, and France would be left out.

American officials see some benefits to U.S. trade in this possibility. The Common Market, they say, has been growing increasingly protectionist in agricultural trade with the United States, which now sells the EEC more than $1 billion worth of food and fiber a year. The last step toward establishment of a common EEC tariff wall against other countries' farm goods shut U.S. poultry out of a thriving market in Germany, touching off the celebrated transatlantic "chicken war," which has now ended in U.S. tariff increases on German trucks and French brandy. Since EFTA has no common agricultural tariff wall against other countries, say Americans, the United States might be able to preserve markets for American farmers in Germany and other countries, or open new ones, dealing individually with those countries as EFTA members.

The Common Market's Council of Ministers will stay in session the rest of the year, trying to keep EEC together and do something on farm policy. But EEC officials say it will be simply impossible for them to come up with a common farm policy by December 31, as France wants, even if they stay in 24-hour session. The number of technical details to be worked out, even if an agreement in principle is reached, is far too great, they say.

France could, of course, delay carrying out its ultimatum if an agreement seems imminent by December 31. But EEC officials say the number of technical details is too great to make an agreement in early 1964 certain, either. So, barring some shift in positions, the crisis seems heading toward a test of how seriously France means its ultimatum.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 13, 1963]

A Farm Deadlock Grips Trade Bloc—Agriculture Chiefs Conclude 4 Days of Tugging Without Finding Basic Solution

(By Edward T. O'Toole)

Brussels, December 12.—European Common Market agricultural ministers concluded 4 days of pulling and tugging over price regulations and farm products tonight without reaching any basic agreement on a common agricultural policy.

"Next week will be decisive," France's Agriculture Minister Edgard Pisani said as he left for Paris late this afternoon to participate in a legislative debate in the French Assembly tonight.

Mr. Pisani had been the storm center of controversy here earlier this week between the delegations from France and West Germany.

But today the atmosphere was peaceful if not genial. Most of the ministers tended to play down the French-German exchange Tuesday, which provoked policy pronouncements from Paris and Bonn on Wednesday.

EXAGGERATION CHARGED

Rudolf Huttebrauker, West Germany's State Secretary for Agricultural Affairs, said today most reports had tended to exaggerate the significance of this week's arguments over Common Market agricultural and trade policies.

"The atmosphere here has not been as bad as it has been represented," he said.

Barend W. Bieshuvel, the Netherlands Minister of Agriculture, who was chairman of the work sessions this week, expressed similar sentiments during a press conference tonight.

"You must remember," he said, "that these discussions affect the lives of millions of farmers and consumers in Europe. In matters so important, it is not unusual if emotions occasionally get out of hand."

The Dutch farm chief said the agriculture experts would continue their sessions next Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday mornings in preparation for the meeting of the full Council of Ministers of the member states that begins December 18.

PRESENT SYSTEMS DIFFER

"It will be a miracle if we can finish our negotiations by yearend," he said.

The farm ministers this week have been attempting to reach an area of agreement on the organization of uniform market and pricing systems for beef and veal, for rice, and for dairy produce.

At present there are separate and largely different systems in use by the Common Market Six—West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg.

West Germany, for example, supports farm prices at the community's highest level, while France's prices are the lowest. The other four member states have price-support programs in between.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 11, 1963]

Common Market Farm Parley Disrupted by French Walkout—Agriculture Chief Edgard Pisani Charges Bonn With Delaying an Agreement on Prices

Brussels, December 10 (Reuters).—French Agricultural Minister Edgard Pisani walked out on a European Common Market meeting here tonight after accusing West Germany of blocking progress toward agreement on common prices for farm products.

The dramatic walkout climaxed the internal crisis that has been brewing ever since French President de Gaulle vetoed Britain's application to join the Common Market last January.

Mr. Pisani delivered a "serious and solemn warning" to the market's agricultural ministers, and said he was leaving to consult his Government about the West German position.

In Paris, United Press International reported President de Gaulle with Premier Georges Pompidou on the deadlock. President de Gaulle was in telephone contact with Mr. Pisani.

Mr. Pisani's warning to the Common Market ministers came on the second day of a marathon session due to end December 21, when the six nations are scheduled to adopt their common agricultural policies and a joint policy for next year's "Kennedy Round" of tariff-cutting negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

But Mr. Pisani gave instructions authorizing lower ranking members of the French delegation to continue negotiations. He expressed the hope "everyone will be able to negotiate from now on, so that extreme risks will be avoided," a French spokesman said.

"Unless given other instructions," Mr. Pisani would probably return to the Belgian capital tomorrow afternoon, the French spokesman said.

Mr. Pisani warned recently that France would revise its policy on the Common Market and European political integration unless the yearend deadline was achieved. His use of the words "extreme risks" to be avoided this evening was viewed in that context.

GERMANY SEES NO HASTE

The French Minister was reportedly particularly annoyed because West Germany's Secretary of State for Economic Affairs told newsmen this afternoon some "myths and legends" about the yearned deadline and introduction of a common cereal grains price next year should be dispelled.

[Rudolf Huettebraeucker, German Secretary of State for Agriculture and Bonn's chief delegate, said there was a sharp exchange of views in which Mr. Pisani accused Bonn of not taking the December 31 deadline seriously.]

Sources close to the Council of Ministers said tomorrow's meeting would take place as scheduled, since Mr. Pisani had authorized a substitute to negotiate for him.

The French delegation was obviously dissatisfied because no German Minister or even State Secretary was present at the first meeting yesterday.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 10, 1963]

Common Market Plans Two Parleys—Farm Integration Is Pushed—Party Leaders To Meet

(By Edward T. O'Toole)

Brussels, December 9.—Two important meetings will be held this week in this unofficial capital of the "new" Europe, which is getting to look more like the "old" Europe every day.

Today the agriculture ministers of the European Economic Community began a marathon series of conferences in an attempt to meet yearend deadlines that have been set by the European Common Market's integration timetable.

Tomorrow Premier Theo Lefevre will be host at a conference of Christian Democrat Party leaders of the European Community six—West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

REASON FOR TALKS

The party leaders are getting together to see what, if anything, they can do in concert behind their own frontiers to get the political and economic integration of Europe moving again.

Many political leaders in Europe believe that if the present Community standstill continues, the six member states eventually will pack up and go home.

The agriculture ministers will be meeting through Thursday in an attempt to break the deadlock over farm policy that has persisted since the demoralizing De Gaulle veto last January.

The timetable of the Common Market calls for agreements to be reached on beef, rice, and dairy produce regulations by yearend 1963.

COMMON CEREAL PRICE

The member states also are supposed to set a common cereal price for the 1964 harvest year which begins July 1. The Mansholt plan, which was proposed last month, calls for moving in one jump to common grain prices by July 1, 1964.

The original schedule called for gradual progress from one year to the next to a common price level by December 21, 1969.

When the full Council of Ministers meets next Monday, the cabinet ministers are scheduled to give their official views of the Mansholt plan. It is expected that the plan, in its present form, will be rejected. The reason: too much, too soon.

French To File Protest

Paris, December 9 (Reuters).—The French Wine and Spirits Export Syndicate will protest against an American decision to raise import tariffs on cognac in retaliation against Common Market protectionism in the "chicken war." Syndicate President Pierre Jeannenau said the protest would be lodged both with the French and international authorities. He called the American decision "discriminatory" and hoped that a solution would be found before the January 7 deadline when the new tariffs would go into effect.

MEETING THE COTTON TEXTILE CRISIS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, a few days ago the House passed a bill H.R. 6196, known as the Cooley bill, designed to abolish the so-called two-price system for cotton in this country and thereby to relieve American cotton textile mills from unfair foreign competition.

I am wholeheartedly in accord with the purpose of this legislation, Mr. President, and I hope the Senate will soon have an opportunity to perfect and adopt such a bill.

However, I also am of the opinion that there is a better way to deal with the cotton problem than the method called for in the House bill.

A far more sensible approach—indeed, a fresh, a new approach—to the cotton problem is provided in a bill introduced in the Senate last March by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] and cosponsored by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey.] This bill, S. 1190, entitled the "Cotton Domestic Allotment Act," makes a lot of sense. I urge my colleagues of the Senate, who have not already done so, to get a copy of this bill and study it carefully. To me, the Talmadge-Humphrey proposals appear to offer the most sensible solutions to our present problems in the cotton and cotton textile industries suggested to date.

I hope, Mr. President, that soon the Senate can consider H.R. 6196, the House bill, amend it so as to include the basic provisions of the Talmadge bill, and then go on to pass it. With this approach we can save our textile industry from destruction, insure a fair return to cotton farmers, and cut the costs of our agricultural programs.

The cotton textile industry is threatened today because, under the two-price system, American mills must pay 8½ cents a pound—or $42.50 a bale—more for American cotton than the foreign mills have to pay.

For too long now, we in the Congress have failed to reach a real solution to the cotton problem. While we have postponed and delayed and temporized and quarreled, hundreds of American textile mills have shut down, throwing tens of thousands of workers out of jobs.

Textile jobs in this country have fallen from more than one and a quarter million in 1947 to less than 840,000 last year. This has created economic hardship in the textile manufacturing areas of New England and of the South.

In my own home State of Maine, there has been a 50-percent decline in the number of cotton mills in the last 5 years. Employment in the textile industry in Maine has dropped more than 50 percent in the past 12 years, from 25,900 in 1950 to 12,000 in 1962.

Domestic cotton textile producers are being displaced not only by manmade fiber substitutes, but also by foreign grown cotton and by increased imports of cotton textiles. Cotton exports during the 1962–63 marketing year were down sharply—a total of only 3.4 million bales. Domestic mill consumption this past season was 8.4 million bales—about one-half million bales less than the previous year. It cannot be said, under these conditions that this industry is a growing and prosperous segment of our economy.

We cannot be satisfied with less than around 5 million bales as our share of the export market for cotton. Neither can we be satisfied unless our biggest and best customers—our own mills—use more cotton as population rises and buying power is at favorable levels.

At present, it is an ailing segment that is being forced into an even worse position. This is a segment too closely tied to our economy and national welfare to permit it to wither on the vine for lack of legislative action. If inaction continues to preclude this industry from competing we simply give carte blanche to foreign competitors to capture world markets, and to dominate domestic markets. Also, we open the floodgates wider for use of manmade fibers. And everyone will suffer—the grower, the mills, the consumer.

There also has been a sharp increase in imports of cotton textiles. For the first 8 months of calendar year 1963, cotton textile imports were up about 2 percent above the comparable 1962 period. Total imports of cotton textiles on a raw fiber equivalent basis were at a record level of 457,000 bales in the first 8 months of this year.

There has been increasing evidence of the loss of cotton markets to competing manmade fibers. We hear of more and more instances where rayon and other synthetic fibers are being substituted for cotton. The production of manmade fibers for the first half of 1963 was about 7 percent above the same period a year earlier. Mill consumption of cotton for the first 3 months of the current crop year is slightly below the same period a year earlier.

Cotton suffered a total competitive loss, as estimated by reliable economists, of 1,150,000 bales between December 1960 and March 1963. Over this period, consumption of rayon in cotton-type spinning mills rose 74 percent. Consumption of dacron and similar-type fibers rose 147 percent. Cotton's share of the fiber used in the cotton industry spinning operations has declined almost monthly.

There is another important factor which should be neither overlooked nor dismissed. This is that the cotton situation has sharply increased Government costs. As of August 31, 1961, Commodity Credit Corporation's investment in upland cotton amounted to approximately $300 million. By August 31, 1963, it had risen to approximately $1.2 billion. The carryover on August 1, 1963, was 11.2 million bales, up more than 3 million bales over last year.

Mr. President, the cotton bill passed by the House would eliminate the unfair two-price system, but it would go about it in the wrong way, by piling one 8½-cent-a-pound subsidy on another.

The House bill would do nothing about solving the problems of mounting cotton surpluses. It does not provide the answer to the decline in cash income to the cotton farmers. And, while it may help the mills and the workers, it does not help the taxpayers.

The Talmadge-Humphrey approach would do all of these things. It would end the two-price system and enable our domestic textile mills to compete once again with foreign mills. Costs to the mills would be lower under the Talmadge bill than under the House bill. It would protect the jobs of American workers. It would protect the income of the American cotton producers. Small family farmers would receive greater protection under the Talmadge bill than under the House bill. It would encourage the exportation of American cotton. And, by taking the Federal Government out of the business of buying and storing cotton, it would effect great savings to the taxpayers—savings not possible under the House bill.

Although no cotton is produced in my State of Maine or in the New England region, I recognize the importance of cotton to the agricultural economy of this Nation. When we enact legislation designed to help the cotton mill worker in New England or the Southeast, I think we also should try to help the cotton producer of the South and the Southwest and the Far West, especially the small farmers, wherever they are.

The Talmadge bill would do this by providing for adequate price supports and compensatory payments to farmers on cotton they produce within their domestic allotment quota. At the same time, the Talmadge bill would allow the producers to grow and sell as much cotton as they please at the lower world market price.

This would eliminate the necessity for the export subsidy. It would restore American cotton to a competitive position in the world markets. It would improve cotton's competitive position with synthetic fibers. It would lower cotton textile prices and savings to the consumer.

Another great advantage to the Talmadge-Humphrey plan, Mr. President, is that it would free the cotton farmer from acreage controls.

I would suggest one amendment to the Talmadge bill, Mr. President, to give the Secretary of Agriculture standby authority to impose controls on cotton production or marketing when and if the world price drops below 50 percent of parity. This would provide added insurance against runaway production.

My distinguished colleagues, the junior Senator from Georgia and the Senior Senator from Minnesota are experts in the field of agriculture legislation, and, Mr. President, they have combined their knowledge and talents to propose a program that I think needs to be enacted by this Congress.

I hope the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will soon take up H.R. 6196, amend it to include the basic provisions of the Talmadge bill and send it to the floor of the Senate so that we may be permitted to vote our approval of it.

In this manner, Mr. President, we will be able to accomplish the avowed purposes of S. 1190:

> To maintain the income of cotton producers, to permit cotton producers to grow and market cotton on a free enterprise basis, to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles, and to encourage the exportation of cotton.

We have an opportunity here to benefit the farmer, the millworker, the mill operator, the consumer, and the taxpayer. And I hope we can seize this opportunity at the earliest possible moment.

CHRISTENING OF U.S.S. "JOSEPHUS DANIELS"

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on November 30, 1963, the U.S.S. *Josephus Daniels*, named for that great American and that great Secretary of the Navy, the late Honorable Josephus Daniels, was christened on the Kennebec River, at Bath, Maine. The naming of the ship for Secretary Daniels was indeed a richly deserved honor to his memory and an expression of appreciation of his wonderful services to our country. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks at the christening, together with a copy of the telegram which I sent expressing Mrs. Hill's and my deep regret that we could not be present on the occasion, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PRAYER—CHRISTENING OF U.S.S. "JOSEPHUS DANIELS" (DLG–27) NOVEMBER 30, 1963

(Invocation given by Chaplain Bey G. Grunder, U.S. Navy, at the Bath Iron Works on Saturday, November 30, 1963)

Eternal God, who art robed in majesty and girded with strength, we beseech Thee to look with favor and compassion upon our Nation. Through the grievous death of our President John F. Kennedy we are again shocked into awareness that the heart of man can so easily be a hotbed of hate, where the trigger is given precedence over truth and tolerance. Assuage our grief and comfort the sorrow of Mr. Kennedy's wife and family. In these critical days we pray for our President Lyndon B. Johnson, that Thou wilt be to him a tower of strength, a fountain of wisdom, and a shield of safety.

We look unto Thee, O Lord of hosts, as our refuge and our fortress, that Thou wilt guard us in all our ways and grant unto us Thy salvation. And now we are about to christen this ship, this product of ingenuity and workmanship, as a powerful symbol of our determination to preserve the freedom Thou hast given us.

In humility and in faith, we invoke Thy blessings upon U.S.S. *Josephus Daniels*; upon her commanding officer and all her crew. May the employment of this ship worthily reflect the genius and patriotism of her illustrious namesake. In every course upon every sea, let the *Josephus Daniels* steam with Thee who dost plant Thy footsteps in the sea and who dost ride upon the storm.

In the name of Thy divine Son our Saviour. Amen.

REMARKS OF JOHN R. NEWELL, PRESIDENT OF THE BATH IRON WORKS

Mrs. Woronoff, Senator MUSKIE, distinguished guests, fellow employees of the Bath Iron Works, it gives me great pleasure to welcome you here today to the banks of the Kennebec River to witness the christening of the U.S.S. *Josephus Daniels* (DLG–27). Unfortunately, we were unable to get towboats here today due to the heavy seas outside, and so we are unable to put the ship in the water this morning. And since the weather is still a little gusty, I am glad that we decided not to launch even with towboats. We hope to launch tomorrow about 12:37 but we won't be able to make that decision until later when we find out what the weather is going to do.

The *Josephus Daniels* is the second of her class—the *Belknap* was launched last July—she is a big ship, 547 feet long, 55-foot beam, and will displace almost 8,000 tons when fully loaded. In fact, she is the longest ship ever launched at this yard or at Bath, Maine. She will be completed in about 13 months.

The *Daniels* is named for the distinguished Secretary of the Navy, under President Wilson, the Honorable Josephus Daniels. He was the editor of the Raleigh News & Observer for many years and built the paper up from scratch to a newspaper of national significance. He was Ambassador to Mexico under President Franklin D. Roosevelt from 1933 to 1942. The *Josephus Daniels* will be christened by a granddaughter of Mr. Daniels, Mrs. Robert Woronoff. We had expected another granddaughter to be present here today as cosponsor, Mrs. Clyde Rich, Jr., but she was unable to be present.

We also have with us today several other members of the Daniels family and many other distinguished guests, a few of whom I will mention:

Mr. and Mrs. Josephus Daniels, Jr.
Mr. Jonathan Daniels.
Mr. and Mrs. Frank A. Daniels, Jr.
Mr. and Mrs. Derick Daniels.
Dr. and Mrs. Worth B. Daniels.
Mr. and Mrs. C. B. Squire.
Mr. Herbert W. Jackson.

The Honorable EDMUND S. MUSKIE, U.S. Senator from Maine.

Adm. Robert B. Carney, U.S. Navy (retired), chairman of the board, Bath Iron Works.

Rear Adm. J. A. Brown, U.S. Navy, Design, Shipbuilding, and Maintenance Division, representing the Chief of the Bureau of Ships.

Air Vice Marshall R. Stanley Aitken, RAF (retired).

Rear Adm. and Mrs. William F. Royall, U.S. Navy (retired).

Rear Adm. and Mrs. J. P. Canty, U.S. Navy (retired).

Air Commodore J. C. Young, U.S. Navy, Fleet Air Wing 3, U.S. Naval Air Station, and Mrs. Young.

Capt. Walter E. Baranowski, U.S. Navy, supervisor of shipbuilding, Bath, representing the commandant of the 1st Naval District.

Capt. Ernest J. Knoche, U.S. Navy, commanding officer, U.S. Naval Air Station, Brunswick, and Mrs. Knoche.

Col. Edward A. Herbes, U.S. Air Force, commanding officer, Bangor Air Defense Sector, and Mrs. Herbes.

Capt. Vincent Deitchman, U.S. Navy, chief of staff, Fleet Air Wing 3, U.S. Naval Air Station, Brunswick, and Mrs. Deitchman.

Capt. Charles W. Ward, U.S. Navy, administration officer, 1st Naval District, and Mrs. Ward.

Capt. and Mrs. Terry T. McGillicuddy, planning officer, Boston Naval Shipyard.

Capt. Russell S. Hitchcock, U.S. Navy (retired), former supervisor of shipbuilding, Bath, and Mrs. Hitchcock.

Capt. Edson H. Whitehurst, U.S. Navy (retired), and Mrs. Whitehurst.

Capt. David M. Burns, U.S. Navy (retired), and Mrs. Burns.

Hon. Carleton Day Reed, Jr. State senator, and Mrs. Reed.

Hon. Frederick E. Drake, Jr., State representative, and Mrs. Drake.

Hon. Ralph W. Brewer, State representative, and Mrs. Brewer.

REMARKS MADE BY REAR ADM. J. A. BROWN, REPRESENTING THE BUREAU OF SHIPS, ON THE OCCASION OF THE LAUNCHING OF THE "JOSEPHUS DANIELS" (DLG–27) AT THE BATH IRON WORKS ON NOVEMBER 30, 1963

Launching traditionally marks the birth of a ship, the moment when it takes to its natural element and begins its vibrant, restless life.

This launching will be the start of a life dedicated to preserving peace and freedom. Such a life calls for power and versatility, both of which this ship has in abundance. It has the size, speed, endurance, and seakeeping qualities to operate effectively with fast aircraft carrier task forces. Its long-range radar and Terrier missile battery will enable it to shoot down attacking aircraft. A powerful sonar and the latest antisubmarine warfare weapons will make it effective against marauding submarines. This ship will have 3-inch and 5-inch guns for closein firepower—for local shore bombardment in support of amphibious operations.

Building such a ship takes great skill, and that we find in abundance here at the Bath Iron Works Corp. This shipyard has demonstrated particular competence in constructing destroyer types and has built many of the Navy's prototype destroyers. Just since World War II, Bath has built the prototypes *Mitscher* (DL–2), *Forrest Sherman* (DD–931), *Dealey* (DE–1006), *Charles F. Adams* (DDG–2), and *Leahy* (DLG–16), and is now building the prototype *Belknap* (DLG–26), a sister of this fine new ship. In addition, Bath is now building the experimental destroyer escort, *Glover* (AGDE–1). Such an array accurately reflects the enterprise of the management of the company, as well as the Navy's confidence in the skill and ingenuity of personnel. I know they have used all this ability in readying this ship for launching.

As this ship is launched, it will be named after World War I Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, by a charming lady who is his granddaughter. I am sure that as she christens the ship she will infuse it with some of her grandfather's greatness of character and intellect. This ship will need these qualities in the life she now begins.

REMARKS BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE, DEMOCRAT, OF MAINE, AT THE LAUNCHING CEREMONIES OF THE U.S.S. "JOSEPHUS DANIELS," IN BATH, MAINE, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1963

Mrs. Woronoff and other members of the Daniels family, Admiral Carney, Admiral Brown, President Newell, and distinguished guests, we meet here today to christen a fighting ship, and to honor a great Secretary of the Navy.

Tragic coincidence finds us doing so as the Nation mourns the death of a naval hero, whose personal courage served us gallantly in war, and whose inner strength was used to lead us wisely and firmly through the uncertain perils of our time.

Fighting ships are a Maine tradition. Maine craftsmen have built them; and have built into them the rock-ribbed strength, the sturdy reliability, and the stouthearted qualities which are bred into our people. Maine men have manned them and fought them, and the tales of their deeds of courage and patriotism are woven into the fabric of our country's history. And so, it is fitting that the launching of a Maine fighting ship should be an occasion for paying tribute to Josephus Daniels and John F. Kennedy. Stouthearted men and stouthearted ships have always felt a kinship for each other.

The ship we christen today, and the men who will man her, are the products of the modern Navy which Josephus Daniels did so much to create. They will be used to implement the national policy of using military strength as a force for peace, which John F. Kennedy did so much to shape.

When Josephus Daniels became Secretary of the Navy, in 1913, the world was dominated by Europe, a gigantic chessboard of power politics, and America was a disinterested spectator, comfortable in the isolationism which seemed such a perfect shield.

In such circumstances, it took vision to see that the oceans, of themselves, were not a perfect shield. Josephus Daniels had such vision, and worked for a two-ocean Navy.

This modest, North Carolina newspaper editor was not a specialist. He was not a skilled tactician. But he understood his country, sensed that America stood at the threshold of world leadership, and believed that she must equip herself to assert her strength upon the seas.

And so, Josephus Daniels labored at making the Navy a better shield, a more effective instrument for world leadership.

Such a Navy required a stepped-up program of ship construction.

Such a Navy required the mobilization of scientific resources for its full development.

Such a Navy required training programs to equip its personnel to use increasingly intricate and complex equipment.

Josephus Daniels foresaw these requirements and acted to meet them. Under his leadership, the Navy grew in physical resources. He organized the Naval Consulting Board for Naval Research. He established schools at sea to train men for their duties and opened to all enlisted men the possibility of becoming naval officers.

This missile frigate is a memorial to him and his work.

It is an instrument of the world leadership which he foresaw and which has become ours to exercise in a far different world than that of 1913.

As such, it has and must have a far different use than did the Navy of a half century ago. Our military strength is infinitely greater, but the consequences of its use can be so infinitely disastrous, that we must be infinitely wiser in that use.

Unless we learn to use it effectively as an instrument for peace, we can derive little comfort from its utility as an instrument for war.

To John F. Kennedy, military strength and power were essential elements of our national influence in the world, but he understood the need for wisdom and restraint in their use. He recognized their limitations as well as their awesome potential.

He saw that military power can only restrain or destroy: That only intellectual and spiritual power can create the good will and understanding essential to peace and justice in the world.

As we christen this ship, let us pray that it may always serve a wise, strong, and compassionate nation.

Let us rededicate ourselves, as President Johnson has asked us, to the task of continuing the work which President Kennedy began.

Let us take up this task in the spirit of a moving tribute which was paid to President Kennedy this week: "It can be said of him, as of few men in a like position, that he did not fear the weather, and did not trim his sails, but instead challenged the wind itself, to improve its direction and to cause it to blow more softly and more kindly over the world and its people."

(At this point, the U.S.S. *Josephus Daniels* was christened by Mrs. Robert M. Woronoff of Larchmont, N.Y., formerly Miss Patricia Daniels, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Frank L. Daniels of Raleigh, N.C., and the granddaughter of the late Honorable and Mrs. Josephus Daniels.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 26, 1963.

Capt. WALTER E. BARANOWSKI,
Supervisor of Shipbuilding,
U.S. Navy, Bath Iron Works Corp.,
Bath, Maine

Mrs. Hill and I deeply regret that due to longstanding engagements in Alabama it is not possible for us to be with you for the launching of the U.S.S. *Josephus Daniels.*

Secretary Daniels was our dear and cherished friend and we rejoice to see honor done his memory. He was the father of our two-ocean navy that contributed so mightily to our winning of World War I. The late great Admiral Dewey declared that he had served in the Navy 62 years and had served under many Secretaries of the Navy but that Secretary Daniels was the best Secretary we had ever had and had done more for the Navy than any other. Secretary Daniels who served our Nation with such brilliance and dedication was more than a great American; he was a great American institution. Again may Mrs. Hill and I express our regret that we cannot be with you.

LISTER HILL,
U.S. Senator.

IMPORTATION OF MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, one of the foundation stones in Wyoming's economy is the raising of cattle and sheep. Our stock growers are a hardy breed of individualists who pride themselves on their self-reliance. They are quite capable of meeting the many challenges that come their way in the risky business of stock raising.

However, in recent months, Mr. President, our stock growers are finding it increasingly difficult to meet the competition of foreign imports. These imports have increased greatly and constitute a definite threat to a vital industry in Wyoming and the West.

Because of my concern over these imports I made an appearance before the U.S. Tariff Commission to request action in behalf of these hard pressed industries. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement to the Commission be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR GALE McGEE BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION HEARINGS ON IMPORTATION OF MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS, INVESTIGATION No. TEA-221(b)-1 UNDER SECTION 221 OF THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962, WITH RESPECT TO THE PRESIDENT'S LIST OF ARTICLES FOR POSSIBLE CONSIDERATION IN TRADE AGREEMENT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing here today both on my own behalf and on behalf of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association. Mr. Dean T. Prosser, Jr., of Cheyenne, Wyo., secretary of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, has prepared an excellent brief for submission to the Commission. A conflict in his schedule has prevented his being here today and I am privileged to present the brief to the Commission on his behalf.

The Wyoming Stock Growers Association takes the position, and rightly so, that the great increase in the importation of beef and beef products is a substantial factor in the desperate situation the cattle industry finds itself in today. As Mr. Prosser points out, nearly one-fourth of the basic gross income in my State, Wyoming, is derived from agriculture and 79 percent of this amount is attributable to livestock and livestock products. The importance and the health of the livestock industry in Wyoming cannot be overstated.

The association contends that the rise in the import level of beef and beef products to nearly 11 percent of our domestic consumption is contributing substantially to the depressed livestock market and, in conjunction with increased production costs and low profit margins, is damaging a most vital domestic industry.

To correct this situation it is recommended that no further reductions in tariff rates be negotiated and that an import quota system be instituted for these products. I heartily endorse these recommendations and urge the Commission to consider the arguments in the brief most carefully and act favorably on these recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, I request that the brief of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association be incorporated into the record at this point. I shall now proceed with my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to urge the Commission to take specific action to treat the ills of the livestock and woolgrowing industries, which have been aggravated in large part by inequitable import levels.

As late as September of this year, the Secretary of Agriculture recognized that compared to most nations the agricultural import policies of the United States are among the most liberal to be found. The agricultural industries of most other nations are much more highly protected by high tariff and nontariff barriers than our own. Our import protections on agricultural products have been steadily reduced over the past 30 years to such an extent that today our farm and ranch product tariffs are among the lowest in the world trade community. Agricultural imports have been rising steadily during this period. For instance, imports of live cattle, beef and veal have risen from 3.9 percent of our domestic consumption in 1957 to nearly 11 percent in 1962. From January to August of this year, these imports were running 22 percent above the same months of 1962. The importation of lambs and lamb and mutton in 1957 was 0.7 percent of our domestic production whereas this percentage rose to 17.8 percent in 1962. From January to August of this year, the figure rose to 22.9 percent.

It is plainly evident to me, Mr. Chairman, that our present tariffs are no deterrent and afford our agricultural industries an insignificant degree of protection. It is equally evident that positive steps must be taken to halt this trend and to place these basic industries in a more equitable position.

The production of cattle, sheep, and wool is among the most basic and important industries in Wyoming and the other Western States. These industries have struggled against an endless chain of adversities, both economic and environmental, to provide the American people with meat and wool. These industries have shown themselves to be capable of meeting the demand for increased quantities of meat products and wool. They have admirably kept pace with our growing population despite the many adverse circumstances encountered. It is manifestly unfair to retard the health and well-being of these industries by a continuation of the present inequitable trade policies. A further reduction of the tariff rates would deal a staggering blow.

Therefore, I urge the Commission to recognize the severe effects of the rising imports on the meat and wool industries as well as the resultant effects on the economy of Wyoming and other States similarly situated. I would urge the Commission to recommend that present tariff rates on these commodities not be the subject of negotiation, that they not run the risk of further reduction. I would urge the Commission, on the contrary, to take steps to establish import quotas for these commodities. The high import pressures on the domestic market must be relieved; the trade position of these industries must be made more equitable.

INITIATION OF INTERNATIONAL YOUTH SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA, AT INTERLOCHEN, MICH.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, picture, if you would, teenage music students from 50 countries gathered on the shore of a little inland lake, the rustle of the pines and the splashing of the waves the only background noise as these students perform one of the world's musical masterpieces.

After their musical session the teenagers of the world are off for a swim, an art class or some other shared activity.

Admittedly, it sounds a bit like a dream. And for years it has been just that—a dream of Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, founder of the National Music Camp at Interlochen, Mich.

But I come here today to report that the dream is about to be clothed in reality.

Mr. President, now in its incubation period and expected to be born on June 28, 1964, is the International Youth Symphony Orchestra. It is planned that 100 to 120 highly qualified young musicians between the ages of 14 and 18 from as many as 50 countries will on that date move into the National Music Camp for 8 weeks of intensive training in symphonic musical performance.

This training period, under the camp's superior instructors and conductors, is expected to culminate in several performances in New York City—certainly at the World's Fair and possibly in Lincoln Center and the United Nations.

The purpose of the International Youth Symphony is to promote world friendship through music, a language that for centuries has needed no translator.

An addenda to the gathering of these young musicians from all over the world will be the first international competition in the United States for players of all orchestral instruments. This will be held August 26–30, with members of the Philadelphia Orchestra serving as members of the jury.

Mr. President, as I say, the plan is well along the way—with full cooperation promised by the State Department and by foundations, industries, organizations, and individuals in the United States who will contribute the estimated $1,200 cost per student.

All that remains for us here to do is to pledge our full support and to add our words of praise for Dr. Maddy and the staff of the National Music Camp for bringing such a worthwhile and praiseworthy project to our country.

Certainly such sentiments are heartfelt on my part. Dr. Maddy and the camp have long been a source of great pride to Michigan. It is inspiring to see Dr. Maddy—at the age of 71—still pursuing with vigor the ideas and ideals of his youth.

I salute him for it, pledge my support, and ask of my colleagues that they do the same.

IDAHO EDITORS COMMEND PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, much deserved praise has been heaped upon the television industry for its complete but sensitive reporting of the somber series of events which began in Dallas at midday on November 22. The visual drama of those first days was so overwhelming that the press was, for a time, eclipsed as a medium for communicating facts and opinion to the American people. I think it is noteworthy, however, that the Nation's newspapers have set a very high standard of constructive comment and appraisal in connection with their reporting of the first days of the Johnson administration. This has been true, so far as I have observed, almost without exception, and without regard to the partisan affiliation which would normally color the contents of the editorial columns. In a crisis, we expect this of a responsible press, but I think it should not be taken for granted. Praise is due. As examples of the kind of editorial writing to which I have referred, and with my commendation to the editors concerned, I ask that several recent editorials from Idaho newspapers be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Statesman, Nov. 27, 1963]

THE NATION RALLIES

Lyndon Baines Johnson, of Texas, catapulted into the Presidency of the United States by the tragic death of the late President John F. Kennedy, is busily assuring everybody that the basic policies of the Kennedy administration will not be changed in the Johnson administration.

That is entirely as it should be. This country, and the world, need and welcome reassurance that this is a transition, but not a crisis. It is a somber occasion but it is, unhappily, by no means a new experience. Such lamentable things have occurred before, but always this Nation has weathered through, and it will again. Actually there is good reason to suppose that this transition will be much less abrupt and far-reaching in its effects than would be the transfer of authority and responsibility from the leadership of one political party to those of an opposing philosophy of government as has frequently been effected in accordance with the provisions of our Constitution.

It is a matter of good fortune that the Kennedy obsequies have brought to this country an unprecedented assemblage of the executives of the world's great powers, both East and West. Thus it has presented an extraordinary opportunity, of which President Johnson is taking full advantage, to deliver his assurances personally, and for him to get better acquainted with the leaders of these other countries, and they with him. It is a development which cannot work out other than to the benefit of all concerned.

Some changes of policy, or tactics, there will be inevitably, because it will be Lyndon Johnson now, and not John F. Kennedy who will bear the responsibility for the final decision. And no policy or tactic can be so inflexible that it must be adhered to at whatever cost in an inexorably changing world.

Mr. Johnson brings to his high office qualifications which are perhaps not completely understood or appreciated.

An outstanding Member of the Congress with many years' experience in the legislative branch of the Government, he has aspired to election to the Presidency and 3 years ago he was a rival for his party's nomination. He didn't make it, but, on Mr. Kennedy's request, he did accept the nomination for the Vice-Presidency, and, in that position, he acquired a good deal of familiarity with the workings of the executive office. At the same time he advocated loyally the policies of the Kennedy administration.

Yet no man is precisely identical with another, and Lyndon Johnson is by no means a rubber stamp. It would seem to be altogether likely that he has his own ideas about the Presidential office and how it should function.

Indubitably Mr. Johnson is already an odds-on favorite for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency in next year's general election. He will be running on his own record which he has only a few short months to fashion. He need incorporate in his own record such portions of the Kennedy record as he may choose, and he may make such modifications as his personal judgment and political acumen may dictate.

In the forthcoming political campaign he will be confronted by the Republican opposition which, of necessity and in decency, must now adhere to the political moratorium it has declared to continue until Mr. Johnson's record takes shape and is defined.

The time is one that calls upon the Nation to rally behind the figure in the White House, as it always has rallied at every crisis or emergency.

[From the (Idaho) Post-Register, Dec. 2, 1963]

"MUST MOVE FORWARD"—JOHNSON

President Lyndon B. Johnson, standing before the Nation and the Congress a bare 5 days after John F. Kennedy's death, showed in word and humble, deeply sober mood that he understood the awesomeness of the burdens he has assumed.

Ringing in his ears as he spoke was one of the most heartfelt, long-sustained greetings Congress has ever given a new President.

Inevitably this must have been greatly reassuring to him, though he would know it could not be meant wholly for him as a man.

This was America's way of celebrating the continuity and durability of its free system of government. Violence broke the pattern of power that centered on John Kennedy. But the shift of power to Johnson was swift, peaceful, decisive in drawing together the shattered threads.

All the drama in the great Chamber of the House of Representatives was infused with this irrepressible spirit of renewal which does still and must always invest our democracy.

The lawmakers assembled in the Chamber heard Johnson dedicate himself with some urgency to pressing for Kennedy's key domestic programs.

The foreign diplomats—and a listening world outside—heard him reassert in clear words America's unbroken adherence to the existing foundations of its foreign policy.

This reassurance from him to the nations beyond our shores is almost as vital as are our words and acts of support for Johnson in this difficult hour of transition. For few of our friends—or adversaries—abroad truly understand how a system of government so flexible can produce policies so generally stable.

Thus, the President said firmly that the United States will stand by its commitments of aid—from South Vietnam to Berlin. We will not flag in the quest for peace, nor in loyalty to our friends, nor in the search for any areas of agreement possible "with those with whom we differ."

Johnson's words were almost one with Kennedy's when he talked of the balance between national strength and national restraint, and readiness to "defend the national interest and negotiate the common interest." What the President said amounted to declaring a posture of great strength, prudently employed.

Nowhere in this context did he mention Communist Cuba, the small but troublesome thorn in America's side. Nor did he speak of disarmament, even to taking note of the existing partial test ban treaty.

But this was not an exhaustive foreign policy review, and the omissions may be without significance.

The new President said, in sum, that America stands as it stood at that tragic moment when a bullet cut down John F. Kennedy. But he made it plain that the Nation must move to far higher ground—if that terrible event is to have any lasting lesson for us as freemen.

"John Kennedy's death commands what his life conveyed—that America must move forward."

With words such as these, Lyndon Johnson summoned the American people to a new, loftier effort at human betterment—a goal too often dimly seen by some in recent years.

No American of good will, sensing the best in the national spirit, could wish not to respond to the President's deeply felt appeal.

[From the Gooding (Idaho) Leader, Nov. 28, 1963]

OUR NATION GOES ON

(Editorial by Herb Love)

There is an old expression in the English language—"the king is dead, long live the king." And it has meant that leaders can come and leaders can go but a nation goes on.

Since last Friday, we in America have gone through the agony and sorrow caused by the assassination of our President. But we knew that our national life would continue much as usual. It is important that we believe this and even more important that the peoples of all other countries believe it. We are fortunate that a man experienced in government and known to the world has been the Vice President and is now our Chief Executive, President Lyndon Johnson.

He has served in Washington since 1931, as a secretary in Congress, as a U.S. Representative and as a U.S. Senator—and, for almost 3 years, as Vice President. During his service as Senator, he was known as one of the strongest and most powerful men in the United States.

In 1960 he lost his party's nomination to Kennedy. Loyalty to his party, no doubt, caused him to accept the second place on the Democratic ticket and he swung much of the vote of the South that helped elect Kennedy.

It is accepted that a man can give orders only after he has learned to obey them. And that he can earn loyalty only by being loyal. President Johnson has demonstrated both.

It is important that the world knows that President Johnson is perhaps best prepared of all Vice Presidents who have taken office after the death of a President. He brings his long period of experience, his many travels into foreign lands as Vice President and his own compelling personality to his new duties. Known so far as a "politician's politician," he will undoubtedly evolve as a "statesman's statesman."

The burdens of the Presidency, no doubt, will make a change in President Johnson's personality. He will become more sober in mien. His words will be fewer since he knows that many contradicting misinterpretations can be made from a thoughtless sentence. His firmness will become more pronounced. Let us hope that his smile will not be diminished and that he can retain his natural good humor through severest trials.

The Democratic Party could not have produced a more capable man to succeed to the Presidency.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Nov. 29, 1963]

The World Appraises Mr. Johnson

President Lyndon B. Johnson's swift, sure assumption of ultimate responsibility, which has transferred national leadership so quickly to a new President, has transferred international leadership also to the new chief spokesman for the free world.

With aching heart and a tremor in his voice, Mr. Johnson stepped forward to meet the demands of destiny. His sincerity, his high sense of purpose and the rightness of his direction already have won for him the confidence of the citizens of his own Nation and of other nations whose survival is linked inseparably with that of the United States.

Editorial comment from British newspapers is revealing in this time of transition. Sometimes, in fact, the British have enough perspective to see Americans more clearly than we see ourselves.

The conservative London Times had this comment:

"The task of succeeding an obviously great President is an exceedingly difficult one. Yet, President Johnson starts with a record much more substantial than was President Truman's when he succeeded President Roosevelt. President Johnson was the strongest majority leader in the Senate in memory. He was indeed much more important a figure in the Senate than President Kennedy himself. President Johnson's record on civil rights is an excellent one.

"The British sense of judgment was attuned to President Kennedy's judgment; his desire to move forward in social and economic affairs mirrored our own almost obsessive needs. Yet, after all, we share our loss with other countries: with Germany, where the threat of the East is so much more immediate; with France, where the political future is so hard to see; with Italy, politically uncertain and feeling a special dependence on the American connection. Most of all, the other allies share the loss with the United States which now so keenly needs great, strong and prudent leadership to solve such grave problems. In the late President, the combination of judgment and courage was unique. The United States will no more find another Kennedy than Britain will find another Churchill. Yet, it was a wonderful life, and the example of courage is never wasted."

The conservative London Telegraph offers this assessment:

"President Lyndon Johnson has been a Vice President of a very special kind; that is President Kennedy's political legacy. As Vice President, he was drawn by President Kennedy into his inner councils, as few if any Vice Presidents have been before. If very different from President Kennedy in personality and method, he has appeared to differ little in his political beliefs. On the supreme issues of foreign policy, he was in the President's confidence, not only at the moments when decisions were taken, but during the stages of deliberation on which those decisions were based. To bear the responsibility of making the decisions himself is indeed altogether another matter. But, as far as President Kennedy could insure that the trust reposed in him could be passed on to another, he did so."

Other British newspapers reflect such views in varying degrees. There are none of the flippant questions so recently asked by certain silly columnists and editorial writers in the United States about "what ever happened to Lyndon Johnson?" The British papers uniformly recognize that the greatest handicap the United States suffers in its leadership of the Western World is its record of racial discrimination at home. Some British papers, notably the Financial Times, express doubts that Mr. Johnson or any other man can achieve quickly the respect of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev which President Kennedy won in the Cuban confrontation and elsewhere. But almost all of Britain's newspapers reflect the gratitude apparent in the United States that a man of Mr. Johnson's caliber is the new President of this country and the new leader of the Western Alliance.

President Johnson's perception in conferring immediately with the leaders of allied nations who came to this country for Mr. Kennedy's funeral also has given him a great advantage in meeting his awesome international responsibilities.

A West German Government spokesman said Chancellor Ludwig Erhard had valued highly his talk with President Johnson and the Presiden't assurance that this Nation's foreign policies will continue.

The French reportedly were most favorably impressed by Mr. Johnson's call for civil rights legislation and his promise that this country will keep its promises to its allies. Even French President Charles de Gaulle, the least cooperative of all Western chiefs of state in advancing Western policies in concert with the United States, seemed gratified by his conference with the new President.

Except for Khrushchev's emotional and apparently sincere expressions of grief upon President Kennedy's death, the spokesmen for the Communist bloc nations of Europe naturally were somewhat skeptical about the American crisis. Yet, the Soviet news agency, Tass, quoted at unusual length Mr. Johnson's promises to carry on the policies of his predecessor. The East Berlin radio said "there are various indications he supports a relatively sensible and, for American conditions, progressive line."

The first reactions abroad to the new American President, in short, were most encouraging. If nothing else, they reminded the citizens of this country—who sometimes tend to forget in periods of extreme partisanship or overemphasis upon provincial concerns—that the whole world has a crucial stake in the thoughts and performance of the President of the United States.

Nobody should ignore the London Times' reminder: "The United States will no more find another Kennedy than Britain will find another Churchill." But the citizens of this Nation and of the world are prepared to believe that the United States has found a fine and well-trained President who could become a great one.—B. J.

HUMAN RIGHTS WEEK

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this country is currently marking Human Rights Week, and this fact makes it especially appropriate to pause for reflection about the efforts we are making to insure human rights both at the international and domestic levels.

In his remarks at the Human Rights Day luncheon, here in Washington on December 10, the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, noted the role played by President Kennedy in breaking the silence about human rights in this country.

His deputy, Richard N. Gardner, also delivered a fine address to the World Jewish Congress on December 8, outlining the programs in the field of human rights which are being implemented through the United Nations.

I commend both of these addresses to the attention of Senators, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

He Broke the Silence

(Remarks by the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, at the Human Rights Day luncheon, at the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., December 10, 1963)

"We meet here today in deep sorrow to honor the memory of a great and noble man." These were the words of Madame Pandit of India, spoken at the General Assembly of the United Nations. She went on: "Three shots fired in Dallas, Tex., on November 22, 1963, took one's mind back to three other shots fired on a January afternoon in India 15 years ago, when Mahatma Gandhi became a victim of the assassin's bullet. Though the time and place were different. the deed in both cases represented the ascendancy, for the moment, of the powers of hatred and violence which both Mahatma Gandhi and John Fitzgerald Kennedy fought against all through their lives."

And from Mr. Balaunde of Peru came a simple and eloquent tribute on the same occasion: "A mysterious crime has cut him down and snatched him away from us. And so his life at its highest point has the infinite beauty of the broken plinths and of the shattered columns. The shadow of Lincoln seems to float over this memory."

"The shadow of Lincoln * * *." In a thousand tributes here and there throughout the world, Lincoln's shadow has been evoked to honor President Kennedy in death. Combined with the shadow of Gandhi, the analogy is exact: more than any other, this President was identified with the issue of human rights, as Lincoln was. As much as any other, he insisted that even massive social change shall be carried off without violence, as Gandhi had taught.

Here among us in America, the Kennedy administration will be remembered as the time when the silence about racial discrimination was broken—for good. The silence, of course, was almost worse than the discrimination.

An American Rabbi, spoke of it when he told at the march on Washington what he observed in Hitler's Germany: "The most important thing that I learned in my life * * * is that bigotry and hatred are not the most urgent problem. The most urgent, the most disgraceful, the most sinful, and the most tragic problem is silence."

But the silence is broken now—the lights are on, it is all out in the open. Partly this was done by Negroes demonstrating and police dogs barking and TV cameras whirring. But mostly it was done by the political leadership of the President of the United States.

If President Kennedy stood for human rights in domestic affairs, what did he stand for in foreign affairs? The historians will note his firm response to missiles in Cuba, to incidents in Berlin, to war by infiltration in Vietnam. They will celebrate his perception that thermonuclear power required fundamental changes in the techniques of peacemaking. They will record his conviction that our national purpose is to make the world safe for diversity.

But I think a strong case could be made that President Kennedy's greatest contribution to international politics was his active promotion of human rights for all Americans.

Thomas Jefferson predicted long ago that the sacred fire of freedom in this continent would someday light the earth. What we do here among ourselves is still—as it has always been—the most contagious and revolutionary part of our foreign policy. Barbara Ward, daughter of a long line of Britons, reminded us about it when she spoke in the Virginia Hall of Burgesses last summer: "With breathtaking audacity, they stood up in this little room and dared to legislate for mankind. For—make no mistake—that is what they were doing. They do not say 'We Virginians', they do not say 'We Americans', they say 'All men'. There is nothing restricted or parochial here. The rights they claim are universal rights, inherent in the human condition; everything is in terms of the generality of human experience."

The impact on our external relations, of the Federal Government's efforts to give every American a fair shake, give the lie to those who say a great power always gets credit for being powerful but never gets credit for being good.

I happened to be traveling in Asia in the fall of 1957 when the unpleasantness at Little Rock was splashed on the front pages of every foreign newspaper. I well remember how hard it was then to convince even my best friends in Asia that we were having trouble because we were making progress, because the silence had been broken by the Supreme Court decision in the Brown case.

Now, 6 years and 100 incidents later, we have just been through a General Assembly in which, so far as our records reveal, no single delegate has criticized our Federal Government for not doing its best to promote—as every member of the U.N. is committed by the charter to promote—the "universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion."

Many delegates have commented on the race issue in America, but most of them have complimented the American national administration for working hard on an admittedly most difficult problem.

We stand in world history at the beginning of the time when the nonwhite peoples of the world are successfully insisting on equality. Most of the world's national societies, even those loudest in their denunciation of racial discrimination, are still, at best, in the "separate but equal" phase of thinking about racial equality. James Baldwin in his bittersweet prose, can see the irony, "People are not," he says, "terribly anxious to be equal (equal, after all, to what and to whom?) but they love the idea of being superior."

In a world where most national leaders are not yet sure that it pays for everyone to be equal, no nation—let's face it, no nation at all—is doing enough about the promotion and protection of human rights for individuals. But during the brief but intensive Presidency of John F. Kennedy, the American Government, by working hard on its own race problem, has helped move to the top of the world's action agenda the issue of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

It is not only for domestic politics, but for international politics as well, that President Kennedy gave us the keynote in a television address at the critical moment of one of our own bloodiest incidents: "Those who do nothing [about civil rights] are inviting shame as well as violence. Those who act boldly are recognizing right as well as reality."

Because President Kennedy acted boldly, the shots that struck him down were heard with powerful clarity around the world. For this reason above all, as Madame Pandit said in the General Assembly, "Mankind will cherish his luminous and fragrant memory."

THE INTERNATIONAL PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS: PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

(Address by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, to the World Jewish Congress, at Stephen Wise House, 15 East 84th Street, New York, N.Y., December 8, 1963)

This week marks the 15th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. On this occasion it is fitting and proper that we review past efforts to strengthen the observance of human rights around the world and consider how these efforts may be strengthened in the future.

One of the several ways in which the Charter of the United Nations marked an important advance over the League of Nations Covenant was in its emphasis on human rights. The charter makes the promotion of human rights one of the main purposes of the Organization. In articles 55 and 56 members assume the responsibility to take action to promote universal respect for and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

The legitimacy of international concern for human rights everywhere was thereby acknowledged in an international instrument ratified by every important independent country at the time. In securing the adoption of these revolutionary changes the United States played a leading part, and in doing so had the undivided support and encouragement of the non-governmental organizations represented at San Francisco.

The United States also took the initiative in the formulation and adoption of article 71, under which international non-governmental organizations subsequently received consultative status, among them this organization, the World Jewish Congress. Cooperation between governments and voluntary bodies is an old American practice, and is perhaps more highly developed in this country than anywhere else. It is one of the distinctive manifestations of our democratic way of life and may fairly be described as an American contribution to the charter.

The nongovernmental organizations made an outstanding contribution at San Francisco, and ever since, as an examination of the record will show, have played an important part in focusing attention on the human rights provisions of the United Nations Charter.

The United States has sought consistently, and under the guidance of its own history and traditions, to give form and substance to the promise implicit in the charter. It pressed for the adoption of an international bill of rights, the first element of which was to be the universal declaration, the 15th anniversary of which we are now celebrating. The draft of this declaration, which was the basis for the action of the General Assembly in 1948, was prepared and formulated by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights under the chairmanship of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

On this 15th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it is appropriate that we rededicate ourselves to this historic effort under the United Nations to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms.

In his address to the General Assembly on September 20, President Kennedy declared: "New efforts are needed if this Assembly's Declaration of Human Rights, now 15 years old, is to have full meaning."

The U.S. Government in the months ahead will continue to take a leading role in the United Nations and elsewhere in the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all men—and to support practical proposals in the pursuit of this objective.

I need hardly emphasize before this audience the importance of continued U.S. leadership in the worldwide promotion of human rights. Since the Declaration of Independence our country has been dedicated to the pursuit of human rights and fundamental freedoms, not just for Americans, but for all men everywhere. Our power in the world derives not just from our position as an arsenal of weapons or as a storehouse of commodities but as a base from which to seek the universal realization of the dignity of man.

The principles and ideals embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are the same principles and ideals embodied in our Constitution and basic laws. They represent an essential and irreversible element in the policy of our country.

This applies to our policy at home as well as abroad. It is no accident that President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his first address to Congress, put special emphasis on the speedy passage of the civil rights bill.

There are practical and urgent reasons for our concern with the realization of human rights on a worldwide basis. The experience of recent years has demonstrated not only the interdependence of nations in their pursuit of basic values but also the interdependence between human rights and national security.

We have seen how the destruction of freedom at home in totalitarian societies of the right and the left can lead to the destruction of freedom abroad. Conversely, we know that worldwide progress in the vindication of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all will also be progress toward creating a peaceful and stable world order.

During most of the U.N.'s 18 years, the drive for freedom has tended to be defined as the drive for national independence. But we know that history is studded with examples of unholy alliances between nationalism and tyranny.

Now that freedom has been achieved for so many new nations, we are still faced with the previous question: What about freedom for individual men and women and children, the individual human persons whose dignity and worth we reaffirmed on the opening page of the U.N. Charter?

We all know how far the world is today from a satisfactory answer to this question.

In some nations, fundamental freedoms are denied by governments as a matter of principle—by racial separation, by political oppression, by religious persecution.

In other nations, many freedoms are deliberately postponed, by government action, to concentrate on what are thought to be more urgent items of public business.

In all nations in greater or less degree, freedoms are infringed by lust for unchallenged political power—by the animosities of tribe or class or caste or sect or party—by prejudice and bigotry and other evils which still divide the branches of humanity.

There is no doubt that these matters are of international concern. They can and should be exposed to the awakened and articulate conscience of mankind in the United Nations and other international forums.

I

What specific measures is the United States now prepared to support in the international effort for the promotion of human rights? The answer falls in two main parts:

In the first place, the U.S. Government has embarked on a new policy of considering United Nations human rights conventions on their merits.

In July of this year President Kennedy submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification three United Nations Conventions dealing with forced labor, practices akin to slavery, and the political rights of women. Each of these deals with an important human right already guaranteed by the Federal Constitution and by existing Federal law. We believe their ratification can play a significant part in cultivating an international environment congenial to American interests.

Beyond pressing for the speedy ratification of these three conventions, we have been actively participating in the consideration of other human rights conventions—including the two human rights covenants. We do not underrate the difficulty and complexity of the problems which must arise when an attempt is made to formulate a single rule of law affecting human rights which can apply to more than 100 nations with varied social and political systems and traditions. But we are resolved to make every contribution we can toward the development of international standards for the protection of human rights which take account of the legal systems and social structures of participating states.

In the second place, apart from the process of drafting conventions, we are considering ways in which the United Nations can deal with human rights questions on a more objective and professional basis.

In the 17 years of its existence the United Nations has developed effective procedures for dealing with two of its principal concerns—the maintenance of peace and security and the promotion of economic development. It has been less successful in developing adequate procedures with respect to its third concern—the promotion of human rights.

At the present time, for example, the United Nations does not provide its members with an up-to-date, comprehensive and professional analysis of the measures taken by member states in fulfillment of their charter obligations to promote human rights for all their citizens. The Human Rights Commission regularly bypasses discussions of current problems in specific countries. In the vacuum thus created the General Assembly is tending to involve itself in politicized and emotional discussions of a few human rights problems without the benefit of a broad and analytical review of the entire subject.

We continue to believe, as President Kennedy told the Assembly, that "new efforts are needed" if the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is to have full meaning.

We should consider the role the United Nations might play in defining standards, in clarifying experience, in reviewing government performance against charter principles, and in exposing to the conscience of the world the denial of those rights which should be the heritage of all human beings.

If this process of international discussion is to bear fruit, however, it must be genuinely devoted to the national pursuit of human rights—not the national pursuit of self-righteousness. In this field we might well benefit from the application of the familiar legal doctrine of "clean hands": those who would call in question the practices of others should at least be making every effort to put their own house in order.

The real test of a nation's commitment to human rights is not what it says for all the world to hear but what it does in practice for all the world to see.

II

This leads me inevitably to some specific comments about the human rights practices of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union in recent years has sought to assert its leadership in human rights issues before the United Nations. There is a certain irony in this effort—an irony of which the United Nations is frequently reminded not only by ourselves but by other members. For the Soviet Union has adopted as government policy a widespread disregard for those fundamental human rights which are embodied in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

We cannot and should not forget for an instant the violations of basic political liberties which have affected all religious and national elements of the Soviet population.

In this gathering today, it is fitting to make some reference to the specific disabilities, religious and cultural, of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union. These are a matter of anxious interest not only to other Jewish communities but to all who seek to build a better world on the basis of the principles embodied in the universal declaration:

There has been a marked decline within the last 3 years in the number of synagogues in the Soviet Union. No Jewish schools are allowed to be established. A majority of the students at the one rabbinical seminary permitted to exist in the entire Soviet Union were denied residence permits in 1962 for the city of Moscow on the grounds of a housing shortage.

No Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917, nor has even a Russian translation of the Jewish Old Testament been allowed. Six, no more than six, books in the Yiddish language have been published since 1953.

Even the baking of matzos for Passover has been prohibited and the last kosher meat market in Moscow has been closed.

A person of Jewish descent, who may have broken completely with his religious tradition, must still carry the nationality designation "Jew" in his identity card.

Our disquiet about the situation of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union is not the result of any diplomatic conflict or the so-called cold war. We are equally opposed to any kind of discrimination, and have made that repeatedly clear, in any other country, irrespective of its social or political structure. Our disquiet flows from the deep conviction, which is as old as our Declaration of Independence, that human rights are inalienable, and that the business of government is to recognize and protect them.

Let me express the hope that the leaders of the Soviet Union will seek to correct a situation in accordance with their own often-proclaimed principle of equality for all the peoples and religions under their jurisdiction. Let me add that any amelioration of this situation would itself be a positive contribution to the development of better mutual understanding, which is the indispensable foundation for a common effort to overcome the dangers and difficulties which stand in the way of the fulfillment of mankind's hope for a better world founded on freedom and justice.

THE CO-OP WAY—ABROAD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the speakers again this year at the annual meeting of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul, Minn., was Mr. Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator for Material Resources at the Agency for International Development. As my administrative assistant from 1953 through 1960, Mr. Waters made countless friends in Minnesota. He is recognized throughout the country as an authority on agriculture. He is respected by farm leaders, businessmen, and Government officials:

One of the areas in which Mr. Waters has particularly concentrated his efforts is cooperatives. His address before the Grain Terminal Association was entitled, "The Co-op Way—Abroad."

In discussing the AID program and the role cooperatives can play in it, Mr. Waters said, and I quote:

> We believe in all of our economic assistance programs we should first seek to achieve our objectives through the private enterprise system before undertaking direct governmental action—and cooperatives are an integral part of our free enterprise system. We want to work through such nongovernmental private organizations wherever possible. In fact, in my opinion, we'd be better off keeping Government out of any services cooperatives can perform through the private sector—in our food programs as well as in our technical assistance programs, domestically as well as internationally. I've always felt that cooperatives should occupy a more significant role in our entire food-for-peace program, as nongovernmental grain merchandisers who can help build future markets for the private sector rather than favoring a growing pattern of state trading.

Mr. President, one of the great cooperatives in the country—in the world—is the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association. It and other cooperatives are well equipped to provide many of the necessary services under our programs of foreign assistance, including food for peace. After many years of urging by myself, many of my colleagues, and responsible public servants and private citizens, co-ops are beginning to get the recognition they so richly deserve. But much more needs to be done in this area. As Mr. Waters told Grain Terminal Association:

> The cooperative movement in the United States, which has contributed so much to the well-being of American agriculture, can and must help meet this newer challenge of bringing new hope to millions of people in other lands seeking to achieve a better life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Waters address be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Co-Op Way—Abroad

(By Herbert J. Waters)

It's always good to be back with my friends in GTA. This makes the 11th annual meeting which I have been privileged to attend.

We've seen a great many changes in those years—but GTA continues to grow stronger and more effective, as an outstanding example of a great American cooperative institution serving its thousands of farmer-owners.

Last year, from this same platform, I talked to you about the tremendous contribution your farm abundance was making to our economic assistance programs, in developing countries, through the food-for-peace program you helped to create. Today, I can assure you of the vital importance of your abundant production with even more conviction, as the result of personal observations in the 27 other countries of the world I have visited in the past year.

Where once food surpluses were thought to be threatening our national economy, the fruits of your industry and technology are accepted today as important weapons in the arsenal guarding freedom.

Our agricultural abundance has provided us with a spear—a weapon to prod the enemies of democracy and freedom—but more importantly—a spear to penetrate into the heart of the greatest problem facing one-third of humanity: hunger.

The spearhead of our agricultural abundance is today—as it has been since the inception of the food-for-peace program—penetrating areas where other forms of assistance—and even diplomatic efforts—have previously failed.

During the past fiscal year over 100 million undernourished people have shared in our agricultural abundance. They included refugees fleeing persecution, and disaster victims uprooted by flood, earthquake, and drought. They included 585,000 laborers earning food as part payment of wages in 19 countries, idle hands given gainful employment in a constructive economic development effort having a dramatic impact on the people in their own villages. They included 40 million schoolchildren, many of whom were too hungry previously to attend classes, who last year consumed approximately 1.5 million tons of American food in classrooms in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

School construction, roadbuilding, land reclamation, rural resettlement, housing, establishment of farmers' cooperatives—an almost endless variety of economic development projects are being carried on—using food instead of dollars to pay labor component costs.

But it isn't about food that I want to talk with you today, as important as food is to our total international effort toward wiping out poverty and disease, and raising living standards. You will hear plenty from others during this convention on the significance of your food production to our national security—including, I am sure, from a man in perhaps the best position of all to know—the distinguished Secretary of State who will address you tonight.

Instead of talking again about food for peace, I want to talk about another topic that should be close to your hearts—the co-op way, and what we are doing about it in developing countries of the world.

Promotion of cooperatives as a tool of foreign aid is now a significant part of your Government's activities in developing areas of the world—and the great cooperative institutions of the United States are assisting in that effort by sharing their know-how, experience, and, yes, even capital resources.

The late President Kennedy who we still mourn had once declared: "Our unfilled task is to demonstrate to the entire world that man's unsatisfied aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by freemen working within a framework of democratic institutions."

Let me emphasize that: "Freemen, working within a framework of democratic institutions"—working for "economic progress and social justice."

Can you offer a better definition of the cooperative solution to economic and social problems?

Don't those words describe what you and I aspire to when we join together as freemen in a cooperative to help ourselves to provide essential goods and services?

This is why we feel that cooperatives, and cooperative techniques, can make a significant contribution to the attainment of our objectives in the developing countries—just as they have in America.

Perhaps no other American institution is so well suited for export to other countries, to provide a technique whereby economic growth and political democracy can develop hand in hand.

To the farmer, to the worker in an underdeveloped land, a cooperative can offer the first exhilarating experience in self-determination, of participating in the shaping of one's own destiny, of ownership of property or land, of local self-government. The cooperative can be—and is proving to be—the community center of training and experience in social and political as well as economic democracy.

Understanding this from his own observations, both in this country and abroad, our mutual friend Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY instigated a historymaking step forward in U.S. foreign policy just 2 years ago when he proposed, and the Congress enacted, an amendment to our foreign assistance legislation setting forth that goal.

In the 1961 Act for International Development, Congress declared that it is "the policy of the United States * * * to encourage the development and use of cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan associations."

That has been our mandate in the Agency for International Development—and we have welcomed it.

Under the guidance of a Cooperative Advisory Committee composed of distinguished American cooperative leaders—including, of course, your own M. W. "Bill" Thatcher—we have moved rapidly ahead toward implementing that objective.

Today, we have 93 major cooperative technical assistance programs underway in 48 countries. That is almost a fourfold increase over the 25 major operating programs in 36 countries reported for fiscal year 1962.

In the past year, we have spent $8,479,438 of AID's development grant funds for this cooperative technical assistance purpose. This represents an increase of approximately 300 percent over the $2,794,400 which was contributed for cooperative purposes in fiscal year 1962—the first year in which we launched our intensive effort to emphasize cooperatives in our foreign aid program.

But, even more significant, is the fact that nearly $100 million in capital has been made available to housing cooperatives, savings and loan institutions, credit unions, cooperative farm lending institutions, and production, processing, and marketing cooperatives in developing areas—primarily in Latin America—by development loans, either directly from the Agency for International Development, or from Social Progress Trust Funds of the Inter-American Development Bank, which also come out of our foreign assistance appropriations—or from private groups such as the AFL–CIO, backed up by our AID investment guarantees.

And, at the same time, cooperative institutions of the United States have spent approximately $700,000 of their own resources on additional technical assistance and services to cooperatives in developing countries during the past year to further this combined effort.

Under review now, with action expected soon, are applications for AID rural electrification loans of $1,500,000 for Colombia and $420,000 for Nicaragua, and a $2 million AID loan for financing of rural cooperatives in trouble-wracked northeast Brazil.

Such a stimulus to the cooperative movement in Latin America, Africa, and Asia has naturally required a vastly stepped up training program for competent cooperative management. The number of foreign participants selected for training in cooperatives from the countries where these programs were in effect increased from 203 persons for year 1962 to 1,675 persons for year 1963.

All of these participants were trained either in the United States or in third countries—many in Puerto Rico. Many more people were trained in their own home countries through the assistance of AID programs.

It has required experienced manpower to direct these programs—and we've turned to the cooperative movement to find the qualified specialists we needed. One hundred and thirty-three cooperative specialists of one kind or another were employed directly by AID during the year 1963, an increase of 49 over the previous year. But most of our work has been channeled through U.S. cooperatives themselves, under contract with AID. And these contracting organizations employed an additional 213 cooperative specialists on our projects during the last year.

The major effort of AID in the cooperative field has been to find ways to bring into active play the resources and experience of cooperative organizations in the United States to help carry out the AID program in developing countries.

Organizations actively participating in AID programs for year 1963 included Credit Union National Association, National Farmers Union, Cooperative League of the USA, National League of Insured Savings Associations, Foundation for Cooperative Housing, and National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, as well as the International Cooperative Training Center at the University of Wisconsin.

Worldwide service contracts have been signed with these organizations during the past year, placing the experience and operating know-how of key cooperative leaders in the United States at the disposal of cooperative planning officials in the developing countries. Each project, therefore, becomes a part of economic planning, and the cooperative a means for helping achieve overall economic and social goals for the country concerned.

We expect to make even greater use of such nongovernmental organizations during the year ahead in furthering this program of cooperative development abroad, and hope to encourage "partnership" ties between cooperatives of other countries and those in the United States—ties of business and trade, as well as ties of friendship and assistance.

We believe in all of our economic assistance programs we should first seek to achieve our objectives through the private enterprise system before undertaking direct governmental action—and cooperatives are an integral part of our free enterprise system. We want to work through such nongovernmental private organizations whenever possible. In fact, in my opinion, we'd be better off keeping Government out of any services cooperatives can perform through the private sector—in our food programs as well as in our technical assistance programs, domestically as well as internationally. I've always felt that cooperatives should occupy a more significant role in our entire food-for-peace program, as nongovernmental grain merchandisers who can help build future markets for the private sector rather than favoring a growing pattern of State trading.

One of the key points of any serious reappraisal and reassessment of our farm programs should be a serious look at what services our private cooperatives can perform, instead of Government, in achieving our objectives.

We're doing that, as a matter of national policy, in seeking to improve agricultural credit, production, processing, and marketing systems in developing countries. We're doing it as part of our dedication to the free enterprise system we are trying to export to others. Perhaps we also need to take a closer look at what is happening right here at home, in regard to the relationship of Government to the private sector in agriculture.

Each of our oversea cooperative projects has a dramatic story of its own buried in the statistics and official reports. Let me give you just briefly a few examples typical of the cooperative programs contributing to a more stable security and political situation by improving the economic position of the people and their own organizations:

While the jungle war in Vietnam goes on, our U.S. aid mission is starting its 3-year program to put 200,000 peasant families on a better economic footing through cooperative effort. Surplus American corn, eight sacks of cement, and three pigs for each family project may turn out to be effective counterinsurgency strategy. The cement is to build sanitary pigsties, the corn is to feed the pigs, and cooperatives are being organized to furnish the necessary farm services to help the farm families move up the economic ladder.

In Peru, the poor people in the isolated jungle town of Iquitos at the headquarters of the Amazon River showed in less than 4 years how a credit union can influence a whole community. Organized in the poorest section of the town, the credit union is now the largest in Peru. It has 3,500 members, deposits of approximately $750,000, and has started to finance a building boom by helping low-cost housing projects among its members.

In Nigeria, the native fishermen of the Western Nigerian Cooperative Fishermen's Association are confidently expecting that their daily catch of fish will increase by 150 percent. Thirty-five fishing boats outfitted with outboard motors and modern fishing gear, will take them out to sea. The fishermen have expanded their cooperative to include transportation, marketing, and a boat repair shop.

These examples of how AID seeks to utilize cooperatives in self-help programs extend to agriculture, fish, livestock marketing, dairy, rural electricity, low-cost housing, credit, health insurance, and even taxi and bus cooperatives. In every project of a community nature, the people are encouraged to raise at least a part of their own capital.

An increasing number of cooperative leaders in the developing countries are learning that many of their problems and requirements are much the same as those which confront other cooperatives. This awareness has helped to bring cooperatives together into regional associations.

In Latin America, for example, the establishment of an Inter-American Cooperative Finance Institute has been recommended by a group of cooperatives. In Central America plans already have been made to form a Central American Credit Union Federation. Plans are also proceeding with the organization of the Cooperatives of America—bridging both North and South America. And AID has contracted for a survey of Latin American cooperatives as a basis for stepping up the program for bringing all Latin American cooperatives into a single federation.

The International Federation of Agricultural Producers, IFAP, which has farm organizations and cooperative members in 32 countries of the free world, has encouraged its members to involve more of their people in these cooperative programs. The northern European countries are proving highly receptive to the idea of developing international teams of technicians and specialists for the developing countries.

U.S. cooperative experts working overseas demonstrate to people of the underdeveloped nations how the United States mobilizes not only the institutional forces of government, but the Nation's human resources as well.

The challenge facing us throughout the world is such that we need the combined effort of public and private resources, if we are going to succeed—and succeed we must.

We in Government can't carry the load alone. It's your challenge as well as ours. We need your help—the help of every individual, every farm organization, every cooperative, every church group, every community. We need your understanding and support.

At a time when we as a nation are engaged in a gigantic struggle for freedom's survival in the world, you should welcome the opportunity to let others know that cooperative enterprises are a significant part of our capitalistic free enterprise system.

As cooperative leaders, as farmers, as individual U.S. citizens—and, even more, as fathers and mothers—you have a vital and continuing stake in the success or failure of U.S. foreign policy—and our foreign assistance program that is used to implement that policy.

We are in a race—a desperate race—against time.

We are competing hourly against the forces of world communism dedicated to destruction of our way of life.

There are threats to the freedom of the peoples in many countries. Governments in the nearly emerging countries face insistent demands for socio-economic progress—demands they are unable to meet without outside assistance.

These governments face persistent pressure by the Communists to exploit them.

Without outside help—food, funds, technical know-how—they face economic stagnation—with its resultant chaos, confusion, and revolution—a fertile field for dictatorship, a sterile field for self-help and self-determination.

We cannot ignore this challenge.

The cooperative movement in the United States, which has contributed so much to the well-being of American agriculture, can and must help meet this newer challenge of bringing new hope to millions of people in other lands seeking to achieve a better life.

PERCY H. WILLIAMS, PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY OFFICER, HONORED BY JAMES J. HOEY AWARD FOR INTERRACIAL JUSTICE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that Mr. Percy H. Williams, now assistant executive director for contract compliance of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, was recently honored by receiving the James J. Hoey Award for Interracial Justice.

The James J. Hoey Award for Interracial Justice was established in 1942 by the family of the late James J. Hoey, one-time collector of internal revenue for New York and one of the organizers and first president of the Catholic Interracial Council. Each year on the Feast of Christ the King, the Catholic Interracial Council of New York confers a silver medal upon a white and a Negro layman who, in the judgment of the council, have made outstanding contributions to interracial justice. This year's recipients at ceremonies held in New York City on October 27, were Mr. James T. Carey, founder of the Catholic Interracial Council of San Francisco, and Mr. Williams. Former recipients include CIO President Philip Murray in 1943, the former U.S. Attorney General, J. Howard McGrath, in 1950, RCA President Frank M. Folsom in 1956, R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., in 1958, Percy H. Steele, Jr., executive director of the San Diego Urban League, in 1959, and Dr. Eugene T. Reed, president of the NAACP Conference of New York State, in 1961.

I am particularly pleased to learn that Mr. Williams' work has been recognized because I have known Mr. Williams since he was a boy when he played baseball on a boys' team I sponsored in Chicago. Since that time he has secured a good education in Chicago universities, has been an outstanding worker for equal justice in human relations, and has held positions as research assistant for the mayor's committee on community welfare in Chicago, director of job opportunities of the American Friends Service Committee, and Midwest regional director of the President's Committee on Government Contracts. In addition to his present position with the President's Committee, he is a member of the Catholic Archdiocesan School Board of Washington, D.C., and a member of the executive committee of the archbishop's committee on human relations.

Mr. Williams is a fine and public-spirited citizen and the recognition paid to him and to the President's Committee by this award is well deserved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the citation of this award and an article which appeared in the Catholic Standard for October 11, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION

Percy H. Williams, of Washington, D.C., assistant executive director, contract compliance for the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, and member of the archdiocesan school board and the archbishops' committee on human relations of Washington, D.C., has a long record of expert and devoted activity in the crucial area of equal employment opportunity.

The Catholic Interracial Council of New York therefore, is happy to propose the name of Percy H. Williams, as a recipient of the 22d annual James J. Hoey Award for interracial justice.

SAMUEL J. SULLIVAN,
Vice President.
JOHN LAFARGE, Jr.,
Chaplain Emeritus.
LAWRENCE PIERCE,
President.
PHILIP S. HURLEY, Jr.,
Chaplain.

[From the Catholic Standard, Oct. 11, 1963]

ANTIDISCRIMINATION OFFICIAL NAMED FOR 1963 HOEY AWARD

Percy H. Williams, a member of the Archbishop's Human Relations Committee and an official of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, has been named by the Catholic Interracial Council of New York as recipient of one of its 1963 James J. Hoey Interracial Justice Awards.

The council, which annually presents two such awards, has named James T. Carey, a University of California criminology instructor who helped found CIC units in San Francisco and Oakland, as the other recipient.

The men will be presented the awards, given annually since 1942 "for outstanding contributions to interracial justice," on October 27, the Feast of Christ the King.

A. Philip Randolph, president of the Sleeping Car Porters Union and organizer of the August 28 march on Washington, will speak at the presentation luncheon in New York's Americana Hotel.

Mr. Williams, a member of Sacred Heart parish, is assistant executive director of contract compliance for the President's Committee. Established in 1961, the Committee is charged with seeing that the executive branch of the Federal Government implements a policy of nondiscrimination in its employment practices.

Before joining the Committee, Williams was a member of the industrial relations staff of the International Harvester Co.

In April of 1963, he was appointed to the archbishop's committee on human relations. He is also a member of the archdiocesan school board.

A member of the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials, Mr. Williams has served as a member of the board of directors of the National Social Action Conference. He formerly was regional director of the President's Committee on Government Contracts. A graduate of De Paul University, he did graduate study at Loyola University, Chicago.

A native of Chicago, Mr. Williams has served as a member of the board of the Catholic Interracial Council of Chicago. Also in Chicago, he had served as president of his parish Holy Name Society.

He is married to the former Jeanne Watson and has three children, Timothy, a freshman at St. John's High School; Anne, in the 8th grade at Immaculata-Dunblane School and Peter, in the 7th grade at Sacred Heart School.

Dr. Carey, who teaches at the Berkeley campus at the University of California, was founder and first president of the CIC of San Francisco and when the Oakland diocese was established last year, was founder of the first CIC there. He is a member of Ste. Mary Magdalein Parish, Berkeley.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced an amendment to the Constitution which would provide for the selection of a new Vice President in the event of a vacancy in that office. My proposed amendment also deals with the closely related questions of Presidential disability and the line of succession.

The recent accession of Vice President Johnson to the Presidency has once again focused public attention on these problems. Yesterday, I inserted in the Record as part of my remarks an article by the distinguished columnist Walter Lippmann in which he suggested modification of existing provisions. Today, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record, editorials from the New Republic, the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, as well as a column by the distinguished correspondent of the New York Times, James Reston.

None of these articles are committed to any one solution; but they are alike in emphasizing the need for new legislation on this vital question. I commend them to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New Republic, Dec. 14, 1963]

The Succession Law

The Constitution provides that in case of removal of the President from office, by death or otherwise, the office shall devolve on the Vice President. That is the end of the self-executing provision. For the rest, the Constitution says that the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal of both the President and Vice President, "declaring what officer shall then act as President."

When the Presidency devolved on Vice President Truman, the statute then on the books ran the line of succession through the Cabinet, in the usual order of seniority, which is the order in which the offices were first established, namely, State, Treasury, War (Defense), and so on. In 1947, at Mr. Truman's instance, the new statute changed the succession, so that now the Speaker of the House is first in line, followed by the President pro tempore of the Senate. These officers are, respectively, John McCormack and Carl Hayden. Accordingly, President Johnson has taken steps to keep Speaker McCormack current on certain security affairs. It is not known whether the President has also made with Mr. McCormack the sort of arrangements that were made both with him and with Vice President Nixon for assuming Presidential duties temporarily in the event of Presidential disability. These latter arrangements are not governed by statutes, but are subject to Presidential discretion.

Speaker McCormack is 71. Senator Hayden is 86. It signifies no disrespect to either man to say that not in the wildest dreams of anyone—including themselves—would they be deemed Presidential timber. Their age alone precludes. Clearly, therefore, until a new Vice President qualifies in January 1965, the country finds itself in a precarious position. The problem is delicate, and there is no sure-fire solution to it—the constitutional provision has itself proved imperfect, as some tenants of the Vice-Presidential office have demonstrated. We have been lucky, but in this most solemn matter, it is not prudent to push one's luck too far.

The line of succession that was abandoned in 1947 was no better than what we have now. Actually, on paper, the present system is an improvement. Cabinet officers often are and often ought to be technicians, specialists, rather than national political personalities They hold office by appointment and relatively automatic confirmation in the Senate. They are not as Cabinet members subjected to the electoral process, and many of them (Secretaries Rusk, Dillon, and McNamara, for example) have never faced an election or been familiar with the inside of a political clubhouse. They may come from foundations, universities, banks, and places like the Ford Motor Co., and be as innocent of political experience and a wide range of domestic and foreign problems as it is possible for a high officer to be. The President carries all of that for them. It would be too fundamental a contradiction of democratic theory and practice to elevate such a man to the Presidency, and it would be a contradiction that would seriously weaken such an incumbent.

The Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate, by contrast, are elected in their own constituencies, of course, and what is more important, they are the choices of their colleagues, expressed in formal votes, for the headship of each of the two Houses. Indirectly, but realistically enough, they represent in their own persons national constituencies. Unfortunately, however, that is a paper reality only. Memory cannot recall a time when the President pro tempore of the Senate was elected on any basis other than that he was simply the senior Senator in point of service on the majority side. The speakership is not always the automatic reward of longevity; but all too often it is, or comes near to being, and in the case of Speaker McCormack, it rather was. The upshot then is that Congress disables itself by its sluggish, self-regarding, in a word, irresponsible reliance on seniority from performing a high function of state, that of filling from its rank a place in the line of Presidential succession.

Thus, the dilemma. The Cabinet succession won't do on principle. And Congress, ideally suited on principle, will not do in practice. Perhaps there is some slight ground for hoping that this grave demonstration of the inexcusable deficiencies in Congress' way of organizing itself will serve to spur congressional reform, which is overdue for a thousand additional reasons as well. But we are talking about the moving of mountains. In the meantime, the Nation faces a clear and present danger, and we dare not fail to consider alternatives.

One possibility would be a statute requiring Congress, within a specified time following the succession of a Vice President as Chief Executive or the death in office of a Vice President, to elect a new Vice President. Members of the Congress should not be disqualified as candidates, even though the risk here is that the Legislature might simply paint itself back into the same seniority corner. One must assume that in the sober circumstances of such an election, Congress would be less clubby and irresponsible than when it makes Speakers and Presidents pro tempore without much thought to the Presidential succession. In any event, the man elected should resign whatever public office he might be holding, and be ineligible for any other, since obviously difficulties of precedence and the like would be faced if he remained, say, in the Senate or the Cabinet. Rather, he should assume the duties of Vice President. The election ought to be by Congress as a whole, and it ought not to be by the antiquated and haphazard method of voting by States, each State casting an equal single vote. Perhaps the election might be by the concurrent vote of both Chambers, each voting separately, as they do when they enact legislation. And perhaps the sitting President might be given a veto, which presidential nominees, after all, have in the selection of a vice presidential candidate.

Other suggestions are conceivable, and this solution is itself not addressed to the risk of a catastrophe that disables both President and Vice President. It is essential only that the process of selection be such as to result in a successor to the Presidency from whom the line runs, albeit indirectly, to a national constituency; otherwise he would lack adequate, self-reliant, and self-starting strength to act in that most awesome of all offices. And it is essential that the selection be deliberate and have regard for the quality of the man, rather than being the kind of relatively automatic method by which Congress selects its own officers.

It is finally to be noted that the office of President is made to devolve on the constitutional Vice President. As to a successor to a former Vice President, Congress is empowered only to declare that he shall "act as President * * * until the disability (of the President) be removed, or a President shall be elected." It would seem open to Congress, therefore, to provide for a special presidential election at some time after the succession, although it is not open to the Congress to so provide in the case of the succession of a constitutional Vice President.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 6, 1963]

Problem of Succession to the Presidency

(By James Reston)

Washington, December 5.—A few minutes after President Kennedy was assassinated the defense forces of the United States all over the world were informed and instructed to be on the alert.

No "emergency defense condition" was ordered. No additional atomic bombers were flushed, as during the Cuban crisis, but in this day of instantaneous attack nobody could be quite sure whether the assassination was the end or merely the beginning of the agony.

The Nation has had too much of death lately to want any ghoulish speculation now, but this urgent signal to the troops even before Lyndon Johnson was sworn in as President indicates just how critical the problem of Presidential succession can be.

Has the Congress prepared the Presidency adequately for the possibilities of a violent age? Is the rule of Presidential succession satisfactory for these days of human madness and scientific destruction? Or do not the men in line for the Presidency—all of them, not just one or two—have to be selected and instructed much more carefully than in the past?

JOHNSON AND M'CORMACK

Lyndon Johnson, of course, was no problem. He had been schooled for years in the mysteries and complexities of emergency defense action. Also, the powers and duties of the President transferred to him automatically on the death of President Kennedy, even before the new chief was sworn in.

But after what happened in Dallas, it is not too difficult to imagine that the assassin might have taken Johnson too, in which case the Presidency would have passed to Speaker McCORMACK, a man 71, who was not prepared for the normal pressures of the Presidency, let alone the emergencies, and who still isn't.

The Congress has been remarkably casual about this succession problem from the start of the Republic. From the beginning of the Nation until now, it has never really dealt effectively with the problem of serious incapacitating illness in the Presidency, and—as we now see—it has consistently put men into the line of succession for the Presidency without ever considering whether they had the capacity to do the job.

The Second Congress of the United States voted in 1792 to make the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House heirs apparent after the Vice President in that order.

This act remained in force for almost 100 years, despite the fact that on several occasions several Vice Presidents died when there was neither a President pro tempore of the Senate nor a Speaker of the House.

Finally, in 1886, the Congress voted to make members of the Cabinet, beginning with the Secretary of State, next in line for the Presidency, and this was changed again, in 1947, to make the Speaker next in line after the Vice President, to be followed by the President pro tempore, and the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Defense, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, and the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, in that order.

The Speaker of the House was moved up in the order in 1947 at least partly, and perhaps even mainly, because a remarkable and highly qualified man, Mr. Sam Rayburn, sat in that chair at the time. But Mr. Sam is gone now, and while there were many who felt Mr. McCORMACK was not the best man to succeed him as Speaker, certainly nobody even considered the possibility that he would, for almost 13 months be first in line after President Johnson.

The tendency now, of course, is to do nothing but pray for the President's health. Johnson has enough problems ahead in Congress without instigating a battle to unseat the Speaker, but there is perhaps another way.

A POSSIBLE SOLUTION

The Speaker himself could propose a solution. If he will not resign as Speaker, he could propose legislation that would name another person first in line for the presidency. This could be done in several ways. For example, he could propose a bill which stated that, in the event of the Vice President succeeding to the presidency, both Houses of Congress should then by majority vote select someone from the President's party to be next in line.

This is not intended as a personal unkindness. Mr. McCORMACK is an industrious and in many ways a competent congressional servant. But he would be the first to concede that it was not the judgment or intent of the Congress that he should ever be first in line for the Presidency of the United States.

He was chosen by seniority for one job and thrust by an appalling accident into line for a totally different job. This raises not a legal or political, but a moral problem—namely, whether a man wishes to remain in line for a job the Congress never intended him to have.

In normal times (whatever they were) maybe it would have been all right to count on luck and avoid raising embarrasing personal questions, but these are not normal times, and lately our luck has not been very good.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 7, 1963]

Action Needed on Succession

The accession of a Vice President to the Presidency has once more called attention to the inadequacy of the Nation's constitutional arrangements for such a situation.

The last time this happened was on the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1945, scarcely 3 months after he had begun his fourth term. Almost immediately President Truman pointed out to Congress that the succession law as it then stood would permit him, in effect, to have appointed his own successor should he die in office.

Since 1886, the statute had provided that Cabinet officers in order of seniority, beginning with the Secretary of State, should assume the highest office in the event that both the President and Vice President should die, resign, or become unable to discharge their duties. Truman recommended that the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate, as elective officials, be placed ahead of Cabinet officers in the line of succession.

Not until a Republican became Speaker of the House did Congress act on Truman's suggestion. Then, in 1947, the succession law was changed in accordance with his proposal. And so it stands today.

Certainly the present law is an improvement on the former one. But it suffers from a serious defect in that neither the Speaker nor the highest officer of the Senate is elected by all the American people, as the Chief Executive indisputably should be. To provide that the Presidency can devolve upon a man elected by a small constituency in one State, or by that constituency of only one State, is surely out of line with the intent of the Constitution. The present Speaker was elected by 105,000 voters in one district of Massachusetts; the present President pro tempore of the Senate was elected by 199,000 voters in one of our smallest States, Arizona.

The simple and logical way to improve the present arrangement would be to give all the people of the Nation the earliest chance to choose a new President when a Vice President has succeeded to the office. When a Senator dies, the Governor usually appoints a temporary successor, but most States hold an early election to fill out the term. The same principle could be applied to the Presidency. The Constitution could be amended to provide that when a President dies, the Vice President shall hold the office until the voters, at the next general election, choose a new President (with a new Vice President) to fill out the term.

Practically, such a provision would make no difference in situations like the present one. President Johnson will be required to face the voters at the next general election in 1964; and that is as it should be. But if a Vice President takes over early in the term for which his predecessor was elected, he can serve for 3 years or more without going to the people; and during that period if anything happens to him the Presidency descends to a man elected by only a tiny fraction of all the voters. That is not as it should be.

Congress ought to give serious study to this question, and while about it might well consider a related one. Has not the time come to review the 22d amendment, which limits a President to two terms? That, too, was proposed by the Republican Congress of 1947, as a kind of posthumous reproach to Franklin D. Roosevelt. It has no place in a democracy, which is willing to trust the people, and which strives to place the Presidency as close to all the people as it can.

[From the Richmond (Ind.) Sun-Telegram, Dec. 8, 1963]

What About Disabled President?

The assassination of President Kennedy automatically brought Vice President Johnson into the Presidency, and the chain of Presidential succession is clearly defined.

However, except for personal agreements in recent years between Presidents and Vice Presidents, nothing specific has been arranged to handle the emergency which would exist if a President were incapacitated, but still alive.

Under the current Presidential succession law, established in 1947, should President Johnson die, the office of President would go to the Speaker of the House. He is Representative JOHN W. McCORMACK, who at 72 years of age, has had 36 years of service in the Congress.

Representative McCORMACK's potential successor as President would be Senator CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate. He is 86 years old, and has had 51 years of service.

From those two posts the line of succession runs down through the Cabinet, with the exception of Secretary of Health and Welfare, a post created after the succession law was established.

Except for the advanced age of Representative McCORMACK and Senator HAYDEN, admittedly a potential handicap, no real problem would arise over a succession of Presidents.

Unsolved, though, would be the problem of what to do if a President would become unable to serve, but still remain alive. Up to now there have been only informal agreements.

Suppose, for example, that President Kennedy would have been wounded seriously. Vice President Johnson would not have become President. He and Kennedy may have reached an understanding but it could not have any official or legal status.

During President Eisenhower's physical difficulties he leaned heavily upon Vice President Nixon but Nixon was never President. He could not have acted in that capacity should an emergency have arisen.

The Congress is aware of the problem. A constitutional amendment giving the Congress power to enact a plan of succession in the eventuality of a disabled, but living President has been awaiting action by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The plan should be examined and, if feasible, put before the public.

As one writer said a few days ago, the country right now is only one heartbeat away from a 72-year-old President, and another heartbeat away from a President who would be at least 86.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. LYNDON JOHNSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our country's First Lady has long been held in the highest esteem by people throughout this Nation and the world for her warmth and compassion for the needs of mankind. Lady Bird Johnson has a deep personal interest in both human and governmental problems. She is an extremely busy person, yet her thoughtfulness in making others feel more comfortable and welcome never ceases to inspire me and increase my admiration of her.

A recent article by Victor Riesel emphasizes these qualities. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lady Bird's Song Sweet to Unions

Washington, D.C., December 3.—The new First Lady is an old friend of some policymaking, vote-getting labor people. Lady Bird Johnson has done right well by the President on this front, as the following untold stories will reveal.

In January 1962, labor strategists called a national meeting of its Women's Activities Division. Some 50 WAD women arrived from 24 pivotal States. It was an important session, yet no particular effort was made to publicize it.

But when Mrs. Johnson learned of the gathering, the labor ladies received invitations to tea at The Elms, the Johnson home. The WAD women were delighted. They were even more impressed when, on the day of the tea, the Johnson limousine rescued them when their chartered bus stalled in the snow.

THEY DIDN'T FEEL STRANGE

So when they got to The Elms, they did not feel themselves strangers. There was no dead air, no awkwardness. Mrs. Johnson had asked Mrs. Arthur Goldberg to help receive them. They separated into groups and were shown every inch of the then Vice President's home except the kitchen.

A young man from Texas sang; a young lady played the piano. Mrs. Goldberg told "how it felt to be a labor wife in the Cabinet." Then Mrs. Johnson asked them to wait for the Vice President.

Lyndon had had a tough day at the office. But he fascinated them with tales of his foreign trips, of working people abroad, of slums and poverty, of his joy at seeing the American flag on his return.

The frosting on this visit came 3 weeks later, when each of the women received two or three photos of themselves with Lady Bird, or with the Vice President or Mrs. Goldberg. Each name had been carefully checked; there were no errors.

Some of the WAD women talked of this the other day. They never forgot her astuteness and graciousness.

AN ELECTION SCENE

More politically sophisticated labor leaders also have reason to know of her. There was the early morning hour gathering in a New York Hotel Commodore suite the night after the 1960 election.

A group of labor men who had spent considerable time, money, and energy in behalf of John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson now were certain they had carried New York State for the ticket. The phone rang. It was Lady Bird. She was phoning long distance to thank them. Then she put Lyndon Johnson on.

Never before had this happened—no First Lady or Second Lady ever had called in this fashion. The union men still talk of it.

REA AND THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the transcript of my testimony before the Federal Power Commission concerning the relationship between the Rural Electric Cooperatives and the Federal Power Commission to be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript of testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Direct Testimony of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota

Question. Please state your name and address.

Answer. Hubert H. Humphrey, Waverly, Minn.

Question. What is your occupation?

Answer. I am the senior U.S. Senator for the State of Minnesota. I have served in the Senate continuously since January 1949.

Question. Will you please state your views on the matter of Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over the rural electric cooperatives?

Answer. The entire legislative history dealing with the relationship between the Federal Power Commission and the Rural Electrification Administration is very clear. It shows conclusively that Congress never intended to give to Federal Power Commission and the Rural Electrification Administration coextensive responsibilities and powers. The authors of the Federal Power Act, in appearing before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, testified that the act only gave the Commission authority to regulate "public utilities," defining these as bodies who had dedicated their property to a "public use" and to the performance of a "public service." Rural Electrification Administration financed systems serve only their own members.

In 1936 it was proposed, by the Senate committee considering the REA bill, that the REA make studies and reports "in cooperation with the Federal Power Commission." The Senators were clear on that day in rejecting the proposition that the REA and FPC should have these overlapping functions.

Thus, the Federal Power Act speaks only of regulating "public utilities" which are traditionally defined in law as dedicated to public use and public service. The Rural Electrification Act, interpreted in the light of its legislative history, shows a clear congressional intent that the Federal Power Commission shall have no regulatory powers over rural electric cooperatives.

After the passage of the Rural Electrification Act, various attempts were made to add regulatory authority over electric co-ops to the FPC field of activity. One of these occasions was in 1946 when the second session of the 79th Congress was considering an amendment to the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act. The amendment provided that REA loan funds for generating plants should not be available "unless the Federal Power Commission shall first certify that there is not sufficient electric current available in the area concerned at reasonable rates." This amendment induced considerable floor debate, all of which was most persuasive in showing the Senate's opposition to such a measure. The distinguished Senators McClellan and Fulbright participated knowledgeably and forcefully in that debate and so did Senators Aiken, Hill, and Magnuson. As the Senator from Alabama very ably pointed out:

"We must realize that in dealing with these cooperatives, we are not dealing with large corporations which have high-priced lawyers and lobbyists and representatives who come to Washington. The fact is that the adoption of this amendment (to give FPC certifying power over REA generation loans) would discourage the REA cooperatives and groups of farmers from going forward with their program throughout the country."

I can think of nothing more damaging to FPC's claim of jurisdiction over REA cooperatives than the fact that bills to give FPC this very authority have been repeatedly brought before the Congress and have repeatedly failed.

I know that Congress understands, if the FPC does not, that cooperatives are very special organizations. By their very nature they do not require regulation. In a cooperative there is a unity of interest, since the owners and the ratepayers are one and the same. As stated by the Supreme Court of Utah: "In a cooperative all sell to each. The owner is the seller and buyer."

There would be no advantage to a cooperative in setting an electric rate which is too high, because the overpayment would simply be returned to the consumer-owners. Nor is FPC needed to protect the interest of the public, whose funds provided the REA loans to borrowers, because after 26 years of rural electrification these cooperatives have clearly demonstrated, by meeting their payments on time and ahead of due dates, that the Government's loans will be repaid in full.

Thus, from the entire record of the REA program, and no one appreciates better than I what that record has meant to the country, there can be found no good policy reason for placing the REA's under FPC jurisdiction.

Nor is there a legal basis for this attempt by FPC to expand its jurisdiction. Cooperatives are not "public utilities" within the terms of the Federal Power Act, because they are membership organizations and do not hold themselves out to serve the public. They serve themselves. A cooperative is a group of people with a common interest working in concert.

There is no legislative reason, no policy reason, and no legal reason for FPC to exercise jurisdiction over rural electric cooperatives.

I conclude with the hope that the Federal Power Commission will give up its efforts to encompass this already embattled cooperative minority and, instead, take the more fruitful path of governing the industries over which the Congress gave it its plenary powers.

A REPORT TO THE NATION'S FARMERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is appropriate that the annual meeting of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association should have had as one of its speakers the Secretary of Agriculture. Secretary Freeman, a former distinguished Governor of our own State, has worked diligently in behalf of the farmers of America. He has served in this difficult position with great responsibility and energy.

So that we may read carefully and understand the efforts and successes of the farm program these past 3 years, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted at this point in the Record the speech delivered by Secretary Freeman at the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association's annual meeting.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at the Annual Meeting of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, Minneapolis, Minn., December 10, 1963

It is good to be back home among good friends again. During the past 2 weeks—in many ways the most sorrowful 2 weeks of my life—I felt the strong desire to seek the companionship of old and trusted friends. I suspect that the tragedy which befell the Nation on November 22 affected a great many people in this same way. It was too great a loss, too sudden a void, to bear alone. I had come to feel a deep personal affection as well as admiration for John F. Kennedy as a person and as a friend, and as a leader—the greatest leader of our time.

He was one of the best friends the American farmer has ever had. I recall that hardly more than 3 years ago he visited GTA headquarters on Snelling Avenue and pledged himself to the cause of the farmer—a pledge which he kept.

He said he would do his best, and as the record shows, that meant results. His background was neither rural nor agricultural, and he never pretended it was. He was not that kind of man. But he knew people. He knew their needs, their aspirations, and their interdependence.

"The interrelation between prosperity on the farm and economic health of the city has never been more apparent," he said.

He knew and appreciated the efficiency of American farmers, and the abundance they created for Americans and the people of the developing countries. He said "our farmers deserve praise, not condemnation; and their efficiency should be a cause for gratitude, not something for which they are penalized."

He recognized the farmer as an important consumer—a $40 billion a year consumer of the goods and services of nonfarm people, and potentially a better customer of business and industry.

And so President Kennedy established clearly defined goals for agriculture, goals which kept all Americans, as well as farmers, in mind. He said he would seek to "eliminate the hardship and suffering which inadequate returns force upon so many of our farm families; * * * reduce our surpluses to manageable proportions; * * * spur our Nation's economy; * * * assure the consumer of stable price levels," and expand "the use of abundance."

He was guided by a deep humanitarian spirit. His first Executive order increased the quantity and quality of food being distributed to needy American families. He expanded the food-for-peace program to reach additional millions of hungry people abroad.

He acted quickly when disaster threatened the family farm. The first major piece of legislation enacted in 1961 and signed by President Kennedy was the emergency feed grain program to strengthen farm income and to reduce surpluses and taxpayer costs.

Legislative and administrative action followed to pave the way for increased farm income, expanded credit to rural people including senior citizens, for financing rural water supply systems, for speeding up conservation and watershed development, for recreation and other improvements of the national forests, for a direct attack on rural poverty, and for the development of community facilities. The full resources of the Federal Government were placed behind the efforts of local people in a nationwide rural areas development program.

These are among the highlights of achievements under President Kennedy's leadership for the benefit of rural and urban people:

USE OF ABUNDANCE

USDA food distribution programs now provide 1 in 6 Americans with a better diet. Where 6 commodities were provided to needy families in 1960, there are now 11 commodities; where 3.7 million persons in 1960 participated in the program, there are now 5.2 million; where there was powdered milk and cornmeal, there is now meat and other high protein food.

A major innovation under President Kennedy was the pilot food stamp program. This program proved so successful in expanding food markets and in improving diets that it was expanded from 143,000 people to 350,000—from 8 areas to 40 counties and 3 large cities in 22 States. There is one project now in operation on the iron range.

Agricultural exports set a new record in 1962—$5.1 billion—compared with $3.5 billion in 1959, and may reach $6 billion this year. Exports sold for dollars represent about 70 percent of the total.

Hungry, needy people reached abroad set a record high—92 million, including 35 million school and 2 million preschool children. U.S. food is paying a part of the wages of 3.1 million people working on self-help economic development projects in 19 countries.

MANAGING SUPPLIES

The feed grain surplus, which had built up progressively for about 10 years, was reduced first in 1961, and in each succeeding year. By the end of the current marketing year, this carryover will have dropped from an alltime high of 85 million tons to about 59 million tons, a reduction of nearly one-third within 3 years. The wheat surplus, which had reached a record 1.4 billion bushels at the end of the 1960 crop marketing year, will by next July 1, assuming the Russian sales, have been slashed to about 725 million bushels, the lowest level since 1953.

EXPANDED CREDIT TO RURAL AMERICA

A record $795 million was loaned to farmers and other rural residents by the Department of Agriculture in fiscal 1963—more than double the amount loaned during fiscal 1960.

USDA credit was either extended for the first time or continued to more than 227,000 farmers or other rural people.

Rural housing was greatly expanded in fiscal 1963 when USDA made almost 20,000 loans valued at $187 million—nearly 20 times the volume handled in fiscal 1960.

USDA's senior citizens housing loan program was started during fiscal 1963, and almost 550 loans were made to farm and other rural residents 62 years or older to construct 305 new dwellings averaging $8,000 in value, to purchase 35 dwellings, and to repair 150 residences.

Indirect benefits of the rural housing program had a far-reaching effect on the economy. It is estimated that the $187 million advanced for various housing loans in 1963 had a total impact of nearly 15,000 man-years of employment and millions of dollars in cash as the "ripple effect" of these loans moved through the Nation's economy.

Nearly 40,000 farm and other rural residents will soon be served by modern water systems for the first time as the result of $15 million in loans during fiscal 1963 to finance community water systems in 135 rural communities in 28 States. The number of water system loans has been increased ninefold during the past 3 years.

For the first time in fiscal 1963, USDA made or insured loans to individual farmers and nonprofit rural associations to finance recreation enterprises to help meet the booming demand of millions of Americans for outdoor recreation.

MORE RURAL POWER

USDA approved 262 electric loans totaling $341 million in fiscal 1963, compared with $261 million in 1962, $275 million in 1961, and $220 million in 1960.

DEVELOPING RESOURCES AND PUTTING THEM TO WORK FOR PEOPLE

Funds made available for small watershed protection and development were increased 170 percent since 1960. The watershed program was expanded by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 to provide for additional storage of water for municipal and industrial use and for recreational development.

Over 224 watershed projects were approved for construction and 329 were approved for planning during the Kennedy years—almost as many as in the previous 6 years. Nearly 20 small watershed projects approved for operation include water storage for recreation. Public recreation areas are being planned in 35 other projects.

Nearly 10,000 landowners and operators established one or more income-producing recreation enterprises in 1963, to provide new outdoor recreation spots for the American family seeking open space and to provide new sources of income for the farm family.

To meet the increased demand for recreation in the national forests, the Department built 8,700 new family camp and picnic units in 1963 to accommodate 40,000 more people. In addition, 168 other recreation sites were developed.

On a pilot basis, about 140,000 acres of cropland moved into other uses during the first year of the cropland conversion program. This shift in land use enabled farmers to put their cropland into other uses, and also produce income for the farm family. And now the pilot land use program has progressed to the point where a nationwide program can be undertaken to aid farmers convert land now in crops to such other long-range, income-producing uses as forests, grasslands, water storage, wildlife habitat, or recreational development. This makes far more sense than a policy to make land lay idle.

FARM INCOME IMPROVED

Through new farm programs and the reshaping of older programs, net farm income in 1961 was $12.5 billion and in 1962 it was $12.6 billion, up around $900 million from 1960. Realized net income per farm rose from $2,961 in 1960 to $3,414 in 1962—up 15 percent. Hourly returns in agriculture rose from 90 cents to $1.04 an hour for all farm labor.

The record speaks clearly that John F. Kennedy kept his pledge to the farmers—he got rural America moving ahead. We see this more clearly now because we can look back to where we were when we began. And this, I believe, is a lesson for us all. The process of government is never neat and tidy, with one step of progress clearly following another. Only afterwards when the record is written does it appear neat. I believe President Kennedy understood this truth better than most, and this understanding sustained the calmness and determination which characterized his Presidency.

This is the mark of a pragmatic man who seeks answers to problems rather than arguments over slogans and dogmas. He recognized that there is no perfect solution, no neat and tidy answer, to the problems which science and technology have brought to agriculture. These are forces of great change, and he knew the farmer and the rural community would progress only if we could shape change in ways that benefit all the people.

President Kennedy thoroughly understood that rapid and irreversible changes were taking place in American agriculture. He had begun to outline a new agricultural policy for the 1960's—and in doing so he often frustrated his critics, especially those seeking neatly labeled bins in which to place this policy or that program.

The reason he so frustrated his critics is that the new agricultural policy is much broader than the commodity programs which have always been the conventional identification for farm policies. It is clear that today any agricultural policy must include not only commodities * * * but also communitywide programs, and policies of trade and aid. We are moving, therefore, toward an agricultural policy for rural America which rests on these 3 stabilizing forces, a three-legged seat for agriculture and rural America.

This triumvirate is the legacy of a pragmatist. It is passed on to another pragmatic man of action in President Johnson who, in his message to the joint session of the Con-

gress, spoke for all of us. He said, "No words are sad enough to express our loss. No words are strong enough to express our determination to continue the forward thrust of America that he began."

"It is," he said, "a time for action. * * * Let us continue."

Let us, then, take a closer look at the three legs.

COMMODITY PROGRAMS

First, there are the commodity programs—always the subject for much talk and more than a normal amount of confusion. Let me make it clear that commodity programs, as far as this administration is concerned, are absolutely necessary to the family farm. The open secret for America's world leadership in agriculture is the family farm system, and we intend to continue this leadership with the help of commodity programs.

Commodity programs are not welfare programs, or relief programs. They are the farmers' muscle in the marketplace—and the farmer doesn't need weaker muscles, he needs stronger muscles. As long as agriculture is forced to carry the heavy burden of change which rapid technological advances bring, commodity programs will be necessary for even the most efficient farmer.

It is only reasonable and fair that the farmer, who provides the American consumer with an abundance of food at the lowest real cost in history, be able to earn an income on a par with other Americans. Commodity programs will be essential to this goal of parity of income so long as the productive capacity of agriculture continues to exceed our ability to consume, sell, or share our food abundance at home and abroad.

And let me emphasize that I am speaking here of parity of income. This is different from parity of price, far different. The parity ratio of farm prices today is 77 percent. If the effects of the commodity programs are added in, the parity ratio of farm prices would be the equivalent of 82 percent. Our goal is 100 percent of parity of income, for the farmer is entitled to as good an income as other Americans. Full parity of income was the goal of President Kennedy, and it is the goal of President Johnson.

Don't be misled the next time the enemies of commodity programs try to undermine your confidence by talking only about parity prices. Commodity programs are the muscle builders for parity of income, they are essential. As long as the farmer has the ability to flood the marketplace, then he is always in danger of drowning in a sea of economic troubles. And commodity programs are the strongest muscle he has to protect himself.

The major commodity problem of immediate interest here is wheat. We estimate that net farm income next year will be down some $600 million, mostly because of lower wheat prices which result from the decision made in the referendum held last May. This is a problem which concerns me deeply, as it did President Kennedy and as it does President Johnson. I have discussed this problm with farmers in every section of the country, most recently in a series of report and review meetings. These meetings indicate to me that four out of five farmers want some kind of wheat program to replace the low price supports coming into effect next year.

I talked with President Johnson last week about the wheat situation, and he indicated then his strong feelings that a wheat program will be necessary. He said the program must be one the Congress will pass, that it must keep costs in line and bring surpluses down. It is clear that the Congress is more receptive to a wheat program than it would have been last spring—but it is also clear that unified farm support will be necessary in a Congress where urban representatives predominate.

COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

The second leg of the policy seat are those programs which relate to the rural community—primarily those involved in the rural areas development program. This program is the first coherent recognition of the fact that no commodity program will provide all of the children now growing up in rural America with the opportunity for a job if they wish to stay in their home community. The fact that 70 percent of those who left rural America during the 1950's were 21 years old and younger is a stark reminder of the serious problem facing rural communities everywhere. RAD also recognizes that no commodity program will provide adequate incomes for farmers on less than adequate farms. Other means are needed to enable these farmers to acquire adequate size farms or to develop other and more profitable uses for their land and water resources in combination with a farming operation.

Here in the GTA area, RAD can be seen in recreation farms and farms combining recreation with crops, in new rural housing construction, in community water system loans, in new and expanded industries in rural areas and in expanded watershed developments.

Through RAD, we seek to encourage the use of land, and not to idle it. We seek to make use of rural resources to meet the needs of the city resident for outdoor recreation—for space and green lands—and to provide the rural community with new income opportunities. We oppose the philosophy which would drive people off the land when there is so much need for all the goods and services which land and people can provide.

TRADE AND AID

The third leg of agriculture's policy seat—trade and aid—holds the key to the problems which neither commodity nor community programs can reach—and that is to find the markets to match the productivity of the farmer.

You want to produce, and we want to sell. We know that the domestic market for food will grow only as fast as our population increases, and farm productivity is outrunning population today and will do so as far as we can see into the future.

This means we must reach out for new markets, and strengthen our position in present world markets. It means we are going out aggressively to sell. It means that the United States is no longer going to be a residual supplier, and we are developing a strong, hardhitting market development program to back up our promise. Currently we maintain two permanent food trade centers overseas, and we are cooperating with over 40 commodity groups and trade associations which are working to develop markets in over 50 nations. Earlier this month the Department sponsored the largest oversea food exhibition in history at Amsterdam, and the response was very enthusiastic from both American exporters and European consumers.

We chose Amsterdam because of its location within the Common Market, a $1.1 billion market for the food and fiber produced by the American farmer. We have seen our efficient poultry producers denied access to this market, and we are fearful of what could happen if the wheat and feed grain producers also are denied access.

President Kennedy was determined to fight hard for fair access to these markets, and President Johnson will be as tough and as determined. We intend to take every possible step to insure that export sales will continue and will increase. What we seek is a guarantee of fair access to our historic markets, and a fair share of the growth in these markets.

As we seek to encourage more liberal trade policies in agriculture—as we must if the wheat farmer is going to find the markets he needs—we must buy if we expect to sell. We must be willing to practice what we preach. I believe we have thus far, for we currently import farm products worth over $2 billion each year which compete with our own domestic producers.

But we do hear from time to time from those who want to raise barriers to outside competition. We cannot insist, however, that others lower trade barriers while we raise them here at home. Particularly in recent days we hear that beef imports are causing the current low market price level, and that we should protect the cattleman. There is conclusive evidence that a short-term overexpansion in feed beef—too many steers on the range, too many feed steers in feeder pens, too many overweight steers sent to slaughter—is responsible for most of the current market situation. Imports do have an effect, but it is far less significant than current overproduction.

We could, however, in this situation, demonstrate to the world that we are willing to give what we ask in return—and that is fair competitive access. We could, for example, seek to negotiate a guaranteed access to a share of the U.S. market—together with a share of its growth—for those nations exporting beef to us.

I am confident that if we bargain effectively and act fairly ourselves, we will continue to have fair access to world markets. If we do, then we must also be prepared to be competitive in those markets—competitive in both price and quality. In this regard, there is today a deep concern about our grade standards, particularly those for wheat. Farm leaders of great integrity and of deep devotion to the welfare of the farmer have strongly differing opinions as to the need to tighten our wheat standards. Public hearings have been held in four places around the country on this question, and opinion is sharply divided. As Secretary of Agriculture, I soon must make a decision. That decision will be carefully and thoughtfully made in the best interest of the American farmer and of the trade that serves him and the Nation so well.

These questions, and the concern over the direction of world trade policies, should not obscure the real accomplishments of the efforts to expand trade. We anticipate that 1963 will be a banner year for farm exports. If the Russian wheat sales materialize, farm exports could exceed $6 billion, and, in any event, exports are going to come close to that mark. Considering that the previous record was $5.1 billion, 1963 marks a decisive step forward.

But, important as this progress is, the real future export markets for America's growing agricultural production will be determined by how rapidly the developing nations can achieve full commercial status as trading partners. If India, for example, which now has a per capita income of hardly more than $60 a year, were to achieve a tenfold expansion in that figure, there would be 650 million new consumers to whom we could offer to sell our food. Two-thirds of the people of the world are not able to buy all the food they need today. One day they will be good customers if we are willing to help them improve their economy so they can buy from us.

It is critical that the American people, including the farmer, grasp the dynamic potential which a combined program of trade and aid in agriculture offers to our economic interests and to our dreams of a world of peaceful nations.

However, before the developing nations can become strong and stable trading partners, it will be necessary that the developed nations in the years ahead provide a volume of food aid which will be substantially greater than is generally realized.

We have, through the food-for-peace program, sought to fill the food deficit which exists today in the developing nations. This deficit is generally a nutritional gap, or the difference between what these nations can produce and the need of the people for an adequate diet. However, as these nations progress, a second type of food deficit arises—an economic, or growth, deficit. It results as income levels improve, and the demand for food exceeds the bare nutritional needs and it is far greater in volume than the amount needed for minimum diets.

The danger of this economic food deficit is in its inflationary impact as increased purchasing power flows against inadequate food supplies. And inflation can destroy economic growth and the promise of higher levels of living.

This economic deficit—which we estimate will reach $25.6 billion by 1980—can be met in part by increased commercial trade, but almost $15 billion will have to be met through a food aid program. Thus, only a combination of trade and aid will provide the answer, for if the developing nations are to trade they will need to grow economically, and this growth, in turn, will depend on the extent of food aid. The strategy of food aid, then, is the key to the future of the developing nations, and to the need for adequate markets for the highly developed nations.

We have set out to create new markets with a clear policy of trade and aid, just as we have set out to move the rural economy ahead with communitywide programs and to strengthen the marketing muscle of the farmer through better commodity programs.

The effectiveness of those policies, and the progress which can flow from them, will depend not only on how well they are carried out by the Government, but also on how well they are understood and how strongly they are supported by those who, like yourself, stand to gain most directly from them.

President Johnson, in these trying days, has called us all to action, not just the executive agencies, not just the Congress, but all of us "to continue the forward thrust of America."

With your help, and only with your help, can we continue to grow and prosper.

FOREIGN POLICY—THE BUSINESS OF THE PEOPLE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the people of Minnesota were honored this week to have Secretary of State Dean Rusk as their guest. The Secretary spoke to 10,000 members of the largest farm organization in our area, the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, who were gathered in St. Paul for their annual meeting.

The presence of Secretary Rusk at the GTA meeting indicates our Government's recognition that agriculture is important not simply for the food and fiber it produces for our own people, but also as a force in our international life for strength and peace.

Secretary Rusk said to his farmer audience:

> The abundance of food and fiber you produce is a powerful element in our national strength. It is a powerful asset in the defense of our national interests and national life, and in promoting peace and freedom throughout the world.

While the Soviet world strains under agricultural crop failure and new emphasis on chemical and fertilizer needs for agriculture, the American farmer continues to produce an abundance of food and fiber representing real wealth and real power.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted at this point in the Record the speech delivered by Secretary Rusk at the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association's annual meeting.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by the Honorable Dean Rusk Before the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, Auditorium, St. Paul, Minn., Tuesday, December 10, 1963

I

It is a high personal privilege for me to meet with the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association and, through you, with more than 300,000 farm families of our upper Midwest. I come in a period of national mourning because the Nation lives and must get on with its appointed tasks. President Kennedy would have had it no other way.

I shall not try to put into words the personal grief shared with us here by hundreds of millions of ordinary men and women throughout the world. We have been diminished by the loss of so much gallantry, so much energy and vision, so much dedication and commonsense. We are benumbed and shamed by the cost of senseless violence, but lifted up and inspired by the rediscovery, in the midst of our sorrow, of the power of the hopes and aspirations of man and the strength of decency and moderation in our relations with others.

In these days of sadness and shock, we have found new sources of confidence. We have found them in the resilience of our constitutional system, in the capacity of our country to unite behind the man who now carries the awesome and lonely burden, in the sure hand and clear head with which he has taken up his task, in the confidence which those beyond our borders have given us in these critical days. I should like to ask you to recall once more the words of President Johnson to the Congress, words which expressed the deepest conviction of one who is intimately in touch with the world about us and the policies which guide our foreign relations:

"This Nation will keep its commitments from South Vietnam to West Berlin. We will be unceasing in the search for peace; resourceful in our pursuit of areas of agreement even with those with whom we differ; and generous and loyal to those who join with us in common cause.

"In this age where there can be no losers in peace and no victors in war—we must recognize the obligation to match national strength with national restraint—we must be prepared at one and the same time for both the confrontation of power and the limitation of power—we must be ready to defend the national interest and to negotiate the common interest. This is the path that we shall continue to pursue. Those who test our courage will find it strong and those who seek our friendship will find it honorable. We will demonstrate anew that the strong can be just in the use of strength—and the just can be strong in the defense of justice."

II

As your Secretary of State I wish to talk to you about our foreign relations. Let me start with a remark which I hope you will never forget: Foreign policy is about you. It is about your home, your community, your safety, your well-being, your chance to live a decent life and prepare a better world for your children. Foreign policy is not a game played by "those people in Washington" with other players from far-off, distant places. It is as close to you as the member of your family, or the neighbor's boy, in uniform, as close as the taxes you pay to sustain the struggle for freedom, as close as the prices and markets for what you produce. Even more personal, it is as close as your highest hopes, your puzzled concern that man can be both so good and yet so evil, your own impulse to do something to build a better world, your own private search for the answer to the ageless question "what is the chief end of man?"

There are those who say that the Department of State has no constituency, but I know better. How we dispose of our affairs at home can decide elections; but how we dispose of our relations with the rest of the world can decide the survival of mankind. So we have our constituency—every man, woman, and child across our great Nation.

III

Our time has seen breathtaking changes. Technology has advanced on a thousand fronts and at accelerating speeds. The atom has been unlocked, and man has begun to reach out from his earthly home toward the moon and the planets. But to me, one of the most wondrous miracles of all is the rise in farm productivity.

I was born on a small farm in Cherokee County, Ga. It wasn't much of a farm by your standards—just a few acres of red clay. Today, when I read the statistics on increased yield per acre and output per man-hour, I can hardly believe them. And the miracle of rising agricultural production continues to unfold.

The abundance of food and fiber that you produce is a powerful element in our national strength. It is a powerful asset in the defense of our national interests and national life, and in promoting peace and freedom throughout the world.

The miracle of American agriculture has not merely produced more and more food for a still hungry world. It has turned men's hopes toward science and technology and their appetites away from plunder and conquest. It has opened the historical possibility of meeting by peaceful means the elementary daily needs of the whole human race.

Our agricultural exports of approximately $6 billion a year—more than 4 billion for hard currency—are crucial to our balance of payments. Without them, we would be hard pressed to meet the costs of guarding the ramparts of freedom and of helping other peoples to preserve their independence and raise their living standards.

Our food-for-peace programs are a mighty instrument of security, good will, and peace. They are saving human lives every day. Under one of them, more than 40 million children in 91 countries get a square meal once a day—at school. Tens of millions of other people are getting supplemental feedings.

Food-for-peace programs are not only saving lives. They are serving economic development. They have had a growing role in our programs of assistance to the less developed nations of the world. Our interest in helping these nations to move forward into the modern world is not humanitarian alone. We want them to move forward because we want a peaceful world. Communism feeds on hunger and frustration; it encourages disruption and exploits chaos. We want orderly progress in freedom—not for ourselves alone but for all men.

Food for peace also serves to develop future markets for American farm products.

As Secretary of State, I find it very reassuring to have in support the great resources of American farm production. From my viewpoint, our agricultural abundance may be regarded as strategic reserves. In certain crises it can be as valuable as our military reserve forces.

Not the least of the contributions which you farmers make to freedom and peace is to demonstrate so dramatically that a revolution in agricultural abundance has taken place in a free society. No Communist country has made a success of food production. Communist China has sunk into misery.

East Germany has been converted from an area with a food surplus to one with a food deficit. The smaller Eastern European Communist states have been plagued by difficulties in farm production. It is significant that Poland and Yugoslavia, where most of the farming is done by families on small farms, have generally fared better than the countries which have enforced collectivization. Shortfalls in farm production in the Soviet Union have been aggravated by climatic handicaps and vagaries of the weather. And by applying more fertilizer and up-to-date methods, the Communists states doubtless could increase their agricultural output. But I am convinced that a large part of their trouble in agricultural production in inherent in the Communist system.

IV

The central purpose of our foreign policy, as of our military forces, is to maintain an environment in which we can "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." When I was a child we felt safe in our continental home behind ocean barriers. Today we cannot find security apart from the rest of our planet. In these days of international missiles and thermonuclear warheads, we can be safe only if our total environment is safe. By total environment we now mean not only the land, waters, and air of the earth, but the adjoining areas of space as far out as man can project himself and his instruments.

In political terms, we seek a peaceful world of independent nations, each free to choose its own institutions so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others, and all free to cooperate in their common interests and in the welfare of mankind. That is the kind of world described in the Charter of the United Nations.

In working toward our goals we have five basic policies. First—and indispensably—we seek to protect the free world against aggression. We possess a nuclear deterrent of unimaginable power. We maintain large conventional forces, and these are modernized and increasingly mobile. And we have been increasing our capacity, and that of our allies, to deal with guerrilla warfare, the form of aggression to which South Vietnam is presently being subjected. We have demonstrated our will and capacity to make resort to force by our adversaries unprofitable and dangerous—and, at the higher levels, prohibitively destructive.

While, with our allies, we check aggression, we seek to build the strength of the free world.

We seek to enlarge and improve our partnerships with the other economically advanced nations of the free world—with Western Europe, Canada, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and others. Our partnerships with these nations embrace defense. They embrace political problems. They embrace trade and economics. We seek the most intimate cooperation in lowering the barriers of world trade, in managing the international balance of payments, and in assisting the less-developed nations.

A third cardinal element in our policy is assistance to the less-developed nations in advancing economically, socially, and politically. We have welcomed with open arms the nearly 50 nations which have emerged in Asia and Africa since the Second World War. National independence does not automatically lead to economic progress. Yet the peoples of all the less-developed countries—new and old—know that man need not live on the edge of starvation, that modern technology makes possible a decent life for all.

I would emphasize that the phrase "modern technology" includes modern methods of producing food and fiber. And, in passing, I would note that the Peace Corps needs more people who can teach modern farm methods. You don't have to be young to join the Peace Corps. Some of our volunteers are 60 and 70 years of age.

Helping the less developed countries to move into the modern world will be a continuing task, for a decade or, in some cases, perhaps longer. But many of them are making genuine progress. And as each moves forward to self-sustaining growth and political stability, it adds to the total strength of the free world. Our aid to the less developed countries is helping to create new markets. And, most important, it is helping to build the kind of world in which we and our children will want to live.

And let me point out that our very able AID Administrator, David E. Bell, was born in North Dakota.

A fourth element in our policy is to improve and strengthen the organizations and institutions which enable the nations of the world to work together more effectively. Some of these are regional, some are specialized. Others are of broader scope. Above them all stands the United Nations. We strive unceasingly to make the United Nations a more effective instrument for making and keeping peace and serving the welfare of mankind.

Let us note that this is Human Rights Day—the 15th anniversary of the approval of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations General Assembly. We in the United States have special reasons to rejoice in this anniversary.

A century and a half ago, Thomas Jefferson sumed up this Nation's position in the world in these memorable words:

"The station we occupy among the regions of the earth is honorable but aweful: Trusted with the destinies of this solitary republic of the world, the only monument of human rights and the sole repository of the sacred fire of freedom and self-government, from whence it is to be lighted up in other regions of the earth, if other regions of the earth ever become susceptible of its genial influence."

On this Human Rights Day of 1963, we can still agree that our station is both "honorable" and "aweful". But no longer are we the "sole repository of the sacred fire of freedom and self-government". No longer are we "the solitary republic of the world", for Jefferson's fire has indeed kindled the earth. No longer are we the only monument of human rights, because the chief precepts of our Bill of Rights have been adopted in many lands, have been expressed in the constitutions of most of the new republics, and have been reaffirmed for the world in the United Nations Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The Charter of the United Nations properly links the rights of individuals with the rights of nations, and tolerance with peace. President Kennedy made the same vital connection last June when he said: "As is not peace, in the last analysis, a matter of human rights?"

Many nations have yet to insure equal rights for all of their citizens, and the struggle to obtain these fundamental rights will color the future course of world affairs.

Personal independence depends not alone on equal rights but, more importantly, on mutual respect. There is no more urgent task before us as a people than to secure for every individual the rights and respect due to him as a human being.

As President Johnson said in his address to Congress on November 27:

"We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. It is time now to write the next chapter, and to write it in the books of law.

"There could be no greater source of strength to this Nation both at home and abroad than to eliminate * * * every trace of discrimination and oppression that is based upon race or color."

V

I turn now to a fifth element in our foreign policy. While we seek to protect and build the free world, we search earnestly and untiringly for areas of common interest with our adversaries—and especially for measures to reduce the danger of a great war.

Recently, we have reached a few limited agreements with the Soviet Union. The first was on a "hot wire" or direct line of communication between the President and the head of the Soviet Government—for use at moments of crisis.

We achieved the treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water. We are pleased that this has now been signed by 107 governments.

The Soviets and we both supported the United Nations declaration against placing in orbit weapons of mass destruction. And they and we have reached a broad agreement on principles of law for outer space.

These are small but useful steps toward peace. But—let me say this frankly—these steps do not yet constitute a detente. The Soviets have not abandoned their aims of world revolution—and neither has Peiping. Chairman Khrushchev has stated on several occasions that the ideological struggle will continue.

There can be no full and lasting detente between the chief Communist states and the free world without settlement of critical and dangerous political issues—such as the division of Berlin and Germany, the aggressions against Laos and South Vietnam, and the use of Cuba as a base for subversive activity in Latin America.

Moreover, this world will remain a very dangerous place until progress is made in controlling armaments and in reducing the dangers of war from surprise or miscalculation.

President Johnson, like President Kennedy, is determined to explore most earnestly and patiently every possibility of reaching agreements on further steps toward a more stable peace. But as yet we are not in the slightest justified in relaxing our vigilance or reducing our effort.

VI

There are significant developments within the Communist world. There is the Sino-Soviet quarrel, which involves both ideology and state relations. It is serious but not a complete break. And, as dictatorships can change dirction overnight, it might be patched up.

There are growing signs of nationalism throughout the Soviet bloc. The smaller Communist states of Europe are finding a little more autonomy for themselves and seeking to increase their trade and other relations with the nations of Western Europe and the United States. And not only in these smaller Communist states but in the Soviet Union itself, there are signs of growing interest in more personal freedom.

The Communist states have problems in allocating their economic resources among the competing demands of armaments, industrialization, consumer satisfaction, and the promotion of the Communist world revolution.

Processes of change are clearly evident behind the Iron Curtain. It would be a mistake to expect these changes to come rapidly. But it would be a mistake to underestimate the power of historic nationalism and of the ideas of freedom.

The ideas of freedom, which gave birth to our Nation and which we have nurtured and fought to defend, have spread over the earth. They are, I believe, inherent in the nature of man. They are shared today by men everywhere, including behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. They are our most priceless possession—and our mightiest asset.

But we cannot win this worldwide struggle between coercion and freedom by standing at ease. We cannot make the world safe for freedom by retreating. There are those who would have us quit the struggle—by slashing our defense and our foreign aid, by abandoning our alliance, by leaving the United Nations. That is a prescription for defeat and disaster.

I believe that the American people are determined to win this struggle—win it by achieving a stable peace in which we and others can live in freedom. We can win if we persevere—if we work at protecting and building the free world with unwavering resolve.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5179) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicle, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Rooney of New York, Mr. Sikes, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Bow, and Mr. Lipscomb were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 5778. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8751. An act to amend the Act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate H.R. 8720, so that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] may explain the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair) laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 8720) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the bill is the House version of an amendment to increase authorizations for the Manpower Development and Training Act. Senators may recall that earlier this session the Senate passed S. 1716 and S. 1831, bills which deal in general with the training of school dropouts and the percentage of the total training allowance which could be used for youth training and the matching requirements which were imposed on the States under the original act, and which the Senate decided to waive until June 30, 1965.

The Senate bills also added 52 weeks of literacy training.

Instead of acting on the Senate bill, the House passed its own bill. I now ask the Senate to accept the House bill. This request is made at the suggestion of the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz. The bill has been cleared with the majority leader, with the minority leader, and with the chairman and all the other members, Republican as well as Democratic, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I pay particular tribute to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], who has been a source of great strength to the committee and to the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower throughout the passage of the Senate bills, and who is quite content to have the Senate act now on the substitute, the House bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I concur in the accolade bestowed by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania upon my compatriot the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty]. He has done yeoman work in this field. He introduced substitute legislation in connection with the Youth Conservation Corps and other matters, some of which has found its way into an improved manpower training bill. So I salute him for the great work which he has done.

Mr. CLARK. I concur in the statement just made by the minority leader.

The differences between the House bill and the Senate bill are relatively minor. The House bill is a little more extensive than the Senate bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, a compilation showing the differences between the House and Senate versions.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Version	Senate Version
1. Lowers the age of youths eligible for training allowances from 19, as in existing act, to 17. The 17-year-olds would have to have been out of school at least a year.	1. Lowers the age to 16. Youth would have to have been out of school 6 months. (S. 1831.)
2. Permits up to 25 percent of the persons receiving training allowances to be youths under 22 years of age. (Present law limits youth training allowances to 5 percent of the total training allowances.)	2. Permits up to 15 percent of the total training allowances to be used for youth training allowances. (S. 1831.)
3. Postpones all matching until July 1, 1965. (Present law requires such matching begin July 1, 1964.) The amendment would require one-third matching in fiscal year 1966.	3. Eliminates 50-50 match requirement for the duration of the program—that is, June 30, 1965. (S. 1716.)
4. Adds 20 weeks of basic education in reading and writing to training allowance period for those trainees receiving training.	4. Adds 52 weeks of literacy training. (S. 1831.)
5. Permits increases in the weekly training allowance to $10 above the State unemployment compensation payment. This provision is designed as an incentive to get unemployed workers to seek training rather than draw unemployment pay.	
6. Permits trainees to work up to 20 hours part time without any loss in training allowances.	
7. Reduces to 2 years the prior work experience required for trainees to be eligible. (Present law requires 3 years.)	
8. Permits a member of the family, where the head is unemployed, to receive a training allowance. Only one person in the family group is eligible at any one time. (Present law limits training to heads of household.)	
9. Provides, through demonstration projects, grants and/or loans to unemployed workers to help finance their relocation expenses.	
10. Title II: Authorizes $161 million for fiscal year 1964, $407 million for fiscal year 1965, and $281 million for fiscal year 1966 for the training programs. (Present law authorizes $161 million for each of fiscal years 1964 and 1965.)	

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a table showing the differences in the authorizations in the two bills.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Authorization for Appropriations Under Title II, Combining S. 1716 and S. 1831 for Comparison With H.R. 8720

SENATE BILL

Fiscal year June 30, 1964:	
New programs	$100,000,000
Old programs	161,000,000
Total	261,000,000
Fiscal year June 30, 1965:	
New programs	100,000,000
Old programs	161,000,000
Pick up State tab	161,000,000
Total	422,000,000
Fiscal year June 30, 1966	0

HOUSE BILL

Fiscal year June 30, 1964:	
New programs	0
Old programs	161,000,000
Fiscal year June 30, 1965:	
New programs	85,000,000
Old programs	161,000,000
Pick up State tab	161,000,000
Total	407,000,000

Fiscal year June 30, 1966: $281 million, which with State matching of one-third ($140 million) brings program level to $422 million.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should be glad to explain the House bill at greater length, if any Senator desired to question me. But in view of the unanimity between the Republicans and the Democrats on the committee, the concurrence of the majority leader and the minority leader, and the desire of the Secretary of Labor to have the House version accepted, I shall not, unless asked to do so, give any further explanation of the differences between the two bills, because they will clearly appear in the Record tomorrow morning, in the insertions I have just made.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. As I understand, the basic objective of the Manpower Development and Training Act is the reduction of hard-core unemployment, unemployment which results from the fact that the potential employee lacks the skills essential to performance in an existing job vacancy. The bill was designed for situations where there is a demand for labor, but in which prior training or a specific skill is a substantial prerequisite for employment in the given job.

It is not intended to cover industries, such as the garment and apparel industry, where minimal training is needed, where traditionally the employer has provided the necessary on-the-job training, and where there exist a substantial number of experienced and able workers who are presently unemployed. As I understand it, we do not intend to give a competitive advantage to one employer over another by having the Manpower Development and Training Act pay costs which usually and traditionally the employer has assumed, nor do we intend hereby merely to transfer unemployment from one area to another. We do not expect use of the Manpower Development and Training Act training programs in highly mobile, highly competitive industries where minimal employee training is needed and now is undertaken by the employer. I feel that Manpower Development and Training Act assistance in such cases would only add to industrial dislocation. It would be a waste of manpower resources, and in the long run would serve only to discredit the Manpower Development and Training Act and detract from its value.

Is my understanding correct?

Mr. CLARK. So I understand, also.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if the Senator in charge of the bill will yield further, there seems to be some question about this matter.

Mr. CLARK. If the Secretary of Labor is not adhering to the policy outlined by the Senator from Michigan—although I think he is—I hope he will begin to do so without, of course, hastily and unexpectedly interrupting any ongoing projects.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I think the bill is a good one, and I am happy to support it.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Before the vote is taken I wish to express my appreciation to the minority leader [Mr. Dirksen], and to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] for their contributions in connection with this bill. The Senator from Pennsylvania is one of the most knowledgeable people in this Congress on manpower problems. He shaped this bill and guided it to pleasant destiny.

Mr. President, 26 million young people will enter the labor force in the 1960's. This great influx of jobseekers at a time when we still have heavy pockets of unemployment is a matter of concern to all.

Right now the unemployment rate is 5.9 percent yet many jobs are unfilled because we lack the skilled people to fill them.

In April of this year I urged the Senate to accept as a substitute for the Youth Conservation Corps an amendment which would alter the Manpower Development and Training Act and make the young unemployed eligible for training allowances. My proposal was defeated at that time. A few days later a Presidential Commission endorsed the same plan and subsequently it was made a part of the administration program.

The bill before us incorporates the idea I offered once before on the Senate floor and which I also introduced as a bill, S. 1691.

The pending legislation also contains other features, and some of these I must concede are untested and of uncertain value. Let us hope that time proves their wisdom.

In closing may I pay tribute to Ed Friedman, Ray Hurley and Mike Bernstein for their fine assistance in drafting this legislation.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his kind words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 8720) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider by laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the passage of the vocational education bill is another milestone in the field of education. Rising to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] on the passage of this measure and on the passage of other important educational measures is becoming a habit, and I must say in all candor that it is a most enjoyable one.

Congress has taken the following noteworthy steps in the field of education:

First. An excellent medical school and dental school bill, under the managership of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill].

Second. A milestone—and the first one—in the field of mental health and mental retardation, also under the distinguished leadership of the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill].

Third. A bill to help our colleges and universities build academic facilities—under the distinguished leadership of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse].

And now, fourth, the bill for modernization of the vocational education program, which is the most significant advance in this field since the inauguration, 46 years ago, of vocational education programs. This bill includes an extension of the National Defense Education Act, with useful improvements, and it also extends the programs for aid to schools in federally impacted areas.

In addition, the Senate has passed an excellent library bill—again, under the skillful managership of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse].

And a moment ago, the Senate passed a fine manpower development and training bill, under the skillful supervision of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark].

Congress has been outstanding at this session in the field of education, and has compiled a record of which it can be proud. For this, a great deal of credit goes to the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]; to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]; to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]; to all other Members, on both sides of the aisle, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and also to the Congress as a whole.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of December 12, 1963, p. 24226, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the major item in the conference report is on military housing. The report, as written by the Senate conferees and the House conferees, makes provision for the number of units of military housing the Senate voted, and also provides exactly the amount of money the Senate voted.

The other items were adjusted as between the House version and the Senate version; and the conference report is unanimous.

I point out, by way of explanation, that two of the items in this measure are really fixed charges, and do not really relate to military construction. So they should be in the Department of Defense appropriation bill; and next year a request to place them there will be made.

By way of summary, let me say that the conference committee on the military construction appropriation bill for fiscal year 1964, H.R. 9139, finished its work yesterday afternoon. Agreements were reached on all items. The conference committee agreed to an appropriation of $1,585,880,000 for the Department of Defense and the three military services. This is a reduction of $380,520,000 from the budget estimate of $1,966,400,000.

Mr. President, by way of explanation, I wish to point out that contained within the appropriation figure of $1,585,880,000, there is a total of $473,400,000 which is comprised of $306,003,000 for operations and maintenance, and $167,397,000 for debt payment for service housing. This amount of money really does not belong in the military construction appropriation bill. The Senate declared in its report that this money should be in the Department of Defense appropriation bill for it had no connection with military construction.

The conference committee approved $948,474,000 for the regular military construction appropriation. This is a 23.9-percent reduction from the budget estimate of $1,232 million for regular military construction projects. The appropriation is broken down as follows: Department of the Army, $200,646,000; Army Reserve, $4,500,000; Army National Guard, $5,700,000; Department of the Navy, $198,853,000; Naval Reserve, $6 million; Department of the Air Force, $468,275,000; Air Force Reserve, $4 million; Air National Guard, $16 million; Department of Defense agencies, $24 million, and Loran stations, $20,500,000.

The Senate position prevailed in the conference on defense family housing. For the sake of clarity, I would like to review briefly the housing situation. The appropriation approved in the Senate bill was $637,406,000. Included in the amount was 7,500 housing units for the 3 services at a total construction cost of $136,063,000, broken down as follows: Army, 1,366 housing units at a cost of $26,664,000; Navy, 3,142 housing units at a cost of $55,649,000, and for the Air Force, 2,992 housing units at a cost of $53,750,000. The bill has not deleted any specific projects from the housing program, but has made available funds to provide for the construction of 7,500 new housing units against the authorization of 10,140 units. The Department of Defense is charged with the responsibility of selecting the housing units and the sites on which they will be built on the basis of priority within each of the services.

Generally speaking, I believe the action of the conference reflects the thinking of the Senate. The reductions made by the Senate were accepted in the conference. And all but a few of the Senate restorations were provided for. On a few items, we were forced to yield, but in no case was the national security injured.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is the senior Republican member of the Senate conferees. He, too, has signed the report, as did all other members of the conference committee. I yield now to him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I support the military construction conference report. We have agreed with the House conferees upon the most important needs of the military when there was a difference between the two versions.

The House has accepted the Senate provision on housing. It is the best method of providing 7,500 houses a year. We leave it to the Department of Defense to determine which of the housing needs have the greatest priority. We do not try to make that decision in the Congress, although as expressed in the conference report we are desirous of being informed how this program is carried out.

I hope the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I understand that the conference report is unanimous.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. As I have said, the Senator from Massachusetts and I signed the report together.

Mr. President, unless there are questions which Senators may wish to ask, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD comparative tables as prepared by the conference committee.

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Conference action on appropriations for military construction, fiscal year 1964, showing 1963 appropriations, 1964 estimates, and congressional action

Item No. (1)	Memo page No. (2)	Title (3)	Appropriations, 1963 (4)	Budget estimate, 1964 (5)	House (6)	Senate (7)	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
								Budget estimate	House	Senate
		DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY								
	7	Military construction, Army	[1] $181,272,000	$249,500,000	$200,293,000	$207,070,000	$200,646,000	−$48,854,000	+$353,000	−$6,424,000
		Military construction, Army Reserve	8,000,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000			
	75	Military construction, Army National Guard	7,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	+2,200,000	+2,200,000	
		DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY								
	9	Military construction, Navy	[2] 193,355,000	269,900,000	194,000,000	202,223,000	198,853,000	−71,047,000	+4,853,000	−3,370,000
		Military construction, Naval Reserve	7,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000			
		DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE								
	11	Military construction, Air Force	[3] 847,810,500	628,200,000	451,000,000	487,090,000	468,275,000	−159,925,000	+17,275,000	−18,815,000
		Military construction, Air Force Reserve	5,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000			
		Military construction, Air Guard	14,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000			
		OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE								
	15	Military construction, Defense agencies	35,677,000	29,900,000	24,000,000	27,000,000	24,000,000	−5,900,000		−3,000,000
	17	Loran stations, Department of Defense	20,000,000	20,500,000	14,500,000	20,500,000	20,500,000		+6,000,000	
		Total, military construction	1,319,114,500	1,232,000,000	917,793,000	980,083,000	948,474,000	−283,526,000	+30,681,000	−31,609,000

[1] Includes $46,625,000 family housing.

[2] Includes $92,542,000 family housing.

[3] Includes $100,771,000 family housing.

Conference action on appropriation for family housing, defense, 1964, showing 1963 appropriations, 1964 estimates, and congressional action

Item No.	Memo page No.	Title	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimate, 1964	House	Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with		
								Budget estimate	House	Senate
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)				
	217	Family housing, Army:								
		Construction		$57,400,000	$41,364,000	$34,681,000	$34,681,000	−$22,719,000	−$6,683,000	
		Operation, maintenance, and debt payments		188,290,000	183,396,000	183,396,000	183,396,000	−4,894,000		
	221	Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps:								
		Construction		94,700,000	80,036,000	68,248,000	68,248,000	−26,452,000	−11,788,000	
		Operation, maintenance, and debt payments		95,981,000	93,944,000	93,944,000	93,944,000	−2,037,000		
	220	Family housing, Air Force:								
		Construction		97,850,000	50,321,000	61,027,000	61,027,000	−36,823,000	+10,706,000	
		Operation, maintenance, and debt payments		197,583,000	193,514,000	193,514,000	193,514,000	−4,069,000		
		Family housing, Defense agencies:								
		Construction		50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000			
		Operation, maintenance, and debt payments		2,546,000	2,546,000	2,546,000	2,546,000			
	19	Total, family housing	[1](691,715,448)	734,400,000	645,171,000	637,406,000	637,406,000	−96,994,000	−7,765,000	
		Total	1,319,114,500	1,966,400,000	1,562,964,000	1,617,489,000	1,585,880,000	−380,520,000	+22,916,000	−31,609,000

[1] No appropriation as such for fiscal year 1963 under this account. The amount of $691,715,448 was transferred from other appropriations and the unobligated balance of the Wherry housing revolving fund.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if there are no questions to be asked about the conference report, I move its adoption.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SOLICITATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL DINNERS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in January 1963, there was much talk, in the press and out, pertaining to the solicitation of Federal employees for contributions to political dinners. On January 17, I stated on the floor of the Senate that it was not the intent of the Hatch Act to prohibit a classified civil service employee from voting as he pleases or even attending a dinner properly labeled a birthday or party dinner. But that it was the intent of the law to prohibit the solicitation of a Federal employee for funds to such an occasion.

Mr. President, I made that statement because I was convinced that if such procedure were permitted to continue, it could ruin the entire merit system. Other Senators also spoke against such political maneuverings.

After so much adverse publicity had been exhibited against these solicitations, it was reported that the late President Kennedy stated that such pressure "was not right" and should not be allowed to recur.

Mr. President, it appears that these pressure tactics have recurred. I, for one, do not believe they should be permitted. I sincerely believe if we are to have a good reliable merit system, the career employee must be protected from political harassment—and that is regardless of political party. As a Member of the Senate and ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I hope the Federal employees will not yield to this pressure. I can assure them they will have my full support.

Mr. President, Joe Young, of the Washington Star, and a champion of the career Federal employee, has written a good article on "Democrats Solicit U.S. Employees for $100 Tickets to Fund Fete." The article of December 12, 1963 states that—

> The Democratic National Committee is soliciting $100 contributions from Government career employees for tickets to a Democratic fundraising affair to be held next year.

Mr. President, the article sets forth in detail some of the procedures being followed by the Democratic National Committee—procedures which hardly follow the letter of law pertaining to the merit system—procedures which cause career employees to fear for their jobs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT—DEMOCRATS SOLICIT U.S. EMPLOYEES FOR $100 TICKETS TO FUND FETE

(By Joseph Young)

The Democratic National Committee is soliciting $100 contributions from Government career employees for tickets to a Democratic fundraising affair to be held here next year.

In fact, Federal careerists have received two communications from the Democratic National Committee in connection with the affair, one signed by Chairman John Bailey.

The solicitation is similar to the one last year when efforts of the Democratic National Committee to pressure Federal career employees to purchase $100 tickets for the Democratic gala held last January brought criticism from merit groups, the press, and Republican Members of Congress.

SOLICITING RENEWED

However, apparently undaunted, the Democratic National Committee is soliciting funds from Government civil servants again.

Career employees from the middle grades on up have received invitations to the affair. In some cases employees in grades as low as grade 9 ($6,675 a year) reported being contacted by the Democratic committee.

The first communication in early November was a formal invitation from the Democratic National Committee. Mailed to the employees at their homes, the letter states the committee "requests the pleasure of your company at the Third Inaugural Salute."

Accompanying this was a card to be filled out, detailing how many tickets (at $100 apiece) the employee wanted. There was also a self-addressed envelope to the Democratic Anniversary Committee, Post Office Box 1213, Washington 13, D.C., to enclose the contribution.

The affair was to have been held at the National Guard Armory on January 23. The assassination of President Kennedy caused the sponsors to cancel the event.

SECOND LETTER

However, about a week ago the career employees received a letter from Democratic National Chairman John Bailey telling them that while the event had been cancelled, a similar event will be scheduled later in the year and that they would be contacted later and advised of the date.

The form letter written by Mr. Bailey is as follows:

"DEAR FRIEND: I am writing to you for Sidney Salomon, chairman of the January affair, to announce that it has been canceled. It is planned to schedule a similar event later in the year and I will advise you of the date when it has been selected.

"I would like to extend my appreciation to those of you who have already contributed. We are taking the liberty of holding these contributions until the new date has been announced, at which time the tickets will be forwarded.

"Sincerely,

"JOHN M. BAILEY."

Democratic officials deny that pressure is being used; they contend the employees have a free choice of purchasing or not purchasing tickets.

EMPLOYEES FEAR EFFECT

However, career employees feel differently. They fear that unless they purchase the $100 tickets, their chances for advancement in their careers is apt to be jeopardized.

Furthermore, they fear it puts them in an untenable position whenever there might be a change of national political administrations.

They point out that one of the first things a new political administration does when taking office is to scan the list of contributors to the opposite political party, to see if Federal employees are on the list. This could and has led to recriminations against employees.

After the adverse publicity of last year's pressure on Government career employees, it was reported by administration insiders that the late President Kennedy said that such pressure "wasn't right" and should not be allowed to recur.

Federal civil servants are hoping that the Johnson administration, in concert with the Civil Service Commission, will make it plain that Federal civil servants are under no obligation to purchase these $100 tickets and that their careers will not be endangered if they don't buy them.

Better still, they hope that President Johnson will use his power to see to it that no more direct solicitation of Federal employees is allowed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Kansas for his statement, and I particularly wish to commend Mr. Joseph Young of the Washington Evening Star for his timely and forthright reporting on the continued efforts by the National Democratic Committee to pressure our civil service employees into making contributions to the Democratic fundraising dinners. Mr. Young's long and confidential relationship with many of our civil service employees makes his observations worthy of attention and credence—and I refer particularly to the statement that these employees "fear that unless they purchase the $100 tickets, their chance for advancement in their careers is apt to be jeopardized."

There is only one answer to this, Mr. President, and that is for the leader of the Democratic Party, President Johnson, to direct the National Democratic Party to cease and desist from such unethical pressures. It will not do to have some Government officials say that there is no requirement to purchase these tickets, and that failure to purchase will have no effect on an employee's future promotions. The damage has already been done. The fear exists, and it is not irresponsible fear. It is fear based on experience. President Johnson ought to issue an Executive order making it clear that no civil service employees shall be permitted to purchase these $100 tickets. Only then will this fear be laid to rest.

I think that this action is highly unethical and unfair. But it is particularly repulsive coming at a time when this Nation is still in a period of mourning over the untimely death of our late President. One would think that the National Democratic Committee would have the good taste to select another period of time for pressuring our civil service employees.

May I say that I also believe this would be a timely occasion for the leaders of the various unions of civil service employees to adopt resolutions in opposition to practices such as this. The integrity of the civil service system—indeed of the executive branch of our Government—is at stake. I might add that these same practices were indulged in a year ago, and Mr. Young faithfully reported them. There were a few calloused protestations of innocent intent at the time, but nothing happened. In fact, since that time the Secretary of Labor has seen fit to solicit contributions for one of the Democratic candidates for reelection to the Senate next year—a practice which should never have happened and never recur.

The public is already sufficiently exercised over reports relating to the Bobby Baker affair and its potential involvement of members of the legislative and executive branches of the Government. Now its patience is being tried still further by this action of the National Democratic Committee. If this is the kind of ethics the people want in their Federal Government, they will have an opportunity to express their approval in the 1964 election. I am confident that they will make it very clear that they want no more of these practices on the part of officials who are working for them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does not the Senator from Kansas agree that perhaps the so-called moratorium can be applied to political speeches but does not apply to the political wherewithal that makes the "mare" go?

Mr. CARLSON. I hope it is more than a moratorium on the political contributions that are requested of Federal employees through a letter from a committee national chairman.

Mr. McGOVERN subsequently said: Mr. President, a short while ago, while I was presiding, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] took strong exception to an invitation which has been sent by the Democratic National Committee to certain Government employees asking them to contribute to a party function to be held sometime after the first of the year. The Senator from Iowa went so far as to suggest that the President of the United States ought to issue an order instructing Government employees that they should not make political contributions.

I disagree 100 percent with the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa. I see absolutely nothing wrong with the letters that were sent by Chairman Bailey to certain Government employees inviting them to contribute to their party.

This same procedure has been followed by both political parties from time immemorial, and I think it should be. I do not think there is anything sacred about a Government employee. He is a citizen, like the rest of us. He is prevented from doing certain things under the Hatch Act. He is prevented from soliciting from other Government employees. But it is perfectly proper, and I think it is the responsibility, of a good party chairman to ask the members of it to contribute to the party of their choice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I to understand that a Member of Congress has objected to the chairman of the national committee of a recognized political party writing a letter to a fellow citizen asking that he make a contribution to the political party?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator is exactly correct.

I think the Senator from Minnesota will agree that we ought to regard it as a privilege in this country to contribute to the party of our choice. We live under a two-party system of government in this country. It requires money to operate our political parties. I personally regard it as a privilege to contribute to my political party, just as I regard it as a privilege to contribute to my church.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall that in about 1956 a dinner was held in the Minneapolis auditorium, at Minneapolis, Minn., at which time our Secretary of Defense, who should not have been making political and partisan speeches, was doing so. Just about everyone who had received a contract for erasers or pen points received a letter asking him to come to the dinner and make a generous little contribution of $100 a ticket. The Republican chairman who invited the citizens to come to that dinner was a very persuasive man. I envy his talents, because 5,000 persons came to the dinner, 1,000 of them at $100 a plate.

Of course, our Republican friends have some love for the so-called class structure. There was another group that came in at a lesser amount. The Minneapolis auditorium holds a large group of people. About 5,000 people were there to hear our Republican Secretary of Defense. The chairman of the Republican National Committee of our State and the national chairman obviously were very effective in sending out letters. I received one. I am happy to report that I did not attend, but I appreciate being included on the selected mailing list, because it was to be a select list. I was invited to attend a select dinner. There were tables with fancy decorations. I was included in the $100 list. There were some who were included on the $50 list, and I suppose there were some that went down to the $5 gallery sections.

I say to the Senator from South Dakota that I did not protest then, and I do not protest now. I stand here in awe and admiration for the success of that invitation. It is a better way of raising money than some other ways. One of the great needs in politics today is to find ways and means of raising campaign contributions so that candidates are not under obligations or pressures by those who have delivered. There is no better way to make such contributions than through attendance at dinners and similar gatherings, where only a limited contribution is made. If one makes a contribution of under $100, the candidate is not likely to be subject to political influences and pressures.

I commend Mr. Bailey for his success. If he is not successful, I invite him to consult the Republican chairman of my State and National chairman who did a fine job in Washington on several occasions.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator may not have discovered yet one technique which took place in the 1960 campaign, when I played a part as a candidate for the Senate. I was mildly surprised that the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Boyd Leedom, and a member of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Sigurd Anderson, joined in an appeal by letter to Government employees and to other citizens in Washington, and throughout the Nation, inviting them to contribute to my opponent. I did not raise any fuss about that, although I thought it was a little odd for members of two regulatory commissions to be soliciting political contributions. But what is involved here is something entirely different. This is not the chairman of the National Labor Relations Board. This is not a member of the Federal Trade Commission. It is the top political officer of the Democratic Party—Chairman Bailey. No one has been able to cite a single instance in which an employee of the Government was pressured against his will to contribute to this fund-raising effort. On the contrary, our party officials have gone out of their way to make it clear that no employee need fear any obligation. It is a purely voluntary effort. It is an invitation from a responsible political committee to citizens to contribute. I think they should. Any Government employee has an obligation that goes perhaps beyond that of the ordinary citizen to contribute to our great two-party process. I would feel something like a "dead beat" if I worked for the U.S. Government, or any other organization, and was too cheap to make a modest contribution to the political party of my choice.

If a person has no political convictions, if he is something of a political eunuch, who has no concern about public issues, that is perhaps a different matter; but those people are not required to contribute. Nobody is required to contribute. This is an invitation to contribute.

I found no evidence of any undue pressure being exerted. The Senator from Iowa and, I believe, also the Senator from Kansas, implied that there was something unethical—I believe they used that word—about letters of this kind going out during the official mourning for our beloved late President. I wish to clarify the record on that point.

The first letter of appeal went out prior to the tragic death of President Kennedy. The second letter went out to notify the people who had received the first letter that the inaugural salute dinner had been canceled, but telling them that sometime next year there would be a party fund-raising function and that at that time they would again be asked to contribute.

I believe this matter has been handled according to the best standards of political responsibility, and I urgently hope that our fellow Government employees will fulfill their obligations as good citizens and make some modest contribution to the party of their choice.

I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding to me.

OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall take about 10 minutes.

Yesterday, I introduced into the RECORD six case histories of gas and oil magnates with incomes of over a million dollars a year who paid either no taxes or very little or small taxes. One of these cases was that of a man who had an economic income of over $26 million in 1 year and did not pay a single cent in taxes. All this was probably done legally, but to my mind it shows a shocking lack of concern for the great common purposes of our Government and of our society.

Today, I should like to introduce into the RECORD material on the estimated depletion allowances taken by 30 of the great oil and gas companies of the country. This material is drawn from the magazine Fortune, published by Mr. Henry R. Luce, the organ of the wealthy business groups in the Nation. I do not believe any one can charge Fortune magazine with being in league with the dark forces of disorder. The material that I introduce is from page 206 of the issue which was published in April of this year.

The article produces material, in the main, on integrated gas and oil companies which are not only producing companies, but also processing companies. In the past it has been difficult to segregate their production from their processing. As a consequence, it has been difficult to estimate the precise amount of the depletion allowances they have taken.

The magazine Fortune has been able to obtain for each of these companies their net crude oil and gas production measured in physical units, and has multiplied the production of the physical units by the average price during 1961, or for fiscal year ended not later than June 30, 1962. It has, therefore, been able to obtain the value of the oil and gas thus produced.

In this connection, it should be remembered that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, in submitting his report last February, showed that a survey of some 350 oil companies, including most of the large ones, showed an average realized depletion during the 3 years 1958–60, of 26.4 percent.

It will be remembered that the depletion allowance, in addition to other tax favors, is 27½ percent of the gross revenue up to 50 percent of net revenue.

Secretary Dillon showed that the average was only 1 percentage point less than the maximum of 27½ percent. Fortune magazine reached the justifiable conclusion that an average so close to the maximum meant that the great majority of companies were clustered around the average. They, therefore, applied this figure of 26.4 percent to the estimated gross revenue of the 30 companies which they studied and they obtained a probable estimated figure therefor of what the total depreciation allowance amounted to for each of the 30 companies.

When they made their final computations, they submitted the figures to the respective companies and asked the companies to comment upon them.

Fortune magazine goes on to say that nearly two-thirds of the companies said the estimates were fairly close. Some offered minor revision. There were, however, some critical comments.

I believe it can be assumed, therefore, that these figures by Fortune magazine are comparatively accurate and that for the first time we have broken through the difficulty of segregating the producing income from the processing income.

I should like to give the main features of these results today, so that they may become a matter of record.

First, I should like to consider the five Standard Oil companies: Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; Standard Oil Co. of California; Standard Oil Co. of Indiana; Socony, which is the Standard Oil Co. of New York; and the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio.

The estimated depletion allowance for Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey was $399 million. For the Standard Oil Co. of California, it was $130 million. For the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, it was $110 million. For the Socony, or Standard Oil Co. of New York, it was $110 million. For the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, it was $10 million—a total for the five Standard Oil companies or the Rockefeller companies of $759 million.

I point out that this is $759 million of net income which is tax free. It is in addition to the deductions for depreciation, for operating costs, for the expense of drilling dry holes, and for the some 75 to 90 percent of exploration drilling and developing costs which the tax laws in this industry allow to be written off in the first year.

This is in addition to everything else.

It is interesting to consider the next five companies.

The Gulf Oil Co. received a depletion allowance deduction of $228 million. It is commonly held that the Gulf Oil Co. is largely controlled by the Mellon family.

Texaco had a depletion allowance of $216 million, and the Swayne and Hogg families were the dominant elements in that company.

Shell had a depletion allowance of $114 million. Shell is a foreign company primarily owned by Dutch and British interests. It is commonly believed that the House of Nassau, the ruling house of the Netherlands, has a heavy influence in this company. There may be other regal influences and ownership as well.

Phillips had $66 million of depletion allowances. This is the famous Phillips 66.

Cities Service had $59 million. This is the former Daugherty Co.

The total of 10 companies had depletion allowances of $1,442 million.

Then came another group of medium-sized giants.

Continental, controlled by the Marland family interests, had $53 million of depletion allowances.

Sinclair—as its name indicates, dominated by the Sinclair family, started by Harry F. Sinclair—had $52 million.

Atlantic, which is, I am informed, a breakup of the Standard Oil interests, with perhaps some Rockefeller interests remaining, had $49 million.

Sun had $47 million. Sun is managed by the famous Pew family of Philadelphia and Bryn Mawr, who have had extensive publishing interests.

Superior Oil Co., formerly operated by the Keck group, received $38 million.

It will be remembered that some years ago Mr. Keck, at the time of the gas bill was under consideration, distributed a plentiful shower of $2,500 checks to candidates for the U.S. Senate through the Middle West. This was exposed by a very honorable and courageous Member of the Senate, the late Senator Francis Case of South Dakota. I sat by the late Senator Case while the special committee appointed by the Senate probed the revelations which he had made. For the first 3 days I thought it was Senator Case who was being put on trial, rather than Superior Oil, but the late Senator Case stood his ground because he had a clear conscience.

In addition Tidewater had $33 million, and Skelly had $23 million; a total of $56 million. These companies are controlled by the Getty interests, headed by Mr. J. Paul Getty, who has lived abroad for a great many years. Exactly where he pays his taxes, I do not know, but he is quite well known in the field of international finance and in the field of international entertainment.

I could go on, Mr. President, but I summarize by saying that the Standard Oil group received a total of $759 million and the next 5 received slightly less than $700 million, or a total of $1,442 million received by the first 10.

If we add the next five, we get a grand total of $1,681 million or, to all intents and purposes, $1.7 billion free of taxes.

Fortune also showed what this amounted to per share of common stock. There may be a misprint in connection with Superior Oil, so I reserve the right to correct, as of a later date, the figures on the depletion allowance per common share for Superior Oil, which is cited as being $89.89. This may not be accurate.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to ask the Senator a question.

Is the Senator getting at the point that if an oil company has achieved a certain amount of percentage depletion the entire amount of that is automatically reflected in the value of its stock at the end of the year?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am saying that they get a certain amount of oil and gas production income, which in practice seems to be about 26½ percent of gross revenue, completely free of taxation. The figures which I have just given were for the total amount in millions and hundreds of millions of dollars. The figures on the shares of common stocks which I have just introduced were derived by Fortune magazine by dividing those millions of dollars by the number of shares of common stock, to get an average figure per share.

Mr. MILLER. I understood that was the point the Senator was making.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I suggest to the Senator that this would not at all be an accurate or realistic way to handle this problem. I am sure the Senator, with his great amount of experience in this particular field, knows that the money does not all go into the bank, and that the great portion of it is used for the continued exploration activities by the oil companies, much of it being lost and deducted as a matter of intangible drilling and development cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Other companies which pay their taxes pay 52 percent of their net profits to the Federal Government in the form of taxes, and those companies are freed from a large proportion of taxes by the depletion allowance.

When I last looked at the combined figure, I believe oil and gas companies paid only about 24 percent of their net income in the form of taxes, as compared to 52 percent paid by the great mass of American companies of equal size.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLER. Surely the Senator from Illinois realizes that a real comparison between an oil company of the kind to which he has been referring and other types of business operations cannot be made, because the other types of business operations do not have to take nearly as much of their profit for use for continued exploration-type activities, much of which is lost and is, of course, deducted in turn through the intangible drilling and development costs.

In other words, I do not believe the Senator can compare the economic situation under which the oil companies operate and the economic situation under which other companies operate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am only taking the figures given by Fortune magazine and Mr. Henry R. Luce, one of the strong supporters of the party of which the distinguished Senator from Iowa is a member. If the Senator from Iowa wishes to quarrel with Mr. Luce, I suggest he go to the Rockefeller Center, go up to the 42d floor, and see the view from there.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa is not quarreling with the figures the Senator from Illinois has been giving the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are given in Fortune.

Mr. MILLER. I am disputing the interpretation the Senator from Illinois seeks to draw therefrom. That is exactly the point. The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Iowa might agree 100 percent with the figures Mr. Luce has given in this article. I hope, before the Senator completes his statement, he will indulge me with a little colloquy to develop the precise point, so that those who read the RECORD will know there is more than one side to this question.

I am sure the Senator from Illinois realizes I have no interest in oil whatever. I come from a State which has no oil. There is some oil in the State from which the Senator from Illinois comes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Quite a good deal.

Mr. MILLER. But while I worked at one time as a member of the Chief Counsel's Office in the Internal Revenue Service I had an opportunity to work on some oil cases, and I think I know something about the situation in the oil industry.

May I ask the Senator a question? Is the Senator suggesting, when he points out that there is a $1.7 billion tax-free depletion allowance that some 15 oil companies have obtained, that Congress should wipe out that allowance, so that there will not be $1.7 billion of such tax-free income? As a very noted economist, does the Senator not really believe that this is such a built-in part of the cost of petroleum production that that $1.7 billion is going to get into the cost of the end product and result in an increase in the price that people will have to pay for oil, gas, and fuel?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the first place, the Senator from Iowa evidently does not understand what the Senator from Illinois is proposing. I have proposed several times that for small oil and gas enterprises, whose gross receipts in a given year are less than $1 million, there be no change in the depletion allowance percentage, but that it remains at 27½ percent; but on the increment between $1 million and $5 million the depletion percentage should be reduced to 21 percent, instead of 27½ percent; and that on the increment above $5 million the depletion allowance should be reduced to 15 percent. This would save $400 million for the taxpayers. It would be a far more productive use of resources than to give this amount to companies, encouraging, in effect, what is overinvestment in this line. That is all I am contending for. The Senator from Illinois is most moderate in what he is trying to do. He is astounded at his own moderation.

Mr. MILLER. Am I to understand now that the Senator is suggesting that the figure of $400 million represents overinvestment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I say this is an amount which can be trimmed off the $2,200 million which the industry as a whole seems to receive——

Mr. MILLER. I am sorry. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. According to the figures submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury, the estimate of the total amount of the depletion allowance for the oil and gas industry was $2,200 million. Those 15 companies obtained $1,700 million. They include companies with assets of over $100 million, who get over 70 percent of the depletion allowance. All I am proposing is trimming $400 million off the $2,200 million and have it go to the people of the United States, instead of to the owners of the property.

Mr. MILLER. Is the Senator from Illinois asserting that if his proposal were adopted, the $400 million to which he has referred would go into the Treasury, without more, or might he not recognize that the $400 million would end up in additional cost of petroleum products to the general American consumer?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; it would go into the Treasury, and, as a result of a somewhat lower return, it would lead to a reduced volume of investment in the industry, much of which is now uneconomic because it is done for tax purposes. This is an industry which, though it will not admit the fact, is overcapitalized in the sense that there is more capital in it than there should be.

Mr. MILLER. Of course, the Senator recognizes that there may be some differences of opinion over his statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Iowa has been a tax lawyer. He knows that when decisions are made on the basis of taxes rather than earnings, an uneconomic consideration has been introduced.

Mr. MILLER. I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that if his proposal were adopted, the $400 million to which he has referred would end up in additional cost of gasoline, oil, and fuel to the general American consumer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to make clear that these surpluses are out of profits. They do not enter into costs. They are surpluses above cost.

Mr. MILLER. But take away those surpluses, which have long been built into the highly competitive pricing of petroleum products, and I am quite sure we shall see an increase in the price of those products.

The unfortunate feature is that when the price of gasoline, oil, or fuel is increased, the general American public pays that cost, and there is no graduated payment. That is akin to an excise tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, if Mr. Getty has his income diminished, it is going to increase costs? And that is true of the Mellons, the Rockefellers, the Sinclairs, the Pews and the Kecks?

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa is not saying that when an individual's income is reduced by an additional tax, that will necessarily be reflected in an increased cost of products.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then the Senator should not be defending the man——

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Illinois knows better than the Senator from Iowa that it is an old axiom that any time corporate—not individual—costs are increased, whether by increased taxes, or a reduced amount of deductions, or increased labor costs, sooner or later it is the general consumer who pays. In the case of the graduated income tax, there are differences in burdens. If the $400 million to which the Senator has referred is now being made up by the general taxpayers throughout the United States, it means that taxpayers, who are subjected to different kinds of graduated income tax, pay according to their relative ability to pay.

If he takes the $400 million away, and this ends up as an increased cost in end items, the people who are less able to pay are going to be stuck with the difference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Iowa maintain that if a man who got $28 million a year and did not now pay any taxes, and later he had to pay a million dollars in taxes, it would mean that the cost of gasoline would go up?

Mr. MILLER. No. The Senator from Iowa has just pointed out that he makes no such claim with respect to individuals. It is with respect to corporations. If we increase the corporate costs, it is the consumer who ultimately will have to pay. I am sure the Senator knows that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What about Superior Oil, and the Keck Co., which, over a period of 5 years, had $65 million in profits and did not pay a cent in taxes, and got a refund of approximately $400,000? Is the Senator from Iowa saying that if they had paid taxes, the price of oil to the consumer would have gone up?

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa is pointing out that when the entire industry, to which the Senator's proposal would apply, is stuck with additional taxes, the competitive situation in the oil industry will bring about an increase in the cost to the consumer.

It is not possible to single out one man, or one company. It is necessary to consider a collective group. That is the point I am afraid the Senator from Illinois is not bringing out in his constant and, I am sure, very sincere criticism of this situation. What the Senator from Iowa is trying to do is to put this matter in its proper perspective.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator really believe these companies ought to get by without paying any taxes?

Mr. MILLER. Of course, no one is going to argue that someone who should pay taxes should not pay any taxes. However, what the Senator from Illinois fails to bring out in such a case is that when we talk about percentage depletion, it cannot exceed 50 percent of net income. Therefore, if a corporation or an individual has a $20 million net income, there cannot possibly be more than $10 million in deduction by percentage depletion.

The Senator forgets to bring out in such a question that the differences may come from net operating loss carryovers or carrybacks, and those adjustments are applicable to all businesses. The Senator fails to point out intangible drilling and development costs, if they are incurred in a company's attempts to find additional oil resources.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are written off in the first year while these same kinds of costs for the ordinary company have to be depreciated over a long period of time.

Mr. MILLER. These are continuing operations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I remind the Senator from Iowa that he does not take into consideration certain other things, such as the 14-point deduction, from 52 to 38 percent which is given to those companies which drill and operate in the Western Hemisphere, and which constitutes an additional benefit to Standard Oil, which has its fields in Venezuela. I wish to point out that he does not take into account the special treatment of capital gains, which apply to the oil industry, and on royalties, and a great many other things. This is the most favored tax-treated industry in the Nation. The result is that some huge oil income is untaxed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I hope the Senator from Illinois knows me well enough to know that I will not ignore such facts of life. The point I am trying to bring out is that when the Senator from Illinois makes these points, we ought to bring out the other side of the question, so that the general public will be able to make an informed judgment on it. The Senator spoke about the favored treatment of Western Hemisphere corporations. This is true of many other corporations.

Since the Senator made that point, it is also well to bring out the fact that a very severe competitive situation now exists. This is particularly true with respect to the Soviet Union in the petroleum field. I am sure the Senator from Illinois knows this. I suggest that if we take away some of the tax advantages of our domestic oil companies, we will reduce their competitive ability vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

I am sure the Senator from Illinois does not want that to happen.

I am not saying that we have a perfect tax law. However, I am saying that we ought to be a little careful about jumping hastily to conclusions, or stating generalities which may cause some people to arrive at erroneous conclusions.

I am not questioning the sincerity of the Senator from Illinois. He is a very dedicated individual, and he is very knowledgeable in this field.

However, I would like to bring out the other side, with which I was in contact in my own experience as a civil service employee of the Federal Government a number of years ago.

Speaking of the competitive situation involving the Soviet Union, I believe it is very important, in connection with U.S. foreign policy, that our domestic petroleum companies be able to compete effectively in the world markets. I am sure the Senator from Illinois agrees. I am sure he would not wish to threaten that competitive ability by eliminating one of the main bases on which this competition can be waged.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, because I believe the Senator from Montana wishes to make a speech. However, the Senator from Iowa has wept copious tears about the sad plight of oversea oil companies, which seldom pay any taxes whatever, and who by importing oil into this country drive the small domestic producers out of business.

Standard Oil is the chief offender in this respect. Through its holdings in Venezuela and through its ownership of Aramco—the Arabian-American Oil Co.—it is the chief offender. Incidentally, it can finance its filling stations and permit the filling stations to wage rate wars on the small independents, and in that way drive the small independents out of business.

I shall be very glad to have the Senator take the floor in his own time in defense of these groups. We can continue this discussion at that time.

Unless he has further questions to ask, I ask unanimous consent that certain material from Fortune magazine for April 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Depletion: What's at stake for 30 companies

	Estimated production revenues		Estimated depletion allowance	
	Total (millions)	As proportion of net sales	Total (millions)	Per common share
		Percent		
Standard Oil (New Jersey)	$1,511	18	$399	$1.84
Gulf Oil	862	31	228	2.18
Texaco	817	27	216	1.74
Standard Oil of California	492	24	130	2.05
Shell Oil	430	23	114	1.88
Standard Oil (Indiana)	415	20	110	3.06
Socony Mobil Oil	415	13	110	2.25
Phillips Petroleum	250	20	66	1.92
Cities Service	225	23	59	5.48
Continental Oil	200	25	53	2.47
Sinclair Oil	196	16	52	3.32
Atlantic Refining	185	33	49	5.37
Sun Oil	180	23	47	3.43
Superior Oil	144	99	38	89.89
Marathon Oil	128	36	34	2.37
Tidewater Oil	123	20	33	2.38
Union Oil of California	122	27	32	3.61
Sunray DX Oil	103	22	27	1.51
Armerada Petroleum	100	97	26	4.17
Richfield Oil	97	34	24	2.96
Pure Oil	96	17	25	2.55
Skelly Oil	.86	35	23	3.93
Signal Oil & Gas	53	18	14	1.38
Standard Oil (Ohio)	39	9	10	2.09
Kerr-McGee Oil Industries	19	11	5	.80
Ashland Oil & Refining	17	6	4	.66
Murphy	16	15	4	1.08
Delhi-Taylor Oil	11	10	3	.43
American Petrofina	11	14	3	.40
Clark Oil & Refining	(1)	----------	----------	----------

(1) Negligible.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield the floor, unless the Senator from Iowa has some questions to ask.

Mr. MILLER. No; I have no further questions to ask. I thank my friend from Illinois for his responsive answers. I am sure he recognizes that although he and I may arrive at different conclusions, he agrees that we ought to put all the facts before the people, so that they can arrive at a balanced view.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to debate this subject in the State of the Senator from Iowa, and he can come into my State and debate it with me there.

"EUGENIE II" DOCUMENTED AS VESSEL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 749, S. 1322.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1322) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Eugenie II*, owned by J. C. Strout, of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 4132 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (46 U.S.C. 11), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause that certain vessel now known as the Eugenie II, built in 1955 in New Brunswick, and now owned by J. C. Strout, of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges, upon compliance with the usual requirements so long as the vessel is owned, and shall continue to be owned, by a citizen of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 768), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to document, with full coastwise privileges, the *Eugenie II*, a Canadian-built vessel of approximately 15 net tons.

The Commerce Committee reported and the Senate passed a similar measure applying to this same vessel in the last Congress. The action was too late in the 2d session of the 87th Congress, however, for the House to conclude deliberations.

REASON FOR THE BILL

The *Eugenie II*, a 50-foot vessel, was built in New Brunswick, Canada, in 1955, and hence is not eligible (1) under the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1927, to transport merchandise between points in the United States, and (2) under section 4132 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 11) to be documented for operation in the coastwise trade.

Under existing maritime statutes, vessels constructed in foreign yards are not eligible to participate in the domestic or coastwise trades. This old and durable restriction has been largely responsible for the preservation of American shipyards. At the same time and for unusual and pressing circumstances, the Congress has on rare occasion enacted special legislation permitting individual vessels the right to participate in the domestic trades, a right they might never have had because of foreign construction or one that was lost due to a transfer from American to foreign registry.

In the case at hand, the vessel, *Eugenie II*, is of such limited size that it is unlikely that she would be able to participate in any traffic competitive with that served by American-built craft. Moreover, this ship would provide what appears to the committee to be a desirable and needed service in a portion of the Maine seacoast that could not otherwise be served. Though this is an exception, it is one of such a limited nature that it will not pose a threat to the overall goals of our still sound coastwise restrictions.

The vessel is owned by J. C. Strout, a U.S. citizen, of Milbridge, Maine, who proposes to use it to supply charterboat and mail service in that area if this bill is enacted. Your committee is informed that no such service is presently available and that its initiation would be a welcome addition to the economy of the area.

The Department of Commerce reports that, in view of the small size of the vessel, it has no objection to favorable consideration of the bill, if there is no objection on the part of the Treasury Department whose responsibility it is to administer, through the Bureau of Customs, the navigation laws which cover the documentation of vessels.

The Treasury Department report stated that the question of granting the coastwise privileges sought is a matter of policy upon which the Department expresses no opinion.

No opposition to the bill has been received from any source.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN PERSONS INVOLVED IN FORGED AND FRAUDULENT GOVERNMENT CHECKS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 752, H.R. 4839.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4839) for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiations of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 771), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The proposed legislation would grant relief to persons who became liable to the United States because they negotiated or presented for payment checks originally procured by fraud at the Parks Air Force Base, Calif., when they had no knowledge of any fact which would constitute notice of infirmity of the checks or defect in the title of persons negotiating them. The bill would grant relief by providing authority:

(a) To relieve persons who are determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be liable to the United States by reason of negotiating or presenting for payment any forged or fraudulent check drawn on the Treasury of the United States beginning July 1, 1955, and ending March 31, 1958, provided such persons were without knowledge of any fact which would constitute notice of an infirmity in such check or defect in the title of the person negotiating it;

(b) To authorize refunds to anyone who has made restitution to the United States of any amount for which relief is granted by the bill; and

(c) To relieve the certifying or disbursing officers for all amounts for which relief is granted, if there was no fraud or criminality on the part of such officer.

STATEMENT

The facts of the bill are set out in the following statement from the favorable House Report 321, 88th Congress, 1st session:

"In September 1957 the Air Force Audit Branch, General Accounting Office, reported it had detected irregularities in the processing of payments to military personnel at Parks Air Force Base, Calif. The irregularities were of such a nature that the Office of Special Investigation, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the U.S. Secret Service were immediately requested to make an investigation. (The FBI later withdrew from the investigation.) As a result of the investigation, three enlisted men (T. Sgt. Theodore Barry, S. Sgt. Charles A. Evans, and Airman James R. Hoyle) confessed to the forging of signatures of payees on a number of checks validly issued by the disbursing office at Parks Air Force Base. It also developed that one of the men, assigned to the disbursing office, had obtained and with the assistance of the other two cashed Government checks issued in accordance with fictitious payrolls prepared by him. The investigation and subsequent audits of the records at Parks Air Force Base disclosed that 426 U.S. Government checks totaling $80,079 had been illegally converted to the personal use of the three members. The men have been discharged from the Air Force. They were tried in the Federal district court, San Francisco, Calif., in November 1957. All were convicted and two were committed for 7 years to the Federal Penitentiary, McNeil Island, Wash., and one was given an indeterminate sentence to be served at Federal Correctional Institute, Englewood, Colo.

"In connection with this matter, this committee has carefully considered the report of the Comptroller General of the United States to the Congress concerning the military payroll irregularities at Parks Air Force Base accounts for the period July 1, 1955, through December 31, 1956. During that period, one of the functions of the Parks Air Base was to disburse military pay and travel allowances to members of the Air Force returning to the United States by water transportation from oversea stations in the Pacific area. Copies of transfer orders and pay records were received in advance of members' arrival at Parks. Amounts payable for travel advances and partial pay were computed and checks were drawn so that payments could be made to the servicemen at dockside as they disembarked. When it was learned that a member would be eligible for discharge within 60 days or would be hospitalized, payment was not made at dockside, and the checks for those individuals were to be returned to the finance office for cancellation.

"In the course of the audit it was determined that 126 checks in the amount of $18,190 were diverted from the rightful payees and were fraudulently negotiated. It was found that checks made out to members to be hospitalized and those eligible for discharge within 60 days were not delivered to the payees but were returned to the finance office as outlined above. Then the checks were to be canceled, but there a member of the Air Force, the staff sergeant referred to above, diverted many of the undelivered checks to his own use since no one apparently checked on the disposition of the returned checks. The crime was apparently hidden by the device of lining out payment entries on the pay records so that the amounts would not be charged against members' accounts, thus precluding subsequent complaints from the actual payee of the check involved. Where checks were returned for cancellation after the pay records were transferred to another finance officer, only he could line out the payment entry. In three instances the staff sergeant initiated action which resulted in the Parks Air Force Base finance officers requesting other finance officers having custody of such pay records to line out the postings and the request erroneously indicated that the checks had been canceled. In these cases the finance officer at Parks Air Force Base failed to verify the status of the checks, and they were subsequently forged.

"In the course of the check frauds at Parks Air Force Base checks were also obtained by the processing of fraudulent payrolls. The corrupt sergeant who perpetrated the frauds instructed his clerks to prepare payrolls based on extra transfer orders which were frequently received in his section with the pay records. This was generally done from 2 to 3 weeks after the members concerned had left the base. The payrolls prepared in this fashion were placed in the normal processing line for check preparation. Checks were issued and the same sergeant picked up the payroll and checks from the cashier on the pretext of delivering the checks to the personnel processing squadron for payment of the airmen. He was given the checks to deliver without question. This was done although he prepared the payrolls and had access to the pay records. All of the checks prepared in this manner were converted to unauthorized use.

"It must also be observed that the finance officer executed the required certificate for each of the fraudulent payrolls. This certificate stated that payments had been made to properly identified individuals and entered on their pay records.

"The checks obtained through the manipulation of pay records and the preparation of fraudulent rolls were disposed of by the staff sergeant and his accomplice by forging first endorsements and then negotiating the fraudulent checks. At first the checks were cashed through bartenders and taxicab drivers. When the dishonest servicemen began obtaining checks in larger quantities, a restaurant business called Chicken on Call was opened to serve as an outlet for passing the forged checks.

"This committee has carefully considered the matter of extending legislative relief in accordance with the provisions of this bill, and has determined that such relief is clearly required in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. In making this recommendation, the committee is fully aware of the position of the Treasury Department which states in its report to this committee:

" 'The Treasury Department is opposed to the enactment of private relief legislation in cases involving Treasury checks where the liability of the parties is governed by applicable principles of law.'

"This committee feels that such a statement misses the point completely. The local businessmen and banks from the area surrounding Parks Air Force Base have appealed to the Congress for relief for the very fact that they find themselves bound to pay in this situation. The question of legislative relief in the light of the facts of this case, and the responsibility shared by the Government, cannot be resolved simply by a legalistic reference to the principles of negotiable instruments law.

"In this connection it is relevant to refer to the findings of the Comptroller General as to the fault of the Government in permitting the conditions which made such a fraud possible. In the report to the Congress it was stated:

" 'A review of the circumstances under which the fraud was perpetrated, and particularly the length of time the fraudulent practices were carried on, clearly demonstrates that management failed to provide adequate controls to safeguard the interests of the Government.'

"The basis for this conclusion was that there were failures to segregate payroll duties which enabled the single sergeant to control or participate in all of the duties to provide himself with the opportunity for fraudulent operations. Further, the undelivered checks should have been turned back directly to the finance officer or his deputy. Proper internal control was violated when the same person preparing the payroll could obtain the checks. The report further condemned the inadequate supervision of payroll duties, and stated:

" 'The personnel responsible for management of the base, including the operation of the finance office, did not adequately perform their supervisory duties.'

"Here it was pointed out that there was a failure to check that certified statements relating to the fraudulent payrolls were factually correct. The Comptroller General further noted that resident auditors of the Air Force Auditor General's office responsible for the review of procedures and controls at the base failed to disclose the irregularities although the fraudulent practices were carried on for over a year. On the basis of this record, the committee has concluded that the Government shares in the responsibility for this situation, and it should be noted that had proper controls and procedures been utilized the frauds would not have continued for such a period and consequently the local businessmen and banks would not have been placed in as desperate a position as they ultimately found themselves. The facts of this matter, outlined in some detail in this report, in the opinion of the committee, make it inequitable for the Government to deny relief and thereby require the losses resulting from the fraud to be borne by the individuals, businessmen, and banks in the Parks area.

"This committee feels that it is to the best interest of the Air Force that relief be granted in this instance. In its report to the committee on the bill, the Department of the Air Force stated that it 'supports the objectives' of the bill, but then stated that it deferred to the Treasury Department as to 'technical comment' on the matters involved in sections 1 and 2, the sections which provide for relief and which are the actual heart of the bill. This somewhat ambiguous position has been interpreted by this committee as reflecting the dilemma faced by the Air Force where a sympathetic resolution of the matter would plainly be in the best interest of the Air Force and its relationships with the people in the Parks Air Force Base area.

"On the basis of these considerations the committee recommends that the bill be considered favorably."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF A CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND TO STATE OF DELAWARE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 754, S. 1767.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1767) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the State of Delaware, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to sell and convey to the State of Delaware, by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such federally owned lands of the Fort Miles Military Reservation, Delaware, which are now declared to be excess to the needs of the United States, excluding, however, approximately ten acres located within the town of Lewes, Delaware, known as the off-post housing area.
>
> "Sec. 2. The conveyance authorized herein shall be upon the following terms and conditions.
>
> "a. That portion of the presently excess lands comprising approximately one hundred and fifty-five acres, more or less, which was ceded to the Federal Government by the State of Delaware without cost, shall be conveyed with the improvements thereon to the State of Delaware without monetary payment.
>
> "b. Such lands, other than described in (a) above, as are presently excess shall be conveyed with the improvements thereon to the State of Delaware upon payment to the United States by the State of Delaware of the amount of money determined by the Secretary of the Army to have been paid by the United States for the acquisition of subject lands.
>
> "c. The lands conveyed shall be used solely for educational and/or public park and recreational purposes, and if such use shall ever cease, title to these lands shall revert to, and become the property of the United States which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon.
>
> "d. The State of Delaware shall pay the cost of such surveys as may be necessary to determine the exact legal description of the real property to be conveyed.
>
> "Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Army shall include in the deed of conveyance authorized to be made by this Act a provision authorizing the Secretary of Defense, in any national emergency declared by the President or the Congress, to enter upon and use without cost to the United States the lands conveyed by such deed if such lands are considered necessary for national defense purposes by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of the Army may also include in the deed of conveyance such additional reservations and conditions he considers to be in the public interest."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of calling up the measure is to have it pending. Very likely its consideration will be resumed later in the afternoon.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, not only is the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] a highly respected Member of the Senate, but he has included in his background and his experience in the Senate a marked proficiency in a number of highly important subjects, in the list of which is his lifelong interest in the problem of an adequate water supply for the people of the United States.

The Senator from Nebraska is necessarily absent from the Senate today. He had prepared an excellent statement on S. 1111, recently passed by the Senate. In his comments, the Senator from Nebraska said, in part:

> The development of this Nation's water resources is, in the long run, the most important problem facing the American people.

How true. S. 1111 is designed in some fashion to assist the people of the United States in making progress toward the development of the Nation's water resources.

The distinguished Senator comments with respect to the responsibilities of local government as well as Federal Government in this field. In his text, he gives a deserved salute to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the prime author of S. 1111.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement By Senator Hruska

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

I was on the floor Monday when the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] rose to dictate—as he put it—a memorandum for the files. He spoke of the unrecorded history of the evolution of our water policy and of those who have participated in the foundation of that policy. He referred to the work that has been done by the committees of the Senate and reviewed the individual efforts of several of our colleagues.

The Senator from New Mexico is a humble man, and I was pleased and delighted when several Members of this body rose to return his tribute to them. It was obvious to all that the words they spoke reflected genuine respect and admiration.

I would like to add a further note to those remarks and those expressions of warm sentiment. Dedication and ability are never in short supply when the Senator from New Mexico turns his energies to a problem. Having worked with him on other water conservation matters, I know firsthand of his dedication to this cause. Again we witness Senator Anderson's steady legislative hand guiding S. 1111 and its supporting record.

While perhaps not as spectacular as tax cuts or civil rights, the development of this Nation's water resources is, in the long run, the most important problem facing the American people. By 1980, major portions of the United States will not have sufficient water to meet the demands of a growing population and an expanding industry. Indeed, in some areas a time of crisis already has arrived.

To hesitate or delay today would be to invite an emergency catastrophe tomorrow. We can ill afford another crash program with its inevitable waste and inefficiency. Nor can we be capricious with our time; 1980 may seem remote to some, but experience shows that it takes many years to bring water resource facilities into operation.

Because of the urgent nature of our water resources problem and because I fully agree with the purposes and objectives of S. 1111, I supported its enactment. On balance, it is a sound bill. Moreover, it moves us substantially along the way of water conservation and development, which course cannot be disputed.

It is too early to predict the precise policies that will be adopted under the auspices of this measure. But it is not too early to sound a warning and to point out some dangers for the benefit of those who will administer this program and who will participate in the activities provided by the legislation.

All levels of government have basic responsibilities in the conservation, development, and utilization of water resources. This must not be disturbed. I am hopeful that under this legislation, there will continue to be a deep commitment and full participation at all levels.

We are dealing in an area where there are varied viewpoints and competing rights. As yet, no lines have been drawn to define the areas of respective authority. It behooves us, therefore, to proceed with caution and with due regard for the interests of each sovereignty.

I am not unmindful of the efforts which have been made to avoid controversy. Many troublesome issues have been put aside. However, we can fairly anticipate that there will be disputed points of view both as to issues involving broad policy and issues involving the implementation of the machinery provided in this bill.

I see the States as full and equal partners in the ventures contemplated in S. 1111. Will they in fact achieve this function or will they be overwhelmed by the Federal Government? Will theirs be a meaningful and useful participation or will they be quietly elbowed out of the way and dispatched to a role of unimportance?

How are these problems going to be solved? Whose counsel is going to be heard and whose recommendation are going to be followed? Whose rights are going to be paramount and whose rights servient?

In time these broad questions will come into sharper focus. As the planning involved in this bill moves forward, we will be better able to pinpoint specific weaknesses and consequently, better able to provide specific relief. We have made a good beginning. We have a good foundation on which to build. But we must stand ready to legislate against domination and disproportionate influence and to provide revision and reform whenever and wherever needed.

The point has been made that S. 1111 is merely a planning measure; that it still will be for Congress to authorize and fund the projects that will emerge. This is true. The bill does relate only to planning. But when one considers that it requires months and sometimes years to develop a comprehensive plan for the maximum use of water, it must be recognized that by the time the planning is completed, there is not much anyone can do. In view of this, there is considerable merit in the contention that he who controls the planning controls the water.

It is for this reason that I so strongly urge that the Congress follow the administration of this bill closely. We must be satisfied that no point of view is slighted or ignored. As legislators vested with the final authority, we must be confident that the plans submitted to us are a true and accurate consensus of opinion and that long held rights have been neither disturbed nor destroyed. In short, we must make absolutely certain that no one interest dominates the planning.

S. 1111 is a pioneering effort. It has been conceived in a spirit of cooperation and good faith. If that spirit is continued, much good can be accomplished. If that spirit is lost, considerable harm can be done.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the program for what remains of this week and for the following week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Nothing remains for this week, thank the Lord. But for next week, the following measures, not necessarily in the order that I announce them, will be considered—I hope.

From the Committee on Banking and Currency, probably the Kennedy 50-cent coin bill, which I understand the House will consider on Monday.

From the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chamizal Treaty, which was reported today by a vote of 16 to 0. It will be taken up in the Senate on Tuesday; at least, that is the time tentatively set. It will not be brought up on Monday.

Both S. 2214, relating to the International Development Association, and H.R. 7406, relating to the Inter-American Development Bank, have been reported, and they may likewise be taken up.

Another meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations will be held on Monday, but what the agenda will be as a result of that meeting, I do not know at this time.

From the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, there will come H.R. 6756, the Mesa Verde National Park bill, on which I understand the report was filed today; and S. 792, the Sleeping Bear Dunes bill, the report on which is expected to be filed today or Monday.

From the Committee on the Judiciary there may be some private claim bills.

From the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare we expect to have for consideration S. 2379, a bill to establish a national council on the arts.

From the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, postmaster nominations are expected to be reported.

From the Committee on Public Works, we hope to receive the House joint resolution to rename the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center.

I understand that on Monday the House will act on the foreign aid appropriation bill. I would hope that the Senate Committee on Appropriations could complete its markup of this bill either this weekend or by Monday next, and that the bill could be brought to the floor of the Senate during next week.

In conference at the present time are the District of Columbia, and the legislative, and the Department of Agriculture appropriation bills.

While the appropriation bill for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the judiciary is not in conference at the moment, it is my understanding that it will go to conference either Monday afternoon or Tuesday morning.

That, in general, is the schedule which should keep us quite busy until the 20th of the month.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

DEFENSE AND MR. McNAMARA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for some time the Government Operations Committee has been inquiring into the circumstances surrounding the award of a contract for development of the TFX plane. What will emerge from this investigation, what legislation will derive from it, cannot be foreseen. It is not my intention to anticipate, much less to prejudge the committee's findings. But whatever the outcome, let there be no doubt as to the interest of the Senate in this matter. It is an entirely appropriate and pertinent interest.

Public funds are spent in vast sums for military research and development. Together with the President, it is the Congress which provides the legal basis for the procedures under which these funds are expended. It is the Congress which appropriates these funds. It is the Congress which must answer to the people as to the general wisdom of the appropriations. And in part at least, the Congress must answer for the effectiveness with which these appropriations are disbursed by the executive branch. The very process of committee inquiry, moreover, has significant value in an educative sense. And in the end, that which may be learned in this or any particular case could well have wider legislative application. In inquiring deeply into the TFX matter, therefore, the Committee on Government Operations is discharging a wholly legitimate function by authority of and on behalf of the Senate.

May I say that what has transpired to date in the investigation has led me to take the floor today. I do so to give voice to the views of one Member of the Senate, a Senator from Montana. The views are not new. Rather, they are views which have accumulated over the years and have begun to crystallize in the light of developments in the TFX inquiry.

It is apparent from these hearings, that an immense number of factors were involved in the TFX contract award. Some of these factors are of a military nature. Others are broader than military in their implications. And many are not open or shut tangibles but, rather, involve best judgments on the part of the men who are expected by the nature of the responsibilities entrusted to them to make best judgments.

Since such is the case, I do not believe that it is reasonable to expect any Senator or committee of Senators to say with certainty that Secretary McNamara's decision in the TFX was the right one or the wrong one. Nor do I believe that the spokesman of any particular branch of the armed services is competent to say with certainty that the Secretary's decision was the right one or the wrong one. Nor, in the light of the factors involved, are all of the spokesmen of the military services combined competent to do so. To be sure, their professionalism gives great weight to such objective military opinions as they may advance. But we should not overlook the fact that their very professionalism compels them to regard the development of a piece of military equipment, not in the context of total costs and national policies but largely in terms of military desirability and specific utility and, perhaps, even more pointedly, in terms of military desirability and specific utility as seen against a background of a particular training and service experience. That is as it should be. Military leaders are not required and ought not to be required to answer the questions of the people of this Nation as to the additional tax burdens or the neglected civilian needs which any military cost may entail. But these questions must be answered by someone in this Government. Indeed, they must be answered by the President and by the Congress. And because that is the case and must remain so under a system of free and responsible government, it is not appropriate and it may be misleading to weigh military observations on any weapons system in a vacuum and to assume that decisions arrived at on that basis are automatically the valid decisions.

Even Mr. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense, with all due respect, cannot speak with certainty as to the correctness of his decisions in the TFX matter. Only time, if even that, will permit a logical assessment of his specific judgments.

The truth is that there are no certainties in matters of this kind.

TFX apart, I am inclined to think—and I reason now from history rather than specifics—that at some future date it will be seen in retrospect that Mr. McNamara made many correct decisions as Secretary of Defense and occasionally that he made wrong decisions. But for the present, all that can be asked, all that should be asked, of any man in his position is that, under the President, he exercise every diligence and full dedication to his public responsibility and do his best to reach the best decisions.

On that score, Mr. McNamara needs no defense from me or anyone else. His record speaks for itself. His is, in these times, the most difficult and the most complex assignment in the Government after the President. His immense international responsibilities which dovetail with those of the Secretary of State involve questions of life or death for tens of millions in this country and elsewhere.

In addition, he has the supreme administrative responsibilities for the Defense Establishment. That department now contains a million civilian employees and more than two and a half million men and women in uniform.

Reposed in him is the trust of dispensing public funds in excess of $50 billion a year. a sum equal to more than the total of all other Federal expenditures combined.

In the light of these vast responsibilities, Secretary McNamara has been an outstanding and exceptional servant of the people of this Nation. He was a tower of strength to the late President in carrying the great burdens of Chief Executive. His remaining in office at the request of President Johnson is an assurance to the Nation that we will continue to have the highest possible degree of intelligent, experienced and dedicated public service in this most critical Cabinet position.

Mr. McNamara was confirmed by the Senate as Secretary of Defense to see to it that this Nation has the kind of defense structure which the President, together with the Congress, deem necessary for national security. He was confirmed by the Senate to bring about and maintain that structure at the lowest possible cost to the people of the United States. That—no more, no less—is what the law, the constitutional powers of the Presidency, and the dimensions of the Office of Secretary of Defense requires of him. And I should think that every Member of this body would want to consider a long time, a very long time, before seeking to require anything else of this Secretary of Defense or any other. I should think, too, that we would want to consider a long time, a very long time, before curbing or undermining the authority of the Office of the Secretary of Defense in view of the critical decisions which must be made if this responsibility is to be effectively exercised.

If the Secretary of Defense does not have the authority to make the critical decisions where else shall it be lodged in this Government? What shall we require of the Secretary if it is not the critical decisions? That he serve as a kind of coach or waterboy or, perhaps, a chaplain for the military services? That the final decisions, not merely those of the battlefield but of defense management and technology in effect, shall be made by military personnel? If I may be blunt, Mr. President, it would appear, in that concept, that the Secretary's principal functions would be reduced to fighting for the Defense Establishment's share of the total national budgetary pie and then to keeping the various services from coming to blows over how it is to be divided. If I may be blunt, in prior years we have had our experience with that kind of an approach.

Indeed, the Secretary of Defense is a sort of umpire. But the fact is that the present Secretary of Defense is an umpire who has sought increasingly to establish service needs and expenditures on the basis of the requirements of total national policies and in response to the admonitions of the Congress for economic and efficient operation of the Defense Establishment. He is an umpire who has exercised the authority of his office to say, not only "Yes," but "No," when necessary, and to make the "no" stick. He has exercised the power to say "No," increasingly, to curb that notorious invitation to waste and extravagence, the cost-plus contract. He has exercised the power to say "No" to budgetary requests from the various services which often and understandably are heavily influenced by a one-service rather than an all-service concept of national defense. He has exercised the power to say "No" to separate service purchase of common use items of equipment and supply. And the Congress knows that this type of purchasing did much to bring about the stockpiling of military surpluses, surpluses whose costs dwarf even those engendered in agriculture. He has exercised the power to say "No" to certain new weapons developments. However, any such development may intrigue its advocates, from the national point of view it ought not to be pursued unless it contains sufficient promise and can otherwise justify itself on the basis of cost-to-potential contribution to total defense. And lest there be any doubt of the need of such curbs, I shall read to the Senate a list of projects and their cost to the public—projects which over the past 10 years did indeed intrigue their advocates but which were abandoned before completion or declared obsolete or surplus soon after completion.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY PROJECTS CANCELED, 1953–63

Missile: Dart; canceled 1958; funds invested, $44 million; prime contractor, Aerophysics Corp. A wire-guided surface-to-surface antitank missile with a range of approximately 6,000 yards. This missile system was canceled since the French-designed SS–10 proved to be more effective in this role.

Ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment: Vigilante; cancelled, 1961; funds invested, $32 million; prime contractor, Sperry Gyroscope. A 6-barrel, 37-millimeter automatic antiaircraft gun system mounted on a full-track vehicle chassis and complete with radar fire control. This gun system was canceled since the Mauler surface-to-air missile system has been designed and should be more effective in the antiaircraft role intended.

Other equipment: AN/USD 4 Drone; cancelled, 1960; funds invested, $40 million; prime contractor, Republic Aviation. A medium endurance surveillance drone, capable of carrying a 450-pound payload for 55 minutes duration. This drone program was canceled since it was considered that the AN/USD–5, when developed, could perform this mission as well.

AN/USD 5 Drone; canceled, 1962; funds invested, $103.3 million; prime contractor, Fairchild Astro Corp. A long-endurance surveillance drone, capable of carrying a 450-pound payload for 90 minutes' duration. This drone program was canceled since cost effectiveness studies have indicated that the Air Force with their F4C and RF–101 modernization program can perform the mission more effectively.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY PROJECTS CANCELED, 1953–63

Aircraft: Seamaster; canceled, 1959; funds invested, $330.4 million; prime contractors, Martin Co., Marlan Construction Co. Jet powered mine-laying seaplane. Specialized for low altitude attack against submarine pens. Canceled because of technical problems, high cost and slippage in program.

Missile: Regulus II; canceled, 1958; funds invested, $144.4 million; prime contractors, Ling-Temco, L. F. Stillwell & Co. Surface-to-surface missile with 500-nautical-mile range and weight of 11,570 pounds equipped with Shoran grid guidance. Canceled because it became redundant when better systems were assured before its completion.

Missile: Petrel; canceled, 1957; funds invested, $87.2 million; prime contractors, Fairchild A/C. Air-to-surface missile with 20-nautical-mile range and weight of 3300 pounds equipped with active radar homing plus acoustic torpedo. Canceled for consideration of reasons including state-of-the-art advances, changing military requirements and cost considerations.

Missile: Corvus; canceled, 1960; funds invested, $80 million; prime contractor, Ling-Temco. Air-to-surface missile with 170-nautical-mile range and weight of 1750 pounds equipped with passive or semiactive radar homing. Canceled for consideration of reasons including state-of-the-art advances, changing military requirements, cost considerations, plus contractor difficulties.

Missile: Eagle; canceled, 1961; funds invested, $53 million; prime contractor, Bendix Aviation. Air-to-air missile with 70-nautical-mile range and weight of 1400 pounds equipped with midcourse command plus active radar homing. Since this was the missile system for the Missileer aircraft, it was canceled when Missileer was dropped.

Missile: Meteor; canceled, 1954; funds invested, $52.6 million; prime contractor, MIT. Air-to-air missile with 10-nautical-mile range and weight of 510 pounds and semiactive homing. Canceled in weeding out of early air-to-air missile projects in favor of more promising air-to-air projects.

Missile: Rigel; canceled, 1953; funds invested, $38.1; prime contractor, Grumman A/C. Surface-to-surface missile with 400-nautical-mile range and weight of 19,000 pounds equipped with ramjet, command midcourse, plus radar homing. Canceled for same weeding out process as Meteor above, plus it was a competitor to Regulus.

Missile: Dove; canceled, 1955; funds invested, $33.7 million; prime contractor, Eastman Kodak Co. Air-to-surface missile with gravity bomb and weight of 1,300 pounds equipped with infrared homing. Canceled because of changing requirements plus technical difficulties.

Ship: Submarine underwater propulsion systems; canceled, 1954; funds invested, $25 million; prime contractors, General Electric, Allis-Chalmers, Elliott Co., Westinghouse Electric. Work began in 1945 and continued to 1954 on closed and semiclosed propulsion cycles, all of which could be used to propel submarines in fully submerged conditions. Canceled because of the success of nuclear propulsion.

Other: NRRS, Sugar Grove; canceled, 1962; funds invested, $70 million; prime contractors, Tidewater Construction Co., Patterson-Emerson Construction. A 600-foot diameter, rotatable radio antenna device to provide an improved capability in space research and intelligence gathering activities. Canceled because costs increased from initial estimate of less than $80 million to over $190 million and, during the period when the structural design phase of the antenna was in progress, other scientific techniques capable of performing the antenna functions were perfected.

Zip fuel: canceled, 1959; funds invested, $123 million; prime contractor, Callery Chemical Co. Fuel of 50 percent higher energy than jet fuel, for use in gas turbines. Canceled because of high cost and technical difficulties.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE PROJECTS CANCELED, 1953–63

AIRCRAFT

ANP: Canceled, 1961; funds invested, $511.6 million; prime contractors, Boeing/General Dynamics, G.E./P. & W. This was a program to develop a nuclear-powered, long-range, long-endurance aircraft for possible strategic application. The program was canceled because it had inadequate military potential in any form which was technically feasible.

F–108: Canceled, 1959; funds invested, $141.9 million; prime contractor, North American. This program was for development of a long-range (1,000 mile), supersonic, manned interceptor, equipped with a highly sophisticated fire control system, to counter the airborne bomber threat of the 1960's and 1970's. The overall program was canceled because of the relative decrease of the manned bomber threat.

XF–103: Canceled, 1957; funds invested, $104 million; prime contractor, Republic. This was an advanced fighter concept for a titanium mach 3.0 fighter, powered by a dual cycle—turbojet/ramjet—propulsion system. It was canceled primary as a result of technical problems—for example, poor visibility, J–67 engine problems—rising costs, and greater promise of the F–108 program—for example, long range.

F–107: Canceled, 1957; funds invested, $100 million; prime contractor, North American. This was a fighter-bomber development program in competition with the F–105. It was canceled in favor of the latter, which proved to be a superior weapon system.

J–83 Engines: Canceled, 1959; funds invested, $55 million; prime contractor, Fairchild. This was a small lightweight turbojet engine in the 2,000-pound-thrust range, for possible missile or aircraft application. It was canceled in favor of a competitively superior engine.

C–132: Canceled, 1957; funds invested, $54 million; prime contractor, Douglas. This was a turboprop heavy long-range transport designed to carry a 100,000-pound payload. It was canceled because of potential high cost and because the C–133, although not capable of as high a payload, appeared sufficiently versatile to meet Air Force needs.

T–61 Engine: Canceled, 1959; funds invested, $37.4 million; prime contractor, Allison. This was an internal combustion turboprop engine of advanced design. Cancellation was based on the fact that the engine had not been designated for application to any specific future weapon system.

H–16: Canceled, 1954; funds invested, $23.4 million; prime contractor, Vertol. This was an extremely large fuselage, twin-rotor, high capacity helicopter. Hampered by technical problems, delays and cost overrun, it was canceled as a result of reappraisal following the crash of an experimental model.

MISSILES

Navaho: Canceled 1957; funds invested, $679.8 million; prime contractor, North American. This was a supersonic surface-to-surface intercontinental strategic missile. It was canceled in its flight test phase, having been overtaken by the accelerated ICBM development program.

Snark: Canceled, 1962; funds invested, $677.4 million; prime contractor, Northrop. This was a subsonic surface-to-surface intercontinental strategic missile. Although completely developed and placed in the active inventory, it was rendered quickly obsolete by the accelerated ICBM program.

GAM–63 Rascal: Canceled, 1958; funds invested, $448 million; prime contractor, Bell. This was an air-launched air-to-surface missile for use by strategic forces (B–47). The program was canceled in favor of the inherently superior Hound Dog.

GAM–87 Skybolt: Canceled, 1963; funds invested, $440 million; prime contractor, Douglas. This was a ballistic missile to be air launched from the B–52 or British Vulcan bombers. Cost escalation, time delay, revised estimates of actual performance, and availability of other ways to do the job better on a cost-effectiveness basis caused cancelation.

Talos—land based: Canceled, 1957; funds invested, $118.1 million; prime contractor, Bendix. This was a land-based surface-to-air missile for the air defense mission. Air Force effort terminated when short-range surface-to-air missiles were designated as an Army sole responsibility.

Mobile Minuteman: Canceled, 1962; funds invested, $108.4 million; prime contractor, Boeing. This program consisted of the present Minuteman surface-to-surface missile transported and fired from railroad cars. It was canceled because of high cost and little military value versus other systems.

Q–4 Drone: Canceled, 1959; funds invested, $84.4 million; prime contractor, Northrop. This was a small turbojet drone to be used by Air Defense Command for training. It was canceled because of a lack of funds and a change in requirements.

SM–73 Goose: Canceled, 1958; funds invested, $78.5 million; prime contractor, Fairchild. This was a subsonic long-range decoy missile for strategic application, to be ground launched as an electronic countermeasure device. The program was overtaken by other developments—e.g. GAM–72 Quail—and by changes in concept of operation.

GAM–67 Crossbow: Canceled, 1956; funds invested, $74.6 million; prime contractor, Northrop. This program was the original air-to-surface antiradiation missile—ARM. The modern version is the Shrike. It was canceled because other systems were considered more favorable and because of uncertainties in the guidance system.

OTHER

AN/ALQ–27: Canceled, 1959, funds invested, $142 million; prime contractor, Sperry. This program was a complete integrated electronic countermeasures system for the B–52. It was canceled because of the extreme cost.

Hi energy boron fuel: Canceled, 1959; funds invested, $135.8 million; prime contractor, Olin Mathieson and others. The program was for the development of fuel to power a chemically powered bomber. It was canceled because it was overtaken by other developments, because of technical problems encountered, and because the requirement was canceled for the specific aircraft to which it had known application.

The total cost of these abandoned projects in the past 10 years is over $5 billion. To be sure, some value, some experience, may well have been obtained from each of them. But let there be no mistake about it. Taken together they are indicative, to say the least, of an immense and conspicuous consumption of the Nation's supply of talent and facilities for research and development. For this technological high living, it is the people of the United States who must pick up the check in actual military costs and in the incalculable costs of a distorted usage of scarce scientific and technological resources.

Taken together these abandoned projects have represented, too, a major factor in running up the accumulation of surplus and obsolescent property by the armed services. For years in the past the total of such property disposed of at a fraction of cost has fluctuated between $4 billion and $8 billion annually. To put this figure in some kind of perspective, consider that it means that every year our Military Establishment got rid of, at a fraction of cost, assets with a value anywhere from about equivalent to, to double the amount that the United Kingdom expends on all its armed services for all purposes. In short, the British have been running their Army, Navy, and Air Forces year in and year out for something less than the cost to us of our annual losses through excess military accumulations or obsolescence.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Defense, has, indeed, said "No" with frequency during the 3 years in which he has been in office. Yet there is nothing to suggest that because he has done so our defense position in the world is any less effective, any less impressive than heretofore. On the contrary, such indications as there are suggest that the Defense Establishment is better prepared and more capable of meeting a wider range of possible military challenges to this Nation.

There is a good deal of talk about the high cost of Government and the need to cut expenditures. In the light of this talk, I cannot imagine that anyone in the Senate would wish to undermine the Secretary's authority to say "no" to the ever-present and immense bureaucratic pressures for expenditures within the Defense Establishment. To be sure we can chop away at almost any item in the budget. The Department of State, for example, had a budget request for $374 million this year and a show of economy can be made by reducing it and closing a few consulates abroad in the process. But we are deluding ourselves if we believe for one moment that it will be possible to curb the growth in the cost of the Federal Government, let alone reduce that cost significantly unless someone has the authority, under the President, to act decisively in connection with defense expenditures. For that is where the great expenditures are. In the 1964 budget, for example, $53.7 billion was proposed by the President for the Defense Establishment. The next allocation in size in that budget was $11.3 billion for Treasury, and of this total $10.2 billion represents an allocation for interest on the public debt.

I ask the Senate to note, further, that the figure of $53.7 billion in new obligational authority for the Defense Department represented the final figure proposed in the budget submitted to Congress early this year. But before it was arrived at, Secretary McNamara had pared down requests from all of the individual military services under his supervision. When these individual requests initially reached his desk they totaled the great sum of $67 billion. In other words, Mr. President, the services, left to their own individual devices, would have sought of the Congress $13.3 billion more than the Secretary of Defense, in the end, allowed them to ask. And yet in spite of this enormous cut, the $53.7 billion requested for the armed services for fiscal year 1964 was still a record high.

With all due respect, would the President have been in a position to direct, except arbitrarily, a cut of $13.3 billion in the combined requests of the various services? With all due respect, would this body or even its exceptionally capable Armed Services Committee have been able to say "No," with any degree of confidence, to the tune of a reduction of $13.3 billion? Would the equivalent body in the House? With all due respect, I think the Congress would have had great difficulty in knowing where to enter the jungle of defense finance and I doubt that we would have gone much beyond the fringes for fear of jeopardizing the necessary defense of the Nation.

And, so, Mr. President, we are back to a Secretary of Defense with authority. If we did not have one he would have to be invented.

I am persuaded that we have in office an exceptional Secretary of Defense who is attempting to meet the full responsibilities of that office. I believe that he is exercising with great determination, intelligence, and knowledge the authority which must go with those responsibilities.

It would seem to me that we ought to do whatever we are able to do to help him in his responsibilities. For we are all in agreement that we are seriously challenged by Communist power from abroad in a military sense as well as in other ways. We are all in agreement that against the military challenge there must be posed the necessary military defense for the security of the Nation, at whatever the cost.

But the extent of the challenge from abroad is a variable depending upon changes in the world situation. The phrase "necessary military defense" is a variable, subject in interpretation to infinite extension.

And the phrase "at whatever the cost" is a blank check which if taken in a literal sense, can be drawn, in the end, upon the total resources of the people of the United States.

These are realities, Mr. President, which are just beginning to dawn upon us. These are realities with which, I believe, the present Secretary of Defense is seeking to grapple. These are realities to which, as legislators, we must turn our attention. It seems to me that we must begin to think deeply as to how the dimensions of "necessary military defense" may be drawn and redrawn more accurately in the light of an ever-changing international situation. And we must ask ourselves, too, how are we to keep "whatever the cost" of that necessary defense at a rational level in order that, in the end, it does not overwhelm the Nation.

These are not empty questions nor are they theoretical questions. "Necessary defense" has been defined and redefined consistently over the past decade as more and more. "Whatever the cost" has risen from $37.8 billion in fiscal 1954 to the $53.7 billion which was requested for fiscal 1964. And the latter figure, as already noted, was presented to the Congress after the Secretary of Defense had reduced the initial service requests of $67 billion by $13.3 billion.

May I say that it is understandable if, in defining the dimensions of necessary military defense, those who have direct military responsibility are inclined to leave a margin for safety. That is appropriate; it is proper; it is to be commended rather than criticized. After all, those who have these responsibilities are grappling in an area which is both inexact and ever changing and one which is not subject, in the end, to computer calculation.

I, for one, do not begrudge the cost of a margin for extra safety—a substantial margin—and I believe the people of the Nation are similarly inclined. But the problem still remains. We must be ever mindful lest in determining what is necessary for military defense we become so obsessed with the extra margin for safety that it grows into a fear-fed monster which, in the end, devours that which it is designed to safeguard.

In the same fashion, our willingness to pay "whatever the cost" of necessary defense must not be an invitation to acquiesce in administrative procedures within the Defense Establishment which tend toward wasteful rather than prudent expenditures. And I would emphasize that in this area—in the area of management procedures—there is no excuse for an excessive margin of safety. Expenditures for the management of the Defense Establishment, unlike the determination of overall defense needs, can be subject to reasonably exact control by computer calculation, by accounting procedures and by the many other tools of modern American business management.

If I may sum up, Mr. President, two questions ought to be ever present in our minds in considering any problem of defense:

First. How are we to insure that this Government defines and redefines "necessary military defense" with full adequacy but without fantastic and obsessive excess, in a world situation in which "necessary defense" is an ever-changing but not necessarily an ever-increasing quantity?

Second. How are we to design the procedures within this Government and within the Defense Establishment so that they will provide this fully adequate necessary defense at the least cost to the people of the Nation, who, in the end, must pay for it?

There is no formula by which these questions may be answered. For years, we have been ordering and reordering the processes of the executive branch, in order that that branch may define more accurately for the President the nature of the international dangers which confront us. For years we have been ordering and reordering the structure of the Defense Department, in an effort to limit expenditures to the necessary. Yet year after year the problem has loomed larger.

If there is not an easy formula, there are certain negatives which might be examined for the light that they shed on what may stimulate defense costs far beyond the necessary. These are the things, it seems to me, we must not do, if we mean to keep a rational perspective on the realities which face us in the world and, in the light of them, hold expenditures for defense at a rational level consistent with national security. These negatives, these tentative observations, I should like to leave with the Senate in concluding my remarks.

In defining and redefining the dimensions of "what is necessary" for defense, we are likely to leave a most wasteful, rather than a desirable, margin for safety, unless these realities are recognized anew:

First. That, under our system of government, there can be no substitute for the preponderant judgments of the President as to the total and the ever-changing challenge from abroad to this Nation. These judgments must provide the key for determining the essential dimensions of what is militarily necessary for the security of the Nation.

Second. That, in making his judgments, the President must necessarily depend on advice and counsel from whatever sources he deems appropriate—military and civilian; but once his judgments are made, it is inappropriate for any permanent official of the executive branch—military or civilian—to do other than his best to carry them into effect.

Third. That the President's judgments—once made—in this connection are subject to challenge, not by permanent officials of the executive branch—military or civilian, but only by the Congress, acting as the Constitution makes clear that it can and shall act—by legislative initiative and by legislative oversight.

Fourth. That, under the President and the laws of the land, the Secretary of Defense has the authority to establish—with the help of the Joint Chiefs—the strategic concepts which shall set, for all the armed services, their appropriate roles in maintaining the kind of defense which the President and the Congress have deemed necessary for the Nation's security; and, further, that within the Defense Establishment, the Secretary of Defense has authority to control administrative procedures and practices for efficient and effective operations.

And if I may continue with the negatives, Mr. President, I should like also to stress that we are not going to get an effective and efficient defense at a tolerable cost unless it is recognized in all frankness:

First. That the Defense Establishment, as the largest single purchaser of goods and services in the Nation, has come to occupy a substantial position in the civilian economy of this Nation; that, in this connection, what the Defense Department does or does not do has come to have great importance not only for defense but for the well-being of business, labor, and whole communities scattered throughout the Nation.

Second. That, in the light of this economic position which the Defense Establishment occupies it would be a gross naivete to assume that pressures—increasing pressures—will not be present for decisions to be made by the Defense Department not solely on considerations of necessary, effective, and efficient defense—and may I say that colloquies on the floor between Senators from various of the larger States underscore this point.

Third. That however understandable these pressures may be—and as Senator from Montana I hope that I try to do as much for my State as any other Member—the Nation will be ill served if there is not within this Government those attitudes and those conditions for administration of the affairs of the Defense Establishment which permit the decisions, in the end, to be made on the basis of necessary, effective, and efficient defense.

Mr. President, in making these remarks today, I have not been unaware of the eloquent farewell address of the former President, Mr. Eisenhower, in which he warned of the need to guard against the development of an industrial-military complex of power in the Nation. Nor have I been unmindful of dangers to that classic doctrine of freedom—the doctrine of civilian supremacy.

And yet, with all due respect, I do not see the principal difficulty which confronts us in these contexts. If there were ever to be an imminent danger to freedom in this Nation of the kind alluded to by Mr. Eisenhower, it is not likely to be the cause of the failure of popularly responsible government. Rather it is likely to be the consequence of the failure of civilian responsibility in the Congress no less than in the executive branch of the Government. And I want to say to the Senate, that this system of freedom which we know will not fail. It will not fail so long as an excessive fear does not drive us to an obsessive interpretation of what is necessary for defense. It will not fail if we are prepared to face the economic and social difficulties which confront the Nation and deal with them on their own merits—their civilian merits—rather than to seek to evade them, or to act on them haphazardly and inadequately and ineffectively because we find it easier to act under the camouflage of an inflated concept of military necessity.

These, then, Mr. President, are some of the observations which I have to make. They are observations stimulated by the work of the TFX inquiry which is being conducted by the very able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] and his distinguished colleagues on the Government Operations Committee. They are observations growing out of a very high respect for the patriotic dedication and the ability with which Mr. McNamara is seeking to serve the Nation under the President.

It is incumbent upon all of us, it seems to me, not to ignore these larger implications of the TFX matter. It is incumbent upon us—the President, the Congress, the press, and the people of the United States—to face them, to discuss them, and, as necessary, to act on them within the Constitution.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a brief comment on his remarks?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. I am grateful that my schedule permitted me to be here on the floor while the majority leader was speaking, because I think his statement of today is one of the most important and one of the most impressive statements made at this session of the Senate.

I share his very high regard for the Secretary of Defense; I think he is the ablest man ever to hold that office.

I wish to ask the majority leader whether, in his wisdom and knowledge, at a time when we have been thinking somewhat painfully over the accomplishments of President Kennedy and his administration, the Senator from Montana regards the revitalization and reestablishment of strong civilian leadership and control in the Pentagon as one of the most outstanding accomplishments of the Kennedy administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no question about it; and I think the exhortation, in effect, laid down in the last communication by our former President, General Eisenhower, has been followed out quite carefully.

Furthermore, in my opinion the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have shown true respect for civilian authority; and, in my further opinion, they have acted within the bounds of that at all times.

I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his kind comments.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, later on, I shall have more to say about this matter.

THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, almost immediately following the assassination of President Kennedy, there were those on the national scene who seized on this tragic event as a pretext for attempts to visit invective upon the particular segments of American society which were the natural objects of their abomination. For the most part, the attempts have been directed at fixing responsibility for the President's assassination on either conservatives, usually referred to with the general smear term "rightwing radicals," or persons living in the southern area of the United States, the latter being most usually referred to with the smear terms "racists" or "bigots."

From some quarters such unfounded attacks are to be expected. For example, the official organ of the Communist Party, U.S.A., the Worker, issued just such a smear attack in a printed dodger under the date of November 23, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from this publication be reprinted in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Worker, Nov. 23, 1963]

An Editorial

The heart of our Nation is heavy with anguish. Our people's grief hangs like crepe across the land, from border to border, from ocean to ocean.

From all parts of the world messages of condolence, sorrow, and compassion pour into Washington.

President John F. Kennedy was martyred by the bullet of a craven gunman. But it was more than the life of the President that the murderer had in his sights. The progress of the Nation and the freedom of our people were his target.

We do not think that this unspeakable crime was the work of the fevered brain of some madman. We think it was the long deliberated and planned for deed of the Fascist-minded forces of the political ultraright and the segregationists with their vested interests in maintaining the racist oppression of Negroes at any cost.

The murder of President Kennedy was the extension into action of the advertised conspiracy of the anti-Negro racehaters, the warmongers, and plotters against every step which would lead toward world peace.

To the ultraright and the racists, President Kennedy's popular leadership was an obstacle to the disaster course down which the reactionaries seek to take our country. The policies of reason and reasonableness in a groping toward a foreign policy of peace through coexistence and toward universal disarmament; the attitude of concern for the economic and social welfare of the working people; the policy of urgent and definitive elimination of all manner of racism and segregation, for securing to the Negro people their full and equal rights. Though killed before these commitments could be fully developed and attained, these policies of Kennedy will live after him.

They constitute a legacy which the people are called upon to make into a mandate upon Congress and the Government to carry into law with utmost urgency.

The finger of guilt points beyond the triggerman who wielded the assassin's gun to a criminal cabal of White Citizen Councilmen, Birch Society plotters, the National States Rights Party chieftains, American Nazi Party moguls, the National Renaissance Party, the Minute Men bandits, and other paramilitary Fascist-racist groups.

It is not fortuitous that the scene of the murder of the President was in Dallas, Tex. where the Dallas Morning News is published and where the Fascist-minded Gen. Edwin Walker lives.

These bands of conspirators against the people's liberties and the Nation's progress must be outlawed and their leaders brought to justice.

The Governor Wallaces, the Ross Barnetts, and Senator Eastlands, and Strom Thurmonds—these foulmouthed inciters to racist crimes—these Kennedy-haters have their share in this crime.

So indeed, must J. Edgar Hoover account to the Nation for the dismal failure of the FBI to bring the neo-Fascist plotters against the President's life and the Nation's liberties to justice.

The tragedy to the Nation in the death of the President must be answered by the Attorney General with sweeping action to enforce the liberties and equal rights of Negro and white Americans equally throughout the South.

In mourning the death of President John F. Kennedy we join with all patriotic citizens in pledging to redouble our work for the realization of all lofty democratic visions which President Kennedy articulated at various times.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, despite the known information about the assassin of President Kennedy, which is rather conclusive that an individual who embraced Marxist beliefs and the foreign ideology of communism murdered the President, attempts to fix the blame on the American public or some segment of it continue, not only from Communist sources, but from others. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks a compilation of comments which appeared in the December 17, 1963, issue of National Review entitled "Re Extremism."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From National Review, Dec. 17, 1963]

RE EXTREMISM

Among their contributions to the calm and reasonable mood, ending all anger, hate, and division, toward which they have so movingly called us, the liberals and the left offer these:

Pravda, official organ of the Soviet Government: "All circumstances of President Kennedy's tragic death give grounds for considering that the murder was conceived and carried out by ultraright, Fascist, and racialist circles."

Emile Servan-Schreiber, veteran French leftist and journalist, in the Paris newspaper Combat: "Confronting the destiny of this young wife clasping the bloody body of her husband in her arms, how can we fail to evoke the image of the Mother of Christ holding on her knees the corpse of her Son, He also killed in the prime of life? It is not a coincidence that so many chiefs of state and of government from regimes of so many diverse sorts came to bow before a tomb as formerly the three magi did before a cradle. Kennedy is dead, but Kennedyism is born. A mystique will unfurl over every continent and will spread, not this time in one or several centuries as the message of the great prophets of old, but with the immediacy of radio and television. A mystique? Perhaps a religion "

Max Lerner in the New York Post: "John F. Kennedy was as surely a victim of a crazed Civil War mentality as was another American President, who fell a victim to the bullet of John Wilkes Booth. * * * It was, I suppose, a cruel accident of history that felled him. Yet was it wholly accident? When rightwing racist fanatics are told over and over again that the President is a traitor, a Red, a nigger lover, that he has traduced the Constitution and is handing America over to a mongrelized world-state, there are bound to be some fanatics dull witted enough to follow the logic of the indictment all the way and rid America of the man who is betraying it."

Trybuna Ludu, official organ of the Polish Government: "The entire world is convinced that the author of the crime should have been sought only among the extremists of racism and fascism."

Bishop James A. Pike: "But in fixing the blame we must include all those who, by their race hate and extreme radical right propaganda, have constantly supplied the fuel which would fire up such an assassin."

Harvard Professor H. Stuart Hughes, the Nation, December 14: "I heard just one expression of anger. A Negro came by shaking his head and muttering in bitter irony: 'Only in America.' His anger reflected what most of us at first thought: That the crime had been committed by a southern racist. Indeed, if we look deeply into our souls, I think many of us will recognize that we were disappointed to learn that such was not the case. As I have tried to meditate on these matters, I have finally come to the conclusion that it is better this way. Had the assassin been a southern extremist, it would have fitted our own prejudices and our own political commitment. Our grief would have been tinged with a spirit of hatred and revenge. This way, our sorrow is pure: there is no hate in our hearts."

Chief Justice Earl Warren, funeral oration at the bier: "What moved some misguided wretch to do this horrible deed may never be known to us, but we do know that such acts are commonly stimulated by forces of hatred and malevolence, such as today are eating their way into the bloodstream of American life. What a price we pay for this fanaticism."

Michel Bosquet in L'Express, the leading magazine of the French non-Communist left: "The lid has opened. Inside the box a horrified America sees a nest of vipers. * * * Texas today is the Algeria of 1959: a colonial country * * * where the oil tycoons, paymasters of the extreme right (in particular, the John Birch Society, which has its headquarters in Dallas and $500 million in its treasury) ferociously defend their ancient privileges by corruption, terror, and armed thugs. * * * The Texas police 'investigate' the murder of John F. Kennedy exactly as the police of Algiers investigated the crimes of the OAS. To prove that the murderer of John Kennedy is a Communist; to destroy anything that might discredit the proof; to unchain popular anger against 'Castro-Communism'; to liquidate Cuba, and level charges of high treason against liberals of all types—how much the Texas tycoons and their police long to do all that. Can they set America ablaze as the Reichstag fire, in January 1933, set Germany ablaze and gave all power to Hitler?"

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is no excuse for the continuation of the diatribes against southerners, conservatives or the American people as a whole for the assassination of President Kennedy. There were many who disagreed with his political views. There was only one misfit who perpetrated the dastardly crime of assassinating the President. This fact has been pointed out in numerous newspaper articles and editorials, and I ask unanimous consent that a number of these articles and editorials be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, Dec. 4, 1963]

DESPITE BACKWASH OF VENOM: THE TRAIL OF GUILT LEADS BEYOND U.S. SHORES

In aftermath of shock, following the tragedy of November 22, not all succumbed to the thunder of mass accusation—searching for "answers" in sound and fury about mass guilt. To quiet that bedlam, a mixture of hysteria and venom, some calming voices have been heard; one of these Kentucky's Senator Thruston Morton, addressing the Senate:

"It was not a flaw in the American system or the American character that struck down John Kennedy. It was not the sin of a city or its citizens. It was not a tragedy that struck from some dark stain of violence on the American system or on the American soul. And we do not serve the best interest of our Nation, or of the memory of a murdered President, by letting wrongly placed recriminations overcome the good sense of this great Nation." The assassin, he added, was "a stranger to the American heritage, and his mind had been warped by an alien violence, not by a native condition.

"Let us mourn the terrible event, but let us not mourn for the American soul—for that soul is stout and lighted by truth and faith. Let the blame be on him who actually committed the crime. What happened was not America's fault. Only the sober realization of that can make our mourning meaningful and not torture it with a guilt that is undeserved and unworthy of the cause in which our Presidents live and for which sometimes they tragically die."

Tennessee Senator Albert Gore seconded that speech, adding for himself, "I accept no blame for what this demented man did. I feel no sense of personal guilt. Why should all America be blamed for the actions of one fanatic? * * * It is an injustice to our millions of people of good will, even the teeming thousands of hospitable, cheering people in Dallas, to charge them with murderous guilt. I reject it for myself and for my people."

In sharp contrast to that reasoned reminder of where the guilt lay, came the screaming invective of former Gov. LeRoy Collins (of Florida) last night, playing divisive demagogue with charges that the assassination was fostered by "Dixie battlecries which incite sick souls to violence."

The assault by this spokesman for the National Association of Broadcasters compounded the affront already registered by flannelmouths among his colleagues.

It was not the people of the United States—North, South, East or West—who killed President Kennedy, as established by all the evidence, it was a self-styled pro-Castro Communist, and a head of the "Fair Play For Cuba Committee."

It probably is true that in the literal sense of the term, he had no "accomplices." That is, there was one hand (his) at the gun; and one finger (his) that pulled the trigger. But that is not to say that he was alone in the conspiracy; or that he was not carrying it out as the triggerman assigned.

Who sponsored Lee Harvey Oswald in this hideous crime? It is pertinent to national security to find out; to establish some answers by following the trial wherever it may lead.

It could not have been by sheer coincidence that it followed the threat voiced by Fidel Castro in September—a speech reported by the Associated Press, containing the warning that "United States leaders" would be in danger if they helped in any attempt to do away with leaders of Cuba.

"We are prepared to fight them and answer in kind," he said. "United States leaders should think that if they are aiding terrorists' plans to eliminate Cuban leaders, they cannot themselves be safe."

Of what was the Caribbean brigand speaking, if not a premonition that his days of personal privileged sanctuary were ending? His threat was not a case simply of fanning the breeze.

As pointed out by the Richmond News-Leader editorial reprinted on this page yesterday, he was rapidly approaching a crisis. "The Soviets were withdrawing troops and aid. There were well-founded rumors that Averell Harriman's deal between Washington and Moscow dealt Castro out. On Monday (November 18) the late President spoke at Miami, and offered to help a Cuban government, any sort of government, if foreign domination were thrown off. It was an open invitation to do away with Castro."

Was the President's offer to help in event of the elimination of Castro an implied consequence of the reported Harriman-Khrushchev deal?

Maybe policymakers know. But policymakers should know the risks involved; and should be deeply cognizant also of the hazards of blind commitment; or any commitment short of enforcible assurance that what followed in Cuba, to be recognized diplomatically and eligible for U.S. help, would be a government totally free of Communist ties—with the Soviet and Chinese forces out, along with their arsenal of hemispheric aggression.

Maybe that would be too much to hope for on the basis of any deal negotiated. It is the least a thinking America, responsibly led, could accept.

Putting the pieces together is the only way of intelligently appraising this mosaic of tragedy—and accounting for it in ramifications leading both far from Dallas and from these shores. It was not the product of any American hate. Despite all the hysteria generated by noisemaking pundits seeking to ascribe those bullets to the far right, they came from the far left.

Banner Columnist Henry J. Taylor drew attention yesterday to the fact that "immediately after Oswald's identification the State Department asked newsmen to play down the possibility that Oswald was a Castro or Kremlin agent, suggesting that this could damage Soviet relations."

That raises its own further questions: Is the State Department more interested in soothing the feelings of Castro and the Kremlin than in finding out who inspired and promoted the killing of President Kennedy? Was it more concerned lest a thorough inquiry should reveal what reportedly was agreed upon by Harriman and Khrushchev with reference to Castro?

From Castro's speech it was clear that he knew he was to be liquidated. It was equally clear—or should have been—that before he allowed that to happen he was going to do his utmost against "U.S. leaders."

This at least is the suspicion and uncontroverted background of the death of a President.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Dec. 4, 1963]

A Nation Wrongly Condemned

(Guest editorial from the Fitchburg (Mass.) Sentinel.)

Unwittingly several speakers and commentators have committed a grave injustice against the great body of loyal and patriotic American men and women of good will.

They have sought to sow the seeds of a universal guilt for the compounded crimes in Dallas.

They have said that the assassination and its ugly aftermath of the slaying of the accused slayer were the result of the sowing of hatred promiscuously among the people of America.

Here they knowingly or unknowingly condemn wrongly a great and good people. If Oswald was, indeed, the killer of President Kennedy, the deed was not done because of grave political disagreements or bloodshed over the civil rights issue. Oswald was a Communist sympathizer. Communism is dedicated to the proposition of gaining its objective through any means, fair or foul, through lies, murders, duplicity, cunning, confusion.

To impute the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy to a massive guilt on the part of the whole population of America is a grievous wrong to the American people.

As the Sentinel has observed, a catastrophe always brings to the surface the hidden ugly details of humanity's day-to-day life. A frustrated Texan murders the President; a night club operator murders the murderer. But so far only two men in a population of 180 million Americans are involved. That does not prove that a heavy blanket of hatred lies over the whole land. The everyday peaceful procedures of a whole continent belie the stigma that speakers and writers would attach to the people.

At Jackson, Miss., at Birmingham, Ala., at Little Rock, Ark.—at a number of places, North and South, East and West—the ugly face of hate has reared itself; and blood has been spilled. Yet America is a great and a good nation. The obligation now resting upon its people is to demonstrate its true character to the world.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Dec. 7, 1963]

Reds Seek To Divide, Confuse Americans—Exploit Kennedy Assassination

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Clever Soviet worldwide propaganda with an incredible assist from the United States is cashing in on our martyred President's assassination by blaming internal America. "President Kennedy was killed by hate festering within the United States," says Pravda.

President Kennedy was killed by Lee Harvey Oswald. What, conceivably, has this man to do with the American soul? We have grievous, tragic problems here, but Oswald does not represent them.

Such ghastly distortion is par for the course in Soviet policy. Yet it is extraordinary, if not astounding, that American frictions, including integration, the nature of American society, etc. are likewise blamed by so many among us for what is, in fact, a typical act by a dedicated Red.

The claim is made (meaningless) that even the Soviet did not like Lee Harvey Oswald. But can anyone claim that Kremlin policy regrets his tarnishing the distinction of the United States? We abhor hate and violence, in anybody by anybody. Does the Kremlin?

Spiders see in eight different directions at once because most species have eight single-lens eyes. So does Soviet policy in regard to conspiracy and demoralization abroad, as well as assassination, and traditionally. Its roots are old.

Young fanatic Serbian Gavrillo Prinzip fired the fatal assassination shots at Sarajevo signaling World War I. But control over Prinzip's hand was Russia's minister at Belgrade, N. de Hartwig, who organized Pan-Slav movements in Austro-Hungarian provinces to consolidate the Slavs under Russia.

The significance, however, couldn't have been worse reported or estimated than to the then President of the United States.

On July 3, 1914, a week after the assassination of Sarajevo, Col. Edward House, Woodrow Wilson's personal envoy touring Europe, wrote him about encouraging talks he had with sovereigns and ministers. House stated: "So you see, things are moving in the right direction (toward peace) as rapidly as we could hope."

As for World War II, while Soviet generals discussed cooperation against Nazi aggression with the combined French-British general staffs the Kremlin was secretly arranging a military alliance with Hitler. Hitler could then avoid a two-front war and, as we know, was free to attack France and Britain.

The Soviet spider's objective was to remain out of the conflict and allow communism to reap the rewards of devastation by the German-French-Britain war in the West.

Kremlin tactics were the same in the Pacific. Tokyo-based Soviet spy Richard Sorge, who greased countless assassins' bullets, was regarded by the Nazis as their own ace agent. But Sorge was a double-agent in Kremlin pay who served Hitler badly and Stalin well. By the summer of 1941 Sorge gave Stalin definite evidence that the Japanese had no intentions against the Soviet and would strike against Pearl Harbor and the Philippines.

Russia could denude her Pacific flank, for she knew she would not have to fight on two flanks. The Soviet acknowledged its debt to Sorge but did nothing to save him when he was caught. Nor did Russia warn us about Pearl Harbor. This is pure communism in practice.

As one result, before World War II Communist parties existed in 43 countries and totaled 4.2 million members. Today Communist parties number 90 and the total number of members exceeds 42 million.

Lack of evidence that Marxist Lee Harvey Oswald was linked to a Castro or Kremlin conspiracy is not pertinent. The splendid commission President Johnson appointed will attempt to unearth all facts; including how this man got an American passport and got back to the United States after renouncing American citizenship. But, in any case, nothing could please the Soviet more than to manage to have us somehow blame ourselves and forget that man's background entirely.

Compounding this diversion here clouds our vision of the enemy confronting us—the nature and tentacles of the Soviet spider as a whole.

It cannot be too often repeated how gainfully all of us could read "The Craft of Intelligence" by former Central Intelligence Agency chief Allen Dulles. There you'll learn how the Soviet helps trap the American mind into mass make-believe. There you'll find all the forces we face. The entire spider—the whole tarantula—is the unending problem on which to focus public attention as a result of Oswald's horrible, horrible gun.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Journal, Nov. 30, 1963]

As the Pastor Sees It

(By Dr. W. H. Clapp, pastor, Southside Baptist Church)

Last week, we were all saddened by the assassination of our President. I don't believe there was a man or woman anywhere in the United States who did not feel that a great crime had been committed and that all the laws of God and man had been broken. There can be no doubt that it took a warped mind to plan and execute such an act.

From what we have been told, a man completely steeped in Communist ideology was responsible. There can be no doubting the fact that a true Communist could do such a thing. To them, any action is justified which will advance the cause of communism. Here is one of the great reasons why it is fallacious for us to think there can be any real meeting of Christian and Communist minds. There is no solid ground upon which we can stand together. The Christian has a system of moral and ethical values based upon a concept of a personal God. Communists have no God. Therefore, morality, to them is that which is expedient for the moment.

Many of us did not see eye to eye with our late President on many of his domestic and foreign policies. However, we, as Americans, believed in all the due processes of law and the final authority of the ballot. There can be no justification for his murder, just as there can be no justification for the murder of the man accused of the crime.

As a minister, I have tried to admonish the people of my congregation time and time again there can be no excuse for violence. These times through which we are passing are fraught with much tension. Traditions, which have been almost sacred for centuries, have been challenged. Entire ways of life have had to be altered. Emotions have been deeply stirred. Yet in the face of all this there can be no excuse for violence. Our Lord said that he who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword. The only answer to the confusion of our day is a clear and certain note. We must not be caught up in the emotional frenzies of those who would lead us downward and not upward.

I have not appreciated the insinuations which have fallen from the lips of some men in high places during the past few hours. The murder of the President was not brought on by those of us here in the South who have reacted in a natural way to the invasion on our rights. We have not been guilty of preaching a disrespect for law and the orderly processes of law. Because we love our Lord, we love our country. However, it has been hard for some of us to accept suddenly that which was the law of the land for so many years is no longer the law. That those who interpreted the law for so many years were completely mistaken through all those years.

Some people seem to feel that we should accept, with a calm acquiescence, all the dictates and desires of those who say we are wrong. May the time never come when we do not have the right to challenge the thinking of any person, whether he be the President or the Judges who sit on the Supreme Court. We have never been guilty of preaching anarchy. We have never paraded down the streets nor marched on our Capitol to demand a change. We have sought every legal means to reverse the decision of our highest Court. We have openly criticized them, and we feel we have that privilege today.

We shall mourn the loss of our late President. We shall pray for him who is our President now. We shall rise up together with all free men who love a risen, coming again Saviour to meet the forces of communism at every street corner. They may kill our President, but we serve notice now, in the name of our Lord, that they shall have to do the same to each one of us, if they are to keep the Gospel of Jesus Christ from the final and ultimate triumph.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 2, 1963]

LEFTISTS NOT WATCHED

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Was John F. Kennedy assassinated because the Secret Service and FBI were watching every radical rightist in Dallas and letting lunatic leftists like Lee Harvey Oswald run wild?

Senator JOHN TOWER, Republican, of Texas, has raised this question in an interview with me. The Senator waited for a decent interval after Mr. Kennedy's stately, heart-touching funeral, but now he says:

"We have reports from Texas that the rightist figures were closely watched during the President's visit to Dallas on November 22. It appears that the leftist figures were not watched."

TOWER, a conservative but no radical by any definition, is an anti-Birchite.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, 1962, will prove it. On that date, TOWER caused the reprinting of a famous article in the rightwing magazine, "National Review," in which the John Birch Society leader, Robert Welch, was drummed out of the conservative movement.

Nevertheless, TOWER has been the target of leftist crackpots who blame the Kennedy assassination on rightist extremists. Undaunted, the Senator will demand investigation of his Dallas reports. He sticks by his conviction that America's worst enemies have been misidentified:

"The radical right," he says, "is the symptom of the disease we call extremism. The radical left is the disease itself."

Was there a failure in high places to take the Marxist menace as seriously as the Birchite menace?

Did that failure contribute to the President's coming within gunfire of a leftist crackpot? It is a hideous thought to contemplate, but it cannot be discarded for that reason. Even if Oswald turns out not to have been the killer (and we may never know), TOWER has much documentary evidence to show that the man was one who bore watching.

In January 1962, Oswald wrote from Minsk, in Russia, complaining to his Senator that the Soviets were holding him and his Russian-born wife in the U.S.S.R. against their will. Upon inquiry at the State Department, TOWER was told that Oswald was a man who had "requested that his American citizenship be revoked," and also a man who had previously, on November 2, 1959, sworn to this affidavit:

"I affirm that my allegiance is to the Soviet Socialist Republic."

Yet the Federal Government, having helped Oswald to return, apparently did not mark him as a dangerous citizen.

Oswald was able to buy a murder weapon, hide himself with the weapon in a warehouse along the route of Mr. Kennedy's fatal journey in Dallas.

Why wasn't Oswald under surveillance?

Was it because the Federal Government, and to some extent the general public, have really come to believe that foolish, ill-mannered hecklers who spit at Adlai Stevenson represent a graver danger than the Communist system whose members and fellow travelers are the terrorists in Venezuela, the guerrillas in Vietnam, and the conquerors of Cuba?

These queries at the heart of TOWER's main question are going to uncork the vials of political passion which abated, very briefly, during the tragic interval of Mr. Kennedy's death and burial.

Three investigations—Federal, congressional, and Texan—are now haltingly in motion to search out the cause of J. F. K.'s foul murder. One or more of these probes had better come up with plausible reports.

Otherwise, the sensational and unprecedented issue of a presidential slaying will be at the center of next year's election.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Dec. 10, 1963]

A VICIOUS LIBEL

At 1:59 p.m., November 22, the Voice of America overseas broadcast announced the murder of President Kennedy. "Dallas," the VOA explained to the world, "is the center of the extreme rightwing."

Arthur Krock of the New York Times, commenting on the vicious suggestion that conservatives were connected with the President's death, declared in a signed column:

"This gratuitous, and as it proved, false, suggestion that such was the affiliation of the assassin was deleted from the broadcast at 2:10 p.m. But it was grist to Moscow's mill, which has been grinding ever since."

Mr. Krock, one of the Nation's most respected journalists, said this implication "especially lacks merit by reason of the only facts known about the suspect, Oswald. He was a Marxist; at least a sympathizer with the religion of communism; emigrated to the Soviet Union; and trying to return. This is certainly not a dossier of the rightwing extremists, a stigmatic label of Dallas which some members of the administration are too prone to affix."

What an outrage that the Soviet Union should find the clue to its own propaganda line in a Voice of America broadcast. Edward R. Murrow, Director of the VOA, should be required to explain and to apologize for a shameful suggestion.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Nov. 27, 1963]

ASSASSINATION EVOKES ODD VIEWS—MANY SEEN LINKING KENNEDY KILLING TO RACISTS, RIGHTISTS, DESPITE FACTS

(By Richard Wilson)

The mood of self-examination which has overtaken the country following the assassination of President Kennedy has produced both ludicrous speculation and tortured reasoning.

We can see coming now the tracts entitled "The Conspiracy to Murder John F. Kennedy." In one version it will be an inverse antidesegregation conspiracy using a double-agent Communist to carry out the deed. In another version it will be just a plain Communist conspiracy. Additional versions will prove the ingenuity of the human mind when stimulated by 4 days of unremitting TV-radio programing.

These fantasies are not confined to the lunatic fringe. Here in Washington, simple but seriously intentioned people arrived at the strange conclusion that the murder of the President is related in some amorphous way to the slaying of a desegregation leader in Mississippi.

In spite of the simple facts of the assassination, there are many in this city who will not separate the President's tragic death from the segregation and "far right" issues. Their tortured reasoning is that the assassin came out of the same plot, that the city of Dallas in the reactionary Southwest had spawned them all and all were equally culpable.

Even the Chief Justice of the United States allowed himself to stray from the path of sound reasoning. The misguided could deduce from his remarks that the extremities of the right in this particular case carried a responsibility for inspiring the extremities of the far left.

It is understandable that reasonable men, shocked and perplexed, should grope for the causes of the savagely incongruous event. But why there should be supposed to be any vague relationship between the assassination of President Kennedy and the assassination of President Lincoln escapes rationality. Lincoln's assassination was indeed the act of a crazed and pitifully inadequate conspiracy that aspired to control of the Nation. That assassination was part of the great Civil War over the issue of slavery and the rights of the States.

All too often, and without sound cause, the events of today are cast in the mold of a century ago, as if the relatively peaceful demonstrations for Negro equality were revolutionary acts. All too often the reaction of the white community of the Nation is related to the cause for which millions of men sprang to arms a century ago.

These exaggerations seem to be part of the uncertain national mood. It could be expected therefore, that the man in the street last Friday, before the circumstances became known, should conclude that the attack on the President could be traced either to the segregation or the far right issues.

This notion is given up by some only reluctantly and if any twisted version can be made to fit their preconceptions they readily turn to it.

Nothing could have been more repugnant to the vibrant spirit and rational mind of John F. Kennedy.

Now a series of inquiries is beginning. One is by the FBI and the Justice Department into both the assassination and the murder of the accused assassin. Another study will be conducted in Congress in connection with legislation to make a murderous attack on the President and Vice President a Federal crime wherever committed. The State of Texas will conduct a special ex post facto inquiry.

If these inquiries are well conducted they can help to clarify whether or not Oswald, in fact, murdered the President and his probable motives; they can never prove in the legal sense, however, that Oswald was the assassin, and he will remain for all time the accused assassin.

Only a continuing self-examination by those who influence public thinking will find the root causes for the act. It may simply be that the cause lies more in the disorderly, undisciplined and callous phases of American life than in the ideological concepts that divide the country.

But one simple fact should not be ignored. The accused, and likely, murderer was a proudly professed Marxist; he never boasted of being a segregationist or a far-righter.

[From the Nashville Banner, Nov. 25, 1963]

Tighten Up Security: Red Plot Clearly Is To Destroy From Within

Dimensions of that assassination plot costing the life Friday of President John F. Kennedy exceeded, unquestionably, the facts revealed to date—and demand the investigation and action of a Government truly concerned for the national security such a conspiracy imperils.

To President Lyndon Johnson, newly installed, fell the duty of rebuking any impression that the case was closed with apprehension of Lee Harvey Oswald as the trigger man—or his death yesterday as the startling sequel, a link in the chain of mysteries binding the whole case upon Federal authorities to solve, leaving no loose ends of doubt.

It would be patently absurd to conclude that the Kennedy assassination was an isolated thing, conceived in the mind of one man who thereupon proceeded to carry it out. It was a plot, and executed as such, whose full proportions can be established only by the full investigation now ordered. As a foreign-hatched conspiracy, it must be met by security action calculated to put the finger on every enemy inside the United States.

Essential to that, and as a primary step, the Federal Bureau of Investigation must be turned loose to tighten up the watch, by whatever provision of surveillance is necessary, on every known Communist in this country.

As a nation we must stop being fools in the soft treatment of those who overtly or covertly are out to destroy us. Under the pretext of "liberties," we have permitted them to say, or do, what they please—inciting hate and poisoning the very wellsprings of the freedom under which they cloak their conspiracy.

The time has come to quit handling internal enemies with kid gloves; to quit subjecting America to the policy of folly which exploded into tragedy last week because one of these—clearly identifiable and identified as a subversive—was permitted to run at large.

It was the supreme irony, surely, that this climax of conspiracy came almost on the 30th anniversary of historic blunder—the renewal of diplomatic relations with Russia; extending recognition to that Communist land, on the promise that it would engage in no subversion here.

To the everlasting credit of one Tennessean, Gordon Browning—then a member of Congress—he strenuously opposed that act of folly, and voted against it. He saw, as did many of his countrymen, the danger invited by taking Moscow to the Nation's bosom, and opening the door thus to the apparatus of godless Communist intrigue. He recognized the Bolshevik movement for what it was and is.

Tragic as this moment is, reflecting the cost of leniency toward a known enemy whose every effort is bent toward America's downfall, it surely awakens the Nation to the realities—and the frivolity of treating the enemy, on either the foreign or the domestic front, with wishful thinking; or glad-handing its evangels from Moscow or elsewhere, whose guise of "friendship" partakes of hypocrisy. The very presence of Deputy Premier Mikoyan as his country's representative at the funeral of President Kennedy is an affront, no less than a message of condolence from Fidel Castro would be.

The plot was carried out at Dallas because that was where the opportunity and the assassin were together. That it was far-reaching, and its ramifications not as yet completely determined, are facts so obvious that none can doubt the necessity—as realized by President Johnson—to pursue this investigaiton all the way. Though the one apprehended as the triggerman is dead, the FBI can unearth all the facts in the case; and must.

Security in this country is more at stake than ever; internal security, that is. And it is time for an awakened nation, through its government, possessed of that responsibility, to tighten that security by intelligent address to the fact of a ruthless, conscienceless, murderous enemy within.

It is time to quit coddling a criminal conspiracy as if it were a mere nonconformist idiosyncracy. The FBI knows it is not that. Director J. Edgar Hoover knows that enemy for what it is.

Let's start acting like an adult people aware that the survival of the Nation we love is at stake.

And furthermore—

A QUESTION TO BE ANSWERED

When Oswald was arrested the world heard him screaming from television screens that he wanted Abt to be his lawyer. United Press International said it was John Abt, of New York.

According to the late Whitaker Chambers, reformed Communist who turned against his friend, Alger Hiss, Abt was a member of the first Communist cell organized in Washington at a location within a block of St. Matthews Cathedral where funeral services for the late President Kennedy were held today.

Chambers said Abt was part of an underground group, including Hiss, and the attorney Oswald apparently was calling for, took the fifth amendment in the now famous hearing of August 1948. His long service with the U.S. Government, beginning in 1933, included work for the Department of Agriculture and as chief counsel for the Senate Labor and Education Committee.

David M. Dallin, author of "Soviet Espionage," lists Federal employees who were a part of the Russian apparatus in this country. Abt and Hiss are among those named.

Abt's last public appearance of prominence was as chief counsel for the Communist Party last December when it was convicted on a charge of failing to register as an agent of the Soviet Union.

The man who murdered the President of the United States called himself a Communist and a pro-Castro Marxist. Why did this man, Lee Harvey Oswald, who went to Russia and sought to become a citizen of Russia, call hysterically for John Abt to represent him as attorney?

The assassin's lips are sealed by death but the Federal Bureau of Investigation has ways of finding out. Does Jack Ruby, who silenced Oswald, know? What are the ramifications of the relationships of this underworld character?

There are many questions to be answered, and under the order of President Johnson, the answers should be forthcoming.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 10, 1963]

More on Hatred

As time, even so little as a few weeks, begins to soothe the profound shock experienced by the Nation at President Kennedy's death, it becomes possible to gain some perspective on subjects of intense and widespread reaction immediately after the tragedy.

The most notable of these was surely hatred. It remains impossible to believe that some voices among us were not deliberately using the tragic occasion to attack their political opponents, especially the "radical right." The notion died very hard that the right was somehow responsible for the assassination, even though all evidence points to an acknowledged radical leftist as the killer. And even where the personal identity of the assassin was acknowledged, there was a tendency to blame his action on a "climate of hatred" supposedly permeating the land.

Hatred itself is a state of mind that all men must struggle to free themselves from. Yet in any political system based on differences of opinion, some political hatred is probably inevitable. Total personal commitment among any substantial group of citizens to any important political goal is bound to produce some hatred of those who block the way to that goal.

Aren't there now, for example, some dedicated liberals who truly hate the congressional system which allows Chairman SMITH his personal control over civil rights legislation? Is it unreasonable to believe that some among them feel hatred also for the chairman himself?

The difference between what is denounced as hatred and what is defended as righteous indignation often seems to be wholly a difference of who's talking about whom.

Since we are men, not angels, the only practicable way to eliminate every vestige of hatred from political thought in a democracy is to eliminate both political thought and democracy.

Justice Holmes insisted on the importance of "freedom for the thought we hate." That about sums it up.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Dec. 10, 1963]

Assassinating National Character: Newspaper Blames Distortion

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of December 3, was forwarded to the State by Houston Manning of Latta. In his letter of transmittal, Manning was sharply critical of the address made to the Columbia Chamber of Commerce by former Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida, now president of the National Association of Broadcasters.

("The bias of the broadcasters," Manning wrote, "is astounding and he [Collins] is the proper man to head them."

(Manning suggests that the accompanying editorial provides a fitting rebuttal to Governor Collins' attempt to link President Kennedy's assassination with "Dixie battle cries * * * employed to incite sick souls to violence.")

[From the Wall Street Journal]

From pulpits and the pens of commentators, from Government officials and assorted other citizens is issuing a torrent of talk to the effect that the American people are consumed with rancor and hatred. In the words of the outgoing head of the National Council of Churches, President Kennedy's assassination forces us to our knees in shame for all "our unharnessed hates."

The prevalence of such views is somewhat puzzling and not a little disturbing. Frightful and frightening as the murder was, it is hard to see on what rational grounds it can be made into an assault on the whole character of contemporary America.

The attack, to begin with, distorts all historical perspective. If this assassination is read as the result of an outpouring of hate peculiar to our time and place how are the assassinations of the past to be accounted for? In the case of Lincoln, at the end of a great civil war, it would seem more appropriate to speak of forces of hatred and violence.

Nor do the histories of other peoples support the idea that there is something especially wrong with our society. A capacity for violence is obviously embedded in all men, and has shown hideous faces in man's long past; how well or ill it is controlled depends on a variety of civilizing influences. Yet in many more or less civilized places today, not even an election can occur unaccompanied by violent death.

In America, the picture of a people possessed by hate does not fit the facts disclosed by simple observation. An assassin who even as a boy was considered by a psychiatrist to be a potentially dangerous psychopath—is it honestly believed that this particular individual sums up the American character? Or sensible to say that he and his rifle could only have emerged out of the forces of hate abroad in the land?

No one could deny that there are individuals and small groups peddling hate. There have always been and probably always will be, but if anything, they are today less important in national life and less indicative of national character than at some other periods.

It is fashionable nowadays to lump the haters with the extremists of the far right. In some individual instances there may be an identity, but individual hatreds also exist at the other extreme, in those who hate so much they would destroy America's institutions. In their obsession with the far right, some people seemingly refuse to believe that the deranged killer was a man of the far left.

In any event, all this is outside the mainstream of American life. Not hatred but growing understanding and even compassion typify the general temper of this society at this time.

Such qualities are evident all around us—in the normal home, in the comfortable working conditions of the normal company, in the increasing acceptance of once-despised minorities. It is hard to think of a time of so much concern by so many for the dignity of all men.

And it was such qualities that marked the reaction of the overwhelming majority of Americans to the President's death. It was not violence and hate but an outpouring of deep and personal grief, and that does reflect the American people.

To make the assassination of a President an occasion for character assassination does worse than confuse issues. The harping on hate is a disservice to the Nation, for it makes it more difficult for the nonviolent majority to get on with their and the Nation's business in a time of sorrow.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, Nov. 26, 1963]

A Loner or a Plot Is Crux of Kennedy Death

All of the ramifications behind the motive for the assassination of President Kennedy may never be revealed, but most Americans probably believe that the death of the President was no more than the whim of a fanatic.

It is easy to suppose that the prime suspect, and possibly others, may have had a direct link to either Moscow or Havana. Lee Oswald, the accused, did attempt to obtain Soviet citizenship and lived in Russia for 3 years. He also was a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, a leftwing activist organization propagandizing in the United States.

If it should develop that the assassination was an international plot, one may rest assured the death of the President will be avenged. Such a connection is unlikely, if for no other reason than the obvious political activities of the accused. More credible seems the motive apparent in the correspondence sent by Oswald to Governor Connally in which Oswald spoke of obtaining justice for his dishonorable discharge from the U.S. Marines. Connally is a former Secretary of the Navy.

More likely, if Oswald is indisputably proved to be the murderer, is the possibility that the assassination was the work of an undisciplined "loner" whose leftist fanaticism twisted his mind over the years into a final, horrible blow at established society.

What is frequently forgotten in the traditional American forbearance for extremely diverse political opinions is that the leftist hue, containing many pro-Castro and pro-Khrushchev activist groups in the United States, owes its allegiance to a foreign government. The sole loyalty of such groups is to the international conspiracy of which they are a part.

If not directly, at least indirectly, all local and national committees and activist organizations alined with the Kremlin subject American society to dire danger. A reawakening to this danger should result from the Kennedy tragedy.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Nov. 27, 1963]

Return to Sanity

While investigators are sifting the history of Lee H. Oswald and the man who killed him, in an effort to shed light on the murder of President Kennedy, it would be good for the country if every citizen would now calm down and restore national composure. The deluge of emotion that has spilled over the country, however understandable, is capable of upsetting normal life and sending disturbed individuals over the brink.

Such a one, we suppose, was Lee H. Oswald. An American woman reporter has made public her recollections of an interview with him in 1959 at Moscow. Her impression was that his desire to become a citizen of Soviet Russia came from "a combination of poverty, the plight of the U.S. Negro, and the U.S. Marines."

"After watching the way workers are treated in New York," Priscilla Johnson said that Oswald told her, "and Negroes in the South, I was looking for a key to my environment. Then I discovered Socialist literature."

Something of the sort has happened to many thousand Americans, judging from the outpouring of talk in recent years. Misunderstanding and dissatisfaction with life in a free country, which requires personal responsibility rather than reliance on blind collective action under rigid rules, have set up a new sort of mass mental illness among a formerly rugged people.

They seem beset by fear. Exploitation of this fear has been perpetrated at many levels. Sometimes motives are noble and sometimes less than noble.

What made Oswald decide to kill the President we do not know. Speculation that he was a hired gun now is being given serious consideration. The Richmond News Leader, a responsible newspaper, says "the finger points to Fidel Castro, an old hand at assassination." Oswald was in Mexico, it has been learned, within the last 7 weeks.

Where did Oswald, who fretted about downtrodden workers, get the money to travel to Mexico? Whence came the money to reach Moscow in 1959? The United States gave him $435 to return from Russia.

These and other questions need answers. Jack Rubinstein's bullet silenced Oswald. But the trail still may be uncovered.

Meanwhile, excesses of emotionalism are confusing the public. Assignment of collective guilt is a favorite pastime in some circles. One of the worst examples that has come to our notice was written by Jimmy Breslin for the New York Herald-Tribune and distributed by the Herald-Tribune news service. In wildly emotional language, Breslin attributed the President's murder to "a country that has let the art of hating grow so strong that we now kill Presidents because of it * * * Dallas is a collective word and it means Birmingham and Tuscaloosa and, yes, Scarsdale and Bay Ridge and the Bronx, too."

Breslin seems obsessed with racial and religious differences, but ignores altogether the solid fact about the assassin; namely, Oswald's Marxist background.

We single out Breslin's article merely because it is the most extreme of a flood of extremism. Until more facts are known, prudent people will reserve judgment. Oswald may have been a madman. He may have been a Communist agent. He was not, we insist, representative of decent Americans of any faith, color, or place of residence.

The suggestion that this tragedy stems from collective guilt of peace-loving people is a shameful lie. Regardless of their individual views, the overwhelming majority of people shared equally the grief of President Kennedy's death.

Collective smearing must stop. It must stop not only as regards the crime of November 22, but with respect to many other aspects of life in America. If freemen cannot discipline themselves in crisis, they will find themselves in the kind of collective straitjacket used to subdue the victims of uncontrollable insanity.

[From the Augusta Chronicle, Nov. 26, 1963]

The Nation Is Not To Blame

As if sadness and shock were not enough for Americans to have to bear, some among us are seeking—in the wake of President Kennedy's assassination—to assign the burden of guilt to the Nation, rather than to an individual. There is no logical or factual basis for such an interpretation.

"Society" cannot be said to have created an environment conducive to the slaying of a President. That we have sharp differences of political opinion and even some "pockets of hate" cannot be held responsible for so dastardly a deed as that committed by Mr. Kennedy's assassin.

This Nation has known political discord and elements of hatred throughout its history. It also has known previous assassinations and assassination attempts. But history reveals no correlation between the two.

Certainly there is no visible connection between President Kennedy's tragic death and the expression of honest differences of opinion, no matter how militant, among loyal Americans. If Lee Harvey Oswald was indeed the assassin, we probably will never know just what motivated his violent deed. But what we know of his life and loyalties strongly indicates that he could not even have pretended to have America's interests at heart and could even have been the agent of a foreign power.

This is the fallacy, it seems to us, in characterizing President Kennedy's death as a reflection of extremism within our own political spectrum. Intense, even radical, political feelings cannot be equated with the emotions that move men to plot and commit murder.

As for the implications by some that the Nation has tolerated irresponsible conduct in the past and thereby helped to squeeze the trigger, this concept violates the Christian and American principle of individual responsibility.

This is not to deny, of course, that each of us needs constantly to reexamine our lives and to seek a higher plane for ourselves and our Nation. But to suggest that the Nation is to blame for this act of terror, which virtually every American sincerely deplores, is to abandon proper perspective.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Nov. 26, 1963]

LET'S BE SENSIBLE

The first reaction upon seeing Lyndon Johnson walking with the others to the service at St. Matthew's was one of surprise. Was it wise for the President, after what happened in Dallas, to take the risk?

The more one thought about it the more proper it seemed. Should the President have ridden behind bulletproof glass? Should the same precaution have been taken in the case of Charles de Gaulle, Prince Philip, Anastas Mikoyan and the others? We think not. For to have done this might have lent a certain plausibility to the false notion that there is a sort of madness abroad in the land; that it was this, not a deranged mind, upon which must rest the blame for the assassination of President Kennedy.

There are, of course, those who preach violence in America. And there are those who practice it. But does this call for an indictment of all of us? Does it mean that ours is a generation apart? There are those who are suggesting as much. But how do they explain the assassination of Lincoln, Garfield and McKinley? How account for the excesses of our own American Revolution? Is there some weakness that is inherent in and peculiar to a free society such as ours? If so, what is the explanation for the assassinations in the closed societies?

No one knows what was at work in the unbalanced mind of Lee Harvey Oswald. Perhaps we will never know. He said something about being embittered because of hardship endured by his mother during the great depression. But millions of mothers suffered during those years. Yet their sons do not go around killing Presidents.

No, this theory of national guilt will not wash. The lunatic always has been and always will be with us. Every proper precaution should be taken to safeguard the President. But his security can never be made absolute. And we might just as well face up to it.

Another absurdity is the conspiratorial explanation of the murder of Lee Oswald by Jack Ruby. The official East German news agency quotes the inevitable "political observers" as saying that the assassination of President Kennedy was ordered by the extreme rightwingers, that an attempt was made to link the Communists to the crime, and that it was then decided to "eliminate" Oswald "in the fascist manner" so that he would never be able to name the real killers. This same line is being heard in veiled suggestions by otherwise sane Americans.

What utter nonsense. President Johnson has wisely called for a "prompt and thorough" investivation of all the circumstances surrounding the President's murder. The report which results should set to rest the orgy of speculation to which we have been treated in recent days.

[From the New York Daily News, Nov. 28, 1963]

THE "DROP THE HATE" HOKUM

We grow exceedingly weary of the current talk about how, in the wake of the Kennedy assassination, we've all got to drop hatred and extremism and get milksoppish and ever-lovin'. Dire consequences are threatened if we disregard this advice.

Our reaction: Nonsense; also nerts, to revive a good old slang word.

The drop-the-hate talk is coming mainly from pinkos and leftists who are bitterly disappointed that Lee H. Oswald, President John F. Kennedy's murderer, was a Communist and a Castroite.

Had Oswald been a member of the John Birch Society or a hater of Negroes, the current peddlers of love and kisses would be stirring up a witch hunt in every one of the 50 States at this moment.

Reds hate all non-Reds and anti-Reds. Hatred is at the core of their creed. They cannot justly complain, and their friends, open or secret, should not be surprised that the Reds' hatred generates counterhatred of equal intensity. Every action, says a law of physics, generates an opposite and equal reaction. It's the same with human emotions.

We think most Americans are going to go right on hating Reds—and the more so because one of these rodents killed a much loved young U.S. President.

Also very boring, we feel, is—the "we're all to blame" blah—being voiced by some supposedly serious thinkers concerning the Kennedy assassination.

MYSTICISM GONE WILD

Insofar as we can follow these eggheads' logic at all, they reason that there is something sinister or cruel or violent in most Americans, and that this mass trait somehow impelled Oswald to murder the President.

If this is so, why is it that the great majority of us neither murder nor maim people we dislike or disagree with, or anybody else? Why do we contribute billions a year to charity and churches? Why don't juries in our homicide cases always convict? And a dozen other questions like unto those.

This we're all to blame stuff just won't wash, as we see it, and is an insult to 99 Americans out of 100, or maybe 999 out of 1,000.

Equally nonsensical, in our opinion, is—the shame of Dallas baloney—peddled by still other serious thinkers, including some in Dallas itself. Or, if you happen to hate Texas, you can speak of the shame of Texas as springing from the fact that President Kennedy was murdered in Dallas, Tex.

WHERE'S ALL THIS SHAME?

True, Dallas is a bit on the wild side. But it is no more so than Birmingham, Chicago, Hollywood, and parts of New York City, among other places.

Nuts, killers, rapists, and arsonists live in all of those cities and frequently do grave harm to harmless citizens. But no shame properly attaches to the cities on that account. Chiefly, it indicates a need for more police and tougher judges. Certainly it is no disgrace to Dallas that President Kennedy happened to be murdered there by a Communist whose spiritual home was Havana or Moscow.

(We're not speaking at this time of the Dallas police and the later assassination of Oswald. We expect to discuss that some other day or days.)

Well, we've been a long time getting around to Thanksgiving Day 1963, and a few remarks concerning this beloved holiday.

The tragic death of the 35th President overshadows the occasion this year; no question about that.

And yet, there were aspects of this hideous event, even, for which we can all be grateful.

MIGHT HAVE BEEN WORSE

By the grace of God, Mr. Kennedy was spared a miserable lingering death like those suffered by our other martyred Chief Executives. He never knew what had hit him, which is the best way to die.

And in the courageous, beautiful, and utterly appealing conduct of Mrs. Kennedy and the two children following the tragedy, Americans have a memory to treasure for decades.

[From the Orangeburg (S.C.) Times and Democrat, Nov. 29, 1963]

LESSONS IN THE TRAGIC EVENTS

(By Thurman Sensing)

For all decent Americans of all political views, the death of President John F. Kennedy was a tragedy that they will remember all their days. No matter how much conservatives disagreed with the policies of his administration, which was their right as citizens, they respected the constitutional office of the President, admired the individual who had served his country bravely in wartime, and wished nothing but personal happiness for Mr. Kennedy, his wife, his children.

A tragic, unexpected fate lay in store for President Kennedy. He was removed from his high office in a way no good man or woman in America wanted or ever thought would happen. Not only was the murder of Mr. Kennedy a dastardly blow at a brave man but a blow at the American system, for the office of the President is the greatest gift that can be conferred under the Constitution that is sacred to our citizens. The assassin who fired at John F. Kennedy fired at the system of government—at the Republic—that is nearest and dearest to the hearts of Americans.

These recent days have been days of darkness and turmoil. They also have been days of confusion. Yet there must be lessons in the tragic events—lessons that the Nation must take to heart.

The man who was charged with the murder of the President was a self-admitted Marxist and a self-described official of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, a Castro front organization. It is tragic as well as ironic that a man connected with such ideas and such a movement should have been the one who police authorities are convinced was the one who struck him down.

In this last year, there has been extraordinary tolerance for Marxists. Student groups that described themselves as Marxist have reappeared on university campuses in the United States and have been accorded tolerance. The "liberal" climate of opinion has been that Marxism is harmless—just another political point of view that a so-called "sophisticated" society should be able to tolerate. But perhaps if the country had not been so "sophisticated," if it had not bought this line, John F. Kennedy would be alive today and safe with his wife and children.

As for the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee investigated this group in the spring of 1961. Conservative writers repeatedly urged the Justice Department to make a deep probe of this organization, which the Senate learned had received funds from Fidel Castro.

But the Justice Department, headed, ironically, by the late President's brother, never listed the Fair Play for Cuba Committee as subversive. "Liberals" continually preached against what they called "a witch hunt." They had torrents of words for so-called "rightwing" extremists, but they saw no evil, heard no evil when it came to leftwing extremists.

Well, tragic events have proven that investigations could have turned up real witches, real subversives, that is. A deep probe of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and of Marxist groups might have turned up the man charged with killing the President.

What the country needs to learn is that there can be an excessive degree of tolerance. A Marxist cannot be dismissed as a mere student or dissenting thinker. A man who regards himself as a Marxist inevitably regards himself as an enemy of American society and of our Government officials. The history of Marxism is intertwined with the history of terrorism and of assassination.

It is to be hoped that these facts will be brought to the attention of the American people in this time of mourning. One of the best ways for people to honor the fallen President is to demand that the Justice Department, through the agency of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, conduct the long overdue deep investigation of all the Marxist and pro-Castro groups now operating inside the borders of the United States.

Indeed, in order to assure the personal safety of President Johnson and of State Governors and other high American officials, it is imperative that the leftist groups subverting our way of life be exposed to the pitiless glare of publicity and surveillance.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Nov. 27, 1963]

Lee Oswald: A Threat to Red Timetable

At first glance, the reaction of most people across the United States is that the Dallas police would rate No. 1 in the Nation for the "booby" prize of all police departments. First, President Kennedy is shot to death in Dallas and then the man who was believed to be President Kennedy's assassin is shot to death while in the custody of the Dallas police. The killing of the man suspected of murdering the President was such a stupid performance that one wonders whether there could have been something behind all this that does not meet the eye.

It is quite evident that Lee Harvey Oswald, the man who is believed to have assassinated the President, had strong Communist connections. He had a Russian wife whom he married in Russia. He had been in Russia and tried to renounce his citizenship. He was an official of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. He was a Castroite. Yesterday this newspaper printed a special dispatch from Florida, detailing Oswald's activities on behalf of Castro in that area.

This Communist, leftwing background of the President's assassin, of course, came as a terrible shock to those elements within our society who have for years been telling the American people that the only danger to this country comes from the "extreme rightwing."

Leftwing propagandists in this country have also carefully hidden the fact that many of their number have a direct affiliation and an apparent supreme loyalty to a foreign power; namely, the Soviet Union. You will see, in the next few days, weeks and months, every attempt made by many communications media in the United States to suppress the fact that Oswald was a Marxist and a Communist. That is what makes the murder of Oswald, before his trial, all the more reprehensible.

An extended trial would have brought out in detail Oswald's Communist connections and exposed much of the Communist plot in this country, something that the leftwingers in our Government and communications media have for years denied ever existed at all.

Already you hear sugar-tongued commentators on the radio saying it would be horrible if the fact that Oswald had been a Communist should lead to a revival of "McCarthyism." Heaven forbid.

Of course, poor Joe McCarthy, in his blundering way, was on the track of the Communist conspiracy when those who controlled the conspiracy in this country ordered him destroyed as a warning to anyone else who might dare to investigate what was going on inside the Communist conspiracy in this country.

Since the downfall of McCarthy, almost no individual or newspaper—except a few, such as our own—has dared to point out the fact that there was indeed a Communist conspiracy going on inside this country. Oswald, who obviously was not the best-balanced individual in the world, upset the applecart of the Communists by killing the President. The Communists in this country and abroad are not interested at this moment in that type of direct action. They want, rather, to lull the United States and its Government to sleep and gain concession after concession from us. At the same time they want to influence our military policy so as to weaken our ability to defend ourselves.

Then, when this Nation is in a completely helpless position versus the Communists, from the standpoint of armed strength, then and then only do they intend to strike. In other words, like the assassins that they are, they want us to have our backs turned to them, just as President Kennedy's back was turned to the foul assassin who struck him down in Dallas. Then when our guard is down and our backs are turned, then and then only do they intend to strike.

It is easy to understand why Premier Khrushchev, on hearing the news of President Kennedy's death, hurried back from the Ukraine to Moscow. Oswald, by his uncontrolled act, had upset the Communist timetable for the takeover of the United States. Khrushchev immediately had to try to cover up the damage. Almost within the minutes of the news of the assassination, the Communist news media all over the world were blaring out the fact that President Kennedy had been slain by a "rightwinger," that it was all a "rightwing plot."

Now, the latest Red line is that the Dallas police allowed Oswald to be killed so as to cover up the fact that he wasn't guilty and it was really rightwingers who killed the President. Actually, the Communists must have heaved a great sigh of relief when the accused killer of President Kennedy was slain, because they knew this would silence much of the publicity which would have been so harmful to the Communist cause and might have awakened more Americans to the nature of the Communist conspiracy within the United States and throughout the world.

While we can sympathize with the White House advisers and the State Department functionaries, who for years have had their little pipedream that communism was changing, and that they, by being nice to the Communists, could make gentlemen out of them, we do hope that President Johnson will take immediate steps to have a real housecleaning in the White House and the State Department and, once and for all, get rid of these men whose wishful thinking could lead to the complete and utter destruction of the United States.

[From the Nashville Banner, Dec. 3, 1963]

Oswald Symbol of Communism in Practice

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The Associated Press photograph of handcuffed assassin Lee Harvey Oswald giving the hammer-and-sickle (clenched-fist) salute in the Dallas jail should not be forgotten in the confused contentions about what kind of American we have today.

It's a picture of pure communism in practice. That fact should not be lost in the debris.

Except for this, Lee Oswald teaches us no more about America than a leopard in a zoo and is about as indicative of true American problems (including civil rights) as was Stalin himself; a man whose agent—alias Jacques Mornard—assassinated Leon Trotsky with an Alpine climber's axe 11 years after Trotsky's exile and half a world away from home.

The Castro Communists' kidnapping of U.S. Col. James James K. Chenault in Caracas is pure communism in practice. In June Reds had attacked our Venezuelan military mission headquarters and set it afire in the same pattern that they burned the British Embassy in Jakarta, September 16. This is also pure communism in practice, as was the November 28 terrorist hijacking of the Venezuelan airliner at gunpoint.

Nothing changes. Valerin Zorin, the Soviet ambassador to the U.N., masterminded the assassinations in the 1948 Czechoslovakian Communist coup from within the Soviet Embassy in Prague.

Poland? The hard core of terrorists there today consists of wartime Communists who fled Warsaw to Moscow and returned to Poland in 1944 with Polish military units accompanying the Red Army. Moreover, Soviet intelligence picked up everywhere, and employs, all the former Nazi SS assassins it could find.

A central and permanent feature of Soviet policy is to cash in on the prestige of violence. Serving this purpose of violence, as well as specific political objectives, the Reds never run out of rope.

The Kremlin also maintains a special department of the Soviet Security Service (KGB) known as the "Disinformation Bureau" for manipulating misinformation. Read all about this in former Central Intelligence Agency Chief Allen Dulles' current "The Craft of Intelligence," a vital, revealing, remarkable book. For it also shows—the number officially revealed for the first time—that the Soviet had "over 40 high-level agents in various departments and agencies in Washington during World War II." Are there fewer now? This is pure communism in practice.

So is the November 15 notice in the newspaper Pradva Vostoka. It states that three Baptist women missionaries in Namangan are sentenced to 2 years in prison. They're accused of "organizing secret meetings of an unregistered Baptist sect." Their crime is "transcribing and distributing so-called Baptist hymns by means of which the character and world outlook of a granddaughter were influenced." It's just the same in Cuba, where if your neighbor does not like you, his word can kill you.

We abhor slums and maybe you can blame Al Capone on the slums of Chicago, although I don't think so; the same slums that produced many a fine Governor and countless civic leaders in the State of Illinois. But to blame American society for President Kennedy's horrible assassination and gratuitously drag in the grievous problem of integration, indict "the American soul," etc., is as preposterous as it is mysterious.

Immediately after Oswald's identification the State Department asked newsmen to play down the possibility that Oswald was a Castro or Kremlin agent, suggesting this could damage Soviet relations. And at this writing there is no known evidence of either link. But does it follow from this that blame be placed on nearly everything except Communist behaviorism, worldwide and traditional?

This was no ordinary murder. Our President was killed. Oswald was no ordinary Texan. He had no more roots in Dallas or Texas or America as a whole than in Timbuktu. But if this bestial act is to teach us anything it should at least teach us the penalty of softheadedness, supineness and apology for a doctrine that has always taught murder as an instrument of national policy whether this particular man was an agent for it or not; a man utterly disciplined in his task and even at the police station.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Dec. 1, 1963]

Hatred and Hysteria

In the emotional aftermath of President Kennedy's murder, the Nation is being subjected to a seemingly endless series of sermons, both in pulpits and in the public prints, on the evils of "hatred." The idea is always pretty much the same. The frame of mind which produced the assassination is equated, in resolute contradition of any known facts, with the attitude of the "radical right"—specifically the attitude of those who favor racial segregation. We are urged to purge ourselves of a poison which the dreadful act in Dallas supposedly has revealed in our blood stream.

The sermons are sincere and, hopefully, edifying as well. But they happen to be irrelevant to the death of Mr. Kennedy.

Segregation is morally wrong. A political program based on the repeal of the income tax is fiscally simple minded. But neither one had anything to do with the murder.

If it is absurd to try to blame the assassination on the political right, it is yet more absurd to insinuate that it was the result of something dreadfully wrong with American political life as a whole. Until we know something different, the reasonable assumption must be that the assassination was the result of something dreadfully wrong in the mind of Lee Oswald.

It would be good and desirable if the world could now abjure all hatred. But since hatred still exists 1,900 years after the crucifixion, it is unhappily unlikely that it will vanish now.

Meanwhile, the continuing hysteria about national hatred as the central feature of this national tragedy does us a national injustice. It ignores, too, the most obvious expression of national feeling.

The line of mourners formed at the Capitol a week ago is still moving.

It may be seen in Dallas, where citizens bring flowers to the place in the road where the President was shot.

It may be seen across the Potomac, where Americans are coming in thousands to visit his grave.

It may be seen in the spontaneous and universal actions taken to reverence the memory of the martyred leader by giving his name to places and institutions that will endure.

Surely it is this outpouring of love and grief which speaks truly of the state of the Nation.

[From the Charleston, (S.C.) News and Courier, Dec. 1, 1963]

False Indictment: The American People Are Not Guilty

(From an editorial in the Wall Street Journal)

In the shock of these past few days it is understandable that Americans should find their grief mingled with some shame that these events should happen in their country. We all stand a little less tall than we did last Friday morning.

Yet, for our own part, we find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who, in their moment of shock, would indict a whole nation with a collective guilt.

It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria they would charge to others, and in so doing show that their own country is past their understanding.

Anyone who has been reading the newspapers, listening to the radio or watching television has heard these men; they include public commentators, members of our Congress and men of God. And the substance of what they charge is that the whole of the American people—and by inclusion, the ways of the American society—are wrapped in a collective guilt for the murder of a President and the murder of a murderer.

A Senator said that the responsibility lay on "the people of Dallas" because this is where the events took place. A spokesman for one group of our people said the Nation was "reaping the whirlwind of hatred." One of our highest judges said the President's murder was stimulated by the "hatred and malevolence" that are "eating their way into the bloodstream of American life." A newspaper of great renown passed judgment that "none of us can escape a share of the fault for the spiral of violence." And these were but a few among many.

Such statements can only come from men who have not been abroad in the land, neither paused to reflect how the events came about nor observed in what manner the whole American people have responded to tragedy.

A President lies dead because he moved freely among the people. He did so because he was beloved by many people, respected by all, and because everywhere people turned out in great numbers to pay him honor. In a society of tyranny the heads of state move in constant fear of murder, cordoned behind an army of policemen. It is the fundamental orderliness of the American society that leads Presidents to move exposed to all the people, making possible the act of a madman.

In the tragedy there is blame, surely, for negligence. In retrospect, perhaps, it was negligent of a President himself not to be aware that there are ever madmen in the world; yet it is a negligence born of courage and confidence. It was negligent of the police authorities, perhaps, not to search and cover every corner, every window, which might shield a madman; yet it was a negligence born of years of proven trust in the crowds of Americans through which Presidents have safely moved.

But this is something different from the charge in the indictment.

It is more than nonsense to say that the good people of Dallas, crowding the streets to honor a President, share a murderous guilt; or that the tragic acts of madmen cast a shadow on the whole of America.

Such an indictment is vicious.

Why Pick on Dallas?

We rise to the defense of Dallas, Tex.

Many commentators and public figures have used the phrase, "the shame of Dallas" in suggesting that a million people in that area must take the major blame, and do penance for the horrible act of one mentally disturbed young man who was, after all, a newcomer in their midst.

Certainly the residents and officials of that unhappy city are expressing an extra measure of shock and grief at their direct witnessing of our Nation's tragedy. That is understandable. But it is not their shame or their failure.

This youth originated in the Bronx, where as a grade school pupil he was given a psychiatric examination, was found to be maladjusted, and to have "potentially dangerous" tendencies. If a city is to be held responsibile for him, the primary responsibility was in the Bronx, which had its chance to set the boy straight, and failed. Yet nobody has come forward with the suggestion that the Bronx should put on sackcloth and ashes.

Oswald went to high school in Fort Worth, and his former classmates there have said he was a "loner" and an oddball. But if Dallas should point the finger of blame at its nearest rival, Fort Worth would indignantly reject the accusation.

The young killer spent 2 years in the Soviet Union; he tried to resign his American citizenship; he married a Russian wife; he devoured Marxist literature as what he called his "personal Bible." But, strange to say, it has not been suggested that the blame for his confusion should rest in the city of Moscow.

He went to New Orleans, where he worked with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, definitely proved by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security to be a Communist front. Pictures of Oswald passing out Communist circulars on the streets of New Orleans were shown to the whole Nation. Yet we have heard nobody express the opinion that New Orleans is a culprit city.

Oswald's travel expenses from Russia back to this country were paid for with money advanced by the State Department, yet Washington is not asked to share the blame for what happened.

Why, then, should Dallas be called upon to undergo the ordeal of recrimination because Lee Harvey Oswald arrived there by way of the Bronx, Fort Worth, New Orleans, Moscow, and Washington with his mind made up, his personality already warped into a pattern which emerged soon after in a heinous crime that has been universally condemned?

If any city were dissected the way Dallas has been, the publicity would reveal the same sort of elements of hate and strife, and would most of all reveal the general lack of concern that allows them to breed. We have a long way to go in detecting and diagnosing mental illness, and in knowing what to do to keep it from being a public menace. The blame does not lie with the city of Dallas, but with all humanity. We can fix the blame for individual failures and mistakes there, but there are potential killers walking the streets of every city of the world. The real question is, "What are we going to do about them—and for them?"

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on December 3, Mr. LeRoy Collins, president of the National Association of Broadcasters, spoke in Columbia, S.C., and accused the South with guilt for the assassination of President Kennedy. In a speech which professed to deplore hate, Mr. Collins resorted to the most intemperate charges in his unfounded and completely unjustified attack on the people of the Southern States. For one who professes to abhor the emotion of hate, Mr. Collins proves himself singularly adept at verbally purveying this most violent emotion. If Mr. Collins had prepared for months to the end of arousing the strongest possible emotional reaction, he could not have done a more thorough job than he did accomplish with his speech in Columbia on December 3. I ask unanimous consent that a number of newspaper editorials and articles commenting on the remarks of Mr. Collins be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, perhaps the most concise appraisal of Mr. Collins' speech appeared at the conclusion of an editorial in the Nashville Banner of Nashville, Tenn., of December 5. This editorial stated:

> If Mr. Collins professes to believe what he has said, he is infected by a germ of extreme aberrations, and employers should dump him as a very sick man.

Mr. President, so vicious and so unfounded are the attempts to fix blame for the President's assassination on either the southerners or the conservatives, that there arises a suspicion that those who make such charges are much more incensed that the assassination was not perpetrated by a member of the American groups which they so despise and on which they attempt to place the guilt for any real or imagined defects in the American society, than they were over the fact of the assassination of the President itself.

If the guilt for the tragic and dastardly assassination of the President is to be placed on a broader base than the individual or individuals who actually participated in the assassination, then the guilt must logically be placed on those who purvey the insidious ideology of communism, for it is they who are the real purveyors of class warfare, bigotry, hatred, and violence in the world today.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Nashville Banner, Dec. 5, 1963]

LEROY COLLINS, ET AL—THE FACTS ARE IGNORED BY HUCKSTERS OF HATE

Peddlers of demagogy carry their own sample kit, and LeRoy Collins—who was a "liberal" politician before becoming president of the National Broadcasters Association—went fully equipped in that particular for his Tuesday evening mission to South Carolina. There he let go with one more swipe with the smear brush at the South—his allegation being that the assassination of President Kennedy was fostered by "Dixie battle cries which incite sick souls to violence."

Desperation can lead to hysteria, it is true—and maybe the charitable thing would be to ascribe this vitriol to ignorance. But Mr. Collins is not a run-of-mine ignoramus. He is the purposeful protagonist of a point of view so foreign to truth that it can only be intended, not to enlighten on facts, but obscure them; not to ameliorate and solidify, but to excite passions of the hate pack with which he clearly runs. Whose ideological bread he eats, their chant he joins.

"Look," they say drooling for another bite of the infected morsel, "he's singing our song."

As a divisive demagog, thus deliberately ignoring facts of record, he fits into the pattern of the propagandists dispensing entirely with fact to pin guilt just anywhere except where it belongs. The South is their target; therefore they act, to a man, as if they had never heard of Lee Harvey Oswald; nor are aware that as triggerman he was an avowed pro-Castro Communist, doing that enemy's business.

To these, mention of the Communist connection seems to be a mustn't-mustn't. It's still more expedient, apparently, to persist in the assertion—launched at the outset as a spontaneous defamation—that southern hate killed John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Some of the commentators among Mr. Collins' colleagues have been persisting in that. They have been addicted to that hate needle by long use; their Operation Dixie rigging the picture for their own propaganda spiel, and playing pundit to the point of difficult extrication when facts of record leave them stranded, to squirm on their own hook.

If Mr. Collins has been listening exclusively to these for his information, it would be understandable that he is totally uninformed; still one would expect somebody going out on the lecture circuit, to discuss a matter of utmost gravity, to at least have a brush with facts before mounting the rostrum.

That the ex-Governor of Florida finds himself thus in the company of Chief Justice Earl Warren is not a circumstance augmenting his stature; the latter also delivered himself of a similar diatribe—no less shockingly wide of the truth because it was an offhand observation—voiced immediately after the President's death before the Red ideology of the killer was known. Nevertheless he repeated his scattergun blast of hate as he stood at Mr. Kennedy's bier in the Capitol Rotunda. Of the three who delivered eulogies, only Warren used the sad and solemn occasion to hurl a jarring note of anger by assigning guilt to fellow Americans.

It is nothing less than peculiar that the insulting conclusions reached by this school of South-baiting extremists parallel the charges peddled by Tass and Izvestia. The propaganda line being circulated by the latter in Russia is that President Kennedy was the victim of a Southern assassination plot. And it is the line emphasized at every opportunity by most of the commentators featured by the medium that pays Mr. Collins' salary. Apparently for pay, the former Governor of Florida takes his cue and turns traitor to his own region, which bears the name of Dixie. Characteristically, no mention of the fact that Lee Oswald was a pro-Castro Marxist, and working member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Most of Washington knows the score on that, even if for the moment it isn't talking much about it. There are facts still to come out; but salient facts already have emerged.

Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas, hit the nail on the head when he rebuked those who blame American "society" for the Presidential murder. "These people overlook the simple fact—or refuse to admit it—that Lee Harvey Oswald was not fashioned by our society. His mind was, in fact, fashioned by the propaganda of Marx, an atheist who laid the foundation of communism.

"Let us remember," he added, "that in talking about extremists, in talking about the purveyors of hate, that the real purveyors of hate in this world, the real fomenters of class war and bigotry are the Communists; and the real disease of this world is Communist imperialism."

Among those refuted by the facts stated are the pundits striving to manufacture of this tragedy a propaganda case for their own further purveyance.

Infamies heaped upon the South this time are so transparently false that the entire Nation must see them for what they are.

If Mr. Collins professes to believe what he has said, he is infected by a germ of extreme aberrations, and employers should dump him as a very sick man.

[From the Edgefield Advertiser, Dec. 4, 1963]

THE COLLINS SPEECH IN COLUMBIA

There is the account of the speech of former Governor Collins in Columbia yesterday with bold heading on the front page of this morning's paper. Too much of the speech is untruth, and on the whole it is a misrepresentation spoken in the face of southern people.

Mr. Collins is now president of the National Association of Broadcasters whose monopoly for propaganda is today the most powerful single voice in the country. Whether it is used with the best taste, in the best national interest, is questionable, but it and its president are adept at propaganda.

The building of a new world through the airways engages much of the time of Mr. Collins, one may be sure. Not content with visiting the homes of the South through remote broadcast of entertainment, he comes into the Deep South to the capital of the Secession State, to preach against the South's evil, which he says is segregation.

It is typical and unfortunate that as men move into positions of power they lose something of the values that made them what they were, but are no longer.

The greatest power is not always at the top, and that is why centralization, seeking perfection in the whole, is bereft of the means of achieving it.

Dictatorship may have many good reasons for acceptance, but it has been historically true that dictatorship and the ultimate ideals of good have been two separate and distinct things.

People naturally and historically resent intrusion; for there is no absolute power except in the conscience of the individual, and there is no power to be respected above one's own convictions.

Mr. Collins has been drawn into the central establishment of power in the United States, which assumes that it can engineer a new social order from the top.

The baptism of power is often fatal; and, in a country of liberty, it is only power that can destroy it. Mr. Collins, who blames the South for the assassination of President Kennedy, would deny criticism, opposition, the spoken and written word, it seems. He would deny the very freedoms that are conscienceful forces in our country dedicated to maintaining our freedoms.

Destroy them, and the well of liberty has gone dry.

Years ago in the days of steam pumps, an engineer was being examined for graduation, when his examiner proposed the following question: "Suppose you have a steam pump constructed for a ship, under your own supervision, and know that everything is in perfect working order yet, when you throw out the hose, it will not draw. What would you think?"

"I should think, sir, there should be a defect somewhere."

"But such a conclusion is not admissible, for the supposition is, that everything is perfect, and yet it will not work."

"Then, sir, I should look over the side to see if the river had run dry."

Those who stand in positions of power inevitably want to create a perfect machine, which now in contemplation is a new world order without freedom.

When, along the way, will they learn that no matter how perfect the machine is designed, the river of liberty, which is life itself, is to be reckoned with, too?

One must agree with Mr. Collins that politicians have misled the people into believing that the public law in time will uphold segregation. Segregation will never be a public ideal. It is a private, personal matter, embraced by freedom, but not by the law.

The idea that men are created equal, he said, "is an idea that can never be stopped, not by custom, not by prejudice, not by hate, not by murder, not by armies, not by any mortal force * * * has the invincibility of simple truth, justice and right."

With all that most southerners agree, and anyone of heart and reason must ever wish that it will be so. It is a great ideal.

But there is no known order, in all history, no system of government, no manmade laws, no army bayonet, no appropriation of funds, or anything else that can be done to bring about equality without first the complete destruction of freedom; for ultimate equality is an ideal of freedom, not of power.

And, while so many leaders talk of advancing the cause of humanity, of moving forward in social and economic fields—all of which sounds so promising and so winning—they seldom say that a dictatorship could get it all done quickly and easily; but that is what they would say, if they wanted to be truthful all the way, which Mr. Collins has not been. But he did say this—thanks to his frankness—"The advancement of all rights * * * as we know, will occur with the overt aid of the National Government * * *."

And, all the while, the power establishment softens its approach to the dictators of the world who are committed to bury us all, and to whom freedom is the sinister evil.

In the power establishment—closely supported by the National Association of Broadcasters—the leaders, the public casually observes, are nearly all millionaires or very rich; and this is so on nearly all leadership levels, the wealth of government having its courtiers now as it did in the early days of royalty.

It becomes importunate that they gather before humanity a set of ideals attractive to the masses, and that they crusade to justify their power and good fortune, to soothe their conscience, to seem to supply a high service and thus to further their own interest—to accomplish what they would like to be given credit for but are not competent either to conceive or to administer.

And like the infallible kings of old, while what they say is a form of power itself, they themselves contribute almost nothing. Like the royalty of ancient times, their work consists of spending money taken from the pockets of the people.

[From the Augusta Chronicle, Dec. 6, 1963]

THE MOTE IN COLLINS' EYE

Not in his most genial mood was Leroy Collins known, as far as we can ascertain, as a Dixiephile. Rather, the former Florida Governor has long been recognized as holding little regard for anything—man or beast—residing below the Mason and Dixon line.

That became evident during his tenure as chairman of the Southern Governors' Conference as well as when he presided over the National Democratic Convention. Nothing he had to say could have been construed as being complimentary to the section of the Nation which had been so good to him.

Even so, there was an absence of vitriol in what Collins had to say about the South. It was damaging, but not dirty.

Now, however, as it has for so many other misdirected Americans, the assassination of President Kennedy has so unbalanced Collins' rationality that we find him unleashing against the South a hatred which seems even more extreme than that which he charges to it.

His address before the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce was a smear of all things southern, carrying with it the implication that the South colluded in the murder of President Kennedy.

He named no officeholders in his remarks, but it was obvious that he referred to elected officials of this area when he asked how long "are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured by these Claghorns."

And, as though it were an everyday occurrence unique to the South and condoned by the South, he asked: "How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?"

It must be presumed that Mr. Collins, in this wholly unfair reference, holds the southern politicians responsible for the violence that has come as the outgrowth of civil rights demands. In so doing, he charges the basest of crimes to men who are motivated not by the hate and extremism that the former Florida Governor himself exhibits, but by deep convictions that States rights are guaranteed in the U.S. Constitution, and that compulsion is neither the way to gain integration nor admiration.

In the soul-filled dislike which he displays for the South, Collins lays to it the abhorrent assassination of President Kennedy as he conveniently ignores the Communist background of the alleged assassin.

It is understandable, in that he, as president of the National Association of Broadcasters, brazenly and banefully, vents his spleen against this region in a chamber of commerce address, how it is that so many members of his current profession—those especially in network positions—are utterly intolerant of the South and the southern viewpoint.

In their hate of us, they fail to see their own.

[From the News and Courier, Dec. 6, 1963]

THE COLLINS INSULT

Besides insulting millions of southerners with public blame for President Kennedy's murder, former Gov. Leroy Collins, of Florida managed in his speech at Columbia to work in a specific insult to a southern family by the name of Claghorn.

The late Fred Allen, one of the greatest American comics of our time, invented a character with a southern accent and called him Senator Claghorn. Members of the Claghorn clan may not have liked this use of the name but at least they could enjoy Mr. Allen's harmless humor.

The venom in Mr. Collin's barb about "these Claghorns"—whom he linked with several murders, including Mr. Kennedy's—is something altogether different. At least one descendant of a Claghorn—a name with an honorable record in American history—has already expressed the resentment that we are confident is spreading throughout this region. Mrs. B. Ellis deTreville of Beaufort, whose mother was a Claghorn, has said she intends to sue Mr. Collins unless he makes a public apology.

We wish it were possible for every affronted southerner, whatever his name and ancestry, to extract an apology from the man, though we are not prepared to say what it would be worth.

[From the Greenville News, Dec. 6, 1963]

LEROY COLLINS' GRIEVOUS ERRORS

We feel for the hosts at the annual meeting of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce and, especially for Gov. Donald S. Russell who was called upon to introduce former Gov. Leroy Collins of Florida prior to his speech in which he denounced, in terms at least as vicious as its most extreme critics have used, his native South.

When he declared that "Dixie battle cries which incite sick souls to violence" fostered or contributed to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the once politically ambitious Floridian not only libeled the South but the whole Nation.

For the things he said of his own region could be said with just as much truth—or the lack of it—of any other region or of the country as a whole.

We shall not waste time taking Governor Collins' remarks apart and dignifying and further broadcasting them by refuting them. But when he spoke in the most extreme terms of the behavior of what he referred to as a few southern extremists, he committed the selfsame sin of which he was accusing them.

Nothing can be said by us or anyone else to excuse or mitigate some of the bombings, shootings, and other crimes to which Mr. Collins referred in the course of his remarks. But he spoke as if they occurred only in the South, and he certainly knows better than that.

The South has its sick souls, of course. But they are about equally divided between the two extremes on the race issue, which Collins attempted to say was the main cause if not the whole cause of the assassination. The available evidence does not support that thesis.

And, as for the incitement of the sick souls, the kind of man who killed the late John Kennedy is capable of killing anyone for the same paranoid reasons; in fact, they don't need any reasons.

The flames of incitement are already burning within their troubled hearts and twisted minds.

Mr. Collins should know that every region and every community in the country has its potential paranoiac assassins. They strike often, except that their victims are lesser folk than Presidents and we call it murder instead of assassination.

Mr. Collins has committed two grievous errors in addition to embarrassing his hosts.

One is that, like certain others, he has attempted to indict unfairly a whole people for the crime of one man or one small group of men.

The other has to do with the old adage that it's a pretty sorry bird who will foul his own nest.

[From the Montgomery Advertiser,
Dec. 5, 1963]

A SWINISH LIBEL

The latest and not least offensive hellmouth to indict the South, and Alabama in particular, for the murder of President Kennedy is a native son—former Gov. Leroy Collins, of Florida, who is now the czar of the National Association of Broadcasters.

Alabamians will remember Collins as the presiding officer at the 1960 Democratic Convention in Los Angeles—prematurely gray, handsome, virile, and athirst for the vice-presidential nomination.

Collins has now hastened to make a finding that upstages the official assassination report to come from the Warren Commission.

The Commission need not consult the FBI, for the elegant, ambitious Collins has ruled that the assassination was the result of "Dixie battle cries which incite sick souls to violence."

Collins deposed that the Communist Oswald was inspired by "the rabble-rousers" who urge the country to "stand up and fight" for segregation and States rights.

Collins referred to unnamed southern politicians and asked:

"How long are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured before the Nation by these Claghorns? How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?"

This swinish libel of a people comes from a man who seeks the patronage of other sections. In times past, even Time magazine has slurred Collins as a civil rights phony. It observed in the September 1, 1958, issue:

"With many a pear-shaped preachment * * * Collins has built a reputation as a civil rights statesman, won favorable mention as a southern moderate who might do nicely as a Democratic vice presidential nominee in 1960. But Collins' practice falls far short of his preachment: Not once during his 3 years as Governor has he proposed even a token program for admitting Negro children to white classrooms in Florida's 100-percent segregated public school system."

What Collins now says is designed to stifle political opposition to the Democratic Party. And it is plainly frivolous.

The Communist Oswald was scarcely inspired to his crime by sympathy with States rights.

Oswald was not inspired by either southern or northern agitators. If anything, he was angry because he couldn't get a visa to return to Russia.

Nobody, including Collins, knows with any certainty what impelled Oswald to his horrendous crime. He was a madman of the kind who could have killed Kennedy one day and Khrushchev the next day with equal pleasure.

And something that Collins and his demagogic breed leave up in the air is this: If Oswald murdered Kennedy because of States rights debate, then what explains the equally crazed act that was Jack Ruby murdering Oswald?

[From the State, Dec. 5, 1963]

THE MAN WHO CAME TO DINNER

Agree or disagree with LeRoy Collins, you must give him credit for consistency if not for propriety.

The former Governor of Florida long has wanted to remake the image of the South into something more nearly resembling that of the rest of the Nation. His efforts in that direction were apparent when he was the chairman of the Southern Governors' Conference—and when he was the presiding chairman over the Democratic National Convention in 1960.

Now that he is president of the National Association of Broadcasters, he carries the same uncharitable view of many things and many people of the South. That is his privilege, and we would be the last to stand in his way of sounding off.

But it seemed singularly inappropriate for him to use the annual banquet of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce as an occasion to castigate the South and its spokesmen. We accept, with somewhat qualified gratitude, his differentiation of South Carolina from our sister Southern States. We cannot accept his more general indictment of the South.

Least of all can we accept from him or anyone else the accusation that Southerners are "un-American" in their adherence to values and traditions which have their very origins in the birth of this Nation of ours.

And for him to impute some sort of collective guilt to the South for the assassination of President Kennedy is both inexcusable and insulting.

If he is genuinely concerned with madmen and meanness, he need only look about in the Northern region where he now resides.

The greatest service LeRoy Collins could render the South, and indeed the Nation, would be to use his considerable influence in the world of network broadcasting to throttle those false messiahs of the microphone who glory in misrepresenting all that is decent in Dixie.

[From the Columbia Record, Dec. 5, 1963]

GOVERNOR COLLINS' SPEECH

"A Deep South community does not have to throw itself onto a funeral pyre of hate," the former Governor of Florida, LeRoy Collins, declared in a Columbia speech Tuesday night.

Nor do southerners have to soak themselves in the oil of guilt and set themselves aflame for distant hordes of Saracens to applaud.

Donning the sackcloth of the apologist, he addressed the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce on "some thoughts that have been brooding in my mind lately. I do not like it when people speak of southerners as if they are not human parts of the United States," he declared. Then, with his customary urbane eloquence, he proceeded to sharpen the lines of misunderstanding and condemnation.

"For too long we have permitted the South's own worst enemies to speak for it," he said. He might have added, "And too often do the South's own best friends speak against it."

"We have allowed the extremists to speak for the South," the former Governor, now president of the National Association of Broadcasters, continued. "They have done it in the national press and on the national radio and television to such an extent that citizens outside the South would be entitled to wonder if they might not need visas to pass through our region. * * * And I ask you tonight, how long are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured before the Nation by these Claghorns?"

The distortion will continue as long as these extremists, these Claghorns, are the only prosouthern voices to which the national press and Governor Collins' own national broadcasters will listen.

The speaker deplored "Dixie battle cries (that) have been employed to incite sick souls to violence," but he ignored the sources of much of the incitement and preachment of hate which are neither Claghorn nor Southern.

"How many Sunday School children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the back? How many Governors have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?" Governor Collins asked, compounding the reckless libel that crime and lawlessness are a hallmark of Southern society.

"It is time the decent people of the South, with all their might and strength," he added, "told the bloody-shirt-wavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry." And they should speak loudly enough to be heard afar in the unholy sanctums of intolerance and prejudiced ignorance.

"Too many politicians down our way," the top broadcaster said, "talk defensively of 'States rights' when they and we well know that there can be no such thing as a State's right to default on a national duty." One of the indictments against the South by those who confuse "national duty" with personal ideology is that the South is too American, too patriotic. Where true national duty has been concerned, the people of Dixie have always stood in the forefront and provided a shield against those who would destroy our national character and heritage. They have observed no conflict between loyalty to State and loyalty to Nation.

"Some politicians in other regions of the Nation contend that the South now bears such a stigma before the Nation that it is incapable of producing national leadership," the speaker declared in his conclusion. "And there are even some southerners who parrot the same fallacy."

Yes, Governor, there certainly are.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Dec. 8, 1963]

BYRNES TAKES ISSUE WITH COLLINS SPEECH

(Editor's Note.—The following article is reprinted from the Columbia State:)

James F. Byrnes, in a statement Friday, charged that "if any group has contributed to building a climate of hate it has been the broadcasters."

Mr. Byrnes, former Governor of South Carolina, and Secretary of State, was taking issue with LeRoy Collins, ex-Governor of Florida, who in a Columbia address attributed hate to the South and racial prejudices. Collins is president of the National Association of Broadcasters.

The firing last summer on a Citadel cadet by a young Negro, and the subsequent shot at that institution's president, Gen. Mark Clark, were cited by Mr. Byrnes. "No broadcaster referred to it or denounced it as encouraging a climate of hate," he declared.

Mr. Byrnes refuted the idea that Lee Harvey Oswald was motivated by racial feeling in the killing of President Kennedy. "On the contrary, all the evidence has shown his feelings in favor of the Soviet Government," Mr. Byrnes said.

Following is the text of the statement of Mr. Byrnes:

"Everybody will agree that there should not be developed in any community, or in the country at large, a climate of hatred for an individual or group because of differences in views about political issues. However, Mr. LeRoy Collins spent his time emphasizing that the climate of hate was built up in Birmingham and other southern spots because of race hatred and race prejudices.

"The fact is, in all the thousands of words written about the assassination of President Kennedy, not one witness has offered a statement indicating even that Oswald was motivated by any feeling on the race question. On the contrary, all the evidence has shown his feelings in favor of the Soviet Government which caused him to try to become a citizen of that country and caused him to go to the trouble and expense of advocating fair play for Cuba.

"In addition, it is noteworthy that when asked about counsel to represent him, he stated he did not want any Texas lawyer but that he would like to have Mr. Abt, of New York, who first came into public view as a close friend of Alger Hiss and who has been the subject of investigation by some Government agencies.

"Oswald was young. He could not have personally known Abt. His immediately expressed desire to have this lawyer represent him would indicate that he has knowledge of and probably has sympathy with the man who, like Hiss and Lee Pressman, has been active in the causes sympathetic with the Communists.

"The truth is, if any group has contributed to building a climate of hate, it has been the broadcasters, because they have consistently misrepresented the South and a people who are misrepresented necessarily resent such treatment.

"The press carried a statement last summer that a Citadel cadet while driving a young lady home from a dance at the Citadel, was fired upon by a young Negro. The bullet entered his jaw and was removed from his chin. No broadcaster talked about that being due to the climate of hate that was built up.

"Within 48 hours after that incident, Gen. Mark Clark, a distinguished general in the U.S. Army and a hero of the attempted assassination, driving to the Citadel, was fired upon. The bullet struck his car but fortunately he was not hurt. The press carried a statement of the attempted assassination but so far as we can recall, no broadcaster referred to it or denounced it as encouraging a climate of hate.

"When Oswald, who admittedly is a Communist sympathizer, and who gave the hammer and sickle salute (clenched fist) in the Dallas jail, killed the President of the United States, his act is attributed by Mr. Collins, to a climate of hate growing out of race prejudice."

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Dec. 8, 1963]

ORANGEBURG STATION RAPS COLLINS SPEECH

Orangeburg.—Radio station WDIX here yesterday took issue with a speech made by former Florida Gov. LeRoy Collins to the Columbia Chamber of Commerce.

The editorial stated that Mr. Collins said many extreme and radical things but used the time to comment on only one point made by the president of the National Association of Broadcasters. Mr. Collins said: "The assassination of President Kennedy was fostered by 'Dixie battle cries which incite sick souls to violence.' "

The full text of the editorial follows:

"Speaker at the annual meeting of the Greater Columbia (S.C.) Chamber of Commerce was the Honorable Mr. LeRoy Collins, former Governor of Florida and now the president of the National Association of Broadcasters. The Associated Press reports the broadcasters' president as saying that the assassination of President Kennedy was fostered by 'Dixie battle cries which incite sick souls to violence.' The broadcasters' president said many other extreme and radical things—intolerant and violent things. We will observe only the one thing—that Dixie battle cries fostered the assassination of President Kennedy.

"What Mr. Collins said was equally well said by the three top officers of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—Gus Hall, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Benjamin J. Davis—also reported by the Associated Press that they 'called the President's assassination "the ultimate end * * * by the racists and forces of the ultraright," ' the Communist Party, U.S.A. What the Honorable Mr. Collins said and what the top Reds in the United States said, has also been said by the Communist news agency, Tass, since their first release on President Kennedy's death. The Honorable Mr. Collins, it must be noted, is joined by Chief Justice Earl Warren and the Communists, in a similar view. That is the privilege of Chief Justice Warren and the Communists and the Honorable Mr. Collins—to smear the South, the segregationists, and 'unnamed southern politicians' who advocate States rights.

"Thank goodness, not all responsible people—like the Honorable Mr. Collins—aline themselves in the manner he has. For instance, in referring to Supreme Court Justice Warren's statement about the 'forces of hatred and malevolence,' the Chicago Tribune said: 'This perverted thesis may be reduced to an attempt, naked and without apology, to liquidate dissent in the United States.' "

STATEMENT OF WALTER J. BROWN, PRESIDENT OF SPARTAN RADIOCASTING CO. AND FORMER PRESIDENT OF SOUTH CAROLINA BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION

It was "inappropriate" to use the words of the Columbia State, for Governor Collins to use the annual banquet of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce as an occasion "to castigate the South and its spokesmen."

As a broadcaster, I go further and say Governor Collins broke faith with those of us who broadcast his speech when, without warning, he chose the occasion to impugn the motives of most southern leaders over a statewide broadcast which had been set with the written commitment that "Governor Collins will deal with the Government threat to the broadcasting industry."

In fairness to Governor Collins, it should be said that late in the afternoon he released his speech to news media, and Governor Russell, having seen an advance copy, had the opportunity in his introduction to issue a disclaimer, but the broadcasting stations carrying the broadcast had no such opportunity.

What I resented most about the Governor's speech was his attempt to link opposition to the so-called civil rights program to the tragic assassination of President Kennedy. Everyone knows he was killed by a known Communist and Castro sympathizer. It is so unfair for anyone, whether he be the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court or president of the National Association of Broadcasters, to contend that opposition by the people of the South or any other section to far-reaching proposals of the civil rights program pending in the Congress was in any way responsible for the trigger that was pulled in Dallas which took the President's life.

No one certainly would want to take from Governor Collins the right to say what he pleases about any subject at any time. However, he is the paid and recognized spokesman for broadcasters. When he makes a blanket indictment against the people of the South and a vast majority of their duly elected Members of Congress, we feel he oversteps his authority and does a disservice to broadcasting.

If Governor Collins wants to come South and talk about "claghorns," "bloody shirt wavers," and riders of "buckboards of bigotry," he should name names. At least this would enable those of us who broadcast his speech to offer equal time.

I know personally most of the southern leaders in Congress, as well as many of our southern Governors. We may not agree with them on all subjects, but none of them falls under the Governor's indictment.

I realize there is a hysteria sweeping the country about civil rights. Perhaps Governor Collins was swept away by this emotional virus when he came to Columbia. But as one broadcaster, I agree with Senator RUSSELL that this civil rights program takes away more liberty than it gives. It deserves calm and deliberate legislative consideration. Governor Collins made no contribution to that end and he made it difficult for those of us who agreed to serve with him in promoting better relations in the Congress for the worthwhile legislative objectives of our association.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND TO STATE OF DELAWARE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1767) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the State of Delaware, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my desire to cooperate with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on his bill, S. 1767; but as the author of the so-called Morse formula, I have the obligation of making sure that the Morse formula is not violated in this case.

Subsections (a) and (b) of section 2, on pages 2 and 3 of the bill, contain provisions which relate directly to the Morse formula.

Subsection (a) of section 2 would not violate the formula if this subsection calls for the reconveyance of lands which were ceded—gratuitously conveyed—to the United States by the State of Delaware in 1873.

Therefore, first, I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware if it is correct that the lands described in section 2(a) were acquired by the United States and the State of Delaware without compensation in 1873?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of an act of the legislature as passed in Dover, Del., February 5, 1873, in which this land was ceded to the U.S. Government for a specific purpose.

There being no objection, the act was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Laws of Delaware, vol. 14, pt. 2, 1873]

CHAPTER 356 OF PUBLIC LANDS

An act to cede certain lands to the United States of America

SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Delaware in General Assembly met,* That William D. Waples, N. W. Hickman, and Dr. D. H. Houston, of Sussex County, be and they are hereby appointed commissioners on the part of the State of Delaware, and they, or a majority of them, are hereby authorized and empowered, in conjunction with any agent or person appointed by the President of the United States, or by the Secretary of War, to locate and fix the boundaries of any quantity of land belonging to the State of Delaware, not exceeding 2,100 feet front and 3,000 feet deep, from low water mark situated and lying on the Delaware Bay, southeast of the old mole, usually called the Government Mole, and between said old mole and the point of Cape Henlopen, and the land belonging to the State of Delaware, located and designated by the boundaries to be fixed and determined by the commissioners aforesaid in conjunction with the agent or person to be appointed as aforesaid by the President of the United States or by the Secretary of War, and all claim, title and right of soil and jurisdiction of the State of Delaware in, to, or over the same is hereby ceded to and vested in the United States in perpetuity; and that a plot of the land so located and hereby ceded as aforesaid be made and recorded in the office of the recorder in and for Sussex County: *Provided,* That the sovereignty and jurisdiction of this State shall extend over the land hereby ceded to the United States so far as that all civil and criminal process issued under any law of this State may be executed in any part of said lands and buildings or structures thereon erected.

SEC. 2. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the above cession of land and jurisdiction hereby made is upon the express condition that defenses, to be built by the United States at the Delaware breakwater harbor, shall be constructed thereon.

SEC. 3. Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the north end of Reedy Island, in New Castle County, Del., not to exceed 50 acres, and also the ice harbor constructed on the east side thereof, be and the same are hereby ceded to the United States; and all claim, title, and right of soil and jurisdiction of the State of Delaware in, to, or over the same is hereby ceded to and vested in the United States in perpetuity; and that a plot of the land so located and hereby ceded as aforesaid be made and recorded in the office of the recorder in and for New Castle County: *Provided,* That the sovereignty and jurisdiction of this State shall extend over the land hereby ceded to the United States so far as that all civil and criminal process issued under any law of this State may be executed in any part of said lands and buildings or structures thereon erected or to be erected.

Passed at Dover, February 5, 1873.

(At this point Mr. INOUYE took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MORSE. That being the case, reversion of this excess Federal land is implied, and under the Morse formula no compensation on section 2(a) lands is required. I should like to make this clear, because over the years the Morse formula has been under discussion in the Senate; it goes back to the year 1946. We have had a number of cases in which the Federal Government obtained parcels of land from a State gratuitously, with the understanding that the land would be used for a specific Federal use only. I have always pointed out that the clear implication is, under those circumstances, that when the Federal Government no longer has need of the land for such use, the land should revert to the State, the municipality, or the county that originally donated the land for specific purposes.

I say to the Senator from Delaware—and I am commenting now out of recollection—I am not so sure that some years ago he and I did not discuss the question when he helped me sustain the Morse formula in connection with a piece of property that involved one of these implied reversions.

I know such was the case with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in connection with the type of property or facility that I now mention which was involved in a bill in respect to a veterans hospital in Kentucky. This particular application of the Morse formula—or in these instances the nonapplication of it—has arisen in cases that involve veterans hospitals where a city or a State has donated to the Federal Government a rather large tract of land for a veterans hospital. Of course, the State or local officials were happy to bring a veterans hospital into a community, because it is a great economic asset to it. The Federal Government built the hospital and developed the facility, and then discovered that it had much more land than it really needed for the purpose, but having obtained it for that purpose it had no right to keep the property for any other purpose.

Thus, we have had bills such as the Kentucky bill and the Roseburg, Oreg., bill and other bills pertaining to other parts of the country, involving implied reversion, in which the property reverted to the State or to the local agency donor.

In view of the answer of the Senator to my first question, that would be certainly true of all the property in section 2(a) of his bill previously alluded to.

A further question relative to the Morse formula is presented under section 2(b). This section calls for payment to the United States by the State of Delaware of "the amount of money determined by the Secretary of the Army to have been paid by the United States for the acquisition of subject lands."

We all know that land values throughout the Nation have increased in recent years. Where lands are to be used for public purposes, as in this case, the Morse formula requires payment of 50 percent of the fair appraised market value, with the inclusion of a reversionary clause. The bill includes the requisite reversionary clause but it does not follow verbatim the language of the Morse formula.

I have held a conference with the Senator from Delaware and we discussed the value of the land. On the basis of that discussion, I now ask him my second question:

Would the price to be paid for section 2(b) lands, as specified in that section, be equivalent to 50 percent of the present fair appraised market value of the land?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would, the portion of the land for which the Government paid as it obtained it. As I pointed out to the Senator from Oregon, there were several different portions of the land, but the particular part referred to is a portion of a 1,010-acre plot that was ceded to the Federal Government by act of the Delaware Legislature passed under date of April 24, 1945.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the act was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Laws of Delaware, vol. 45, 1944–45]

Chapter 7: Cession of Military Reservation to United States

An act granting the consent of the General Assembly of the State of Delaware to the acquisition by the United States of a certain tract or parcel of land in Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred, Sussex County, Del., and ceding jurisdiction to the United States for certain purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Delaware in General Assembly met:

Section 1. That the consent of the General Assembly of the State of Delaware be, and the same is hereby given, pursuant to the 17th clause of the 8th section of the 1st article of the Constitution of the United States, to the acquisition by the United States of America of a certain tract or parcel of land situate in Lewes and Rehoboth Hundred, Sussex County, Del., used in connection with a military reservation officially designated Fort Miles, being a part of the harbor defenses of Delaware, bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a stone marked U.S., which stone is at the southwest corner of the U.S. Fort Reservation (ceded to the United States of America by act of Legislature of the State of Delaware, passed February 5, 1873), formerly known as the Delaware Breakwater Military Reservation; thence along the southerly boundary of the said U.S. Fort Reservation north 68°24′19″, east 2104.6 feet to a stone marked U.S., which stone is the southeast corner of the said U.S. Fort Reservation; thence along the easterly boundary of the said U.S. Fort Reservation; north 21°38′30″, west 2243.5 feet to a monument on the southerly boundary of the U.S. Naval Reservation; thence along the southerly boundary of the said U.S. Naval Reservation, north 89°57′30″, east 1399.6 feet to the high water line of the Atlantic Ocean; thence southeastwardly along the high water line of the Atlantic Ocean 3,950 feet, more or less, to a stake in the northerly boundary of the former Cape Henlopen Lighthouse Reservation (acquired by the United States of America, April 13, 1792); thence along the northerly boundary of the said Cape Henlopen Lighthouse Reservation south 71°57′30″, west 2353.7 feet to a monument at the northwest corner of said Cape Henlopen Lighthouse Reservation; thence along the westerly boundary of the said Cape Henlopen Lighthouse Reservation south 18°2′8″, east 3,298.4 feet to a monument at the southwest corner of the said Cape Henlopen Lighthouse Reservation; thence along the southerly boundary of the said Cape Henlopen Lighthouse Reservation, north 71°58′16″, east 2,285 feet to a stake set in the high water line of the Atlantic Ocean; thence southeastwardly along the high water line of the Atlantic Ocean, 2,700 feet, more or less, to a stake; thence north 89°58′40″, west 6,601.8 feet to a stake; thence due north 6,932.8 feet to a stake set in the southerly boundary line of a right-of-way now or formerly of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.; thence crossing the said right-of-way and along lands of Mark T. McKee, formerly known as U.S. Pier Reservation, north 7°49′10″, east 1,632.3 feet to the low water line of Delaware Bay; thence northeastwardly along the said low water line of Delaware Bay 243 feet, more or less to a stake; thence south 7°49′10″, west 73 feet to a point in the high water line of Delaware Bay; thence northeastwardly along the said high water line of Delaware Bay 410 feet, more or less, to a stake set in the westerly boundary of the former U.S. Quarantine Reservation (ceded to United States of America by act of Legislature of the State of Delaware, approved May 5, 1941); thence along the westerly boundary of the said former U.S. Quarantine Reservation, south 24°39′0″, east 1,183.4 feet to a stone set in the southwest corner of the said former U.S. Quarantine Reservation; thence along the southerly boundary of the said former U.S. Quarantine Reservation, north 65°21′0″, east 611.9 feet to the westerly boundary of the aforesaid U.S. Fort Reservation, formerly known as the Delaware Breakwater Military Reservation; thence along the westerly boundary of the said U.S. Fort Reservation, south 21°38′40″, east 1,257.5 feet to the point or place of beginning.

Excepting a one-acre parcel of land located near the southeast corner of the above-described lands and bordering on the Atlantic Ocean, which lands are known as the Cape Henlopen Coast Guard Reservation (ceded to the United States of America by the State of Delaware, deed dated April 1, 1897).

Containing 1,010.8 acres of land, more or less.

Sec. 2. *Be it further enacted,* That exclusive jurisdiction over the aforesaid land is hereby ceded to the United States of America for any of the purposes described in said clause of the Constitution of the United States; *Provided,* That the sovereignty and jurisdiction of this State shall extend over the said land so far as that all civil or criminal process issued under authority of any law of this State may be executed in any part of the land; said jurisdiction to continue so long as the land shall be used for the purposes for which jurisdiction is ceded and no longer.

Sec. 3. *Be it further enacted,* That this act shall take effect from and after its passage.

Approved April 24, 1945.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The State of Delaware did not receive anything for the 1,010 acres. There is one sentence in the act of the legislature which ceded the land to the Federal Government which I should like to read:

> Said jurisdiction to continue so long as the land shall be used for the purposes for which jurisdiction is ceded and no longer.

So that portion of land was ceded to the Federal Government by the State of Delaware with the understanding that it would go back to the State. But on the remainder—that portion which the Federal Government received through condemnation and payment—when we reimburse them under the terms of this bill, in my opinion, it will more than meet the Morse formula.

Mr. MORSE. In connection with section 2(b), the only land that concerns me is land which the Federal Government bought from the State of Delaware. I have to be certain—and I believe the Senator made it possible for me to be certain—that, as of 1963 or 1964, the taxpayers of the United States will get, when the final deal is consummated, the equivalent of 50 percent of the appraised fair market value. They are not entitled, under the formula, to get 100 percent of the appraised fair market value but they are entitled, under the formula, to get only 50 percent.

For the purposes of the Record, I believe we should point out that we are dealing with land that really consists, for the most part, of sand. It is land that is so located that irrespective of what the Federal Government paid for it in the first place, it was important to the Federal Government to obtain it for quarantine purposes. That is what the Government sought it for. But it is so located that it would be, really, of little value at the present time, unless we took into account the specific purpose for which it will be used, which I will mention in a moment.

We are dealing not only with land that consists of sand, but also with land which the State of Delaware, by legislative action, has encumbered with a prohibition so far as its being used for taking out sand for commercial purposes. At one time in this area there were what we can call commercial sandpits. They were doing damage to the area, in the opinion of the lawmakers of Delaware, and they passed legislation, which at the present time prohibits use of the property for commercial purposes.

Am I not correct in my statement that that would really leave this land practically of no value, unless the Federal Government wants to use it for military purposes, and they are declaring this part surplus for that purpose; that it is practically valueless unless it is used for the purpose that the Senator has in mind in his bill—for park or recreational purposes?

A part of this eventually will be used for Boy Scout or Girl Scout camp purposes, I believe. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The State does not permit removal of the sand from the beach area. The land would be valuable largely because of what the State wishes to do with it, which is to make it into a recreation park. The real value of the land in question comes from the value of the land which the State had turned over to the Government without payment. This would go back to the State under the agreement. The State itself owned the really valuable land around the beach. We now want to turn all of that into a park area.

As I pointed out, that land was deeded to the Federal Government at the beginning of the war, in 1941 and in 1945 for the establishment of a fort. It was deeded for national defense purposes. The act of the legislature specifically provided that the Federal Government could keep it so long as it was used for the purposes for which it was being acquired.

I have asked that the act of the legislature be printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated March 7, 1963, signed by Leon de Valinger, Jr., State archivist, addressed to me. This letter, written upon the suggestion of Governor Carvel, of Delaware, reaffirms the fact that the other portion of the land was deeded to the Federal Government without any compensation whatever coming to the State of Delaware.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF DELAWARE,
PUBLIC ARCHIVES COMMISSION,
Dover, March 7, 1963.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Governor Carvel has referred your letter of February 22 to this office. On May 5, 1941, an act passed by the Delaware Legislature was approved ceding certain land to the United States for defense or other governmental purposes only. This is published in the Laws of Delaware, volume 43, chapter 4, pages 7 and 8. On April 24, 1945, another act of the general assembly was approved. It specifically defines the boundary of the Fort Miles Reservation as acquired by several previous cessions and provides that Federal jurisdiction shall continue "so long as the land shall be used for the purposes for which jurisdiction is ceded and no longer." That act appears in Laws of Delaware, volume 45, chapter 7, pages 35–37. It also states that 1,010.8 acres of land, more or less, were acquired.

We do not find that any payment was made to the State of Delaware and it is obvious from the acts that it was ceded without payment by our State for national defense purposes. If we can supply you with any further information please call upon us. May I express the hope that you will be successful in having this land returned to our State.

Cordially yours,
LEON DEVALINGER, JR.,
State Archivist.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in view of these statements by the Senator from Delaware, the land itself, covered by section 2(b) of the bill, certainly does not fall under any restriction of the Morse formula.

That leaves me only one further point, a third point which I raise with the Senator from Delaware for clarification purposes.

On some of the property there are located some old Army barracks, I am advised by the Senator from Delaware. There have been cases considered by the Senate in the past in which the Federal Government has invested huge sums of taxpayers' money on improvements on land and, at the time it was sought to return the land and the improvements to the State or city or county or other governmental agency. I always made clear that the taxpayers were entitled to compensation for the improvements. The Morse formula applies to the improvements, for half of their fair market value, in a case involving public use. The Senator from Delaware is aware of that.

No Senator has ever been more cooperative with the Senator from Oregon over the years in connection with the Morse formula than has the Senator from Delaware. On many occasions the Senator has said to me, "You are correct. Stick by your guns," or language to that effect, "So long as you are consistent and make no exceptions you will always find me supporting you."

The Senator has supported me on the Morse formula, and he is supporting me today on the Morse formula.

When we have considered these cases involving so-called improvements, the improvements have been of value.

I have talked to the Senator from Delaware about the old Army barracks which are on a portion of this sand area which is involved in the program.

I ask Senators to keep in mind that this all goes back to the 1870's and 1880's, so far as the quarantine aspect is concerned. The barracks, of course, are of much later vintage than that.

The real purpose for obtaining this property in the first place was to get a quarantine station. The Government had it for a while as a Federal quarantine station, and then the Federal Government decided it did not wish it any more for that purpose, and the land reverted back to the State of Delaware. Then at a later date the Federal Government decided it wanted a quarantine station again, so it asked for the land again, and there was set up a second time a quarantine station.

Then, as we got into the period of war, there were some barracks erected on the land.

I wish to talk about those barracks for just a moment. It is my understanding—and the Senator from Delaware can correct me if I am not correct—that so far as the present or future use of the barracks is concerned, they are valueless. In other words, they are not worth the price of demolishing them. So far as the State of Delaware is concerned, if the Federal Government wishes to go in and demolish them and pay for the cost of demolishing them that would be perfectly satisfactory, save and except for one item which I will mention in a moment.

I wish to make that very clear, because I do not want any Senator to come to me later this year, or next year, or in the years ahead, to say, "Listen, WAYNE, you gave Delaware some old barracks and you did not make the State pay for them."

I will make the State pay for them, if they are worth anything.

Mr. President, if it is true, as the Senator from Delaware assures me, that these barracks are not worth the demolition cost, I am not going to go through what would amount really to a matter of form and not a matter of substance.

I understand that on a part of this sandy area there may be some old barracks that the State might permit to be used for recreational purposes, for the Boy Scouts or some other club or organization.

Although the Senator from Delaware is not sure whether they are still in the area or not, there may be some old guns and emplacements that really belong to the Federal Government, which could be left for ornamental purposes, and as interesting attractions for young people who might be using that area of land as a Boy Scout or Girl Scout camp, at the pleasure and sufferance of the State of Maryland.

Am I correct in stating for the RECORD today that these old barracks really can be said to be of no value, even for salvage, because it would be more costly to salvage them than to let them stand or fall apart?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If a war should break out tomorrow and the Government needed them the Government has an investment in them which would be worth a lot of money. However, when the Government abandoned the fort and area it abandoned all the need for these barracks, and now they represent only an expense. As one officer pointed out, it is now costing the Government about $5,000 a month to maintain the barracks in an idle status. The Government would like to get rid of this expense.

If we do not follow the requested procedure, the barracks would have to be torn down and sold in commercial outlets for whatever salvage could be obtained.

The State is planning to open all of this area up into a park. The bill provides specifically that the area will remain in the possession of the State only so long as the State uses it for such recreational or educational purposes. The State now has plans to keep a portion of the barracks, perhaps for use by the Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts of the surrounding communities. For that reason some of the barracks may be preserved. Other than that, they represent the expense of tearing down.

It has been my experience that when one is involved in tearing down a building one cannot even give it away.

As the Senator has pointed out, I do not know whether there are any old guns left on the property which were installed during World War II. I have asked the

Army if they have not moved them, to leave them, if they could. By the time they moved them and melted them down the recovery would not be much.

Since this area is to be turned into a State park it would be most advantageous if the guns could be left. I am not sure they have not been demolished. If not, we will try to persuade the Army to leave them.

Mr. MORSE. So far as those guns are concerned, I believe they would come under the so-called Monument Act, anyway, and would not be involved in the Morse formula.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not believe they would either.

Mr. MORSE. I have one further point in respect to the barracks. I hope the Senator will correct me if I am in error, but it is my understanding that if we take into account the amount of money which the Government will get back from Delaware under the terms of the bill—the Senator has already stated it will be at least equal to 50 percent of the fair market value—and if we take into account the small value of the barracks and the limited purposes to which they could be put to use, plus the fact that there is a reverter clause in the bill, if it ever becomes necessary for the Federal Government to take back the property for Federal uses the Government will have the power, and the taxpayers will suffer no loss in respect to the barracks.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not think so. As a State we would be delighted for them to clear the barracks and take them away.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware very much for his fine cooperation in regard to this question, because, as he knows, the Senate has increasingly cooperated with me in respect to the application of the formula. Seldom do I have to raise an objection to the violation of this formula, because it has become one of the accepted policies of the Senate, and has resulted, as we know, in a saving of a good many millions of dollars over the years to the taxpayers of the country. I say to the majority leader that not only do I raise no objection to the bill, but I support it.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I am very happy to join my colleague, the senior Senator from Delaware, in support of this bill, S. 1767, which we have cosponsored.

The merits of the bill are plain: Delaware donated most of the Fort Miles area without cost to the Federal Government during World War II and now wants to recover surplus Government land for use by the public.

The land in question was considered common land for public use for more than 250 years before the Federal Government took it over in 1941.

It is important to emphasize that the State of Delaware will repay the Federal Government the amount it paid for the property in question.

The State of Delaware has drawn up plans for development of the area as Cape Henlopen State Park and as a University of Delaware education center.

My State, Mr. President, is not large as it is, and acquisition of this property will be of great benefit to it.

I strongly urge passage of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FORMER GOV. LEROY COLLINS OF FLORIDA—A NEW VOICE IN THE SOUTH

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon one of our colleagues expressed disapproval of the speech delivered by the former Governor of Florida, now president of the National Association of Broadcasters, Mr. Leroy Collins. The speech was delivered on December 3, 1963, at the annual meeting of the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce, Columbia, S.C.

When I spoke on this subject the other day, during the morning hour, I did not have a copy of the speech. I had only a news account of the speech. I praised the speech most highly as typical of the new voice of the South. It is only fair to Governor Collins, in view of the comments which were made on the floor of the Senate that a copy of that speech, which I have subsequently received, be published at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the text of the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by LeRoy Collins, President, National Association of Broadcasters, Before the Annual Meeting of the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce, Columbia, S.C.

It is a high privilege for me to be here in Columbia, and to participate in this Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce annual meeting of 1963.

I like South Carolina, and I always have. Yours is a State rich in history and exciting in opportunity.

Your distinguished Governor, Donald Russell, who honors us all by his presence here tonight, is a public leader of conspicuous competence and of uncommon dedication.

I would like to add my warm congratulations to all of your chamber of commerce officers and committees. You have had a remarkably successful year; and, while the rank-and-file support of your membership doubtless has been excellent, special praise is due all who have supplied the leadership.

My message this evening is being carried by many broadcasters across this State. I am grateful to them. I also salute them, along with all other broadcasters, for their enormous efforts in reporting to the American people and to the world the story of our Nation in the agony of its trial after the assassination of President Kennedy. As soon as the first dastardly shot was fired in Dallas, response of news broadcasters was immediate. It became complete, and reflected the highest skill and dedication.

This was the free broadcaster at his finest. No one from the Government had to make the slightest move to get him going, or to keep him at his task, or to hold out any hope that his commercial losses would be offset in any way or shared by anyone else. It was his job. And in performing it, he "asked not what the country could do for him, but only what he could do for his country."

I do not believe anyone is more genuinely proud of his southern birth and "raising" than I am. I love this land. Some thoughts have been brooding in my mind lately, especially in the few mad days since the murder of our young President, and I think South Carolina and Columbia are good places for me to talk these out.

Not all of you will agree with what I have to say. This does not trouble me, and it should not trouble you.

I have tried to be a southerner who speaks plainly on sensitive issues, and you are sons and daughters of a State which, from the time of Sumter and Pickens and Calhoun, has been characterized by forthright debate.

Doubtless as you have detected down the years, a number of people in other neighborhoods of America have not always agreed with the forthright talk emerging from South Carolina. But debate, if it is honest and thoughtful, refines the decisions in our Republic and makes them more intelligent.

I have not come to address old grievances. It is the future of the South and of our Nation I wish to take up with you here tonight. And the one is inseparable from the other.

I would hope first that we might consider as our own the creed of our new President, Lyndon Johnson, who, once exasperated by his critics in the Senate when he was the leader of that forum, sought to explain himself in these terms: "I am a freeman, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat, in that order."

Most of us, when we talk about the South, find the easy things to say. We like to recall the handicaps our region has suffered in the exploitation of its natural resources; the impoverishment which followed the Civil War, and the later unjust and repressive efforts made to thwart our growth and development. Then we like to speak of the happier days of our recent dynamic economic growth and prosperity—of the "new South," a land of vast new opportunities. And these things are all true. We can prove them by the bank deposits, by the new factories, by the lines on the charts, by the clothes we see children wear to school.

We also like to speak of the "new, new South," which glitters with projections of future prosperity almost beyond comprehension. And I firmly believe that you and I will see all this come to pass in our lifetimes.

But let us think together this evening about things more personal than material progress.

I do not like it when people speak of southerners as if they are not human parts of the United States. But the prime reason they do this is that for too long we have permitted the South's own worst enemies to speak for it.

We have allowed the extremists to speak for the South—the very ones against whom we in the South have had to struggle in our towns and in our State capitals for much of the progress we have made.

They have done it in speeches on the floor of Congress which have sounded like anti-American diatribes from some hostile foreign country.

They have done it in the national press and on the national radio and television to such an extent that citizens outside the South would be entitled to wonder if they might not need visas to pass through our region.

And all the while, too many of the rest of us have remained cravenly silent or lamely defensive while Dixie battle cries have been employed to incite sick souls to violence—

egged on by the rabble-rousers' call to "stand up and fight."

It is little wonder that other Americans fail to regard us on occasions as being in the mainstream of American life and citizenship.

And I ask you tonight, how long are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured before the Nation by these Claghorns? How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the back? How many Governors have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?

All those evil happenings have been the products of environments where hatred has been preached and lawlessness extolled—environments which you and I know are foreign to the South for which we care deeply and are repugnant to most southerners.

It is time the decent people in the South, with all their might and strength, told the bloody shirt wavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry. It is time we started speaking and acting together more like loyal Americans and self-respecting southerners.

You here in South Carolina have shown in many ways that you understand—that you are moving forward.

The cities of Oxford, Birmingham, Little Rock, New Orleans, Dallas—and Philadelphia and Chicago, for that matter—are not to be found in the State of South Carolina.

And that fact, as all of you well know, is no accident of geography.

It is because the leadership of this community and this State reached a rational decision that South Carolina was not going to allow bigotry and lawlessness to pervade your society and pollute your bloodstream.

There has been no need for Federal marshals patrolling your university campuses, thanks to the good sense and respect for law among the people of this State.

You have demonstrated to the rest of the Nation, which includes the rest of the South, and to yourselves, that a Deep South community does not have to throw itself onto a funeral pyre of hate.

Yes, there are forces at work in the South—men and women who do not have their faces turned backward, stalwart men and women who have not received the headlines and public notices which have been accorded the more sensational examples of lack of progress, but who have been in the vanguard of progress nonetheless.

There is a story which came out of World War I. I do not vouch for its literal accuracy. In fact, there are many reasons for doubting its truth in detail. But its message rings true.

Three American soldiers—one a Protestant, one a Catholic, and one a Jew—became fast friends as they marched and fought together in France. They entered into a pact committing the survivors to do everything possible for the family of any one of them who might be killed in action.

In a battle soon afterward, on the outskirts of a small French village, the Protestant boy was killed. The only place of worship was a little Catholic church. The Catholic boy and the Jewish boy asked the priest of this little church for permission to have their friend buried in the church cemetery adjoining. But when the priest learned that the dead boy was not Catholic, he regretfully declined, pointing out that under the regulations of the church the cemetery had been established and blessed for the burial of Catholics only.

After considerable discussion of the point, the priest suggested as an alternative that the burial be made just outside the fence of the cemetery and said, "Here we will be sure to see that the grave is cared for and not desecrated, just as faithfully as we care for the graves on the inside."

The arrangement was worked out, and the two boys who survived went on through the war. When peace came, they returned to their homes in the United States.

They had the understanding, however, that 3 years from the date their friend was killed they would meet in the French village and together visit the grave.

When this day came, they met as agreed and soon came to the little church. But when they arrived just outside the fence where they had buried their friend, they were shocked to see no sign of the grave. Angrily, they found the old priest and scolded him for his neglect.

Then the old father took the two young men out into the cemetery and led them down the inside of the fence. There was the grave just as the soldiers had left it. Then he said, "You know, some time after you left, I went back and studied our regulations further. I found it to be very clear that while I was not permitted to allow the burial inside the fence, there was nothing which prevented me from later moving the fence over."

Fellow southerners, we can talk about our mores, our local laws and customs, the low standards of many Negroes, but the time has come when we must move some fences.

The soul of man is beyond the reach of a court order or a legislative act. But while courts and laws cannot change the innermost dictates of the human conscience, courts and laws most certainly can control the acts of men.

This task of assuring racial justice is no easy one for us in the South—nor is it for those in the North. But Americans everywhere must recognize that this is a national commitment and a national necessity. It is not going away.

The advancement of all rights of national citizenship, as we well know, will occur with the overt aid of the National Government if local citizens and local and State governments do not move effectively to accomplish this on their own.

Yet, too many politicians down our way have been hoodwinking the people on the civil rights issue. They have been trying to pretend, for their own personal political advantage, that the changes which are coming over the hill really are not there. They talk defensively of States rights when they and we well know that there can be no such thing as a State's right to default on a national duty.

Any rational man who looks at the horizon and sees the South of the future segregated is simply seeing a mirage.

"That all men are created equal" is not an empty cliche. It was not put in our Declaration of Independence by Jefferson merely to stir our revolutionary forces to greater sacrifice.

It is a mighty idea that is the keystone of our Nation's whole meaning and perpetual commitment. It is the basic idea which supports the dignity of man as an individual.

It is an idea that can never be stopped—not by custom—not by prejudice—not by hate—not by murder—not by armies—not by any mortal force.

It may be thwarted—it may be delayed—its triumph may be at great cost and sacrifice—but it will keep coming on and on, for it has the invincibility of simple truth, justice, and right.

Aside from human attitudes the most basic changes which must occur to aid us in resolving our racial difficulties is the improvement of the standards of living of all underprivileged Americans. The taproot of future progress is greatly expanded and improved public education for all American youngsters.

While in the Florida Legislature many years ago, I undertook the leadership for the passage of legislation known as the minimum foundation program. Under it, the State government guaranteed to every child in Florida, regardless of where he lived or how poor his county, a public education of no less quality than certain prescribed standards. This has worked quite well, and other States have developed similar plans.

There was talk at the time that a program like this would rob local communities of local interest and influence, but this did not turn out to be the case.

Now, I feel that we should mount in this country a massive national minimum foundation plan under which the nation would assure to every child an education adequate to the full development of his talents.

This would call for the supplementing of local resources in proportion to need. It could enable us to close our educational gap and bring to an end our vicious cycle of ignorance breeding more ignorance with resulting impoverishment of body, intellect and spirit.

This is not only a national need; I say it is a necessity. We must do this to enable the nation better to meet its adversaries in a hostile and competitive world. But, more importantly, we must do it to provide for American children a seedbed of simple justice which is now their rightful heritage, although for millions it has not been their inheritance.

Our country has a right to expect the best from all of us, regardless of where we live.

And just as it is wrong for anyone, including some southerners, to sell the South short, by the same token we in the South have no right to go off in a corner and sulk.

Southerners, like Americans from every section of this land, have a solemn obligation to make whatever general and unique contributions they can to the national good.

It is high time the South rid itself of any political inferiority complex.

Leadership in the South—business, professional, educational and political—instead of being rejected out of hand nationally must be regarded as a valuable resource in the role which America must play in meeting the challenge of history.

Some politicans in other regions of the Nation contended that the South now bears such a stigma before the Nation that it is incapable of producing national leadership. And there are even some southerners who parrot the same fallacy.

After all, where was this Republic founded? By whom were our Nation's principles of freedom and individual dignity hammered out?

So much of this came from the minds of Washington and Jefferson and Henry. The young Republic was nourished by the philosophies of Madison and Monroe and Jackson. Southerners all.

The South should be bright and optimistic indeed, as we face the future.

To become a more vital part of the Nation's effort for the fulfillment of national goals will not demean our posture as States, but enhance it. It will not be a retreat, but an advance. It will not be a defeat, but a victory.

My fellow countrymen, a few long days ago our young President was struck down on the street of an American city. Good men have differences, and many Americans had differences with John Kennedy. But I do not know of any fellow countryman who, after rendezvousing with his soul, would not share the sweet dream of John Kennedy for a better America or his dedication to move his dreams toward reality. He was the unusual heroic person in politics who thought not in terms of years, but in terms of generations and of what America must be for our children and the children of our children.

Just a few days before his death, President Kennedy was talking to one of our leading southern editors—a very close friend—William Baggs of the Miami News, about the year A.D. 2000, and of what we, in our generation, must plant and plow up to make this country right for its sons and daughters in A.D. 2000.

I say to you tonight that above all else it is the moral duty of our generation to plow under racial injustice everywhere in the United States and to plant new opportunities for the generations which will come along after us and reside in this green part of our old planet.

This has not been anything like the speech that last week I expected to make here.

But the other day, as I followed the caisson drawn by the six white horses to Arlington's green hillside and listened to the bugler's mournful cry and saw the flame lighted on the grave as if to hold back at least a tiny part of the approaching darkness, my conscience grew heavy with the long promise of history: "Beyond the sundown is tomorrow's wisdom; today is going to be a long, long ago."

Oh, God of all mankind, help us to find that wisdom. Help us to make today count for more than its sorrows.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some of the editorial material which was inserted in the RECORD this afternoon sought to cast reflection on the mental stability of Governor Collins. That is an old smear technique. It is particularly a smear technique used by yellow journalists, whose number is legion.

One need only read this truly great speech of Governor Collins to realize that we have here a mentality which is far ahead of the bigotry that characterizes so much of his opposition, and that any reflection upon him by yellow journalism is to his credit and not to his discredit.

I once again praise Governor Collins for his courage and for his foresight and for his challenge not only to the South, but also to all Americans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join in the praise of Governor Collins. It was my privilege last Sunday to participate in a seminar and convocation in Los Angeles under the auspices of the Fund for the Republic and the Center for Study of Democratic Institutions. I heard Governor Collins on the subject of federalism, and the relationships between Federal and State governments. It was a masterful address, thoughtful and provocative, and it indicated a sense of foresight and imagination that qualifies this man for the title of great leader. I am delighted that the Senator from Oregon has given him due credit and praise, because he deserves it. He is a marvelous public servant and a fine citizen.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, because the Senate was extremely pressed for time, I did not, during my presentation of the conference report, find the time to say all I wished to say.

Yesterday and again today I had expressed my deep appreciation and thanks to the Members of the Senate conference and their great help to me in finally succeeding in that conference to come forth with an acceptable bill.

I wish to thank again the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], whose help to me has been of inestimable value. I also thank the majority leader the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I counseled with him time and again. I should think that he would have grown weary of my requests for counseling with him in handling these education bills.

He arranged the schedule in the Senate for my convenience time and time again when we thought it was most propitious to offer these two major bills. He cooperated, and spoke to my conferees about postponing action on the higher education bills on the floor of the Senate until a conference report was adopted by the conferees. I want him to know how appreciative I am.

I also wish to thank our colleagues on the House side. I am satisfied that one need only read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday, from beginning to end, which I have done, to realize that no vocational bill would have come out of the House by way of conference acceptance had it not been for the leadership of the Representative from New York [Mr. POWELL]. He performed efficiently and effectively during the conference. We were deadlocked time and time again, and time and time again he was most helpful in finding areas of agreement which would make it possible for us to resolve our disagreement.

I thank him very much, indeed.

I also thank the chairman of the subcommittee in the House from which subcommittee the House vocational bill came in the first place, the gentleman from Kentucky, Representative PERKINS.

I am not trying to give undue credit, or to draw any lines of distinction, because there was no one in favor of the bill on the House conference side who was not of great help to me.

I mention Representative BRADEMAS of Indiana, and Representative GREEN of Oregon. Some of the greatest help came to me from Representative LANDRUM of Georgia. I know the Senate enjoys a chuckle now and then. All one has to do is read the debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning to enjoy a chuckle. I enjoyed one this morning when I read that debate. Apparently Representative LANDRUM was having a little difficulty with some of his southern colleagues in regard to the bill. In effect, he said, as the RECORD shows, that if the Representative from Georgia can find himself in agreement with the Senator from Oregon, and if both can sign the same report, it cannot be a bad report.

It was that wonderful attitude on the part of Representative LANDRUM that was so helpful in getting the bill adopted.

There is not one of them to whom I do not wish to pay my respects.

I particularly wish to mention, however, Representative POWELL and Representative PERKINS. I mention these two men because they had the official responsibility of leadership on the House side.

Representative POWELL was the chairman of the House conferees, and Representative PERKINS was the chairman of the subcommittee from which the vocational bill came in the first place.

I know whereof I speak when I point out that the education bills, about which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] spoke, have resulted in Congress—and it is Congress, not individuals—making a record in the field of education which has not been equaled in a hundred years, which has not been equaled since the Morrill Act of 1862. The President of the United States was quite right in pointing out that historic fact.

I am greatly indebted to all of them for their assistance in bringing that record to pass.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to express one Senator's appreciation of the great work that has been undertaken and accomplished by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The program of higher education, vocational education, the extension of national defense education, and education for impacted areas, that has been adopted by Congress is the most comprehensive, far-reaching, generous program of Federal aid to education that this Nation has ever known. It stands alongside the great Morill Act and the Land-Grant College Act, two of the great programs of the 1860's.

The Higher Education Act surely will bear the title of the Morse-Green Act, because the two distinguished citizens of Oregon, Senator MORSE and Representative GREEN, had so much to do with these legislative achievements. I commend both of them.

I was talking with the Senator from Oregon today. In our conversation, he told me that he introduced his first bill on higher education in 1947. I have always known that the Senator from Oregon is a tenacious, persevering, and persistent gentleman. I have tangled with him in debate on occasion. That is an exhilarating experience that ought not to be tried too often. I commend him on his tenacity and perseverance, because while it took 16 years for the Senator to accomplish his objective, he has been able to achieve it. It is a splendid record.

So far as vocational education is concerned, we are all indebted to the leadership of our late President, who admonished us and advised us and sent us the message on vocational education, expanding its activity and its scope. But the bill also had the guiding hand of the Senator from Oregon, and he has been most generous.

The bill has also received the guidance of the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the other members of the committee. But I am sure the Senator from Oregon would agree with me that the honors for the bill ought to be shared by many.

I hope that when the President signs the bill, and when he speaks of it as the Higher Education Act, he will refer to it as the Morse-Green Act; and that when he signs the vocational education bill, he will refer to it as the Powell-Morse-Perkins Act.

It seems to me that that would be according just and proper honor to those who have done so much toward the enactment of that measure.

I salute the Senator from Oregon for his singular achievement.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the graciousness of the Senator from Minnesota. Although he is not a member of my subcommittee, he is the Democratic whip of the Senate. I have already paid my thanks to the majority leader; but the whip knows that he, too, has participated in many of these conversations. He has been instrumental in helping to bring these bills into a position so that they could be passed. I thank him from the bottom of my heart.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN TERMINAL LEASES FROM PENALTIES UNDER THE SHIPPING ACT OF 1916

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 751, S. 2317.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2317) to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 U.S.C. 814), be amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "*Provided, however,* That the penalty provisions of this section shall not apply to leases, licenses, assignments, or other agreements of similar character for the use of terminal property or facilities which were entered into before the date of enactment of this Act, and, if continued in effect beyond said date, submitted to the Federal Maritime Commission for approval prior to or within ninety days after the enactment of this Act, unless such leases, licenses, assignments, or other agreements for the use of terminal facilities are disapproved, modified, or canceled by the Commission and are continued in operation without regard to the Commission's action thereon. The Commission shall promptly approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify each such agreement in accordance with the provisions of this section."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2317) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 770), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, imposes civil penalties of up to $1,000 for each day an agreement required by that section to be filed with the Federal Maritime Commission is in effect prior to Commission approval. S. 2317, as reported with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, would amend section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, so as to exempt from the penalty provisions of that section leases, licenses, assignments, or other agreements of similar character for the use of marine terminal property or facilities entered into prior to the date of enactment of this bill. However, those agreements for the use of terminal facilities that continue in effect beyond the date of enactment would be required to be filed within 90 days with the Federal Maritime Commission in order to be within the amnesty provided by this bill. Any such agreement that was continued in effect without regard to cancellation, modification, or disapproval by the Federal Maritime Commission would subject the parties to that agreement to civil penalties under section 15 of up to $1,000 for each day the agreement was in effect prior to Commission approval. Any agreement subject to the filing requirements of section 15 entered into subsequent to the date of enactment would not be included in the amnesty to be afforded by S. 2317.

DISCUSSION OF THE BILL

The Federal Maritime Commission, charged with administration of the Shipping Act and more knowledgeable as to marine terminal problems than any other governmental body, has requested this legislation. Under section 15, agreements between persons subject to the Shipping Act which involve "fixing or regulating transportation rates or fares; giving or receiving special rates, accommodations, or other special privileges or advantages; controlling, regulating, preventing, or destroying competition, * * * or in any manner providing for an exclusive, preferential, or cooperative working arrangement" must be filed with the Commission, and parties to the agreement are subject to penalties of up to $1,000 for each day the agreement is in effect prior to compliance and Commission approval. Until 1959 it had never been assumed that lease-type agreements for the use of terminal facilities were within that language, nor had the Federal Maritime Board ever contended that such agreements were subject to section 15.

The Federal Maritime Board (predecessor of the Federal Maritime Commission) changed this situation in 1959 by determining that a lease-type arrangement between Baton Rouge Port Commission and Cargill, Inc., was subject to the terms of section 15. This determination was upheld in *Baton Rouge Port Commission* v. *United States* (287 F. 2d 86 (5th Cir. 1961), cert. den., 368 U.S. 985 (1962)).

Leases of terminal facilities usually contain requirements that the lessee operate the facilities in accord with specified standards and often grant future rights to the lessee. The *Baton Rouge* case involved a lease which required the lessee to charge rates competitive with and not greater than charged at other gulf ports, and afforded the lessee a right of first refusal to lease additional facilities. It is the presence of such covenants that has brought lease-type agreements within the requirements of section 15, even though for over 40 years such provisions had never been considered within the scope of that section.

Immediately following the *Baton Rouge* decision, port authorities began filing lease-type agreements, some of which had been in effect for a number of years, and others of which had terminated in years past.

The committee bill, in the nature of a substitute, is as follows:

"That section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 U.S.C. 814), be amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: '*Provided, however,* That the penalty provisions of this section shall not apply to leases, licenses, assignments or other agreements of similar character for the use of terminal property or facilities which were entered into before the date of enactment of this Act, and, if continued in effect beyond said date, submitted to the Federal Maritime Commission for approval prior to or within ninety days after the enactment of this Act, unless such leases, licenses, assignments or other agreements for the use of terminal facilities are disapproved, modified, or cancelled by the Commission and are continued in operation without regard to the Commission's action thereon. The Commission shall promptly approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify each such agreement in accordance with the provisions of this section.' "

Although incorporating three technical changes, S. 2317, as reported, in no way departs from the intent and purpose of the bill as introduced. These changes were advocated and supported by all witnesses at the hearing, including the Federal Maritime Commission.

The first change is that agreements within the amnesty be described as "leases, licenses, assignments, or other agreements of similar character for the use of terminal property or facilities" rather than merely "leases, licenses, or assignments" of such facilities. This change was adopted in order to assure that all agreements intended to be within S. 2317 would receive that benefit even though they are not labeled as a lease, license, or assignment, or considered such under strict property concepts. It is intended that the amnesty apply to agreements involving a conveyance of some interest in terminal facilities, even though not technically leases, licenses, or assignments, if of a character similar to such arrangements.

The second change from the bill as introduced is that the amnesty be applied to all agreements entered into prior to the date of enactment rather than prior to the arbitrary date of October 1, 1963, as originally provided. The date of enactment seems a more logical cutoff date, and technical problems that would be raised in the case of a lease entered into before October 1, 1963, and expiring after that date yet prior to the date of enactment are avoided.

The final change from the bill as introduced is that only agreements continuing in effect beyond the date of enactment are required to be filed with the Federal Maritime Commission. The bill as introduced would have required all lease-type agreements not previously filed and approved be submitted to the Federal Maritime Commission, even though such agreements may have terminated many years ago.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CLOSING OF DEFENSE PLANTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, more and more angles are coming to light in connection with the supposedly straightforward announcement by the Department of Defense about a "great economy program" which, so we are told, is underway.

I have just returned from a meeting with Representative Pirnie, of New York, and my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], in regard to the announced closing of the Roama Base, in Rome, N.Y. At a hurriedly assembled meeting on Wednesday, we were told by the Deputy Secretary of Defense that 7,500 jobs would be affected by that closing. That figure was used in newspaper accounts and otherwise.

Now we are told that the actual figure is 3,800. That change is a welcome one, insofar as it goes, of course, for that figure is about half the one we were originally given. But that change is an indication of the fact that this entire matter was not thought through, but instead, was hurriedly concocted in order to give a great show of "economy," in a move which I intend to demonstrate is no economy at all.

When this "great economy move" was first presented to the members of the New York congressional delegation, on Wednesday, at a meeting with high Defense Department officials, we were also told that about "35 installations will be closed throughout the country."

We were told that one—perhaps two—eastern Navy yards would be closed, but that the closing would not include the Brooklyn Navy Yard. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] asked the Defense Department whether there was any bright spot in the picture. They said yes. The closing of one or two Navy yards on the east coast should give more work to the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Between Wednesday afternoon and Thursday morning someone changed his mind. We are now told that there is no present plan as to anything affecting the Navy yards at Philadelphia and Boston, which were originally involved. The final list of closings issued in a press release by the Defense Department on Thursday was revealing. Quite a few States had one—often a small installation—reduced or eliminated. A few had two. California had four. Texas had two, one of which had already been completely deactivated.

New York, which has recently been bearing the brunt of the so-called Defense Department economy, has seven closing down. The seven do not include Fort Slocum, in New Rochelle, N.Y., containing the Army Information School, which the Defense Department decided to remove from the New York area—from the center of the information industry—some months ago.

It also does not include the anticipated personnel reduction in the Plattsburgh Air Force Base, which will undoubtedly be announced as soon as Congress recesses.

So the total extent of the loss to New York is not seven bases but closer to nine—more than twice as many as any other State.

These are not obsolete bases. A distinguished journal of our country in an editorial today states that the purpose of a $50 billion-plus defense budget is to provide national security, not job security, and that national security is much better advanced by modern weapons than by obsolete installations.

That is the result of more Defense Department propaganda. There is no one in any position of authority of whom I know who calls either Rome or Schenectady—the two most seriously affected in the State of New York—obsolete installations. Indeed, there is not a single activity of Rome which is not to be transferred to some other base. It has the most up-to-date equipment there is. It is an electronics procurement center. Electronics is certainly one area of activity in the Air Force which is far from obsolete.

The journal I referred to also contained the following sentence:

> Senator KEATING's outrageous complaints about unemployment in New York may be true but they are irrelevant.

I wish to state, Mr. President, that I do not consider that they are irrelevant. When there is unemployment in my State I intend to continue to "yelp" about it. I believe that is the duty of a Senator representing any State, particularly when that State is singled out for an increase in unemployment.

If these New York installations were procuring obsolete aircraft or were stockpiling Civil War cannon, I certainly would not be objecting in any way to their closing. Both the Rome base and the Schenectady Army Depot are doing a job that will still have to be done, but for some reason the Defense Department does not want to have it done in the State of New York.

This work, and some other jobs, will be transferred to installations in other States that have much lower efficiency ratings and not nearly so good a performance record as these New York installations. These New York activities rank high in efficiency, and always have.

The Defense Department talks about economy. Let us analyze that a moment. In the already depressed areas, like Rome and Schenectady, which qualify for direct Federal assistance to make more jobs, the cost of creating these jobs is roughly, by their own estimates, $4,230 per job per year.

The Federal Government would have to spend nearly $38 million in upstate New York alone to counteract the depressing economic impact of Defense Department so-called economies.

What does the Defense Department say? In a rather cold manner, without much concern for the feelings of the people who will be directly affected at this season of the year—perhaps we cannot expect anything better from the Defense Department—they say, "It is not our responsibility."

Mr. President, it is the responsibility of the Congress, of the President of the United States, and of the taxpayers of this country if it is going to cost $38 million to save $5 million.

Yesterday, I introduced proposed legislation to require a study by the Area Redevelopment Administration of the immediate and long-term impact of these actions. This is the kind of information that the country needs, in order properly to evaluate what the Defense Department advertises in its propaganda as great moneysaving economies. This is precisely the kind of information that the Defense Department does not have and does not care about. But it is vitally important.

In the meeting we attended, I asked a question. There are eight of the so-called "AMA's," or air materiel areas, Roama in Rome, N.Y., one of the eight. The Defense Department is closing one. They are picking out one with a high efficiency rating. I said, "How many of the others are located in depressed areas or in areas of substantial unemployment?"

The answer was, "We do not know. We do not know."

When pressed on that, the Secretary said, "We do know that the Rome Air Force Base is in the most depressed area of any of them."

The fact is that none of the others is located in depressed areas. This is the only one, and they recognized and knew, when they made the decision, that Rome was today the hardest hit of any. Hearings on the bill which I have introduced and which is cosponsored by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], would provide the Congress and the country with much needed additional information and would open the way to a more intelligent overall decision as to the wisdom of these particular moves.

I am certainly not opposed to genuine economies in Government which are in the national interest. Indeed, I emphatically urge real and not fancied economies.

I am not opposed to closing down any obsolete or inefficient facilities, wherever located, either in the State of New York or anywhere else. That should have been done before now.

But I certainly am opposed to actions done for advertising purposes which will do more harm in the long run than good and to actions which at least up to this time have not been adequately explained and justified. Propaganda press releases should not be allowed to be a substitute for proof.

Hearings on the legislation which we have introduced will be an important step in the full, honest, and objective evaluation of what is going on.

Moreover, Mr. President, I have asked those responsible for economic development in the affected areas in New York to supply me as soon as possible with their views and available data as to the effects in the areas they are familiar with. This information, as well as the Defense Department figures, is an important part of the record and should be fully available.

This whole problem should be looked at not merely from the point of view of economies in one department of Government, but with a consideration of the question, "Will it result in an overall economy?"

Requests have come to the Congress for a billion dollars more money this year for the Area Redevelopment Agency, which is to take care of areas exactly like Rome and Schenectady. Both of those areas qualify for aid under that act. It makes no sense at all for a great advertisement to be made that we are to save $100 million, if it will cost $1 billion or $500 million or several times the $100 million to effect the saving.

One way to make the facts known is to have hearings on the legislation which we have introduced. I urgently appeal to the appropriate committees to conduct hearings so that the facts can be brought out and so that we will not have these one-sided statements from one Government department as to the great economies which are being effected.

MILITARY SPENDING REDUCTIONS: AN OPPORTUNITY, NOT A CATASTROPHE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, yesterday and today news stories have appeared announcing plans by the Defense Department to phase out a number of military installations which are believed not necessary for our national defense.

It has been indicated that 33 installations in 14 States will be closed or reduced, affecting an estimated 16,000 civilian employees.

Press reports tell of strong protests from Members of Congress who represent areas where surplus military installations are located.

The concern of Members of Congress in the communities affected by the phase out of these installations is of course understandable, but I believe it reveals a strange situation. Have we become so dependent upon military spending that we now regard the Defense Department as a kind of public relief agency? We cannot afford to freeze our Defense Establishment into a permanent WPA. This would endanger both our military security and the economic strength of the country.

We must be prepared, as the Secretary of Defense indicated, to accept defense cuts resulting either from shifts in weapons systems or from reductions in total defense or disarmament. Any one of these contingencies can create temporary unemployment.

I believe that what is needed is conversion planning, to minimize or avert economic dislocations caused by defense changes, rather than resistance to every proposal designed to benefit taxpayers; not only that, but also we need to streamline, to give ourselves a more efficient Defense Establishment.

Are we asking our Secretary of Defense to plan the enormously costly defense of our country on the basis of how many men he can keep working in military installations that are surplus to our real defense needs?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the Senator believe that Congress is entitled to have it proved that a closing is in fact a real economy and not a fancied economy?

Mr. McGOVERN. I cannot agree with the interpretation the Senator from New York has placed on the motivation of the Secretary of Defense. I respect the Senator's right, as a representative of the State of New York, to express his views to the Defense Department and to receive careful consideration of the objections he has raised.

Mr. KEATING. I respectfully suggest that that does not exactly answer my question. Whatever motivations are involved, one way or another, it seems to me it is the responsibility of Congress to look not only at defense but also at all factors, including unemployment; and that it is appropriate and proper for a Member of Congress to ask the question, "Will this closing effect a real economy in taxpayers' dollars or will it cost more in the long run than to continue the installation at a reduced figure?"

I should like to know whether the Senator disagrees with that.

Mr. McGOVERN. I believe that is a legitimate concern. My own view on this is that we should not base our Defense Establishment on considerations as to how we are to take care of our employment needs. The only criterion should be what will give the Nation the best possible Defense Establishment.

The problem to which the Senator referred both in his question and in his earlier remarks is an important one. It involves the question as to what we should do with respect to areas of economic depression and what we should do with respect to related unemployment problems in those areas.

This is not a matter under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense. I believe it is an area the Congress should deal with, using such programs as the manpower training program and construction of needed public facilities, such as classrooms for our young people, hospitals, improvement of city transportation systems, and other things which will put men and women to work on useful, needed functions. We should not ask the Secretary of Defense to continue unnecessary installations insofar as our defense needs are concerned.

Mr. KEATING. Let me put the case to the Senator this way: If the activities carried on at a base are absolutely essential to the operations of our Defense Establishment and are admitted to be such, would not the Senator agree that one factor—I do not necessarily say the controlling factor—properly to be considered by the Defense Department is whether those activities shall be carried on at a present installation which is in a depressed area or shall be moved to another area which has no problem of unemployment whatever?

Mr. McGOVERN. If the Senator's assumption that the activities are essential to our national defense is correct, then, of course, that is a different matter. My understanding has been that, after a careful review of these defense installations that have been recommended for phasing out, the Secretary of Defense has actually concluded that they are not contributing to our defense.

Mr. KEATING. If the Senator will yield further—and I do not want to interfere with the continuity of his presentation—perhaps the Senator, not being involved in the problem from the point of view of South Dakota, has not given to this matter the study we have. I have just come from a meeting at which the Secretary of the Air Force said that procurement of electronic equipment, which the Senator and I know is one of the most important areas in the Air Force, and which is the activity at the Rome Air Base, of course, must be carried on and expanded, but it is proposed to move that activity to a lot of different bases.

If that work were to be given up, I would not for a moment protest it, but it seems to me that one of the factors to be considered is that Rome is a depressed area, and those facilities will be moved from that area into areas that have no problems of unemployment. That is the factual situation.

Mr. McGOVERN. When the Senator states those facts, I think there is great merit to the point he makes.

On the general matter to which I was addressing myself, I personally applaud the efforts of President Johnson and Secretary McNamara to effect savings in defense costs. Having offered an amendment on September 24, to reduce defense appropriations by $2.2 billion, I am encouraged by press reports that the administration is considering military cuts for the next fiscal year that may total $1.5 billion.

This will still leave us with a military budget well in excess of $50 billion.

Mr. President, as long as I am in the Senate, I am going to do everything in my power to protect and secure for my State necessary Government installations and payrolls. But I do not think it would serve the interests of my State or the Nation to fight for unneeded Government plants that waste our resources, our taxes, and our manpower.

Instead, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting legislation I introduced on October 31, the National Economic Conversion Act, to ease the transition from military to civilian production. This Nation need not fear the phaseout of unnecessary military spending, provided we plan now to direct the dislocated manpower and investment into other useful tasks. Our able colleague from Michigan [Mr. HART] is the sponsor of another proposal to meet the changing requirements of our technology.

I am today urging the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee [Mr. MAGNUSON] to request early reports on my bill so that hearings can be held in the near future. Hearings on Senator HART's bill have already been held by the Manpower Subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. I am also seeking administration counsel to determine whether or not the basic objectives of conversion planning in my bill could be largely accomplished by Executive order without legislation.

Mr. President, I cannot believe that needless military spending serves the national interest. I cannot believe that we want to shackle our highly able Secretary of Defense in his efforts to eliminate waste from our defense budget. I cannot believe that there is any American worker who can really be satisfied in devoting his labor to unneeded tasks at the expense of his fellow citizens.

Instead, let us get on with the urgent tasks of building needed schools for our children, clinics and hospitals for our citizens, better housing and transportation in our cities, wholesome outdoor recreation facilities and development projects in our rural communities, let us also use some of the proposed reduction in defense costs to relieve the burden of taxation on our businessmen and our citizens in general.

Communist critics have long contended that the United States has to maintain a high level of military spending to keep our economy from collapsing. I do not believe that. I think we need a powerful Military Establishment to protect us so long as dangerous tensions exist in the world, but neither our defense nor our economy is served by wasteful military spending or surplus defense installations.

I have great faith in the capacity of the American economy to expand and flourish when geared to peacetime purposes. We demonstrated the glory of our economy and the vision of our citizens at the end of World War II. We can do it again.

I hope that my colleagues will not unduly hamstring the efforts of President Johnson and Secretary McNamara to give us a more economical and more efficient defense program. Instead, let us concentrate our efforts on smoothing the transition to vitally needed expansion of our peacetime economy and to the early enactment of the President's tax reduction bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that news articles from the Washington Post of yesterday and today on this subject be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 12, 1963]

United States May Drop 30 Bases, 75,000 Jobs—Pentagon's Plan Affects 16 States

Congressmen of five States were informed yesterday of Defense Department decisions to cut back U.S. military installations.

Congressional sources said Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara will spell out the cutbacks in detail today. One, Representative Alexander Pirnie, Republican, of New York, said New York Congressmen were informed that more than 30 installations in 16 States will be closed or reduced, affecting some 75,000 civilian employees.

Pirnie said 7 New York installations with a total of 11,000 employees would be affected by the cutback.

Representative Delbert L. Latta, Republican, of Ohio, said some Ohio Members of Congress were told there would be a cutback announcement today. He said Secretary of the Army Cyrus R. Vance told the Ohioans that the Army Supply Center at Port Clinton would be phased out over a 3-year period, along with other unspecified installations across the Nation.

Latta said the cutback could affect some 1,750 civilian employees at Port Clinton.

Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell L. Gilpatric, accompanied by Vance and Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert, broke the news to the New York congressional delegation.

Representative Leo W. O'Brien, Democrat, of New York, described the meeting as a "furious session." He along with Representative Samuel S. Stratton, Democrat, of New York, and Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York, confirmed what Pirnie reported but said they understood 17 States would be affected.

Stratton said Gilpatric and the others told them the bases would be closed down over a period of 3 years, but that the New Yorkers were not given any specific timetable.

TELEGRAM SENT JOHNSON

The Congressmen said they have sent a telegram to President Johnson asking for a meeting with him and are urging the House Armed Services Committee to seek the basis for the decision.

Meanwhile Congress Members from Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and California reported that a naval survey board had recommended immediate closing of naval shipyards in Philadelphia, Boston, and San Francisco.

Later, however, informed sources said the decision was not final, and Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, reported last night that the Pentagon had informed him the Boston shipyard would remain open.

"NO COMMENT" AT PENTAGON

To all of the reports a Pentagon spokesman replied with a "no comment."

It could not be learned immediately what other States or installations might be affected.

The closing of military bases considered surplus to military needs is not a new program.

Secretary McNamara announced the start of a continuing effort of this sort on March 30, 1961, a little more than 2 months after the Kennedy administration took office.

At that time, there were about 6,700 defense installations, about two-thirds of them in the United States and the rest abroad.

The Pentagon reported early this week that more than 400 installations have been closed or reduced in scope since March 1961 at an estimated annual saving of $316 million.

McNamara, testifying before Congress last January, said a review of the need of various bases would be made annually, apparently in connection with the preparation of the following year's defense budget.

The question of Navy-owned yards also has been a perennial one. Last June, the Defense Department made public a study comparing costs in private and Navy shipyards. It showed, in general, that costs were considerably higher in naval shipyards.

The report, made by a public accounting firm under contract to the Navy, said fringe benefit costs represented the most significant factor in the higher average overhead rates at naval yards.

The Navy now maintains 11 shipyards. For the most part, they handle overhaul and modernization work.

Private shipyards now account for about 80 percent of new naval ship construction, Navy sources said.

The Navy generally would like to hold onto its shipyards because they are geared for its needs and are ready on short notice for repair jobs and other work.

Two years ago, a Pentagon staff recommendation called for closing all the Boston, San Francisco, and Philadelphia yards but President Kennedy then ordered that they remain open.

Representative Thomas P. O'Neill, Democrat, of Massachusetts, said Assistant Secretary of the Navy Kenneth E. BeLieu told him Tuesday the board had recommended gradually closing down six yards by October 1966, but later said the board had asked for immediate action on the Boston, Philadelphia, and San Francisco yards.

It was estimated that shutdowns at those three yards would involve nearly 25,000 civilian jobs—8,202 at Boston, 9,032 at Philadelphia, and 7,124 at San Francisco.

O'Neill said House Speaker John W. McCormack, Democrat, of Massachusetts, had already protested to the White House on the reported closing of the Boston yard.

Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, Republican, of California, sent a letter to President Johnson asking for an appointment to discuss the San Francisco facility.

Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said he had sent telegrams to Mr. Johnson, McNamara, and Secretary of the Navy Paul Nitze "expressing my strong belief that the Philadelphia Navy Yard is vital to our defense posture and must remain open."

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 13, 1963]

McNamara Sees More Reductions—Protests Heard From Areas in New York, Ohio

(By John G. Norris)

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara announced yesterday that 33 military bases will be closed as an economy move and predicted that base surveys now underway will bring further reductions.

His announcements of the move, which will eliminate 16,000 jobs and save an estimated $106 million a year at 26 domestic and 7 oversea installations, brought mounting opposition in Congress.

Shortly after McNamara disclosed his action at a news conference, Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican, of New York, introduced legislation designed to block any shutdown in an economically depressed area.

Another irate New Yorker, Representative Samuel S. Stratton, a Democrat, promised to turn the Pentagon "upside down" before accepting the shutdowns. His district is losing the Schenectady Army Depot, one of seven bases to be closed in New York State.

But there was little or no chance of stopping the base closures, in light of the congressional and Administration economy drives. Representative F. Edward Hébert, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of a House Armed Services Subcommittee that long has been investigating military waste, said he would not protest the closing of Camp LeRoy Johnson and the Army Overseas Supply Agency in New Orleans.

"I've been preaching economy for all these years and I'm not going to start screaming now just because they shut down something in my backyard," he stated.

Others in Congress were worried about subsequent closures, in light of McNamara's prediction and earlier reports that the immediate shutdowns were to include the big naval shipyards at Boston, Philadelphia, and San Francisco. The 16,000 personnel cut resulting from all the closures includes 7,800 military billets.

MORE STUDIES

There were reports that last-minute congressional appeals to the White House caused the shipyards to be removed from the closure list, but McNamara denied that there had been any such "reprieve."

He said, however, that "there is no question but that we have excess capacity" at the 11 major shipyards, and intensive Pentagon studies of these and other bases undoubtedly will show that "further reductions" should be made.

McNamara said these studies will be completed "sometime in the next 12 months"—raising a question whether their consideration might not be put off until after the November election.

The defense chief was asked whether President Johnson personally had approved the list of base closures and whether it stemmed from the late President Kennedy's actions or those of Mr. Johnson.

He replied that the "decision was mine" but reflected his instructions from both. Such economies, he said, conform to President Johnson's emphasis on making all possible savings to secure support for passing the tax bill.

MAJOR HIRING FREEZE

McNamara stressed that under plans worked out by the Pentagon, all employees affected by the closures will have Government jobs offered them elsewhere.

There will be a major freeze on new hiring by the Armed Forces, and the bases cut back will be phased out, in some cases over 3½ years. Where employees are offered new jobs in another locality, the Government will pay the cost of moving, and will retrain personnel for such jobs if necessary.

McNamara would not list the seven bases to be closed in foreign countries, pending negotiations with the governments involved. News reports from Japan said there would be reductions of Japanese civilian employees there, plus the withdrawal of 3,000 American military personnel.

Besides the 7 bases in New York, 13 other States will lose bases. Four will be closed in California; two each in Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas, and one in Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, Illinois, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, and Ohio.

* * * * *

SURPRISE AND ANGER

Included are 14 Army, 7 Navy, and 12 Air Force installations.

Defense officials said three are in areas classified by the Labor Department as economically depressed—with unemployment 6 percent or higher. They are: the San Diego, Calif., Naval Repair Facility; the Stockton, Calif., Navy Storage Annex; and the Rome, N.Y., Air Force Air Materiel Supply Mission.

There was sharp reaction from the Rome-Utica area in New York, where civic leaders and military employees expressed anger and surprise at the news.

At Port Clinton, Ohio, where the Erie Army Depot will be shut down, the order was called the "worst economic blow we've ever had" by James A. Wolf, president of the chamber of commerce. The depot is a mainstay of the local economy.

CLOSE TO GOAL

McNamara noted that the new list of base closings was a continuation of a program he initiated in early 1961. After sharp political reaction to his first publicized move, the Pentagon made only local announcements of the addition of smaller scale closures that followed.

Yesterday's list brought total annual savings from the shutdowns to $442 million and personnel economies to 70,000 jobs, close to the goal set in 1961, the Secretary said. It has been reported that President Kennedy turned down earlier McNamara proposals for closing shipyards and other major bases.

The Secretary said yesterday that he was raising his goal, under the new economy drive, to $600 million a year savings and suggested another 125 to 150 bases could be closed. The total number of defense installations, however, remains at about the 1961 total—6,700—because of the activation of new radar and missile sites, the Pentagon said.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 13, 1963]

MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AFFECTED BY McNAMARA CUTBACK

(By the Associated Press)

The military installations affected by the economy announcement of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and the kind of cutback to be made are:

ALABAMA

Mobile: Theodore terminal of the Army, excess in July 1964.

Air Force Reserve troop carrier operations at Bates Field, transferred to Brookley Air Force Base by December 1964.

ARIZONA

Litchfield Park: Naval air facility, excess by June 30, 1967.

ARKANSAS

Army's Fort Chaffee at Fort Smith, inactivated by the end of June 1965.

CALIFORNIA

Mira Loma Air Force station at Ontario, closed by December 1964.

San Francisco: Army oversea supply agency, closed by July 1964.

San Diego: The naval repair facility, shut down by January 1965.

Stockton: Navy storage at Stockton annex, inactivated by December 1965.

GEORGIA

Byron: Navy forms and publications supply office, moved to Naval Supply Depot, Philadelphia, by September 1964.

ILLINOIS

Chicago: 5th Army headquarters, relocated to Fort Sheridan, Ill., by June 1966.

LOUISIANA

New Orleans: Army's Camp Leroy Johnson, excess. Army's oversea supply agency, phased out by July 1964.

MISSISSIPPI

Greenville: Greenville Air Force Base, excess by June 1965.

NEVADA

Reno: Activities at Stead Air Force Base, reduced to Air Defense Command-SAGE operations, by June 1966.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Manchester: Air Force Reserve training at Grenier Field, transferred to Pease Air Force Base, N.H., by June 1966.

NEW YORK

Brooklyn: Army's oversea supply agency at Brooklyn Army terminal, phased out by July 1964.

Long Island: Army's Fort Tilden, inactivated except for Reserve Training Center. Nike sites relocated to Montauk Point (Camp Hero) and Lido Beach by December 1966.

New York City: Army's Fort Totten inactivated except for Reserve Training Center and family housing by December 1966.

Port Washington: Navy training device center, excess by December 1965.

Rome: Supply mission at Rome air materiel area relocated by June 1967.

Schenectady: Army's Schenectady-Voorheesville depot excess by December 1966.

Staten Island: Army's Miller Field inactivated by June 1965.

NORTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth City: Naval air facility excess by January 1965.

OHIO

Port Clinton: Supply and maintenance mission at Erie Army depot discontinued by December 1966.

TEXAS

Fort Worth: Fort Worth Army depot excess by December 1965.

San Marcos: Army's Camp Gary, now inactive, turned over to GSA for disposal by December 1964.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, as previously ordered, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 16, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 13, 1963:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named person to be lieutenant in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Jan R. Dazcy.

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Thomas E. Langmann
Stephen D. Csintyan
David J. Bain
Roger D. Williams
John A. MacDonald
Cameron A. Hatfield

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Betty J. Parker, Axis, Ala., in place of J. T. Parker, deceased.

B. Kenneth Bennett, Grove Hill, Ala., in place of J. T. De Witt, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Roman A. Anthony, Scott, Ark., in place of C. M. Davis, retired.

Jesse H. Dills, Sulphur Springs, Ark., in place of M. E. Whaley, retired.

Lois M. Henry, Thornton, Ark., in place of C. M. Wise, retired.

M. Eugene Martin, Van Buren, Ark., in place of E. W. Deering, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Edith F. Turl, Five Points, Calif., in place of J. R. Edde, resigned.

Mary M. Seegers, French Camp, Calif, in place of V. S. Pambianco, retired.

Dolly S. Condo, Hinkley, Calif., in place of M. C. Gordon, resigned.

Gerald J. Stephens, Stirling City, Calif., in place of H. J. Martin, retired.

COLORADO

Ernest R. Alexander, Glenwood Springs, Colo., in place of W. H. Farnum, Jr., deceased.

CONNECTICUT

Elizabeth N. Bojarski, Hanover, Conn., in place of M. D. Neusse, retired.

James A. D'Amato, Morris, Conn., in place of L. F. Skilton, retired.

Helen D. Whitaker, Suffield, Conn., in place of M. H. Kennedy, retired.

GEORGIA

Maytrice M. Lindsey, Danburg, Ga., in place of J. M. Lindsey, transferred.

Louise D. Drury, Nahunta, Ga., in place of E. P. Dodge, deceased.

IDAHO

Eugene W. MacDonald, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, in place of S. J. McMillan, retired.

Parlette W. Petersen, Rexburg, Idaho, in place of W. J. Lyman, retired.

ILLINOIS

Robert T. Elgin, Fairmount, Ill., in place of R. M. Hart, retired.

Carol C. Woiwode, Forest City, Ill., in place of L. E. Folkman, retired.

Alice L. Williams, Rockbridge, Ill., in place of R. W. Jacobi, retired.

INDIANA

Marvin D. Helmerick, Boswell, Ind., in place of W. H. Lynch, deceased.

Clair T. Albin, Greencastle, Ind., in place of R. R. Neal, retired.

Ellsworth G. Hartley, New Albany, Ind., in place of W. S. Darneal, retired.

Malcolm W. Menke, Westphalia, Ind., in place of R. H. Meier, resigned.

IOWA

Harry G. Powell, Jr., Troy Mills, Iowa, in place of Paul Wilson, retired.

KANSAS

F. X. Buche, Miltonvale, Kans., in place of E. E. Buche, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Maurice F. Foley, Rockport, Mass., in place of R. R. Wilson, retired.

MICHIGAN

Charles F. Collins, Flat Rock, Mich., in place of R. H. Smith, resigned.

MISSOURI

Warren H. Dial, Belton, Mo., in place of N. H. Mullen, retired.

MONTANA

Philip E. Pings, Augusta, Mont., in place of J. A. Manix, retired.

John J. McGlynn, Whitehall, Mont., in place of D. C. Bryan, retired.

NEBRASKA

Lorene M. Smith, Benedict, Nebr., in place of Viola Calhoon, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Willis A. Ober, New Hampton, N.H., in place of D. L. Moody, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Evelyn Burger, Quakertown, N.J., in place of P. P. Burger, deceased.

Samuel A. Van Sant, South Seaville, N.J., in place of M. M. Ratcliffe, resigned.

NEW YORK

Louden Rampe, East Hampton, N.Y., in place of S. B. Cline, retired.

Francis J. Foote, Valois, N.Y., in place of J. E. Hawes, declined.

OHIO

Nelson E. Sundermeier, Cleveland, Ohio, in place of J. S. Frantz, retired.

Victor C. Ramus, Sherwood, Ohio, in place of W. W. Miller, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles C. Kerlin, Falls, Pa., in place of C. H. Freas, resigned.

John F. Walker, Leechburg, Pa., in place of J. E. Clark, retired.

Charles N. Moyer, Jr., Reinholds, Pa., in place of W. C. Brendel, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Darlene E. Meyer, Conde, S. Dak., in place of J. R. Kohlman, deceased.

TEXAS

Verna A. Vanderlip, Kemah, Tex., in place of A. M. Martin, retired.

Cecil O. Burton, Waxahachie, Tex., in place of E. H. McElroy, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Cecil B. Niswander, Lesage, W. Va., in place of L. M. Galford, resigned.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Allen, Ronald L.
Austin, Henry W.
Breeding, Earle G., Jr.
Pinnick, James H.
Wylie, Moffatt F.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Atteberry, George W.
Cavagnaro, Dennis A.
Rodgers, Robert F.
Villeneuve, David A.
Radzyminski, John T.
Elser, Thomas L.
Losey, James L.
Doane, Edward R.
Flynn, John G.
Culpepper, Warren A.
Whaley, Robert G.
Fritsch, John R.
Dupont, Delbert H.
Hoppmeyer, Herbert E., Jr.
Tremper, William F.
Babos, Robert L.
Powers, Allen L.
Gilliard, James D.
McKenzie, Benny M.
Bradfield, Richard C.
Kubik, Edward F., Jr.
Green, Edward L.
Jackson, Terry C.
Kennedy, Glenn O., Jr.
Reed, William C., Jr.
Feind, William J.
Crowley, James P.
Dentz, Joseph G.
Lathrop, Jerry L.
Fisher, Zane B.

The following-named for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Anthes, Fred W.
Ashe, Thomas D.
Bartlett, Robert O.
Beaver, Dale S.
Bode, Wichard H., Jr.
Bowden, Holland C.
Campbell, Wallace E. A.
Carter, Kenneth L.
Chavez, Lonnie S.
Church, Jorel B.
Clark, James A.
Curran, James E., Jr.
Demeo, Angelo C.
Duncan, Dorris A.
Faught, Robert J.
Franz, Howard A.
Girvin, Bobby G.
Golden, John J.
Gray, Edwin T.
Holbrook, Vernon J.
Incociati, Raymond F.
Jones, Robert E.
Joyce, Robert W.
Land, Carlton E.
Manco, Edward J.
McCurry, Kenneth D.
Merry, Bion E.
Mitchell, Robert L.
Mockenhaupt, Robert J.
Noe, Robert E.
Olson, Robert V.
Perry, Leon E.
Pitts, Thomas E.
Rickmon, James E.
Roberts, Morris R.
Robinson, Jean O.
Rodgers, John H.
Scaplehorn, William E., Jr.
Scott, Gerald E.
Simmons, Clyde M.
Smith, Clarence D.
Starzynski, Paul M.
Tanksley, Lawrence E.
Vangrol, Daniel P., III
Wieden, Clifford, Jr.
Yaeger, Richard A.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Reed-Hill, Robert E.
Welker, Daniel L.

The following-named (platoon leaders class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Armstrong, James H.
Beard, Norman W., Jr.
Benson, Stanley L.
Bledsoe, Vadney C.
Caskey, John B.
Chapman, Leonard F., III
Clark, Edward T., III
Cochran, Moncrieff M., III
Crell, John B., Jr.
Dematteo, Douglas A.
Dyke, Walter
Ebbecke, Vincent R.
Ernest, John F., Jr.
Gavin, James F.
Hitchens, Alan W.
Hodder, Mark L.
Huddleston, Gene K.
Jaye, Donald B.
Johnson, Donald P.
Lindholm, Hans W.
Manning, Gary L.
Mitchell, James E.
Miller, Michael R.
O'Buch, Warren J.
Pierce, Robert C.
Regan, Richard J.
Roe, Frederick S.
Rowe, John H.
Runstad, Harold J., Jr.
Sargent, George L., Jr.
Schmitt, James H.
Tucker, Gilbert A., Jr.
Ward, Joel D.
Weeks, Larry L.
Wilkins, James R.
Griffing, Darryl R.
Jaroch, Roger M.
Claxton, Sammy R.
Richards, Robert J.
Walke, Alfred J.
Schade, Dewey D.
Korte, James M.
Vetter, Lawrence C., Jr.
Peters, William J.
Baroch, Jerome P., Jr.
Vandam, Albert R.
Polyascko, Gerald J.
Reed, Don T.
Rick, Ronald A.
Dugan, James A.
Erickson, John R.
Shara, Robert L.
L'Heureux, Robert D., Jr.
Kenyon, William O.
Goldstein, Mark K.
Swallows, Jack E.
Corbett, David C.
Longan, Laird C.
Kennedy, Dennis M.
Fratarcangelo, Paul A.

The following named for permanent appointment to commissioned warrant officer CWO W-2 in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Johnson, Albert D.
Stevens, Glenn B.
Womack, Carl G.
Merrell, Edward L., Jr.
Turner, Roland L.
Newton, Orbin D.
Cusimano, Joseph
Cervin, Michael V.
Rose, William W.
Schultze, Edward W.
Steiner, Clifford D.
Dowell, Sidney C.
Young, Fred F., Jr.
Holman, Ottie P., Jr.
Campbell, Henry C.
Schwab, Charles F.
Lark, Scott E.
Dierickx, Phil A.
Hallet, James G., Jr.
Corriveau, Orval J.
McLaughlin, Melvin W.
McCue, Merrill W.
Pawlik, Mitchell W.
Baumwart, Eldon L.
Morrisey, Robert B.
Lane, Keary L.
Hershey, Rodger E.
Dixon, John C.
Voss, Bethel A.
Nichols, Bobby J.
Magaldi, Joseph M., Jr.
Kueker, William R.
Stevens, Jerome E.
Kent, Donald E.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Paul J. Harrell, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 31: 1: *Woe to those who go down to Egypt for help and rely on horses, who trust in chariots because they are many and in horsemen because they are very strong, but do not look to the Holy One of Israel or consult the Lord.*

With all our military might, weight of wealth, allies and alliances, we recognize, O God, that we can be and indeed are weak and poor and alone until we look to Thee for guidance and consult Thee concerning decisions, direction, and destiny.

We humbly pray that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy grace and glad to do Thy will. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion, from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way.

Endue with the spirit of wisdom, truth, courage, and nobleness those to whom, in Thy name, we entrust the authority of government, the President of these United States and the Members of Congress, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that through obedience to Thy law we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth.

Grant, O God, that this day and each succeeding day may bring us closer to a final victory, not of group over group or nation over nation, but of man over his own evils and weakness. In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5778. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5179. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicle, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7063. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the above-entitled bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McClellan, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Holland, Mr. Fulbright, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Mundt to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2311. An act to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college debate topics; and

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Public Works certain information on water pollution control.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9140) entitled "An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes."

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk may be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker may be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the distinguished majority leader if this request implies that the House is going to adjourn over until Monday next, thereby missing tomorrow, Saturday?

Mr. ALBERT. It implies that a request will be made later for that purpose.

Mr. HALL. But it is not inherent in this request?

Mr. ALBERT. This does not bind the House not to meet tomorrow, no.

Mr. HALL. Then I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EFFICIENCY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is the tendency of a bureaucracy to feed itself, entrench itself, and to resist every effort to deprive it of its power, its strength, and its bigness. I, for one, commend President Johnson on his all-out attack on the "unnecessary" in Government. He recently noted that Federal civilian employment had risen only 686 since October of 1962 and had the growth followed the trend of local and State governments it would have been up 106,000. He went on to say—and I like this:

> But these facts do not justify a continued upcreep in Federal employment. They do not justify us in having 10,000 or 1,000 or even 100 more employees than we need.

The President in his attack on bureaucracy laid down some ground rules:

> Cut out excessive paperwork because it breeds overstaffing. Measure workloads carefully. Strip down overly elaborate organizations. Give as much attention to management as you do to your programs.

I share the President's concern and commend him for the action taken to increase efficiency in our Government. We all know this is a very necessary step toward reduction of expenditures. The people of my district approve of the President's action and I add my voice to theirs in commending him.

CHRISTMAS TREES

Mr SAYLOR.. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago a colloquy occurred on the floor of the House between the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] and the majority leader [Mr. Albert], in regard to whether or not the House would have any session during Christmas and there was some comment made as to whether or not trees would be provided and decorated.

I am privileged to represent the "Christmas tree-growing Capital of the United States," Indiana County, Pa. The Christmas tree growers of my great district have taken my colleagues at their word and have presented to the cloakrooms of both the majority and minority parties of the House and Senate some beautiful—finest of—Christmas trees. They are samples of the trees grown in this area that have brought it international renown. I hope they will bring brotherly love and add a little Christmas spirit and joy among the Members from now until adjournment.

FOREIGN AID VERSUS AID TO OUR OWN PEOPLE

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, there are two very interesting headlines in the only morning Washington paper on page 1. I read: "Twenty-six Million Others Have Bare Essentials—1 out of 10 Americans Lives in Abject Poverty, Study Reveals."

On page 21 of the same only morning newspaper in Washington, D.C., I read and I am sorry the gentleman is not here: "Passman Sticking To Perennial Role as Chief Slasher of Foreign Aid Bill."

Mr. Speaker, one of these things is distinctly wrong. If we are in such abject poverty—and apparently this is an elaborate study and is supposed to be correct—perhaps it is just as well that the gentleman should slash some of the foreign aid and turn around and help our own 24 million people who are living under bare subsistence. You cannot have it both ways. If we are the richest and the greatest country in the world, we should not have that many millions of people living in poverty and in dire and bare subsistence.

REQUEST TO TRANSFER CALL OF CONSENT CALENDAR AND MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES FROM MONDAY NEXT TO TUESDAY, DECEMBER 17

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar and motions to suspend the rules in order on Monday next be transferred to Tuesday, December 17.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the purpose of putting this business over from Monday until Tuesday?

Mr. ALBERT. We have no business scheduled for Tuesday, or ready for Tuesday, but we do anticipate having the foreign aid appropriation bill on Monday. It seems to be the part of wisdom to separate these programs and to balance them out. That is all.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman this question: Why not take up these bills regularly scheduled for Monday, and then go into foreign aid and let the foreign aid carry over into Tuesday, if necessary. I should say the foreign handout bill. I did not mean to dignify it by calling it foreign aid.

Mr. ALBERT. I have made the request after consulting with the acting minority leader merely for the purpose of expediting the business of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 239]

Abbitt
Alger
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Avery
Ayres
Becker
Belcher
Brademas
Brock
Bromwell
Burkhalter
Burton
Cahill
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen,
  Don H.
Cohelan
Collier
Curtis
Davis, Tenn.
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Duncan
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Evins
Farbstein
Fino
Flynt
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gill
Glenn
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Halleck
Hansen
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Hoffman
Jensen
Karth
Kee
Kelly
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Laird
Latta
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Moore
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Brien, Ill.
Olson, Minn.
Osmers
Pepper
Pilcher
Powell
Pucinski
Quillen
Rains
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Ryan, Mich.
Scott
Shelley
Siler
Snyder
Stephens
Sullivan
Taft
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tuck
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watson
Weltner
Wilson, Bob
Wright
Wydler
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 317 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5179) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicle, and for other purposes, with an amendment of the Senate thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 5179) entitled "An Act to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicle, and for other purposes", do pass with the following amendment: page 2, after line 20, insert:

"SEC. 4. Section 4359(e)(2) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the word 'highway' the words 'or development'."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment does not alter the purpose of the bill as passed by the House. It merely inserts three words in section 4359(e) of the Postal Code to the effect that "not to exceed one publication published by the official development agency of a State" which contains no advertising and meets all existing conditions for second-class entry may be mailed under rates applicable to qualified nonprofit organizations.

The law now permits such mailings of not to exceed one publication published by the official highway agency of a State, and the amendment would permit similar mailings of not to exceed one publication published by the official development agency of a State. At present there is one official State highway agency magazine that qualifies—that of the Arizona Highway Agency—and only one similar publication by a State development agency—that of the Vermont Development Agency.

The Post Office Department reports that it has no objection to the amendment and that the cost, if any, will not be material.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 5179 which the House passed on August 5 and has now been passed by the other body would enable the Post Office Department to manage the transportation of mail in a more efficient manner and would reduce mail transportation costs within the Post Office Department. This legislation, which I introduced and which I am pleased to sponsor, has the support of the Department and the administration and I recommend that the House accept the Senate amendment which has been added to H.R. 5179. This amendment, although not in the nature of making any change in the original bill is acceptable so far as I am concerned and I understand the Post Office Department reports that it has no objection to the Senate amendment.

I therefore recommend, Mr. Speaker, that the bill H.R. 5179 be passed and sent forward for the President's consideration as it is in the best interest of the Post Office Department and their obligations to move the mail as economically and efficiently as possible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee to concur in the Senate amendment?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Saturday, December 14, to file a report on the foreign aid appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona reserved all points of order on the bill.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, 1964

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1036)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$200,646,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$198,853,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$468,275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
(per C.R.J.),
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN STENNIS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALAN BIBLE,
HARRY F. BYRD,
THOMAS KUCHEL,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1—Military Construction, Army: Appropriates $200,646,000 instead of $200,293,000 as proposed by the House and $207,070,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed to the reductions as proposed by the Senate and the following additions to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Fort Stewart, Ga., fuel conversion	$97,000
Fort Sill, Okla., enlisted men's barracks	508,000
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., consolidated enlisted men's mess	983,000
Fort Lewis, Wash., water supply facilities	610,000
Army Security Agency, location O3, gymnasium	273,000

In addition, the conferees have reduced the total funds available for this appropriation by $2,890,000 instead of $4,390,000 as proposed by the House and will expect the Army to meet this funding reduction by recoupment of funds from prior appropriations and savings in this construction program.

Amendment No. 2—Military Construction, Navy: Appropriates $198,853,000 instead of $194,000,000 as proposed by the House and $202,223,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed to the following additions to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, helicopter blade test facility	$442,000
Marine Corps Base, Camp Butler, Okinawa, combat training tank	155,000
Training facility building	461,000
Land acquisition	2,295,000

In addition, the conferees have reduced the total funds available for this appropriation by $2,618,000 instead of $4,118,000 as proposed by the House and will expect the Navy to meet this funding reduction by recoupment of funds from prior appropriations and savings in this construction program.

Amendment No. 3—Military Construction, Air Force: Appropriates $468,275,000 instead of $451,000,000 as proposed by the House and $487,090,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed to the reductions as proposed by the Senate and the following additions to the amounts and line items as proposed by the House:

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, dormitory, airmen	$250,000
Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, logistical facility depot	$1,280,000
Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tennessee, gas dynamics wind tunnel	2,442,000
Atlantic Missile Range, Widewake Field, dormitory, airmen	93,000
Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, composite medical facility	1,792,000
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, gymnasium	257,000
Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, commissary	165,000
Homestead Air Force Base, Florida, chapel annex	119,000
Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, composite medical facility	4,763,000
Adair Air Force Station, Oregon, service club	173,000
Lajes Air Base, Azores:	
Area search radar	87,000
Lighting approach	385,000
Kimpo Air Base, Korea, gymnasium	126,000
Naha Air Base, Okinawa, service club	415,000
Special facilities (AFTAC)	3,048,000
Minor construction	500,000

In addition, the conferees have reduced the total funds available for this appropriation by $9,256,000 instead of $12,256,000 as proposed by the House and $6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and will expect the Air Force to meet this funding reduction by recoupment of funds from prior appropriations and savings in this construction program.

Amendment No. 4—Military Construction, Defense Agencies: Appropriates $24,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $27,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the funds made available for Military Construction, Defense Agencies shall also be available for planning and minor construction.

Amendment No. 5—Military Construction, Army National Guard: Appropriates $5,700,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6—Loran Stations: Appropriates $20,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7—Family Housing, Defense: Appropriates $637,406,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $645,171,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have approved the action of the Senate in providing funds for the construction of 7,500 units of new family housing to be allocated to the military services by type and location by the Department of Defense. The Secretary of Defense is directed to inform the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate of the allocations to the several services prior to the execution of this program.

Amendment No. 8—Family Housing, Defense: Provides that not to exceed $34,681,000 shall be available for the construction of family housing for the Army as proposed by the Senate, instead of $41,364,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9—Family Housing, Defense: Authorizes not to exceed $68,248,000 for the construction of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps as proposed by the Senate instead of $80,036,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10—Family Housing, Defense: Authorizes not to exceed $61,027,000 for the construction of family housing for the Air Force as proposed by the Senate instead of $50,321,000 as proposed by the House.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
(per C.R.J.),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a tabulation.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, at a time when bases are being closed the question will naturally arise should we now consider a bill for $1.5 billion for military construction. Well, I can assure the House that there is no conflict except in one instance, and I call attention to that one. It is Stead Air Force Base in Nevada. There is an item of $236,000 for a hangar and a classroom facility. This item was not in conference. It was approved by the House and approved by the Senate before the action announced on yesterday for the closing of bases. Therefore, an amendment to delete this item would not be in order. However, I call attention to the fact that in the Air Force alone this committee cut the bill an overall figure of $9,256,000 below the budget request for the items that had been approved, just to be certain that we would take care of any situations of this nature that might arise and any other situation where savings would be possible. I can assure the House that this committee will insist that funds not be used at any base which is being closed. I do not think that is necessary. I do not think the Department of Defense would undertake to spend money at those bases, but we will give the House that added safeguard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I touch on the details of this bill, may I have just a moment to call attention to the fact that the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of this subcommittee, one of the outstanding and most beloved Members of the House, who has been having a little bout with sickness at the hospital, is back with us today. He is a grand warhorse who will not stay home as long as he should in order to become fully recovered. He is here today to give this work on the floor his blessing. I just think a good hand for SHEP is in order.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report provides for the appropriation of $1,585,880,000. This amount is $380,520,000 under the budget estimates, $31,609,000 below the Senate bill and $22,916,000 above the House bill. The amount agreed to is approximately $425 million below comparable appropriations for fiscal year 1963. I am certain that every feature of this conference report does not satisfy every Member of the House of Representatives or every Senator. In the give and take which always accompanies conference actions, some items have been deleted from the bill, a few have been restored. I think the conference action is sound and that the bill will meet the necessary requirement for military construction for each of the services for fiscal year 1964. The specific items added to the House bill are listed in the statement of the managers. There are, however, several items which I would like to call to your attention.

The House bill provided $645,171,000 for the family housing program. The Senate bill provided $637,406,000. The House has accepted the Senate amendments. The reductions made by the Senate relate wholly to construction of new family housing units. The bill approved by the House provided for the construction of 7,755 units at specific locations. The House action eliminated all relocatable and prefabricated type units. The Senate has provided funds for 7,500 units of new construction with the type of housing and the locations to be provided by the Department of Defense on a priority basis with the several military services. The House has approved the Senate action. This is the same number authorized in fiscal year 1963. I am certain that it will provide a realistic family housing program for the Department of Defense. In the meantime I urge the Secretary of Defense to thoroughly study this entire matter of providing family housing for military personnel and to carefully coordinate the program for fiscal year 1965 and future years so as to meet the objections which the Committee on Armed Services and the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate have raised to this program. Particularly, emphasis must be placed in regard to leased housing, so-called section 810 housing, debt payments, and operation and maintenance. I am certain that if this is done, we shall be presented with a very sound family housing program for fiscal year 1965.

In the Department of the Navy we have provided funds for a helicopter blade test facility at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla. This item was eliminated by the House and restored by the Senate. In agreeing to the inclusion of this facility in the conference report, the conferees are in unanimous agreement that maximum utilization must be made of existing commercial facilities and that this facility at Jacksonville will be available to the other military services as well as the Navy.

Funds were requested in the amount of $3,400,000 for a medical facility at Amarillo Air Force Base, Texas. This item was deleted by the House and restored by the Senate. It has been eliminated by the conferees. This is a replacement for an existing facility. The House action, which prevailed in the conference, was based on a disagreement with the policy of the Department of Defense not to provide obstetrical facilities in this hospital. Existing medical facilities at this base do provide obstetrical care for the dependents of military personnel. The Air Force, in their submission of this project, requested provision of obstetrical facilities. These were eliminated by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. It is contemplated by this office that obstetrical and other special cases will be placed on the local economy. The Air Force estimates that savings which would accrue as a result of providing obstetrical services in-house would amortize the cost of facilities in approximately 2½ years. In addition, to this mathematical computation, in eliminating obstetrical facilities, the Department of Defense has also eliminated services for gynecology. This means additional out-of-pocket costs to the servicemen themselves. Under the medical care program, which is supported by appropriated funds, gynecology requirements are provided only on an in-patient basis. Medical statistics show that most of these problems are handled on an outpatient basis. This means more money out of the pockets of Air Force enlisted personnel. Testimony presented to the House committee disclosed that a recent complete survey of existing community hospitals had not been made by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come when we must stand up and be counted on whether or not we are providing adequate medical facilities which we have promised to military personnel. In its report on this bill our committee called for a study of this entire program prior to construction of this hospital. We pointed out the necessity of providing adequate medical facilities to meet Air Force requirements for the foreseeable future. The Secretary of Defense stated to the committee that he would be pleased to review the present policy relating to care of dependents. I am certain that he will undertake such a study at an early date, if he has not done so already. Pending the results of this study facilities at Amarillo Air Force Base will be reasonably adequate to meet the needs of the military personnel and their dependents. Let me emphasize that this is the only medical facility in this construction program which does not make provision for obstetrical care for dependents. The denial of the request for funds at this time in no wise can be interpreted as a denial of the requirement for a replacement of the existing hospital at this base. Frankly, we only want to provide a facility which is adequate to meet the needs of military personnel and their dependents in the most efficient and economical matter.

I realize that this conference report is not totally acceptable to every Member of this House or the other body, yet I am certain that it is a good bill. It provides for a solid program which, if properly implemented by the Secretary of Defense and the military services, will provide an excellent military construction program and enhance to a large degree the effectiveness of our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include a tabulation showing, service by service budget estimates, House action, Senate action and the action taken in the conference.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, FISCAL YEAR 1964

Title	Budget estimate, 1964	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with—		
					Budget	House	Senate
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Military construction, Army	$249,500,000	$200,293,000	$207,070,000	$200,646,000	−$48,854,000	+$353,000	−$6,424,000
Military construction, Army Reserve	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000			
Military construction, Army National Guard	3,500,000	3,500,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	+2,200,000	+2,200,000	
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY							
Military construction, Navy	269,900,000	194,000,000	202,223,000	198,853,000	−71,047,000	+4,853,000	−3,370,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000			
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE							
Military construction, Air Force	628,200,000	451,000,000	487,090,000	468,275,000	−159,925,000	+17,275,000	−18,815,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000			
Military construction, Air Guard	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000			
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE							
Military construction, Defense agencies	29,900,000	24,000,000	27,000,000	24,000,000	−5,900,000		−3,000,000
Loran stations, Department of Defense	20,500,000	14,500,000	20,500,000	20,500,000		+6,000,000	
Total, military construction	1,232,000,000	917,793,000	980,083,000	948,474,000	−283,526,000	+30,681,000	−31,609,000

APPROPRIATION FOR FAMILY HOUSING DEFENSE, 1964

Title	Budget estimate, 1964	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with—		
					Budget	House	Senate
Family housing, Army:							
Construction	$57,400,000	$41,364,000	$34,681,000	$34,681,000	−$22,719,000	−$6,683,000	
Operation, maintenance, and debt payments	188,290,000	183,396,000	183,396,000	183,396,000	−4,894,000		
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps:							
Construction	94,700,000	80,036,000	68,248,000	68,248,000	−26,452,000	−11,788,000	
Operation, maintenance, and debt payments	95,981,000	93,944,000	93,944,000	93,944,000	−2,037,000		
Family housing, Air Force:							
Construction	97,850,000	50,321,000	61,027,000	61,027,000	−36,823,000	+10,706,000	
Operation, maintenance, and debt payments	197,583,000	193,514,000	193,514,000	193,514,000	−4,069,000		
Family housing, Defense agencies:							
Construction	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000			
Operation, maintenance, and debt payments	2,546,000	2,546,000	2,546,000	2,546,000			
Total, family housing	734,400,000	645,171,000	637,406,000	637,406,000	−96,994,000	−7,765,000	
Total	1,966.400,000	1,562,964,000	1,617,489,000	1,585,880,000	−380,520,000	+22,916,000	−31,609,000

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I shall yield time to other Members who desire to speak. If my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] desires me to yield, I yield to him at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Can the gentleman tell me whether the Department of Defense, under the continuing resolutions has been following the legal rate in the expenditure of money during the interim from July 1 of the new fiscal year until this time?

Mr. SIKES. Of course, in general operations, yes. In planning and preparation, yes. But as far as actual expenditures for construction on individual bases are concerned; the awarding of contracts, beginning of construction of facilities contained in this appropriation, there has been no such action.

Mr. GROSS. I raise the question because it has been discovered that one agency of Government has been spending beyond the rate of the appropriations made last year.

Mr. SIKES. I think I may safely assure my distinguished friend that there is no such situation here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman—perhaps he stated it earlier and I did not hear him—whether he anticipates, in view of the closing of a number of bases, a further reduction in this particular appropriation next year.

Mr. SIKES. Does the gentleman mean the fiscal year 1965?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. SIKES. That is difficult to anticipate at this time. Actually in the bill now before us there is a buildup in one or two instances, an added item at one or two bases because of the fact that a base is being closed and facilities to be used at other bases require additional facilities. There is one at Fort Benjamin Harrison but this particular facility will cost something under $1 million. The Department will save $1.5 million per year by closing Fort Slocum where the facilities that are to be transferred are now located.

As far as the effect on next year is concerned, it would be hard to predict. I would be reluctant to attempt it. We will hold costs down wherever we can. I think the gentleman knows that from the history of this subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that this bill now is $425 million, approximately, below the expenditures for the same general purposes last year.

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I think that is commendable.

Mr. SIKES. And considerably below the budget; $380,520,000 below this year's budget estimate.

Mr. GROSS. I am not particularly interested in the budget estimate because that is always the inflated asking price. My friend from Florida well knows it is how much a bill is reduced below expenditures for the same purpose in the preceding year that provides the real test of economy.

Mr. SIKES. I compliment the distinguished gentleman for his continuing interest in the problem of savings.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished friend knows, I think, about my concern over the proposal to remove the Headquarters of the 5th Army from Hyde Park in the district which I have the honor to represent to Fort Sheridan.

Mr. Speaker, if this is done, of course, the Federal Government will have to put in several millions of dollars in building new facilities at Fort Sheridan.

Will the gentleman assure me that there is no money contained in this appropriation bill that can be drawn upon for that purpose?

Mr. SIKES. I compliment the gentleman for his interest. I can give the gentleman that assurance.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman can give me that assurance?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. From the bottom of my heart, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, a man whose contributions have been invaluable and who has been very cooperative and very helpful in making this conference report possible.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which is before you is an excellent compromise which has been worked out with the other body and makes sufficient funds available to provide a strong military construction and family housing program for fiscal year 1964. At the same time it represents a substantial reduction under the budget estimates, approximately 20 percent, and is therefore most favorable to the taxpayers of this country.

Due to circumstances beyond my control, it has been necessary for me to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] to handle the bill on the floor and to a large extent in the conference. I wish to thank him for the work he has done in this respect. Without his efforts this report would not be before you today and it would be impossible for me to make the statements I have just made. The gentleman has done a marvelous job for the military services, for the House, and for the taxpayers, and he is to be congratulated. This bill is not the work of any one man. It represents a combined effort by all people involved, including the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG], and I thank them all for their assistance to me, especially in the past several weeks when my medical problems have made it impossible for me to be in attendance.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, first I thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], for his complimentary references.

Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Florida in extending good wishes to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], who has not been well for the last few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, we work as a team in this subcommittee. I have never known any politics to become involved in any of our deliberations. It is a very pleasant association which I enjoy with the majority members of the subcommittee.

We make a conscientious effort to get a dollar's worth of construction for every dollar that we authorize the services to spend.

I concur in the views expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Florida, that this is a good bill now resulting from the conference which we had with the conferees of the other body.

The Members of the House will note if they will look at the conference report—and those who are interested and who would like to come by one of the tables can look at the breakdowns—we did not make any even splits. We did not just split the difference between the two bills. We undertook to arrive at a final decision, based upon whether we were convinced that some of the items added by the other body were justified and whether additional cuts might be made.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we considered this bill in conference on a line-item basis and not a wholesale basis.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have brought to the House a conference report that is worthy of acceptance by the House, and I join the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], in urging its adoption.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time because certain events within the last 48 hours make it abundantly clear that the Congress is being ignored in a matter vitally affecting the economic future of the United States and its ability to sustain our defense effort. With but 24 hours advance notice, many Members of this body were informed that military installations and facilities in their districts would be reduced or eliminated. In my district alone, I was told that upward of 7,400 jobs would be lost. Not only was the announcement precipitous, but no opportunity was given me or the members of my State's delegation to check the dollar-and-cents savings which allegedly would result. Such arbitrary action represents an affront to the Congress. Every taxpayer favors the most economical use of the defense dollar and I have always supported cutbacks where real savings could be demonstrated. But no proof was offered that the slash in my State would result in real dollar savings. The operation affected in my area is the Rome Air Materiel Area—central New York's largest employer of civilian labor. The Pentagon agreed that its mission is not obsolete; that the work must be done somewhere and that most of the existing jobs would have to be transferred elsewhere. This will necessitate massive relocation and retraining costs which will more than offset the saving as the result of any positions eliminated.

Experience has shown that only a small percentage of those permitted to transfer find it possible to do so because of the nature of the positions offered. Thus, the vast majority of those affected by a cutback are thrown upon the labor market. My own district has long been on the list of economically distressed regions and the impact of this reduction will be catastrophic. It makes no sense for one agency of the Federal Government to throw people on the unemployment relief rolls and another agency to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to create new jobs in the very areas affected.

I am obliged to comment on the callous timing of this drastic announcement. Coming as it did almost on the Christmas Eve, it has not only blighted the economy of my area, but crushed the hearts of thousands of people at a time when happiness should be the right of all.

Yesterday, along with other Members of the New York congressional delegation, I introduced legislation that would require congressional review of all Defense Department plans to reduce military activities in distressed areas. I believe the people's Representatives are entitled to the courtesy of seeing such proposed plans well in advance of final action so that they may be properly analyzed. If such cutbacks are valid they should be able to survive such scrutiny. Furthermore, we are told that the Defense Department does not take into consideration the economic impact of its action. If it does not, it should. I have the responsibility in any action I take, so does all the Congress, and so should the Secretary of Defense. The stability of our defense structure depends upon the maintenance of a healthy, dynamic economy. The President has indicated the gravity of our national unemployment situation. If he is concerned with this condition, how can he add more thousands of unemployed to our area where already 6 percent of the labor market are without jobs. Enactment of the proposed legislation could prevent such a calamity unjustifiably befalling anywhere throughout the Nation.

This action comes right into focus as we consider the actual need of funds for new military construction. Slightly over 2½ years ago the proposal to eliminate the Rome Air Materiel Area in my district was reviewed by President Kennedy. The plan was canceled. Since then, nothing has occurred to lessen the need for this vital mission which, at a central location, supplies the Air Force worldwide with ground-based electronics equipment. During this period the Defense Department has requested, and the Congress has appropriated, additional millions to strengthen its mission. Nothing has been offered by the Department of Defense to justify discontinuance of this vital supply activity at its present location. If the proposed theft of its missions is permitted, what of the fine buildings and modern equipment? Cannot they serve some of the needs purported to be provided in this bill?

In the past we have had waste masquerading as economy. Now that 33 bases and facilities have been declared excess, what assurance does the Congress have that some of the new military construction is necessary? Could not this surplus space be utilized for existing and future requirements?

This should not be difficult. The Pentagon planners apparently find it easy to realine and disperse the vital, efficient, and centralized operation of the Rome Air Materiel Area.

I commend the Secretary of Defense for his determined drive for maximum economy in the Defense Establishment, but it is not in the national interest to accept blindly every action taken in the name of economy without thoroughly scrutinizing the overall cost—not only to the Department of Defense—but to the country as a whole. Congress can and should be consulted. It must fulfill a responsibility now ignored elsewhere—that of assessing the real cost of such cutbacks in terms of national economic strength.

I appreciate greatly the allocation of time to me so that I could present this problem. I know that the gentlemen who have brought this bill to the floor have scrutinized it very, very carefully. It represents a reduction not only from the budget request but from the expenditures of the past year.

I want, as do all, to meet our obligation to defend this Nation at all times. I do not wish to be provincial, and I am not simply talking about my area because my ox has been gored, because the things I have said here today, can have an application to every single Congressman and his district. That which has happened to me could happen to them. If we are called upon to make sacrifices in the name of the national good, let us be assured they are demonstrable to our people. Then, as Americans we can accept whatever comes, but if we are to be treated carelessly and callously without such show then it is not in the interest of the Nation and the change is merely masquerading as economy.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], the ranking member of the great Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report recommended by this great committee. At this time may I pay my respects and indicate the great regard I have for the dedication and industry of this committee. There is no harder working group of men on any subcommittee or indeed any committee of the Congress. For and on behalf of my chairman and myself and for the Committee on Armed Services I want to say this at this time because you deserve it. I also want to say I am very happy to see the distinguished chairman here today. Even though he is indisposed, we welcome him back.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will yield, if the gentleman needs more time on this subject he may have it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Maybe a little later on.

In the absence of my distinguished chairman, I feel it is essential to say a few words because the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has told me to say what I am saying.

On November 18, 1963, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] called to the attention of the House that included in the military construction and appropriations bill are more than 1,300 line items proposing military construction projects for the fiscal year 1964. In addition, there are hundreds of other projects lumped into the general authorization provided in the classified section of the authorization and appropriation bills.

To better understand the tremendous problem involved in assessing the genuine need for the additional construction for fiscal 1964 we must understand that this involves a total of almost $2 billion. I want to also remind the House that we have between this committee and our committee made dollar savings of about $380 million, if my figures are correct, taking into consideration what the reductions were in the line items and the dollar savings from savings of past appropriations.

Although military construction is commonly considered as involving nothing more than brick and mortar, implicit in this construction authorization and ultimate appropriation process is a blessing and approval of Congress of new military programs and policies. For example, when we approve the construction of a new facility, we obviously automatically endorse the hiring or assignment of additional personnel to these facilities to make them capable of discharging their intended functions.

Therefore, in a very large sense, Mr. Speaker, the military construction authorization and appropriation bills represent the keystone upon which have developed the shape, the face, and the size of our Military Establishment. To put it another way, Mr. Speaker, although the annual military construction bill may amount to less than $2 billion, its approval by the Congress commits to the appropriation of many billions of dollars more. This fact is particularly important today just after the Secretary of Defense has announced the inactivation of 33 defense installations that are no longer required—as I have noticed by the papers, and this is my authority.

We should hope that it will produce annual savings of more than $100 million. It does not make sense, and I hope you will get this, it does not make sense to me as a member of the Committee on Armed Services to expand the military departments by approving billions of dollars of new construction when at the same time we are declaring excess substantial portions of already existing facilities. And I do not want anything I say here this morning to give you the impression that I approve of the manner in which these reductions were announced. I do not think this was very complimentary to this branch of the Congress. I regret that this was handled in this way because I see in the future, knowing of the many telephone calls I have received in the absence of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], I see in the future not the same tranquillity from the membership of this House to my committee when we bring bills before you as we have enjoyed in the past, and I would not blame them.

I am certain that many of us here today do not completely agree with every action taken by the House and Senate conferees on the military construction appropriation bill for next year, 1964. Nevertheless, I know and I am sure that every Member of this body agrees that the judgments made by the conferees were prompted only by what is best for our entire Military Establishment and the security of this country.

Now I am disturbed—and I want the chairmen of the committee on both sides to pay attention to what I have to say—this is not in criticism of you but this is in criticism of what has happened over which you have had no control—we are disturbed about a statement which was made by a conferee of the other body relating to the inclusion in the military construction appropriation of funds necessary for the operation and maintenance of military family housing. The statement indicated a desire to transfer the appropriation for the operation and maintenance of military family housing to the annual defense appropriations bill. I have no quarrel with the manner in which the appropriations committee of the House and of the other body propose to report appropriations to the Congress, if in the judgment of the respective appropriations committees they desire to include the appropriation for operation and maintenance of family housing in the annual defense appropriation bill rather than in the annual military construction appropriation bill. I would have no quarrel with this arrangement since it would not conflict with the objectives implicit in the authorization bill to identify for the Congress the actual cost of the operation of this family housing. However, I do wish for our committee to go on record as strongly opposing any inference or implication that the present requirement for an annual authorization for the operation and maintenance of the cost of military family housing be abolished.

We should know what is going on if we are going to fulfill our responsibility. The requirement for the annual authorization for all support costs for military family housing has enabled the Congress for the first time to note and comprehend the complete cost of this program. It would indeed be a great tragedy if we now took a step backward by eliminating this annual authorization requirement.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to make one further observation. The Congress, by Public Law 88–174, authorized the construction of 10,140 units of military family housing during fiscal year 1964.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear the gentleman from South Carolina say that the Congress and the Committee on Armed Services in particular should know what is going on. Obviously we have not known what is going on in certain respects. I remember when we built the bases in French Morocco, for instance, and many of us were concerned at the tremendous number of dollars, millions of dollars, that we were spending, and we knew we would not have those bases very long. I remember only a year ago when the bases were closed money had been spent for projects just completed, but to the best of my recollection, this is the first time where yards have been closed even before the legislation became law. I am glad to see the gentleman take the floor and demand that we be advised, because under the Constitution the roles and missions of the Armed Forces come within the purview and responsibility of the Armed Services Committee of the Congress.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman. That provision of the Constitution says among other things, and the substantive law reflects, that Congress shall provide the military and the President shall be the Commander in Chief, and Congress shall make the rules and regulations for the government thereof. It is not delegated to anybody, but to the Congress.

The conferees on the appropriation bill have now recommended 7,500 units. As I said, we authorized 10,140. I believe that this figure is unfortunately austere and, therefore, I hope that the appropriation committees of both the House and the other body will be willing to finance a larger number of units of family housing during fiscal year 1965 if the departments demonstrate to the Congress both their continued need for the additional family housing and, secondly, their ability to execute expeditiously the housing authorizations and the appropriations herein provided.

I do not impute this to our conferees, but I hope the conferees will watch this, because I want to say again that you have done an outstanding job.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, all I have to say at this time is not in any way directed at the distinguished conferees. I think they have done an excellent job. They have brought in a bill that has been reduced somewhat, but it is still over $1.5 billion. Last year it was over $1.5 billion. Next year it will be over $1.5 billion, and so on ad infinitum.

I just wonder if any figures are available to the committee which would show how many billions of dollars worth of construction we authorized in the past now lies idle in craters of despair around this country even though it is still usable. I will be curious in the years ahead to see how much will be added to future military construction bills to take care of these economy transfers of one base to another place.

I listened very carefully to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE], and as he spoke I realized there is something rather pathetic about a Member of this House standing up and bleating because his ox is gored.

I think most Members who are not affected sit back and figure, "Well, thank the good Lord, it has not touched us." Others say, "Well, it is economy." I want to address myself not to the 120-mile belt of despair which the Pentagon has drawn in the Mohawk River area of upstate New York; and I do not want to talk about my own installation. I simply want to address myself to an atmosphere that has been created in the last 48 hours. There has been applause throughout the Nation in the press and even on the floor of this House for the great, courageous Secretary of Defense who has at long last recognized the demand for economy and reduced his budget by $100 million. Fine. I am for a saving of $100 million. But let the Secretary of Defense and the Pentagon tell us that this $100 million will find its way to the taxpayers of this country as a saving. If they say it I will challenge the truth of what they say to their teeth, because for every dollar allegedly saved we here have or will appropriate $2 to fill the void that has been created.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what this conference group has done. I think we have to have military construction. But I say, as a gesture of protest, I intend to vote against this conference report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Gladly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I point out to the gentleman that the records of the McClellan committee of the other body in connection with the TFX contract are replete with testimony that the TFX fighter plane could have been built by the Boeing Co. for at least $400 million less than under the contract as awarded to General Dynamics. Secretary McNamara could have saved not $100 but $400 million on that contract alone.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that I think we have in this Pentagon economy package a little TFX, without conflict of interest, of course, because the experts of the Army itself, after a 13-month study and an expenditure of $500,000 urged as an economy move that the Schenectady Army Depot remain open. And then the whiz kids, for whatever reason I do not know, made some changes on a slip of paper and repudiated their own experts, their own $500,000, their own 13 months.

I will say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I wish those responsible for this the merriest Christmas and the happiest New Year that their conscience will permit them to have.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pirnie] relative to the so-called economy move on the part of the Defense Department in discontinuing certain activities in Army, Navy, and Air Force installations. Both of these gentlemen have worked long and diligently to protect the people of their districts who are employed in the Schenectady Army Depot and in the Rome air materiel area.

Because of the proximity of two of the counties of my district to the Schenectady Army Depot, I am particularly concerned about the proposed closing of that installation. Approximately 200 civilians, residents of my district, are grateful I am sure to the President for the Christmas present that he has presented to them. Nothing could have been more ill timed than this announcement.

Twenty-four hours prior to the announcement of the closing down of these and other installations, the New York delegation was invited to meet with Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric; Army Secretary, Cyrus Vance; and Air Force Secretary, Eugene Zuckert. Mr. Gilpatric stated that the proposal was to be submitted to the President for final decision and confirmation the next day; that in keeping with the President's urgent message to them to economize, they were making this recommendation to him. But it was emphasized re-repeatedly that the final decision would be up to President Johnson. Let us put the blame where it belongs. Criticism should not be directed solely to the Defense Department officials because they emphasized repeatedly that the decision would be that of the President.

The President in my opinion cannot justify himself in talking economy in one breath and then later urging the Congress to pass welfare programs, foreign aid programs, and Alliance for Progress programs, which will involve the expenditure of not millions but billions of dollars.

The retraining, transfer, and reemployment of only a few of these civilians who are being put out of jobs will cost the Government and the taxpayers far more than the closing down of these installations and in taking these people off the payroll. Many of these people will wind up on relief. The area of the Mohawk River Valley in New York State is already a depressed area. I cannot see why responsible Government officials even in the Pentagon have not taken this into consideration when they decided to go on this so-called economy binge.

At the conference with the New York delegation, Mr. Gilpatric informed us that three navy yards were to be closed; indirectly, Philadelphia, Boston, and San Francisco were mentioned. Somebody has a better contact with the White House than the New York delegation because when the closing of these installations was announced by the press, these three had been deleted.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time only to suggest to my friend from Florida or the chairman of the subcommittee to ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks in the Record.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the way in which the Defense Department and the defense budget exercise a profound effect on the Nation's economy. We may not like it, we may hope it might be otherwise, but we all know that when you put $50 to $54 billion into the Nation's economy it is bound to have a profound effect.

That is the reason why today we have before us the military construction bill. When we get into the question of shifting or expanding the Nation's military operations it is appropriate—in fact, it is required by our system of government—that these decisions should not be made without the approval and consultation of the Congress of the United States. That is the way it happens throughout the defense program. In fact, the Defense Department even comes back to the House and to the individual committees whenever there is even a small reprograming action that might affect some military contract or some military operation. They ask for our approval as a committee even for these relatively small changes.

And so it is really astounding and amazing, Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] mentioned a moment ago, that, when a decision is taken to create not just a slight shift but an entire disruption of the economy of some portion of the Nation by the closing down of military installations, there is no obligation on the part of the Defense Department at all to come in advance to the Congress or to the Committees on Armed Services.

We have seen now that what has happened has happened without any prior warning, in some cases even without any official consultation with the Committee on Armed Services, with any other committee, or even with any Members of the Congress. The Department has taken action which is bound to have a very profound effect on the economy of the country, yet without even consulting with Congress.

Some people seem to think it is funny when someone loses his job because of the closing of a military installation. Mr. Herblock tried to have a little fun in the Washington Post this morning. But I submit to you a man out of work when a military installation closes down is just as serious a matter, just as much a cause for concern for this Congress and for the country, as a man out of work in Appalachia or a man out of work in any other distressed area. There is nothing funny about it.

The closing down of military bases is a matter that affects the Nation's economy, and whether it is a wise decision or not should not, I say, be left solely up to Mr. McNamara. It ought to be something on which the appropriate committees of this House and the Congress should have an opportunity to deliberate and to decide.

We have now been denied this opportunity. We were given the information only a few hours before it was released to the press. We were told that the decisions that had been made by the Defense Department were made solely on the grounds of whether these installations were or were not required for the Nation's defense. Now I submit that this is not true. I submit this high-minded, computerized approach that we have been told produced these decisions is not the full story.

When Mr. Gilpatric met with the members of the New York delegation we were told that installations would be closed in 17 States. We were told that three naval shipyards were to be closed down. But when the information was released to the press yesterday we found that only 14 States would be affected, and there were no naval shipyards on the list. Apparently somebody had already protested successfully. Apparently there were considerations other than purely military ones which influenced the Defense Department action between the time it was presented to our delegation and the time it was announced to the public. This makes it clear that Secretary McNamara, contrary to what he says, did not act solely for military or economic reasons.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that until these matters are submitted fully to our committee, as the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has indicated he believes they should be, there is going to be a cloud over this whole action, over the decisions of the Defense Department, and over the economy of the Nation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think this action has been taken without approval of the President?

Mr. STRATTON. I am not sure whether it has been taken with the approval of the President or not; presumably it has. But I am suggesting that when a decision is made that is going to have such a profound effect on the economy of the country certainly the Congress of the United States ought to have an opportunity to consider it, and to know the full facts.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the order or decision concerning the shipyards was rescinded?

Mr. STRATTON. I am just giving the gentleman the facts, as I know them.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, we have read about the closing of military installations and I suppose we will read of many more. I think we are in a very anomalous situation here in the Congress. We are striving for peace, trying to reduce world tension, and we hope that in the future we can cut down military expenditures. When a man's area is affected it is no joke. It is nothing to be flippant about, because this means hardship for families. But we must hope that in the years to come the tensions will ease and we will stop spending billions of dollars for defense.

I just take the floor to remind my colleagues that it is the duty of ourselves and all other people in high places to start planning now for conversion of our economy to a peacetime economy, because we cannot kid ourselves, we have been booming because we have been in a wartime economy. The challenge of the next decade is whether we can gear our economy to peace and make jobs for the American people. The tax bill alone will not do it.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Would the gentleman feel that this kind of decision is a decision that ought to be made by one man, or would the gentleman agree with me that this is a decision that ought to require consultation at least between the executive and the legislative branches of Government and be a decision on the part of the Government as a whole.

Mr. JOELSON. I think the general policy is so important that it cannot be done piecemeal. It must be done according to a plan, and there must be an alternative for these people who lose these jobs to have new jobs.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. The Communists have been telling the world for years that we can be prosperous only because of a wartime economy. It is our duty and our challenge to prove to the world that we can be prosperous in times of peace also.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in view of some of the discussion we have had, may I reiterate that this bill has nothing to do with the closure of any military installations. It carries no funds for that purpose. It does represent a saving of 20 percent below the budget estimate for construction at military installations here and abroad. I think this is the largest saving, percentagewise, that has been brought before the Congress this year.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the conference report.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 301, nays 4, not voting 130, as follows:

[Roll No. 240]

YEAS—301

Abernethy
Adair
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Derounian
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dwyer
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gross
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Healey
Hechler
Herlong
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lipscomb
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Steed
Stinson
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wyman
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—4

Abele
Dulski
O'Brien, N.Y.
Stratton

NOT VOTING—130

Abbitt
Addabbo
Alger
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Avery
Ayres
Barrett
Becker
Belcher
Boggs
Bolton, Frances P.
Brock
Buckley
Burkhalter
Burton
Cahill
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Cohelan
Collier
Cooley
Curtis
Davis, Tenn.
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Duncan
Edmondson
Evins
Farbstein
Fino
Flynt
Foreman
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Halleck
Hansen
Harding
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Hoffman
Hutchinson
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Laird
Latta
Leggett
Lindsay
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Macdonald
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Moore
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
Osmers
Pepper
Pilcher
Powell
Pucinski
Quillen
Rains
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
Scott
Shelley
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Staggers
Stephens
Taft
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tuck
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watson
Weltner
White
Whitener
Wright
Wydler
Younger

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Becker.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Hoffman.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Curtis.
Mrs. Hansen with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Goodling.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Whitener with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Gill with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Freylinghuysen.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Harding with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Burkhalter with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Weltner with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. White with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mrs. May.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Wright with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Tuck.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Abbitt.

Messrs. STRATTON and DULSKI changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROONEY of New York, SIKES, CANNON, BOW, and LIPSCOMB.

There was no objection.

SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK AND PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, many newspaper columnists and editorialists have been sharpening their editorial pens on the Presidential succession law. There are some serious questions that need clarification respecting succession. Unfortunately, too many pundits are beclouding the issue with personal opinions that are a direct attack on the Speaker himself. I deplore and resent these attacks. I know the Members of this House share this resentment.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to read into the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Holyoke, Mass., Transcript-Telegram, December 10, 1963. This newspaper is an independent, highly influential and respected newspaper published in western Massachusetts. I compliment the editor on the position he takes and his newspaper in helping to lay to rest the shabby arguments that the present Speaker of this House should not be in the line of succession to the Presidency of the United States.

THE SPEAKER ON THE SPOT

Our sympathies are with Speaker of the House JOHN W. McCORMACK, whose situation as next in line to the Presidency is so rudely being advertised as a national calamity. The number of alternatives now being suggested to the succession law put on the books in 1947 implies that almost any arrangement would be better than having the veteran Massachusetts Congressman standing on the White House steps.

We find this extremely insulting to a man who has spent his life in public service, who has lived quietly and in good health for 72 years, and who knows his way around government. If fate had played the cards a little differently former Speaker JOE MARTIN might have found himself in the same position a few years ago, and there is little doubt that he would have been treated the same shabby way Mr. McCORMACK is being treated now.

The reason the Speaker of the House, and then the head of the Senate, succeeded the Vice President, before members of the Cabinet, is that they are elected to office. Mr. McCORMACK, in expressing his approval of the present succession law, has pointed out that he has been elected not only by the voters of his Massachusetts district but also by the Democratic caucus in the House. This means that his leadership is reasonably representative. We would not prefer, as President, a man appointed to a Cabinet position because he held the high esteem of one person, a President.

So while we are not political supporters of JOHN W. McCORMACK, we believe the Speaker of the House is an appropriate person to be third in line for the Presidency.

As a matter of fact, it might be argued that it takes more of a man to become elected Speaker of the House than to win a party nomination as candidate for Vice President. We have had some fairly invisible people in the Vice Presidency, and some totally invisible ones on losing national tickets. It is a great blessing that in the present emergency a man of experience and ability was ready to become President.

The same compliment can be paid to Speaker McCORMACK. For though there may be many other people we would prefer to see Speaker of the House, let alone President of the United States, than Mr. McCORMACK, he didn't get where he is by being incompetent, and we admire the manners he is showing in his present embarrassment.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN McCORMACK, was not only elected by the Democratic caucus in the House but, let me add, by the House itself.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I personally feel that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, has all the qualifications we could ask to be in this line of succession. I believe any other Speaker would be so qualified. A Speaker knows his way around government. To be sure, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN McCORMACK, does.

Mr. Speaker, I consider the attacks upon him in the press very unfair and very unreasonable. I think in its wisdom the Congress in establishing this law of succession in 1947 recognized that the Speaker of the House would be an appropriate person to succeed to the Presidency and would continue to provide leadership for the Government. The gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN McCORMACK, is a sincere, fair-minded, honest, capable man and is qualified to serve his country as President if the need arises.

I again want to say that I consider this attack upon the Speaker and his qualifications very unreasonable and unfair. I have confidence in the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN McCORMACK, and believe the entire Congress does too.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts that his sentiments bespeak those of the constituents whom I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Speaker, my people would be well satisfied if fate placed the Presidency in the hands of the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN McCORMACK. There is no finer American. There has been no greater Speaker.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I have asked the gentleman from Massachusetts to yield to me at this time simply to say that I thank the gentleman most sincerely for his comments on the floor this afternoon. I think these comments have been well said and needed to be said.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. May I say that a lot of the downgrading of the distinguished Speaker is a part of the downgrading of the entire House of Representatives. The Speaker of this House is chosen by ballot of the majority of the House of Representatives, representing the entire United States. So, when they criticize the Speaker as the end result of our choice it represents another expression of their contempt of us as Congressmen as a group.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I would like to congratulate the gentleman and express my own high regard for the Speaker and the great service which he has rendered to this House and to the Nation.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

SITUATION IN HOLMES COUNTY, MISS.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been called to my attention a situation in Holmes County, Miss. I have known of the situation for some time. I have withheld comment in hopes that at a local level the matter would be remedied. However, the situation has not been remedied. And so in the belief, Mr. Speaker, that our freedoms are indestructible and that an infringement on freedom in one State, if unrepaired, extensively affects freedom in other States, I now have decided to bring the matter to the attention of the House.

I have made an effort to obtain supporting opinion for the situation as outlined to me. As a result, I believe to my satisfaction that the facts as presented to me are correct.

Mr. Speaker, once again the liberties we cherish are being imperiled. This time, the victim of community persecution is a white woman editor of two weekly newspapers. She is Hazel Brannon Smith, recipient of several awards for fine journalism, who edits the Durant News and the Lexington Advertiser in Mississippi.

Since 1954, a concerted effort, led by the White Citizens' Council of the county, has been carried on with the objective of preventing Mrs. Smith from carrying out her professional responsibility of reporting the news in her community with fairness, in truth, and without fear or favor. This is a constitutionally guaranteed right, as we all know. Editors during the life of our Nation have encountered repression and violence in their efforts to print the news. It began in the very early days of our history, notably with Peter Zenger. It might be useful for those among us, who continually hasten to point out that they are Jeffersonian Democrats, that it was Thomas Jefferson who, when asked what his choice would be between free government and free newspapers, chose free newspapers.

The sad and despicable story goes back to the year 1954 when Holmes County became the first county in which a White Citizens Council was established in Mississippi. Mrs. Smith's Lexington newspaper carried an account of an unjustified shooting of a Negro by a sheriff. The sheriff sued for libel. A verdict, returned against Mrs. Smith in lower court, was thrown out by the State high court. The most recent case of legal harassment is a $100,000 libel suit filed by two Lexington policemen growing out of a fatal shooting of a 38-year-old Negro war veteran in June of this year. The suit is still pending.

In between these two episodes other accounts of wrongdoing have been published in the Smith newspapers.

In payment, a cross has been burned on Mrs. Smith's lawn. Other acts of social ostracism have been carried on. The White Citizens' Council, unable to silence a courageous editor, has helped finance a rival newspaper. This newspaper, now in its fifth year, has successfully outbid the Smith newspaper on contracts to print legal proceedings of Lexington and the county governments. The normal cost of such a contract, I am told, is about $60 a month. The White Citizens-backed paper bid 1 cent for 2 years. Thus the Smith newspapers have successfully been deprived of a most lucrative source of revenue. Efforts have been made to persuade subscribers and advertisers to shun the Smith newspapers. Mrs. Smith by valiant effort and bone-cutting economy in business and personal finances has managed to keep her newspapers afloat.

In recent years, while this harassment has been carried on, Mrs. Smith has won the Herrick Award of the National Editorial Association for "editorial writing, embracing the highest type of American principles and ideas." The Mississippi Press Association commended her at its convention in 1957. Theta Sigma Phi, national women's journalism honorary society, in 1958, presented her its valued Matrix Table.

My able and distinguished colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, on December 12 on page A7565 of the daily RECORD has inserted an article on the situation. And she quotes from Mrs. Smith's own column that appears regularly in the Lexington Advertiser and Durant News:

> Suppression of news and trying to control what newspapers print never works. No newspaper worth a cent would let anyone tell it what to print—and those who toady to their advertisers to such an extent that they have lost their souls will one day lose their advertisers too—for after awhile they won't have any readers. The public is entitled to read the news and judge issues for itself on the basis of truthful, honest reporting.

Any city room of a large metropolitan daily would be proud, I would hope, to frame and hang that paragraph on its wall.

A member of my staff has talked with a great leading editor of the South about this matter, Mr. Speaker. The editor said it is "most disgraceful. I have had things done to me for my views but what has been done here and to a woman is atrocious."

I would like to quote, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion from a letter of Mrs. Smith's.

> The climate of fear, hate and suspicion that we have been living in now for 9 long years has come full circle and claimed the life at the top—that is, President Kennedy. Mississippi has had this fanaticism ever since 1954 when the Citizens' Councils were organized. Ours is based mostly on race, while that of Dallas seems more political. But it is all part of the same kind of madness—and what we have been fighting here for so terribly long.

A native Southerner, newspaper owner in her community 27 years and an editor of recognized ability, Mrs. Smith is being badgered and coerced and punished for printing the news. Do members of the community deny what the articles state? No, Mrs. Smith says: "They just do not want them printed."

The long shadow of oppression has cast its shadow across still another community. Oxford and Jackson and Birmingham and Americus and Danville and, now, Lexington, Miss.

The winds of intolerance, unless abated, blow, Mr. Speaker, without regard for State boundaries. We are all affected; we are all involved. The bell tolls for us all in this situation.

ADDRESS BEFORE U.S. INTER-AMERICAN COUNCIL

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, December 9, 1963, I had the privilege of addressing the members of the U.S. Inter-American Council in New York City. The membership of this council is composed of executives of more than a hundred U.S. firms doing business in the Latin American area.

Those who are familiar with the Charter of Punta del Este know that the success of the Alliance for Progress depends to a large degree on an increasing amount of private investment in the Latin American countries. Therefore, private investors' reluctance to plunge into the turbulent economic waters which exist in many of the nations south of the Rio Grande is one cause of the difficulties the Alliance is now encountering.

In the text of my address, which follows, I have made an effort to point out the need to strengthen the free world's position against the increasing Communist offensive in Latin America and the role private enterprise must play in this undertaking.

Address of Congressman Armistead Selden, U.S. Inter-American Council, New York City, December 9, 1963

I welcome this opportunity to speak to a group concerned about the future of United States policy in Latin America. As chairman of the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee, I am painfully aware that too few of our citizens appreciate that area's importance to our own Nation's security and prosperity.

In his recent article in the New York Times magazine, Mr. Adolf Berle points out that our foreign policy planners traditionally have given Latin America only secondary consideration in our overall global strategy. As a result, the people of the United States have tended to take our hemisphere's solidarity for granted.

However, one segment of our population that has recognized the need to give increased attention to the problems of Latin America is the U.S. business community. If trade follows the flag, it must also be said that understanding follows trade.

This country's businessmen were giving priority attention to Central and South America when most of our Government policymakers were yet myopic to the region's importance. Now that events have led to a new recognition of this country's hemispheric responsibilities, the experience and specialized knowledge of U.S. businessmen in Latin America can be an invaluable policymaking asset—if only our policymakers will put it to use.

Recently, I returned from the Inter-American Conference at São Paulo, where I participated as a member of the four-man U.S. congressional delegation. Anyone who is familiar with the Charter of Punta del Este knows that the success of the Alliance for Progress depends to a large extent on an increasing amount of private investment in Latin American countries. At São Paulo, it was obvious to most observers that the Alliance has run into serious difficulties. To a large extent, this trouble is the result of private investors' reluctance to plunge into the turbulent economic waters which exist in most Latin American nations today.

During the past 2 years, U.S. private investment in the region has totaled an estimated $350 to $400 million. The overall rate of outside private investment in the area, from other countries as well as our own, is far below expectations. Undoubtedly, continued political instability has caused a considerable retrenchment in private business plans for the area.

In this regard, a large measure of blame for the Alliance's failure to encourage new investment must lie with certain irresponsible Latin American political leaders. This is not intended as a blanket indictment, of course, since many of the region's political leaders have demonstrated a high degree of responsibility in carrying out their part of the Alliance program. But the schizophrenic policies of some have done incalculable harm to their countries' economies.

You cannot invite business investment into your country one day and threaten to confiscate it the next without undermining the basic element of economic growth—confidence in the stability of the system. The time is long overdue for these irresponsibles to face up to their national and hemispheric obligations. And it is also time for this country to stop pampering these leaders in Latin America who fail to meet those obligations to their people and to the inter-American system.

This country has committed over $2 billion to the nations of Latin America during the past 2 years. Yet, such gains as have been made during this period are at best treadmill advances. We have had to run hard in an effort to even keep pace with the region's expanding needs. As you know, not the least of our problems in the area is that its 2.9 percent annual population increase represents the highest growth rate in the world.

Nevertheless, though the Alliance is having its troubles, we are by no means at the end of our lifeline in Latin America. To be sure, after decades of investing time, study and billions of dollars into other areas of the world, we have only begun our effort to help raise the standard of living in our own hemisphere.

The $2 billion we have thus far put into Latin America under the Alliance program is far less than the amounts we have spent on subsidizing the economies of nations like Yugoslavia, Indonesia, India, and Cambodia. Certainly the United States, which has continued to pour aid money into a country such as Tito's Communist Yugoslavia for 15 years can demonstrate a degree of patience with our own hemisphere's political and economic problems.

As Dr. Figueres recently indicated in a letter to the Times, we have only begun to understand the nature of our problem in Latin America. And, if the area's economy is relatively primitive, its economic problems are proportionately complex. Dr. Figueres supports this view in discussing one important aspect of our difficulties—Brazil's economic dependence on the price of coffee. I quote in part from his letter:

"President Getulio Vargas wanted 90 cents for a pound of coffee. This was not out of proportion to what the poor countries pay for a jet ticket or an international telegram. I (that is, Dr. Figueres) participated in studies that showed that 50 to 60 cents for the different grades were minimum levels needed for the development of the coffee countries. Today's price is 37 cents under the World Coffee Agreement. This is the stabilization of hunger."

I have no way of knowing at what level coffee prices should be. I do know that Latin American economic experts regard 37 cents as much too low. I know also that, prior to 1949, coffee prices had been so ruinously low that millions upon millions of trees were chopped down and coffee, itself, was used to fire locomotives in Brazil. Yet, when coffee prices finally recovered in the early 1950's, our Government to the amazement and consternation of Latin Americans began an inquiry to determine the reasons for the "high" price of the commodity.

And certainly, to the extent that reduced coffee prices contribute to Brazil's economic problems, the U.S. housewife who today pays 37 cents for a pound of coffee beans might well find her children and grandchildren paying a prohibitive price in hemispheric freedom and security.

But the price of coffee is only one cause for Brazil's economic decline. I would remind Dr. Figueres that if we have not always taken the long view of Brazilian problems, there is no ignoring the fact that Brazil's leaders themselves have been guilty of monumental shortsightedness and irresponsibility in the handling of their nation's fiscal and economic affairs.

Regardless of how much assistance outsiders provide, Brazilians can only solve their domestic problems by (1) reversing the irresponsible monetary policies they have pursued for the past decade; and (2) intensifying their efforts at crop diversification as an answer to coffee overproduction. Yet, as Dr. Figueres pointed out, the depression in Latin America's coffee-producing industry is a leading cause of economic and political instability in the area.

All this is by way of pointing up our failure to come to grips with the economic ills of Latin America in the same way that we tackled Europe's problem following World War II. Our Marshall plan for Europe was a bold and imaginative program, aimed at blocking the spread of communism on that continent. We did much the same thing in other parts of the world. For example, in Japan, we rebuilt the economy of a defeated enemy. Even today our Government adheres to trade policies aimed at protecting and promoting the economic stability of Japan—though many of these policies have a drastic effect on our own domestic industries competing with Japanese industry.

Yet, in the case of our closest continental neighbor—Latin America—we have attempted only to buy time by giving the patient monetary blood transfusions on a crisis-to-crisis schedule.

Perhaps Latin America's mistake was in fighting on the right side during World War II. Had the coffee-producing countries of Latin America ended that war as defeated enemies of this country, the possibility is excellent that Dr. Vargas would have attained his 90 cents a pound, or whatever was needed to maintain his economy.

Let me make this point clear: I am against subsidizing foreign industries and interests at the expense of the U.S. taxpayer and consumer. But just as the Marshall plan proved a necessary exception to this principle, we must face up to the need for exceptional action if the alien menace of communism is to be stopped in our own hemisphere.

That strong, bold action can thwart Communist plans for the Americas is borne out by last week's elections in Venezuela. Yet, the success of democratic forces in Venezuela will delay—not halt—the Communist subversive timetable in Latin America. Nor should our gratification concerning the Venezuelan election outcome lead us to gloss over—even temporarily—the very serious long-range problems pointed up at São Paulo.

In an effort to offset the tendency of Latin Americans to blame the lack of success of the Alliance for Progress on the United States, our Government agreed last month at São Paulo to the creation of an Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress (CIAT) as a central agency to coordinate all Latin American requests for Alliance loans.

While a committee of this nature may or may not be helpful as far as placing more of the burdens for decisions on the Latins themselves, the future success of the Alliance will not depend on the creation of such a committee.

The Alliance for Progress—or any other U.S.-supported program for Latin America—can only be successful if:

First, the nations of Latin America live up to the self-help commitments made by them at Punta del Este in August of 1960.

Just as we in this country must—if necessary—be prepared for additional sacrifices to halt communism in our hemisphere, so must our Latin American neighbors come to recognize that economic stability begins at home. It cannot be imported—it must be locally produced.

Second, a favorable climate for private investment is created and maintained throughout Central and South America. There will never be sufficient U.S. public assistance funds available to guarantee the success of the Alliance.

In fact, it has been estimated that 60 percent of the investment resources in Latin America must come from the private sector.

Third, the United States and the democratic nations of Latin America recognize the fact that, unless countered, subversive Communist activities emanating from Cuba will undermine the Alliance.

In my opinion, this last point is of greatest importance. For so long as a Communist base operates in the Caribbean it will serve to aggravate tensions throughout Latin America and to nullify any forward steps that result from programs carried out under the Alliance for Progress.

We can take heart that Castroism suffered an electoral setback in Venezuela. However, we would be foolish to forget the historic fact that Communists do not rely on elections to gain power, but on subversion and force. The Castroites hoped to paralyze the democratic processes in Venezuela. They failed. But with the encouragement and assistance of the Communist Cuban apparatus, they will renew their campaign of violence and terror probing for a weak spot in the armament of Venezuelan democracy.

In the aftermath of Sao Paulo, I therefore see no reason to alter the position I took following each of the Punta del Este meetings. The elimination of the Communist beachhead in the Caribbean is the first order of business for the hemisphere. Together, the nations of the hemisphere must act to restore the Cuban people to the family of the Americas. And upon the United States, as leader of the hemisphere and the free world, the responsibility falls to see that such action is taken.

In brief, as I have said before, Alianza para el Progresso must be preceded and accompanied by Accion para el Progresso. Let us not forget that in saving the nations of Europe from communism, we employed not only the bold economic measures of the Marshall plan, but the firm measures of the Truman Doctrine. If we could engage the human and technical resources of this country to root up communism in Greece—if we can do the same today in combating the Red thrust for power in southeast Asia—we are compelled by logic alone to meet the challenge of Castro communism in our own hemisphere.

What then can be done to eliminate Castroism from the Americas? There are many avenues—short of war—that can be followed. As a matter of fact, we run our greatest risk of war by permitting an armed and hostile Communist force to exist in the heart of the Americas. This is the key point made in the report "Castro Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere," published last March by the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee. The report followed extensive subcommittee hearings into the subversive threat to hemispheric security.

As chairman of the subcommittee, let me say that the findings and recommendations made by our group have been borne out by the events of recent days. Dr. Betancourt's demand for an air and sea blockade of Cuba reflects a welcomed Latin American awareness that half measures and empty proclamations are insufficient to deal with the Castro Cuban threat.

Recommendation No. 1 made by our subcommittee last March was a restatement of section (a) of the joint resolution of Congress, October 3, 1962. This joint resolution urged immediate steps "to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of the hemisphere."

These were the words of the congressional resolution of last year, and of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee this spring. Now Dr. Betancourt—confronted by a growing subversive threat—had joined the call for action. The Organization of American States has appointed a factfinding committee to look into Dr. Betancourt's charges. I recommend that the subcommittee save time and expense by simply reviewing the evidence and finding of our subcommittee. Finding No. 7 of our March report declared:

"Venezuela is the primary target for Cuban-based Communist subversive aggression. Castro Cuba has provided training in subversive warfare to more nationals from Venezuela than from any other country. An estimated 200-plus Venezuelans received such training in Cuba during 1962. Although (to quote Central Intelligence Director John McCone) 'the Communists have not demonstrated the ability to stand up to armed forces, or seize and hold government buildings,' increased terrorist activity in Venezuela poses one of the most immediate Communist threats to any country in the hemisphere.

"Creation in 1962 of the so-called Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN) is the result of a unification of command to coordinate Castro Communist subversive activities in Venezuela."

This finding was based on testimony given our subcommittee by the Director of the CIA, Mr. McCone, and others thoroughly familiar with the situation in the Caribbean area.

The OAS must meet and act quickly to stop the exporting of violence and subversion from Cuba to Venezuela and anywhere else in the hemisphere. And the United States must use its position of leadership to spearhead and help enforce inter-American action toward this end.

When, in October of 1962, President Kennedy acted firmly against Soviet efforts to expand the offensive potential of Castro Cuba, the hemisphere stood solidly behind us. And it will again—whenever this country takes action to make the words of the Monroe Doctrine, the Rio Pact, the Caracas Pact, and the Pact of Punta del Este, a reality. And those words are unambiguous in their meaning: the alien, hostile power of communism is not to be permitted to intrude into this hemisphere.

And if there be a risk attached to the hemisphere's backing up those words, never forget that the risk of doing nothing is even greater. Already, the failure of the Organization of American States to meet its commitments to act against Castroism resulted in weakened confidence in that hemispheric body. If by his persistence Castro can succeed in destroying the effectiveness of the OAS, that in itself will represent a serious setback for hemispheric security—and a great victory for the Communists.

The future of Latin America and the menace of Castro communism is a matter of critical priority as President Johnson assumes his new duties. The smooth transition of power in the world's leading democracy could not but inspire confidence in our system on the part of our Latin American neighbors. And, although it is much too early to determine in what ways the Johnson policy toward Latin America will differ from that of the late President Kennedy, we can be thankful that at this time in the Nation's history the power to guide our foreign policy is not passing into inexperienced hands. Time alone will determine whether Lyndon Johnson's reputation as the "can do" man of Capitol Hill will carry over into the solving of our many and varied hemispheric problems. But certainly nowhere in the world is there a greater need than in Latin America for a "can do" program to strengthen the free world's position against its Communist opponents. And, certainly there is no area in the world that the United States can less afford to lose.

I am indeed hopeful that the new administration will bring to bear on our Latin American relations the firmness, patience, tenacity of purpose and decisiveness of action which have so characterized President Johnson's past performance in Washington.

President Johnson has come to power under the most tragic of circumstances and at the most challenging of times. Under new leadership, for the people of this country and other nations of the Americas, as Senator Benton once said, "fresh discovery lies ahead."

"The world is pressing in on the once neglected countries of Latin America," wrote the Senator, looking to the future. "And the world must now accustom itself to being pressured in return. The voice of Latin America is beating upon us in a mighty chorus—a chorus less and less discordant and with ever-increasing harmony. For our part, we must learn better how to listen and how to convert the pressures upon us into the leadership the hemisphere and the world seek from us."

And, although we disagree with Senator Benton as to the choral harmony of our Latin American neighbors, we must agree with his admonition as to our assigned role in the future of that area—to listen, to learn, and to lead.

THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, for many reasons—most of them fully familiar to all of you—it is imperative that our country embark immediately upon a program leading to the first flight of a superior supersonic commercial transport in the shortest possible time. I would not presume to say at this time that such an aircraft must fly at three times the speed of sound, at two times the speed of sound, or somewhere between mach 2 and mach 3. But I do know of several practical considerations—fully within the grasp of the competent layman—that must have vital bearing upon this mach 2–mach 3 decision. I am speaking of such factors as funding, our international prestige, development leadtime, the financial and operational problems of the airlines, and—perhaps more importantly—the economic health of many large and populous industrial areas in several of our States.

From personal observation in my own district and in the larger southern California aerospace industry complex, and from reliable reports from other areas with like industries, I know that our aerospace companies have declined to a fraction of the employment level of 2 or 3 years ago. Even where they have made the transition from aircraft to missiles or spacecraft successfully, these companies no longer provide the volume of employment they once did. This is particularly true in my own district where unemployment has been high and several plants have substantial overcapacity.

Due to the size and complexity of any of the proposed supersonic transports, it is inevitable that the impact of such a program will spread to plants of subcontractors and suppliers throughout the Nation, with a significant beneficial effect upon employment.

I must point out also that we cannot afford to allow our aircraft plants to wither away. We cannot afford to allow our friends overseas to win away our leadership in commercial transport manufacture by default—particularly when we have near empty plants and unemployed aircraft workers capable of competing successfully with this European effort.

We have the technology today to begin development of a supersonic transport. We have experience with supersonic military aircraft, as well as a vast accumulation of information resulting from the individual research efforts of many of our companies. We can enter this race with every expectation of winning it. We can do all of this, however, only if we set out to build the best aircraft possible within the limits of our present technology. Obviously, this aircraft will have to fly at least as fast as the mach 2.2 British-French Concorde in order to compete for sales. But certainly it does not have to fly at three times the speed of sound. There is no particular magic in this arbitrary mach 3 speed level—only a whole array of problems in design, manufacture, financing, and operation. Such an aircraft is beyond our present technical competence. It would be fantastically expensive to build and to buy—estimates run as high as $30 million per plane—and would, I suspect, become more an expensive nuisance than an asset to our airlines. From the statements made by airline officials and from the interest displayed by our own air transport companies in the British-French aircraft, it is apparent that a significant segment of our industry is reluctant to tackle the problems that must accompany a mach 3 commercial transport. And these airline operators know, too, that the mach 3 aircraft will have a speed advantage only over the longest intercontinental routes. One president of a major airline pointed out not long ago that on a flight from Miami to Los Angeles the passenger of the mach 2.2 plane would have his baggage in a taxi and be leaving the terminal before the mach 3 aircraft touched the runway.

This executive was not playing a numbers game. He was merely employing commonsense evaluation of practical operational problems. On such a transcontinental flight, the mach 3 aircraft would spend so much time getting up to its operational altitude and down from that altitude that the slower plane would actually make substantially better time.

How, then, can we justify an expensive crash program to develop an aircraft for which there is no present demonstrated need, no apparent demand? Obviously we cannot. While I have no wish to stand in the way of progress, I cannot reconcile the expenditure of public funds to accomplish technological advancement purely for its own sake. There must be a demonstrated need, a practical advantage to be gained, and in this case we find neither. The only evident justification is an illusory challenge to search out the limits to which we can push our scientific resources by the sheer force of wealth and manpower. I submit that this is no justification at all.

In due course our aerospace industry will push the limits of our technological horizons to mach 3, mach 4, mach 5 aircraft. But this can be done only through logical evolution. If we begin today on the mach 2-plus commercial transport we will see that within no more than a year after the first one flies it will be modified—at relatively little expense—to give substantially better performance. Our aircraft industry has demonstrated this sort of design flexibility throughout its history. First generation subsonic jets have been modified in this way, as were piston engine aircraft before them. There is a natural evolution that takes place when economic and engineering considerations become compatible. There is no reason to fear that this will not take place in the case of supersonic aircraft. When we upset this normal progression we incur additional expense and introduce both operational problems and safety hazards.

I must add, too, that the normal technological progress of the aircraft industry takes place with a minimum of governmental financial assistance. Technical data accumulated in the development of military aircraft does, of course, assist in the design of commercial craft, but this does not involve heavy, direct outlay of public funds to subsidize what is, and should be, a private business venture. There is a legitimate national interest to be served by the development of a superior supersonic transport in time to compete with the British and French version to the extent such a program deserves governmental support. But development of the mach 3 aircraft with all of the problems inherent in such a program would call for heavy Government expenditure. And, I suspect, would force our major trunk airlines back on Government subsidies when the time came to operate mach 3 aircraft.

In view of all this, I find myself resenting our apparent decision to gamble with our future in the commercial aircraft market on the chance that we might be successful in accelerating the development of a mach 3 transport. I feel that decision in favor of the best supersonic aircraft we can build with our present technology will tend to return responsibility to industry, where it belongs. Our aircraft industries and our airlines have competed successfully in the world marketplace for more than 50 years. There can be no logical justification for risking destruction of these industries by insisting that they accept more governmental help than they need. And that is just what we shall be doing if we persist in demanding a mach 3 commercial transport at this time.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am calling upon the Johnson administration to give recognition to the Dominican Republic, to reinstate Alliance for Progress funds, and to lend assistance to that country in its present battle against Castro's band of June 14 guerrillas.

I have been calling for recognition of the Dominican Republic. The failure to recognize that country now will make it an easy prey for another Castro-type Communist takeover.

Within the past week, events have taken place which should remove any doubts our State Department has apparently harbored regarding the civilian triumverate presently ruling the Dominican Republic.

The triumverate took power because of Juan Bosch's softness on the Communists. Yet our State Department experts heatedly denied that Bosch refused to stamp out communism. On December 9, however, Bosch revealed his true colors as he called upon the members of his Dominican Revolutionary Party and all "good Dominicans" to take up arms and then to join the Castro band of June 14 guerrillas.

Now that the ruling pro-American triumverate in the Dominican Republic has been vindicated, any further delay in recognizing and aiding them in their crucial hour of need will open the door to another Cuba in this hemisphere.

[From the San Juan Star, Dec. 11, 1963]

BOSCH URGES DOMINICANS TO TAKE UP ARMS

(By Norman Gall)

Deposed President Juan Bosch and exile leaders of his Dominican Revolutionary Party are calling on their followers at home to abandon peaceful political activities and fight for the restoration of constitutional government.

In a 2,000 word declaration released yesterday, Bosch and eight other D.R.P. leaders declared:

"It is our conviction that the D.R.P. should cease its activities as an electoral organization. There is no, and there cannot be under present circumstances the least opportunity for the people to act freely in the electoral field.

DUTY OF THE HOUR

"The duty of the hour for all good Dominicans," the declaration read, "is to fight for the rescue of liberty, for the restoration of the state of law, to fight to reestablish in America the prestige of our people that has fallen again in the mud of international shame."

The nine Dominican exiles signing the declaration were Bosch, Senate president Juan Casasnovas Garrido, vice president Armando Gonzalez Tamayo, D.R.P. President Angel Miolan, Finance Minister Jacobo Majluta, Public Works Minister Luis del Rosario, Senate vice president Thelma Frias, Dr. Anetto Gomez, San Juan Dominican Consul Nicolas Garrido, Manuel Eusehio and Health Minister Samuel Meadoza Moya.

GROUNDS FOR WONDERING

(By A. W. Maldonado)

Juan Bosch continues to be a puzzle. Up to now it has been almost universally accepted that Bosch is not a Communist but instead a firm believer in democracy. Today, however, there are grounds for wondering just what kind of "democracy" the ex-Dominican President believes in.

Bosch and eight other leaders of his Dominican Revolutionary Party have officially pronounced that "the D.R.P. should cease its activities as an electoral organization." He called on all D.R.P. members in the Dominican Republic to take up arms. He praised the group of guerrilla fighters now hiding in Dominican mountains.

This is unequivocally a call for violence and civil war. It is a negation of the democratic principles and processes that Bosch and his close followers have in the past professed support for. But there is much more to this odd story.

PRO-CASTRO GROUP

The groups of guerrillas now fighting in the central Dominican mountains are led by and mostly composed of members of the June 14 movement—a self-confessed pro-Castro, bitterly anti-American and extreme leftist group. In ideology this group is almost identical to Castro's 26th of July Party and the National Liberation Armed Forces (FALN) in Venezuela.

The June 14 group, which believes as much in "democracy" as Fidel Castro and FALN, strongly opposed the general elections in the Dominican Republic in 1962.

After Bosch was elected, however, the group completely turned around and fully supported Bosch and his government.

Bosch, in turn, never openly supported the June 14 campaign that was mostly of the hate "Yankee imperialism" brand. But Bosch did nothing to oppose or contradict the June 14 leaders. In fact, several days before the military coup that overthrew Bosch, Dominican businessmen staged an anti-Communist strike.

Bosch retaliated by closing all privately owned radio and television stations. Only the government station stayed on the air, broadcasting the appeals of June 14 leader, Manuel Tavarez Justo, to end the strike.

MANY WERE FOOLED

When Castro said that he was fighting dictator Batista for "democracy," many observers throughout the world believed him. As it turned out, Castro also fooled many Cubans who fought with him. But the record of the June 14 movement is so clear and open, that it seems unlikely that anyone will believe that they are "fighting for the return of 'constitutional' " government.

Ironically, the June 14 group has a heroic beginning. It started as an underground movement to overthrow the brutal Trujillo dictatorship. In its ranks were young men ranging from extreme to democratic leftists. On July 31, 1961, after the assassination of Trujillo, it came out into the open and joined the National Civic Union in trying to rid the country of the legacy of Trujillo dictatorship.

But almost immediately the pro-Castro elements and the democratic leftists began to fight among themselves. Finally, on November 22, 1962, the democrats broke away and formed their own June 14 movement under the leadership of Felix German. Now the remaining June 14 group under Tavarez Justo was a hard core of Castroites. Eventually, Felix German's group fizzled out and disappeared.

IN CASTRO'S COMPANY

Today, Bosch and his group are making heroes of these June 14 guerrilla fighters. Bosch is finding himself in the company of Castro and Radio Havana who have also supported and praised this guerrilla movement.

Bosch and his group are attempting to justify violence and a civil war by alleging that there is in the Dominican Republic now a "chaos which does not permit a pacific or civilized solution." But all the evidence is that this is not true, that the events of violence and disturbance are being created by the Communists and pro-Castro groups.

The triumvirate now running the government as had unexpected success in carrying forward a crash program of national economic and agricultural recovery. A series of elections to restore constitutional government are being prepared—the first now scheduled for July 1964. The triumvirate has invited the Organization of American States to supervise the elections just as it did in December 1962 when Bosch was elected by a landslide.

Bosch's own party, the triumvirate has said, is free to participate in the elections. A news story that circulated outside the Republic saying the opposite, has been denied by the triumvirate. In any case, it is highly unlikely that the OAS would go along with an election in which the DRP was outlawed.

The Dominican situation is strategically complex. One can allege that new elections may prove as meaningless as the last elections as long as the Dominican Armed Forces have the power of nullifying the election results. This may be true. But what is the alternative? Is it to try "democracy" again and again? Is it for democrats to hang on or for them to quit? Bosch now has chosen to turn to violence and the June 14 guerrillas.

When he was president, Bosch refused to fight the Dominican Communists because, he said, he would not use undemocratic means to defeat democracy. His reversal today is truly remarkable. For he has, for the first time, embraced a group of men who proudly proclaim their desire to make "another Cuba" of the Dominican Republic.

SOLICITATION OF U.S. EMPLOYEES FOR TICKETS TO FUND FETE

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, those of us who assumed there was a 30-day political moratorium were interested in an article appearing under the byline of Joseph Young in the Star last night. The lead paragraph reads as follows:

> The Democratic National Committee is soliciting $100 contributions from Government career employees for tickets to a Democratic fundraising affair to be held here next year.

I shall not burden the Members with the rest of the story, it will be included in the RECORD, but I would suggest they not only read the article but that portion of the Hatch Act which makes this activity unlawful which follows the newspaper article.

The newspaper article referred to is as follows:

DEMOCRATS SOLICIT U.S. EMPLOYEES FOR $100 TICKETS TO FUND FETE

(By Joseph Young)

The Democratic National Committee is soliciting $100 contributions from Government career employees for tickets to a Democratic fundraising affair to be held here next year.

In fact, Federal careerists have received two communications from the Democratic National Committee in connection with the affair, one signed by Chairman John Bailey.

The solicitation is similar to the one last year when efforts of the Democratic National Committee to pressure Federal career employees to purchase $100 tickets for the Democratic gala held last January brought criticism from merit groups, the press, and Republican Members of Congress.

SOLICITING RENEWED

However, apparently undaunted, the Democratic National Committee is soliciting funds from Government civil servants again.

Career employees from the middle grades on up have received invitations to the affair. In some cases employees in grades as low as grade 9 ($6,675 a year) reported being contacted by the Democratic committee.

The first communication in early November was a formal invitation from the Democratic National Committee. Mailed to the employees at their homes, the letter states the committee "requests the pleasure of your company at the third inaugural salute."

Accompanying this was a card to be filled out, detailing how many tickets (at $100 apiece) the employee wanted. There was also a self-addressed envelope to the Democratic Anniversary Committee, Post Office Box 1213, Washington, D.C., to inclose the contribution.

The affair was to have been held at the National Guard Armory on January 23. The assassination of President Kennedy caused the sponsors to cancel the event.

SECOND LETTER

However, about a week ago the career employees received a letter from Democratic National Chairman John Bailey telling them that while the event had been canceled, a similar event will be scheduled later in the year and that they would be contacted later and advised of the date.

The form letter written by Mr. Bailey is as follows:

"DEAR FRIEND: I am writing to you for Sidney Salomon, chairman of the January affair, to announce that it has been canceled. It is planned to schedule a similar event later in the year and I will advise you of the date when it has been selected.

"I would like to extend my appreciation to those of you who have already contributed. We are taking the liberty of holding these contributions until the new date has been announced, at which time the tickets will be forwarded.

"Sincerely,

"JOHN M. BAILEY."

Democratic officials deny that pressure is being used; they contend the employees have a free choice of purchasing or not purchasing tickets.

EMPLOYEES FEAR EFFECT

However, career employees feel differently. They fear that unless they purchase the $100 tickets, their chances for advancement in their careers is apt to be jeopardized.

Furthermore, they fear it puts them in an untenable position whenever there might be a change of national political administrations.

They point out that one of the first things a new political administration does when taking office is to scan the list of contributors to the opposite political party, to see if Federal employees are on the list. This could and has led to recriminations against employees.

After the adverse publicity of last year's pressure on Government career employees, it was reported by administration insiders that the late President Kennedy said that such pressure "wasn't right" and should not be allowed to recur.

Federal civil servants are hoping that the Johnson administration, in concert with the Civil Service Commission, will make it plain that Federal civil servants are under no obligation to purchase these $100 tickets and that their careers will not be endangered if they don't buy them.

Better still, they hope that President Johnson will use his power to see to it that no more direct solicitation of Federal employees is allowed.

§ 118i Executive employees; use of official authority; political activity; penalties; reports to Congress.

(a) It shall be unlawful for any person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, to use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government; or any agency or department thereof, shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. For the purposes of this section the term "officer" or "employee" shall not be construed to include (1) the President and Vice President of the United States; (2) persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the office of the President; (3) heads and assistant heads of executive departments; (4) officers who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws. The provisions of the second sentence of this subsection shall not apply to the employees of the Alaska Railroad, residing in municipalities on the line of the railroad, in respect to activities involving the municipality in which they reside.

(b) Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be removed immediately from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress for such position or office shall be used to pay the compensation of such person: *Provided, however,* That the U.S. Civil Service Commission finds by unanimous vote that the violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty shall be imposed by direction of the Commission: *Provided further,* That in no case shall the penalty be less than 90 days' suspension without pay: *And provided further,* That in the case of any person who has heretofore been removed from the service under the provisions of this section, the Commission shall upon request of said person reopen and reconsider the record in such case. If it shall find by a unanimous vote that the acts committed were such as to warrant a penalty of less than removal it shall issue an order revoking the restriction against reemployment in the position from which removed, or in any other position for which he may be qualified, but no such revocation shall become effective until at least 90 days have elapsed following the date of the removal of such person from office.

(c) At the end of each fiscal year the Commission shall report to the President for transmittal to the Congress the names, addresses, and nature of employment of all persons with respect to whom action has been taken by the Commission under the terms of this section, with a statement of the facts upon which action was taken, and the penalty imposed. (Aug. 2, 1939, 11:50 a.m. E. S. T., ch. 410, § 9, 53 Stat. 1148; July 19, 1940, ch. 640, § 2, 54 Stat. 767; Mar. 27, 1942, ch. 199, title VII, § 701, 56 Stat. 181; Aug. 8, 1946, ch. 904, 60 Stat. 937; Aug. 25, 1950, ch. 784, § 1, 64 Stat. 475.)

FEDERAL LAW TO CURB POSSESSION OF PEYOTE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will extend to peyote the provisions of the Federal law now applicable to marihuana. Peyote comes from a species of cactus known as "Lophophora Williamsii." Peyote buttons, the dried flowering top of the peyote cactus, are the source of the dangerous substance.

Local authorities in Dade County, Fla., have recently reported an unusual influx of the so-called "dream buttons" to my district. While peyote reportedly does not cause addiction as do other narcotics, a strong habit for its use can be psychologically developed. After its use, hallucinations have been reported as continuing for weeks, and even months.

Because of this danger, State Representatives Richard Fincher and Tom Spencer requested me today to introduce this bill so as to amend the Federal narcotic laws to make applicable to peyote the present penalties and prohibitions which apply to marihuana. I am grateful to these outstanding gentlemen for their alertness in spotting this potential menace to the health and welfare of the citizens of the Dade County, Fla., area and for bringing it to my attention.

Florida is one of the few States with a law governing peyote; possession of it is a misdemeanor punishable by a $500 fine and/or 6 months in jail.

But it is obvious that the State law is inadequate to cope with the traffic through the mails and other means of interstate shipments, especially since not all States have a law governing this strange and dangerous substance.

Although the buttons are not eaten because their taste is so horrible, users grind them into powder, capsule it and swallow them. Sometimes the buttons are stewed and the water is drunk for a faster "kick." While this substance reportedly provides the user with visions of brilliant colors and wonderful music, prolonged usage could seriously and harmfully affect the mind. It is reported to cause hallucinations that last for long periods of time followed by dangerous moods of depression.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I earnestly request that the appropriate committee promptly consider the legislation which I have today introduced so as to provide the necessary Federal prohibitions and applicable criminal penalties to the importation, interstate shipment, and possession of peyote. If this is done, then additional stringent measures of enforcement will be available together with the efforts of the highly trained, skilled, and effective agents of the Bureau of Narcotics of the Federal Government.

First offense for importation or transfer of peyote under my bill would bring imprisonment of not less than 5 years nor more than 20, and a fine of up to $20,000. For someone who passes the substance without having the proper license or commits any other act without necessary license, the penalty for first offense is imprisonment for not less than 2 years nor more than 10 and a fine of up to $20,000.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my bill would amend the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act so that it applies to peyote, and chapter 39 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 would be similarly amended.

CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would provide that the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, while serving in that capacity, be assigned the rank of lieutenant general.

At the present time, the law provides that an officer serving as the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall serve in the grade of major general. This is a two-star grade, and I am strongly of the opinion that this office is so important to our national security that the officer assigned to this duty should be given the prestige and authority that accompanies three-star rank.

The Secretary of Defense has, by the recent reorganization of the National Guard and the various Reserve components, emphasized the vital role played by these components in our effort to insure national survival. It is particularly significant that the highest priority for our reserve forces has been assigned to the National Guard. They are, therefore, truly in the front line of our national defense forces.

The Chief of the National Guard Bureau is responsible for almost a half-million military personnel. He has in the Army National Guard responsibility for 17 combat infantry divisions, 6 armored divisions, and hundreds of other smaller operational units.

In the Air National Guard, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau is responsible for 27 fighter interceptor squadrons; 19 tactical fighter squadrons; 13 tactical reconnaissance squadrons; 3 aerial tanker squadrons; 17 air transport squadrons; 4 troop carrier squadrons; and many other operational units absolutely essential to our mobilization capability.

As a consequence of this tremendous responsibility, the Congress in numerous statutes enacted into law, has emphasized the importance of this position and attempted to insure that the Chief of the National Guard Bureau would always have direct access to the Chief of Staff of the Department of the Army. The purpose of this stipulation in the law was to protect the separate identity of the National Guard so as to insure its responsiveness to both Army and State requirements.

The Secretary of Defense has recently recognized the importance of the billet of Chief of the Army Reserve components by raising the grade of the officer assigned to this billet, to that of lieutenant general. I completely endorse this action. However, similar action should be taken in respect to the position of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau so as to insure the harmonious functioning of these two offices as contemplated by the Congress.

This legislation will accomplish this purpose.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF DECEMBER 16

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader the schedule for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the acting minority leader yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry, may I advise first that we have completed the legislative program for this week. The program for the week of December 16 is as follows:

On Monday, the 1964 foreign aid appropriation bill.

On Tuesday, the Consent and Private Calendars will be called, and there will be five suspensions, as follows:

H.R. 9413, to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

H.R. 8459, to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to allow Federal credit unions greater flexibility in their organization and operations.

H.R. 1211, to admit the vessels *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade.

S. 1172, authorizing amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86-518.

S. 1698, extending the time for commitment of vessel construction reserve funds.

Wednesday is undetermined.

For Thursday and the balance of the week, additional appropriations in connection with mental retardation.

This, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make this statement. It is hoped that the House will adjourn sine die during the latter part of the week of December 16, 1963. In view of this fact, additions to the program will be announced daily. Members are accordingly requested to be available during the entire week.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have completed the legislative program for this week, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HALL. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

Mr. MATHIAS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Can the gentleman tell us when the river basin conference report will be brought up next week? The conference report was filed early this week. There are many projects which necessarily must have additional authorization if they are going to continue.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Florida, this of course is important business. While we have not listed the conference reports, it is expected that that conference report will come up next week.

Mr. HALL. Can the majority leader advise us if and when during the remaining portion of this session the Indigent Defendants Act might be brought up for which we passed a resolution or rule during the early part of this week?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I have consulted with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York, and he does not propose to call up that bill until January.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY of New York). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

JACQUELINE KENNEDY AND THE LIGHTS OF HANUKAH

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I have read in the publication of Isaiah Israel Congregation, in the district that I have the honor to represent, the column headed "From the Rabbi's Desk." In this period of the Jewish observation of Hanukah and the kindling of the Hanukah lights in Jewish homes, which began on Tuesday last the article by Rabbi Hayin Goren Perelmuter is especially timely, and I know will be read with interest and appreciation by my colleagues.

The article follows:

FROM THE RABBI'S DESK

She stepped forward at the fresh grave of her martyred husband and kindled an eternal light.

At that moment the inexpressible heroism of Jacqueline Kennedy shone forth at its brightest. For me, I saw there a link to the Ner Tamid of our faith, and an echo of the imperishable heroism of the Hannah we remember in the Hanukah story when soon we kindle its lights of courage and faith.

There are no words to describe the anguish the shock and the pain that was caused by an act of madness or of calculated evil. And if an evil deed can cause a grief that has no words, it is the acts of dignity, of faith and of courage that emerge from our wordlessness that must show us the way.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy had a way of capturing the vision and the hopes of us all and articulating them with a youthful freshness and vigor. And now his brave heart is stilled and his vibrant voice silenced.

Perhaps the light that burns at his grave on that slope in Arlington Cemetery is not so very far removed from the Hanukah lights we shall soon be kindling. For they too speak to us of courage, of hope and of faith amid the overwhelming threat of darkness and oppression.

And when we sing the words "Who can retell the things that befell us * * *" we shall think of the then and the now. As it was then, so it shall be now, that our undying faith expressed in action that unites, that heals and hallows, can show us the way by the flickering light of the menorah we kindle.

She stepped forward at the fresh grave of her martyred husband and kindled an eternal light. We shall think of her Maccabean-like courage when we kindle ours.

IN PRAISE OF SECRETARY McNAMARA

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, any Secretary of Defense who can keep all 435 Members of Congress happy could not be doing his job well. It is the prerogative of Members of Congress to raise cain if jobs are lost through closing of defense installations. But if any real economies are going to be achieved, there must be economies in the $50 billion defense budget.

I am certain that deep down in his heart every Member of Congress believes that it is in the national interest to locate defense installations in accordance with military and not political considerations. It takes courage to make the hard decisions which Secretary McNamara is making, and the Nation will applaud that courage even more in the months to come.

And speaking of courage, let us not forget that the Commander in Chief, President Lyndon B. Johnson, is the man with the ultimate responsibility. President Johnson has captured the imagination of the entire Nation in these critical weeks with his determination that economies must be achieved. I know that President Johnson and Secretary McNamara will succeed, in the best interests of our national strength and the economy of the United States of America.

KNOWLES DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on next Monday or Tuesday, the

House will have an opportunity to vote in favor of a preferential motion that the House recede from its disagreement with the Senate and agree to Senate amendment No. 26, authorizing the Knowles Dam and Reservoir on the Flathead River in my district in Montana, as part of H.R. 8667, the river basin authorization bill.

Because of much correspondence being circulated in the House, I think it appropriate to point out that Knowles Dam and Reservoir is not a spending or cost item for this Government. It is rather an investment or loan that will be repaid to the Treasury of the United States through electrical power revenues. Of course, there will also be flood control savings by reason of the great storage of the project. It should be noted, too, that the investment in the Knowles Dam and Reservoir would be on the same historical basis as all other river projects have been justified.

The Corps of Engineers submitted to the Committee on Public Works that the cost of the project has not changed, largely because it is an earth-fill dam. They have reviewed all of the costs as recently as June of this year, in the light of the criticisms that have been made by others. They submitted to the committee the following information:

KNOWLES PROJECT, MONTANA (H. DOC. NO. 403, 87TH CONG.)

Location: The Flathead River which flows into the Clark Fork, one of the principal tributaries of the Columbia River, drains an areas of 9,101 square miles in western Montana and Canada. The Knowles project is located on Flathead River 2.7 miles upstream from its confluence with the Clark Fork and about 5 miles above the town of Paradise. The drainage area above the damsite is 9,000 square miles.

Authority: Resolution, Senate Committee on Public Works, adopted July 28, 1955, and other resolutions.

Existing project: A total of 10.9 million acre-feet of storage sufficient to control major Columbia River floods, to 1,030,000 cubic feet per second at The Dalles is presently available at Federal and non-Federal projects in the Columbia River Basin. Existing, under construction and authorized Federal projects have an aggregate installed hydroelectric capacity of 10,200,000 kilowatts.

Flood problem: The area of major flood damages in the Columbia River Basin lies along the 140-mile reach of the Columbia River below Bonneville Dam. Flood damages as modified by existing projects are about $24 million annually. The Knowles project would also be effective in reducing flood damages experienced locally downstream from the dam in the vicinity of Plaines, Mont., and near Pend Oreille Lake and along Pend Oreille River to Canada.

Recommended plan of improvement: Construction of a multiple-purpose storage project for power, flood control and recreation, with usable storage 3,080,000 acre-feet and a powerplant with an initial installed capacity of 256,000 kilowatts and provision for ultimate installation of an additional 256,000 kilowatts.

Estimated cost (price level July 1961):	
Federal (initial project)	$247,000,000
Non-Federal	------------
Total	247,000,000

Project economics (based on 100-year life and 2⅞ percent interest):[1]

Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization	8,635,000
Operation, maintenance and replacement	914,000
Total	9,549,000
Annual benefits (with Canadian storage):	
Power	11,681,000
Flood control	466,000
Recreation	58,000
Total	12,205,000

[1] Economic analysis based on initial construction cost of $247 million plus present worth of additional installation cost of $28,976,000 at the 50th year.

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.3.

Local cooperation: None required.

Comments of Federal Agencies:

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

Department of Agriculture: Favorable.

Department of Commerce: Favorable.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Favorable.

Federal Power Commission: Comments not made at this time because of competing applications before the Commission for alternative developments.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget: No objection.

Mr. Speaker, the only dispute in this matter is the same old dispute that has been historical in this kind of project. It is private power against public—and in this instance, it is a project that private power has failed to perform and does not now offer to perform. Nor does any other—the Indians, for instance—suggest they would build this needed project.

Thus the only possibility for this needed project of more than 3 million acre-feet of storage, and the resulting production of almost 1 million kilowatt—of which 517,000 kilowatt would be salable firm power—is Federal investment. The benefit-investment ratio is 1.3 to 1.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this very worthwhile investment in natural resource development of our country.

PROCEDURE UNDER CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to address a question to the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], if I may. I want to ask a question about the schedule for Calendar Wednesday next.

Mr. ALBERT. Calendar Wednesday has not been dispensed with, therefore the call of the committees under the rule will be in order.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Will it be the intent of the leadership then to go through with the Calendar Wednesday procedure or will it be the intent to attempt to adjourn the House as was done last week?

Mr. ALBERT. That is a matter, first of all, that is within the jurisdiction of all the committee chairmen who might have bills which they might intend to call up. I am not able to answer what procedure we might expect on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If a committee chairman does not choose to call a bill up, can a member of the committee?

Mr. ALBERT. May I suggest to my colleague, that he might address that parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, may I address that question to the Chair: If a committee chairman does not choose to call a bill up on Calendar Wednesday, may a member of the committee then call up a bill which has been passed out by the committee?

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY of New York). That is possible if the chairman has been specifically authorized by the members of his committee to do so.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I am sorry I did not understand the Speaker's reply. My question was: If the chairman chooses not to call up a bill, may a member of that committee then call it up?

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Only if the committee has specifically authorized that member to do so.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the Speaker.

DISTRESS SIGNAL OVER THE PENTAGON

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, as I came past the Pentagon this morning, I noticed the flag on the riverfront of the Pentagon flying upside down. This is the recognized signal of distress. I was curious as to why the Pentagon should be flying a distress signal this morning. Having sat through the debate that has just been concluded and having heard the very profound arguments that have been advanced with respect to the closing of certain bases in various parts of the country and the military, social, and economic effect of closing those bases, I can now better understand why the distress signal was flying from the Pentagon.

I am sure that the Members here will be gratified that there is someone in the Pentagon who feels so strongly that they would fly the distress signal. I am sure that the anxious soul within the Pentagon will be gratified that there has been an answer from Capitol Hill to the signal.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the Chamber during the vote on the conference report on the military construction appropriation bill, H.R. 9139. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

NO MEAN CITY

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal written about the President's assassination. We as a people are analyzing and reanalyzing the condition of our country's soul. A great many worthy commentators have said that this despicable act arose from the breeding of hatred, bigotry, and extremism in our country. If the President's death will help us cleanse our souls of hatred, that is a wonderful thing, but let us not be misled about the nature of the despicable act that struck down our President.

This week, Dr. George Gallup, referring to weekly polls that started some 30 years ago, made this comment:

> Talk of hatred in this country today is greatly exaggerated. It is confined to a very tiny segment of the population.

Dr. Gallup also said:

> I don't think this is a period when hatred is more in evidence than other periods—as we see it in the polls. Extreme rightism was much more in evidence during the McCarthy period.

There appears to be a frantic effort on the part of ultraliberals to blame the President's death on the rightwing. Up to this point I have not seen a single shred of evidence connecting the President's death, in the most remote fashion, to any rightwing movement. On the contrary, it appears by present evidence that the assassin was a Marxist or a Communist who hated and wanted to destroy our whole system.

Mr. Speaker, one of the wisest pronouncements on this whole matter was made last Sunday by the Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate. In his eloquent and inspiring "Spires of the Spirit," Dr. Harris never fails to touch chords of spiritual love and understanding. His wisdom deserves our solemn reflection. Accordingly, under unanimous consent, I include as a part of my remarks at this point Dr. Harris' column of December 8, 1963, entitled "No Mean City":

NO MEAN CITY

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris)

Almost 2,000 years ago there lived and wrought a man whom the centuries have called St. Paul. His name is cut deeply on the record of the ages. In defending himself from certain unfair charges he declared, "I am from Tarsus, Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city." In this dread day that proud assertion might well be on the lips of those whose home city has had turned upon it the searchlight of the world's critical scrutiny, since on that black Friday, November 22, triumph suddenly turned to tragedy, as the President's life was snuffed out. That fair city is Dallas, Tex. Since the dastardly act which set the world aghast it has been the target of vituperation and blame.

There are those examples of the hate they verbally deplore, who assume that this expanding metropolis, so typically American, will be forevermore a byword and a hissing. Such conclusions are, of course, not warranted by any thinking person. In the face of the fateful happenings, mourned nowhere with more poignancy than in that city, its citizens with heads high have reason enough to stand with Paul of Tarsus and say with him, when the case for Dallas is called, "We are citizens of no mean city."

Let it be remembered that what happened there could happen in any city in America. In spite of all precautions there are no exceptions. The marvelous Secret Service would readily agree to that. Surely in America the exhortations coming from the high and the low against bigotry, hatred, and violence desperately need to be preached. But the horrible deed of the alleged dastardly assassin is the wrong text for these sermons. There is no evidence that he was the product of any present agitation gripping the political life of America. This sinister person was so un-American that to make him the symbol of all that is wrong in America is to blunt the preachments which need to be made. To suggest that all Americans, in a sort of mass guilt-complex, belong in the dock which awaited him is to arraign those who refuse to be stigmatized by what one Senator called "wrongly placed recriminations." And, another Senator, agreeing, commented, "It is an injustice to teeming thousands of hospitable, cheering crowds in Dallas, to charge them with murderous guilt. What happened was not America's fault. Only the sober realization of that can make our mourning meaningful and not tortured with a guilt that is undeserved."

What happened in Dallas was not the result of any aspect of the moral malignancy from which America, in her grasping materialism, is suffering. Much—very much—could be said about that. What happened grew out of the twisted mind of one deluded young man. There will never be a Utopia where dangerous, warped individuals, antisocial, will not be at large ready to wrap their venom in a bullet. It may be from a window in Dallas, from a reception line in Buffalo, in a theater or a railroad station in Washington, or in like attempts in Chicago or Florida. But assassinations or foiled attempts do not damn the cities involved. In spite of sharp divisions in the minds of people as to any administration's policies—and that is the precious prerogative of United States citizens—Dallas had gone all out to put differences aside and to give the President an enthusiastic welcome. The wounded Governor of Texas bears witness that Mr. Kennedy's last words expressed his gratitude and delight at the warmth of the reception the city was according him—"magnificent" was the word between the President and the Governor.

And then the unbelievable happened and the death weapon was held by one who had but recently come to the city.

And what about the real Dallas? I know it well. To me it is not a city of spites but of spires. It has been my high privilege to join the outstanding church and civic leaders there on various occasions. The religious life of the city is an inspiration to those who have felt its uplift in the dedication of its laymen and the potency of its prophetic pulpits. Nowhere in America have I experienced evidences of benevolence and care more closely binding all segments of a city's life. United Givers crusades there have the fervor of oldtime revival meetings. In hospital projects, Catholics and Protestants work together in beautiful fraternity.

Dallas is rightly proud of this great metropolis rising majestically on the plain, of her boulevards and parks, her office buildings and hotels, her cultural institutions, her newspapers, her palatial banks and world famous stores. But most of all she glories in her churches, great and small, and she has some of the largest in the land; and, of her schools and colleges including a famed theological seminary training prophets for the years that beckon.

One of the prized photographs in my pictured autobiography is that of a young lad, dressed as Uncle Sam, presenting to me a certificate as an honorary citizen of Dallas. Gazing at that certificate, even while writing this, I say with Paul, "I am a citizen of no mean city."

POLITICAL FAVORITISM IN MILITARY ECONOMY ACTION

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the House passed the conference report on H.R. 9139, making appropriations for military construction. I was tempted during the discussion on that matter to raise the issue of the Defense Department economy plan. Now briefly I desire to address a few restrained remarks to the House on that subject because the Pentagon's ax not only includes closing various defense installations but also Defense Secretary McNamara has just announced a so-called economy action in terminating the Dyna-Soar program which will result in some 5,000 Boeing—Seattle—employees losing their jobs.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, I have stated that if Mr. McNamara could justify closing or curtailing defense establishments or contracts affecting my constituents I would support this action.

In this case I have been briefed by his representative, Dr. Fubini, and at the moment I am not sure that the cancellation of Dyna-Soar will save any money. I doubt it, or at least I doubt whether the substitution of a Gemini trailer or new manned orbital laboratory in the long run will result in overall savings. There are many pros and cons and I am compelled to withhold any criticism until I find out more about it.

However, I must say and this is a feeling shared by many of my colleagues, that in an austerity program there is one thing I demand—one and the most important of all things I demand is that no favoritism or political considerations be a part of such retrenchment.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask: How can I fail to protest in this instance the special treatment accorded the Boston Navy Yard?

This was the shortest shipyard closure in history. One evening the papers reported: shipyard to close; the next morning the papers and radios carried the joyous tidings: shipyard eludes Pentagon ax.

I have nothing against the Boston Naval Shipyard, but frankly I am hard put to explain this situation to Boeing workers who are losing their jobs. Why cannot my constituents obtain some special treatment too?

Of course, the President's Office was flooded with telegrams of protest when the rumor spread that the Boston yard was to be closed. On last Wednesday evening, according to a newspaper story, the Speaker sped to the White House to deliver a personal protest. Apparently that did it.

According to the Christian Science Monitor, fast decisive action by the Massachusetts congressional delegation appears to have halted reported plans of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to close down the historic yard.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago Mr. McNamara was reported to have proposed closing three public yards including this one. The late President Kennedy reportedly vetoed the plan.

Maybe this Massachusetts delegation uses facts and not political persuasion. All I wish to say for the record is that I cannot justify to terminated Boeing workers the rescinding of the Boston Shipyard closing if it constitutes special treatment.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, a forthright and clear statement denying any political pressure or influence is in order. Even so, after the TFX investigation, I doubt if such a statement will be accepted by unemployed workers either in Seattle or elsewhere.

When an election is held less than a year from now, these workers may register their feelings and render their judgment on the administration as to politics and favoritism.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS TO AMPUTEE VETERANS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that there exists a severe inequity between the retirement benefits available to amputee veterans of World War II and those who retired since the passage of the Career Compensation Act in 1949.

The act provided for the retirement of amputee veterans, thus entitling them to receive all benefits available to other retired officers, including commissary privileges and hospitalization for themselves and their dependents. World War II amputees, however, were medically discharged. Thus they receive Veterans' Administration compensation but not retirement benefits.

I am introducing legislation today to correct this inequity. The Defense Department has recognized the justice of providing retirement benefits to disabled amputees since 1949; this will enable the Department to extend this policy to World War II amputees.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the tragic events of the past few weeks have once again drawn attention to our laws governing Presidential succession. Many of our fellow citizens believe the present law is unwise and inequitable.

On Monday, December 9, the Herald Statesman of Yonkers, N.Y., carried the following editorial entitled "It's Time for Congress To Provide Law for Presidential Succession":

IT'S TIME FOR CONGRESS TO PROVIDE LAW FOR PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The question of who runs the store in the event of a President's disability has returned to haunt Congress and the country with heightened urgency—and an added complication.

So far the only remedy has been in the form of specific agreements of understanding between President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon, President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson, and now President Johnson and House Speaker John M. McCormack, who is next in line of succession.

All these agreements, while better than nothing, have the built-in impediment of fuzziness. They rest on such imponderables as how to determine disability and who shall make the determination. And at best they provide for the No. 2 man to serve as "Acting President," a rather nebulous legal identity.

The added complication in the present instance is that Speaker McCormack would according to the best legal appraisals, have to resign from Congress to serve as "Acting President," an irrevocable step that would leave him nowhere if the President were able to resume his duties.

Aside from that, of course, the accession of the House Speaker would put at the White House helm a man elected not by the Nation, not even by a State but only by a congressional district—in short, a man never really measured as presidential timber. And a man not briefed or groomed as a presidential understudy.

What's the answer? To elect two Vice Presidents, as some people have lately suggested? Or to scrap the present congressional and Cabinet line of succession and authorize Congress to elect a new interim Vice President any time a Vice President ascends to the top office?

In short, Congress has two problems to solve: The problem of how to deal with presidential disability and the problems of the void that occurs when there is a Vice Presidential vacancy.

These are delicate, intricate problems, to be sure, but they'll never be solved by forgetting about them every time a crisis abates. As we have again been taught all too tragically, fate can be abrupt. It's long past time for Congress to provide the legal machinery for assuring the Nation maximum continuity, competence and experience at the Executive level under all forseeable emergencies.

I commend the foregoing editorial to my colleagues as an example of the soul searching going on throughout this great country of ours concerning Presidential succession. An institutional form of government, such as ours, requires orderly succession.

CIVIL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution amending the Constitution to extend to women all rights now provided thereunder to men.

It may well surprise many in this honorable House as well as citizens generally to be reminded that with all the hue and cry about civil rights in these times we still deny them to women. It is true that the 14th and 15th amendments give equal protection and political rights to all persons—citizens—regardless of race, creed, or color. Yet court decisions have in effect excepted women from certain of the applications of these amendments. The U.S. Supreme Court has said that the only right women won under the suffrage amendment was the right to vote. Their civil rights were not affected by the amendment. Unless a State law provides otherwise, and this is not always the case, women are still subject to the medieval English common law as it stood when the Constitution was adopted.

Because of this constitutional anomaly, women today are frequently subject to restrictive work laws, and married women do not receive equal "protection" in all community property States. Some States require a husband's consent before a wife may go into independent business, while guardianship and control of a child's earnings belong to the father only in some States. Women suffer other embarrassments and humiliations for lack of this amendment which provides no more than fair play.

I cannot conceive of any Member who, in today's great pleadings for civil rights, or, in fact, at any other time, could seriously oppose this equal rights amendment. Are there any among us, of the male sex, that is, so bold as to hold himself on some kind of legal pedestal above the ladies?

I take it, therefore, that failure to act on this resolution which others have long ago introduced, and which has the official support of both political parties, stems solely from inertia. I would hope that this House will see fit promptly to overcome this longstanding and wholly senseless injustice.

KNOWLES DAM

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Battin] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal appears a story about the Knowles Dam project in Montana.

The House will have an opportunity to consider Knowles Dam when we consider the conference report on H.R. 8667.

The real consideration here is the dislocation of people and a question of whether or not the people of Montana are going to have a Federal power project against their wishes. I hope the people will prevail.

For those who are interested I submit the following article from the Wall Street Journal dated December 13, 1963.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 13, 1963]

MONTANA DISPUTE: STATE'S GOVERNOR FIGHTS TO BAR A NEW FEDERAL POWER PROJECT

(By Ray Schrick)

HELENA, MONT.—A lengthy House-Senate feud in Washington, which involves a $950 million river basin authorization bill, reflects even sharper disagreement here in the "Treasure State."

The argument has split the State's leadership, put two Indian tribes on the warpath and produced the unusual spectacle of a Governor in opposition to the spending of millions in Federal funds in his State.

Cause of the conflict here, and a major factor in the Washington dispute, is Knowles Dam, a proposed Federal project for the Flathead River, in the western part of the State. The dam would cost about $250 million. An initial $50 million authorization is included among a host of items in the public works bill now embroiled in disagreement between the House and Senate.

With the strong backing of Montana Senators MANSFIELD and METCALF, the Senate version of the bill included Knowles Dam. But the House just as strongly opposes inclusion of the Knowles project, as well as several other items. Montana's two Representatives are split on the Knowles proposal, the Democrat for and the Republican against.

Here in Montana the Knowles proposal has touched off a controversy as rugged as the Rocky Mountains in which the proposed site on the Flathead River is located.

"Can your pocket stand a $688 million tax bite? That is what wasteful Knowles Dam does to you," claims a booklet issued by Montana Power Co. The company contends its alternative proposal—two dams in the region of the Knowles project—would pay $138 million in taxes in a 50-year period. In contrast, it says, the big Federal dam would cost taxpayers $550 million more than its revenues from power sales in the same period.

"It's plain old pork barrel," explodes Gov. Tim Babcock, the State's 44-year-old chief executive. "I can't subscribe to this raid on the Federal Treasury, even for use in my own State."

A CONTRASTING CLAIM

But a leading Democrat charges Montana Power Co. "destroyed its credibility by putting out propaganda that is so obviously untrue no expert knowledge is needed to see the errors." The Army Corps of Engineers, in seemingly amazing contrast to the private company figures, claims nearly $70 million in "benefits" in a 50-year period, over and above the costs of the $250 million Knowles Dam project.

The wide variance in figures points up the different ways of arriving at a Federal project's cost.

Montana Power Co. says its figures are based on the Federal Government's borrowing money at 4 percent interest—about the current cost—to build the project, then repaying its costs from the power sold through the U.S. Bonneville Power Administration at its average rate—about 2 mills per kilowatt-hour. The "profit and loss" statement thus shows nearly $14 million a year in costs compared with about $3 million a year in revenues—or about $11 million a year annual loss, the company claims.

The Army Engineers arrive at their figures in a different way. First, they figure the cost of Knowles Dam at about 3 percent interest, rather than 4 percent. Then they figure the cost of a project that would provide the same benefits in electric power, flood control and recreation by some alternate means. If the alternate means costs more, the Knowles project has a favorable benefits-to-cost ratio. They argue Knowles' costs in a 50-year period came to $11,238,000 a year compared with $12,625,000 for an alternate project with equivalent benefits—nearly $1.4 million a year "benefits" over "costs," according to the Army Engineers.

How will the Federal dam compare with the two Montana Power Co. sites? Both projects would have approximately the same installed capacity at the site—256,000 kilowatts at Knowles Dam compared with 240,000 kilowatts at Buffalo Rapids Nos. 2 and 4 of Montana Power. The similarity largely ends there.

Supporters of the Federal project argue that comparing power produced only at the Federal and private sites is unfair. They note that water released from the big Federal reservoir will help produce a great deal of additional power at dams downstream. But critics contend the extra power isn't needed and that, in any case, it does not offset other differences. The two private dams would cost only $42 million compared with the $250 million for the big Federal dam. The U.S. dam would cut nearly $1 million a year from tax revenues. The private dams would add $2,772,000 a year in tax revenues.

DISLOCATIONS DIFFER

The dislocations caused by the projects differ greatly, too. The Federal dam involves almost 60,000 acres of land, floods 9,000 existing irrigated acres ("it's reclamation in reverse," charges Governor Babcock), displaces 1,284 people, and requires the relocation of 35 miles of railroad line (objected to by Northern Pacific Railway Co.) and 115 miles of highway. About half the cost of the Knowles project goes for relocations—over $107 million, compared with $310,000 for the private projects. The private dams would relocate 7 miles of highway, no railroad, displace 12 people, flood 100 acres, and involve about 9,000 acres in all.

The Indians of the confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes are against both projects. They have filed for a preliminary permit from the Federal Power Commission to build their own dams. This rivals the license application by Montana Power to build Buffalo Rapids Nos. 2 and 4, which are located on the Indians' Flathead Reservation. On the other hand, the Federal dam not only would flood all the rival damsites but also about 20,000 acres on the Indian reservation.

Politically, Republican Governor Babcock's peppery stand against the big Federal project has made him enemies as well as friends. "Republicans are for him, Democrats opposed," says one newsman. Enemies have labeled him the "rubberstamp" for Montana Power Co.

However, the undaunted chief executive brands Knowles an "unneeded" Federal expenditure and adds: "Before we get fiscal integrity on the national level, we must be morally responsible on the State level. If it's wrong, it's as wrong in your home State as somewhere else."

OUR BELOVED AND MOST DISTINGUISHED LEADER, THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the 3 weeks since the terrible tragedy that befell our Nation we have read much about Presidential succession. Most of what I have read properly recognizes the great qualities of statesmanship, leadership, and professional competence of those who now stand in the line of such succession.

Among the more complete, accurate, and truthful appraisals of our distinguished colleague who now ranks immediately after the President in our Government is one that I read only today. The writer knows his history. And, obviously, he knows his subject. He writes with a refreshing candor, yet with a warmth that is most fitting for his subject. Though now writing a weekly column in the Prince Georges, Md., County News, the writer is himself, I am told, a native Bostonian and a fellow Irish-American of the gentleman he describes.

Other than its terming James Reston's comments a "McCarthylike assault"—which, though I disagree with them, they are not—the column does express what is in my heart. Since, I am sure, it likewise expresses the feelings of every one of my distinguished colleagues, I would like to read it into the RECORD, so that all who read this RECORD may have a better understanding of our beloved and most distinguished leader, the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

POLITICS FROM THE PRESS BOX

(By Gerard F. Devlin)

Since Lyndon Johnson has succeeded to the Presidency, the office of Vice President will remain vacant until January 20, 1965. Until that time the successor to the Chief Magistrate's Office is, under the terms of the Presidential Succession Act of 1947, House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

We have noted in various newspapers around the Nation some agitation for a return to the status quo which existed before 1947 which provided that the succession should pass from the Vice President to the members of the President's Cabinet starting with the Secretary of State and proceeding ultimately to the Secretary of Labor in the order of establishment of the respective departments.

Some of this criticism has come from partisan journals in Massachusetts who are merely transferring purely local Bay State partisan struggles to the national scene. The North Adams Transcript for example, recently suggested that MCCORMACK step down in favor of "a younger and wiser man."

The restraint and moderation implicit in the above is a rather typical phenomenon of a State where going for the jugular vein is an established fact of political life. We think that the North Adams Transcript assault upon the Speaker will receive the ho-hum it so richly deserves.

More serious, however, is an article by James (Scotty) Reston in the New York Times which casts aspersions entirely unsupported by any kind of documentation about the Speaker's fitness to succeed to the Presidency in the event of the death or disability of Lyndon Johnson.

Reston has always been respected as one of America's premier journalists and to see him make a McCarthy-like assault upon McCormack is somewhat distressing to put it mildly.

Very few Americans know very much about John W. McCormack and this is not particularly surprising for he has constantly avoided playing to the galleries and has devoted his efforts to getting legislation enacted into law.

He has never been a headline hunter and has often been eclipsed in the public eye by individuals whose ability has been considerably less than his own.

The Speaker has been accused by some of being a partisan politician. Since he was floor leader of his party for more than 20 years, his support of his party is about as big a surprise as the Pope's support of Catholicism.

In the parliamentary tradition of Pitt, Disraeli, Gladstone, and Churchill, for 20 years he participated in the give and take of the legislative struggle as leader of his party. His legendary battles with former Congressman Clare E. Hoffman, an acid-tongued Republican from Michigan, are part of the lore of the House of Representatives.

Since becoming Speaker, McCormack has had to forgo most of the pleasures of participating in the day-to-day skirmishings of the House, but if you watch him closely you might get the idea that like most old battlers he would rather be down on the field than refereeing.

There are also some who allege that McCormack is a provincial legislator whose views are narrow and parochial, that he has been stunted by the alleged intellectual aridity of his native environment.

To those who feel this way, we echo Al Smith and say, "Let's look at the record."

At a time when Hitler's star was at its zenith, most of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress followed the lead of Senator David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts, a leading isolationist and a fixture in the U.S. Senate for almost 30 years, and pandered to the Anglophobia which is part of the Boston-Irish tradition.

Even then, McCormack was, as he is now, an internationalist even if it meant his seat in Congress.

The menace of Hitler was too real to take second place behind jingoistic Boston-Irish prejudices.

As a matter of fact, the then majority leader was a cosponsor of the first British loan, and if you can think of anything more unpopular in South Boston than a loan to "perfidious Albion," we can't imagine what it might be.

At a time in the middle 1930's when the rantings of Father Coughlin were inflaming antisemitism among the Boston Irish, McCormack took his stand for religious toleration and was roundly denounced by the priest demagog from Detroit whose gift for invective was unrivaled anywhere.

Needless to say, McCormack's Jewish constituents have never forgotten his courage during the thirties and in Boston's heavily Jewish ward 14 he is a kind of folk hero.

From the time he came to Congress, away back in 1928, McCormack was singled out as a "comer" by the leadership.

At the end of his first term he was given a seat on the tax writing Ways and Means Committee, an honor which has been bestowed upon only three freshmen Members in the last hundred years.

Speaker Garner recognized that in contrast to his predecessor, the late James A. Gallivan, a bibulous nonentity, McCormack was headed for great things in the House.

Almost from the beginning of his long service, McCormack has played a key role in shaping the legislation passed during the period of almost constant crisis that has been our lot since the stock market crash in 1929.

We are really not sure that any job in the world is adequate to prepare a man for the awesome burdens of the Presidency but if, God forbid, anything does happen to Lyndon Johnson that would keep him from carrying out his duties, we can think of none more qualified than the good, gray, Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

PASSING OF THE HONORABLE HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to join with those who have expressed their sense of loss at the recent passing of the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman, of New York.

Governor Lehman had a most distinguished career, and during his 85 years he served his country and his State unselfishly and devotedly. He was a respected businessman for most of his life, came of a wealthy family, and, if he had so desired, could have retired to a life of peace and leisure. But at the age of 50 he entered the political arena, and the country is the better for his dedicated service to the public during the latter years of his life. As outstanding proof of his ability in the field of politics, he was Franklin D. Roosevelt's Lieutenant Governor for 4 years, was then elected four times as Governor of the great State of New York, and the voters there subsequently sent him to the Congress of the United States where he represented New York in the U.S. Senate for 8 years, until his retirement from public office in 1957.

Between his services as Governor and Senator, he did not hesitate to occupy himself with programs and projects designed to assist those less fortunate than he, and gave unstintingly of his time and energies in relief and rehabilitation work under the Department of State and then as Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. In fact, he was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize in connection with his work for UNRRA.

He gave of himself and his talents in an entirely selfless manner, and was ever in the forefront of the liberal movements which have brought so much social and economic progress to our country.

He will be sorely missed, though well remembered for his enviable qualities which led to his designation by the late President John F. Kennedy to receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom, which has been conferred on him posthumously by President Johnson.

I extend my deep and sincere sympathy to his widow and his family.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Rooney of New York). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Van Deerlin] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I realize that for a Member of Congress to speak up this week in protest against economy reductions by the Department of Defense, lays him open to abuse as a man of two faces.

Most of us in this body have put ourselves on record at one time or another in favor of tighter Government economy. I believe most of us have been sincere in this position. Today, the columnists and commentators are having a field day with the suggestion that few of us really favor economy if it means withholding Government money from our own districts—that we are all for saving it someplace else in the country.

Perhaps, in these few remarks, I shall be taking a somewhat different approach.

As one whose home district has been grieviously hit by yesterday's order for defense shutdowns, let me begin not by condemning Secretary McNamara and his staff, but by recognizing that they have performed an unpleasant task with courage and—according to their lights—with wisdom.

For the moment we can ignore the seeming callousness of taking such action as this during the holiday season—though it brackets the U.S. Government with the storied landlord who takes special delight in evicting tenants on Christmas Eve. Nor shall I dwell on a question of tact which is raised by having it occur during the period of mourning for President Kennedy.

It is not Mr. McNamara's task to consider the social niceties. His job is to maintain the world's best war-ready defense establishment in the most efficient and least expensive manner—to follow the findings of his cost accountants.

As the national representative of 400,000 citizens, I am entitled to demand of Mr. McNamara's accountants that they justify the shutdowns of San Diego's naval repair facility—and this I intend to do, because no real explanation has yet been offered for this specific action. All responsible studies—including the celebrated report by Arthur Andersen & Co., in which some Members of Congress have reposed such confidence—show the San Diego repair facility to be among the most efficient of navy yards. Moreover, anyone familiar with its operation knows this installation has been extremely busy in recent months, performing its share of work on a near-record volume of Navy shipyard spending. Nor is it argued that the San Diego yard is limited in the scope of its capability; it can and does perform repairs on vessels of any size.

But these technical considerations represent the extent of the area in which it seems proper to dispute Mr. McNamara. And, failing to persuade him the decision on San Diego was unsound from the standpoint of efficiency and economy, we have only one valid court of appeal. That is the White House.

If Mr. McNamara is determined to reduce the number of Navy shipyards, so be it. But there remain questions of selectivity and timing in implementing that decision. I cannot believe that San Diego County, suffering 7.2 percent unemployment at the end of November and with all forecasts agreed that the rate will be nearer 8 percent through the first 6 months of 1964—I cannot believe that this is the sort of place in which to launch the Defense Department's economy program. My community has already been hard hit by changing needs of the aerospace industry. Of the 33 places marked for defense installation shutdowns, San Diego is 1 of 3 already listed by the Labor Department as an economically "depressed" area. I would note that more than a year ago, Time magazine carried a feature article on San Diego as the prime example of a city that had multiplied its size on defense contracts, and was now feeling the impact of their phaseout. All this, of course, was long before the announcement of an intended shutdown by the major Government employer in my 37th Congressional District, with the added loss of 1,827 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the special circumstances surrounding the naval repair facility, I intend to seek a delay in the effective date of the order closing it. I wish to aline myself with the remarks by other Members who have spoken earlier today, and to say that I hope it will be the temper of this Congress that the administration must be selective in implementing its economy orders; that while there is every justification for demonstrated economy, it is not the intent of this Government, in pursuit of economy, to extend areas of need.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY NEXT WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, during the past week the House was unable to brace itself for the ordeal of Calendar Wednesday—on Wednesday last. On Thursday the House did not debate the indigent defendants bill as had been scheduled. Today we have considered a conference report and there is the hope that the House may adjourn by 3 o'clock. I am not going to hold it long.

I understand we are going to meet tomorrow, Saturday, without a schedule of legislative business. There has been a suggestion that we abandon Calendar Wednesday again next week. Now, our critics—and there are critics of this House and of the institution of Congress in the country—our critics might say that this is a desultory way of doing business.

Mr. Speaker, there is an impression abroad in the country—I have visitors every day in my office who indicate this is true—an impression which is being nurtured by some that the House may consider the civil rights bill of 1963 in 1963.

If it is the wish of the majority which controls the calendar of the House to undertake this debate, I think all the Members of the House should know it and be able to prepare for it. But if, on the other hand, the majority has no intention of attempting to debate civil rights in 1963, I think that we as Members of the House have a right to know that and I think the country should know it.

Mr. Speaker, to keep the sincere, the conscientious, the dedicated people who have worked for civil rights under some delusion that we are going to do something that we are not going to do, is a sham. It is window dressing, or, if you think the season justifies the phrase, it is tree trimming.

If I may address an inquiry to the majority leader, I would judge, sir, from the gentleman's indication that there is a possibility of adjourning sine die next week. It would seem, therefore that our civil rights debate would now come sometime in 1964; is that right, sir?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the gentleman I want to emphasize that if the Committee on Rules, or a discharge petition should make this bill in order, I am sure we would be willing to program it as soon as possible.

The gentleman I am sure is aware of the practical situation. The gentleman is apparently indicating that we are trying to hold this up for some special reason until 1964.

I will say to the gentleman that we are trying to pass a civil rights bill and I will say to the gentleman that we are going to pass a civil rights bill. There is not any question about that in my opinion.

Mr. MATHIAS. I thank the gentleman. I did not mean to imply that the distinguished gentleman was trying to hold it back. I just think that there is some misunderstanding in the country about exactly what our practical problems are. I do not think there is anything that needs to be withheld.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MATHIAS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALBERT. I say there are practical problems and one of them is the problem of getting a rule. We have been advised that this problem will be expeditiously surmounted next year—early next year. There is a practical problem with reference to getting sufficient signatures on a discharge petition. We have been advised by sufficient Members, I think, that failing to get a rule in due time sufficient signatures will be affixed to the discharge petition.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to advise the gentleman and the Members of the House that it is the sincere desire of the leadership—and I know it is the gentleman's sincere desire also—to get this bill to the floor as soon as possible.

We do have certain rules to which we must conform. In conformity with the rules of the House we intend to move this bill expeditiously and in a manner that will best guarantee that it will go to a successful conclusion.

That is our only desire in connection with this matter.

Mr. MATHIAS. I certainly thank the distinguished majority leader for that assurance. Let me say, sir, I accept completely the sincerity of the majority leader's assurance of his own intention and of his colleagues' intention on the majority side.

All I am attempting to do now is to make it perfectly clear there are certain difficulties. I think the proponents of this legislation as well as the opponents should understand what the difficulties are. As I understand the rules, the earliest possible date this bill could be called up would be the 23d. Obviously, if we adjourn next week we are not going to be here on the 23d. I understand, too, that under the rules there is a further difficulty in that a discharge petition may not be called up within 6 days of the end of a session. So that creates a further practical difficulty on action this year if we contemplate adjournment. From those people who call upon me daily to discuss this question, there is every evidence of a lack of understanding of these problems.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. The majority leader has been here a good many years. I admit I have not signed the discharge petition to date. I feel that the Congress should have the right to work its will. I feel that the bill has not been before the Rules Committee for an unreasonable length of time—10 legislative days. I would like to ask the majority leader if the bill, in his opinion, has been before the Rules Committee an unreasonable period of time.

Mr. ALBERT. That is merely a question of judgment on which I do not intend to comment. I would like to say to the gentleman that as far as the leadership is concerned our desire is to do what in our judgment will accomplish two things: First, get the bill up as expeditiously as possible and, second, get it up in a manner that will insure its passage and will prevent any attempt to thwart our action. That is the reason why we did not want to take it up under the Calendar Wednesday rule.

Mr. CONTE. I realize that is a matter of judgment, and that is the reason I asked the question. I would like to get the judgment of the gentleman from Oklahoma who has been here so many years. Can he tell me whether he feels 10 legislative days is an unreasonable period of time? I certainly feel if this bill is going to be bogged down in the Rules Committee, then I will sign the discharge petition. At this point I do not know of any indication it will be bogged down.

Can the gentleman tell me whether it will be or not?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I believe anyone who knows what is going on recognizes that early in October of this year the minority leader, in cooperation with the minority ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, made a solemn promise and agreement that if this bill that has been voted out of the Committee on the Judiciary would be voted out they would do all within their power to support it. That is why it is now reported in the form it is.

Certainly, when anybody claims they do not know what has been taking place, they have not been listening to what is going on. Any of this so-called information as to not being guided on what is going on, the guidance should come from those who had the understanding. That understanding was that the minority and majority members of the Committee on the Judiciary have voted out the bill and have agreed to support the same. But when that discharge petition is placed on the desk, they run away. Why?

Mr. CONTE. I would like to ask the leadership whether the leadership is requesting its members to sign the discharge petition, and if it is in order, whether the leadership has signed the discharge petition?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am not the leadership.

Mr. CONTE. I understand that.

Mr. ALBERT. My response to the gentleman remains. I am going to do those things, and I think other members of the leadership will, too, which will bring the subject up for consideration expeditiously and successfully.

Mr. CONTE. You are going to do what?

Mr. ALBERT. In my opinion we are going to do those things which will insure the passage of this bill at the earliest possible date, and we will assume the responsibility in that connection. I will say to the gentleman that if the 88th Congress and if this House, whether it is late in this session or early in the next session, passes the bill, that will be the answer to the gentleman and the answer that the country is demanding

Mr. CONTE. I have no doubt about that. I strongly favor the bill. I had filed a much longer bill before the Committee on the Judiciary. I went into that with the gentleman from Maryland. I have spoken for the bill in the past. I was trying to get some guidance from the Democratic leadership as to whether they feel the resolution has been before the Committee on Rules an unreasonable period of time. I do not feel it has. Maybe I am wrong. I would like to be told.

Mr. ALBERT. That is a question the gentleman can answer for himself. It is a question of individual judgment.

Mr. MATHIAS. I think that from the colloquy which has occurred on the floor here we have some guidelines. We understand what the proportions of the situation with which we are dealing are, and we can arrange to deal with it. As the gentleman from Colorado has suggested, this is a bipartisan bill. It has had and it will have bipartisan support. When we come back in January I am hopeful that we will have a rule on this bill at a very early date. If we do not, I am hopeful that we will not abandon Calendar Wednesday as a possible means of bringing it to a prompt and well considered vote, because under Calendar Wednesday we can have very adequate consideration. We should not abandon either Calendar Wednesday or the discharge petition as methods for bringing it to a vote, in the words, if I may quote the distinguished majority leader, "as expeditiously as possible."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I just say to the gentleman that I think it is very clear on our side that we are convinced that Calendar Wednesday is the worst way to consider this bill. We realize, and I am sure the gentleman does if he has ever been through Calendar Wednesday, and I do not know whether or not he has, that there are so many parliamentary maneuvers, there are so many other restrictions it would simply mean we would probably never get to a legitimate debate on a most important bill by means of Calendar Wednesday, and then if the time expires the bill would be dead for the entire session.

Mr. MATHIAS. It is not true that the time need not expire, the House can go on with recesses?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No. The time automatically expires within the 24-hour period.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION AND CONTINUITY OF GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY of New York). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to speak on a very important problem to the Congress and to the Nation. I hope my remarks will not be misunderstood because I would not speak on this subject at this time if I did not believe that it is of importance to the Congress and to the Nation.

The subject of my speech is a proposal which I have made by a House concurrent resolution for a joint committee to study the Presidential succession and continuity of Government.

Mr. Speaker, the sudden and tragic death of President Kennedy causes us to reexamine our national precedents and practices relating to Presidential succession. Unfortunately, as a Nation we are too often disposed to wait until calamity or disaster strikes before examining the means to prevent their occurrence or to minimize their effects. In this, the Congress, as the grand inquest for legislative purposes and the constitutional lawmaking body, must carry the largest share of the blame. That is why I am proposing, in a resolution which I shall present with these remarks, a means for enabling the Congress to begin to fulfill its grave responsibilities in insuring the continuity of our national life and governmental leadership.

True, in this hour of national trial, we have been blessed with a brilliant and experienced successor in the Presidential office, Lyndon Baines Johnson. He has shown at once his ability to master the awesome responsibilities of the highest office in the land. He has brought to bear long years of experience in the legislative branch, where he gained political wisdom and new insights into the ways of men and nations; and he has had 3 years of additional and highly essential preparation for national leadership in his capacity as Vice President of the United States.

I do not doubt that this has been the smoothest and most orderly Presidential transition in our history. President Johnson's strong sense of command, his delicate sense of tact, and his sure touch and footing in the onrush of events, have been matched by the responses of a mature and intelligent citizenry. The political divisions which characterize any healthy democracy were quickly forgotten as the Nation and its several branches of Government sought to heal this most grievous of all wounds to the national body politic—the loss of the President.

We were successful, and the world has witnessed a transition which has earned us applause and respect on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Our democracy has not failed us in showing its resiliency and its ability to recover quickly when dealt a staggering blow.

There are not, of course, any guarantees that, as a Nation, we will always be thus fortunate. Even now, we have no Vice President, and the law of succession, both constitutional and statutory, poses questions of the most baffling nature. We must do better than we have done, no matter how difficult the task, and we must move not only with great deliberation but with reasonable speed to overcome the national handicap under which, as a Nation, we live and work and plan for the future—to resolve the uncertainties regarding succession to the Presidency.

The enigmas start, of course, with the wording of the Constitution, article II, section 1, clause 6, which provides that in case the President dies, resigns, or becomes unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, "the same shall devolve on the Vice President." The clause also empowers the Congress to provide for succession after the Vice President, declaring what "officer" shall act in a Presidential capacity until a disabled President is able to resume the post or a new one is elected.

In the long stretch of years since those words were penned by the Founding Fathers, Congress has enacted succession laws only three times. I will not now examine the problems which evoked the several changes in the succession laws. These laws have been the subject of study and commentary by historians, academic scholars and others. For the benefit of my colleagues who are interested in this subject the American Law Division of the Library of Congress has prepared a useful background study of presidential succession which is now being published and will be available to the Members.

Suffice it to say here that there are contending schools of thought about the nature of the succession roster to the Presidency. There are those, like former President Dwight Eisenhower, who favor a return to the succession law of 1886 which placed the Secretary of State and other Cabinet members in the line of succession, after the Vice President, without reference to the Speaker of the House or the President pro tempore of the Senate. The rationale for this view is that the Cabinet members, appointed by the President who has been withdrawn from office by death or disability, are men of stature who enjoyed his confidence, who were privy to his hopes and plans, who could be expected to carry on his program for the remainder of the presidential term or until the presidential disability were ended.

The other view is that the great vitalizing force of election by the people shall be reflected, even if indirectly, in the choice of a successor to the Presidency.

Thus the 1947 succession law, which I voted for in good faith, harking back to the first succession law of 1792, gave effect—in part, at least—to President Truman's strong plea that the democratic principle be more fully subserved in choosing presidential successors. Thus, primacy was given in the law of succession after the Vice President to the highest elective officers of the House and Senate—the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate. This time the order of precedence was reversed, however, so that the Speaker stands first in line after the Vice President, whereas in the 1792 law the President pro tempore was first.

These leaders of the House and Senate are elected persons in their own right, representing given segments of the people; and, in turn, they are elected by their peers to their positions of leadership in the legislative branch. The value of the elective principle must be balanced, of course, against the possibility that the Speaker or President pro tempore may be of a different political persuasion than the dead or disabled President, a possibility that would not ordinarily arise in case a Cabinet member were first in line of succession.

In my own terms of service in the House in the 80th and 83d Congresses, we saw this situation arise where the President was of one party and the House of Representatives and the Senate were of another party.

My own preference and sentiment are to retain the elective principle in defining those who should stand at the top of the roster of succession next to the Vice President. Yet I am aware, as others have been quick to observe, that the 1947 succession law is not without its deficiencies and ambiguities. Along with many other Members I did not realize this at the time I voted for it.

The Constitution refers to the successor to the President or Vice President as an "officer," and those who challenge the concept that the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate are officers within the constitutional contemplation, question the constitutionality of the 1947 succession law.

Of course, it is obvious that I cannot decide that, but it is being questioned. There is also this paradox, based on the fact that the 1947 succession law requires either the Speaker of the House or the President pro tempore of the Senate to resign his position in the event he is called upon to assume the powers and duties of the Presidential office. To resign an office is to give it up, to be out of it. Even if one agrees that the Speaker or President pro tempore is an officer in line of presidential succession, how can he be an officer when he has resigned his office?

Now, assuming that this is a transient paradox which can be resolved by legal construction—and I would hope that it could be—the Speaker or President pro tempore still may find himself in the anomalous position of being called on to serve for a short time as President, either because of presidential disability or a brief time before the expiration of the presidential term, and then having no elective office and no speakership or presidency pro tempore to which to return.

It has been pointed out also that if the Speaker succeeds to the presidential office, the House would proceed forthwith to elect a new Speaker. Providing he was otherwise qualified, he would in turn take first place in the line of succession; and so, conceivably, the speakership of the House would be a continuing source of availability without recourse to the President pro tempore of the Senate. I will not pass judgment on whether this is wise or not. I do not know. But there is a question as to whether it would ever go past the speakership of the House. Maybe this is a wise solution, but I do not believe that it was in the contemplation of those who passed the 1947 act, because it was not so explained to us at that time.

The problem of temporary disability has a been a particularly vexing one and one which has never been solved. Historic controversy has raged as to whether the Vice President or his successor, in assuming the powers and duties of the presidential office, also acquires the title. The precedent established by John Tyler in 1841, that he who assumes the presidential office is the President, seems clear enough in the event succession is by death, but what of temporary disability? The Congress never has exercised its constitutional right to clarify this problem. We are left with personal arrangements between the President and Vice President, as was made known by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, and presumably will obtain as between President Johnson and Speaker McCormack.

It is evident to me, and certainly to many others, judging by the storm of discussion and editorial comment in the daily press, that we have not yet begun to grapple forthrightly with these complicated and legal issues and the anomalies or ambiguities of existing law and constitutional phraseology. There have been many bills through the years to change the succession laws in one way or another; there have been numerous joint resolutions to amend the Constitution and modify the provisions for presidential succession. There have been learned studies by scholars and hearings by the Judiciary Committees. But there has been no resolute action or comprehensive solution. It seems compelling to me that the Congress, acting jointly through a specially selected committee, should bring together the numerous ideas and proposals, study them, select those which seem worthwhile, devise others which may be necessary, and make recommendations to the Congress which then can be acted upon expeditiously by the committees of jurisdiction.

And this is basically what I am advocating today, that a study of all these proposals, of all these constitutional questions be made and referred to the Congress for such action as it may deem necessary in the interest of national continuity and presidential succession.

I want to make it very plain that in making this proposal I do not want to detract in any way from the stature and prestige of the present Speaker of the House, the Honorable John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts. He has the respect and affection of this House. He is a friend and colleague and a leader of long standing. He is, in my book, a great progressive who knows the art of government, who knows how to get things done without sacrificing his own basic principles of government. The Speaker himself has suggested, in response to questions from the press, that there are great differences of opinion to be reconciled, that congressional review and reappraisal of the problems of succession would be highly appropriate.

My concern goes to the nature of the position not to the individual, certainly not the incumbent Speaker, who is respected and eminent. The problem is the structural gap in the presidential succession. As I suggested before, there is great merit in having the Speaker first in line of succession after the Vice President. The House is the most numerous body of the legislature; the only body which from its very constitutional origins was directly elected by the people. Its term of election is shorter than that of the Senate or the Presidency, and the whole membership stands for election at one time, enabling the people to record their wishes and wants in a manner not given to any other part of the National Government.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman particularly on what he said about our Speaker. Earlier today the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] made very clear that in the discussion of this issue there were some small minds and there were some small people who have tried to twist this issue into an attack upon our Speaker. As far as I am concerned the matters which the gentleman has been discussing are, of course, serious matters and are matters which I think need to be clarified in order that the people of our country may have assurance that orderly government at all times, if possible, will be maintained.

But I would say to the gentleman that while I think this is most important, I should hope that his resolution would include in it a provision that we will completely divorce ourselves from any consideration that affects the present Speaker or the present President pro tempore of the Senate.

I think the matter is of sufficient depth that it will require great and serious study over a long period of time. I hope the report of the committee will not be made until at least after the next election when the matter as to personalities will have been resolved and all question that it is aimed at an individual will have been lifted and that it therefore can be considered without personalities being involved, because I know of no man as far as I am concerned whom I think is better qualified than the present Speaker of the House of Representatives for what the present law makes possible with reference to the office that he might have to hold. God forbid; and I am sure we would all agree.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I am in complete accord with the gentleman. I know of no man who has had more experience in the art of Government than our Speaker.

I hesitated to make this type of speech today because I thought some might say that this was in consideration of our present Speaker that I have introduced this resolution, which is a resolution to study the problem. I am not proposing any specific solution. They might very well come forward with the same solution that we have now or some modification of it.

But I would like to say a lot of other issues are involved. I am getting to some of these issues, which I think are equally as important in just a moment.

Of course, there are flaws in procedures and practice, of the House, as well as the Senate. There are worthwhile and even pressing reforms to be made, which I believe could be made. My colleagues may differ with me on some of these items, yet the constitutional spirit and purpose and function of the House of Representatives make it a promising source of leadership and availability in the line of presidential succession.

To prepare for the office of the Presidency in the contemporary world is a new and serious challenge which we are only beginning to understand. The Vice Presidents of recent years, in my considered view, are no longer figureheads or irrelevancies. They are understudies to Presidents, as we have found out in these last tragic days and as former President Harry Truman found out at the time he was in the Speaker's office and was notified of the tragic death of President Roosevelt. A Vice President is the No. 2 man. He, by constitutional mandate, must succeed to the Presidency in the unhappy but not unknown occasion when the President is removed from office by assassination or sickness or death from natural causes.

We must devise somehow, some way, a means of succession to the Presidency which preserves, directly or at second remove, the elective principle, and at the same time select those who are enabled to prepare themselves—to participate in the affairs of Government, to learn the workings of the executive branch, to peer into the distant reaches of foreign affairs, to master the intricacies of defense and security—and thus to qualify themselves to assume the Nation's highest post if the need ever should arise.

I was delighted when I heard that our Speaker was being invited into the innermost counsels of the National Security Council and to Cabinet meetings and to defense discussions, because I think it is one of the most important things for the continuity of the Nation that he be given every access to every problem that the President has. I say this because if this horrible thing to contemplate should happen again or if God in his wisdom should take President Johnson through sickness or accident, the man then that takes upon his shoulders the responsibilities of directing this great Nation will assume great responsibilities. I know that there is not a man within the hearing of my voice who will not pray that he be capable to meet the issues as they arise.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege this morning of having a conversation with the President on other matters, atomic energy matters, and as I walked out of that room with my colleagues from the Senate committee and the members of the House committee, I just said to myself, "Thank God I do not have on my heart and mind the responsibility that this man and every man who occupies the Presidency has."

There is another part to this story, another broad and continuing concern I have, in which the problem of Presidential succession is only a chapter. This is the problem of continuity of Government—maintenance of a working governmental system in case this Nation is attacked by a nuclear power. If unforeseen disaster in the form of an assassin's bullet can strike down the Chief of State, the national leader, what untold disasters could befall us, what untold ruin would be visited upon the governmental structure of the Nation if we were to be the victims of enemy nuclear attack? I trust sincerely, I hope with all my heart, that the serious and basic question of national survival in emergency will not be neglected, will not be cast aside, in a patchwork attempt to provide a quick and esay way of assuring an orderly succession to the Presidency in peacetime.

The stark fact we must reckon with is that a single nuclear weapon detonated over Washington, D.C., either by means of an ICBM or launched from a submarine off the Atlantic coast, could destroy both Houses of Congress, the Supreme Court, and all Cabinet successors to the Presidency, unless by chance one or more successors happened to be away from the Capital.

This is a stark reality. This is not just imagination. We came very close to this possibility in connection with the Soviet missiles in Cuba. If they had been allowed to stay there and if they had been launched in anger, there was this possibiilty, because Washington, D.C., was within the missile range of Cuba.

Despite the hundreds of billions of dollars we have spent over the years to develop and maintain a military capacity of the highest order, a single sneak blow could render our Nation leaderless, without established means of reconstituting effective civilian leadership.

This is not an insoluble problem. There could be numerous safeguards to prevent such a calamity. But it is an unfortunate fact that these safeguards do not exist today and cannot be developed without legislative action.

Thus, we see that the problem of presidential succession in peacetime, pressing though it is, becomes but part of the larger problem of preserving Government continuity in wartime.

I call attention to the fact that the House of Representatives, despite repeated prodding from the executive branch, has yet to approve a constitutional amendment providing for its own continuance in an emergency.

While we have provided a law of succession, for better or worse, relative to the Presidency, we have not provided a law of succession for the House of Representatives which is closest to the people, the most numerous and most representative branch, the great workshop of democracy.

Our Founding Fathers could not see the hydrogen bomb at the time they wrote the Constitution, the greatest document ever stricken off by the mind and hand of man, a document which can be changed. It has resiliency in it to take care of anything that might occur centuries ahead. But if we do not use that great document and the powers contained in it, the resiliency in it, and make those changes that may be necessary, then in my opinion we are in default in our own responsibilities.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. The gentleman from California is making a very learned and profound statement, and I know he has made a very serious and painstaking study of this matter. I agree with the gentleman in some respects—especially on the question of the explosion, God forbid, of an atomic bomb here in our Capital of the Nation, thereby laying waste to the city and the membership of the House and of the Senate, that would destroy our Government. We ought, as the gentleman from California has said, set up a joint committee to solve this matter. While there has been legislation introduced along this line, it needs action as my dear friend has indicated.

I voted in 1947, along with the gentleman who is speaking, for the present line of succession to the Presidency.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman knows I am not quarreling.

Mr. CHELF. I understand that. The gentleman has said, and rightly so, there has been much ado about this in the newspapers.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And much confusion among the people.

Mr. CHELF. Yes, much confusion among the people. Let me say with all sincerity and with all candor I voted for the succession that we now have, that became law in 1947, because I believed then, and I believe now, that a man elected from a congressional district is close to the people and that in having been elected by his colleagues as the Speaker of the House, who are likewise elected Representatives of the people, he ought to be next in line to the Presidency because in the event of the death, God forbid, of the President and Vice President, the Speaker, a man carefully schooled and learned in our form of government, steps in and becomes President.

I understood the gentleman a while ago to say that there was a possible question that a man is an officer of the Government if he is elected to Congress. In my humble opinion, you and I are officers of our Government whether we are elected or appointed. Also I understood my friend to say that if the Speaker resigns to accept the position of President, that there would be a temporary void and therefore run the risk of not being an officer when sworn in. When our Vice President was sworn in as the President he did not resign his office as Vice President. When he was sworn in as President, he automatically vacated his office as Vice President. He did not resign his office as Vice President. Neither would the Speaker, who is one of the greatest Americans of our time, have to resign his office. He would merely be sworn in as President of the United States and then there would be a vacancy in the speakership so that the succession would go orderly along. This is where I think the newspapers wittingly or unwittingly have everybody in a state of confusion. This is bad and the gentleman is doing a real and great service to the Nation by going into this most vital and important matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman understands I am not trying to resolve that question. I only called attention to it.

Mr. CHELF. I understand perfectly. I am with the gentleman. I want to compliment him on the magnificent statement he is making, because he is focusing the attention of our beloved people on this very serious matter. I believe with the gentleman that something must be done.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Confidence in the structure of our Government by the people of the United States is our basic strength.

Mr. CHELF. You are eminently correct—if our people lose their confidence in the structure, form, and succession of our Government, America is lost, all is lost, and down the drain we go, and we would not need an atomic bomb to finish us or to polish us off. I want to thank the very able and distinguished gentleman for yielding to me. He is my good friend, and he is an honorable, wonderful person. But then he ought to be—for he was born in old Kentucky and is a Kentucky colonel.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have thought and worried about this problem as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, having served on that committee since 1946 when it was created by law. Since 1955 I have served also as chairman of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations in the House. In both capacities I have studied the problems of civil defense. Basic reports have been prepared under my direction detailing the probable consequences of nuclear attack, the measures necessary for survival and recovery, the essentials for preserving the integrity of governmental processes, and the means for perpetuating our national existence. I have never stopped sounding the alarm, though often mine was a lonely voice in the wilderness, and I may say that there are many in high places in government today who are beginning to understand and to accept the need for civil defense, to take steps to insure the continuity of government. I am not so sure that the present Congress is of this mind, judging by the difficulties we have had in enacting, authorizing, and funding legislation for a very modest civil defense program and in supporting the work of the Office of Emergency Planning. I dare say there are not a dozen men in this House who understand the type of work they have done and are doing right now on this planning as to what we would do in the case of an emergency.

As long ago as 1950, I introduced a resolution, House Joint Resolution 419, 81st Congress, proposing that a commission be created to investigate the measures which can be taken to insure the continuous operation of the U.S. Government in the event of nuclear attack by a foreign power. I proposed that the commission have two main fields of inquiry: First, the feasibility of an alternate seat for the Government; and, second, appropriate measures for selecting the successor of any President, Vice President, or Member of Congress who might become unable to perform his duties as a result of attack.

In 1951, I introduced a resolution of similar nature, House Joint Resolution 259, 82d Congress. In 1954, I proposed a resolution, House Joint Resolution 525, 83d Congress, and in 1955 I reintroduced this resolution, House Joint Resolution 322, 84th Congress, to provide for filling vacancies in the House of Representatives in the case of enemy attack. These resolutions propose to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors of States to fill, temporarily, vacancies in the Congress caused by a disaster. This may not be the right way to do it, I do not know, but I think it ought to be given study.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair entertain a unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind the gentleman from California that there are other orders pending which must be recognized at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of Members who may have special orders at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from California be extended for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Speaker of the House, and also thank those of my colleagues who may have special orders.

In 1951, I introduced a resolution of similar nature, House Joint Resolution 259, 82d Congress; in 1954, I proposed a resolution, House Joint Resolution 525, 83d Congress; and in 1955, I reintroduced this resolution, House Joint Resolution 322, 84th Congress, to provide for filling vacancies in the House of Representatives in case of enemy attack. These resolutions proposed to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors of States to fill, temporarily, vacancies in the Congress caused by a disaster.

In the years after World War II, when Soviet Russia demonstrated its ability to build atomic and thermonuclear bombs, many Members of Congress introduced bills and resolutions of one kind or another along similar lines. There are still a few today. Occasionally a bill or resolution would get a hearing by a committee or subcommittee of jurisdiction, and even action in one House. I recall, for example, that the late esteemed Senator Estes Kefauver, as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, reported out favorably in April 1955 a Senate joint resolution similar to mine. He pointed out in the accompanying report—Senate Report No. 229, 84th Congress—that the House of Representatives was least favored of all the Government branches in the matter of succession. There was a law for the Presidency. Vacancies in the Senate could be temporarily filled by appointment of Governors of the respective States. The Chief Executive, or his successor, could reconstitute the judiciary fairly readily by appointments. But in the House of Representatives, where revenue measures must originate, vacancies must be filled by special elections, and such elections entail inevitable delays.

The Constitution as it stood then, and as it stands today, confers no statutory authority on State Governors to appoint Members to the House of Representatives, although five or six times the other body has passed resolutions to amend the Constitution and confer this authority. In ordinary times this want of authority is no great failing. In times of national emergency or disaster, it could paralyze representative government.

There are certain responsibilities today assigned by law to the President and assigned by him in turn to the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning to plan and provide for the continuity of government at all levels. The objectives of this program are to maintain Federal leadership and authority, preserve the structure of Federal civil Government, and strengthen the capability of the Federal Government to operate in emergencies. In achieving these objectives OEP provides policy guidance, planning, and coordination which seek to establish official lines of succession to key governmental positions, that is, speaking of the executive branch, to make necessary delegations of authority and train delegates in their emergency responsibilities, to provide dispersed and protected control centers, to preserve records essential to Government operations and the protection of individual rights, and to promote the full use of Federal resources in emergencies.

The President, in whose behalf these emergency planning functions are exercised, is the Commander in Chief as well as the Chief Executive. From his authority at the apex of Government there run separate lines of command and control to the military and the civil agencies.

How shall these separate authorities cooperate or converge in time of emergency?

What system of command and control shall prevail if the President and his constitutional and statutory successors are wiped out?

How shall the historical and traditional values of civil control over the military be preserved, even in times of dire emergency, as a legacy for the future, so that democracy and freedom will survive?

These are but a few of the questions which concern the planning authorities in the executive branch and which should concern the Congress far more intimately than is now evident. How many Members of this body know about the plans for continuity of Government? Are the plans adequate? Are they supported by the necessary constitutional and legislative authority? Do they show promise of effective performance in emergencies? Are we giving enough potential protection to the President of the United States, to the Cabinet, to the essential adminstrators? And, yes, to the Members of Congress? Are we giving enough protection to our Speaker?

Perhaps the Members of this body do not want the question to be raised, because no one wants to be put in the position of providing officially for his own protection when the people of the country stand naked against nuclear attack. But these problems will not be solved by ignoring them, by sweeping them under the rug, by letting someone else worry about them. These are the problems of the Congress—the constitutional body for making policy and writing laws.

And that is why I call upon the Congress to create for itself a temporary joint committee, equally represented in both parties so that there will be not even the faintest suggestion of partisanship—there is no politics in national survival—which at long last will come together for a common purpose of the highest import to the Nation's future. I propose to call this temporary group a Joint Committee on Presidential Succession and Continuity of Government.

There are good reasons, Mr. Speaker, for constituting such a study group as a joint committee of the Congress. I know that there are a few resolutions proposing such studies to be made by the individual committees of jurisdiction in the matter of Presidential succession. A case also could be made for a temporary, mixed commission which includes representatives of the executive branch as well as of the public. The best and most expeditious procedure, it seems to me, is to have a joint committee of the House and Senate, because the highest officer in each house is in the line of Presidential succession under present law.

It is true, of course, that the Speaker stands next in the line of succession to the Vice Presidency by law, and to the Presidency by unhappy circumstance, because we have no Vice President now. For this reason, and as the largest elective body with the broadest democratic base of representation, the House should be preeminently concerned in the matter. However, we are interested in positive and timely recommendations for constitutional and legislative amendments, and these are responsibilities of the Congress as a whole. A joint committee, working for a defined and limited period but commissioned with matters of direct mutual interest to both Houses of Congress, will be able to gain speedier acceptance of its recommendations in the Congress, without trespassing upon the final responsibilities of the committees of jurisdiction in each House.

And finally, the matter is of broad, basic interest to the Congress as a whole because my resolution deals not only with the problems of Presidential succession in peacetime, but of Presidential succession in time of emergency, in time of war, or impending attack.

I cannot see how the problem of peacetime Presidential succession can be considered in isolation from the larger problem of wartime Presidential succession and indeed of continuity of Government in time of war and its aftermath—in time of lightning war with means of devastation never before known to humanity.

This joint committee which I propose, if established, hopefully would complete its labors within a reasonable length of time and report the necessary findings and recommendations to the Congress for expeditious action by the committees of jurisdiction. I append the proposed resolution to these remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be inserted at this point.

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 245

Resolution establishing a joint committee to conduct an investigation and study the problems of Presidential succession and continuity of Government, to make findings of fact and recommendations for constitutional, legislative, and administrative changes, and for other purposes

Whereas the sudden and tragic death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy and the succession of Lyndon Baines Johnson to the Presidency leaves the United States without a Vice President until the next regular election; and

Whereas the constitutional and statutory law governing succession to the Presidency leaves uncertain and unresolved many issues of the gravest import to the future welfare of the United States and to the successful functioning of its Government; and

Whereas the problems of Presidential succession in peacetime merge into the larger and even more serious problems of Presidential succession in wartime, and in fact into the whole crucial problem of the continuity of the Federal Government in the event of enemy attack; and

Whereas the continuity of the Presidency of the United States and of the Federal Government would be severely jeopardized by a sudden enemy attack; and

Whereas existing emergency preparedness measures to provide for continuity of Government are incomplete, and normal procedures for preservation of Government operations would be for the most part inadequate for a national emergency; and

Whereas the President by law and in his dual constitutional role as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and civilian Chief Executive of the United States is charged with exercising extraordinary powers in emergencies for successful conduct of military operations and for protection of the civilian population; and

Whereas measures must be taken to protect and preserve the principle of civilian control over the military in the event of national emergency and particularly if the President and other civilian authorities in the line of succession are killed or incapacitated; and

Whereas it is essential that normal succession arrangements, recordkeeping, operating procedures and other elements of Government command and control neither inhibit nor be inhibited by emergency methods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint committee of the Congress to be known as the Joint Committee on Presidential Succession and Continuity of Government.

Sec. 2. The joint committee shall be composed of 12 members, 6 to be Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House, and 6 to be Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate. No more than three members of the joint committee from each House shall be of the same political party. The joint committee shall select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect its powers and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

Seven members of the joint committee shall constitute a quorum.

Sec. 3. The joint committee shall conduct investigations and studies of the problems of presidential succession in peace and war, and of all means for effectively maintaining continuity of the Federal Government in the event of enemy attack or other emergency; shall review and assess present plans and existing means of assuring such presidential succession and continuity of Government under normal and emergency conditions; and shall report its findings to the Congress, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable for constitutional amendments and legislative and administrative measures designed to improve the national readiness and Federal Government capabilities to cope with emergencies.

Sec. 4. The joint committee shall report to the House of Representatives and Senate at the earliest practicable date during the present Congress the results of its investigations and studies together with its findings and recommendations.

Sec. 5. For the purposes of this resolution the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the session, recesses, and adjourned periods of the present Congress; to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The expenses of the joint committee, not to exceed $250,000 in the aggregate, shall be paid from the contingent fund of that House of which the chairman is a Member, and upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

HONORING WEST VIRGINIA: AN EVENING TO REMEMBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, a colorful ceremony at the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library of Congress last night signaled the formal opening of a major exhibit saluting West Virginia's 100th year of statehood. Eloquent and scholarly addresses were delivered to a host of friends of West Virginia by the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, senior U.S. Senator of West Virginia, and Dr. Festus P. Summers, renowned professor of history at West Virginia University. The Librarian of Congress, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, welcomed the guests at the impressive ceremony.

This was an evening to remember. It was also an evening of promise. Both Senator RANDOLPH and Professor Summers in their remarks conveyed the spirit of the remarkable surge of progress which West Virginia has made in the past 100 years, the momentum of which will most certainly carry the Mountain State forward to greater goals in the next century.

I invite my colleagues and the general public to visit this magnificent exhibition which will remain on view in the Library of Congress through the summer of 1964. The exhibit is on display in the ground floor corridors of the Main Library Building.

HISTORIC ITEMS ON DISPLAY

Nearly 200 manuscripts, broadsides, newspapers, rare books, maps, prints, drawings, and photographs—chiefly from the Library's collections—have been selected for display. Topics covered include: Exploration, early settlement, border wars, the great 18th century land companies, the Burr-Blennerhassett affair—after which historic Blennerhassett Island in the Ohio River, south of Parkersburg, W. Va., was named—the Harpers Ferry raid (1859), statehood and the Civil War in West Virginia. Other topics, relating to West Virginia's cultural and social development from the 1760's to the 1860's, include: Early industry, internal improvements—transportation—education, the early press, and the mineral springs resorts of western Virginia.

Some of the major sources of materials for the display are the Lincoln papers and the George B. McClellan papers in the Library's Manuscript Division—illustrating the Civil War in West Virginia and steps in the formation of West Virginia, as well as the papers of George Washington. Items selected from the Washington papers will include several of his diaries, ranging from that of March 11 to April 13, 1748—which he kept while on a surveying expedition for Lord Thomas Fairfax into what was later to become the eastern panhandle of West Virginia—to that of September 1 to October 4, 1784, prepared by Washington while journeying to inspect his lands on the Ohio and the Great Kanawha Rivers. The latter diary is of particular interest to those West Virginians who in recent years have taken an active interest in the preservation of "Washington's Western Lands" as a historic site.

LINCOLN'S WEST VIRGINIA PROCLAMATION

A highlight of the exhibit will be the original proclamation admitting West Virginia into the Union, signed by President Abraham Lincoln on April 20, 1863, to become effective on the day we achieved statehood—June 20, 1863. This is one of several documents on loan from the National Archives for this exhibit. The document was one of the featured displays in the highly successful Centennial Exhibit Train which toured West Virginia from June 1 to September 1, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the two Presidents of the United States who did more for West Virginia than any other Chief Executives were Abraham Lincoln and John F. Kennedy, both of whom were victims of assassins' bullets. Coming as they did at the beginning and the end of a great century of progress, President Lincoln and President Kennedy launched West Virginia into the Union and assisted the Mountain State to achieve its economic destiny. We particularly honor these towering figures for the contributions which they made in the shaping of the history of West Virginia and the Nation.

And now, Mr. Speaker, there follows the addresses delivered by Dr. Mumford, Senator Randolph and Professor Summers.

REMARKS BY DR. L. QUINCY MUMFORD, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS, AT OPENING OF LIBRARY OF CONGRESS EXHIBIT SALUTING WEST VIRGINIA'S 100TH YEAR AS A STATE, DECEMBER 12, 1963

Senator RANDOLPH, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, the Library of Congress is very proud to have a part in the centennial observance of the statehood of West Virginia. On a similiar occasion, 50 years ago, Herbert Putnam, then Librarian of Congress, wrote a poem entitled "West Virginia, 1863–1913." These lines from it are appropriate to repeat:

WEST VIRGINIA: 1863–1913

(By Dr. Herbert Putnam, then Librarian of Congress)

Today we celebrate
The ripe achievements of our 50 years
The mastery
Of forest, field and mine, the mill which rears
Its bulk o'er many a stream, the forge and factory's
Incessant hum,
The railways linking mart to mart and home to home,
The growth of trade in each emporium,
And other wealth material that has come
To bless
Our subjugation of a wilderness,
And mien undaunted in a time of stress
All these we proudly sum.
The pride is just; but let it not ignore
Our progress in the things that count for more
In the strengthening a state
Than wealth material won.
Let it relate what we have done
To further education, and promote
An understanding near of things remote.
What may we claim
Of those fine civic traits which earn the name
Of a great commonwealth,
And are the tokens of sound civic health?
Respect for law, to each his equal chance,
For variant opinion, tolerance;
Yet in the issues real
That touch the common weal
Conscience implacable, that alike defies
The bribe, the threat, or coward compromise.
And most of all,
As we survey the decades since our birth,
And count our present worth.
Let us recall
The hardy virtues that first cleared the ways
To these abundant days;
Nor, in the privilege
Of statehood which has brought us where we are,
Forget the pledge
Implied when first we set our eager star
Amid the galaxy
That crowns the ensign of a nation free:
The pledge to keep that star forever pure
By probity of purpose and of deed;
In home and court and office to abjure
The sordid aim, the cloudy arts of greed;
Keep clean and straight
Our private ways; and dedicate
The best that in us lies to serve the State
So that the light symbolic of that star,
By us replenished still, shall constant be,
And carry far
The noblest radiance of democracy.

So ended Dr. Putnam's tribute to West Virginia.

The Library's present exhibition marks the 20th in a series that was begun in 1945 to commemorate important anniversaries of various States. In presenting these exhibitions we have endeavored to express the deep and genuine pride felt by the people of the States in their history and in their contributions to American life and culture. This is our purpose, and we hope our achievement, in presenting the centennial exhibition on West Virginia.

It is now my pleasure and privilege to introduce the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, the senior Senator from West Virginia, who will preside and introduce our speaker.

WEST VIRIGNIA'S CENTENNIAL AND OUR FUTURE

(Remarks of Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, in introduction of Dr. Festus P. Summers, professor of history at West Virginia University, at the opening ceremonies of the Library of Congress' West Virginia centennial exhibit, Thursday, Dec. 12, 1963)

Centennial 1963 is drawing to a close. We feel a touch of sadness as this year of excitement and effort nears its end. During its span we have known the joys of unity of purpose, and we have experienced together the satisfaction of a job well done. We have faced and overcome the challenge of a difficult task and we have suffered some of the pangs known to those familiar with the truism that "hindsight is better than foresight."

As December's shorter days bring nearer the new year, we weigh the results of this period of festivity and commemoration. Also, we examine and evaluate events which have occurred and lessons which have been learned.

First, we have discovered in West Virginia a new spirit—a determination, a hope, a sense of responsibility—which imbues our citizens with enthusiasm, and lifts them to new and higher goals. Achievement has become our watchword and there is optimism prevailing among our citizens in a degree which indicates eagerness to face the trials ahead.

Civic bodies, veterans' organizations, labor, and industry groups—all are showing commendable interest in the problems of the day—and in the public issues which, in solution, shape the pattern of days ahead.

Each week, I receive at my office in Washington hundreds of pieces of mail, many of which reflect a careful analysis of available information and contain expressed views based on conscientious thought. I am happy to receive letters of this type. They reveal the concern of the individual citizen—a concern which is a cornerstone of our system of popular ballot.

Second, I sense in West Virginia a new progress. The sleeping giant of our economic potential is beginning to stir; there are evidences of growth.

State Commerce Commissioner Hulett C. Smith recently reported that during the past 28 months, 82 new plants have come to West Virginia. In addition, 93 expansions in existing industries have been noted. These 175 industrial developments represent a new investment of $145 million, and only manufacturing is included in this statistic.

Figures released at the close of the last calendar year reveal that our annual growth rate placed West Virginia 25th among all of the 50 States of the Union—and above such States as Michigan, Indiana, New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. Our rate of growth in 1962 exceeded the national average by 5 percent. This is positive proof of West Virginia progress.

Although still at unsatisfactory levels, unemployment has been reduced within our borders in an encouraging amount. Three years ago, 10 to 12 percent of persons in our labor force were out of work. As of September 1962, this percentage has decreased to 9.6 percent. And in October of this year it has been reduced to a low for recent years at a level of 7.5 percent.

In educational and vocational training, in water and land conservation and use, in the addition of needed community facilities, and in the improvement of our transportation system, West Virginia is growing stronger. Equally important, we are demonstrating the potential to move forward which lends inspiration to our men and women, and energizes them for the difficult but rewarding road ahead.

Third, among benefits accuring to our State as a result of centennial 1963 has been the building of a better "image." To many who visited with us in these busy months it is apparent that there is a conviction that West Virginians are ambitious, friendly, and progressive people—that we are Americans with our roots planted firmly in the future, and that we are determined to overcome shortcomings.

Gone, for the most part, are impressions that this land of mountains has been sidetracked by automation and has drifted outside the mainstream of the American economic boom. It is recognized by those who know us and have seen the fruits of our labors that West Virginians have made substantial strides toward a parity with progress and are determined to add new improvements.

Finally, I have noted in West Virginia a new momentum—one drawn from the total effect of our new spirit, our new progress, our new image. We are aware of our capabilities and we fully recognize the achievement which comes as the result of wholehearted civic interest.

Among the principles set forth by the renowned mathematician, Sir Isaac Newton, there is one which can be applied to the economic status of our State and the Appalachian region. In layman's language, his first law of motion states that an object which is at rest will remain at rest, while one which is in motion tends to continue in motion.

The organized and coordinated activities of our centennial year have served to set West Virginia in motion. It is now our responsibility to insure that this forward progress is maintained and that we continue to move vigorously toward an even more rewarding tomorrow.

We have attained momentum, and we must make it stick.

We are fortunate to have with us, as we meet to open one of the final events of centennial 1963, an eminent archivist, lecturer, and historian, and one who senses fully the growth and potential of our State of West Virginia.

Dr. Festus P. Summers is a valued member of the West Virginia Centennial Commission, and is a past president of our State's war history commission. He has served on the faculty of West Virginia University since 1935, and headed the history department from 1947 to 1962.

In the 1930's Dr. Summers was one of those instrumental in establishing the West Virginia collection at the library of West Virginia University, and since then he has devoted much of his energy to historical and biographical writing.

Centennial 1963 has been a banner year for West Virginia. We have spread throughout the land an optimistic and accurate picture of our progress, our people, our purpose. It is a genuine privilege to introduce a West Virginian who shares with us the satisfaction derived from a year of cooperative achievement, and our dedication to the goal of a brighter tomorrow.

Ladies and gentlemen, I present Dr. Festus P. Summers.

WEST VIRGINIA: ITS PROBLEMS AND PROGRESS, 1863–1963

(Address by Dr. Festus P. Summers, professor of history at West Virginia University, at opening of Library of Congress exhibit honoring West Virginia's 100th year of statehood, delivered at Coolidge Auditorium, Library of Congress, Dec. 12, 1963)

It is an honor and a privilege to be here to join in this observance of our State's birth. I bring greetings from the West Virginia Centennial Commission and appreciation from all West Virginians who are indeed grateful to the Library of Congress for the magnificent exhibition on display in the halls outside.

In their behalf I wish particularly to thank Mr. Mumford, Mr. Rogers, and Mr. Sanborn and their associates who have brought this facet of our heritage so clearly into focus. We have employed both the usual and the unusual in celebrating our first important birthday but we have mounted no exhibit as comprehensive and representative as this. It enables us to write the last chapter of our centennial with a sense of climax.

Geographically, as historically, West Virginia defies easy classification. It is not wholly southern; for the northern Panhandle juts northward almost 64 miles from the Mason-Dixon line. It is not entirely northern; since Welch in McDowell County is in the latitude of Richmond. Certainly it is not all western; for its eastern counties lie within the Washington metropolitan area and provide this city with much of its water. Nor is it entirely in the Ohio River Basin. The Potomac River rises in West Virginia and flows eastward between our State and Maryland until it meets the Shenandoah at Harpers Ferry.

An important source of water supply for others, yet with water problems of its own; with abundant mineral resources and bright industrial prospects, although without large cities; and with a mean altitude of 1,500 feet—the highest of any State east of the Mississippi—West Virginia has been called a Rocky Mountain State set down in the East. However, both in size and in population, West Virginia is relatively small.

What a magnificent State it would have been had the Continental Congress established Westsylvania as people west of the Alleghenies demanded during the Revolution. Extending from the Allegheny River to the Kentucky, from the Allegheny Mountains to the Ohio River, and including southwest Pennsylvania and eastern Kentucky, Point Pleasant would perhaps have been our capital. And, I might add, we would have solved a perennial problem: Our universities could recruit their football teams without leaving the State.

We must take off our hats to West Virginia. It is the only State in the Union, Will Rogers said, where when one gets tired he can lean against it and rest. Go to West Virginia that you may climb the highest hill and bow before "Almighty God," said a Philadelphia visitor in 1864. John Brown spoke with a sense of finality when he last surveyed the West Virginia scene in 1859: "This is a beautiful country." Rutherford B. Hayes who spent 3 of his 4 Civil War years campaigning there became so entranced with the hills, mountains, and valleys that he begged his wife not to worry. "I never enjoyed any business or mode of life as much as I do this," he said. "I really feel badly when I think of several of my intimate friends who are compelled to stay at home. These marches and campaigns in the hills of West Virginia will always be among the pleasantest things I can remember."

West Virginia became the 35th State of the Union on June 20, 1863, nearly 2 weeks before the battle of Gettysburg. The creation of the Mountain State was the culmination of more than a half century of sectional conflict which had kept eastern and western Virginia divided almost as unalterably as had the physical barrier of the mountains between them. Like most of its streams, the trans-Allegheny was socially and economically, though not historically and politically, oriented toward the West. An adequate system of internal improvements linking East and West might have counterbalanced divisions stemming from geography, but such improvements the Virginia government had failed to provide.

Yet, it must be remembered that in 1861 when Virginians had to decide whether their loyalty was to be to the State or to the Nation, at least 19,000 votes were cast in present West Virginia for the Ordinance of Secession as opposed to 34,000 against it; and at the outbreak of hostilities most of the men in the southwestern counties of Virginia as well as impressive minorities in the northwestern were ready to take up arms in defense of the Commonwealth.

From 7,000 to 10,000 West Virginians served in the Confederate Army, including some of note. When our friendly neighbors and kinsmen, the Virginians, challenge our claim to Stonewall Jackson, who was born and lived to manhood in western Virginia, prior to division, we simply ask by what formula they claim Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Marshall, and Monroe. The famous "Stonewall Brigade" numbered 12 companies of West Virginians, the 31st and 36th Virginia regiments mustered 9 and 6 companies of West Virginians, respectively, while the 22d Virginia regiment, commanded by Col. George H. Patton of Charleston, was composed entirely of West Virginians.

Our State supplied 26 regiments, or 32,000 men, to the Union Cause, only a few hundred of whom were draftees and substitutes. Union death casualties among West Virginians exceeded 3,000.

Douglas Southall Freeman said that if a Virginia ferryman rowed you across a river after the Civil War he would be sure to talk about three things before reaching the opposite bank: The bravery of the southern soldier, the beauty of southern women, and the legality of secession. I am sure that if you rode back with him he would belabor you with the duplicity of Lincoln, the inhumanity of Sheridan, and the unconstitutionality of the formation of West Virginia.

Everyone knows that the 35th State, like the first 13, and Texas, is a child of revolution and of civil war. Those who laid the groundwork for its statehood in the Second Wheeling Convention confirmed this when they paraphrased the Declaration of Independence while writing "An Address to the People of Virginia," adopted June 17, 1861. On that occasion too, a member recalled that this day was the anniversary of Bunker Hill; another that there were 56 members present—the identical number who signed the Constitution of the United States; still another rejoiced that June 17 was the anniversary of the gathering of the états-général which began the French Revolution.

West Virginia profited from the troubled course of events. We cannot celebrate the birth of the New Dominion without remembering the ordeal of the Old; for Virginia's extremity became West Virginia's opportunity.

It is well known how chaos followed secession and how revolution followed chaos throughout Virginia; how State forces occupied Harpers Ferry and the Gosport Navy Yard; how the Virginia convention signed a military alliance with the Confederacy and dispatched Congressmen and Senators to the Confederate capital at Montgomery—all before the voters had balloted on the secession ordinance.

Unionists opposed the secession of Virginia to no avail. Railroads, geography, differing racial strains, social deviations, and economic divergence, conspired to alienate the Trans-Allegheny area from the South. The rift between east and west was as old as the hills that separated them. And situated between the scissor-blade States of Pennsylvania and Ohio the people of the Trans-Allegheny were in no position to support the Confederacy even had they wished to do so.

Yet had the Civil War ended in a few months as Lincoln hoped, there would have been no West Virginia. Because even as the war continued our people had to await the darkest hour of the Union for the green light of statehood. For the United States sponsored the restored Government in order to return Virginia to the Union, not to dismember her.

President Lincoln entered the West Virginia picture earlier than most people suppose. We had cherished a tradition that Abraham Lincoln's mother was born in our State, but, unfortunately the Nancy Hanks Commission, appointed by the State legislature and given $1,500 to investigate facts and erect a proper marker, had scarcely spent the money when the Lincoln National Life Foundation reported that there was not one shred of evidence of documentary nature which implied "that Nancy Hanks ever lived within several hundred miles of the spot."

Whatever the truth about the mother, the son showed a keen interest in West Virginia almost from the day he first set foot in the White House. Lincoln faced two sizable problems before his Presidency was 6 weeks old: The security of Washington and the restoration of the Virginia government.

Present West Virginia held the key to the defense of east-west communications and played a vital role in the defense of Washington. Especially strategic was the Trans-Allegheny which looked out upon 300 miles of the Ohio River, with the panhandle counties reaching north to the latitude of industrial Pittsburgh and within 70 miles of Lake Erie.

Thus did this northernmost salient of the projected Confederacy become a threat to the loyal States of Ohio and Pennsylvania and a peril to the corridor which united east and west. Consequently, while General Scott pondered the deployment downstream of Union forces at Cincinnati, General McClellan gave priority to events along the upper Ohio; for on June 1, 1861, his forces occupied the strategic rail junction at Grafton. Six weeks later at Rich Mountain, McClellan fought and won the first battle with major results after Fort Sumter. For his campaign ironed out the threatening saillient and opened the important east-west trunk line B. & O. from the Ohio to the Potomac. And McClellan's western Virginia campaign settled summarily the political destiny of Trans-Allegheny Virginia, making possible the use of that area as the testing ground for Lincoln's reconstruction policy.

Many students of Civil War history, including some who should know better, contend that the restored government of Virginia was a straw government erected by a minority to form a new State. That it did become the agency for the creation of West Virginia no one will deny. Obviously these students overlook national policy as well as military considerations.

Students of the question fall deeper into error as they argue that Lincoln encouraged the West Virginia movement, and promoted it, while ignoring irregularities which accompanied some of the steps. On the contrary, the President was deeply troubled by the new-State movement and signed the statehood bill relucantly. West Virginia was created by West Virginians who exploited first a State emergency, then a national emergency; so to say "Virginia's extremity was West Virginia's opportunity" is to state only a half-truth.

When the statehood bill came up for passage in the House in December 1862, Mr. Lincoln's Secretary of the Navy wrote gloomily, saying, "To me the division of Virginia at this time looks like a step toward a division of the Union, a general breakup." And Lincoln's close friend Senator Orville H. Browning who carried the enrolled bill to the White House found the President distressed, and wishing he had more time to consider the measure. Browning supplied him with a copy of the bill and held the original almost a week.

Lincoln had remained cool toward the new-State movement beyond the Alleghenies, one can well believe, because it embarrassed his reconstruction plans; and because he had doubts as to its constitutionality. Perhaps he, too, feared the psychological effects which troubled Navy Secretary Welles. He had also to consider that the conservative Republicans and practically all of the Democrats, opposed the dismemberment of Virginia.

West Virginia leaders meanwhile bombarded him from Wheeling with telegrams and letters, and Representatives Blair and Brown and Senator Willey called frequently at the White House. Talleyrand Senator John S. Carlile, also called, but to insist upon a veto.

Carlile told this story.

"Now, Mr. President," said Carlile, "You must veto that bill."

"Well, I'll tell you what I'll do," Lincoln replied. "I'll split the difference and say nothing about it."

Archibald W. Campbell, editor of the Wheeling Intelligencer as well as postmaster at Wheeling and Presidential troubleshooter, wrote that secessionists waited behind every bush to exploit a veto—that a veto would be the death warrant of Unionism in West Virginia. Finally loyal Virginia Gov. Francis H. Pierpont clinched the argument, Lincoln later told him, when he convinced the President that the issue was political, not constitutional.

Abraham Lincoln signed the West Virginia bill late in the evening of December 31, 1862. He stated his reasons; but did he tell all?

The bill reached Lincoln in the darkest night of the war. In his memorable message to Congress at the beginning of December he had spoken great truth in those timeless lines which began, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present;" and, "The occasion is piled high with difficulty."

Threatened defection of the Radical Republicans, the ever present danger of foreign recognition of the Confederacy, the defeat of his compensated emancipation policy, congressional meddling in the conduct of the war, and triumph of the Democrats in the congressional elections—each had cast its shadow. Now, at mid-December, the thin thread on which the Union seemed to depend had all but snapped under the weight of battle and defeat at Fredericksburg.

Navy Secretary Welles believed that a determining factor in the President's decision was his desire to placate the radicals who were behind the West Virginia movement and gunning for Cabinet members Seward and Stanton. Though he put it obliquely, Welles suspected a deal had been made after Fredericksburg which included an understanding that Lincoln could have his Cabinet if the radicals got their West Virginia.

Could it then have been Fredericksburg, not Rich Mountain, not McClellan or Pierpont, or Lincoln, but Lee who made West Virginia?

Whatever the considerations, the President signed the birth certificate of the 16th slave State and became party to a house divided after all. But happily this new State was a slave State with a difference—its constitution would contain a provision for gradual emancipation.

The truly remarkable fact about the Civil War in West Virginia was that there where wounds penetrated deepest they were among the first to heal. By the mid-eighties Blue and Gray held reunions together while Confederate and Union veterans were saying with Representative William L. Wilson of the second district, himself a Southern cavalryman, that "greater than the preservation of the Union was the extinction of slavery and greater than the extinction of slavery was the annihilation of every ground, occasion, or excuse for further sectional division or sectional hate."

It was not sectionalism or sectional hatred but a national contagion which retarded the growth of our infant State during its impressionable years. After the ordeal of reconstruction came that orgy of exploitation which swept through the mining, petroleum, and timber States under the guise of development. Whatever else may be said, West Virginia must have been a hardy child indeed to survive those first rugged years.

For a generation our State wrote the most shameful chapter of its history as it sat on the sidelines, with others to be sure, while avarice and greed took their toll of its timber, coal, oil, and gas resources. For a generation West Virginia kept its eggs in the basket of the extractive industries and its economy in a condition that the more prosperity the State enjoyed the poorer it became. Add to this exploitation of labor, low-tax policies of State and local governments, indifference to health, welfare, and educational programs, mix well with West Virginia's "peculiar brand of politics" of that day, and we have a recipe for prodigality.

In an address delivered at the White House Conference of Governors in 1908, State Geologist I. C. White made a special point of the criminal waste of natural gas in West Virginia—saying that despite the pleading of Governors Atkinson, White and Dawson, "Some unseen power greater than Governors or legislators had thwarted and palsied every effort to save the State and the Nation this priceless heritage of fuel.

"Why was it permitted? Simply because it was nobody's business to stop it, and it was somebody's business not to stop it." Small wonder that the West Virginia Conservation Commission wrote its own death warrant the following year when it asked "Whose gas was it?" and answered that it "belonged to the people of this generation and those which are to follow."

Some say all this was for the good of the country because it prepared the Nation for great responsibilities ahead. If so, West Virginia has a strong claim upon the country's gratitude, if not its bounty. In any event it was this great waste of natural resources, coupled with the successful evasion of taxes by many engaged in the extractive industries which led Governor Dawson to suggest in

1907 that the State hold—not sell—its delinquent and escheated lands; which inspired Senator Martine of New Jersey in 1913 to suggest nationalization of the coal industry; which prompted Governor Glasscock to urge in 1911 the collection of a depletion tax on natural gas, to be earmarked for roads and schools.

But if we passed the peak of our oil production after 1900, of lumber after 1909, and of natural gas after 1917, these industries did continue to prosper, and they prosper today. West Virginia became the Nation's coal bin when it gained first place among the States in bituminous production in 1927, a position it has held unchallenged since 1942. And West Virginia will hold that position for a long time. Although our collieries wasted 5 billion short tons in a hundred years while marketing 7 billion, 59 billion tons remain to be mined mechanically and another 40 billion that can be utilized by gassification and other processes.

And besides coal—"king of the State's economy, indicator of its prosperity and the object of its most intensive research"—the State has oil and gas, extensive deposits of salt brine, limestone, sandstone, glass sands, and nonrefractory clays. The extractive and related industries dot the slopes and valleys with booms, tipples, and derricks, while industrial plants, too, continue to appear in ever increasing size and complexity.

Even though ghost towns and deep gashes from strip-mining operations now keep watch in silent valleys and on once verdant hillsides, West Virginia still has many unspoiled vistas left. "The passage of the Potomac through the Blue Ridge is, perhaps, one of the most stupendous scenes in nature," quite "worth a voyage across the Atlantic," wrote Thomas Jefferson. "He might have listed other sights of equal grandeur: The canyons of the Cheat, the New, and the Blackwater Rivers, and the narrow gorge of the South Branch called the Trough; Pinnacle Rock and Seneca Rock; Blackwater Falls; Canaan Valley and Germany Valley; the vast panorama from the summit of East River Mountain. Cranberry Glades in Pocahontas County and Cranesville Pine Swamp in Preston County are botanical wonderlands." Nature lovers come in spring to see our wildflowers and orchards in bloom, many return in summer to climb our mountains and sleep under our stars. Once the playground of the Old South, West Virginia has become a vacation land for all sections.

And there are men to match the mountains. In Berkeley, now Jefferson County, after the Revolution lived three of its generals—Adam Stephen, Horatio Gates, and Charles Lee. Stephen was a native, Gates and Lee residents who had come as people still do when they learn that Shenandoah air is like the lightest of wines. General Washington had been their nemesis and the story goes that once at Lee's house the host lifted his glass and said: "You, Stephen, distinguished yourself by getting drunk when you should have been sober, you Gates, were cashiered for advancing when you should have been retreating, while I, your humble servant, covered himself with glory and laurels and was cashiered for retreating when he should have been advancing."

West Virginia has produced rare profiles; for example, Archibald W. Campbell of Wheeling, who displayed great courage as the editor of the only antislavery daily newspaper in Virginia before the Civil War; who won new laurels for his insurgency in the Republican National Convention in 1880 with the memorable words, "I always intend to carry my sovereignty under my hat."

And our State proudly claims another patriot, who stood up when the chips were down—Peter G. Van Winkle—some of the courageous Republican Senators who so nobly sacrificed their political future in defense of President Andrew Johnson in 1868. Alphabetically the last of the recusant seven who voted "Not guilty," he too looked beyond the next election and deserves greater credit than historians accord him.

No figure on the West Virginia political scene has shone brighter than Charles J. Faulkner, Sr., of Martinsburg, U.S. Minister to France, who was marked for arbitrary arrest following his return to Washington in 1861. Without evidence of disloyalty beyond rumor, the Government imprisoned Faulkner without charges, subjected him to indignities, and promised release on condition that he take an oath of allegiance. Faulkner replied to Secretary Seward with words that will live long. "To take the oath which you prescribe," he wrote, "would * * * furnish no evidence of my loyalty. It might be proof of my subserviency and cowardice. * * * Loyalty springs from the heart; it cannot be manufactured by thumbscrews, political tests or prisons."

West Virginia, too, has made its contributions to art, literature, music, science, technology and the rest. We are proud of the heritage which nurtured Pearl Buck and Melville Davisson Post, Eleanor Steber and Phyllis Curtin; William L. Wilson, John Barton Payne and Newton D. Baker; John W. Davis and Dwight W. Morrow; I. C. White, Mike Benedum, and Walter Reuther.

We do not believe it mere coincidence that out of the class of registrants for the Armed Forces on June 5, 1917, West Virginia supplied a higher percentage of fighting men than any State in the Union, 64.7 percent. We do not think it accidental that figures from a recent survey of distinguished college alumni by a national weekly ranked West Virginia University among the leading six State universities. And we think it in true character that West Virginia was among the first of the former slave States to apply fairly the principle of separate but equal in public education. It is fitting also that the State which reared Booker T. Washington should claim the honor of admitting the first Negro to a white law school south of the Mason-Dixon line, be the first to open the doors of its graduate schools to Negro students, and the first virtually to complete integration of its public schools. West Virginia has many things to be proud of, few things she is ashamed of.

West Virginia has been called a paradoxical State. Perhaps it is. It does seem odd that a people who preferred John C. Breckinridge for President in 1860 should close ranks behind Abraham Lincoln in 1861; that the State with perhaps the highest birthrate in the Nation should lead the States in population decline; that a State which stands so high in illegitimacy, ranks so low in juvenile deliquency; that a State born of violence and picturesquely nurtured by feud and industrial warfare can now claim one of the lowest crime rates in the Nation; that West Virginia, a "Protestant State, with a snugly fitting Bible Belt, 'proudly' made it possible for the first Roman Catholic to be elected President," the lamented great President we deeply mourn.

In an address delivered last April at Charleston on the centennial's "Forum of the Future" panel, our then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson expressed his interest and surprise at finding that despite economic trends downward "twice as many persons in West Virginia [were] owning and holding stocks on the New York Stock Exchange" as in his own State of Texas. And he went on to suggest that the discouraging experiences of recent years in certain areas of our economy might justify West Virginians adopting the philosophy of Mr. Dooley who said, "Anyhow, there is always one ray of light ahead—we're sure to have hard times."

West Virginians this year have used their first centennial of statehood to take inventory and to rededicate themselves to unfinished business. As President Johnson said in his Charleston address, their chief problems are not all of their making but are national, even international. And he might well have added just as they were 100 years ago. For, as one of our centennial poets wrote, "Our key has flung a clear circle."

PEACE CORPS—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Dole] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, following House debate on H.R. 9009, it appeared to me some very important questions had not been answered. While there are many, many questions in the minds of Members concerning the real success of the Peace Corps, it may be that my letter to Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver of November 19, 1963, and his reply of December 6 will answer some, and stimulate others. The responses are of vital interest, as we will soon consider the request for funds for fiscal 1964:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., November 19, 1963.

Hon. Sargent Shriver,
Director, Peace Corps,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Shriver: Thank you for forwarding the Second Annual Report to Congress covering Peace Corps operations during fiscal year 1963.

I have questions concerning certain facets of the operation resulting from House debate on H.R. 9009 and study of the hearings on H.R. 8754. The questions are as follows:

1. Section 13(a) provides for payment of experts, consultants or organizations to be compensated at rates not in excess of $75 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business, actual travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses at the applicable rate prescribed in the standardized Government travel regulations. Since the inception of the Peace Corps, how many "experts, consultants or organizations" have been utilized and what amount has been expended? I would appreciate receiving the name of each expert, consultant or organization, the dates of employment and the amount paid to each.

2. What countries in which the Peace Corps now operates, or those now seeking Peace Corps assistance, do not now receive, have received or will receive foreign aid as authorized by the Mutual Security and Assistance Act?

3. On page 16 of the hearings, in response to a question by Congressman Adair, you indicated that as of October 15, 1963, 13 Peace Corps volunteers are now in private industry. May I have the names of these persons, where they are now employed, in what capacity, and what relation, if any, their experience in the Peace Corps contributes to their present employment?

4. Are volunteers classified according to age groups, that is, is information available on how many over 50 years of age serve, how many between the ages of 25 and 30, etc.?

5. Much is said of sacrifices made by volunteers. Are records available indicating what "volunteers" were receiving prior to their enrollment in the Peace Corps and employment prior to enrollment? Is it possible for Peace Corps "volunteers" to take "leave" from their present employment, receive Peace Corps compensation and, at the

same time, continue to receive salaries or benefits from their employers?

6. There has been discussion of "sacrifices" made by staff members of the Peace Corps. I should like information relative to the 50 highest paid staff members indicating their length of service with the Peace Corps, their starting and present salaries, other travel and subsistence allowances, if any. In each instance, would also appreciate information about employment, by whom and where, and salary received prior to Peace Corps employment.

7. On page 31 of the hearings, in answer to a question by Congressman BARRY, you stated, "They would work for the Peace Corps, in a Peace Corps office where we have our headquarters. In Kuala Lumpur, instead of having two American girls there who are secretaries, to whom we pay $5,000 or $6,000 a year, we would have two Peace Corps volunteers."

My question is, are there two American secretaries now in Kuala Lumpur receiving between $5,000 and $6,000 per year, and will they be replaced by Peace Corps volunteers if the legislation is enacted?

8. On page 72 of the hearings, in response to a question by Congressman GROSS, you indicate that in fiscal 1963 the sum of $238,950 was expended for research. The hearings are incomplete and do not list the firms, the work completed in fiscal 1963, and the amount paid to each firm. May I have this information, along with some explanation of what each firm has done?

9. A constituent has inquired whether Peace Corps volunteers and staff members are permitted to purchase foreign-made motor vehicles for use in the country where they serve or for use in this country when they return. Have there been any examples of this, and if so, how many?

Answers to these questions will be appreciated at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

BOB DOLE,
Member of Congress.

PEACE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., December 6, 1963.

Hon. BOB DOLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOLE: This refers to your letter of November 19 in which you raised a number of questions with regard to the Peace Corps.

The answers to each of your questions are included in the attachments.

Thank you for your interest in the Peace Corps. Please let me know if we can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

(1) Attached are two lists of experts and consultants which show those formerly employed and those currently employed by the Peace Corps. Work performed averaged 1 to 3 days per week.

Whenever work was performed away from their homes or regular place of business, they were reimbursed for travel expenses at the applicable rates prescribed in the standardized Government travel regulations.

While information concerning the exact amount paid to each can be prepared, it would be a costly task. We, therefore, hope the attached information will meet your needs.

We have, however, previously furnished substantially the same information with respect to experts or consultants on our rolls as of April 30, 1963. This information appears in hearings before the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 88th Cong., 1st session 500–02 (1963).

Experts and consultants formerly employed

Name	Dates employed		Per diem rate
	From—	To—	
Abram, Morris B	Feb. 28, 1961	Aug. 18, 1961	$75
Albee, George W	Jan. 1, 1963	June 30, 1963	75
Allen, Terrence M	Sept. 11, 1961	Jan. 12, 1962	40
Alvord, Frederick R	June 28, 1961	Aug. 5, 1961	40
Ames, Olivia	May 31, 1962	Dec. 31, 1962	20
Amoss, Harold L	July 16, 1962	Sept. 4, 1962	45
Andrews, Minerva W	Feb. 12, 1962	Aug. 22, 1962	35
Andrews, Thomas G	June 21, 1961	Oct. 3, 1961	55
Antic, Tharon M	Apr. 18, 1962	Nov. 3, 1962	25
Apter, David E	May 21, 1962	Jan. 4, 1963	50
Barber, Wilda W	Apr. 25, 1962	June 30, 1962	20
Bayley, Edwin R	Feb. 24, 1961	Sept. 30, 1961	60
Beek, Phyllis P	Feb. 12, 1962	Feb. 13, 1962	15
Benedict, Russell R	July 6, 1961	Oct. 5, 1961	40
Bigelow, John C	Apr. 18, 1962	June 1, 1962	20
Bingham, Joan S	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 23, 1962	20
Black, Margaret C	Aug. 12, 1926	Oct. 31, 1962	35
Blakeslee, Betty	June 20, 1962	Sept. 14, 1962	25
Boyce, F. Gordon	Mar. 19, 1961	Dec. 16, 1961	70
Brachman, Judith	Apr. 16, 1962	Aug. 30, 1962	20
Brinker, Russell C	Sept. 6, 1961	Jan. 10, 1962	50
Bronfenbrenner, Urie	Sept. 22, 1961	Dec. 9, 1961	50
Brown, Theodore E	June 16, 1961	Sept. 8, 1961	55
Buckingham, John H., Jr	Apr. 26, 1962	Dec. 31, 1962	45
Budd, Elaine	Feb. 12, 1962	June 26, 1962	25
Bulger, Paul G	June 21, 1961	July 30, 1961	75
Burns, Patricia B	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 9, 1962	20
Cabell, Patricia W	Apr. 25, 1962	July 6, 1962	20
Capsas, Cleon W	July 26, 1961	Sept. 16, 1961	40
Carney, Hal	June 17, 1963	Aug. 23, 1963	50
Carliner, Miriam K	Feb. 12, 1962	June 12, 1962	30
Cattell, Jeanne E	do	May 11, 1962	20
Chamberlin, Daniel E	Nov. 26, 1962	Feb. 16, 1963	50
Christensen, James B	May 4, 1961	May 10, 1961	50
Clark, Dale D	Sept. 18, 1961	Jan. 6, 1962	40
Coffin, William S	do	Oct. 31, 1961	50
Cohee, Glenn W	Mar. 28, 1963	June 30, 1963	30
Cohen, Marilyn R	Feb. 19, 1962	Sept. 21, 1962	20
Comitas, Lambros	June 18, 1962	Feb. 16, 1963	45
Cowan, L. Gray	Dec. 7, 1962	do	50
Coy, Grace C	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 15, 1962	50
Cunningham, Nicholas	Mar. 18, 1962	July 15, 1962	25
Curley, Nancy B	Feb. 12, 1962	June 15, 1962	25
Danaceau, Paul	Sept. 1, 1962	do	35
Darley, Kathleen M	Feb. 12, 1962	Aug. 17, 1962	25
Davies, Martha A	Feb. 19, 1962	Mar. 2, 1962	20
Davis, John W	Sept. 18, 1961	Dec. 11, 1961	40
Defreitas, Louis A	Apr. 23, 1962	May 3, 1962	15
Dennis, Lawrence E	July 22, 1962	Sept. 1, 1962	75
Dichter, David	June 1, 1963	Sept. 28, 1963	30
Doran, Margaret T	Jan. 12, 1962	Sept. 1, 1962	45
Doress, Irvin	May 14, 1962	Aug. 31, 1962	30
Dow, Roger	Aug. 16, 1962	Nov. 21, 1962	50
Downs, Richard E	Aug. 14, 1961	Sept. 20, 1961	40
Doyle, Ellamae E	Feb. 12, 1962	Apr. 30, 1962	20
Dugan, Robert D	July 11, 1963	Nov. 13, 1963	55
Easley, John A., Jr	June 4, 1962	Sept. 30, 1962	35
Edelston, Ellen	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 23, 1962	30
Epstein, Lionel C	Nov. 21, 1961	June 30, 1962	50
Ferguson, Daryl E	Feb. 12, 1962	June 15, 1962	20
Ferkiss, Victor C	June 16, 1961	Feb. 24, 1962	40
Finan, John L	May 27, 1963	Sept. 30, 1963	60
Fiske, Donald W	Oct. 23, 1961	Dec. 9, 1961	45
Fletcher, Frank M	May 23, 1963	Sept. 30, 1963	70
Foster, John T	May 28, 1963	Sept. 17, 1963	50
Fotos, John T	June 25, 1962	Sept. 8, 1962	55
Fournier, Virginia W	Feb. 19, 1962	Mar. 2, 1962	20
Fox, Geraldine M	Nov. 2, 1962	Jan. 1, 1963	25
Fox, Sam S	Mar. 31, 1962	Apr. 6, 1962	40
Frankel, Charles L	Feb. 19, 1962	Mar. 2, 1962	$30
Friedman, Burton D	June 13, 1962	Aug. 14, 1962	40
Gentry, George G	Apr. 2, 1962	June 22, 1962	20
Gilbreth, Lucille E	May 22, 1962	June 12, 1962	45
Ginsburg, Edward M	May 20, 1961	Jan. 6, 1962	40
Godwin, Francis W	June 7, 1962	Feb. 16, 1963	70
Gomez, Rosemary	Mar. 12, 1962	Mar. 17, 1962	30
Goodman, George J. W	Feb. 12, 1962	Feb. 14, 1962	75
Goodstein, Leonard D	May 27, 1963	Sept. 30, 1963	70
Gordon, Suzanne N	May 15, 1962	Aug. 31, 1962	40
Gowen, Ruth C	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 16, 1962	20
Grace, Harry A	Feb. 14, 1962	Feb. 15, 1962	50
Gray, Mary S	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 23, 1962	20
Haak, Harold H	do	Feb. 23, 1962	30
Hadl, Robin H	June 4, 1962	Aug. 10, 1962	20
Haram, Mary S	Feb. 12, 1962	June 30, 1962	20
Harlan, Homer C	Sept. 6, 1961	Sept. 28, 1961	50
Harris, Mervin R	Aug. 30, 1961	Dec. 9, 1961	70
Hart, Donn V	June 11, 1962	Sept. 7, 1962	35
Haughton, Ronald W	Oct. 29, 1961	Dec. 29, 1961	65
Hay, Kitty	May 31, 1962	June 30, 1962	30
Heath, Dwight B	May 21, 1962	Mar. 31, 1963	35
Henderson, Dagny	Apr. 18, 1962	June 3, 1962	25
Herman, Caroline B	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 15, 1962	20
Hilderbrandt, Leonard J	June 1, 1961	Sept. 15, 1961	45
Hill, Carl H	Nov. 6, 1961	Jan. 29, 1962	60
Homet, Sarah C	Feb. 12, 1962	Apr. 30, 1962	30
Hoppenfeld, Leonora	do	Mar. 23, 1962	25
Howell, J. Carney	Feb. 19, 1962	Aug. 3, 1962	70
Ingram, Lawrence B	July 11, 1961	Oct. 6, 1961	40
Intermaggio, Jean B	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 23, 1962	30
Jacobson, Eugene H	Sept. 22, 1961	Dec. 9, 1961	50
Jonas, Gilbert	Apr. 13, 1961	Dec. 31, 1961	60
Kaplan, Alma D	Feb. 19, 1962	Mar. 9, 1962	30
Katz, Paul	Apr. 25, 1962	Sept. 29, 1962	15
Katzell, Raymond A	May 27, 1963	Sept. 30, 1963	65
Keegan, Frank L	Mar. 26, 1962	Sept. 5, 1962	55
Kelly, Everett L	Dec. 4, 1961	Nov. 30, 1962	75
Kelsey, Clyde E	Apr. 16, 1962	Aug. 31, 1962	50
Kiehne, Frank C	Sept. 18, 1961	Feb. 18, 1962	40
Kilby, Winifred A	Feb. 12, 1962	Feb. 13, 1962	20
Kittle, George W	Feb. 14, 1962	Aug. 30, 1962	30
Knox, Ellis O	Oct. 4, 1961	Dec. 11, 1961	35
Krader, Lawrence	May 22, 1961	Sept. 15, 1961	50
Kranz, Harry	May 8, 1962	Dec. 11, 1962	45
Lanoue, Fred	Sept. 18, 1961	Sept. 17, 1962	50
Lapp, Royce E	Feb. 19, 1962	Mar. 9, 1962	45
Larson, Donald R	May 16, 1962	May 18, 1962	75
Latsis, Mary J	Feb. 19, 1962	Mar. 2, 1962	30
Layton, Wilbur L	May 23, 1963	Nov. 15, 1963	60
Lee, Marian K	Apr. 2, 1962	June 30, 1962	20
Levy, Jacques M	Feb. 19, 1962	Mar. 2, 1962	30
Levy, Phyllis K	do	do	30
Lewis, Sallie K	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 9, 1962	20
Lichtenstein, Eugene	Jan. 7, 1962	June 30, 1962	55
Livingston, Mary W	Feb. 12, 1962	June 14, 1962	20
Lystad, Robert A	Nov. 5, 1962	Feb. 16, 1963	60
McClain, Maryan	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 9, 1962	20
McDavid, Robert F	Apr. 25, 1962	Sept. 14, 1962	40
McHale, Thomas R	Nov. 12, 1961	Feb. 24, 1962	60
McHam, David O	July 16, 1962	Sept. 7, 1962	30
McHugh, Daniel J	Apr. 26, 1962	June 7, 1962	20
MacEachron, David W	Apr. 3, 1961	June 30, 1961	75
Manning, Bayless A	Mar. 20, 1961	Aug. 18, 1961	75
Marchese, Theodore J	July 13, 1962	Dec. 17, 1962	20
Mason, Vivian C	Apr. 1, 1962	Sept. 1, 1962	40
Mathison, Joseph E	Mar. 28, 1963	June 30, 1963	30
Maynard, Eileen A	Mar. 14, 1962	June 7, 1962	20
Michael, Elizabeth K	July 2, 1962	Aug. 31, 1962	15

Experts and consultants formerly employed—Continued

Name	Dates employed		Per diem rate
	From—	To—	
Miller, Carol L	Jan. 31, 1962	Feb. 5, 1962	$35
Miller, William A., Jr	June 18, 1962	Sept. 30, 1962	50
Miner, Joshua L., III	Aug. 2, 1961	Aug. 1, 1962	40
Mischel, Walter	June 21, 1961	Dec. 9, 1961	55
Mitchell, Jean	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 9, 1962	25
Moseman, Sally	do	Mar. 8, 1962	20
Mulvihill, Grace	do	Sept. 28, 1962	35
Nason, Marshall R	July 17, 1961	Jan. 22, 1962	45
Nemser, Joan C	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 23, 1962	20
Nickols, Marcia	Apr. 25, 1962	Aug. 24, 1962	25
Nielsen, Agnes K	Jan. 6, 1963	Mar. 30, 1963	25
Normile, Richard H	June 20, 1962	Sept. 30, 1962	20
Owens, Esther R	Feb. 12, 1962	June 30, 1962	55
Page, Curtis C	Apr. 26, 1962	Sept. 7, 1962	45
Parker, L. Mayland	June 9, 1963	Sept. 9, 1963	45
Passman, Mary J	Feb. 12, 1962	June 14, 1962	20
Pereira, Wallis	Apr. 16, 1962	Sept. 30, 1962	50
Persell, Vernon R	Aug. 3, 1962	Aug. 30, 1962	50
Peterson, Robert V	Apr. 19, 1962	June 1, 1962	20
Pfanner, David E	May 26, 1962	May 28, 1961	50
Poore, Thomas L	Aug. 27, 1963	Sept. 1, 1963	40
Poston, Richard W	Apr. 3, 1962	July 30, 1962	60
Potvin, Gregg R	May 15, 1961	Dec. 8, 1961	40
Prial, Francis J	Nov. 26, 1962	Apr. 30, 1963	35
Ramsey, Nathalie H	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 13, 1962	20
Reese, Robert C	Feb. 5, 1962	Feb. 11, 1962	40
Rego, John L	Oct. 29, 1961	Dec. 29, 1961	45
Reid, Robert W	Feb. 5, 1962	Feb. 23, 1962	35
Reynolds, Martin R	Dec. 4, 1962	Jan. 2, 1963	65
Roe, Anne	May 27, 1963	Sept. 30, 1963	55
Rogers, Joseph R	Mar. 28, 1962	June 30, 1962	50
Rosandich, Thomas P	Nov. 13, 1962	Dec. 26, 1962	35
Ross, Marise G	Mar. 18, 1962	Apr. 21, 1962	25
Rowe, Thomas A	Feb. 19, 1962	Feb. 27, 1962	40
Russell, Mary W	Feb. 12, 1962	Sept. 28, 1962	20
Salant, Edna G	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 9, 1962	20
Scherman, Rowland	Feb. 3, 1963	Apr. 16, 1963	17
Schiff, Bennett	Feb. 27, 1962	Aug. 30, 1962	40
Schneider, Allan J	July 17, 1962	Oct. 13, 1962	25
Scholten, Robert	July 31, 1961	July 30, 1962	35
Schramm, Wilbur L	Nov. 21, 1961	Feb. 24, 1962	75
Schulte, Anthony M	Mar. 19, 1961	June 30, 1961	$55
Semple, Susan K	Feb. 12, 1962	Nov. 1, 1962	20
Shack, William A	May 18, 1962	Sept. 5, 1962	40
Shaplin, Judson T	Apr. 28, 1961	May 28, 1961	60
Shelly, Carolyn H	Apr. 18, 1962	July 6, 1962	20
Sims, Albert G	Feb. 14, 1961	Aug. 18, 1961	70
Slavin, Sheldon	Apr. 23, 1962	June 29, 1962	15
Sloanaker, John L	Feb. 3, 1963	Sept. 30, 1963	40
Smith, M. Brewster	Sept. 22, 1961	Sept. 21, 1962	06
Snobble, John K	June 27, 1961	Jan. 10, 1962	25
Snowden, Virginia H	Apr. 25, 1962	June 30, 1962	20
Sommers, Cordelia L	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 23, 1962	20
Stein, Morris I	June 19, 1961	May 16, 1962	75
Stoffel, Helena G	Nov. 28, 1962	Jan. 4, 1963	20
Stokley, Dorothy H	Feb. 12, 1962	Oct. 26, 1962	20
Summerskill, John H	Aug. 15, 1961	Jan. 9, 1962	70
Swan, Charles L	Apr. 25, 1961	Dec. 31, 1961	40
Swanson, Myrtle M	Apr. 18, 1962	June 30, 1962	25
Sylvester, Robert P	Feb. 19, 1962	Mar. 9, 1962	30
Textor, Robert B	June 21, 1961	Jan. 19, 1962	55
Thomsen, Raymond	July 1, 1962	Sept. 17, 1962	25
Trager, Frank N	May 7, 1961	May 10, 1961	50
Tucker, Sterling	May 21, 1961	Sept. 22, 1961	40
Venn, Edwin G	Jan. 5, 1963	Jan. 31, 1963	65
Wagley, John R	Feb. 12, 1962	Mar. 6, 1962	40
Walder, Leopold O	July 23, 1962	Sept. 11, 1962	40
Walinsky, Louis J	June 5, 1961	June 6, 1961	50
Wetmore, Reagh C	June 23, 1961	Jan. 10, 1962	40
Wickert, Frederic R	Jan. 1, 1963	Mar. 30, 1963	60
Wilson, Carroll L	Apr. 17, 1961	Aug. 18, 1961	75
Wilson, Patricia A	Apr. 18, 1962	Aug. 31, 1962	20
Wind, Robert E	Dec. 18, 1961	Jan. 30, 1962	30
Wright, James E	Feb. 12, 1962	Sept. 12, 1962	20
Wright, R. Stuart	Jan. 1, 1963	Sept. 13, 1963	45
Young, Charles E	July 5, 1961	Dec. 29, 1961	40
Zack, Arnold M	Oct. 3, 1962	Oct. 31, 1962	50
Zasloff, Joseph J	Aug. 1, 1962	Mar. 31, 1963	45
Ziegler, Jerome M	Sept. 14, 1961	Sept. 30, 1961	60
Zimmerman, Vernon K	Apr. 17, 1962	Aug. 24, 1962	60

Experts and consultants presently employed

Name	Date of appointment	Per diem rate
Arnelle, Hugh J	Sept. 23, 1963	$35
Bender, Wilson R. G	Sept. 21, 1963	70
Boulger, John R	May 6, 1963	60
Brown, Harold W	July 16, 1963	75
Brown, William N	Oct. 28, 1963	45
Caplan, Gerald	June 10, 1963	75
Cohen, Louis D	Jan. 1, 1963	75
Delano, William A	Sept. 14, 1963	75
Derner, Gordon F	Aug. 21, 1963	50
Dimmitt, Dorothy V	Oct. 20, 1963	35
Dudden, Arthur P	June 21, 1963	50
Engar, Keith M	May 13, 1963	50
Gilbert, Gustave	Nov. 11, 1963	75
Goins, John F	July 21, 1963	45
Goldberg, Lewis R	Jan. 1, 1963	45
Hand, Margaret	Sept. 27, 1963	25
Hare, Alexander P	Aug. 8, 1963	55
Hartman, A. Arthur	May 23, 1963	75
Hobbs, Nicholas	Mar. 17, 1963	75
Jourard, Sidney M	Apr. 28, 1963	55
Kap.an, Sylvan J	Apr. 17, 1963	75
Kempton, Beverly E	Sept. 3, 1963	40
Knopf, Irwin J	May 23, 1963	75
Kutash, Samuel B	May 27, 1963	$75
Lapin, Jake	July 16, 1963	43
Leadbetter, Dorothy A	Oct. 27, 1936	40
Leopold, Robert L	Jan. 1, 1963	75
Love, Kennett	Apr. 14, 1963	65
Madsen, Brigham D	Oct. 27, 1963	45
Margolis, Philip M	Aug. 5, 1963	75
Meyers, Tedson J	Nov. 2, 1963	60
Morris, Charles M	May 23, 1963	75
Napoli, John G	Oct. 1, 1963	60
Newland, T. Ernest	do	55
Noffsinger, John S	Sept. 1, 1963	60
Nolan, Richard E	Oct. 1, 1963	50
Rae, Norman T	Nov. 4, 1963	50
Rotter, Julian B	May 27, 1963	70
Sebastian, Lois P	May 23, 1963	40
Standley, Robert R	Nov. 11, 1963	35
Stone, Joics B	June 13, 1963	65
Stripling, Robert O	May 23, 1963	75
Toland, William G	May 21, 1963	45
Verdet, Pierre	July 1, 1963	35
Webb, Wilse B	May 27, 1963	65
Werkman, Sidney L	Nov. 9, 1963	70

Answer to question (2):

The Peace Corps has volunteers in 46 countries listed below:

AFRICA

Cameroon, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Nyasaland, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somali Republic, Tanganyika, Togo, Tunisia.

FAR EAST

Malaysia, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand.

LATIN AMERICA

Bolivia, Brazil, British Honduras, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Panama, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, St. Lucia.

NEAR EAST/SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan, Ceylon, Cyprus, India, Iran, Nepal, Pakistan, Turkey.

All of these countries have received foreign aid as authorized by the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and/or the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. However, the Peace Corps is in no position to predict future decisions of the Agency for International Development.

(3) In response to question 3, the following volunteers are employed in private industry. At the time the director testified, the number was 13. This has grown to 17 as the list below indicates. Judging from all reports, Peace Corps experience has had a valuable effect upon the employment potential of returning volunteers:

1. Richard Dancey served as an engineer in Colombia. He also served as a leader of other Peace Corps volunteers. He is now working as a mining engineer in Colombia. We are attempting to ascertain the name of his employer.

2. Emil Steinkrause served as an electrician and community development worker in Colombia. He returned to a position with the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. He is also working on a degree in business administration at Rutgers University.

3. William Woudenberg served as a construction worker in Colombia. He is now the plant manager of the Pre-Cast Concrete Co., and studying toward a bachelor's degree at Rutgers University.

4. James Coleman taught agriculture in Chile. At last report, he was going to Mexico to work as a farm manager for W. Atlee Rurpee Co.

5. Charles Combs, who served as a technician in Malaya, is working for the General Electric Co. in their production facility at Louisville, Ky. He is hoping to complete his bachelor's degree at the University of Louisville.

6. Earnest Phillips did road survey work in Malaya. He is now working as a survey party chief for Genovase and Associates. He plans to complete his bachelor's degree.

7. Elin Youngdahl taught high school mathematics in Nigeria. She is now working

as a mathematician for the Ratheon Corp. in Massachusetts.

8. Helen Rupp, who served as a teacher in Nigeria, is now working in the public relations department of McCormack and Co. in Baltimore as a secretary to the director.

9. David Schieckele, who served as an English teacher in Nigeria, is now working as a production assistant in the television department of Columbia Broadcasting Co.

10. James McKay, who served as construction worker in west Pakistan, is working as a bricklayer in Hornell, N.Y. He plans to start his college education soon.

11. Martin Hurwitz, who served as a high school and adult education teacher in the Philippines, is now working as an international assignment reporter for United Press International.

12. David King, who taught high school in the Philippines, is now working in the sales department of the American Book Co., in New York. Eventually, he plans to study international relations.

13. Lynne Walker, who served as an elementary school teacher in the Philippines, is now the family section editor of a newspaper in San Luis Obispo, Calif.

14. Thomas Kincaid, who served as a teacher in the Philippines, has accepted a temporary position in the receiving department of the DuPont Corp., in Wilmington, Del. He is applying for a position with USIA but may be drafted.

15. Harvey November, who served as a teacher of technical subjects in the Philippines, is working for the Ampak Electric Constructoin Co., in Brooklyn. He is also taking night courses in education at Brooklyn College.

16. Charles Joyce, who served as an engineer in Tanganyika, is working as an engineer for the consulting firm of C. T. Main. He eventually hopes to enter international engineering.

17. James O'Hara, who served as an engineer in Tanganyika, is working as an engineer for the Jo-Lac Construction Co., Latrobe, Pa.

(4) The following tables give information on age groups of volunteers and trainees:

Volunteers and trainees by area and age, as of Sept. 30, 1963 (ages computed as of June 30, 1963)

Program	Total	20 and under	21 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	51 to 60	61 to 70	71 to 80	Average age
Male:										
Africa:										
In training	252	16	198	28	6	1	1	2		23
Overseas	1,225	47	929	175	56	11	4	3		25
Far East:										
In training	104	4	86	9	4	1				24
Overseas	581	24	417	107	28	2	1	2		25
Latin America:										
In training	505	65	391	29	14	2	4			23
Overseas	1,142	101	760	203	59	11	4	4		25
Northeast and south Asia:										
In training	202	46	130	11	4	4	1	3		24
Overseas	400	30	268	69	22	7	1	2	1	25
Total:										
In training	1,063	131	805	80	28	8	6	5		24
Overseas	3,348	202	2,374	554	165	31	10	11	1	25
Female:										
Africa:										
In training	117	5	96	7	1	2	1	5		25
Overseas	734	21	556	95	30	12	11	8	1	25
Far East:										
In training	65	1	48	8	1	2	2	3		27
Overseas	544	27	406	77	20	5	4	5		24
Latin America:										
In training	369	45	276	24	12	5	6	1		24
Overseas	656	65	428	70	41	18	18	15	1	26
Northeast and south Asia:										
In training	84	5	58	2	4	4	7	3	1	26
Overseas	184	4	125	29	10	6	7	3		25
Total:										
In training	635	56	478	41	18	13	16	12	1	25
Overseas	2,118	117	1,515	271	101	41	40	31	2	25

Volunteers and trainees by area and age as of Sept. 30, 1963 (ages computed as of June 30, 1963)

Program	Total	20 and under	21 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	51 to 60	61 to 70	71 to 80	Average age
Male:										
Africa	1,477	63	1,127	203	62	12	5	5		24.3
Far East	685	28	503	116	32	3	1	2		24.5
Latin America	1,647	166	1,151	232	73	13	8	4		24.3
Near East and south Asia	602	76	398	83	26	11	2	5	1	25.0
Total	4,411	333	3,179	634	193	39	16	16	1	24.3
Female:										
Africa	851	26	652	102	31	14	12	13	1	25.3
Far East	609	28	454	85	21	7	6	8		25.0
Latin America	1,025	110	704	94	53	23	24	16	1	25.5
Near East and south Asia	268	9	183	31	14	10	14	6	1	27.3
Total	2,753	173	1,993	312	119	54	56	43	3	25.5
Grand total	7,164	506	5,172	946	312	93	72	59	4	24.9

Male volunteers and trainees by program and age as of Sept. 30, 1963 (ages computed as of June 30, 1963)

Program	Total	20 and under	21 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	51 to 60	61 to 70	71 to 80	Average age
AFRICA										
Cameroon 62-01-07	18	1	16	1						23
Cameroon 63-01-06	5		5							22
Cameroon 63-01-06	1		1							23
Cameroon 63-02-07	31		24	4	3					24
Ethiopia 62-01-07	181		143	26	7	4	1			25
Ethiopia 63-01-06	85		67	9	8		1			24
Ethiopia 63-01-06	1		1							22
Gabon 62-01-11	38	10	23	3	1		1			23
Gabon 63-01-06	4		3	1						23
Gabon 63-01-06	1		1							22
Gabon 63-02-08	27	8	13	3	3					23
Ghana 61-01-07	0									
Ghana 62-01-06	41	1	32	6	2					24
Ghana 63-01-02	17		11	6						23
Ghana 63-02-06	23		22		1					24

Male volunteers and trainees by program and age as of Sept. 30, 1963 (ages computed as of June 30, 1963)—Continued

Program	Total	20 and under	21 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	51 to 60	61 to 70	71 to 80	Average age
AFRICA—continued										
Ghana 63-02-05	1		1							23
Ghana 63-03-07	12		9	3						25
Guinea 63-01-07	29	7	22							21
Guinea 63-02-07	8		8							22
Ivory Coast 62-01-06	16		14	1		1				25
Ivory Coast 62-02-10	6		6							24
Ivory Coast 63-01-06	6		6							22
Ivory Coast 63-01-06	2		2							23
Liberia 62-01-06	48		37	5	5			1		25
Liberia 63-01-02	18	2	14	1	1					23
Liberia 63-02-06	94	1	85	6	2					23
Liberia 63-02-06	2		2							24
Morocco 62-01-10	39	10	24	5						22
Morocco 63-01-06	35	2	31	1		1				23
Morocco 63-01-06	3		2	1						23
Niger 62-01-06	6		6							25
Niger 62-02-10	9	3	5							22
Nigeria 61-01-07	10		5	4	1					26
Nigeria 61-02-09	1		1							25
Nigeria 61-03-09	22		12	9	1					26
Nigeria 62-01-06	43		35	4	4					24
Nigeria 62-02-09	75	1	56	15	3					24
Nigeria 63-01-06	84		72	9	3					24
Nigeria 63-01-06	6		4	2						24
Nigeria 63-02-09	46		40	4		1		1		25
Nyasaland 62-01-10	25		20	5						24
Nyasaland 63-01-06	2		1	1						27
Nyasaland 63-02-09	56		48	6	1			1		24
Senegal 62-01-06	2		2							23
Senegal 62-02-10	28	6	15	4	3					24
Senegal 63-01-06	22	6	15	1						22
Senegal 63-01-06	2		2							23
Sierra Leone 62-01-06	32		29	2	1					24
Sierra Leone 62-02-07	22	3	15	3	1					24
Sierra Leone 63-01-06	32		24	7		1				24
Somali Republic 62-01-04	24		10	12	1	1				27
Tanganyika 62-01-06	0									
Tanganyika 63-01-08	55	1	42	9	2		1			24
Togo 62-01-06	11	1	5	1	2	2				29
Togo 62-02-07	8		2	4	2					29
Tunisia 62-01-04	18		7	7	3			1		29
Tunisia 62-02-06	31		20	9		1	1			27
Tunisia 63-01-02	13		9	2	1			1		27
Total.										
In training	252	16	198	28	6	1	1	2		23
Overseas	1,225	47	929	175	56	11	4	3		25
Grand total, Africa	1,477	63	1,127	203	62	12	5	5		24.3
FAR EAST										
Indonesia 63-01-02	15		13	1	1					24
Indonesia 63-02-09	16		14	2						23
Malaya 61-01-10	11		7	3		1				27
Malaya 62-01-02	13		2	9	2					28
Malaya 62-02-07	34	1	18	9	4		1	1		28
Malaya 63-01-02	26	1	17	3	4			1		26
Malaya 63-02-09	43	1	35	5	2					24
Sabah/Sarawak 62-01-06	38	7	22	7	1	1				23
Sabah/Sarawak 63-01-02	20		15	4	1					24
Philippines 61-01-07	3		3							24
Philippines 61-02-08	4		3	1						25
Philippines 61-03-12	25		17	7	1					25
Philippines 62-01-03	31		22	7	2					25
Philippines 62-02-06	89	4	69	14	2					24
Philippines 62-03-09	38	2	29	6	1					23
Philippines 62-04-11	23	3	18	2						23
Philippines 63-01-06	31	2	23	6						23
Philippines 63-01-06	2		1	1						24
Philippines 63-02-06	36		33	1	2					24
Philippines 63-02-06	8		7			1				26
Thailand 61-01-10	24		9	12	3					28
Thailand 62-01-06	30	3	21	5	1					23
Thailand 62-02-11	20		17	3						24
Thailand 63-01-02	17	1	14	2						23
Thailand 63-02-02	26		20	4	2					24
Thailand 63-03-06	27		25	1	1					23
Thailand 63-03-06	3		3							22
Thailand 63-04-09	32	3	26	1	2					23
Total:										
In training	104	4	86	9	4	1				24
Overseas	581	24	417	107	28	2	1	2		25
Grand total, Far East	685	28	503	116	32	3	1	2		24.5
LATIN AMERICA										
Bolivia 62-01-03	11		3	6	2					27
Bolivia 62-02-06	28	6	16	3	2		1			24
Bolivia 62-03-10	23	5	12	5	1					23
Bolivia 63-01-06	11		8	2	1					24
Bolivia 63-02-09	15		13	1	1					23
Bolivia 63-03-09	3		2		1					26
Brazil 62-01-02	25	3	16	4	2					24
Brazil 62-02-07	44	8	27	6	2			1		24
Brazil 63-01-03	29	6	19	3	1					23
Brazil 63-02-05	0									
Brazil 63-03-07	19	6	12		1					22
Brazil 63-04-08	21	9	12							20
British Honduras 62-01-06	15		9	1	3	1	1			30
Chile 61-01-07	1		1							25
Chile 62-01-04	4		2	1		1				29
Chile 62-02-07	17	1	12	4						24
Chile 63-01-06	33	6	26	1						22

Male volunteers and trainees by program and age as of Sept. 30, 1963 (ages computed as of June 30, 1963)—Continued

Program	Total	20 and under	21 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	51 to 60	61 to 70	71 to 80	Average age
LATIN AMERICA—continued										
Colombia 61-01-06	2		2							23
Colombia 62-01-02	31		23	4	4					25
Colombia 62-02-07	30	3	21	5	1					24
Colombia 62-03-10	42		31	8	3					25
Colombia 63-01-02	39	6	26	7						24
Colombia 63-02-02	25		19	6						24
Colombia 63-03-04	23		21	1	1					23
Colombia 63-04-06	58	4	51	2		1				22
Colombia 63-04-06	9	1	8							22
Colombia 63-05-07	0									
Colombia 63-06-08	43	11	30	1	1					22
Colombia 63-07-09	26		25	1						22
Colombia 63-08-09	25	3	21		1					22
Costa Rica 62-01-10	12		10	2						24
Costa Rica 63-01-06	19		18	1						23
Dominican Republic 62-01-03	19		11	7	1					25
Dominican Republic 62-02-07	31	6	19	4	1			1		23
Dominican Republic 62-03-09	24	3	15	5	1					24
Dominican Republic 62-04-10	22		13	8	1					27
Dominican Republic 62-05-11	28	2	17	6	3					25
Dominican Republic 63-01-06	9	2	7							22
Dominican Republic 63-01-06	1			1						26
Dominican Republic 63-02-07	36	1	30	4	1					24
Ecuador 62-01-03	31	3	15	9	3		1			26
Ecuador 62-02-07	67	8	45	8	6					24
Ecuador 63-01-06	30	7	19	3	1					23
Ecuador 63-02-07	10	1	8	1						23
Ecuador 63-03-07	63	5	53	4	1					22
Ecuador 63-04-08	32		27	3	2					23
Ecuador 63-05-09	7	1	3	2		1				27
El Salvador 62-01-01	17		10	7						25
El Salvador 63-01-06	13		11	1	1					23
Guatemala 62-01-11	17	6	10				1			23
Guatemala 63-01-06	33	9	19	5						22
Guatemala	2		2							22
Guatemala 63-02-08	30	2	26	1			1			25
Honduras 62-01-06	5		1	4						27
Honduras 63-01-08	30	7	18		2	1	2			26
Jamaica 63-01-04	19		10	3	4	2				28
Jamaica 63-01-02	8	1	5	2						23
Jamaica 63-02-07	16		15		1					23
Panama 62-01-11	12		8	4						25
Panama 63-01-02	11	2	8	1						22
Panama 63-02-07	24	4	19				1			24
Peru 62-01-03	7		3	3		1				29
Peru 62-02-04	20	1	6	9	3	1				28
Peru 62-03-06	42	3	26	8	2	1		2		27
Peru 62-04-07	30	1	24	4	1					24
Peru 63-01-01	19		12	4	3					26
Peru 63-02-02	16		10	5	1					26
Peru 63-03-02	29	7	16	5		1				23
Peru 63-04-06	12		11			1				25
Peru 63-05-06	14		13	1						23
Peru 63-05-06	1		1							23
Peru 63-06-06	15	1	9	4		1				26
Peru 63-07-09	4		2	2						25
Peru 63-08-09	15	1	9	4	1					25
St. Lucia 61-01-08	1			1						27
St. Lucia 63-01-06	8		7		1					25
Uruguay 63-01-06	7	1	5	1						22
Uruguay 63-01-06	3		3							21
Venezuela 62-01-04	17		8	7	2					26
Venezuela 62-02-05	18	3	13	1	1					23
Venezuela 62-03-07	5		2	3						25
Venezuela 62-04-09	13		10	2	1					24
Venezuela 63-01-07	14		14							22
Venezuela 63-01-07	7		7							23
Total:										
In training	505	65	391	29	14	2	4			23
Overseas	1,142	101	760	203	59	11	4	4		25
Grand total, Latin America	1,647	166	1,151	232	73	13	8	4		24.3
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA										
Afghanistan 62-01-06	3		1	2						26
Afghanistan 63-01-03	17	1	10	4	1			1		27
Ceylon 62-01-06	23	5	14	3	1					23
Cyprus 62-01-06	22	1	14	4	2	1				25
India 61-01-10	24	1	11	10	1	1				26
India 62-01-06	38	5	20	7	4	2				26
India 63-01-01	31	2	19	4	4	1		1		27
India 63-02-06	14		11	2	1					24
India 63-03-09	46	12	29	3		1		1		23
Iran 62-01-06	33	3	25	4	1					23
Iran 63-01-06	6		6							24
Nepal 62-01-06	50	4	36	10						23
Nepal 63-01-06	40	2	35	3						22
Pakistan 61-02-08	0									
Pakistan 62-01-07	37	3	23	7	3				1	26
Pakistan 62-02-10	7		5	1	1					25
Pakistan 63-01-02	19	4	9	3		2	1			27
Pakistan 63-02-06	14		10	2	2					25
Pakistan 63-03-06	55	12	37	2	1	3				24
Pakistan 63-04-09	55	20	24	6	2		1	2		24
Turkey 62-01-06	26	1	21	3	1					24
Turkey 63-01-06	36		33	3						23
Turkey 63-01-06	3		3							22
Turkey 63-02-07	3		2		1					29
Total:										
In training	202	46	130	14	4	4	1	3		24
Overseas	400	30	268	69	22	7	1	2	1	24
Grand total, Near East and south Asia	602	76	398	83	26	11	2	5		25

Female volunteers and trainees by program and age as of Sept. 30, 1963 (ages computed as of June 30, 1963)

Program	Total	20 and under	21 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	51 to 60	61 to 70	71 to 80	Average age
AFRICA										
Cameroon 62-01-07	20		17	2	1					24
Cameroon 63-01-06	5		5							22
Cameroon 63-02-07	11		7	2	1	1				26
Ethiopia 62-01-07	89		66	12	2	4	2	3		27
Ethiopia 63-01-06	60	1	45	6	2	2	2	2		27
Gabon 62-01-11	0									
Gabon 63-01-06	13	3	10							21
Gabon 63-01-06	1		1							22
Gabon 63-02-08	0									
Ghana 61-01-07	1			1						26
Ghana 62-01-06	19		18	1						23
Ghana 63-01-02	2		1				1			41
Ghana 63-02-06	25	1	22		1		1			23
Ghana 63-03-07	0									
Guinea 63-01-07	8	2	6							21
Guinea 63-02-07	22	3	19							21
Ivory Coast 62-01-06	14	1	10	2				1		26
Ivory Coast 62-02-10	7	2	2	3						24
Ivory Coast 63-01-06	7	1	6							22
Ivory Coast 63-01-06	3		3							23
Liberia 62-01-06	35	1	25	7	2					24
Liberia 63-01-02	26	4	17	3			1	1		26
Liberia 63-02-06	62	5	49	8						22
Liberia 63-02-06	2		2							24
Morocco 62-01-10	15		15							23
Morocco 63-01-06	16	1	15							22
Morocco 63-01-06	2		2							22
Niger 62-01-06	0									
Niger 62-02-10	0									
Nigeria 61-01-07	5		4	1						25
Nigeria 61-02-09	2		1	1						27
Nigeria 61-03-09	9		4	2	2	1				29
Nigeria 62-01-06	33		27	3	2		1			25
Nigeria 62-02-09	34		30	2	2					24
Nigeria 63-01-06	65	1	53	6	2	1	1		1	24
Nigeria 63-01-06	2		2							23
Nigeria 63-02-09	27		23	2	1			1		24
Nyasaland 62-01-10	16		13	2			1			25
Nyasaland 63-01-06	1			1						26
Nyasaland 63-02-09	12		4	3		1		4		38
Senegal 62-01-10	1		1							24
Senegal 62-02-10	0									
Senegal 63-01-06	12		10		2					25
Sierra Leone 62-01-06	17		13	2	1		1			26
Sierra Leone 62-02-07	8		5	2	1					26
Sierra Leone 63-01-06	22		20		1			1		25
Somali Republic 62-01-04	9		5	3		1				27
Tanganyika 62-01-06	22		13	5	3	1				27
Tanganyika 63-01-08	38		34	2		1	1			24
Togo 62-01-06	11		9	2						23
Togo 62-02-07	9		2	6		1				28
Tunisia 62-01-04	0									
Tunisia 62-02-06	7		5	1	1					25
Tunisia 63-01-02	24		11	9	4					27
Total:										
In training	117	5	96	7	1	2	1	5		25
Overseas	734	21	556	95	30	12	11	8	1	25
Grand total, Africa	851	26	652	102	31	14	12	13	1	25.3
FAR EAST										
Indonesia 63-01-02	2		1		1					27
Indonesia 63-02-09	3		3							22
Malaya 61-01-10	19		9	8	2					27
Malaya 62-01-02	16		7	4	4			1		29
Malaya 62-02-07	11		8	1		1	1			29
Malaya 63-01-02	33		21	7	2		1	2		28
Malaya 63-02-09	55	1	38	8	1	2	2	3		28
Sabah/Sarawak 62-01-06	16	2	9	3	2					25
Sabah/Sarawak 63-01-02	14	1	7	3	2	1				27
Philippines 61-01-07	6		6							23
Philippines 61-02-08	5		5							24
Philippines 61-03-12	11		8	3						24
Philippines 62-01-03	18		13	5						25
Philippines 62-02-06	121	10	95	11	1	1	2	1		26
Philippines 62-03-09	34	2	27	4	1					23
Philippines 62-04-11	37	4	29	3				1		24
Philippines 63-01-06	59	5	51	2	1					21
Philippines 63-01-06	1		1							22
Philippines 63-02-06	22		20	2						23
Philippines 63-02-06	1		1							25
Thailand 61-01-10	10		7	2	1					25
Thailand 62-01-06	18		11	6		1				25
Thailand 62-02-11	21		17	3		1				24
Thailand 63-01-02	4		2	1	1					26
Thailand 63-02-02	34	1	24	7	2					24
Thailand 63-03-06	33	2	29	2						22
Thailand 63-04-09	5		5							22
Total:										
In training	65	1	48	8	1	2	2	3		27
Overseas	544	27	406	77	20	5	4	5		24
Grand total, Far East	609	28	454	85	21	7	6	8		25.0

Female volunteers and trainees by program and age as of Sept. 30, 1963 (ages computed as of June 30, 1963)—Continued

Program	Total	20 and under	21 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	51 to 60	61 to 70	71 to 80	Average age
LATIN AMERICA										
Bolivia 62-01-03	23	1	15	2	1	2	1	1		28
Bolivia 62-02-06	6		4		2					23
Bolivia 62-03-10	17		11	5	1					25
Bolivia 63-01-06	4		3		1					25
Bolivia 63-02-09	21	2	15	2	1		1			25
Bolivia 63-03-09	2		1	1						25
Brazil 62-01-01	14	4	8	2						23
Brazil 62-02-07	36	5	21	4	2	2	1		1	26
Brazil 63-01-03	9	3	6							22
Brazil 63-02-05	20	4	14	2						22
Brazil 63-03-07	12	3	9							21
Brazil 63-04-08	20	7	12	1						21
British Honduras 62-01-06	15		6	4	1	2	2			32
Chile 61-01-07	1			1						26
Chile 62-01-04	13		7	2	4					28
Chile 62-02-07	20		16	2			2			27
Chile 63-01-06	29	5	22	1	1					22
Colombia 61-01-06	0									
Colombia 62-01-02	0									
Colombia 62-02-07	39	9	25	3	1		1			22
Colombia 62-03-10	9		7	1	1					24
Colombia 63-01-02	0									
Colombia 63-02-02	0									
Colombia 63-03-04	0									
Colombia 63-04-06	28	6	22							21
Colombia 63-04-06	8	2	6							22
Colombia 63-05-07	55	13	41			1				22
Colombia 63-06-08	7	1	6							22
Colombia 63-07-09	34		30	2	1		1			23
Colombia 63-08-09	28		24	4						23
Costa Rica 62-01-10	14		13	1						24
Costa Rica 63-01-06	22	1	21							22
Costa Rica 63-01-06	1		1							22
Dominican Republic 62-01-03	0									
Dominican Republic 62-02-07	6		5					1		29
Dominican Republic 62-03-09	0									
Dominican Republic 62-04-10	3		3							24
Dominican Republic 62-05-11	0									
Dominican Republic 63-01-06	14	1	12	1						23
Dominican Republic 63-01-06	2		1	1						27
Dominican Republic 63-02-07	25	1	18	4	2					24
Ecuador 62-01-03	16	1	8	3	3		1			27
Ecuador 62-02-07	36	9	19	2	4		2			26
Ecuador 63-01-06	7	1	5	1						23
Ecuador 63-02-07	1		1							22
Ecuador 63-03-07	0									
Ecuador 63-04-08	0									
Ecuador 63-05-09	8		7	1						23
El Salvador 62-01-01	4		2	1				1		35
El Salvador 63-01-06	14	1	10	1	1			1		26
Guatemala 62-01-11	8	5	2			1				23
Guatemala 63-01-06	6		4	2						24
Guatemala 63-02-08	40	6	30	2			1	1		24
Honduras 62-01-06	22		12	2	4	1	2	1		31
Honduras 63-01-08	20	1	14		2	2	1			28
Jamaica 62-01-04	10		6	2			1	1		32
Jamaica 63-01-06	1		1							23
Jamaica 63-02-09	20	1	12	2	4	1				27
Panama 62-01-11	6	1	3	2						24
Panama 63-01-02	0									
Panama 63-02-07	7	1	5				1			26
Peru 62-01-03	8			5	1		2			36
Peru 62-02-04	23		14	3	1	1		4		31
Peru 62-03-06	34		21	4	3	1	1	4		30
Peru 62-04-07	19	1	15	2	1					24
Peru 63-01-01	8		3	2	2	1				29
Peru 63-02-02	16		12	4						24
Peru 63-03-02	35	7	21	1	2	3	1			25
Peru 63-04-06	10		9	1						24
Peru 63-05-06	8		7					1		27
Peru 63-05-06	2		1			1				34
Peru 63-06-06	8		6			2				28
Peru 63-07-09	5		4				1			30
Peru 63-08-09	13		10	2	1					24
St. Lucia 61-01-08	1		1							25
St. Lucia 63-01-06	7		4		2	1				29
Uruguay 63-01-06	11	3	6	2						22
Uruguay 63-01-06	2	1	1							22
Venezuela 62-01-04	0									
Venezuela 62-02-05	8	1	5		1	1				27
Venezuela 62-03-07	5		4		1					26
Venezuela 62-04-09	10		8		1		1			27
Venezuela 63-01-07	9	2	6	1						22
Total:										
In training	369	45	276	24	12	5	6	1		24
Overseas	656	65	428	70	41	18	18	15	1	26
Grand total, Latin America	1,025	110	704	94	53	23	24	16	1	25.5
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA										
Afghanistan 62-01-06	6		4	1	1					26
Afghanistan 63-01-03	9		7		1		1			28
Ceylon 62-01-06	11		4	3	3	1				28
Cyprus 62-01-06	0									
India 61-01-10	1			1						28
India 62-01-06	11		5	3		1	1	1		33
India 63-01-01	9	1	4	1	1		1	1		32
India 63-02-06	19		16			2	1			25
India 63-02-06	5		5							22
India 63-03-09	11	2	8	1						22
Iran 62-01-06	5		5							23
Iran 63-01-06	1		1							25

Female volunteers and trainees by program and age as of Sept. 30, 1963 (ages computed as of June 30, 1963)—Continued

Program	Total	20 and under	21 to 25	26 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	51 to 60	61 to 70	71 to 80	Average age
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA—continued										
Iran 63-01-06	1		1							25
Nepal 62-01-06	13		8	2	1	1		1		28
Nepal 63-01-06	0									
Pakistan 61-02-08	1			1						27
Pakistan 62-01-07	18		11	5	1	1				26
Pakistan 62-02-10	22		14	5	2		1			26
Pakistan 63-01-02	10	1	6	1			2			29
Pakistan 63-02-06	2		2							23
Pakistan 63-03-06	20	2	15			1	2			27
Pakistan 63-04-09	10		5		1		2	2		38
Turkey 62-01-06	11		9	2						24
Turkey 63-01-06	35	2	29	4						23
Turkey 63-02-07	37	1	24	1	3	3	3	1	1	31
Total:										
In training	84	5	58	2	4	4	7	3	1	29
Overseas	184	4	125	29	10	6	7	3		26
Grand total, Near East and south Asia	268	9	183	31	14	10	14	6	1	27.3

(5) There are no available existing records which present salaries received prior to Peace Corps service.

Some volunteers are able to take leave from their present employer; however, this almost always results in a financial sacrifice. Teachers, for example, do not normally receive service credit on salary schedules for time spent in the Peace Corps. In business and industry, their promotion is delayed. In almost every case, the Peace Corps volunteer loses 2 years toward seniority and retirement credit.

According to figures presented by the College Placement Council, the average student graduating from college today receives between $5,000 and $8,000 in his first job. Thus a comparison between this salary and the compensation received by a Peace Corps volunteer, provides a rough picture of the financial loss incurred through Peace Corps service.

(6) We have attached a list of the 50 highest paid staff members. No special allowances are paid to any. Transportation and subsistence allowances are paid, as required, in accordance with standardized Government travel regulations.

As you can see, 15 of this group accepted lower salaries upon Peace Corps employment and 9 accepted Peace Corps employment at no increase over prior salary received.

It is significant that Peace Corps staff members do not receive post allowances normally accorded American officials who live in difficult, uncomfortable or isolated places. In some places, these allowances amount to a 25 percent bonus over base salary. Consequently, the Peace Corps staff gives up what could be a very substantial benefit. We believe that it would be inconsistent for us to compensate our staff on any basis suggesting that difficult living conditions justify special rewards or privileges. The volunteers do not have such privileges.

Also, starting salaries for the 50 highest paid Peace Corps employees totaled $34,499 less than the salaries they received from their former employers. This is notwithstanding the fact that such highly competent employees normally expect and receive moderate increases when they change jobs.

Name	Date of appointment to Peace Corps	Starting salary	Present salary	Formerly employed (firm, location)	Former salary
Alexander, John W	May 14, 1961	$15,030	$17,500	AID, Washington, D.C	$13,510
Astle, Edwin P	Jan. 12, 1963	15,900	16,400	AID, Belize, British Honduras	15,900
Bell, Darwin M	May 27, 1962	13,955	16,900	AID, Washington, D.C	12,890
Caldwell, Charles A	Oct. 21, 1963	17,925	17,925	Senator Estes Kefauver, Washington, D.C	18,772
Carr, Milton L	Sept. 9, 1962	14,900	16,400	UPI (press), Atlanta, Ga	10,400+
Carter, George E	Mar. 27, 1961	11,700	18,975	American Society of African Culture, New York, N.Y	11,250
Colmen, George M	Mar. 23, 1961	13,000	16,400	Pan American Union, Washington, D.C	13,000
Colmen, Joseph G	May 21, 1961	14,055	17,000	USAF (Personnel Research Branch), Washington, D.C	14,055
Cousins, William J	Mar. 4, 1962	14,900	16,400	AID, Washington, D.C	13,245
Craig, William G	July 1, 1963	18,500	18,500	State Department, Puerto Rico	18,450
Erwin, Francis W	Aug. 20, 1962	15,030	16,485	Mutual Broadcasting System, New York, N.Y	15,000
Ferguson, Glenn W	June 15, 1961	14,300	18,975	McKinsey & Co., Washington, D.C	12,000
Fishbein, Peter M	Jan. 8, 1963	17,925	17,925	Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, New York, N.Y	15,000
Fuller, Warren G	Nov. 5, 1962	18,200	17,925	International Migration Agency, Rome, Italy	16,830
Gale, Robert L	Feb. 18, 1963	15,600	16,965	Carlton College, Northfield, Minn	15,000
Garvey, James A	Oct. 29, 1962	17,925	17,925	GSA, Washington, D.C	17,500
Graham, Richard A	Nov. 1, 1961	15,600	18,900	Graham Transmissions, Inc., Menomonee Falls, Wis	36,500
Harper, Ashby T	Dec. 3, 1961	15,600	16,400	St. Louis Country Day School, St. Louis, Mo	18,500
Hellawell, E. Robert	Apr. 10, 1961	13,730	17,900	Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, Cleveland, Ohio	20,000
Henry, Edwin R., III	Feb. 1, 1963	19,000	19,000	Standard Oil Co., New York, N.Y	26,500+
Hernandez, Andres	Jan. 15, 1962	10,400	16,400	International Development Service, New York, N.Y	9,600
Houston, Charles S	Sept. 26, 1962	17,250	19,650	Aspen Clinic, Aspen, Colo. (medical practice)	18,687
Jacobsen, Dorothy M	June 11, 1961	15,030	16,965	U.S. Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C	12,990
Josephson, William H	Apr. 30, 1961	13,730	20,000	AID, Washington, D.C	10,635
Karsh, Norman	Sept. 30, 1963	15,525	16,500	Defense Supply Agency, Washington, D.C	15,525
Katon, William E	Oct. 28, 1963	18,000	18,000	GSA, Washington, D.C	18,000
Kramer, Murray W	Aug. 21, 1963	16,500	16,500	do	15,045
MacAlister, Robert	Oct. 8, 1962	14,900	16,400	Senator Claiborne Pell, Washington, D.C	14,275
MacKenzie C. Bruce	July 13, 1962	16,675	17,925	IBM, New York, N.Y	24,000+
Mankiewicz, Frank F	Oct. 24, 1961	15,600	18,975	Kaplan, Livingston, Goodwin & Berkowitz, Beverly Hills, Calif	22,000
McCarthy, Wilson D	Apr. 15, 1962	16,295	17,500	Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C	15,255
Medley, Max	May 20, 1963	19,500	20,000	Indian Land Development Co., Las Vegas, Nev	24,000
Moyers, Bill D	Mar. 22, 1961	16,900	19,500	Vice President Johnson, Washington, D.C	16,800
Pagano, Jules O	Nov. 20, 1961	15,600	16,965	Communications Workers of America, Washington, D.C	16,350
Parmer, J. Norman	Sept. 16, 1963	18,500	18,500	Northern Illinois University, De Kalb, Ill	16,080
Quimby, Thomas H	Mar. 19, 1961	18,200	18,900	AID, Washington, D.C	18,200
St. Lawrence, J. Lee	June 4, 1961	12,535	16,400	do	11,245
Saltonstall, William G	July 1, 1963	18,975	18,975	Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N.H	20,000
Sancho-Bonet, Rafael A	July 1, 1961	13,000	16,400	Department of State, San Juan, P.R	11,100
Schiffman, Edward C	Sept. 3, 1961	15,255	17,400	AID, Bangkok, Thailand	15,255
Sheldon, Christopher B	July 27, 1961	11,700	18,400	President, Ocean Academy, Ltd., Nassau, Bahamas, and Darien, Conn	17,500+
Singer, Derek S	June 4, 1961	12,210	16,400	AID, Washington, D.C	10,645
Story, Bascom H	May 13, 1962	15,610	18,975	AID, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	12,890
Vaughn, Jack H	Dec. 2, 1961	15,965	18,975	AID, Washington, D.C	15,965
Ward. T. Craig	Aug. 5, 1963	16,965	16,965	Papert, Koenig, Lois, New York City, N.Y	18,500+
Wiggins, Warren	Aug. 20, 1961	18,050	20,000	AID, Washington, D.C	18,050
Williams, Franklin H	Apr. 10, 1961	18,200	18,000	State of California, San Francisco, Calif	16,500
Wofford, Harris L	June 17, 1962	18,450	19,650	President Kennedy, Washington, D.C	18,500
Woodard, Charles C	June 17, 1963	20,000	20,000	Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., New York, N.Y	28,000
Wright, T. Lloyd	Dec. 29, 1961	15,600	17,500	Baptist General Convention of Texas, Dallas, Tex	12,500

(7) In Kuala Lumpur, the Peace Corps now has one full-time American secretary who receives a salary of $6,560 a year, and a part-time secretary at an annual salary rate of $4,725.

When the appointments of the present encumbents expire, we would consider volunteer secretaries if the proposed legislation is enacted.

Answer to question (8):

Research contracts, fiscal year 1963

Contractor	Nature of research	Obligations	Expenditures
Institute for International Services	Evaluation of Peace Corps project in Nigeria	$72,449	$18,934
Do	Analysis of motives for applying to the Peace Corps [1]	18,100	14,947
Cornell University	Research and measurement of the effect of the Peace Corps-Plan Nacional program in Peru	24,651	13,958
University of Minnesota	Feasibility study for research on volunteers and the Peace Corps teaching program in Ethiopia [1]	4,768	1,418
University of Michigan	Declination study, phase I [2]	3,550	0
Harvard University	Parametric study of language training	53,796	0
Total		[3] 177,314	49,257

[1] Completed in fiscal year 1963.

[2] Completed in fiscal year 1964.

[3] The total for research should read $177,314 rather than $239,950 which appears in the transcript of the hearing. The $239,950 included (a) an amendment to a fiscal year 1962 contract in the amount of $5,119, and (b) a portion of the Cornell University contract amounting to $57,517 which was a program rather than a research requirement.

(9) No volunteer is permitted to purchase any kind of automobile for use while in service.

If a staff member or a former volunteer wishes to purchase an automobile while overseas, there is no prohibition against such purchases. These would be private transactions. We have no information as to whether any staff members or former volunteers have purchased automobiles overseas from personnel employed under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or from the Agency for International Development, should any of its vehicles have been declared excess. We could not obtain such information without communicating with each of our representatives abroad.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago there was some colloquy about the civil rights bill and how we might bring it to the floor. On this subject, I would like to point out that many of us who worked long and hard on that bill in committee—and it took many weeks—are not disposed to have it considered on Calendar Wednesday. The reason for this is that there are many parliamentary devices which would make consideration of this most important legislation by such procedure difficult and cumbersome. The entire bill would be jeopardized.

However, many Members believe it is appropriate to file a discharge petition as a guarantee that the civil rights bill will not be unduly delayed in the Rules Committee. I am confident a majority of the Members will not permit the will of the Nation to be frustrated.

I do not think the fact that some Members have not signed the discharge petition at this point is any indication of their lack of enthusiasm for the civil rights bill. Rather it is a matter of their judgment as to how that bill should be brought to the floor so as to assure its successful passage. Similarly, some of us do not support attempting action on Calendar Wednesday because we believe it would not contribute to the goal we seek.

One Member indicated that he had introduced a bill which was better than the bill which the Committee has reported to the floor. I would commend the committee bill to his consideration and to his careful study, because I believe the bill which has been reported out has very broad support from both Republicans and Democrats on the Judiciary Committee. In my judgment, it is the best bill that has been authored on civil rights. I sincerely hope that we will get it to the floor expeditiously and that it will be passed in its present form. Only in this way will we fulfill our responsibility to the late President Kennedy and to the Nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Riehlman (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for 1 week, on account of official commitee business (Committee on Science and Astronautics).

Mr. Pepper (at the request of Mr. Sikes), for Friday, December 13, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. Chamberlain (at the request of Mr. Ford), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Addabbo, for Friday, December 13, 1963, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Hechler, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. Dole, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson (at the request of Mr. Albert), on December 17, for 15 minutes; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Philbin, and to include a poem.

Mr. Hechler to include addresses and other extraneous matter in his special order today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Mosher) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Beermann.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. Sullivan in two instances.

Mr. Bob Wilson (at the request of Mr. Mosher) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Findley (at the request of Mr. Mosher) and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2311. An act to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college debate topics; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Public Works certain information on water pollution control; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5778. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8751. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9009. An act to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, December 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1433. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "a bill to amend subsections (a) and (b) and to repeal subsection (f) of section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish the Rural Electrification Administration loan account, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1434. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Operating expenses," for the fiscal year 1964, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1435. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Retired pay", for the fiscal year 1964, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1436. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report showing that the appropriation to the U.S. Coast Guard for "Reserve training," for the fiscal year 1964, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1437. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the overpricing of modification kits for interrogator sets under Department of the Army fixed-price contract with General Instrument Corp., Newark, N.J.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1438. A letter from the Assistant Surgeon General, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the report to the Surgeon General of the Second National Conference on Public Health Training, pursuant to section 306(e) of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1439. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to a proposed amendment to the concession contract with the Sisters of Mercy of St. Joseph's Hospital, a corporation, authorized to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271, as amended by 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1440. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1441. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases in which the authority was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 9413. A bill to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1038.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4010. A bill to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz. and Nev., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1039). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5302. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the Newton area, California, to Clarence J. Wilder; with amendment (Rept. No. 1037). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 9481. A bill to require an economic survey by the Area Redevelopment Administrator prior to the termination of operations at certain installations or facilities of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 9482. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1915, relating to the requirements, qualifications, and regulations as to crews of certain vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9483. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 9484. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the rank of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 9485. A bill to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 9486. A bill to amend section 107 of title 23 of the United States Code to prohibit the Secretary of Commerce from condemning certain lands for highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9487. A bill to amend section 4243 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 9488. A bill to extend to peyote the provisions of Federal law now applicable to marihuana; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 9489. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 9490. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to accord to certain persons, who suffered the loss of a hand or foot in World War II, benefits and perquisites similar to those enjoyed by persons suffering such a loss during the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 9491. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1915, relating to the requirements, qualifications, and regulations as to crews of certain vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 9492. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 9493. A bill to require an economic survey by the Area Redevelopment Administrator prior to the termination of operations at certain installations or facilities of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 9494. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.J. Res. 868. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of a second Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.J. Res. 869. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 870. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution establishing equal rights for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.J. Res. 871. Joint resolution providing for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.J. Res. 872. Joint resolution providing for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 873. Joint resolution providing for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.J. Res. 874. Joint resolution providing for renaming the the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 589. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 79; to the Committee on Home Administration.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Res. 590. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 55; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9495. A bill for the relief of Spyros Katsihtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9496. A bill for the relief of Alexandros Andreopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9497. A bill to authorize Gen. Graves B. Erskine, U.S. Marine Corps (retired), to accept and wear certain decorations, presents, and other things tendered him by certain foreign governments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

513. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Steven D. Hughes, Salem, Oreg., requesting Congress to order published as a House document an address by the Right Honorable Lester D. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada, to the Pilgrims of the United States, New York, November 6, 1963, issued by Informative Division, Department of External Affairs, Dominion of Canada, Statements and Speeches, No. 63/22; to the Committee on House Administration.

514. Also, petition of Leroy Davidson, Salem, Oreg., requesting Congress to make Guam a part of the United States; grant Guam a nonvoting Member in the U.S. House of Representatives, and establish a civil government for Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

515. Also, petition of the national president, the Propeller Club of the United States, New York, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to reaffirming its strong opposition to any breaching of the historic policy of preserving our domestic commerce of vessels built in the United States, documented under the laws of the United States and owned by citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

516. Also, petition of Steven D. Hughes, Salem, Oreg., requesting Congress to grant, notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary and in the absence of formal application therefor, all rights and privileges accorded veterans' survivors to Mrs. John F. Kennedy and children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

517. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., with reference to enfranchising all American citizens residing in the 5,050 Federal "enclaves" in this Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

518. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., with reference to making his interpretation of the articles of the Constitution relative to provisions for Presidential succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

519. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to adopt a resolution praising President Johnson for attitude toward the U.S. Comptroller General regarding cooperation in a thrift and economy program, and commending the President for promoting it; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

520. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., urging the U.S. space program leaders to include a graduate of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in the space program; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

521. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to pass legislation directing the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to place on the market a 5-cent stamp honoring the late President John F. Kennedy; also a joint Kennedy-Lincoln postcard; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

522. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., with reference to his personal attitude in relation to Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

> (b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the second calendar quarter of 1963 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Charles D. Ablard, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,083. E. (9) $1,329.89.

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.

D. (6) $106.50. E. (9) $84.85.

A. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,270. E. (9) $1,159.20.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $7,643.92.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,307.89. E. (9) $2,307.89.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $13,410.02. E. (9) $13,410.02.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $117. E. (9) $9,810.06.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,802.20. E. (9) $4,802.20.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $493.17.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $15,043.02.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $843.60.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Consolidated International Trading Corp., Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $537. E. (9) $51.43.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $371.25.

A. Associated Fur Manufacturers, 101 West 30th Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Associated Fur Manufacturers, 101 West 30th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $2,250.

A. Association of Undergraduate and Practical Nurses of the District of Columbia, 327 Carroll Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $600.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3,540.42

A. Automotive Trade Association National Capital Area, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Frank Baird-Smith, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $459.

A. Raymond Maxfield Barnes, 305 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

D. (6) $244. E. (9) $102.27.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Parking Associations, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lowell R. Beck, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bar Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Becker & Greenwald, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bulk Carriers, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $159.52.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,202. E. (9) $821.03.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 607 South Pine, Tacoma, Wash.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,388.85.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,501.02.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,432.73. E. (9) $3.50.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,680. E. (9) $1,680.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,570.50.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $937.50.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $104.31.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Florida Inland Navigation District, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $267.34.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 24 Beekman Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Burger, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Georgia B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $240.

A. Frederick P. Burns, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $450.12.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,692.27. E. (9) $269.23.

A. Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,454.31.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $4,456.66. E. (9) $4,881.32.

A. Albert E. Carter, 19 Craig Avenue, Piedmont, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $3,142.68.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. South African Sugar Association, 704 London Assurance House, 321 Smith Street, Durban, South Africa.
E. (9) $61.82.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Channing Service Corp., 85 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250.

A. Alexander K. Christie, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,551.59. E. (9) $300.

A. David Cohen, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $25.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $34.97.

A. Paul G. Collins, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William K. Condrell, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Forest Industries Committee on Timber Valuation and Taxation, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,874.98.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,750.

A. Edward M. Corneaby, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,008.40.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $827.24. E. (9) $827.24.

A. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
E. (9) $21.86.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $535.32. E. (9) $535.32.

A. Joseph M. Creed, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bakers Association, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $38.

A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $750.

A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mahogany Association, Inc., 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. C. B. Culpepper, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $525.47.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.
D. (6) $33,000.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $345.23.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automotive Service Industry Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Customs Inspectors' Association, Port of New York, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $291.77.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
E. (9) $520.70.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $181.54.

A. Ronald W. De Lucien, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $70.

A. Wesley A. D'Ewart, Wilsall, Mont.
B. Montana Reclamation Association, Sidney, Mont.
D. (6) $700.37. E. (9) $700.37.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. Ehrich, Stock, Valicenti, Leighton & Holland and Richard L. Goldman, 20 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y.
B. Channing Service Corp., 85 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $29.80.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $251.25. E. (9) $20.50.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $592.38. E. (9) $23.05.

A. Edward O'Brien Fennell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, Inc., P.O. Box 8800, O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joe G. Fender, 2033 Norfolk Street, Houston, Tex.
B. National Conference of Nonprofit Shipping Associations, Inc.
D. (6) $4,054.82.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $300.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,617.34.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, P.O. Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Forest Industries Committee on Timber Valuation and Taxation, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $18,394. E. (9) $37,244.97.

A. James F. Fort, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $317.35.

A. Milton Fricks, Papillion, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $300.35. E. (9) $300.25.

A. George Milan Fuller, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William C. Geer.
B. The Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Jack Golodner, 1301 Delaware Avenue SW., Washington, D.C.
B. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $310.

A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,833.34.

A. John F. Griner, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,851. E. (9) $485.10.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Colville Indian Association, Coulee Dam, Wash.
E. (9) $19.35.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State, 3121 Wilson Lane, East, Tacoma, Wash.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $19.35.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $325.

A. C. L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., and Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. William A. Hanscom, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1, 250. E. (9) $225.

A. Robert B. Harris, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $786.32.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. David W. Herrmann, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $250.

A. Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, USMC, retired, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $60.04.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $222.92. E. (9) $222.92.

A. John W. Holton, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $467.37.

A. Joe L. Howell, Jr., 3800 U.S. Highway 51 North, Jackson, Miss.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Floyd E. Huffman, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $592.38. E. (9) $21.60.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Fred G. Hussey, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,020.87.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs & Warehousemen of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $16,928.64.

A. Ralph K. James, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Margaret E. Jenkins, 30 Deerpath, Norgate, Roslyn Heights, Long Island, N.Y.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Max H. Jordan, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $592.38. E. (9) $31.10.

A. Edwin L. Kahn, Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $249.75. E. (9) $2.71.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Equipment Distributors and Sprinkler Irrigation Association.

E. (9) $388.16.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman.

D. (6) $1,518. E. (9) $1,518.

A. William L. Kohler, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $151.83.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Wall Street Traders, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $4,743.84.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 407 West 18th Street, Austin, Tex.

B. Quality Brands Associates, 1001 Grant Street, Gary, Ind.

D. (6) $900.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 407 West 18th Street, Austin, Tex.

B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1001 Grant Street, Gary, Ind.

D. (6) $999.96.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $669.83.

A. Alan Latman, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Legislative Committee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2,778.58.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,561.90. E. (9) $4,561.90.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $24.80.

A. Paul H. Long, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware corporation), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) $218.20.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $186.11.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., Eleventh and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $2,340. E. (9) $3,372.91.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1501 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $843.60.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. William J. McDonald, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.

B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.

D. (6) $781.26. E. (9) $835.21.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, N.Y.

D. (6) $357.75. E. (9) $14.56.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $35.79.

A. Mahogany Association, Inc., 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $272.05.

A. James D. Mann, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

D. (6) $3,099.99 E. (9) $1,365.27.

A. Drew Martin, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $450. E. (9) $513.23.

A. Albert E. May, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $320. E. (9) $53.50.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of National Association, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,530. E. (9) $665.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $773.97.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $65.15.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $2,471.01.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 536 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

D. (6) $332.18. E. (9) $332.18.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $625.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Undergraduate & Practical Nurses of the District of Columbia, 327 Carroll Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Curtis Morris, Premier Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

D. (6) $2,730.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $110,366. E. (9) $10,709.50.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 348 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $22,313.20. E. (9) $1,710.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $12,115.51.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $450.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

D. (6) $1,077.85. E. (9) $1,996.30.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.,

D. (6) $4,082.50. E. (9) $634.84.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $576,266.76. E. (9) $12,091.19.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $5,580.44.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $625.75.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $33,235.65. E. (9) $33,507.15.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, 386 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,500.

A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $5,413.50.

A. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $591.75.

A. National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,053.95. E. (9) $2,908.47.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $87,133.18. E. (9) $11,200.07.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,627.38. E. (9) $14,627.38.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Parking Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,080. E. (9) $841.16.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23,058.75. E. (9) $8,553.46.

A. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $837.

A. National Small Business Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,562.52.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,607.71. E. (9) $8,457.15.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,159. E. (9) $6,656.61.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $520.87.

A. North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, Post Office Box 5425, Raleigh, N.C.
E. (9) $285.54.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $650. E. (9) $3.24.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 3033 Excelsior Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $774.46.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Sugarcane Planters, 4th Floor, Gonzaga Building, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 409 Davies Building, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,197.30.

A. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $5,454.08.

A. Perry S. Patterson, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Wurlitzer Co., the Seeburg Corp., and Rock-Ola Manufacturing Corp., Chicago, Ill.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N.J.
D. (6) $4,374. E. (9) $2,072.58.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $105.63. E. (9) $21.25.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P. Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $85.85.

A. James H. Pipkin, 10[illegible] Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $2,955.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Felix M. Putterman, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $511.23.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $584.33. E. (9) $143.33.

A. Lawrence D. Reedy, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Association of Advertising Agencies, Inc., 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,001.60.

A. Geo. L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $799.98. E. (9) $144.96.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 653 Cortland, Fresno, Calif.
B. Western Cotton Growers Association, 1008 Guarantee Savings Building, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $1,103.75.

A. John Rippey, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $393.39. E. (9) $33.60.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $363.32.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,100.04. E. (9) $208.85.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creative Arts Committee for Better Copyright Laws, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $390.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, et al.
D. (6) $500.

A. Ernest Schein, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Distribuidora de Azucares S.A., Azucareros Independientes LTDA, Compania Azucarera Del Valle S.A., Bogotá, Colombia.
D. (6) $6,918.60. E. (9) $30.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Editorial Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $363.17.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $300.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Julian H. Singman, 1832 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Forest Industries Association, 2319 Lloyd Center, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $21,024.54. E. (9) $3,124.54.

A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. W. Smiley, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $4,650.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, Esquire, 1100 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,025. E. (9) $446.01.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,807.53. E. (9) $2,859.47.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers' Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $584.33.

A. Spray, Price Townsend & Cushman, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Marian S. Stafford, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $260.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa; Association of Landowners of Okinawa, Naha, Okinawa.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $150.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Miscellaneous Japan General Merchandise Exporters Association, Tokyo, Japan; et al.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $12.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $221.21.

A. Sam S. Studebaker, Tipp City, Ohio.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $62.85. E. (9) $62.85.

A. C. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $78.40.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $195.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,055.18.

A. Eugene M. Thorés, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $495. E (9) $9.79.

A. William H. Tolbert, Post Office Box 191, Santa Paula, Calif.
B. Ventura County Citrus Growers Committee, Post Office Box 191, Santa Paula, Calif.
E. (9) $8,394.58.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperative League of USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gladys Uhl, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens for State 51.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $30.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,378.79.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $255. E. (9) $225.

A. Universal Exchange, Post Office Box 2782, Orlando, Fla.
E. (9) $125.95.

A. Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140.25. E. (9) $3.77.

A. T. M. Walters, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. David Weinberg, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $108.33.

A. Western Cotton Growers Association, 1008 Guarantee Savings Building, Fresno, Calif.
E. (9) $1,908.75.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $21,713.31. E. (9) $24.80.

A. Don White, 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $4,625.01. E. (9) $531.44.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 706 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,907.85. E. (9) $5,003.85.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 501 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $23.45.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $16.78.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $3.93.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $5.88.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Frank B. Rowlett, 143 Chatham Road, Ellicott City, Md.
E. (9) $6.35.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.
E. (9) $6.28.

A. W. A. Williams, Jr., Santa Fe, N. Mex.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $419.25. E. (9) $419.25.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,165.

A. Linda Bell Zimmer, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C
D. (6) $25.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1963:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(*a*) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(*c*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $--------Dues and assessments
2. $--------Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $--------Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $--------Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $--------Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $--------TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $--------Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $--------TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $--------TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $--------Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $--------Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $--------"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": --------

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through ------------------, 19----)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(*a*) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $--------Public relations and advertising services
2. $--------Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $--------Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $--------Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $--------Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $--------Telephone and telegraph
7. $--------Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $--------All other expenditures
9. $--------TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $--------Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $--------TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $--------TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $--------Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $--------Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates*	*Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11:	Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15:	Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL	

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $325. E. (9) $15.80.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,200.30. E. (9) $4,200.30.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
E. (9) $231.47.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,270. E. (9) $1,153.60.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,366.85. E. (9) $3,366.85.

A. George Venable Allen, 4370 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.

A. Nicholas E. Allen and Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif., and 22 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $283.49.

A. Edwin N. Altman.
B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $233.33.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employes of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,422.08.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $479.27. E. (9) $479.27.

A. American Claims in Cuba Committee.
D. (6) $1,202. E. (9) $1,202.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., or 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,429. E. (9) $25,429.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $39,650.19.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19,436.50. E. (9) $14,976.47.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $181,464.50. E. (9) $6,366.65.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,126.41. E. (9) $5,126.41.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,575.96. E. (9) $4,351.40.

A. American Justice Association, Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. American Legion National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,829.89. E. (9) $30,569.21.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $933.34.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $18,233.81.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., in care of Dr. Melvin B. Dunbar, 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.
D. (6) $7,128.52. E. (9) $7,128.52.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $720.18. E. (9) $720.18.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,640.79. E. (9) $1,333.47.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,890. E. (9) $11,211.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $844.89. E. (9) $844.89.

A. American Surveys, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $146.10.

A. American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 411 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,289. E. (9) $2,626.17.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, care of E. C. Connor, Foster Machine Co., Westfield, Mass.
D. (6) $1.35.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $9,516.20. E. (9) $9,516.20.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $607.50. E. (9) $1,000.47.

A. W. B. Ardery, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corporation, 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, 1000 Federal Bar Building, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Hemisphere Exports Council, 21 Tothill Street, London S.W. 1, England.
D. (6) $656. E. (9) $656.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $1,972.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $154.84.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $79.56.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,200.99.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 183 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,954.68. E. (9) $13,954.68.

A. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,475.25.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,544.16. E. (9) $2,544.16.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,097.50. E. (9) $1,097.50.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $600.

A. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $300.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $10.

A. Automotive Trade Association National Capital Area, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aerospace Services Association, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $53.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.
D. (6) $2,457.75. E. (9) $120.55.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $448.76.

A. Richard B. Barker and Jay W. Glasmann, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N.Y.

A. Richard B. Barker & Jay W. Glasmann, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Lime Association, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $277.61.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Co. of North America and Life Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $483. E. (9) $138.05.

A. Roy Battles, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Bearden, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,093.74.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $874.99.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,569. E. (9) $849.43.

A. John H. Beidler, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,549. E. (9) $311.64.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $12.83.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $5,250.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 607 South Pine, Tacoma, Wash.

A. Charles C. Bevis, Jr., 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4.20.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,680. E. (9) $375.60.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, et al.
E. (9) $36.15.

A. Leon G. Billings, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Henry J. Bison, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $435.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $605.

A. James C. Black, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $5,325.25. E. (9) $1,089.57.

A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1200 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $15,360. E. (9) $3,498.89.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $1,346.78.

A. Maurice G. Boehl, 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Benjamin W. Boley, 745 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Geothermal, Inc., International Building, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $398.10. E. (9) $398.10.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $160.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $111.90.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, Room 502, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $427.50. E. (9) $6.22.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, 537 Cherry Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, 537 Cherry Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $245.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1145 19th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $11.70.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $423.44.

A. Broseco Corp., 718 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,051.51. E. (9) $3,051.51.

A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,080. E. (9) $2,080.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,360.50.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $937.50.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Company, Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $49.73.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Electric Bond & Share Company, 2 Rector Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Montana Power Company, Butte, Montana.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,450.58.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $306. E. (9) $274.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $2.99.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $161.77.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $6.62.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $59.68.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $394.88.

A. Gustave Burmeister, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,287.50. E. (9) $10.33.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,999.99.

A. The Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $95,975. E. (9) $40,506.95.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $80.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $491.04.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $52.50.

A. Don Campbell, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

A. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,531.77.

A. Ronald A. Capone, 505 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 3–6 Bury Court, St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3.
E. (9) $1,064.48.

A. Ronald A. Capone, 505 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. General Council of British Shipping, 3–6 Bury Court, St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $958.22.

A. James R. Carnes, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $162.63.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Advertising Specialty National Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Advertising Specialty Guild International, 620 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $260.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 605 Davis Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lithographers & Printers National Association, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $412.50. E. (9) $282.83.

A. Channing Service Corp., 85 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Alger B. Chapman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Chapman and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $7.62.

A. Chapman and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc., 1527 Keeaumoku Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
E. (9) $48.13.

A. Chapman and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jeppesen & Company, 8025 East 40th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $47.36.

A. Chapman and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139–141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $6.54.

A. Chapman and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., Post Office Box 2521, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $23.64.

A. Chapman and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S.A. de C.V., Balderas No. 36—Primer Piso, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.
D. (6) $8,750. E. (9) $11.46.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
E. (9) $826.68.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $175.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,664.70. E. (9) $3,664.70.

A. Alexander K. Christie, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,551.59. E. (9) $300.

A. Citizens Committee on American Policy in the Near East, Box 368, McLean, Va.
D. (6) $2,880. E. (9) $3,049.54.

A. Citizens Committee for a National Service Corps, 412 Albee Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,654.38. E. (9) $2,974.68.

A. Citizens Committee for a Nuclear Test Ban, 844 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $27,757. E. (9) $61,240.64.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $954. E. (9) $97.98.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, 410 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,312.50. E. (9) $124.70.

A. Joseph Coakley, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building Service Employees International Union, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,100.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $24.71.

A. J. I. Collier, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11.51.

A. Collier & Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $220.90

A. Collier & Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tool & Stainless Steel Industry Committee, care of Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $278.45.

A. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, in care of John M. Maxwell, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,750. E. (9) $4,987.71.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $51,175. E. (9) $31,981.01.

A. Committee for Time Uniformity, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $60.50.

A. Ralph T. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William K. Condrell, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Forest Industries Committee on Timber Valuation and Taxation, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,718.77. E. (9) $32.65.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $40. E. (9) $10.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George W. Cooley, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. John Shepherd Cooper, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,558.45. E. (9) $2,427.53.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 550 Burrard Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $5.55.

A. Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc., 301 First Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $22,838.20. E. (6) $23,469.93.

A. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward M. Corneaby, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,253.92.

A. The Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,163.79.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $11.72.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $4.80.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. P. Møller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Raleigh Industries of America, Inc., 1168 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Wisconsin Corp., 500 Union Street, Seattle, Wash.

A. Mrs. Warren E. Cox, 3608 North 25th Street, Arlington, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $9.43.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. C. B. Culpepper, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
B. National Conference of Nonprofit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. John Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,549. E. (9) $838.30.

A. Bernard Cushman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $756.25. E. (9) $36.69.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. James S. Copley, 7776 Ivanhoe Avenue, La Jolla, Calif.
E. (9) $130.80.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck and Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $404.51.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
D. (6) $116.50. E. (9) $116.50.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., 36th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Consumer Finance Companies, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Virgin Islands Gift & Fashion Shop Association, Inc., St. Thomas, Virgin Islands.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $221.47.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Customs Inspectors' Association, Port of New York, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $169.90.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1505 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Merritt S. Deitz, Jr.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $174.15.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $420.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3006 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,102.50.

A. Joe T. Dickerson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,687.50. E. (9) $218.56.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,851.81. E. (9) $226.81.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Thurman & Wright, 1208 Latham Square Building, Oakland, Calif.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tulelake Irrigation District, Post Office Box 787, Tulelake, Calif.
D. (6) $947.60. E. (9) $47.60.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $1,874.35. E. (9) $74.35.

A. Disabled American Veterans National Service Headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $5,915.40.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $275. E. (9) $7.50.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,398.73. E. (9) $26,681.82.

A. Thomas Dixon, 1311 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $380. E. (9) $288.08.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $220.50. E. (9) $1.30.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, Farragut Building, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, Farragut Building, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Seatrain Lines, Inc., 595 River Road, Edgewater, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Harry J. Donohue, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $583. E. (9) $3.14.

A. Ronald D. Doremus, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9.50.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,139.95.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,966.15.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,340. E. (9) $742.94.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $84.75. E. (9) $50.88.

A. Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N.J.
D. (6) $4.50. E. (9) $4.50.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140.

A. Wallace Edgerton, 1762 Church Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. Ehrich, Stock, Valicenti, Leighton & Holland, and Richard L. Goldman, 20 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y.
B. Channing Service Corp., 85 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $16.40.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $516.25. E. (9) $45.70.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,404. E. (9) $265.66.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $63.75. E. (9) $14.48.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $65.00.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $12.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $3,532.50. E. (9) $50.37.

A. Charles P. English, Post Office Box 2154 AMF, Miami, Fla.

B. Luisa Reldan de English, Apartado Aereo No. 14256, Bogotá, Colombia.

D. (6) $512.32. E. (9) $512.32.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $461.54. E. (9) $57.20.

A. Clinton Fair, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,549. E. (9) $260.76.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) $15. E. (9) $1,261.68.

A. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $43,858.49. E. (9) $34,888.64.

A. Federation of Regular Taxpayers, Route 4, Box 58, Hastings, Mich.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $400.

A. Joe G. Fender, 2033 Norfolk Street, Houston, Tex.

B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

D. (6) $418.06.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

B. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) $400. E. (9) $118.03.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Council of the Forest Industries of British Columbia, 400 Forest Industries Building, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

D. (6) $8,000. E. (9) $450.22.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $300.

A. John B. Fisher, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Employment Association, 260 Southfield Road, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $2,920.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $2,125.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Con-Gas Service Corp., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,175. E. (9) $23.54.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.

E. (9) $1,800.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

E. (9) $1,556.62.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Forest Industries Committee on Timber Valuation and Taxation, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $23,187.60. E. (9) $7,715.74.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $214.32.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $165.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $470.40.

A. Robert W. Frase, 1820 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 58 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,896.85. E. (9) $1,885.20.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $390. E. (9) $8.10.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $10. E. (9) $1.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $13,371.52. E. (9) $7,864.67.

A. Malcolm H. Frost, 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. West Coast Steamship Co., 1210 Standard Plaza, Portland, Oreg.

A. George Milan Fuller, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $2,537.45.

A. Warner W. Gardner, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Steamship Traffic Executives Committee, 1 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Warner W. Gardner, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Geothermal, Inc., International Building, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $302.65.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $50.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Aubrey D. Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $170.

A. William C. Geer.

B. The Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750.

A. General Council of British Shipping 3–6, Bury Court, St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.
D. (6) $5,453.22. E. (9) $5,456.22.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. William P. Giglio, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $739.31.

A. Jay W. Glasmann, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. H. J. Heinz Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, 99 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $419.80.

A. Glen Alden Corp., 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,000.

A. Philip Goldstein, 410 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, 410 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,833.34.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employes' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,710.77. E. (9) $6,317.75.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $14,862.35. E. (9) $39,487.22.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $255. E. (9) $50.04.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corporation, 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Consumer Finance Companies, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. J. S. Grigsby, Jr., 1107 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Colville Indian Association, Coulee Dam, Wash.
E. (9) $22.55.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State, 3121 Wilton Lane East, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) $19.55.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, American Smelting & Refining Co., and American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.
D. (6) $4,750. E. (9) $2,300.

A. Terry Gunn, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gypsum Association, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $584.16.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $954. E. (9) $45.84.

A. Hal H. Hale, 419 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Haley, Bader & Potts, and Andrew G. Haley, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens National Committee for Higher Education, 1500 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Council of Private Lending Institutions, Inc., RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $666.67.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Airlines, Inc., 10 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $87.75.

A. Charles A. Hamilton, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $39.85.

A. W. C. Hammerle, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $356.50.

A. Mildred B. Harman, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $720. E. (9) $353.49.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,750.02. E. (9) $134.24.

A. Herbert E. Harris, II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $42.90.

A. Walter A. Hasty, Jr.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,939.90.

A. Paul M Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $368.75. E. (9) $209.54.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hays and Hays, 920 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $1,300.20. E. (9) $24.45.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $73.35.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,156.51. E. (9) $1,156.51.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $189.07.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary & Secondary Education, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick and Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Lima, Peru.
E. (9) $54.92.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,662.12. E. (9) $537.12.

A. John K. Herbert, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $376.23. E. (9) $376.23.

A. David W. Herrmann, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $250.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $48.90.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $29.66.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Wool and Textile Association, Post Office Box 742, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $60.60.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $3,256.29.

A. Robert L. Higgins, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Hight, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $200.

A. James A. Hirshfield, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, USMC (Ret.), 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $105.81.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $120.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $38.75.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Holland & Hart, 500 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,647. E. (9) $1,071.63.

A. Fuller Holloway, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $9,150. E. (9) $729.96.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $3,790.40.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Fred G. Hussey, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Luther A. Huston, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,600. E. (9) $279.91.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
B. Richard F. Bates, et al.
E. (9) $351.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5.

A. William J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) $2,025.97.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,159.85. E. (9) $8,159.85.

A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $0.50.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs & Warehousemen of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $19,630.75.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,112.50. E. (9) $6.65.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W–1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $1,304.54.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $138.

A. Raymond M. Jacobson, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Inter-American Trade and Cultural Center Authority, Post Office Box 59–2294, Miami, Fla.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $162.62.

A. Japanese-American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $150.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,725.01. E. (9) $64.25.

A. Philip F. Jehle, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Mrs. Margaret E. Jenkins, 30 Deerpath, Norgate, Roslyn Heights, Long Island, N.Y.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., et al.
E. (9) $4.

A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 727 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $5,954.19.

A. Peter D. Joers, 810 Whittington, Hot Springs, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.
E. (9) $220.35.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,229.98. E. (9) $243.26.

A. Ned Johnston, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $612. E. (9) $764.82.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8.80.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 3206 Ferndale Street, Kensington, Md.
B. Illinois Association of Consulting Engineers, Post Office Box 1202, Springfield, Ill.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Raymond R. Kahl, 8008 Jackson Street, Paramount, Calif.
B. General Pipe & Supply Co., Inc., 222 East Manville Street, Compton, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,250.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,187.50. E. (9) $659.14.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.

A. Karelsen & Karelsen, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $293.21.

A. Howard B. Keck, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 9864 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.
E. (9) $275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware corporation), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $121.60.

A. Eugene A. Keeney, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. John T. Kelly, Esq., 1411 K Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American-Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $87.50.

A. William J. Kerwin, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $576. E. (9) $881.92.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 510, Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,713.22. E. (9) $1,496.57.

A. Edward W. Kiley, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $246.25.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Rossmoor Leisure World, Seal Beach, Calif.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $8.16.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $236.25. E. (9) $1.17.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors and Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
E. (9) $547.45

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $725.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $630. E. (9) $72.80.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,552.

A. George W. Koch, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert M. Koch, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $26.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $3,393.03.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,375. E. (9) $5,928.71.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,648. E. (9) $444.30.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $5,302.98.

A. Lake Carriers Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Kenneth C. Landry, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500.

A. Richard H. Lane, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 407 West 18th Street, Austin, Tex.

A. Latham & Watkins.

B. Rossmoor Corp., P.O. Box 125, Seal Beach, Calif.

D. (6) $780. E. (9) $90.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $900.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $245. E. (9) $1.35.

A. Thomas B. Lawrence, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.

D. (6) $650.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $125. E. (9) $35.08.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Nurseymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $42.14. E. (9) $98.97.

A. Leonard F. Lee, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) $92.10.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $50. E. (9) $322.74.

A. Richard T. Leonard, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $421.38.

A. Roy T. Lester, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $587.49. E. (9) $9.55.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $2,029.95.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,312.76. E. (9) $3,312.76.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,250.

A. Lawrence J. Linck and Co., 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $700.29.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David A. Lindsay, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

B. Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, 140 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $637.50. E. (9) $74.13.

A. Basil R. Littin, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Continental Oil Co., Box 2197, Houston, Tex.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tenn.

D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $38.91.

A. Paul H. Long, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware corporation), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fifth Avenue and 82d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.

B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va.

D. (6) $300.

A. James C. Lucas, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $45.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Medical Corporation, 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. A. B. Luckey, Jr., 411 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 411 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750.

A. A. B. Luckey, Jr., 103 G Street SW., Washington, D.C.

B. Menlo Realty Co., 6303 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $67.71.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,375. E. (9) $42.77.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,884.56.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $350. E. (9) $59.13.

A. Angus H. McDonald.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,852.76. E. (9) $136.60.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, 6400 Winston Drive, Bethesda, Md.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. W. F. McKenna, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $9,000.

A. William F. McKenna, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $105. E. (9) $20.55.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,187.50 E. (9) $29.69.

A. William N. McLeod, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Household Finance Corp., Prudential Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. William N. McLeod, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Republican Statehood Party of Puerto Rico, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $222.75. E. (9) $9.07.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.

D. (6) $4,600. E. (9) $248.04.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Plywood Corp., 55 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $525. E. (9) $586.60.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. R. E. A. Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $940.50. E. (9) $276.66.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Confectioners Association, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Peanut Butter Manufacturers Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. David I. Mackie, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N.J.

B. Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N.J.

D. (6) $4.50.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.

D. (6) $687.50. E. (9) $35.75.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,058.65.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.

B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,800. E. (9) $208.65.

A. D. L. Manion, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $537.50.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Olya Margolin (Mrs.), 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,242.02. E. (9) $113.66.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,052.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $276.34.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Robert O. Marritz, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $45.

A. David M. Marsh, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $3.60.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $80.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $370.11. E. (9) $259.30.

A. Paul V. Martenson, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,386.47. E. (9) $263.47.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japanese-American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $150.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

B. Pittsburgh Coal Exchange and Mechanical Contractors Association of Pittsburgh, Inc.

A. P. H. Mathews, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $698.20. E. (9) $421.05.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $262.50. E. (9) $98.33.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George E. Meagher, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,552.90. E. (9) $60.90.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $2,802.60. E. (9) $4.80.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

E. (9) $1,514.98.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $198.40.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Cooperage Industries of America, Inc., 408 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $90.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The League of New York Theatres, Inc., the National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $215.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 605 Davis Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $100.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Dallas (Texas) Chamber of Commerce.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana & Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,090. E. (9) $1,649.47.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $464.50.

A. Othmer J. Mischo, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $804.41.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 536 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $70. E. (9) $124.05.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. William S. Beinecke, 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $24.10.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1.55.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,705.45.

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
D. (6) $2,730.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ray R. Murdock.
B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700.01.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $900.

A. John J. Murphy, 420 Gardiner Drive, Hillsmere Shores, Annapolis, Md.
B. National Customs Service Association, care of John J. Murphy, 420 Gardiner Drive, Hillsmere Shores, Annapolis, Md.

A. Robert F. Murphy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,494.80. E. (9) $44.40.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Walter Myres, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,249.96. E. (9) $457.21.

A. Raymond Nathan, 1812 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Glen Alden Corp., 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,100.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $111.70. E. (9) $111.70.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $683.40. E. (9) $617.15.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $13,750. E. (9) $15.60.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $471.14. E.(9) $12,158.91.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $340.80. E. (9) $340.80.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $10,161.67.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $699.87. E. (9) $699.87.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $330.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $7,871.38.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,384.62.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $678.51. E. (9) $503.75.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $22,137.29. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,953.26. E. (9) $7,953.26.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $3,086.26.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, 386 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $6,500.

A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, P.O. Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $2,875.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $14,187.85. E. (9) $14,187.85.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $90.25.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,800. E. (9) $6,150.

A. National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $190.

A. National Creative Arts Committee for Better Copyright Laws, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,610.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $86.92. E. (9) $86.92.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,186.85. E. (9) $24,813.31.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,445.50. E. (9) $2,309.92.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,441.66. E. (9) $3,679.55.

A. National Life & Accident Insurance Co., Nashville, Tenn.
E. (9) $74.14.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,833. E. (9) $1,833.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,253.64. E. (9) $5,284.97.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,299.48. E. (9) $5,299.48.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $800.64.

A. National Parking Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $8,619.49. E. (9) $8,619.49.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $4,495.01.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,057.04. E. (9) $17,114.63.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $812.16.

A. National Small Business Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $64,935.91. E. (9) $2,384.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $95. E. (9) $95.

A. Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $1,900.47.

A. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $518.03. E. (9) $518.03.

A. Mrs. Sarah H. Newman.
B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. George L. Nichols, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,384.62. E. (9) $52.61.

A. Stanley D. Noble, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $768.72.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $67.98.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Graham T. Northup, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,873.47.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,779.98. E. (9) $159.28.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $11,372.95.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 3033 Excelsior Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $319.33.

A. John F. O'Connor, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,374.96. E. (9) $189.90.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Sugarcane Planters, 4th Floor Gonzaga Building, Manila, Philippines.
E. (9) $500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, Davies Building, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,298.53.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $2,559.47.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,726. E. (9) $72.65.

A. Samuel Omasta, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $22.50.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $5,361.64.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Finlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md., and 1131 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $923.10.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.
B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.
E. (9) $219.37.

A. Walter Page, 912 University Building, Syracuse, N.Y.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
E. (9) $97.09.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $177.91. E. (9) $110.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $185.50.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $825.05.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,143.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $700.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $200.44.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $159.53.

A. Sandford Z. Persons, 1321 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United World Federalists, 1321 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $225.09.

A. Ervin L. Peterson, 1145 19th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $43.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $21.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $136.79.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $136.67.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $30.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $999.23.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $950.

A. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) 459.53.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M., Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $24,977.30. E. (9) $1,350.

A. James K. Polk, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co., of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $495. E. (9) $4.09.

A. Peter T. Posmantur, 485 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Football League Players Association, 19th and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $216.69.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, Jr., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $437.10.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas W. Power, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $300.

A. Graydon R. Powers, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,500.

A. William R. Pringle, 23640 Bryden Road, Cleveland, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Con-Gas Service Corp., 4 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., Managua, Nicaragua.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $6.57.

A. Felix M. Putterman, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $307.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Retail Bakers of America, 735 West Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill., et al.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $142.57.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y.; Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, New York, N.Y.; United Cerebral Palsy Association, New York, N.Y.; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, New York, N.Y.; National Committee for Research in Neuro. Disorders, New York, N.Y.; Charles H. Brown, Inc., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,499.97. E. (9) $6,782.59.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $237.48.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 1st Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $83.34.

A. J. A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 8840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $280.33. E. (9) $130.33.

A. Stanley Rector, 520 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Time Uniformity, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,300.01. E. (9) $3,316.99.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas railroads.

A. J. A. Reidelbach, Jr., 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $69,095.65.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $16,647.64. E. (9) $7,706.28.

A. F. Marion Rhodes, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Cotton Exchange, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,133.34. E. (9) $30.16.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana railroads.
D. (6) $31.25. E. (9) $72.68.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, Esq., 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of Consumer Finance Cos., 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, Esq., 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Entertainment Law Committee, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. James W. Riddell, Esq., 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., 112 East Washington Street, Bloomington, Ill.

A. Richard J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,124.98 E. (9) $204.67.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $450. E. (9) $1,175.52.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $250.

A. Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers of the U.S.A.

A. Roberts & Holland, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. I.O.S., Ltd. (S.A.), 119 rue de Lausanne, Geneva, Switzerland.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $175.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Cos., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $437.50.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $5,260.

A. T. J. Ross & Associates, Inc., 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $3,950.27.

A. Edmond F. Rovner, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,250.

A. James H. Rowe, Jr., and Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Haytian American Sugar Co., S.A., Port au Prince, Haiti.

D. (6) $3,750.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pinkerton's National Detective Agency, Inc., 154 Nassau Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $367.12.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $526.83. E. (9) $196.49.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Creative Arts Committee for Better Copyright Laws, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,610. E. (9) $2,610.

A. Oswald Ryan, 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) 500. E. (9) $25.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,999.88. E. (9) $60.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $133.43.

A. John C. Satterfield, Yazoo City, Miss.

B. Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc., First & C Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $1,500.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Nurses' Association, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $450. E. (9) 62.06.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,950.

A. William H. Scheick, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $400. E. (9) $878.40.

A. Ernest Schein, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Distribuidora de Azucares S.A., Azucareros Independientes LTDA, Compania Azucarera Del Valle, S.A., Bogotá, Colombia.

A. Jacques T. Schlenger, Esquire, 1409 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Broseco Corp., 718 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $6,455.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington, D.C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $573.82.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sessions & Caminita, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Floyd A. Segel, 215 West Oregon Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $439.92.

A. Clifford Setter, 55 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $586.60.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $189.75.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,306.25. E. (9) $110.85.

A. David C. Sharman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $413.36.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 6326 Southcrest Drive, Shreveport, La.

B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Max Shine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $992.50. E. (9) $20.

A. Richard C. Shipman.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,188.86. E. (9) $81.26.

A. Robert L. Shortle, International Trade Mart, New Orleans, La.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $700.

A. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,045.23.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

E. (9) $3,582.87.

A. Harold S. Skinner, Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.

B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. Harold Slater, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,312.50. E. (9) $43.08.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,812.50. E. (9) $14.40.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $102.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.

D. (6) $4,650.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

D. (6) $822. E. (9) $276.34.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $165.01. E. (9) $236.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) $275. E. (9) $119.88.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,557.70.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. S. L. Sommer and Associates, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, 99 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $75. E. (9) $2.40.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,938.41. E. (9) $2,414.72.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,354.25.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1102–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

D. (6) $25,394.67. E. (9) $4,171.26.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers' Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.

D. (6) $130.33. E. (9) $130.33.

A. William W. Spear, 214 Fremont National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.

B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $729.17. E. (9) $11.87.

A. John F. Speer, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Sprague, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware corporation), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) $78.50.

A. Spray, Price, Townsend & Cushman, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Gypsum Association, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Marian S. Stafford, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $250.

A. Mrs. C. A. L. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Russel M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Claims in Cuba Committee.

D. (6) $1,190. E. (9) $12.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $210. E. (9) $9.60.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone and Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $105. E. (9) $1.20.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $785. E. (9) $42.70.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $16,062.15. E. (9) $4,521.90.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, 99 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $340. E. (9) $79.80.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa.

E. (9) $50.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters Association and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association of Tokyo, Japan, et al.

D. (6) $800. E. (9) $300.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Post Office Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Box 907–X, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampleman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, 25 Main Street, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 827 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,625.

A. Sam S. Studebaker, Tipp City, Ohio.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. John J. Synon, 1301 Park Avenue, Richmond, Va.

B. Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom, Inc., First and C Streets NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,711.63. E. (9) $1,215.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers' Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John I. Taylor, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $34.27.

A. Mrs. Margaret K. Taylor, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary & Secondary Education, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard W. Taylor, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,384.60.

A. J. B. Thayn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $5.63.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

E. (9) $226.20.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

D. (6) $700. E. (9) $1,149.56.

A. Wm. B. Thompson, Jr., 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $14.98.

A. John N. Thurman, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,266.95.

A. J. R. Timmins & Co., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,500.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.

D. (6) $147.50. E. (9) $86.95.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,041.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,062.50. E. (9) $297.91.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $12,432.60. E. (9) $1,669.66.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $350. E. (9) $33.25.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $55.34.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,812.50. E. (9) $88.80.

A. Alben W. Barkley Truitt.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,892.43. E. (9) $200.60.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 918 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.

B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $950.

A. Ernest A. Tupper, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John W. Turner, Railway Labor Building, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.

E. (9) $35.10.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

E. (9) $690.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Association, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,334.42.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $330,317.75. E. (9) $48,140.74.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $19,439.03.

A. United World Federalists, 1321 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $12,010.12. E. (9) $12,010.20.

A. Henry A. S. van Daalen, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Common Carrier Conference, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $10.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,490.90. E. (9) $15.

A. W. M. Vaughey, Post Office Box 4268, Jackson, Miss.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Venable, Baetjer & Howard, 1409 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Broseco Corp., 718 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John E. Vetter, 635 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. B. J. Viviano, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. The Voice of the People in Action (the Society of the People, Inc.), 621 Sheridan Street No. 21, Chillum, Md.

B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner, 621 Sheridan Street No 21, Chillum, Md.

D. (6) $72. E. (9) $61.92.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $140.25. E. (9) $8.36.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $298.75. E. (9) $17.13.

A. T. M. Walters, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. William A. Walton, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,267.21. E. (9) $2,182.67.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $559.21.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $650. E. (9) $11,289.15.

A. J. P Watson, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.

B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.

E. (9) $734.78.

A. Weaver and Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) $300.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5. E. (9) $3.27.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $225. E. (9) $7.32.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. J. R. Timmins & Co., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $153.06.

A. William H. Webb, La Salle Building, Washington, D.C.

B. City of Redondo Beach, Municipal Building, Redondo Beach, Calif.

D. (6) $750.

A. William H. Webb, La Salle Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,813. E. (9) $679.57.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $3.979.28.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.

E. (9) $7601.30.

A. Mrs. Richard S. Wheeler, 5614 33d Street North, Arlington, Va.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $18.55.

A. Don White, 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.

D. (6) $7,624.91. E. (9) $1,051.04.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $782.75.

A. John C. White, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Council of America, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $250.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $1,030.60.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 501 5th Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $5.85.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

E. (9) $3.01.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

E. (9) $32.81.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.

E. (9) $5.65.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Frank B. Rowlett, 143 Chatham Road, Ellicott City, Md.

E. (9) $1.70.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

E. (9) $5.65.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $64.71.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $950. E. (9) $240.15.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $233.86.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $601.39. E. (9) $73.07.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 120 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.

D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $955.44.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 2d Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 2d Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,400.

A. Henry B. Wilson, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $23.50.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 200 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.; United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $90.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Lawton B. Wolfe, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $0.50.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

D. (6) $200.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Flying Tiger Line Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street, Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $432. E. (9) $35.26.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,000.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1963:

(Note.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the Record, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

File One Copy With the Secretary of the Senate and File Two Copies With the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

Place an "X" Below the Appropriate Letter or Figure in the Box at the Right of the "Report" Heading Below:

"Preliminary" Report ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"Quarterly" Report: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------ ◄

REPORT

Pursuant to Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

Note on Item "A".—(a) In General. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) Separate Reports. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. Organization or Individual Filing:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

Note on Item "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. Employer.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

Note on Item "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. Legislative Interests, and Publications in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated International Trading Corp., Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.

A. George W. Apperson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employes of America, AFL–CIO, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David Apter, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. E. G. & A. International, Inc., 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Potter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lever Brothers Co., 390 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Automotive Trade Association, National Capital Area, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Douglas B. Bagnell, Post Office Box 1286, Fairhope, Ala.
B. Maine Potato Council, Presque Isle, Maine.

A. Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Gas and Electric Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. Broseco Corp., 718 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. California Municipal Utilities Association, 1127 11th Street, Sacramento, Calif.

A. W. Randolph Carter, Drawer 499, Suffolk, Va.
B. Virginia-Carolina Peanut Association, Inc., Drawer 499, Suffolk, Va.

A. Channing Service Corp., 85 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Citizens Committee for a National Service Corps, 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Junius N. Cobean, Sr., 109 West Windsor Avenue, Alexandria, Va.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. J. I. Collier, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 120 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, First and C Streets NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Betty Carlin Cott, 240 East 76th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Ruder & Finn, Inc., 130 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Wisconsin Corp., 500 Union Street, Seattle, Wash.

A. Theodore F. T. Crolius, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert E. Cronin, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. James S. Copley, 7776 Ivanhoe Avenue, La Jolla, Calif.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., 36th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John F. Dawson, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL–CIO, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wallace Edgerton, 1762 Church Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. E. G. & A. International, Inc., 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Ehrich Stock Valicenti Leighton & Holland and Richard L. Goldman, 20 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y.
B. Channing Service Corp., 85 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles P. English, Post Office Box 2154 AMF, Miami, Fla.,
B. Luisa Roldan de English-Family, Apartado Aereo No. 14256, Bogota, Colombia.

A. Richard M. Gibbons, 940 25th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William P. Giglio, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Armistead W. Gilliam, Jr., 1832 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Don A. Goodall, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Graves, 1736 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oxy-Catalyst, Inc., 511 Old Lancaster Road, Berwyn, Pa.

A. Dale W. Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Charles Aaron Greer, Route 2, Box 274, Gresham, Oreg.
B. Marks Mines, Inc., 685 Northwest Eighth Street, Gresham, Oreg.

A. J. S. Grigsby, Jr., 1107 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

A. Gypsum Association, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Airlines, Inc., 10 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Larry Hogan Associates, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Apartment Owners Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Larry Hogan Associates, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.; Washington Board of Realtors, Investment Building, Washington, D.C., and Federal City Council, 1526 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond M. Jacobson, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Inter-American Trade and Cultural Center Authority, Postoffice Box 59–2294, Miami, Fla.

A. Raymond R. Kahl, 8008 Jackson Street, Paramount, Calif.
B. General Pipe & Supply Co., Inc., 222 East Manville Street, Compton, Calif.

A. Ken Kendrick, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harley Walter Kidder, 61 Summer Street, Barre, Vt.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marine Transport Lines, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard H. Lane, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

A. Geo. Stephen Leonard, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc., 301 First Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Lerch, Jr. & Co., Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 51st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Algonquin Investment Co., 6828 Oakland, St. Louis, Mo.

A. O. R. Lundborg, 400 1st Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Coca-Cola Export Corp., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. William F. McKenna, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter H. Maloney, Jr., 6124 Baltimore Avenue, Riverdale, Md.

B. Eastern Emigrant Cherokee Protective Association, Post Office Box 315, Locust Grove, Okla.

A. Marine Transport Lines, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Mehler, Smollar & Buschmann, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Steering Committee for Rebuilders of Automotive Parts.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated Cooperage Industries of America, Inc., 408 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Lexington and Liberty Streets, Baltimore, Md.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 120 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Investors Syndicate of America, Inc., 800 Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Stephen A. Mitchell, Box 932, Taos, N. Mex.

A. Edward K. Moss, Post Office Box 4893, Washington, D.C.

B. Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center Authority, Post Office Box 59-2294, Miami, Fla.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julia J. Norrell, 1332 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gerald G. Wagner, G.M.I. Associates, 1332 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert R. Poston, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Caroline Cullen Ramsay, 1414 34th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. John Rippey, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Roberts & Holland, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. I.O.S., Ltd. (S.A.), 119 rue de Lausanne, Geneva, Switzerland.

A. Rogers & Cowan, Inc., 250 North Canon Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

B. Citizens Committee for National Service Corps, 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John F. Rolph, 3d, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ruder & Finn, Inc., 130 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Citizens' Committee for a Nuclear Test Ban.

A. Ruder & Finn, Inc., 130 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y., and 1812 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Committee for Competitive Prices, 130 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ruder & Finn, Inc., 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United World Federalists, 1321 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Satterfield, Yazoo City, Miss.

B. Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, 1st and C Streets NE., Washington, D.C., and Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission, New Capitol, Jackson, Miss.

A. Jacques T. Schlenger, 1409 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Broseco Corp., 718 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. Sharp & Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Imported Hardwood Plywood Association, Inc., Ferry Building, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Thomas F. Shea, 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Citizens Committee for a National Service Corps, 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julian H. Singman, 1832 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gordon Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. E.G. & A. International, Inc., 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Spray, Price, Townsend & Cushman, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Gypsum Association, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Aluminum Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John J. Synon, Richmond, Va.

B. Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, First and C Streets NE., Washington, D.C.

A. J. R. Timmins & Co., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Charles and Baltimore Streets, Baltimore, Md.

A. Venable, Baetjer & Howard, 1409 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Broseco Corp., 718 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. John E. Vetter, 635 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. J. R. Timmins & Co., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. David R. Weinberg, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Mrs. Richard S. Wheeler, 5614 33d Street North, Arlington, Va.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

B. Colorado Railroad Association, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Lawton B. Wolfe, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Sixty To Be Honored at Academy Interview Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Saturday noon, January 11, 1964, 60 outstanding young men of the 20th Congressional District, Illinois, will be honored at a luncheon at Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.

They are the candidates for appointment to the military academies, class to begin in June 1964. Qualifying for final consideration by passing civil service examinations, each will receive recognition at the luncheon, which is part of a day-long program of interview and evaluation. During the morning, each will be interviewed by a civilian board. Members of the boards were selected because of their deep interest in the military affairs of our country.

Serving on the interview boards will be: Gene Terry, Quincy; Ralph Knotts, Pittsfield; Donald W. Marshall, Macomb; Philip L. Robinson, Springfield; Lee Ensel, Springfield; Frank Strieby, Quincy; Carl T. Meyer, Jr., Springfield; Harper C. Allen, Springfield; Ray Samples, Jacksonville; Jack Huff, Quincy; Richard Crook, Springfield; E. C. Bone, Jacksonville; J. E. Fetter, Quincy; Russell D. Shambrook.

From the young men now entering the military academies must come tomorrow's military leadership for the United States. Therefore, I am most anxious to select the best available talent. I appreciate the fine cooperation of the members of the interview boards in making possible this mode of selection.

Here are the candidates:

Charles E. Adkins, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Frederick H. Adkins.

William Robert Kastien, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Herbert D. Kastien.

John S. Lowe, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Siebert Lowe.

John B. MacWherter, Jr., Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. John B. MacWherter.

John William Mavis, Rochester, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Alvin M. Mavis.

Anthony Pianezza, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Pino Pianezza.

David J. Sweet, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Sweet.

Thomas Stewart Church, Rochester, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Alexander S. Church.

Lawson Eugene Barclay, Macomb, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Wilson Barclay.

David B. Owen, Bushnell, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank M. Owen.

John Neale Watson, Macomb, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. John D. Watson.

Rollie Platt, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Platt.

Larry York, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert G. York.

John Leonard Komnick, Athens, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Ben J. Komnick.

Ted Olson, Jacksonville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Edwin G. Olson.

Robert DeForrest Burley, Jr., Beardstown, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert D. Burley.

Barry Davis English, Jerseyville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. William W. English.

Michael Eugene McFain, son of Major and Mrs. Robert E. McFain.

Larry Vail Agans, Rushville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Lora V. Agans.

Darrell Dean Althide, Basco, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Orville F. LaBonte.

Howard R. Arnett, Carlinville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Russell T. Arnett.

Douglas Earl Asby, Gillespie, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Leland E. Ashby.

Roger Damon Cox, Plainville, Ill., son of Colonel and Mrs. Omer L. Cox.

Jack F. Curry, Mendon, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene M. Curry.

Tim Doolin, Ashland, Ill.

James Timothy Farrell, Pittsfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. James E. Farrell.

James David Ivers, Eldred, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. James Ivers.

Roger Lee Keithley, Blandinsville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert L. Keithley.

John Martin Silvester, Staunton, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Alex Silvester.

Richard Manard, Baylis, Ill.

Gary D. Schwartz, Quincy, Ill.

Douglas Lee Butler, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles R. Butler.

William J. Daughton, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. James E. Daughton.

Thomas Michael Feger, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Harold H. Feger.

John William Gilman, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. Paul Barber.

John Lapicola, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Lapicola.

Jay Samuel Griswold III, Camp Point, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Jay S. Griswold.

Steve Gustison, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Herbert W. Gustison.

Alfred E. Hempen, Hamilton, Ill., son of Mrs. Margaret Hempen.

Thomas G. Holford, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. John M. Holford.

Forrest Dean Krell, Williamsville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Walter A. Krell.

Robert Lewis Hormell, Jerseyville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Jack L. Hormell.

James Lee Narup, Golden Eagle, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Everett C. Narup.

Eugene Randall Olson, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Weslie W. Olson.

Robert P. Randolph, Macomb, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Anthony W. Randolph.

James Merritt Shank, Clayton, Ill., son of Mrs. and Mrs. Herbert M. Shank.

Daniel J. Schoenekase, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Carl H. Schoenekase.

Carl Damrau, Jacksonville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Adolph G. Damrau.

Joseph Lawrence Barbush, Benld, Ill., son of Mrs. Eileen Barbush.

Paul R. Bonansinga, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph R. Bonansinga.

Thomas Lloyd Dukett, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd J. Dukett.

Corley Lee Keran, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Wendell Keran.

George Robert Laswell, Springfield, Ill., son of Lt. Col. and Mrs. Harry T. Laswell.

Robert S. Micheletti, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Americo Micheletti.

Fred Edmun Smith, Bushnell, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Fred K. Smith.

Jeffrey D. Kinnan, Rochester, Ill., son of Maj. and Mrs. Floyd H. Kinnan.

Willie Cox, Alexander, Ill.

John Keith Feikert, Carthage, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Dale W. Feikert.

James Herbert Hoener, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Herbert H. Hoener.

Craig S. Cherry, Girard, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Bob S. Cherry.

Dr. Bradford's Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am highly privileged to request that I may be permitted by unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very moving poem by Charles H. Bradford, M.D., of Boston, concerning our beloved late lamented President John F. Kennedy. The poem is entitled "Farewell."

Dr. Bradford is an outstanding doctor and one of the greatest medical and humane leaders in the country.

Of a famous Massachusetts family, tracing back to the first Governor of our Commonwealth, he is of the Harvard College class of 1926, a great football player and hammer thrower, member of Phi Beta Kappa, magna cum laude graduate, also equally distinguished in the Harvard Medical School.

He is now a very famous orthopedic doctor in Boston. He is a twin brother of Mr. Edward Bradford, another fine Harvard athlete in football and track, and the brother of the Honorable Robert Bradford, the very able, distinguished former Governor of Massachusetts.

All the Bradford boys have had great collegiate and service records in time of war. Mr. Bradford was a paramedic and made many parachute jumps behind the enemy lines during World War II.

His father, Dr. Edward Bradford, founded an institution which has done immeasurable good for crippled children, the renowned Massachusetts Hospital School for Crippled Children at Canton, Mass., where the famed Mr. N. V. Swede Nelson has been trustee for the past 22 years.

Dr. Bradford has given most unselfishly the best part of his life to the care and treatment of handicapped children and other afflicted people.

He was a close friend of my late, much-admired friend and great football player-coach, Mr. Charles F. Crowley, of Harvard, Notre Dame, and Columbia.

To my mind, Dr. Bradford is one of the greatest Americans of our time, and it is with genuine feelings of pride, as well as deep appreciation, that I insert his beautiful, touching poem on President Kennedy in the RECORD.

FAREWELL

So bid him now farewell, but not goodbye;
The purposes he built must never die.
Great men, great hearts, great thoughts continue on
Long after we who thrilled to them are gone.
Into our heritage, he now has passed,
Joining the men whose work will always last.

—C. H. BRADFORD, M.D.

BOSTON.

Same Freeman Solution: More Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the scandal involving the operations of one Anthony De Angelis, of the Bronx, is mounting. Total losses to those who dealt with him or his firms are estimated at more than $100 million, a goodly part of this sum resulting from warehouse receipts for oil which cannot be found.

In addition, several brokerage firms were caught in a squeeze when it developed that the De Angelis firm, Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corp., of Bayonne, N.J., could not meet margin calls for futures in vegetable oil which it had been buying. This hit the brokerage firms very hard. One apparently is bankrupt as a result of the credit extended the De Angelis company. The New York Stock Exchange plans to put up $12 million to help one of the concerns involved. A third firm has been suspended from trading.

Undoubtedly there will be investigations as time goes on which will reveal more about De Angelis and his methods. I am concerned about the individuals and firms which may lose heavily in this mess. I am also concerned about another development growing out of the De Angelis crash. There are authentic reports that, as a result of futures trading by the Bronx manipulator and his firms, the Department of Agriculture plans to ask for more control over the commodity exchanges.

The decision apparently has been taken even before the Congress knows anything about this affair beyond what is read in the newspapers. The reports make me very uneasy. My uneasiness grows out of the attitude taken in the past by the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman. Mr. Freeman has his own pet remedy for agriculture's ailments. That remedy is more Government control.

It will be remembered that when Mr. Freeman, former Governor of Minnesota, took office in 1961 he proposed legislation which would have made him a veritable farm czar. The Congress, after the Department decided what it wanted to do, would have had veto power and nothing else. As Mr. Freeman envisioned it, the House and Senate's function was to rubber stamp his ideas.

As might have been expected, Mr. Freeman's request was rejected. Nothing daunted, he came forward with new proposals for mandatory power. To date, every proposal he has made for farm legislation calls for greater authority for himself and the Department's bureaucrats. Only last spring a wheat measure, which contained mandatory features, was rejected by the growers themselves in a nationwide referendum.

Offhand, I would have thought that Mr. Freeman and his followers would get tired of asking for more power over farmers and institutions which serve the farmers. Not so. Immediately we are told—via the newspapers—after the De Angelis scandal broke, that the Commodity Exchange Authority of the Department had to stand helplessly by while De Angelis and firms tried to corner the vegetable oil futures market. Obviously, this is Department propaganda, and now we hear that Mr. Freeman has decided he needs more authority over futures trading and is going to ask for it.

I want to know a lot more about events before I subscribe to the Secretary's view that the way to prevent other De Angelis situations is to give him more power.

Mr. De Angelis, if reports are true, was one of the really big oil operators under Public Law 480, which authorizes export sales of domestic agricultural commodities for foreign currencies. In actuality, most of these sales are heavily subsidized, since the foreign currencies are piled up abroad and rarely return to this country as dollars. Mr. De Angelis apparently had been in trouble before with the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the SEC, and the Department of Agriculture itself. He operated largely, it is said, as a subcontractor in recent years, and consequently did not do business directly with the Department. Yet it seems common knowledge that he sold oil abroad at fantastically cheap prices, prices which apparently figured in his downfall. It would seem that the Department would have bestirred itself and would have looked into the reasons for his strange operations. Surely this kind of trading in Government-subsidized transactions required close scrutiny. These sales abroad did not involve the commodity exchanges, or, if so, in a minor way. With all its vast authority, it seems that the Department could have done something to prevent the chaos which we have now. If anybody at the Department made any moves to head off the De Angelis crash, I have not heard about it.

There is a paragraph in the Wall Street Journal of December 9, 1963, which interests me very much:

> Months ago, Wall Street Journal commodity reporters, puzzled by the record increase in the number of vegetable oil futures contracts outstanding, questioned CEA officials. They were told: "Nothing seems to be wrong. We have a man on the trading floor most of the time, as a regular procedure. But no special investigation is underway."

This would seem to indicate that the CEA was not overly concerned. Is it possible that this regulatory agency, which has a history of asking for additional authority, simply stood quietly by, figuring that De Angelis and his operations might be the road to the legislation they have wanted for years?

Another factor gives me pause. Mr. Freeman and his Department have displayed a propensity to blame private business when something goes wrong. This propensity was evidenced in the course of the Billie Sol Estes scandal. This Texas manipulator got credit from an eastern chemical firm and also made heavy purchases of fertilizer. The chemical firm held liens on some Estes grain warehouses as security for the money it had lent. The Department, quite sanctimoniously, in the spring of 1962 announced it was moving the grain out of the elevators in order not to rescue Billie Sol from his "current financial difficulty." The Department knew that its blow really hit this private company. In the congressional inquiries which followed, some Democrats attempted to put the blame for Billie Sol Estes on "eastern city slickers," the business firm. Officials of the firm were given a thorough going over, and it seemed plain that the Department wanted the firm to take the rap. Now Billie Sol has sunk back into obscurity. It generally is recognized, I think, that this chemical firm was blameless in the Billie Sol Estes affair, while there is grave question in my mind as to whether the Department was in the clear.

As I have indicated, the proposal to give the Department additional authority over the commodity exchanges is not new. It has been put forward several times in the past, the excuse being given that speculation was causing high prices, or low prices, whichever fitted the situation at the time.

Insofar as I can find out, no farmer has lost anything in the De Angelis scandal. Farm prices did drop after reports of the Government's intention to ask for more authority over exchange trading. The markets apparently feel that the result of additional power over the exchanges will be bearish where prices are concerned.

One other factor in this whole picture amazes me. Our cattlemen are in real trouble. Imports are rising. Prices are low and promise to go lower. It is ironic then, that the Department is excited over trading on the commodity exchanges, yet seemingly indifferent to the plight of the cattlemen. The latter are being told, in effect, that nothing can be done about a situation which is costing them millions of dollars each day.

The Department says that cattlemen have refused, in the past, to submit to a control program and that, therefore, they are out of luck. Is a control program the price of help for the cattle producers? Is this the penalty which must be paid? Let me emphasize that Mr. Freeman's answer to every problem is control. I am of the opinion that there are ways to help the cattlemen without putting them in a Government straitjacket. I have an idea that many of them would feel better if the Department evidenced as much concern over these losses as it is evidencing in losses from the manipulation of Anthony De Angelis.

Mr. Speaker, I propose therefore, to take a long and objective look at any request from the Department of Agriculture which asks for more authority over any segment of agriculture, or industry.

The Food Industry and the Food Stamp Plan—An Effective Approach in Combating Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 13, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective ways in which we can intensify the battle against poverty in the United States is to assure every American, regardless of income, of a well-rounded and nutritious diet. Without any doubt in the world, we have the food resources to accomplish this. Under the food stamp plan, we also have the necessary machinery—the political instrument—for accomplishing such a purpose. But the food stamp plan is in operation only in a comparatively few areas of the country—in 40 counties and in the cities of St. Louis, Detroit, and Pittsburgh. Many more areas of the country, including all of the major cities not now included, would enthusiastically participate, I am sure, if the funds were available and their expenditure authorized by law so that the food stamp plan could be extended on a nationwide basis.

But to accomplish this will require the passage of legislation. The administration's food stamp bill, H.R. 8107, which I was permitted to introduce for the administration, has been pending for many weeks in the House Committee on Agriculture after having been approved by a subcommittee. I know the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture strongly supports the food stamp idea—he proved that on many occasions over the years in supporting my efforts to have the original proposal I made in 1954 enacted into law in 1959. That law has expired. A new law is needed if the limited pilot plans now financed under section 32 funds are to be extended nationally and be financed by direct appropriations.

FOOD INDUSTRY NOT GENERALLY AWARE OF PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, one of the major reasons for the slow progress on the bill this year is that the food industry has failed to evidence as much interest in this plan as it undoubtedly would if more elements of the food industry, and of the general public, were aware of the workings of the program as now operating.

Several months ago, on October 13, I discussed the food stamp plan at the convention of the Missouri Retail Grocers Association in St. Louis. Since then I have been told that this speech presents the kind of explanation of the program and of the philosophy of the food stamp plan that warrants making it more generally available through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am, therefore, submitting it for that purpose, as follows:

STATUS OF THE FOOD STAMP PLAN

(Speech by Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of St. Louis, at 64th Annual Convention, Missouri Retail Grocers Association, Statler-Hilton Hotel, St. Louis, October 13, 1963)

One of the most moving phrases ever spoken in the Halls of the Congress of the United States was included in a memorable farewell speech a dozen or so years ago by General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur. I am sure you all remember it, for it is now part of the folklore of familiar quotations. Taken from an old barracks ballad, the General's reminder, in closing his military career, was that old soldiers never die, they just fade away.

In politics, it is different. Old issues neither die nor fade away. They constantly recur. They live on, and periodically flare up into immediate importance all over again. I won't try to make you a list of such issues—it would be endless. But your invitation to speak to you today on the subject of the food stamp plan took me back nearly 10 years—for it is almost that long since I introduced my bill to establish a nationwide food stamp plan, and the issue, I might add, is more alive today than it was then when I first raised it in the House of Representatives.

The difference is that now we have food stamp plans in operation in numerous areas of the country, including St. Louis, and—instead of being the visionary dream of some impractical theorist—these plans work and they work well.

HAVE PILOT PLANS JUSTIFIED EXPECTATIONS?

No longer do we debate—as I had to do over and over and over again through a series of congressional hearings and House debates—whether the idea of a food stamp plan is workable and sound, and whether it is preferable to the direct method of food handouts of surplus commodities to the needy.

The question we debate now is whether the pilot plans in operation have been sufficiently successful to justify adopting the same methods on a nationwide basis. This debate has not ended. It is still going on in the Congress. One of the reasons I was so anxious to accept your invitation to talk today on this issue is that you who represent the grocery industry in Missouri can help materially in the resolution of that national debate if you are convinced the food stamp idea is workable and desirable and should be placed in operation in all of the stores in Missouri which might wish to participate in it.

We have the plan in operation in St. Louis only because the city administration, and the food industry here in St. Louis, joined enthusiastically with me in solving a hundred or more problems of redtape and administrative headaches in what was then a relatively untried field. We felt the potential of this plan was great enough to warrant the work which went into solving the problems. And now, I believe, everyone in St. Louis who has any part in the operation of the plan, or who participates in it, recognizes the value of the results.

WORKING OUT ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

But it was not easy and effortless activity in getting the plan started, and in working out the administrative complexities and inflexibilities. At my end of the telephone in Washington, I was in constant touch with the city and State welfare people here, and with the mayor and the aldermen and others vitally interested in making the plan work; and, also, I was a nuisance—I am happy to say—to the officials in the Department of Agriculture in pushing and persuading and forcing administrative changes to make the plan operate effectively and intelligently.

Now, I think the time has come to let other communities—in Missouri and elsewhere—share in what is fundamentally a very sound approach to the improvement of the diets of America's lowest income families. Do we have the food in sufficient abundance to assure every worthy American family at least a minimum-standard American diet? There is no question about it.

Our abundance of food, and our ability to produce more and more food far above our own requirements, constitute one of the most glaring differences between our system of enterprise and the Communists' approach. There are, of course, many, many other differences between freedom and totalitarianism, and the abundance of food is by no means the most important difference. There have been occasions in our history when freedom was not necessarily always accompanied by abundance of food and good eating. Most of us, I believe, would take in our belts drastically if freedom required it. It just so happens that our problems today—agriculturally—are just the opposite: that is, what to do with all of the food and how to utilize it intelligently so it does not rot and spoil.

NOT UTOPIA ON A HANDOUT CARD

All the more reason, therefore, why it is un-American—and I use that term advisedly—for us not to make sure every American family has the opportunity for a good, nutritious, American diet. And the food stamp plan provides us the means and the method to achieve that goal.

As I told the House Committee on Agriculture on June 10 during hearings on my nationwide food stamp bill—which is the Kennedy administration measure, I might add—an administration bill which I was given the opportunity to sponsor because of my long association with this issue, even though I am not on the committee which handles the legislation—but, as I told the committee during the hearings:

"The food is here; all of us prefer to see it eaten rather than stored or powdered or dehydrated or destroyed. The food stamp plan is a workable, effective method of getting good food and needy Americans together at the dinner table, where the rest of us can be found every day of the year."

I also pointed out in my testimony that this plan is by no means "Utopia on a handout card." And I explained why.

PURPOSE IS BETTER UTILIZATION OF FOOD ABUNDANCE

For one thing, every family which can meet the rather stringent income ceilings related to family size and composition, must purchase its food stamps out of the money it would normally be expected to spend on food. This came as something of a shock to many families previously receiving free surplus food each month. They had looked upon the food stamp plan as a possible avenue for increasing their net spendable income on things other than food. But it has not worked out that way, and it has not been intended to work out that way.

The idea—and the only legal basis for a food stamp plan under existing law—is to increase the consumption of food grown on American farms. We have been spending billions of dollars over the years encouraging food output, and other billions in storing the abundance, or in subsidizing its sale or donation overseas. The food stamp plan is the only really workable and successful approach we have developed for enabling more Americans to buy increased quantities of this food.

And the studies already made in the short 2 years since the first timid pilot plans were instituted show that the food stamp plan has indeed resulted in higher consumption of meat, milk, dairy products, fresh vegetables, fruit and other nutritious basic food items the very poor had not previously been able to consume.

FRESH FOODS IN PREFERENCE TO POWDERED

Why powder the surplus eggs if we can get more families to eat fresh eggs purchased in the corner grocery? Why powder surplus milk if we can get more families to drink more fresh milk? Why buy up cattle and convert them into canned meat and gravy for the free distribution program if we can enable more families to go into the meat market and buy red meats right out of the refrigerated cases?

Probably the most surprising statements in favor of a food stamp plan of aiding the needy in preference to the older method of distribution of storable surplus commodities each month from central depots came from a former high official of the Department of Agriculture under the Eisenhower administration. When I saw this material printed in a conservative publication, I was, frankly, flabbergasted. For the very man who made the report which gave the food stamp plan the edge—and a decided edge—over the distribution of commodities directly—had been one of the bitterest foes of my food stamp bill during the Eisenhower years. His name is Don Paarlberg, now a professor of agricultural economics at Purdue University, but previously an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture under Ezra Taft Benson.

Let me say that Professor Paarlberg thinks very few Americans go hungry because they are impoverished. Perhaps you in the food business, seeing what your low-income customers buy and live on, might have a different idea about that. But the former Agriculture Department official—who opposed the food stamp idea vigorously when he was in the Department—nevertheless now concedes that in operation, it has shown many, many advantages over the direct distribution method he used to defend so strenuously against my attacks.

GREAT INCREASE IN FOOD BUDGETS OF NEEDY

For these are some of the things which have happened under the food stamp plan:

First, instead of seeing their poorer customers going to a firehouse or an armory or a schoolhouse or some other distribution point to obtain large quantities of flour and dried milk and powdered eggs and cornmeal and so on, the food merchant in the food stamp areas now sees these customers back in his store buying good, appetizing, fresh and frozen and processed foods—just like everyone else.

Second, the low-income families participating in the food stamp plan, while having no more disposable income to spend on other things, have a great income increase when it comes to food purchases. They can now afford a good, well-rounded diet. Their children are introduced to the delicious foods all of the rest of us have taken for granted for years—orange juice, canned soups and frozen vegetables and fresh produce and good red meat and tasty baked goods and delicious poultry and all of the other wonderful domestically produced items you sell.

Third, the food stamp program enlists the State and local authorities in a direct manner and gives them many responsibilities for certification of eligibles. This is no longer done on a hit-and-miss basis, as was often the case in the direct distribution program where no one seemed to care too much how much chiseling went on—after all, it was just surplus stuff the Government couldn't get rid of any other way except shipping it overseas to give away there. But now the local authorities and the State welfare people must investigate and certify—and take responsibility for eligibility.

REGULAR CHANNELS OF TRADE

Fourth, the regular channels of trade are used all of the way through—from manufacturer to wholesaler to retailer.

Fifth, the costs of the program are clearly identifiable. Under the direct distribution program, the actual cost of the free food items is hard to determine, the storage and distribution costs are cloudy because they are divided among various jurisdictions and authorities, and the value of the time devoted by public officials at the various levels to the distribution functions can never be really accounted for. Under the food stamp plan, there are costs—there are expenses. But they are visible and ascertainable, and pretty exact. And the interesting thing about the costs is that even taking into consideration the subsidies involved—the difference between the amount each family spends in purchasing the food stamps and the cash value in terms of the food which can be purchased with those same stamps—the cost to the Federal Government would be about the same under a nationwide food stamp plan as they are now for the direct distribution program.

That is because the storage and packaging and shipping and warehousing and refrigerating and other costs which are necessary under the direct distribution plan would be eliminated under the food stamp plan. A customer coming into your store and buying a pound of butter out of your refrigerated case, and paying for it with a food stamp coupon, is paying for all of the costs of distribution with that coupon. But when a free pound of butter is handed out at a food distribution center, has the Government not had to shoulder similar distribution costs? Of course it has. And these would be saved. Together—adding together the present costs of direct distribution of surplus foods—they come to an amount equivalent to the subsidies involved in a food stamp program.

MORE PUBLIC CONCERN REQUIRED

So what is holding up the adoption of the food stamp plan on a national basis? The answer is that you are—you and others in the food business around the country who have not yet made your voices heard in the Congress on this issue; and your customers, who have not yet learned of the advantages to the needy and to the public of the food stamp plan over the direct distribution system; your Congressmen, and Congressmen from other States, who have not seen enough evidence of interest back home in this issue; and public officials at every level, who have failed to call for action in Congress.

The Secretary of Agriculture is solidly behind this plan. So is the President. So is the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. Hearings have been held on my bill and a subcommittee has recommended some technical changes which I was willing to accept, and which the administration accepted. I look for action in this session—if there is more interest on the part of grocers, wholesalers, manufacturers, and others in the food business, and more interest on the part of public officials at every level, and more awareness on the part of the general public and of the press to the importance of this idea in building better diets and having better nourished Americans in a nation overwhelmed in food abundance.

Unfortunately, I do not at the present moment see any substantial Republican support in the House Agriculture Committee for the plan. They talk about making it a joint Federal-State plan with the States shouldering half of the cost of the food stamp subsidies. If that were to be written into the bill, the program would be killed. There is no doubt about it.

PRIMARILY AN AGRICULTURAL STIMULATION PROGRAM

Missouri, for instance, is not going to appropriate the money to pay half of the cost of the present subsidy in the food stamp plan in St. Louis. It took a lot of doing even to get the State to shoulder some of the costs of certifying the eligibles under the regular welfare machinery. If the State were going to spend more money for its welfare clients, it would probably prefer to increase the monthly checks—and that, of course, is a necessity in any event. The State of Missouri is worried about the adequacy of many welfare costs—medical, rent, clothing, and so on—not just the food costs of its welfare recipients. Every State faces this problem.

The Federal program, however, is not primarily a welfare program—it is a food purchase stimulation program. It is an Agricultural stimulation program, now being paid for out of customs receipts earmarked for the farmers' benefit. One-third of all import duties, by law, are earmarked for surplus food removal purposes or other programs to help stimulate the consumption of agricultural products. It is this source of funds which has financed the food stamp pilot projects.

ATTEMPTS TO SCUTTLE PROGRAM

Under my bill, we would also add direct Federal appropriations to make the plan nationwide. But it would still be a farm-help program primarily. Unless and until we ever increase welfare payments to a level which would enable the recipients to afford all of the elements of a decent minimum standard of living, including a good diet, there is no other way to assure adequate quantities of good food for the lowest income families in our midst.

If a proposal comes under the heading of aiding the farmer, however, it is amazing how much help we can get for the undernourished. And that is the basis on which this program now operates. It may not be the most idealistic basis on which to approach it—but it works. And that, in itself, is important in a democracy.

So my advice to the grocers of Missouri—those of you from outside St. Louis who also want to enjoy the advantages of participating in this program and who want your low-income customers also to participate—is to get after your own Congressmen and impress upon them the values and virtues of this proposal. Get the grocery industry nationally more directly involved. Get the food manufacturers and processors into it—some have already shown an interest.

And, by all means, don't let the idea be scuttled by impractical amendments and conditions imposed by those who are fundamentally opposed to the whole idea, and who always have been opposed. I am not being partisan when I say that I never got a single Republican vote out of the House Agriculture Committee on my food stamp idea—not once in 10 years. Therefore, I do not intend to go along with crippling amendments intended to appease the enemies of the legislation. On a rollcall vote in the House, I know we can win. The problem is to get the bill out of committee without killing its effectiveness, and I think we can do that, too, if the food industry will join in the fight, and fight intelligently.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT IN AREAS OF UNEMPLOYMENT

This is not a partisan issue, but some partisans have made, or tried to make, partisan advantage out of it. In an instance I am sure you all heard about, a Member of Congress attacked the pilot plans because all of them, at first, went into areas represented by Democratic Members of Congress. But after his anguished cries of the partisanship he claimed was present in the establishment of the pilot programs, implying that Democrats were alone enjoying the benefits of this wonderful program, he didn't lift a finger to try to get it for his own district, or to help get through legislation which—like my bill—would extend it to all districts.

On the other hand, one of the strongest supporters I have had in the Congress for my bill is a Republican Congressman from Pennsylvania who now has a pilot food stamp plan operating in his district. I helped him get it. I supported his efforts. Why? Because, the first time I ever succeeded in having the idea voted on in the House—and it was a bitter battle—he was the only Member of the minority party to stand up and support me. Since then, many other Republican Congressman have helped—but none on the Agriculture Committee.

So it is not partisanship—it is primarily a reflection of the kind of district a Member represents. Those Members with a high percentage of unemployment in their districts, and with substantial numbers of people on welfare or receiving surplus food, know what the food stamp can mean in terms of a better diet and a better life for their people, and a better break for the neighborhood grocer, too, I might add.

ST. LOUIS PLAN A SOURCE OF PRIDE

My parting plea, therefore, is: Make sure your Representative in the Congress knows of your interest in this plan. You carry weight with him, for you are a local businessman and what you think about proposals in the Congress bearing on your business are important to your Congressman.

The food stamp plan, as I said, is not utopia on a handout card. It is stringently administered, and if you get it installed in your area, many of your eligible families may not want to participate, at least not at first. That would indicate either that they don't need the help, or that they don't want it; or, and this is more likely, that the administrative red tape is strangling their interest. That happened at first in St. Louis, but we pretty well corrected it. The requirements were overly rigid; they were initially drafted in Washington and Chicago, not St. Louis.

But if a program is valid, and needed, and wanted—the bugs can be worked out. And what has resulted in St. Louis is a source of pride to all connected with it. It certainly is a source of pride to me.

Case for a Mock Republican Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the distinguished Member from Iowa, FRED SCHWENGEL, recently addressed members of the student body of Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland, Ohio.

He presented a sound political argument to the student body, and under unanimous consent I include his speech as a portion of my remarks in the RECORD.

CASE FOR A MOCK REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

Greetings from Iowa's First District and from Iowa; from the Congress and especially from the Republicans in the Congress.

A special greeting to you from your Representative in Congress, FRANCES P. BOLTON. Let me add this reminder in regard to her service as your Representative. She is recognized by Democrats and Republicans alike as one of the outstanding Representatives in the Congress. She is an incisive and diligent worker on the Foreign Affairs Committee where she is both practical and human in her approach to the problems there. She, as most of you know, has a great interest in the educational institutions in America and students in particular. She told me she was very happy to know about this indication of your interest in politics at this very crucial and important time in our history.

It is good to be with students again; with people who want to learn about the affairs of state while they are preparing themselves for some technical and special service in this great and free economy we call the American system. As students in a school like this you are interested in and are taught the facts. Then, working from and using sound principles and rules and formulas, you apply your talents to build for the future.

Coming into this kind of atmosphere, it occurred to me that I should present this question—Should Case Institute of Technology hold a mock Republican convention? to one of the miraculous computing machines of today which all of you know about.

I fed these facts into the machine. For the Democrats I included the tax bill and budget deficits, the politics of civil rights, nepotism, the ineptness of our foreign policy—the Cuban fiasco, the Berlin wall, Latin American problems, Vietnam, and the fact that less than 5 percent of the President's recommendations have been acted on by an overwhelming Democrat Congress.

Then I fed the Republican facts into the machine such as their fight against inflation in order to stabilize the dollar, the continued efforts for a realistic and adequate farm program, their consistent fight for a strong civil rights law, the battle for a commonsense foreign policy and the Republican attempt to implement the entire Republican platform adopted in Chicago.

Then I put into the machine the fact that enrollment in this institute is all men with the exception of 10 or 12 coeds.

Then I pressed the button and breathlessly I waited for the answer. The answer was: "If you hold a Republican mock convention one of the candidates could be Jayne Mansfield."

When I pressed for an explanation I got this answer: "She has a better profile."

Now, let me commend you for your interest in politics. We need more young people who have a vital interest in the welfare of this country; people who are well prepared to carry this interest throughout their lifetime. A good place to start is Case Institute of Technology. Political parties are the heart of government in America. They provide the parts that make up the mechanism of government. The more people we can get actively interested in government and politics the more certain we can be that we will have good government.

My confidence in young people has been increased and strengthened through experience I have had in my office as host to 90 college students from Iowa who have been guests of Mrs. Schwengel and me in our home for a week (two at a time) and who spend the day in my office and learning about Congress in action through appointments we set up and meetings and sessions they attend.

In addition, each year I appoint a team of college students as research assistants from the University of Iowa.

Also, each year, I take a graduate student, selected by the political science department at the University of Iowa, to work in my office as legislative assistant and to serve as a liaison to my research team.

These have been enriching experiences for me and, I believe, rewarding experiences for them. I have been thrilled, in my association and work with them, to note their marvelous response to the problems that are presented to them. From them I have received many exciting ideas, among them the Iowa Plan for Growth and Progress in Higher Education. This is a program to allow every student in America who has a desire to gain a college education to do so through the private economy of America.

Now, to emphasize the reasons why you should hold a Republican mock convention. I would like to present two sets of reasons: candidates and issues. Unbiased examination of the facts can result in no other answer but a resounding decision in favor of a Republican mock convention.

Compared to the clearly evident prospects of an exciting Republican convention, the Democrat convention would be a dull, drab affair. There is no contest in the opposition party. The man in the White House controls his party's machinery and there will be little meaningful discussion of platform, issues, and candidates. Unless, of course, they try to run Bobby for Vice President. There will be no opportunity for grassroots ideas; everything will be well planned and, undoubtedly, skillfully executed. Yes, the Democrat convention would be a show, one of the dullest, most uninspiring and uninteresting shows of the century. It will be even longer and, yes, even more boring than "Cleopatra."

On the other hand, the Republicans can look forward to a spirited race for the presidential nomination. A number of well-qualified candidates have appeared on the horizon. There is no sure bet. There are at least six, perhaps seven, candidates who could conceivably become our nominee. There very well could be a dark horse candidate and you in Ohio are aware of the possibilities of Rhodes to a better profile.

Let me say that all of the Republican candidates have a better profile and would have the capacity and courage to act constructively. It seems that during this administration the craze has been touch football but this is indicative of the character of this administration; they have touched everything but tackled nothing.

Here, you as college students will have a chance to make a meaningful contribution to national politics. Here you will be called upon to make an important and far-reaching decision.

In a Republican convention there would be an opportunity for ideas and brainchilds to come forth from the grassroots.

In 1960 the Republicans formulated one of the best campaign platforms ever written by a national nominating convention. This platform was the result of a study by competent leaders from every facet of our economy which ended in the publication "Decisions for a Better America." This was used as the basis for the platform.

These are the type of decisions that you will have the opportunity to ponder on, build on and extend if you had a Republican convention. You, then, would have the opportunity to make decisions for a better America. An opportunity which will not present itself in a Democrat convention that will provide little opportunity to work its will because their platform has already been written during the last 4 years. And, even with its shortcomings there will be little chance to improve it.

The primary issues which you will be able to discuss at a Republican mock convention, without restrictions or commitments to an administration program are:

Fiscal policy: Here you would have a chance to formulate a policy that would assure a sound dollar, curb and prevent inflation, one that would call for a balanced budget and not a planned deficit.

Civil rights: We Republicans are the party of Lincoln—the first and greatest Republican

President. It was Lincoln who said during the Civil War:

"We should adopt some program by which the two races could live themselves out of their old relationships with each other and both come out better prepared for the new." This program has not been completed to date. In 1957 and 1960, under President Eisenhower, the Republicans passed the first civil rights legislation since reconstruction. Now, after almost 3 years of Kennedy rule, with many promises and commitments, we still have no new civil rights legislation.

You, in a Republican mock convention can help to formulate the program initiated by Lincoln. Here we are dealing with a moral question; one that is a problem throughout our country and one to which we must find a solution.

Foreign policy: What we need most of all is a clear, concise, well-defined foreign policy to go with our foreign aid programs. We Republicans have an excellent record in foreign aid. But help is needed and you can assist in providing it, to formulate a foreign policy that would reflect our heritage of freedom and would be conducive to its spread.

Aid to higher education: We need a new outlook on aid to higher education. There is no long-range solution among the administration's proposals. I have a plan, as I mentioned earlier, that provides a new approach that could lend to the solution of this problem, free of church and state difficulties and free of the always present fear of Federal control.

Farm problem: Last but certainly not least, I, coming from a farm State, can see firsthand the failure of this administration to formulate an effective farm program. Here again a new approach is needed. New solutions must be sought. You, through a Republican mock convention, can help us in finding the answers to these questions—you can play an important part.

All in all, a Republican mock convention would provide you with more excitement, it would provide more intellectual stimulation, it would provide for more creative work on your part and would enhance, to a greater extent, your understanding of a national nominating convention.

In light of what I have said, I have no doubts but that you will choose to hold a Republican mock convention, and at its conclusion you will decide to actively support whatever candidate is nominated at the national convention and work to help the Republican Party in this election and in all elections to come.

Consumer Economics and the "Credit Addict"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by the majority leader today that the House next week will consider H.R. 8459, dealing with Federal credit unions, recalls to my mind that at the time President Kennedy was assassinated, I had just returned to my home in St. Louis and had turned on the radio after having met that morning with the Missouri Credit Union League, and had given the keynote address at the league's 35th annual meeting.

The subject of my talk was "Credit Unions and Consumer Economics." In the course of the talk I briefly discussed H.R. 8459 and other legislation affecting credit unions, but primarily the talk dealt with the problems involving the uses and abuses of consumer credit.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest being shown by consumer groups and organizations of lending institutions in the plans of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency for inquiring into consumer credit matters, and in view of the scheduled consideration in the House next week of H.R. 8459, I am submitting herewith for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my keynote talk before the Missouri Credit Union League on November 22, as follows:

CREDIT UNIONS AND CONSUMER ECONOMICS

(Address by Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of St. Louis, at 35th annual meeting of Missouri Credit Union League, 9 a.m., Friday, November 22, 1963, at Chase-Park Plaza Hotel, St. Louis)

It is always a great pleasure for me to meet with the men and women responsible for the success of our credit unions, and it is a particular pleasure for me to be invited to serve as keynote speaker at the 35th annual meeting of the Missouri Credit Union League. I don't think we have to take any time complimenting each other back and forth, because you all know of my strong interest in this movement. And since others on your program are going to discuss pending credit union legislation, I see no point in being repetitious and going into that matter in any great detail, either. Of course you know that you can count on my support in the Committee on Banking and Currency for any reasonable legislative proposals to make credit unions more effective and more successful in meeting the needs of their members, but on the whole I think the credit union program now has to look inward as much as to legislation for its future development.

The credit union movement has been growing to such an extent that there is always the danger that you may outgrow your most important virtue and advantage, and that is the personal knowledge which the officers of the individual credit union have of the character and reliability and integrity of the individual member who is often a borrower. This personal aspect must be retained.

SUPPORT IN CONGRESS FOR H.R. 8459

Of course, the larger you become the more problems you encounter in finding useful and profitable places for your surplus funds. I think there will be a great deal of support in the Congress for proposals to make it more practical for the credit unions to help finance home improvement loans and to invest in various types of instrumentalities of the Federal Government, as proposed in H.R. 8459. There is broad sympathy in Congress for your goals. Most of the Members of Congress think highly of credit unions, because they have had some firsthand knowledge of the credit unions movement; and if they didn't have this information before coming to Congress, then your very effective national organization has certainly managed to lobby them with great skill on the good points about credit unions.

Furthermore, there is a congressional employees' Federal credit union in the basement of the building in which my office is located—and so many congressional staff employees belong to it, and use it, that the Members themselves wouldn't dare to be disinterested in the legislative problems of credit unions.

CHAIRMAN PATMAN PRAISES CREDIT UNION MOVEMENT

A month or so ago—on October 17—when the President signed H.R. 4842 allowing the Federal credit unions greater flexibility in their operations—not a revolutionary bill at all but useful in relieving you of some of the rigidity in the redtape in connection with annual meetings and the appointment of a manager—the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas, recalled on the House floor his sponsorship in the House 29 years earlier of the Federal Credit Union Act, at a time when he was not yet even a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. And he called attention to the fact that credit unions, Federal and State, now have a combined membership of nearly 14 million persons and assets of more than $7 billion. And we all applaud your growth. But as Mr. PATMAN declared, the most important single aspect is the common bond which binds together those who belong to the same credit union. This concept dare not be lost in expansion. Perhaps in some instances where growth is proceeding at a rate which threatens the unity of the membership and the close identification of members with each other, you may have to adopt the principle of a subcommittee structure so that responsibility is more widely shared.

For when you come right down to it, the credit union is the last of the friend-to-friend lending institutions, other than in the field of mortgage credit—and in that area, the savings and loans are now being automated and electronic computerized to such an extent that once the mortgage is arranged, you can carry on all transactions by mail and never see the inside of the institution for years on end. Don't let that ever happen to your credit unions.

NEED TO EDUCATE CONSUMERS ABOUT CREDIT

Now let us turn to the subject your president asked me to discuss: credit unions and consumer economics. Of course, everything you do in your credit unions is directly related to consumer economics—encouraging saving and providing temporary financial help at reasonable interest rates. I cannot think of a better group to talk to on the general subject of consumer issues and consumer problems, because credit unions are already far ahead of most other financial institutions in orienting their philosophy toward the consumer.

I would like to see you do much, much more educational and promotional work in this field, not because you are not already doing an excellent job in consumer relations and consumer education but because there is so much more which has to be done and which is not being done, and which you can do well.

As a nation, we have gone in so heavily for "buy now pay later" that the volume of outstanding consumer credit has more than doubled in the last 9 years; from $32 billion in 1954 to $66 billion today. This doesn't include mortgage debt, which runs to another $176,200 million.

The $66 billion includes only consumer credit other than mortgages; that is, automobiles, other consumer goods, charge accounts, personal loans, and so on. And about 78 or 79 percent of the $66 billion in outstanding consumer debt is represented by installment debt alone. The total of installment debt comes to more than $51½ billion, and automobile paper is less than half of this total; it is about 42 percent of the total of outstanding installment debt.

INSTALLMENT DEBT EQUALS ALL CORPORATE PROFITS

I think we can only begin to appreciate the magnitude of the $51½ billion in outstanding installment debt for consumer goods and consumer wants, things we have bought and are using or have used, but which we must continue to pay for into the future, when we realize that this figure of $51½ billion is almost exactly equal to the rate of total annual profits, before taxes, of all of the corporations in the United States.

Just imagine what would happen to those corporate profits, by the way, if we suddenly had no more installment credit. It would be unthinkable. Factories everywhere would close. Our whole economy is geared to the concept of enjoying now the things we want to buy or use, regardless of whether we can scrape together enough money to pay the whole amount.

If we were to try to go back to the period in our history when people bought only what they could pay for in cash, we would really be in a sad economic state. Generations of consumers have grown up in this country who have learned the magic secret of how not to do without the things they want but can't afford to pay for on the spot.

AMORTIZED MORTGAGES AND INSTALLMENT BUYING

Years ago, about the only thing a family could readily buy without paying cash was a home. In the deal for a home, they usually paid only the interest on the mortgage and had so little equity in the home that they lost it with the first cold breeze of recession—recessions were called panics in those days—when the market value of the home dropped below the face value of the mortgage, and the family was not able to scrape up the thousands of dollars necessary to reduce the mortgage to the home's lower actual value. This was before FHA, and before we had that emergency program in the first years of the Franklin D. Roosevelt New Deal to save people's homes—the Home Owners Loan Corporation.

FHA brought secure and practical home ownership within the reach of the majority of American families, who began to pay off their homes in the same manner in which they had previously paid rent. And this is how millions also pay off their cars and their furniture and clothing and refrigerators and other goods contributing to an improved quality of living.

A young couple getting married today sees very little reason to start out with few possessions, as their parents probably did, and certainly they see no economic necessity for doing so. They want to start out at about the same level of living as they enjoyed in their parents' home, and credit is easy enough for most young couples to enable them to have a nicely furnished home or apartment, a late model car, television, lots of travel, good clothing, and all of the things which make for the good life and which their parents or grandparents may have achieved only after 20 or 25 years of hard work and sacrifice—if they ever did achieve them. But, oh, those monthly payments. And, oh, the havoc of any temporary unemployment.

"SAVE NOW—BUY LATER"

The credit unions do a very good job of stressing installment buying in reverse—that is, urging members, though month-by-month savings to accumulate in advance the money necessary to buy the things one wants. Of course, in today's economic fashions, it's a losing battle, but nevertheless, every little bit of education in this direction helps. So keep it up. I am amazed at how many people will do this very thing of advanced financing through Christmas or vacation saving accounts on which they receive no interest at all. I'd like to suggest a kind of promotional campaign in which you stress to your members not only how much less an item will cost if paid for in cash saved up in advance, but also how much less than that it will cost if the money is saved through an interest-bearing savings account, such as in a credit union. Reducing it to such terms, perhaps we can swell the ranks of the save-now-to-buy-later consumer contingent.

We are all price conscious. But, as Senator DOUGLAS' hearings on the truth-in-lending bill have brought out, most Americans have no idea in the world what credit actually costs them, let alone how much the interest rate is. If they knew these things, undoubtedly more people would try to pay in full for the things they buy.

INQUIRY INTO NEED FOR FEDERAL LEGISLATION

My Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs has before it now about nine bills which are companion measures to the Douglas bill in the Senate—including the bill which I introduced and which would be the vehicle for hearings when we finally reach that stage. There is widespread interest in the subcommittee, on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democratic alike, in the subject of consumer credit and in the possible need for corrective Federal legislation in a field which often resembles an impenetrable jungle of confusing information.

Senator DOUGLAS, who was a professor of economics before he was a public official, is one of the most knowledgeable persons in the United States on the intricacies of credit and of the technical aspects of interest determinations, and he has made this legislation one of his major crusades in the Congress. To say his bill is controversial is to engage in massive understatement. Many of those who bitterly oppose the bill claim it is unworkable because of its requirements for stating in each instance not only the cost of financing but also the true annual rate of interest on any loan or credit transaction, with monetary damages in case of glaring error. However, many of the opponents say they are quite willing to provide the borrower with the actual dollar-and-cents cost of financing or of interest, claiming that this is what people are most interested in anyway rather than in the interest rate calculations themselves.

CONSUMERS UNAWARE OF INTEREST RATES

My own feeling, as expressed in that famous advertising slogan some years ago, is that "it's more fun to know"—to have all of the facts on costs and interest rates. I think most people would be grateful for the full facts about any credit transaction in which they were involved. On the other hand, I recognize the technical difficulties—as well as the very formidable political ones—in placing the true interest rate disclosure requirements into effect through national legislation. Undoubtedly, the prevailing true rates of interest would sound excessive—unconscionable—to most consumers now unwittingly paying 18 to 24 percent or more in true annual interest, when they think they are actually paying a rate somewhere in the neighborhood of 6 percent which they regard as the fair rate.

Your national organization, CUNA, has been doing a tremendous educational job on this issue, and has provided a good deal of the technical information being used by proponents of effective Federal legislation. And I applaud you for this work, for we are all benefiting from the facts which have been brought out and developed in connection with truth in lending.

We have never had legislation on the subject of credit regulation or credit disclosure in the House or in the House Banking Committee since the World War II period when regulation W was in effect, and again when it was proposed during the Korean war. Regulation W, as you may recall, was a Federal Reserve Board requirement that purchasers must pay at least one-third down on any installment contract, and must pay off the balance in a limited period—usually 18 months. This was undertaken during the war as a brake on inflation—as a means of preventing people from using credit too freely in competing for scarce consumer goods very much in demand.

EXCESSIVE USE OF CREDIT UNSTABILIZING

Excessive use of credit has been recognized for years under Federal law as an unstabilizing factor. In 1934, the idea of controlling margin was written into the Securities Exchange Act to prevent excessive and unstabilizing speculation in the stock market with borrowed money. This authority is used constantly by the Federal Reserve Board to raise or lower minimum margins according to the fever temperature of the stock market. Right now, the minimum margin is 70 percent.

In the investigation my subcommittee has been conducting into the surge in sugar prices this year, we discovered that futures speculation on borrowed money—on no more than 10 percent margin, and often as little as 2½ percent—contributed materially to the price spiral last spring which has cost us, as consumers, hundreds of millions of dollars. An unnecessary or artificial increase of as little as 1 cent a pound in the price of raw sugar comes out to $200 million a year. At one brief point this year the price was 6½ cents above normal. As a result of our inquiry, and the questions we have raised, the Department of Agriculture has now, for the first time, suggested not only regulation of sugar futures speculative trading, but of margins as well.

So the unrestrained use of credit, in any area of major economic activity, is definitely a matter of national concern, both to the consumer and to the economy as a whole. It is certainly important to you.

USES AND ABUSES OF CREDIT

Our plan in the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee is to dig into the various types of consumer credit for a better understanding of how credit is used effectively and how it is used destructively—into the uses and abuses of an economic device which can either bring great economic benefits for the country as a whole or great personal hardship for individual families, depending upon how it is used.

As part of our research work preliminary to hearings, we have been making a particular study of the rising tide of personal bankruptcies—nonbusiness bankruptcies—involving individuals not in business or in the professions. About 90 percent of all bankruptcies across the Nation fit into this category, and many, if not most, of them involve people who just couldn't resist buying things they couldn't afford.

THE BANKRUPTCY TRAIL

It is a tragedy written out over and over again in dreary legalisms in the Federal courts—symbolized by the two uneven lists on the bankruptcy petition—one being the short list of assets, the other the long list of liabilities. It is a sad thing indeed to see a wage earner's wordly possessions reduced into terms of 10 shirts worth 50 cents each; a child's coat, $2; dinette set, $10; sewing machine, $22.50 and so on. And on the other side of the petition—or on the next page—are item after item of installment debts, personal loan balances, hospital bills, utility bills, rent bills, and all sorts of unpaid obligations ranging through necessities up through expensive luxuries, including large amounts still due on repossessed cars or other installment purchases.

And often—I am sorry to say—the names of credit unions show up in the listings of unsecured creditors of people going into bankruptcy. One fairly large credit union reported to me that it has lost $18,000 or more in unsecured loans to borrowers who went bankrupt. I have come across cases of borrowers owing as much as $900 to their credit unions, meanwhile also owing everybody else in town—and also owing lots of merchants or loan companies in other towns as well. Amazingly enough, the bankrupts often have a history of relatively low earnings but relatively extravagant wants and desires they were able to indulge for quite a while before the house of credit cards collapsed.

DISCOURAGING FINANCIAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

So it comes back to the question of how well do you actually know your borrowers—how well do you know their characters? When fellow members of a credit union are willing to cosign a friend's note, the supposition is that they are convinced the man is a good risk. They should be sure. When you are working together in the same plant or shop or office, the chances are you get a pretty good opportunity to size up the other fellow in terms of his ability to manage on a salary not too much different from yours. Most of us can spot the chiseler in the gang, the fellow who lives over his means and, in addition, is probably gambling on every lottery or horserace or athletic event he can. A credit union cannot be victimized if the members, as well as the officers, refuse to be just plain softies for bad risks.

Let's face it: the fellow who has run up debts all over time is never a good credit union risk unless, and I stress this, unless the credit union works with him to get him out of debt. Just to hand over a wad of money to such a fellow so that he can pay off his other debts is not the answer. If he has been irresponsible enough to live far above his means, and to try to balance one creditor off against another—constantly borrowing from Peter to pay Paul—you've got a problem on your hands if you lend him money, for he may not proceed to use the money as you had expected.

Under Missouri law, the credit adjusters have now been put out of business, but a good credit union can nevertheless often perform many of the same functions—the worthwhile functions of credit adjusting—if you can arrange for a credit addict to get out from under, perhaps getting the borrower and his employer to agree jointly to have the loan repaid by payroll deductions.

TEMPTING THE CREDIT ADDICT

The credit addict would never reach his sorry state of constant shifting of debts and piling of debts one on top of the other if there were not so many merchants and lending institutions willing to tempt him and play along with him, contributing to his addiction, in the knowledge that a garnishment or a suit in a magistrate's court will get the money back plus a usurious interest rate besides.

As long as the garnishment law makes it comparatively certain for a creditor to get his money back eventually, the abuses of too easy credit are going to continue. What I have suggested is a sort of friendly or voluntary garnishment arrangement to help a credit addict back to economic health.

But of course there are the career deadbeats who feel they have it made—and who have, in effect, made a shambles of consumer credit.

These are the people who buy and buy in one town and then go bye-bye to the next, and their number is large enough, I am sorry to say, to cost us all money—in higher prices we must pay for the things we buy. Credit losses from deadbeats are not large enough to discourage the stores from granting credit, but the losses must be made up somewhere, and you and I are the ones who have to help to make them up.

THE SELECTIVE FINANCIAL AUTOBIOGRAPHY

A career deadbeat very often has a talent for writing a remarkably selective autobiography when he applies for credit, and he also has great skill in keeping a limited number of credit accounts in good standing somewhere. When he applies for credit, on anything from a record player to a late model Cadillac convertible, he can give several credit references which will usually stand up on a cursory inquiry. He may owe every other major store in town, but have a single good account he can cite to the credit office in opening a new account somewhere else. He can obtain the late-model car he wants to buy by citing a paid-up account for a beat-up old-model car he bought elsewhere sometime earlier, while neglecting to mention the ugly repossessions which dot his automobile credit history like junk heaps in an automobile graveyard. The used car dealer is not too concerned for he has so many financing companies competing for his paper that he can dispose of it very frequently on a no-recourse basis, and often without any discount at all, because the financing terms on the good risks are high enough to cover the losses on the deadbeats.

I have discussed with many officials in the credit business the ease with which the career deadbeat seems able to operate and the answer usually is that the credit bureaus could do a better job if all of the firms and organizations which come to them for information were equally interested in giving information to the credit bureaus.

OPPORTUNITIES TO VICTIMIZE PURCHASERS

Certainly, I don't have the answers for all of the ills which plague the economy as a result of such widespread abuse of credit opportunities, but obviously this is a matter which concerns us all as consumers. On the one hand, we don't want to see overly trusting consumers victimized by excessive charges and hidden fees which often turn routine-seeming credit transactions into nightmares, even causing the loss of their homes through fraudulent second mortgages; on the other hand, we do not want to be charged, as a cost of the merchandise we buy, a higher price than the seller would otherwise have to charge if his credit losses were not so high.

Whether or not we can close all of the loopholes in Federal, State and local legislation—and the chances are that new credit abuses will always spring up as we outlaw old ones—the fact is that education in the economics of credit, and in the intelligent use of credit, is the only way to enable the average consumer to cope with almost any credit situation—or at least know what he's in for.

One of the most effective agencies for doing a good job in credit use education, as I said, is the credit union. Of course, the best place of all is the home—but how can parents teach what they themselves have not learned? Teach the parents.

CUTTING THE TRANQUILIZER INTAKE

I guess I'm old-fashioned at heart. We had so little money in my parents' home—with nine children in the family—we had to approach every purchase, no matter how necessary, with a great weighing of all of the pros and cons. I'm glad that today most families do not have to scrimp and go without, but—looking at it another way—when we were able to save a little money ahead in order to buy something we really wanted, the experience of making the purchase, and the joy in its use, were thrills beyond description. When a luxury comes easy, it can't begin to carry the same joy with it.

And there was a lot to be said—a whole lot to be said—for not having the parents lie awake night after night wondering how they were going to be able to meet the monthly installments on a house full of luxuries they really couldn't afford to buy. When my parents worried at night, it was over the rent—and all those shoes.

Of course we are not going back to the old-fashioned ways; there is not a chance. But proper use, rather than abuse, of the opportunities to buy on credit would go a long way, I am sure, toward cutting down the sleeping pill and tranquiliser intake in many an American family where to use cigarette slogan sentence structure, the living is deceptively easy because the credit terms are.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Paul J. Harrell, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Acts 17: 28: *God is never far from any one of us for in Him we live and move and have our being.*

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, in the calm created by this pause, cause Thy spirit to steal into our hearts and reveal just how near and how dear Thou art.

In those times when Thou art not real to us, make us to realize it is not because Thou hast withdrawn from us, but because we accidentally or deliberately have wandered away from Thee. When we no longer hear Thee speaking nor sense Thy direction, make us to know it is not because Thou art not speaking but because we are not listening.

Be gracious unto Thy servants, the Congressmen of the United States. Give them wisdom and strength for the special duties of this day. Where courage is needed, be Thou near to make strong; where patience is required, let the calming weight of Thy hand be felt; where decision is demanded, deliver from dillydallying.

Grant, O God, that the true spirit of this Christmas season—its joy, its beauty, its hope, and above all its abiding faith—may live among us, that the blessing of peace be ours, the peace to build and grow, to live in harmony and sympathy with others. In the name of the Christ of Christmas we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1963.

The Honorable the SPEAKER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on December 13, 1963, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate on Saturday, December 14, 1963, the following messages:

That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4955) entitled "An act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.";

That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) entitled "An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.";

That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9139) entitled "An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.";

That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1868) entitled "An act to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating to adult Indian vocational training.";

That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2139) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho.";

That Mr. HUMPHREY be appointed a conferee on the bill (H.R. 7431) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.";

That the Senate passed H.R. 3005, entitled "An act to amend sections 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code to remove the requirement that an alien must make a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States before he may be enlisted or appointed in a reserve component.";

That the Senate passed H.R. 4338, entitled "An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances for travel performed under orders that are canceled, revoked, or modified, and for other purposes.";

That the Senate passed H.R. 4839, entitled "An act for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, California."; and

That the Senate passed H.R. 6720, entitled "An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.".

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS OF THE HOUSE SIGNED BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Friday, December 13, 1963, he did on today, December 14, 1963, sign the following enrolled bills of the House:

H.R. 6518. An act to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; and

H.R. 7885. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended, and for other purposes.

BILL OF RIGHTS DAY

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, December 15, is American Bill of Rights Day.

The first 10 amendments were written into the Constitution to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers. These amendments contained safeguards intended to spell out guarantees of our individual liberties that every free people should possess. These rights guarantee freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, the right of assembly and petition, the right of trial by jury, the right to be secure in one's own home, the protection of due process of law and private property and public trial and other rights that many of us, it seems to me, often take for granted.

Therefore, I think it especially appropriate that in Congress we take note of this day and recognize the freedom our American Constitution allows us to enjoy.

Thomas Jefferson once wrote that the need of a bill of rights was to protect the people from the tyranny of the legislatures and added:

> That of the executive will come in its turn, but it will be at a remote period.

In observing American Bill of Rights Day, it would seem to me, Congress should rededicate itself to preserving its own independence and integrity. Otherwise due to crisis, continuing mobilization and ever-growing government centralization, there may be undue power delegated and abrogated by Congress to the executive branch of our Federal Government.

Anyone who reads history will recognize why the guarantees and immunities of our American Bill of Rights are a heritage which should be upheld at any cost.

Let each of us and all citizens today resolve to protect these rights above anything we possess including life itself.

URGENT NEED FOR CONCERTED HEMISPHERIC ACTION

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the United States is today extending diplomatic recognition to the Governments of Honduras and the Dominican Republic. This action by our Government has come none too soon. It, nevertheless, represents a welcome recognition not only of two Caribbean regimes, but of the primary hemispheric need of the moment: unified inter-American action to meet the rising and increasing violent Communist threat to the countries of Central and South America.

On October 8, 1963, in a speech to the House, I urged our Government to extend its recognition and its assistance to the newly formed Governments of Honduras and the Dominican Republic. At that time, I pointed out that democracy in Latin America historically has been threatened most by its weak servants rather than by its strong enemies.

Now that diplomatic recognition finally has been extended I urge the executive branch of our Government to take whatever steps may be necessary to enable these countries to bear their responsibilities in maintaining the hemisphere's defenses against its enemies.

Recent events in Venezuela, Bolivia, and elsewhere in Latin America are ominous proof that the Castro-Communist movement is stepping up its campaign of subversion and violence. There is an urgent need for concerted and purposeful hemispheric action to meet this threat. Today's action is a step in that direction, but many additional steps will be necessary if the security of the Americas is to be safeguarded.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, we expect to have the appropriation bill for foreign aid on the House floor Monday.

I hope each Member will avail himself of the opportunity to obtain a copy of the report to accompany the bill in order to study it in detail prior to the time the bill is called up on Monday.

We are bringing out a good compromise appropriation, and I trust there will not be any serious attempt to cut the amounts below what the committee has recommended.

THE WORK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. BEN REIFEL, Ph. D. and Member of this House, gave me an Indian prayer which I have framed and in my office. It says:

> Great spirit—grant that I might not criticize my neighbor until I have walked a mile in his moccasins.

I try to adhere to this. I believe this long year of attendance to duty qualifies me for the long mile.

Although I do not concur that this is a do-nothing Congress—if that label implies that a Congress which defeats bad legislation does nothing—I do believe its incredible tendency to drag on, and on, is a mark of inept leadership which cannot go unnoticed. "Leadership" can be defined as an inherent, finely apportioned mixture of morale, loyalty, bravery, integrity, discipline, and the American traditional quality of follow me rather than do as I say, not as I do. One has only to review the past 2 weeks' record to see that the troops are restless.

Last Saturday, for reasons known only to itself, the leadership held this House in special session—a special session which by the most liberal interpretation lasted perhaps 1 minute and 30 seconds.

The purpose of that special session, the instigator of which did not show up, was not to permit the House to work its will on pending legislation which has kept Members here long beyond any reasonable expectation. Rather, its purpose was political in nature and to fulfill a political objective; namely, the 7-day requirement for a petition of discharge. The leadership wanted this House to work its will on the cause of it all—the civil rights bill. Subsequently the hocus-pocus of having the petition ready to sign on Monday was exposed for all to see. It could very well have done this under the Calendar Wednesday procedure, for which provision was made this past Wednesday.

But instead, Mr. Speaker, the House met for less than 2 minutes last Saturday. It adjourned before 1:30 last Wednesday. It completed regular business before 1:45 yesterday. Presumably it will adjourn within the next few minutes today. And here we sit, and sit, and sit; and wait, and wait, and wait; while the House leadership bides its time. If the leadership is truly interested in the House working its will on legislative matters, there were many bills on which rules were granted long ago, but which lay dormant while the leadership counted noses, or twisted arms, cracked the whips of patronage, bought off—or whatever the leadership does when it fears the "will of the people" through their elected Representatives may not coincide with the will of the leadership.

The conference report on the college facilities bill was filed on November 4, yet we waited more than a month—including a 10-day recess—to have the report considered.

Not all the Members of this House are members of the "Tuesday to Thursday Legislators' Club," and those of us who stay here to perform our elected duties, ought not be penalized at the expense of the Thursday to Tuesday commuters. We cannot commute from Washington to California, or Oregon, or Kansas, or Missouri on weekends. Yet we have been here from January almost up to Christmas Eve to accommodate those whose legislative duties seem to commence on Tuesday morning and end on Thursday evening.

The American people are smart enough to realize the part that politics has played in this marathon session.

And what of consideration of Members of this House, who rightly believe there are occasions when they should journey back to their districts, and communicate, and meet with, their constituents whose views they are expected to represent?

They return here for threatened rollcalls which are never called.

They return here for threatened legislation which is never legislated.

They return here for committee markups that are never marked.

They return here for Saturday sessions which last 2 minutes.

It is odd to me that we drag on and on, twiddling our thumbs, and yet when something as important as the Manpower and Development Training Act is considered, as it was on Thursday of this week, there is no time for a rollcall of record.

Mr. Speaker, most thinking people realize that this House of Representatives has within its grasp the power to save this Nation and our Ship of State, not only by turning us toward sanity in domestic problems, but in international relations. It alone can stop us from pouring out our substance to the point of national emaciation, weakness, and death among the world powers. The elected representatives of the States of the Union in the other body cannot do it, or will not do it for many subsequent elections. The executive branch will not do it as long as they adhere to "pig in a poke" theories socially, economically, and politically. The judicial has faltered in its judgment and prosecution. It is, therefore, imperative that we do our paramount job at this time; albeit this week, we have, in fact, many times gone down the branch of the road known as increased spending while standing on our reduction of taxes on the other branch of the road. This is an example of big government ambivalency. If we are to survive, we must not only choose a branch of the road, but the correct one. It is our high and solemn duty as the people's personally elected Representatives to perform now—and the time is 2 minutes until midnight.

The hour is now early Saturday afternoon. We have a whole legislative day ahead of us. The American people wonder why the expensive Congress is still in session, even though except for slim and tenuous dependence on an emergency wartime act, we would have been adjourned on July 30. I also wonder, and I for one, am here today with my "homework" done and ready to vote on any bills the leadership is prepared to bring forth. If we cannot lead, or "program" let us find those who can "fish or cut bait," and get on with the job, or adjourn sine die.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HALL. I thank the Speaker for the long minute.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to address the House today, but if anyone ever had any doubt about the fairness and the generosity and graciousness and calmness and the many wonderful qualities of our great Speaker of the House, I do not see how they could have any doubt now.

Mr. Speaker, may I say to you how proud we are of you. God bless our Speaker.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a copy of a House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 871) which was introduced on December 13 for the purpose of establishing a National Center for the Performing Arts and naming it in memory of our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

I take this time only to urge the Members of this body to give a thorough consideration to this legislation lest we detract from the purpose for which this legislation was introduced. I am in favor of this cultural center project, and I am totally in agreement that it is a uniquely fitting tribute to the late President. But one of the sections of this bill even includes a borrowing authority for the inclusion of parking, and so forth, at this site. I would very much dislike, Mr. Speaker, to make this the first Presidential memorial in history which has a first mortgage attached to it.

DEFENSE BASE CLOSINGS

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Defense Department in closing seven military bases in New York State runs counter to congressional policy. Congress has passed a good deal of legislation costing millions to aid depressed areas and alleviate unemployment and now the Defense Department arbitrarily eliminates thousands of jobs without requesting constructive alternatives from the Congress and without fully justifying the move to the Congress.

Therefore, I am introducing legislation which will require military closings to be studied by the Area Redevelopment Administration and to be justified by defense officials to the Armed Services Committees before final action can be taken.

With Congress constantly involved in appropriating money and determining our defense posture, the appropriate action, particularly for a move of this magnitude would be for defense officials to come before the Armed Services Committee of both Houses and submit detailed justifications for closing these bases.

After all, their appearance is essential and their justifications required by law each time new military construction is authorized. They should also be required when closings are contemplated.

Some of the people in my district will lose their jobs because of this action. And, in the Mohawk Valley, which has been designated a "distressed area," the economic impact will be tremendous.

I attended the New York State congressional delegation meeting when Air Force Secretary Zuckert and Deputy Defense Secretary Gilpatric told us that 17 military installations would be closed throughout the country, including 3 naval bases. Yet when the official announcement came out the next day, only 14 installations were included, none of them naval bases. At this time, no naval bases have been scheduled to be closed, and this naturally makes one question whether some influence was brought to bear to retain the naval bases.

I am for efficiency and economy in Government, but we were not given any facts or figures to substantiate that those things would follow, at least to satisfy me.

The economy, if any, no doubt will be determined as future budgets are sent to the Congress. It may turn out to be the same elusive will-o'-the-wisp which has accompanied other Pentagon pronouncements on saving the taxpayers' money.

The manner in which these closings were announced was ill-considered, in my opinion. The New York congressional delegation was given 48 hours' notice. They were not requested to make suggestions.

Inasmuch as the closings are to be spread over several years, we should have been allowed a few weeks' grace period.

These officials refused also to entertain any suggestions of delay until after Christmas. This, at least, would have softened the impact during the holiday season on many families.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BRAY, for December 16 to December 21, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MOSHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5179. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicle, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6518. An act to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution;

H.R. 7885. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8720. An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; and

H.R. 8747. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5778. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase from 10 to 20 miles the area within which the Postmaster General may establish stations, substations, or branches of post offices, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6518. An act to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution;

H.R. 7885. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8751. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHANSEN) there were—ayes 77, noes 17.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise the gentleman that on a motion to adjourn, when the majority of Members present vote in favor of the motion, a quorum is not required.

The motion to adjourn was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until Monday, December 16, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1442. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting the text of a convention (No. 118) concerning equality of treatment of nationals and nonnationals in social security, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 46th session, at Geneva, on June 28, 1962 (H. Doc. No. 183); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1443. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "The American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1444. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report of the Department of Defense relative to its disposition of foreign excess personal property for the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1445. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of October 31, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1446. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed supplemental agreement to the operating permit as amended under which the Rainier National Park Co. provides services to the public, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 9499. A bill making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1040). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 875. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1041). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the States of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 9498. A bill to require an economic survey by the Area Redevelopment Administrator prior to the termination of operations at certain installations or facilities of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 9499. A bill making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.J. Res. 875. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

523. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to hold an investigation of the New York stock market relating

to its antics after the death of President Kennedy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

524. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to certain material appearing in the Congressional Record of June 5, 1963, on pages 10222 and 10223; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

525. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to form a special committee to celebrate the 175th anniversary of the first quorum of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Herbert Lehman: Statesman and Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, December 14, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the death last week of one of America's most remarkable elder statesmen, Herbert H. Lehman, has thrust an additional sadness upon a people still mourning the loss of their President. I would like to take this opportunity to express my deep personal grief over his passing and to pay tribute to a beloved national and international servant.

It is difficult for me to realize that Mr. Lehman is no longer with us. Aside from being a personal friend during my adult life, he had been a dynamic and respected political figure since my boyhood in New York State. His indomitable ability and courage had permeated New York politics for more than a third of a century.

Of the great names in American politics that New York has produced, Herbert Lehman stands alone as the only man in the last 100 years to occupy all of her highest elective posts. He was elected to serve her twice as Lieutenant Governor, four times as Governor, and for two terms in the U.S. Senate. His abundant energies and social consciousness benefited not only his State and Nation, but all mankind as well.

On the day of his death he was preparing to leave for the White House to receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom, our Nation's highest peacetime award for a civilian. It is no wonder that the people of the world, and the people of my State especially, feel a kind of empty sadness—as if an old and dear friend is gone.

He was a courageous and practical idealist, a reformer, a philanthropist, a religious leader, a financier and, above all, a humanitarian. He will be remembered among the best Governors ever to serve New York. He was able to reorganize State finances and change an inherited $100 million deficit into a surplus of more than $75 million. He urged programs for public development of natural resources, to improve the prisons, to expand the mental hospitals, to develop welfare and housing programs, and improve the administration of relief.

He was an extremely capable administrator, but he was more. He said:

> Before I went to Albany my life was pretty well divided between business and welfare work. Business was business, and it was only in my welfare work that I allowed my heart and sympathy to play a part. I had not been there long before I discovered that in public work it was impossible to draw a line between business and welfare. I don't believe that I have encountered a question of policy in all my public life which did not cover the economic as well as the humanitarian field.

In his unceasing efforts to promote human welfare, he set before us an inspiring example of how we may hope to forward the international community and world peace.

At the outbreak of World War I, he became associated with the Joint Distribution Committee and directed the collection and disbursement of $75 million for the relief of Jewish war sufferers in Europe and Palestine. Later he became a civilian assistant to Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Navy. After the war he was appointed a special assistant to Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War. In 1919, he received the Distinguished Service Medal for his competence and devotion.

At the outbreak of World War II, he resigned his office of Governor at President Roosevelt's request to become head of the newly created Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations. In November 1943, plans for joint United Nations relief activity, which Lehman had begun to formulate, were implemented as 40 countries formed the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Lehman was chosen as Director-General. In 1942, he said:

> There will be those who will raise objections to our spending money for the people of other lands. They are the ones who say that what happens in other parts of the world is not our concern. But surely this war has proved that we cannot live within our own little shell. We must feed and clothe and find shelter for the millions whose lives have been disrupted by the war. Then we must do what we can to help these people to become once more independent.

He showed this same kind of courage throughout his political career. During the McCarthy hysteria, he joined with Senator Ralph E. Flanders in an effort to strip Senator McCarthy of his committee chairmanships. And on the eve of a crucial senatorial contest, he voted against a crude piece of anti-Communist legislation. It was political dynamite. At the time, he stated:

> I will not betray the people of my State in order to cater to the mistaken impression some of them hold. My conscience will be easier, though I realize my political prospects may be more difficult.

In the twilight of his life it was this same kind of spirit that made him join with Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt to push for governmental reform in his beloved State.

Herbert Lehman spent a lifetime attempting to do what he could to help and benefit other people. He lent an image and a stature to public office that, unfortunately, is too often lacking.

I was 15 when I first met Mr. Lehman. He was then a 50-year-old man with half a century of experience and tremendous personal and financial success behind him. That was 1928, the year he began his political career as Lieutenant Governor under Franklin D. Roosevelt. Youth is impressionable—and in Herbert Lehman we found an officeholder to look up to with admiration and respect. This respect was not dimmed by adulthood.

At the age of 26, I was privileged to be elected to the State senate in Albany. There, my respect for Governor Lehman increased and our acquaintance became a close friendship.

Despite our difference in political party, our goals were similar; and we sought to achieve these to the best of our abilities and respective political parties. We shared a bipartisan belief in the goals of peace, justice, freedom, and the dignity of the individual. Our political affiliation over the years was based on the mutual desire to enact programs that would benefit all the people of New York. I am extremely proud of the fountain pens and certificates adorning the walls of my office that Governor Lehman used to affix his signature to many bills which I had sponsored.

Our personal affiliation was based on respect for the opinions of each other and on the interests we held in common.

The last time I talked with Mr. Lehman and his very lovely and gracious wife, Edith, an exceptionally talented woman in her own right, was last May during a 2-day speaking engagement I had in California. I visited him at the Desert Hospital in Palm Springs. Despite a broken hip and obvious pain, he was alert and cheerful. At 85, he still had the spirit of a young man.

Herbert Lehman served his State and Nation long and well, but he also served mankind. He was the kind of world citizen so desperately needed on a globe beset by misery, misunderstanding, and strife. He was a religious man and he believed that we are our brother's keeper.

The world will miss Herbert Lehman—and we hope for more men like him.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore, Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of grace and glory: Once more with an unnumbered host under all skies, crowding the Bethlehem way, we jubilantly approach the feast of The Child, who in His advent was set for the falling and rising of nations.

We come with a joyous Te Deum in our hearts that He, who came to a crib of straw, and who could not be stopped by a cruel cross, is our Great Contemporary, and that when from our grateful plenty, we feed, warm, shelter, and clothe even those who think of themselves as our enemies, we, too, bow at the manger to keep Christmas in our hearts, as the Christ of the Holy Night whispers, "Ye do it unto Me."

Grateful that faith has still its Bethlehem, may we here highly resolve that the word of childlike humility, of uncalculated service, of undaunted courage, and of undimmed faith may be made flesh in our own lives, cradled by faith and hope and love. With this invincible defense, send us forward into the waiting new year determined to put into the fugitive fragments of every day such quality of work as will make us unashamed when all our days are done.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 13, 1963, was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of December 13, 1963, Mr. FULBRIGHT, on December 14, 1963, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably Executive N, 88th Congress, 1st session, a convention with Mexico for solution of the problem of the Chamizal, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 7) thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of December 12, 1963,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on December 14, 1963, signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 6518. An act to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; and

H.R. 7885. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on December 13, 1963, the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 1703. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1868. An act to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating to adult Indian vocational training;

S. 2139. An act to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho;

H.R. 3005. An act to amend sections 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the requirement that an alien must make a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States before he may be enlisted or appointed in a Reserve component;

H.R. 4839. An act for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.;

H.R. 4955. An act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, to extend for 3 years the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas), and for other purposes;

H.R. 5179. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicle, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8720. An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962;

H.R. 8747. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9139. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, during the morning hour, statements be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following leters, which were referred as indicated:

AMERICAN-MEXICAN CHAMIZAL CONVENTION ACT OF 1964

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate compliance with the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed August 29, 1963, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONVENTION ADOPTED BY INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, Convention No. 118, concerning equality of treatment of nationals and nonnationals in social security, adopted by the International Labor Conference at Geneva, on June 28, 1962 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department, on foreign excess personal property, as of June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONCESSION CONTRACT IN HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed amendment to the concession contract with the Sisters of Mercy of St. Joseph's Hospital, to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT TO CONCESSION PERMIT IN MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed supplemental agreement to the operating permit under which the Rainier National Park Company provides concession services to the public in Mount Rainier National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 9

"The 22d day of November will go down in history as the anniversary of the day that the people of the world were thrown into deep sorrow upon hearing of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

"It was a day of sadness for all and will linger in the minds of mankind for many years to come.

"It would be most fitting for the Congress of the United States to set aside November 22 of each year as a day when the people of our Nation can rededicate themselves to the ideals which were set forth by our 35th President: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to declare November 22 as President Kennedy Memorial Day; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate in Washington, D.C. as well as each Member of the Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

"MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
"*Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.*"

RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF CITY OF BUFFALO, N.Y.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N.Y., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1773, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to encourage investment in the American merchant marine by providing a program of assistance in the construction of vessels, to correct inequities, to stimulate the domestic commerce of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PELL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 2379. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States (Rept. No. 780).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

H.R. 7044. An act to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission (Rept. No. 783); and

H.J. Res. 778. Joint resolution to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law, and authorizing appropriations therefor (Rept. No. 781).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

H.J. Res. 779. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 (Rept. No. 782).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2389. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2390. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to accept money from certain universities for the purpose of augmenting the pay of medical personnel engaged in conducting a medical teaching program at the District of Columbia General Hospital; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. DODD, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 2391. A bill to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2392. A bill to provide an additional place for holding court in the district of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 2393. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John W. Cassell, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON S. 815, TO ADJUST LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN FEDERAL ENCLAVES

Mr. MUSKIE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 236); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of the hearings on S. 815, a bill to adjust legislative jurisdiction over certain Federal enclaves, held before its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations during the Eighty-eighth Congress, first session.

SPORTS ANTITRUST BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators THOMAS J. DODD, EDWARD V. LONG, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, KENNETH B. KEATING, and ROMAN L. HRUSKA, I am introducing a bill to clarify antitrust regulations that have been as great an irritant to professional sports as an umpire who is unfair in some cases and uncertain in others.

Currently, football, basketball and hockey come under the law while baseball is exempted by Supreme Court decisions that invited legislation. This bill, in my opinion, would put all four team sports on an equal footing.

This proposal, however, recognizes that professional sports have a unique character and, therefore, limits the applicability of the law.

Specifically, the bill states that antitrust regulations will not apply to agreements and rules pertaining to—

First, the equalization of competitive player strengths.

Second, the employment, selection, or eligibility of players, or the reservation, selection, or assignment of player contracts.

Third, the right to operate within specific geographic areas.

Fourth, the preservation of public confidence in the honesty of sports contests.

Player drafts, reserve clauses, and territorial franchises have been the practice for years but their legality has always been in doubt—at least in the case of football, hockey, and basketball.

In my view, all organized team sports should be treated alike. While we recognize professional team sports as businesses, we feel they have peculiar problems that should be given consideration if professional sports are to flourish for the public's enjoyment.

Since 1958, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly has considered legislation in this field, and has seen one bill become law during the 87th Congress, permitting member clubs of a league in these four sports to pool their separate rights in the telecasting of games and permitting the league to sell such rights. Therefore, some reference to the judicial and legislative history in this area is necessary to an understanding of the problem.

In 1922, in *Federal Baseball Club of Baltimore* v. *National League*, 259 U.S. 200, the Supreme Court ruled that in its opinion, baseball was not a commercial enterprise and, therefore, was not subject to the Federal antitrust laws. In 1953, the Court followed this decision in *Toolson* v. *New York Yankees*, 346 U.S. 356, saying in part:

> The business has thus been left for 30 years to develop on the understanding that it was not subject to the existing antitrust legislation. The present case asks us to overrule the prior decision and with retrospective effect hold the legislation applicable. We think that if there are evils in this field which now warrant application to it of the antitrust laws, it should be by legislation.

Then in 1955, in *United States* v. *International Boxing Corp. of New York*, 348 U.S. 236 (1955), the Court ruled that professional boxing matches were fully within the antitrust laws. And in 1957, in *Radovich* v. *National Football League*, 352 U.S. 443 (1957), held that professional football could claim no exemption from the antitrust laws. The Court in commenting upon the apparent inconsistent rulings in the Federal Baseball decision of 1922 and the Toolson decision of 1953 said in part:

> If this ruling is unrealistic, inconsistent, or illogical, it is sufficient to answer, aside from the distinctions between the businesses, that were we considering the question of baseball for the first time upon a clean slate we would have no doubts. But Federal Baseball held the business of baseball outside the scope of the act. No other business claiming the coverage of those cases has such an adjudication. We, therefore, conclude that the orderly way to eliminate error or discrimination, if any there be, is by legislation and not by court decision. Congressional processes are more accommodative, affording the whole industry hearings and an opportunity to assist in the formulation of new legislation. The resulting product is therefore likely to protect the industry and public alike.

The net effect of the Supreme Court decisions is to give baseball a preferred status outside of the antitrust laws, a status that is not enjoyed now by other organized sports such as football, hockey, and basketball. This result would appear to be inequitable and the legislation is designed partially to eliminate that inequity.

In July 1958, during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee held hearings on two similar bills, H.R. 10378, approved by the House, and S. 4070, both of which would have provided antitrust exemptions for the four professional team sports. The bills were tabled because of insufficient time for the Senate to give them adequate consideration.

In July 1959, during the 1st session of the 86th Congress, the subcommittee held hearings on two additional bills dealing with this subject, S. 616 and S. 886. On September 2, 1958, the subcommittee reported out another bill, S. 2545, which exempted from the antitrust laws those activities of football, basketball, and hockey which were deemed necessary to their operations. Baseball was not included under this bill, and no final action was taken on it.

In May 1960, during the 2d session of the 86th Congress, the subcommittee held hearings on S. 3483, similar to S. 886, but again no final action was taken.

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the subcommittee's consideration of this issue related only to one aspect of the total problem, the telecasting of professional team sports events, which had been discussed as part of the earlier bills. Action was needed because of a district court decision prohibiting pooling of separate television rights for sale to a network. On September 12, 1961, the subcommittee reported out S. 2427, to permit member clubs of a league in football, baseball, basketball, and hockey to pool their separate rights in the telecasting of their games and permit the league to sell such rights. A similar bill, H.R. 9096, was passed by the House on September 18, 1961, and approved by the Senate on September 21, 1961. It has become Public Law 87–331. Another bill, S. 168, granting exemptions from the antitrust laws, was not acted upon.

The bill I am introducing, with one exception, is similar to S. 4070, on which the subcommittee held hearings in 1958. The provision in S. 4070 relating to regulation of rights to broadcast and telecast reports and pictures of sports contests has been eliminated because Public Law 87–331 now is in force.

Therefore, I am urging the Congress to take favorable action on this legislation in order to eliminate the legal uncertainty which presently exists and to place the four major professional team sports on an equal status under the law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the Record and that the bill may be permitted to lie on the table for 48 hours so that Senators who may wish to do so may join as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and will lie on the table, as requested.

The bill (S. 2391) to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hart (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 2, 1890, as amended (26 Stat. 209); the Act of October 15, 1914, as amended (38 Stat. 730); and the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (38 Stat. 717), shall not apply to any contract, agreement, rule, course of conduct, or other activity by, between, or among persons conducting, engaging, or participating in any one of the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, or hockey which relates to—

(1) the equalization of competitive playing strengths;

(2) the employment, selection, or eligibility of players, or the reservation, selection, or assignment of player contracts,

(3) the right to operate within specific geographic areas; or

(4) the preservation of public confidence in the honesty in sports contests.

Sec. 2. As used in this Act, "persons" means any individual, partnership, corporation, or unincorporated association or any combination or association thereof.

Sec. 3. Nothing in this Act shall affect any cause of action commenced prior to the effective date hereof in respect to the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, or hockey.

Sec. 4. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to deprive any players in the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, or hockey of any right to bargain collectively, or to engage in other associated activities for their mutual aid or protection.

Sec. 5. Except as provided in Section 1 of this Act, nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to change, determine or otherwise affect the applicability or non-applicability of the antitrust laws to the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, or hockey.

Sec. 6. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to amend or otherwise affect the Act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 732).

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] for his leadership in introducing this legislation, and I am most pleased to join with him in this project.

As a lover of sports and also as one who tries his hardest to live up to American ideals of sportsmanship, I believe it is absolutely essential that the Congress let professional team sports know the exact rules of the game that they have to play within; and when I say rules of the game, I mean that body of complex antitrust laws which, over the years, has had much uncertain and uneven application to professional sports as well as to almost every other avenue of business enterprise. This one thing I know; that every professional sport ought to be treated alike under the law unless there are circumstances peculiar to particular sports which dictate a rational differentiation in treatment.

The bill which is being introduced today will serve as a proper vehicle for reexamining the status of several key team sports under the antitrust laws, and while quite possibly the hearings we will have will disclose areas in which the bill should be modified, I concur in the main lines of approach from which we are starting and accordingly join with my colleagues in the introduction of the bill today.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 362)

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 16, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1868. An act to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating to adult Indian vocational training; and

S. 2139. An act to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 335) designating the 17th day of December of each year as "Wright Brothers Day."

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. MILLER:

Statement delivered by him before the U.S. Tariff Commission, December 12, 1963, with respect to duties on dressed beef and veal, and a supporting table.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF 1ST SESSION OF 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time I should like to take my place in this body, as a Member of the Senate and as a Member of the Congress, to say some kind and some well-deserved words for the Congress. I do so in my capacity as a Senator from the State of Montana, because what Congress does, it does as a whole; and what the Senate does, it does as a whole, and does as a body composed of both Democrats and Republicans.

This session of the 88th Congress is almost over; and after a short and needed breather, we shall be in the 2d session. There has been a lot of talk and some criticism about this Congress; and while I think some of it is deserved, we are going to end with a respectable record, and I hope this will be recognized. There is very important work yet to be done, but we are going to come back here next year and get to work and do it. So this is not the time for a final report on how the 88th Congress has done, any more than the half-time period is the time to talk about who has won the football game.

I want to say that while I do not think the work is done, I think we have made a good start. The Senate has passed 88, or 65 percent of the 137 Presidential recommendations sent to us. This includes the higher education bill, the medical education bill, and the vocational education National Defense Education Act impacted areas bill, all of which the Congress as a whole has passed. This Congress also greatly strengthened and expanded the Manpower Retraining Act. I believe this unequaled record in education alone makes this a good Congress, even if we had done nothing else. But we have. This Congress also enacted the first really important mental health legislation, with the Mental Health Facilities Act and the Mental Retardation-Child Health Act. I think that makes this Congress about first in this new and vital field, as well.

There has been legislation, important legislation, too, in the field of natural resources, which will conserve some of the wild and beautiful parts of our country for later generations. Here, too, more needs to be done; and I believe that at the next session we will do it.

But, in my opinion, the greatest accomplishment of this session was the nuclear test ban treaty. This represented the first calculated step on the road to reason in international nuclear affairs—in other words, the road to peace. This debate, which occupied the Senate for several weeks, enabled the country to hear the issues, weigh the dangers, and decide on the merits of a matter dealing with the most crucial question of our time.

This Congress has had to deal with hard, tough questions from the start: foreign relations, railroad labor, Federal aid to education, tax reduction, and civil rights. Any one of these is big enough and controversial enough to keep the Congress busy for a long time. Put them together along with hospital care for the aged and you have just what we have here: a long session almost over, with hard work—perhaps the hardest—yet to be done.

But I say this is only the half time; and with the leadership, the forcefulness, and the determination of President Johnson, this Congress will, in my opinion, have answered "yes" to every one of these major issues by the time we adjourn next year.

Mr. President, let me also invite the attention of Senators to the fact that by means of the seven appropriation bills passed by the Congress as a whole and sent to the White House, Congress has reduced appropriations in the sum of $4,199,831,250. There are still other appropriation bills to come. The appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies, the legislative appropriation bill, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and the State, Justice, and judiciary appropriation bill are at present in conference; and I hope we shall have before us the foreign aid appropriation bill, which today is to be brought up in the House of Representatives. It is my further hope that the Senate will take them up before it adjourns.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a subject report, under date of December 13, on Presidential recommendations, indicating what the situation is in this respect and in other respects; also a memorandum on the action status of Presidential recommendations; also a Senate legislative activity tally sheet through December 12, 1963.

There being no objection, the memorandums were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 6, 1963.

To: Senator MANSFIELD.
From: Majority policy committee staff.
Subject: Presidential recommendations.

There have been 125 legislative recommendations submitted in the various messages, letters, and executive communications. There are 15 appropriations, including the two supplementals for fiscal 1963. The combination makes a total of 140. There are three on which specific draft legislation has not been submitted: Narcotics control, user charges—fuel and air freight, and urban affairs department. Based on 137, the following figures apply:

	Percent
Action completed	54 or 40
In conference	5 or 3
Passed Senate	29 or 22
Total	88 or 65

DECEMBER 13, 1963.

ACTION STATUS OF PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS (LEGISLATIVE, 123; APPROPRIATIONS, 14)—SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE, 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Recapitulation: Action completed (54), in conference (5), passed Senate (29), Senate Calendar (1), passed House (1), House Calendar (9), committee action (24), no action (14), rejected (1), no legislation (3)—

ACTION COMPLETED (54)

1. AEC authorization. Public Law 88–72.

2. AEC supplemental authorization, Public Law 88–189.

Appropriations

3. Agriculture supplemental for 1963, Public Law 88–1.

4. Supplemental, 1963. Public Law 88–25.
Fiscal year 1964:

5. Defense, Public Law 88–149.

6. Independent offices, Public Law 88– .

7. Interior, Public Law 88–79.

8. Labor-HEW, Public Law 88–136.

9. Military construction, Public Law 88– .

10. Public works, Public Law 88– .

11. Treasury-Post Office, Public Law 88–39.

12. Civil Rights Commission extension, Public Law 88–152.

13. Clean Air Act, Public Law 88– .

14. Corporate-excise tax extension, Public Law 88–52.

15. District of Columbia fiscal affairs, Public Law 88–104.

16. District of Columbia National Cultural Center, Public Law 88–100.

17. Disarmament Agency—increased authorization, Public Law 88–186.

18–21. Education: Exceptional children, teachers, Public Law 88–164; higher education, Public Law 88– ; medical education, Public Law 88–129; vocational education—National Defense Education Act—impacted areas, Public Law 88– .

22. Equal pay for women, Public Law 88–38.

23. Export-Import Bank extension, Public Law 88–101.

24. Feed grains, Public Law 88–26.

25. Foreign aid authorization, Public Law 88– .

26. Foreign Service buildings, Public Law 88–94.

27. Housing for elderly, increased authorization, Public Law 88–158.

28. Mental health, Public Law 88–164.

29. Mental retardation, child health, Public Law 88–156.

30. Military construction authorization, Public Law 88–174.

31. Military pay, Public Law 88–132.

32. Military procurement authorization, Public Law 88–28.

33. Outdoor recreation, Public Law 88–29.

34. Peace Corps expansion, Public Law 88– .

35–37. Public debt, increase ceiling: To August 30, 1963, Public Law 88–30; to November 30, 1963, Public Law 88–106; to June 29, 1964, Public Law 88–187.

38. Railroad labor dispute, Public Law 88–108.

39. Railroad retirement amendments, Public Law 88–133.

40. Reorganization plan I—Roosevelt Library. Effective July 26.

41. Silver policy repeal, Public Law 88–36.

42. Space authorization, Public Law 88–113.

43. Tax on air passenger transportation—extend at 5 percent, Public Law 88–52.

Treaties ratified

44. Nuclear test ban.

45. Coffee agreement.

46. Consular convention with Korea.

47. Consular convention with Japan.

48. Extradition treaty with Brazil—amend.

49. Extradition Treaty with Israel.

50. Extradition Treaty with Sweden.

51. Protocol to International Civil Aviation Convention.

52. UMT extension—4 years, Public Law 88–2.

53. Veterans' family benefits, Public Law 88–21.

54. World Bank—increase capital stock, Public Law 88–178.

IN CONFERENCE (5)

1–4. Appropriations: Agriculture, District of Columbia, Legislative, State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary.

5. Pacific Northwest Power.

PASSED SENATE (29)

1. Airport construction extension (August 26), House Calendar.

2. Area Redevelopment (June 26), House Calendar—rule hearing (September 24).

3. Dairy program (October 10).

4. Equal time suspension, House Joint Resolution 247 (October 2).

5. International air rates, S. 1540 (November 26).

6. Juvenile Delinquency Act extension (September 25), House subcommittee approved October 8.

7. Land-use adjustments (October 11).

8. Library services and construction (S. 2267) (November 26).

9, 10. Manpower Training Act amendments (two bills), H.R. 8720, passed House December 12.

11. Mass transit (April 4), House Calendar.

12–15. Migratory labor (four bills, S. 521, S. 523, S. 524, S. 525).

16. National Defense Education Act, extend loan forgiveness provision, S. 569 (October 24).

17. National Service Corps (August 14), House Labor Subcommittee approved December 11.

18. President's Transition Act, passed Senate amended October 17.

19. Public defenders (August 6), House Calendar.

20. River basin planning (December 4).

21. SEC amendments (July 30), House hearings November 19–21, December 3–5.

22–24. Shorelines: Lake Mead, House Calendar; Canyonlands; Ozark National Rivers.

25. U.N. Participation Act amendment (December 6), House Calendar.

26. Water pollution control (October 16), House Public Works hearings December 4–6, 10, 11.

27. Water resources research program (April 23), House Interstate Subcommittee approved December 5.

28. Witnesses (April 9).

29. Youth employment (April 10), House Calendar, rule requested April 22.

SENATE CALENDAR (1)

1. Oregon Dunes, S. 1137.

PASSED HOUSE (1)

1. Reorganization Act extension (amended). (June 4) Senate Government Operations.

HOUSE CALENDAR (9)

1. Adult basic education, H.R. 5542.

2. Civil Rights Act of 1963, H.R. 7152.

3. Equal employment opportunity, H.R. 405. Senate Labor executives December 12.

4. Foreign aid appropriations, floor action December 16.

5. Interest equalization tax, H.R. 8000.

6. Kennedy 50-cent piece.

7. Land conservation fund, H.R. 3846.

8. Patent fee increase, H.R. 8190. Rule hearing December 13.

9. Pay bill, H.R. 8986.

(See passed Senate: Airport construction, rule hearings, December 13; area redevelopment, Lake Meade; mass transit; migratory labor, contract registration; public defenders, rule December 4; U.N. Participation Act; youth employment. House Calendar.)

COMMITTEE ACTION (24)

1. Airports, Dulles and National, management. House Interstate executive consideration underway.

2. Bureaus of Community Health and Environmental Health in NIH, create. H.R. 2410: House Interstate hearings April 23–26; May 14, 15; June 10.

3. Civil service retirement financing. S. 1562: Senate Post Office and Civil Service hearings concluded August 14.

4. Coffee Agreement, implement. H.R. 8864: passed House November 14; Senate Finance hearings December 16.

5. Cotton subsidy. H.R. 6196: passed House December 4; Senate Agriculture hearings May 20–27.

6. District of Columbia home rule. H.R. 5794: House District of Columbia hearings November 18–20.

7–9. Education: Cooperative research. H.R. 8408: House Education ordered reported August 27. Elementary and secondary school construction. H.R. 5344: House subcommittee hearings underway. Teacher quality. H.R. 6013: House subcommittee reported August 27.

10. Fallout shelters. H.R. 8200. Senate Armed Services Subcommittee hearings to conclude December 13.

11. Food stamp plan. S. 1387: Senate Agriculture. H.R. 8107: House Agriculture executive October 30.

12. Foreign Affairs Academy. S. 865: Senate Foreign Relations markup July 10. H.R. 3668: House Foreign Affairs.

13. Housing for elderly, make single persons eligible for moderate income housing. S. 1170: Senate Banking hearings October 2–4.

14. Inter-American Bank—increase contributions. H.R. 7406: Senate Foreign Relations hearings November 15, December 3.

15. International Development Association—increase resources. S. 2214: Senate Foreign Relations hearings November 15, December 3. H.R. 9022: House Banking hearings December 3.

16. Medicare. S. 880: Senate Finance; H.R. 3920: House Ways and Means hearings, November 18–22; suspended until next session.

17. Minimum wage coverage expansion. H.R. 5958, 6075: House Labor subcommittee hearings underway.

18. National forest roads and trails. S. 1147: Senate Public Works subcommittee concluded hearings July 31; executive, August 15.

19. Presidential Commission on Automation. Senate Joint Resolution 105: Senate Labor hearings suspended December 5.

20. Stockpile disposal. S. 2272: Hearings, March 7, 1962, January 30, 1963, December 3–4.

21. Tax reform—cut. Public hearing, September 25. Hearings, October 15th; December 10; executive started December 12.

22, 23. Transportation policy (two bills). S. 1061, 1962: Senate Commerce hearings, concluded October 24. H.R. 4700, 4701; House Interstate executive, October 15–17; November 12.

24. Watershed Act amendments—multiple use. S. 566: Senate Agriculture hearings, June 3.

NO ACTION (14)

1. Air carriers—limit subsidy payments. S. 1884: Senate Commerce.

2. Bank accounts—savings and loans—increase insurance coverage. S. 1799: Senate Banking will wait for House. H.R. 7404: House Banking.

3. Civil defense—footstuffs stockpile. S. 1711: Senate Armed Services. H.R. 5121: House Armed Services.

4. Food and drug amendments, H.R. 6788: House Interstate.

5. General university extension, H.R. 1779: House Education and Labor.

6. Group practice facilities, mortgage insurance, S. 1426: Senate Labor; H.R. 4534: House Interstate.

7. Hill-Burton Act, extension and expansion, S. 894: Senate Labor.

8. Immigration amendments, H.R. 7700: House Judiciary; S. 1932: Senate Judiciary.

9. Mental health, vocational rehabilitation, S. 968: Senate Labor; H.R. 5194: House Labor.

10. Political campaign tax incentives, H.R. 7308: House Ways and Means.

11. Public welfare work, training, S. 1803: Senate Finance; H.R. 7262: House Ways and Means.

12, 13. Social security amendments, S. 1357, 1358: Senate Finance; H.R. 5839, 5840: House Ways and Means.

14. Unemployment compensation, permanent program, S. 1542: Senate Finance; H.R. 6339: House Ways and Means.

REJECTED (1)

1. District of Columbia rapid transit, December 9—recommitted.

NO LEGISLATION (3)[1]

1. Narcotics control. President reviewing Advisory Commission report.

2. User charges, fuels, air freight.

3. Urban Affairs Department.

STATUS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS, FISCAL YEAR 1964 AND SUPPLEMENTALS FOR 1963, AS OF DECEMBER 13, 1963

Enacted into law (nine): Defense, independent offices, Interior, Labor-HEW, military construction, public works, Treasury-Post Office-Executive Office, Agriculture supplemental, 1963, supplemental, 1963.

In conference (four): Agriculture, District of Columbia, Legislative, State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary.

House Calendar (one): Foreign aid. Floor action December 16.

DECEMBER 13, 1963.

SUBJECT, REPORT OF PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS (LEGISLATIVE: 123,[1] APPROPRIATIONS: 14)—SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE

AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES, AND STATUS

1. Feed grains program (B, SPM, January 31), Public Law 88–26.

2. Cotton program (B, SPM, January 31), H.R. 6196: Passed House December 4. Senate Agriculture hearings May 20–27.

3. Dairy program (B, SPM, January 31), S. 1915: Passed Senate October 10. Additional House hearings September 17, 18.

4. Expand food stamp program (B, SPM, January 31), S. 1387: Senate Agriculture; H.R. 8107: House Agriculture executive October 30.

5. Amend Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit development of available sites for multipurpose use (SPM, January 31), S. 566: Senate Agriculture hearings June 3.

6. Land use adjustments, raise limitation SPM, January 31), S. 1588: Passed Senate October 11; H.R. 6491: House Agriculture hearings June 24–27.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

7. Area redevelopment, increase limitation (B) S. 1163: Passed Senate June 26. House Calendar (rule hearing September 24).

ATOMIC ENERGY

8. AEC authorization, 1964. (*) Public Law 88–72.

9. AEC supplemental authorization, 1964. (*) Public Law 88–189.

CIVIL RIGHTS (SPM February 28, June 19)

10. Omnibus, S. 1731: Senate Judiciary hearings started July 16; recessed September 11. H.R. 7152: House Calendar (rule requested November 27). Discharge petition filed December 9. S. 1732: Public Accommodations—Senate Commerce ordered repeated, October 8. S. 1750: Omnibus minus public accommodations.—Senate Judiciary hearings started July 16; recessed September 11.

11. One-year extension of Civil Rights Commission, Public Law 88–152.

12. Equal employment opportunity, S. 773, S. 1210, S. 1211: Senate Labor Subcommittee approved September 16; executive December 12. H.R. 405: House Calendar.

13. Public defenders (SU), S. 1057: Passed Senate August 6. H.R. 7457: House Calendar (rule December 4.)

14. Immigration amendments (B), S. 1932: Senate Judiciary; H.R. 7700: House Judiciary.

15. Equal pay for women. (*) Public Law 88–38.

16. Manpower Training Act amendments, postpone date of matching requirements and increase fiscal year 1964 authorization, S. 1716: Passed Senate September 4; H.R. 8720: House Calendar. Floor action, December 12.

17. Manpower Training Act amendments, illiterate training, S. 1831: Passed Senate September 6; H.R. 8720: House Calendar. Floor action, December 12.

18. Public welfare work-training, S. 1803: Senate Finance will wait for House; H.R. 7262: House Ways and Means.

COMMERCE AND TRANSPORTATION

19. Strengthen national transportation policy (B, SU, E) S. 1062: Senate Commerce hearings. Concluded October 24; H.R. 4701: House Interstate executive, October 15–17, November 12.

20. Minimum rate transportation (B, SU, E), S. 1061: Senate Commerce hearings. Concluded October 24. H.R. 4700: House Interstate executives, October 15–17, November 12.

21. Urban mass transit ($500 million, 3-year program—$100 million first year). (B,

---

[1] Not included in totals for Presidential recommendations.

[1] Excludes three which have not had specific proposals submitted.

E, SU), S. 6: Passed Senate April 4; H.R. 3881: House Colendar (Rule hearings concluded June 13).

22. Extend airport construction program (B), S. 1153: Passed Senate August 26. House Calendar.

23. Consolidate management of Dulles and Washington National Airports. (B), H.R. 826: House Interstate executive underway.

24. National forest roads and trails. (*) S. 1147: Senate Public Works Subcommittee markup, August 15.

25. International air fares. (E/C) S. 1540: P/S November 26; H.R. 6400: House Interstate.

26. Limit right of certain air carriers to receive subsidy payments. (*) S. 1884: Senate Commerce.

DEFENSE

27. Fallout shelter program. (B) H.R. 8200: Passed House September 17; Senate Armed Services Special Subcommittee hearings to be concluded December 13.

28. Military pay increase—effective October 1, 1963. (B) Public Law 88–132.

29. Military procurement authorization. (*) Public Law 8–28.

30. Extend universal military training to July 1, 1967, (B), Public Law 88–2.

31. Authorize Secretary of Agriculture to provide essential foodstuffs for civil defense needs (B), S. 1711: Senate Armed Services; H.R. 5121: House Armed Services.

32. Stockpile disposal. (B) S. 2272: Senate Armed Services hearings December 3, 4.

33. Military construction. (*) Public Law 88–174.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

34. Increase existing authorizations governing appropriations to District of Columbia; authorize Federal loans (B), Public Law 88–104.

35. Home rule. S. 1650: Senate District of Columbia Committee; H.R. 5794, House District of Columbia Committee hearings, November 18–20.

36. Rapid transit system for District of Columbia (SPM May 27), S. 1647: Senate District of Columbia Committee; H.R. 8929: House recommitted December 9—278 to 76.

37. National Cultural Center extension, Public Law 88–100.

EDUCATION (SPM JANUARY 29)

38. Vocational education, amended to include the National Defense Education Act and impacted areas extension. H.R. 4955: Report filed December 11.

39. Higher education. H.R. 6143: Public Law 88– .

40. NDEA—extend loan forgiveness, S. 569: Passed Senate October 24.

41. Library services and construction, S. 2265: Passed Senate November 26; H.R. 4879: House Calendar.

42. Exceptional children—teachers, Public Law 88–164.

43. Cooperative research, H.R. 8408: Ordered reported August 27.

44. Adult education. H.R. 5542: House Calendar.

45. Teacher quality. H.R. 6013: House subcommittee reported August 27.

46. Elementary and secondary education, H.R. 5344: House subcommittee hearings underway.

47. General University Extension, H.R. 1779: House Education and Labor.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

48. Improve financing of civil service retirement system (B), S. 1562: Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee concluded hearings August 14.

49. Revise silver policy (E), Public Law 88–36.

50. Bank deposits—savings and loans—increase insurance coverage (*), S. 1799: Senate Banking will wait for House; H.R. 7404: House Banking.

51. Kennedy—50-cent piece. E/C December 10, H.R. 9413: House Calendar.

52. Hill-Burton Act—extension and expansion, S. 894: Senate Labor.

53. Medical school aid—doctors, dentists, nurses, Public Law 88–129.

54. Create new Bureaus of Community Health and Environmental Health, H.R. 2410: House Interstate hearings. April 23–26; May 14, 15; June 10.

55. Group practice medical and dental facilities. S. 1426: Senate Labor; H.R. 4534: House Interstate.

56. Food and Drug amendments—consumer protection. H.R. 6788: House Interstate.

57. Air pollution control. H.R. 6518: Public Law 88– .

58. Water pollution control. S. 649: Passed Senate October 16. H.R. 3166: House Public Works hearings. December 4–6, 10, 11.

59. Narcotics control. (B), Presidential reviewing Advisory Committee report. Excluded from total since specific proposal has not been submitted.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

60. Urban Affairs Department, establish (B), Excluded from total since specific proposal has not been submitted.

61. Increase present maximum authorizations for direct housing loans for elderly and moderate income families (B, SPM February 21), Public Law 88–158.

62. Amend 1961 Housing Act to make single elderly persons eligible for housing financed under section 221(d)(3) (SPM February 21), S. 1170: Senate Banking hearings October 2–4.

INTERNATIONAL

63. Enlarge resources of International Development Association (B), S. 2214: Senate Foreign Relations hearings November 15, December 4; H.R. 9022: House Banking and Currency hearings December 3.

64. Nuclear test ban treaty, Executive M., ratified September 24.

65. Authorize U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for an increase in the Banks' authorized capital stock (B), Public Law 88–178.

66. Authorize $50 million payment as U.S. share of Fund for Special Operations of Inter-American Development Bank (B), H.R. 7406; passed House August 19; Senate Foreign Relations hearings, November 15, December 4.

67. Extend life of Export-Import Bank to June 30, 1968, to increase its resources (B), Public Law 88–101.

68. Foreign aid authorization for fiscal year 1964, H.R. 7885; Public Law 88– .

69. Foreign Service buildings program (B), Public Law 88–94.

70. Establish National Academy of Foreign Affairs (B), S. 865, Senate Foreign Relations, markup July 10; H.R. 3668, House Foreign Affairs.

71. Disarmament Agency authorization increase, Public Law 88–186.

72. Coffee Agreement, International (SPM–62), ratified May 21.

73. International Coffee Agreement, implement, H.R. 8864; passed House November 14; Senate Finance hearings, December 16.

74. Amend U.N. Participation Act to give President wider discretion in assignments (*), S. 949, passed Senate December 6, H.R. 6283, House Calendar (in Rules).

75. Consular convention with Korea, Executive B, ratified October 22.

76. Consular convention with Japan, Executive I, ratified October 22.

77. Protocol to amend International Civil Aviation Convention, Executive D, ratified October 22.

78. Extradition Treaty with Sweden, Executive E, ratified October 22.

79. Extradition Treaty with Israel, Executive E, ratified October 22.

80. Amend Extradition Treaty with Brazil, Executive F, ratified October 22.

LABOR

81. Unemployment insurance—permanent program (B, E), S. 1542, Senate Finance Committee; H.R. 6339, House Ways and Means Committee.

82. Extend minimum wage coverage (E), H.R. 5958, 6075, House Education and Labor Subcommittee hearings, started November 20.

83. Railroad retirement amendments (B), Public Law 88–133.

84. Migratory agricultural workers—fair labor standards (*), S. 523, passed Senate June 11.

85. National Advisory Council on Migratory Workers (*), S. 525, passed Senate June 10.

86. Registration of interstate farm labor contractors (*), S. 524, passed Senate June 11; H.R. 6242, H. Calendar (in Rules).

87. Educational opportunities—migratory farm workers (*), S. 521, passed Senate June 10.

88. Railroad labor dispute (SPM, July 22); Public Law 88–108.

89. Presidential Commission on Automation (*), Senate Joint Resolution 105, Senate Labor Committee hearings started November 15; adjourned subject to call December 5.

MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM (SPM, FEBRUARY 5)

90. Maternal and child health and mental retardation planning amendments of 1963; Public Law 88–156.

91. Mental health community centers and retardation; Public Law 88–164.

92. Expand Vocational Rehabilitation Act to include programs for mentally retarded, S. 968, Senate Labor Committee; H.R. 5194, House Education Committee.

NATURAL RESOURCES

93. Land conservation fund, including user fees (facilities and water transportation) (B), H.R. 3846; House Calendar; Senate Interior Committee hearings concluded March 8; Executive August 26.

94. Reserve necessary power supplies for Pacific Northwest (B), S. 1007; in conference.

95. Outdoor recreation (B, SU), Public Law 88–29.

96. Water resources research program (B), S. 2; Passed Senate April 23; House Interior Subcommittee approved December 5.

97. River basin planning (B), S. 1111; Passed Senate December 4.

98. Wilderness bill (B), S. 4; Passed Senate April 9; House Interior.

Shoreline areas (B)

99. Canyonlands, S. 27; Passed Senate August 2.

100. Lake Mead National Recreational Area, Ariz., S. 653; Passed Senate August 2; H.R. 4010; House Calendar.

101. Ozark National Rivers, S. 16; Passed Senate October 21; House Interior; executive December 4.

102. Oregon Dunes, S. 1137; Senate Calendar.

POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

103. Political campaign tax incentives, H.R. 7308, House Ways and Means.

104. Presidential transition act (*), H.R. 4638, passed Senate, amended October 17.

105. Equal time suspension (*), House Joint Resolution 247, passed Senate, amended October 2.

PUBLIC DEBT

106. Temporary $307 billion debt limit through June 30, 1963; $309 billion through August 30, 1963 (B), Public Law 88–30.

Temporary increase in debt limit to November 30, 1963 (E, B), Public Law 88–106.

107. Temporary $315 billion debt limit through June 29, 1964 (E, B), Public Law 88–187.

REORGANIZATION

108. Extend President's authority to transmit reorganization plans to Congress (B), H.R. 3496, passed Senate, amended June 4; Senate Government Operations.

109. Reorganization plan I-Franklin plan, effective July 26, D. Roosevelt Library (SPM, May 27).

110. Amendments to Securities Exchange Commission Act (*), S. 1642, passed Senate, July 30; H.R. 6789, House Interstate hearings, November 19–21, December 3–5.

SALARY ADJUSTMENT AND REFORM

111. Pay legislation (B, SPM, April 29), H.R. 8986, House Calendar; Supreme Court hearings, September 4.

SENIOR CITIZENS (SPM, FEBRUARY 21)

112. Medicare—effective January 1, 1965. Pay benefits for those not covered by social security from regular appropriations, S. 880, Senate Finance; H.R. 3920, House Ways and Means hearings, November 18–22. Suspended until next session.

113. Amend the Social Security Act to provide assistance in development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services for training, through research, development, or training project grants, through grants for construction or recreational activity centers, and through grants to stimulate employment opportunities, S. 1357; Senate Finance; H.R. 5840, House Ways and Means.

114. Improve public assistance provisions of Social Security Act relating to aged individuals, S. 1358, Senate Finance; H.R. 5849, House Ways and Means.

SPACE

115. NASA authorization for 1964(*), Public Law 88–113.

TAXES

116. Tax cut and reform (B, SPM January 25), H.R. 8363, passed House September 25; Senate finance hearings, October 15–December 10; Executive started December 12.

117. Temporary interest equalization tax (SPM July 18), H.R. 8000; House Calendar.

118. Extend excise taxes to July 1, 1964 and Public Law 88–52 corporate rates to December 31, 1963 (B).

USER CHARGES

119. Extend aid passenger transportation at 5 percent, Public Law 88–52.

120. Effective January 1, 1964, enact user charges: (B) (a) 2 cents a gallon on all fuels used in commercial air transportation, including jet fuels; (b) 5 percent on airfreight; (c) 3 cents a gallon on all fuels used in general aviation; (d) 2 cents a gallon on all fuels used in transportation on waterways; excluded from total since specific legislation has not been submitted.

121. Increase patent fees (B), H.R. 8190 House Calendar.

VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES

122. Increase benefits of children and dependent parents of veterans who died as a result of military service (B), Public Law 88–21.

YOUTH (SPM FEBRUARY 14)

123. Youth Employment Act, S. 1, passed Senate April 10; H.R. 5131, House Calendar (rule requested April 22).

124. Establish National Service Corps, S. 1321, passed Senate August 14; H.R. 5625, House Labor Subcommittee approved December 11.

125. Peace Corps expansion ($180 million), H.R. 9009, Public Law 88– .

126. Juvenile Delinquency Act extension, S. 1967, passed Senate September 25; H.R. 5866, House Labor Subcommittee, approved October 8.

(Symbols: SU—State of Union message; B—Budget message; E—Economic message; SPM—Special message; * in accord with the President's program; E/C—Executive communication.)

STATUS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS, FISCAL YEAR 1964 AND SUPPLEMENTALS FOR 1963 AS OF DECEMBER 13, 1963

Enacted into law (9); Defense; independent Offices; Interior; Labor-HEW; military construction; public works; Treasury-Post Office-Executive Office; Agriculture supplemental, 1963; supplemental, 1963.

In conference (4): Agriculture; District of Columbia; legislative; State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary.

House Calendar (1): Foreign aid, floor action December 16.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY THROUGH DECEMBER 12, 1963—SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE—88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

The tally sheet so far:

Senate activity, 1st session of 88th Congress:

Days in session	179
Hours in session	1,003:57
Total measures passed	810
Confirmations	66,430
Treaties ratified	8
Public Laws	199

Following is a brief review, by subject, of the more significant measures acted on, including Presidential recommendations (PR):

AGRICULTURE

Feed grains: Extends through 1964 and 1965 crop years the feed grains program in effect in 1962 and 1963, providing price support for producers who make voluntary acreage reduction. Public Law 88–26. (PR.)

Dairy program: Clarifies Secretary of Agriculture's authority to provide for allotments under milk marketing orders so that producers will receive a higher return on milk covered by allotments and a lower return for milk in excess of allotments, instead of a uniform blend price. S. 1915; passed Senate October 10. (PR.)

Mexican farm labor: Extends the Mexican farm labor program to December 31, 1964. S. 1703, Public Law 88– .

Federal crop insurance coverage: Expands the Federal crop insurance to permit it to be offered in 150 additional counties. S. 277, passed Senate August 28.

Agricultural development in Alaska: Authorizes a $1¼ million Alaskan farmland development program to aid in clearing, draining, shaping, and conditioning land for crop production and pastures. Limits maximum payments to $125,000 for any 1 year. S. 623; passed Senate June 25.

Tobacco allotment leasing authority: Extends for an additional 2 years the authority to transfer, by lease, tobacco acreage allotments from one farm to another within the same county for a more economical operation. Public Law 88–68.

Misuse of relief feeds: Establishes civil and criminal penalties for misuse of feed made available for relieving distress or to preserve and maintain foundation herds. S. 400; passed Senate June 25.

Producer livestock programs: Permits voluntary programs for promotion, research, and education relating to livestock. Public Law 88–61.

Agricultural experiment stations: Authorizes Federal assistance to States, on a matching basis, to help finance additional research facilities at State agricultural experiment stations. Public Law 88–74.

Rice acreage allotments: Permits a rice producer permanently withdrawing from rice production to transfer his history for allotment purposes without transferring his land (as required by existing law). S. 1604; passed Senate July 22. H.R. 3742, House Calendar.

Rice acreage: Validates all 1956–62 crop rice acreage allotments properly apportioned on the basis of producer history and allocates to the farm by the county committee in good faith; applies only in States where rice allotments are made on the basis of the producer's history of rice production. Public Law 88–160.

Conservation reserve—Land-use adjustment: Increases the limit on annual payments under the land-use adjustment program from $10 to $20 million; and authorizes extension of conservation reserve contracts (soil bank) through 1965 which expire in 1963 and 1964. S. 1588; passed Senate October 11. (PR.)

APPROPRIATIONS

Agriculture supplemental: Agriculture supplemental of $508,172,000 to meet fiscal 1963 expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Public Law 88–1. (PR.)

Agriculture: Appropriates $6 billion for Department of Agriculture and related agencies for fiscal 1964. H.R. 6754; passed Senate September 30. In conference. (PR.)

Defense Department: Appropriates $47.2 billion for fiscal 1964. (Budget request $49 billion.) Public Law 88–149. (PR.)

District of Columbia: Appropriates a total of $319,587,785 for the District of Columbia for fiscal 1964 and chargeable against the revenues of the District. Provides for a $45 million Federal payment and $20,800,000 as a Federal loan to the general fund. H.R. 7431. In conference. (PR.)

Independent offices: Appropriates a total of $13.2 billion in fiscal 1964. (Budget request $14.6 billion.) Public Law 88– . (PR.)

Interior and related agencies: Appropriate $958 million for fiscal 1964. (Budget $1,028,509,000.) Public Law 88–79. (PR.)

Labor-HEW and related agencies: Appropriates a total of $5.4 billion for fiscal 1964. (Budget $5,471,087,000.) Public Law 88–136. (PR.)

Legislative: Appropriates total of $168,273,069 for fiscal 1964. Conference report adopted by House November 13. (PR.) Senate recommitted November 27.

Military construction: Appropriates a total of $1,585,880,000 for military construction for fiscal 1964. H.R. 9139. Public Law 88– . (PR.)

Public Works: Appropriates a total of $4,406.272,700 for public works for fiscal 1964. H.R. 9140. Public law 88– . (PR.)

State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary: Appropriates total of $1,821,343,000 for fiscal 1964. (Budget $2,159,891,900.) H.R. 7063. In conference. (PR.)

Supplemental for 1963: Appropriates a $1.5 billion supplemental for 1963, which includes $450 million to accelerate public works projects. (Budget $1.6 billion.) Public Law 88–25. (PR.)

Treasury-Post Office-Tax Court: Appropriates $6 billion for fiscal 1964. (Budget $6.1 billion.) Public Law 8839. (PR.)

Budget: Establishes a joint committee of Congress to examine and make recommendations on the Executive budget. S. 537, passed Senate May 20.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Civil Rights Commission: Extends for 1 year to September 30, 1964, the life of the Civil Rights Commission. Public Law 88–152. (PR.)

Equal pay for women: Amends the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide that equal work must be compensated with equal pay regardless of the sex of the workers (this measure had been before Congress for 18 years). Public Law 88–38. (PR.)

Manpower Training Act amendments: Postpones effective date of State matching requirements under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 from June 30, 1964, to June 30, 1965, to provide the State legislatures with sufficient time to appropriate matching funds, and increases the third year authorization for training programs from $161 million to $322 million. S. 1716; passed Senate September 4, (PR.) HR 8720; passed House, December 12.

Manpower Training Act—expanded: Expands the job-training program for unemployed youths by lowering the age from 19 to 16 and adds new literacy courses primarily for older jobless workers; authorizes $200 million—half to be spent for the expanded youth program and half for the literacy program; provides a maximum of 52 weeks' extra training allowance for courses in functional literacy and basic work skills which is in addition to the 52 weeks of job training now permitted. S. 1831; passed Senate September 6. (PR.) (H.R. 8720; passed House, December 12.)

DEFENSE AND AEC

Military pay increase: Effective October 1, 1963 authorizes pay increases averaging 14.4 percent for 1.9 million military personnel at a cost of about $1.2 billion a year. Public Law 88–132. (PR.)

Military training: Permanently fixes 6 years of service for enlistees in Reserve program to fulfill their military obligations. Public Law 88–110.

Draft extension: Extends to July 1, 1967, the following provisions of law: authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces, authority to issue selective service calls for physicians and dentists; suspension of permanent limitation on the active-duty strength of the Armed Forces; authority to pay quarters allowance to all enlisted members of the Armed Forces with dependents; and the authority for special pay to physicians, dentists and veterinarians. Public Law 88–2. (PR.)

Military procurement: Authorizes $15.3 billion procurement program for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for fiscal 1964. Public Law 88–28. (PR.)

Military construction: Authorizes a total of $1,642,253,380 for military construction for fiscal 1964. Public Law 88–174. (PR.)

AEC authorization: Authorizes $216,271,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission and of this amount $172,562,000 is for new construction projects. Public Law 88–72. (PR.)

AEC supplemental authorization: Authorizes an additional $17 million for construction of 12 new facilities for the nuclear weapons development program. Public Law 88–189. (PR.)

Air Force personnel: Extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1965, present authority for an additional 4,000 officers in the grade of lieutenant colonel in the Air Force. Public Law 88–63.

Medals: Expands authority for award of the Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, the Air Force Cross, and the Silver Star to permit award of these medals for heroism and gallantry that occur in cold war situations. Public Law 88–77.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Fiscal affairs: Authorizes a permanent annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia of $50 million. Increases the borrowing authority from a flat $75 million to $175 million. Public Law 88–104. (PR.)

Foreign chanceries: Prohibits locating foreign chanceries in the residential areas of the District of Columbia. S. 646; passed Senate July 1924.

District of Columbia redevelopment: Broadens the application of the District of Columbia Redevelopment to include commercial as well as residential areas. S. 628; passed Senate July 16.

District of Columbia courts: Expands jurisdiction of municipal court; changes its name to Court of General Sessions. Public Law 88–60.

District of Columbia business corporations: Amends District of Columbia Business Corporation Act to conform more closely to the model act of this type prepared by American Bar Association. Public Law 88–111.

National Cultural Center: Extends the National Cultural Center Act to September 1, 1966; increases the number of general trustees to 30 and provides staggered terms for the additional trustees. Public Law 88–100. (PR.)

School lunch program: Authorizes funds for expenses incurred by the District of Columbia school lunch program. S. 1078; passed Senate July 22.

District of Columbia nursing: Amends the District of Columbia Nurses' Licensing Act to make it possible for competent practical nurses to obtain a practical nursing license without written examination if they have resided in the District and actively cared for the sick in the Washington metropolitan area for the year immediately preceding the effective date of the licensing act (July 29, 1961). S. 933; passed Senate August 28. Passed House November 6 amended.

School census: Authorizes a school census of all children in the District of Columbia under 18. S. 999; passed Senate July 22.

Nurses registration: Lowers from 21 to 19 age requirement for registration as a nurse in the District of Columbia. Public Law 88–81.

Communicable diseases among minors: Authorizes immediate treatment of minors in District of Columbia who are found to have a communicable disease. Public Law 88–137.

Property owners: Strengthens enforcement procedures against owners of unsafe structures in District of Columbia. S. 994; passed Senate July 22.

Condominium owners: Establishes within the District of Columbia a new estate in property known as condominium which is the ownership of single units in a multiunit structure with common elements. H.R. 4276; passed Senate, amended December 6.

District of Columbia learner's permit: Provides authority to increase from $2 to $5 the fee charged for a District of Columbia learner's permit, to enable an expansion of the driver education program. S. 1964; passed Senate November 26.

District of Columbia relocation costs: Authorizes District of Columbia Commissioners to pay relocation costs to individuals, families, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced by District governmental activities in amounts up to $200 per individual or family, and $3,000 per business or nonprofit organization. S. 1024; passed Senate November 26.

D.C. Transit System: Transfers functions relating to mass transportation from the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission. S. 1533. Public Law 88– .

District of Columbia Teachers College: Authorizes establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College. S. 1406; passed Senate November 26.

District of Columbia life insurance companies: Exempts life insurance companies of the District of Columbia from the regulation of loans on securities. Public Law 88–191.

Uniform Commercial Code: Adopts the Uniform Commercial Code, approved by the American Bar Association for the District of Columbia. H.R. 5338. Public Law 88– .

EDUCATION AND SCIENCE

Vocational education—impacted areas—National Defense Education Act: Authorizes $581 million in new matching grants to the States from 1964 through 1967 to expand vocational education programs, extends the National Defense Education Act for 1 year to June 30, 1965, and extends the impacted areas program for 2 years to June 30, 1965. H.R. 4955. Public Law 88– . (PR.)

Higher education: Authorizes a 3-year $1.2 billion program of grants and loans for construction of college academic facilities at public and private higher education institutions. Provides for $230 million a year in grants and $120 million a year in loans. Earmarks $50,600,000 a year of the grant funds for junior colleges and technical institutes. Conferees deleted the Ervin-Cooper judicial review amendment authorizing any taxpayer to challenge in the U.S. district court the constitutionality of specific grants or loans to any institution under the bill. H.R. 6143. Public Law 88– .

Science and Technology Commission: Establishes a 12-member Commission on Science and Technology to study the possibilities and methods of strengthening the Government's contribution in promoting national security, national progress in scientific and technical development, world peace, and in insuring maximum use of all scientific know-how and information by coordinating Federal research and development programs with those of private industry and nonprofit organizations including educational institutions. S. 816; passed Senate March 8.

National Service Corps: Establishes a National Service Corps of Volunteers to aid communities, at their request, with people and problems of social need; limits membership to 1,000 and appropriations to $5 million for fiscal 1964 and $10 million in 1965. Limits program to 2 years. S. 1321; passed Senate August 14. (PR.)

Medical education aid: Authorizes 3-year program of $175 million in matching grants to expand teaching and research facilities of medical, dental, and related type colleges, and $30.7 million in student loans. Public Law 88–129. (PR.)

Medical student loans: Permits up to 10 percent cancellation of student loans to physicians and dentists if they practice in a shortage area so designated by the appropriate State health authority for periods up to 5 years. S. 2220; passed Senate December 9.

National Defense Education Act amendment: Extends the provisions of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 relating to cancellation of loans, to teachers in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education. S. 569; passed Senate October 24. (PR.)

Library Services Act of 1963: Increases Federal aid for expanding public library improvements to urban as well as rural areas and authorizes matching grants for construction of public library buildings. S. 2265; passed Senate November 26. (PR.)

Adult Indian vocational training: Increases from $7,500,000 to $12 million a year the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Indian vocational training program. S. 1868; passed Senate August 28. Passed House November 18.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

FBI: Authorizes the President to appoint the next Director of the FBI, subject to Senate confirmation, and sets the salary at $22,000 a year. S. 603; passed Senate June 13.

Student trainee travel expenses: Authorizes payment of travel expenses to student trainees on completion of college when assigned to positions where the Civil Service Commission determines there is a manpower shortage. (Present law provides for these expenses only if the trainee has been promoted to the shortage category position.) Public Law 88–146.

Coast Guard retirement: Removes the percentage (1 percent) limitation on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard with 20 year's service. Discontinues the practice of paying a good conduct bonus on retirement, but excludes those presently in the service who meet the requirement. Public Law 88–114.

Alien employment: Authorizes Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity. S. 1291; passed Senate, July 9.

GENERAL ECONOMY

Area redevelopment amendment: Authorizes an additional $455 million in Federal funds for loans in urban and rural areas and public facility grants. S. 1163; passed Senate, June 26. House Calendar. (PR.)

Public works planning: Authorizes an additional $10 million for Housing and Home Finance Agency's program of advances for public works planning. Senate Joint Resolution 129; passed Senate November 19.

Public debt ceiling: Places a ceiling of $307 billion for the remainder of fiscal 1963 and $309 billion through August 31, 1963. Public Law 88–30. (PR.)

Extends the temporary debt limitation of $309 billion to November 30, 1963. Public Law 88–106. (PR.)

Raises the ceiling to $315 billion to June 29, 1964. Public Law 88–187. (PR.)

Duty-free allowance: Extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1965, the $100 exemption from import duties allowed on foreign goods brought back from outside the United States, but continues the $200 exemption for the Virgin Islands until April 1, 1964, when it will drop to $100. Public Law 88–53.

Silver purchase: Withdraws silver backing of paper currency, averts shortage of silver for coinage by repealing the tax on silver transfers and other obsolete sections of Silver Purchase Act of 1934. Public Law 88–36. (P.R.)

Cadmium: Authorizes disposal of 2 million pounds of surplus cadmium from the national stockpile valued at about $4 million. Public Law 88–8.

Corkboard insulation: Authorizes a temporary (3-year) suspension of import duty on corkboard insulation. Public Law 88–32.

Chicory—Duty free: Extends to June 30, 1966, existing suspension of duty on crude chicory except endive, and continues for the same period the statutory rate of duty of 2 cents a pound for chicory, ground or otherwise prepared. Public Law 88–49.

Metal scrap—Duty suspension: Extends to June 30, 1964, suspension of duties on metal scrap. Public Law 88–50.

Heptanoic acid: Continues for 3 years the existing suspension of import duty on heptanoic acid. Public Law 88–93.

Tanning extracts: Extends for 3 years the period during which tanning extracts may be imported free of duty. Public Law 88–92.

Tampico fiber: Continues to September 5, 1966, the existing suspension of duty on dressed or manufactured istle or tampico fiber. Public Law 88–90.

Attorneys' fees—bankruptcy: Permits courts, on their own motion, to examine into the reasonableness of attorneys' fees in bankruptcy proceedings. Public Law 88–17.

Bankrupt funds: Permits the deposit of funds of bankrupts' estates in interest-bearing accounts. Public Law 88–16.

Small Business Act amendments: Increase by $84.3 million SBA's revolving fund bringing the total authorization for the fund to $1,700,300,000 and broadens the causal basis of SBA's authority to make loans from its disaster fund to cover all natural disasters. S. 1309; passed Senate, November 21.

Small business investment amendment: Liberalizes investment provisions of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and encourages increased capitalization of SBIC's by raising the amount of capital that SBA may invest in an SBIC, on a matching basis, from $400,000 to $700,000. S. 298; passed Senate, November 21.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Mrs. Kennedy: Provides for a 12-month period, office space, equipment, and staff for Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy's use; provides a lifetime use of the franking privilege; authorizes Secret Service protection for a 2-year period for Mrs. Kennedy and her two children. Limits staff salaries to $50,000 a year and authorizes an appropriation of $65,000 to carry out purposes of the act, $15,000 of which is for the President's burial. H.R. 9291. Public Law 88– .

Government contracts: Establishes uniformity and equality in contracting for public utility services and in purchasing natural gas, coal, and other utilities by limiting Government contracts for these services to 10 years. S. 572; passed Senate, May 27.

Parcel post rates: Permits Postmaster General to continue parcel post at present rates for a 3-year period, pending congressional action on problem of deficits from fourth-class operations. Public Law 88–51.

Registration of pesticide chemicals: Provides for a system of labeling insecticides and pesticides. S. 1605; passed Senate October 22.

Coast Guard: Requires an annual legislative authorization for major capital construction and procurement programs of the Coast Guard prior to the appropriation of funds. Public Law 88–45.

Indian tribes—Export assistance: Establishes a $900,000 revolving loan fund for the Secretary of Interior to make loans to Indian tribes for services of expert researchers and witnesses in prosecuting their cases before the Indian Claims Commission. Public Law 88–168.

Puerto Rico: Establishes a Commission to recommend procedures for settlement of political status of Puerto Rico. House Resolution 5945. Public Law 88– .

Licensed attorneys: Eliminates admission requirements for licensed attorneys to allow persons to be represented before all Federal agencies by counsel of their choice. S. 1466; passed Senate December 6.

Indian Leasing Act: Increases from 50 to 55 years the term of leases of individual and tribal lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, and business purposes, S. 48. Passed Senate August 28.

Indian heirship: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to reduce the rapidly increasing number of Indian allotments in multiple ownership, and increases the Indian revolving credit loan fund from $20 to $55 million. S. 1049, passed Senate October 11.

Pinkerton detective agencies: Permits Federal agencies and the District government to contract with Pinkerton and other private detective agencies for guards. S. 1543; passed Senate October 17.

Guam: Authorizes up to $45 million in loans and grants to help Guam finance public works and community development projects. Public Law 88–170.

Guam: Permits the Government of Guam to authorize a public authority to undertake housing activities. Public Law 88–171.

Virgin Islands: Reinstates authority of the Virgin Island Government to issue general obligation bonds for schools, firehouses, slum clearance, libraries, electric systems, etc. Public Law 88–180.

Submerged lands: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to convey certain tracts of submerged lands surrounding the territories of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa when the lands are needed for a specific economic development or for a public purpose. Public Law 88–183.

Salem Maritime National Historic Site: Provides for the acquisition (purchase or donation) of the 17th century Narbonne House in Salem, Mass., as part of the Salem Maritime National Historic Site. H.R. 976. Public Law 88– .

HEALTH—PHYSICAL AND MENTAL

Retardation and community centers: Authorizes an overall 10-year, $320 million program of aid to the mentally ill to: (a) Construct research centers and facilities; (b) construct and establish community mental health centers; and (c) train teachers of children who are mentally retarded or mentally ill as well as other handicapped children. Public Law 88–164. (PR.)

Maternal and child health and mental retardation: Authorizes 5-year, $350 million program to increase aid to States for maternal and child health services and for crippled children's programs; provides grants for maternity care and research projects to prevent mental retardation. Public Law 88–156. (PR.)

Water pollution control: Establishes a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration within HEW and authorizes a 4-year, $80 million program of demonstration grants for research and development of better sewer systems; authorizes establishment of water quality standards; and establishes procedures to evaluate progress in developing decomposable detergents so they will not cause or contribute to pollution of surface and underground waters. S. 649; passed Senate October 16. (PR.)

Clean Air Act: Authorizes a 6-year $187 million program of Federal aid to State and local governments to combat air pollution. H.R. 6518. Public Law 88– . (P.R.)

Physically handicapped: Authorizes an additional $100,000 a year (to $400,000) for the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Senate Joint Resolution 103; passed Senate November 20.

Medical care for fishing boat owners: Restores to self-employed U.S. fishermen eligibility for medical care in hospitals, outpatient clinics, and other medical facilities of the Public Health Service in the event of illness or injury incurred while engaged in their hazardous occupation. Such eligibility existed until 1954. S. 978; passed Senate May 28.

Medical care for Coast and Geodetic Survey: Subject to regulations of the President, this bill entitles to retired ships' officers and retired crew members of Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels to medical, surgical, and dental treatment, and hospitalization at facilities of the Public Health Service if the employee was on duty on July 1, 1963, or date of enactment, whichever is later. Public Law 88–71.

HOUSING

Mortgage Insurance Authority: Extends for 2 years to June 30, 1965, authority of FHA to insure mortgages for sale and rental housing for low- and moderate-income groups. Public Law 88–54.

Essential housing mortgages: Extends sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act—sales and rental housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces, NASA, and AEC—for 2 years from October 1, 1963, to October 1, 1965. Public Law 88–127.

Housing for elderly: Authorizes an additional $50 million for loans to nonprofit corporations and consumer cooperatives to provide housing for the elderly and designed to meet their special needs. Public Law 88–158. (PR.)

INTERNATIONAL

Foreign aid authorization: Authorizes $3.6 billion in foreign aid funds for fiscal 1964. Public Law 88– . (PR.)

Peace Corps expansion: Increases the authorization for the Peace Corps from $63,750,000 to $102 million for fiscal 1964. H.R. 9009. Public Law 88– . (PR.)

Churchill: Proclaimed Winston Churchill an honorary American citizen. Public Law 88–6.

Export-Import Bank Act extension: Extends the life of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for 5 years to June 30, 1968, and increases the lending authority of the Bank by $2 billion (to $9 billion) and insurance coverage from $1 to $2 billion. Public Law 88–101. (PR.)

International Coffee Agreement: Ratified the International Coffee Agreement to stabilize prices in world trade by establishing quotas for exporting countries and binding importing countries to limit their purchases of coffee from countries not parties to the agreement. (May 21.) (PR.)

World Bank capital stock increase: Amends the Bretton Woods Agreement Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) to vote for $1 billion increase in the capital stock of the Bank. Increase is required to permit new member countries of the Bank to subscribe and to enable present members to increase their subscriptions. Public Law 88–178. (PR.)

Foreign Service buildings amendment: Authorizes $49,824,000 for a 2-year Foreign Service buildings program; and amends the Philippine War Claims Act of 1962 by earmarking (1) between $30 and $40 million for claimants up to $25,000, (2) between $30 and $40 million for the Government of the Philippines to use for educational purposes, and remainder to revert to the U.S. Treasury (antilobbying amendments). Public Law 88–94. (PR.)

Disarmament Agency: Increases the authorization for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to $20 million for fiscal year 1964 and 1965. Public Law 88–186. (PR.)

U.N. Participation Act: Authorizes appointment of a representative in Europe of the U.S. mission to the U.N. and permits shifting assignments of mission members. S. 949; passed Senate December 6. (PR.)

Industrial property: Increases the ceiling on the U.S. contribution to the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property from $7,270 to $15,000 a year. Public Law 88–69.

State Department: Authorizes one additional Assistant Secretary of State; and permits retired Foreign Service officers to accept employment as consultants to foreign governments, if authorized by the Secretary of State. S. 1512; Passed Senate July 16. H.R. 6283; House Calendar.

Laos: Permanently authorizes appropriations for the U.S. contribution to the International Commission for supervision and control in Laos ($650,000). S. 1627; passed Senate July 16.

Marking requirements for imports: Provides that when imported articles in a container, required to be marked under section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as to the country of origin are repackaged after importation, the new package must be marked to indicate the English name of the country of origin. H.R. 2513. Public Law 88– .

Nuclear test ban treaty: Ratified the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water, signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963, on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. September 24. (PR.)

Civil Aviation Convention: Ratified Convention on International Civil Aviation. October 22. (PR.)

Sweden Extradition Convention: Ratified convention on extradition between United States and Sweden. October 22. (PR.)

Brazil-protocol: Ratified additional protocol to the Treaty of Extradition between the United States and Brazil. October 22. (PR.)

Israel Extradition Convention: Ratified Convention on Extradition between United States and Israel. October 22. (PR.)

Korea Consular Convention: Ratified Consular Convention between United States and Korea. October 22. (PR.)

Japan Consular Convention: Ratified Consular Convention between United States and Japan. October 22. (PR.)

JUDICIAL

Supreme Court Justice widows—annuities: Increases the annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices from $5,000 to $10,000 a year, payable monthly. S. 1686; passed Senate November 5, 1963.

Public defenders: Authorize Federal judicial circuits to establish a public defender system at public expense. S. 1057; passed Senate August 6, 1963. H.R. 7457; House Calendar. (PR.)

Crimes abroad: Permits prosecution in U.S. district courts of offenses against this country committed abroad. Public Law 88–27.

Court of claims: Authorizes five additional Commissioners for the U.S. Court of Claims. S. 102; passed Senate October 16.

Judicial council: Provides for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit. S. 979; passed Senate October 17.

Tort claims: Permit civil action on tort claims to be brought in the district court of the district where the act or omission occurred. H.R. 2985; passed Senate October 30; reconsideration motion, October 31.

Courts: Clarifies the status of Federal circuit and district judges retired from regular active service. Public Law 88–176.

Sport bribes: Prohibits bribery schemes in interstate or foreign commerce from influencing the outcome of sporting contests. S. 741; passed Senate October 30.

Escape of juvenile delinquents: Imposes a fine of $1,000 or 1 year in prison, or both, as a penalty for a juvenile delinquent under 18 who escapes or attempts to escape from the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative for violation of any law not punishable by death or life imprisonment and if the Attorney General has not specifically directed the institution of criminal proceedings. S. 1319; passed Senate December 6.

LABOR

Railroad labor dispute: Creates a seven-member arbitration board, composed of two members appointed by the carriers and two by the union to arbitrate the two key issues of firemen's jobs and train crew jobs (President named three since the four could not reach an agreement). Public Law 88–108. (PR.)

Railroad Retirement Act: Restores the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems to a satisfactory financial condition by reducing the actuarial deficit in the railroad retirement system by $61 million a year and improves the financial condition of the unemployment system by about $20 million a year. Public Law 88–133. (PR.)

MIGRATORY WORKERS

Day-care services for migrant farm children: Authorizes a 3-year $750,000-a-year program to assist States in providing day-care services for children of migratory workers. S. 522; passed Senate June 10.

Educational opportunities—migratory farmworkers: Authorizes a 5-year program of aid in educating children of migratory workers. The Federal Government will pay 100 percent of the program the first 2 years, and the States and Federal Government will match costs for the next 3 years. S. 521; passed Senate June 10. (PR.)

Agricultural workers—fair labor standards: Extends the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to certain children employed in agriculture. S. 523; passed Senate June 11. (PR.)

National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor: Establishes a 15-member Council to advise the President and Congress on the operation of Federal law, regulations, programs, policies, and all other matters relating to migratory agricultural labor, to provide a better understanding on conditions, needs, and long-range solutions. S. 525; passed Senate June 10. (PR.)

Interstate farm labor contractors—registration: Establishes a system of Federal registration for farm labor contractors of migrant agricultural workers. S. 524; passed Senate June 11. House Calendar. (PR.)

Migratory health services: Authorizes a 4-year $2.5 million annual program of Federal grants to alleviate serious health problems among migratory farm families. S. 526; passed Senate June 10.

REORGANIZATION

Presidential transition: Authorizes the Administrator of General Services to provide, on request, to each President-elect and each Vice President-elect, suitable office space, payment of staff salaries, travel expenses, communication services, printing and binding, and postage during the transition period between election and inauguration. Limits the authorized appropriation to $500,000 for necessary expenses. H.R. 4638; passed Senate; amended October 17. House requested conference, October 31. (PR.)

Treasury Department: Authorizes an additional assistant secretaryship in the Department of Treasury. Public Law 88–58.

Additional mint facilities: Authorizes a 10-year construction and building equipment program for the Bureau of the Mint operations and limits aggregate appropriations to $30 million. Public Law 88–102.

Inland waterways: Repeals the Inland Waterways Corporation Act and provides for liquidation of the affairs of the Corporation. Public Law 88–67.

SEC reforms: Extends to approximately 5,600 industrial, utility and banking concerns whose stocks are traded over the counter, the financial disclosure, proxy and insider-training requirements that have applied since 1934 to companies listed on stock exchanges. S. 1642; passed Senate July 30. (PR.)

Reorganization Plan No. 1: Transfers to General Services Administration complete authority for operation of Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, N.Y., now managed jointly with Department of Interior. Effective July 27, 1963. (PR.)

Administrative conference: Creates an administrative conference to study the mutual problems of Federal administrative agencies. S. 1664; passed Senate, October 30.

RESOURCES BUILDUP

Wilderness bill: Authorizes "setting aside" 35 million of the 761 million acres of federally owned land as a wilderness unavailable for commercial use. (Government permits commercial development of a major portion of its land.) S. 4; passed Senate, April 9. (PR.)

Pacific Northwest power sales: Guarantees electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants of that region and guarantees electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. S. 1007. In conference. (PR.)

Water resources research: Authorizes up to $20 million a year Federal aid program to land grant colleges and universities to stimulate and expand water resources research and scientific training program. S. 2; passed Senate, April 23. (PR.)

River basin planning: Provides for a Federal-State program of long-range comprehensive planning for conservation of the Nation's water resources. Establishes a Federal Water Council to make biennial assessments of water supplies and requirements and appraise the effect that individual river basin plans have on other regions. S. 1111; passed Senate, December 4.

Dixie project, Utah: Authorizes Federal construction of a $44 million Dixie multipurpose project in Utah with $40 million of the original cost reimbursable. S. 26; passed Senate October 30.

Outdoor recreation: Authorizes development and coordination of Federal and State outdoor recreation plans through studies, research, and education programs under guidance of Secretary of Interior. Public Law 88–29. (PR.)

Small reclamation projects amendments: Amends the Small Reclamation Project Act of 1956 to increase the authorizing ceiling from $100 to $200 million S. 283; passed Senate October 17.

Ozark national rivers: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to designate portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as the Ozark National Rivers for the purpose of conserving and interpreting unique scenic history. S. 16; passed Senate October 22.

Pecos River Basin: Authorizes continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, New Mexico and Texas. Senate Joint Resolution 49; passed Senate October 22.

Alaska mineral lands selection: provides for an additional 5 years from Jan. 3, 1964 within which the new State of Alaska may select lands under Federal mineral lease. S. 1878; passed Senate November 27.

Fisheries research: Authorizes a $28,250,000 5-year program of coordinated aid to the States to develop commercial fisheries by stimulating research and development on the local level. S. 627, passed Senate July 22.

Lake Mead National Recreation Area: Grants statutory authority for the official operation of Lake Mead National Recreation Area in Arizona and Nevada, established by an interbureau agreement in 1936. Authorizes additional lands to be acquired to build up this shoreline area at an estimated cost of $1,200,000. S. 653; passed Senate August 2. (PR.) H.R. 4010, House calendar.

Canyonlands National Park: Authorizes the establishment of Canyonlands National Park in Utah as a shoreline recreation area. S. 27; passed Senate August 2. (PR.)

Reclamation Project Act: Provides for renewal, subject to negotiation, of long-term contracts between Secretary of Interior and municipal, industrial, and domestic users of water service under the Reclamation Project Act of 1959; Public Law 88–44.

Rivers and harbors authorization: Authorizes $950 million for rivers and harbors and flood control for fiscal year 1964 and 1965, which includes seven new starts and increases for ten projects already underway. H.R. 8667; Public Law 88– .

Cochiti Reservoir: Authorizes approximately 50,000 acre-feet of water from the San Juan-Chama unit of the Colorado River storage project for filling a permanent pool for recreational purposes at Cochiti Reservoir of the Rio Grande Basin. S. 614; passed Senate June 19.

Rivers and Harbors Act: Abolishes the Beach Erosion Board established under the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1930, and establishes a Coastal Engineering Research Center to conduct research relating to coastal engineering and near shore oceanography. Public Law 88–172.

Rio Grande dams: Authorizes Secretary of Interior to market electric power generated at Falcon Dam and Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande. H.R. 4062, passed Senate; amended November 27.

Wildlife conservation in Oregon and California: Provides a permanent basis for administration of the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California to promote wildlife resources conservation on the Pacific flyway. S. 793; passed Senate July 15.

Lead-zinc: Amends the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961, to make certain that payments under this act will be made only to small producers whose primary products are lead and zinc. This is achieved by (1) providing that a small producer must have as his principal product or products lead and zinc; and (2) defining the term "principal product and products" to mean that more than 50 percent of the value of metal or minerals produced or sold is lead or zinc or a combination of both. Public Law 88–75.

Oil-Gas Compact: Grants congressional consent to a 4-year renewal and extension from September 1, 1963 to September 1, 1967, of the Interstate Gas and Oil Conservation Compact. Public Law 88–115.

Bureau of Reclamation: Made nonreimbursable all costs of investigations of a general nature or investigations leading to authorization of reclamation projects or works in order to provide for uniformity throughout the Bureau of Reclamation. S. 46; passed Senate August 28.

SENATE PROCEDURES

Former Presidents: Authorizes former Presidents of the United States (unless otherwise prohibited) to be entitled to seats in the U.S. Senate as Senators at Large; with the right to speak on the floor of the Senate and to participate in committee activities. Senate Resolution 78; adopted October 1.

SPACE

Space authorization: Authorizes fiscal 1964 appropriations totaling $5,350,820,400 for National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Public Law 88–113. (PR.)

TAXES

Tax-rate extension: Continues for 1 year, to July 1, 1964, present corporate tax rate of 52 percent and the present rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, general telephone service and transportation of persons by air. Public Law 88–52. (PR.)

Unemployment tax rates: Eases Federal unemployment insurance taxes established to repay the Government for extra compensation payments made to unemployed workers between 1957 and 1960. Public Law 88–174.

Accrued vacation pay—deductible: Extends to January 1, 1965 period during which accrued vacation pay may be deducted as a business expense for income tax purposes even though liability to a specific individual has not been established. Public Law 88–153.

Unemployment tax: Reduces the 1963 tax for unemployment compensation and readjusts allotments to States for administrative expenses. Public Law 88–31.

Taxes: Permits deduction for child care by a wife who has been deserted by her husband. Public Law 88–4.

Ground rent: Provides a deduction from income taxes for payment of redeemable ground rent. Public Law 88–9.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION

Mass transit: Authorizes a $375 million grant and guarantee bond program through fiscal 1966 to assist urban areas in their planning and developing of both public and private mass transit systems. S. 6; passed Senate April 4. House Calendar. (PR.)

International air rates: Gives the CAB discretionary authority to prescribe rates and to suspend tariffs in international air transportation to and from the United States under the same standards now applicable to interstate transportation. S. 1540; passed the Senate November 26. (PR.)

Equal time: Suspends application of equal time requirement of Federal Communications Act to nominees for President and Vice President in 1964. House Joint Resolution 247; passed the Senate, amended October 2. (PR.)

Alien radio operators: Provides for issuance of authorizations for alien amateur radio operators to operate their stations in the United States and its possessions, with reciprocal agreements between the United States and the alien's government. S. 920; passed the Senate October 16.

War risk insurance: Permits U.S. citizens who are owners of vessels built in U.S. shipyards with construction subsidies to obtain war risk insurance coverage. S. 927; passed Senate December 5.

Federal Airport Act: Extends for 3 years, to June 30, 1967, the Federal airport construction program which authorizes Federal matching funds of $75 million a year for airport development. S. 1153; passed Senate August 26. House Calendar. (PR.)

Dual rates: extends to April 3, 1964, the provision of law which requires the Federal Maritime Commission to approve, disapprove, cancel or modify existing dual rate contracts in use in U.S. waterborne foreign commerce. Public Law 346 enacted in 1961 authorized foreign commerce carriers to enter into "effective and fair" dual rate contracts but set up specific standards which these contracts must meet. This bill extended the Commission's time to make certain these contracts do or do not comply with the requirements. Public Law 88–5.

Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway: Authorizes a study to determine if there are means and economic justification for providing year-round navigation on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway. S. 530; passed Senate June 25. House Calendar.

Federal Aid Highway Act amendment: Apportions through 1971 funds for completion of Interstate and Defense Highway system; fixes January 1965 as cost estimate deadline; raises Federal payments for construction engineering; continues billboard control program for 2 years. Public Law 88–157.

Urban construction: Authorizes 5 percent increase on the limitation on payments for construction engineering for Federal aid primary, secondary and urban projects. S. 626; passed Senate June 24.

Lumber-tariff: Excludes cargo which is lumber from certain tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act of 1916. Public Law 88–103.

Emergency transportation: Exempts from ICC regulations emergency towing or transportation in interstate commerce of any wrecked or disabled motor vehicle. H.R. 2906. Public Law 88– .

Seat belts: Provides safety standards for seat belts sold in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles. H.R. 134. Public Law 88– .

U.S. Waters—fishing: Prohibits fishing in territorial waters or along the Continental Shelf claimed by the United States except by domestic vessels or as provided by international treaty or by the Secretary of Treasury issuing licenses to foreign vessels where it is certified by the Secretary of Interior that permission would be in the national interest. S. 1988; passed Senate October 1.

Fishing subsidies: Increases from 11⅓ to 55 percent the subsidy for construction of fishing vessels; extends program for 5 years to July 1, 1968. S. 1006; passed Senate October 2.

Alaska Railroad: Improves and encourages collective bargaining between the management of the Alaska Railroad and representatives of its employees, and permits to the extent practicable adoption by the Alaska Railroad of the personnel policies and practices of the railroad industry. S. 622; passed Senate, June 24. House Calendar.

Coast Guard officers: Establishes a new officer promotion system in the Coast Guard and provides interim authority for involuntary retirement of Coast Guard officers in the grades of captain and commander to alleviate stagnation of promotion to those grades. Public Law 88–130.

Collisions at sea: Authorizes the President to accept, on behalf of the United States, certain regulations formulated at the Fourth International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, and to proclaim an effective date for regulations for preventing collisions at sea. Public Law 88–131.

Professional nurses—U.S. Merchant Marine: Grants authority for registration of professional nurses as staff officers in the U.S. Merchant Marine. Public Law 88–128.

Communications Act—Petitions: Requires that petitions for intervention in hearings for a broadcasting license be filed with the Federal Communications Commission within 30 days after publication of the issues in the Federal Register. S. 1193; passed Senate September 25.

Communications—Nonbroadcast operations: Authorizes the Federal Communications Commission to grant special temporary authorization for 60 days in those cases where an application for a special temporary authorization is filed pending filing an application for regular operation. S. 1005; passed Senate September 25.

VETERANS

Veterans family benefits increase: Increases by approximately 10 percent monthly rates of dependence and indemnity compensation payable to widows, children, and parents of veterans dying of service-connected causes. Public Law 88–21. (PR.)

Compensation increase—Veterans' widows: Increases from $112 to $150 the basic monthly rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans who died from service-connected disabilities. Public Law 88–134.

Educational assistance: Provides educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled as a result of a service-connected disability arising out of active military, naval, or air service during the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the induction period. H.R. 221. Public Law 88– .

GI insurance: Reopens National Service Life Insurance for World War II and Korean war veterans who let their policies lapse, and set up a new optional payment method for holders of long-term insurance. H.R. 220; passed Senate; amended June 20.

Veterans—Vocal chords: Adds "complete organic aphonia with constant inability to communicate by speech" to the existing types of service-connected disabilities, and authorizes an additional $47 award for such disability. Public Law 88–22.

Deafness of both ears: Adds "deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction" to the types of service-connected disabilities for which compensation is awarded. Monthly compensation will be $47. Public Law 88–20.

Burial expenses: Extends the time during which a veterans' family may claim an allowance for burial expenses. Public Law 88–3.

War orphans: Designates State agencies to work with the Veterans' Administration in approving educational courses for war orphans. Public Law 88–126.

Grants in aid: Extends for 5 years the program for reimbursement of the Philippine Government covering hospitalization for service-connected veterans who served with the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II. Public Law 88–40.

Veterans—Dependents: Increases from $80 to $135 monthly rental on servicemen's dwellings which are subject to the protective provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, and prohibits eviction of dependents of military personnel where monthly rental does not exceed $135. S. 384; passed Senate May 28.

Autos for disabled veterans: Extends to the disabled service-connected veterans of the cold war the present policy of allowing such veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict an allowance of $1,600 toward a specially equipped auto. The disabled veteran must have suffered from the loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands or feet or permanent visual impairment to a prescribed degree. S. 449; passed Senate May 28.

Veterans—Waiver of indebtedness: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to waive recovery on defaults on home loans in certain hardship cases. Public Law 88–151.

V.A. facilities: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to use private hospital facilities for the treatment of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities if there is no veterans' hospital located within the State or within 500 miles of the border of the State. (Bill applies only to Alaska and Hawaii since all other States have a veterans' hospital.) S. 625; passed Senate June 19.

WELFARE

Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation: Authorizes incorporation of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, a privately financed charitable and educational foundation. Public Law 88–11.

Dependent children—foster care: Extends for 1 year, to June 30, 1964, authority granted under the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 which permits the responsibility for placement and foster care of dependent children under the program of aid to needy families with dependent children to be exercised by a public agency other than the agency which regularly administers this program. Public Law 88–48.

YOUTH PROGRAMS

Youth employment: Authorizes a 5-year program to employ and train jobless youngsters between the ages of 16 and 22 in a youth conservation corps and a hometown service corps. S. 1; passed Senate April 10. H.R. 5131: House Calendar. (PR.)

Juvenile Delinquency Act extension: Extends to June 30, 1967, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act and authorizes appropriations of $10 million a year for grants to States to help develop aids to control existing problems of juvenile delinquency. S. 1967; passed Senate September 25. (PR.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week, I obtained unanimous consent to have the report of the minority leader printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and also printed as a Senate document. I submit it today. I shall read only two paragraphs. I am glad the distinguished majority leader is present to hear them:

> Mr. President, it has been traditional for the report of minority leaders to be rather partisan and political in character, recounting the mistakes, the erroneous judgments, and the sins of omission and commission of the majority party, in summoning the people to take heed in passing on the record. This report departs somewhat from that tradition.
>
> First, I must pay tribute to the distinguished majority leader, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, for his cooperation, his generosity, and his willingness at all times to adjust Senate schedules wherever possible to accommodate all Members of the Senate, minority and majority alike, whenever necessary arrangements might cause them to miss action upon important measures in which they were interested. Whenever an effort was made to fix time limitations on debate on any given proposal, he was ever willing to provide ample time to fully and adequately explore the proposal. He could have taken advantage of the fact that he was the floor spokesman for two-thirds of the Senate membership. He might have been, and in fact was, in a position to be captious and arbitrary, had he been so disposed; but always he pursued the fair and reasonable course, and for that he merits a salute from the minority leader and the minority Members of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The remarks of the minority leader are totally unexpected, but nevertheless deeply appreciated. I believe he has gone a little too far in complimenting me on my activities in the Senate. I will say in all honesty that what the distinguished minority leader said about me could, as far as I am concerned, apply equally, if not more so, to the cooperation, the understanding, the tolerance, and the good judgment which the distinguished minority leader has shown at all times.

The Senate could not operate solely on a Republican or Democratic basis, but it can and it does operate on a basis of mutual understanding and tolerance, placing the best interests of the Nation ahead of the best interests of either political party.

That is as it should be. That is as it has been. That is as I confidently expect it will continue to be.

If there is any credit to be given, it should go to the distinguished minority leader himself, and it should go to the Senate as a whole.

Again, I wish to express my deep personal thanks to my longtime friend and colleague, the distinguished minority leader who has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I add only one comment. I remember when the distinguished Senator from Montana became the majority leader of the Senate. We met in his office. He said that the Senate is a two-way street and that it cannot operate in any other fashion. I am delighted that the Senator from Montana is sitting in the opposite chair because, out of understanding, I am sure we shall be able to cause the Senate to operate successfully in the national interest. He has done so.

I assure him that my complimentary remarks about him come from the heart.

Pursuant to the order previously entered, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and to be printed as a Senate document (S. Doc. 47), as follows:

THE REPUBLICAN REPORT OF U.S. SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, OF ILLINOIS, MINORITY LEADER FOR THE 1ST SESSION, 88TH CONGRESS, TOGETHER WITH DIGESTS AND ANALYSES OF MAJOR LEGISLATION AND TREATIES

SECTION I: THE REPUBLICAN REPORT, 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. President, it has been traditional for the report of minority leaders to be rather partisan and political in character, recounting the mistakes, the erroneous judgments, and the sins of omission and commission of the majority party, and summoning the people to take heed in passing on the record. This report departs somewhat from that tradition.

First, I must pay tribute to the distinguished majority leader, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, for his cooperation, his generosity, and his willingness at all times to adjust Senate schedules wherever possible to accommodate all Members of the Senate, minority and majority alike, whenever necessary engagements might cause them to miss action upon important measures in which they were interested. Whenever an effort was made to fix time limitations on debate on any given proposal, he was ever willing to provide ample time to fully and adequately explore the proposal. He could have taken advantage of the fact that he was the floor spokesman for two-thirds of the Senate membership. He might have been, and in fact was, in a position to be captious and arbitrary had he been so disposed, but always he pursued the fair and reasonable course and for that he merits a salute from the minority leader and the minority Members of the Senate.

Secondly, the most grievously monstrous thing to happen during the 1st session of the 88th Congress was the assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a deed so shocking that it cast a pall over the entire world. To both branches of the Congress where he served for many years this evil and heinous deed came as a personal shock and will be long remembered for its infamy.

Had this evil thing occurred in many other countries, it might have produced the collapse of the government and a serious crisis. How grateful we can be that, under our constitutional system and the stability of our people, a new President quickly acceded to the office of the Chief Executive, the continuity of the legislative process was assured, and the Nation continued its uninterrupted march on the road of constitutional government. What a tribute it is to the vitality of our system and what a solemn warning to this generation that it be preserved and maintained.

Turning then to an appraisal of this the 1st session of the 88th Congress, let me observe in a personal way that I have served in the House of Representatives and in the Senate in 29 sessions of the Congress. Some of the sessions have been long and some have been short. This tenure covered the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the Eisenhower administration, and the New Frontier. Hundreds, if not thousands, of men and women have come and gone to and from the Congress in that time.

Each of these sessions has been measured by one yardstick or another, depending on who made the appraisal and what the appraiser's dominant interest might be.

There was the statistical test applied to Congress. How long was it in session? How many bills were introduced? How many pages were filled in the Congressional Record? How many measures were enacted into public law? This is an unselective assessment to say the least and has little more than a comparative significance.

There was the group test. What did the Congress do for agriculture? What did it do for labor? What did it do for business and industry? What did it do for the jobless? What did it do for the elderly? What did it do in the domain of education? What did it do for veterans? This test recalls the concern expressed by President Arthur Twining Hadley, of Yale University, in a symposium held in 1900 when a number of prominent Americans in various fields of endeavor were asked to forecast what they saw in the 50 years ahead. He alone foresaw the prospect of organized group demands upon the National Legislature regardless of where the national interest lay and their shattering effect upon our national well-being. One might well say that this is in effect the self-interest test.

Then there is the fiscal test. How much did the Congress appropriate out of the public Treasury? What did it do to restrict unwise and imprudent and unnecessary spending? What provision did it make for the necessary revenues? Was there a deficit? What was the state of the national public debt? Did it have an inflationary or deflationary impact? What did it do to the cost of living? This is truly vital to every citizen in the land because it might well be described as the pocketbook test.

Then there is the prestige test. What did the Congress do in the field of foreign relations to enhance our prestige? How compassionate was it in dealing with the problems of other lands? What did it do to weld the free world into a more effective and militant entity? What did it authorize and how much did it appropriate for foreign assistance? How liberal was it in providing foreign credits? What of its action in behalf of this hemisphere and the Alliance for Progress?

Somehow, in these various appraisals, two prime considerations seem to become lost. The first is the pure national interest in which the interest of any group or any major activity of the Federal Government must be related to the well-being of all citizens and to the future as well as to the present. The second consideration is the growing intrusion of the National Government into the affairs of the people and its relation to the question of freedom and very particularly freedom from Federal controls with the administration's farm proposals providing a clear-cut and classical example.

The epithets and slurs hurled at the Congress came in the main from those whose will was not done, whose demands were not met, whose desires were not fulfilled. Select any uncomplimentary remark that one will, choose any aspersion upon the Congress which comes to hand and trace it to the source and one can quickly ascertain that it is usually only a cry of frustration and ill-concealed disappointment. The Congress has simply refused to lift its eyes from the larger goal of the national interest and bend to the will and desire of a part of the whole.

Perhaps in all this the basic character of the Congress is forgotten. It is the exclusive lawmaking body in our Government. It is elected by all of the people. Its powers are carefully spelled out in the Constitution and likewise the limits on its powers. The Constitution directs that, from time to time, the President shall give to the Congress information on the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient. But nowhere in that exalted document does it say that those recommendations must be carried out or that they may not be altered, modified, changed, or rejected. The Congress has a clear and distinct responsibility of its own and likewise an accountability of its own. Whenever it has failed to act on its own, it was quickly dubbed a "rubberstamp Congress" and assailed for failure to exercise its powers as an equal and coordinate branch of Government.

When all is said and done, the 1st session of the 88th Congress was not a "do-nothing Congress" as some would have it or a "do-little Congress" or a "standstill Congress." The more appropriate term would be a "stop, look, and listen Congress."

It took careful account of the whole fiscal picture including a succession of deficits, a growing public debt, a constantly rising budget, unorthodox methods of financing such as the sale of assets, advance payments for military equipment, prepayment of debts by foreign countries, and the issuance of nontransferable short-term notes to the central banks of Europe. These are the considerations which persuaded a preponderant majority of the Senate Finance Committee to take a long hard look at a tax proposal which, according to the Secretary of the Treasury himself, would result in budget deficits in excess of $9 billion in the fiscal years 1964 and 1965, and a deficit of undetermined amount in the fiscal year 1966. If these estimates materialized, it would mean a public debt in the area of $330 billion or more with a corresponding increase in the annual interest burden which is already in excess of $10 billion. Is this a do-nothing attitude or is it the kind of vigilance which the American people want and deserve?

It was not until June 19, 1963, that an Executive message and the accompanying legislation dealing with civil rights was sent to the Congress for consideration. All-embracing civil rights measures have always been controversial. This year particularly, tensions and pressures on the whole subject of civil rights were heightened by the many demonstrations and acts of violence across the land. While the administration measure was under consideration in the House of Representatives, the Attorney General appeared and made recommendations which resulted in a bill being reported by the House Judiciary Committee. The end result satisfied no one. The all-out civil rights devotees considered it a retreat. It was still anathema to those opposed to legislation in this field, and, in the case of those who took the moderate view, it was still unacceptable. Can this be regarded as inertia and indifference, or is it a proper regard by the Congress for the present and future implications of a proposition which is bound to have a durable impact upon the entire Nation for a long time to come?

Farm legislation offers still another example of the basic differences between those who believe agriculture is a free way of life and that free farmers are the Nation's greatest asset in providing a subsistence for our people and for others, and those who see our surplus hoard of commodities as an evil which could be scotched only by despoiling the farmer of his freedom. The original New Frontier farm proposal offered the farmer a generous subsidy in return for accepting Federal shackles. The proposed extension of the Feed Grains Act in the instant session was predicated on the same theory and it was accompanied by a demand for speedy action on the ground that it was urgent. Urgent it was indeed from the administration standpoint because it was felt that action might have a salutary effect on the outcome of the wheat referendum in which farmers voted whether or not to accept Federal emoluments in return for their freedom of action. But the farmers chose freedom, despite the pressure campaign waged by the administration and its bureaucratic personnel all over the Nation. The program could not command so much as a simple majority of those who voted, and far from the necessary two-thirds required.

Still another category of items might be added to this recital to fully establish the thesis that the basic problem which confronted the present Congress was the sharp divergence of opinion between the Congress and the administration on the new functions which the Federal Government should undertake in the face of a rising budget, rising deficits, a rising public debt, and the threat which such a course offers to our fiscal solvency and the defense of the dollar. The National Service Corps, commonly known as the Domestic Peace Corps, is a prime example. In essence, it proposed to grubstake a few thousand young people to augment and supplement the work now being done by trained social workers, members of the clergy, teachers, law-enforcement officers, and the many community groups who have been operating in this field for a long time. It was not so much the modest initial outlay for this activity and the dubious results that would be obtained, but the important fact that, like every other agency in Government, it would proliferate, it would grow, and in due time become a costly duplicating enterprise, which once entrenched, could never be dislodged. When a nation is beset with debts and deficits, with a rising budget, and future fixed commitments which could well challenge its fiscal integrity, is it a provident course to add new functions to the vast array of activities in which the Federal Government is already engaged? It's the old story of the camel getting his nose under the tent and is indeed a wide departure from the course of fiscal responsibility which the Republican Party has pursued, knowing that nations founder on the rocks of careless stewardship in this field.

One other subject merits comment in this report and that is the repeated charge that Congress, and very particularly the Senate, has been unduly dilatory in dealing with annual appropriations bills. On this point, the minority leader can comment with some sense of authority, born of long experience on the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate.

In the House of Representatives, the Appropriations Committee is regarded as exclusive, meaning that a Member assigned to it serves on no other committee. Moreover, its members concentrate on a single subcommittee whether it be Agriculture, Foreign Aid, Labor, and HEW, or any other. Thus, a member becomes a specialist and can give his committee work undivided attention. When testimony on any given bill has been taken by the subcommittee, it reports to the full committee for final approval and the measure then goes to the House floor for debate under a procedural rule which limits debate. It is then messaged to the Senate.

On the Senate Appropriations Committee, members not only serve on three or four subcommittees but on other important Senate committees as well.

Now it has been the custom of agencies of Government to present to the Senate Appropriations subcommittees testimony on those items in a bill on which they are aggrieved by the action taken by the House. In some years the list of grievances is small; in other years it might be larger.

Members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, fully conscious of a budget which was pushing the $100 billion mark, have been giving painstaking attention to every appropriation item and not merely those where the department or agency in question was seeking reconsideration of action taken by the House Appropriations Committee. Add to this the fact that there were items on which the Senate and House sharply differed and had difficulty in composing those differences. Where action on appropriations was not consummated, resolutions to continue the availability of funds at the 1963 fiscal year level were adopted.

But let us go back once more to the basic problem which has been so readily glossed over; namely, the difference in viewpoint between the Congress and the Executive. For after all, this is the heart of the problem and accounts for the pace of the 88th Congress. It is not a question of rules as some would insist, because the rules under which both Houses of Congress operate have evolved out of experience over a long period of time, and they have proven time and again their suitability to meet emergency speeds. It is not a matter of staffing as some contend. It is not the machinery of procedure. It is not willfulness. It is, in short, a question of what to pursue to insure the survival of a free, solvent, secure, prosperous Republic in which Government is kept in its proper place.

Thomas B. Macauley, the eminent English historian, writing in 1857 to Henry Randall, one of the early biographers of Thomas Jefferson, commenting on the operation of our political system in a time of adversity and distress, did observe: "I seriously apprehend that you will, in some such season of adversity as I have described do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you act like people who should in a year of scarcity devour all the seed corn and thus make the next a year not of scarcity but of absolute famine. There will be I fear spoliation. The spoliation will increase the distress. The distress will produce fresh spoliation. There is nothing to stop you. Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. As I said before, when a society has entered on this downward progress, either civilization or liberty must perish."

A similar concern exists today both in and out of Congress. Can we spend ourselves rich and prosperous? Can heavy tax cuts be justified without a reasonable curtailment of the spending budget? Can we subsidize elementary education out of the Federal Treasury without inviting Federal control over the school systems of the Nation? Are new and dubious functions justified in the face of large deficits and a colossal debt? Do we calmly accept an astronomical budget merely because of a rising gross national product? Do we blithely accept the increasing intrusion of the Federal Government into the affairs of the people and the slow but steady erosion of their freedom of action? Do we throw overboard the present Federal-State cooperative program for medical care for the aged and supplant it with a socialized system under which the whole operation will be directed from Washington? Do we continue at present levels a costly and not too effective program of foreign assistance? Do we in a single step adopt an all-inclusive civil rights program which could invite a host of constitutional, legal, enforcement, and adjustment problems to disturb the tranquility of the Nation for a long time to come? These are but some of the problems where a divergence of viewpoint exists between the Congress and the Executive and they will not be lightly brushed away.

On these and other matters, the Congress has rather clearly indicated its intention to exercise its responsibility as the exclusive lawmaking branch of the Government, accountable only to the people, and I apprehend that, as time goes on, this settlement will sharpen rather than diminish.

As to Republican cooperation and initiative on basic matters involving the well-being of the Nation, the more detailed explanations which follow speak for themselves and for the Republican record in this the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

Appropriations

The last time appropriations bills cleared the Senate before the fiscal year began was in 1954, the last year of Republican committee control, then under the Appropriations chairmanship of the late Styles Bridges. At that time, 9 years ago, Senator Bridges remarked that it was only the second time in a quarter century that all regular money bills had cleared Congress before the start of the fiscal year for which they were carrying funds. He said that the last time it had been achieved was in 1948, when there was also a Republican Congress.

Since 1955, when Democrats took over Senate control, money bills have bogged down in a mire of confusion. This year, for instance, not a single appropriations bill had cleared either House by April 1. Not in recent memory were these bills further behind at the quarter mark of the session. Not until June 4 did the first regular appropriations bill, that for the Treasury-Post Office Departments, emerge from Congress for the President's signature.

By July, only 1 out of the 12 regular appropriations bills had been enacted. Thus, it became necessary to approve a resolution—for the unusual period of 60 days—to permit the various agencies and departments to function until regular appropriations were approved and signed by the President. Since the majority of the appropriations bills still were not enacted at the end of that period, a second 60-day resolution was necessary. Another 30-day extension was granted to November 30. And, finally, it was necessary to grant an extension to January 31, 1964, a most unique and unprecedented situation.

On July 18, the fiscal 1964 appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior was finally passed and sent to the President. It was December 9 when the Senate finally approved the public works appropriations bill after defeating Republican attempts to slash funds for a pump-priming accelerated works program. On December 9 the military construction appropriations bill was passed by the Senate and on December 10 the independent offices appropriations bill was finally approved. It was December 12 when the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments appropriations bill cleared the Senate.

It was not until August that the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Departments appropriations were approved. In September, approval was given for Defense Department appropriations.

In looking for a reason for this tardiness, one need look no further than the budget itself—$98.8 billion. This staggering sum, never equaled before in peacetime, warranted the most careful scrutiny Congress could give. As each appropriations bill came before the committee and, later, before the Senate, it was evident that such scrutiny had been given these bills.

Above everything else, this was the cause for the delay in handling appropriations this year. Such a delay was mandatory if the best interests of the United States and the American people were to be served.

Civil rights

During the Republican administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower the first two civil rights bills in decades were made public laws.

On March 29, 1963, nine Republican Senators introduced a series of bills and resolutions which would translate into law recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

These measures included the establishment of voter qualifications for State and Federal elections; a plan for desegregating schools; equality in employment; a housing plan for those displaced by the Federal highway program; administration of justice by penalizing unconstitutional official violence; public accommodations bills; and a bill to make the U.S. Civil Rights Commission a permanent executive agency.

On June 19 the executive branch sent up to Congress civil rights proposals embodying most of the points made in bills introduced by Republicans.

The bill was divided into two parts in the Senate. With the exception of the public accommodations, which went to the Committee on Commerce, the remainder of the bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee.

In the House the bill was referred to a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. There, the committee after many weeks of consideration, reported a bill stronger than that requested by the executive branch.

Hearing repercussions politically, the Attorney General spent hours before the committee to induce it to tone down much of the measure. It was a case of marching up the hill and marching back down again.

There followed a series of meetings by members of the committee with the White House. Republican leaders in the House were called to help and to provide a bill which it was felt had some possibility of passing the House and being considered by the Senate.

When a bill was obtained more nearly in line with that requested by the executive branch there was a public acknowledgment of the help of the Republicans in providing a fair and equitable bill which would have a chance of being approved by Congress.

Despite all these efforts to get immediate action on a civil rights program, no significant civil rights laws have been placed on the books since January 1961.

Civilian space program

Controversy raged this year about the civilian space programs of the executive branch. Of major concern to the Republicans in the Senate was the man on the moon project.

Concern over the impetus being given this project prompted the staff of the Republican Policy Committee to issue, in May, a study on the Apollo project entitled "A Matter of Priority." This touched off heated controversy throughout the Nation and caused a reexamination of the entire moon race.

Backed by solid scientific opinion, both Houses of Congress agreed to cut the authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from $7.5 billion to $5.3 billion.

Domestic Peace Corps

Despite the fact there are 1.5 million teachers, 133,000 social workers, 280,000 law enforcement officers, and 200,000 clergymen in this Nation devoted to helping the underprivileged and those incapable of helping themselves, the administration felt a new agency was needed. So, without permission of Congress, an executive branch committee was formed and the Domestic Peace Corps was created.

After the fact, the executive branch came to Capitol Hill and asked for authorization to create the National Service Corps, patterned to a degree after the oversea Peace Corps.

It demanded of Congress a "modest" little sum—$5 or $6 million—with which to get the National Service Corps started. With this money it was expected to be able to solve the Nation's welfare problems where others have failed.

The argument was to "sell" the Domestic Peace Corps as an agency which would serve on Indian reservations and in depressed areas, both rural and urban, to augment existing welfare services. The plan had its obvious drawbacks, most important being the idea of hiring youngsters just out of college and without specialized training to undertake this important task. It was inconceivable to many that these young men and women could move into some of our big city slum areas, where even hardened police officers walk in pairs, and accomplish a task which experienced and skilled social workers have not been able to accomplish.

To work these miracles, the administration suggested 5,000 or so college graduates might suffice.

Another factor which tended to increase opposition involved the memory of what happened in the matter of the oversea Peace Corps. This, too, started out as a moderate venture. It was felt that this agency could get along on $5 million in 1961, but by year's end that figure had been upped to $30 million. In 1962, the figure soared to $58 million, and by 1963, the request was for $108 million. The Congress finally voted $102 million for the oversea Peace Corps.

There is a genuine fear among many on both sides of the aisle that this new baby in the Federal crib will start growing, and with added growth will come a bigger and bigger appetite.

Republican efforts to hold back this new spending program and the unwarranted invasion of a field which should be left to charities and local government were to no avail. The measure passed the Senate by a vote of 47 to 44.

Republicans, aided by some Democrats, did succeed in trimming the measure somewhat. First, life of the legislation was limited to 2 years. Then, fiscal 1965 authorization was limited to $10 million. And, finally, to prevent unwanted incursion into the States, the Corps was prohibited from working in any State without a prior request from the Governor of that State.

Republicans also forced into the bill a requirement that Corps employees must be American citizens, or Cuban refugees of good moral character.

Funds for hiring consultants were limited to 2 percent of the total.

The bill now languishes in the House.

Education

In the area of education the Congress again this year began work on a shopworn rewrite of a Federal aid to education program. This one contained nothing new, nothing that had not been voted down repeatedly by Congress itself.

Republicans, on the other hand, offered new and imaginative proposals for college construction and vocational education. In both instances the Republican emphasis prevailed.

A program to aid construction of college academic facilities—which Republicans said should receive the highest priority—was prepared as a separate measure. Not until October did the House act on such a bill. This college aid bill authorizes the spending, over the next 3 years, of $690 million in grants for undergraduate classrooms, libraries, and laboratories; $145 million in grants for such facilities for graduate schools; and $360 million in loans for graduate and undergraduate facilities. In addition, the bill authorizes $150 million for academic facilities for public community colleges and technical institutes. All of this Federal money must be matched by the colleges and universities.

Also approved was a $1.2 billion bill, a large part of which would aid in expanding vocational education. This is a step in the right direction. Republicans have long emphasized that the needs of our school dropouts and unemployed youth could be met with sound vocational education which would prepare them for useful skills.

It is more than interesting to note that during debate on the vocational assistance programs a Senate Republican Policy Committee staff study of March 4, entitled "The Forgotten Youth," was used as authority by both Democratic and Republican Senators.

Aid to federally impacted areas, where there are large numbers of children of Federal employees, was approved, giving assistance to elementary and secondary schools.

No action was taken on general aid to education to elementary schools because of the controversy over granting such assistance to parochial schools.

Congress approved the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act in September, the first new education measure since 1958.

This $236.4 million medical education bill is designed to aid medical and dental schools and to train doctors and other health personnel.

It is a 3-year program authorizing $175 million in grants to cover up to two-thirds of the total cost of building medical and dental schools. It also authorizes $30.7 million in low-interest loans to medical students, dentistry students, and students of osteopathy over a 3-year period to enable students already receiving aid under the program to complete their education.

It is hoped that by this action the shortage in these fields can be alleviated.

Equal Pay Act

After many attempts in the past, the Congress approved and the President signed into law an act which prohibits discrimination based on sex in wages paid for employment in interstate commerce. This step recognizes that skills, regardless of whether they are possessed by men or women, should have equal representation in the marketplace.

Finance and taxation

The fiscal year 1964 budget, delivered January 17, 1963, weighing 9 pounds, outlined the spending of $98.8 billion, or about $11 billion per pound of budget document. This idle statistic, coupled with the emergence of a theory which said an unbalanced budget is not important (because what we must balance is not the budget but the economy) fittingly describes the new approach to fiscal solvency.

The choice presented us is quite simple. Shall we spend more than we receive or shall we receive less than we spend? The new breed of economist says the former is an "active" deficit, therefore, good, and the latter a "passive" deficit, therefore, quite undesirable. Unnoticed in the frenzy of intramural theorizing was a Treasury Department report of February 6, 1963, which showed U.S. gold reserves at their lowest point in 20 years.

At the core of executive branch proposals were three decisions: (1) Cut taxes some $10.2 billion; (2) increase Federal spending $5.4 billion; and (3) cause the Nation's first deliberately planned deficit, at that time $12 billion.

The Republican goal in the 1st session of the 88th Congress was a reduction in Federal spending so as to lead to a legitimate, reasonable tax cut. We knew it could be done because the two major tax cuts during the past 30 years, both made by Republicans, were accompanied by spending cuts.

Ever since the New Deal a primary excuse for the expansion of Federal spending has been the supposed necessity for Government action to eliminate unemployment. The out-of-work percentage of our labor force—which averaged 4.9 percent during President Eisenhower's 8 years in office—rose to 6.7 percent during 1961, was 5.6 percent in 1962, and stood at 5.6 percent as the third quarter of 1963 drew to a close. The chief harm done by this spending is not that it has failed to reduce unemployment and offset recessions, nor that it has introduced an inflationary bias into Government policy, but that it has fostered an expansion in Government activities at the Federal level and prevented a reduction in the very taxes about which some economists now express concern.

Surveys at the grassroots level through the spring and summer months could not help but reinforce the legislator's high regard of his constituency. Citizens who responded to polls indicated their desire for tax cuts if, and only if, sky-high Federal spending could be reduced. The country's perception in times like these is a joy to behold. Imagine, then, the astonishment when Dr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, said that the adherence of Americans to the "Puritan ethic" was to be blamed for the lack of enthusiasm on tax reduction without a reduction in Federal spending.

By this time, May of 1963, the Treasury's stock of gold had fallen another $150 million and left our gold stock at a new record low of $15.83 billion, down from the May 1962 level of $16.47 billion.

At the end of June, America's balance-of-payments deficit had reached an annual rate of $5.2 billion, although since showing some improvement. The plain truth then, as now, is that the Federal Government is not in a wholesome financial position. A foreign creditor is willing to hold our dollars instead of demanding gold so long as he sees nothing occurring that might impair the value of those dollars. When he sees the parade of deficits totaling more than $20 billion since 1961, a foreign creditor worries about the inflation potential and he demands gold to play safe. Exactly like the foreign creditor, plain, ordinary Americans are worried about the value of the dollar. They have painful memories of the inflationary Truman years when the value of the dollar was reduced almost 50 percent. That's why polls have shown the overwhelming majority of the American people don't want a tax cut if it means increasing the national debt.

The Revenue Act of 1963, commonly called the tax bill, passed the House of Representatives in September and is now in hearings in the Senate Finance Committee. Republican members of the committee have always favored sound, legitimate tax reduction, and reform. But at this writing, it cannot be said that the Nation's economy is faced with a recession. In a period such as this there is no justification for enlarging the Federal deficit through tax reduction. Nor is there justification for assuming, simply because our record high, balance-of-payments deficits have abated somewhat in the third quarter of 1963, that the drain on our gold reserves is no longer of importance. We are continuing to run deficits. We continue to spend more than we receive. We continue to lose gold to oversea creditors. No nation, so disposed to squander its resources, can long remain free in this world of thunderclouds and deep waters.

Export-Import Bank Extension

A slight indentation was made in the "backdoor spending" method of financing when the Congress approved a bill extending the life of the Export-Import Bank for another 5 years. Although increasing the Bank's lending authority from $7 to $9 billion and authorizing $2 billion instead of $1 billion for the Bank's aggregate amount of export credit insurance and guarantees, the Bank, now, instead of being authorized to borrow funds from the Treasury ("back-door spending"), must come to Congress for direct appropriations, thus restoring full control to the legislative branch.

Silver Purchase Act

Congress authorized the Treasury to retire its present $1 and $2 silver certificates, including $1.5 billion in the familiar $1 bills, and replace them with Federal Reserve notes. This action is intended to ease the pinch caused by the Government's increasing demand for silver, to meet the steadily increasing demand for coins, and to fill requests for the metal from the Defense Department and other agencies.

The legislation also repeals the silver purchase acts, under which the Treasury bought 3 billion ounces of silver to help support the Nation's producers of the metal.

In addition, the legislation permits the Secretary of the Treasury to sell silver in the market if its price rises above its monetary value of $1.29 an ounce.

National Debt Extensions

National debt ceiling increases were formerly enacted—at most—once a year. Since January 1961, however, debt ceiling extensions come not once but twice, even three times a year. Permanent debt ceiling stands at $285 billion. But since our national debt as of November stood at $307 billion, the House, on November 8, voted to raise the "temporary" debt ceiling to $315 billion. Republicans opposed the measure in the House to a man and were joined, in fact, by 32 Democrats. The Senate agreed to this temporary increase since the Government's debt obligations must be met.

Foreign policy

We live, not in a world of simple issues, nor in a day of rational behavior, but rather in a spectrum of anxiety among friend and foe, brother and neighbor. We do not contest the nature of relationship between Congress and the executive branch. Nor do we contest the frightful responsibility cast upon the executive branch in the conduct of our affairs beyond the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific. Republicans, traditionally, have encouraged a bipartisan approach to the intricate machinations of foreign policy. Our desire is to remain bipartisan.

It is most necessary to the fruition of this concept of bipartisan support that each potential supporter of Presidential and State Department positions know what policy he is asked to support.

Congress, charged with control of the public purse, must of necessity inquire carefully into the reasons for support—indeed subsidization—of such governments as those of the leftist and aggressive Egypt and Ghana, and all the new, so-called independent states whose development remains far in the future.

Vietnam, perhaps more than we now realize, was a stage on which tragedy evolved from misjudgment. The United States, through the actions of its Department of State, too often predicates official action upon known reactions of our experience, our own civilization; not upon the reactions of persons bred in the culture, the civilization, with which we are dealing. That two duly elected leaders of a foreign ally should be murdered, due perhaps in part to our own inconsistency, is an act so tragic as to assume proportions not yet realized in the affairs of this ancient land. We are in South Vietnam to prevent the expansion of Communist colonialism. Over 100 American men have been killed in this commitment of U.S. forces and aid. If our State Department—and all the other multitudinous agencies of the executive branch—have not erred, we should begin to see results in the period ahead.

One vital step forward was executed in 1963 with the signing of the partial nuclear test ban treaty, designed to end nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in space, and in underwater areas. It was extraordinarily gratifying to see this fruition of President Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles' long, patient negotiation with the Soviet Union for a test ban. This treaty, by way of explanation, constitutes a first step which will advance, although not assure, world peace. The treaty inhibits the nuclear arms race by radically limiting the testing in which the United States and the Soviet Union might otherwise engage. While the treaty cannot wholly prevent the spread of nuclear arms to nations not now possessing them, it does prohibit assistance by signatories to nonsignatories.

A similar kind of treaty was first proposed by President Eisenhower in 1959. The tests conducted by both the Soviet Union and the United States had not, up to that time, resulted in any substantial alteration in the strategic balance of power. In 1959 our relative nuclear strength was great enough to make a limited test ban desirable. Although there had been a change of circumstances and of the relative position of the world powers concerning nuclear technology between the date of the proposal of the Eisenhower administration and the present proposal—enough to cause doubts to be raised about ratification—the treaty was nevertheless a first step. Neither did the Eisenhower proposal enable the Soviet Union to veto each and every project by the United States for the peaceful use of atomic devices for such purposes as diverting hurricanes, digging channels and canals, and other, so-called plowshare program. The 1963 treaty does this, if radioactive debris extends beyond our national boundaries.

The treaty did not mean that we could now proceed to an overnight solution of the Berlin wall, or of Cuba, Vietnam, Korea. Nor does it eliminate Communist China's threat to invade India, nor relieve the pressure on the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa. The treaty does not free the captive nations of Europe, nor does it serve as a panacea for the evils and tensions of the cold war.

This partial test ban treaty, ratified by the Senate of the United States on September 24, 1963, merely provides the potential of a small beginning that might lead to better things, not only for America but for all men.

To the same end, that of bringing better things to this world, the United States has provided over $100 billion from the public purse to assist in the development of healthy, free societies overseas. In discussion of the foreign aid bill before the Senate this year several new avenues of inquiry were considered. Since private investment had been found to be a useful tool for the purpose of inducing more private enterprise to engage in operations in the countries we were aiding, especially in the newly developing countries, we felt some further investment guaranty programs should be encouraged.

On October 31, the Senate agreed to an amendment of the Foreign Assistance Act expressing the sense of Congress that the institution of full investment guaranty programs under the act by recipient countries would be regarded "as a significant measure of self-help by such countries improving the climate for private investment both domestic and foreign."

On November 5, the Senate agreed to an amendment to limit the authorization for the Development Loan Fund to $950 million for fiscal year 1964.

On November 6, the Senate agreed to an amendment (1) reducing the President's contingency fund to $175 million and (2) increasing the authorization for the Alliance for Progress to $600 million. Later, on November 6, amendments providing overall reductions in authorizations were agreed to: (1) providing for authorization for the Development Loan Fund of $950 million for fiscal 1964, with cancellation of the hitherto authorized $1.5 billion annual authorization for the Development Loan Fund for fiscal years 1965 and 1966; (2) reducing military assistance from $1.3 billion to $1 billion; (3) repealing existing authorization of $50 million of unappropriated funds for previous years for the Alliance for Progress; and (4) requiring, on any project which exceeded $500,000, approval either by the U.S. Corps of Engineers or by a reputable U.S. private firm of engineers. The reduction in authorizations of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee version totaled $460 million.

Also, on November 7, an amendment was agreed to by the Senate denying assistance to any country which the President determined to be engaged in or preparing for aggressive military efforts against the United States or any country receiving assistance under this or any other act, or any country to which sales were made under Public Law 480.

On November 8, the Senate agreed to an amendment establishing an Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid. An amendment was also agreed to eliminating Presidential authority to waive restrictions on aid to all Communist countries.

On November 12, the Senate agreed to an amendment providing that none of the foreign aid act's provisions be construed to bar assistance to any country pursuant to the Peace Corps Act, as amended, or the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. On November 13, the Senate agreed to an amendment reducing authorization for support assistance from $400 million to $380 million.

On November 14, the Senate agreed to an amendment providing for appointment by the President of committees to review, evaluate, and make recommendations respecting foreign aid programs. Only then, on November 15, was the foreign aid authorization bill passed by the Senate. As the bill stood for passage it authorized these appropriations for fiscal year 1964: Development loans, $950 million; development grants, $225 million; schools and hospitals, $21,600,000 (foreign currency); Alliance for Progress, $600 million; international organizations, $136,050,000; supporting assistance, $380 million; contingency fund, $175 million; military assistance, $1 billion; AID administration, $52 million; State Department administration, $3,025,000; and Latin American development, $155 million.

Thus the foreign aid bill, with the amounts as above, passed the Senate by a vote of—yeas 63, nays 17.

The Senate, on December 13, adopted the conference report which set the foreign aid authorization at $3.6 billion by a vote of 61 to 26. The final authorization bill contained some decreases and some increases in the various appropriations.

Manpower retraining program

Although there are none who would question the need for retraining for many in this age of automation, the question of extending the existing manpower retraining program for another year centered not on the need but upon first, the administration's timing, and, second, the apparent apathy of the States to the program.

With a huge Federal deficit and the need for curtailing Federal expenditures, it was not the time, in the opinion of many, to place the whole financial burden of the program on the Federal Government.

Despite these drawbacks, the Senate approved the continuance of the program for another year, dropping the requirement that the States pay 50 percent of the cost starting July 1, 1964, thus providing sole Federal financing for the third straight year, and increasing the outlay in 1964 from $161 million to $322 million, or double the amount. The House voted to extend the program 2 years to June 30, 1967, lowered the age limit for training from 19 to 17, added basic education courses, and gave the States 1 more year before paying their part of the program costs, as well as reducing the Federal financing to $276 million. The differences will be adjusted in conference.

In the 1 year of experience with the program, the Labor Department reports there is a tendency to train only the best of those out of work because of automation, leaving the others right where they were. The Department also reports that it needs more money to train young people since they comprise almost 25 percent of those being trained.

This is just another example of more Federal funds—less State responsibility—and the reason our Federal debt continues to increase and increase.

Mexican farm labor

After a defeat originally in the House, the Senate approved the Mexican farm labor bill extending it for a period of 1 year. To place the U.S. farmworker on a par with the Mexican bracero, an amendment was approved which requires employers seeking Mexican laborers to offer American workers the same housing, transportation, expenses, workmen's compensation, and work-period guarantees given to the Mexican workers. On a second vote the House approved the legislation. When the bill returned for Senate concurrence, the Senate amendment was deleted and a simple continuance for only 1 year was agreed upon.

This was the sixth time this so-called temporary law had been extended; a law originally enacted during the Korean war in 1951 when agricultural workers were in short supply, and it was felt that it had served its purpose.

National defense

In a time when peril faces the free world, when our civilization and our institutions are threatened, no man in the Republican minority in the U.S. Senate could in good conscience oppose any sums deemed necessary to bolster the defense of our Nation.

The program so carefully drawn by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower is coming of age. It has been an expensive program; but when our Nation faces the kind of threat it faces today no warranted expense can be spared.

Historically, Republicans have supported a sound policy of defense. Our goal has ever been to maintain such strength that we can deal at arm's length with any nation in the world. We must have such strength as to fear no nation nor any combination of nations.

Republicans, under leadership of President Eisenhower, established a solid bulwark, a strong deterrent force. The Eisenhower administration developed the concept of the intercontinental ballistic missile as a main line of defense. Under the Eisenhower administration the Atlas, Titan, Minuteman, and Polaris were developed. This taut muscle of defense has become the mainstay of our national security and that of the free world.

We would like to call attention to several facets which merit close public scrutiny.

First, the evidence which has cropped up of conflict of interest within the Department of Defense. This situation calls for a thorough housecleaning in that Department and a searching of souls on the part of many officials who still hold positions of public trust.

Then, closely correlated with this is the business of handing out defense contracts. This practice of subordinating security for political gain must come to an end if we are to maintain our security.

The use of defense contract announcements for political purposes is a shoddy business and one which must cease. This practice, while in itself perhaps not harmful to our total defense effort, gives rise to suspicions in the minds of Americans. They are beginning to wonder if their peace and security is a plaything in the hands of political experts. These suspicions, in turn, will give rise to others, and we cannot maintain a strong and effective defense if the American people are not totally committed to it and totally in support of that program.

These are matters of concern to the Republican minority in the Senate. They are matters of growing concern to many millions of Americans throughout our land.

Philippines war claims

The Philippines war claims bill finally became law after a long and rocky trip through Congress because of revelations that a lobbyist would have collected hundreds of thousands of dollars in fees from the Philippine claimants under its original provisions.

The law, to eliminate claims running into millions to a few, provides that of the estimated total of 68,000 claims, each is to be paid up to a limit of $25,000.

To aid the Philippine people as a whole, after these claims are paid, the remaining $30 to $40 million is to be used to create a special Philippine-American educational exchange fund.

Claims for beneficiaries of those who have died or who cannot be traced are expected to amount to from $5 to $10 million, and will revert to the U.S. Treasury.

The law contains stringent penalties to prevent lobbyists collecting fees for allegedly steering the bill through Congress.

Railroads

For months the executive branch tried to solve the question of railroads work rules and related rules.

After going through the courts and with a crippling railroad strike facing the Nation, the Secretary of Labor tried to help solve the controversy. With no solution in sight, the President then requested that Supreme Court Associate Justice Arthur J. Goldberg be called upon to bring the two sides together.

The unions rejected this offer and, as the deadline for a nationwide railroad strike neared, the administration sought a solution in Congress. For the first time a compulsory arbitration act was approved which was binding for a period of 180 days.

To try to bring a final solution to this problem, a tripartite board was established to determine a binding settlement on two of the thorniest issues in the dispute, that of elimination of firemen on carriers which management protested are not needed, and the question of how many conductors and brakemen would man each train. This panel was composed of two management, two union, and three public members, the latter named jointly by the two political parties, and in the event of any disagreement on the public members the President then would appoint a member.

This board would hand down its findings within 90 days and the award would go into effect 60 days later. Meanwhile, management and unions would resume collective bargaining on other issues in dispute such as pay structure, interdivisional runs, and combination of yard and road work. After the law expires, both sides are free to fend for themselves, and the union could strike on the so-called secondary issues, subject to provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

It is to be hoped that Congress, which should not have been brought into the controversy over binding arbitration on a labor-management dispute, will have accomplished more than a 6-month delay and that a strike will be avoided, but no one can say for certain.

Reorganization Act of 1959 amendment

The Democrat-controlled House voted June 4 to withhold from the executive branch the authority to create any new executive departments. This was the first time any such authority was denied the executive branch.

The House also prohibited the executive branch from using the act to abolish or transfer the functions of an executive department or to consolidate any two or more executive departments and all their functions.

This proposal, limiting as it was, received no action from the Senate.

Along this same line, the Senate approved an amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act creating a Joint Committee on the Budget for a more effective evaluation of the executive agencies, and to ascertain how, and why funds are requested, in order to keep more of a watch on the taxpayer's money. The House took no action on this measure.

Wilderness preservation

The wilderness system bill, passed by the Senate on April 9, intended to keep congressional control over the system, was not acted upon in the House.

Youth employment and conservation programs

The old and extinct Civilian Conservation Corps, commonly known as the CCC back in 1933, was resurrected under a new name of "Youth Employment" designed to place about 60,000 unemployed youngsters at work on Federal lands and State conservation projects in its first year of operation. This so-called new CCC also called for a Youth Conservation Corps, under which an additional 15,000 young men between 16 and 21 years of age would be put to work on Federal forest and park lands, to provide jobs and work experience. It does not take much imagination to figure just what work experience might be had for a youth returning to a highly urban area after a year or so in the woods.

The Federal-State portion of this program provided for Federal grants to States and localities to set up work groups of boys and girls 16 to 21 years of age to work in parks, hospitals, and other projects, supervised by the States, with a maximum of enrollees set at 60,000.

Republicans made alternate proposals to this make-work program realizing youth unemployment is a real and pressing problem that could scarcely be solved by these methods.

Our proposals embraced:

1. Expansion of the vocational educational system.

2. A study of State and Federal laws and rules restricting youth employment opportunities.

3. Amendment to the Manpower Retraining Act to expand the youth training sections and lift the 5-percent ceiling on expenditures for youth.

4. Changes in the draft and military reserves program so that more youths would be inducted in the services at the ages of 18 and 19. At present these dropout, jobless young men are usually not called into the services until 22 or 23 years of age.

5. Expansion of conservation job opportunities for young men, but without the elaborate structure and excessive national corps operated and controlled by the Secretary of Labor.

Although the administration's bill was passed by the Senate April 10, without many of these constructive proposals, the bill never got to the House floor for action.

The Republican record, 1900–1964

Since the dawn of the 20th century, 64 years ago, Republican administrations have guided our Nation's destiny for 34 years. Democrats have occupied the White House for 30 years. Yet Republicans have accomplished 22 balanced budgets; the Democrats only 3.

Democrats have accounted for $293 billion in cumulative budget deficits; Republicans barely $14 billion.

Republicans accept responsibility for 4.4 percent of our national debt; Democrats must shoulder the blame for 95.6 percent.

Average unemployment under Republican administrations is 5.6 percent; under Democrats, 8.5 percent.

Republicans have achieved eight tax reductions; Democrats two.

Conversely, Republicans have only raised taxes twice; Democrats, 13 times.

Finally, when all the oratory is finished, three major wars have been fought under Democratic Presidents; none under Republicans.

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF MAJOR LEGISLATION AND TREATIES, 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Agriculture

Feed Grain Act of 1963 (Public Law 88–26; Approved May 20, 1963)

This law (H.R. 4997) provided for 1964 and 1965 voluntary feed grain programs similar to the 1963 program but with various changes. In general, the law provided with respect to the 1964 and 1965 crops for:

1. Price support for corn at 65 to 90 percent of parity (and comparable levels for grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye) if a feed grain diversion program were in effect.

2. Conditioning eligibility for feed grain price support on participation in an acreage diversion program (with authority for a malting barley exemption from this requirement), or, at the Secretary of Agriculture's discretion, on keeping within the farm base acreage if there were no diversion program.

3. Use of payments in kind as a method of feed grain price support if an acreage diversion program were in effect (with authority tc make up to 50 percent of any such payment in advance of determination of performance). While the law did not contain any limit on the amount of price-support payments that could be made, the Secretary had indicated that price-support payments under the 1964 and 1965 programs would not exceed the 18 cents per bushel for corn provided by law under the 1963 program.

4. A minimum feed grain value for redemption purposes equal to current support price (minus that part made available through payments), plus reasonable carrying charges.

5. Feed grain diversion programs in 1964 and 1965 if the supply would otherwise be excessive.

Payments in kind could be made under such programs at rates up to 50 percent of the support price multiplied by the normal production of the acreage diverted for diverting up to 50 percent of the farm feed grain base (or 25 acres, if greater) to conservation uses. The programs would cover corn, grain sorghums, and barley; oats and rye where requested by the producer for purposes of having wheat coverage as feed grain acreage; and wheat to the extent of the excess of the farm's 1959, 1960, and 1961 average acreage of wheat produced under the so-called feed wheat exemption over the farm's small farm base acreages in any State or county and for up to a 1-percent State reserve for farms with no base period history. Farms receiving apportionments from such reserve would not be entitled to diversion payments for the first year for which feed grain bases were established for them.

Extension of Tobacco Allotment Leasing Authority (Public Law 88–68, Approved July 19, 1963)

This law (S. 581) amended the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years, 1964 and 1965, the present provisions permitting the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments from one farm to another within the same county. (The leasing of any Maryland tobacco allotment was precluded unless at least 75 percent of the allotment for each of the 2 preceding years was planted on the farm.)

Agricultural Experiment Station Research Facilities (Public Law 88–74, Approved July 22, 1963)

This law (H.R. 40) authorized appropriation, as Congress deems advisable, of Federal funds, on a matching basis, specifically for the purpose of assisting in the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other physical facilities for agricultural research in the State agricultural experiment stations. Grants under the bill would be available for 3 years.

Atomic energy

Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Authorization (Public Law 88–72, Approved July 22, 1963)

This law (S. 1745) authorized appropriation of $216,271,000 for fiscal year 1964 for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. Included in this authorization was $172,562,000 for new construction projects.

Atomic Energy Commission Supplemental Appropriation Authorization (Public Law 88–189, Approved Nov. 29, 1963)

This law (S. 2267) amended Public Law 88–72, the Atomic Energy Commission Fiscal Year 1964 Authorization Act, by providing a supplemental authorization of $17,945,000 for construction of 12 new facilities for the nuclear weapons development program.

Civil rights

Equal Pay Act of 1963 (Public Law 88–38, Approved June 10, 1963)

This law (S. 1409) amended the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide that equal work must be compensated with equal pay, regardless of the sex of the workers.

Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason—Extension of Civil Rights Commission (Public Law 88–152, Approved Oct. 17, 1963)

This law (H.R. 3369), by rider to a House-passed private relief bill revived and extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 1 year. The life of the Civil Rights Commission had expired September 30, 1963, except that an additional 60 days had been provided for liquidation of its business.

Education

Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 (Public Law 88–129, Approved Sept. 24, 1963)

This law (H.R. 12) authorized a $175 million, 3-year (1964–66) program of matching grants for construction of teaching facilities for the training of physicians, dentists, nurses, and professional public health personnel as well as for pharmacists, optometrists, and podiatrists, and for new construction and expansion and renovation of existing facilities; and authorized a 3-year (1964–66) $30,700,000 program of student loans.

The law also authorized such sums as may be required to enable students who have received a loan prior to July 1, 1966, to continue or complete their education. Estimated requirements for this purpose for 1967, 1968, and 1969 totaled an additional $30,700,000.

Finance and taxation

Temporary Increase in Public Debt Limit (Public Law 88–30, Approved May 29, 1963)

This law (H.R. 6009) provided a temporary debt limit of $307 billion for the remainder of fiscal 1963 and a temporary debt limit for the first 2 months of fiscal 1964 (July and August) of $309 billion.

The temporary debt limit for fiscal 1963 was $308 billion from July 1, 1962, through March 31, 1963; from April 1 through June 24, 1963, $305 billion; the last week of the fiscal year, $300 billion.

Silver Legislation (Public Law 88–36, Approved June 4, 1964)

This law (H.R. 5839) repealed the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, section 4 of the act of July 6, 1930, the act of July 31, 1946, and the related transfer tax on silver bullion. It would prohibit the Government from selling silver, restricting the use of free silver to coinage and sale to other Government agencies, unless the market price exceeded the monetary value. It would continue the requirement that the Treasury must keep a reserve of silver to match outstanding silver certificates and must supply silver in exchange for silver certificates on the holder's demand. It would authorize the issuance of $1 and $2 Federal Reserve notes to meet the needs of business and the public.

Continued Suspension of Duties on Metal Scrap (Public Law 88–50, Approved June 29, 1963)

This law (H.R. 4174) amended section 2 of Public Law 869, 81st Congress, as amended, to continue for 1 year, to June 30, 1964, the suspension of duties on metal scrap including iron and steel, aluminum, magnesium, nickel, and nickel alloys. The law provided that the suspension would not apply to certain specified types of scrap.

Tax Rate Extension Act of 1963 (Public Law 88–52, Approved June 29, 1963)

This law (H.R. 6755) extended for 1 year, until June 30, 1964, the existing corporate-tax rate at 52 percent and certain excise-tax rates (so-called Korean conflict emergency taxes), and continued the existing 5-percent rate on air transportation to June 30, 1964.

Exemption From Duty for Returning Residents (Public Law 88–53, Approved June 29, 1963)

This law (H.R. 6791) extended for 2 additional years to July 1, 1965, the temporary reduction, from $500 to $100, in the amount of purchases abroad that a returning resident of the United States may bring back into this country free of duty.

Export-Import Bank Extension (Public Law 88–101, Approved Aug. 20, 1963)

This law (H.R. 3872) amended the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for 5 years, to June 30, 1968; to increase the Bank's authorization for insurance and guarantees from $1 billion to $2 billion; and to increase the limitation on the amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance outstanding at any one time from $7 billion to $9 billion. A proposal to increase the Treasury borrowing authority of the Bank from $6 billion to $8 billion was eliminated in conference.

Temporary Increase in Public Debt Limit (Public Law 88–106, Approved Aug. 27, 1963)

This law (H.R. 7824) provided a temporary debt limit of $309 billion for the period September 1, 1963, through November 30, 1963.

The temporary debt limit had been increased previously to $307 billion to the end of fiscal 1963 and to $309 billion for the first 2 months of fiscal 1964 (July and August). (The debt ceiling under permanent law is $285 billion.)

Temporary Increase in Public Debt Limit (Public Law 88-187, Approved Nov. 26, 1963)

This law (H.R. 8969) provided a temporary debt limit of $309 billion beginning December 1, 1963, through June 30, 1964, and provided an additional leeway of $6 billion to be available during the year for seasonal variations in the receipt of revenues and the payment of bills owed by the Federal Government, the additional $6 billion to expire June 29, 1964.

The temporary debt limit had been increased previously to $307 billion to the end of fiscal 1963, to $309 billion for the first 2 months of fiscal 1964 (July and August), and to $309 billion for the period September 1, 1963, through November 30, 1963. (The debt ceiling under permanent law is $285 billion.)

Government

Supplemental Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, 1963 (Public Law 88-1, Approved Mar. 6, 1963)

This law (H.J. Res. 284) made supplemental appropriations of $508,172,000 for the Department of Agriculture under the foreign assistance programs in title I of Public Law 480 (83d Cong.) to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in fiscal year 1963 for the expenses and costs of the sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies. The same item had been included in the 1964 budget.

Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963 (Public Law 88-25, Approved May 17, 1963)

This law (H.R. 5517) provided $1,467,430,491 in supplemental appropriations for the various departments and agencies for fiscal 1963.

Among provisions in the law was an appropriation to the President of $450 million, $50 million below the budget estimate, for the public works acceleration program.

A Senate-passed provision which would change the manner of payment of $73 million for war damage compensation under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act, for the purpose of prohibiting compensation to certain lobbyists, was stricken.

Criminal Offenses Not Committed In Any District (Public Law 88-27, Approved May 23, 1963)

This law (H.R. 2842) amended section 3238 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that the trial of all offenses begun or committed upon the high seas, or elsewhere out of the jurisdiction of any particular State or district, shall be in the district in which the offender, or any one of two or more joint offenders, is arrested or is first brought; but if such offender or offenders are not so arrested or brought into any district, an indictment or information may be filed in the district of the last known residence of the offender or of any one of two or more joint offenders, or if no such residence is known the indictment or information may be filed in the District of Columbia.

Treasury-Post Office Departments Appropriations For Fiscal 1964 (Public Law 88-39, Approved June 13, 1963)

This law (H.R. 5366) made appropriations of $6,045,466,000 for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for fiscal year 1964.

The Treasury Department total was $1,103,650,000. The Post Office Department total was $4,925,500,000. For the Executive Office of the President the total was $13,841,000. The law also appropriated funds to the President's Emergency Fund and expenses of management improvement, the Tax Court of the United States, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy.

Continuing Appropriations, 1964 (Public Law 88-55, Approved June 29, 1963)

This law (H.J. Res. 508) provided for financing continuing Government functions with respect to which annual appropriations bills had not been signed into law prior to August 31, 1963.

Interior Department Appropriations For Fiscal Year 1964 (Public Law 88-79, Approved July 26, 1963)

This law (H.R. 5279) made appropriations of $958,456,500 for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1964.

The Interior Department total was $612,061,750.

The total appropriated for related agencies was $346,394,750, including funds for the Forest Service, the Public Health Service, the Indian Claims Commission, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Capital Transportation Agency.

Continuing Appropriations, 1964 (Public Law 88-109, Approved August 28, 1963)

This law (H.J. Res. 667) provided for financing continuing Government functions with respect to which annual appropriations bills had not been signed into law prior to October 31, 1963.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Acts, 1964 (Public Law 88-113, Approved Sept. 6, 1963)

This law (H.R. 7500) authorized appropriations of $5,350,820,400 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as follows: (a) Research and development, $4,119,575,000; (b) construction of facilities, $713,060,400; and (c) administrative operations, $518,185,000.

The law divided into 22 major categories all of NASA's research and development work, with a price tag limitation on each category. The authorization for the communications satellites program provided that no funds for this purpose could be obligated or expended for the exclusive benefit of any person providing satellite communications services other than an agency of the U.S. Government, except at the request of such person and on a reimbursable basis. The authorization provided for the lunar and planetary exploration program was $274,400,000.

The provision authorizing an Electronic Research Center was conditioned upon transmittal by the Administrator to the space committees of both Houses of a detailed study of the geographic location, the need for, and the nature of, the proposed Center, and the written approval of each of these committees.

Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Departments Appropriations for Fiscal 1964 (Public Law 88-136, Approved Oct. 11, 1963)

This law (H.R. 5888) made appropriations of $5,471,087,500 for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for fiscal year 1964.

The Labor Department total was $350,078,000. The HEW total was $5,090,904,500, including $918,454,000 for the National Institutes of Health.

The total for related agencies, including the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board, was $30,105,000.

Continuing Appropriations, 1964 (Public Law 88-162, Approved Oct. 30, 1963)

This law (H.J. Res. 782) provided for financing continuing Government functions with respect to which annual appropriations bills had not been signed into law prior to November 30, 1963.

Continuing Appropriations, 1964 (Public Law 88-188, Approved Nov. 29, 1963)

This law (H.J. Res. 809) provided for financing continuing Government functions with respect to which annual appropriations bills had not been signed into law prior to January 31, 1964.

Housing

Extension of Housing Mortgage Insurance Authority (Public Law 88-54, Approved June 29, 1963)

This law (H.J. Res. 467) amended section 221 of the National Housing Act to extend for 2 years, to July 1, 1965, the broadened eligibility for mortgage insurance (FHA) on low and moderate income housing.

Housing for the Elderly (Public Law 88-158, Approved Oct. 24, 1963)

This law (H.J. Res. 724) amended section 202(a)(4) of the Housing Act of 1959 by authorizing the appropriation of an additional $50 million for loans to nonprofit corporations and consumer cooperatives to provide housing for the elderly. Of the $225 million authorized in existing law, $150 million had been appropriated and commitments made with respect thereto. Budget request for this program for fiscal 1964 was $125 million. The $50 million which was authorized by this law would supplement the remaining $75 million previously authorized thereby providing an uncommitted authorization of $125 million, in line with the budget request.

International affairs

Amendment of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (Public Law 88-186, Approved Nov. 26, 1963)

This law (S. 777) authorized appropriation of $30 million for fiscal years 1964 and 1965, to remain available until expended, to finance the continued operation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It also amended the Arms Control and Disarmament Act of 1961 in order to facilitate its administration with respect to security clearance of contractors and subcontractors, to make clear that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has no jurisdiction over the possession or use of firearms by individuals, and to impose certain limitations on the obligation and use of funds by the Agency.

Labor

Railroad Work Rules Dispute Resolution (Public Law 88-108, Approved Aug. 28, 1963)

This law (S.J. Res. 102) provided machinery for settlement of the labor dispute between certain railroad carriers and railroad brotherhoods. Binding arbitration would be provided for two major issues, involving the use of firemen on diesel locomotives and the makeup of road and yard crews.

The Arbitration Board would file its award not later than 90 days after enactment, but the award would not become effective until 60 days after it was filed with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. The award would continue in force for such period as the Arbitration Board determined, but not to exceed 2 years from the date the award took effect, unless the parties agreed otherwise.

Resumption of collective bargaining on the remaining issues to the dispute would be required of both the carriers and the brotherhoods.

The law would expire 180 days after its enactment, except with respect to the provision that the award of the Arbitration Board concerning the two primary issues would not exceed 2 years.

Restoration of Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act Amounts (Public Law 88-173, Approved Nov. 7, 1963)

This law (H.R. 8821) revised provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury, by modifying the rate of employer repayment and by permitting, at the option of the State each year, installment repayment by a State in lieu of additional employer taxes.

National defense

Extension of the Draft (Public Law 88-2, Approved Mar. 28, 1963)

This law (H.R. 2438) extended the induction provisions of the Universal Training and Service Act for 4 years to July 1, 1967.

The provisions included (1) the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces; (2) the authority to issue selective service calls for physicians and dentists; (3) the suspension of permanent limitations on the active-duty strength of the Armed Forces; (4) the authority to pay a quarters allowance to all enlisted members of the Armed Forces with dependents; and (5) the authority for special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians.

Authorizations for Aircraft, Missiles, and Naval Vessels, Fiscal 1964 (Public Law 88-28, Approved May 23, 1963)

This law (H.R. 2440) authorized appropriations of $15,314,291,000 for fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. Of this amount, $363,700,000 was authorized for research, development, and test of RS-70 aircraft.

Award of Certain Medals and Medal of Honor Roll (Public Law 88-77, Approved July 25, 1963)

This law (H.R. 2998) amended titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, to expand authority for award of the Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, the Air Force Cross, and the Silver Star to permit award of these medals for heroism and gallantry that occur in cold war situations.

Special Enlistment Training Program Revision (Public Law 88-110, Approved Sept. 3, 1963)

This law (H.R. 6996) repealed section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, and amended the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to revise, consolidate, and extend these laws under which the so-called 6-month training program and other special Reserve enlistment programs have been operated, and to continue an exemption from conflict-of-interest laws for members of selective service local boards and other uncompensated persons who administer the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

The law provided (1) a standard 6-year period of Reserve obligation; (2) a minimum period of active duty for training of not less than 4 months; and (3) that persons who volunteer may be given active duty for training of longer periods to qualify them on military specialties that are needed by their units.

Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-132, Approved Oct. 2, 1963)

This law (H.R. 5555) amended title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services. The annual estimated cost would be $1,213 million, the largest increase in military pay in our history.

Among other things, the law provided for (1) increases ranging from $60 to $110 a month for officers; (2) increases of from $5 to $120 for enlisted personnel; (3) only military personnel with at least 2 years of service of benefit; (4) benefits to reservists, retired military personnel, and widows; (5) increases in the special pay of military doctors; and (6) special pay to personnel assigned to hazardous duty, including "duty subject to hostile fire (cold war)."

Defense Department Appropriations for Fiscal 1964 (Public Law 88-149, Approved Oct. 17, 1963)

This law (H.R. 7179) made appropriations for the Defense Establishment of $47,220,010,000 for fiscal year 1964.

Of this appropriation, the Air Force received $18,493,840,000; the Navy, $14,369,963,000; the Army, $12,105,534,000; and the joint defense agencies, $2,250,673,000.

Military Construction Authorization, Fiscal 1964 (Public Law 88-174, Approved Nov. 7, 1963)

This law (H.R. 6500) authorized the Secretaries of Defense, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, with new authorizations totaling $1,642,253,380. Included in this authorization was $685,312,000 for military family housing.

Natural resources

Coordination and Development of Effective Programs Relating to Outdoor Recreation (Public Law 88-29, Approved May 28, 1963)

This law (S. 20), to promote the coordination and development of effective programs relating to outdoor recreation, provided:

A congressional finding that all levels of government and private interests should take prompt and coordinated action to assure adequate outdoor recreation to the American people.

Authorization to the Secretary of the Interior to (1) take inventory of outdoor recreation needs and resources, (2) prepare a system for classification of such resources, (3) formulate and maintain a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan, (4) provide technical assistance and advice, (5) encourage interstate and regional cooperation, (6) participate in research relating to outdoor recreation, including directly or by contract or cooperative agreements and cooperation with educational institutions and others, (7) cooperate with and promote coordination among the various Federal departments and agencies, and (8) accept and use donations of money, property, personal services, or facilities.

(a) A requirement for consultation with the Secretary of the Interior by the Federal departments and independent agencies involved with respect to the use of resources and the conduct of the activities which were pertinent to their work, and (b) that such agencies carry out their responsibilities in conformance with the nationwide plan authorized under this act.

Public welfare

Reduction of Temporary Additional Federal Unemployment Tax and Authorization of Employment Security Administrative Expenses (Public Law 88-31, Approved May 29. 1963)

This law (H.R. 4655) amended title IX of the Social Security Act, with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative expenses, and reduced the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for the calendar year 1963 by making four changes:

1. It reduced the extra Federal unemployment tax attributable to the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961, from 0.4 to 0.25 percent with respect to wages paid in 1963. This made the combined net Federal unemployment tax for 1963 wages 0.65 percent (apart from any reduced credit provisions that might apply in particular States).

2. It substituted for the $350 million limitation on grants to the States to cover the administrative costs of unemployment compensation and the employment service, a flexible ceiling of 95 percent of the estimated receipts under the regular 0.4 percent net Federal unemployment tax. Applied to fiscal year 1964, this ceiling would be about $460 million.

3. It extended from 5 to 10 years the period during which States could obligate, for administrative purposes, certain funds transferred from excess Federal tax collections.

4. It increased the ceiling on amounts which could be granted to States for administrative expenses for fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, from $400 million to $407,148,000.

Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963 (Public Law 88-156, Approved Oct. 24, 1963)

This law (H.R. 7544) amended title V, parts 1 and 2, of the Social Security Act by increasing authorizations for existing programs for maternal and child health and crippled children's services from the present $25 million each, by steps of $5 million, to $50 million each by fiscal year 1970; by authorizing a new 5-year program of grants for maternity care projects designed to prevent mental retardation; and by authorizing grants or contracts for research projects related to maternal and child health or crippled children's services that show promise of advancing these programs. It also authorized one-time grants to the States to encourage planning and other activities that promote State and community efforts to combat mental retardation.

Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-164, Approved Oct. 31, 1963)

This law (S. 1576) authorized appropriations aggregating $329 million for matching grants and other assistance in combating mental retardation through—

A 4-year program of assistance in the construction of mental retardation research centers, and facilities for the mentally retarded;

A 3-year program of construction of community mental health centers; and

A 3-year program of training grants and research and demonstration projects for teachers of handicapped children.

Public works

Local Rights in Federally Constructed Reservoirs (Public Law 88-140, Approved Oct. 16, 1963)

This law (H.R. 1696) defined the interest of local public agencies in water reservoirs constructed by the Federal Government which have been financed partially by such agencies pursuant to contracts under which such local interests pay the Government, over a specified period of years, money equivalent to the cost of providing space to be used for the storage of water. Under present conditions the customary practice was to make these contracts applicable over a 50-year period. The law would make the interest acquired by these local interests permanent and would further provide that the interest of the local interests would be made subject to their fulfillment of the conditions under which they had executed their contractual agreements.

Social security

Amendments to Railroad Retirement and Railroad Retirement Tax Acts (Public Law 88-133, Approved Oct. 5, 1963)

This law (H.R. 8100) amended the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Temporary Extended Railroad Unemployment Insurance Benefits Act of 1961.

It was intended principally to restore the railroad retirement system to a sound financial condition and to reduce the existing deficit from $77 million to $16 million a year.

It would also improve the financial condition of the railroad retirement unemployment insurance system.

The deficit in the railroad retirement system would be reduced in the following manner:

1. The taxable and creditable monthly compensation for an employee would be increased from $400 to $450 a month.

2. A new formula was provided for determining interest rates on obligations issued by the Treasury Department. Previously the interest yield on the special obligations was limited to 3 percent. This law provided for a conversion of the 3-percent obligation and the new special obligations with interest rates determined from the average market yield. The interest rate on future investment would be determined in the same way.

3. An actual cost basis for reimbursing the railroad retirement account for crediting military service was substituted for the present system.

With reference to the railroad unemployment insurance system, this law increased the contribution rate from the present maximum of 3¾ to 4 percent of payroll up to $400 a month per employee. It was estimated that this increase would bring the system additional revenue amounting to some $10 million a year.

Transportation

Inland Waterways Corporation Act Repeal (Public Law 88–67, approved July 19, 1963)

This law (S. 1031) repealed the Inland Waterways Corporation Act and gave the Secretary of Commerce all responsibility and authority involved in the liquidation of the affairs of the Corporation.

Federal-Aid Highway Act Amendments of 1963 (Public Law 88–157, Approved Oct. 24, 1963)

This law (H.R. 7195) amended various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems. These amendments included a minor change in the formula of the apportionment of urban funds with respect to the States of Connecticut and Vermont; revised dates for the submission to the Congress of Interstate System cost estimates; elimination of the 1975 interstate "design date" restriction, substituting therefor the requirement that geometric design standards for the Interstate System be based on 20-year traffic projections; and an extension from June 30, 1963, until June 30, 1965, of the period during which a State may enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Commerce relating to the control of outdoor advertising along the Interstate System, provision for research and development in highway planning, design, construction and maintenance, and provision for an increase, at the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, in the limitation on payments for construction engineering from 10 to 15 percent of the total estimated cost of a project financed with Federal-aid primary, secondary, or urban funds.

Treaties

International Coffee Agreement, 1962 (Ex. H, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., Ratified May 21, 1963)

This 5-year agreement established the International Coffee Organization and set up regulations for participation of exporting and importing countries in order to prevent further decline in the world price of coffee and to bring the world supply of, and demand for, coffee into better balance. Among other provisions, the agreement (1) established quotas for exporting countries and bound importing countries to limit their purchases of coffee from countries not parties to the agreement, and (2) provided a mechanism for encouraging consumption in importing countries and limiting production in exporting countries. The agreement would require implementing legislation for U.S. participation. Countries that already had signed the agreement represented 95.1 percent of world coffee exports in 1961.

Test Ban Treaty (Ex. M, 88th Cong., 1st Sess., Ratified Sept. 24, 1963)

This treaty sought the achievement of an agreement on disarmament under international control "in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons." The original parties to the treaty were the United States, Great Britain, and the U.S.S.R. Each signatory undertook to ban "any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion" in the atmosphere, in outer space, or underwater. Underground tests, permitted under the treaty, would also be banned if they caused radioactive debris outside of the state in which they occurred.

The treaty was to be of unlimited duration open to all states for signature. (At the time of the Senate vote on ratification approximately 100 states had signed it.) It was to become effective after its ratification by all of the original parties. Amendments could be proposed by any party thereto. To be approved, future amendments required a majority of the votes of all parties to the treaty, and the votes of all the original parties. Each party could withdraw from the treaty upon 3 months' notice to all other parties to the treaty.

Protocol To Amend Convention on International Civil Aviation (Ex. D, 88th Cong., 1st Sess., Ratified Oct. 22, 1963)

This protocol would amend the original convention by increasing the number of requests from contracting states required to convene an extraordinary meeting of the Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) from 10 to not less than one-fifth of the total number of contracting states (101 at present). The ICAO Council, a permanent body of 27 members, would continue to have its own authority to call such a session.

Treaty of Extradition Between the United States and Sweden (Ex. E, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., Ratified October 22, 1963)

This treaty followed the historical pattern of some 65 other extradition treaties. The convention contained a list of the crimes subject to extradition, conditions to be satisfied, procedures to be followed, and circumstances when extradition would not be granted.

Additional Protocol to Treaty of Extradition With Brazil (Ex. F, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., Ratified Oct. 22, 1963)

This protocol made it clear that Brazil had no obligation to surrender its nationals and was a prerequisite for submission of the treaty itself to the Brazilian Congress.

Treaty of Extradition Between the United States and Israel (Ex. E, 88th Cong., 1st Sess., Ratified Oct. 22, 1963)

This treaty followed the historical pattern of some 65 other extradition treaties. The convention contained a list of the crimes subject to extradition, conditions to be satisfied, procedures to be followed, and circumstances when extradition would not be granted.

Consular Convention With Korea (Ex. B, 88th Cong., 1st Sess., Ratified Oct. 22, 1963)

This convention, among other things, made provisions concerning establishment of consular offices, appointment of consular officials, their functions, protection to their own nationals, and legal rights, privileges, and immunities for consular officials.

Consular Convention With Japan (Ex. I, 88th Cong., 1st Sess., Ratified Oct. 22, 1963)

This convention, among things, made provisions concerning establishment of consular offices, appointment of consular officials, their functions, protection to their own nationals, and legal rights, privileges, and immunities for consular officials.

Veterans

Compensation Increase for Parents and Children of Veterans Dying From Service-Connected Disabilities (Public Law 88–21, Approved May 15, 1963)

This law (H.R. 211) amended title 38, United States Code, to provide a 10-percent increase in monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation which were not subject to automatic adjustment and payable to eligible parents and children of veterans dying of service-connected causes. The total first year's additional cost of the law was estimated to be approximately $5 million.

Hospitalization of Certain Veterans in Philippines (Public Law 88–40, Approved June 13, 1963)

This law (H.R. 249) amended section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a 5-year extension, to June 30, 1968, of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for hospitalization for service-connected veterans of the Commonwealth Army who served with the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II. It also extended the program for outpatient care and placed a $500,000 ceiling on hospital payments for any fiscal year after 1963.

Increased Payments for Widows of Veterans Dying From Service-Connected Disabilities (Public Law 88–134, Approved Oct. 5, 1963)

This law (H.R. 5250) amended section 411(a) of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compenation payable to widows of veterans dying from service-connected disabilities.

The law increased the monthly rate from $112 plus 12 percent of the basic pay of the deceased husband to $120 plus 12 percent of the basic pay of the deceased husband. Estimated cost for each of the ensuing 5 years was $11,779,000.

NOTE.—As of the issuance date of this report, the Senate of the United States had not acted upon the Chamizal Treaty or the foreign aid appropriation.

KEATING CHARGES DOUBLE STANDARD IN ELIMINATING WORK FROM NEW YORK STATE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last week the Defense Department with considerable fanfare claimed great economies to be achieved by transferring jobs and installations out of depressed areas in New York and into other areas where employment is plentiful. When members of the New York State congressional delegation inquired how these great economies would result when the Defense Department was creating additional unemployment in areas that qualify for direct Federal assistance under other programs, the reply of the Deputy Secretary of Defense and also of the Secretary of the Air Force was:

> Yes, we know these activities in New York are in depressed areas. Yes, we know the work they're doing is not obsolete work. We know the facilities now in existence there

are modern and up to date. We know the work being done is necessary and will have to keep right on being done wherever it's moved. But it's not our responsibility to give any consideration whatsoever to the fact that these parts of New York are depressed areas, and that the other places that are going to get the jobs are areas of full employment. That's not our job.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that an exactly opposite process of reasoning was applied not long ago when the Internal Revenue Service wanted to locate all of its facilities in Massachusetts. New York, as some may recall, was a regional center and had sought to have a data processing plant located on Long Island. This was turned down and the electronic data processing plant was located instead in Lawrence, Mass., an area which admittedly does have a considerable unemployment problem. The next step the Internal Revenue Service wanted to take was to move the entire regional office out of New York and up to Boston in order, so they said, to be closer to the Data Processing Center. In explaining why the Data Processing Center had to be in Massachusetts instead of close to New York, which is recognized as the financial capital of the Nation, Mortimer M. Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, declared:

> It would be a terrible blow to move the Lawrence service center and the people there. These are not high-salaried people. It is a depressed area.

It seems strange to me that the Internal Revenue Service gives such great consideration to locating facilities in depressed areas even though that is not specifically its responsibility, whereas the Defense Department gives no consideration whatsoever to this factor, and admit that they give no consideration, when it transfers out of depressed areas important continuing operations and up to date facilities.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **KEATING**. It is particularly strange that no matter which argument is used, or which way it is cut, New York always seems to be the loser. It seems fair to ask: Is the Federal Government playing a game of musical chairs with a special effort being made to stop the music every time there is a chance to unseat a New York activity?

JUDGE CHARLES E. CLARK

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, a beloved judge, teacher, and scholar of the law died last Thursday night. He was Charles E. Clark, former dean of the Yale Law School, former chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and, at the time of his death, associate judge of that court.

Judge Clark was described by his colleague, Chief Judge J. Edward Lumbard, as "the principal architect of the Federal rules of procedure who led the way in liberalizing the judicial process and making our court machinery more efficient, useful, and inexpensive."

He served from 1935 to 1956 on the Advisory Committee on Civil Procedure of the U.S. Supreme Court which prepared the Federal rules of civil procedure. While he was dean at Yale, Judge Clark reorganized the law school's curriculum to place more emphasis on the social functions of the law, including the interrelation between law and commerce, sociology, medicine, psychology, and economics.

His opinions on the Federal bench consistently gave evidence of his concern for civil liberties and the rights of the individual. His many contributions to American jurisprudence will insure for him a place in the history of our land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article published in the New York Times concerning Judge Clark.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Charles Clark, Ex-Chief Judge of U.S. Appeals Court, Is Dead: Former Dean at Yale Law School Helped Prepare Rules of Civil Procedure

Judge Charles E. Clark of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit died Thursday night in his home at 36 Laurel Road, Hamden, Conn. He was 74 years old last Monday.

Judge Clark was appointed to the court in 1939 after 10 years as dean of the Yale University Law School. In 1954 he became Chief Judge of the Federal court, serving until 1959, when he voluntarily resumed his status as an associate judge. The court, one of the most important in the country, embraces New York, Connecticut, and Vermont.

Judge Clark was described yesterday by his colleague, Chief Judge J. Edward Lumbard, as "the principal architect of the Federal rules of procedure who led the way in liberalizing the judicial process and making our court machinery more efficient, useful, and inexpensive."

Judge Lumbard was referring to Judge Clark's service from 1935 to 1956 on the advisory committee on civil procedure of the U.S. Supreme Court. The committee prepared the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which were adopted for all Federal trial courts and copied by many State courts.

HONORED BY YALE

Judge Clark's work in the field of judicial reform was recognized by Yale University in 1962 when it conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of laws. The citation described him as "an architect of court reform" who had "helped free the judicial process from obstructive and useless procedural technicalities."

Judge Clark was 5 feet 11 inches tall, with broad shoulders, blue eyes, a shock of iron-gray hair and a pleasant, almost cherubic countenance that could, however, become stern when occasion demanded.

His colleagues remember him as a warm-hearted jurist, a scholar in the law, whose interest in the students during his days at Yale Law School was reflected in a kindly attitude toward young lawyers who appeared in his court.

He was regarded as a liberal who viewed the law in the light of changing social and economic conditions.

He concurred in the unanimous ruling of the court of appeals on November 25, 1960, reversing the conspiracy conviction of 20 men who attended the meeting of alleged underworld leaders at Apalachin, N.Y., in 1957.

The court held that the Government's evidence in the district court trial was insufficient to prove that the alleged conspirators had made an agreement to lie to investigative bodies about the purpose of their meeting.

He also took part in the court's unanimous decision of August 4, 1958, reversing the conviction of six secondary Communist leaders for conspiracy to violate the Smith Act. The court ruled that mere teaching or advocacy of forcible overthrow of the Government did not amount to the "call to action" required to constitute violation of the law.

Judge Clark, who was born in Woodridge, Conn., was graduated from Yale College in 1911 and Yale Law School in 1913. He was admitted to the Connecticut bar the same year.

After 6 years of private law practice he began his teaching career at Yale Law and advanced through the academic ranks. His deanship was notable for a reorganization of the law school's curriculum to place more emphasis on the social functions of the law, including the interrelation between law and commerce, sociology, medicine, psychology and economics.

Judge Clark, a Republican, was active in Connecticut politics and served on several committees seeking to improve the State government. He was a special assistant U.S. Attorney General in 1938, serving in the antitrust division. He supported many of President Franklin D Roosevelt's New Deal policies, including the proposal for enlarging the Supreme Court.

He wrote and collaborated on several books and articles on legal subjects. He was a member of several national, State, and local bar associations and professional groups, including the American Judicature Society.

Surviving are his widow, Dorothy E. Gregory Clark; a daughter, Sarah Ann Hall, a son, Charles E., a member of the Yale Law School faculty and two brothers, Samuel O. and Theodore.

Funeral service will be held on Monday at 2 p.m. in Battell Chapel of Yale University.

ADDRESS BY DR. WILLIAM B. WALSH UPON ACCEPTANCE OF FIRST THANKSGIVING AWARD, CLARKE COLLEGE, DUBUQUE, IOWA, NOVEMBER 26, 1963

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, on Thanksgiving Day, Dr. William B. Walsh, Director of the project Hope—the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc.—was given the first Thanksgiving award of Clarke College, Dubuque, Iowa.

This outstanding college, one of the best known in the Nation, with a long and proud history, is to be commended for making this award to Dr. Walsh, who has contributed so much to the welfare of the people of the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the address by Dr. Walsh upon his acceptance of the first Thanksgiving award at Clarke College, Dubuque, Iowa, November 26, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Dr. William B. Walsh Upon His Acceptance of the First Thanksgiving Award of Clarke College, Dubuque, Iowa, on November 26, 1963

Sister Mary, Miss Chambers, Judge Knoch, Father Friedman, faculty, students, and guests, I can't find the proper expression for receiving such an award on such a day and such a time as this. Do not misunderstand that I'm not grateful. But my sacrifice, if you wish to call it that, and the contributions of others who have made my dream come true, pale before the tragedy of the last few days.

What message can I give you today, in the shadow of such an event. You have seen a man die for his country. You have seen his wife Jacqueline prove herself as a woman bearing her husband's loss and the loss of this country's President.

Sister Mary has asked me to give you a message of faith and inspiration. But it seems highly appropriate at this time to give you rather the message of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as he spoke to America on that bitter cold inaugural day in Washington, D.C., 3 years ago.

He said "Let the word go forth from this time and place to friend and foe alike that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans."

You are that new generation of Americans. You are the generation that has been tempered by war. You are the generation that has been disciplined by a hard and bitter peace. But above all, you are a generation that not only has the ancient heritage of which he wished you be proud—but you have a mission which he has left for the future.

Do not look to the future with fear, but with courage. The President gave his life for his country. Each of you must be willing to equal his sacrifice.

Your country will have a future only if you give this faith its fullest sway. Too often, even in our own country, in modern times have we lost sight of the value of ourselves as individuals. We have come to believe that the atom controls us instead of we control the atom. We have come to abrogate our individual responsibilities by asking or permitting the Government to assume one function after another, whether they want to assume that function or not.

We have seen freedom grow in a world by historical fact rather than by the fact that these people were ready to accept their freedom.

Freedom is a responsibility. Freedom will flourish only where there is faith. In those countries which we like to call free and in which there is dictatorship, the people have lost their faith. They have accepted a centralized government or a state in place of God, because they no longer have the opportunity to worship.

But more than the faith in the Lord, they have lost faith in themselves.

All power in government comes from you. It comes from you as an individual and if you do not exercise the privilege of your own thinking, of your own dedication, then you do not deserve the right to be free.

The President through all of his actions constantly asked us to think in terms of what we, as individuals, could contribute. Each of you who sits before me has the blessing of a wonderful education—an opportunity to make something of yourselves for your country. If you choose to be a mother and housewife, be a good one.

Nowhere was the dignity of women better demonstrated than by our First Lady. She held her dying husband in her lap and still had the strength to face the world. She felt her husband deserved a place in history, but she hated the fact that he had obtained that place by such a disaster. She was demonstrating that life must go on and that in this country, the family is the root of life. This woman is my second message for you today. It is a better message than any I could give you.

Another factor: Don't stop dreaming. This country was built on a dream. It was built on the most audacious dream that man has ever conceived—that a group of people could come across the ocean to a new land and create this wondrous world in a mere 200 years. That alone should prove to each of you that nothing is insurmountable.

Never forget, you, as individuals, can be anything that you want to make yourself. Remember that this is the torch that has been passed to your generation and to the generation that my own sons, too, will make.

We need not fear for the future. I have seen enough right here today to believe that. I have seen enough in the other schools and colleges that I have visited to know that our future is in safe hands.

My only apology to you is that we have left you such a big job to carry on. We have not always done as well as we might have. But remember not my message of today but the hope which John F. Kennedy has given to us and the magnificent courage with which Jacqueline Kennedy has faced her responsibilities and her future.

THE WORLD L.B.J. INHERITED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Kansas City Star of December 1, 1963, is an article entitled "The World L.B.J. Inherited: Problems Remain, but There Is a Record of Progress," written by the well-known newspaperman, Roy A. Roberts.

I commend this article to the attention of all Senators, because it is the result of personal observations. Those of us who know Mr. Roberts know that he writes with a sweeping but fair pen. He has undertaken to make an analysis of the situation as it exists, primarily in the field of foreign policy, but to some extent in the field of domestic policy as well. I ask unanimous consent that this outstanding summary by this outstanding newspaperman may be incorporated in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The World L.B.J. Inherited: Problems Remain, but There Is a Record of Progress

(By Roy A. Roberts)

This world that Lyndon B. Johnson now leads—it is a bit brighter, a bit more promising than it was when John F. Kennedy assumed the burden of global leadership.

There has been no miracle and there will be none. Peace will not be achieved by a miracle but by the painful inch-by-inch progress of mankind in his search for the grail. The tides of cold war tension have ebbed and flowed; improvement here, deterioration there. But each day, each year that passes is a milestone in the long search.

I would suggest that these positive gains can be listed among the achievements of the Kennedy administration:

There is a wider acceptance and understanding of the terrible fact of our era: In nuclear war there can be no victors, only losers. It is a fact that in itself lessens the danger that the button will ever be pushed.

There is a greater appreciation—elsewhere and at home—of the military might of the United States. Not so very many years ago Sputnik I sent shivers down a nation's spine. Then, we entered a glum national mood in which we underestimated our own strength and overestimated Soviet strength. Now, we see things more rationally. Our industrial capacity, our reservoirs of science and technology have closed any gap that may have existed. We know—more important, the Soviet Union knows—that while the Communists can do untold harm to the United States, this Nation could destroy the Red lands.

There is a greater certainty that rising living standards behind the Iron Curtain are in themselves factors working for peace. Because of their own economic progress, the Communists have more to live for, less to die for in a nuclear showdown.

Now, we have a new President and a truth of international diplomacy is pertinent. In these postwar years, each crisis has demanded its own particular type of reaction. The foreign policy of today can never be a carbon copy of yesterday's policy.

Yet President Johnson has already made it clear to this Nation and to the world on both sides of the Iron Curtain that the basic goals of the United States will remain unchanged. He put it well in his first message to Congress:

"This Nation will keep its commitments from South Vietnam to West Berlin."

No need to read between the lines there. It was perfectly clear.

It is my personal belief that Mr. Johnson will not be reckless. But he certainly knows when to be decisive. I would guess, in fact, that he will prove somewhat more firm, somewhat less conciliatory than his predecessor. Lyndon Johnson is a great believer in direct action, direct contact. In his few days in office he has already met the De Gaulles, the Erhards, even the Mikoyans, with whom he will work in the months ahead.

In fact, I suspect that there will be more personal diplomacy. I say this even though L.B.J. is a man of tradition. He will not use Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, as a mere errand boy.

On my recent trip to Washington and New York—before the tragic death of John Kennedy—I sounded out everyone I could on the world picture. In part, I was seeking knowledge that would cast light on the forthcoming political campaign.

It is not always easy to weigh the facts of contemporary history. View them one way and you might conclude that, with Europe falling apart, with flames shooting up here and there, trouble was ahead. View them another way and you might see the dream of peace all the closer. I suspect that a proper appraisal lies between pessimism and optimism—perhaps slightly closer to optimism. Our inch of progress cannot be ignored.

As a people, I fear, we tend to form opinions on the basis of day-to-day developments rather than on the broad picture. Ignore the Congos and the Vietnams for the moment, and consider the plus factors:

One of the most impressive stories of our times is the amazing comeback of Western Europe. There have been predictable difficulties over the Common Market. There have been quarrels within the NATO alliance. Yet this apparent pulling-apart of the Atlantic community, which to many is the evidence of foreign policy deterioration, is to me something else.

I believe that when the United States and its Allies can afford to fume and fuss at each other, it is a sign of a great internal strength. Let Moscow make a move and you would see all these differences quickly forgotten. Danger—the danger of world communism—is the cement that holds our alliance together. Even the stubborn Charles de Gaulle, with his dreams of French leadership, would march on the side of the West in case of a showdown.

A decade ago—even a few years ago—Europe meekly accepted this Nation's leadership without challenge. It was so weakened by war that it had no choice. The best evidence of Europe's resurgent strength is this tendency to self-assertion. The United States needs, for the long struggle of cold war, a strong Europe. Now these nations are no longer weak and nominal allies; they are Allies with a capital A. They are partners who eventually must and will take over more of the burden that the United States has carried.

Look, next, across the Iron Curtain, where Russia is having a similar experience with its allies. Some of the satellites, once mere pawns, perhaps colonies, are stirring restlessly. Russian tanks still keep them in line. But as one world diplomat told me:

"Moscow is finding that it can't spank the satellites any longer. They are growing up and the spanking days are gone."

Russia, in short, is becoming less essential to its satellites. More and more, I suspect, you will hear them sounding off. It is a development that does not serve the strategy of monolithic world communism.

Thus, in the broad picture, there are these signs that definitely measure progress. The state of our world leadership is at the moment, I believe, generally better than is recognized. Obviously, however, someday, somewhere, Nikita Khrushchev is going to test Lyndon Johnson. It will not come too soon, although the Kremlin is a notoriously poor judge of American reaction. Nevertheless, it will come, possibly to the point of another missile-to-missile confrontation.

I do not think that the Kremlin, looking ahead to that moment, could find comfort in the new President's initial speech. It was firm in tone and Mr. Johnson meant it to be. Actually, he could have assumed no other posture. But comfort or no, Moscow, when it sees the opportunity, will try the stuff of L.B.J. The Russians probed President Truman, President Eisenhower, then President Kennedy. President Johnson can expect no favors from the Kremlin. The Communists will want to see how far they can go in their own peculiar type of brinkmanship.

Even so, you can look forward to some genuine negotiating. If I had a guess right now, it would be in the area of further agreement on armaments, particularly nuclear. It may very well come in the form of additional efforts to declare certain regions off-limits, so to speak, to the atom.

Of course, the whole atmosphere is conditioned by the upcoming 1964 election. Moscow knows that the new President will be walking on political eggs. Toughness, not appeasement of any kind, is the predictable stand of Washington. But election years always carry some added danger because of the risk of miscalculation on the part of the Kremlin.

In this respect, however, remember that the Russian leaders, too, know how very much they have to lose, should a nuclear missile be fired in anger.

Another basic development has perhaps been underemphasized in this country. But, I was told in Washington, it has had a far-reaching effect in Europe, Africa, South America, and Asia. I refer to the sputtering and virtual breakdown of the agricultural economy not only in Red China but also in Red Russia.

Red China may boast of the great leap forward by a Marxist utopia. But when, because of drought, inefficiency, or whatever reason, it has to turn to the free world—Australia and Canada—for hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat and soybeans to feed its people, it is evidence of failure that the Orient, with its millions on low food rations, can understand. Precious gold has been used for these purchases and the loss of gold will cripple China's growth plans.

Then, when Moscow itself had to look westward for wheat and butterfats, it was another scar on the Communist image. The free world—with bad crop years and good years—has food, cotton, and other essentials running out its ears. Despite its tremendous acreage, Russia does not have enough. And Moscow surrendered gold to feed the people. In Washington I heard that the Kremlin already had sold in world markets more than half a billion dollars in gold. It may be a one-shot deal. Nevertheless it is, for communism, mighty poor propaganda in the underdeveloped lands.

I have tried here to paint the broad picture. A quick travelog of world fronts might be helpful, however:

There is, in New York and in Washington, some fear that Europe's terrific economic pace simply cannot be sustained. For years, there have been forecasts of an end to the boom, but momentum has been sustained. Now, however, there may be signs of softness, especially in Italy. Certainly that nation is displaying a political softness toward the Communists.

Because of De Gaulle's intransigence, the Common Market for the time being is pretty well stalled. Probably it will mark time at least until after the British election.

The new West German leader, Ludwig Erhard, believes much more strongly than did the aging Adenauer in the use of trade as an instrument of peace. The United States and Britain most certainly will find him easier to work with. Unquestionably his Germany will tie its future to the United States, not as Adenauer's Germany seemed to be doing, to France.

On France, I heard at the U.N. that De Gaulle himself might be mellowing and might become a less difficult ally.

Naturally, our association with our closest friend, Britain, contains an element of uncertainty because of the forthcoming election in that nation. But I was told several times that as violent as British disagreements on foreign policy might be during a campaign there seldom was a significant change once the votes were cast. The continuing thread of policy ties Britain closely to the United States. Nevertheless, political uncertainty casts a shadow across world diplomacy.

Both at U.N. headquarters and in Washington, observers told me that the most disturbing development was the deteriorating situation in Latin America. Mexico, once the soft spot, is now the pillar of strength. Elsewhere, political instability, expropriation of foreign assets, critical inflation in nations such as Argentina and Brazil—all are factors not only drying up the flow of foreign capital, but causing a flight of local capital to the United States and Switzerland.

Cuba is a still-festering sore in the world of Latin America. But do not underestimate the problems elsewhere. Political instability and financial irresponsibility are negating much of the work of the Alliance for Progress.

As a Texan, Lyndon Johnson has a heritage of understanding of Latin American problems. But what he or anyone else can do about them is not clear. About the only element of encouragement I received came from one diplomat, who noted that for decades everyone had been predicting that there would be a blowup in Brazil. But with its great natural resources, it somehow has muddled through. The diplomat did not suggest how Brazil might get out of its present mess. Small comfort in his thoughts.

Elsewhere—in Africa, in Asia and especially in Vietnam—you have this pattern of improvement in one spot, deterioration in another. No basic change in the pattern is in sight. But of importance to us—Japan, which has written its own great industrial drama, is now skating on thin ice financially.

Back from the world, let's look at the picture at home. And here, I believe, is a really discomforting development. It concerns me a great deal, and I see its signs in the furious attacks on the United Nations, the savage assaults on foreign aid, the attempts by Congress, in various money bills, to bind the President's hands in foreign policy. It all is a manifestation of what one observer described as a "national frustration." Its ultimate expression is found in the radical right, with its stand against almost any form of international cooperation.

The explanations of this national frustration are complex. I have mentioned that our allies more and more want to have a voice in world decisions and each—as does the United States—speaks for its own national interest. The United Nations, once almost a department of U.S. diplomacy, now does not always follow U.S. leadership, the United Nations now reflects global opinion.

But above all, perhaps, is a fact so difficult for many to accept: The United States cannot expect to remake the world in its own image. We cannot export our own brand of democracy. Not all nations can or will fit in the U.S. mold. It simply is not the way of history or of men and we must recognize this fact.

Certainly, however, the manner in which the United States has assumed world leadership forms one of the most brilliant chapters in American annals. I am confident that history will so judge our postwar effort.

I do know that it is only human to grow weary of the burden. Nerves grow taut and you see the evidences of extremism. I do know, too, that our allies are becoming increasingly able to assume part of this burden. They will have to do so in a cold reappraisal of the challenge that confronts them as well as us. Only in passing will I mention the possibility of reductions in U.S. troop strength overseas, of a genuine tightening up of foreign aid. But I have no doubt that these changes are in the works, and Europe will have to react accordingly.

Nevertheless, I am convinced that this great and shining chapter cannot now be brought to a close. There will be changes in the pattern, to be sure, but the assignment of this Nation, basically, is unaltered.

Indeed, I was reminded of this a few days ago. In 24 hours or less, captains and kings, premiers and princes arrived in Washington to pay a final tribute to their fallen statesman. Within 24 hours they were gone, home in their own capitals. It was a reminder of the one world of today. The great quest of that world is for peace. It is a quest that the United States, recognizing change and swallowing frustration, still must lead.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PURCHASING POWER OF THE DOLLAR

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, Washington Daily News Columnist Lyle C. Wilson on December 13 had a timely warning that if the Federal Government's spending binge does not soon halt, we will soon have a 25-cent dollar. In building his case, Mr. Wilson draws from statistics prepared by the highly regarded Tax Foundation, Inc., of New York.

These figures show that in terms of the dollar's purchasing power, a person would need $7,451 today in order to buy what $3,000 would in 1940, and that a man who earned $7,500 in 1940 would have to earn nearly $20,000 today.

With the purchasing power of the dollar being reduced practically every month—it has gone down from 46.6 cents in December 1960 to 45.1 cents the past October—that 25-cent dollar of which

Mr. Wilson speaks is on the way unless our billion-dollar deficits are halted.

I ask unanimous consent that the column entitled "It's Time the Taxpayers Turned," along with an editorial from the Daily News, entitled "Dollar's Value for a Dollar," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Dec. 13, 1963]

It's Time the Taxpayers Turned

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The U.S. taxpayer is a mealy type who permits his elected servants in State and Federal office to spend him toward bankruptcy at worst and short rations at best.

Big spenders in Federal and State office seem to be miraculously protected from the punishment outraged taxpayers would visit upon them if the taxpayers had the wit to be outraged. The taxpayers are voters. It is their habit to return to office public servants whose most notable achievements are in the area of spending the taxpayers' dollars.

Tax Foundation, Inc., 50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, is in with some figures suggesting what the big spending public officials have been doing to the citizens who vote them into office and keep them there. For example:

Taxes and the rotting of the U.S. dollar's purchasing power by currency inflation have combined to give the average family man a hard time. Consider your friend, Joe, who was your next door neighbor in 1940, 23 years ago. Joe was a family man. Two kids, a jalopy, a mortgage, and a job. His income was $5,000 a year in 1940.

Tax Foundation, Inc., calculates that Joe's take-home pay after taxes and currency inflation have had their bite would have to be $12,832 a year today to keep Joe and his family even with their 1940 standard of living. That would be a hike of 157 percent in Joe's annual earnings.

The man who earned $3,000 in 1940 would need to earn $7,451 to break even today, 148 percent up. The $7,500 man would need nearly $20,000 today and the $10,000 a year man of 1940 would require $26,888, an up of 169 percent.

These figures are in terms of the dollar's purchasing power. That is, $7,451 would buy today no more than $3,000 would buy in 1940. That is a measure of the dollar rotting process underway in the United States. Currency inflation is much more responsible for this shrinking purchasing power than are taxes. It is a fact that the big spending public servants handle the taxpayers' money as though dollars were going out of style. But these big spenders seem to have little stomach for proposing tax increases to pay the bills. On the contrary, it is proposed now that spending be increased and that taxes be reduced.

This spending binge has been going on almost without pause for 30 years, gradually squeezing the dollar's purchasing power toward zero. Two-bit dollar, here we come.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Dec. 13, 1963]

Dollar's Value for a Dollar

Defense Secretary McNamara has announced the closing of 33 military installations he says are "surplus."

He foresees annual savings of more than $100 million by this action, even though most of the 15,000 employees to be affected probably will be absorbed in other Government jobs. But this will be done by giving them preference in jobs which become vacant—not by creating new jobs.

Moreover, the shutdowns will be gradual, taking about 3½ years to complete. Phasing out a mere 33 installations out of some 6,700 around the world hardly can be considered a meat-ax operation, the shrill protests of many Congressmen notwithstanding.

Even before Mr. McNamara formally called his shot, the outcries from Congressmen who imagined woeful consequences in their districts could be heard all down Pennsylvania Avenue. Some even went dashing to the White House to register their objections. This was typical, but it ill befits Congress, which bears the constitutional task of guarding the taxpayer's dollars.

President Johnson, with what appears to be extraordinary force, has ordered a holdback on Government spending all down the line. He says this is "a time of severe budgetary stringency"—which it is.

For years spending has been on the rampant rise. It will take a superior effort by the President and all hands just to slow it down. Getting the hay out of it will take more effort. As much as anyone, Mr. Johnson knows where the hay is. He was chairman, for instance, of the Senate committee which turned up waste after waste in military spending when the Korean war was on. He knows, too, that the more careful the spending, the stronger our defenses. A tight ship is the most efficient.

"I don't want to waste a dime," he said.

Before Members of Congress, or others, start objecting let's see if the President can do what he is talking about—"get a dollar's value for every dollar spent." We think the country will support that proposition right down to the penny.

PETITION OF THE WOMEN OF THE CHURCH, PRESBYTERY OF ORANGE, SYNOD OF NORTH CAROLINA, PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, U.S.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Women of the Church, Presbytery of Orange, Synod of North Carolina, Presbyterian Church, U.S., have presented to the Members of the Congress from the State of North Carolina a petition expressing their misgivings in respect to the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States; namely, Engel against Vitle, which is reported in 370 U.S. 421, and Abington School District against Schempp, which was handed down on June 17, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that this petition be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection the petition was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Women of the Church, Presbytery of Orange, Synod of North Carolina, Presbyterian Church, U.S.:

Due to the deep concern of many Christians in the United States over the successful efforts of non-Christians in obtaining rulings from the Supreme Court that will prohibit the use of the Bible and prayer in daily devotions and in Bible study in the schools of the Nation, the Spiritual Growth Committee of the Women of the Church of the Presbytery of Orange was authorized by 106 women attending a prayer retreat from the various churches in the presbytery, meeting at Glade Valley School, Glade Valley, N.C., on August 24–25, 1963, to take the necessary steps to inform the North Carolina Representatives in the U.S. Congress of the overwhelming objection of Presbyterian Women of the Church, Presbytery of Orange, Synod of North Carolina, Presbyterian Church, U.S., to the rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States on prayer, Bible reading and Bible study in the public schools.

The committee was further instructed to do everything possible toward getting the Supreme Court to reverse its ruling through public pressure, or by getting the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution in order to void the rulings of the Court in reference to prayer, Bible reading, and Bible study in the public schools, and to promote the establishment of whatever safeguards are necessary to prevent any further developments toward deleting practices that lead to the recognition of God and His power.

Therefore, the Spiritual Growth Committee of the Women of the Church, Presbytery of Orange is asking the Women of the Church, Presbytery of Orange, Synod of North Carolina, Presbyterian Church, U.S., to accept the following recommendations:

1. That the Women of the Church, Presbytery of Orange, Synod of North Carolina, Presbyterian Church, U.S., in recognition of the atheistic influences that are becoming so widespread and the recent rulings of the Supreme Court regarding prayer and Bible reading and Bible study in the public schools, hereby instructs the executive board of its organization to sign a recommendation authorizing the appointment of at least two representatives from the Women of the Church, Presbytery of Orange to call on the Members of the Congress from the State of North Carolina and present to them copies of resolutions from the presbyterial objecting to the trend toward a lack of religious emphasis in schools and government. And, further, that these resolutions state the objection of the presbyterial to the rulings of the Supreme Court regarding prayer, Bible reading, and Bible study in the public schools of the Nation.

2. That these resolutions be drawn for the affixing of signatures of the members of the executive board who may be present for the annual meeting of the board of the Women of the Church, Presbytery of Orange, and that these signatures be notarized.

3. That these representatives be known as the Orange Presbytery's Women's Committee for Prayer and Bible Reading in the Public Schools. In the event that other Women of the Church groups in the other North Carolina Presbyteries approve a similar action, the committee, or representatives, should be called the North Carolina Presbyterian Women's Committee for Prayer and Bible Reading in the Public Schools.

4. That this committee report to the executive board of the presbyterial at its next meeting and all meetings thereafter until a satisfactory disposition of the proposal has been made.

Spiritual Growth Committee, Women of the Church, Presbytery of Orange, Synod of North Carolina, Presbyterian Church, U.S.

Mrs. Waylon Blue, *Chairman*.
Mrs. Z. T. Piephoff.
Mrs. P. Hunter Dalton.
Mrs. Sam Bason.
Mrs. Clarence Brown.
Miss Frances Pritchett.

These recommendations were accepted by the Women of the Church, Presbytery of Orange, Synod of North Carolina at its annual meeting at the Presbyterian Church of the Covenant, Greensboro, N.C., October 10, 1963, and signatures of the members of the executive board are affixed and notarized as specified as follows:

Nancy Bishop Piephoff, president; Ellen C. Adams, vice president; Maxine W. Collins, recording secretary pro tempore; June L. Jones, corresponding secretary; Marion G. Furr, treasurer; Nancy B. Neal, historian; Mildred J. Brown, chairman of World Missions; Zelah C. Foushee, chairman of Christian Education; Lucille Garrison, intergroup chairman; Elizabeth P. McPherson, chairman of White Cross; Valeria McF. Peters, program chairman; Mary Coble Lentz, key woman, Glade Valley; May T. White, honorary life membership chairman; Cynthia V. Price, chairman of annuities and relief; June F. Hollman, chairman of general funds; Cornelia W. Satterfield, chairman of church extension; Marie H. Bason, stewardship chairman; Lottie S. Gunn, key woman, seminary; Virginia G. Stone, chairman of district No. 1; Myrtle C. Greesoni, chairman of district No. 2; Willene Y. Vincent, president of 1963–64; Mary Lea Barker, historian of 1963–64; Jane E. Miller, chairman of World Missions, 1963; Mazie O. Pamont, chairman of Christian Education; Emma W. Nabors, key woman, seminary, 1963; Margaret P. Bennett, corresponding secretary, 1963–64; Frances Dalton, chairman of nomination committee; Dorothy Williams Rankin, key woman of Glade Valley; Frances Van Liervich, nomination chairman, 1963–64; Eugenia H. Vaske, scholarship chairman.

Sworn to and subscribed to before me this the 10th day of October, 1963.

Ruth Pritchett,
Notary Public.

My commission expires July 21, 1964.

NORTH CAROLINA EDITORIALS EULOGIZING PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, when the Senate memorialized our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, on December 11, 1963, I inserted in the Congressional Record, as a part of my remarks, editorial comments from North Carolina newspapers and radio and television stations, on the life and services of our late President. Since that time, I have received additional editorials of this nature. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Asheboro (N.C.) Courier-Tribune, Nov. 25, 1963]

Passing of John Kennedy—A Time of Grief, Dismay

When the news came it lent a feeling of unreality to the moment. It was midafternoon and most people in Asheboro had only just returned to work from lunch.

Housewives were busy, their television and radio sets perhaps turned on. Possibly a frantic telephone call from a friend gave them the first report.

Others were at their desks, or machines, or working with whatever tools they earn their living.

"Shot in the head * * * probably mortally * * * now undergoing surgery."

We caught only fleeting words before the realization came that the President had been wounded by gunfire in Dallas. The tone of the newscaster was grave, face ashen and it was clear that death was thought imminent or already a fact.

Townspeople were somber, shocked as they gathered around TV sets and radios through the city. Business was at a standstill. Customers came into stores—those who hadn't heard or didn't know what else to do but finish their shopping entranced. At some counters, they were given attention; mostly it was an unreal shopping day in the business district.

In business offices, workers were passing news reports among themselves. Several had small transistor radios which were turned to high volume for their coworkers' benefit.

Stories passed from hand to mouth. Rumors developed that the Vice President—though by then he was already President of the United States—had suffered a heart attack. Finally it was confirmed that the President had died from his wounds, in fact had had little chance of survival, that the Vice President had already been given the oath of office.

Even then the news was difficult to grasp.

Emotion flooded the moment. First, of dismay, then of bereavement, then anger toward the killer—anger that he might have done this as an expression of ideological differences while others used the ballot box and words to express any disapproval. For a moment we felt a sense of shame for the Nation, until the saddened faces, all American, came in focus around us.

Then the emotion passed, and it was a moment to appreciate the solidity of democracy as the reins of Government passed quietly into the hands of the Vice President—and even if he too had lost his life, there would have been another, constitutionally appointed, to take his place.

Today, this week or next isn't the time to evaluate the brief performance of the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

It is a time for sympathy for the late President's young wife and family—a wife who before Friday stood beside the leader of the most powerful Nation of the world, and now as his widow, left only with memories in the absence of physical presence.

He was a dynamic man, young for the Presidency.

He was a member of an unusual family in which political instincts are keen, successfully exercised.

He had devoted his entire life to public service, first in war, then in Congress, then the Presidency.

This much we now know and can say.

But who can say in total what his mark will be on the United States, and indeed the world. It remains for the historians.

The Nation has been divided, faced with an aggressive foe pledged to destroy our freedom either by subversion or force. The divisions and the foe remain.

But the problems belong to another, now.

[From the Brevard (N.C.) Transylvania Times, Nov. 28, 1963]

A Tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy

It was the saddest of weekends as the world mourned the passing of the great leader of democracy, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Across the Nation, Americans silently wept within their hearts as the slain President of these United States lay in state in the Nation's Capitol.

Churches were filled to overflowing. People in all walks of life sought comfort that comes only from the word of the Bible and the Almighty.

The slain leader of the free Western world will live long in the hearts and the memory of those he served.

His flashing smile. His boyish-looking hair. His Harvard accent. His determination. His gestures. His vigor. His dedication to his fellow man and his country. His drive to make this great country even greater.

These things we will ever remember.

During the few, short years that he was President, he became a part of every home in America. A good friend one day; a dynamic leader in a world crisis.

Today, America has a new President. We must carry on. Lyndon Johnson has vowed to do his best with our help and with God's.

We must and we will rally to him while we mourn the passing of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

[From the Brevard (N.C.) Transylvania Times, Dec. 12, 1963]

Mulholland Delivers Eulogy to Late President Kennedy

Rev. Charles Mulholland, pastor of the Sacred Heart Catholic Church of Brevard, delivered the following eulogy to the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, at a special memorial service at the Brevard Elks Lodge.

The late President was a member of the Boston Elks Lodge.

The eulogy follows:

"John Fitzgerald Kennedy was in a special way one of us all. He so beckoned to the common greatness in the common man that we never realized the full size of him until he left us. Like a giant oak suddenly made leafless by a vagrant wind, we are startled by the size and strength of the rugged branches reaching to the sky and the strength and shelter that it gave us. And now this oak shall never don its green again and the emptiness, sadness, and suddenness of this realization has wrenched from us some inner vital part.

"He was born—like most of us in this century; he fought in the war that we shared in (the memory of which is now like a youthful boast); he was on the football team and unashamedly a sports fan; he was a college student; he was an Elk, he was a husband and a father and through all this there was the sickness and sadness that touches every large family (perhaps even in a larger measure—in his own). His older brother and then a sister untimely killed—a younger sister born demented. Struggles and defeats that touch us all. He was wealthy and enormously talented—characteristics which often make our identification with a person difficult or impossible. Yet, he had two great traits that are available to us all and united us to him more than we know. He loved the adventure of human life and he had the courage of his convictions.

"He did not retire to an indifferent and comfortable niche and fervently hope that life would be pleasant and gay. He ventured forth into the highways of humankind because he wanted to share and serve the life of his countrymen who traveled that highway. Like many of his fellow citizens he had a passion for politics and with a smile he gayly abandoned himself to the difficult vocation of governing freemen. How easily his talents and influence could have won him the important but quiet contribution of a wartime desk job, but he was in the Pacific bearing up one of his injured sailors for 18 hours in enemy waters. He wanted to take part as much as he possibly could. 'A man does what he must,' he wrote, 'in spite of personal consequences, in spite of obstacles and dangers * * * and pressures * * * and that is the basis of all human morality.' We know that our life has involved the same choices, although less publicized and less distinguished. He further said, 'We shall bear every burden, meet any hardship, support any friend * * * oppose any foe, to assure the success of liberty.' And by his life he called us to invoke this creed in our own daily and community lives; inviting us, urging us to share in the great human adventures of our time. He did it without cant or hypocrisy, without posing or affectation, without pride or pomposity. He was just his great human self and asked that we be the same.

"He was courageous—as we should be. Not in the storybook style of blazing guns and slashing fists, but in laboring on a book while he was in a hospital bed; impatiently bearing with the price of political life; in making the difficult and unpopular decisions that often spell the doom of a political career. He stood up for us and said all the difficult words that we should say in our hearts—to troops and Governors in Mississippi; to steel presidents and labor leaders. He had that courage which saves a man from the laziness of fanaticism or demagoguery. He was a determined, but not a bitter or vindictive fighter. He was unsparing in his effort for what he thought to be right but not so that he was unsympathetic or unforgiving. He insisted that this country must be guided by the lights of learning and reason, not hate and violence. These qualities and the courage necessary for them are available to us all.

"In his last talk he said, 'This is a dangerous and uncertain world; no one expects our lives to be easy—not in this decade, not in this century.' And yet, there are times when we—you and I—look for the easy life, hope for the simple solution, the swift and easy answer to communism, poverty, and human greed.

"He deplored the confusion of rhetoric with reality; of words with deeds, and lived this dictum in his lifetime. He summoned us to be with him, to be a great people as he was a great man. To ask not what we can get, but what we can give. And his words ring in the terrible silence of his graveside; they will bring forth a golden and enduring echo if we respond to his call and his example."

[From the Davidson (N.C.) Mecklenburg Gazette, Nov. 28, 1963]

THE PRESIDENT IS DEAD * * * LONG LIVE THE PRESIDENT

It's all over now.

It's Tuesday and the world is gradually returning to normal.

We, at the Gazette, were among a handful of people in the land working yesterday.

Most of the Nation was in deep mourning * * * attending by television * * * the last rites of our late President.

But news gathering is the business of newspapers * * * and even those of us making up the staff of a small country newspaper accept our responsibility as an agency of communication, and do what we must.

Millions of words have been written and spoken about John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, since he was cut down by an assassin's bullet Friday afternoon.

Millions of tears have been shed by a grieved nation since that fateful day last week when the voice of an emotion choked radio announcer blurted out the shocking, horror-provoking news: "The President has been shot."

Thirty minutes later an unbelieving American people heard the awful tidings—"He is dead. The President is dead."

It seemed at that moment as though the world and time itself stood still, while people tried to grasp * * * struggled to understand * * * how such a terrible thing could happen in this country * * * our "sweet land of liberty."

"I can't believe it," was the cry throughout the land.

But it was true. John Kennedy lay dead in a Dallas hospital with a bullet in his head.

And it seemed strangely ironic that one born to the cradle of freedom and bred in an atmosphere of cherished liberty should be responsible for the death of this young vibrant man, who dedicated his life to the ideals of freedom and equality for all men.

The hesitant hand of fate brought a young Catholic to the highest office in the land. His margin of victory was slight, and because he was the first of his religion to serve this Nation as President, John Kennedy walked carefully, almost gingerly. He did not have time, in his brief, 3-year span of service, to become the great man many believed he could be.

So, John Kennedy, the millionaire's son, the husband of beautiful Jackie, the father of magazine illustration children, the eldest living offspring of indomitable Rose, the hero of a family of young beautiful brothers and sisters, the lucky man who had everything, lies dead and lonely in Arlington Cemetery.

And in the midst of our tragedy and grief, Lyndon Baines Johnson grasps the helm of the Ship of State.

He is another fate has singled out. A southerner who never could have attained the Presidency by a vote of the people.

Perhaps the idiotic patchwork quilt of destiny conceals a mystical tapestry too complex for mere men's eyes.

Because these two men—one a Catholic, the other a southerner—were politically handicapped. America does not trust her institutions to those who are different * * * and these men were different.

Yet John Kennedy, a Catholic, served his country well and with great honor. And now Lyndon Johnson, a southerner, begins his term as this Nation's leader. And we are reassured by history. Greatness thrust upon a man tends to transform him—to magnify his ability.

While he lived John Kennedy's voice was not always loud enough to be heard above the caterwauling of the frenzied * * * the lunatic fringes of right and left.

But now, as he lies dead, the small still voice inside each of us will not permit rest or peace.

Perhaps the voice we ignored when it was vigorous and full of life will become more insistent now that it is stilled in death. Perhaps John Kennedy's hopes for a New Frontier in human relationship will become reality.

And perhaps this is the answer to the anguished question.

Why?

[From the Elkin (N.C.) Tribune, Nov. 25, 1963]

JOHN F. KENNEDY

John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, died needlessly of an assassin's bullet molded in hate by one who knew only malevolence bred by the infection of the Communist virus.

And his death came as a stunning blow to every American who believes in the American way of life; to every foreign nation whose people cherish freedom.

In Elkin the news of the President's death came with a sense of numbing shock. Stores were quiet. People who made their way up and down the street wore solemn faces, as if they had suffered a very personal loss.

When John F. Kennedy was elected President of the United States, he did not carry Elkin as our citizens exercised their rights to vote as their conscience dictated. But when the news of his death burst like a bombshell here, all thoughts of politics were forgotten; all real or fancied dislike submerged under the very real flood of grief which swept our community.

Americans are like that. We fight and argue in political campaigns, and criticize those in power. But when the chips are down we close ranks and bring to the fore that sense of justice and fair play which underlies every heart.

The President is dead. He served his country as a dedicated public servant, forging straight ahead toward the ideals in which he believed, without fear, without faltering. That the cowardly bullet of an assassin struck him down is an act which will never be understood but must be accepted.

We have a new President now, who faces a multitude of problems. All of us should lend our loyalty and our prayers to the support of Lyndon Baines Johnson, who of all the men in the world today has the job most unenviable.

[From the Newland (N.C.) Avery Journal, Nov. 28, 1963]

MY FAVORITE MEMORIES OF J.F.K.

(By Barbara Davenport)

Disbelief is fading now, and we realize that the events of the past week are all too real. In time of tragedy and sorrow the human instinct is to turn to the past. We will all remember John F. Kennedy in some special moment:

Turning to wave from the steps beside a waiting plane.

Standing windblown before the Berlin City Hall.

Slashing the air with his hand to emphasize a point.

Walking hand in hand with a little girl named Caroline.

Announcing with pride that he was the man who acoompanied Jacqueline Kennedy to Paris.

Standing in the cold one January morning and saying, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

My favorite memory will be a bright blue October day when he came to Chapel Hill to speak and receive an honorary degree. He was in a cap and gown as he walked across the green field at Kenan Stadium. He laughed with his audience when he announced that he came from "a small land-grant college up in Massachusetts." His robe flapped briskly behind him as he strode away from the ceremony. Every movement was alive and electric with youth. That is why his death is so hard to accept.

John Kennedy is a part of America's past now. The rocking chair has been stored away. The model of PT–109 that stood on his desk is gone. Caroline and John will not come again to entertain him with a dance in his office. The youthful dreams of the New Frontier are dead, dreams that truly lit his way to dusty death.

No one knows what history books will say about John Fitzgerald Kennedy except "he was shot down on a street in Dallas November 22, 1963," but those who lived through the past few days will carry some memory of him always. Only inasmuch as we renew ourselves in his image of tolerance and service will he live in more than history books and memory.

[From the North Wilkesboro (N.C.) Journal-Patriot, November 1963]

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

A dismal day in U.S. history was recorded Friday afternoon at 1:30 p.m., when John F. Kennedy, vigorous President of our country, was felled in a despicable act of murder.

It was a great personal tragedy to the Kennedy family and a tragic loss to the United States of America. There were those who opposed his views; there were few who didn't admire him for his personal charm, dedication to duty, his devotion to family, his Christian faith and gentlemanly qualities.

John F. Kennedy was an unusual man. Born into wealth, he prepared himself for public service. Blessed with a brilliant mind and vigorous optimistic view of life, he was a complete success in public affairs.

His administration was not without controversy, for it was an active one, proclaiming a bold, new era for the United States. While controversy swirled around him, his image suffered little, for he didn't resort to petty bickering. It was not his nature to do so.

Through the medium of television, the American people became closely associated with the President. They see him in all phases of life, with his family, at affairs of state, at public functions. The people especially drew close to President Kennedy.

He was a young man, handsome, energetic, dynamic. His wife was beautiful and charming, and the Kennedy children romping through the White House captured the fancy of all.

President Kennedy was in good spirits Friday morning, telling the crowd that Mrs. Kennedy was not present because it "takes her longer to get organized," and quipping that it's supposed to "because she looks better than we do."

He was obviously pleased that Mrs. Kennedy was taking an active part in his campaign. Everywhere he went on his Texas campaign he was beaming.

But an assassin's bullet was destined to extinguish this wonderful spirit and personality.

When a reason is sought for this dastardly act, there can be none. Nothing was accomplished but utter waste and grief.

Now, in this hour of national tragedy, it behooves us to draw close to President Johnson.

He has had suddenly thrust upon him the greatest responsibility that man can bear.

It is hard for us to realize that our President could be shot down in the United States. We can only prayerfully hope that nothing like this will ever happen again.

[From the Raeford (N.C.) News-Journal, Nov. 28, 1963]

THE NATION IS TO BLAME

For the fourth time in history, the assassin's bullet has struck down a President of the United States.

In an unspeakable act of violence, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was slain Friday in the streets of Dallas, Tex., by a sniper who lay in wait for the Presidential caravan to pass.

The Nation mourns, and long shall mourn. For the bullet which felled our young and energetic leader also struck deep into the heart of America and the free world.

It is only passing significance that the apparent assassin himself was slain as officers attempted to transfer him from one jail to another. The world was not deprived of an answer to the question: "Why was President Kennedy slain?"

The answer is written in the hearts of Americans everywhere.

It would be easy to write off the assassination as the criminal act of a fanatic, but in so doing, we would be closing our eyes to fact.

The Nation shares the blame.

There is in this land a growing hatred of those who would secure for all people the God-given rights of man.

President Kennedy was foremost among them. No man since Lincoln strived harder to bring to reality the brotherhood of man. And some who opposed him lashed out in venomous tongues with a resentment which was rapidly boiling into hate.

"They did not kill the President," we say of the radical right. "He was slain by a member of the lunatic left."

No. But they incited the fanatical fringe to bomb a church in Birmingham and to slay a Negro leader on its streets.

And when President Kennedy came to Texas, they did not pull the trigger. But they had murder in their hearts.

There is a lesson to be learned from this tragedy. We fervently hope that from this evil shall come good; that from this hate shall come love; that from this loss shall come gain.

That, we are sure, would be the desire of the man who said: "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

[From the Reidsville (N.C.) Review, Nov. 25, 1963]

THERE WAS ANOTHER DEATH

The heartless murder of the President has struck dumb our Nation and much of the world. With befitting respect, we here in Reidsville add a voice to the world's common outcry of grief and indignation at this foul deed which was perhaps the inevitable climax to a summer of madness when the Nation's streets and public places became places of turmoil and danger.

But, because this is America we need have no fear that the transition of Government will not be brought about in an orderly manner. Our country will not be subjected to the chaos which would result from such a tragedy in other parts of the world.

Because this is America we were free to criticize; to oppose this, our leader, who is dead.

Because this is America we need fear no purge of those of us who may have entertained and expressed opinions different from that of the President.

Because this is America we see the mighty of the world converge on our shores in a reassuring outpouring of sympathy never before witnessed.

And because this is America we are moved today to write not a eulogy to our dead President whose untimely passing shook the world—but as he, himself, might have wished, we write instead of another death; another widow; other orphans.

In Dallas, Tex., Friday an American citizen, a police officer, gave his life in attempting to arrest the suspected slayer of this country's Chief.

Patrolman J. D. Tippitt, as much as the President, personified the American public servant. This man, just as the President, was not unaccustomed to danger. Twice before in his 11 years as a policeman he had faced death in line of duty. Normally, this man's death would go largely unnoticed outside his own city, but now the opportunity presents itself to make us mindful of the fact that his example is duplicated over and over again, throughout the Nation, year after year.

It is no sign of disrespect that today we switch from the scene of national mourning to remember this officer's careworn wife and his three children, who in the normal course of events will be quickly forgotten. "He was so good," she said. "I don't know what will happen now."

Neither do we, Mrs. Tippitt. But we do know that as long as the weaknesses of humanity spawn acts of inhumanity, men like your husband will continue to risk their lives in every community across the land, in a largely unappreciated effort to protect us, their neighbors, both the great and the small.

[From the Rutherfordton (N.C.) Rutherford County News, Nov. 27, 1963]

JOHN F. KENNEDY—HE WAS OUR PRESIDENT

Much has been said and written of the tragic crime against the United States—the assassination of the President.

We have little to add to what has already been said many times.

The sickening, infamous act, which has left us still stunned, should be considered as high a crime as sabotage or treason against the United States and the American system.

President John F. Kennedy was a strong Chief Executive who pushed hard for what he believed was right for the country.

Many of us did not share all of his beliefs, but that made him none the less our President.

As one Rutherfordton woman recalled her father speaking of an earlier President: "Whether he is a Republican or Democrat, whether or not I like what he is doing, he's my President."

Whether or not we agreed with the late President Kennedy, no matter what our political views, our religious faith, our race—he was our President.

All thinking people in Rutherford County and the rest of the country and the world are repulsed by the assassination and are saddened by the tragic death of the President.

We are fortunate that the American system provides for orderly "changing of the guard" in such emergencies. We are also fortunate that an experienced man is assuming the office of President.

Our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, in his first public address after assuming this office, asked for our help and God's in this period of national crisis.

It is a time for all people to come to the aid of their country.

[From the Rutherfordton (N.C.) Rutherford County News, Dec. 4, 1963]

PRESIDENT KENNEDY

(By Dr. William T. Anthony)

Much has been said and written about the tragedy of the untimely and treacherous death of our late President. Through television and radio information and comment in fullest detail have been made available to everyone. And I realize more keenly than anyone else that I cannot presume to have anything of the smallest importance to add or to say.

Nevertheless I am obeying an impulse to think aloud in this way about a thought and reflection or two that have been and are in my mind, more perhaps for my own satisfaction than anything else.

The shock and grief at the death of Mr. Kennedy is worldwide. The crime of it and the great loss to the world pass, so it seems to me, our comprehension and realization. The shock of it is enough to move some of us even to revise and improve some of our thinking and opinions.

There are those who are now saying in all seriousness that Mr. Kennedy's death is part and result of the hate and venom and prejudice that are too common amongst us. Possibly so. I do not know. Who can tell for certain?

We have been told that all of us have a share in the guilt of it. To the extent that we do hate I suppose there is an element of truth in this. I am reminded of what Eugene Debs once said: "So long as there is a criminal class I am of it, so long as anyone is in prison I am not free." It is enough to drive us to deep thinking and to our knees.

The office and job of the President of the United States is responsible and burdensome beyond the imagination of most of us. It is enough to inspire and fill everyone with soberness and restraint and self-command and the highest respect for the Presidency. So that it becomes impossible to think of the man in this high and lonely office without being always conscious of and assuming his integrity and sincerity and dedication to do and give his best for his country and ours.

The President is always more than the head and leader of his political party. He is the President of all of us. He needs the help and support of everyone. This is not to say that we are always to agree with him, or never to find fault with him, or even to oppose him and his measures.

But we should ever be deeply mindful of the dignity and sacredness of the Presidential Office. And as a supposedly religious people we should never forget to pray for our President even if we remember that we conscientiously voted against him. His task is terrificly heavy and crushing. The more we may disagree with him the greater his need of our prayers.

To pray earnestly for the President helps us to cultivate the right and just feeling about him and leads us to the deeper understanding of him that is our bounden duty to strive for.

President Johnson has asked earnestly and sincerely for the help and prayers of all of us. He has a right to this. He has great need of it. So let us pray for the President every day in our private devotions, every time that we go to church. Let us think and speak with restraint and respect about him on all occasions.

A young and good and brilliant and much-loved President and leader has been killed by an assassin's bullet. Whoever the murderer, whatever the reason and motive, how it all came about, and who of us know enough to speak responsibly and with sufficient knowledge? Mr. Kennedy is dead.

Let us all highly resolve to do away with as much as possible all wrong thinking and evil speaking. Let us pray with all our heart every day for our President that he and we together may do our best to make us a truly religious, righteous, and God-fearing people.

[From the Rutherfordton (N.C.) Rutherford County News, Dec. 11, 1963]

Anderson Writes Letter on Death of President

(Editor's Note.—The shots that killed President John F. Kennedy have been heard around the world. Reactions to this crime, which may have changed the course of history, have come from every corner of the earth. A Rutherfordton native, Fred Anderson, who is presently studying at Oxford University, England, has written the following letter to a Chapel Hill friend, and those of the Englishmen around him to the Kennedy death.)

President Kennedy's death has left a dark, deep trace upon the minds and hearts of the people of England. Again and again during this tragic weekend I have wished that Americans could see firsthand how the English, and all the people of Europe, are sharing with us deeply grieved and troubled hearts over the loss we are all strained to bear. But the reaction here this weekend affirms that in spite of often ardent disapproval of American policy, in spite of complaints of American control of European affairs, in spite of manifold criticisms of our handling of our internal affairs, Europeans still feel a profound alliance with our cause and destiny and they were particularly involved with the fate of the man upon whom had been placed the responsibility of leading, not only our own country, but the entire Western world. He was our President, but we selected him to lead our country. I can see now from the somber, intense faces of Englishmen around me in Oxford, that he belonged in effect to them as well.

It is difficult to describe the feeling the small group of Americans in my college had when every act and word, every betrayed emotion, became a profound personal tribute to our countryman. In despair there was pride, and a realization of the great respect held here for the man. It was 7:30 in the evening before the news reached us, but before 11 p.m. that night the rector of our college had written a personal note of condolence to every American in the college—14 in all. Balliol College Chapel was filled at 10 p.m. the same night for prayer and tribute. Every college in Oxford has flown the British flag at half-mast since Friday. Sunday afternoon Radcliffe Square, the center of the university, was filled with people who had come to remember the late President in silence. And of course there have been long, unhappy conversations in which for once the stubborn heat of political argument has been replaced by unashamed acknowledgment of what the President meant personally to people here.

I have tried to see as best I could what it is that made the Englishman and Europeans across the channel so profoundly admire the President in particular. It seems to boil down to this, that he maintained a hopeful and even idealistic outlook for the future, an outlook and vision which he tempered with a sober and practical awareness of the means one uses in a political world to gain one's ends. This is a great tribute for any man coming from Europeans, for they among all the peoples on earth are the best-trained to know the virtue, having been betrayed by so many not possessing it during the past strife-ridden decades.

This summer Kennedy made a speech in Berlin that won him the hearts of all Germany. It was an idealistic speech, full of spirit and optimism, yet fully admitting the grave difficulties of modern Berlin in its fight to remain free. He ended every point concerning courage and freedom with the refrain, "I am a Berliner." And now we can see that everyone in Germany who heard him knew that in spirit he was. He was to Europeans a man who could translate the American ideal into terms a skeptical and wary European could appreciate and understand.

And finally we come to the essence of what was so tragic to the people here in his untimely death. The Sunday edition of the Observer of London expresses it quite well: "When great men of state die, it is their achievements which come to mind. The tragedy of Kennedy's death is that we have also to mourn the achievements to come. There is a feeling that the future has been betrayed."

Thus there is a deep-seated sense of frustration here, much as I know there is at home.

[From the Salisbury (N.C.) Sunday Post, Nov. 24, 1963]

John F. Kennedy, a Great Man

(By Homer F. Lucas)

John F. Kennedy was truly a great man.

He was a just man.

He was a man who believed all men were equal in the sight of God.

He was a man of peace.

He was a man determined, with all his soul and body, that the ravages of war would never again befall mortal man.

He was a man of love.

He was a man born to riches. He was a man who loved the ordinary man, like you and me.

He was a man of courage.

He was a man who was the butt of ridicule and nasty jokes as he displayed his courage.

He was a man of power. He was a man who never wielded, as history will evaluate, this power unjustly.

He was more than mere man to the men of the free world. He was a hope, a symbol.

He was a man who gave so much of himself to the people of the world.

He was a man of principle.

He was a kindly man.

He was a man of easy formality.

He was a man, above all, of magnificent heart.

He was a man who has passed into a new world from which no traveler, but one, has returned.

But the world which he loved and served remains.

There are times in life when time stands still.

Now is such a time.

The men of the free world, the men of love, the men of peace, and the men of courage are groping in darkness for the light.

But the light is there in the principles and beliefs of John F. Kennedy, a truly great man.

[From the Waynesville (N.C.) Mountaineer, Nov. 25, 1963]

All Our Enemies Aren't Foreigners

It has been 3 days now since the world was shocked and sickened by the tragic murder of President Kennedy. The world is still in a daze trying to shake itself loose from what seems an unreality.

The murder appears to have been deliberate. It was apparently planned in every detail. This makes the tragedy all the more heartbreaking.

Perhaps the real motive will never be known. Maybe it will, but the damage and loss of a great man to the world will remain. Civilized men wonder in heartbreak just what could be in a man's heart to cause him to do such a barbaric deed.

This Nation was shocked beyond words and as Senator Sam Ervin, Jr., said, "It just makes you sick." And as sick as the Nation still remains over the tragic news, one thing is certain, we are a united Nation of solidarity, and determination in purpose and spirit.

In the days ahead, it is going to be essential to maintain this unity, as President Johnson takes over and organizes his men for the grave tasks ahead.

Very few times in the history of this Nation has there been a greater need for divine guidance than now. It has been a source of gratification to hear President Johnson and those to be closely associated with him, point to this very fact.

The tragic event of "Black Friday" will be a constant reminder for the years to come that all of our enemies do not live on foreign soil.

[From the Waynesville (N.C.) Mountaineer, Dec. 9, 1963]

Two Black Days on the Pages of U.S. History

Thousands of citizens were unaware Saturday, December 7, that it was 22 years ago that America suffered the worst sneak attack in history as the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and thus plunged us into World War II.

That was a black hour in American history which will go down as comparable to another black hour, November 22, when President Kennedy was slain.

Such occasions as these come and go and we often let the years erase them from our minds. Perhaps it would be better if we would be ever aware that any tragedy can and does happen in this modern world and age.

[From the Waynesville (N.C.) Mountaineer, Dec. 9, 1963]

Office of President Is Due More Respect

November 22 will long be remembered as "Black Friday" or the day of the tragic death of President Kennedy.

Historians might also record that November 22 marks another event. It could well be the beginning of an era when the American people take a different attitude toward the office of President.

In the past several score years, the average American has had a tendency to ridicule, and poke fun at the office of President as well as the man. Comedians have made the President the subject of many a joke. Records have been made which were nothing more than ridicule or belittling the man and office.

There must be a certain degree of guilt on the consciences of many an American that participated in this thing of "downgrading" the highest elective office in our land.

Peoples in other lands are taught to look with respect and with dignity to their leaders.

The tragic death of a noble man could well be the turning point of the attitude of Americans on this matter.

It is way past time to correct the errors of our ways, and look up to the office of President, even if at times we disagree with policies.

[From radio station WBBB, Burlington-Graham, N.C., Dec. 11, 1963]

The Senate Puts Aside Its Work Today To Eulogize the Late President; as Our Contribution to the Occasion, We Present the Following "Radiotorial"

The President is dead, long live the President. We hardly think there is a man living who would exchange places today with either the dead or living President. Whether we all liked all of the policies set forth by President Kennedy, none of us can deny but that he was sincere in his beliefs and his desires to help his fellow man. It must be admitted that any man who sets forth on a program to improve life for so many will face a barrier of misunderstanding, criticism, and even hate, which those who have no desire to be improved will throw up around themselves. The path of progress is a long but narrow thoroughfare which runs through a forest of doubt and fear, and those who attempt to lead the way down this narrow path are naturally the first to meet his enemy. President Kennedy met an enemy—at this point, we are prone to believe that whoever pulled the trigger that started that fatal bullet on its way, was a misguided, confused, and disarranged mental deficient. No man, or men, in this modern time could plan such a dastardly act and still be in his right senses. I also believe that, had he lived, President Kennedy would have expressed a sympathy for the man. But the President is dead, and now, long live the President. Lyndon B. Johnson has had thrust upon him the heaviest burden of any living man today. In becoming the President of the United States by inheritance, he must begin his administration below the bottom, and yet maintain it for the present, at least, at the level President Kennedy left it. In memory of President Kennedy he must justify the past and solidify the future. President Johnson, with all of his political finesse must have the full cooperation of the people and of Congress.

And Congress must also recognize the grave responsibility it faces—to pass or reject the political pets of the Kennedy administration, without offending the memory of a great President who died in the service of his country, or without endangering the political future of his successor who will die a thousand deaths in his efforts to unify a country, to say nothing of the world. How would you, as a private citizen, accept these responsibilities? And so, let us forget the past, accept the present, and look toward the future with a determination that we will all serve as good citizens, our new President, in memory of the old. The President is dead. Long live the President.

FINANCIAL DEALINGS OF HON. RALPH M. PAIEWONSKY, GOVERNOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on December 10 there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Daily News, a newspaper published in Charlotte Amalie, Virgin Islands, which alluded to alleged financial dealings of the present Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Honorable Ralph M. Paiewonsky.

In view of the fact that this editorial, which was printed in the body of the RECORD, contained matters which reflected unfavorably upon Governor Paiewonsky, in order to make the record complete and in fairness to the Governor, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of December 11 by Governor Paiewonsky to the editor of the Daily News be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS OF
THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
CHARLOTTE AMALIE, ST. THOMAS,
December 11, 1963.

Mr. ARIEL MELCHIOR, Sr.,
Editor-Publisher, The Daily News,
St. Thomas, V.I.

SIR: I have delayed making a refutation of your false charges concerning Peter's Farm, St. Croix, because I could not lay aside vital official matters requiring my complete attention.

I am now free to avail myself of the column you offered in your newspaper.

1. You deliberately stated that I still am financially interested in the West Indies Investment Co., which owns all the stock in the St. Croix Real Estate Development Co.

This is not true.

I have no interest whatever, direct or indirect, in that company. My stock in that company was among the holdings that I disposed of after becoming Governor. That stock was sold to an outside person with whom I have no financial connection.

It is correct and it is a matter of public record that I signed a deed as Governor in January 1963. That deed refers to an agreement I executed as Governor in September 1962. It was set forth upon the open court record that there was an agreement to settle the lawsuit by a sale of the property for $100,000.

What is not correct is your charge that I still had an interest in the company at the time of that settlement agreement.

2. You stated in your column that the Peter's farmland, St. Croix, was sold by the Virgin Islands government at "a mere fraction of assessed value."

When the Virgin Islands government owned the land it was not subject to assessment, and, hence, there was no assessed value. The government made a sale to its lessee (West Indies Investment Co.) on the basis of current 1962 value, less a credit confined to a minimum basis for the improvements added by lessee. The 1962 value was determined by appraisers appointed by Commissioner Mario Lewis in accordance with standard government practices. Men selected by him were recognized appraisers, men who do appraisal work for the two leading banks in St. Croix, one of them a senior official of his bank.

3. An article in your newspaper charged that the lease rental was set in 1955 at an improvidently low rate.

The company's rental proposal in 1955 was accepted by the administrator for St. Croix upon the recommendation of the municipal committee of the St. Croix Municipal Council, though the term was set at 30 years instead of the 50-year period requested.

One cannot judge a 1955 contract by the hindsight of 1962 knowledge. No one else was interested in this property in 1955. The Virgin Islands government had abandoned the site for hospital use. Every roof was leaking like a sieve. Taking into account the pitiful condition of rundown, termite ridden, deserted, and vandalized buildings, the 1955 rental was reasonable at that time.

4. You reiterate the charge that at the time of the January 1955 lease the lessee corporation was not even in existence.

This is a calculated effort on your part to insinuate wrongdoing to persons not familiar with business affairs. Even a novice to the world of business knows that businessmen organize through de facto corporations to conduct matters during the period required for completion of legal formalities.

If you had taken a few minutes to examine the open file you would have discovered that Attorney Isherwood filed with the court the documents showing that in December 1954 the corporation's president sent the St. Croix administrator proposed articles of incorporation and the customary fee; and that the short delay of 1 or 2 months was solely to make the revisions in the charter suggested by U.S. Attorney Leon Miller. The St. Croix Real Estate Co. was plainly in existence in January 1955, as a de facto corporation, a well-known form of legal entity.

5. You state that in 1960 the government brought suit to recover the property on the ground that the lessee had breached the lease. Mr. Russell Johnson, former attorney general, officially advised my administration that in his opinion the government was on weak legal ground. This was also the view of former Associate Solicitor Edwards of the Department of the Interior, of Comptroller Peter Bove, as well as Attorney General Corneiro.

6. It is a pity that you have mounted a campaign of vilification; of unfounded innuendo; of airing baseless charges; of printing deliberate assertions that are false.

It is a pity, because you have energy and talent that could be of service to the community if you harnessed them to constructive use. I do not suppose anyone really enjoys criticism, but I welcome criticism that is responsible and constructive for I know that in the long run this will help guard me from error and alert me to conditions that need watching.

7. What is more the pity is that you seem unable to appreciate that it is the Virgin Islands, as a whole, and not the government officials assailed, which is damaged by the false image created on the mainland by your hostility and distortions.

Very truly yours,
RALPH M. PAIEWONSKY,
Governor.

THE INTERNATIONAL PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS: PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an address by Mr. Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs entitled, "The International Promotion of Human Rights: Problems and Opportunities."

This address was delivered to the World Jewish Congress at Stephen Wise House in New York City, Sunday, December 8. It is worthy of the attention of every citizen, and particularly of every elected official.

I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS: PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

(Address by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, to the World Jewish Congress, at Stephen Wise House, New York, N.Y., December 8, 1963)

This week marks the 15th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. On this occasion it is fitting and proper that we review past efforts to strengthen the observance of human rights around the world and consider how these efforts may be strengthened in the future.

One of the several ways in which the Charter of the United Nations marked an important advance over the League of Nations Covenant was in its emphasis on human rights. The charter makes the promotion of human rights one of the main purposes of the organization. In articles 55 and 56 members assume the responsibility to take action to promote universal respect for and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

The legitimacy of international concern for human rights everywhere was thereby acknowledged in an international instrument ratified by every important independent country at the time. In securing the adoption of these revolutionary changes the United States played a leading part, and in doing so had the undivided support and encouragement of the nongovernmental organizations represented at San Francisco.

The United States also took the initiative in the formulation and adoption of article 71, under which international nongovernmental organizations subsequently received consultative status, among them this organization, the World Jewish Congress. Cooperation between governments and voluntary bodies is an old American practice, and is perhaps more highly developed in this country than anywhere else. It is one of the distinctive manifestations of our democratic way of life and may fairly be described as an American contribution to the charter.

The nongovernmental organizations made an outstanding contribution at San Francisco, and ever since, as an examination of the record will show, have played an important part in focusing attention on the human rights provisions of the United Nations Charter.

The United States has sought consistently, and under the guidance of its own history and traditions, to give form and substance to the promise implicit in the Charter. It pressed for the adoption of an international bill of rights, the first element of which was to be the universal declaration, the 15th anniversary of which we are now celebrating. The draft of this declaration, which was the basis for the action of the General Assembly in 1948, was prepared and formulated by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights under the chairmanship of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

On this 15th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it is appropriate that we rededicate ourselves to this historic effort under the United Nations to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms.

In his address to the General Assembly on September 20, President Kennedy declared: "New efforts are needed if this Assembly's Declaration of Human Rights, now 15 years old, is to have full meaning."

The U.S. Government in the months ahead will continue to take a leading role in the United Nations and elsewhere in the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all men—and to support practical proposals in the pursuit of this objective.

I need hardly emphasize before this audience the importance of continued U.S. leadership in the worldwide promotion of human rights. Since the Declaration of Independence our country has been dedicated to the pursuit of human rights and fundamental freedoms, not just for Americans, but for all men everywhere. Our power in the world derives not just from our position as an arsenal of weapons or as a storehouse of commodities but as a base from which to seek the universal realization of the dignity of man.

The principles and ideals embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are the same principles and ideals embodied in our Constitution and basic laws. They represent an essential and irreversible element in the policy of our country.

This applies to our policy at home as well as abroad. It is no accident that President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his first address to Congress, put special emphasis on the speedy passage of the civil rights bill.

There are practical and urgent reasons for our concern with the realization of human rights on a worldwide basis. The experience of recent years has demonstrated not only the interdependence of nations in their pursuit of basic values, but also the interdependence between human rights and national security.

We have seen how the destruction of freedom at home in totalitarian societies of the right and the left can lead to the destruction of freedom abroad. Conversely, we know that worldwide progress in the vindication of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all will also be progress toward creating a peaceful and stable world order.

During most of the U.N.'s 18 years, the drive for freedom has tended to be defined as the drive for national independence. But we know that history is studded with examples of unholy alliances between nationalism and tyranny.

Now that freedom has been achieved for so many new nations, we are still faced with the previous question: What about freedom for individual men and women and children, the individual human persons whose dignity and worth we reaffirmed on the opening page of the U.N. Charter?

We all know how far the world is today from a satisfactory answer to this question.

In some nations, fundamental freedoms are denied by governments as a matter of principle—by racial separation, by political oppression, by religious persecution.

In other nations, many freedoms are deliberately postponed, by government action, to concentrate on what are thought to be more urgent items of public business.

In all nations in greater or less degree, freedoms are infringed by lust for unchallenged political power—by the animosities of tribe or class or caste or sect or party—by prejudice and bigotry and other evils which still divide the branches of humanity.

There is no doubt that these matters are of international concern. They can and should be exposed to the awakened and articulate conscience of mankind in the United Nations and other international forums.

I

What specific measures is the United States now prepared to support in the international effort for the promotion of human rights? The answer falls in two main parts:

In the first place, the U.S. Government has embarked on a new policy of considering United Nations human rights conventions on their merits.

In July of this year President Kennedy submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification three United Nations conventions dealing with forced labor, practices akin to slavery, and the political rights of women. Each of these deals with an important human right already guaranteed by the Federal Constitution and by existing Federal law. We believe their ratification can play a significant part in cultivating an international environment congenial to American interests.

Beyond pressing for the speedy ratification of these three conventions, we have been actively participating in the consideration of other human rights conventions—including the two human rights covenants. We do not underrate the difficulty and complexity of the problems which must arise when an attempt is made to formulate a single rule of law affecting human rights which can apply to more than 100 nations with varied social and political systems and traditions. But we are resolved to make every contribution we can toward the development of international standards for the protection of human rights which take account of the legal systems and social structures of participating States.

In the second place, apart from the process of drafting conventions, we are considering ways in which the United Nations can deal with human rights questions on a more objective and professional basis.

In the 17 years of its existence the United Nations has developed effective procedures for dealing with two of its principal concerns—the maintenance of peace and security and the promotion of economic development. It has been less successful in developing adequate procedures with respect to its third concern—the promotion of human rights.

At the present time, for example, the United Nations does not provide its members with an up-to-date, comprehensive, and professional analysis of the measures taken by member states in fulfillment of their Charter obligations to promote human rights for all their citizens. The Human Rights Commission regularly bypasses discussions of current problems in specific countries. In the vacuum thus created the General Assembly is tending to involve itself in politicized and emotional discussions of a few human rights problems without the benefit of a broad and analytical review of the entire subject.

We continue to believe, as President Kennedy told the Assembly, that "new efforts are needed" if the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is to have full meaning.

We should consider the role the United Nations might play in defining standards, in clarifying experience, in reviewing government performance against Charter principles, and in exposing to the conscience of the world the denial of those rights which should be the heritage of all human beings.

If this process of international discussion is to bear fruit, however, it must be genuinely devoted to the national pursuit of human rights—not the national pursuit of self-righteousness. In this field we might well benefit from the application of the familiar legal doctrine of clean hands: those who would call in question the practices of others should at least be making every effort to put their own house in order.

The real test of a nation's commitment to human rights is not what it says for all the world to hear but what it does in practice for all the world to see.

II

This leads me inevitably to some specific comments about the human rights practices of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union in recent years has sought to assert its leadership in human rights issues before the United Nations. There is a certain irony in this effort—an irony of which the United Nations is frequently reminded not only by ourselves but by other members. For the Soviet Union has adopted as government policy a widespread disregard for those fundamental human rights which are embodied in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

We cannot and should not forget for an instant the violations of basic political liberties which have affected all religious and national elements of the Soviet population.

In this gathering today, it is fitting to make some reference to the specific disabilities, religious, and cultural, of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union. These are a matter of anxious interest not only to other Jewish communities but to all who seek to build a better world on the basis of the principles embodied in the universal declaration:

There has been a marked decline within the last 3 years in the number of synagogues in the Soviet Union. No Jewish schools are allowed to be established. A majority of the students at the one rabbinical seminary permitted to exist in the entire Soviet Union were denied residence permits in 1962 for the city of Moscow on the grounds of a housing shortage.

No Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917, nor has even a Russian translation of the Jewish Old Testament been allowed. Six, no more than six, books in the Yiddish language have been published since 1953.

Even the baking of matzoth for Passover has been prohibited and the last kosher meat market in Moscow has been closed.

A person of Jewish descent who may have broken completely with his religious tradition must still carry the nationality designation "Jew" in his identity card.

Our disquiet about the situation of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union is not the result of any diplomatic conflict or the so-called cold war. We are equally opposed to any kind of discrimination, and have made that repeatedly clear, in any other country, irrespective of its social or political structure. Our disquiet flows from the deep conviction, which is as old as our Declaration of Independence, that human rights are inalienable, and that the business of government is to recognize and protect them.

Let me express the hope that the leaders of the Soviet Union will seek to correct a situation in accordance with their own often proclaimed principle of equality for all the peoples and religions under their jurisdiction. Let me add that any amelioration of this situation would itself be a positive contribution to the development of better mutual understanding, which is the indispensable foundation for a common effort to overcome the dangers and difficulties which stand in the way of the fulfillment of mankind's hope for a better world founded on freedom and justice.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN F. KENNEDY BY COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U.S.A.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many eulogies and statements have been made, here and all over the world, wherever men have attempted to communicate their sorrow to others. The words have reflected the deep shock and grief which the world suffered due to the death of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

Last Tuesday the entire day was set aside to eulogize the President; but still there are thoughts unsaid, sorrow unassuaged.

The Cooperative League of the United States released a statement which is noteworthy for its positive tone and its resolution in the face of calamity. It is a pledge, on the part of 15 million Americans that they will persevere, that they will dedicate themselves anew to the ideals which President Kennedy so ably characterized in his words and demonstrated in his actions. This is the spirit which now must fill all American hearts. Though the man is gone, the tasks he set for himself and for the country yet lie before us. He would have us continue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. be made a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Voorhis Asserts Cooperative's Support of New Unity in Nation

(On behalf of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., the member organizations of which encompass some 15 million U.S. families, Jerry Voorhis, executive director of the league, issued the following statement Monday, November 25.)

In the name of the Cooperative League of the United States and on behalf of its several million thoughtful and devoted members, this statement is made and this pledge affirmed:

First. We share with every true citizen of our country an overwhelming sense of grief and shame. Our President has been struck down. In the very midst of his work for peace, for equality, for freedom, and for a better life for man, the gun of a miserable assassin has murdered him.

John F. Kennedy died a martyr to the cause of the welfare of his fellow human beings.

Not since the murder of another great President, Abraham Lincoln, at a time and under circumstances all too similar to those of this hour, has our Nation appeared in such a tragic light before the world.

What, then, shall we do?

We shall herewith resolve with all our souls that, in Lincoln's own words, "these dead shall not have died in vain."

We shall begin by seeing clearly that both President Lincoln and President Kennedy were killed in the midst of their work for human reconciliation and for the equal dignity of all human beings. And we shall solemnly dedicate ourselves to working with quadrupled effort to put these principles into practice in the everyday activities of life. As it happens, they lie at the very core of the objectives to serve which the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. exists. Had we worked with greater effect toward reaching them, the President might not have had to die.

Second. We shall dedicate ourselves to helping to bring about the "real change in the temper of our times" for which the Chicago Sun-Times, in an editorial of sheer greatness, called with these words:

"Those who impugn the motives of our national leaders, who defy the courts, distort the operations of the United Nations, or advocate a change in our form of government, might not themselves do violence. But they engender the kind of hate that must have been in the eyes that lined up Mr. Kennedy's head in the crosshairs of a rifle sight.

"The right of dissent, the exercise of free speech, must not corrode into sullen rebellion that breeds violence. All Americans, those who agree with their Government's policies and those who disagree, must stand together on this fundamental and demonstrate this unity by action as well as words."

Third, we reaffirm out own stand on this fundamental of unity within diversity. The longstanding policy of open membership of the Cooperative League does not mean that the organization countenances persons whose beliefs commit them to actions which would destroy the very cooperatives in which they have been accepted in membership.

This stand is spelled out in the membership policy of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. as follows:

"Membership in cooperatives is open to all people of good will regardless of race, creed, or economic status. But cooperatives are not called upon to admit to membership * * * persons who hold beliefs which render it impossible for them to desire the success of cooperatives as a basic solution to human problems.

"Therefore, it is the policy of the Cooperative League of the United States that no person who holds to a belief in totalitarian government, whether Communist or Fascist, is eligible for or properly admissible to membership in an American cooperative society."

In time like these there can be no room within our cooperative organizations for those who, whatever their professions to the contrary, are necessarily committed to objectives as foreign to those of true cooperatives as night is to day.

Fourth, we shall find in our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, a man as worthy by experience, by nature, and by character to assume the awesome burdens of the Presidency in these tragic hours as providence and the good judgment of men could have provided us. To him we pledge, as to every President, but especially to him in present circumstances our support, our labors, and our unswerving loyalty.

And fifth, we shall go forward in a spirit which was—perhaps prophetically—outlined in an editorial in the official magazine of the Cooperative League, Co-op Report, only 3 short weeks before the tragedy of November 22. The editorial reads in part as follows:

"All of us must fulfill one primary duty, of understanding why those with whom we disagree think as they do.

"If we—all of us on both sides of every issue—do this, honestly and fairly, we shall learn to respect once more the rights and opinions of others, and to treat and regard them as good citizens—however sharply and deeply we may disagree with them.

"Our Nation never needed a basic unity of purpose and unity of spirit as it needs them now. Those who destroy that unity by hate, bitterness, false accusation and name-calling, should consider whether in their drive to have their own way completely, they are not in the process going to make it impossible for our American rights and freedoms to continue to exist at all.

"It's a hard and often not very satisfying role—but what our country needs now is a larger and larger number of reasonable middle-of-the-roaders who will work as hard as the extremists do, who will hold those extremists in check and blunt their unreasoning bitterness—and save our Nation from the tragedies of civil strife which now threatens to engulf us."

If the struggle of the forces of freedom and peace against tyranny and violence is to be won for freedom in the world today, it will be won by the methods of John F. Kennedy and those who carry forward the principles and ideals for which he stood. We pledge ourselves to carry forward that struggle by those methods.

NEED FOR NATIONAL FARM POLICY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, when you hear the word "farm" today, it is very often followed by "problem."

I am sure we will all agree this is unfortunate. Here we are blessed with an abundance of food while the bulk of the world's peoples are in just the opposite situation.

Our farm problem, of course, is basically that our supply of foodstuffs and fibers is greater than our needs. This in turn has depressed the agricultural economy and at the same time has resulted in huge expenditures of tax dollars to bolster that economy.

I would not be so foolish as to indicate that I have a solution to the farm problem. But I do know this: there is not going to be any long-range solution until the farm problem is dealt with on a comprehensive basis. We desperately need a national agricultural policy against which we can measure various individual crop programs. That is why on October 22 I introduced S. 2299, which would establish a Commission on National Agricultural Policy.

We cannot reasonably hope to devise a workable farm policy if we do not step back far enough to see the forest. We have been stumbling into first one tree and then another for years. We ought to be tired of this exhausting exercise.

My bill, I well realize, would not do away with the farm problem. But it would provide a basis for solving it, as well as produce recommendations for dealing with it, and this would put us much farther ahead than we are now.

In an article on December 14, 1963, Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor refers to the perplexing farm situation in an editorial appropriately called "Farm Merry-Go-Round." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, which is further evidence of the need for a comprehensive study, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 14, 1963]

FARM MERRY-GO-ROUND

No one wants to face the farm problem in the United States. The prospect is for another alliance between farmers and politicians to evade it. This means more huge surpluses, more huge subsidies from the taxpayers.

This is the situation as the House opens hearings on a new wheat bill.

The problem itself is simple enough; only the politics are complicated. Take wheat: in the past quarter century the yield per acre has been nearly doubled by modern farm technology. There is now an enormous capacity to overproduce.

There are only four possible solutions, broadly speaking: (1) Return to the free market. No one wants this, because the price would plummet. (2) Production controls and a sustained price level. No one one likes production controls. (3) The present system (only tentatively modified by last year's wheat bill) of largely uncontrolled and Government-subsidized overproduction and surpluses. Except for some farmers and politicians, no one likes this. (4) A deliberate use of the present system of surpluses to feed hungry nations gratis. Few are so generous as to favor this.

So, there is no popular way out.

This newspaper doesn't relish production controls any more than anyone else. There is talk, once again, of "voluntary controls" which have turned out in the past not to control. Unless they can be made to work, on a voluntary or legislated basis, Americans will have to accustom themselves again to exporting their unsolved problem in the benevolent if costly form of food for the hungry.

Perhaps it would be better to stop talking about controls—a term that is negative and misleading—and seek the best possible use of the democratic process to adjust production to demand.

APPOINTMENT OF THOMAS C. MANN TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, President Johnson's appointment of the Honorable Thomas C. Mann, currently our Ambassador to Mexico, to the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs is, I am confident, a move that will have the broadest bipartisan support in Congress and will inspire the confidence of all those in Latin America who look to the United States for leadership in the fight for progress, stability, and freedom from Castroite tyranny.

As one who has known Ambassador Mann for a number of years and who has visited him several times in the Embassy in Mexico, I honestly believe that President Johnson could not have found a more able or more knowledgeable or more gifted man for this critical assignment.

In connection with the appointment of Ambassador Mann to his new position, I think all of us will welcome the President's decision to place him in charge of the coordination of all aspects of our Latin American policy, political, economic, social, cultural, and military. We have been handicapped in the past by the absence of such coordination. To find one man capable of coordinating these vast and complicated programs posed a problem that might have seemed impossible of solution. In the appointment of Ambassador Mann to his new position, I am confident that the President has found the proper answer to this problem.

In the letter to Ambassador Mann which was printed in this morning's papers President Johnson declared that he is determined to achieve, "an American community of nations moving forward together in progress and freedom." Those Latin Americans who know Ambassador Mann will, I am confident, see in his appointment a dramatic confirmation of President Johnson's declaration.

Mr. Mann, in his years in Latin America, has built up a reputation as a devoted friend of the Latin American peoples, as a true progressive who sympathizes with their aspirations for a better life, and as a statesman who has the qualities of understanding and courage to cope with the growing menace of subversion and aggression from Castro's Cuba.

I believe that the appointment of Ambassador Mann as coordinator of all aspects of our Latin American policy will give new life to the Alliance for Progress and will again underscore our commitment to the defense of freedom and social progress in the Western Hemisphere.

I am pleased to note that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who was present at the discussion between the President and Ambassador Mann, shares my evaluation of the significance of this appointment.

Mr. President, I am sure that Ambassador Mann will have the best wishes and the warm support of all of us in the onerous duties which he is now assuming.

DEATH OF JUSTICE CHARLES E. CLARK

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is my regret to inform the Senate that on Friday, December 13, one of the ablest members of the Federal judiciary, Justice Charles E. Clark of the 2d Circuit Court of Appeals, passed away.

Judge Clark, and I shall call him judge instead of justice because that was his preference, left his mark on American jurisprudence in many ways. He is considered by many to be all that is admirable in the expression "Connecticut Yankee." Born in Woodbridge, Conn., he was the product of Connecticut public schools, of Yale University, and of Yale Law School.

After several years of successful private practice he became a member of the faculty of Yale Law School in 1919 and in 1929 he became dean of Yale Law School.

In 1939 he was appointed by President Roosevelt to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. He served as chief judge of that body between 1954 and 1959. In the last years of his life he relinquished the position of chief judge but continued to serve as a justice.

Judge Clark leaves behind a life of remarkable achievement as teacher, lawyer, writer, and judge.

He is known in Connecticut as the principal architect of the reform of our State courts which resulted in the establishment of our new circuit court system.

He is known in the academic world and the legal fraternity as one of the truly great teachers of law of all time. His monumental impact on generations of students from 1919 down to the last year of his life can never be adequately measured.

He never gave up teaching. Despite the many duties and responsibilities he carried, he continued to teach and lecture. He was known as a teacher who always had time for his students, one whose affection and interest followed his students throughout their lives.

To the legal world Judge Clark is known as the father of the liberalized Federal rules of procedure. His purpose was to provide the best procedures under which both plaintiff and defendant could get the essential facts before judge and jury. There was one purpose of rules of procedures in his view, and that was to strengthen the likelihood that substantial justice would be done.

He was at the same time a foremost champion of proper courtroom procedures and a prime enemy of the hollow formalisms which obstruct and obscure justice. Perhaps the greatest tribute to both the soundness of his legal philosophy and the clarity of his writing was the fact that his views on Federal rules of procedure were incorporated almost bodily by our Federal judicial system.

Through all of his labors as lawyer, teacher, writer and judge ran one great thread. He believed that the integrity of our judicial system constituted perhaps the essential difference between a dictatorship and a true democracy. And he believed that meticulous adherence to proper rules of procedure was the essential ingredient of the integrity of our judicial system.

Every student who studied under him, every lawyer who practiced under him became conscious of the duty of conscientious dedication to the task of seeing to it that both the results, and the means to the results, were properly ordered so that justice would be the end product.

He died at the age of 74 in the midst of his many labors and interests. His passing is a loss to the country, to the Federal judiciary and to the cause of justice everywhere.

I was privileged to know Judge Clark as a teacher while I was a student at the Yale Law School, and I was happy to know him as a friend as well, not only during student days but up to the time of his death.

He was one of the truly great men of law in this country and all who value justice will mourn his passing.

THE HIDDEN CANCER OF HATE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I received yesterday a copy of a sermon given November 24 at the Star of the Sea Church in Honolulu by Father John H. McDonald. It is never too late for us to read such a message and I earnestly commend this sermon to all my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the sermon in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Behind the Mask of America in Mourning Hides the Cancer of Hate

Death is abroad in our land today, and sorrow in the whole world. This is a strange thing, that good men everywhere and those, by all accounts, not so good are shocked numb by the death of one man.

We modern sophisticates are used to violent death. News media list dozens: death on the highway because of drunkenness and irresponsibility, death in places of business, death from jealousy, death from lust, death from greed. How many times in a few years have we learned of the violent death of some other head of state, a husband and father, earnest and devoted for all we know. And not this reaction.

The universal outrage at the senseless, cruel thing that happened Friday cries out for explanation. Not for 100 years has the world felt anything so deeply. Why?

Because for the first time in several lifetimes we are face to face with the full malice of hate, face to face with a crime entirely worthy of Satan himself, who is the personification of hate.

Had our President died violently as the result of the plotting of the leaders of an unfriendly power, were he assassinated through the machinations of the evil forces at work in our own land, we could accept the fact more readily and with less outrage. But this is not the fact.

What really happened during one dreadful half-second on Friday? All of these things happened: A young man in the full prime of a vigorous life was murdered. A wife and two small children lost forever the husband and father they loved and needed. The greatest military force in the world lost its Commander in Chief One hundred and eighty million Americans lost their Nation's President in the most perilous times that Nation has ever known. The hundreds of millions of men and women of the free world lost the leader to whom they could look with faith and trust for the courage and wisdom and strength to continue the struggle to make all mankind free. And a thousand million enslaved humans behind the Iron Curtain of despotism were deprived of the most significant force for good their desperate struggle for liberty has yet known.

His greatness is almost beside the point. It is a fact that he was all of these things; and it is a fact that on Friday, he was destroyed, in a split second, by the twitch of a finger guided by the hate-filled little mind of a miserable creature mankind had never heard of and will, please God, soon forget.

This is the "why" of the world's grief and outrage. All of these really dreadful things are the result of one sin of hate. There is great malice in every sin; but the sin of hatred can be infinite in its malice and scope, for any of us. There is no limit to it. We can hate one man, or a hundred, or a hundred million, or the whole universe including God himself.

God intends some great, universal good to result from this tragedy. And this must be part of what He intends: that you and I and the world realize that one sin of hate can affect the lives of every man, woman, and child in the world.

What about your hates and mine? (For we have all hated.) Deep in our hearts we know that we must share responsibility for the death of our President. Have we turned our thoughts or rased our voices against a fellow man—we have hated. Have we (in our homes, our places of worship or business, our communities) been guilty of bigotry and intolerance? These are other names of hatred. And hate engenders hate. Singly our little hates have small effect; taken together they have provided the climate in which thrives the big hate, on the right, on the left, in the center, that can explode into Friday's cruel and tragic death.

If our Nation is so sick that it is not sickened by the wanton murders of our President and his murderer, God help us. We must banish hatred and try to love as Christ loved. We must fight for justice and freedom and peace as John Kennedy fought for them. We must rise up in holy anger at the cynical hatred that exists in high places—even now. We must atone for past hatred.

There is a personal good that has come for me from Friday's outrage, and I feel compelled to pass it on to you. History records that some 2,000 years ago a woman stood on a knoll outside the walls of Jerusalem and watched her son pour out his life in a violent death because his vision was, as John Kennedy's was, greater than the vision of smaller men. Although I have tried hundreds of times to fathom what she felt and what she said, I have been unequal to the task until last Saturday morning. And then I read that as Jacqueline Kennedy bent over the stricken body of her husband she whispered, "Oh—no." This must be what Mary felt and said at the foot of the cross.

NATIONAL GRANGE FAVORS VOLUNTARY CERTIFICATE PLAN FOR WHEAT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Mr. Herschel Newsom, master of the National Grange, appeared today before the House Agriculture Committee's Subcommittee on Wheat and presented a very significant statement in relation to wheat.

Mr. Newsom's statement included a resolution adopted at a meeting of nine organizations concerned with wheat and feed grains. The organizations were unanimous that wheat legislation is needed by March 1 of next year in order to prevent a disastrous drop in wheat prices and farm income.

On behalf of the National Grange, Mr. Newsom urged the enactment of a voluntary wheat certificate plan.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include the text of Mr. Newsom's statement in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of the National Grange Before the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture by Herschel D. Newsom, Master, National Grange, December 16, 1963

The National Grange commends this committee for its recognition of the urgency of doing something constructive toward solving the problem of wheat, as evidenced by the scheduling of these new hearings at this time.

At our 97th annual session, convened in Portland, Oreg., last month, our delegate body reaffirmed its support of legislation embodying the principles of the grange voluntary certificate plan for wheat, and further directed me, as national master, to issue an immediate call to representatives of all interested bona fide national agricultural organizations to meet together at the earliest convenient time to consider the necessity of developing a sound program for wheat and the enactment of appropriate legislation in time to be effective for the 1964 crop.

This meeting was held in our Goss conference room last Thursday and Friday, and before its conclusion the following release was issued to the press:

"Washington, D.C.—Nine organizations met December 12 and 13 in Washington, under the auspices of the National Grange, to deal with the adverse economic impact that farmers can expect in the absence of an effective Federal farm program for the 1964 crop of wheat. Invited to the meeting were 10 of the Nation's organizations representing the interest of wheat and feed grain producing areas on national legislation.

"Organizations attending the meeting were the Grain Sorghum Producers Association, Missouri Farmers Association, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Corn Growers Association, National Council of Farmers Cooperatives, National Farmers Organization, National Farmers Union, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, and the National Grange.

"Representatives speaking for these organizations 'commended the action of the House Wheat Subcommittee in beginning new congressional hearings now, leading to the immediate development of a program for the 1964 wheat crop.' Alternative programs were reviewed and revision of the 1964 program was considered. Conferees 'unanimously agreed that any change of program needs to be enacted and made available to farmers prior to March 1, 1964.

" 'We strongly support the objectives of President Lyndon B. Johnson and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman in preventing the expected sharp drop in the income of wheat farmers. We pledge our support in obtaining early congressional approval of wheat legislation, with the corresponding helpful effect of maintaining the present highly successful and effective feed grain program. Failure to act now on a wheat program jeopardizes the voluntary feed grain program.

" 'National economic growth cannot be expanded unless farm income is maintained and improved. The drag on the economy posed by an expected $600 million loss in farm income in the absence of an effective farm program would be disastrous. Prevention of this loss is, therefore, of prime concern to farmers, main street businesses in rural America, and factory workers whose jobs and livelihood depend on a healthy farm economy that must continue to contribute to the strength of the Nation's economy, receiving in the process its equitable share of the Nation's income.' "

The Grange believes that a sound program for wheat requires the use of a certificate system as a means of maximizing farm income by recognizing that wheat properly has a higher value for primary human food use than it has for other or secondary uses. At the same time, we believe that any such program should be designed to maximize the producer's freedom from Government controls. To accomplish these objectives, we have long advocated the enactment of appropriate legislation to implement our voluntary wheat certificate plan. Many of the principles of this plan were incorporated in the mandatory program authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and we supported that measure, notwithstanding its mandatory features, in the belief that they might be justifiable during a transitional period to check and reduce the alarming buildup in Commodity Credit Corporation's stocks and the costs to Government attendant thereon.

As originally conceived by the Grange, however, the wheat certificate plan was designed to be operative on a voluntary basis, and we do not believe it at all necessary that it be made mandatory to be effective. Moreover, it is now obvious that the adverse vote in the referendum was because of the mandatory controls which would have been imposed, and does not reflect a rejection of the other features of the program for wheat, which are provided for in the 1962 act. It is our judgment that the disastrous loss in farm income, which is almost sure to follow from the alternative which existing law now leaves because of the adverse vote in the referendum, calls for the prompt enactment of remedial legislation designed to remove the mandatory aspects of the program presently authorized.

In addition to the fundamental necessity of preventing a further disastrous drop in farm income, it seems to us that we should recognize that we have no thoroughly satisfactory way of living up to our International Wheat Agreement commitments under the existing legislative structure. Further, legislative laissez-faire at this time could not but, in our opinion, jeopardize the operation of our effective current feed grains program.

There are several reasons, therefore, for urging wheat legislation in ample time to give wheat producers in all parts of the country a reasonable opportunity to come into compliance with such legislation for their 1964 crop.

Prompt authorization of a voluntary wheat certificate program, coupled with authority to supplement farm income as may be found necessary by acreage diversion payments during a transitional period, is the best method we know of to meet the serious situation with which we are confronted. We, therefore, support the early enactment of such legislation.

JAMES RESTON ON THE INWARD-TURNING MIND OF THE CAPITAL

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, James Reston, the noted columnist for the New York Times, has authored a thoughtful column which appears in the December 15 issue of the Times. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 15, 1963]

THE INWARD-TURNING MIND OF THE CAPITAL

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, December 14.—The conversation of Washington usually influences and foreshadows the legislation of Washington, and lately the conversation has changed in tone and direction.

It has been quieter and less dogmatic since the death of President Kennedy. It has been less partisan. And it has been more concerned with the structure and development of our own country than with the urgencies of foreign affairs.

The period of mourning has been good for Washington. Odd things have been happening. Officials have been going home nights and having dinner alone with their wives or a few friends. Some of them have even had time to think or read a book, and the beginning of a new administration, under melancholy circumstances, has encouraged new approaches to old problems.

M'NAMARA'S IDEA

Secretary of Defense McNamara, for example, has been working this week on an absolutely original and even revolutionary idea. This is that if a military base in the United States or overseas is no longer necessary to the security of the United States, it should be closed.

Congressmen in the districts concerned are of course furious, but even their angry laments have done some good. For it is now evident that many of these bases were being run at great expense, not because they were essential to the defense of the country, but because they were essential to the economy of the communities where they were located. And this in turn has forced the Government to think a little more about having a plan to convert part of its vast Military Establishment to useful civilian projects.

Mr. McNamara has been telling us in great detail recently that we were way ahead of the Soviets in almost every phase of military defense, yet he has also been telling us that we still need a military budget in the next year of about $50 billion. Until lately this sort of thing was accepted as if it made sense, but now people here want to know why.

A lot of important domestic projects have been paralyzed for years because powerful political forces could not agree. Integration of the races in the public schools is one of them. Substantial progress has been made in some areas, but only token progress has been made in most places in the South and the political fight has centered on forcing total integration as soon as possible.

Lately, however, a new theme has been heard here. This is that, while the battle for integration of the public schools must go on, a great deal more must be done to improve the education in the Negro schools if another whole generation of Negro children is not to come on the labor market unprepared for jobs in an increasingly technical society.

Most of the Negro children in the South, and in many of the large cities of the North, are not only going to segregated schools, but to school that are both separate and unequal. Accordingly, at least some officials and politicians here are now talking about trying to make the Negro schools equally as good as the white while at the same time continuing the fight for the public school integration.

Even the battle over Federal aid to primary and secondary schools is now coming in for renewed study. This has been blocked for years by differences between Protestants and Roman Catholics over Federal aid to public but not to private schools.

GALBRAITH'S IDEA

Kenneth Galbraith, the Harvard economist, suggested here this week that instead of a broad bill applying Federal aid to all public schools in all States, the problem should be attacked as an emergency measure dealing first with the very worst problems in the Nation.

"Why don't we select, beginning next year," he said, "the 100 lowest income areas and designate them as special educational districts? They would then be equipped or reequipped with a truly excellent and comprehensive school plant."

It is interesting that ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, when he was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, put forth roughly the same idea of an emergency educational plan to be financed by the Federal Government, like any other national emergency, before the Congress. It even reached the point where a majority of the Rules Committee was for it, but it finally got lost in the shuffle.

There is, however, a new atmosphere here now, a more receptive mood, a greater willingness to look for ways out of old dilemmas. Accordingly, Galbraith's idea is now likely to get a better hearing than RIBICOFF's did just 2 years ago.

More than this, there is a feeling here that it is both necessary and possible to give a higher priority in time and money to domestic affairs, without affecting the security of the country or the alliance.

Some people here have felt this was true for quite a while, but policies have a life of their own and often continue long after the conditions that produced them have changed.

The shock of President Kennedy's death, however, has startled the Capital out of many assumptions, and created a new receptivity for new ideas and a new concern for the Nation.

EULOGY TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY BY ARTHUR SCHLESINGER

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the finest tributes to the late President Kennedy I have seen was written by Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., for the December 14 issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. Schlesinger, a special assistant to the President, is one of the Nation's most brilliant historians. He writes with a unique insight and sensitivity.

I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows :

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Dec. 14, 1963]

A EULOGY: JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(By Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.)

The thing about him was the extraordinary sense he gave of being alive: This makes his death so grotesque and unbelievable. No one had such vitality of personality—a vitality so superbly disciplined that it sometimes left the impression of cool detachment, but imbuing everything he thought or did with intense concentration and power. He was life affirming, life enhancing. When he entered the room, the temperature changed; and he quickened the sensibilities of everyone around him. His curiosity was unlimited. The restless thrust of his mind never abated. He noticed everything, responded to everything, forgot nothing. He lived his life so intensely that in retrospect it almost seems he must have known it would be short, and that he had no time to waste. Or perhaps it was that, having lived closely to death ever since he swam those lonely, terrible hours along Ferguson Passage in 1943, ever since he nearly died after the operation on his back in 1955, he was determined to savor everything of life.

He was a man profoundly in earnest. Yet there was never a moment when his manner was not informal, reverent, rueful and witty. He took life seriously, but never himself. He cared deeply, but his passion was understatement. No heart ever appeared on his sleeve, though only the unaware could have concluded that this meant there was no heart at all. He mistrusted rhetoric, and he detested histrionics. But the casualness, the dry humor, the sardonic throwaway lines, the cool precision in press conference, the sense of slight distance from emotion, the invariable courtesy and the inextinguishable gaiety—none of this could conceal the profound concern and commitment underneath.

His whole life gave him that concern. He came from a religion and race which had known discrimination and persecution. He came from a family which in its energy, its warmth, its subtle and disparate solidarity had nourished his capacity for competition, for tenacity and for affection. Education developed his intelligence and awakened his historical imagination. This was most important; for he saw the movement of events as a historian sees them, not as a morality play, but as a complex and obscure interaction of men and values and institutions, in which each man's light is often dim but each must do the best he can. As a senior at Harvard he wrote an honors essay to explain why Great Britain was so poorly prepared for the Second World War. The book was published the next year, and he wrote in the introduction: "In studying the reasons why England slept, let us try to profit by them and save ourselves her anguish." He had the insight and the sense of language which could have made him a distinguished historian, but his was the nerve of action.

The hard experience of war deepened and toughened him. He was, of course, an authentic hero, a man of valor and hope. As a young skipper on a PT boat, he displayed his capacity for command, which always meant for him, not the compulsion to bark orders, but the capacity to enlist confidence and assume responsibility. After the war, he was broken in health but lively in spirit. Though his father had been one of the most successful businessmen of his time, something had saved the older Kennedy from the ethos of the business community; he inspired his children with the belief that serving the Nation was more important than making money; and it was the natural thing for young Lieutenant Kennedy, pale and shaken from the war, to run for Congress from 11th District of Massachusetts. I had been a classmate of his older brother at Harvard and had been aware of John Kennedy, who was a sophomore when I was a senior; but I first knew him when he became the Congressman from the district in which I lived. One remembers the quick intelligence, the easy charm, the laconic wit. One did not then see the passion and power which lay underneath.

I have always felt that in these years John Kennedy perhaps thought he was going to die because of the unresolved trouble with his back, and that he was therefore determined to have the best possible time in the days left to him. This was his season of careless gaiety, of Palm Beach and Newport, of dances and parties, and he married the most beautiful girl of them all. But the trouble with his back remained; and in 1955 he underwent a long and complicated operation—a double fusion of spinal disks with ensuing complications. He received last rites and nearly died. But he fought through, as he had fought through the waters of Ferguson Passage. When he recovered, he knew that he would live. My guess is that at this point he decided to become President of the United States.

HE WANTED TO USE POWER

There used to be a fashion of criticizing John Kennedy for being ambitious, as if anyone ever became President of the United States who had not schemed and labored to that end. Of course he wanted to be President. But he wanted to be President not because he wanted power for its own sake: He wanted to be President because he wanted to use power to advance the purposes of the Nation. He was a supreme politician. He loved the flicker of tension and persuasion, the cut and thrust of political infighting, the puzzles of political strategy. He also came to love campaigning. He always seemed a little surprised by the ardor of the crowds which flocked to see him; but he gathered strength from them as they gathered strength from him.

But, overriding everything else, he had a vision of America, of what this country might do and might be, and he had a vision of the world. He saw this Nation as a noble nation, rising above mean and ugly motives, subordinating private selfishness to public purpose, raising the standards of existence and opportunity for all its citizens. He was always receptive to new experience, and new experience steadily deepened his sense of what America must do to fulfill the vision. Thus the primary campaign in West Virginia in the spring of 1960 gave his understanding of poverty and his determination to eliminate it new concreteness and urgency. He never could understand the complacent rich who, so long as they had everything they needed for themselves, were content to starve schools, medical services, and social services for their less fortunate fellow citizens. In one of the last talks I had with him, he was musing about the legislative program for next January and said, "The time has come to organize a national assault on the causes of poverty, a comprehensive program, across the board."

So, too, the agony of the Negroes transformed another abstraction into cruel reality, and so he committed himself to the battle for civil rights. He did this not for political reasons, because he always believed it would lose him many more votes than it would gain him. He did this because it was necessary to keep the faith of American democracy and preserve the fabric of American life. He did this because he felt with cold passion that it was the right thing to do.

These things deeply preoccupied him, but what preoccupied him most, I believe, was the peace of the world and the future of mankind. His historian's perspective made him see the conflict with communism not as a holy war but as a difficult and perilous struggle for adjustment and accommodation. The world, he deeply believed, was in its nature and its historical movement a diverse world—a world which had room for a great diversity of economic systems, of political creeds, of philosophic faiths. He respected the distinctive values and traditions, the distinctive identities, of other nations and other societies. He felt that, as the possessing classes in the American community had an obligation to the weak and defenseless, so the possessing nations had an obligation to the nations struggling to emerge from the oblivion of stagnation and want. And he saw this not just as a moral obligation but as a social necessity. "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible," he once said, "make violent revolution inevitable."

Above all, life must survive on this planet. He knew what nuclear war would mean, and he believed that the avoidance of such a war was the common interest of mankind—a common interest which must transcend all conflicts of ideology and national ambition. This common interest was the bridge across the dark abyss. His deepest purpose was to strengthen that bridge against the storms of suspicion and fear, and to persuade his adversaries that, if each nation and people respected the integrity of the rest and accepted the reality of the world of diversity, if nations abandoned a messianic effort to remake the world in their own image, peace would be possible, and humanity would endure.

These hopes, I believe, guided him in his terrible task. In the midst of his crushing burdens, he moved always with grace, composure and cheer. His office reflected his own serenity in a world of chaos. He was a man born to the exercise of power, but also a man born to the responsibility of power. He immersed himself in the issues, understood what mattered and what did not, mastered the necessary information and dominated the process of government. I have so often seen experts come before him, men who had worked on problems for months or years, and I have seen him penetrate at once to the heart of the issue, and then place it in a wider context, raising questions of significance which the experts had not thought about. His presence pervaded Washington, and he infused the laborious and opaque machinery of government with a sense of his own standards, his own imagination and his own high purpose. With all this, his kindness, his consideration, his gaiety and his strength were absolute.

He had grown all his life, and he grew even more in the Presidency. The ordeal of the first Cuba made possible the triumph of the second Cuba. He broke new paths in a dozen sectors of national policy—in civil rights, in economic policy, in the reorientation of military strategy, in the reconstruction of foreign aid, in the exploration of space, in the encouragement of the arts. But the bright promise of his administration, as of his life, was cut short in Dallas. When Abraham Lincoln died, when Franklin Roosevelt died, these were profound national tragedies; but death came for Lincoln and Roosevelt in the last act, at the end of their careers, when the victory for which they had fought so hard was at last within the Nation's grasp. John Kennedy's death has greater pathos, because he had barely begun—because he had so much to do, so much to give to his family, his Nation, his world. His was a life of incalculable and now of unfulfilled possibility.

Still, if he had not done all that he would have hoped to do, finished all that he had so well begun, he had given the Nation a new sense of itself—a new spirit, a new style, a new conception of its role and destiny. He saw America, not as an old nation, self-righteous, conservative, satisfied in its grossness and materialism, but as a young nation, questing, self-critical, dissatisfied, caring for greatness as well as for bigness, caring for the qualities of mind, sensibility and spirit which sustain culture, produce art and elevate society. He was the most civilized President we have had since Jefferson, and his wife made the White House the most civilized house in America. Statecraft was for him not an end in itself; it was a means of moving forward toward a spacious and splendid America.

And so a crazed political fanatic shot him down. With this act of violence, and with the violence that followed, the idea of America as a civilized nation—the idea which John F. Kennedy so supremely embodied—suffered a grievous blow. The best way to serve his memory is to redeem and revindicate the values of decency, of rationality, of civility, of honor—those values for which he stood through his life and to which in the end he gave his life.

MOLLY KAZAN SALUTES PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Molly Kazan, wife of the distinguished theatrical producer, Elia Kazan, died on December 14 of a cerebral hemorrhage. Before her death, she wrote a beautiful poem setting forth her feelings about the life and death of the late President Kennedy. I ask unanimous consent that her poem entitled "Thanksgiving, 1963" be printed at this point in the Record:

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 15, 1963]

MOLLY KAZAN DIES: WROTE J.F.K. MEMORIAL POEM

New York, December 14—Molly Kazan, wife of theatrical producer Elia Kazan, died here today in Bellevue Hospital, apparently from a cerebral hemorrhage suffered Friday night. She was 56 years old.

Mrs. Kazan, born Molly Day Thatcher, managed a certain prominence in her own name as a playwright—the while she raised four children. Her play, "The Egghead," opened at the National Theater in Washington in 1957 before its Broadway showing.

She and Kazan met in Yale University's graduate drama school when the famous producer ("A Streetcar Named Desire," "One Touch of Venus," "Death of a Salesman," etc.) was making $10 a week as an actor-clerk, and she was getting $35 weekly in a New Jersey department store's advertising department. They celebrated this 30th wedding anniversary last year.

Surviving besides her husband are their children, Judith Morris, of Washington, D.C.; Christopher, a copy editor for the Washington Post, and Nicholas and Katherine of

New York. She also leaves a brother, Alfred Thatcher.

Besides their New York City home on Central Park West (where Mrs. Kazan was stricken Friday), the Kazans maintained a home in Sandy Hook, Conn., where many of the country's literati were frequent houseguests.

(The following poem, entitled "Thanksgiving 1963," was written by Molly Kazan after the death of President Kennedy. It was read originally as part of a church service:)

I think that what he gave us most was pride.
It felt good to have a President like that:
Bright, brave, and funny and goodlooking.
I saw him once drive down East 72d Street in an open car, in the autumn sun (as he drove yesterday in Dallas).
His thatch of brown hair looked as though it has grown extra thick, the way our wood animals in Connecticut grow extra fur for winter.
And he looked as though it was fun to be alive, to be a politician, to be President, to be a Kennedy, to be a man.

He revived our pride.
It felt good to have a President who read his mail, who read the papers, who read books and played touch football.
It was a pleasure and a cause for pride to watch him take the quizzing of the press with cameras grinding—take it in his stride, with zest.
He'd parry, thrust, answer or duck, and fire a verbal shot on target, hitting with the same answer, the segregationists in a Louisiana hamlet, and a government in southeast Asia.
He made you feel that he knew what was going on in both places.
He would come out of the quiz with an "A" in economics, military science, constitutional law, farm problems, and the moonshot program and still take time to appreciate Miss May Craig.

We were privileged to see him on the worst day (till yesterday), the Bay of Pigs day, and we marveled at his coolth and style and were amazed at an air (that plainly was habitual) of modesty and even diffidence.
It felt good to have a President who said, "It was my fault."
And went on from there.

It felt good to have a President who looked well in Vienna, Paris, Rome, Berlin and at the podium of the United Nations;
And who would go to Dublin, put a wreath where it did the most good and leave unspoken the satisfaction of an Irishman en route to 10 Downing Street as head of the U.S. Government.

What was spoken was spoken well.
What was unspoken needed to be unspoken.
It was none of our business if his back hurt.

He revived our pride.
He gave grist to our pride.
He was respectful of intellect;
He was respectful of excellence;
He was respectful of accomplishment and skill;
He was respectful of the clear and subtle uses of our language;
He was respectful of courage.
And all these things he cultivated in himself.

He was respectful of our heritage.
He is now part of it.

He affirmed our future.
Our future is more hopeful because of his work but our future is not safe nor sure.
He kept telling us that.
This is a very dangerous and uncertain world.
I quote. He said that yesterday.
He respected facts.
And we must now live with the fact of his murder.

Our children cried when the news came. They phoned and we phoned.
And we cried and we were not ashamed of crying but we were ashamed of what had happened.
The youngest could not remember any other President, not clearly.
She felt as if the world had stopped.

We said, "It is a shame, a very deep shame."
But this country will go on more proudly,
And with a clearer sense of who we are and what we have it in us to become,
Because we had a President like that.
He revived our pride.
We are lucky that we had him for 3 years.

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, there have been a great many comments made about the question of right-to-work laws over the years. We have such a law in Utah and have had the experience with its effects on unions and the economy in general.

Recently Dr. O. Preston Robinson, editor and general manager of the Deseret News in Salt Lake City, made a statement on this subject based on that experience. Because the Deseret News is widely read in other parts of the country and because Dr. Robinson's views are carefully thought out and are well presented I ask unanimous consent that his article on right-to-work laws be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS ARE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(By O. Preston Robinson)

(Oliver Preston Robinson is a well-known editor, author, and university professor. Since 1952 he has been general manager and editor of the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram, Salt Lake City. As an author, one of his books, "Dead Sea Scrolls and Original Christianity," published in 1958, was the result of trips and studies in the Middle East. He has authored a number of other books dealing with retailing and merchandising. From 1929 to 1946 Dr. Robinson was a professor in the School of Retailing at New York University. He is a native of Farmington, Utah.)

The controversy over the question of voluntary versus compulsory unionism strikes at the foundation of our American liberties. The basic issue involved is that of individual freedom of choice. It is an issue which affects intimately one's constitutional rights to life, liberty, and the possession of property.

Right-to-work laws, now in effect in some 20 States generally declare it, "to be public policy that the right of persons to work, whether in private employment or for the State, or any of its political subdivisions, shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union, labor organization or any other type of association." Some of these laws specify that the right to live includes the right to work and that the right to work must be protected and maintained free from undue restraints and coercion.

Under such laws, union organizations that have won membership or even the right of representation among employees of a business organization or other institution do not have the right to require, as a condition of employment, that all employees join the union. In other words, under these laws, employees have the right, voluntarily, to join a union or to refuse to join a union depending upon the dictates of their own judgments and consciences.

The arguments presented by opponents of right-to-work laws may be classified under three general headings.

The first of these is the so-called "freerider" argument. This argument is based upon the premise that unions help to improve working conditions for employees and, consequently, benefit both members and nonmembers alike. Therefore, the argument concludes, nonmembers should be required to join as a condition of participation in these improved conditions.

This argument is faulty on a number of counts. In the first place, it cannot be proved that working conditions in States without right-to-work laws have improved any faster than in States where these laws exist. Studies conducted in the Mountain West States, in fact, have indicated just the opposite. Hourly wage rates and working conditions in general have actually improved faster in Utah, for example, with its right to work law, than in neighboring States where such laws do not exist.

Moreover, looking at this argument logically, it would be equally as inconsistent to maintain that every business in a community must be required, for example, to join the chamber of commerce, because this organization improves business conditions for both its members and nonmembers.

This is equally true with all social and religious organizations—all of which exist for the purpose of bringing certain advantages to their members and, in doing so, they improve conditions generally in the community. Would it be consistent and reasonable to conclude, for these reasons, everyone should be forced to join these social or religious organizations?

The second opponent argument is known as, the majority rule. This argument is based on the premise that all workers in the shop, store, office, or industry should be required to join a union if there is a majority vote in favor of the union.

This argument runs headon into a basic principle of democracy. If the majority rule contention were applied to political organizations, to social groups and to other organizations and institutions governed by democratic principles, minorities would automatically be eliminated. This type of philosophy might be expected to operate in an authoritarian atmosphere but it is completely inimical to democratic procedures and ideals.

Other arguments advanced by those who would eliminate right-to-work laws may be grouped under the general heading of employee-employer relationships.

These arguments are centered around the idea that discipline of employees and improved cooperation with employers can be maintained if the union membership includes all of the employees rather than only part of them. As with the other opponents' contentions, this argument also falls apart under careful scrutiny. Research convincingly indicates that industries in which compulsory union membership has existed longest have suffered as many disputes and stoppages as have those which have not been completely organized.

As a matter of fact, the natural competition between nonunion members and union members has, in many instances, improved working conditions and employer-employee cooperation. It stands only to reason that the union itself, if it is conscientiously competing for the good will and friendship of nonunion members, is most likely, through the effects of this refining process, to improve its own organization and operating procedures in order to make them more attractive.

In a carefully conducted survey of the effect of right-to-work laws in 17 States including Utah, there was every evidence that the law had in no way damaged the legitimate, proper rights of workingpeople or of the unions and that, actually, it had been beneficial in its overall effect.

Right-to-work laws are an expression of the American way of life and represent a fundamental aspect of the freedoms guaranteed under our Constitution. In no way do they imply any impairment of a union's right to attempt to organize employees and to bargain collectively for them. They do not abrogate the right of any individual, if he so desires, to join and participate in a labor union.

On the contrary, they protect that right. At the same time, also, they protect the individual's basic freedom to choose.

They guarantee to him the privilege, voluntarily, to make his own free choice and to protect his rights, under the Constitution, to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

PEACE CORPS AT THE CROSSROADS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Deseret News in Salt Lake City was one of the Nation's first newspapers to endorse and support the Peace Corps concept. It has followed the progress of the Peace Corps with great interest, both at home and by personal observation abroad on the part of Deseret News personnel.

For that reason, I feel that the comments made by the Deseret News in its editorial of December 10 titled "Peace Corps at the Crossroads" are most instructive and should be called to the attention of all Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS AT THE CROSSROADS

Of all the accomplishments of the Kennedy years, perhaps nothing won quite as much universal approval as the Peace Corps.

Abroad, its success has been astonishing. In virtually every country where Peace Corps volunteers have worked, the cry has been the same: Send us more volunteers.

Even in that much tougher testing field, the U.S. Congress, the Corps has come through unscathed. The House, which cut the rest of the foreign aid to ribbons, increased the Peace Corps authorization from the $63.7 million voted last year to $102 million. Even Representatives who had voted against the Corps in the past testified to its success.

As Sargent Shriver, the personable and dedicated Corps Director, said on a visit to Utah last August, the Peace Corps volunteer has become, in many countries, America's secret weapon against Communist aggression.

On the crest of this success, the Peace Corps has this week begun a recruiting drive on the basis of which the 5,923 volunteers now overseas may be doubled, in view of Congress' tender treatment of the fiscal 1964 budget.

Having been among the original boosters of such a program and having seen it in action in a number of countries, however, we feel constrained to raise a question: Is a change of emphasis, because of the drive to enlarge the Corps, actually endangering its success and its future?

The original volunteers were recruited purely on the basis of an opportunity to serve their fellow men. Within months after President Kennedy had uttered that ringing challenge, "Ask what you can do for your country," young Americans all across the Nation were replying by offering themselves to the Peace Corps. It was a tremendous manifestation of the humanity and selflessness that underlie our Nation.

The result was that the early projects, which have been ending just in the past few months, were staffed by the highest type of dedicated individuals, and this quality has been reflected in the universal respect the Corps has enjoyed.

But there has been a subtle shift in recruiting emphasis. Today the approach is more along the lines that service in the Peace Corps offers opportunities for service, yes, but also to live among foreign peoples, to broaden horizons, to see the world.

These are not bad goals, of course. But in this shift—from what Peace Corps service will do for others to what it will do for oneself—is there danger that a different kind of person is entering the Corps?

This question needs to be considered in the context of disturbing reports that moral standards are not always kept as high as they might be. If word gets around that Peace Corps service is a way to break free from conventional shackles, to live it up for a couple of years, the results could be disastrous.

We make no claim that this point has been or is about to be reached. But the danger is obvious.

To preserve the Peace Corps as the marvelously selfless, dedicated instrument it started out to be will require the most painstaking attention to guard against these problems.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in yesterday's New York Times magazine the respected historian from Columbia University, Dr. Richard B. Morris, presented a concise, yet comprehensive, history of the complicated problems surrounding our laws on Presidential succession. Dr. Morris began his article by asking if the present arrangement is what we want, and whether or not it meets the contingencies of the age in which we live. His answer to these questions was a rather decisive no.

The aim of Dr. Morris' article was primarily to evaluate the problems surrounding our succession laws rather than to propose solutions; but he did suggest the importance of insuring a certain amount of continuity in policy by permitting the President to participate in the choice of his own successor. I fully concur in this opinion, and continuity is one of the primary ends of the constitutional amendment which I have proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 139.

Dr. Morris pointed out in his article that the United States has been without a Vice President 15 times. Fortunately, we have never been forced to press another officer of the Government into service as President. We have, however, on all these occasions, been without the services of the Vice President and in danger of being forced to rely on some other official in the event of a double tragedy. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Morris' article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

I would also like to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point articles by the leading scholar on the problems of the Presidency, Richard Neustadt, and the respected columnist of the New York Times, Arthur Krock.

Mr. Krock, I believe, put his finger on the key to the problem when he pointed out that "no solutions can be perfect but must be devised," and that "the first step indicated is the submission of a constitutional amendment." The essential components of such an amendment as outlined by Mr. Krock—sections dealing with the related problems of disability and replacing the Vice President—are contained in my amendment.

Dr. Neustadt too is concerned with the problem of disability, and while his solution and mine are not the same, I think his remarks contain many valuable insights and I commend them to my colleagues. Dr. Neustadt and I are in agreement on the questions of replacing the Vice President and changing the line of succession. While I think the Congress should be given a veto over a new President's choice, it seems only logical to me that the President be allowed to participate in the choice of his own successor. Dr. Neustadt's thoughtful remarks on this question deserves careful study.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 15, 1963]

THE MUDDLED PROBLEM OF THE SUCCESSION—AFTER A VICE PRESIDENT BECOMES PRESIDENT, QUESTIONS REMAIN ABOUT THE NEXT IN LINE

(By Richard B. Morris)

(Richard B. Morris is Gouverneur Morris, professor of history at Columbia University.)

The problem of the presidential succession, brought home to us by the tragic death of President Kennedy, raises questions as complicated as they are grave. Dissatisfaction with the present system is widespread and mounting daily.

We have an obligation to ask ourselves: Is the present arrangement what we want and does it meet the contingencies of the age in which we live?

It is fair to say at the start that the Nation's confidence in the ability of the new President to carry on the policies and programs of his predecessor is more a tribute to Lyndon Johnson himself than to the provisions for succession embodied in the Constitution and the laws of Congress. The Founding Fathers did not and indeed could hardly be expected to anticipate all the problems of presidential succession that have been raised since the establishment of the National Government.

The Constitution provided that the Vice President would be the person receiving the second highest number of electoral votes. The draftsmen of the Constitution, who did not foresee the rise of the two-party system, felt that this provision would insure the succession falling to men of outstanding ability. The first presidential elections bore them out. John Adams was Vice President under Washington, Thomas Jefferson under Adams. Both men were elected to the Presidency in their own right.

The election of 1800 forced a reexamination of the methods of electing the Vice President. Jefferson and Burr each received 73 votes; Adams only 65. The election was thrown into the House of Representatives, dominated by the Federalist Party opposed to Jefferson; and Burr, although clearly not the people's choice, came within a hair's breadth of being elected President. As a result the 12th amendment was adopted which provided for separate balloting for President and Vice President. This amendment stripped the Vice Presidency of much of its glamour, and since then it has been difficult to entice first-rate men to run for that office.

Nevertheless, most Vice Presidents have risen to the challenge when the Presidency has been thrust upon them. Others have not been able to command the measure of support their predecessors did from Congress and party leaders. In such cases we have had an orderly succession but a sharp break in continuity of policy.

The first test of the Vice Presidential succession occurred in 1841. William Henry Harrison, who had swept into office in a colorful "Log Cabin and Hard Cider" campaign, died of pneumonia precisely 1 month after taking office. John Tyler, the Vice President who succeeded him, was of a different faction and had been pointedly ignored by the President in all policy decisions.

At sunrise on the morning of April 5, Tyler was awakened in Williamsburg by a pounding on his door to learn that the President had died the previous day. He acted promptly and with energy. Leaving at once for the Capital, he found that city swirling with confusion. The following day he took the oath of office in Brown's Hotel, and quickly made it clear that he regarded himself as President, not as Acting President. Tyler soon found himself at loggerheads with the Whig leaders and deserted by most of Harrison's Cabinet. Since Tyler was in fact opposed to the basic program for which the Whigs stood, his administration was one of infuriating frustration.

The succession of Millard Fillmore to the Presidency upon the sudden death of old Zachary Taylor in 1850 had momentous consequences. The Nation was now sharply divided over slavery. Taylor had made it clear that he opposed any yielding to the South. Fillmore, on the other hand, advocated a moderate course and initiated steps which led to the passage of the Compromise of 1850, a measure which temporarily settled outstanding differences between the slave and free States. For his efforts Fillmore was repudiated by the more extreme antislavery group within his party.

Tragic cleavages within the Government and the Nation appeared quickly following the assassination of President Lincoln in Ford's Theater. As President, Andrew Johnson faced problems far beyond his limited capacity, perhaps beyond that of any statesman of the time. The wounds of war had to be healed; the South had to be brought back into the Union; the rights of the Negro had to be guaranteed. Lincoln's assassination, coming as it did hard upon the Confederacy's collapse, inspired not only universal grief but vindictive rage. In such an atmosphere Lincoln's conciliatory program, which in essence Johnson sponsored, had little chance of success. The radicals in Congress blocked Johnson at every turn, passed law after law over his veto, and almost succeeded in removing him by impeachment.

When Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office upon the death of President McKinley 8 days after he had been shot by the anarchist Leon Czolgosz, it was widely anticipated that there would be a change in tone if not in policy. "T.R.", who was far less timid than his predecessor and much more deeply committed to reform, inaugurated a "square deal" which changed the entire character and program of the administration.

Even when the Nation has not enjoyed continuity of policy after the death of a President in office, it has always witnessed an orderly transition. But is this enough?

Although most people know that eight Presidents have died in office, few remember that seven Vice Presidents have not lived out their terms, and that one, John C. Calhoun, resigned to run for the Senate. Thus the succession beyond the Vice Presidency is a contingency that the American people must be prepared to face.

The possibility that disaster might strike down a cluster of chief officers of state was dramatically brought home to the Nation on at least two occasions. In 1844, while the Presidential party was aboard the warship *Princeton* a gun exploded, killing the Secretary of State, Abel P. Upshur, and the Navy Secretary, Thomas W. Gilmer, and injuring numerous others. President Tyler escaped by the narrowest of margins.

The assassination of Lincoln was part of a plot against other officers of the Government. Secretary of State Seward also was shot but recovered. Today the potentialities of nuclear warfare should prepare us for the possibility of a disaster of large proportions.

How have we prepared ourselves for that contingency? The present law of presidential succession was enacted in 1947 at the behest of President Truman. Under the previous law, on the statute books since 1886, President Truman's successors would have been the Cabinet officers in order of historic rank beginning with the Secretary of State. President Truman was disturbed by the possibility that a Vice President succeeding to the Presidency on the death of the incumbent might wish to replace the Secretary of State in order to name his own successor. He therefore proposed that the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate be placed ahead of the Cabinet officers in the line of Presidential succession.

The act of 1947 passed the House and Senate with only brief debate. At that time Representative Kefauver and Senator Alexander Smith proposed a full-scale investigation of the question of the Presidential succession. Congress was content with a piecemeal law.

Truman's rationale was that Congress was a nationally elected body and the Cabinet an appointive one, and that, of the two Houses, the House of Representatives was more reflective of the national will than the Senate since the entire House, but only one-third of the Senate, is elected every 2 years. In other words, as he and other advocates of the bill saw it, the Speaker more than anyone else had a mandate from the whole people.

Ironically, the midterm congressional elections badly blunted the force of President Truman's argument. When the new law was enacted, the Republicans were in control of both Houses. Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN, an implacable foe of New and Fair Deal programs, was now next in line of succession. Did that reflect the popular will about succession? Certainly not, judging from Truman's victory when he ran for the Presidency in 1948.

In 1947 many people wondered whether Speaker MARTIN was better fitted to succeed to the Presidency than George C. Marshall, Truman's Secretary of State. Questions were raised at that time whether any Member of Congress may be said to have a national mandate, whether in fact he is not elected by a particular district, and is selected for the Speakership because of talents quite different from those demanded of a President. In 1947 there were many who doubted that the Speaker is over the long run as likely as the Secretary of State to fill the office of President with distinction. In 1963 these doubts will not down.

The new turn of events underscores the fact that the present law of presidential succession is something less than ideal to meet the contingency for which it was designed. The present Speaker, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, will be 72 on December 21. Next in line of succession is CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate, now in his 87th year. Without questioning the fitness of either gentleman as legislators, one can make out a strong case that neither possesses the administrative experience nor has demonstrated the very special combination of talents and resources demanded of the Presidency in these critical times. In short, neither fits the popular image of a President.

History hardly supports the case for the Speaker as successor. Granted we have had some distinguished Speakers. Granted that a Henry Clay, a Thomas Reed, or a Sam Rayburn would have graced the White House. Nevertheless, the list of the incumbents of that office from Frederick Muhlenberg of Pennsylvania in 1789 to JOHN MCCORMACK of Massachusetts in 1963, has numbered far more mediocrities than statesmen of exceptional gifts.

Without making invidious comparisons among present-day political figures, we have a right to ask whether Speaker Nathaniel Macon of North Carolina was as well qualified to assume the Presidency as Secretary of States James Madison, or Philip P. Barbour of Virginia as John Quincy Adams, or Speaker John White of Kentucky as Daniel Webster.

Would the American people have preferred the foul-mouthed and uncouth Speaker Joe Cannon to Secretaries of State John Hay or Elihu Root, men preeminently fitted by temperament and intellect to wear the mantle of Chief Executive? If the issue had been put to the people, could they conceivably have preferred Speaker Frederick H. Gillett to Charles Evans Hughes?

In the early days of the Republic the Nation wanted a President who, as Alexander Hamilton felicitously put it, could "think continentally." Today we require the man with broad experience in international as well as domestic affairs, the man who can take the world view of American problems. On balance, it is fair to say that a Secretary of State is more likely to have that outlook than a Speaker. If vigor and initiative are qualities that the country admires in its Presidents, are we likely to seek them out in a legislative body so structured by its seniority and procedural rules that it seems to be engaged in a perpetual slowdown?

Numerous other arguments have been raised against having the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate in the direct line of presidential succession. The former serves for a 2-year term and could conceivably succeed to the Presidency and serve out a presidential term of considerably greater length than the one for which he was elected. Should the Speaker be of the opposing party, his succession might well mean an overturn of policies as well as heads of departments. All down the line there could be paralysis in the executive branch of the Government.

This is no unlikely contingency. There have been six occasions within the present century when the control of Congress was in the hands of the opposition party, most recently during the administration of President Eisenhower. It is also conceivable that the Nation could be left without any person to act as President should the presidential vacancy occur before Congress had been organized or had a quorum and a Speaker and President pro tempore had been elected.

Insistently grave doubts have been raised about the constitutionality of either the Speaker or the President pro tempore of the Senate succeeding to the Presidency. Article II, section 1, of the Constitution empowers Congress, in the event of the death or inability of the President or Vice President to perform the duties of the Presidency, to declare "what officer" shall then act as President. James Madison, the chief architect of the Constitution, questioned whether either the Speaker or the President pro tempore were "officers" in the "constitutional sense."

The Supreme Court has never removed these doubts. A long line of cases holds that the term "officer" of the United States is confined to one holding a commission from either the executive department or the judiciary.

One objection to the Speaker or President pro tempore succeeding to the Presidency springs from the idea that such succession violates the principle of separation of powers imbedded in our Constitution. As a Senator the President pro tempore might conceivably be involved in impeachment proceedings initiated against a President. This could prove a tasteless business.

Many people thought just that when President pro tempore Benjamin Wade, a remorseful foe of Andrew Johnson, cast his vote for the President's impeachment despite the fact that he was an interested party and under the existing law of succession next in line for the Presidency. Wade was so confident of success that he even picked his Cabinet before the impeachment trial was concluded.

No one is completely satisfied with the present law, nor is there agreement on what should be written in its place. Strong arguments have been presented by former President Eisenhower, among others, for returning to the plan on the books before 1947, providing for succession by Cabinet officers, beginning with the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Defense, and Attorney General in that order. It has also been proposed that members of the Supreme Court, beginning with the Chief Justice, be placed in the line of succession, and that even persons in the military service be made eligible for succession.

Proposals have frequently been made for holding a special election to fill out the term of the Presidency if more than 4 months of the presidential term remains unfilled on the death of the Vice President. The Succession Act of 1792 contemplated having the President pro tempore of the Senate or the Speaker merely act as President until the electoral college chose a successor. There are pitfalls there, too. When such a vacancy arises it is actuarily certain that a number of the members of the electoral college will themselves have passed away. While the legislatures of 50 States vote to fill these vacancies in the college, an appreciable amount of time could well elapse.

To supersede the old electoral college by a new one would involve a national popular election, with all of the frenzied uncertainty that such an eventuality would be bound to create. In the meantime the person acting as President would possess little force or authority. It has also been proposed that the Constitution be amended to provide for the election of two Vice Presidents. One can hardly anticipate a stampede by men of national stature to declare their candidacy for the second Vice Presidency. It has been proposed that the next in line of succession be elected by the House or the Senate, or that we distinguish between the powers and duties of an elected Vice President succeeding to the Presidency and those of any other individual executing the office of the Presidency.

The entire problem demands reexamination and justifies the appointment of a commission with power to bring in recommendations. To relieve both the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate of embarrassment, it would perhaps be best for the President rather than Congress to appoint such a commission. Its membership might properly include persons from all three branches of the Government—from the executive department, the Supreme Court, and Congress—along with disinterested citizens who do not hold governmental posts.

A commission of inquiry into the presidential succession rates the very highest priority. The Nation requires procedure guaranteeing the orderly continuity of government, one untainted by ambiguities and constitutional doubts. The Nation requires a succession law that will give reasonable assurance that the post of Chief Executive will always be filled by men of broad experience and sound judgment and who enjoy the confidence of the country. The Nation requires a system of succession that anticipates national emergencies in the same way that our Military Establishment already does.

We should act now. Perhaps time is running out.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 8, 1963]

Succession Problem: The Death of Kennedy Again Points Up the Need To Devise Solution

(By Arthur Krock)

Washington, December 7.—Even since the formation of this Republic the American people have been in a bind created by the failure of the Constitution to provide definite solutions of the problems generated when Presidents are disabled, or die at a time when is no Vice President to succeed them. But the dreadful event at Dallas, Tex., on November 22 has alerted Congress and the people to the problems as never before. And this has stimulated the first real show of determination in many years to legislate practical solutions.

These solutions cannot be perfect because of the separation of powers among the three branches of the Federal Government that is the heart of the constitutional system. And this is the principal reason why previous undertakings have ended in inadequate compromise or total abandonment. But the unusual urgency of the current situation appears to be bringing general persuasion that the impossibility of perfection must no longer be allowed to blockade the path to at least feasible solutions of the basic unsolved problems.

NO HISTORICAL PARALLEL

The special urgency arises from a combination of facts without historical parallel. That there is no Vice President, thereby eliminating the only Presidential successor provided for in the Constitution, is a situation which has occurred seven times without breaking the continuity of Government under a nationally elected citizen. But in none of these seven periods has the Vice President (whom the death of the President made the Chief Executive) been previously incapacitated by a massive heart attack or a comparably serious illness. In none of these periods had the statutory successor already passed the age of 70 when he became next in line.

The monumental tragedy of the assassination of President Kennedy at the age of 46 exposed this unprecedented combination of risks that come in singles for elective government in normal circumstances. But their origin is in the Constitution, and in the long abdication of Congress of an exigent duty. This is to supply definitions, however imperfect, of the generalities in the Constitution that:

(1) Devolve upon the Vice President the "powers and duties" of the President in a time of the President's "inability," but provide no means by which his "inability" is to be determined or by whom.

(2) Restore these "powers and duties" to the President when the "disability" has been "removed" (if that occurs during the term to which he was elected), but make no stipulation how this "removal" shall be ascertained, and by whom proclaimed.

The lack of a definition in the first instance has left the Nation prone to situations in which a President incapable of exercising his "powers and duties" continues to retain them because he physically or mentally cannot declare his "inability," or physically and mentally able to do so, refuses.

The lack of a definition in the second instance leaves the Nation open to a situation in which, having declared his "inability," a still-disabled President can at will resume the exercise of his "powers and duties."

Congress has grappled several times with the problem of the line of succession, now high in the public consciousness because of the current unusual combination of circumstances described above. The Constitution empowers it to do this by statute, except that Congress may not remove the Vice President from his place as first in the line.

But the fact that the Cabinet, beginning with the Secretary of State, and later the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate, were put by Congress at the head of the line, shows there is no perfect solution of this problem either.

There were times when the incumbent Secretary of State, during the period when he followed the Vice President, notably lacked the public confidence and political talent he would have required as the statutory successor to the Presidency. Also, while members of the Cabinet are subject to Senate approval, they are not the products of popular suffrage. Hence Congress and the public strongly supported President Truman when he induced Congress to change the line of succession so that citizens whom voters put into office—specifically, the Speaker and the Senate President pro tempore—were given precedence over the Cabinet.

PERSONALITY A FACTOR

The concept of continuous responsibility was broken by the timing of the change, because when it became law (July 18, 1947) the beneficiaries were Republicans: First Speaker Martin, and then apparently, Senator Vandenberg, the Senate President pro tempore. ("Apparently" is used above, because it is now argued that, since there must always be a Speaker, a Senate President pro tempore can never succeed to a Presidential vacancy).

Now personalities, not the issue of continuous party responsibility, are a factor in the proposal that the law be changed once more, to replace the Cabinet first in line. But part of the reason for this is that Speaker John McCormack is 71 and the Senate President pro tempore, Carl Hayden, is in his upper eighties.

If the signs mature that Congress will soon grasp the nettle of the double problem, finally accepting that no solutions can be perfect but must be devised, the first step indicated is the submission of a constitutional amendment. This, subject to ratification by three-fourths of the States, will empower Congress to supply the missing definitions dealing with the determinations of Presidential "inability" and its ending.

OPINION BY EXPERTS

Some eminent lawyers and political scientists long have argued that the Constitution envisages that the Vice President, when there is one, shall make the determination of Presidential "inability" when the President is in this state and cannot or will not so declare. They also favor the creation of a commission to advise him, composed of competent medical authorities, congressional leaders and others, excluding, however, the Supreme Court. But there is general agreement among them that only the disabled President can constitutionally declare the termination of his "inability," with impeachment the sole recourse if he abuses this power.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 13, 1963]

Who Succeeds: President's Choice Urged

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

"The most sensible proposal I have seen for changing the Presidential Succession Act," says Political Scientist Richard E. Neustadt of Columbia University, "is to give the President, when he has no Vice President, the freedom to designate his successor."

Professor Neustadt is particularly opposed to the Speaker of the House being in the line of succession.

He feels that the problem of temporary presidential disability, however, already is being resolved in the most satisfactory way possible, through custom and what amounts, in time, to "a common law basis."

He sees real dangers in determining presidential disability or return from disability through means provided by legislation.

Affirming his support of arrangements initiated by the President on what should happen in case of disability, Professor Neustadt says: "There is no way to legislate oneself out of unpredictable contingencies."

Dr. Neustadt served from 1949 to 1953 on President Truman's White House staff, as special adviser to the President on a variety of policy and administrative problems. He also served as an adviser to Senator John F. Kennedy during the 1960 election campaign and during the period between the election and his inauguration. He drew upon his political experience for his book, "Presidential Power," which deals with the political skills needed for effective presidential leadership.

Dr. Neustadt says that "one has to distinguish very sharply between the problems of succession and disability—they are quite different problems."

"Regarding the first problem," he says, "there is considerable evidence to suggest a change in trend in national convention action. We don't have enough experience to know whether common law on these matters is firm, but if you look at the action of nominating conventions since the shock of Roosevelt's death and Eisenhower's illness, you certainly find that recent tickets have been perceptibly different from those of Wilson and Marshall.

ACT OF 1886 PREFERRED TO 1947

"Marshall felt himself totally incapable of taking over as President. The year 1960 produced in the vice presidential nominees of both parties men with claims of their own on the presidential nomination. Going back to 1952 * * * whatever you may think of Nixon and SPARKMAN, they were men of considerable capacity and experience.

"One can look forward with some confidence that in 1964 and 1968 the President nominated will have to think of the look of the running mate as a possible successor—as well as having to think of ticket balancing. This happened in 1960. And the assassination in 1963 should help this trend along," he continued.

Turning to the problem posed by the current succession system, and where no Vice President is available, Dr. Neustadt said:

"In my own opinion, the 1886 act was better than the one of 1947. The act called for succession by the Cabinet in order of rank, I feel it was better because it assured that the President had chosen his successor and that there would be some continuity of intention and administration.

"In pushing the 1947 law, Truman said he didn't feel it was democratic if he picked the man who might be his successor. This was a very senatorial point of view—and wrong, in my opinion. It was a view of Truman's first days, and not a very wise one.

"After all, the customs of the convention system permit the nominee to choose his running mate, and this makes great sense. Since Roosevelt had chosen Truman, I don't see why Truman felt inhibited about choosing his successor. But he did," Dr. Neustadt said.

DOUBLE ELECTION

"The Speaker was substituted on the theory that his was an elective office and that it was more democratic to have a successor be an elected than an appointed official. But the Speaker holds his place through a double election, neither electorate remotely resembling the Presidency's electorate.

"As a senior Member of the House and therefore from a relatively safe constituency * * * in his constituency, geographically and otherwise, he is completely remote from the Presidency. Nor does the majority party caucus that elevates him to the Speakership have a relationship to the Presidency.

"Furthermore, the Speaker," said Dr. Neustadt, "as active leader of the party in the House, has an active legislative job to do while he is acting in the place of the Vice President. Therefore, he is very poorly placed to get even the spectator training that Nixon and Johnson got.

TRAINING QUESTIONED

"Also, the legislative way of life is not very useful—sometimes very disadvantageous training—for the Presidential office. Nixon and Johnson at least went through a halfway house of spectatorship in the move from the Senate to the Presidency."

How about President Kennedy, who had moved to the Presidency from the Senate?

"For a legislator," says Dr. Newstadt, "moving directly into the Presidency—as Kennedy did—there is bound to be a great, often difficult leaving and adaptive process.

"In the case of a Kennedy, this was tempered by the fact that from Congress he actively and persistently sought the Presidency and to some extent must have been thinking himself into executive office while he held legislative office.

DIFFERENT SITUATIONS

"But no modern day Speaker has sought to be anything else and no active Speaker is free to understand or even hunger for the Presidency while functioning as a Speaker. Psychologically, the young Presidential aspirant in the Senate and the older Speaker at the top of his profession are very different situations."

What of the problem posed by disability?

"This," said Dr. Neustadt, "is the most interesting problem, perhaps. I personally am offended by the unreality of the whole discussion—those who want everything to be 'tidy,' those who feel they can't leave to the commonsense of a responsible people the determination of what to do about what, at the time, becomes an unprecedented situation.

"Actually, commonsense has already taken us a long way toward resolving potential disability problems, and a common law is developing on this subject. There was the agreement voluntarily entered into between Eisenhower and Nixon, and Kennedy and Johnson, and now there is one between Johnson and McCormack.

COMMON LAW

"If these agreements are reached once or twice more, it will become a common law, a fixed point of view and custom.

"This is much to be preferred to any statutory formulation because it means the Vice President receives his duty to determine the disability of the President as a matter of personal arrangement between them—not as a matter of right vested independently in his constitutional office."

Dr. Neustadt continued: "There are two great matters at stake here. First, a Vice President cannot be removed from his position at the President's pleasure. If you give this man, in an independent capacity, certain powers over the President—you give him potentially a weapon to use against the President.

BETTER SOLUTION

"Much the same thing is true if you would give the power to declare disability to the Cabinet or a special commission. No President should have to come into office knowing that in other people's hands—despite his own preference—lies the power to declare him disabled and out of office, even temporarily.

"For him to delegate the power, by informal agreement, after he is in office, is better than for it to be imposed on him by law.

"There have been moments in our history when Vice Presidents or Cabinet members would have been sorely tempted to threaten a President with the use of such a power. One could, for example, conceive of a mixed commission—made up of Cabinet officers, legislative members, and Supreme Court Justices—which would have been moved to threaten Lincoln—to say nothing of the first Johnson—had this disability power been independently vested in them.

BARGAINING WEAPON

"I am not suggesting," said Dr. Neustadt, "the literal problem of a conspiracy. What I am suggesting is that the mere holding of such power becomes a bargaining weapon in the background, between the President and those who hold this vested power.

"It would introduce another unstable element in the relations of the President and other chief members of the Government. Why do it?"

Dr. Neustadt went on: "There is a second aspect of this problem: When is the President's disability over? The agreements, say that of Eisenhower, provided that the President himself is the sole judge of this. As I see it, there is no way out of this kind of approach. If the President can't decide this, he can't do anything. There is no way out of this other than saying a man who is disabled is out for good.

CAPACITY DENIED

"In denying the President the right to determine his own recovery, you deny him all capacity to exercise office. What is more essential than the right to decide when he is ready to go back to work? If you can't trust him with this decision, you can't trust him with anything and you had better then take the position that once a President is disabled, he is removed for good.

"There is no way," said Dr. Neustadt, "to legislate oneself out of unpredictable contingencies. These contingencies are dangerous only if the President or the Vice President or whoever else is involved is irresponsible. There is no way by legislation to protect oneself against irresponsible officials."

"On the other hand, there is no reason to be concerned—because in our whole history we have scarcely any examples or irresponsible conduct by Presidents—nor do our conventions put up presidential candidates on the lunatic fringes of our parties.

"OTHER DISADVANTAGES?

"Mr. Wilson's certainly was not a case of irresponsibility. He may have never fully recovered from his stroke. But there is no reason to assume the country would have been better off if he had resigned the Presidency. Could Marshall have done better? It was not irresponsible of Wilson to feel he could go on. It was not irresponsible for him to feel the Presidential job could be better performed if he remained on—than if he stepped down.

"We cheerfully entrust Presidents with human judgments that have life and death consequences for the whole society. We do this as a matter of course. Are we to say we are to refuse this same man the right to decide when he is well enough to function?"

Are there any other disadvantages to legislation, as you see it?

RISKS RUN

"Yes," said Dr. Neustadt, "whenever one tries to legislate for future contingencies to make future improvements on past difficulties, one runs the risks of wayward side effects which have not been foreseen and which confront us with new difficulties that may be larger than those we sought to correct.

"For example, in 1934 we cut down the interval between election and inaugural and abolished the lameduck Congress—to avoid transition difficulties like those between Hoover and Roosevelt.

"In the process we created new difficulties of a different sort experienced by Eisenhower and Kennedy in turn. The difficulties of a very abbreviated transition interval brought the new man to office half prepared at a time when Congress was in regular session. If Lincoln had had to take office in such circumstances he would have faced incredible problems and might not have been able to oppose secession effectively. With Congress out of session until he chose to call it, Lincoln was able to organize Federal resistance to Southern secession.

"This illustrates the unintended side effects of curing old difficulties by statute. What I have called common law—custom development resting on the ingenuity and responsibility of the people at the time: [as this] gets built into the practice of succession it is much to be preferred [over legislation]."

Here Dr. Neustadt was asked whether—wholly apart from the problem of disability—he envisioned any changes in the succession act. "No," he said. "It is unlikely—so long as the present Speaker has indicated his own willingness to serve and his own agreement with the principles on which the present succession law are based."

DESIRABLE OFFICE

Referring to Dr. Neustadt's stated preference for a law that would, under present circumstances, allow the President to select his own successor, the reporter asked: "How could we be assured that this would be a good choice? Said Dr. Neustadt: "A Vice President taking office after a death would be bound to be careful of his choice of his successor. He certainly would be watched very closely, in view of what has happened."

Elaborating on his point about the growing importance of the Vice Presidency, Dr. Neustadt said: "Nixon's precedent made the Vice President more attractive. I am not talking about illness or death. * * * I am talking about opportunity. * * * He was the first Vice President who did get a crack at the Presidency from the Vice Presidency. The office used to lead nowhere. Now it is a more desirable office. This adds to the other elements I have mentioned in the trend to better men being chosen for the second spot on the ticket."

MILITARY AID TO DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, January 1, 1959, Castro took over in Cuba; what will happen by January 1, 1964?

Will we see a second Soviet bloc become a reality in the Western Hemisphere because of our blindness to the present situation in the Dominican Republic?

The ultimate aims of the junta are free elections. Are these not preferable to another Castro regime?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the column "Dominicans Ask U.S. Aid," by Hal Hendrix, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUERRILLA FORCES MAY TOTAL 1,000—DOMINICANS ASK U.S. AID

(By Hal Hendrix)

MIAMI, December 12.—The provisional Government of the Dominican Republic has informally asked U.S. military aid to help crush an outbreak of guerrilla warfare.

Extent and type of equipment requested is undisclosed. It is believed, however, that helicopters and modern jungle warfare weapons are included.

An informal approach was necessary since the United States has not recognized the civilian triumvirate which has governed since the September 25 military coup that toppled the leftist regime of President Juan Bosch.

FLAREUP FEARED

The request reflects the concern of Dominican officials that the guerrilla "brush fires" might get beyond control.

A Western diplomat in Santa Domingo said relatively few persons outside Dominican officialdom were taking the guerrilla problem seriously.

"But if this is not eradicated quickly it could easily become a very nasty situation." the envoy remarked.

"This country is too close to Communist Cuba to allow conditions similar to those in Venezuela to develop—or to have another Castro-type mountain war get a foothold.

(Venezuela has been harassed by guerrilla-terrorist activities of the pro-Castro armed forces of National Liberation (FALN).)

ANTI-UNITED STATES

The guerrilla uprisings in the Dominican Republic, which erupted 11 days ago on several scattered fronts, are led by the anti-American and pro-Castro June 14 movement.

Its leaders have called for establishment of a "second Socialist republic in the Americas."

Dominican officials originally estimated guerrilla strength at 250 men.

One high-ranking Government officer said, however, the number "could be as high as 1,000."

CUBAN ARMS?

Dominican officials say there is no hard evidence that Castro's regime is shipping arms to the rebels, but small amounts of weapons and propaganda seized with captured guerrillas indicate some had their origin in Cuba.

It is also believed in Santo Domingo that the rebel forces have radio contact with communist guerrilla strategists in Havana.

Often reports of guerrilla activities are heard on the Communist Cuban broadcasts before they are general knowledge in the country.

DAMAGING MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the imports of livestock and meat products during the past several years have had a depressing effect on prices received by our own American producers. For some months I have been urging on the floor of the Senate and in letters to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State that the necessary action be taken to curtail these imports.

Last week the U.S. Tariff Commission held hearings on this most important problem affecting the livestock and meat industry and the economy of this important segment of American agriculture. I presented to the Chairman of the Tariff Commission a statement setting forth my views on this problem and expressing to the Commission the hope that swift and necessary action would be taken to bring the needed protection to this economically beleaguered industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement to the U.S. Tariff Commission be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 11, 1963.

Mr. BEN D. DORFMAN,
Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the past week many spokesmen from throughout the country have appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission and Members of the U.S. Congress have also presented a plea to your organization to utilize the machinery at your disposal to prevent the increasing flow of livestock and/or meat products into this country which are having such a depressing effect on the prices received by American livestock producers.

I could implement with figures of my own the numbers of heads of livestock which are imported into this country each year and also the numbers of pounds of meat products which are brought into the country in competition with our processed meat. I could, like so many others have done, point out that approximately 10 percent or more of our meat products are imported each year and that this percentage is continuing to rise with each passing month. However, I know that all of these facts and figures are available to you through your own technicians or have been made available for your information through the testimony presented during the past week.

There is one point which I would like to make, however, and that is during the debate on the so-called Trade Expansion Act of 1962 there were many assurances made by Members of Congress who participated in the debate on the legislation which led to approval of the act that machinery did exist for protecting the economy of our American industries and that this machinery would be used to protect our American industry and American jobs.

For instance, on September 19, 1962, then Senator Carroll, of Colorado, in a speech on the floor of the Senate stated, "I have consulted with officials in the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce in my efforts to insure that the bill before us contains adequate safeguards for the legitimate interest of the American livestock industry. I am assured that the bill does contain such safeguards and I look for their proper implementation to carry out the intent of Congress." These remarks can be found on page 19863 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 19, 1962.

To further supplement this point that the machinery exists to protect our American livestock industry may I point out that Senator HARRY F. BYRD, the eminent chairman of the Senate Finance Committee which had jurisdiction over the legislation when it was in the Senate stated in remarks which can be found on page 19570 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 17, 1962, "The bill, as amended, gives very broad authority to the President to raise duties, impose quotas, or take other action when he finds it to be in the national interest. This would arm the President and the chief negotiator with wide powers to use trade restrictions when necessary or advisable to induce foreign countries to remove burdensome or unreasonable restrictions on our exports."

With this assurance from the chairman of the Finance Committee that the machinery exists I cannot urge too emphatically that those in the Executive or quasi-judicial segments of the executive branch of Government who are charged with the administration of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 now utilize this machinery to protect the American livestock industry from further financial depression.

Further, Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, a most important member of the Senate Finance Committee, who also represented the administration's desire to have this legislation approved, on page 19583 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 17 stated, "The bill before the Senate is not perfect. Few measures of such scope and importance meet fully the criteria established by any one person or organization. But I think it is a good bill. It was reported unanimously from the Finance Committee. It would provide to the President the essential authority needed to negotiate in behalf of American industry and agriculture and, in my opinion, it provides safeguards which will reasonably protect the vital interest of the Nation's security and the Nation's economic strength."

Thus, during the Senate debate, representations were emphatically made to U.S. Senators representing livestock-producing States by such pronouncements that the Trade Expansion Act did provide the machinery to protect our constituents from excessive imports which would depress the prices of any segment of the agriculture industry. Frankly, I have been dismayed that it has taken so many months for the appropriate agencies of government to even give consideration to the problem which has been confronting our livestock producers. The evidence has been pyramiding with each passing day of the depressing effect which the continuing imports of livestock and/or meats are having on prices received by our producers. A report was recently issued by the Department of Agriculture indicating that in the past year an average livestock feeder suffered a financial loss of $20 per head on each head of livestock which he had in feed lot during the past year.

This is not only a loss to the individual livestock feeder but to the Nation through loss of income tax. This loss affects our national economic growth. It affects the purchasing power of the feeder and thus the loss is not only to the individual livestock feeder but to many other people engaged in the production, processing, and sales of consumer products to these feeders. It has long been an economic axiom in agriculture that the agriculture dollar turns over seven times in our economy. Our projected economic growth rate must not be impeded in this vital segment of our agriculture industry because someone has been hesitant to use the machinery which Congress provided to protect the economy and fiscal stability of these producers of an agriculture product.

I, therefore, sincerely and emphatically urge that every consideration be given by the Tariff Commission to take whatever action is necessary to curtail these imports, thereby restoring confidence in the minds of Members of the Congress, who were assured that the machinery was available to safeguard our American industry, that this machinery will be expeditiously and effectively used for the purpose for which it was intended.

Time is of the essence for the economy of the livestock industry of America. Congress, in 1962, provided the tools—I now hope that the administrators of these tools will be swift and helpful so that 1964 will bring to this segment of agriculture the optimistic hope for a profitable year of operation unencumbered by competition from excessive imports or fear of depressing prices through no fault of their own.

With best wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

Karl E. Mundt.

DECLINE OF COTTON TEXTILES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the need for new and remedial cotton legislation has become a matter of survival for the cotton textile manufacturers. It is that clear cut.

In the past decade, hundreds of American mills have ceased operations. Textile jobs in the Nation have dropped from more than 1¼ million in 1947 to approximately 800,000 last year. My region, the Southeast, has been especially hard hit by the decline of the cotton market, which for the most part is the result of the ruinous two-price cotton system.

This week we learned of the impending closing down of still another mill, the Covington, Ga., plant of M. Lowenstein Corp. This mill had about 450 employees who soon will be without work. Covington is a small city of about 8,000, and, of course, this many persons lose their jobs in one fell swoop, it has a devastating effect on many lives and the local economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news story from the Wall Street Journal of December 12 concerning the closing of the mill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 12, 1963]

Lowenstein To Close Covington, Ga., Plant—Mill's Operations Will Be Merged With Aleo Manufacturing Unit; About 450 Workers Affected

New York.—M. Lowenstein Corp. has announced it will gradually close its Covington, Ga., textile mill beginning at once, eventually idling about 450 employes.

Everett C. Darke, president, said the plant's operations will be consolidated with its Aleo Manufacturing Co. mill in Rockingham, N.C. A spokesman for the company said the Covington mill hasn't been operating profitably recently.

Both the Aleo and Covington mills are engaged principally in the manufacture of blended fabrics and synthetics, and Mr. Darke said the consolidation will result in "improved operations and efficiencies." The Aleo mill was acquired in 1946 and has about 64,000 spindles; the Covington facility was acquired in 1955 and has about 30,000 spindles.

New equipment recently was installed in the Covington plant, and a Lowenstein spokesman indicated that this will be switched to the Aleo plant.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I am certain that the two-price cotton system contributed to the downfall of this mill. But this is only one of the miserable shortcomings of the present national cotton program.

If we are to help textile manufacturers put their products back on the domestic and world market at competitive prices; if we are to assist the cotton farmer by guaranteeing him a fair share of the national income; and if we are to give the taxpayer some relief from costly cotton subsidies which really benefit only a fraction of American growers, then we must have a new program from start to finish.

We cannot achieve these desired goals by legislation which is stopgap in nature and much more costly to the taxpayer.

Mr. President, I submit that the Talmadge-Humphrey bill, the Domestic Allotment Act, will accomplish these things and it is my hope that it can be substituted for the cotton bill recently passed by the other body.

It is my hope that we can give this country a lasting and totally effective solution to the cotton problem.

There appeared in the Savannah, Ga., Morning News on December 10 an editorial in support of the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill. It very forcefully points out its advantages over the other bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Talmadge Plan Is Better

The cotton legislation proposed by Georgia's Senator Herman Talmadge is a wiser, more far-reaching bill than that approved by the U.S. House of Representatives.

The House-okayed bill, which was sponsored by Representative Harold Cooley, of North Carolina, will make it easier for American cotton mills to compete with foreign industries. The measure sets up a triple-subsidy plan for obtaining this desirable result.

As matters stand, foreign industries can buy U.S. cotton cheaper than American mills can. Then, their expenses cut further by cheap labor, they ship U.S. cotton back to this country in the form of finished goods which are priced so low that U.S. manufacturers cannot compete in the same price range.

This means an eventual switch to synthetic fibers by those in the textile industry who do not cease operation altogether. It means a blow to the textile industry in the United States and to cotton growers. This country cannot afford to see an entire industry jeopardized with our employment problem what it is.

Representative Cooley's solution is to pay a subsidy to American mills for the purchase of U.S. cotton. This would enable them to buy at the same price paid by foreign mills. But it creates a third subsidy in addition to the two already existing: that given cotton producers in the form of parity payments and that paid by the Government in order to export surplus cotton at the low world price.

The advantage of the Cooley bill over no bill at all is obvious. It is at least an effort to deal with the problem which is hurting both the American cotton grower and the textile industry. As this bill goes to the Senate, however, we hope that legislative body will take a look at the Talmadge plan, which would pay farmers a subsidy on bale allotments and allow surplus production to be sold at the world price. The Talmadge plan would help the textile industry and would be less expensive for the taxpayer. It would take the Government out of the cotton surplus business and allow domestic growers to compete on the world market if they chose to do so.

Senator Talmadge's proposal is aimed more at permanent solutions than stopgap measures. It would probably save the country's taxpayers $8 billion in storage costs alone, he estimates.

Perhaps the Senate will realize that it must return to this problem if it does not seek a more lasting solution now. It should do so, and should consider the Talmadge bill or some of its provisions as a substitute for the bill passed by the House. It should pass some form of cotton legislation unless it wants to see an entire industry suffer.

THE PRESIDENT ON ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, those of us who have long urged economy in the Government are extremely pleased to see President Johnson moving toward a general tightening up of Federal expenditures.

On Wednesday, December 11, the President told his Cabinet to hold the line on employment in the various departments of the Government and to work toward economies in their proposed budgets.

In his splendid statement, the President said there was no justification for a continued increase in Federal employment and that he would not approve requests for personnel increases except where it was absolutely necessary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of the President to the Cabinet

In my memorandum of November 30, I asked each of you

"To press ahead vigorously with your program for manpower control and utilization which you developed in response to President Kennedy's directive of October 11, 1962.

To hold agency employment at or below the personnel targets established in response to President Kennedy's statement to the Cabinet of September 23, 1963."

You and I know we can hold the line on employment without causing real damage.

I am depending on you personally to deal with this problem.

Nine out of ten Government employees do a full day's work for a day's pay—but I want that 10th man to measure up also.

We need to cut out excessive paperwork because it breeds overstaffing; measure workloads carefully; and strip down overly elaborate organizations.

In short, I want you to give as much attention to management as you do to your programs.

For fiscal year 1965, the Budget Director must have your full support in carrying out my directive to hold down Government employment. The 1965 budget total for year-end civilian employment must be held below the levels in the 1964 and 1963 budgets. This can be done.

Your budgets should reflect economies from better management and higher productivity resulting from improved methods, procedures, organization, and employee incentive. A good manager can do all of this.

I intend to disapprove any budget request for more personnel except where the facts leave me no choice.

This means that I will grant increases only when they are absolutely necessary to meet fixed commitments; to properly carry out new legislation, and to do work of the highest national priority.

Federal employment has, by your efforts, been held well below the growth rate of our population and our economy.

Regular civilian employment grew only by 686 persons from October 31, 1962, to the same date in 1963.

If it had followed the trend of State and local government it would have risen by 106,000.

But these facts do not justify a continued upcreep in Federal employment.

They do not justify us in having 10,000, or 1,000, or even 100 more employees than we need.

HOOSIER POET WRITES EULOGY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it has been my good fortune to make the acquaintance of Arthur Franklin Mapes, a fellow Hoosier from Kendallville, and I value his friendship highly. He is well-known throughout Indiana for his poetry and is the author of our official State poem.

On the assassination of President Kennedy, Mr. Mapes was inspired to write a poem entitled "He Moved the World" which I believe to be one of the most touching tributes to our fallen leader which I have seen. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

He Moved the World

A constant flame, a gleam of light,
A flame eternal, burns tonight;
A flame that flickers, yet reveals
The glory of his great ideals.

His heart gave love, his words gave hope,
He furnished light for those who grope
In darkness yet, that they might find
A lasting peace for all mankind.

He moved the world with strength of truth.
He loved the aged and the youth.
He showed concern for those in need
Regardless of their race or creed.

With courage and sincerity
He struggled for equality,
From those who would his dreams reject
Came admiration and respect.

He smiled through sorrow, laughed at gloom,
He visioned yet a world in bloom,
When dreams of lust and hate were ended,
When man could live as God intended.

If every man would hoe his row
The weeds of hate could never grow;
The world would be a garden grand,
And peace would bloom in every land.

—Arthur Franklin Mapes.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1391, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO VENUE GENERALLY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. Robertson], and with the approval of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the bill, H.R. 2985.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 2985) to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to venue generally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. Beginning with line 6, page 1, it is proposed to strike out all to and including line 8, page 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(f) A civil action on a tort claim arising out of the manufacture, assembly, repair, ownership, maintenance, use, or operation of an automobile may be brought in the judicial district wherein the act or omission complained of occurred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the House patron of the bill, I wish to say that the amendment is agreeable to him. It is agreeable to me. The amendment is offered because of an objection voiced by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], who wished to have the venue limited to automobile cases. Otherwise, the tort action could have been general.

We were primarily interested in a situation such as would occur when a man from New York killed somebody in Virginia, so that the complainant would not have to go to New York to obtain a remedy.

The amendment is in line with the agreement. It will be necessary for the bill to go back to the House, so that the House may concur in the amendment.

The amendment would merely limit the proposal to automobile cases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 2985) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 758, H.R. 7406.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 7406) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

JOHN STEWART MURPHY—REMOVAL OF BILL FROM CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I note that Calendar No. 703, H.R. 5083, has been carried on the calendar several times, even though the measure has been recommitted to committee.

I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the calendar, Calendar No. 703, H.R. 5083, be omitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Rear Adm. Reynold D. Hogle, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PARTIAL REVISION OF RADIO REGULATIONS—AND ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL SIGNED AT EXTRAORDINARY ADMINISTRATIVE RADIO CONFERENCE—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President of the United States today transmitted to the Senate Executive S, 88th Congress, 1st session, the Partial Revision of Radio Regulations, Geneva, 1959, and the Additional Protocol signed at Geneva on November 8, 1963, by delegates of the United States of America and other countries represented at the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference held at Geneva October 7 through November 8, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the partial revision and additional protocol, and together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the texts of the Partial Revision of the Radio Regulations, Geneva, 1959, with annexes, and the Additional Protocol signed at Geneva on November 8, 1963, by delegates of the United States of America and other countries represented at the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference held at Geneva October 7 through November 8, 1963.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State in regard to the abovementioned instruments.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 16, 1963.*

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service. Since the names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

Robert J. Francis, of Tennessee, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eugene G. Hulett, of Oregon, to be a U.S. marshal for the district of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Clifton Edwards, Jr., of Michigan, to be a U.S. circuit judge, sixth circuit.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination will be passed over.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Carson A. Roberts, U.S. Marine Corps, to have the grade indicated on the retired list in the Marine Corps effective from the date of his retirement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—NOMINATION OF GEORGE CLIFTON EDWARDS, JR., OF MICHIGAN, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, still in executive session, I now move that the Senate proceed to consider the nomination of George Clifton Edwards, Jr., of Michigan, Calendar No. 1835, message No. 257.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Clifton Edwards, Jr., of Michigan, to be U.S. circuit judge, sixth circuit.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am happy to have the privilege of making a few remarks endorsing George C. Edwards, the nominee for this high appointment.

I want to say, by way of preliminary remarks, that the nominee has been cleared by the FBI, approved by the Department of Justice, approved by the State bar of his home State of Michigan, as well as the bar of his own city of Detroit, and by the American Bar Association. The nomination was presented by President Kennedy, with endorsement of my colleague, Senator HART, and myself.

Hearings were held by the Judiciary Committee and the committee reported the nomination favorably. Mr. Edwards has performed honorably for many years in various public offices in the State of Michigan, beginning in the city of Detroit. He was of distinct service to his city as president of the common council, following service in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II from which he was honorably discharged. After leaving the service he attended law school and ultimately was admitted to the bar. He served in the judiciary from the lowest court of the State through the highest, the Supreme Court of Michigan. He is a very fine citizen of Michigan and a very fine family man.

His reputation is attested to by clergymen and members of both political parties in our State, all the way from the Governor on down. I know George Edwards will continue his fine career of public service if the nomination is approved, which I hope it will be.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan gave the reason which impelled us, and I hope will impel the Senate, to act favorably on the nomination.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I must admit that I have spent many hours on questions which have been raised relating to the nominee. The more deeply these questions were developed, the stronger became my conviction that here, indeed, the Senate is offered, as a nominee for the high position on the appellate court, a man whose background is as full as that of any nominee who has been presented in the period of time that I have been a Member of the Senate.

I have not examined the records on all past nominations for such a high position, but I do not believe I would be going out on a very long limb if I suggested that he brings to the Senate for its judgment a record that is fuller than that of any other such nominee whose nomination has heretofore been considered by the Senate during the period of time that I have been a Member of it.

This man has served for years, first as a juvenile court judge, then as a trial judge of a county court of general jurisdiction, and subsequently as associate justice of the supreme court of our State.

This man has had both trial court experience and appellate experience.

His performance in the several roles has been more than satisfactory; indeed, it has been outstanding. That is indicated by the strong support which the people, first, of the county involved, and then of the State, gave him on those occasions—and there were several—when he went to the people, as judges in Michigan do for election or rejection.

I am delighted that the Committee on the Judiciary has reported his nomination favorably. I know that history's verdict of George C. Edwards as an appellate judge of the sixth circuit will reflect the same character and sheen that attaches to his already luminous record in other positions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is never easy to oppose a nomination to the Federal judiciary. I do so with some trepidation, perhaps, because on 10 or 11 different occasions I have submitted nominations to the U.S. district court bench and to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. All of them were confirmed by the Senate. I have often said that if I leave a monument at all, it will be in the character of the men whose names I have submitted for appointment to the judiciary. Had it not been for the Federal judiciary, I doubt very much whether the Constitution of the United States could have been made to operate. Therefore I set high store by them. I like to discharge my full duty when the nomination of any citizen comes before the Senate for confirmation to the bench.

If a man does not change as he goes from youth to maturity, he must have given little heed to the general experiences in life.

The nominee we are considering today, George C. Edwards, who has been named to the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, comprising the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, and Michigan, was a labor union organizer and the leader of a strike charged with violence. We would like to think that this came in his younger years, but he certainly was at the age of discretion and understanding. The accounts of that strike at the time recount how he organized the strikers, who threw lead weights at the police from the roofs of buildings. Three hundred police were called in. Tear gas was used, and there was hand-to-hand fighting against the police.

Now he is being nominated for a position on the second highest court of our land.

There is also written into his history, as a young man, the defiance of lawful orders of the court. In that case the lawyer appointed by the court as an adviser in the proceeding recommended leniency for most of the defendants, but said he could not recommend leniency for all, and that there were a few who willfully, knowingly, and viciously violated the court's order," naming Mr. Edwards and one other defendant.

According to the account I have before me, this case involved the type of issues which the nominee might well have to decide if his nomination were approved, because in its findings in that case the court said:

> The testimony in this case is overwhelming that these respondents contemptuously defied the order of the court to evacuate the plant of the plaintiff.
>
> This has ceased to be a labor controversy; it is not even a question of the legality of a sitdown strike; it has passed beyond that stage, and it has become a question of whether we have a government of law and order or not. The order of this court was not appealed from. It represents law and public authority. If these respondents may defy the lawful order of this court, then any person has the same right to defy any and all ordinances and laws.

In his youth Mr. Edwards also was a leader of the ultra liberals. Of course, that in itself certainly is not against him. However, the Communist Daily Worker, in a dispatch from Columbus, Ohio, on December 30, 1935, reported that Mr. Edwards was elected national chairman of the American Student Union, and that the delegates at a meeting of that organization in December of that year took the "Oxford pledge," promising that they would not support any war the United States might undertake.

I am advised, however, that he served in the Army of this country as a 2d lieutenant from 1944 to 1946, despite his earlier pledge not to help fight any wars for the United States.

He was also secretary of the League for Industrial Democracy which the House Committee on Un-American Activities has charged with calling for the disarmament of the capitalist state and arming of the proletarian state. In the record of the testimony of Ralph Knox, formerly president of local 212 of the UAW, before that committee on October 19, 1938, it is recorded:

> The CHAIRMAN. Can you give the names of some of the minority bloc?
>
> Mr. KNOX. Yes, sir; George Edwards is a member of the Socialist Party and a member of the executive committee, I believe.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. When you say "the Socialist Party," you mean the revolutionary branch?
>
> Mr. KNOX. That is the revolutionary group.

The nominee admits all these things, but he says that he has learned with the passage of years. It may well be true that he has learned; that he has changed since his youth; and that, as he says, he regrets some of the things which he has done.

Frankly, I have no doubt that the nominee is a man of some talent and some ability. I think I can go so far as to say that he is a man of equable temperament and of fine mind. But I must approach this nomination from a different standpoint. While he has served on the Supreme Court of his own State, and he left that bench to take the position of police commissioner of the city of Detroit, I approach the nomination from a different standpoint, because he will be sitting on the bench, in a robe, and litigants and attorneys from four different States will come before him. The question, then, is, How much confidence will they have in a judge with such a record? The important question is, What do the people think of him? Will they think he will dispense justice evenly and fairly to all who may come before him?

Our judicial system is founded upon the proposition that those with controversies shall lay their controversies before an impartial judge and abide by his decision in the matter. That system is worth less than nothing if the people have no confidence in the judge. Trials become a useless step and the people take the law into their own hands just as the nominee did as a young man when he disobeyed the lawful order of the court.

We are not concerned here only with what the people of Michigan think of the nominee, because the judicial office to which he has been nominated covers four States: Michigan, Kentucky, Ohio, and Tennessee. As the people of Tennessee look at this nominee, they are not concerned with the close connection between the nominee and the United Auto Workers, when he was a labor organizer for that union. They are concerned with the character and fitness of the nominee to be a judge of their controversies.

Let us see what the people and the lawyers of Tennessee have said in open hearing concerning this nomination.

The president of the Tennessee Bar Association testified:

> It was, and is, the position of the Tennessee Bar Association that the admissions by Commissioner Edwards before this subcommittee of certain past activities would show a disqualification for this high judicial office and would create in the public mind and in the bar a lack of confidence in the courts of the United States.
>
> We have the highest respect for the courts of the United States and are of the opinion that it is essential, if our strong judicial system is to continue, that the public and the bar have the utmost confidence in the courts.

Then the president of the Nashville Bar Association expressed the opposition of his legal association, and the parade continued as the president of the Chattanooga Bar Association expressed the opposition of that organization. They were followed by the immediate past president of the Memphis Bar Association, who said that his association endorsed 100 percent the statements of the other bar associations in opposition to the Edwards nomination.

This is the way lawyers outside the State of Michigan feel about the nominee who has been appointed to judge their cases. The State bar association and the bar association of every major city in the State is opposed to the nomination.

In recent weeks I also received some significant mail concerning the nominee from the people of the State of Michigan. I say "significant" because it bears directly upon their belief that they could not receive a fair trial from him. It arose out of some statements he recently made as commissioner before a congressional committee, and the issue it poses was well stated in the following editorial in the Michigan Catholic:

> Perhaps a reflection of this is the distinctive American presumption of civil law—the accused is innocent until proven guilty.
>
> The commissioner seems to have skipped by this presumption when he accuses individuals by name of crimes for which he has no incontestable proof.
>
> No ordinary citizen can know who, if any, of those accused are guilty. Those who may be innocent, as well as innocent members of their families, have suffered irreparable harm.

> Along the way something has been damaged in the American way of life—call it jurisprudence or simply playing by the rules no matter how the cards are stacked.

That was because of testimony given before another committee of the Senate.

The Courier newspapers of Michigan were more critical. They said:

> Commissioner Edwards would have to rule out every single one of his utterances if they were made in a court of law before him.
>
> One can only come to the conclusion that Edwards was willing to completely disregard the fundamentals of law and ancient theories of fair play.

And the Detroit Free Press commented:

> But in seeking to defend the security of our democracy, Edwards used methods which are the antithesis of the democratic system. He accused these men of crimes which he cannot prove they committed. And they have no recourse in law by which to defend themselves.
>
> We are not defending them, but rather the concept that the burden of proof is on the State, not on the individual. The concept is essential to our system. It makes the difference between a free society and a police state.

So we have the case against George C. Edwards' nomination. It does not go to the activities of his turbulent youth, his defiance of the police and the courts or his espousal of Communist-approved causes, or to the ability and experience he may have gained in later years. It goes directly to whether the people he will be judging have confidence they will receive fair trial from him. They have said emphatically that they do not have that confidence.

On that ground, Mr. President—not because I believe that Mr. Edwards is not in many respects qualified to be a judge, but because I am thinking of those who will serve as attorneys in the court over which Mr. Edwards will, if his nomination is confirmed, preside, the attorneys who will present cases for litigants or the attorneys in four Commonwealths who will present their cases—I wonder whether, in light of the record, they will get a "fair shake."

Mr. President, on the question of confirmation of this nomination, I shall not request a yea-and-nay vote. I merely wish the RECORD to show that I think people of greater talent and finer background might have been obtained for this position, the second highest nomination in our entire judicial scheme. So I must oppose the nomination.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am not a member of the Judiciary Committee, and therefore I did not have an opportunity to hear the testimony of the appointee, or to hear Hon. George Clifton Edwards, Jr., other testimony bearing on his appointment.

I have always taken the position that when the President of the United States makes an appointment, it is to be given great weight and that unless there are compelling reasons to the contrary, one should not oppose confirmation of the nomination. I believe this attitude is generally observed in the Senate.

However, with respect to judicial appointments, I believe there is a special duty to look very carefully to the character and quality of the appointments.

I have great interest in the appointment, as my State of Kentucky is one of the four States which comprises the Sixth Judicial Circuit—in which circuit the nominee would sit. At times in years past, I have practiced before the circuit court of appeals in this circuit and I am acquainted with its history and work.

I have not had an opportunity to meet Judge Edwards. All I know about him has been adduced from the evidence which was obtained during the hearings on his nomination.

From reading his biography and his testimony, I would say that he has had a very interesting life. As one reads his testimony, it is clear that he is a very intelligent and sensitive man, and—as one of the witnesses, Judge Souris, testified—a man of imagination and perception. Nor do I question his loyalty to our country.

I oppose his nomination, because I believe it is not in accord with the standards that have been established in the selection of judges for this circuit.

I recall that during the administration of President Eisenhower, two vacancies occurred in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. As is the practice, the Republican Members of the Senate were consulted—as I am sure in this case, the distinguished Senators from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA and Mr. HART] were consulted. On the first occasion I remember talking to the then Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, in company with the late Senator Taft and Senator Bricker. When the second vacancy occurred, I had an opportunity to consult again with the Attorney General. I shall always remember the care taken in the consideration and selection of the two judges. As was proper, there was insistence placed upon the high quality of the appointee's experience and record as a lawyer and as a judge—for one of those appointed had been a judge. There was an extremely careful investigation of the appointee's background and judicial temperament. It was a searching examination to secure the best possible appointment for the sixth circuit, which has a great burden of cases, particularly arising in the State of Ohio. The members of the court have always been among the ablest members of the Federal judiciary. I recall Judge Florence Allen, a distinguished woman who was a member of the court for several years as a distinguished judge, and one who many times was suggested for appointment as a member of the Supreme Court of the United States. At present, the court is composed of judges of the very highest caliber. One of its members, Judge Shackleford Miller, is from my State, and is known to be one of the great justices in the country. A present member of the Supreme Court of the United States, Associate Justice Potter Stewart, was formerly a member of this court.

Judging the qualifications of a Presidential nominee for the bench is a very delicate and difficult matter. Yet, I must say that after reading and studying the hearings, I shall vote against confirmation of this nominee. I shall do so because I do not believe that in his professional career—as described in detail in the record—he has had the legal practice and judicial experience which, in my opinion, is required in order to meet the standards which have been set for this court in prior years.

I know that the appointee holds today a very important position—that of police commissioner of Detroit. But it does seem strange to me that one who is devoted to and interested in the law, and who is now proposed to be a judge—a position which requires qualities which sometimes even a great practicing lawyer or advocate does not have—should quit the bench to become the police commissioner of a city.

As I have said, I do not question his integrity. The testimony given for him by the Senators from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA and Mr. HART] holds my respect.

I am of the opinion, based upon my reading of the record, that on the basis of his record Judge Edwards does not meet the qualifications which heretofore, at least, have been established for appointment to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Consequently, I shall cast my vote against his confirmation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take just a moment to say a word in behalf of this nomination and this nominee.

I have known George Edwards since the midforties—in fact, since the time I served as mayor of Minneapolis and Mr. Edwards served in the government of the city of Detroit. I have known him as an attorney, as a public official, as one who was active in political life, and as a very personal friend. I have also known his family, and know them well—his very fine and lovely wife, and his children, who today are young men and young women.

I feel that in this nominee we have a man of judicious temperament, qualified in the law, brilliant, and one who has earned the respect and the admiration of people of all walks of life.

If there is any one quality that George Edwards has above others it is his deep sense of social justice and his sense of fairness. I can think of nothing more needed today than that the law be tempered with a sense of humanity and compassion, and yet administered fairly, honestly and courageously.

As police commissioner of the city of Detroit, George Edwards, established a record for law enforcement that has earned him national attention. His program of community relations, improved race relations, and plain human relations, has set the pattern for the entire Nation.

There is much more one could say about Mr. Edwards. I know he has his critics. That is all the more reason why his nomination should be confirmed. A man who does not have critics is a man who apparently has no convictions, sense of purpose, or sense of idealism.

George Edwards is a man of deep conviction, and yet he is also committed to the constitutional system of our country. He is committed to government by law and under law, and to the sense of fairplay in the judicial process that is so essential in our society.

I speak now as a personal friend of a longtime associate. I call upon Senators to reconcile any doubts they may have in behalf of George Clinton Edwards, Jr., to support him, and to give the nomination overwhelming support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement by Nathan B Goodnow, president of the bar of Michigan.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Nathan B. Goodnow, President, State Bar of Michigan

Mr. Goodnow. Thank you, Senator.

My name is Nathan B. Goodnow, and I am the president of the State Bar of Michigan and, for purposes which will ultimately become apparent, perhaps it should be mentioned that I have served as president of the Detroit Bar Association.

I am a Republican and a member of a 30-man law firm in Detroit, which is, I think, properly characterized as primarily Republican.

I appear here in my own behalf and at the request of the board of commissioners of the State bar and express their views as well as my own—that view basically being the matter of urging you gentlemen to confirm the Presidential nomination of Justice Edwards.

We have a number of reasons which I shall attempt to put forth briefly for our commendation of Justice Edwards to you.

In the first place, gentlemen, we feel that he has a very extensive judicial experience and no bill of particulars is required at this point in the record by virtue of what has previously been said.

Perhaps as a footnote it should be mentioned, Mr. Chairman, that this judicial experience has been a rich blend between the criminal jurisprudence and the civil jurisprudence, a fact that we, as members of the bar, regard as important.

Another footnote is that during his tenure on the circuit bench of Wayne County, I believe it is true that he had no reversals during that period, and had but one modification of any order or any——

Senator Ervin. I would like to go off the record here for a moment.

(There followed a discussion off the record.)

Mr. Goodnow. Mr. Chairman, there is another point to which there has been no reference this morning, that is perhaps worthy of note. The Detroit Bar Association, through the years, has conducted a bar poll which is designed to procure the appraisal of the practicing lawyers in Wayne County with respect to all judicial elections. I recently, on learning that I would be down here, checked those records and find that in every single bar poll in which Justice Edwards had been a candidate, he led the group save for one instance, in which case he placed second. So there seems to be no question about his popularity with the profession.

There has been reference, Mr. Chairman, this morning to the 1937 sitdown strike at Yale & Towne in Detroit. I would like very briefly to address myself to that subject because it happens that fate decreed that our office represented the company and I had slight participation in the judicial proceedings to which there has been reference this morning.

I have observed through the years that as newspapermen and citizens and even lawyers have talked about Justice Edwards' participation in that sitdown strike, there have been so many errors, so many baseless scuttlebutt, that I just feel it is my duty to reveal to you that there was never a scintilla of evidence of any throwing of anything by Justice Edwards toward any policeman.

The facts basically were that in 1937, a couple of years after you gentlemen adopted the Wagner Act, the landmarks were not so clear. The Fansteel case did not come until years later. There was a bona fide contention—I say this against the interest of our then client—that our client had been guilty of one or more unfair labor practices. At that time, there was a considerable body of law to the effect that in the event that a company did engage in unfair labor practices, it would, under the circumstances, justify a sitdown.

This might seem strange now, but this is long prior to Fansteel, so that it is true that Justice Edwards and a hundred and twenty other men and women who performed the same act were taken into custody. I think that just as a matter of fairness and equity, we should note that Justice Edwards was then 23 years of age. He had not matriculated into law school, and he was the leader of a cause and as a Republican, as a lawyer on the other side of the fence in that case, I cannot help but feel that it was a fine thing that he and others did in leading that cause.

Briefly on the subject of judicial temperament, I have classified myself and the office as Republicans, and I want everyone to know, in behalf of everyone in our firm, that in his various judicial capacities, he has given us and our clients nothing but fairness and equity, and this is in spite of partisan politics, and in spite of the fact that he was on what we would call the other side of the labor-management controversy in litigation.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the other matters have been pretty well discussed.

In closing, therefore, I wish merely to mention that I personally regard Judge Edwards to be the possessor of the classical attributes for a fine jurist. There is no question about his courage. There is no question about his prudence, his education, both formal and practical, and I feel that on the basis of his record conclusively, we and you must accept the fact that he, and no one else, is the keeper of his own judicial conscience.

Thank you for the opportunity to be here.

Senator Ervin. Mr. Goodnow, the committee wishes to thank you for your appearing and giving this statement.

Thank you.

Next is Mr. Damon Keefe, commissioner, State bar of Michigan.

Senator Hart. Mr. Chairman, as with Mr. Goodnow, I am proud to be able this morning to introduce to the committee Mr. Damon Keefe, commissioner, State bar of Michigan.

Senator Ervin. For my information, what is the commissioner, State bar of Michigan?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, each of us is—and very properly should be—sensitive with respect to a judicial nomination. I believe comments have been made in the Record in the course of this relatively brief discussion which for those who are litigants before the court and for those who are observers of the process of selection, nomination and appointment of judges to the Federal judiciary might raise some serious question.

For that reason I should like to make a rather unusual unanimous consent request. I believe that members of the bar and the American community generally should have in full the materials that were made a part of the record before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, with which I sat, when the subcommittee considered the nomination. A full reading of the record will explain more eloquently than any language of mine, and perhaps that of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], as to why we have a deep and abiding conviction that we have been talking about an outstanding American and jurist, and one who gives rich promise of contributing great luster to the Federal judiciary.

I believe the verdict of history will support the Senate in advising and consenting to the nomination.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the record of the hearings constitutes a 78-page document; and the request to print hearings in the Record is rather unusual.

Mr. HART. I acknowledge that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But if the distinguished Senator from Michigan feels it necessary to do justice to the appointee, I shall not object.

However, I should not like to see the request become a precedent, because hearings are available in sufficient quantity to anyone who wishes to take the trouble to obtain a copy from the committee that held them.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HART. My concern is not so much the doing of justice to the nominee as our continuing confidence in the judiciary, including the nominee in question, because some of the remarks made would, without further explanation, give real pause to any litigant or lawyer.

If it would be preferable, I shall then ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts, which I shall designate, be printed in the Record. The reason I avoided asking to have excerpts printed is that the excerpts I would put in would not reflect the basis for some of the comments that were made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the highest confidence in the capacity and integrity of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I know that he will select excerpts that will do justice to the whole case.

It would minimize the amount of material to be printed in the Record. To that request, Mr. President, I would have no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, then I amend my request to ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from these hearings may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Biographical Sketch of George Clifton Edwards, Jr., Nominated To Be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit

Born: August 6, 1914, Dallas, Tex.

Education: 1930–33, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex., A.B. degree; 1933–34, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., A.M. degree; 1938–44, Detroit College of Law; 1948–49, D.J. degree.

Bar. 1944, Michigan.

Experience: 1934–36, League for Industrial Democracy, New York City field representative; 1936–37, Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co., Detroit, Mich., enameler in brake department; 1937–40, UAW–CIO, Detroit, Mich., director of welfare department; 1940–42, director of Detroit Housing Commission; 1942–44, councilman for the city of Detroit; April–October 1943, Timken-Detroit Axle Co., Detroit, Mich., assembly worker; 1944–46, U.S. Army, Second Lieutenant; 1946–50, president of Detroit City Council; 1946–51, practice of law, Detroit, Mich.; 1951–54, judge of probate, Detroit, Mich.; 1954–56, judge of Wayne County circuit court; 1956–62, justice of Michigan Supreme Court; 1962 to the present, police commissioner for the city of Detroit; present, deputy judge of administrative tribunal of the International Labor Organization.

Marital: Married, two sons.

STATEMENT OF NATHAN B. GOODNOW

My name is Nathan B. Goodnow. I live in Grosse Pointe Farms, Mich., a suburb of Detroit.

I have been engaged in the practice of the law in Detroit, Mich., continuously since my admission to the Michigan bar in 1930.

I am a Republican; a member of a 30-man Detroit law firm, Dykema, Wheat, Spencer, Goodnow & Trigg; a past president of the Detroit Bar Association; and the current president of the State Bar of Michigan, consisting of approximately 9,500 lawyers.

I wish to urge the Senate to confirm President Kennedy's appointment of Judge George Clifton Edwards to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit.

My reasons for urging his confirmation include the following:

1. He has extensive judicial experience. He has served extensively, and with distinction, on three different courts.

(a) He served from 1951 to 1954 as the sole juvenile judge in Wayne County, Mich., a county with a population approximating 2 million persons.

(b) He thereupon served as a member of the Wayne County Circuit Court for the period from 1954 to 1956. This is a trial court of general jurisdiction. Judge Edwards' appellate record on this court was excellent (one modification; no reversal).

(c) He thereafter served from 1956 to 1962 as a member of the Michigan Supreme Court, the highest appellate court in our State.

(d) Incidentally, Judge Edwards would unquestionably have continued as a member of the Michigan Supreme Court had he not been willing to resign at the imploration of Detroit's Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh to serve as Detroit's police commissioner, a post he still retains.

2. He has enjoyed popularity with attorneys. As a judicial candidate, he has generally led bar polls conducted by the Detroit Bar Association.

3. His background includes extensive experience in both civil and criminal jurisprudence.

(a) As a practicing attorney, before ascending to the bench, his private practice was primarily of a civil nature. His judicial experience has included extensive experience in civil jurisprudence.

(b) On the other hand, his judicial service as a juvenile judge, circuit court judge, and supreme court justice, combined with other experience, such as the police commissionership of the city of Detroit, provide him with extensive practical legal and judicial knowledge with respect to criminal jurisprudence.

(c) The Institute of Judicial Administration, housed at New York University, has recognized his position of preeminence as a jurist by appointing him as a member of the Anglo-American Criminal Trials Team. This team was sent this past summer to study criminal jurisprudence in England.

4. He possesses unquestioned judicial temperament.

(a) Although he is a Democrat and I and the majority of my partners are Republicans, we have nothing but praise for Judge Edwards as a jurist.

(b) Although he has been active on the labor side of labor-management controversy and litigation, and our office is extensively engaged on the management side in this field, we and our clients have always been treated fairly and equitably by Judge Edwards.

5. He enjoys the classical characteristics of an excellent jurist, possessing industry, courage, integrity, extensive formal and practical education, unquestioned judicial temperament, and is obviously the uncontrolled keeper of his own judicial conscience.

(a) Although he is a former union employee and legal counsel, he wrote the majority opinion for the supreme court which denied relief to Gus Scholle, of United Automobile Workers, in litigation seeking a judicial determination against the constitutionality of a 1952 Michigan constitutional amendment concerning political redistricting. (*Sholle* v. *Secretary of State*, 360 Mich. 1.)

(b) Although his personal professional exposure to the Michigan Workman's Compensation Act was on the side of the employee, he wrote the majority opinion for the Michigan Supreme Court which ruled that the Michigan Workman's Compensation Act was constitutional even though it limited awards to employees afflicted with silicosis (*Gauthier* v. *Campbell, Wyant & Cannon Fdy.*, 360 Mich. 510).

(c) He has a lucid, easy, thorough writing style. It is not the artificially flowery style which sometimes makes for ambiguity.

(d) In spite of his prior union affiliations, he wrote the majority opinion for the Michigan Supreme Court which ruled against employees of a company suing in assumpsit for damages consequent upon alleged violation by the company of its collective bargaining contract (*Cortez* v. *Ford Motor Company*, 349 Mich. 108).

Mr. EDWARDS. Senator, these are not comments which are prepared for this particular hearing. I think that almost anything which was would be subject to the possibility that I would have some ad hoc purpose. But these are comments made during the course of my life as a judge.

The first is a very brief statement which I made to the Women's Lawyers' Association in the city of Detroit as I was functioning as a circuit judge. I suggest to you that it has importance principally because it was addressed to the people who were appearing before me daily in court and in considerable number and, since it was printed in our press, if that which I said there did not correspond with my actions as a judge it would have been very simple to have the matter challenged.

This was phrased as "A Judge's Prayer."

"I hope I will always be impressed with the enormous power vested in the position I hold over the property and more importantly the lives of people. I hope I will never let myself become arbitrary or calloused in the exercise of it.

"I hope that I will always remember that that power is placed there by the people, can, thank God, be withdrawn by them, and that our law is not above the people but for them and of them.

"I hope that I will always remember how I felt as a young lawyer the first time I walked into a courtroom and looked up at the bench. I hope that I will always try to give the younger members of the bar the sympathy, courtesy, understanding, and help that their profession merits.

"I hope that I will always remember that at least one great trial judge has said that any impatient judge should be impeached, and whether we accept that drastic measure or not, that it should serve to remind me that patience is a virtue more needed on the bench than in any other occupation.

"I hope that I shall always remember that the greatest job of the court is to deal with people in trouble and that I shall always endeavor to handle criminal cases, divorce cases, and matters involving children with at least the time and interest and concern with which the court traditionally deals with property disputes.

"I hope I can always remember that the three most important words to anyone interested in learning are 'I don't know,' and that I will never be too afraid or embarrassed to use them.

"I hope I shall always remember that the people look to the courts to defend their fundamental freedoms that I have no right ever to sacrifice one iota of those rights for the least significant person because of the ranting of demagogs or the pressures of press or politics. I hope I shall always remember to respect the office I hold and require others to do likewise in my courtroom.

"I hope in the midst of tragedy and pathos with which the courts deal I will be able to maintain some sense of humor and I hope I will never take myself too seriously and that I will be able to laugh with the parties who subsequently point out to me how often I have failed in these ambitions."

The second one, this from circuit court experience, somewhere around 1955, the second was written while I was a member of the Michigan Supreme Court. It was written in preparation, first, for delivery to a training section of the Michigan State police force to which from time to time in past years I have lectured at their request. And then subsequently it was printed in the Michigan Bar Journal, the official organ of the Michigan State bar, of which I am privileged to be a member. And I will read only an excerpt. I believe that the entire article was entitled "The Courts, the Constitution, and the Police":

"In ancient times and modern, America pays tribute to liberty. Let us seek for a moment to try to explore why.

"There appear to be two main justifications for our adherence to liberty. One is ancient in origin. It comes to us out of the anguish of a human history familiar with the darkness of dungeons, the lash of the cat-o'-nine-tails, torture of the rack, and the degradation of chains. It is deeply philosophic, or religious, in its nature. As stated in the Declaration of Independence it is that each person is a child of the Creator and hence endowed from birth with inalienable liberty.

"This postulate rejects automatically the theories of tyrannies, both ancient and modern, that man lives for the state. It implies central to our way of life that the government we know exists to cherish, protect, and bring to full fruition the capabilities of each individual. This we assume to be an absolute good, self-evident, and beyond argument.

"The second justification is more modern, at least in its vigorous espousal. It is that a free society has the greatest potential for creativity. In discussing this justification it is necessary to spell out the characteristics of a free society in a little more detail. These characteristics would include a society which preserves individual initiative, which maintains a free marketplace of ideas, which presents an essentially classless character by offering reasonable equality of opportunity, and which is sustained by free universal education.

"Here we cite our past history and present-day richness and strength to prove that a society with an open mind can better welcome the new and original ideas and techniques which can enrich and have enriched our economy, our culture, and our spirit. Our belief is that the wealth of America lies more in its people than in its mines and fields. The absence of stratification and the presence of opportunities have, in past history, given America a Lincoln from a log cabin, a Knudsen from an immigrant ship, a Carver from slave parentage, and with something approaching reverse English, the socially minded Rockefellers and Harrimans of today from industrial robber baron ancestry.

"An infinity of variety is made possible by American freedom of choice, freedom of movement, freedom of opportunity, freedom of idea, and freedom of expression, and out of such variety we have a chance to select the best in terms of industrial progress, political leadership, social gain, and cultural advance."

Beyond that, Mr. Chairman, the only thing that I would comment to the committee is that my reason for leaving the Supreme Court of Michigan to take the post of police commissioner of the city of Detroit is very well known in my State. Perhaps it is not here.

We had, as is true with many cities in the United States, a serious problem in race relations in our community and a major factor in that problem was the conflict in the attitudes and mind between the police department of the city of Detroit and the Negro community of Detroit, which at that time mustered 29 percent of our population. This had reached the point of some crisis, described in Detroit by one of our business leaders, Mr. Willis Hall, as, "We were sitting on a keg of dynamite," and I was asked to leave a position which I never in my life had even thought of attaining but once having attained I believed I would be accurate in saying that I had no serious possibility of failing to continue to hold it, to take a position which never in Detroit's history prior to now has led anywhere except to trouble.

I have heard myself described as a politician. Well, all I can say is that this is the strangest kind of decision for a person who is primarily interested in public service and the terminology that is usually identified by the term "politician" to make that you can think of.

You function as a police commissioner at the cutting edge of the law. Every day you have to make decisions about protecting people's property and people's rights. These are not guided as they are in the appellate courts by precedent and the assistance of your brethren on the bench. These are decisions which have to be made quickly, immediately.

I think that our record in these 2 years from a situation deemed by many in our community as being one of the most difficult in the country to one where we now feel that, in these 2 years, we have done perhaps better than any big city in the country, both in maintaining order and in winning support of all segments of our economy for law enforcement, I think that this is fulfillment of the purpose which I was asked to serve by the mayor, by the press of Detroit, by much of the leadership of Detroit, and which I sought to serve.

You see, in 1943, as a member of the city council I lived through a race riot in Detroit. It was the worst 48 hours I have ever spent as a human being, and I made a deep resolve that if ever I had an opportunity to do what I could to avoid a similar situation ever recurring in the city which I loved, I would do it. And we have sought successfully in these 2 years, I think, to make some gains in this direction.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Lansing, September 30, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: I understand that you have before the Judiciary Committee the nomination of George Edwards of Detroit as a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Judicial Circuit.

I have known George Edwards and his family well for about 20 years. During that period, both Mr. and Mrs. Edwards have been outstanding and contributive citizens of Detroit and Michigan.

We have not always agreed, of course, and our political philosophies are probably widely different today. However, I respect the sincerity and depth of Mr. Edwards' convictions, and, after all, such differences are a part of our country's strength. That in no way detracts from my warm regard for him as a man of character and integrity.

I have observed George Edwards in a variety of public activities over this period, as a Detroit councilman, later in a series of increasingly important judicial positions, and most recently as Detroit's police commissioner. He has served with great energy and with great feeling for people. He has been motivated by a genuine desire to serve, and has been a "public servant" in the finest sense of that term.

I hope these comments may prove helpful to you and to the committee.

Sincerely,

GEORGE ROMNEY.

[From the Detroit News, Oct. 10, 1963]

GEORGE EDWARDS AND FEDERAL BENCH—UNQUESTIONABLY QUALIFIED

Senate Republican Leader DIRKSEN says that two of President Kennedy's nominations for Federal judgeships have drawn more protest than any others. He judges from this that the two are not popular. One of the two he has in mind is George Edwards.

Well, for heaven's sake.

Sure, Edwards' nomination is less than popular with the local rightwing crowd who make careers of writing letters and circulating tracts which cast doubt on the integrity—if not the loyalty—of anyone slightly to the left of Dick Durant.

But if popularity be the test for the job, DIRKSEN might note that the people of Michigan twice elected Edwards to their supreme court, once by the largest margin ever afforded a candidate for State office.

And if the Senator entertains some doubt that the people were really qualified to judge, there's Edwards' popularity among his colleagues in the legal profession, demonstrated by the fact that he has three times led the field of judicial candidates in Detroit or Michigan State Bar polls. This endorsement gets to the heart of the matter: Would Edwards, on his record, make a good Federal judge? There should be no doubt on that score.

His enemies have dragged out all the presumed dead cats they can find in his past. All the objections are stale.

Edwards spent a few days in the Fort Smith, Ark., bastille in 1935, for leading demonstrations by WPA workers. Heavens to Betsy. That he was let out shortly, with no charges filed, indicates how weak that case was.

His father was "probably the best known Socialist in Texas." His father was also the best known labor lawyer, way back then in Texas, at a time and place when that was a most lonely and most needed profession.

And then, there's piece de resistance: His 30 days in the clink here in Detroit in 1937, at age 23, for leading the Yale & Towne sitdown strike in defiance of a court order. Of that, Edwards says himself that on the basis of what he knows now as lawyer and judge, he would rule as the judge did then—against young unionist Edwards.

But more to the point is the testimony of Michigan State Bar President Nathan Goodnow, bona fide Republican, whose law firm represented Yale & Towne at the time. The legal landmarks were not so clear then, says Goodnow; Edwards' leadership of the strike "was justified"; and finally, "we have nothing but praise for Justice Edwards as a jurist."

There's a long span of years and experience between the youthful George Edwards, fiery unionist in an era when spunk was a unionist's price of survival, and the George Edwards who went on to become a lawyer, mature party statesman and a judge with an excellent record on every bench on which he served.

Some Senators have questioned that record. They imply that as a former UAW employee, he should not have participated in State supreme court labor cases. That's as preposterous as the notion that no lawyer who ever represented a corporation should ever sit in judgment, as a judge, on a case involving business.

In short, all the objections boil down to ancient political grudges, of no significance now, save as they indicate that George Edwards was, as in a different context he is now, a man of conviction and spirit. Would DIRKSEN prefer some party hack, noncontroversial simply because he never had the brains or the nerve to commit himself to anything?

The last word on the nomination of Edwards as a Federal judge should be Goodnow's: "He possesses unquestioned judicial temperament."

SUPREME COURT OF MICHIGAN,
September 26, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am advised that your committee will on October 1 next conduct a hearing on the nomination of the Honorable George Edwards to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

As you undoubtedly know, Commissioner Edwards was a member of this court for some years and from my association with him I formed a very high opinion of his ability as a jurist as well as an administrator. He is a diligent worker with an especially keen analytical mind; and has rendered able service to the people of this State as a public official. His public record is such as to leave no question on the part of those who have worked with him in the past as to his ability and integrity.

Very truly yours,

LELAND W. CARR,
Chief Justice.

THE SUPREME COURT OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul, September 18, 1963.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: It has come to my attention that George Edwards, commissioner of police for the city of Detroit, has been nominated by the President for appointment to the U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit. My purpose in writing is to convey to you my strongly held conviction that Judge Edwards is exceptionally well qualified for this position and to urge that his candidacy be given favorable consideration by the U.S. Senate.

For about 10 years I have worked closely with Judge Edwards in implementing the judicial program of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. He has come to Minnesota at my invitation to speak on the problems of youth, and he has articulated an enlightened approach which has a remarkable impact on both laymen and professionals in the field of law enforcement. It is difficult adequately to express my profound respect for Judge Edwards' fine legal mind, the breadth of his experience, and the courage, integrity, and vigor with which he has addressed himself to improving the administration of justice.

Having myself been a member of the judiciary for 15 years, I have no hesitation in saying that his confirmation will bring strength and learning to the bench of the United States which will reflect great credit to our profession.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. OTIS.

Montgomery County Juvenile Court,
Dayton, Ohio, September 18, 1963.
Senator Philip A. Hart,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hart: Last week President Kennedy nominated Hon. George Edwards of Detroit for the vacancy on the bench of the sixth circuit court of appeals. This is the court of appeals for our district and I am very much interested in seeing the best man available placed on this bench.

I was delighted to hear of the nomination of George Edwards as I have worked with him and come to know him very well during the past 10 years. He has a fine background of experience both on and off the bench that in my estimation qualifies him superbly for this important position.

Having worked with him in a group of judges selected from all over the United States, I have been in a position to learn something of his abilities and the very high regard in which he is held by all of the judges, more or less 50 in number, in our group. I wish to add my personal recommendation to the many which I am sure you have already received for his early confirmation in this position. We need men with the character and ability of George Edwards in these very responsible judicial positions and I am confident that he will give the same fine quality of work there that he has given in the various positions that he has held in the past.

Neither Judge Edwards nor any of his friends has solicited this from me but I feel that I would like to add my word of commendation for whatever value it may be.

Sincerely yours,
Frank W. Nicholas,
Judge, Domestic Relations and Juvenile Court.

U.S. District Court
for the District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C., September 19, 1963.
Hon. Philip A. Hart,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Hart: I am writing regarding the appointment by President Kennedy of the Honorable George Edwards, commissioner of police in Detroit, to the sixth circuit court of appeals.

I have come to know Mr. Edwards intimately in connection with my membership on the Advisory Council of Judges of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. He is a man of keen judgment, outstanding ability, and has shown a real dedication to public service, both as an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Michigan and as commissioner of police of the city of Detroit. In my opinion he would be a great credit to the Federal judiciary of our Nation and would render outstanding service on the court of appeals. I wholeheartedly recommend his confirmation by the U.S. Senate.

Sincerely yours,
Luther Youngdahl.

District Court of Minnesota,
Minneapolis, Minn., September 19, 1963.
Hon. Philip A. Hart,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hart: I have noted that George Edwards of Detroit, Mich., has been nominated by the President for appointment to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. I am writing this letter without any knowledge on the part of Judge Edwards.

I have known and worked with Judge Edwards on the Advisory Council of Judges of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency for more than 10 years. I also have come in contact with him in connection with judicial seminars conducted by the Joint Committee for the Effective Administration of Justice. From these associations I have come to appreciate the outstanding legal ability he possesses.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to take this means to recommend the confirmation of this appointment by the U.S. Senate.

Sincerely and respectfully,
Theodore B. Knudson.

Court of Common Pleas,
Division of Domestic Relations,
Lucas County, Ohio, September 20, 1963.
Re George Edwards for circuit court of appeals.
Hon. Philip A. Hart,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: While in the hospital this week I heard a radio announcement that President Kennedy had sent the name of George Edwards, Detroit, Mich., to the Senate as a nominee for the vacancy on the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. Having known Judge Edwards (presently Commissioner Edwards, as you know) for 25 or 30 years, and having learned that you are chairman of the subcommittee which will pass on the nomination, I think I owe it to you to tell you that in my opinion, no President could have made a happier choice.

In my 50 years at the bar, 27 of them on the bench, I have met and dealt with judges from all types of courts from the humblest juvenile court to the august U.S. circuit court of appeals. It is my judgment that George Edwards would bring to the latter a wealth of experience rather rarely found in the court of appeals. Having been himself a juvenile, probate, circuit, and supreme court judge in the State courts, before becoming Detroit's outstanding commissioner of police, he has firsthand knowledge along many lines which most circuit court of appeals judges acquire, if at all, from the books.

His broad experience has gained for him not only superior knowledge, but superior know-how Years ago when he was on the juvenile bench he was a respected leader in the juvenile court movement. On the circuit court bench he was widely recognized as a distinct asset to that court. On the Supreme Court of Michigan he was a clear-thinking, courageous, unbiased balance wheel.

His postjudicial experience has given him a breadth of information and understanding rarely found in any judge, but bound to be useful in any court.

As an older man I have watched his career with admiration for a long time. When he dons the robes in the U.S. court of appeals for our sixth circuit, it will be one of the best things that ever happened to that court.

Yours faithfully,
Judge Paul W. Alexander.

The State of New Hampshire,
Supreme Court,
Hanover, N.H., September 20, 1963.
Senator Philip A. Hart,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hart: I have just learned that George Edwards, presently commissioner of police in the city of Detroit, Mich., has been nominated by the President for the vacancy on the sixth circuit court of appeals.

I am taking the liberty of writing to you about him. Ten years' association with him on the Advisory Council of Judges has convinced me that he possesses unusual intelligence, energy, and devotion to any task which he undertakes. His training as a jurist on the courts of the State of Michigan, including 6 years as an associate justice on the highest court of that State, coupled with a broad and varied experience in many other fields, have given him what I sincerely believe is a uniquely fine background for a position on the circuit court.

I assume you will have available his ample educational qualifications and all the details of his various activities, but if there is any further information which you wish from me, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
Amos N. Blandin, Jr.

Baltimore, Md., *September 23, 1963.*
Senator Philip A. Hart,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Hart: I am very glad to know that the President has nominated Commissioner George Edwards for a vacancy on the bench of the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals and I write this letter to endorse that nomination enthusiastically. I do this in my capacity as a friend of Judge Edwards and as the former chief judge of the supreme bench of Baltimore City in which court I served for approximately 25 years until my retirement, for age, last fall.

I have known George Edwards for several years in various organizations devoted to the improvement of the administration of justice, the last one being the Anglo-American criminal trials team which visited England last summer to study the British system of criminal administration. I am sure that you have full biographical data regarding Judge Edwards and, therefore, will not presume to give you details which you already have.

Judge Edwards is a man of wide understanding of the problems of the law and is far more than a learned "book lawyer." As you know, he has sat as a member of the Supreme Court of Michigan, a position which he resigned as a matter of public duty to become police commissioner for Detroit. He is of the right age to return to the bench and by his learning, his public standing, and his capability I am sure that he will make an outstanding record as a judge of the United States. I therefore urge you, without reservation, to support his nomination.

Respectfully yours,
Emory H. Niles.

Circuit Court,
St. Louis, Mo., September 23, 1963.
Senator Philip A. Hart,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hart: I have just learned that the President has nominated George Edwards to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. Over a number of years I have been associated with George in various national organizations, and consider him eminently qualified in every way to sit on the U.S. court of appeals. I thought you might be interested in the opinion of one not from George's own State.

I trust that he will be speedily confirmed, as I am confident he will be a great addition to the Federal judiciary.

I am,
Sincerely yours,
Ivan Lee Holt, Jr.

U.S. Court of Appeals,
Oklahoma City, Okla., September 23, 1963.
Hon. Philip Hart,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hart: I must write to thank you for sponsoring Judge George Edwards for the court of appeals, sixth circuit.

For more than 10 years it has been my privilege to work very closely with him as a member of the advisory council of judges, a group of 50 judges from every level in the judiciary, devoted to the administration of criminal justice.

Surely no one is more competent to discharge the duties of the office than George Edwards.

Sincerly yours,
A. P. Murrah.

THE JUVENILE COURT OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
September 26, 1963.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Judiciary Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: I was delighted to learn 2 weeks ago that the President had nominated my friend George Edwards, to serve as a judge of the U.S. court of appeals for the sixth district. I am heartily in favor of this nomination and urge that your committee consent and approve it.

I have had the pleasure of knowing and working with George Edwards for the past 4 years in the Advisory Council of Judges of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. In fact, both of us are now serving on the executive committee of this organization. On every occasion that I have dealt with George Edwards I have been impressed by his outstanding analytical and legal wisdom, his integrity, and his forthright discussion of the emergent problems which face the judicial system today. I am confident that his outstanding record of service for the State of Michigan and his varied experience in legal, executive, administrative, and judicial positions are well known to you.

Therefore, it only remains for me to say that I would welcome him again as a fellow judge and hope that your committee will consent to his appointment.

Sincerely,

ORMAN W. KETCHAM.

SEPTEMBER 27, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I hope it would not be presumptuous for me, writing purely as an interested citizen, to urge your favorable consideration of the Presidential appointment of George C. Edwards to the circuit court of appeals.

I have known George Edwards personally for more than 30 years. Our friendship dates back to the days when he was a young labor union representative and I was a young reporter. I have known him intimately in the intervening years during which he has served as the head of the city of Detroit's Public Housing Commission, as a member and president of the Detroit City Council, as a probate judge, as a judge of the Wayne County circuit court, as a Michigan Supreme Court justice and, most recently, as police commissioner of Detroit.

I can flatly state that I know no man in whose integrity I have more confidence and who is more intelligent. I say this despite the fact that we frequently disagree on political questions on which I am inclined to be the more conservative and he the more liberal. I fully expect such disagreements to continue in the future, but I remain confident that, although I might differ with Mr. Edwards on a specific question, I would never doubt the integrity and intelligence with which he reaches a conclusion.

I think that Edwards' standing and success in this community is best exemplified by his performance over the last 2 years as police commissioner. I need not tell you that the racial question has been a principal problem here as it has been in every other part of the country where there is a large Negro population. Perhaps you do not realize, however, that Detroit, which has been unfortunately publicized in the past for turbulent race relations, has gone through this summer with no serious trouble. Mr. Edwards is the man principally responsible for that success. His approach is testified to by the fact that extremists on both sides of the question disapproved of him. At the start of his administration, he was accused, improperly, in my opinion, of being pro-Negro. Most recently, he was attacked in a television broadcast by militants within the Negro community because, quite properly, in my judgment, he publicly defended police officers in two instances involving the shooting of Negro criminals.

I repeat that I would not anticipate always agreeing with every decision which George Edwards might write as a Federal judge but, as a citizen of the area which would be incorporated in his jurisdiction, I would have complete confidence that he would follow the law and dispense justice with complete honesty.

Sincerely,

MARTIN S. HAYDEN,
Editor, the Detroit News.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

APPOINTMENT OF THOMAS MANN TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has recently announced that Thomas Mann, who has been serving as U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, has been appointed to be the new Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America.

I rise to highly commend the President for this appointment, and to congratulate Ambassador Mann.

Last week, a few of us were consulting with the President in connection with United States-Latin American relations in particular, and in connection with the contemplated appointment of Mr. Mann by the President. We assured the President of our exceedingly high approval of the suggestion.

I have known Ambassador Mann for a good many years. I have said in many places that I consider him to be one of the most able ambassadors serving the United States. Ambassador Mann knows Latin America. He has a long history of distinguished and able service to our Government in connection with his foreign assignments and his assignments in Washington dealing not only with Latin American problems, but also other foreign policy problems as well.

The President has made clear that in making this appointment he is looking forward to a thorough review of United States-Latin American relations, including a thorough review of the entire Alliance for Progress program.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, Mr. Mann can be assured—as were his predecessor and all other members of the State Department, including the Secretary of State—that he will continue to receive my full cooperation in carrying out my responsibilities to the Senate.

That statement does not mean that I shall always find myself in agreement with the policies proposed in connection with Latin America, any more than I find myself in agreement with the pending bill in the Senate today. But I am delighted with the appointment, and I assure Ambassador Mann and the President of the United States that they will have my full cooperation, within the framework of my responsibilities, in seeing what can be done to bring about much needed changes in United States-Latin American relations, including much needed changes in American policies in the Alliance for Progress program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials. One is entitled "New Deal on Latin America," and was published this morning in the New York Times. I find myself in complete and enthusiastic agreement with this editorial. The other editorial is entitled "Latin Shift," and was published today in the Baltimore Sun. I also find myself in complete agreement with this editorial.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 16, 1963]

NEW DEAL ON LATIN AMERICA

The announcement that Thomas C. Mann, our Ambassador to Mexico, is to return to his old post of Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs is good news. It is also an open recognition by the White House that something has been amiss in the administrative handling of Washington's Latin American policies. The changes now contemplated evidently involve much more than the replacement of Assistant Secretary Edwin M. Martin by Mr. Mann.

There is no need to seek scapegoats. Despite many able and expert individuals, the U.S. Government was poorly prepared when President Kennedy first took office, quickly and hopefully launched the Alliance for Progress, and then was brought—by the shock of the Bay of Pigs fiasco—to a study and realization of the fact that Latin America, as he put it, was "the most critical area in the world today." It was his misfortune that no McNamara or Ball was available for Latin American affairs.

The fact that the area is so critical was outside the control or policies of the United States. The wisest policies, the best planning, and the most expert administration could not have prevented the revolutionary ferment and the economic, political, and social problems that were brought to a crisis by the Cuban revolution, although they were brewing for years. Yet, it should have been possible to avoid obvious mistakes, to show more understanding, and to work on policies that would meet the challenges of the 1960's and not those of years ago.

The Alliance for Progress remains a fine and hopeful concept, and it has been run well by its coordinator, Teodoro Moscoso. It needs more money. It also needs, and is in process of getting, a revamping that will, among other things, emphasize its hemispheric nature. How necessary this is was proved by the United States when it unilaterally withdrew the Alliance for Progress team in the Dominican Republic at the time Washington broke relations in September.

Latin American critics of the plan as an instrument of U.S. policies were thus given apparent proof of their cynicism.

Thomas Mann is probably the best equipped State Department career officer in the Latin American field. No one will be able to accuse him of being soft on communism or Fidelismo, for his sentiments on these subjects are fierce. As Assistant Secretary under President Eisenhower he showed a flexibility and understanding which, combined with firmness, can make him the outstanding figure that U.S. relations with Latin America require today.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Dec. 16, 1963.]

LATIN SHIFT

It is significant that President Johnson's first major nomination should deal with Latin America, for in the last several years this has been an area of tremendous inspiration and of deep disappointment. The need for a new relationship between the United States and the nations to the south was recognized by President Kennedy in his conception of the Alliance for Progress. More than 2 years after its proclamation the Alliance remains a grand design, still to be fully tested, not yet wholly understood or accepted.

With the appointment of Thomas Clifton Mann, now Ambassador to Mexico, as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, succeeding Edwin M. Martin, Mr. Johnson appears to be determined to push the Alliance forward. As coordinator of all aspects of Latin American policy, Mr. Mann will have much broader powers than his predecessor. The United States obviously is undergoing a period of self-examination in its hemispheric policies, and it is probable that there will be other reassignments of personnel—not in repudiation of past performance but as a sign of shifting emphasis.

Thus far, despite its deep interest, the United States has found its southern neighbors hard to lead, impossible to drive and difficult even to understand. Over the weekend, for instance, Washington renewed its diplomatic ties with Honduras and the Dominican Republic—not because it wanted to, but because the cold-shoulder treatment was no longer practical. Formal relations with both countries had been broken off when military cliques overthrew elected governments. The United States feels it cannot condone such violations of democratic procedure, and it withheld recognition until the new regimes promised popular elections. Washington has the promises, but there are no guarantees that the elections ever will take place.

As a region Latin America nevertheless is more challenging to Yankee ingenuity now than it was when the Alliance for Progress was founded. The Alliance itself, under Director Moscoso, has taken forward steps. Through the example of Cuba, communism in these last 2 years has been largely discredited. The success of the Venezuelan election, held despite Communist terror, is heartening proof. The desire for change, for improvement in economic and social standards, but without yielding to alien doctrine, has been awakened. The United States must gage the wind, and harness it.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon who, in his position as chairman of the subcommittee which deals with Latin American affairs, is probably more familiar with problems connected with the Alliance for Progress than is any other Member of this body.

I feel that I also have a long-range acquaintance with these problems, since 30 years ago this month I accompanied the delegation headed by then Secretary of State Cordell Hull to the Seventh Inter-American Conference at Montevideo in the capacity of the adviser to the delegation. There was only one, and I was that adviser. I had been appointed upon the recommendation of Secretary Hull to President Roosevelt.

It was at that historic meeting that the first venture into Latin American affairs after President Roosevelt had taken office was made. There, we implemented the principles of the Good Neighbor policy and applied those principles to Latin America. We made a number of recommendations which seemed wise and far-reaching at the time, and they were adopted.

One thing we did was to abjure armed intervention. Up to that time the United States had been carrying on, for a quarter of a century or more, what has since become known as "gunboat diplomacy," by which we intervened forcibly, with Army, Navy, and Marine Corps in our neighboring countries to the south. The United States had sent marines into the little Caribbean republics of Haita, the Dominican Republic, and into Nicaragua, and had invaded several times the territory of our neighbor Mexico.

The United States in those days was constantly rattling a saber. The time had come—and President Roosevelt, with his great vision, knew the time had come—to abandon such a policy.

That was one of the important steps taken at the conference in Montevideo in November and December 1933.

We also sought to make the Monroe Doctrine, in the words of President Roosevelt, a joint concern. It was no longer to be a unilateral affair but a joint responsibility of all the nations of the Western Hemisphere. That was a wise move, although it has not worked nearly as well as we hoped it would.

There is, regrettably, great reluctance in the Organization of American States to take steps which seem to be clearly indicated, in response to the request by President Betancourt, of Venezuela, to do something to stop the exportation of revolution and arms from Cuba to overthrow our neighbors' duly elected governments.

So I point out that my continuing interest in Latin American affairs for more than 30 years leads me to feel qualified highly to praise the appointment by President Johnson of Thomas C. Mann to be Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

I hope that Mr. Mann, in his new and important capacity, will have a free hand. Without wishing to make any suggestions which might seem to be critical of what was done in the past, I believe one man should have responsibility in this field. He should have the right to withhold aid as well as to grant it. If, in applying the principles of the Alliance for Progress, we do not insist on a mutuality of responsibility, nothing but trouble will ensue.

We should insist at the same time we advance our taxpayers' funds that we have a right to expect a corresponding sense of obligation on the part of the recipient nations, whose governments should abjure waste, extravagance, usurious practices, and corruption, and which should move to stop inflation and seek other needed reforms. If they do not do this and yet we continue to pour our money into bottomless pits, we shall not only ruin the Alliance for Progress so far as that one country is concerned, by condoning improper practices there, but also for all other countries, because other countries which are making serious attempts to comply with such logical prescriptions will say, "What is the need of our doing this? You are pouring money into this other country which is doing nothing on its part, so why should we?"

I hope, therefore, that Thomas C. Mann—at present our excellent Ambassador to Mexico, who before that was Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs and is perhaps more knowledgeable than any other man in public life now serving in this field, will have a free hand and that he will be authorized to withhold aid as well as to grant it.

I do not expect, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] does not expect, that we always shall be in agreement with the decisions he may make. At least there will be serving, now and henceforth, a knowledgeable man, a competent man, an experienced man who is a dedicated public servant who knows this field well.

I wish him every success, and I highly commend the President for making the appointment.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in those first dark days, 3 weeks ago, when President Johnson took up the torch which fate had passed to him from the hands of John F. Kennedy, we all admired—and were grateful for—the sureness with which he moved to demonstrate the continuity of America's highest purposes as well as America's highest office.

While the event itself was overshadowed by our grief and sorrow, I know that our neighbors in this hemisphere did not fail to observe and appreciate one act which, of itself, spoke volumes about the man and about the will of the people he leads.

In his first official statement on foreign policy, President Johnson returned to the room in the White House where, in 1961, President Kennedy had set forth the principles on which the Alliance for Progress were formed. There before virtually the same audience, and with Mrs. Kennedy at his side, President Johnson proclaimed his continuing support for that historic Alliance.

Today we have—and our neighbors have—another remarkable demonstration of both President Johnson's determination to make the Alliance for Progress succeed, and his rare understanding of what is neccessary for its success.

He has, as his first major policy appointment, succeeded in bringing to the tasks of directing our inter-American affairs the man whom many throughout this hemisphere regard as our most able career diplomat in this field, Ambassador Thomas Mann.

If he had searched for months, the President could not have found, in either private or public life, a man so clearly the right man at the right time for this sensitive and critical duty.

Ambassador Mann does not have to learn Latin America. He knows it—he has known it all his life. Likewise, Latin America does not have to study Ambassador Mann's record, or await his public statements, to learn where he stands or what he stands for. The democratic, progressive leaders throughout Latin America already know Tom Mann, know his vast knowledge of their needs and their problems, and trust him as a friend.

I know this appointment will be welcomed with the greatest enthusiasm in every republic south of the Rio Grande.

President Johnson deserves to be—and I am sure he will be—congratulated by Senators on both sides of the aisle for going directly and promptly to this seasoned, able, and successful diplomat and prevailing upon him to take this important work. It is especially important—and especially welcomed—that our Latin neighbors may know henceforth that the man in charge of inter-American affairs of this Government has the trust and the ear of the President of the United States as a personal friend.

President Johnson brings to the highest office of our land a great personal understanding, sympathy and devotion for Latin America and the Latin American people. Nothing could be more fiting than that he has chosen as his representative a man who shares his views, understanding, and devotion, and one who will work closely with him in assuring the success for the Alliance for Progress.

For myself, I believe this appointment—accomplished with such dispatch and insight—may well prove the turning point we have been awaiting in the effort to get the Alliance for Progress moving. I have long been a personal admirer of Ambassador Mann in both his service here in Washington and his service at various posts in the Americas. He is a man of vision, a man of conscience, a man of deep feeling for the people of Latin America. He is, above all, a man who understands—as few others in our country understand—what can and must be done to build a base for solid accomplishment in realizing the goals of justice, freedom, and peace for this hemisphere.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which deals with Latin American affairs, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and one of the longtime experts on Latin American affairs, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], in commending the President of the United States upon the appointment of Ambassador Thomas Mann to be Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. It is an excellent appointment, and one which I am sure will stand as well in terms of programs and policies in the Western Hemisphere in the days ahead.

Ambassador Mann is unusually well seasoned in both Latin American affairs and in the economic and trade policies which must be so much a part of the work of this hemisphere.

Symbolically and appropriately, Ambassador Mann was born on the border between Anglo-America and Latin America. From a lifetime of experience, he knows the Latin peoples intimately, speaks their language in every sense of that term, knows their needs and their hopes. His record is excellent.

In 1955, he served with distinction as our Ambassador to El Salvador.

In 1957, he was entrusted with the vital post of Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs.

In 1960, Secretary of State Herter recognized his unusual talents and capacities in regard to Latin America by asking him to become Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs.

In 1961, after the Kennedy administration took office, he was asked to continue in that post to assist in the preliminary stages of consideration of the Alliance for Progress, and was sent by President Kennedy to be our Ambassador in Mexico, in recognition of the great importance of our relations with that key Republic.

I note that his record as Ambassador in Mexico has gained the respect and admiration of the people of the United States and of Mexico—business people, labor people, and all those interested in education, health, and cultural activities.

It was my privilege to visit with Ambassador Mann in Mexico last year. I came away with a profound respect for his great talents of diplomacy and his fine character. Both Ambassador Mann and his wife are able and effective representatives of this country wherever they may serve. I am pleased that his great work has been given further recognition by President Johnson.

Ambassador Mann wished to retire. He was not looking for promotion. He was called to this task. He was asked to assume this task. He did not seek it. He accepts this new responsibility at great personal sacrifice.

President Johnson has made a fine start in demonstrating his understanding of this country's foreign relations by selecting a man so unusually well qualified—and by giving him the scope of authority necessary to assure success in this important post.

I noted the comments of my colleagues as to the task which remains before Ambassador Mann, of coordinating and improving our general program in the Latin American area, so I welcome the news that President Johnson intends to raise the status of the Alliance for Progress program within the U.S. Government. I welcome the news that the high priority assigned to Latin America by President Kennedy will soon be reflected, thanks to President Johnson's action, in the official machinery of the U.S. Government.

I have long believed that if Latin America is "the most critical area of the world," then the U.S. Government machinery should reflect this priority. If the Alliance for Progress is the basis of our policy in Latin America, then the basic policy decision for the Alliance should be made at the highest levels of the Government.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I wonder whether the Senator from Minnesota does not share the view, to which allusion has been made in the press, that if Ambassador Mann is offered and accepts this post, there should be a modification, an upgrading, making his new post an under-secretaryship, rather than an assistant secretaryship.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was about to say that the Senator has powers of prophecy or clairvoyance, because the next line I was about to read was to the effect that the creation of the post of Under Secretary for Latin American Affairs would permit central direction of all the different aspects of our Latin American policies, and direct access of the Under Secretary to the Secretary of State and the President.

I believe that if the emphasis placed upon Latin America is to have real meaning, the status of this program must be upgraded. That means a post such as Under Secretary for Latin American Affairs or Inter-American Affairs ought to be established.

I am hopeful that the President will send such a recommendation to Congress. I have reason to believe it is in the offing.

Mr. GRUENING. I am delighted to hear this from the distinguished majority whip. I hope the legislation will be submitted. I shall certainly be glad to support it vigorously.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the President discussed it with the chairman of the subcommittee and of the full committee. It is my understanding that very likely this recommendation will be forthcoming.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I join the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Alaska in this suggestion. There have been these discussions; and the Senator from Minnesota has stated the situation accurately. I hope the position will be created. As I have indicated, I hope Ambassador Mann will be willing to fill the post.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more on that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I also know, as the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, that Ambassador Mann was planning to retire; and that he is accepting this new appointment at a personal sacrifice to him. That is an additional reason, besides the importance of the assignment and the need of lifting it to a higher level, for making it an Under Secretaryship. So, for both personal and general reasons, the change in designation and such assignment to the new post are highly desirable.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

The change in structure which we have been discussing should not be interpreted as a change in U.S. policy toward Latin America. On the contrary, it should be interpreted as an effort to improve the machinery of the U.S. Government for making the policy initiated by President Kennedy more effective.

The appointment of an able and experienced diplomat to an Under Secretary-level post enjoying both the confidence and the close personal friendship of the President, and the assured continuation in key posts of top officials who have been responsible for launching and conducting the Alliance for Progress program during the past 2 years, is a clear indication of President Johnson's keen interest in Latin American problems and of his intention to continue the policy pursued during the Kennedy administration. As a principal architect of the Act of Bogotá of 1960, which was an important forerunner of the Alliance charter which was adopted at Punta del Este the following year, Ambassador Mann was among the first group of U.S. officials to grasp the need for a change in U.S. policy, to appreciate the urgent necessity of meeting the pressing social problems of the hemisphere, as well as the economic problems of underdevelopment. As one whose experience in Latin American affairs runs from the good neighbor policy of the Roosevelt era through the Alliance for Progress program initiated by President Kennedy, Ambassador Mann can well appreciate the necessity of continuing an approach to Latin America which combines sympathy of attitude, firmness of policy, and flexibility of method.

I would like to comment on the change in structure of the U.S. Government that I anticipate and also offer some suggestions which I have already presented to and discussed with President Johnson.

I find most encouraging, therefore, the new recognition that if the Alliance for Progress program is to have the priority that it should have in the U.S. Government, the program cannot remain merely as one of the four regional programs in the overall foreign aid agency, the Agency for International Development. It is different than the rest of the program and should have a different status. It should be more independent and more autonomous and should be under the direction of an official of at least Under Secretary rank. I told the President that if it is feasible from a practical point of view, the Alliance for Progress program might well be carried out through a separate agency, like the Peace Corps. It would then have its own Director who would report directly to the President, and yet would have some formal liaison with the State Department. This would be the ideal arrangement. I am aware that this might cause serious administrative problems. If the creation of a separate agency would pose too great a problem of coordination with the State Department, then other steps can be taken to upgrade the Alliance program, make it more autonomous and visible. This is now being done. The establishment of an Under Secretary of State for Hemisphere Affairs or Latin American Affairs, who will coordinate all our programs in the Latin American area and will have direct access to the President, should meet the need.

The top official must not only have responsibility for our diplomatic and economic aid policy, but for the direction of all our programs in Latin America. He must have under his direction our programs in the political, financial, informational, military, educational, and cultural fields—all of which represent an essential part of our total policy in Latin America.

It is particularly important that tight coordination of financial operations be achieved, ending once and for all the policy variations between various lending agencies now in operation. Firm policy guidelines implemented by strong leadership should govern the operation of all the various aid "windows."

It is equally important that he share responsibility for our military policy in Latin America. As long as an American Ambassador in Chile or anywhere else is without authority to effectively control the burgeoning military establishment that is now present in almost every Latin American country, there will be no unified or effective U.S. policy in Latin America.

Just as our AID program worldwide should reflect a greater reliance on multilateral institutions, so our aid program under the Alliance for Progress should also lean more heavily on the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank. Through the Inter-American Loan Bank and possibly the World Bank one might be able to undertake projects of continental dimensions which are absolutely essential to the economic and social development of Latin America, but which transcend the boundaries, the development plans or the current domestic political difficulties of any one country. Thus an international institution like the World Bank might well be able to finance a continental highway system or telecommunication system which is essential to every country in Latin America and continue this project to completion regardless of the political problems or economic problems that might arise in one country or another. This could hardly be done on a bilateral basis. Yet its contribution to the economic, social, and political development of Latin America could be immense. Our strong support of the present policy of the World Bank under its new leadership, a policy which permits the Bank to undertake more ambitious and risky projects than it has in the past, could do much to promote the economic and social development of the continent.

TRADE AND INVESTMENT POLICY

Any review of our overall relations with Latin America must include not only a review of our diplomatic and aid policy, but also of our trade and investment policy. It is an accepted fact that the terms of trade have in the past decade run heavily against underdeveloped areas like Latin America, which have seen the prices for their commodities steadily decline, while the prices of the imports required for the modernization of their society have steadily gone up.

COMMODITY STABILIZATION AGREEMENTS

Commodity stabilization agreements like the International Coffee Agreement are a step in the direction of stabilizing foreign exchange earnings for our Latin American neighbors. A more sweeping review and negotiation of our trade policies will take place at the United Nations Trade Conference which is scheduled to begin in March 1964. If the U.S. Government policy for this Conference is to be in accord with our overall policy in Latin America, it is absolutely essential that a ranking official dealing with Latin American affairs be included as a ranking member of the U.S. delegation and also participate in the formulation of our policy for this Conference. The importance of our trade policy for Latin America cannot be exaggerated.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

To enlarge the role of private enterprise under the Alliance, the President suggested in April of this year the enactment of a tax credit for firms investing in underdeveloped countries. This tax investment credit, reported as 30 percent of net earnings, has never been formally proposed to Congress. If it is to be passed before 1965, it must be incorporated into the foreign aid bill which will be presented to the Congress early in 1964. The principal effect of this tax credit would be in Latin America, where it might appreciably affect the flow of American capital into that area.

NEED FOR IMPROVED EFFICIENCY

One of the chief purposes of any structural reforms or personnel changes is to end the interminable delays in obtaining decisions and, to a lesser extent, implementing them. The pace of Alliance operations in Washington must be speeded up, so that any delays that might remain will be the result of inaction on the part of the Latin Americans, not of the United States. If some of the bureaucratic layers must be removed to achieve efficiency and prompt action, then this should be done.

If the Alliance is to succeed in the Latin American countries, it is essential to engage the active political leaders in support of Alliance programs. One way of encouraging this is through frequent contact between the legislative leaders of both continents. I suggest the establishment of an Inter-American Parliamentary body, somewhat along the lines of the NATO parliamentarians conference in which legislators from Latin American countries would meet regularly to get to know each other's domestic problems, and thereby achieve a greater appreciation of the need for cooperation in meeting the problems of this hemisphere.

In the future as in the past, our official policy must, of course, permit cooperation with governments of many types in Latin America, but we should continue to give our most active support to the reform-minded, non-Communist groups who truly espouse the objectives of the Alliance for Progress. Up until now, the two principal groups in Latin America that fit into this category have been the democratic left group in the Caribbean and the Christian Democratic parties in South America. The democratic left group has provided the leadership of progressive constitutional forces in Latin America during the past decade with men like Jose Figueres of Costa Rica, Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela, and Luis Muñoz Marin of Puerto Rico. Today they are carrying on with people like Daniel Oduber and President Orrlich in Costa Rica and President-elect Raoul Leoni in

Venezuela. The second group whose program and outlook most closely coincide with the Alliance social and economic philosophy and U.S. foreign policy objectives is the Christian Democratic movement which has only recently become a significant force in Latin America politics, but is rapidly growing in strength in such important countries as Brazil, Venezuela, and Chile. It has just become the second largest party in Venezuela, under the leadership of Raphael Caldera, and stands a good chance of electing Edwardo Frei as the next President of Chile in September 1964. Like the democratic left group in the past, the principal strength of the Christian Democratic Party today is among the younger generation, particularly strong among the labor and university circles as well as among the young professional groups. A third group that might be called indigenous nationalists may also fall into this category. It would include men like Belaunde in Peru and Illia in Argentina, neither of whom have been in office long enough to permit any definitive judgment on them.

It is among groups like these that the Alliance for Progress has generated interest rather than among some of the older established elite groups. It is these groups that will be most sensitive to any change in U.S. policy toward Latin America.

NEED TO LOOK AHEAD

In some countries (Venezuela, Costa Rica, Peru), they control the present government and the major political parties. In others (Chile, Brazil) they do not yet control the government but may do so within 1 to 3 years. In all of these countries, their influence is rising.

If these younger progressive groups are given reason to believe that we are reverting back to the Republican policy of concentrating exclusively on economic development through private enterprise and ignoring social and economic reforms, the result will be disastrous for the United States in Latin America. What is important to these progressive forces in Latin America is not changes in structure of the U.S. machinery for dealing with Latin America, but changes in ideology and changes in the policy of the U.S. Government. It is essential that our Latin American friends know that structural changes do not imply a change in our ideological view or our policy.

I have long believed and stated many times that greater emphasis should be placed on enlarging the role of private enterprise under the Alliance for Progress and on perfecting institutional means of encouraging private enterprise. This does not mean, however, that the economic and social reform programs that have been undertaken can be shunted aside. There is today in Latin America a widespread uneasiness about whether the new U.S. Government will bow to the demands of those vocal elements in the U.S. business community and in the Congress who insist that the promotion of private enterprise in Latin America should be our exclusive goal. Given the prevailing nationalistic currents in every important Latin American country, and the unmet social and economic needs of the mass of the people, no government could survive that adopted such a policy.

Although we must continue the pressure upon Latin American governments to press ahead with basic economic and structural reforms, it would be a mistake to succumb to the congressional pressures of the moment to adopt a "hard line" with our neighbors and cut them off if they do not enact every reform immediately. Where a national government is clearly irresponsible, as in Brazil today, there is no point in extending substantial capital assistance to that government. But we should resist the tendency which is pronounced in the U.S. Congress to apply much more rigid standards in our relations with Latin American countries than in other areas of the world—such as the Far East.

We should face squarely the fact that the unmet social and economic problems of Latin America requires basic reforms. I say basic reforms in the sense that the New Deal effected fundamental changes in the structure of society, in the structure of the economy. Even in dealing with Latin American political leaders whose devotion to constitutional government equals their determination to achieve economic and social development, we shall require a policy that includes flexibility as well as firmness.

The Eisenhower policy for an earlier decade did not solve the long-range problems. The Latin America of the 1960's is not the Latin America of the 1950's. The policy of the past 2 years must be continued.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator from Minnesota has made this statement of high commendation of Ambassador Mann. I intervene for a moment only to say that I take pride in the fact that we can disagree with someone and still have high regard and high respect for him. It is only appropriate at this time that the words I now speak should be placed in the RECORD in regard to the present Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Edwin Martin.

I have worked closely with Assistant Secretary Martin during his services as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. I well recall when President Kennedy assigned him to this post. I participated in three conferences with President Kennedy during the period of time he was considering various names for filling this post. I enthusiastically supported the final decision involving Mr. Martin.

Assistant Secretary Martin has given to that post dedicated service. He has carried out his duties as he thought them to be in the best interests of our country. He has made recommendations accordingly. During his service I found myself in agreement with him most of the time.

Starting with his article of a few months ago in the New York Herald Tribune, I found myself in very thorough disagreement with his position on juntas. But, Mr. President, he may be right and I may be in error. One never knows. Each has the duty to use his own sights and follow the facts as he sees them and support the policies he thinks will be in the best interests of his country.

I take this moment to offer my thanks to Assistant Secretary Martin for the dedicated service he has rendered this country in this position. His service is not over. He can be of great help to our foreign policy. Those of us who disagree with his policies will continue to disagree with them if we find ourselves running counter to them. But, Mr. President, our Government operates efficiently and effectively only so long as all who occupy positions of trust know that they are free—and they should be free—to follow policies they think are in the best interests of the country.

Assistant Secretary Martin has followed policies which he thought were in the best interests of his country in initiating and "getting on the road" the Alliance for Progress. We owe him much in connection with the Punta del Este conference, to which he was assigned by Secretary Rusk, and he worked very closely with the congressional delegation that went to Punta del Este as advisers to the Secretary of State. Again I thank him for the great service he rendered in connection with the Costa Rica conference.

No one should think for a moment that the appointment of Ambassador Mann is in any way a reflection upon Assistant Secretary Martin, because it is the policy—and it is a wise policy—in connection with our Foreign Service, to make changes after a period of time, and have persons moved to other assignments. So I want to thank Assistant Secretary Martin for the service he has rendered and the many courtesies and consideration he has shown me over the years.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I, too, commend President Johnson for the steps he has taken toward coordinating and upgrading our relationships and our cooperative efforts with Latin American countries.

We are not reflecting in any way upon those who have had charge of the work up to now. Mr. Coffin, Mr. Bell, Mr. Moscoso, and Mr. Martin have all done as good work as they could do under the circumstances. However, it is nevertheless becoming evident that this work was becoming too diversified and too uncoordinated, and that we were trying to extend our efforts in assisting Latin American countries in too many different ways and in too many different directions; and possibly we have been trying to put our image upon them too rapidly—more rapidly than we should.

In appointing Secretary Mann to coordinate our Latin-American relations, I believe President Johnson has chosen a capable person who understands the nature of our Latin American friends, one who understands their governments, and who will know how to go about drawing together the variety of efforts under which we have been operating in countries up to this time.

I should like to make another suggestion on which I have previously touched; that is, that our ambassadors in most of these countries and possibly in all of them, should be given more authority than they have at the present time. It seems to me that our ambassadors in these countries and in other countries also should not be downgraded, and should be able to answer simple questions on policy without referring them back to Washington for a decision. In many instances our ambassadors are better qualified to tell what we should do to help underdeveloped and developing countries, and in most cases know the situation better than some of those who have had the authority to make decisions, and who may not be familiar with the countries that may be affected by their decision.

Therefore, I hope that in the work of coordinating and consolidating and making more effective the cooperative efforts in which we are interested in Latin-American countries, President Johnson will also find it advisable to give more authority to our ambassadors, so that they can hold up their heads and say, "I represent the United States. I do not have to refer every question as to whether it will rain today back to someone in Washington to answer such questions." I believe the President has made a wise move. Without reflecting in any way upon the men who have been heading the various agencies up to the present time, I wish Secretary Mann all the best in the position he is about to fill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I fully concur in all the expressions with regard to Secretary Martin in the position he is assuming as Assistant Secretary. He has done good work. I am confident he will play a significant role in the further development of our Latin American policies.

As a part of these remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter from President Johnson to Ambassador Mann. From that letter I wish to quote the following paragraphs:

> I want you to work closely with private U.S. groups and institutions carrying out activities in Latin America. These include, but are not limited to, the AFL-CIO, religious and charitable groups, cooperatives, and the private business sector, which can make the significant contribution envisaged in the Punta del Este charter.
>
> You will find many outstanding public servants throughout our Government who will help you in your difficult task. You can count on my intense interest and complete support.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

I feel that the President's letter to Ambassador Mann is a guideline of policy and a direction of policy which bodes well for the future. I am confident that this direction which has been given, this statement of purpose, and the objective, as well as the outline of details by the President of the United States, will mean a reinvigoration and revitalization of our entire political, economic, and cultural program in Latin America.

The work that was so ably and brilliantly started by President Kennedy is now being carried forward by President Johnson, who has placed such high priority upon our hemispheric relationships and upon our political and economic relationships with the countries in the Western Hemisphere.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., December 15, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS MANN,
U.S. Ambassador,
Mexico City, Mexico.

DEAR AMBASSADOR MANN: I want you to know how gratified I am by your response to my request that you leave your important position in Mexico and come home to take up the tasks we have discussed.

I have asked you, in addition to your duties as Assistant Secretary, to undertake the coordination and direction of all policies and programs of the U.S. Government, economic, social and cultural; relating to Latin America. There can be no illusion that the work will be easy. But, as I told you, next to keeping the peace, and maintaining the strength and vitality which makes freedom secure, no work is more important for our generation of Americans than our work in this hemisphere.

I am sure you share my pride in the accomplishments to date; my deep gratitude to the loyal and dedicated U.S. officials, and to officials of other governments in the hemisphere, who have made this possible; and to the Congress for its vision in authorizing and financing the Alliance for Progress program.

I know that you share my determination to press to full realization the visions of President Roosevelt and President Kennedy of an American community of nations moving forward together in progress and freedom.

The Alliance for Progress is a partnership in which each free American republic has a part to play together. We must find ways to expand education, health, and low-cost housing facilities; we must find ways to help governments increase revenues by tax reforms and, at the same time, maintain an adequate and sustained rate of economic growth; we must find ways to bring about land reform and, at the same time, to increase agricultural production. Job opportunities must be expanded and educational and health facilities and low-cost housing must be provided. Social justice is a goal for which we must constantly strive.

All of the American nations must market their resources and devote themselves to finding ways to bring the strength of those resources to the task at hand.

I want you to work closely with private U.S. groups and institutions carrying out activities in Latin America. These include—but are not limited to—the AFL-CIO, religious and charitable groups, cooperatives and the private business sector which can make the significant contribution envisaged in the Punta Este Charter.

You will find many outstanding public servants throughout our Government who will help you in your difficult task. You can count on my intense interest and complete support.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point sundry editorials and articles dealing with this entire subject.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Dec. 16, 1963]

LATIN SHIFT

It is significant that President Johnson's first major nomination should deal with Latin America, for in the last several years this has been an area of tremendous inspiration and of deep disappointment. The need for a new relationship between the United States and the nations to the south was recognized by President Kennedy in his conception of the Alliance for Progress. More than 2 years after its proclamation the Alliance remains a grand design, still to be fully tested, not yet wholly understood or accepted.

With the appointment of Thomas Clifton Mann, now Ambassador to Mexico, as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, succeeding Edwin M. Martin, Mr. Johnson appears to be determined to push the Alliance forward. As coordinator of all aspects of Latin American policy, Mr. Mann will have much broader powers than his predecessor. The United States obviously is undergoing a period of self-examination in its hemispheric policies, and it is probable that there will be other reassignments of personnel—not in repudiation of past performance but as a sign of shifting emphasis.

Thus far, despite its deep interest, the United States has found its southern neighbors hard to lead, impossible to drive, and difficult even to understand. Over the weekend, for instance, Washington renewed its diplomatic ties with Honduras and the Dominican Republic—not because it wanted to, but because the cold shoulder treatment was no longer practical. Formal relations with both countries had been broken off when military cliques overthrew elected governments. The United States feels it cannot condone such violations of democratic procedure, and it withheld recognition until the new regimes promised popular elections. Washington has the promises, but there are no guarantees that the elections ever will take place.

As a region, Latin America nevertheless is more challenging to Yankee ingenuity now than it was when the Alliance for Progress was founded. The Alliance itself under Director Moscoso has taken forward steps. Through the example of Cuba, communism in these last 2 years has been largely discredited. The success of the Venezuelan election, held despite Communist terror, is heartening proof. The desire for change, for improvement in economic and social standards, but without yielding to alien doctrine, has been awakened. The United States must gage the wind, and harness it.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 16, 1963]

NEW DEAL ON LATIN AMERICA

The announcement that Thomas C. Mann, our Ambassador to Mexico, is to return to his old post of Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs is good news. It is also an open recognition by the White House that something has been amiss in the administrative handling of Washington's Latin American policies. The changes now contemplated evidently involve much more than the replacement of Assistant Secretary Edwin M. Martin by Mr. Mann.

There is no need to seek scapegoats. Despite many able and expert individuals, the U.S. Government was poorly prepared when President Kennedy first took office, quickly and hopefully launched the Alliance for Progress, and then was brought—by the shock of the Bay of Pigs fiasco—to a study and realization of the fact that Latin America, as he put it, was "the most critical area in the world today." It was his misfortune that no McNamara or Ball was available for Latin American affairs.

The fact that the area is so critical was outside the control or policies of the United States. The wisest policies, the best planning and the most expert administration could not have prevented the revolutionary ferment and the economic, political, and social problems that were brought to a crisis by the Cuban revolution, although they were brewing for years. Yet, it should have been possible to avoid obvious mistakes, to show more understanding, and to work on policies that would meet the challenges of the 1960's and not those of years ago.

The Alliance for Progress remains a fine and hopeful concept, and it has been run well by its coordinator, Teodoro Moscoso. It needs more money. It also needs, and is in process of getting, a revamping that will, among other things, emphasize its hemispheric nature. How necessary this is was proved by the United States when it unilaterally withdrew the Alliance for Progress team in the Dominican Republic at the time Washington broke relations in September. Latin American critics of the plan as an instrument of U.S. policies were thus given apparent proof of their cynicism.

Thomas Mann is probably the best equipped State Department career officer in the Latin American field. No one will able to accuse him of being soft on communism or Fidelismo, for his sentiments on these subjects are fierce. As Assistant Secretary under President Eisenhower he showed a flexibility and understanding which, combined with firmness, can make him the outstanding figure that U.S. relations with Latin America requires today.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Dec. 16, 1963]

President Stresses Progress—Gives Views on Latin America Policy Letter to Mann

WASHINGTON, December 15.—President Johnson said tonight he is determined to achieve "an American community of nations moving forward together in progress and freedom."

Mr. Johnson said that next to keeping the peace and maintaining the strength and vitality which makes freedom secure, "no work is more important for our generation of Americans than our work in this hemisphere."

The President sketched in broad terms his views on policy toward Latin America in a letter to Thomas C. Mann. Mr. Johnson selected Mann yesterday to be the new Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and apparently is upgrading this position.

CONFERS WITH MANN

Mann, now Ambassador to Mexico, will replace Edwin M. Martin who the White House said is to be given a major ambassadorial assignment in Latin America.

The President conferred with Mann today. Officials said Mr. Johnson told Mann he wants him to take the best parts of the good neighbor policy laid down by President Roosevelt and the Alliance for Progress launched by President Kennedy and use them as a guideline for plans to eliminate poverty, illiteracy and disease from the Western Hemisphere.

Officials said yesterday in announcing the new appointment for Mann, that he will be in charge of all political, economic and military aspects of U.S. policy on Latin America.

OMITS REFERENCE TO MILITARY

In his letter today, Mr. Johnson omitted any reference to the military and there was no explanation of why.

He told Mann:

"I have asked you, in addition to your duties as Assistant Secretary, to undertake the coordination and direction of all policies and programs of the U.S. Government, economic, social, and cultural, relating to Latin America. There can be no illusion that the work will be easy."

MENTIONS ROOSEVELT, KENNEDY

The Chief Executive also said:

"I know that you share my determination to press to full realization the visions of President Roosevelt and President Kennedy of an American community of nations, moving forward together in progress and freedom."

But, following the line of his Presidential predecessor, Mr. Johnson injected a note making it clear that he expects other American nations to share the load.

"All of the American nations," he said, "must market their resources and devote themselves to finding ways to bring the strength of those resources to the task at hand."

The President emphasized that the Alliance for Progress is a partnership in which each free American republic has a part to play.

"We must find ways," Mr. Johnson said, "to expand education, health, and low-cost housing facilities; we must find ways to help governments increase revenues by tax reforms and, at the same time, maintain an adequate and sustained rate of economic growth; we must find ways to bring about land reform and, at the same time, to increase agricultural production.

CALLS FOR EXPANSION

"Job opportunities must be expanded and educational and health facilities and low-cost housing must be provided. Social justice is a goal for which we must constantly strive."

After sketching over these goals which paralleled those of President Kennedy, the President told Mann he wants him to work closely with private U.S. groups and institutions carrying on activities in Latin nations. He mentioned as examples the AFL–CIO, religious and charitable organizations, cooperatives, and the private business sector.

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 15, 1963]

Precarious Partners—Distrust Poisons Alliance

(By George Sherman)

The growing fashion in Latin America is to blame U.S. harshness for subverting the Alliance for Progress.

In North America the reverse seems to be in vogue: Latin American irresponsibility is killing the Alliance.

Both sides are right in their basic premise. In the popular imagination the Alliance is dying. And in the process any genuine dialog between the two halves of the hemisphere is being replaced by shouting match in which neither side listens much to the other.

Even the most optimistic apologists for the Alliance now admit that it is in mortal danger. They find themselves drowning in an atmosphere of popular distrust, misunderstanding and mutual recrimination.

The new Johnson administration seems to regard this basic deterioration simply as an administrative problem to be solved here by revamping machinery to suit "get-tough" domestic critics. The drastic reassessment of organization currently going on in White House and State Department councils is dangerously close to degenerating into a search for scapegoats—mainly Teodoro Moscoso, the coordinator for Alliance affairs chosen by President Kennedy.

NEW POWERS FOR AID

Whether this in fact happens is now up to Thomas C. Mann, personal friend of the President, whom Mr. Johnson yesterday picked as his new Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. The President made clear that he would have new powers to coordinate all U.S. policy in Latin America.

But precious little has been heard so far about a careful reexamination of policy which should precede, not follow, a major shakeup in personnel.

The assassination of President Kennedy has created the tragic pause for such an examination. The numbing shock of his sudden loss throughout the hemisphere has momentarily silenced the storm of bickering.

But all the basic problems are waiting to break out from under the moratorium imposed by mourning. And President Johnson will have to face them without benefit of the strong personal mystique which John F. Kennedy created in Latin America through his sympathetic handling of Latin affairs.

At the moment, U.S. aid administrators are really President Johnson's most sympathetic allies. The vast majority are able and dedicated men. But they find themselves caught in a deadly crossfire between local resentment over aid restrictions and congressional charges of mishandling of taxpayers' money.

RESTRICTIONS DRAW COMPLAINT

"Do you know that Washington headquarters now has a 3½-page list of congressional restrictions which must be checked off before a plan is granted?" said one aid official in the field. "It is a wonder any project is approved there, let alone put together here."

Once a project is approved, Latin Americans bitterly chafe under minute supervision of how the money is spent.

"We feel like a general staff of North American accountants is breathing down our necks," said one exasperated Argentine planner. "Any change, even the smallest one and even for good reason, has to be cleared with them."

Despite these complaints, U.S. aid officials and their local counterparts throughout Latin America have no trouble proving that the Alliance has achieved something during its 2½ years.

They point to 140,000 homes built, 8,200 new classrooms, 900 hospitals and health centers, 4 million textbooks printed, and 15 million people fed with surplus U.S. foodstuffs. They point to $2.2 billion in U.S. aid committed in 2 years, as promised at the founding conference of Punta del Este, Uruguay, back in August 1961—$1.8 billion of that commitment has already been disbursed on approved projects.

But what the experts cannot prove is that these projects have a decisive political impact. The statistics of disease, misery and a terrifying population explosion are so staggering that any start on correcting them pales in comparison.

Also, the main thrust of the Alliance has been toward long-term help. Vast sums have gone into projects like powerplants, road systems, airport construction and educational systems which will take years to show results.

Another 25 percent of all U.S. aid has been paid out to help finance government budget deficits of foreign debt crises caused by falling prices of Latin American exports and increased cost of industrial imports needed for development. Much effort has also gone into piecing together competent national development plans in feudal countries which lack both trained personnel and the machinery of modern government.

All these measures, no matter how essential, do not yield the immediate tangible fruits upon which politicians live. So in exasperation they tend to dismiss the statistics as a boring exercise.

UNITED STATES IS SCAPEGOAT

The result is a steady eclipse of reason in Latin America. In their search for scapegoats, local politicians spend little time building that psychology of self-sacrifice which is the real key to survival in a Latin America undergoing drastic reform. And the most natural scapegoat is the United States.

In country after country you hear North American policy condemned for everything from fomenting "Socialist revolution" to restricting aid in support of a "reactionary" status quo. Redtape and bureaucratic dictation from Washington are the most favored culprits.

From the vantage point of the southern continent the U.S. response to irresponsibility is too often a dangerous game of tit for tat. The U.S. Congress seems determined to pay back in kind every piece of Latin American hostility. And in many Latin American eyes the North American press also fans the flames by its absorption with "communism, conflict and chaos" in Latin America.

"The spectacular is all that interests you," fumed a Venezuelan official before the recent national elections, and the spectacular distorts the truth. The press reports from here concentrate on Castroite terrorism, bombing and guerrilla warfare. They make you think that Venezuela is on the verge of civil war or revolution.

"Nothing could be further from the truth," he continued. "The terrorists are a tiny minority and they play on your headlines to exaggerate the danger. I wish we could get as much free publicity for the land reform, health programs, and economic recovery of the past years under democratic government."

But the main butt of criticism is the U.S. Congress.

"Sometimes I think that your politicians are as silly as ours," said a young Peruvian administrator acidly. "They are all for 'peaceful revolution' down here, but they forget that any revolution hurts, and hurts hard. They preach land, tax, and education reform to us, but they cannot take the confusion—and even the excesses—that go with real change."

He was speaking in the wake of the bitter foreign aid debate here this fall. Perhaps no other event in the past 2 years has cast more doubt on U.S. good intentions south of the border. Even the most reasonable Latin Americans now wonder how firmly the United States is committed to the 10-year, $10 billion aid program set for the Alliance for Progress at Punta del Este.

CRITICISM IRKS CHILEANS

The examples of bad faith seem endless. In October leading newspapers in Santiago, carried a speech on foreign private investment by Senator MORSE, Democrat of Oregon. He bitterly complained against excessive Chilean taxation and control of the North American-owned copper mines, and demanded a cutoff in U.S. aid until "conditions" to attract private capital were established.

These remarks undoubtedly were pleasing to North American ears, but in Chile they caused a furor.

Private U.S. companies produce 90 percent of Chile's copper, and account for 60 percent of Chilean foreign income. In a word, foreigners are the mainstay of the Chilean economy. Furthermore Chile received the largest chunk of U.S. aid in all Latin America during the last fiscal year—$135.3 million. To highly nationalistic Chileans, therefore, the Morse remarks looked suspiciously like an official U.S. power play to blackmail Chile for the benefit of the private copper companies.

FISHING AMENDMENT FUROR

Only a few weeks later another shock came to Chile, and this time it spread to Ecuador and Peru as well. The Senate passed a fishing amendment to the foreign aid authorization, cutting off all aid to nations interfering with U.S. fishing vessels beyond coastal limits recognized by the United States. The measure obviously was aimed at legislating protection for private U.S. tuna and other fishers in their running feud with these three countries on the west coast of South America.

The next blow, this time for Argentina and Peru, was the new Hickenlooper amendment proposed by Senator HICKENLOOPER, Republican of Iowa, to cut off all aid to countries which cancel contracts with U.S. companies without offering immediate compensation. The amendment exploded like a bombshell in the disputes both Argentina and Peru were having with large foreign oil companies. It was also ignored in the subsequent decisions of both countries to cancel foreign control over their oil exploitation.

What infuriated all these countries about the amendments was what they termed the blatant assumption that dollar-aid could be used to blackmail them into preserving the private North American interests. The Latins rebelled against the implication that they would only find an equitable solution to their private disputes if the aid stick were held over their head.

U.S. DIPLOMAT DECREES TACTICS

"The Congress is trying to legislate prepackaged diplomacy," moaned a discouraged U.S. diplomat in Argentina. "It gives us no flexibility in negotiation. It is not a question of the rights or wrongs in what the Argentines threaten to do, it is a question whether the present tactics will even permit us to sit down and discuss those rights and wrongs with the Argentines."

Nor did the list of irritating congressional acts end here. One amendment by the House of Representatives would raise to 2 percent the next-to-nothing interest rate on U.S. loans promised at Punta del Este, and reduce their duration from 40 years to 35. Another amendment would have 50 percent of all U.S. development loan funds go through private enterprise, thereby cutting out local government participation in a number of power dams, roads and construction projects basic to their national economies.

FIRST IMPRESSIONS LAST

It matters little to the public mind in Latin America that most of these amendments have been either lost completely or watered down in the complicated legislative process. They did their damage in the initial publicity by being passed in even one House of Congress. They have planted the seed of suspicion about basic U.S. devotion to the promise of helping to change the face of this hemisphere. They portray a basic intolerance and lack of feeling for the monumental hardships facing a whole continent.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 15, 1963]

UNITED STATES NAMES NEW LATIN POLICY CHIEF—MANN REPLACES MARTIN IN STATE DEPARTMENT POST

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

President Johnson yesterday nominated Thomas C. Mann as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

The White House announcement said that Mann will be in charge of coordinating all aspects of Latin American policy, an indication that his post will take on a new importance.

Mann, 51, a friend of the President and a native of Texas, now is Ambassador to Mexico. His selection is the first major appointment by Mr. Johnson.

Mann replaces Edwin M. Martin, a fellow career Foreign Service officer. Martin, who has been Assistant Secretary since March 1962 is headed for a major ambassadorship in Latin America.

MAY BE TOUGHER

Latin American specialists last night were puzzling over what policy differences, if any, the Mann appointment would make.

White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger was asked whether Mr. Johnson was satisfied with the progress of Latin American affairs.

Salinger replied, "No."

Mann is regarded as more direct and blunt than Martin. This has created speculation that he will promote a tougher line toward the Latin nations.

This toughness could be felt in two directions at the same time: Greater insistence that Latin nations leave American investments untouched and a stronger demand that the southern Republics embark more rapidly on internal social reform as a condition for receiving American aid.

UNDER ATTACK

The Alliance for Progress, the 10-year program conceived by President Kennedy to raise Latin living standards has been under sharp attack from several points on the political spectrum.

Liberals have complained that many Latin countries have moved too slowly on land and tax reform. Conservatives have argued that many Latin countries continue to engage in loose fiscal policies and indiscriminate confiscations of U.S. property rights in oil and other industries.

Mann also was Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs when the Kennedy administration took office. White House aids concerned with the region were unhappy with his performance and he was moved to Mexico.

However, President Kennedy was reported to have been dismayed by a statement that Martin made in October. On the heels of several military coups, Martin said that military regimes in Latin America had displayed restraint and achieved progressive accomplishments. Mr. Kennedy, the White House said, had then discussed another post with Martin.

MAY DOWNGRADE MOSCOSO

In his new job, Mann will be in charge of economic and military as well as political policy in Latin America.

This apparently means a downgrading for Teodoro Moscoso who has been in charge of economic aid for Latin America as administrator of the Alliance for Progress. Moscoso had enjoyed equal standing with Martin.

Last night, however, Moscoso did not see the change in this light. He told a reporter: "The political level should have primacy. The Alliance is a political program with economic instruments."

Moscoso said he would stay on if he could help, but it is expected that he will be shifted to some other task.

PRAISED BY HUMPHREY

Mann conferred yesterday with the President. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, the Democratic whip, also participated in the talks.

Afterward, HUMPHREY said: "I regard this as a move to upgrade the Alliance for Progress program and to place additional emphasis on our entire Western Hemisphere policy. I think it's a good sign."

One subject under discussion was the possibility of legislation elevating Mann to an under-secretaryship. Replying to a question on this point, Salinger said that Mann will be given the authority he needs to carry out his directive.

Mann was born in Laredo, Tex., and graduated from Baylor University and Baylor's law school. After 8 years of private practice, he joined the Foreign Service in 1942. He served in several posts dealing with Latin affairs and was appointed Ambassador to El Salvador in 1955. President Eisenhower appointed him Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs in 1957 and Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs in 1960. He is married to the former Nancy Aynesworth. They have a son, Clifton.

Martin, 55, is from Dayton, Ohio. He came to the Government as an economist in 1935 and went to the State Department 10 years later. Before his appointment to the Latin post, he too was Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it is indeed fortunate that two outstanding experts in Latin American affairs have been placed in these two responsible

positions. I refer, of course, to Assistant Secretary Martin and Assistant Secretary Mann. Mr. Mann formerly held this position and then became Ambassador to Mexico, where he has done outstanding work. I am pleased that Mr. Martin, on leaving his present post, will be given an ambassadorship in one of the important countries in Latin America. It is a fine thing that two such men are available to take over these important positions.

I believe that our country supports the Alliance for Progress program. I believe that, insofar as it has been understood, the people are strongly behind it. I realize that it has been considered difficult to get it off the ground, so to speak. A great deal of that feeling may be due to the impulsive nature of the American people. We are impatient. We want things to move overnight. Sometimes we do not realize how long it requires for some of the reforms that we insist upon putting into effect.

A very interesting article was published in the Sunday Star of yesterday. It was printed on page 1 and continued on the inside of the newspaper. It dealt with the Latin American program, primarily with the Alliance for Progress. It is the first article in a series of five articles. I shall look forward to reading the other four articles with a great deal of interest. The article I have read brings out many points about which we should remind ourselves. I commend a reading of that article to all Senators in connection with the present Latin American situation and in connection with our hopes for future development and expansion and progress in this program.

It was my good fortune to be at the White House when President Kennedy announced the Alliance for Progress program. That announcement was made with representatives of all Latin American countries present. I know it was received with a great deal of promise; a great deal of hope, and a great deal of optimism.

It is true that it has not moved as well as many would have liked to have it move, or as fast as they felt it should have moved. However, it has moved further than most of us have stopped to realize, when we consider the number of projects now underway, and the long-range nature of these projects, as well as the amount of help that has been extended.

It is not perfect, and probably will not be for a long time to come. But I still have hope for this great program. I know that just as President Kennedy was dedicated to the success of the program, so is President Johnson. By giving these two outstanding diplomats, Mr. Martin and Mr. Mann, the responsible positions they are to hold, in company with Mr. Bell, Mr. Moscoso, and others, whose responsibility it is to administer the program, I feel absolutely confident that the Alliance for Progress can be made to succeed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I share the views expressed by the Senator from Alabama and in connection therewith make an announcement. The Senator may recall that many months ago the Committee on Foreign Relations adopted a motion authorizing the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs to proceed with a study—and it made it very clear that it should be a study, not an investigation—of the Alliance for Progress program. Because of the many emergencies that have arisen in the Committee on Foreign Relations, which have taken so much of our time, the members of the committee have never been able to pursue that study to completion. There have been two or three conferences with officials of the Alliance for Progress.

However, I have already made it clear to the White House that either in January or soon thereafter we shall endeavor to make the service of the subcommittee available for a continuation of those discussions. I have made it clear to Mr. Mann that the subcommittee will be at his disposal for any assistance we can be to him in helping him to fulfill his new assignment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am delighted that the Senator from Oregon has brought that note into the discussion. I remember quite well that he made that suggestion in the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the committee unanimously supported the suggestion.

This is not the first study that the Senator from Oregon, as chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, has sponsored. We have heretofore made a series of studies on conditions generally.

While commending ourselves for having available the service of these able men who will head the Latin American program, I know of no one who has been a more tireless and able leader of a subcommittee than the Senator from Oregon, chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations. As a member of that subcommittee, I look forward to the study of the Alliance for Progress, because I know that much good can be accomplished.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the kindness of the remarks of the Senator from Alabama. I have followed the course of action that there is no chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs. We are all joint members of it. The help I have received from the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the other members of the subcommittee, bears out what I am convinced is sound policy in conducting subcommittees; namely, that ours is a subcommittee in name only. All of us are jointly responsible for its work, and we have functioned on that much-to-be-recommended democratic basis.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What the Senator from Oregon says is true, except that someone must take the lead. The chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, the able Senator from Oregon, has done so in an excellent way.

Mr. SPARKMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, in my remarks of a few minutes ago, I referred to an article published yesterday in the Washington Star. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record immediately following those remarks, the article, which is entitled "Precarious Partners—Distrust Poisons Alliance." The article was written by George Sherman, Star staff writer; and in the editorial note it is stated that Mr. Sherman has just returned from a 2-month trip covering 15,500 miles in Latin America. This article is the first of five by him.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PRECARIOUS PARTNERS—DISTRUST POISONS ALLIANCE

(By George Sherman)

The growing fashion in Latin America is to blame U.S. harshness for subverting the Alliance for Progress.

In North America the reverse seems to be in vogue: Latin American irresponsibility is killing the Alliance.

Both sides are right in their basic premise. In the popular imagination the Alliance is dying. And in the process any genuine dialog between the two halves of the hemisphere is being replaced by a shouting match in which neither side listens much to the other.

Even the most optimistic apologists for the Alliance now admit that it is in mortal danger. They find themselves drowning in an atmosphere of popular distrust, misunderstanding, and mutual recrimination.

The new Johnson administration seems to regard this basic deterioration simply as an administrative problem to be solved here by revamping machinery to suit "get tough" domestic critics. The drastic reassessment of organization currently going on in White House and State Department councils is dangerously close to degenerating into a search for scapegoats—mainly Teodoro Moscoso, the coordinator for Alliance affairs chosen by President Kennedy.

NEW POWERS FOR AID

Whether this in fact happens is now up to Thomas C. Mann, personal friend of the President, whom Mr. Johnson yesterday picked as his new Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. The President made clear that he would have new powers to coordinate all U.S. policy in Latin America.

But precious little has been heard so far about a careful reexamination of policy which should precede, not follow, a major shakeup in personnel.

The assassination of President Kennedy has created the tragic pause for such an examination. The numbing shock of his sudden loss throughout the hemisphere has momentarily silenced the storm of bickering.

But all the basic problems are waiting to break out from under the moratorium imposed by mourning. And President Johnson will have to face them without benefit of the strong personal mystique which John F. Kennedy created in Latin America through his sympathetic handling of Latin affairs.

At the moment, U.S. aid administrators are really President Johnson's most sympathetic allies. The vast majority are able and dedicated men. But they find themselves caught in a deadly crossfire between local resentment over aid restrictions and congressional charges of mishandling of taxpayers' money.

RESTRICTIONS DRAW COMPLAINT

"Do you know that Washington headquarters now has a 3½-page list of congressional restrictions which must be checked off before a plan is granted?" said one aid official in the field. "It is a wonder any project is approved there, let alone put together here."

Once a project is approved, Latin Americans bitterly chafe under minute supervision of how the money is spent.

"We feel like a general staff of North American accountants is breathing down our necks," said one exasperated Argentine planner. "Any change, even the smallest one and even for good reason, has to be cleared with them."

Despite these complaints, U.S. aid officials and their local counterparts throughout Latin America have no trouble proving that the Alliance has achieved something during its 2½ years.

They point to 140,000 homes built, 8,200 new classrooms, 900 hospitals and health centers, 4 million textbooks printed, and 15 million people fed with surplus U.S. foodstuffs. They point to $2.2 billion in U.S. aid committed in 2 years, as promised at the founding conference of Punta del Este, Uruguay, back in August 1961—$1.8 billion of that commitment has already been disbursed on approved projects.

But what the experts cannot prove is that these projects have a decisive political impact. The statistics of disease, misery, and a terrifying population explosion are so staggering that any start on correcting them pales in comparison.

Also, the main thrust of the Alliance has been toward long-term help. Vast sums have gone into projects like powerplants, road systems, airport construction, and educational systems which will take years to show results.

Another 25 percent of all U.S. aid has been paid out to help finance government budget deficits of foreign debt crises caused by falling prices of Latin American exports and increased costs of industrial imports needed for development. Much effort has also gone into piecing together competent national development plans in feudal countries which lack both trained personnel and the machinery of modern government.

All these measures, no matter how essential, do not yield the immediate tangible fruits upon which politicians live. So in exasperation they tend to dismiss the statistics as a boring exercise.

UNITED STATES IS SCAPEGOAT

The result is a steady eclipse of reason in Latin America. In their search for scapegoats, local politicians spend little time building that psychology of self-sacrifice which is the real key to survival in a Latin America undergoing drastic reform. And the most natural scapegoat is the United States.

In country after country you hear North American policy condemned for everything from fomenting Socialist revolution to restricting aid in support of a reactionary status quo. Redtape and bureaucratic dictation from Washington are the most favored culprits.

From the vantage point of the southern continent the U.S. response to irresponsibility is too often a dangerous game of tit for tat. The U.S. Congress seems determined to pay back in kind every piece of Latin American hostility. And in many Latin American eyes the North American press also fans the flames by its absorption with "communism, conflict, and chaos" in Latin America.

"The spectacular is all that interests you," fumed a Venezuelan official before the recent national elections, "and the spectacular distorts the truth. The press reports from here concentrate on Castroite terrorism, bombing, and guerrilla warfare. They make you think that Venezuela is on the verge of civil war or revolution."

"Nothing could be further from the truth," he continued. "The terrorists are a tiny minority, and they play on your headlines to exaggerate their danger. I wish we could get as much free publicity for the land reform, health programs, and economic recovery of the past years under democratic government."

But the main butt of criticism is the U.S. Congress.

"Sometimes I think that your politicians are as silly as ours," said a young Peruvian administrator acidly. "They are all for peaceful revolution down here, but they forget that any revolution hurts, and hurts hard. They preach land, tax, and education reform to us, but they cannot take the confusion, and even the excesses, that go with real change."

He was speaking in the wake of the bitter foreign aid debate here this fall. Perhaps no other event in the past 2 years has cast more doubt on U.S. good intentions south of the border. Even the most reasonable Latin Americans now wonder how firmly the United States is committed to the 10-year, $10 billion aid program set for the Alliance for Progress at Punta del Este.

CRITICISM IRKS CHILEANS

The examples of bad faith seem endless. In October leading newspapers in Santiago, carried a speech on foreign private investment by Senator MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon. He bitterly complained against excessive Chilean taxation and control of the North American-owned copper mines, and demanded a cutoff in U.S. aid until conditions to attract private capital were established.

These remarks undoubtedly were pleasing to North American ears, but in Chile they caused a furor.

Private U.S. companies produce 90 percent of Chile's copper, and account for 60 percent of Chilean foreign income. In a word, foreigners are the mainstay of the Chilean economy. Furthermore Chile received the largest chunk of U.S. aid in all Latin America during the last fiscal year—$135.3 million. To highly nationalistic Chileans, therefore, the Morse remarks looked suspiciously like an official U.S. power play to blackmail Chile for the benefit of the private copper companies.

FISHING AMENDMENT FURORE

Only a few weeks later another shock came to Chile, and this time it spread to Ecuador and Peru as well. The Senate passed a "fishing amendment" to the foreign aid authorization, cutting off all aid to nations interfering with U.S. fishing vessels beyond coastal limits recognized by the United States. The measure obviously was aimed at legislating protection for private U.S. tuna and other fishers in their running feud with these three countries on the west coast of South America.

The next blow, this time for Argentina and Peru, was the new "Hickenlooper amendment" proposed by Senator HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa, to cut off all aid to countries which cancel contracts with U.S. companies without offering immediate compensation. The amendment exploded like a bombshell in the disputes both Argentina and Peru were having with large foreign oil companies. It was also ignored in the subsequent decisions of both countries to cancel foreign control over their oil exploitation.

What infuriated all these countries about the amendments was what they termed the blatant assumption that dollar-aid could be used to blackmail them into preserving private North American interests. The Latins rebelled against the implication that they would only find an equitable solution to their private disputes if the aid stick were held over their head.

U.S. DIPLOMAT DECRIES TACTICS

"The Congress is trying to legislate prepackaged diplomacy," moaned a discouraged U.S. diplomat in Argentina. "It gives us no flexibility in negotiation. It is not a question of the rights or wrongs in what the Argentines threaten to do, it is a question whether the present tactics will even permit us to sit down and discuss those rights and wrongs with the Argentines."

Nor did the list of irritating congressional acts end here. One amendment by the House of Representatives would raise to 2 percent the next-to-nothing interest rate on U.S. loans promised at Punta del Este, and reduce their duration from 40 years to 35. Another amendment would have 50 percent of all U.S. development loan funds go through private enterprise, thereby cutting out local government participation in a number of power dams, roads, and construction projects basic to their national economies.

FIRST IMPRESSIONS LAST

It matters little to the public mind in Latin America that most of these amendments have been either lost completely or watered down in the complicated legislative process. They did their damage in the initial publicity by being passed in even one House of Congress. They have planted the seed of suspicion about basic U.S. devotion to the promise of helping to change the face of this hemisphere. They portray a basic intolerance and lack of feeling for the monumental hardships facing a whole continent.

Latin Americans have little sympathy with the North American plea of fatigue under the heavy burden of massive foreign aid carried since World War II. They know only that they were neglected for years while Europe received billions of dollars in outright grants. And they are rapidly losing respect for a political leadership which allows them to bear the brunt of frustration over an aid program in which they have scarcely participated.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I join other Senators in expressions of congratulations, first to the President, for appointing as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, Mr. Thomas Mann, Ambassador to Mexico and former Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs. I would not want my congratulations to imply in any way dissatisfaction with the fine work which Ted Moscoso has done as head of the Alliance for Progress. It has been my happy privilege to have known Mr. Moscoso well since 1947.

As has been so well stated by the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], at its outset the Alliance for Progress faced many major obstacles; but even while facing them, it has made considerable progress, and much of the progress that has been made is due in large measure to the energy of Ted Moscoso and the intelligent manner in which he has operated the program.

I wish also to commend the excellent work that has been done by Edward Martin, who has been filling the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America. He, too, has worked diligently, intelligently, and well.

We who have had the privilege of knowing Tom Mann for some time are much encouraged by the fact that he will now be in a position of great influence and importance. I recall having a conversation with him in Mexico City 3 or 4 years ago in which he told of the importance of the United States having one position and following that particular position with respect to a certain country, and having, as the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has pointed out, the ambassador to the country actually serve as spokesman for the United States with respect to that policy. He remarked about the difficulties that arose when an ambassador would take a certain position; then a representative from the foreign country would come to Washington, visit various other agencies of the Government, and get various rulings which conflicted with that of our ambassador, thus putting the ambassador in an untenable position.

Mr. Mann felt that particularly in the Latin-American area, it was necessary for the United States to have one policy, that policy, of course, to be administered, first, by the President, then by the Under Secretary of State, then by the Assistant Secretary of State, and then by the ambassador, who would be the spokesman in carrying out all major policies with respect to the particular country. I congratulate Mr. Mann for the work he has done in the past and encourage him in the great work I know that he will do in the future.

So far as I am concerned, I believe that the letter which the President has written to Mr. Mann, urging him to take the position and outlining the program, will in itself do much toward helping to alleviate some of the immediate problems with which we are confronted in Latin America.

I was particularly impressed, as was the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who spoke previously, with the fact that the letter from the President emphasized the necessity of utilizing private capital and having it working in Central and South America. This cannot be done, of course, if we are to permit or allow to go unrecognized expropriation by whatever type of government might be in control. Obviously, no intelligent businessman would be willing to recommend to his company that it send capital into a country which is likely to take it over, with no likelihood of compensation of any kind in return. It is important that we make it clearly understood that there is not enough money in the U.S. Treasury to carry on all the programs that need to be conducted in Central and South America, and that private capital is needed in that area of the world. I was especially delighted to learn that the President has emphasized this particular point.

Moreover, we know how important it is that the housing program be pushed forward. Much of it was started in 1961 by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY,] the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and myself and other Senators. At that time we discussed the importance of a housing development in Central and South America, because all of us believe that the best way to make people capitalistic-minded is to provide them with the opportunity to own their own homes. In order to start such a program, it was necessary to develop a system similar to the Federal Housing Administration in the United States, by which the Federal Government and local governments were enabled to provide the financing which was needed for large-scale housing, but which could be guaranteed only by the U.S. Government.

All in all, I believe the President has made a fortuitous appointment. The United States is most fortunate to have as the head of the program a man of the capability of Tom Mann, who is willing to accept this highly challenging position.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to add to the remarks I made earlier today, in colloquy with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], in high praise of the appointment of Tom Mann and of congratulations to President Johnson—to whom yesterday I sent a telegram congratulating him on this appointment—by saying that one of the recent and great achievements of Ambassador Thomas Mann was the preparation of the preliminaries for adoption of the Chamizal Treaty, which also stands as a monument to the late and beloved President Kennedy, who had those arrangements made after one-half of a century of failure by the United States to comply with the solemn obligation to decide this issue by arbitration which was entered into in 1911, and should have been fulfilled in 1913, under the terms of the treaty, but was never carried out. The passage of the years has made it much more difficult to carry out that obligation, because the population of the city of El Paso has grown steadily and more and more investments were made in the area that the arbitral award under existing treaties belonged to Mexico. It was to Ambassador Mann that President Kennedy assigned the difficult task of making the preliminary arrangements for the treaty, which shortly will come before the Senate, and I hope will be ratified. No one could be better qualified than Tom Mann to handle this task, since he was born and reared in the border town of Laredo, on the Rio Grande, and has thorough knowledge of the psychology and language of our two neighboring peoples. Indeed he has grown up with this problem. The implementation of that treaty is one of the lasting achievements of President Kennedy; and Ambassador Mann has contributed greatly to bringing this to pass.

I also wish to pay tribute to Ted Moscoso, a brilliant and dedicated public servant, an able administrator, who faced the almost insuperable task of implementation of the Alliance in its beginnings and to date and also the great additional problem—not generally known—of having some of his wise decisions overruled for political reasons, and thus making his assignment very difficult for him.

So I repeat the wish I expressed earlier today—namely, that I hope President Johnson will give his new appointee, to take charge of Latin American affairs, Tom Mann, full authority, not only to make loans and to grant aid, but also to withhold loans and aid when, in his judgment, it is desirable to do so, because unless the Alliance is a cooperative arrangement, with both the giving nation and the recipient nations doing their full parts, it will not succeed. I am confident that Tom Mann is so knowledgeable, competent, and firm that if he is given this authority, the program will have a better chance of success than it has ever had before.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Alaska; and I know that Tom Mann will greatly appreciate the generous remarks made about him by the Senator from Alaska, particularly when he stops to recall, as all of us do, that the Senator from Alaska has had a great deal of experience, not only in Latin America generally, but, in particular, in Mexico, where as a young man he served as a reporter; and I believe the Senator from Alaska is the only Member of this body who has written a book on Mexico. It is one of the most authoritative and respected books on that country, and is to be found in all the libraries of this country. So I am sure that Tom Mann will appreciate very much the remarks made about him by the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, whatever may be our differences about particulars and details, I am sure there is not a Senator in this Chamber who does not agree that the most important sector of our foreign policy today is Latin America.

Our intentions have been consistently good. Our efforts to implement those intentions have—for too long—been consistently less than satisfactory. One important aspect of our difficulties has been that of finding outstanding, seasoned, effective leadership to direct our efforts and to assure their success.

I was reared in a State adjoining a Latin American nation. I practiced law in a border State; and I have seen the changing policies toward Latin America and the effect of sometimes radical and drastic changes.

I believe the President has moved most wisely in acting to nominate Ambassador Thomas Mann for the position as Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs. He was reared in Laredo, Tex., on the Rio Grande, directly across the river from Nuevo Laredo; and he grew up in that bilingual area, where all the people south of the river speak Spanish, and approximately two-thirds of those in Laredo, Tex., speak Spanish. He grew up in the midst of Latin American affairs and international affairs. For many years, Laredo was the main port of entry between the United States and Mexico, because it was on the main railroad line tying together the two countries; and until the growth of air traffic, some 20 or 25 years ago, most of the tourist traffic to Mexico from the United States used the railroad line which crosses the border at that point.

In my experience, Ambassador Mann has been without a peer in both understanding Latin America and in helping

Latin America understand the true purposes and interests of the United States.

At this moment, this kind of ability is exactly what the Alliance for Progress needs. The Latin American nations will, I am sure, recognize in Ambassador Mann's appointment that President Johnson has signified his own deep and abiding interest in the success of the Alliance. In the Latin capitals there will be no question about the priority which the Chief Executive attaches to the success of our common goals and common aspirations. I believe this will be especially valuable in lifting the morale and reinvigorating the spirit of effort and accomplishment among all the free American Republics.

As we know, Ambassador Mann has enjoyed the trust and confidence of administrations of both parties. The Eisenhower administration utilized his considerable talents and abilities in the economc and trade field as well as the Latin American field. When President Kennedy came into office in 1961, he and his administration quickly recognized Ambassador Mann's invaluable talents and prevailed upon him to continue his service here during the formative months of the Alliance for Progress before later asking him to take the key ambassadorial post in Mexico City.

President Johnson has not only shown outstanding good judgment in his selection of Ambassador Mann for these new duties, but, also, he has manifested great wisdom in acting so promptly to reassure the Alliance nations of his personal determination for the success of this joint undertaking.

I know that all Americans in this country will find it reassuring also that our President has the courage—as well as the knowledge, background, and understanding—to exercise such confident initiative in the direction of our foreign policy, as it relates to Latin America.

I heartily endorse the selection of Ambassador Mann for this post; and I congratulate the President, both for his selection and for the manner in which he has acted in taking this step forward.

Today, I have written President Johnson a letter in which I recommended that the post of Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs be upgraded to the post of Under Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs. This will be most important for this hemisphere and for the two continents in it, to show the dignity which we attach to this office.

I have known Ambassador Mann for many years. It is interesting to note how he came into government service. He came from a family of lawyers on the Texas border.

In 1942, shortly after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the United States found that it had to do something about Latin America and do it fast. The conventional diplomatic channels were not getting the job done. So under the Roosevelt administration, the Board of Economic Warfare undertook recruitment of special people who would go into Latin America with extra-ambassadorial powers. Actually, they had more powers than Ambassadors. The Board of Economic Warfare representatives, under a special treaty with a Latin American nation, could freeze the account of any person who was suspected of trading with the Nazis. The task required great discretion, because a competitor could write a letter and accuse a businessman of dealing with the Nazis when actually he was not doing so.

The assignment required judgment, tact, and firmness.

In order to discover that type of person, the U.S. Government recruited, from all over the country, people who were not in Federal service. They did not know where they would find them, but they needed people who were bilingual, trained in the law and possessing tact and judgment.

They found Tom Mann practicing law in Laredo, Tex., and he set something of a record. He was sent to Montevideo, Uruguay, in 1942, as a special assistant to the U.S. Embassy in economic affairs, where he exercised the power I have named. He was brought back to Washington to the Department of State. His knowledge of Latin America was soon recognized in the Department, and he remained there for 4 years, from 1943 to 1947.

He went into the regular Foreign Service in 1947 as a Foreign Service officer, and was Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs in 1950–51. He was deputy chief of the U.S. mission, American Embassy, Athens, in 1953. He was brought back to Washington and later was made a counselor in the Embassy in Guatemala City in 1955 at a crucial time in Guatemalan affairs. He was U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador from 1955 to 1957. All of the appointments I have named—to Athens, to Guatemala, and to El Salvador—were made during the Eisenhower administration.

He was Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs from 1957 to 1960; then Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, 1960–61. Then, in 1961, President Kennedy appointed Tom Mann Ambassador to Mexico, the highest post he was to hold, and a difficult post in our relations with Latin America.

Mexico has the largest Spanish-speaking population of any nation on earth. It is the largest in area of Spanish-speaking people on earth.

We had one problem in our relations with Mexico that colored and made difficult our relations with all of Latin America for more than 50 years. That was the dispute over the El Chamizal territory in the city of El Paso and Juarez. The dispute began in the 1860's. Finally, in 1910, President Taft for the United States and President Diaz for Mexico met on a bridge between El Paso and Juarez and signed a treaty to arbitrate the El Chamizal difficulty.

The question was submitted to arbitration. Under the treaty that was negotiated as a result of the meetings between President Taft and President Diaz, an arbitration commission was set up and constituted, which made an award that the United States considered went beyond the terms of the power creating the commission, and the United States backed out. The treaty of 1910, which was ratified by the Senate, stated that the El Chamizal was disputed territory.

Since we did not abide by the 1911 award that was made as a result of that arbitration, Mexico has since refused to arbitrate any other question with us. They have said, "You will not live up to the awards that were made as a result of the arbitration. What point is there in arbitrating?"

That problem has worsened our relations with Mexico for more than half a century and has had an adverse effect throughout Latin America.

Tom Mann, during his service as Ambassador since 1961, when he was appointed by President Kennedy, has brought to a successful fruition the negotiations over El Chamizal. We now have a treaty. I believe it is to be submitted to the Senate tomorrow for ratification. It was one of the most delicate missions, one of the most difficult pieces of negotiation, and one of the most difficult problems in our relations with Latin America with which this country has ever been confronted.

A man who has brought about that successful result has eminently earned promotion to the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Latin-American Affairs. In such an important field, I should like to see the position upgraded to Under Secretary of State.

It is estimated that by the year 2000 or 2010 the population of Latin America will reach 600 million—as much as China today. The population will be almost double ours. Up until 15 years ago the population of the United States had exceeded that of all of Latin America combined. That alone would indicate the growing problems that we have to solve in our daily relations with our neighbors to the south, and the importance of those relations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I congratulate the able Senator from Texas on the remarks he has made. I also congratulate him on the suggestion that the appointment of Thomas Mann be upgraded to Under Secretary. I, too, have made recommendations along that line for a number of years, and I believe the proposal is long overdue.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, through these past 3 weeks, I believe every American has come to feel a growing sense of gratitude to John F. Kennedy for the magnanimity and foresight he displayed in keeping his Vice President so well and so intimately informed about the duties and responsibilities which might devolve to him.

We have seen the welcome fruit of this in many fields already. I certainly agree with the Senators that it is heartening, reassuring, and welcome to see President Johnson acting so wisely, forthrightly, and courageously in regard to our relations with the other nations of this hemisphere.

President Johnson's knowledge of Latin America—and its peoples—is the result of a lifelong interest and association. He knows the area. He knows the people. The people—and their leaders—know this and feel, I am sure, a great warmth for our President.

I recall that back in 1958—long before Lyndon Johnson's name was actively mentioned for national office in this country—the newly elected President of our good neighbor, the Republic of Mexico, made the unusual gesture of asking the then Senator Johnson to meet privately with him at Acapulco before he was inaugurated. President Lopez-Mateos sensed a kindred spirit and closeness which I know is shared by many other leaders of our neighboring lands. Still later, before Senator Johnson became Vice President Johnson, President Lopez-Mateos journeyed to his ranch home with his family to stay as guests of the man who is now our Chief Executive.

I can say from personal knowledge that President Kennedy was very much aware of his Vice President's special rapport and special usefulness in relation to Latin American affairs. On many occasions, the late President sought President Johnson's counsel on such matters and called upon his talents for vital services which the history books will someday tell.

In this perspective, I believe President Johnson has acted with real genius to demonstrate convincingly to all the Americas that their expectations for his administration will be fulfilled to the fullest measure. He has begun his administration with a reservoir of good will and trust south of the border such as few American Presidents have ever enjoyed. In moving as he has to place the foremost expert of our career professional Foreign Service at the helm of our hemispheric policies—a man who has the added strength of enjoying President Johnson's personal trust and confidence—the President has masterfully assured the peoples and governments of Latin America that this hemisphere will not be a secondary concern of his administration.

I know, admire and trust to the fullest Ambassador Tom Mann. He has been outstandingly successful in every post entrusted to him. His wide and intimate acquaintance with the leaders of the democratic forces throughout Latin America means that he will start his new duties with a personal asset long needed to assure the success of the Alliance for Progress.

President Kennedy had long recognized the need—and had pursued the policy—of finding exactly the right man for the key area policymaking post in the Department of State. He recognized that no policy could succeed to its full potential without such understanding, direction and interpretation. In this first such choice of his own, President Johnson has both followed President Kennedy's high standards and shown a reassuring initative and independence of decision in so doing. All who shared President Kennedy's hopes and dreams for the Alliance for Progress can take comfort and courage—this most vital enterprise has passed to good and understanding hands.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am delighted with the announcement that President Johnson has named Mr. Tom Mann as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs. The President could not have selected a more able man for this important post. Mr. Mann is uniquely qualified by experience, knowledge and temperament to direct our Latin American policies and programs.

We have been fortunate to have the services of Assistant Secretary Ed Martin in this post and it is reassuring to me to note that Mr. Martin will be assigned to another important responsibility.

We all know of the great interest which the late President Kennedy manifested in the Alliance for Progress. President Johnson shares that concern and in Mr. Mann he will have a powerful, respected lieutenant to assist him. I wish Mr. Mann well in his important task.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on November 26, 4 days after becoming President, President Johnson reaffirmed his continuing devotion to the Alliance for Progress inaugurated by President Kennedy.

In that statement, President Johnson added:

> I * * * pledge all of the resources of my Government to the achievement of our common objectives.

In the selection of career Ambassador Thomas Mann to direct our hemispheric policies—and in his broadened delegation of authority to Ambassador Mann—the President has offered our Latin American friends tangible and reassuring evidence that the United States means business in our determination that the Alliance shall succeed.

Ambassador Mann is certainly not a political appointee to this position—but, more importantly, he is not a compromise choice. He has the respect of all who have worked with him—in this country and in the Latin nations—as an able, effective, dedicated servant who knows both the Latin problems and Latin aspirations as well as any man in the U.S. Government.

Our Latin friends will not miss the point that, in making this choice, President Johnson has chosen a man he knows and trusts as a friend. This certainly should reassure Latin America of the President's strong personal commitment to assure the success of the Alliance.

Considering the great importance to the security of the United States—and to the prosperity and progress of this hemisphere—of the Alliance's success, it will be heartening to all Americans to have this persuasive evidence of the President's keen personal interest and determination to get our hemispheric house in order.

INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H.R. 7406) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The pending business is H.R. 7406, a bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in support of H.R. 7406, a bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank. I am confining my remarks to a consideration of what I regard as the salient factors involved in this bill, for I do not wish to take the time of the Senate with an exhaustive presentation of material already contained in the printed hearing record and in the committee report. Moreover, as is the case with any proposed legislation dealing with international financial matters, the background to this proposal contains some extremely complicated data which is better comprehended by scanning the printed material. At the same time, I wish to emphasize that the brevity of my presentation is no indication of the strength of my support for this bill.

The first point I wish to make is that we should keep firmly in mind the fact that the Inter-American Development Bank is the central institution in the concept for the Alliance for Progress. Because the Latin American countries collectively contribute over 50 percent of the resources of the Bank and because of their proportionate role in the Bank's management, they feel a clear sense of participation in an instrument which they themselves can use to promote the economic progress and ultimately the political stability of their area. I believe that the record shows that the Inter-American Bank has indeed been a sound means of promoting social and economic progress in Latin America.

The second point I want to stress is that only $50 million out of the total $461.8 million authorized for appropriation by this bill would actually represent a cash outlay by the U.S. Government, short of a most unexpected contingency. The $411.8 million authorized for the regular operations of the Bank would entirely take the form of callable capital against which the Bank could raise money in the private market through the flotation of bond issues. In this connection, it should be noted that the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury possesses the power to prohibit the flotation of such a bond issue in the United States if he determines that such an action would not be justified in terms of our overall balance-of-payments position. It should be further noted that Secretary Dillon has testified that the purchase by Western Europeans of bonds issued in the United States could have a salutary effect on our balance of payments.

A third factor which is of great importance is that the regular operations of the Inter-American Bank—which involve over 80 percent of the funds furnished to date—are modeled on those of the highly successful World Bank. While the Inter-American Bank has had only 3 years to make its record of accomplishment, there is every reason to believe that this institution will go far toward matching the great success of its World Bank prototype.

The next point I would mention is that the fund for special operations, small though its resources have been, has added a highly useful degree of flexibility to the Bank's operations. It has made possible the financing of certain projects within sound developmental plans, which otherwise could not be fulfilled because of an individual country's inability to service a hard business loan at any particular time. In addition, it should be noted that this contribution to the special fund is being sought at this time as a one-time operation. For the future, the fund is being made the subject of a careful study designed to bring these operations into a more efficient relationship to the comparable activities undertaken through the social progress trust fund, financed by the United States and administered by the Bank.

The final point I would make is that, contrary to some allegations, the United States has not been bypassed in terms of the use of Bank loans for procurement purposes. Secretary Dillon has testified that about 47 percent of total Bank resources have been utilized to finance procurement of goods from the United States. The fact is that this represents close to the percentage of the total contributions which have been made by our country.

Mr. President, there is no question that the United States played a determining role in the creation of the Alliance for Progress concept. There is not much doubt also that we waited almost until the last possible minute to establish an activity which was long overdue. Now there are many voices being raised to deplore the slow rate of progress being achieved by the alliance, and I do not believe it is an exaggeration to say that the future of this vital program is in serious jeopardy. I suggest that a heavy vote in favor of this bill would be an important reaffirmation of a U.S. policy which must not be permitted to fail. It is in this context that I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7406.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would the share of the United States in this joint and important operation with our Latin American friends—as I understand, all the Latin American countries except Cuba—remain the same, or would it be changed under the terms of the proposed act?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Our share in the Bank would be the same.

There are three sections in the bill. The first section would authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank to vote to increase the authorized capital stock in the Bank by $1 billion, of which the share of the United States would be $411,760,000.

None of this capital would be paid in by the member countries. The percentages are the same as now exist.

This is an increase to allow all members to increase their participation in the Bank. The stock is used as callable capital, against which the Bank may issue bonds in the private market.

This is the same procedure as that used in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct in my understanding that all the participating countries in this hemisphere—including our Nation and all Latin American nations except Cuba—have paid their shares of the original assessment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. The percentage would remain the same under the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. The percentage would remain the same, and the other countries would be guarantors or participants, or whatever one might call them, under the new program with the United States in the new issue on the same basis that they are participants with us on the original capital contribution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the committee yield to me so that I may ask a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I noticed in the transcript of the hearings that there was considerable discussion between the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and Secretary Dillon, who was the principal witness for the proposed legislation, as to whether the Hickenlooper amendment would apply to funds channeled through the Inter-American Development Bank. The Senator approached this question with a long discussion of various types of confiscation and expropriation which were taking place or threatened in Latin America, and raised the question as to whether this would be a new way of getting money into the Alliance without the protection which the Hickenlooper amendment had given to funds directly loaned as a part of the program.

Secretary Dillon answered:

> No. Once our funds are committed to the Inter-American Bank, they are not subject to a political decision by the United States.

This is one question I have about the proposed legislation. Would this be an entering wedge for taking even more jurisdiction from the Senate than it now has—which is not very much—and turning over the power to make loans to the countries in the Alliance through a channel over which the Senate and the Congress have no control?

It seems to me we face a problem, now that we are viewing the Alianza program critically—and in my case, with a view toward improving it—as to whether there is danger of expanding this deviation from Senatorial authority to a group of what we might call unseen men in a bureau—an international agency—somewhere, making loans without the controls the Senate has imposed or would like to impose on direct aid through our regular AID agency.

I wonder whether the chairman would be willing to discuss that subject to some extent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has stated the situation correctly. Not only would there be no control of that kind on this particular bank, but exactly the same is true with respect to the World Bank. We cannot impose restrictions similar to the Hickenlooper amendment on that organization, or on any other multilateral international organization. We cannot do that in connection with the Hickenlooper amendment.

We also cannot do it in the case of procurement or "tied loans," except to a modest degree. However, in fact there is a payment, according to the Secretary of the Treasury, of about 47 percent of these funds for procurement within the United States. That is approximately what our contribution is.

With regard to the Hickenlooper amendment, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, conscious of this difficulty, has been and is in the process of working out an international convention on arbitration, which is designed to cover this type of thing. Mr. Black, the former President, instituted this; at least, it was begun under his administration.

If this effort should come to a successful conclusion it would go far, I believe, toward answering the Senator's fears about expropriation in the international field.

So far the experience of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has been good. I know of no serious defaults or violations, by which a government has expropriated properties upon which the Bank's loans were based. The same is true for the Inter-American Bank.

I believe that what the Senator said about the Hickenlooper amendment necessarily would be restricted to strictly bilateral loans.

Mr. GRUENING. I have one other general question. I notice that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] called attention to the fact that one of the loans from the Inter-American Development Bank was $11 million for a government-owned refinery in Chile.

The Senator voiced concern, which naturally occurs to many of us, about how much of our money is going to finance government operations, when our emphasis is and should be on private enterprise.

Then he asked how many more loans of this type have been made. Secretary Dillon said he did not have the information, but he would be glad to give it. Later, he said he would give more detailed information on loans of this type which have been made.

That was November 15, a month ago. Has that information reached the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is information in the record on this subject.

On page 22 of the hearings will be found "Loans by IDB to Government-owned Industrial Projects."

If my memory serves me correctly, the loan to Chile, which the Senator from Alaska referred to, is an application, action on which has not yet been concluded. I do not believe it was. Perhaps it has been approved.

Reference to $11 million will be found on page 22 of the hearings. I think it was found it was not competitive with private enterprise.

I read from page 23 of the hearings:

> 4. ENAP (Chile): Eleven million dollars from ordinary capital. ENAP is the Government oil enterprise which has a monopoly on production of oil in Chile, is considered efficient and has operated with a profit. The purpose of this loan is to construct an oil refinery at Concepcion. A major American oil company is participating with the Bank in financing the external cost of constructing this refinery.

The Senator will find six examples in the hearings, beginning at page 22.

Mr. GRUENING. Somewhat like the fears expressed about backdoor financing, I express the fear that this bill perhaps is the beginning of a method to diminish the powers of Congress in controlling loans or grants to Latin America.

Here is a clear example, which is not new, but which is brought out in relief by the fact that we are increasing the amount of money to go to Latin American countries and the Hickenlooper amendment, which I consider to be desirable, and whose validity has been established, is going to be circumvented.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In that connection, I think the Senator is quite correct in that when we get into multilateral arrangements we are not able to have the same degree of control or put into effect our individual conditions, as is true in exclusively American aid programs. On the other hand, to offset that disadvantage, I am highly gratified that we are able to obtain participation by other countries. In this case, the percentage of our participation in capital stock is about 42 percent. Also, the voting is weighted, as it is in the International Bank, and as it is in IDA. In IDA, the other proposal which is before us, which was reported by the committee, our percentage of participation is approximately 32 percent. I believe it is a very good idea to have other countries participate in the program of aiding underdeveloped countries.

If the Senator's theory were adopted, it would force us to finance completely—100 percent—all of the development loans. If I had to choose between an opportunity to receive the support of other countries and a substantial contribution—in this case more than 50 percent—and the privilege of imposing the Hickenlooper amendment, I would choose the multilateral approach. I think it has worked very well. The International Bank is the best and most obvious example of success. It has not only done a great deal of good, but it has made more than $800 million in profits, and has more than that in reserves today. The Bank has had no difficulties. If properly administered, I do not doubt that this is a superior way of operation. In view of the extremely critical statements about the operations of AID, and in spite of the restrictions to which the Senator has referred, I would prefer this kind of operation if it resulted in an operation anywhere near the efficiency of the International Bank.

Mr. GRUENING. Are the loans repayable in dollars or soft currencies?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Most of the loans are repayable in the credit or currency that is loaned. In some cases, however, the repayment is in soft currency.

Mr. GRUENING. If they are made in hard currencies, are they then invariably repayable in hard currencies?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are, so far as the regular operations of the Bank are concerned, but not so far as the special fund is concerned. The special fund is a separate one. That is the third resolution. It is administered under rules different from those of the Bank itself. As I understand, the Bank's repayments are in the currency which is advanced by the Bank. In other words, if the Bank makes a dollar loan, the loan is repayable in dollars. If it lends a local currency, it is repayable in the same currency in which it is loaned.

Mr. GRUENING. I wonder if the Senator will be kind enough to explain the third special category.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is for special operations. These special operations are intended for the undertaking of loans which are normally in the nature of what is sometimes called infrastructure. For projects like roads or education, which are not profitmaking projects.

Mr. GRUENING. What would be the relation between loans of this kind and loans made by AID? As the Senator recalls, there was considerable discussion during the debate on the foreign aid bill. I proposed an amendment which would make all our loans at the same rate of interest which the U.S. Government pays. That amendment was defeated by a small margin of 47 to 41. I thought it was unfortunate that some of the loans were made on the basis of a 10-year moratorium, with no payment, and three-quarters of 1 percent interest for 30 years, actually costing the United States a vast sum in addition to the face value of the loan. But the Senate, in its wisdom, adhered to the much milder provision of interest at the rate of three-quarters of 1 percent, originally with no repayment for 5 years, and then changed to 10 years. Now it is proposed to make another loan procedure. Should we not limit the loans to one category that is visible to the naked eye? If we are to grant these loans at such low rates, its seems to me that they should be controlled by the Congress and the agency which is set up by the Executive, which could be supervised by the Congress, rather than accomplished by an unseen group of men in an international agency over which Congress has no control whatsoever.

It seems to me we are creating an additional spigot for handing out taxpayers' dollars which we ought to be vigilant about. I am fearful about it. The entire foreign aid program has been characterized by much giveaway and lack of real vigilance for the American taxpayer's interest. That does not mean that I do not see the necessity of making grants to countries that cannot afford to repay loans; but when we call them loans in order to give money, when the rate of interest charged is only three-quarters of 1 percent, with a moratorium of 10 years, and then provide that the loans are repayable in soft currencies, we are getting into the program very deeply. That is one of the many aspects of foreign aid that we should be vigilant about. I hesitate supporting such legislation as this now before us for that reason.

In my own study of foreign aid I have discovered at least twoscore of spigots, if I can call them that, by which foreign aid is ladled out, about which most people, including Members of the Senate, are not aware.

I believe we should be very vigilant about these matters. When we enact legislation like this we turn over the administration of the aid program to someone else. These are not businesslike loans. We can assume that the first two categories dealt with in this bill represent businesslike loans, even though they are not subject to the Hickenlooper amendment. I wish they were. However, there are three categories under one of which several types of loans are made, with no interest or nominal interest, and over which we in the Congress have no control. It, therefore, seems to me that we now remove the little control we have one step further. When AID makes the soft loans, or other unsound loans, we do not know anything about them for years afterward. Then we discuss them, perhaps, and it is too late. I was present at the signing of a loan to a Middle Eastern country, to construct a profitmaking powerplant. It would be profitable from the day it started to generate the power. That loan was made with a 10-year moratorium included, at three-quarters of 1 percent of interest, for 30 years. It would cost us $12.5 million for that $30 million loan even before a start was made to repay principal and interest. That was scarcely a sound transaction from our standpoint.

Of course, that is water over the dam. All we can do when a matter of this kind comes up 2 or 3 years later is to say that it was a mistake. Now we are opening a new channel for this kind of operation. We should go slowly. I am therefore very reluctant to approve this kind of legislation, in giving this additional blank check to an unseen group of men in a bureau.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator wish me to make a comment on his statement?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes; I wish the Senator would make some comment. I should like to hear some defense of this procedure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator says that we have no control over the operation. We have 42 percent of the vote. For all practical purposes our Government can exert influence. If the Senator has no confidence in the wisdom of our representatives, or has very little confidence in them, what he is saying is correct. We do have 42 percent of the votes in the organization, so that we can influence, as a practical matter the support we need to veto any particular project.

Regarding the special fund loans, they have not been soft so far as the interest is concerned. It has averaged 4 percent. As I have said, with very few exceptions, the loans are repayable in the currency loaned. The really soft loans, in the sense of carrying low interest and being repayable in other than the currency loaned, are a small amount. The amount is roughly estimated at $20 million or so.

The special fund loans I have mentioned generally are for development projects which cannot be financed under regular bank financing.

The Senator has criticized AID loans which carry low interest rates. However, they are repayable in dollars. When the Senator says that such a loan is not a loan, I disagree with him completely. During the Marshall plan we made outright gifts to countries which now, by hindsight, it is agreed, would be able to repay the amount we gave them. It was a mistake that such grants were not made on the terms that we insist upon with respect to loans. The principal is repayable in the currency loaned. There is a low interest rate, of course, but the purpose is to give the countries an opportunity to make progress and get started.

The Senator may, if he wishes, cast doubt on their being able to live up to these terms. No one can absolutely guarantee that a loan will be repaid. If they live up to their agreements, they will be repaid. The principal will be repaid with low interest.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator can talk from now until doomsday and say that such a loan is not a loan. It is a loan, and it carries a low interest rate. If the Senator wishes to say that we are subsidizing the interest rate, he is correct. We are, just as we are subsidizing the interest rate in connection with REA. I have supported REA, and continue to do so. We make those loans at interest rates which are lower than the Government must pay for the money that is loaned.

When the Senator says that the so-called spigots are operating without anyone knowing anything about them, I do not understand what he means. There is no program that is investigated more than the foreign aid program. Committees in both Houses investigate it, and GAO likes to investigate it all the time. They particularly relish finding some examples of mistakes in it. There have been some mistakes. I do not deny that. However, I believe that to say it is not a loan because the interest rate is low is to make an inaccurate statement of fact.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to correct the Senator's view of my comment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what the Senator said.

Mr. GRUENING. I do not believe that a mere low interest rate should disqualify the transaction from being called a loan. However, when there is a 10-year period during which we are paying out money at 4 percent, so that before the loan becomes ready for repayment we have already gone into our Treasury for millions of dollars, with no obligation to repay that sum it is not a loan, because it is actually a grant—a concealed grant on top of the loan.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a grant of interest. It is a subsidization of interest. They agree to repay the principal. I read the other day that Kuwait, because of its religious opposition to interest—an orthodox Moslem thinks it is evil to charge interest—is making an interest-free loan. However, they expect to have the principal repaid. We in the West do not think it is immoral to charge interest. However, we are charging less interest than the money costs us. There is no mystery about it. There is no attempt to try to fool anyone. We require that the loans be repaid. It is not correct to say that it is not a loan merely because the interest rate is low. It would be correct to say that it is a low interest rate. Nevertheless, it is still a loan. The principal must be repaid. It is a loan with a very low interest rate. But here we have been speaking largely of our own AID program.

Mr. GRUENING. If the Senator will yield once more, I should like to make one further point; then I will subside. The Senator has said that we have 44 percent of the votes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Forty-two percent. That is our percentage of the weighted vote. We have a weighted vote in the International Bank. That is the kind of weighted vote we have in this organization.

Mr. GRUENING. My criticism was directed to that. It was my understanding that the word "we" referred to us in Congress. That is where the control should be. My hesitation in approving this kind of legislation is in giving more power to the bank board to make loans. This is something we are doing more and more. We are giving them—not Members of Congress—more and more money to expend. We shall see this tendency grow, and I believe the next time the foreign aid bill comes before Congress we shall find that more and more of this money, the American taxpayer's money, will be turned over to a lending agency, an international agency. The military program will be turned over to the Pentagon. It will be placed in the armed services bill and not the foreign aid bill. We shall be left with nothing to do in the Congress but nod our heads and give rubberstamp approval. That will be a very unfortunate development, and one which I fear.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I respect the Senator's right to disagree with our AID program. It is not a very palatable program. It is nothing to be enthusiastic about, and has never had any enthusiastic support in Congress. I take no great pleasure in noting the burdens that our country must bear in international affairs.

I do not quarrel with the Senator for being against the program. I am trying to explain it. I am sure it is due to the peculiar position our country holds in the world, financially, militarily, and otherwise. As the leader of the free world we have some responsibilities that we cannot escape. This is a program which is domestically very unpopular. I do not quarrel with the Senator's opposition to it. On the other hand, the administration of a program like this is essentially an executive function. I do not believe Congress is equipped to administer this kind of program. The Senator says that we have no control. We have the ultimate control of abolishing it if we wish to do so. There is nothing to prevent Congress from completely stopping the entire program. We can do that. We could have done it this year. We can cut it down. There is no deprivation of the power of Congress to stop these programs. Every administration during my service in the Senate has felt that this is an essential program. Not only the civilian but also the military divisions of our Government have supported it before our committees and have stated that it is in the national interest.

The Senator is opposed, for example, to putting the military aid program under the military. I submit that for all practical purposes the military department, under existing law, from the beginning, has exercised primary discretion in the administration of the military aid program. As to whether this has been good or bad, anyone is entitled to his own opinion. But I do not believe anything drastic would happen if this phase were turned over to the military, both in form as well as in substance, letting the military accept the responsibility. Much of the criticism of the AID program has arisen from the operations of the military aid part of it. But when the information gets into the press, the distinction between civilian and military programs is dropped, and there appears to be a tremendous waste in the AID program. Yet when one reads the reports carefully, he finds that a great part of the criticism has been of the military aspects of the program. Perhaps it would be a little more honest and better understood by the public and the Government if this aspect were turned over to the military.

Speaking only for myself, I would recommend that military aid be carried in the military budget, because it is essentially military in character and has been administered all these years by the military, although in form it has been in the civilian foreign aid program.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. He has a gentle and persuasive way of presenting the case.

To keep the record straight, I am not opposed to the program. I believe in foreign aid. However, the program as presented and carried out hitherto needs to be much improved, cut down in size, and more carefully controlled. If the statements that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has made were considered in retrospect, we would see that the great grants made under the Marshall plan and the loans made without interest have an application to the caution flags that some of us are trying to raise now. We want to try to obviate the same errors or corresponding or analogous errors in the future. That is the real burden of my remarks. I would not vote under any circumstances to abolish the program. If such a proposal came before the Senate, I would speak against it and vote against it. But I think it can be operated more efficiently, and that we can learn by the mistakes of the past. It should be gradually diminished as the billions of dollars we have expended make the beneficiary countries able to take care of themselves without aid.

We have not learned half as much as we should have learned. What has happened in Cambodia should make us reexamine the program to make certain that this particular type of situation does not recur. That is the whole point of my remarks in connection with the measure before the Senate.

The entire subject should be scrutinized carefully before we diminish the control of Congress over this program. The point has been made before that Congress cannot administer the program. I contend that it should do its constitutional duty to be vigilant about the funds appropriated. We are dealing with a new instrument of foreign policy, one which did not exist 20 years ago. It is the use of large sums of money as an instrument of foreign policy. Up to that time, the function of the Senate in foreign affairs was merely to ratify treaties and confirm presidential foreign service appointments. But now a new element has come into the picture, with the appropriation of billions of dollars as an instrument of foreign policy. At that point, it seems to me, it is the duty of Congress to inject itself and to have a voice and a vote on what should be spent, where, and how much. We are only starting to do it now. We should have done it long ago.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not true that the purpose of the original act endorsed by the Senate was to get free from what was generally called foreign aid, and to have the countries of Central and South America enter into a joint undertaking with us to try to solve their individual problems?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. To summarize in a word, although it is an oversimplification, the main purpose of what we thought was a new approach at Bogotá and Punta del Este was to bring in the Latin American countries as what might be called partners or participants in a program to which they could contribute not only money but various kinds of reform; that we would take part in the program, but not in a completely unilateral, wholly American program.

The Senator from Florida is quite correct. This is one of the major objectives of the program.

Mr. SMATHERS. So the Senator would agree that we must go forward with this type of program if we are eventually to reduce the size of the foreign aid program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think this program is the best hope of accomplishing that purpose.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does not the Senator further agree that creating the inter-American aspect, such as we now have, actually encourages this particular system of banking and encourages private enterprise not only in the United States, but in the countries of Central and South America, to participate to some extent with the Bank in solving the economic and social problems of the individual countries?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is quite correct. The record shows that.

Mr. SMATHERS. My last question is perhaps somewhat repetitious of the first question: If we ever are to settle the problems which we all recognize exist in this hemisphere, particularly among our neighbors to the south, it would be much better to settle them in this rather hardheaded banking way, whereby the Central and South American countries would be required to participate, rather than to have the United States continue to try to be the big brother and provide all the money that would be necessary to settle the problems of those countries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is absolutely correct. We cannot expect to impose the rules, as we have done in our exclusive bilateral aid program.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Before I speak in opposition to the bill, I should like to ask the chairman a few questions, to make a legislative history.

Speaking hypothetically, and assuming that the Senate did not pass the bill today, or postponed action on the bill today, to what extent would the operation of the Inter-American Bank be interfered with in the next few weeks?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The critical element in the timing is the matter of the appropriation for the funds for special operations, which involves a sum of $50 million. If the bill is not passed, the authorization for that appropriation will not have passed; therefore, within this week that sum could not be included in the appropriation bills which are now in process of being developed and which are expected to be passed before this week is out. That would be the major effect of a failure to pass the bill this week.

Mr. MORSE. But the request could be renewed in the next session of Congress, could it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; but the opportunity for appropriation would thereby be delayed. This is a December 31 deadline for agreement, in accordance with the agreement which was made by our representatives and other representatives. It would be necessary to make another start, so to speak. I suppose there is nothing to prevent that. If the agreement were to lapse, we could start over again next year, I suppose. But the present agreement will lapse on December 31 if it is not renewed.

Mr. MORSE. But there is nothing sacrosanct about the present agreement. If the policy is a sound one, in the opinion of the members of the Bank, the representatives of the various countries in the Bank could renew their proposal at the next session, so far as we are concerned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. But such an action would be interpreted by the Latin American countries as a form of withdrawal, or certainly of great doubt about the future of our support of the organization.

The Senator from Oregon knows, as well as I do, that such reaction is speculative. If the United States were not to support it, I do not know what would happen. This is a difficult area. Our best informed people in this field believe it is very important that the bill be passed in order to give reassurance to the participants from Latin America that we are in the program seriously. However, as the Senator from Oregon says, there is no constitutional or other prohibition against our refusal to go forward with the program.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wished to make a legislative history.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The particular agreement into which we have entered, and which, of course, is subject to action by Congress, will lapse on December 31, if we do not act.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Inter-American Bank now without funds?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; it is not.

Mr. MORSE. Can the Senator tell the Senate how much uncommitted money the Inter-American Bank now has?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In that connection, I assume the Senator is speaking of the Inter-American Bank itself. This particular bill, requires only an authorization to increase capital, which is callable and which does not require actual cash outlays. The Inter-American Bank is not without funds.

The special fund, which I stated would require $50 million, or at least an authorization of $50 million, is practically without funds; whereas, the Inter-American Bank is not. The Inter-American Bank could continue to operate. The special fund is almost without funds, as I recall.

I am informed that perhaps approximately $20 million is left in the Fund for Special Operations—which would not carry it very far.

Mr. MORSE. But the Inter-American Bank still has a heavy load of work facing it in passing upon requests for loans, from various Latin American countries, for various projects and programs. In some instances, it has not finished processing them, and in other instances it has not yet even begun to process them. Is that not true?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We were informed by the Secretary of the Treasury that the Bank could remain in operation until early 1965, before complete exhaustion of its funds, but that the normal leadtime required in its operations, if the funds are not increased, would require a gradual phasing out of the operations, if it were not assured of the receipt of additional funds. So this is about the actual leadtime between the time of the making of applications for loans and the time of consummation of the payments.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much, for that is the legislative history I wish to make at this point.

Mr. President, it is my opinion that the Senate should not consider itself ready to pass on this bill today. It is my opinion that it is highly important, in the interest of our foreign policy, that

Senate action on the bill be postponed until early in the second session of this Congress; and before the afternoon is over, I shall make the appropriate motions to seek to bring about such postponement, because basic policy questions are being raised by the bill, and therefore I think the Senate should take the time required to consider them long and earnestly. The Senator from Alaska has raised some questions.

Let us consider the timetable in connection with the bill. It was voted on by the Foreign Relations Committee last Friday, at about noon. Some of us could not be at the committee session on that occasion. I am an opponent of the bill; but I was bound by a unanimous-consent agreement which required my attendance on the floor of the Senate, to manage the time in opposition to the foreign aid conference report. Those proceedings lasted until 2 p.m., when the vote was taken. But, Mr. President, one who reads the committee report on the bill would not have the slightest idea that any member of the Foreign Relations Committee was opposed to the bill.

I have been critical of the technique in connection with the reporting of bills. When a Senator examines a committee report, I believe he should be able to know whether the report is a unanimous one; and I believe committees should stop the practice of sending to the floor of the Senate unsigned committee reports. When we examine the report on any bill, we should be able to know how many members of the committee favor it and how many are opposed to it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The vote was 12 to 3. In the past, we have not engaged in the sort of practice referred to by the Senator from Oregon. Of course, that is subject to the determination of the committee. If the Senator from Oregon wishes to have the committee adopt such a practice, he is at liberty to make such a suggestion to the committee whenever he wishes to do so.

The bill was introduced on June 11, on behalf of the Government. The Senator from Oregon knows that about at that time, the Senate was deep in its consideration of the foreign aid bill. Then came the nuclear test ban treaty, which the then administration felt was of great importance. So we laid aside the foreign aid bill for almost 2 months, and thereafter took it up again; and it was given priority by the administration and by the committee. The fact that the committee voted on the bill only last week was largely a result of the specific requests by various Members of the Senate to have it put over from time to time, in order that they might obtain new information, and so forth.

I say this only to clarify the RECORD and to point out that the bill did not come to the Senate only recently; it was not suddenly reported. It has been before the Senate since June; and, as I recall, two or three committee meetings were scheduled for consideration of the bill and for voting on it. One of the other committee members asked that the bill go over because he wished to obtain some new information; and there were other delays. Those are the reasons. I do not think the RECORD should indicate every precipitate or unconsidered action by the committee. I think there was very favorable consideration of the bill, and I hope the RECORD will show that there was not precipitate action by the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I assure the chairman of the committee that I had no intention of implying that there was precipitate action. As the chairman of the committee has said, the bill was introduced at the time he stated; but nothing was done about it for a long time, because of the necessary postponements which have been pointed out by the Senator from Arkansas. We did consider first the foreign aid bill and the nuclear test ban treaty.

Finally, we heard Mr. Dillon testify on the bill. At that time, I thought the bill was a sound one; and I said for the record that I thought it was a good bill, but that I wished to ask some questions.

Because at that hearing there was so much pressure of time—because we had already passed the 12 o'clock limit—I agreed to submit some questions in writing. I also made clear that I wished to study the bill.

I did both; and I have reached the conclusion that the bill in its present form is a bad one, and should not be passed by the Senate until there is further consideration of the bill and adequate time for Senators to study it. The bill involves some very basic foreign policy questions which I believe have arisen as a result of this bill and other developments in the field of foreign aid.

Although I am not critical of anyone in this connection, I wish to say that when a bill is reported at noon on Friday, and when a committee member is in opposition to the bill and when we come to the floor of the Senate on the following Monday and pick up the report and, to our surprise, discover that the bill is the pending business, although we have not even had an opportunity to file minority views, certainly the bill should not then be considered here on the floor. The Senator from Missouri can speak for himself, but he also had grave doubts about this bill.

If I had known the bill would be taken up so quickly, following the taking of the vote in the committee, I would have asked for time in which to prepare minority views, because certainly they require time for preparation. The Senate needs to study both the majority report and the minority views on the bill before the vote on it is taken.

I am not charging that precipitate action was taken; but I am simply saying that from Friday noon until noon today, there has not been sufficient time for consideration of the bill by those of us who are opposed to it. I did not even have notice that the bill would be before the Senate today.

I know there is an unhappy situation within the Foreign Relations Committee, but that has nothing to do with the chairman of the committee.

We shall discuss it behind the closed doors of the Foreign Relations Committee. I wish to say for the public record that, with a staff knowing my views on the bill, I should have been notified immediately as to the contemplated passage of the bill so that I could have had an opportunity to prepare minority views. I should have been notified of the intention to bring the bill up for a vote today. That was not done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is usually the responsibility of the leadership—the policy committee, particularly the leadership—to set bills down for consideration. I had no assurance that the bill would be brought before the Senate today, tomorrow or the next day. Particularly near the end of a session, the leadership does the best it can to schedule bills for consideration. I assure the Senator that the reason why the bill is up for consideration is because of the deadline. I believe, the IDA bill was reported because of the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. The leadership either agreed or tentatively agreed not to ask for its consideration because there is no deadline on it. It can go over until next year without embarrassment to the administration; whereas, if the bill before the Senate is delayed beyond December 31, it will undoubtedly be embarrassing to the administration.

In its normal operations, the leadership, while not completely subservient to any administration, at least tries, insofar as possible, to give consideration to the needs of the administration and what its policy is in this field.

So I do not believe the leadership should be criticized, under the circumstances, for perhaps not giving notice to Senators. I am not sure they knew they could bring it up today. But the bill does have a deadline on it. While the deadline, might seem to be the 31st, actually that deadline would be today or tomorrow if the item is to be included in an appropriation bill. The appropriation bills are already in the "mill," and I am told that the House Committee on Appropriations cannot, or will not, include the item unless the Senate passes the bill today or tomorrow.

The leadership can speak for itself, but I believe this is one reason why the particular bill was called up and action was desired today.

Lastly, I do not wish to labor the point but the Senator from Oregon well knows that 2 or 3 weeks ago the chairman of the committee sought to obtain action by the committee. He knew that except for one or two members, the committee was ready to act on it, and deferred action only at the request of certain individual members to accommodate them insofar as the obtaining of certain additional information requested was concerned. That was the reason for it.

The bill was not sprung as a surprise on any Senator. The committee was thoroughly aware of the intention of the chairman to report the bill as soon as we could. That endeavor began 2 or 3 weeks ago.

Mr. MORSE. I have a few more comments to make about procedural matters that the distinguished Senator from

Arkansas has raised, before I enter into a discussion of the merits of the bill itself.

Stating the facts, as I have, certainly does not imply any criticism of the leadership or anyone else, but they are facts as to the time elements involved in the handling of the bill. Being facts, the conclusion is inevitable that those of us in opposition to the bill have not had adequate time to file minority views, because we did not even know we were in the position in which, if we were going to file minority views, we would have to do so immediately. We knew what the procedure would have been if we had asked for some time to file minority views, and, if we knew that the bill was going to be brought up, we would have been granted time. Of course, in that event, the bill would not be here today.

Later I shall come to the subject of the deadline again. That is nothing but a pressure argument; it is without merit. As Senators we have no right to take action on a bill in the so-called dying hours of a session on the basis of the claim that if we do not, the administration will be embarrassed by some kind of deadline. There is no embarrassment. That is a figment of people's imagination.

We have a duty to enact legislation on its merits. If the so-called deadline gets in the way, that is too bad for the deadline. It must give way. The trust given to all Senators is to pass on proposed legislation in accordance with its merits.

The chairman speaks about the practice of the Foreign Relations Committee sending to the floor of the Senate unsigned reports. I believe he is quite correct that the practice should be changed, if that is considered to be the practice of the Foreign Relations Committee. I will not know until I go into the record of the committee as to the last time when minority views were reported to the Senate. I recall that when there was a voice vote on the foreign aid bill, certain Senators were necessarily absent. I happened to be in Oregon at the time. In a telephone call I said that I should like to have it announced that I was against the bill but that I should be perfectly willing to make that procedural change—along with a whole group of procedural changes which I intend to recommend in the immediate future, for the operation of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I believe that when a committee report comes to the floor of the Senate—a Foreign Relations Committee report or any other—and a Senator picks it up, that committee report should tell him where the committee stands in regard to the membership of the committee.

Be that as it may, I wish to turn to what I consider to be some of the policy demerits in the bill that justify the motion or one of the motions I intend to make during the afternoon seeking to postpone action on the bill until after the 1st of January.

So, Mr. President, I raise a parliamentary inquiry: Will I be in order during the afternoon if I move that action on the bill be postponed to a day certain?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon may make a motion to postpone to a day certain.

Mr. MORSE. That will be the first motion that I shall make. I am perfectly willing to accept any day certain within a reasonable period after the convening of the next session of the Congress, because I believe that there should be time for Members of the Senate, who are all acting under great pressure in the dying days of this session, to study the committee report and the hearings and give the matter some serious study before the vote is taken.

Let us not fool ourselves—or the public. If a vote on the bill is called for this afternoon and, assuming hypothetically that every Senator is present, I say most respectfully there will not be 75 Senators voting who will have the slightest conception as to the policy questions involved

I do not believe that is the way to enact legislation. If I am correct—and I am satisfied that I am—basic policy questions in relation to foreign aid are involved.

Earlier today we discussed—and it has been announced to the press by the President of the United States—that it is contemplated that there will be a review of the whole United States-Latin American program. The entire Alliance for Progress program will be reviewed. The new Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, Mr. Thomas Mann, about whom many of us have spoken and highly commended earlier today, will be in charge. Legislation will be introduced to create a new post in the Department of Justice in the Under Secretary of State for Latin America. I am for it.

But, Mr. President, the policies and programs and functions of the Inter-American Bank are part and parcel of that policy and program. It, too, needs to be reviewed. I do not believe, as a matter of policy, that we can possibly justify rushing through the Senate this afternoon a bill that seeks to contribute many millions of dollars of the taxpayer's money to a so-called progress program of the Inter-American Bank without a thorough review and reexamination of it, not only at the Senate level, but at the administration level in connection with the review of the Alliance for Progress program.

With the administration announcing that it intends to take a new look at the Alliance for Progress program, I do not believe that the Senate can justify passing the bill this afternoon as a matter of policy. I believe consideration of it should be postponed, so that we can get on with the business of seeing all the interrelationships among the various institutions and programs involved in connection with the Alliance for Progress program before passing the bill.

I could not agree more than I agree with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] in regard to one of the great dangers in the bill. I would that my colleagues in the Senate would give heed to the point of view of the Senator from Alaska and of the Senator from Oregon without any personal implications and without any interpretation that when we make these criticisms of the proposal involved in the bill we are reflecting upon U.S. representatives in the Inter-American Development Bank, for I am not. I have exceedingly high regard for them, as I have for the Secretary of the Treasury.

I shall continue to direct my attention to policy with no relationship whatsoever to personalities.

When American personnel are employed in institutions such as the Inter-American Development Bank what do they become? Inevitably they become advocates of the program. They develop special interests. They do not occupy a position of judicial review, which is the obligation of Members of Congress. They want what they want.

So, when the chairman of the committee and other Senators quote the members of the delegation representing the United States sitting on the Inter-American Development Bank, I am a good enough lawyer to know that I am called upon to evaluate the testimony of special pleaders. That is what they become. I have the responsibility, and every one of my colleagues in the Senate has the responsibility, of carrying out the constitutional mandate which is ours, which so many in the executive department have shown in past months they want to evade or forget.

As was said during the debate on foreign aid, the Secretary of State was critical of the Congress because it sought to exercise what he deemed to be an interference with the administration of American foreign policy. I said good-naturedly, pointedly, and rightly, that he ought to go back to high school and take again his civics course, because no Secretary of State could justify making the criticisms of the Congress that he made in that press interview, and in subsequent press releases which the Secretary of State released from his office, and reconcile the criticisms with the trust and obligation of Congress to carry out its constitutional mandate.

I say to the Secretary again, as I say to the proponents of the bill, that under the Constitution of the United States no money of the taxpayers of the United States can be spent by the executive branch of the Government or by any official of the executive branch of the Government except money authorized by law by the Congress. That is the constitutional obligation which rests on every Member of Congress.

This bill is another part of the subtle program to downgrade the Congress in the exercise of its constitutional duties. From this floor again I say to the American people, "Open your eyes. The move is on to develop an executive branch of Government which is supreme, not coordinate and coequal with the legislative branch of the Government."

If American funds are to be commingled with funds of other countries, we should take a look at the terms and conditions under which the other countries contribute their funds. In the debate we have heard to this time, one might be led to believe that the same policies are followed by other countries that it is proposed that the United States follow in respect to its contribution, but that does not happen to be the case.

It is the same old game again—the endeavor to get the United States to pour its millions into an international fund, so to speak, and to permit a multilateral group to administer the funds and determine the policies under which the funds are to be spent.

The chairman of the committee says, "We can stop the whole program if we wish to withdraw." There is nothing very realistic about that. In my judgment, if we follow the course of action being proposed in the bill before the Senate today and the American people once get wise to the Congress, we will receive orders at the ballot boxes to withdraw, and fast—and we should.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Oregon well knows that the junior Senator from Louisiana was active in the Finance Committee at the time the pending bill was reported, and did not have the benefit of the discussion which occurred in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MORSE. I did not have much benefit, either, because I was active on the floor of the Senate, trying to protect the American taxpayers in respect to the foreign aid giveaway bill. Last Friday, when the committee voted to report the bill, without notice to the senior Senator from Oregon, I was on the floor of the Senate in charge of the opposition to the foreign aid conference report. So the Senator from Louisiana is no more uninformed than the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The point which caused me to believe that the bill appears to be meritorious is that other countries would put up about 60 percent of the funds. I thought perhaps this would be better than to have the United States advance all the money which goes into international developments.

I came in late during the Senator's argument. I am curious to know why the Senator feels the demerits of this proposal outweigh the fact that other countries would put up a substantial portion of the capital for the Inter-American Development Bank.

Mr. MORSE. Because we are to put in many millions more than any other single country, once we have put them in we are to lose administrative control as to the expenditure of those millions of dollars. Furthermore, there will not be a uniformity of policy in regard to the funds.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would it not be advantageous, however, for the other countries to put up 60 percent of the funds that would go into this undertaking and therefore, at least theoretically, relieve the U.S. Government of the considerable financial burden which it would have if it undertook to do the job alone in financing such economic projects?

Mr. MORSE. I have two comments to make about that statement. Of course, it is based on the assumption that the amount of money is an amount we ought to put in; and, second, that we have to put it in this way in order to induce the other countries to contribute. I do not know of anything to stop Great Britain, France, West Germany, or other countries from going ahead and developing their own programs and making their own contributions. We do not have to agree to lose our administrative control over our funds in order to get them to contribute. If so, let us call a halt to the whole thing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope the Senator understands that I am not quarreling with him.

Mr. MORSE. I understand.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I merely wanted him to understand that there would be a substantial contribution, 60 percent, coming from other countries. I think the Senator will agree that it is desirable for them to share the burden with the United States.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think we ought to buy their support by the Congress of the United States losing its clear checking duty under the Constitution of the United States.

What I am worrried about is what I know they are talking about downtown, because I have had completely reliable information as to what they are seeking to do. I have spoken about it twice on the floor of the Senate. The executive branch of the Government is greatly upset because their steamroller on foreign aid has not worked on the Hill this year. They are upset because for the first time in many, many years the amount of money which they asked for has been cut drastically—and it should have been cut even more. Amendments on policy were adopted in the two Houses, but many of them were lost in conference that should not have been lost in conference. That is why I spoke against the conference report and voted against it. They are upset because they see the handwriting on the wall. They see that, in another year, if the same procedures exist on foreign aid, they are in for serious trouble. And they ought to be, unless they are willing to reform the procedures and make some of the changes that the Foreign Relations Committee in its own report confessed should be made, and then did not do a tinker's dam about. It simply passed the buck to the executive branch, with the statement, "We hope you will do something about it next year." That is no way to carry out our responsibility.

This is the situation we are up against. Department by department, particularly AID, will try to get the American taxpayer's money commingled with various international agency funds. They will get some money from others countries, which, in each and every instance, will make a token contribution compared to the large amount the United States will be asked to contribute to the various agencies. Then when they get to work that way, they will have an intermingled board of directors, representing various countries. Then when Congress tries to impose some checks, they are going to say, "After all, this is not the money of the United States alone. This is an international organization and it has international moneys, and, of course, we cannot impose any terms and conditions as to how the money contributed by the American people is to be used."

The American taxpayers will continue to be rooked, fleeced, cheated, and defrauded under a foreign aid program that is so shocking that I made perfectly clear at the White House recently that the American people are about to rise up and knock it down unless it is reformed.

This is no way to reform it. That is why I shall make my motion to postpone consideration until the next session of Congress. I want to hear what the new President's program is going to be in relation to the Alliance for Progress. I want to hear what the new Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Mann, is going to say our Alliance for Progress relationships should be and what our program policies should be. And I want to hear what is said when the subcommittee which I head, starting early in January, starts with a series of conferences or hearings, or whatever one wants to call them, on the Alliance for Progress. Then we shall submit to the Foreign Relations Committee our recommendations, based on the complete record.

I say, and I will be saying all afternoon, that the Senate is not going to vote on this measure now. I will be saying that all afternoon, until the Senate hears my point of view. I have learned after 19 years the value of repetition for both emphasis and education.

Senators may think they are ready to vote on the bill, but they are not, if, by being ready to vote, they mean they have the facts that justify their casting a vote. They have not studied it enough to pass judgment on the policies involved.

I say to my colleagues that hidden in the bill are some foreign relations policies matters so vital to the future of the foreign aid program that I do not think Senators ought to vote on the bill today, and I shall do my best to accommodate them, because I want Members of the Senate to go back home to their constituents and pass an examination on this question. If they were to take an examination, 90 percent of them would flunk this afternoon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, he has been so persuasive that I shall take the committee report and read it.

Mr. MORSE. I say to my colleague on the Foreign Relations Committee that while we may not agree on a final evaluation, when the Senator from Louisiana studies the matter, I have no doubt that we shall get a decision from the Senator from Louisiana that is based upon what he believes to be his clear duty in connection with the subject matter, since he has one of the most brilliant minds in this body. All I ask the Senator to do is read the hearings and the report.

The Senator was not present when I made the point earlier. Does the Senator know when this matter was voted on? Friday. I understand the staff was told to get the report ready, because the bill would be voted on that day. That is no way to pass legislation in the public interest.

The Senator from Oregon has fought such tactics for years in the Senate. Senators are not ready to vote on it. They should not be allowed to vote on it in the best interests of the country. I shall do my best to accommodate Senators.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to be informed, he should take more than the committee report to the cloakroom with him. He should take the hearings and read some of the material in the hearings to which I called attention, which is not in the report. For instance, all this money will not be subject to the Hickenlooper amendment. In other words, we are going to be able to dish out more money which will be used in connection with confiscation and expropriation and will not be subject to the Hickenlooper amendment.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. If the Inter-American Bank, for example, decides to lend $50 million to Project X—whether it be a refinery, a pipeline, a railroad, or whatnot—what control is Congress going to have over it? None, except what the Inter-American Bank works out. The chairman of the committee says, "We have 42 percent of the vote. We ought to be able to get a majority to vote with us if we have 42 percent of the vote."

What makes the chairman think so? What makes him think that even 42 percent of our delegates will vote in accordance with what we think public policy ought to be? I do not believe in giving that kind of unchecked power to the administrators of the Government. We are seeking in this case to give too much power to a multilateral board of directors.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I want the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] to know that I learned a very great deal about many of these projects as the result of reading in detail the addresses they made last Thursday afternoon. I congratulate them for bringing these details on the AID program to the floor of the Senate. I do not necessarily agree with all conclusions drawn, but believe they did a masterly job.

In that connection, I asked our Ambassador to Indonesia this morning—in executive session so one cannot go into details—whether the figures given on page 24395 of the RECORD by the Senator from Alaska with respect to aid to Indonesia were correct. He was not prepared to answer in full detail.

Mr. MORSE. He should have been. They are State Department figures.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The State Department is checking the figures. I also asked him whether the comments about Indonesia, shown on page 24438 of the RECORD, as having been made by the senior Senator from Oregon, were correct. That information also is being furnished by State.

I also asked him whether the statement made by the senior Senator from Oregon, as shown at page 24442 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was correct. That information will also be furnished.

If it is true that we are still giving military aid, as was stated by the Senator from Alaska, to Indonesia, that comes as a surprise and something of a shock to me; and that is only a part of the aid he says is being given.

With respect to the comments made by the senior Senator from Louisiana about adjusting the rates between dollars and local currencies, it is my understanding that the rupiah in Indonesia fluctuate in their relationship to dollars. The questions I asked in this connection had to do with the tens of millions of dollars of aid we are also giving under Public Law 480 to Indonesia; and we are also getting answers to that.

If the Senate acts, in effect, as a board of directors, comparable to the way a board acts in a business, having presented to it justification for additional expenditures, if that is the prerogative of the Senate in addition to its automatic prerogative under the division of powers, I believe this debate has been most constructive.

What we are discussing this afternoon is the Inter-American Development Bank, which is a relatively hard loan institution, one of the now countless international financial institutions. I believe the International Development Association bill will not be brought before the Senate until after the first of the year.

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe either one should be.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The amendments I have been considering are along the lines of the discussion today. The House passed the bill for the Inter-American Development Bank, but has not acted on the International Development Association. I have an amendment drawn up which would take into consideration the problem presented by the Senator from Alaska. My amendment reads:

> The U.S. Governor of the Bank is hereby directed to take appropriate steps to seek the establishment by the Bank of a system of arbitration applicable to any case of expropriation or nationalization of a project financed by the Bank.

The amendment could be stronger, but we have now developed a position with this Bank which makes it difficult to change, because there are many partners in addition to ourselves, although this Nation is putting up the biggest portion of the money.

Again let me say to the Senator from Oregon that he has performed a service in bringing so much of the detail of this program to the Senate.

It is my plan next Thursday to make the last of five addresses on the growing problem of our continuing unfavorable balance of payments. One of the suggestions I will make is that unless the balance-of-payments problem can be shifted to the point where gold stops leaving this country, we might determine what we can do under GATT.

Unilateral decisions have been taken by other countries under GATT, and let me hasten to say they have that right. I believe we have never taken any unilateral step, despite our being permitted to do so under the agreement. I hope the information will be available by Thursday, because it involves suggestions I plan to present on this balance-of-payments problem.

I raise this question at this time because, as the Senator from Oregon knows, what we are discussing today affects materially the entire question of balance of payments, and loss by the United States in recent years of more than 35 percent of its gold reserve.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Missouri very much. As he knows, I have followed very carefully and closely his speeches on the balance-of-payments problem. I think so highly of them that I will tell him what I believe ought to be done with them. After he has delivered his fifth address—and I am sure it will be of the same high quality as the other four—I believe they should be printed in a little booklet and made available for ready reference not only to Members of Congress, but to the American public in general, and certainly to the officials of the executive branch of the Government. He has done a masterly job on the balance-of-payments matter. It causes me to say that what I think is needed right now—this week, starting this moment—in the Senate and in the House is a moratorium on the passage of legislation of this kind until the next session of Congress. Congress should have some time to study this subject. Members of Congress have a great problem in finding time even to do the ordinary reading to keep ourselves legislatively literate. We have had thrown at us such a mass of work in the last 2 weeks that if we let this bill go to a vote this afternoon—and I have no intention of letting it go to a vote this afternoon—Senators will be voting on a bill without having the slightest concept as to what is involved from the standpoint of policy matters. I am trying to warn the Senate, because we have not had the time to study the bill. There is no hurry about it. The chairman has said that the Inter-American Bank has plenty of work to do, that it has plenty of projects to work on. Although he did not put it in so many words, that is the only conclusion that I could draw from his answer to my question as to whether they still had projects to consider and loans to make. His answer was yes. He said that they will go well into 1964 before they will run out of funds.

I am not talking about any postponement. I am perfectly willing, when I make my motion, to base it on a day certain or a period certain when it will be taken up. I am perfectly willing to take it up under a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate to a reasonable time. However, I am convinced that the Senate is not ready to pass judgment this afternoon on the policy questions raised by the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I was especially impressed by the remarks of the able Senator from Oregon with respect to the so-called Cooper amendment, submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper]. Instead of giving this gigantic sum of money, en masse, to the countries in question, the Senator from Kentucky recommended teams of independent people, commissions, to analyze the requirements, accomplishments, and other details of the countries in question, then come back to Congress and the people and say, "This is what we believe should be done, and this is why we think so."

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator recall that it was said there would not be many such teams—perhaps three or four? But someone got the idea that there would be a team for every country. Not at all. There would be an examination of foreign aid on a regional basis throughout the world—in Africa, Asia, South America, and Europe. If there is any place where we ought to take a look at the program, it is in Europe. It cannot be justified there. But that provision was lost in conference.

The policy position of the Senate on point after point was gutted in conference. It caused some of us to wonder whether some Members of the Senate, who expressed criticism of foreign aid in the committee report, really want to do anything about it next year.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. As I understood, whereas the Senate felt loans at three-fourths of 1 percent, for 50 years, with no repayment of principal for 10 years, were in effect not loans, as a result of discussions in committee it was agreed we would not charge interest at three-fourths of 1 percent after the first 5 years. The House eliminated entirely the three-fourths of 1 percent. Nevertheless, in conference, the conferees decided they would allow a period of 10 years at three-fourths of 1 percent, not previously approved in either the House or the Senate.

Based on the legislative experience of the able Senator from Oregon, was that not the creation of new legislation in conference, because it had nothing to do with what the conferees took from their respective Houses?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I do not know whether the Senator from Missouri knows what I am about to say, or not. There is no reason why he should. I went into that question. I raised no point of order. It was a very interesting situation as it concerned the foreign aid bill this year. Do not forget that the Senate committee bill was a substitute for the House bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. A clean bill.

Mr. MORSE. I checked the rules of the Senate. I shall not take the time to discuss the situation today, but in the next session I shall propose a new rule which would prevent such a situation from ever again developing in a parliamentary situation such as that in which we found ourselves. The conference committee acted as it did because the bill was a substitute for the House bill. The conference committee could have written an entirely new bill, as I understand the rule. That practice should never be allowed again. In my judgment, the rules of the Senate should be changed so that no conference committee could ever be put in a position of being able legally to flout the will of the Senate, as the conference committee on the foreign aid bill this year technically was able to do. We could not have raised a point of order. If we could have, I would have done so. In my judgment, it is necessary to amend the rule.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Was that because the Senate was considering a clean bill on its own?

Mr. MORSE. It was because the bill was a substitute for the House bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If that is true, as I follow the Senator, if the House had agreed to no interest payment of any kind, and the Senate had under consideration a substitute bill and had said that the rate of interest should be the going rate of the cost of money to the American taxpayer, the conference committee could have decided that the interest rate should be 4 percent on any loans, and that could have been the bill agreed to in conference.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. My understanding is that the conference committee could have written a new bill. I do not believe that practice should be allowed.

Again, what the Senator from Missouri has been saying expresses my position. The Senate is not ready to act on the bill, for many reasons of policy. We do not know what the flux is in Latin America. We do not know what the result of the action of Saturday will be in Latin America. I am not ready to vote millions dollars to the Inter-American Bank without at least having some check on what the Bank can do with American taxpayers dollars. I do not believe the taxpayers of the United States want to support military dictatorships in Latin America. But we are doing so.

Last Saturday afternoon I was at the airport, waiting to fly to Florida, when the press communicated with me and announced over the telephone that the United States had recognized the junta in the Dominican Republic. I do not say it was a junta; it was a civilian commission acting as stooges for the junta. I issued the following statement:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Senator Wayne Morse, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, issued the following statement in regard to the U.S. Government's recognition of the military junta government in the Dominican Republic:

"The recognition of the civilian stooges of the military junta in the Dominican Republic, as though they were a legitimate government, is a sad mistake. Every democratic government presently existing in Latin America is now placed in jeopardy of being overthrown by military Fascists or Communists. All extremists groups in Latin America now know that the United States can not be counted upon to support free governments when the chips are down. The United States has walked out upon its responsibilities to support and defend democratically elected constitutional governments in Latin America. This obligation to defend freedom is basic in our oft-repeated promises under the Alliance for Progress program. State Department hypocrisy is no substitute for statesmanship. Ever since the military junta in the Dominican Republic overthrew constitutional government there, Rusk, Ball, and Martin, in our State Department, have been laying their propaganda plans for advising our Government to make this bad mistake. Recognition of military totalitarianisms in Honduras will be next. What a sad day."

In my judgment, the recognition of the military junta in the Dominican Republic—and it may be followed by a recognition of the military dictatorship in Honduras—has created serious problems for the Alliance for Progress. It has created serious problems for our friends in Latin America. In my judgment, it has jeopardized democratic governments in Latin America, because in area after area in Latin America, two totalitarian forces are lying in ambush—one of them the Communists, the other the military Fascists.

We have set a sorry example by recognizing the junta government in the Dominican Republic and not waiting until constitutionalism was restored in the Dominican Republic. Do not forget that the Bosch regime was elected in a legal election, in accordance with constitutional processes. It was overthrown by the military junta.

We announced that we would not recognize the junta government and that we would withdraw military and economic aid. But what we did is an interesting record. We did not remove all our missions and personnel. The State Department and the Pentagon were slow of pace. But some of us kept jogging them. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, I requested reports on the progress that was being made. In my opinion—and it is only mine—it was only because we kept jogging them that they kept moving as they did. I believe it was contemplated from the beginning that after the passage of a few weeks there would be recognition prior to the reestablishment of constitutionalism in the Dominican Republic.

I think we have only to read the Martin article, which was published in the New York Herald Tribune, and Dean Rusk's endorsement of it, to know that at the very time the intention—which can be observed by reading between the lines—was to recognize that junta government, acting through its civilian stooges, before there was the reestablishment of constitutionalism in the Dominician Republic.

It is very interesting that many of us, in conversations during the intervening period of time, have said to other Senators what was going to happen, and used almost the identical language which was used by the State Department officials in their attempts to rationalize U.S. recognition of this military junta, acting through its civilian stooges.

Mr. President, I have on my desk—but am not in a position to use it, of course—some highly classified information. There early came into my possession evidence of what American interests in the Dominican Republic had to do in connection with this coup.

Powerful American economic interests in that country did everything they could to prevent the election of Bosch, in the first place. I believe it no answer for the State Department officials to say, "Well, after all, they have a right to take whatever position they want to take in regard to the internal affairs of any country in Latin America." They certainly have; but we as a Congress must decide the kind of economic support our country will give to a country in which they have played the game of aiding and abetting the overthrow of a constitutional government. Certainly no chain store or oil company or other American company in the Dominican Republic has any right to ask the U.S. Government to continue its assistance to that country, in order to give that business firm economic benefits, when it follows a course of totalitarianism, rather than constitutionalism, in that country.

Mr. President, many important policies are bound up to the bill now before the Senate. So I do not intend to vote in favor of carte blanche authority to the Inter-American Bank, to enable it to proceed to spend the requested additional millions of dollars of U.S. taxpayers' money, until I know the use that will be made of those dollars, for they are still U.S. taxpayers' dollars, no matter whether the State Department officials attempt to cause them to lose their identity by intermingling them with the funds of an international agency to which other countries contribute. However, in each case, the other countries contribute far, far less than the U.S. contribution.

All this is part of a scheme of agencies downtown to try to get around Congress, because of our attack this year on the foreign policy. I say to Senators that they cannot duck this issue, for they have the responsibility of seeing to it that the U.S. taxpayers' funds which are expended, are expended only in accordance with the constitutional provision of appropriations pursuant to law; and that constitutional provision requires that Senators fulfill their constitutional trust, which they owe to their constituents, by asking, "How is this money to be spent?"

That is where Mr. Dean Rusk moves out of the picture—although apparently he does not understand that constitutional principle; he would like to have Congress give him lump-sum funds, and then permit him to spend the money in accordance with his own volition. But that cannot be justified; and so long as I serve in the Senate, I shall continue to fight for congressional checks on the expenditure of every dollar of the funds of the taxpayers of the United States that goes into foreign aid.

If other Senators think this bill is not a foreign aid bill, they could not be more mistaken. This is an Alliance for Progress bill. Under the bill it is proposed to spend these millions of dollars of money of the U.S. taxpayers, purportedly in carrying out the Alliance for Progress. But, Mr. President, I want to know what part of the Alliance for Progress the money will be used for, and for what projects connected with the Alliance for Progress, and what controls there will be, and how much of the money will be used, for example, for projects which would help build up totalitarianism, not freedom, in Latin America, and really, in the long run, would aid and abet the Communists, for, in my judgment, the recognition of military juntas anywhere in Latin America—whether in the Dominican Republic or Honduras—does Khrushchev's job for him. That is the way to build up communism, because in that case we play directly into the hands of the Communist propaganda.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alaska?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Is it not clear that, as I stated in the colloquy which occurred earlier between me and the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, this bill is but a preliminary move to take more and more power from the Senate and turn it over to a bureau in an unseen agency, to enable it to spend this money, for which Congress should be responsible?

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly the plan. The chairman of the committee can support it if he wishes to; he has that right. But certainly some of us have the clear duty of opposing it—those of us who have special knowledge, as he does, of what is happening in Latin America. I am referring to the danger of establishing, in connection with this bill, a policy precedent which will come to haunt us, and we shall rue the day we voted to establish it.

Mr. President, mention has been made of embarrassment; the chairman of the committee said that if the deadline is not met, someone will be embarrassed. But I deny that. Sometimes I believe that these Latin American countries know our constitutional processes and the limitations of our State Department much better than many Members of Congress seem to.

But, Mr. President, the real embarrassment will occur in a year or two, if Senators proceed to vote to aid and abet this scheme to circumvent the U.S. Congress and to give another body authority and power to spend U.S. taxpayers' money without having the Congress lay down the conditions, project by project, in advance of the expenditure. If that is not done, there will be such a reaction from the American people that they will say to Senators, as politicians, "Get out of that program fast." When a Senator is told that, he really will be in an embarrassing situation; and I am trying to prevent that embarrassment. I want Senators to wait until we ascertain the facts. I want the Senate to wait a few weeks. I am perfectly willing to agree, today, to have the Senate take up the bill on a day certain or in a period of time certain, early at the beginning of the next session of Congress, and also to agree to a limitation on debate on the bill, with a reasonable time for Senators to present their case, after Members of Congress have had, over the recess period, at least an opportunity to study the bill, so they will not have to try to give excuses to their constituents.

If this proposal goes awry, I can hear what some Senators will say to their constituents: "That bill came up on December 16; and it was voted out of the committee on December 14, and the committee report did not reach our desks until the afternoon of the day when we voted. I thought I made an intelligent guess. I did the best I could, under the pressure of time; and I thought the decision I made was a good one. I want you to know that is why I voted as I did"—hoping that their constituents will forgive them. However, I want to enable Senators to avoid that situation. That is why I want them to have time to study the bill; and I say that, by and large, at the present time the Senate does not have the slightest idea of what is provided by the bill.

If a vote is had on the bill this afternoon, there will not be 25 Senators who will really know what is involved. Even fewer will know what is implied in the policy questions that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I are raising.

I should like to have the attention of the majority leader. I have a great deal more to say about the bill, but I always wish to accommodate the majority leader, and I understand that he wishes to take a minute or two on another matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] may proceed for 2 minutes, provided that in doing so the Senator from Oregon will not lose his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REQUIREMENTS FOR MARKING CERTAIN IMPORTED ARTICLES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of December 18, 1963, pp. 24910-24912, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, this bill, passed by the House and the Senate, would require that when articles are imported in bulk and repackaged in the United States, the new packages be marked to show the country of origin.

The Senate amended the bill to require the marking of imported sawed lumber to indicate to the purchaser the country of origin. It was agreed that sawed lumber was to include all lumber even though further planed or dressed after sawing.

The Senate conferees prevailed and the House conferees receded, with certain technical changes. The Senate amendment had set June 1, 1963, as the effective date. That time has long since passed, and it was necessary to set another effective date. The effective date agreed upon in conference was April 1, 1964, which would allow the usual 90 days in which the President could make the necessary changes in any trade agreements that might be affected.

The other changes were purely technical and I urge the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CONVENTION WITH MEXICO FOR SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM OF THE CHAMIZAL—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST ON TREATY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, provided that in doing so he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the prayer and the reading of the Journal, if reading is not dispensed with, the Senate go into executive session to consider Executive N, 88th Congress, 1st session, a convention with Mexico for the solution of the problem of the Chamizal, and that debate continue no later than 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair would like to inquire of the Senator from Montana as to who will control the time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The time will be equally controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader. I ask unanimous consent that they be allowed to delegate the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me. This matter has been cleared with all parties concerned.

The unanimous-consent request reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, December 17, 1963, immediately after the prayer and approval of the Journal, the Senate go into executive session for the consideration of the treaty (Ex. N—88th Cong., 1st sess.) with Mexico for solution of the problem of Chamizal, and that debate thereon be limited not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, or someone designated by them, *Provided*, That final vote on the resolution of ratification be taken not later than 2 o'clock p.m. tomorrow.

MESA VERDE NATIONAL PARK, COLO.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 759, H.R. 6756.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 6756, a bill to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 778), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of H.R. 6756, by Congressman ASPINALL, is to enlarge the boundaries of the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and thus to add approximately 740 acres to the park.

NEED

Mesa Verde National Park was established by act of Congress in 1906 to preserve a remarkable collection of ruins representative of successive stages of development of Pueblo Indians. The area was continuously inhabited by them from the 1st to the 14th centuries, anno Domini. The park now includes about 51,000 acres and attracts over a quarter of a million visitors a year.

Opportunity has arisen to add to the park the 740 acres of land covered by the bill. About 260 acres are already in Federal ownership; the remainder are privately owned. The opportunity is one that should be taken.

The lands to be added lie along the entrance road to the park. Their inclusion within its boundaries will not only protect against possible unsightly or incompatible intrusions but will permit removal of the administrative headquarters site to a better location than that it now occupies and reduce the travel distance between the headquarters and the nearest local communities by 22 miles. The removal is part of a program to reduce the congestion at Spruce Tree Point caused by the presence there not only of the park headquarters but also of most of the accommodations for visitors which the park contains. Another part of the program consists of the relocation from Spruce Tree Point to Navajo Hill of the overnight cabins and certain other facilities which a concessionaire now maintains at the former location.

COST

Independent appraisals made for the National Park Service indicate that the 481 acres of private land which are to be acquired under the bill have a value of not more than $125,000, which is the appropriation authorized by the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his courtesy.

INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

The Senate resumed consideration of H.R. 7406, to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Bank, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to join the chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, in the request for more time. I should like to have the attention of the majority leader, if I may. I, too, suggest that the bill go over until a time certain, early in the new year, so that we may really have time to study it and be enabled to receive the benefit of further views of the President of the United States on his Latin American program, and possibly those of the new distinguished appointee to the Assistant Secretaryship, Thomas Mann.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not in charge of the bill. All I am doing is occupying this chair. I believe the request should be made of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GRUENING. I thought that inasmuch as the majority leader has scheduled the bill, his influence in the matter would be controlling.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator knows as well as I do how much influence I have. I believe this is not the time to be joking.

Mr. GRUENING. I am not joking.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is a serious matter. I believe th bill is a serious bill.

Mr. GRUENING. I believe the implications of it are far reaching, as the debate has pointed out. It is, in my judgment—confirmed by colloquy with the chairman of the committee—the beginning of a vast change in Latin American policy, an attempt to begin to bypass Congress in the matter of foreign aid, to turn it over to a board of unseen men in a lending agency. I believe this is a serious matter which needs to be fully discussed. Few Senators have any awareness of what is in the bill. Several members of the Foreign Relations Committee had objections and were not present at the meeting last Friday when the bill was voted out and, in an incredibly short period, having it come up for action as the pending business today—the next day of Senate sessions.

I agree that that is not the way to legislate. I should like to have the support of the majority leader on the request made by the Senator from Oregon, in which I join, that the bill go over to a fixed time early in the next year. This is not an attempt to postpone it unduly. We can fix a date and limit the debate. I am sure it will meet with no objection. I believe such a decision would be wise. Otherwise, I believe we will have to debate it at some length.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much for yielding to me.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION AND COMPARATIVE COST STUDY OF GOVERNMENT NAVAL SHIPYARDS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I have followed with great interest the developments of the past week on the reported or threatened closing of defense establishments. First the telecasts and radio newscasts featured in their news stories the reported decision to close the Boston Naval Shipyard, the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, and the San Francisco Naval Shipyard. That came on the evening broadcasts. But the next morning, the newspapers carried the stories that the congressional delegations of Massachusetts and the other States had risen up in arms and that these shipyards would not be closed.

I was reminded of what had happened more than 2 years ago—nearly 3 years ago—on March 30, 1961, when Defense Secretary McNamara had announced the decision to close many defense establishments throughout the Nation. I remember quite well because my own State of Maine was hard hit on the announced closings. I would like to repeat now what I said then. This is what I said:

> I regret that in the rapidly changing character of the security and defense of our country—and specifically in the development of the missile program—the long anticipated inactivation and termination of the now outmoded Snark program and the resulting scheduled closing of the Presque Isle Air Force Base have now become realities, as a result of the decision by President Kennedy.
>
> The far easier course for me to pursue politically would be to vigorously protest this action and, as a Republican Senator, to point out that the decision was one made by a Democratic President, and to make a political attack on the decision of President Kennedy.
>
> The far easier course for me to pursue politically would be to demand the now outmoded Snark program be continued, so that the Presque Isle Air Force Base be kept operating, to aid the economy of the area and to avoid the impact and dislocation that its closing is bound to have on the economy of this area.
>
> But in all good conscience I cannot do this, for this would simply be playing politics with our national security, our national defense, and our taxpayers' dollar. It would be submitting to the economic philosophy that our National Defense Establishment and our national security program must be operated primarily for the local economy.
>
> I shall do what I can to help the Presque Isle area absorb the economic impact of this unpleasant decision made by President Kennedy; and while I can understand and appreciate the concern of the people of the area, I am confident that the great majority of the people of the area are not only fairminded about this long-anticipated development, but also are of such admirable self-reliance that they will meet the impact well and successfully.

Mr. President, I am prepared to take the same position with respect to future closings of defense establishments in Maine—closings on the basis of no further defense justification for their existence. But I do want the justification for any such closing proved beyond the shadow of a doubt.

In the past week, certain things have been said to me that are most disturbing. First a Member of the Senate said to me that there would be no closings of Government naval shipyards until after the 1964 election. I am disturbed by the political implications of any such delay of closings if there are to be closings. Because such political timing is not fair to the workers at these yards—nor can it be justified with the taxpayers.

I have been concerned about the status of the Portsmouth-Kittery Naval Shipyard for many years. Many years ago, in the late forties, the workers in that shipyard were degraded by the President and the Department of the Navy to a second-class citizen pay status and given a lower wage scale than the workers of the Boston Naval Shipyard. Never was an official reason given by the Executive to the Congress for such pay degrading of the workers at the Portsmouth-Kittery Naval Shipyard.

So that in 1958, with the vigorous aid of the present President of the United States—and with the supporting vote of the late President of the United States—I got the Senate to pass my pay equalization bill to remove this second-class status. The Senate even overrode a Presidential veto of that bill—the first time an Eisenhower veto had ever been overridden. But the succeeding presidential administration never kept its campaign pledge to rectify the situation by Executive order.

Earlier this year, two admirals of the Navy Department flatly charged that the workers at the Portsmouth-Kittery Naval Shipyard "just won't work." The workers then demanded a congressional investigation of such charge and an opportunity to defend themselves. I supported their demand. But the investigation was blocked by those Members of the Senate who alleged that such an investigation would be used against the workers and would place the Portsmouth-Kittery Naval Shipyard in jeopardy. The local chambers of commerce joined in the opposition to such an investigation.

When subsequently a new nuclear submarine construction award was assigned to the Portsmouth-Kittery Naval Shipyard, I pointed out to the Secretary of the Navy that such award was in conflict with the admirals' "just won't work" charge and, in response to my demand for a clarification, the Navy Department admitted that the admirals' charge was untrue. It took a great deal of effort and time for me to get the Navy Department to clear the name of the workers but I was gratified in being able to do so.

I have outlined this history of my efforts for the Portsmouth-Kittery Naval Shipyard to illustrate my continuing concern and effort for it, for the workers and for the people of the area—and as prelude to the bad news I am about to reveal. I realize that what I am about to say does not make for political popularity. But I must speak my conscience in all fairness to the workers of the Portsmouth-Kittery Naval Shipyard and to the people of that area.

It has been no great secret in Washington that Defense Secretary McNamara has taken the position that the costs of private shipbuilding are so much lower than the costs of Government shipbuilding that Government shipyards should be closed. Last week his position came to the surface even if only momentarily and to be quickly submerged for cover after the massive congressional counter against him.

Over this weekend, a Government official of full authority informed me that the Government shipyards were on their way out under Defense Secretary McNamara as being economically and "defensely" without justification. When I asked about the importance of having the Government shipyards in time of emergency, his answer was that we would always have the Boston Naval Shipyard and the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash. He said that the Portsmouth-Kittery Naval Shipyard was on its way to being closed and that it was merely a matter of time without indicating when that closing might come.

Mr. President, if there should develop a situation in which it is proved beyond a doubt that there is absolutely no justification or defense need for the Portsmouth-Kittery Naval Shipyard, I shall take the same position as I did on the closing of the Presque Isle Air Force Base. I will not submit to the economic philosophy that our National Defense Establishment and our national security program must be operated primarily for the local economy.

I am confident that the people of Maine feel the same way. And I am confident that the people of the Kittery, Maine; York County, Maine; and Portsmouth, N.H., feel the same way. I think they can emulate the people of Presque Isle who accepted the blow without whimpering but instead set themselves to provide a substitute for a Military Establishment for their economy.

But I do think that the workers in the Portsmouth-Kittery Naval Shipyard are entitled to have this bad news now so that they can make their own plans for the future—instead of suddenly without warning, or with very little warning at best, being told that their jobs are ending. I think that the leaders, both civic and business, of these communities should have advance warning to start plans and activities designed to absorb the shock of what has been represented to me as inevitable closing of the Portsmouth-Kittery Naval Shipyard.

It is reported that Defense Secretary McNamara has cost details which reveal the comparative costs of each Government naval shipyard—comparative with each other and comparative with private shipyards. I believe that public disclosures should be made of these costs so that it can be more accurately determined if the closings are made on the basis of costs—if the more costly Government shipyards are closed first rather than the basis of closing being dominated by politics—and rather than the timing of the closings being determined by elections with delays being made until after the 1964 election.

For example, how do the two Government shipyards indicated to me to be spared from closing—how do they compare with those Government shipyards slated to be closed?

Mr. President, I propose that that subcommittee which President Lyndon B. Johnson once chairmaned—the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee—immediately start an investigation and study of this matter with a request for the comparative cost study that Defense Secretary McNamara reportedly has and with a request for the schedule of the closings of the Government naval shipyards. I have so written the chairman of that subcommittee requesting such an investigation and study.

I think we should get this matter out into the open. That is the least that we can do for those workers and those areas that will have to bear the brunt of the economic loss with the closing of these shipyards. They are entitled to have the truth—and they are entitled to have it now.

Mr. **KEATING.** Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me?

Mrs. **SMITH.** I do not have the floor. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. **KEATING.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Maine.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **KEATING.** I commend the distinguished Senator from Maine for her suggestion. I join with her in the request to the chairman of the Preparedness Investigations Subcommittee for a thorough investigation of this subject. As I understand the Senator's suggestion, it is that the chairman of the Preparedness Investigations Subcommittee go into this matter.

Mrs. **SMITH.** That he and his committee look into the comparative costs of the yards which are to be closed and the yards which are not to be closed.

Mr. **KEATING.** I agree with the Senator. The closing of the naval shipyards is a matter of concern to me. There are arguments on both sides of this question, but one thing which the Preparedness Subcommittee will certainly be interested in is the instant readiness of the yards to meet any national emergency. From what study I have made, there is a definite need for the continuance of the naval shipyards.

I agree with the Senator that apparently there is a tendency in the mind of the Secretary of Defense toward closing these yards. If any or all are to be closed, or the work is to be shifted or reduced, the best yards should not be the ones to be cut. In that regard, I agree entirely with the Senator. We should be provided with the full facts.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric met with the New York congressional delegation and informed them about the closing of certain bases in New York, seven in number—two large installations and five smaller ones—on Wednesday afternoon last. At that time I interrogated him by saying: "Is there any bright spot in this picture for the State of New York?" To which he said: "I think I can say there is because it will shortly be announced that one or maybe two eastern Navy yards, will be closed, which would mean that there would be more work, naturally, for the Brooklyn Navy Yard or for yards on the west coast. We are determined to keep the Brooklyn Navy Yard in operation."

Between Wednesday afternoon and Thursday noon, when the announcement came out, somebody's mind had been changed. Not only that, but the Secretary of Defense was reported in the press to have said that there had not been any discussion of the subject of closing the Boston or Philadelphia shipyards at that time.

I do not mean by these remarks to indicate that I think the Boston or Philadelphia yards should be closed. That is not my point. I am not well enough informed to know whether that is so or not. But the Members of Congress should be told the facts, and when they are given information, that same information should not later be denied by high-ranking Government officials.

It is easy to draw the conclusion—although I know nothing about the facts—that some pressures were brought to bear and that the Defense Department changed its mind. But that is denied in its entirety by the Secretary of Defense. I was not privy to any conversations that went on between him and other congressional delegations.

It was my intention to request the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee to go into not only the subject which the Senator from Maine has mentioned—and the Senator from Maine is a member of that subcommittee, and a very valuable member—but to go into the question from the point of view or aspect of our national defense, so that the committee would look into other closings, not only of naval shipyards, but certain others. It would look into closings, not where an obsolete facility exists or where a particular facility has served its purpose and is no longer needed but where the operations of such facilities are going to be continued, and perhaps continued at an expanded rate, at some other areas. Particularly I would investigate the transfer of continuing important activities out of depressed areas and into areas with jobs aplenty.

I recognize that the Preparedness Subcommittee as such would not be too much concerned with the depressed areas consideration. That consideration would come before us in some other way. But certainly, speaking specifically of the Rome Air Force Base, which is concerned with the procurement of ground electronic equipment, if there is one area in the Air Force—in which the distinguished Senator from Maine is an officer, as knowledgeable as any other Member of this body—that is going to continue indefinitely at an expanded rate, it is this area of electronics and radar.

It makes no sense to me to close the one procurement area that is dealing with this particular kind of equipment and spread that procurement to many other areas that are procuring airplane parts, and then tell the American people that a great deal of money is being saved by the operation. So I welcome the suggestion made by the Senator from Maine.

I would not want in any way to impair the inquiry which she suggests by having it too broad in scope. I am very deeply interested in the very point the Senator from Maine is making, but I am hopeful the Preparedness Subcommittee might see fit to extend such an inquiry into certain other areas, because the judgment of this committee, is always helpful. We cannot consider these problems with our blinders on. I refer particularly to areas of great unemployment losing more jobs in order to put certain operations into areas that have full employment.

I commend the Senator from Maine for her suggestion, and join with her in the request to the Preparedness Subcommittee to go into the entire subject.

Mrs. **SMITH.** I deeply appreciate the observations of my distinguished colleague from New York. This is a subject that concerns not Maine alone, but many other areas of the country; and I am most grateful that the Senator is willing to cooperate in this manner with the Preparedness Subcommittee.

INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

The Senate resumed consideration of H.R. 7406, to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Bank, and for other purposes.

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. President, in support of my suggestion that action on the bill be postponed until sometime in January, I invite the attention of Senators to material which starts at page 2 of the hearings and continues to page 10.

After I first heard the Secretary of the Treasury testify on the bill, as I said earlier this afternoon, I was very much impressed by his testimony, but I started thinking about it and looking into it, and then I decided that it called for much more intensive consideration than it was receiving.

Page 29 of the hearings shows that I filed a series of questions. They were to be answered by the Treasury Department. The questions and answers are printed in the hearings beginning at page 29.

At page 5 of the hearings, in a statement by the Secretary of the Treasury, he says:

> I should add with respect to the Fund for Special Operations—

That is what we are talking about. That is what is proposed in connection with the funds, running into millions of dollars, which under the bill we would pay to this international agency, over which we would not have control—

> I should add, with respect to the Fund for Special Operations, that the proposed increase in resources represents approximately 1 additional year's needs for loan operations. The future of this Fund and its potential need for additional resources is presently the subject of special study. The Directors of the IDB were instructed by the Governors earlier this year to conduct such a study, looking especially at the relationship of this Fund, which was designed to make so-called soft loans, to the other activities of the IDB. It has been the view of some—and I tend to share this view—that the image of the IDB and its operations might be strengthened if its three existing loan windows could be consolidated into two windows. Consideration will therefore be given by the Executive Directors and the Governors to the advisability in the future of limiting the IDB's operations to the existing ordinary capital or "hard loan window"

> and one "soft window" which would combine the operations now conducted through the Fund for Special Operations and the Social Progress Trust Fund—much along the lines of the IBRD/IDA arrangements. Such a consolidation would not, of itself, affect the total amount of funds needed by the IDB for economic and social development purposes. At least as much—perhaps even more—will be needed than in the past for these purposes.

We are being asked for $50 million, carte blanche. This $50 million is to be turned over to the Board of Directors, to be spent by the Board of Directors. They do not have a plan at the moment that I am speaking on the floor of the Senate.

What are they going to do with the $50 million? The Secretary of the Treasury tells us that the subject is under study. I quote him again:

> I should add, with respect to the Fund for Special Operations, that the proposed increase in resources represents approximately 1 additional year's needs for loan operations. The future of this Fund and its potential need for additional resources is presently the subject of special study.

Let us have the study. Why should we continue, in the foreign aid program, constantly to put the cart before the horse?

The taxpayers of the United States say to the Senate this afternoon:

> You should not vote a bill which proposes to give that authority to this Bank when they haven't even a plan for spending the money.

The Secretary's own testimony, in my judgment, eloquently justifies my motion to postpone, until a time certain in January, the proposal now before the Senate. We have the right to know what is intended to be done with the money. That is our obligation.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Would it not be well to procure from the chairman of the committee a statement as to when he expects the study to be completed?

Mr. MORSE. He could not tell us that, because the Secretary of the Treasury does not know. The chairman could not possibly tell us that.

Mr. GRUENING. How can we vote the $50 million if the results of the study are not known?

Mr. MORSE. We should not. This supports one of my major premises this afternoon. This is a request for unchecked power. I invite the attention of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], who is a keen lawyer, to this matter. I ask him if he thinks I am in error when I say that when Mr. Dillon comes before us and says he wants $50 million, and says that the use to which it is to be put is under study, and we have not the slightest idea as to what he will use it for, he is asking for funds to spend with no check placed upon him by Congress.

Mr. TALMADGE. That is the opinion of the Senator from Georgia. I believe that any Federal agency or any other agency which comes to Congress seeking an authorization for funds or an appropriation of funds ought to have a clear outline as to what the expenditure will be made for, and a plan as to how the funds will be expended.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree. I believe that this bill is a scheme—I do not care whether it was so intended or not—for a run around the Senate and the House of Representatives. This is a bill seeking unchecked power. I am fed up with giving unchecked power under the foreign aid program.

To the contrary, I am for imposing one check after another on one administrator after another who has any jurisdiction over the expenditure of foreign aid funds. We have not only a right, but also a duty. We have the duty under the Constitution of the United States to ask the question: "Mr. Secretary, what is the money going to be used for? Do not give us generalities. What projects are they, and where are the projects? In what military dictatorship? In what particular governments of Latin America?"

I wish to repeat again that I had no opportunity to file minority views. I opposed the bill in committee. The committee voted on Friday noon to report the bill and gave the staff instructions to report it to the Senate by Monday. I was not even present at the committee meeting because I was sitting in the chair of the majority leader, handling, by unanimous-consent agreement of the Senate, the opposition to the foreign aid conference report. I was in the Chamber from noon until 2 p.m. Thereafter, I was in charge of the conference report on the vocational education bill. How could I have filed minority views when I did not even know the bill was to be reported by the committee? No member of the staff of the committee notified me. We have a right to better service than that from the staff of the committee. There ought to be a recognized rule in committee that when a bill is to be reported, and any member of the committee is absent, he will be notified immediately of the action taken. It was known that I was opposed to the bill. I had left a proxy, either at the meeting before or two meetings before, in opposition to the bill and asking for a postponement of the consideration of the bill. The committee knew that the Senator from Oregon was opposed to the bill. I was at least entitled to an opportunity to prepare minority views on the bill.

Mr. President, the bill needs to be thoroughly analyzed. I want to file minority views, and I will make use of some of the leading experts in Washington to advise me in the preparation of minority views. I do not believe it is right or proper to vote on the bill this afternoon, or to try to do so, under this kind of parliamentary pressure.

That takes me back again to the statement of the chairman of the committee that it could be embarrassing if the so-called deadline of December 31 were not met. Embarrassing to whom? The representatives of the Latin American governments know that the administration cannot act without congressional approval. They have known that all along. It would not be embarrassing to them. But I will tell the Senate what will be embarrassing. It will be embarrassing in the future to have Members of Congress wake up to the fact that millions of dollars are being spent for purposes that American taxpayers will consider to be unwise, at least, if not improper, such as for military dictatorships, to help to strengthen the arms of juntas. Now is the time to place checks with regard to such expenditures of funds.

I should like to assume that the Secretary of the Treasury had in mind, when he said, as appears on page 5 of the hearings, that a study is underway, that these are the kinds of problems that will be studied. If that is so, the Secretary ought to make policy recommendations in regard to them before the administration asks for the money. I say most respectfully that the Secretary of the Treasury has put his cart before the horse. He came before Congress and asked for blanket authority for the spending of $50 million. He did not have a plan that would indicate to Congress how he would spend that money. He gave us no report on possible conditions and restrictions that ought to be put on the use of the money.

I refer Senators to page 41 of the hearings. There is much controversy over the testimony of Mr. N. R. Danielian, president of the International Economic Policy Association, a witness whom the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] called for. Mr. Danielian gave some thought-provoking testimony. His views—and they are my views, as well—are set forth on page 41 of the hearings, as follows:

> In brief, Congress is entirely free to condition the new contribution to the SPTF on any terms it may prescribe, including the standards written into the Foreign Assistance Act. So far as section 620(e) is concerned, it is expressly applicable to the new authorization for the SPTF, by reason of the amendment, inserted by this committee, that assistance under "this or any other act" is suspended when section 620(e) is violated.
>
> What I have said should not be construed as opposition to the proposed legislation nor to the concept of international programs of economic development. Admittedly, internationalization of aid has some attractive aspects, such as participation by other developed countries, the utilization of technical and personnel resources available outside of the United States, and even, perhaps, more efficient administration.
>
> These desirable qualities, however, do not equate nor can they override other national objectives, which have been subject to long and arduous discussion in this and previous sessions of Congress, such as U.S. balance of payments, encouragement of private savings and investment, guarantees against expropriation, fiscal and political stability, and responsibility of recipient countries.

Mr. President, what is wrong with those conditions? This witness is right. Congress has the power to impose such conditions. We have the duty to impose such conditions, and the Secretary of the Treasury says he has the subject under study. Yet he has asked for the money. Why is he asking for the money before the study has been completed?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I am in complete agreement with the comments of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Senators are dealing with a proposal which has been suddenly thrust upon them with no warning. As the Senator from Oregon says, the bill was approved by a vote of the committee last Friday noon, when the Senator from Oregon and other members of the committee who had not been fully informed about the bill could not be present. Thus they were not given an opportunity to study the report. They were taken by surprise when they reached the Senate Chamber at noon today and learned that the bill was the pending business. They want an opportunity, as I do, and as I am sure other Senators do, to study the proposed legislation and understand the full import and implications of it.

An earlier colloquy between the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and me led me to the obvious conclusion that we were embarking on a new policy; that we are planning or beginning to extend the lending and granting process of our foreign assistance program to an international banking agency, thus removing even further the control of Congress over the expenditures for foreign aid. If this process is continued, the Congress might as well go home, so far as the foreign aid program is concerned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I could not agree more completely with the Senator from Alaska. What he and I are trying to do is to make the RECORD clear. We are seeking to have the Secretary of the Treasury give us some information about a study he says he has underway. We should like to have him give us some idea of what the money would be spent for, where it would be spent, and to what extent might be walking into a trap, in which the money could be used to strengthen already existing military dictatorships in Latin America. We are on the Board of Directors. We have only 42 percent of the vote.

I do not know the extent to which the taxpayers' money, if we gave the bank unchecked power, might be used to support another Trujillo in Latin America—another Facist military leader in Latin America.

Congress ought to protect the American taxpayers by retaining control of the expenditure of their money, and not turn it over to a multilateral board.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a unanimous-consent request which I am about to propound.

I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of Calendar No. 758, H.R. 7406, the pending business, be postponed to January 14, 1964; and that on that day, at the conclusion of the morning hour, there be a limitation of debate of 1 hour on each amendment and 2 hours on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:)

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That the further consideration of H.R. 7406, a bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes, be postponed until the close of the routine morning business on Tuesday, January 14, 1964; that the Senate thereupon resume its consideration and during such period debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I congratulate the Senator from Oregon on his exposure of another attempted method to circumvent the Senate in its constitutional duty of vigilance over the expenditure of funds. This is another instance of the ladling of the taxpayers' dollars to an international agency, the expenditure of money which should properly be voted by Congress. Congress should not be deprived of that right.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Alaska is correct; and when Members of the Senate take the time to read the record that has been made this afternoon, I think the result on January 14 will be very greatly different from what the result would have been this afternoon.

ATTEMPT TO EXPAND U.S. MILITARY AID PROGRAM AND AMERICAN MILITARY FORCES INTO SOUTHERN ASIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I invite attention to the latest maneuver in the Pentagon in connection with foreign aid.

Those of us who have looked into the generalities and the details of the foreign aid program are rarely shocked at any American activity in this field. Yet reports from the Pentagon that one of the worst absurdities of foreign aid is to be extended into yet another part of the world do shock me.

This is the expansion of both the military aid program and the presence of American military forces—at one and the same time—into southern Asia.

We have always been told that huge military aid grants, plus economic aid grants to support military forces, are really cheaper than putting Americans in uniform to defend the countries involved. As we pointed out time and again during the recent debate, the American people are being duped by this theory, because we are doing both. We send tens of millions in military and economic grant aid each year to such countries as Turkey, South Vietnam, South Korea, and Taiwan on the contention that arming their nationals is cheaper than sending American forces to defend them. But we still have around 10,000 troops in Turkey, 50,000 in South Korea, 15,000 in South Vietnam, the 7th Fleet in the China seas, and thousands of more Americans in uniform in Japan and Okinawa.

Over the years, one of the largest of all U.S. military aid programs has seen billions go to Pakistan on the theory that she was a partner with us against Communist aggression. That theory has already proved fallacious. But the only response the Pentagon is able to come up with in such matters is to throw good money after bad.

So it is programing a military aid program for India that is on about the same scale as that for Pakistan. I am satisfied that if any use of our aid to these countries ever occurs, it will be against each other and not against any Communist power.

But while we are undertaking to build and maintain their military forces on the basis of making India and Pakistan a bulwark against Red China, the Pentagon is preparing to send American naval forces into the Indian Ocean on a permanent basis for the first time.

Mr. President, I am all fed up with these unsound rationales that emerge from the Pentagon for spending more money. I note that expansion of the fleet into the Indian Ocean is described in one press report as achieving what it calls a longstanding ambition of the Navy. I do not doubt that the U.S. Navy is anxious to replace the British Navy on international waters. But I remind the Navy, and the Pentagon, that the only reason the British Navy is no longer dominant on the seven seas is that the British taxpayers finally ran out of money. They went broke trying to support a worldwide network of naval forces, colonies, enclaves, lifelines, army and marine forces, and puppet governments. The British Empire collapsed a lot faster than it was built up simply because its ambitions and commitments outran its economic base.

At the rate the Pentagon is going, we Americans have the same fate in store. I regret that the House Appropriations Committee left intact only military aid in the foreign aid program. Half a billion dollars for military aid would be more than enough.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I heartily approve the sentiments the Senator from Oregon expresses.

However, if we are to send the U.S. Navy into waters where it has not been seen for a long time, but where it is needed, should not it be sent to the coast of Alaska? There is in Alaska a headquarters of the Navy which has the two pretentious titles of "The Alaska Sea Frontier," and "The 17th Naval District." Yet such titles seem altogether too similar to the imaginary and fictitious title of "Admiral of the Swiss Navy," who has no ships, for the Navy has no ships to speak of in Alaska. Yet Russian fishing vessels are very numerous and very active in that area. They are tearing up Alaskan fishermen's crab traps; they are invading American waters, and they are taking from them great quantities of fish and crabs.

I submit that if the fleet is to be sent into new waters, it should be sent to the waters of Alaska, to show the American flag there and to show the people of Alaska that they are not being abandoned and their livelihood based on their long-established fisheries in their historic fishing grounds is not being destroyed by foreign invaders. I have made this request before. I repeat it now and I shall continue to repeat it as long as the invasion of our waters and destruction of our fisheries continues.

Mr. MORSE. I wholly agree with the Senator from Alaska, as I do in connection with his views on most facets of U.S. foreign policy.

SHORTCOMINGS OF THE PRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is now 5 minutes after 5 p.m., and there are 6 Senators in the Chamber. For the benefit of the United Press, I point out that five Senators are more than the number of Senators who have been in the Chamber most of the afternoon.

I ask unanimous consent—again, for the benefit of the United Press—that there be printed in the RECORD an article which was published on Saturday in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORSE RAPS PRESS FOR IGNORING HIM

> Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, complained yesterday that the press failed to report a long speech he made Thursday night against the compromise foreign aid authorization bill.
>
> MORSE, who led a protracted fight against the bill last month, spoke for more than an hour to a nearly empty Chamber Thursday reiterating much of his previous opposition.

Mr. President, I now read from the article. The headline is: "Morse Raps Press for Ignoring Him."

Beneath the headline is the notation "United Press International."

Mr. President, I am accustomed to this treatment by the United Press correspondents in the press gallery. I do not know whether they write what they do out of prejudice, ignorance, or both; but certainly they do not very often write factually.

I now read from the article:

> Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, complained yesterday that the press failed to report a long speech he made Thursday night against the compromise foreign aid authorization bill.

I do not know whether this United Press correspondent can read or does not want to read. In that speech I made very clear what I was complaining about—and I made abundantly and perfectly clear that I did not consider consequential my personal involvement—namely, that two major speeches which on that occasion were delivered by the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon, two opponents of that bill during the debate, and later a speech by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], were unreported in the American press.

I also suggested that regardless of what the United Press may think of me or of the Senator from Alaska, certainly the reading public was entitled to receive a report in regard to our objections to the conference report. But, once again, the United Press failed to fulfill its responsibilities to the American people, under the great, precious privilege given to it in the Constitution—that of freedom of the press.

Mr. President, what can be expected of a wire service which, as was pointed out in public hearings earlier this year, in connections with some of its so-called foreign news was perfectly willing to take money to write alleged or purported news stories whereas the stories really were lobby services by the United Press to foreign governments, foreign concerns, and foreign clients?

Ever since I heard that shocking testimony, although I did not have much confidence in the United Press before then, I have none now, and I expect from it the kind of yellow journalism to which I am referring in connection with this article.

It is also stated in the article:

> MORSE, who led a protracted fight against the bill last month, spoke for more than an hour to a nearly empty Chamber Thursday reiterating much of his previous opposition.

Of course, it is obvious that the United Press reporter who wrote this story either did not read the speech or did not listen to the speech, or else deliberately misrepresented the speech, because in it I took up the conference report section by section, and expressed my opposition to the decisions made by the Senate conferees in connection with the conference report. That is what the speech was about.

So the impression sought to be given, that I was merely repeating my earlier opposition, overlooks the fact—which the reporter should have made very clear—that in that speech, in presenting my arguments, I presented my objections to the conference report, section by section, and I set forth my reasons for objecting to it; and on that occasion the Senator from Alaska did the same thing.

I should not wish to prejudice the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. He is not mentioned in the article. Apparently the press has some love and affection for him. They only made use of the opportunity to "stick it into" the Senator from Oregon again. But I welcome it. I am proud to have the opposition of the United Press—for that matter, most of the press.

Continuing to read from the article:

> Not a word of his views was carried in the morning newspapers, he complained in the Senate yesterday.
>
> "However, that is typical of the journalistic concealment policies of the American Pravda press," he said, "and is very typical of the abuse of the precious constitutional principle of freedom of the press that the American press, by and large, is constantly committing."

Later in the article the writer said:

> There were three persons in the Press Gallery, a few aids on the floor, and not a single Senator present to hear MORSE's speech Thursday night except the presiding officer, Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut.

The writer was in error in that statement, but not many Senators were present.

Apparently the young journalistic sophomore in the Press Gallery labors under the illusion that the speeches of Senators should not be made unless every seat is filled. If that were to be the case, not many speeches would be made in the Senate. Some would like that procedure, but Senators would not be carrying out their responsibility.

I do not wish to embarrass the majority leader, the majority whip, or anyone else, but I should like to say for the edification of the United Press journalistic sophomore in the Gallery that less than a week ago I listened to the majority leader deliver a major, wonderful and fine speech—and not more than two or three Senators were present. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I have held down the Senate floor late in the afternoon and late at night, with the Senator from Minnesota speaking and the Senator from Oregon listening. With the presiding officer we were the only Senators present.

What tommyrot is this to seek the downgrading of a Senator or to damage him with his constituents, by sending out that kind of shoddy reporting, based upon the fallacious premise that unless we are talking to a full Senate, we are not performing service for our constituency or the people of the country by making speeches in the Senate?

Many Senators have told me, "I want you to know that I read your speeches. I have to do so for self-protection." But the point is that the speeches in the Senate are read. Our job is to speak to the country and to Senators who wish to remain in the Chamber to listen to us.

That kind of snide, below-the-belt, yellow journalism, so typical of so much of the United Press, needs to be answered. Some Senators have said, "WAYNE, why do you do it? Do you not know that the press has the last word?"

I have said, "As long as you take that position, you can let the press have the last word, but I do not intend to give them the last word so long as I am in politics."

That is all I wish to say on that subject. I do not want any AP reporter to die tonight of a heart attack.

On the present occasion the Associated Press did an honest job of reporting what happened, for in its story it set out the major objectives of the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon against the conference report. Irrespective of what they think of Senators who oppose conference reports, the American people should be put in a position in which they can be the judges of the merits of the positions taken by Senators on the respective issues in the Senate, including conference reports. But so long as the American press continues to follow a program of concealing such news as it wishes to conceal, and concealing such facts as it wishes to conceal, I repeat that the American people are not enjoying a free press but a rigged press time and time again in its reporting policy.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT ON THE SIGNING OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the great statement made this morning at the White House by the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING H.R. 6143, THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

I am proud and happy to approve at this time the Morse-Green bill, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and to especially compliment Chairman POWELL, Congresswoman GREEN, and their colleagues in the House, Senator MORSE and his colleagues in the Senate, and everyone else who worked so hard for the passage of this very important legislation.

A great former President of the Republic of my State said: "The educated man is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that freemen recognize and the only ruler that freemen desire." So this new law is the most significant education bill passed by the Congress in the history of the Republic. In fact, this session of the Congress will go down in history as the education Congress of 1963, and every person here this morning who has been invited to come to the White House at the request of the President can be very proud, and their children can be very proud, of the part they played in the enactment of this legislation.

Working together, the Congress and the executive branch have made possible the enactment of a series of legislative landmarks in the field of education. Under these various measures:

1. We will help to provide college classrooms for several hundred thousand more students who will nearly double college enrollment in this decade.
2. We will help to build 25 to 30 new public community colleges every year.
3. We will help to construct the technical institutes that are needed to close the gap in this crucial area of trained manpower.
4. We will help to build graduate schools and facilities in at least 10 to 20 major academic centers.
5. We will help to improve the quality of library facilities in our universities and colleges.
6. We will increase the number of medical school graduates and we will relieve the growing shortages of physicians and dentists and other needed professional health personnel.
7. We will enable some 70,000 to 90,000 additional students to attend college each year under the expanded loan program.
8. We will modernize and expand our Federal-State programs for vocational education in order to train for the changing world of work the 8 out of 10 young people who will never obtain a college education.
9. We will reduce the shortage of qualified personnel for the training and teaching of mentally retarded and other handicapped children.
10. We will expand our manpower development and training program to meet the growing problem of untrained, unemployed school dropouts.
11. We will expand programs for teaching science and mathematics and foreign languages, while extending the other valuable provisions of the National Defense Education Act.
12. We will continue the program of Federal finance assistance for the construction and the maintenance and the operation of schools that are crowded by the presence of children of Federal personnel.
13. And finally, we will, under legislation to be passed shortly, provide public libraries for the residents of cities and counties all over this great country who now have only antiquated library facilities and some have no libraries at all.

This legislation is dramatic, and it is concrete evidence of a renewed and continuing national commitment to education as the key to our Nation's social and technological and economic and moral progress. It will help meet the demands of our economy for more skilled personnel; it will enable many more of our young people to cope with the explosion of new knowledge and to contribute effectively in a world of intellectual, political, and economic complexity.

But these new measures will still not do the whole job of extending educational opportunities to all who want and can benefit by them, nor in meeting our growing national needs. I, therefore, strongly urge the Congress to take early, positive action on the unfinished portion of the National Education Improvement Act, particularly those programs which will assist elementary and secondary schools. In addition, I urge prompt action on proposed programs for combating adult illiteracy, for expanding adult education, for improving the quality of education at all levels.

President Kennedy fought hard for this legislation. No topic was closer to his heart. No bill was the object of more of his attention. Both his life and his death showed the importance and the value of sound education. The enactment of this measure is not only a monument to him, it is a monument to every person who participated in passing it, and most of you are in this room today.

It clearly signals this Nation's determination to give all of our youth the education they deserve, and as long as we have a government, that government is going to take its stand to battle the ancient enemies of mankind, illiteracy and poverty and disease, and in that battle, each of you are soldiers who wear the badge of honor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would that every Member of the Congress—in fact, all the American people—would read that statement. It was an eloquent defense of the educational program of the late President Kennedy and President Johnson. The President was very kind in giving credit to those in the two bodies for the passage of the legislation. But credit should be given to others, too. In my judgment, there would not have been a single education bill passed this year had it not been for the great statesmanship and leadership of President John F. Kennedy, for ever since he became President of the United States he made the educational needs of our country one of his major concerns. He has performed a magnificent service for American boys and girls for generations to come as the result of his leadership in the field of education legislation.

As a result of the awful turn of events of the recent past, he has been succeeded by another great executive leader in the field of education—President Johnson. While he served as majority leader in the Senate, while he served as Vice President of the United States, and now serves as President of the United States, President Johnson has always given unfailing assistance to both Houses of Congress, the committees that had jurisdiction, and the leaders of those committees that had the responsibility of taking pieces of proposed legislation through the Congress, his help and his cooperation.

I say to the American people, "You can count upon President Johnson to continue to do so, not only in that field of education, but in every field of legislation."

That does not mean that we shall always be in agreement with the President, but we shall always be in agreement in respect to the motivation from which he serves. That will be a motivation of dedicated service to the American people.

So I thank President Kennedy and President Johnson for the great part that they played in making it possible for us to succeed in passing the various pieces of proposed legislation relating to education that have been passed thus far in the present session of the Congress.

I wish to tender my thanks to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary Celebrezze, and Commissioner of Education, Mr. Keppel, to Wilbur Cohen, the chief aid to the Secretary in the field of education. I wish to pay my thanks to the predecessor of the present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, our colleague in the Senate now, but then the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, ABRAHAM RIBICOFF. We did not pass the bills in a fortnight. We did not pass the bills in a year. Long, hard work went into the preparation of the bills for final passage. Those men did yeoman service in furthering the passage of the bills by the Congress. Also at the White House Mr. Larry O'Brien and Mr. Mike Mantos are deserving of the special mention and thanks that I make this afternoon in respect to the bills. I have already thanked my colleagues in the Senate and my colleagues in the House. But, as a result of the President's message on higher education, at the signing of the higher education bill today, someone might form the impression that it was the Congress alone that did the job. We did not. All those men, including those two great Presidents of the United States, deserve great credit—more than we deserve—for the preparation of the bills for ultimate passage by the Congress of the United States.

I close by saying to the President, "I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the statement you made today." This eloquent statement offers to the American people a challenge for the passage of legislation in the field of education which must be passed, including, for example, legislation in the field of elementary and secondary education.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] has been one of the hardest workers in this body on this particular subject. I have heard the Senator from Michigan say many times—and I agree with him—that elementary and secondary school legislation is the most important field so far as the need for Federal aid to education is concerned. I look forward to standing shoulder to shoulder with him next January as we press for hearings and final determination of the Senate's position on an education bill involving elementary and secondary school legislation.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I heartily join in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who has managed the educational program in the Senate this year, and pushed the great accomplishements in that area. I thank him for his kind reference to me. I am sure we can depend upon his help, as he indicated, in the next session of Congress, to further extend to educational Federal aid in the field which now remains, by comparison, needed more than aid in almost any other area.

I thank the Senator again.

TRIBUTES TO THEO W. SNEED

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in 1946 the Congress passed a legislative reorganization act which created the Public Works Committee of this body.

In order to assist in the establishment of this committee, the Senate borrowed from the Corps of Engineers a lieutenant colonel who, in 20 years, had accumulated great experience in the development of river basin projects. The committee and the colonel got along so well that he never returned to the corps—but remained as the most essential staff member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors projects.

Now, 17 years later, Theo W. Sneed, still affectionately called "Colonel," will retire from the staff of the committee.

Over the years many Members of the Senate have served as members of the Public Works Committee. I think none served very long without realizing that Theo Sneed was an inexhaustible supplier of information about every matter that came before the committee.

They learned quickly that they could rely on him for exact and correct information.

He probably carries in his head the greatest amount of detail on the greatest number of projects of anyone on Capitol Hill.

Whether it be a flood control problem, a rivers and harbors project, a public building, a stretch of highway, or details of enabling legislation, if we want the answer, we just ask the colonel.

Sneed had a long and distinguished career with the Army Corps of Engineers before he came to the committee.

A graduate of the University of Alabama, he made many valuable contributions to the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers. He was with the Memphis district from 1926 to 1937.

It will be long remembered that in 1927 one of the most disastrous floods in history struck the Mississippi River Valley, resulting in a loss of 214 lives and property damage in excess of $275 million.

Congress responded quickly to this disaster by adopting the Flood Control Act of 1928, which provided for levee improvement between Cape Girardeau and the Head of Passes.

Theo Sneed contributed immensely to the development of this plan during his tour of duty with the Memphis district.

In 1937 Theo Sneed transferred to the Little Rock district of the Corps of Engineers in order to participate in the important work that was to take place in the Arkansas River Basin.

He is responsible for much of the information which was compiled and published in the document which formed the basis for the authorization of that great project.

In addition to his civil service activities, Theo Sneed also served his country in time of war.

He reported for active duty in 1942 as a captain in the Corps of Engineers. He was released in 1945, having obtained the rank of lieutenant colonel.

He held many important posts during the war, one of which was in connection with the construction of the Alcan Highway. For his service, he was awarded the Army Commendation Ribbon.

He is a graduate of the Engineer School and the Command and General Staff College of the U.S. Army.

Mr. President, all of us will miss Theo Sneed, but after 37 years of dedicated public service he deserves the leisure time he has earned.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have received from Representative Robert E. Jones, of Alabama, who has known and worked with Theo Sneed for many years, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

December 4, 1963.

Senator Pat McNamara,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I understand that Mr. Theodore W. Sneed, a professional engineer on the staff of your committee, is due to retire at the end of this year. I wish to express to you my sincere appreciation of the work that he has done for this Committee in assisting the members and staff in connection with the coordination of our activities. I have many recollections of Mr. Sneed in conferences when his advice and information was so helpful in reaching decisions on difficult and complex matters.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House Committee on Public Works as well as having a very great devotion to the development of our Nation's water resources, I feel it only fitting that I should write this letter to you on behalf of the sincere and dedicated public servant to whom my best wishes go in his retirement.

Sincerely yours,
Robert E. Jones,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the committee yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield to a good member of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. I wish to associate myself with the tributes to Colonel Sneed. Although I am a "freshman member" of the Committee on Public Works, I have found Colonel Sneed to be extremely helpful, always ready to serve. As stated by the chairman, Colonel Sneed is a walking encyclopedia of information on rivers and harbors projects and all other public works projects. I believe I speak for all members of the Committee on Public Works when I say that we shall miss him. I wish him the very best in his future endeavors.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am pleased that the chairman of the Committee on Public Works has taken this occasion to make his remarks about Theo Sneed. I wish to join in paying tribute to him.

I have known Theo Sneed for many years. As the chairman stated, he graduated from the University of Alabama. He used to live in my home county in Alabama.

After I came to the Senate I became a member of the Committee on Public Works. There I found Theo Sneed. I found him to be all that the chairman and the Senator from Hawaii have said about him. I particularly like the reference to him as an encyclopedia of information on various projects. I have found him to be exactly that.

Time after time I have gone to him, not only as a member of the committee, but also since that time, to inquire about various projects. I have never found a project so little or so insignificant that he did not have the facts about it.

I regret very much that Colonel Sneed is leaving us. I wish him well. He has rendered truly distinguished service. I am grateful to him for what he has done I congratulate him upon his accomplishments. I wish him all happiness in his retirement.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Alabama for joining in this brief tribute and commendation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. When I first met Ted Sneed I did not know from where he came and I did not know what was his background, but it did not take me long to find out he had a great deal of ability and that he was willing to share that ability with Members of the Senate. We have been very fortunate to be able to call upon him whenever we needed information regarding the work of the committee.

It did not matter to him whether one was a Senator, an administrative assistant, or the lowest paid employee in the Senator's office. He was glad to give the information that was requested. It did not matter whether that person was a Republican or a Democrat, or what his political philosophy was. His only interest was in giving complete information and assisting Senators and their offices.

I am sure Ted Sneed typifies, as a member of the professional staff, what was intended by the Legislative Reorganization Act should be the role of committee staffs. He set an example for others to follow. I am sorry he is leaving us. I certainly hope whoever succeeds him will follow his example. If he does, we shall be delighted.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as a former member of the Public Works Committee, I wish to express, for myself and for my staff, long years of gratitude, and to commend Colonel Sneed for the very fine services he has rendered to the committee and the entire Senate.

I was impressed from the very beginning with his fine knowledge of his work. I have never seen him falter, much less fail, when he was called upon to render the innumerable services he rendered in such fine fashion.

I think it is a great credit to the Senate and to him that he stayed here all these years. I regret exceedingly that he is about to retire. My entire staff feels a kindliness to him for his attitude and for his fine assistance. I do not know of anyone, since I came to the Senate, who has rendered more efficient service or done more willingly work that represents what an ideal public servant should be.

I wish for Colonel Sneed and Mrs. Sneed many of the worthwhile satisfactions of life which they so richly deserve.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield now to the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in paying well deserved tribute to Theo Sneed. Colonel Sneed is retiring after more than 15 years of service to the Senate as a professional staff member of the Public Works Committee.

Diligent and hard working, serving Senators impartially regardless of party affiliation, Theo Sneed has more than earned a respite from the rigors of daily toil. Superbly qualified by training, experience, and ability, he has been a valued and trusted adviser.

He possesses a phenomenal knowledge of American geography. I believe he knows our rivers, harbors, roads, parks, and countless public works projects all over the Nation as he knows the back of his hand. He constantly amazes us with his detailed knowledge.

A product of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Theo Sneed added to that expertise a thorough grasp of the legislative process in this field, a combination particularly useful to members of the committee and to all Senators.

As a newcomer to the Senate and to the Public Works Committee in 1959, I soon discovered Theo Sneed was an indispensable guide and instructor. I personally feel a deep sense of gratitude for his ready and able assistance, which enabled the senior Senator from Hawaii to serve his State and his country far better than otherwise. Certainly, Hawaii has benefited greatly from his efforts.

In fact, I would venture to say that every State in the Union has benefited from the work of Theo Sneed.

I, for one, shall miss his sound counsel very much, and regret that the committee is losing his faithful, dedicated service.

Since he has chosen to retire, my fervent hope is that he will find happiness, contentment, satisfaction, and new vistas in these coming years.

My very warmest wishes, Godspeed, and aloha to Theo Sneed.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield now to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], who serves on the Public Works Committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure and privilege for me to endorse everything that my colleagues have said about Theo Sneed, known affectionately as "The Colonel." I have a very fine recollection of my first day on the Public Works Committee. When I first came to the Senate I was put on the Public Works Committee. I later moved off the committee. Then I had the privilege of going back on the Public Works Committee. I have always enjoyed working on the committee.

I always found Colonel Sneed to be helpful to me. I also wish to emphasize, as the Senator from Mississippi said about his staff, that my staff has always leaned on the colonel for obtaining information pertaining to public works. The colonel always had the right answer. He did not have to hunt very long to get it.

We shall miss the colonel. I hope and pray that he will enjoy whatever he does when he retires. He is entitled to decide what he wants to do, instead of doing what he has to do, and not be bothered by questions from Senators asking him about every imaginable water project in the country.

I would like him to stay long enough to see the session come to an end and see various projects he worked on get through this session.

It is a privilege for me to make these few remarks and to join my colleagues in praise of the colonel. I wish him not only Merry Christmas, but many years of happiness in what he wants to do.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield now to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join in all that my colleagues have had to say about Mr. Sneed. I have not had the pleasure of working closely with him, but I know of his fine record of service. It is the kind of service that keeps Congress effective and makes committees an effective instrument of public policy.

I join Senators in paying tribute and commending Mr. Sneed for a job well done and in wishing him many happy days ahead.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his contribution. I am sure the colonel will appreciate his kind words.

I point out for the RECORD that, but for the lateness of the hour, it being about 25 minutes of 6, I am sure all members of the Public Works Committee would want to participate in this tribute to the colonel. I hope, if they bring in statements later, they will be added to the RECORD.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I noted the retirement of a great public servant, Col. Theo W. Sneed who has been a member of the technical staff of the Public Works Committee since the legislative reorganization of 1946 which he helped us with.

At one time it was my privilege to serve on the Public Works Committee and no one was more kind and more understanding in giving the details that so helped to simplify my work on that great committee.

I am sure I know what his loss means to Chairman McNamara and the other members of the Public Works Committee, and I hope the people of America realize what he has done for them in the vital fields of water control, public roads, public housing, and all the other important subjects on which he is a true expert and an outstanding servant of the people.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman and other members of the Committee on Public Works in tribute to the outstanding service rendered the committee by Col. Theo W. Sneed during his many years as a professional staff member of the committee.

Not only will we miss the unfailing good humor and good will which he communicated in his work, but his veritable encyclopedic knowledge of public works legislation, and his intimate knowledge of the background of individual projects will be difficult to equal after his retirement.

As one who has served on the Public Works Committee for the past 5 years, I say without reservation that Theo Sneed has greatly lightened the burden of this Senator, and has saved my personal staff untold hours of research by his extensive knowledge and his unfailing willingness to assist in matters regarding public works.

We shall sorely miss the good colonel, and my regret at seeing him leave is tempered only by my knowledge that his retirement is justly earned as a reward for a life of contribution to his government of the highest caliber of service. I have little doubt that his years of retirement will be just as vital and rewarding as have been the years of his active career. I add only the wish that he will enjoy many such years and that during that time he will not completely deprive us of the enjoyment that we have known during our previous association.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there have been innumerable eulogies of our late, beloved President, but I was particularly impressed with one I read a few days ago, published in a weekly paper in Alabama, written by a young girl, a high school student, by the name of Cam McCurry.

The subject of her little article is "Reflections of a Tragedy." She lives in Oneonta, Ala., and I presume this article was published in the Oneonta newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that it may be included at this point in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Reflections of a Tragedy

(By Cam McCurry)

From the events of this past week, we, the citizens of the United States of America, should have gained a lesson. Such a tragic event has brought to us a numbness, a disbelief, but from this we have gained a feeling of unity. A great man has died. He was killed by an assassin's bullet. Such a senseless, dastardly deed. He died as he lived, courageously.

How can decent men believe such a thing has happened in these United States? And we ask ourselves the unending question, Why? Why did this sickening thing happen?

I believe it happened because we, the people of the United States, let our minds and hearts stray—stray from the lesson of love Christ taught to the ways of hate, the ways of sick, stupid men. How can we, people who call ourselves Christians, intelligent people, sit in judgment on this one man, the man who pulled the trigger of a gun that cut down a great man, John F. Kennedy, when we helped to load the gun and we planted the idea in his mind? Yes, we did. We let ourselves hate so that we might as well have handed Lee H. Oswald the loaded gun.

The man, the good, kind man, is dead. But he died a hero, a martyr for the cause of freedom and of justice, freedom for his country, and justice for his fellow man. May God grant that his spirit live within us and from his courage may we gain the courage to do away with the strife and hate between man and unite America once more in freedom and in courage.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have before me another eulogy, from Radio Station WAMI of Opp, Ala. Mr. Jim Williams, the manager of WAMI, on the occasion of the assassination of President Kennedy, gave an editorial over that radio station.

I ask unanimous consent that this eulogy may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the radio editoral was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Every community throughout the United States is in deep mourning today—mourning for our leader and President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, cut down by an assassin's bullet early Friday afternoon in Dallas, Tex. President Kennedy made an indelible mark and profound image on this Nation and the world during his comparatively short 46 years. He did this by seeking out his country's needs, our world problems, and according to his sincere convictions, implementing the measures that would make this a better country for all mankind, a safer world for our children, grandchildren, and future generations. President Kennedy, having a deep compassion for all of the world population, and at the same time respecting the differences of opinion that are rampant in the 20th century, may, indeed must, have found his job frustrating many times. It has been said that the post of our Presidency is a lonely spot for any man. Every action taken by President Kennedy, it seems, was a step he thought would bring a better understanding among the peoples of the universe, and an effort to get all men to meet on a common ground, a mutual ground where they could live in dignity with themselves and in peace with their fellow man. On the world scene, he commanded respect for our Nation, yet he conveyed to people everywhere his eagerness to search for a world where all men could live in self respect and in peace. President Kennedy was many things to many different individuals. History is a factual report of the past, and it seems that tomorrow's history will read something like this. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, U.S. President, from January 20, 1961, until November 22, 1963, convinced reasonable men throughout the world that America wanted peace on earth and good will toward man. During the coming weeks, probably, his 3-year-old son will ask for daddy or perhaps seek to locate daddy's new office. Unlike, "John-John," as he was called by his father and our President, we realize that the answer won't come and that his office will not be found, but many Americans, in childlike bewilderment, will join "John-John" in asking: "Why?"

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have also received a tribute to the memory of President John F. Kennedy, delivered by Paul-Henri Speak, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Belgium, before the U.N. General Assembly on November 26, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that this eulogy may be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Tribute to the Memory of President John F. Kennedy, by Paul-Henri Spaak, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Belgium, Before the U.N. General Assembly, on November 26, 1963

Mr. President, the assassination of the President of the United States has shocked the women and the men of my country more than it was possible to imagine. They wept for the human tragedy. They worried about the possible political consequences.

When death strikes one of the great of this world who has arrived at the end of his career, whose work is done, one accepts the inevitable. One bows before this foreseen fatality. But when death blindly strikes the man who is in full possession of his faculties, whose personality is growing, from whom one still expects so many things, then stupefaction and revolt fill the heart and the mind.

John F. Kennedy has already given us a great deal but we were confident that we could expect much more still.

Amidst the elder statesmen, he represented a new generation. He symbolized youth in the ascent, youth that affirms itself.

As I have seen him and as I think I understood him, he was a rare combination of courage and imagination, of daring and composure. He had the will that would not give in on essentials, and the desire not to let any occasion escape to better international relations.

Like so many great Americans, he believed in democracy, he cherished freedom and wanted peace.

He did not shrink from any responsibilities. He accepted them, on the contrary, with a kind of contagious and touching enthusiasm.

In the few conversations I had the rare privilege to have with him, I felt my affection, my esteem and my admiration for him constantly grow.

I like to remember that the first time I met him he let me talk, the second time he questioned me, the third time he gave me his advice, the fourth time he took the decision.

Thus, gradually, his personality developed. The qualities of the heroic officer of the great war, of the young Senator, of the President of the United States grew into one. The statesman was born.

Since his life was too short for his work to be complete, he will remain essentially the man who fostered the legislation on civil rights and the equality of races, the man who without bravado but with a rare composure, faced a great danger that menaced his country, and still more, the man who signed the Treaty of Moscow which brought to the world a glimmer of hope.

He was cordial and simple and had an extraordinary presence. I still cannot accept the idea that he is no more. Immobility, nothingness, are so contrary to the vitality and the ardor which he represented. How can we accept the idea of the death of John Kennedy, when he was so extraordinary alive and when he could have remained with us for a very long time?

To his family, to his friends, to his advisers, to his compatriots, we express not only our profound condolences. There is much more. Their sorrow is our sorrow. Their loss is also our loss and the man whose memory we honor today was not only the President of the United States of America; he was a citizen of the world who belongs to us like he belonged to them.

John F. Kennedy, 35th President of America, we will cherish your memory a very long time. We will be inspired by your example. In the great struggle that we will carry on for the ideal which was common to us, you will remain our companion until the day of victory.

JIMMY SIDLE—AN ORPHAN NO MORE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I do not know whether it is unusual to say something on the floor of the Senate and to have printed in the Congressional Record remarks about a football player.

At Auburn University in Alabama this year there was a quarterback who made an unusual record and who was selected as an All-American in the Look magazine selections.

When he was in New York recently a sportswriter, Edwin Pope, wrote an article which was published in the Washington Post. It is entitled "True All-American."

It is a very fine article about this young man who grew up as an orphan, moving from the home of one kinsman to another, but persevering until he got through high school. Then he went to Auburn University, where he achieved a highly creditable record in the school, more particularly on the athletic field.

The article makes interesting and inspiring reading. The article closes with the words "Jimmy Sidle is an Orphan No More."

I ask unanimous consent that this article, published in the Washington Post on December 10, may be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUE ALL-AMERICAN—AUBURN'S SIDLE SPURNS RECORD

(By Edwin Pope)

NEW YORK, December 9.—One minute remained in the bloody football feud between Auburn and Alabama in Birmingham a week ago when a coach on the Auburn side seized a player by the shoulder. Backfield coach Buck Bradberry knew quarterback Jimmy Sidle needed just 4 yards to set a school total offense record of 1,720 yards. It would be no great trick to get it now. Only a minute was left, sure. But Auburn had it won, 10 to 8. All Sidle had to do was sneak for what he needed.

But Sidle wasn't in the game. Another quarterback, postgraduate Mailon Kent was. Sidle was on the sideline with Bradberry.

"Go on in there, Jimmy," said the coach. He pushed Sidle toward the field. Finish it up." Sidle, a brushcut 200-pounder, held back politely but firmly. "I'd rather not, coach," he murmured.

"Are you kidding?" said Bradberry. "You know what this means to you."

"It means more to me," said Sidle, "that Mailon stay in there. He came back this year just to help us. This is his last game. He belongs in there."

Thus did one of the best football players in southern history spurn his chance at statistical immortality.

But not even the statistics will dim the achievements of the orphan boy who brought Auburn out of football orphanhood.

The rash of commercialism and jerry-built heroes, constructed from the imaginations of press agents, has all but wiped out the image of the "All-American boy" in college football.

Sidle is one of those who may yet restore it.

His is as much a story of victory over adversity as that of any immigrant who ever came to this country penniless and made it big.

Today Sidle is All-American quarterback as a junior and the acknowledged leader of the Auburn team, which plays Big Eight champion Nebraska in the Orange Bowl in Miami, January 1.

He missed by only 11 yards (1,006 yards to Memphis State's Dave Casinelli's 1,016) becoming the first T-formation quarterback ever to lead the Nation in rushing.

You could have gotten 10 to 1 against it 10 years ago.

Sidle's father was killed on Guam during World War II when Jimmy, now 20, was an infant in Sylacauga, Ala. When Jimmy was 10, his mother was killed in an auto accident. He lived with first one family and then another until his half-brother, a high school coach named Shorty White, married and the boy came to live with him.

When Birmingham's Banks High called for White as an assistant, Jimmy went along. In his final two seasons, he was outstanding in football, track, and even tennis.

Last year, as an Auburn sophomore, he led the Southeastern Conference with a 6.5 yards per carry.

What has happened since is a matter of horrible record to nine Auburn opponents. Only underrated Mississippi State beat the Tigers. Auburn goes into the Orange Bowl as a 2-point favorite over Nebraska.

The other night Sidle was at a gathering of All-Americans here. He was introduced to Bob Brown, Nebraska's towering 295-pound tackle, first draft choice of the Philadelphia Eagles. "Think you got anybody who can block him?" someone kiddingly asked Sidle.

Sidle's eyes popped and he nodded his head vaguely. "I hope so," he said.

The irony of this is that Sidle's magnificent running has been chiefly responsible for giving Auburn one of the best blocking backfields in the country.

Until Jimmy showed what he can do, the other three members of the Tiger backfield were regarded as tremendous runners themselves—217-pound Tucker Frederickson, speedster George Rose and bonebuster Larry Rawson. Yet Sidle became so effective on the option play that the three were reduced mostly to blocking assignments, and became deadly efficient at it.

They don't seem to mind. They look up to Sidle as a player and, more particularly, as a person. He is a leader in the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, and came here with Georgia Tech quarterback Billy Lothridge, another FCA member.

Sidle's pro future is no more than academic at this point. He has another season to play for Auburn. But he probably will not be drafted as a quarterback. He is the first to admit he is no great passer.

Gil Brandt, chief talent scout of the Dallas Cowboys of the National Football League, says: "Jimmy doesn't have to worry. He can play anywhere. He's some kind of a package of football player."

Jimmy Sidle is an orphan no more.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement issued by the White House relating to the foreign aid funds as proposed by the House.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The drastic reduction in foreign aid funds proposed in the House, if sustained, would be a severe setback to American leadership and to U.S. interests in many parts of the world. The $2.8 billion recommended to the House is $1.7 billion below the figure requested by President Kennedy.

The proposed reductions in foreign aid funds would put our foreign policy in a straightjacket. For example:

The amount proposed for the Alliance for Progress would be sharply less than was appropriated last year. This would represent a failure on our part to carry out the undertakings of President Eisenhower in the Act of Bogota and of President Kennedy in the Charter of Punta del Este. It would mean that the United States would be providing for all of Latin America less than the Soviet Union is putting into Cuba alone. This is no way to combat communism in Latin America.

The amount proposed for contributions to International Organizations would mean that the United States could not keep its commitments and pledges. This is a startling proposal. It would undercut our efforts in the United Nations to insure that the Soviet Union and other reluctant nations live up to their pledges to the United Nations.

The amount proposed for development loans would not even be enough to meet clear existing program commitments to five countries whose independence and progress is vital to the success of freedom in Asia and Africa—India, Pakistan, Turkey, Nigeria, and Tunisia—to say nothing of the other countries in Asia and Africa that we plan to assist.

The amount proposed for supporting economic assistance would not suffice to cover program plans and commitments in several of the countries where U.S. political and security interests are most seriously threatened—including Vietnam, Laos, Korea, Jordan, and the Congo.

The amount proposed for the technical assistance programs, under which the U.S. conducts people-to-people assistance in less-developed countries would be severely restricted.

I cannot believe that the Congress intends to require the United States of America to follow policies of weakness and retreat.

I urge the Congress, therefore, to appropriate the funds essential to conduct strong and forward-looking foreign assistance programs in the U.S. national interest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have asked that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point because I believe the Senate has the responsibility of restoring adequate funds for the foreign aid program, so that the President may carry out the duties imposed upon him as the Chief Executive of this Nation and as its Commander in Chief.

It is incredible to me that the same Congress which can vote more than $50 billion for defense will argue and haggle over a few hundred million dollars for another area of defense, namely, our foreign aid program.

With all due respect to Members of Congress, I say we have no right to be critical of the Executive if we deny that Executive the tools and the means with which to do the job.

As our late beloved President Kennedy said during the debate on the foreign aid bill in the Senate, it is he, the President, who has to take this responsibility. If things go wrong, the blame falls upon him.

Congress can do many things, and it does, but one thing it cannot do is conduct foreign policy; nor should it.

Therefore, I hope that when we meet in committee tomorrow to mark up the foreign aid bill we shall be mindful of the fact that the House appropriated only $2,800 million and that we have an authorization before us of $3,600 million; further, I am sure all of us have learned that when we go to conference we are fortunate to come out of it with an even split between the two bills, and that on foreign aid it has generally been less.

Therefore, I hope we shall not deny the President of the United States, by any action in the Senate, the amount that he should have to fulfill his responsibilities under the authorizations of foreign aid.

I know that many of my colleagues in the Senate feel as I do. I am hopeful that we can give to the President the support which he so richly and justly deserves in this instance.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 17, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 16, 1963:

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Reynold D. Hogle, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for the appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 16, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Eugene G. Hulett, of Oregon, to be a U.S. marshal for the district of Oregon for the term of 4 years.

George Clifton Edwards, Jr., of Michigan, to be U.S. circuit judge, 6th circuit.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Carson A. Roberts, U.S. Marine Corps, to have the grade indicated on the retired list in the Marine Corps effective from the date of his retirement, to be lieutenant general.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Maj. Hans E. Sandrock, Chaplain, USAF, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of all men, a grateful nation pauses at Christmastide to contemplate the gift and meaning of peace. Keep us mindful:

That Thou hast called us to be watchmen on the walls of world freedom.

That "except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

That only "that government is the strongest of which every man feels himself a part."

That we enjoy peace when every citizen is strong in the pursuit of peace.

That we remain free when every citizen is dedicated to the cause of freedom.

That America will be in all things strong when every citizen becomes a partner in her strength.

Help us to be worthy of our power and responsibility; to exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint; to achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of peace on earth, good will toward men. In the name of Him who is the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 14, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On December 11, 1963:

H.R. 2467. An act to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak.;

H.R. 2905. An act to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned land;

H.R. 4760. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Mary Martin; and

H.R. 9291. An act to provide office space, supplies, equipment, and franking privileges for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, to authorize appropriations for the payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and for other purposes.

On December 12, 1963:

H.R. 976. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and add certain lands to the Salem Maritime National Historic Site in Massachusetts, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5949. An act to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek compact.

On December 13, 1963:

H.R. 134. An act to provide that seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain safety standards; and

H.R. 9009. An act to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended.

On December 16, 1963:

H.R. 6143. An act to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions; and

H.R. 7885. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1322. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Eugenie II*, owned by J. C. Strout, of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges;

S. 1767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the State of Delaware, and for other purposes;

S. 2317. An act to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties; and

S. 2364. An act to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress.

ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF THE BULGE

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the Battle of the Bulge in World War II is indelibly etched on the memories of every American fighting man who served in the European Theater of Operations. On December 16, 1944—19 years ago today—Adolf Hitler sent his crack panzer and S.S. divisions through the early morning fog in the Ardennes in a last desperate gamble to push American and British forces into the sea. For weeks the tide of battle favored the Nazis as a ring of steel encircled and tightened around the 101st Airborne Division in Bastogne. Finally, the sun came out, penetrating the fog, and enabling the American Air Force to support the inspired counterattacks by American and British troops. By late in January 1945, the lines had been restored, setting the stage for the final victory in Europe.

For Americans on the fighting fronts in Europe, the Battle of the Bulge constituted the darkest period of the war. Casualties were heavy. Yet, as in the case of Valley Forge, Pearl Harbor, and other dark hours of American history, America rose to the challenge and the occasion brought forth the noble effort which produced victory.

On this anniversary of the dark days of the Battle of the Bulge, all Americans are still, and will continue to be, deeply affected by the events of 3 weeks ago, and the loss of the man who inspired love and respect in every nation of the world. Yet, under the leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson, Americans are showing that once again in our history, out of darkness, despair, and desolation, this Nation can rise to its finest hour.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, December 2, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present and voted, I would have voted "aye" on both rollcalls 211 and 213.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DESIGNATING THE 17TH OF DECEMBER AS "WRIGHT BROTHERS DAY"

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 335 designating the 17th day of December of each year as "Wright Brothers Day," with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, after "issue" insert "annually."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to serve notice on the Members of the House that in connection with the business of committees or in transacting the business of the House, I will object to any unanimous-consent request that deals with the transaction of such business, no matter how meritorious it may be, unless the Member goes to one of the microphones on the floor of the House so that all Members may hear the request.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 241]

Avery
Baker
Becker
Belcher
Bray
Burkhalter
Cederberg
Celler
Cohelan
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Ellsworth
Evins
Fulton, Tenn.
Grabowski
Grant
Green, Pa.
Hagan, Ga.
Hansen
Hébert
Henderson
Hoffman
Kee
Laird
Landrum
Latta
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Pepper
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Rains
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Shelley
Short
Sisk
Sullivan
Trimble
Tupper
Ullman
Van Pelt
Wilson, Bob
Younger

On this rollcall 377 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to order of the House on December 10, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9499, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration today makes appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

The bill recommends total appropriations of $3,113,100,370, including some $15.8 million which has no relationship to foreign aid.

In addition to this bill, the Congress has already considered several appropriation bills which contained funds for what might also be considered as foreign aid programs—such as the agriculture appropriation bill which contained $1,719,966,000 to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities sold or given away under the Public Law 480 program—now known as food for peace—and the Treasury Department appropriation bill which carries the annual appropriation to pay the interest on the public debt, a portion of which has been generated by our generosity in the foreign assistance field. The House has also passed the military construction appropriation bill which contained approximately $183 million for construction of oversea military facilities which may in the long run prove more endurable and valuable than some of these facilities financed by this bill.

During its hearings our subcommittee received testimony that our aid program is being continued in countries where one of the following illegal actions has occurred:

A dictator has taken over control of the country.

A military junta has overthrown a friendly government.

A President or Premier has been assassinated.

A newly elected President has been prevented from taking office.

A monarch has been dispossessed by a rebel force.

The testimony indicated that our aid program in these countries may have been suspended temporarily but in each instance it was resumed within a very short period of time. Page 115 of part 3 of the printed hearings contains a listing of 29 aid-recipient countries which experienced an illegal change of government during the period 1948–63. Of these 29 countries Cuba is the only country which is not now receiving direct U.S. aid, although she does receive assistance from the United Nations.

Our committee has long felt that this program has been attempting too much for too many. For example, of the other 112 countries of the world, the Executive contemplates the granting of assistance during fiscal year 1964 to a minimum of 100 countries, territories, or possessions. The proposed military assistance program alone envisages grant aid to 65 countries and credit assistance to 3 additional countries.

The committee is of the opinion that our "aid dollar" could be more wisely spent by concentrating our assistance in fewer countries with well-planned projects. It does not believe that we have to have an aid program in some countries—especially in the African area—to maintain a U.S. presence, or image. Whatever financial assistance is required by these developing countries should, it seems, be the responsibility of the former metropole since the latter is generally tied to the newly formed country by a common language, trade agreements, and substantial investments.

The committee is also of the opinion that it is not the sole responsibility of the United States to provide substantial assistance to newly developing countries who turned to the Communist bloc for aid, have become disenchanted with such aid, and are now looking to the United States for financial assistance. The committee wonders how much faith and reliance can be placed on such countries.

In other countries—the attitude of the official and semiofficial press and radio is anti-American. However, according to the testimony of the executive branch officials, the people are pro-American and this supposedly justifies an aid program.

In still other countries, unwise fiscal policies, inflation, deficit spending, and lack of self-help efforts seem only to qualify those countries for larger grant assistance.

In Latin America, there are 5 countries which still maintain trade and diplomatic relations with Cuba—Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and Uruguay. It is almost inconceivable to the committee that the administration would propose for fiscal year 1964 a total increase of approximately $100 million in economic and military aid above the fiscal year 1963 aid program for these five countries.

Of the total 2,157 projects in the aid program—1,896 grant and 261 loan projects—our subcommittee examined virtually every one of the 1,244 projects contained in this year's congressional presentation books and at various times throughout the hearings the executive branch witnesses testified as to the "illustrative" nature of the program, and further testified that portions of the project estimates were too high, needed further examination and review, or were being completely dropped from the request.

Mr. Chairman, a review of the printed hearings of the past several years will indicate the concern of the committee with the "gold outflow" problem.

During the early years of the foreign aid program the dollar was regarded as a superstrong currency, despite the fact that the United States had a deficit balance of payments in every year beginning with 1950 through 1962 with the sole exception of 1957, when we experienced a surplus balance of payments of approximately $500 million.

Since 1958, the dollar has been growing weaker and one of the major reasons, in the opinion of the committee, has been the outflow of gold. On December 31, 1957, the gold stock of the United States amounted to $22,857 million. Since that date our gold stockpile has been diminishing steadily, and on June 30, 1963, it amounted to $15,830 million, a drop of $7,027 million. During this same period of 5½ years, 52 foreign nations—each one a recipient of U.S. foreign aid—purchased from the Treasury $6,823,200,000 of U.S. gold.

While there may be good and valid reasons why foreign nations have been able to purchase our gold, in the opinion of the committee one of the primary reasons is that the United States, through the foreign aid program for the same period of January 1, 1958, to June 30, 1963, extended $11,947,400,000 in economic and military assistance to these same 52 foreign nations. This financial assistance by the United States in turn released the revenues of these 52 nations to be used in any way they saw fit, and obviously one of the ways was to buy $6.8 billion of gold from the U.S. Treasury.

The committee has also been concerned with the serious problem confronting the United States with reference to the balance-of-payments situation. As previously noted, the United States has had a deficit position in its international balance-of-payments in each year since 1950 with the exception of 1957, when we experienced a surplus position of approximately $500 million. Present data indicates that we will again have a substantial deficit in 1963.

During fiscal year 1963 the Agency for International Development allocated $901,996,000 to 23 countries for balance-of-payments purposes, budgetary support, and cash grants.

At the same time the administration is trying to improve our own very serious balance-of-payments position which, as already noted, had a deficit balance of $2.2 billion in 1962 and the present estimate for 1963 appears to be a deficit of approximately $2 billion, by recommending legislation to the Congress, taking administrative action, and requesting funds to implement such actions. It is a moot question, to say the least, as to whether the United States should be giving financial assistance to foreign countries to alleviate their balance-of-payments problems when we cannot balance our own, and whether the United States should be giving budgetary support and direct cash grants to foreign countries at a time when we are experiencing substantial budget deficits here in this country.

AID states, Mr. Chairman, that today fully 80 percent of AID funds are committed for the export of U.S. goods and services, and in fiscal year 1964 and future years AID intends to raise this proportion even further.

The AID policy of tying economic aid to procurement in the United States rather than abroad appears to the committee to be a "gimmick" to sell the aid program to the American taxpayer. What the agency neglects to add is that the taxpayer is financing the cost of the 89-percent U.S. procurement and in addition is also financing the additional 20 percent that is procured overseas.

U.S.-tied procurement also increases the cost of the aid program to the taxpayer, as it tends to create a wall around the U.S. manufacturer and insulates him from the need to meet competition from the foreign producer. This tied procurement policy would appear to be aid to U.S. industry rather than aid to the developing nations.

Another argument cited in favor of a continuation of the foreign aid program is that our assistance builds up the economies of the developing nations which then creates a demand for U.S. exports. India, for example, has been one of the 10 largest aid recipients and in fiscal 1963 was the recipient of the largest amount of foreign aid. If the statement is valid, then one would naturally expect India to be a growing importer of U.S. products.

However, if U.S. exports financed by AID and Public Law 480 commodities are subtracted from the total trade, our net trade balance with India was a minus $77 million in 1958 and our deficit trade balance with India increased to a minus $88 million in 1962. In this one instance at least, this argument for foreign aid does not appear to be valid.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the $2,801,700,000 in new obligational authority recommended for the mutual security program—title I—in the bill under consideration, the executive branch has indicated that it would also obligate or commit $1,826,300,000 in foreign currencies to the program.

Last year, the committee expressed its concern with the increasing pipeline of unexpended funds in the foreign aid program.

Theoretically these unexpended funds represent firm obligations for goods and services on order but not yet delivered; consequently, such funds should not be available for the purchase of additional goods and services.

However, experience has shown that both programs—economic and military assistance—have been able to deobligate or dereserve funds in a magnitude that allows substantially more flexibility than the committee deems advisable. Such deobligations or dereservations then become available for the purchase of additional goods or services, and a substantial portion of them have been used to initiate new projects that have never been presented or justified to the Congress.

As I have mentioned, the committee is recommending an appropriation of $2,801,700,000 to finance a mutual security program for a minimum of 100 countries and territories in fiscal year 1964.

Last year the committee quoted in its report an excerpt from a letter to the gentleman from Missouri, Chairman CANNON, from Secretaries Rusk and McNamara which, in effect, stated that a workable program could not be accomplished with the cuts proposed by the committee in the fiscal year 1962 bill.

Again, when the committee reported the fiscal year 1963 bill to the House, recommending an appropriation of $3,630,400,000, Secretary Rusk addressed a letter to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker McCORMACK, which stated in part:

> DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am gravely concerned by the drastic cut of over $1,100 million which the Appropriations Committee has recommended in the appropriation requested by the President to conduct the foreign aid program for fiscal year 1963.

Subsequently, the Congress approved an appropriation of $3,928,900,000, an increase of $298,500,000 above the House committee recommendation. As of June 30, 1963, the unobligated/unreserved funds amounted to $524,281,836, which includes the investment guaranty account. Therefore, if the House committee recommendation of $3,630,400,000 had been approved, the program would still have had an unobligated balance on June 30 of well more than $100 million, despite the executive branch representations.

As I have noted, the unobligated/unreserved funds amounted to $524,281,836 on June 30, 1963. One of the primary reasons why this unobligated/unreserved figure is as "low" as it is, stems from the "committee" process in the development loan appropriations accounts. Basically, the agency commits or reserves a specified sum of money which will fully fund a loan application which has been approved technically but on which all negotiations such as repayment, terms, signatures, and so forth, have not been completed. While a "commitment," is not a true obligation, Mr. Chairman, the committee has traditionally recognized a commitment as being an obligation. During the month of June the agency "committed" $421,075,000, or approximately 41 percent of the total funds available for development loans during the fiscal year. On Thursday, June 28, the agency committed $126 million and on Friday, June 29, the last normal workday of the fiscal year, the agency committed $138,975,000, or a total in the last two normal working days of the fiscal year of $264,975,000.

The committee recognizes the possible necessity in some cases for committing funds prior to a firm obligation in order to insure that funds will be on hand when all necessary details of the loan negotiation are completed. However, the amount of funds that are "committed" in the last 2 or 3 working days of the fiscal year, despite the fact that the Congress appropriates this money on a no-year availability basis, raises a question as to whether these funds are "committed" just prior to the expiration of the fiscal year in order to show as small an unobligated/unreserved balance as possible as justification for an additional appropriation of funds somewhat near the magnitude of the budget estimate for the program.

Mr. Chairman, this is the ninth year that it has been my privilege to bring in a foreign aid appropriation bill. Each and every year, I, as well as other members of the committee, have been accused of recommending that this program be wrecked. But I should like to say that the total reductions below the budget estimate during the past 8 years, since it has been my privilege to serve as chairman of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, amounted to $6,582,937,000, yet we appropriated more money than was needed every year. Last year, the Congress, in its wisdom, cut the request by $1,032,400,000. The people downtown said, in effect, "This is one time you have wrecked the program completely." Nevertheless, when they came back this year they had $744 million in the program that was unobligated, $522 million of that amount being in title I—mutual security.

May I note, Mr. Chairman, that we are getting close to the time of year where we look for Santa Claus; and we are playing Santa Claus this year, through foreign aid, to 100 nations and territories. It is fantastic, but true, that the bill now before you calls for aid to 100 of the other 112 nations of the world, Communist and so-called neutral nations, friendly nations, wealthy nations, and all the rest. I believe I should say also that the United States has a public debt that exceeds by $24 billion the combined public debts of all the other nations of the world.

And, it should be mentioned, too, that from the time we set up our first bookkeeping system in 1789 to record the receipts and expenditures of our Government we have collected a total of $1,312,508 million in revenues. Notwithstanding this fact, during that 175 years for every dollar collected we have created an obligation of $1.81.

Furthermore, we hear people talk about a public debt of $305 billion. But, in fact, our Federal Government has a public debt of $1,050 billion. The borrowed part of it on December 31 will stand at about $305 billion, but there are statutes which call for the paying out of money in subsequent years for services rendered in previous years. So our true public debt, then, is $1,050 billion. Yet, we are still going strong with the spending.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I should say that this bill is very loose. It is practically a blank-check appropriation.

The executive branch people can do with this money just about whatever they want to do with it.

For instance, practically everything is illustrative. They come in and ask for money to do certain things. If they ask for money, for example, to build a road in Argentina, they can take that same money and build a brick building in Algeria with it. If they come in and justify 37 projects in Guatemala, they can take that money and start 37 projects out in India or Pakistan. The bill is just that loose. Just about everything is illustrative, and we do not know what they are going to do with the money until after they get it.

Mr. Chairman, we have permitted a lot of weaknesses to grow up in this program, weaknesses that should be corrected. I do not know how to go about it, but I am doing the very best I can do. The program has, for instance, what is known as a pipeline. And, under this bill, it is not unusual for those in charge to obligate funds 6, 7, 8, and 10 years in advance of the completion date. They will estimate the cost to complete the program and obligate the funds, even though it may be 7, 8, or 10 years before they will need the money for that purpose.

Also, the Congress permits these people to operate on very loose estimates. Funds are frequently obligated far in excess of the amounts actually needed. For instance, in fiscal years 1962 and 1963, Congress appropriated for the military assistance program a total of $2,925 million. Upon examination, we found that they had obligated $3,415,700,000. We asked where they got the additional $490,700,000, and the answer was that it came out of unused obligations of previous years.

I think the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] pinned the matter down when he said that the privilege to obligate and to deobligate is the greatest invention since the wheel.

On June 30, 1960, the pipeline, as we call it—that is, the money on hand unexpended—amounted to $5,180,495,000. At that time we were thinking about getting it even lower. We had given some thought to trying to get it back maybe to a year's pipeline, which is about the average needed in a tight program. But, in 1960, 1961, and 1962 they withdrew out of the pipeline an average of about $3.2 billion but were putting in money in excess of the amount they had drawn out. We worked the pipeline down to $4.83 billion at the close of the year.

However, on June 30, 1963, the pipeline had $7,044 million in title I and $490 million in title II, or a total pipeline of $7,541 million. The executive branch people had moved the money in the pipeline up almost $3 billion in 3 years.

Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara last year addressed themselves to the Speaker and the President of the Senate. They said we were wrecking the program and if the cuts the House made last year were not restored, the program would be ruined. The facts, however, have proved them wrong again.

They finished the fiscal year with total unobligated funds on hand of $744,181,000 and $524 million of that amount was in title I—mutual security. Of this unobligated money, $280 million is capital in the Inter-American Development Bank and $117 million is in the investment guaranty account, but in excess of $400 million in unobligated money is completely loose. It would have lapsed, in fact, or a good part of it would have, if we had not asked you to reappropriate it in this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us go into some of the specific items in the bill.

The development grant appropriation, according to the presentation material, provides technical assistance to help create the human resources necessary for development.

The budget proposed such assistance to 62 countries, territories, organizations, and regional programs, exclusive of programs for Latin America. In addition, development grants were programed for such purposes as internal security, interregional expenses, ocean freight, and research.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $150 million for this grant aid program.

Of particular concern to the committee is the practice of the Agency in initiating projects during the fiscal year that have never been justified to the Congress. During 1963 the Agency initiated 82 projects in the Far East, the Near East, and South Asia, and the African regions at a fiscal year 1963 cost of $17,753,000. The total cost to complete these 82 projects is presently estimated to be $50,905,000.

The committee can understand the possible necessity of initiating projects which may have a high priority; however, it cannot understand the necessity of initiating projects which would appear to be of doubtful value or where the completion cost is of such magnitude that the Congress should have an opportunity to review such projects prior to their initiation.

A new appropriation item in the foreign aid program is for American schools and hospitals abroad. In the past, funds have been made available to American-sponsored schools and hospitals abroad from the development grant appropriation. The committee recommends the appropriation of $14,300,000 for this purpose in fiscal year 1964.

In addition, there is a special foreign currency program for American hospitals abroad. The recommended appropriation of $4,700,000 includes $3.9 million for the purchase of excess foreign currency—Polish zlotys—owned by the Treasury to finance completion of the U.S.-sponsored children's hospital in Krakow, Poland, which is being built under the auspices of the American Research Hospital in Poland, Inc.

In addition to this appropriation, the hospital is programed to receive $2,200,000 for imported equipment which is included in the estimate of $20 million for American schools and hospitals abroad. The balance of the appropriation, $800,000, is for the purchase of Egyptian funds for the American University in Cairo.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $100 million for international organizations and programs. There are several programs contained in this appropriation estimate that are of concern for the committee. The first program is the U.N. Technical Assistance and Special Fund, for which $55 million is being requested.

For this item, while the U.S. percentage contribution has remained constant at 40 percent, since 1959 the dollar contribution has been increasing by approximately $7 million a year.

At the same time the U.S. Technical Cooperation program—now Development Grants—has increased from $113 million in 1958 up to $225 million in 1963. Also, the Congress created the Peace Corps in 1961 with an initial appropriation of $30 million and the budget estimate for fiscal year 1964 is $108 million. This substantial and increasing financial effort by the United States on a bilateral basis in the technical assistance field does not appear to warrant an increasing dollar contribution to the U.N. technical assistance program and the committee suggests that every effort should be made to reduce our percentage contribution to this program.

The second program under this estimate that is causing the committee some concern is the FAO world food program, for which the fiscal year 1964 estimate is $2 million, plus $16,500,000 in surplus agricultural commodities.

This year the committee ascertained that as of June 30, 1963, the Agency had obligated $1,638,096 plus $2.5 million in surplus commodities for the world food program in fiscal year 1963 without any justification or promised consultation for the program or for the expenditure of funds.

The third program which is of concern to the committee is the Indus waters project, for which the revised estimate is now $30,300,000. Two years ago in its report on the fiscal year 1962 appropriation bill the committee stated in connection with this project:

> The United States contributed $6,800,000 in grant aid to the project during fiscal 1961 and also made a DLF loan of $70 million to Pakistan for the project. The committee points out that the United States has agreed to participate in the project prior to (1) the establishment of firm cost estimates for the different phases of the project, and (2) an arrangement for the sharing of costs in the event actual construction costs exceed the estimate of $1,064 million.
>
> Such haste to commit the U.S. taxpayer to the expenditure of over half a billion dollars without recognition of the potential cost illustrates the kind of thing that can happen when commitments are made prior to full review and approval.

The committee's statement of concern of 2 years ago was well warranted as testimony in this year's hearings clearly indicates.

Supporting assistance, according to data contained in the summary presentation, is that part of the economic aid program which is directed primarily toward meeting immediate political and security objectives.

The budget proposed a program funded by this appropriation for 18 countries and the CENTO organization in the amount of $435 million.

In addition to this supporting assistance program, the budget proposed other economic and military assistance programs which amount to a minimum of $954,398,000 for the same 18 countries and CENTO.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $300 million for the supporting assistance program for fiscal year 1964.

An example of the types of projects financed by this appropriation is the Khmer-American Friendship Highway in Cambodia. According to the testimony, the original estimate of cost of this project was $15 million. A contract for construction was awarded on May 5, 1955, at a cost of $18 million. By the time the highway was completed in June 1959, the cost had risen to approximately $30.9 million. Immediately after completion of construction portions of the highway began to deteriorate, and since that date the United States has obligated a total of $13.4 million for repairs with an additional cost of approximately $1.2 million in fiscal year 1964 and future years. Thus, the total cost of this project is now estimated to be $45.5 million, an increase of over 300 percent in the original estimate.

Another practice of the AID that causes the committee some concern is the practice of committing millions of dollars to a government or a project. While the committee recognizes the value of the United States of honoring its commitments, it questions whether these commitments should hold firm despite a change in government—legally or illegally—or a lack of desire on the part of the recipient government to cooperate in the successful liquidation of the commitment. For example, the President, in 1959, committed the U.S. Government to finance the Rangoon-Mandalay Highway project in Burma at a cost of $28 million. Since that date expenditures have totaled only $880,000.

In fiscal year 1963 AID obligated approximately $9,100,000 for the project and the estimate for 1964 is $19 million on the assumption that AID can reach agreement on engineering questions on a particuar segment of the highway. Obviously, the 1964 estimate is still not firm. Anticipated expenditures in fiscal year 1964 are approximately $1,800,000.

For the fiscal year 1964 the committee recommends an appropriation of $50 million for the contingency fund. In addition, the committee has deleted the proposed budget language which would have returned to the Treasury on June 30 the unobligated balance of $127,098,666 of the fiscal year 1963 contingency fund appropriation. In effect, the committee has made available to the President a total of $177,098,666 as a contingency fund for the foreign aid program in fiscal year 1964.

The committee has noted that the President obligated only $149,197,327 of the $250 million appropriation for the fiscal year 1963 contingency fund. However, the committee cannot reconcile the obligation of $105,250,000 during fiscal year 1963, to assist countries to take remedial measures to restore internal and external fiscal stability, with the purpose of the contingency fund, which is to provide a source of funds for the President to meet unforeseen emergencies in the world which are important to the national interest.

Of particular concern to the committee is a $17 million loan to Indonesia for balance-of-payments purposes which was obligated on March 7, 1963. The day before the obligation was recorded Indonesia announced the purchase of three luxury American jet aircraft for its deficit-ridden airline at a cost of $20 million, payable in hard currency, one-half the purchase price being due on or before January 1, 1964.

Last year the committee commented in its report on June obligations made under the fiscal year 1962 contingency fund, noting that of June obligations of $87,959,000, obligations on Saturday, June 30, amounted to $38,366,000. This year in connection with the fiscal year 1963 contingency fund, June obligations were $51,487,000, of which $16,810,000 was obligated on Friday, June 28, the last normal working day of the fiscal year, $724,000 was obligated on Saturday, June 29, and $2,932,000 was obligated on Sunday, June 30, the last day of the fiscal year. Evidentally, our loyal AID employees were busy spending the taxpayers' money on Sunday, just as they do on every other day of the week.

Mr. Chairman, the budget proposed an appropriation of $200 million for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program, which would be allocated as follows: $195,500,000 for loans under the social progress trust fund, which is administered by the Inter-American Development Bank under a trust agreement between the United States and the Bank; and $4,500,000 to carry forward special projects of the Organization of American States.

The initial appropriation of $500 million for this program was approved on May 27, 1961.

The United States is the sole provider of capital of the trust fund, which is a mutual security program source of dollar loans repayable in the borrower's currency. The interest rate on the loans is 1¼ percent, except for loans for water which are normally 2¾ percent, plus a service charge of three-fourths of 1 percent which is payable in dollars.

As of June 30, the trust fund had made 64 loans with a total value of $349,000,500. The budget proposed that $195,500,000 be made available to the trust fund in fiscal year 1964 for the same types of loans.

The Pan American Union—OAS—was allocated $6 million, of the 1961 appropriation, and the budget proposed that $4,500,000 be made available to the OAS in fiscal year 1964.

In addition to the testimony on this program, the committee considered the following factors in connection with this estimate: First, the Congress created the 4-year Alliance for Progress program last year and provided an initial appropriation of $525 million, and that the Congress has authorized an additional appropriation of $525 million to the Alliance for fiscal 1964; second, the Congress has authorized an appropriation of $450 million for the Inter-American Development Bank, and over the past 3 years has appropriated the entire amount, and it is being requested to authorize and approve this year an additional contribution of $50 million to the Bank; and, third, other financial institutions such as the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, the International Development Association, and the U.N. organizations are also providing financial assistance in Latin America. Therefore, the committee has recommended that an appropriation of $100 million be approved for this program. The committee is also of the opinion that all future budget estimates for U.S. assistance to Latin America should be presented to and considered by the Congress under the Alliance for Progress program rather than on a piecemeal basis. It also feels that such assistance should be channeled through and administered solely by an agency of the U.S. Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us discuss briefly the Alliance for Progress program.

Last year in its report on the Alliance for Progress appropriation, the committee stated:

> One of the many factors that encouraged the committee to recommend funds last year for the Inter-American Social Progress Fund was the assurance that before aid would be given, there would have to be specific programs worked out accompanied by basic legislation and institutional reforms in such matters as tax structure, land tenure, and legal procedures. To say the least, the committee is disappointed with the minimal progress that has been made to date in these fields.

This year, based on the testimony and other data, the committee again points out that very little progress has been made by the recipient nations of Alliance for Progress financial assistance toward meeting the very laudable objectives of the Act of Bogotá, the Charter of Punta del Este, and section 251 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

In summary of comments on the overall institutional progress made by the Latin American countries, the Second Annual Report of the Inter-American Development Bank states:

> It must be noted that the mere preparation of a law or the creation of an agency does not automatically bring about an immediate solution of existing problems, and that some time must elapse before any definite results can be expected. The progress in the various countries has been unequal and, while some countries have made fundamental changes, political, economic, and social factors in others have delayed accomplishment of the institutional reforms needed in order to accelerate the growth process.

The committee supports the Alliance for Progress and recognizes the need for the program. At the same time the committee recognizes that actions speak louder than words and the committee can only reiterate and paraphrase the statement which I have just quoted:

> The mere preparation of a law or the creation of an agency does not meet the criteria of self-help and reform measures that qualify a country for financial assistance from the United States.

Another factor that is causing some concern to the committee is that the Alliance for Progress program is predicated upon the economic and social development of the participating Latin American countries through democratic societies. Since the Act of Bogotá, September 1960, the following six countries have experienced political upheaval: Argentina, March 1962; Peru, July 1962; Guatemala, March 1963; Ecuador, July 1963; Dominican Republic, September 1963; and Honduras, October 1963.

The budget proposed grant aid for all six of these Governments. However, the committee notes that Secretary Rusk recently announced the suspension of military and economic aid to the Dominican Republic and Honduras, but current news reports indicate that the United States now recognizes the existing Governments of those two countries.

The following statement of the U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress program, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, with reference to the attitude of some of the heads of government in Latin America has caused the committee some concern:

> Mr. MOSCOSO. Even when they recognize it, sometimes they decide for political reasons they may not want to be associated too much with the fact that the United States is giving them assistance.

Last year the Congress appropriated $126 million for development loans and $100 million for development grants under the Alliance for Progress program. The testimony this year indicates that as of June 30 the development loan appropriation had an unobligated balance of $92,017,879 and that the development grant appropriation had an unobligated balance on June 30 of $1,326,845—exclusive of $10 million transferred during the year to the 1963 supporting assistance appropriation. Testimony further indicated that as of June 30, 1963, there was an unliquidated balance of approximately $1,983 million in the Latin America area from the 16 spigots of foreign aid.

Under the Development Grant appropriation, which I have discussed, the committee commented on the practice of the Agency in initiating projects which had never been presented to or justified to the Congress. Under the development grant portion of the Alliance for Progress, AID initiated 49 projects in fiscal year 1963 at a cost of $17,337,000. The total cost of these 49 projects from inception to completion is presently estimated to be $38,678,000.

Taking all factors into consideration in connection with this estimate, the committee recommends an appropriation of $430 million for the Alliance for Progress program in fiscal year 1964. Also, the committee again recommends that these funds be made available as two funds: $350 million for loans and $80 million for development grants.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $600 million for the development loan program in fiscal year 1964.

Since fiscal year 1958 when the development loan program was initiated, the Congress has made available appropriations amounting to $4,087,500,000.

The original Development Loan Fund was in operation from fiscal year 1958 through November 3, 1961, and made dollar loans which were repayable in dollars and/or local currency. During its existence the DLF made 217 loans and commitments and 3 guarantees amounting to $2,008,500,000. As of June 30, 1963, loan repayments and interest collected totaled $170,696,330. All of the repayments, dollars and local currency, made under the original DLF program, are credited to the U.S. Treasury and are not available for further lending.

The new AID development lending program, initiated on November 3, 1961, has had total appropriations of $2,087,500,000. As of June 30, 1963, it had made 126 loans totaling $2,033,700,000. To date no principal repayments have been made. Interest and credit fees collected to date under the new development lending program total $2,018,746. Such payments are deposited into a revolving fund and continue available for further lending.

All development loans are now repayable in dollars, and most of the loans are very long term—30 to 40 years—carry a three-quarters of 1-percent credit fee in lieu of interest, and provide a grace period of up to 10 years prior to commencement of repayment. The recently enacted authorization bill, however, now provides for a service charge of three-quarters of 1 percent per annum for the first 10 years and an interest rate of at least 2 percent per annum thereafter to maturity on all loans made after approval of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963.

While the Agency appears to be making some effort to harden the terms of the loans, the number of countries in which the policy is in effect is minimal. In addition, the committee has noted from the testimony and data supplied that while the United States is extending what amounts to be a subsidized loan—as Administrator Bell stated: each loan is "perhaps two-thirds grant and one-third loan"—other free world and Communist bloc countries are extending their development loans on much harder terms.

During the hearings, Administrator Bell testified he was sure the United States could get harder terms on our loans, but that our position was that the terms of repayment should be related to the balance-of-payments prospects of the borrowing country. This principle has been accepted by the members of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD, including Germany, England and Japan, but the committee can see very little evidence of softening of lenders' terms.

In addition to the $4,087 billion which the United States has already appropriated since fiscal year 1958 for development loans on a bilateral basis, the United States has agreed to participate in two other multilateral development lending institutions and the Congress has provided appropriations to date totaling $450 million for the Inter-American Development Bank.

Included in another section of the bill is a recommended appropriation of $50 million for the Special Operations Fund of the Inter-American Development Bank. In addition, the Board of Governors of the Bank recently recommended that each member country of the Bank take legislative and administrative actions necessary to make the proposed increase in capital stock of $1 billion as soon as possible. The U.S. share of this proposed increased capitalization of the Bank is $412 million.

Another recently established development lending institution is the International Development Association, an affiliate of the World Bank, which was created to provide development financing on more flexible terms than the World Bank. At present IDA makes loans, repayable in dollars, with a maturity date of 50 years, a 10-year grace period, and a service charge of three-fourths of 1 percent. The Congress has provided $196,978,700 in appropriations to date toward fulfilling our total subscription which represents approximately 32 percent of the presently authorized capitalization.

Also included in another section of the bill is $61,656,000 as the fiscal year 1964 appropriation to the Association, with an additional appropriation of identical amount required in fiscal year 1965. In addition, legislation has been recently introduced (S. 2214) which would authorize an additional appropriation of $312 million to the IDA over a 3-year period beginning in fiscal year 1966.

While the committee recognizes the need for a source of funds for development purposes, it questions the wisdom of an apparent trend toward a number of institutions, with the United States as the largest contributor, providing such assistance on soft terms.

One objection to loans with soft terms is that with grace periods and maturity dates so far in the future, the Banks' resources are soon exhausted and then there is a requirement for additional capitalization. I have already noted the propositions for increased capitalization for both the Inter-American Development Bank and the International Development Association.

In view of the substantial percentage of the 1964 estimate for economic assistance that is requested for development loans, the committee is quite concerned, as it has been in prior years, as to the lack of detailed information presented to the Congress in justification of the estimate of funds required for the program. The committee commented rather extensively last year in its report on this appropriation item with reference to the fact that projects are selected by the Agency and funded only after Congress makes funds available for development loans.

This year Assistant Administrator Hutchinson stated that the development loan program estimate was far more illustrative than any other part of the AID program. The committee questions whether that is possible, but it is willing to take Mr. Hutchinson's word.

The committee is of the opinion that future estimates for development loans should be justified on a country basis with definite loan applications on hand to back up the estimate for each country. In support of its position that such a presentation is possible, the committee points to the Latin America area, where on June 30 AID, Washington, had specific loan applications on hand in the amount of $285,552,000, in addition to $110 million in potential loans which were under negotiation on that date.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as specific loan applications, exclusive of loan applications in negotiation, are approximately 52 percent of the fiscal year 1964 estimate for development loans in Latin America, and if the additional $110 million of loans in negotiation are included, the percentage rises to approximately 70 percent, the committee is of the opinion that the Agency could, and should, have a separate project sheet for each loan by country which would supply all pertinent data on each proposed loan. With such information on hand, the committee would have a more businesslike basis upon which to recommend funds for this type of program. As it is now, the committee and the Congress are asked to appropriate funds in the dark, and can only hope that the Agency will approve during the year only those applications that are sound, worthwhile investments.

In addition, the estimates would not contain items such as the $20 million estimate for development loans for Israel which, according to the justifications, "rests increasingly on political comparisons rather than on an economic evaluation."

Such a presentation would also give the Congress itself an opportunity to approve or disapprove loan applications for specific projects such as the Bokaro steel mill project in India. As the program is presented to the Congress now, the only way the Congress can express its disapproval of a development loan project is through a specific prohibition in the authorization act. The committee is of the opinion that the Congress should have a strong voice in the decision as to how the U.S. taxpayers' money is to be spent overseas. As it is now, the executive has the sole authority for this decision.

In connection with the Bokaro Steel Mill project in India on which the House has expressed its opinion, the committee was quite concerned to read that our Ambassador to India, Chester Bowles, made the following statement in a press conference in Calcutta on September 25, subsequent to House action on the authorization bill:

> Ambassador BOWLES. * * * The next point that is important to remember, that this does not in any way change the amount of American aid money going to India. We had been planning to spend $500 million on Bokaro. We will now have $500 million we did not have before to spend on something else. This now releases the same sum of money for other projects, assuming we continue to get the budgets we have had for aid to India. It is not a loss of income or aid money or grants or loans to India—it simply switches from one set of projects to another. For instance, there are projects which India is financing herself with her own foreign exchange, that you earn from the sale of jute, iron ore, and other products. We can take over some of those, releasing your own funds for Bokaro.

Such an attitude on the part of the U.S. Ambassador to India is hard to understand and in the opinion of the committee, puts any project in India which the United States may finance in the future in a very questionable light. The committee also questions the need for the allocation of any funds for the construction of steel mills overseas.

The committee recommends an appropriation for AID administrative expenses in 1964 of $50 million. The committee recommends also an appropriation of $2,700,000 for administrative expenses of the Department of State connected with the foreign aid program.

Mr. Chairman, the military assistance program, according to the budget, is designed to strengthen the security of the free world by contributing to the development, maintenance, and training of modern military forces. For this purpose, the committee recommends an appropriation of $1 billion in fiscal year 1964. There are 65 proposed recipients of this type of grant aid for fiscal year 1964.

The military assistance program reservation account, authorized by section 108 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act of 1956, was established as a means of controlling military assistance appropriations. This provision provides that the military departments are to be reimbursed only upon receipt of documentary proof of delivery of the military goods and services ordered by the military assistance program.

The committee has no objection to the philosophy and objective of section 108. However, in practice military assistance program orders—reservations—are issued to the military departments, with major items specifically identified and costed while secondary items such as spare parts, consumables, et cetera, are in total dollar amounts, without item identification or unit cost. In the opinion of the Committee this latter type of reservation for secondary items without item identification or unit cost is tantamount to the military assistance program making a deposit of funds with the military departments and being able to withdraw from its "bank account" at some subsequent date such sums of money as may be necessary to fund new and even unjustified programs.

An example of the use of this "bank account" is detailed on pages 129–132 of part 1 of the printed hearings. Briefly, in March of 1962 the military assistance program was justifying a request for fiscal year 1963 funds to purchase 73 FX aircraft. Testimony developed that the cost would be $54,700,000 for the 73 aircraft which were to be assigned to 4 countries. Subsequent testimony 6 days later indicated that the cost would be $54,800,000 and that the planes would go to eight countries. In May 1962 the Pentagon selected the F–5 aircraft for procurement. During the testimony this year the committee ascertained that $140 million has been allocated for procurement of 85 F–5 aircraft. Rather than waiting for approval by Congress of the fiscal year 1963 program which contained the request for funds for this aircraft, the military assistance program, upon authorization by Secretary McNamara dipped into the fiscal year 1962 and prior years' reservation account and on May 25, 1962, allocated $2,500,000 to the program. On Friday, June 29, 1962, an additional $22,500,000 was allocated to the program. The balance of the funding for procurement of the aircraft, $115,020,000, was approved on October 16, 1962, out of fiscal year 1963 funds. In toto, approximately $85 million more than what was justified was obligated for this one program. This would indicate that there was not a lack of funds available to the military assistance program, yet the Congress was charged with "harming" the national security by its reduction of $175 million in the fiscal year 1963 military assistance program.

A review of the reservation process in the past several years has caused the committee some concern. It would appear that the military assistance program develops a grant aid program of a certain dollar magnitude including both new obligational authority and an estimate of "recoupments" or deobligations. The Congress, after a careful review and analysis of the program, generally makes available a reduced amount of funds. This reduction does not seem to have very much effect on the program, inasmuch as the military assistance program officials, apparently, simply increase the amount of "recoupments" for the year to generally offset the reduction in the program recommended by the Congress.

A simple analysis of the program since passage of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 indicates that the Congress has been "spinning its wheels" in its efforts to reduce the funds available to the military assistance program inasmuch as the reservation process allows the military assistance program to obligate funds far in excess of the amounts contemplated by the Congress in approving appropriations for the military assistance program.

During this year's testimony on the military assistance program, Secretary of Defense McNamara stated with reference to the congressional reduction of $175 million in the fiscal year 1963 military assistance budget:

> Secretary MCNAMARA. We did not have any unused funds in fiscal year 1963. We did suffer because of the cut in fiscal year 1963. There is not a unified commander in the U.S. military forces today who will tell you that we did not suffer. Our national defense was injured because of the cut. I can say it without qualification.

The Secretary specifically mentioned Greece and Turkey in his testimony as being harmed by the reduction in the appropriation request. Subsequently, the Secretary supplied information for the record which indicated that other countries close to the border of the bloc, such as Pakistan, Korea, the Philippines, and the Republic of China, were also affected.

Subsequent testimony by General Fuqua, the Director responsible for administration of the Near East, South Asia, and Africa region military assistance program is as follows:

> In connection with the Greek military assistance program:
>
> "Mr. PASSMAN. At least, you have $219 million. Did you find you had a sufficient program for Greece in fiscal 1963? Your requirements were taken care of reasonably well?
>
> "General FUQUA. I believe so, sir."
>
> In connection with the Turkish military assistance program:
>
> "Mr. PASSMAN. You do not know of any serious deficiencies which would frighten you at this time?
>
> "General FUQUA. None that would frighten me; no, sir.
>
> "Mr. PASSMAN. Thank you very much."

The other four countries specifically mentioned by the Secretary were Pakistan, Korea, the Philippines, and China. The budget program of March 1962 for these four countries, plus Greece and Turkey, was reduced, as of March 1963, by $220,456,000.

The committee recommends and the Congress appropriates funds for the military assistance program on a lump-sum basis; the decision as to how much money is to be allocated to a specific country is the decision of the executive branch. The executve branch—not the Congress—determined that the six countries mentioned by the Secretary should receive funds below the estimates justified to the Congress.

In addition, an analysis of the total fiscal year 1963 program—as of March 19, 1963—indicates that the executive branch allocated to 32 countries and 2 area programs funds totaling $223,885,000 in excess of the amount requested and justified to the Congress for these 34 programs.

The executive branch made the decision to allocate to these 34 programs approximately $224 million more than was requested and justified to the Congress. This is more than the amount by which the 1963 budget programs for the six countries cited by the Secretary was reduced; therefore, the committee can see no validity to the Secretary's claim that our national security was injured by the congressional reduction of $175 million. Rather, it would appear to the committee that the executive branch made that decision.

The committee is pleased to note that military grant assistance to Europe is at a decreasing rate—from $370.6 million in 1962 down to the proposed $229.3 million in 1964—but it is of the opinion that the United States is still programing too much grant aid to this area, especially in view of the phenomenal economic recovery of the area. It would appear that the greater majority of the European nations could well be taken off the grant aid rolls as they are now financially able to buy from the United States whatever military equipment and services they may require.

Another aspect of our military grant aid program for Europe that has caused the committee some concern is the fact that the NATO countries do not appear to be as concerned about the need for adequate defense expenditures as is the United States. While NATO has increased her defense expenditures, expressed as a percentage of gross national product, from 5 percent in 1950 up to 5.4 percent in 1962, the United States has increased its percentage from 5.1 percent up to 9.8 percent during the same period.

On a dollar basis NATO has increased her defense expenditures from $5,879 million in 1950 up to $17,298 million in 1962; during the same period the United States has gone from $14,559 million up to $54.4 million.

Another item of some concern to the committee was the decision in May of the executive branch by Presidential determination to permit sales of military hardware to Yugoslavia despite the obvious intention of the Congress to prohibit the furnishing of military hardware to Yugoslavia and other Communist governments. Such action was possible by the use of section 614(a) of the Authorization Act which gives the President the authority to waive the provisions of the authorization and appropriations acts when he deems such waiver is important to the security of the United States. The committee questions whether the use of this waiver authority to provide military assistance to Yugoslavia was important to the security of the United States.

I have already discussed the initiation of programs not justified to the Congress and the reservation of funds process. Typical of both of these comments is the MAP program in the Congo, which was initiated last year without presentation and justification to the Congress with an allocation of $3,378,000. Of this total amount, $696,000 was set aside for training. As of March 19, 1962, no training spaces had been assigned for Congolese military personnel.

During the testimony on the military assistance program for Africa the committee ascertained that funds were being requested to ship military materiel to four countries. The only thing wrong with the estimates was that there was no materiel to be shipped to the four countries.

Mr. Chairman, I have also commented previously about the proliferation of our aid program. One of the basic reasons seems to be the fact that once you start a program, you cannot stop it.

The following colloquy from our hearings is of interest in view of the Secretary's statement that the congressional reduction of $175 million had injured our national security.

> Mr. PASSMAN. You allocated out of the regular military assistance program appropriation to India last year $60,002,000?
>
> General FUQUA. That is correct.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. Was that out of the reduced appropriation, or did you have to go into some other section for funds for this item?
>
> General FUQUA. We used the military assistance appropriation.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. There has been no supplemental or other source used to finance these plus projects? This all came out of the regular reduced appropriation that the Congress approved last year; is that correct, sir?
>
> General FUQUA. That is correct.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. It came out of the fat we left in the bill. Thank you for the smile.

Another example of the initiation of unjustified projects and the ability of the military assistance program to use "recouped" funds is the infrastructure program in Thailand. The committee first learned of this program in November of 1962—4 months after the start of fiscal year 1963—when representatives of the committee were on a survey trip in the Far East area. The following colloquy is self-explanatory:

> Mr. PASSMAN. You are familiar with the infrastructure program in North Thailand?
>
> Admiral HEINZ. Yes.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. What did that program cost last year?
>
> Admiral HEINZ. The total program to military assistance program in 1963 was $———.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. How much in fiscal 1962?
>
> Admiral HEINZ. In 1962, the cost to military assistance program was $———.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. When did you start the program?
>
> Admiral HEINZ. This program was finally approved by the Secretary in June of 1962.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. When did you justify it to the Congress?
>
> Admiral HEINZ. The program was not contained in our presentation of the 1963 program last year.

Another example of the so-called harmful effect of the congressional reduction of $175 million last year is in the Latin America area. The following colloquy from pages 503–504 of part 2 of the printed hearings illustrates the effect of congressional action to try and control this portion of the foreign assistance program:

> Mr. PASSMAN. What was your total request for Latin America for fiscal 1963?
>
> Colonel ASHTON. Our total request for fiscal year 1963 in Latin America was $76.9 million.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. What is the ship part of it?
>
> Colonel ASHTON. The ship loan is $22 million.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. As the Congress did not pass the ship loan legislation, that would have made your request, by election, $54,900,000; is that correct, sir?
>
> Colonel ASHTON. If the funds that were in for the ship loan were taken out of Latin America, the chairman is correct.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. How much, then, did you obligate for Latin America in fiscal 1963?
>
> Colonel ASHTON. Our fiscal year 1963 program amounts to $70.6 million.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. Where did you get the other $15,700,000?
>
> Colonel ASHTON. The $15 million that was put in the program——
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. $15,700,000.
>
> Colonel ASHTON. $15,700,000. The funds were given to the region from worldwide recoupments, as explained by General Wood.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. That money came from the recoupment program too?
>
> Colonel ASHTON. Yes.
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. That is really a great device.
>
> Mr. RHODES. The greatest invention since the wheel.

An excerpt from pages 564–565 of part 2 of our hearings relate to the unexpended balance on June 30, 1963, in the nonregional program of the military assistance program. Last year the fiscal year 1963 estimate for the account was $47,055,000, and the unexpended balance on June 30, 1962 was $194,000. During fiscal year 1963, $97,248,000 was programed for the account, deliveries during the year were $106,121,000 and the unexpended balance on June 30, 1963 was $112,867,000. The committee is at a loss to fully explain the mathematical legerdemain as to how any account can grow in 1 year from a minus balance of $194,000 to a plus balance at the end of the year of over $112 million at the same time as deliveries are made with a value of over $106 million, during a year in which an 11½-percent reduction in the estimate "harmed" our national security. However, the following colloquy is sufficiently clear to establish that this fund was subject to the "recoupment" process and could have been used to procure ammunition for Greece, communications equipment in Turkey, aircraft for China, naval vessels for Korea, or any other purpose deemed necessary by those officials responsible for the administration of the military assistance program.

> Mr. PASSMAN. You have reserved, or you have disbursed, $218,988,000 out of this nonregional program. Along the way had you previously justified a requirement of $47,055,000 remained firm and had your procedures been the same you would have had $171,933,000 that could have been dereserved and transferred over to the availability category. Would you say that that statement is correct?
>
> Mr. COMER. The way you have put it I think that the answer would have been "Yes" if——
>
> Mr. PASSMAN. Leave the "if" out temporarily, please, but if your requirement in category A did not have a high priority, say, such as a shortage of ammunition in Greece, and you had this squeezeout that we have established now, a net of $171,933,000, then that money could have been allocated to any program with a higher priority, could it not?
>
> Mr. COMER. I think we would say "Yes."

Under title II of the bill, Mr. Chairman, an appropriation of $89 million, plus the reappropriation of approximately $3.9 million of unobligated funds, is recommended to finance the activities of the Peace Corps in fiscal year 1964. The total recommended appropriation is $33.9 million above the 1963 appropriation, and will finance a Peace Corps strength of approximately 10,500 so-called volunteers.

During the recent hearings on the fiscal year 1964 authorization bill for the Peace Corps, Director Shriver advised the Congress that the Corps had not reached its contemplated strength of 9,000 volunteers by August 31 but had on board on that date 6,634 volunteers and that $3.9 million of the fiscal year 1963 appropriation of $59 million had lapsed. Director Shriver further advised that the revised 1964 program now contemplated a program of $102 million to finance a Corps of 11,300 volunteers by August 31, 1964, rather than 13,000 volunteers at a cost of $108 million as originally proposed.

The committee is not as fully convinced as to the success of the Peace Corps as are its advocates and is concerned as to the very rapid growth of the Corps as evidenced by the fact that in just 2 years it is now operating in 47 countries and the proposal is to extend its operations into 1 additional country in fiscal year 1964. The committee is of the opinion that the Peace Corps is overextending itself prior to an impartial review and evaluation of its operations.

The committee ascertained during its hearings on the economic aid program that the Peace Corps has taken over projects that were being successfully operated by the economic assistance program of AID. Briefly, for one example, the AID agency was successfully operating the rural teaching training project in Liberia under a contract with the International Voluntary Services at an average annual cost of $4,704 per IVS volunteer. The 26 IVS volunteers assigned to the project were replaced by Peace Corps volunteers with an average annual cost of $7,164 per volunteer. Therefore, the annual cost to the Federal Government to have the Peace Corps take over the AID project is a minimum of $63,960. If the Peace Corps supplies more so-called volunteers to a project than the IVS did, then the cost to the Federal Government increases by $7,164 for each additional Peace Corps volunteer.

Another matter of concern to the committee is the value of some of the Peace Corps projects toward meeting the needs of the economically underdeveloped countries of the world. For example, as of August 31 there were 107 volunteers overseas in 11 countries in physical education projects and there were an additional 68 volunteers in training for additional projects in this field.

While physical education projects may be desirable and worthwhile, the committee questions their value to an underdeveloped country, especially when the Congress is being called upon to provide economic assistance appropriations of $228,125,000 to assist the same 11 countries in their economic development. It would appear to the committee that if these countries are proposed to receive that much money for economic development purposes, then the Peace Corps projects should also be directed toward their economic development.

The budget proposed a limitation of $20,500,000 on administrative expenses of the Peace Corps in fiscal year 1964, an increase of $5,030,000 above the fiscal year 1963 obligations. The revised 1964 estimate noted above also reduced the administrative expenses estimate to $20,300,000. The committee recommends a limitation of $19,500,000 for the purpose in fiscal year 1964.

Included within the administrative expense limitation is an estimate of $1 million for research, which represents an increase of 150 percent above the 1963 program.

Another item that concerns the committee is the rental cost of staff housing overseas. The budget estimate for the purpose is $325,000 for rental of 124 residences, or an average annual rental cost of $2,621 per residence. This compares with the average cost of $2,380 per year as of June 30. Information submitted by the Agency indicated that the highest annual rental for staff housing was $6,367 in the Ivory Coast, exclusive of utilities. Such a rate is exorbitant and the committee suggests that the Peace Corps continue every effort to obtain adequate housing at reasonable rates.

In his general statement to the committee, Director Shriver stated:

> Requests from host countries: These requests are far in excess of the number we will be able to provide. Every country which now has volunteers wants more. Countries not having any have urgently requested us to send some.
>
> I might say there are approximately two dozen countries that have asked the Peace Corps to come to them, that we have not gone to.

Despite the apparent acceptance and success of the Peace Corps, according to the foreign countries which have benefited from its operations, the committee ascertained that as of June 30, all of the host countries that have projects now and want more volunteers have only contributed approximately $3,336,000 toward meeting some of the local expenses of the Peace Corps in their countries. It would appear to the committee that if the Peace Corps is so successful in the eyes of the host countries, they should give consideration to taking over completely the projects initiated by the Peace Corps now that they have proven successful; or if complete takeover of the projects is not feasible at this time, the host countries should give serious consideration to increasing their contribution. The committee hopes that the Peace Corps will work toward both these objectives in the future.

The committee recommends the appropriation of $10 million, which is $1,045,850 above the funds available in 1963, for the Ryukyu Islands, Department of the Army. The committee has specifically denied the request for $1 million for disaster relief.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $56 million, plus the reappropriation of approximately $14 million in unobligated funds on hand as of June 30, 1963, for assistance to refugees in the United States during fiscal year 1964. The committee has also taken cognizance of the following provision of Public Law 87–510 which is a source of additional funds for this refugee program in the event it should become necessary:

> SEC. 2(c). Whenever the President determines it to be important to the national interest not exceeding $10 million in any fiscal year of the funds made available for use under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be transferred to and consolidated with funds made available for this act in order to meet unexpected urgent refugee and migration needs.

The committee considered a supplemental estimate of $18,374,000, contained in House Document No. 174, for contributions to the peace-keeping activities of the United Nations and recommends the appropriation of $18,374,000 for this purpose in fiscal year 1964.

Mr. Chairman, for other migration and refugee assistance, the budget estimate was $10,683,000.

The major reason for the program decrease in fiscal year 1964 is due to the fact that the fiscal year 1963 appropriation included $2,775,000 for the 1962 program. This action enabled the United States to put its contribution on a calendar year basis, the same period on which other nations are contributing to the program.

For these contributions to international and voluntary refugee relief organizations, the committee recommends an appropriation of $10,550,000.

Last year the Congress appropriated $60 million to complete the U.S. subscription to the capital stock of the Inter-American Development Bank. To date, the United States has made contributions totaling $450 million.

The balance of the Bank's resources, $509,476,000, has been contributed by 19 Latin American Republics, with the exception of Cuba, who is not a member of the Bank.

The present estimate of $50 million as a U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations is the U.S. share of a proposed increase of $73,158,000 in the Fund also.

Last year the committee commented on the apparent excessive costs of the annual meetings of the Board of Governors of the Bank. While there appears to be a leveling off of the expenses of these annual meetings, the committee is quite concerned with the cost of such meetings. It is of the opinion that the costs of the meetings far exceeds the value received, and it is of the opinion that the resources of the Bank can be better utilized in support of the Bank's basic objective which is the economic development of Latin America.

Last year the committee commented on the practice of the Treasury in paying the U.S. subscription when due, only to have the Bank reinvest a portion of the payment in U.S. securities. The committee is pleased to report this year that the United States has taken back and substituted non-interest-bearing notes to the extent of $75 million of the ordinary capital subscription and $50 million of the Fund for Special Operations subscription. The Treasury also plans to use a non-interest-bearing note payment procedure if this appropriation is approved by the Congress.

The committee recommends the appropriation of the budget estimate of $61,656,000 for the International Development Association, which is the fourth installment of the U.S. subscription to this affiliate of the World Bank. Public Law 86–565, approved June 30, 1960, authorized a total subscription of $320,290,000, of which $196,978,700 has been appropriated to date. If this appropriation is approved, an additional payment of $61,656,000 will be required in fiscal year 1965 under this authorization.

As of June 30, 1963, the International Development Association had 76 members with total assets of $969,677,399. Of this amount $595,781,250 has been paid in as of that date.

As of June 30, 1963, IDA had authorized loans with a value of $495,150,000.

India is the largest borrower of funds from this organization, having received 13 loans with a value of $300 million.

Title III of the bill, Mr. Chairman, provides for a limitation on operating and administrative expenses of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The President's budget proposed an operating expense budget of $1,317,866,000, including $3,500,000 for administrative expenses of the Bank. The committee has approved the budget estimate for both purposes and has included limitations in the bill to that effect.

Included in the overall limitation is a limitation of $963,500,000 for commitments for development project loans, the same amount as the budget estimate for this purpose.

Title IV of the bill, based upon the recommendations of the Standing Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, includes a total of $2,838,275 under eight heads of appropriation for the legislative branch for fiscal year 1964, all but one relating to ordinary running-type expenses for the House of Representatives and its Members. With exception of the first item, the customary gratuity to widows of Members decreased since the last provision on the matter, the amounts are based on estimates submitted in House Document No. 174 and are, in total $175,960 below them.

The committee has also included, under title V of the bill, $12,982,095 for the payment of claims and judgments rendered against the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with relation to the appropriation for international organizations, I wish to add that the committee unanimously supported the Children's Fund, UNICEF. We have never earmarked any funds in that account. They do not want the funds earmarked. Further, I want to make it abundantly clear that during the subcommittee markup of the bill several Members—including the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Gary], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte], suggested that the committee make legislative history on the floor of the House in order to indicate that it was the intention of the committee that the Children's Fund was to receive the full amount of $12 million, even though the majority of the committee reduced the total estimate for international organizations. I think the members of the committee are unanimous in wanting UNICEF to have the full $12 million. We have never cut this program since its inception. The committee does not wish to have the program cut this year. We are providing the money. It would be an arbitrary action on the part of the people downtown if the money for this Fund should be reduced.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that I raised the question in the subcommittee concerning the UNICEF program along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte]. The committee definitely agreed that they did not want the UNICEF program cut in this bill. There is another program that I think is very important and that has been very effective. That is the malaria eradication program. I for one, and I think the entire subcommittee are in complete agreement—do not want either of these programs cut, regardless of any cuts in the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman brought this matter up first. I think he will agree that in prior years we did not earmark these funds. We discussed that matter in the committee; does not the gentleman agree?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. And we want the same kind of treatment in this matter for fiscal year 1964.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee could tell us where the cuts will come in the international organizations? The subcommittee has cut the amount $36 million from a request of $136 million. And if you do not take it out of the Children's Fund and if you do not take it out of the World Health Organization, which of these programs, Mr. Chairman, do you propose to take it out of?

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say to the gentleman that it is not $136 million. The people downtown said that they had asked for more money than they needed. So, they sent us a letter asking that the total amount be reduced.

We likewise know that they have adequate funds and they also have flexibility to reallocate the money wherever they want to use it.

Also, the President may transfer out of his contingency fund into certain other funds in the U.N.

Mr. Chairman, I want to mention now the malaria eradication program, which is scattered throughout this entire bill. We have never cut this program since its inception.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] had an interest in this particular program. I discussed it with the gentleman. We are today making legislative history here to the effect that the reduction we are recommending should not apply to the malaria eradication program.

Mr. Charman, I ask the Members to look at the amount of credits under development grants, development credits, supporting assistance, and so forth, as carried in the total amount of the bill.

They are going to have in excess of $3 billion in these accounts. You know and I know that insofar as the $29 million is concerned that is "peanuts" to the aid people. So, they are using it to see if they cannot start rolling the committee on the small items and then they think they can turn the entire thing over.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. With relation to the Peace Corps, this appropriation bill also includes in addition to the $89 million mentioned by the gentleman, the carryover of $3.9 million to which the gentleman previously referred; does it not?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, sir; the amount is $3,863,971.03.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is also provided in this bill?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. And you did, Mr. Chairman, include that in addition to the $89 million; is that correct, and does it not come out to about $93 million?

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I have presented a reasonable and understandable explanation of the bill under consideration. I trust the Members will support the recommendations of our committee. And I thank my colleagues for the attention that they have given to my remarks.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should like to take advantage of this opportunity to explain that I was one of a very small minority in opposing the drastic reductions made by the subcommittee and full House Committee on Appropriations on the pending bill. I have all along supported the late President Kennedy and present President Johnson in their appropriations requests for foreign aid—mutual security—the Peace Corps and the other matters in this bill.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, more often than not in the past the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and myself have been on opposite sides at the time this bill has come to the floor of the House for consideration. On some occasions in the past we have violently disagreed. But I want to say on this bill today I wholeheartedly support the action taken by the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, ever since the action was taken on Friday in the subcommittee and on Saturday in the full committee all of us have received a number of telegrams and communications of one sort or another condemning the action of the subcommittee and the full committee and urging each and every one of us to do something to remedy the alleged harm and detriment that has been done to this program as a result of the reductions which the subcommittee and the full committee have made.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a telegram from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce urging that we appropriate $3.6 billion. I have a telegram from one of our former colleagues, Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, director of the department of legislation, AFL–CIO, urging that we appropriate more money than is recommended in this bill.

I have a letter from Victor G. Reuther of the AFL–CIO urging us to appropriate more money than we have proposed.

I have a telegram here from Dr. Alona E. Evans, the area representative of the American Association of University Women. She is greatly disturbed because of the alleged drastic cuts made by the subcommittee and the full committee.

I have a telegram here from Murray D. Lincoln and Jerry Voorhis, executive director; and Roy Townsend, director of the Washington office of the Cooperative League, urging that more money be made available than is included in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, there are some other telegrams here in this pile. However, I think we ought to take a look at, perhaps, the reason why some of these telegrams have been sent to us. I take, for example, the one from the Cooperative League particularly. They have more than a casual interest in this program. As a matter of fact, they have contracts with the Agency for International Development. They had four contracts in fiscal year 1963, one for $35,000, one for $88,000, one for $343,000, and another one for $24,000.

Mr. Chairman, based upon fiscal 1963 and what is anticipated in fiscal 1964, the Cooperative League of the United States of America has contracts with AID to the extent of $533,430.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think they are unprejudiced in the consideration of this legislation. Therefore, I think we all have to take a good look as to from whom we are receiving some of these pleas for action. We ought to take a look and see whether they are really as unbiased and objective as they appear to be.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to be sure that I have a paragraph here at this point.

We have also been urged by the President to change these figures upward. It appears the administration desires the full authorization figure of $3.6 billion. Now, this is not unique for a President to urge more funds rather than less. I know of at least three other Presidents in the last 15 years who have urged us on reasonably similar occasions to increase funds that the House Committee on Appropriations has recommended for the foreign aid program. However, I think that when you look at the overall picture today, the amount of money recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations is adequate to do the job with the possible exception of military assistance. I will say more on this later.

Let me give to the members of the Committee some evidence as to why I believe that. Last year we went through a somewhat similar exercise. The President recommended about $4.9 billion. The House Committee on Appropriations cut it very substantially, a reduction of slightly over $1 billion.

There were cries of "woe" from people that the program was going to collapse, our foreign aid policy would be destroyed.

Let me take just two or three examples to show that these cries of "woe" should fall on deaf ears once in a while.

Take the development grants. Budget request last year, fiscal year 1963, $335 million. Actually appropriated, $225 million, a $110 million cut. That is a pretty sizable reduction.

Last year they recommended for development $1.25 billion. Congress appropriated $975 million, in this case a $225 million reduction.

Everybody said that the economic aid program was going to be in serious jeopardy. It was alleged we cannot carry out our foreign commitments, our foreign policy programs will be destroyed.

Let us take the hearings. During the hearings, page 1393, part 4, I was interrogating Mr. Gaud, who was at that time head of the area involving India and Pakistan. On page 1392 I asked Mr. Gaud this question:

> What were the reasons for the difference between the $465 million which you justified and the $402 million which you executed?

In other words, in fiscal 1963 program they asked for $465 million. When they got all through with fiscal 1963 they actually executed $402 million.

Questions and answers followed. On page 1393 Mr. Gaud stated:

> We did not make as big a commitment as I anticipated; that is correct.
>
> Mr. FORD. Because of the shortage of the consortium funds.
>
> Mr. GAUD. That is right.
>
> Mr. FORD. So whatever changes you made in your program between what you justified and what you executed had no relationship to a reduction made in the appropriations by the Congress?
>
> Mr. GAUD. That is true.

Now let us turn to Pakistan. Bear in mind in fiscal year 1963 we had in the overall a cut of $110 million in development grant fund, we had a $275 million in cuts in development loans.

Again I was trying to find out what they asked for and what they actually executed.

> Mr. FORD. So far as Pakistan is concerned, in fiscal 1963 there was more than enough unobligated funds available to consummate the program up to the level you justified?

Incidentally, they justified $235 million for Pakistan and they executed $186 million. So there was a difference of $49 million between what they asked for and what they actually executed.

> Mr. FORD. It was not lack of money that caused any troubles with Pakistan?
>
> Mr. GAUD. That is right.

Then our chairman could not help but get in a comment:

> Did too much money cause you any concern?
>
> Mr. GAUD. It has not yet.

But the facts are they justified a high figure, and they executed a low figure. When they justify the high figure they know very well they cannot carry out those programs. So when the reductions are made by the Congress, as they have in the past, in my opinion these programs can absorb those reductions. The history of the programs proves that beyond any doubt whatsoever.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to ask a question with respect to page 11 of the committee report, justifying, as I understand it, the reason why $70 million was cut from the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The statement to which I refer is, a reduction of $70 million reflects in part the committee's action in recommending $89 million for the Peace Corps.

Do I understand the theory is because less is being appropriated for the Peace Corps than was requested, this justifies the $70 million less in development grants?

I am not sure what the relationship is for the granting of a reduced amount for the Peace Corps and therefore using that as a justification for a $70 million reduction in development grant funds.

Mr. FORD. From my own recollection, I cannot associate or connect the two reductions. I would only say that the reductions in the development grant, as far as I am concerned, were done on the basis of the facts involved in that program, and there was no necessary relationship between that program and the Peace Corps.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As I understand the gentleman's argument, it is because they use less in specific projects than they estimated they would we are now justified in cutting the requested amount from $220 to $150 million?

Mr. FORD. I was just trying to illustrate how last year they asked for a high sum and they actually carried on a program at a lower level. On the testimony of Mr. Gaud, the reduction in the amount we gave them in fiscal year 1963 did not interfere with the execution of that program by his own testimony.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. This would seem to be an argument that an agency which spent less that it was able to spend or might have spent would therefore be penalized next year when it comes around looking for more funds.

Mr. FORD. No. I think we have to take the record and see how they have inflated their programs in the past. In that way we can make bona fide reductions.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from Michigan is well aware, I am sure, that the bill we now have under consideration reappropriates in the category of development grants the sum of $47,399,786, which was unobligated at the end of the last fiscal year.

Mr. FORD. We have reappropriated all the funds they did not obligate in fiscal 1963, money which would have lapsed in the ordinary course of events.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The total appropriation for development grants is in the neighborhood of $200 million.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the only area I am personally concerned with or apprehensive about is the military assistance program. The administration asked for $1,405 million. The authorization level was set by law at $1 billion. We have made available all of the money that could be made available under the authorization. We approved a $1 billion military assistance program plus the reappropriation of about $25 million for money that had lapsed at the end of fiscal year 1963. In addition to this, under the basic authorization act they can withdraw up to $300 million of our own military mobilization reserve stocks and come back later to the Congress for replenishment funds. In other words, if the authorities run short under the military assistance program in fiscal 1964, on the order of the President and the Secretary of Defense they can dip into our own military mobilization reserve stocks and draw up to $300 million, utilize those stocks, then subsequently come back to the Congress for replenishment. If they can justify it, the Congress I think would be receptive to give them the necessary obligational authority to replenish the stocks that have been depleted. So when you add the $1 billion plus the authority in section 512, in my judgment the military assistance program can be financed in fiscal year 1964.

I cannot help but say at the same time that some of us in the Congress are a little irritated and some of us are a little concerned about the attitude of our allies, primarily some of our allies in Europe. We have given to our NATO allies since the end of World War II almost $40 billion. Overall I do not think Europe today is doing its fair share for their or our mutual defense.

Right now Europe is enjoying a recordshattering period of prosperity. There is overemployment and not unemployment. The living standards of Europe are rising at a rapid rate. The European currencies in many respects are stronger than our own. Everybody knows that the economy of Europe as a whole is thriving. There is a serious threat to our own gold supply and our balance-of-payments problem is dangerous. Yet, we are doing more than our share and we have been doing it since the end of World War II.

For example, in foreign aid alone, if you go back to the fiscal year 1961, the total U.S. foreign aid program was almost $5 billion. The total foreign aid program of the NATO allies was about $2½ billion and much of it goes to former colonies. We are doing twice as much on foreign aid as they are and our economic problems today are more serious than theirs.

The burden of defense of Western Europe is heavier on the shoulders of Americans than it is on the shoulders of Europeans. As a matter of fact, when you look at the total U.S. defense expenditures in fiscal year 1962 they were about $54 billion or 9.8 percent of our national output. Our European NATO allies at the same time spent about $17 billion, or 5.4 precent of their national output.

As a matter of fact, most, if not all, of our NATO allies do not have as tough a draft law as we have. They do not have as large a percentage of their total manpower in their military forces. Overall, our European allies are not doing their share and we are doing more than our share. It is about time that they, our allies, do better, or we should restudy the situation and possibly make some changes in our overall military programs for Western Europe.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I would be remiss as a new member of this subcommittee if I did not pay tribute to our fine chairman and the distinguished minority member who chairmans our side of the delegation, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES]. It has been a pleasure to work with them; with all the members. As you know, we have spent practically 800 hours and some 4 months on this bill in committee and in research. Our committee record comprises many volumes.

There are many facets that I should like to discuss about the foreign aid bill, but it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that one of the most important results of the foreign aid hearings this year is the acknowledgment by the executive branch that the American public is being denied much of the true facts about the foreign aid program. Time and again during the hearings this year, I have questioned the validity of classified portions of the request. The published hearings would be substantially thicker, two or three volumes worth as a matter of fact, if all of the testimony were printed.

As our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], said to one AID official:

> It looks like a ticker tape parade when you see us lifting secret and classified stuff in the hearings.

For 5 years I have sat behind locked doors of another subcommittee—Defense Department Subcommittee on Appropriations—and discussed our Nation's most acutely sensitive defense secrets. We have heard top Pentagon officials from Secretary McNamara on down, and in all those years I have not seen more classified labels than I have in just the past few months as a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

I remarked in committee, and I repeat it today on the floor: this overclassification by the executive branch is a device to prevent the American people from finding out just how ridiculous some of the aid programs are. I think we should let the public know some of the silly things we are doing. They are more than annoyed now with the little they have found out.

When I first came to Congress in 1955 I was disturbed by the manner in which both the foreign aid authorization and appropriation bills were presented to the Congress, cloaked in secrecy and stickered over with labels reading from "confidential" to "top secret." A year's service on the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee has confirmed what I have always suspected: that the "classified" label all too often is nothing but a coverup.

It is only when the money is spent and gone that we discover that our tax money has sent air-conditioned Cadillacs to Middle Eastern potentates, built inoperable fertilizer plants in Taiwan, provided Lebanese bulls with nine stalls apiece, bought extra wives for Kenyan Government officials, equipped jungle villages with 23-inch television sets, outfitted Greek undertakers with new suits, supplied hundreds of surplus aircraft to nations suffering a shortage of trained pilots.

AID officials this year admitted there is no conscionable reason for much of the classification of information in the foreign aid budget request. They have promised to put the facts on the table in the future. I think they are finally aware that the American public is no longer going to tolerate their tax dollars being wasted on programs and projects which benefit neither our own nor the recipient nation.

The classified label has been a convenient way of cloaking over this sort of misuse of public money. I am hopeful that the executive branch is sincere in the assurances its officials gave me that next year's request for foreign aid money will not be overclassified.

This "coverup" during their presentation was obvious throughout the subcommittee hearings, and I refer specifically to pages 1411, 1425, 2017, and 2018 just to name a few of the printed hearings when we were given definite assurances that aid officials would avoid using the classified stamps on programs of a nonsensitive nature. It is very apparent in this year's budget that many items were placed in the national security class when such classification actually was a matter of mere State Department political expediency.

This overclassification is one of the reasons that many of us who would willingly vote for programs fulfilling a moral obligation or performing a genuine service will be compelled today to vote against this bill. Hopefully our protest will demonstrate to the executive branch that the American public will no longer tolerate waste and extravagance which benefit neither our own nor the recipient nation.

When I first came to Congress in 1955, some 9 years ago, I supported foreign aid. I recognize that in some areas we have a moral obligation, in others a definite commitment involving national security. This does not outweigh the fact that the bill before us today carries in it so much that could be eliminated, so much unnecessary fat even despite our $800 million cut, that I must vote against its passage.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have listened to the able chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], give us at least 100 good reasons why this House should vote this bill down today. Mr. Chairman, the Members of Congress were assured by the proponents of the foreign aid bill when it was first presented to Congress that after 5 years all foreign nations would be self-supporting and could stand on their own feet. Hence I, like most of the Members of the Congress, voted for it. But lo and behold, after the 5 years has expired the amount of our taxpayers dollars had been given away free, gratis, to those nations in greater sums year after year. In this bill now before the House we are asked to appropriate over $3 billion to be handed free, gratis, to over 100 nations across the 7 seas. Most of the rank and file people in those nations do not know we are doing so, as they get little or no benefit from our generosity.

Mr. Chairman, if we in the United States of America had $3 billion lying around doing no good to anyone, it might be a different story; but the facts are that our U.S. Treasury is in the red $310 billion on which the overburdened American taxpayer pays upward of $11 billion just for interest alone on our national debt. Putting that total amount in language and in figures more understandable, each American family on the average is paying about $12 per month just for interest on the national debt. At the same time we are told by high officials of this Government that there are 10 million families in America today who are eking out a bare existence, which is not difficult to understand when we know that the ultimate consumer of goods pays every dime spent by local, State, and our Federal Government.

A great hue and cry is heard, "Soak the rich." But let me say that is just so much baloney to placate the rank and file of our American people when the facts are that over 70 percent of all goods and services are bought and consumed by people whose annual income is less than $6,000. And so these relatively non-well-to-do people of America are paying over 70 percent of every dime this Congress appropriates, and that local and State governments appropriate. Our factories, our merchants, and our service groups must add all their taxes to the price of their goods and services or they will soon be forced to close their doors. And to that they must add the high cost of doing business, which is climbing by leaps and bounds year after year—caused to a marked degree by the increased taxation of every nature.

Now listen to this statement on page 5 of the committee report:

> During the early years of the foreign aid program the dollar was regarded as a superstrong currency despite the fact that the United States had a deficit balance of payments in every year beginning with 1950 through 1962 with the sole exception of 1957 where we experienced a surplus balance of payments of approximately $500 million.
>
> Since 1958 the dollar has been growing weaker and one of the major reasons, in the opinion of the Committee, has been the outflow of gold. On December 31, 1957, the gold stock of the United States amounted to $22,857 million. Since that date our gold stockpile has been diminishing steadily and on June 30, 1963, it amounted to $15,830 million, a drop of $7,027 million. During this same period of 5½ years, 52 foreign nations—each one a recipient of United States foreign aid—purchased from the Treasury $6,823,200,000 of U.S. gold. A table showing the net sales of gold from the U.S. Treasury to recipients of the foreign aid program follows.

Net sales of U.S. gold to foreign aid program recipients

[In millions of dollars—Negative figures represent net sales by the United States; positive figures represent net purchases]

Country	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	Jan. 1-June 30 1963	Total
Austria	−$84.2	−$82.7	−$1.1		−$142.5	−$50.0	−$360.5
Belgium	−329.4	−38.5	−140.9	−$144.4	−63.0		−716.2
Burma			−3.8		−20.9		−24.7
Cambodia			−12.0	−3.1	−1.7	−2.3	−19.1
Cameroon Republic						−1.9	−1.9
Central African Republic						−.7	−.7
Ceylon		−7.5					−7.5
Chad						−.7	−.7
Chile	+3.0	−1.3	−2.0	−6.6			−6.9
Costa Rica				−2.3	−.5		−2.8
Cyprus				−2.0			−2.0
Dahomey						−.8	−.8
Denmark	−17.0	−15.0	−15.0	−35.0	+15.0		−67.0
Dominican Republic				−3.0			−3.0
Ecuador					−3.2	−2.3	−5.5
Egypt			−7.5	−7.8	−1.2	−.9	−17.4
Country A		−4.7	−3.0				−7.7
France		−265.7	−173.0		−459.1	−202.6	−1,100.4
Gabon						−.7	−.7
Germany (West)			−33.8	−22.5			−56.3
Ghana			−5.6				−5.6
Greece		−15.0	−47.0	−10.2	−19.1		−91.3
Honduras			−.8				−.8
Indonesia		−11.0	−24.9				−35.9
Iran	−2.3		−.4	−16.1		−5.9	−24.7
Iraq			−20.8				−29.8

Net sales of U.S. gold to foreign aid program recipients—Continued

[In millions of dollars—Negative figures represent net sales by the United States; positive figures represent net purchases]—Continued

County	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	Jan. 1-June 30 1963	Total
Israel		−4.4			−10.0		−14.4
Italy	−348.8			+100.0			−248.8
Ivory Coast					−1.5		−1.5
Japan	−30.1	−157.4	−15.2				−202.7
Korea		−1.6					−1.6
Laos				−1.9			−1.9
Lebanon				−21.0	−32.1		−53.1
Mexico		−30.0	−20.0				−50.0
Morocco			−21.0				−21.0
Netherlands	−260.9	−29.9	−249.4	−24.9			−565.1
Niger						−.8	−.8
Nigeria				−20.0			−20.0
Pakistan			−12.5				−12.5
Peru			−15.0	−5.0	−.6		−20.6
Portugal	−20.0	−10.0					−30.0
Saudi Arabia			−11.3	−47.5	−12.6		−71.4
Senegal						−1.7	−1.7
Somalia					−1.9		−1.9
Spain	+31.7		−113.7	−156.2	−146.1	−130.0	−514.3
Surinam	−2.5		−2.5		+2.5		−2.5
Syria			−2.1		−1.3	−.2	−3.6
Tunisia			−.5		−.5	−.5	−1.5
Turkey			−6.1	−2.5	−1.1	+6.0	−3.7
United Kingdom	−900.0	−350.0	−550.0	−305.7	−387.0	+124.5	−2,368.2
Upper Volta						−.8	−.8
Yugoslavia		−1.5	−15.9		−1.5	−.8	−19.7
Net sales of gold	−1,900.5	−1,026.2	−1,535.8	−737.7	−1,289.9	−273.1	−6,823.2

Yet this very day we are asked to impose an additional burden of taxes on each American family on an average of $3.50 per month, which is doing little or no good, nor appreciated by the common people in those more than 100 nations across the sea.

Hence I shall vote a loud "no" on this bill.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, at the outset I want to join with my other colleagues in complimenting the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member for the hard and conscientious work which they have done during the hearings on this very important issue.

Mr. Chairman, as the members of the Committee of the Whole will recall, I objected to my chairman asking unanimous consent to file the report on this bill by midnight last Saturday. I did so, Mr. Chairman, because I felt that a bill of such great importance not only to the United States but the free world should have been reported out and given enough time for the Congress and for the people of the United States to voice their opinion on this important subject matter.

Here, Mr. Chairman, we reported the bill on Friday and to the full committee on Saturday. In the interim, we had Sunday, the Lord's day. And now we are coming in here trying to intelligently debate this particular issue today.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one other observation, and that is this: I hope the Democratic majority will respond to the plea of their President, the Chief Executive of our country, and try to do everything they can today to restore the cuts that have been made to this bill. Because, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, if those cuts are not restored and if such an attempt is not made by the Democratic majority, I do not see how the Democratic administration can ever again come to the Republican side of the aisle and ask for bipartisan support on foreign policy because, certainly, they would be letting me down, they are letting the people down who are looking to them for leadership today.

Mr. Chairman, the bill reported out from the Appropriations Committee appropriating funds for the foreign aid program concerns me greatly. I believe that there is considerable doubt as to whether this bill is adequate to protect our national security and foreign policy interests.

Every President since the close of World War II has supported this bill strongly. President Eisenhower has only recently reaffirmed his support for foreign aid. President Kennedy strongly endorsed the need for foreign assistance. And I was pleased to see that President Johnson also has given his strong endorsement of an adequate foreign aid appropriation.

The bill reported by the Appropriations Committee has a number of glaring inadequacies, in a number of respects it is a prescription for retreat, and there can be no question that the bill shaves the margin of safety for this country much too close.

For the first time, the Congress is on the verge of repudiating the United Nations. And this repudiation comes at a time when the President of the United States is due to address the General Assembly. This is hardly the Christmas present that we should be giving the President to carry with him to the United Nations. As he stands before them tomorrow, he will carry with him that the Congress of the United States believes that other nations should live up to their commitments, but that we do not have to do so.

The executive branch has requested $130,903,000 in appropriations for the contributions to the international organizations—most of which are U.N. organizations. These go for programs that are of great importance to us—not only because they assist other countries, but also because all the nations of the world are invited to share the costs—and most do share these costs. In other words, this appropriation is one of the most valuable we can make because it brings along with it funds from others. To cut this fund is certainly a false economy because others will follow our leadership and cut their budgets to the U.N. also.

I think that this cut in contributions to international organizations comes at a particularly bad time, for another reason. We are taking the position that those who fail to live up to their commitments to the U.N. should lose their votes in that body. Although I realize that the contributions involved in this category for the most part do not involve assessed contributions so that we would not lose our vote for failure to live up to our pledges, nevertheless, a principle of meeting our just obligations is involved.

The report of the committee stated that there were several programs of concern but the committee did not say whether or not we should live up to our commitments to these programs. The United States under President Eisenhower's leadership made an offer to the nations of the world that we would match contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance and special fund. This matching formula in which the United States agreed to put up 40 percent of the total has worked dramatically: the contributions of other countries have increased by approximately $50 million per year. When President Eisenhower made his matching offer for this fund, he stated that we would provide 40 percent of the total until a fund of $150 million per year is reached. We are now very close to that total. But to attempt to reduce our percentage of this fund right now would not only mean that the contributions of others would fall off, but it would constitute a direct attack upon the promise of General Eisenhower.

The committee attacks the contributions that we make to the World Bank for the Indus River project. It is true that the estimates for this project were not completely firm at the time that we agreed to enter into the project under the leadership of the World Bank. But this commitment by the United States was made. It was made to further a political settlement of one of the two great outstanding problems between two countries involving half of the population of the free world. The United States has made its solemn pledge. Would the committee have us back off from that pledge? I do not think that any responsible American would have us fail to meet our commitments—yet insuffiecnt funds have been provided under this bill.

It may be possible by various funding techniques to meet our commitments to international organizations without appropriating the full authorization under contributions to international organizations. I personally believe that we should call upon the executive branch to make every economy possible. I therefore believe that funds should be restored to the international organization chapter, but not the full amount.

The reduction in the funds available for supporting assistance undercuts directly the security of the United States. These funds, which go largely to Vietnam, Korea, Laos, and Jordan, have been reduced from about $800 million appropriated for similar purposes in fiscal year 1961. But this is not the time to cut back our program to Vietnam: the new Government deserves our support. In Korea, we have obtained some recent action on the part of the Koreans in return for our support. If we undercut our commitments we not only can cause financial chaos within the country and give the Communists an opportunity to exploit the situation, but we will have indicated that we do not intend to support the present Government of that embattled country. Once before this country indicated that it would not draw the line in defending Korea. The quick answer of the Communists was an invasion of South Korea. Are we going to make the same mistake again? Are we going to tell the world that we are reducing our commitment to defend the free world? This is a policy of retreat and defeat which should not be followed.

If the countries of Jordan and Laos lose our support, those countries stand great chances of ceasing to be countries at all. They could very easily disintegrate entirely, with their neighbors invading and starting wars over the spoils. These wars will inevitably involve the United States.

DEVELOPMENT LOANS

Mr. Chairman, the foreign aid bill before us proposes a sharp retreat from American leadership of the free world. It would deprive our new President of the tools he needs to fulfill his promise to the world, that America will remain strong around the world and will meet our commitments.

Mr. Chairman, of particular concern to me is the slash of more than one-third in funds appropriated for development loans to a level of only $600 million. The Congress—and wisely so—pressed the AID agency to move its economic assistance from grants to loans. AID has moved successfully: In fiscal year 1961 only 30 percent of country economic assistance was in loans; the funds proposed for fiscal year 1964 earmark almost 60 percent in dollar repayable loans. We are rewarding this important improvement by slashing appropriations for development loans below the reduced amount authorized.

The appropriation of only $600 million for development loans would mean that the United States would fail to live up to its international commitments. In India, Pakistan, and Turkey, the United States has entered into multilateral arrangements to provide vitally needed development capital. The commitments which the United States has made to date for use in these three countries alone in fiscal year 1964 exceed the $600 million appropriation proposed.

The United States has played a leading role in fostering multilateral aid giving because more aid funds from other aid sources are obtained on a matching basis under these arrangements. The drastic reduction of loan appropriations will have a "multiplier effect" in reverse: the less we are able to loan, the less others will loan.

The failure to give adequate support to the development efforts of India and Pakistan will mean that about half of the free world's population will live without hope for the future. And our firm consortium commitments to these two countries require AID loans of about $340 million from fiscal year 1964 funds.

In Nigeria and Tunisia the United States has made long-term commitments to these two African development leaders. The drastic reduction could mean that we would fail to meet our scheduled commitments there.

Although a 5-percent carryover of funds from fiscal year 1963 will add about $50 million to these appropriated for fiscal year 1964 and be available for the fiscal year 1964 program, there are a number of countries where loans would appear difficult if not impossible: In Greece and Israel where an immediate termination of lending would have serious political consequences; in Liberia and Ethiopia where the United States has special interests; in Korea where long-term investment is the only hope for self-sufficiency; and in about 20 other smaller countries where very modest development loans can make a major impact upon the economies.

The appropriation of only $600 million in development loans would thus preclude the United States from fulfilling its existing commitments, slow down development efforts in key countries of Asia, Africa, and the Far East, and indicate a withdrawal of U.S. interest and leadership from half of the globe.

Mr. Chairman, this unwise slash in our development loan fund strikes at the heart of our foreign aid effort. It must be restored.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my concern over other cuts. The Alliance for Progress reduction comes at a crucial time for the Western Hemisphere. We should be augmenting our support, not cutting it down. We should give the Alliance our support.

The foreign aid program is essential for our national security. The cuts we make can endanger every one of us. It is our responsibility to make the best judgment we can. I believe that we should act responsibly. We cannot rely upon the other body to provide an adequate amount—we must make up our own minds. I believe that we should restore some funds which we have cut. I hope that others will agree.

Mr. Chairman, at the last press conference that our late lamented President Kennedy had he was asked how he felt on some of the cuts made in the authorization bill in the Senate, and he said:

> But on the other hand, the President bears particular responsibilities in the field of foreign policy. If there are failures in the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, and South Vietnam and Laos, it is usually not a Senator who is selected to bear the blame, but it is the administration, the President of the United States.
>
> I regard this, President Eisenhower regarded it, and President Truman; it is no coincidence that all three Presidents since this program began, and presidential candidates: Mr. Nixon, and Mr. Stevenson, and Governor Dewey, and all of them, Governor Rockefeller today, and others—it seems to me all recognize the importance of this program. It is because it is a very valuable arm of the United States in the field of foreign policy. I don't think it is recognized what an important influence this has.
>
> Now we spend $51 or $52 billion on defense. We spend $2½ billion on the atomic energy program, and we spend $5 billion on space, of which at least a good percentage has a military implication in the sense of our national security, and we spend all of this money and yet we are going to deny the President of the United States a very, very valuable weapon in maintaining the influence of the United States in this very diversified world.
>
> I can't imagine anything more dangerous than to end this program. I can assure you that whoever is President of the United States succeeding me will support this program.
>
> The second point I want to make is that what we are now talking about is only a fourth of what we tried to do in the early 1950's. What I said in the—I don't understand why we are suddenly so fatigued. I don't regard the struggle as over and I don't think it is probably going to be over for this century. I think this is a continuing effort, and it is not a very heavy one. It is a fraction of our budget, a fraction of our gross national product, and the gross national product of the United States has increased $100 billion—will have by the end of this year, in a 3 year period.
>
> So what we are asking is a billion dollars less than the average program since 1947; the need today is greater, these countries are poorer, there is a good many more of them; and yet we are being denied—the President of the United States is being threatened with denying him a very important weapon in helping him meet his responsibilities. The Congress has its responsibility, but in the field of foreign policy there are particular burdens placed on the President, whoever he may be.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I should like to commend the gentleman for his statement. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs I agree thoroughly that this bill was brought up with unseemly haste. There is really no time today in which to state the case for more adequate funds or to lead a fight for them. Indeed there seems to be little leadership evident today. However, I do think in this area of international agencies that a case can easily be made for a more adequate amount than the $100 million which is being proposed.

I am concerned about the legislative history which has been made thus far. We have indicated only that a few of those agencies should get their full amounts—the chairman of the subcommittee indicated that the contingency fund might be a source of supply if more money is needed. Yet on page 19 of the committee report it is suggested that the contingency fund should be used only for the purpose of providing a source of funds for the President to meet unforeseen emergencies in the world which are important to the national interest. This would seem to me to preclude the use of the contingency fund to make up for amounts which we know we should be providing in this bill.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the late lamented President Kennedy was then talking about $3,600 million, which has been pared down with a meat ax to less than $3 billion as of today.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment the chairman of our subcommittee for the great job he has done in conducting the hearings on this bill and bringing the bill to the floor. I sat with him during most of the sessions while we heard hundreds of witnesses and filled four volumes of testimony. I wish each Member of the House, each American, could read the testimony in these four volumes. It is impossible in this short time to discuss all of the many, many acts of irresponsibility on the part of the officials who handled the execution of this foreign aid program, but I should like to invite each Member of the House to read from page 996 of volume III of the hearings, one of the most unreasonable cases that has ever come to the attention of this committee.

In June 1962, on the 25th day of the month, the head of one of the recipient governments told the AID officials that his country was no longer interested in 29 projects that had been planned for that country, carefully planned, so we were told. Money had been spent on the plans and some money had been spent to implement some of those plans.

On the 25th day of June 1962, the head of that country said, "We do not want those 29 projects, we want the cold cash." The AID people worked like beavers and on the 30th day of June, the last day of the fiscal year, they deobligated those 29 projects that had been designed to help the people of that nation and that $5 million plus earmarked for those 29 projects was reobligated in the form of a cash grant to that country. The money was deposited to the credit of that country in a bank in New York City, and as late as September of this year, and I am sure as late as of today, not a dime of that money has been withdrawn. That money has been earning 3½ percent to the credit of that country that was the recipient of aid.

So do not feel that we have hurt this program by cutting it. As our chairman has repeatedly said, we are trying to get this program under the control of the Congress. It is generally understood that whatever money we give the AID people is a blank check. They can spend it for any purpose they desire. They can obligate for one project today, deobligate tonight, and reobligate tomorrow. This program is uncontrolled and uncontrollable, as the gentleman from Louisiana has said many times.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. On some of those 29 projects over 50 percent of the money allocated had been spent. It was the residue of those 29 projects, that had been well planned. We yielded to the pressure and gave them the money, and it was unjustified money.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Yes, and that money is still in a New York bank drawing 3½ percent interest to the credit of that country, and the taxpayers of America are paying from 3 to 4 percent interest on that money today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA].

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Chairman, I remember a truism from my youth. It was that if something is worth doing, it is worth doing well.

I think of this maxim frequently in connection with the Alliance for Progress.

There can be no argument, I believe, over the premise that the preservation of Latin America, within the framework of political liberty and personal dignity, is worth maintaining. There can be no argument on that point that the rescue of millions of human beings—now and in the future—from the degrading bonds of poverty and misery—is a valid exercise. There can be no argument as to the desire of millions of Latin Americans to break those bonds, and the desire of millions of our own people to keep them.

The Alliance for Progress, I am convinced, seeks exactly these things. I am convinced that there is no alternative to it. Whatever other course of action may be contemplated, it will have to travel the same road as the Alliance.

Yet I detect today too much defeatism about the Alliance. I hear too much talk against the Alliance. I read too much that says it cannot succeed if this is not done, or that is not done, or this is being done wrong, or that is not being done right, or that too much money is being spent for too little progress.

Mr. Speaker, gentlemen, I suspect that too many of us approach the Alliance for Progress as a cutrate proposition. We may be trying to get wholesale, a change that can come only in generations.

Let us look at the Alliance, its basic principles, its problems, its achievements, its future—let us look at the Alliance realistically—let us see if it is worth doing and, if so, doing well.

President Johnson, I think, touched upon the essence of the Alliance in his speech to the Latin American leaders at the White House on November 26. There, as you know, he reaffirmed the U.S. commitment to the Alliance.

The four basic principles of the Alliance, the President said, are:

> The right of every American nation to govern itself, free from outside dictation or coercion from any quarter.
>
> The right to human freedom—the right of each person to freely speak his views.
>
> The right to social justice—the right of every citizen to share in the progress of the nation; and, dedication to economic progress.

"We all know," the President said, "that there have been problems within the Alliance. But the accomplishments of the past 3 years have proven the soundness of our principles."

These are the principles. There can be no argument with them.

But what of the problems?

The chief problem of the Alliance, I feel, is that when it came there was overoptimism on what it could accomplish. Now, there is an overpessimism on what it has not accomplished.

The optimism, I am sure, came both here and in Latin America. There, for 15 years, the Latin American nations had been seeking a greater U.S. participation in their efforts for social and economic development. For too many of these 15 years, we answered the call with words rather than actions.

When we decided to act, inevitably there was a reaction of relief and of optimism. The power of the United States was known and respected. If the United States would work with Latin America, Latin America's problems were as good as solved.

Every cautionary word or phrase—and many were spoken, by John F. Kennedy, and others—was disregarded in the heady intoxication of a bold new policy.

This headiness came to us as well. We were accustomed to viewing Latin America only as a problem. We, too, were seeking to find a policy which would cause Latin Americans once more to regard us as good neighbors.

The Alliance for Progress was that policy, and we shared the delight of our neighbors.

Over 2 years have passed since the noble words of our fallen President were transformed into a definitive plan of action at Punta del Este. Over 2 years have passed, while we and the Latin Americans sought, with one hand, to shore up the effects of past neglect, and with the other, to build new institutions and new structures. The task is terribly difficult.

As we who come in January, and are still here in December know well, early enthusiasm vanishes rapidly. The success of a day is dreary against the goal of 10 years. There is a letdown, sometimes greater because hopes have been higher than day-to-day reality can bear.

This, Mr. Chairman, is what has happened to the Alliance for Progress. It is not, and never was, a panacea. It is not, and never could be, a placebo. It was, and is, an intelligent and studied diagnosis of Latin America's diverse ailments. It was, and is, a prescription demanding great effort and discipline by the patient, and substantial external care, over an extended period of time.

We are just realizing this, and because the patient is only bending his knees, when we and he want to run, we and he are critical of the medication. Yet you have to walk before you can run, because young things crawl before they walk or run.

But let us regard another maxim: "Help comes to those that help themselves." And, this, precisely, has been another of the problems of the Alliance.

Because the United States was so strongly identified with the Alliance—because it marked a long-sought turn in our policy—because it was to be marked by massive U.S. assistance, there was too much of a tendency in Latin America to sit back and wait to be aided—by the United States.

All of our assistance, Mr. Chairman, however much it might be, would be a mere palliative unless it would be matched with effort—new effort—from Latin America. All of our assistance would be wasted unless it resulted—really—in new and more appropriate institutions in Latin America, in change and in reform. We cannot afford to spend a billion dollars a year to maintain a status quo that is based on the past. We must have more modern men in more modern societies.

I say this not because I feel that the Alliance has not produced change. It has, and it will produce more. But I want to see more. I particularly want to see more done—in Latin America—toward recognizing the achievements and the potential of a free enterprise system such as that we have here in the United States.

Notice my last phrase. There is free enterprise in Latin America—and because it is the type of enterprise that it is—high cost, monopolistic, exploitative—it is disliked. It has not produced low cost goods for the hungry masses—but tantalized them with things they cannot afford. It has not sought wide markets—but restricted production. Too frequently, it has not interested itself in the cares and preoccupations of its workers. The record of free enterprise in Latin America—when compared with free enterprise in the United States—is poor.

So the people of Latin America have looked to the state rather than to free enterprise—they have been abetted in this by the sycophants of the left. The state has been left to do too many things that it should not. This may be changing.

One of the least noticed, and certainly one of the most critical achievements of the Alliance for Progress, I feel, has been the reconsideration which it is forcing of the role of the public versus the private economic sector. The planning which has come under the Alliance has indicated—to all but the most indoctrinated of Latin American economists—that the state cannot do all—that modern private enterprise must provide a tremendous share of the cost of development. A new cycle in Latin America may be beginning.

But the theory is not going to prosper, so long as we have acts which are hostile to the climate of investment. We are not going to encourage foreign or domestic businessmen to invest their hard-won capital, their complex skills, their astute knowledge of markets, in countries where contracts are canceled, agreements are broken, crippling restrictions are placed on them, and inflation is uncontrolled and unchecked. The light must come quickly to the Argentinas, the Perus, and the Brazils.

And when this light does come—as it has already to many of the nations which are partners in the Alliance—we must be ready to move, and move swiftly. I can think of no surer way to demonstrate the validity of the Alliance's principles than to provide massive help for those who help themselves massively.

Such a policy, I know, has been followed to a considerable extent by the gentlemen in AID. I commend it to them. I recommend they push ahead with it. I will even point out some possibilities for them.

The second annual review meeting of the Alliance for Progress, as you know, was held last month in São Paulo, Brazil. For this meeting, the experts at the Organization of American States prepared an accounting of the Alliance in 1962.

They found, gentlemen, that 10 nations—10 of the 19 Latin American nations which are participating in the Alliance—had met or surpassed the contemplated 2.5 percent growth rate in 1962. With an exception or two, these are the countries which have been doing most for themselves.

Let us, then, take 8 or 9 or 10 countries. Let us see what they can do with more concentrated assistance. Let us accelerate the speed of their development. They should receive the greater share of the resources which we allocate for Latin America.

Let there be no mistake; however, we shall be the sole determiners of what nation should receive such concentrated assistance. Never should there be a time when the United States is not the sole administrator of her foreign assistance. Surely, no other nation or people have a right to distribute the good will of the American people.

It is Americans who make foreign aid and assistance possible and it is Americans who should see to its proper use. The only way to assure such useful implementation is to have the power and hold the power of denial and approval of such aid. That is paramount to our own interest.

Just to answer those who insinuate that the Alliance has failed, I also would like to point out other conclusions of the ministers who met at São Paulo. Their final report notes that:

Export earnings are rising.

The process of economic integration is advancing.

A significant increase in public investment—financed with new money raised by new taxes and tax reforms—is possible in the foreseeable future.

Substantial additional local resources are being devoted to education, public health, and housing.

Ten nations have now land reform laws, a sharp increase in number in only 2 years.

Serious efforts are being made to improve public administration. Latin American nations are moving. It demonstrates that the supporting investments which the United States is making are being used with good effect. It records that the process of change in Latin America is underway.

It proves that the Alliance for Progress is worth doing, and worth doing well.

In considering the resources we should make available to Latin America, I would like to point out that Communist Cuba, a country of some 7 million people, is presently receiving an estimated million dollars a day, and I note from the New York Times of December 12 that Cuba is sending a mission to the Soviet bloc to press for an even greater amount of economic assistance.

At the same time, Cuba is carrying on an intensive subversive campaign against our friends in Latin America. The increasing evidence in Venezuela and elsewhere is now convincing the Latin Americans that Castro's Cuba is as much the enemy of their countries as it is the enemy of the United States, and they are increasingly becoming aware of the fact that through the Alliance for Progress they can best defend themselves against the onslaught from the Marxist left.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude with another truism from my youth: Easy things get done first, because everybody can do them. Hard things get left to the last.

The achievement of the goals of the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Chairman, is not an easy thing. It is an incredibly complicated and complex program, which can be put through only after surmounting the tremendous obstacles of ignorance, sloth, and misunderstanding. It must surmount crises of commission and omission, of action and inaction. It will not progress either as swiftly as we like or as surely as we would like. But of this much, I am certain, it will progress—swiftly if we continue adequate help, surely if we continue our understanding.

If the Alliance for Progress were easy to accomplish, Mr. Chairman, it would have come before—it would have been done before. It is a thing which only one nation in this world could help accomplish. We are that Nation.

So we must try, harder, with ever-increasing skill, and with the unswerving dedication that President Kennedy showed in the past 2½ years.

I ask only that you look at the evidence. I defy anyone to cite a single example of a successful Communist revolution in Latin America since the Alliance for Progress began. Yes, there have been revolutions and violent overthrow of governments. We do not condone such action—it has never been our policy to do so and hopefully will never be. Nevertheless, those revolutions which have occurred have been of an anti-Communist nature. In most instances the revolutionary governments have assured this Nation and their own people of democratic reform and free elections. Is this not the aim of the Alliance for Progress? I say, it is and I say it is accomplishing that aim.

The Alliance for Progress, Mr. Chairman, will succeed because it must succeed. Thank you.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend to the reading of every Member of the House the report on this bill. In my 11 years in the House of Representatives this is the best committee report I have ever seen. I wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the staff for this fine piece of work. If anybody wants to understand what this program is about he can do so by reading this report.

Every year I take the well of the House in order to tell you my concept of foreign aid and to tell you what I think of the bill which we have before us in that particular year. My concept of foreign aid has not changed. I think foreign aid, if it is any good at all, has to be good for the American taxpayer. It is not charity. It is an adjunct to foreign policy. It is not charity, because charity is something which is voluntary, and I do not need to tell any of you there is nothing voluntary about paying taxes.

Mr. Chairman, you are dealing with taxpayers' money in this program. It is very fine for us to have a big heart and we should. It is fine for us to think of the ills of the people around the world, and we should. But let us also remember the fact that when we do this we are dealing with the money of the taxpayers of the United States of America. Americans are charitable, but let them handle their own charity. You and I were not elected to do it.

I have said that foreign aid is an adjunct to foreign policy. It is and it should be. However, too many times in the past we have found that instead of it being an adjunct to foreign policy it has become a substitute for foreign policy. This is wrong. This is a trap into which we should never fall, because you do not buy friends around the world. Rather, you get them by being the type of nation that people can respect. You get respect by being the type of nation which says what it means, means what it says, and lives up to its commitments.

The chairman has said, and the gentleman from Alabama also has said, that this program is uncontrolled and uncontrollable. They are right. It is uncontrolled and it is uncontrollable. Before I elaborate on that I would like to say that I have all of the respect in the world for the fine Members of the House who serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and anything I say is not to be taken as a criticism of them or of their work. However, I would like to state here and now, Mr. Chairman, that we have too many times in the past—and we are doing it again this year—tried to make some sense out of a legislative program with an appropriation bill. What we should do and must do some year is to start to make sense out of this program in the authorization bill. This is a program, Mr. Chairman, in which we do not appropriate money by nation; we do not appropriate by project.

This is an illustrative program. We have people from the AID agency come before the committee and tell us what they think they will do with the money which we are asked to appropriate. They can transfer from one category to another within certain limits. They can later decide that the project which they have justified to us will not be built at all but that some other project will be built. They can say that they are going to build a project in X country and build it in Y country.

Why do not we appropriate by nation? Because we have a concept, right or wrong—and I happen to think it is wrong—that if we appropriated by country we might make country A mad, because it does not get as much as country B. I think it is time that we faced up to the realities and let the nations of the world know what we are doing. They know anyway. We might not know up here on Capitol Hill what we are doing but they know in Moscow, usually before we do. I do not know whom we think we are kidding with all this secrecy about which nation is getting which amount.

So one of my first recommendations would be that this program be changed so that we appropriate by nation. Then, we should appropriate by project. I think if we did this we would find our situation greatly improved. We would have a foreign aid program which would work, and which would win us the respect of the world.

It has been mentioned that we are in 101 countries with foreign aid. And we are. With that type of proliferation it is not possible for us to do the type of job in any one country which the taxpayers expect us to do. It is not at all possible for us even to take a few countries and make show places out of them. Instead of that we put a little here and a little there. Why do we do this? The people downtown tell us we need a "presence" in many of these nations. This is apparently to promote the knowledge on the part of the people of the country that there is such a country as the United States of America. Of course, I say this is dead wrong. If we need to do this by money, then heaven help us. If this great Nation which we firmly believe is the greatest nation in the world must try to impress newly created nations around the world by the use of money, then I suggest to you that we have taken the wrong tack and that this is the wrong approach completely. We had for years been able to do this by giving fair and just treatment to all, and demanding the same treatment in return. Is it old-fashioned to feel that this is still the best diplomacy?

Another reason why this program is uncontrolled and uncontrollable is because there are little nooks and crannies in it that do not meet the eye. There is a section called section 614(a). Let me tell you about section 614(a). It provides in substance that any administration can spend $250 million of dollars or $100 million of local currency in any given fiscal year for any purpose that it desires, as long as it is within the general purposes of the act.

This section has been construed as applying not only to acts which have been passed but to acts which may be enacted in the future. In other words, if the Congress of the United States were to put a limitation on the foreign aid bill which would prohibit the President and the administration from spending funds in certain ways, they could still go to section 614(a) and spend $250 million in dollars or $100 million in local currency for the very purpose which we prohibited. As I have said, this law has been construed, as not only being a retrospective, but a prospective whitewash. It erases limitations which we might put on the authorization bill, limitations which we might put on an appropriation bill before we ever pass them.

This is the greatest legislative gimmick ever known to man and why we keep on year after year reenacting the authorization bill and leaving section 614(a) in it, I will never understand.

Also, we have another contingency fund which few people know anything about.

I should say in all fairness that the Secretary of Defense has said he would not use that contingency fund, and he has not used it. Nevertheless, it is in the act, and available. That fund is in the amount of $300 million. The Department of Defense can transfer equipment of that value, if it so desires, from the stocks of the Department of Defense over to the military assistance program to be used for the purposes for which this bill is enacted.

So, Mr. Chairman, here is another little gimmick, another little nook or cranny, which can be used to sweeten up this program.

Then, of course, there is the item of transferability. They can transfer from one category to another. We have said that we are appropriating $197 million to the category of development grants. If it is desired to sweeten that up at the expense of some other program, it can be done, up to an amount of 15 percent thereof. This is another reason why the chairman says that this program is uncontrolled and uncontrollable, and I say so also. Frankly, it is just that.

Mr. Chairman, there are so many nooks and crannies, so many ways by which the Congress has voted to defeat its own intent that this bill is a legislative monstrosity if I ever saw one.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should like to ask a question about the proposed reduction in appropriations for international organizations and programs. We have had some legislative history about which of these programs should not be cut by the proposed reduction in the amount of the authorization. This is a relatively concentrated area; we are talking about relatively few programs.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], has indicated that the contingency fund, perhaps, would cover some expenses, if extra money were needed. Is it proposed, for example, that we should cut the funds to provide assistance to the Palestine refugees, the FOA, the World Food Organization? We only know, from what has been said so far, that UNICEF should not be cut.

Which of these programs should be cut, in the opinion of the gentleman? Was there any determination made by the Committee on Appropriations with respect to this? I might say that the authorizing committee looked into this situation fairly closely. The only place I can see where there could be a moderate cut would be in the Indus water project.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I shall yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], to answer that question.

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me answer it, if I may, by saying to the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that the Agency came in and asked that the funds be cut by approximately $9 million. So, the amount that the Agency is asking for, the full amount is $127 million and not $136 million. Our committee believed that $88 million would be adequate, but we decided, nevertheless, to go up to $100 million. We did not take into account the fact that they had $134 million on hand in undisbursed funds on June 30. It is left up to the Agency to determine where the cuts will be applied, with the exception of UNICEF.

If the gentleman will look at the hearings of the State, Justice, and Commerce Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, he will find that $57 million is included for the United Nations under our contributions, and another account of $14 million, another account of $18,374,000. They are scattered all over the field.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The total amount for international organizations in the State Department bill is $81 million. I think this would be the category which is parallel to the one to which the gentleman from New Jersey referred.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am sorry, but I do not understand either gentleman's explanation. I wish time would permit some opportunity for an understanding of what the gentlemen are talking about. What is this figure of $81 million about which we are suddenly hearing? What is this figure that the gentleman from Louisiana mentioned of $134 million?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As the gentleman knows, there are appropriations for the international organizations in the appropriation bill for the Department of State, as well as in the foreign aid bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. But nothing being asked for here is appropriated in any other bill. That is my understanding.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. So, the fact that there are other funds to supply other needs of the State Department is entirely irrelevant to what we are talking about here.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not think it is irrelevant, but I agree with the gentleman that it may not be precisely in point. Generally, I think it is.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; you have in here other programs than you are referring to, such as the World Health Organization, the World Food Organization, and other international organizations. Certainly there is money in this bill for the same item.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. For the same agency, but not for the same business. The gentleman indicated that there was complete ignorance on the part of the Committee on Foreign Affairs as to what is going on and what has been requested by these agencies. This is not so. Nor does the fact agencies agree to reductions in their original requests is not saying that they agree to a reduction to $100 million. This is what the Appropriation Committee, in effect, is claiming.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Your intent is simply to use the rifle rather than the buckshot treatment on these recommendations?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. The Marshall plan, designed to help Western Europe to get on its feet after World War II, was remarkably successful, and many people assumed that massive economic aid of this type was the key to developing a strong economy anywhere. They forgot that Western Europe was already highly industrialized, with a skilled labor force. The problems of a country such as Laos, Latin America, and Africa are utterly different. Economic aid to such countries should be tailored to their needs, emphasizing aid that will help them help themselves. The fact that the Soviet Union has cut its foreign aid program in half indicates that the Russians, too, have been disillusioned by massive aid as a costly and ineffective way of waging the cold war in undeveloped countries.

Specifically, I urge a five-point revision of the foreign aid program:

First. More emphasis on technical and military assistance where needed, rather than financial aid. We must provide weapons for such countries as India and South Vietnam, which are engaged in a "hot" war with the Communists, but we cannot at the same time carry the burden of ineffective general economic aid.

Second. More emphasis on loans rather than grants. In cases where economic aid is justified, it is likely to be better used if the country realizes that this money is going to have to be paid back.

Third. A general cutback in the overall foreign aid program, which would force the administrators of the program to commit funds to only the most urgent projects.

Fourth. An immediate end to aid to Communist-bloc countries, such as Yugoslavia. If there was any justification originally, it should be clear now that it no longer exists. We should call an immediate halt to throwing good money after the close to $3 billion already lost aiding this Communist dictatorship.

Fifth. Insistence upon more equitable participation by our allies in the common effort to fight communism.

I want to compliment the members of this appropriations subcommittee. They have followed the direction of the Congress in cutting back on unnecessary funds and presented a bill that more clearly reflects the needs. The initial administration request was $4.9 billion, the Clay Committee recommended $4.5, the House authorized $3 to $5 and today we are voting on $2.8 billion appropriation. A cutback of nearly $2.1 billion certainly is deserving of recognition by the American taxpayer. This type of effort has my full support.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that the appropriations in the State Department appropriation bill are for the United Nations assessments? The appropriations in this bill are for voluntary contributions to United Nations agencies.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct. I think "voluntary" perhaps should be in quotes, because the amount which is to be appropriated for this year is pretty well agreed upon by negotiation between our Government and the international body.

Mr. GARY. But it is voluntary. We are under no compulsion. Under the other we are under agreement to appropriate.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman is precisely correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9499, the bill making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies, comes to the House after more than 4 months of considered hearings by the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations.

As a new member of this subcommittee, I commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] for the diligent manner in which they have worked to bring this bill to the floor of the House and for the outstanding manner in which each of them has presented this bill today.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is by no means perfect. I know of very few perfect pieces of legislation. I do say it is the best bill that this subcommittee can bring to the House of Representatives.

As a Member of the House who has for many years voted against authorizations and appropriations for foreign aid, I intend to vote for this bill if it is not substantially amended. I plan to vote for it because I believe it is the best bill of its kind that has ever been brought to the House of Representatives. I believe it serves notice on the Agency for International Development that the Congress intends to oversee the expenditure of these funds and to demand the elimination of waste, extravagance, and duplication. I believe that an affirmative vote by me on this bill is a vote of confidence in the President and his announced intention to reduce expenditures and to eliminate waste as nearly as he can.

Some have criticized the action of the subcommittee and of the full Committee on Appropriations for the cuts which have been made from last year's appropriation bill and from the budget requests presented to the Congress this year.

The responsibility for setting the amount in this bill is vested in the Congress and, Mr. Chairman, I believe we can justify the amount in the bill far better than we could justify either the amount requested in the budget or set in the authorization act.

Mr. Chairman, it should be recalled that the Congress cannot permit this agency or any other agency of Government, to determine what cuts shall be made and what cuts shall not be made from the budget request. This the committee has conscientiously sought to do.

This is the best bill it has been possible to bring forth, and I commend it to the favorable consideration of the House without substantial amendments.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. PASSMAN, and the members of the subcommittee and to compliment them for the report accompanying the bill. I share their concern and want to thank them for their thorough study of our foreign aid.

The criticisms leveled against our foreign aid programs are reason enough for disapproval of any further aid at this time. Some of these criticisms include:

First. The money, some $7.6 billion, already on hand unspent in the pipeline without voting more.

Second. The aid going to 29 countries that have sustained illegal government overthrow.

Third. The less than necessary type programs that are proliferating throughout the 100 nations we are aiding.

Fourth. Aid to those countries which are Communist or are trading with those who are Communist.

Fifth. The lack of guidelines that should specify what projects in what countries.

Sixth. The $6.8 billion of our gold purchased since 1957 when our gold level has dropped $7 billion.

Seventh. The imbalance of payments.

Eighth. The questionable tied-procurement policy which has become a subsidy to U.S. industry, giving reason for foreign giveaways.

These are but some of the arguments against foreign aid as it has become in practice.

However, for my part, I will not agree to borrow money to give it away, to commit future taxpayers to pay the bills which we refuse to pay today. So I must oppose the bill, even though the total has been substantially reduced.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, at long last there is some hope that loan repayments and interest collections in the Development Loan Fund and Alliance for Progress revolving funds will come under control of the Congress.

Authority to reloan these repayments without reappropriation has existed, and when the foreign aid authorization bill was considered by the House earlier this year, I introduced an amendment so as to provide that these funds would revert to the U.S. Treasury. However, this amendment failed to pass, especially, I think because the Speaker of the House took the floor to oppose it. The vote was very close.

Later when the authorization bill was considered by the Senate, amendments were adopted to bring these two revolving funds under the annual appropriation procedure. Unfortunately, however, these amendments were stricken from the bill in conference. This occurred because the executive branch wanted to continue its authority to operate this program without normal congressional scrutiny. The administration wants a free hand.

In this bill, Mr. Chairman, provision to correct this situation are included, and the Committee on Appropriations has followed my suggestion and placed language in this bill to prevent spending these revolving funds unless first specified in appropriation acts. In other words, the limitation would preclude exercising back-door spending authority and assure an appropriation.

My purpose in rising, Mr. Chairman, is to express my hope that these provisions will be retained in the bill and thereby another blow against back-door spending will prevail.

The Congress must regain and retain control over all expenditures of the taxpayers money.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, permit me a brief moment to compliment the chairman and each of the members of the subcommittee that have brought this bill before us today. The evidence of the diligence and dedication with which they have worked on this subject during the course of this year is amply demonstrated in the excellent committee report that accompanies the bill. The report sets forth facts and figures which should have been conveyed to this House and the public long ago.

I find it difficult to understand how anyone who may have read the committee report on this bill can possibly support any attempts to increase the appropriations. This report actually reads like a best-selling mystery novel. I might suggest a title of "Programs, Projects, and Pilfery." It has mystery that will baffle anyone's comprehension.

The report specifically identifies in practically all categories of the various aid programs covered by this appropriation gross mismanagement, poor administration, a complete lack of proper accounting, estimates that in some cases are in error as much as 300 percent, funds transferred from one project to another, and from one country to the other, projects that have been turned down by some countries, other countries that do not even want to be identified with the programs, moneys that have been obligated in the last hours of the fiscal year just to get them spent, as well as many other discrepancies far too numerous to mention in this short discussion.

We see identified funds that have been obligated and deobligated, funds that have been authorized and deauthorized, funds that have been expended and unexpended, in amounts that are staggering even to anyone's imagination.

I am sure it is of prime concern to all of us that there is aid in one form or another to more than 100 countries out of the 112 countries in the world. It defies anyone's judgment to believe that this Nation is going to be able to sustain the economies of 100 countries throughout the world, when we are experiencing great difficulty in even sustaining our own economy, in view of budget deficits and a continuously mounting national indebtedness.

Every day we hear references to losses in our gold supply and problems with the balance of payments. This is surely not to be wondered at when we note on pages 5 and 6 of the report that since 1958 and up to June 30 of 1963, a period of 5½ years, 52 foreign Nations have purchased $6,823 million plus of our gold, while during that same period, to these same Nations we provided foreign aid in the amount of $11,947 million plus, thereby providing their economy with sufficient moneys with which to deplete our gold supply.

Of equal noteworthy discrepancy is the fact so specifically revealed that other European countries are in a position to be more concerned about supplying aid than we are, only to find that they are contributing only a minor amount by comparison and in most instances, where loans are involved, commanding higher interest rates and shorter periods for repayment.

It is also true that the response of other nations to supplement our help in improving their economy and well-being has not been forthcoming in anywhere near their capacity to do so. I note in one country, for instance, where our aid funds amounted to more than $10 apiece for every person in the country. This amount, in turn, is more than twice what each person in that country pays in income taxes. If we are to entertain the hope that one day the economies in these nations are to improve, then it necessarily follows that they themselves must be at least equally responsive to their needs as we have been responsive by actual contributions.

There are endless examples of the extent to which these programs have not served the best interests of either our own Nation or free people throughout the world, but probably of equal importance in the decision that this House must make today is the fact that we are considering this bill on the 16th day of December, providing moneys for a program that actually began last July 1, so Congress must surely accept its failure to respond in directing this program at the proper time. It is difficult for any department to proceed in compliance with a direction that it has not received. This experience should serve as a reminder that in future consideration and future years, we ought to make sure that authorizations are provided sufficiently early so that appropriations could be made and the proper direction given at the beginning of the fiscal year.

The Appropriations Subcommittee, as well as the full committee, have patiently waited for these many months in order to be authorized to make the proper determination as to the moneys needed. I am well aware of the need of this Nation to supply leadership, assistance, and aid to the depressed areas and countries of the world, but to do so with any kind of effectiveness or any hope to achieve the desired objective, it becomes essential that at least we display our concern and direction of policy at the time when it is needed, and not supply it as an afterthought, which is actually the case with this bill today.

There are those who feel that we are not now sufficiently accomplishing this purpose. To improve that situation cannot be done with a mere appropriation of more money. The proper action would be one of a more properly directed and administered program. There seems to be no way that this can be accomplished other than for Congress to regain control of these expenditures by demanding a full and proper accounting of what has been done, to begin with, and further, to demand ample justification for all future expenditures.

In light of these facts and many more, the biggest contribution that this House can make today to the future improvement of our own stature throughout the world would be to make sure that we have registered effectively and convincingly our desire that all of our aid programs should better serve the best economic interests of our own Nation, as well as those receiving the various aids.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, as one who believes strongly in the time-tested principles of mutual security and in the objectives of our foreign assistance program, I am very distressed with the apparent indifference many have shown and are showing toward the program we are considering today.

It may be a cliche, but I believe it has been conclusively demonstrated that our foreign aid program is one of the most important weapons in the defense of the free world against Communist subversion and expansion. Who can say how the world would look today if it had not been for America's assistance to its friends abroad in the years since World War II.

If American foreign aid was instrumental in rebuilding Western Europe after the most devastating war in history, is it any less important today to those countries which are just now emerging into the 20th century? I cannot believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress fails to recognize the need for continuing to help those who need our help today just as Western Europe did in years gone by.

We all know there have been instances of waste and mismanagement in our aid program. This is unfortunate, but I believe we have made great strides in reducing waste. I believe too that our aid is dispensed much more selectively now than it was a few years ago. Past mistakes in a program as venturesome and imaginative as this one certainly are a poor excuse for deep, indiscriminate cuts in the funds necessary to sustain this vital, but beleaguered, foreign policy effort.

If cuts are needed, I believe we should approach them responsibly—with a scalpel, not with an ax. Let us reduce our expenditures where reductions are needed; but let us not tie the hands of our President and the men charged with the responsibility for decision making in foreign policy. Let us permit them the flexibility they need to meet changing conditions in a rapidly changing world.

President Johnson has warned that "the drastic reduction in foreign aid funds proposed in the House, if sustained, would be a severe setback to American leadership and to U.S. interests in many parts of the world."

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will not sustain the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations. I hope we will, instead, give our President what he needs to enable this Nation to meet its international commitments.

I do not believe the Congress is prepared, for example, to admit that our investment in all of Latin America should be less than the Soviet Union is pumping into Cuba. Our President put it very well when he said:

> This is no way to combat communism in Latin America.

I hope all my colleagues have had the opportunity to read President Johnson's statement. I thoroughly concur with that statement.

Since the tragic events of November 22, 1963, and the days following, I believe the Congress has acted very responsibly in helping President Johnson fulfill his pledge of continuity without confusion. Now I think it is imperative for us to reverse the deep cuts recommended by the Committee on Appropriations to give our President the tools he needs to continue the foreign policies of his three predecessors—the late President Kennedy, President Eisenhower, and President Truman.

If the recommended cut is sustained, if we should vote to put our foreign policy in a "straitjacket," I hope the opponents of foreign aid will understand if this Nation should find itself unable to act with imagination and dispatch to meet changing conditions which may develop almost overnight. I hope they will not be critical of President Johnson and his administration if our friends abroad begin to turn elsewhere—to the Sino-Soviet bloc—for the assistance they need to help themselves.

It is, I think, ironic that those who have most consistently opposed our foreign aid program are the first to despair when our foreign policy shows any signs of faltering—when we are unable to cope fully and successfully with the many challenges facing America and the free world. They demand a strong foreign policy, but they balk when it comes time to pay for it.

Like President Johnson, I cannot "believe that the Congress intends to require the United States of America to follow policies of weakness and retreat." Let us, instead, vote for a policy of strength and advance. Let us give the President what he has asked—"the funds essential to conduct strong and forward-looking foreign assistance programs in the U.S. national interest."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there is reason to congratulate the House Appropriations Subcommittee which has reported to us this reduced foreign aid bill today. The previous action of this body in providing an additional authorization of over $3.5 billion was cause for alarm. Today's bill reflects substantial reduction in additional appropriations over that which was requested, and the amendment adopted by way of the motion to recommit restricts use of loan authority to guarantee Russian debts on a wheat deal contrary to the wishes of the Congress.

At the same time, no matter what is said of it, this bill provides an additional appropriation for foreign aid when we already have on hand and unspent in the fund over $7 billion.

So while this bill may be a reduction over that requested, it is certainly not a reduction in foreign aid—it is an additional appropriation.

No nation in the history of the world has given of its own resources to less fortunate people as has the United States since adoption of the Marshall plan following World War II. But with so much to be done here at home, with the highest tax rate in our history and the highest national debt, it is long past time we look to a complete overhaul of the foreign aid program. We could accomplish this by refusing to appropriate any additional funds for 1 year, while we take another look at its results and its failures. This would not bring halt to the program, as funds already on hand would carry it at present level for over 2 years without any additional money being appropriated.

I voted for the motion to recommit in order to restrict use of the loan guarantee to support the sale of wheat to Russia. I voted against the bill on final passage for the reasons stated above. Those who say they are for a cut in foreign aid had only one choice today. That was to vote against the entire additional appropriation.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the editorial "Foreign Aid Is Slashed Again" which I include as part of my remarks, is most timely and directs our attention to the true monetary facts of life, and certainly hits the nail on the head.

I am most hopeful that our action will reflect the basic logic of this editorial rather than the propaganda and double-talk of the State Department and the administration.

The editorial follows:

FOREIGN AID IS SLASHED AGAIN

Congress had barely settled upon a sharply curtailed $3.6 billion foreign aid authorization bill when the ax fell again.

On Saturday the House Appropriations Committee, acting on the appropriation bill which must follow the authorization, lopped off another $800 million, bringing the total down to $2.8 billion—the lowest figure since 1957 and more than $2 billion below the late President Kennedy's original request. Cuts were made in many areas, but chiefly—and properly so—in economic aid.

The committee action came swiftly on the heels of a subcommittee report recommending $3 billion, and was even more drastic. The measure now goes to the floor of the House, where approval is expected. The Senate, judging from precedent, is likely to be more softhearted.

Representative PASSMAN, of Louisiana, the Democrat who is chairman of the subcommittee, turned down a last minute plea from President Johnson for the maximum appropriation permitted by the authorization bill, namely $3.6 billion. For years, Mr. PASSMAN has protested the waste and futility of much of our foreign aid, largely in vain. Now that Congress finally seems to be emerging from its hypnotic spell and coming around to his way of thinking, Mr. PASSMAN has no intention of giving in. Summoned to a night conference at the White House, he told the President that he believed $3 billion was more than adequate and that he could not surrender his convictions.

Mr. Johnson's position is much less tenable. The country needs a sound fiscal policy and he has set about building himself up as the man who can provide it. He has called upon department heads to cut expenses wherever possible. The people recognize foreign aid as a gigantic boondoogle which has proved to be worth nowhere near the $100 billion and more that it has cost. Previous cuts in foreign aid have been made without any of the calamitous results which, we were warned, would result from them. The failures of foreign aid have been for lack of policy, not for lack of money.

Let Mr. Johnson appeal for a more generous appropriation, if he wants. But in these circumstances, not even a politician of his skill can go very far in urging unnecessary spending without exposing himself as a hypocrite. We applaud Mr. PASSMAN's perseverance. His course is the right one, and should be the winning one.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

International organizations and programs: For expenses authorized by section 302, $100,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRASER

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRASER: On page 2, line 19, strike out "$100,000,000" and insert instead "$130,903,000".

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, it is with some hesitation that I rise to offer an amendment to a bill which I know the chairman of the subcommittee has spent many hours considering. Along with many other Members of the House I enjoyed and appreciated his presentation this afternoon.

The problem, however, Mr. Chairman, as I have reviewed the report of this subcommittee is that I have found that for the first time within my memory the amount of money that is appropriated for the United Nations organization and programs, the amount of money that is provided for the Children's Fund, for the Palestine Refugee Fund, for the Special Fund and the expanded Technical Assistance Fund, for the Indus Waters Funds, and these many other funds that have enjoyed support from this Congress and the President for many years, has been drastically, and I repeat, drastically cut.

So I looked at the committee report and I got a copy of the report last Saturday from the Appropriations Committee, to find out what there was about this request of $136 million, a request, by the way, which went through the House Foreign Affairs Committee unchanged, a request that survived the floor of this House unchanged, a request that survived the Senate committee unchanged, and survived the Senate itself unchanged, this figure of $136 million that was asked and that was authorized by this Congress, to see where this $36 million was to be cut from, what program it was that was so poorly administered.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is the gentleman asking me a question?

Mr. FRASER. If the gentleman will defer his question, I am just explaining how I come to be offering this amendment.

So I read the committee report, but it really did not tell me much. It did not tell me whether it was to come from the Children's Fund, it did not tell me whether we were going to renege on our commitment of a matching 40 percent for the Technical Assistance Fund, it did not tell me it was to wipe out the Palestine Refugee Fund. In short, the committee report did not tell us where the $36 million was to come out of these many programs.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The report on page 15 does indicate that the committee feels we should renege on our obligations in connection with the 40 percent that we are presently contributing to these voluntary programs. The language to which I refer is:

This substantial and increasing financial effort by the United States on a bilateral basis in the technical assistance field does not appear to warrant an increasing dollar contribution to the U.N. technical assistance program.

The committee seems to believe that we should repudiate what admittedly is an increasing dollar load even though this obligation was accepted by us as a reasonable share.

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman is correct when he talks about the language of the report. However, I could not believe the chairman of the subcommittee was saying we should renege on our commitment, a commitment of long standing that was not new in 1963 or 1964 but has existed ever since we got to the 40-percent level on the funds—since 1959.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would hope that would be the conclusion that the gentleman from Louisiana would reach. However, the same sentence from which I was reading concludes as follows:

The committee suggests that every effort should be made to reduce our percentage contribution to this program.

What could be a more effective way to reduce our contribution than not to give enough funds to make it possible to continue it? This is not a very praiseworthy way of achieving an objective even though some may feel we should try to reach it. I do not think we should simply renege, as the gentleman puts it, on our voluntary agreement to contribute.

Mr. FRASER. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey that one of the reasons I did not believe the chairman wanted us to renege was that last year he did not cut a dime off the authorization. Last year the administration asked for $148 million. Last year we authorized $148 million. Last year the chairman of the subcommittee and the subcommittee recommended $148 million based on precisely the same commitments that we have for fiscal year 1964. So I was not willing to believe the chairman did want us to renege on these commitments.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

As I mentioned in the general debate, in previous years we have overfunded a lot of the smaller accounts. I might state to the gentleman that the amount of money on hand unexpended as of June 30 amounted to $134 million and the gentleman's amendment calls for more money than the agency requested. The agency, subsequent to the time of presenting its case to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, came to the Committee on Appropriations and said, in effect, "We asked for $8,960,000 more than we need." They volunteered to reduce the request to $127 million.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. Will my colleague let me finish, if I may.

I might say also that a purpose of the President's contingency fund is that in the event one of these programs should accidentally be cut lower than it should be—and there is no record, however, that this has been done—the President can transfer out of the contingency account. For the contingency fund, we actually are allowing $17 million more than was originally requested. They did not ask originally for unobligated funds to be reappropriated.

I do not want to get into an argument about the U.N., but I can say that, in our opinion, the only amount of money that we believe should be earmarked as such would be for UNICEF—$12 million. Beyond that they have the right to allocate the funds where they see fit. But I can assure you, the gentleman's amendment is in excess of what the agency asked for; and I repeat, if it should get into trouble, and I do not think it will, then of course money could be transferred from the contingency fund to meet the needs.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that the committee struck from the bill a proviso which limited the President to the transfer of $10 million to this item?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. And we struck out that limitation altogether.

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, we took out the limitation. The President, if he wanted to, could go up to the full amount of the authorization. I can assure the gentleman that some members of the committee felt that $88 million would be completely adequate to care for this program but, by compromise, we went on up to $100 million.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. Is it not a fact that although the $127 million-figure was contained in the letter submitted by the

Department of State that, subsequently, they indicated they need $130 million? If the gentleman does not know about it, I can give you a copy of the statement.

Mr. PASSMAN. They asked for $136 million. It was reduced to $127 million. Now they are back to $130 million.

I think $88 million would be an adequate figure, but we recommended $100 million.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. I wonder if the gentleman will tell us which of these funds you want to cut back on. You told us you do not want to cut back on the World Health Organization.

Mr. PASSMAN. I was discussing the Children's Fund. We are leaving it up to the agency to allocate the other $88 million. There is "fat" in this appropriation category.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes. I yield.

Mr. FRASER. Will the gentleman tell me where the "fat" is in one of these projects? I have been trying to find out for 2 days.

Mr. PASSMAN. There is "fat" in most of them, if not actually all of them.

Mr. SNYDER. Speaking of "fat," is it not true that the World Health Organization is the one that sent two boatloads of Jeeps down to Cuba?

Mr. PASSMAN. I think that is so. I ask for a vote.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota asks where the fat is in this particular item in the bill. I would say to him that as far as I am concerned, almost all of it is all fat. And with respect to UNICEF, I hope some history is made here with respect to that particular fund; that is, that those administering the money do not turn around and finance the United Nations as they did a few years ago with a $10 million loan. If they have $10 million to loan for the operating expenses of the United Nations, then they have $10 million too much. There is no reason why UNICEF should be in that kind of lending business.

Mr. Chairman, over the weekend President Johnson is reported to have condemned the House Committee on Appropriations for cutting the foreign handout program, calling it a "severe setback to American leadership—that would put our foreign policy in a straitjacket."

What the Committee on Appropriations is doing, and commendably, is to put a brake on American checkbook foreign policy. It is about time President Johnson and all the rest of the freewheeling foreign spending crowd realize that they have been putting American taxpayers in a steadily tightening straitjacket for altogether too many years.

President Johnson says the House appropriation bill would mean less U.S. spending for all of Latin America than the Soviet Union is putting into Cuba alone. How does he know what the Russians are actually putting into Cuba? Does he include missiles and troops? Where are his figures and what do they represent? If, without onsite inspection, he knows what has happened and what is happening in Cuba, he has an obligation to tell Congress, for no one else has provided a clear and accurate picture since the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

And speaking of the Alliance for Progress, why should the United States continue to spend a single dollar on any one of those five Latin American countries that have refused to break off relations with Cuba? Take Brazil as an illustration, one of the countries that refused to break off relations with Cuba.

We committed to Brazil earlier this year $398.5 million and we made an immediate commitment to that country some $80 million. Why did they have to have $80 million immediately. Among other things, to meet their short-term obligations, many of those obligations being to the Communist bloc. In other words, they were using U.S. taxpayers' money to meet their obligations to the Communists.

Before my time runs out, and speaking of the American taxpayers, I want to call attention to an example of what is happening in this country. I understand that on December 4 the Erie Railroad announced it was unable to meet its New Jersey property tax bill of $4.5 million because of financial difficulties and refusal of the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve a Government guarantee of a $5 million loan to this same Erie Railroad.

But the World Bank, to which the United States is the largest single contributor, using funds fleeced from Iowa, New Jersey, and all other American taxpayers, ladled out, with the greatest of ease, $35 million to Yugoslavia to modernize that Communist country's railroads. And 2 or 3 years ago, if memory serves me correctly, Yugoslavia bought U.S.-financed diesel locomotives in Europe, not in the United States. Although we financed the purchase of those locomotives, they were obtained in Europe, not in the United States where our industry and labor could get at least some of the benefit.

I would not care to be a Representative from the State of New Jersey, which is going to lose substantial property tax revenue because one of its industries cannot get from the Government equal treatment given to foreigners, and vote for this cockeyed bill.

It would be impossible for me, if I were a New Jerseyite, to go home and tell my people I voted for a program that poured $35 million into Communist Yugoslavia to modernize their railroads when a similar industry in my State could not get help to negotiate a $5 million loan for the same purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment and I am opposed to the bill for I agree with the opening statement of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], who brought this bill to the floor, that it is still too fat at $2.8 billion. As a cold, hard fact, this foreign giveaway program must be reduced to a few hundred million dollars a year if this Nation is to be saved from bankruptcy. The waste in this program is intolerable and it is hopeful that the American people are at last coming to realize that $120 billion of their tax dollars have, for the most part, been frittered away.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE, as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. FRASER: Strike out "$130,903,000" and insert instead "$120,000,000."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is to cut down the figure in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, to $120 million. In other words, it restores $20 million to the United Nations fund.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said here today by the Chairman in regard to the unexpended funds of the international program. I would like to point out to the House, based on his figures—as of June 30, 1963—there was unobligated $336,227. That is as of June 30 of this year. Maybe by this time none of these funds are left that were unobligated back on June 30. But even so, Mr. Chairman, the amount that was unobligated as of June 30 was merely $336,000.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in order to express my strong support of the U.S. voluntary contibutions to 10 international organizations and programs.

In attempting to amend this international organization fund by restoring $20 million out of $36 million cut from this necessary and important program, I am hoping to find some solution to the serious effects a drastic cut would have on our foreign assistance program.

By restoring this amount of money, the Congress could help salvage the damage that would accrue through the needless and unnecessary slashing of a program that has untold benefits around the world.

According to Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizational Affairs, voluntary contributions fall into four major categories: In order—

First. They help finance the major agencies of the United Nations for channeling resources from the industrially developed members to the newly developing members, the U.N. expanded program of technical assistance, the U.N. special fund, and the U.N. children's fund.

Second. Voluntary contributions for the special case of the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees.

Third. Voluntary contributions to programs of the specialized agencies, and other multilateral organizations temporarily financed outside of their regular budgets, such as the NATO science program, malaria eradication, community water supply, and medical research in the World Health Organization, and technical assistance operations of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Fourth. Voluntary payments which have helped to finance extraordinary expenses of major peacekeeping operations under U.N. auspices.

We must also consider that the appropriation request for this year was approximately $18 million less than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1963. And when an agency comes before the Appropriations Foreign Aid Subcommittee with a good sizable reduction, I think that the organization deserves a great deal of praise.

A serious cut in this program at this time will seriously jeopardize our entire foreign policy structure.

We cannot afford the terrible consequences that will come if these essential programs are cut.

It will appear as though the United States is not willing to join the world fight against disease, poverty, and deprivation.

In the following areas, particularly, the program will suffer:

EFFECT OF REDUCTION IN FUNDS REQUIRED FOR VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

A $30 million cut in the budget for U.S. voluntary contributions to international organizations amounts to a reduction of about 22 percent. The spread of such a cut among these contributions would require very serious consideration of the political and economic problems involved before it could be determined in detail. In general, however, such a cut would have to be applied among all the programs, with the following consequence:

First. A reduction in the U.S. contribution to the U.N. expanded technical assistance program and the Special Fund would mean an appreciable cutback in the technical assistance projects of these programs which are helping in the economic development of the less-developed countries. There are now over 2,000 experts in less-developed countries financed by these two programs; the United States contributes 40 percent of the total cost. A substantial reduction in the U.S. contribution will mean a substantial cutback in the assistance which can be provided.

Second. In the case of the U.N. program of economic assistance to the Congo, a decrease in the U.S. contribution can only mean seriously cutting the program, the purpose of which is to stabilize the economic situation in the Congo as the U.N. military operation is being phased out. Without such stabilization, the impact of the military operation can be seriously negated.

Third. A decrease in the U.S. contributions to UNICEF will inevitably be reflected in a reduction in the worldwide program of assistance to less-developed countries in maternal and child health which UNICEF has been furnishing so successfully over the years.

Fourth. The estimate for U.S. contributions for U.N. peacekeeping operations in the Congo and Middle East is for voluntary contributions to these two peacekeeping operations. If funds are not available, it will not be possible for the United States to do its share in meeting the costs of the operation on the basis of the resolutions passed by the General Assembly.

Fifth. A 22-percent reduction in the U.S. contribution to the U.N. program for Palestine refugees, where the United States provides up to 70 percent of the cost, would mean a serious reduction in refugee relief, where the rations and relief are already down to a minimal subsistence cost of $28 per refugee per year or 8 cents per day. The impact of this effort on countries where the refugees are located could lead to violent political reaction.

Sixth. The effect of the proposed reduction on the Indus Waters project would mean the United States would not be able to live up to its commitment to meet the scheduled callup of contributions to the World Bank under the Indus Fund agreement. A consequent delay in project execution could mean a delay in the closely scheduled water withdrawal rate by India or the payment of heavy indemnities by Pakistan with resultant increase in friction between these two countries.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier in my speech on the main bill itself, tomorrow President Johnson goes to the United Nations with his message. Let us permit President Johnson to go to the United Nations with the necessary amount of funds to carry out these voluntary programs.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I, too, am against this amendment, I want to say to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Please permit me to say that back in 1947 under the name of the Marshall plan, many of us who were here at that time were told that our allies were broke and hungry and down and out and needed help; that we must save them from communism. Out of the goodness of the hearts of the American people, we voted to help our old allies and friends, to put a smile on their faces and a song in their hearts, so to speak. We voted to give them food for their mouths, to put clothes on their backs, a roof over their heads and money in their pockets so that they could hold their heads high, and thereby be in a better frame of mind and position to come back spiritually, morally, physically and economically. This they have done. They are in better financial condition than the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, 17 years later and with $110 billion less today than we had then in the Treasury of the United States, with 102 of the 110 recognized nations of the world today drawing or receiving aid from us—we are still at this "handout" program. We simply cannot keep this program up. It is absolutely impossible. We do not have the funds. Our allies were honest back in those war days. They were broke, they knew it, they asked for help and we gladly gave them assistance. However, the situation is now in reverse, we are broke, do not know it, will not admit it, do not care, and are spending money like a "loose ninny" out on a drunken binge.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, that is what caused me to say the other day in the debate on the authorization of the foreign aid bill that we were appropriating and spending money which we have not got on people we do not know, trying to impress others who hated our guts.

If all of the nations of the world who hold our I O U's would suddenly line up at our Treasury for payment, we not only could not pay, but what is even worse—we would not have enough gold to back our American dollar. No businessman in his right mind would do what our Government is doing.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I have endeavored to stay out of some of the weak points of this program, but in self defense—that is, to defend the committee—I think I should bring to the attention of the Members of the House at least two or three items. One of them is the World Health Organization program, about which we have heard a good part of the argument. I want to say to that out of $100 million in this bill, only $500,000 is in here for the World Health Organization, trying to make up the total requirement in order to go down and pick up $500 million for economic aid to the Congo. And, the Congo is getting aid out of about 15 other spigots.

In connection with this waterways project that you have heard so much about, there is $13 million in the bill for this project.

For the united technical aid program, the bill has $55 million. They are dipping also out of other aid accounts. Sometimes there are maybe five different agencies on one project. Several years ago they were getting into fist-fights as to who would do the program.

The bill has $55 million for technical aid; it has $5 million for the Congo, and for WHO, which is where they get funds for Cuba, there is an amount in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the pending amendment be defeated.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not anxious to be known as a Member of the Congress who in Christmas of 1963 decided to gang up on the United Nations, which is the best device that has been created for peace on earth and good will toward men. I am not anxious to be one of the august body who made his contribution to society by ganging up on sick and hungry kids throughout the world in the name of false economy.

I have listened to eulogies on our late President, John F. Kennedy. I heard about his patience, his courage, his vision. I feel I have been left a heritage by this man, and a responsibility. I do not shrink from this challenge. Whether it is good or bad politics, I support the U.N. and anything that will strengthen the U.N. and the depressed peoples of this earth.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, tomorrow President Johnson is scheduled to address the United Nations. I think a serious cut in the amount to international organizations and programs would not be the best point of departure for the President's first major U.N. address.

I would like today to speak briefly with regard to two amounts that could be affected by this cut. The first is the United Nations Emergency Force—$1.18 million; the second is the United Nations Relief Works Agency for Palestine refugees in the amount of $17.2 million. United Nations Emergency Force, in my judgment, is important to keeping peace in the Near East. This 5,300 member multinational U.N. force is essential to keeping down incidents on the Israel-United Arab Republic border, and a substantial cut in United Nations Emergency Force funds could be adverse with reference to peace and trigger hostilities on a sensitive border.

The second amount relates to United Nations Relief Works Agency. This amount, I repeat, is $17.2 million. It involves 1.2 million refugees and 882,000 who are drawing rations and health services from United Nations Relief Works Agency. The 22-percent cut, if applied, would affect men and women presently receiving minimal rations and relief at the rate of 8 cents per day, or $28 per year. That would bring it down to 6 cents per day.

Further, we have been making progress in our diplomacy in shifting from relief services to vocational and educational programs; toward a solution of the refguee question. Above all, Mr. Chairman, the United States is still engaged in trying to seek and build peace in the Near East, and anything that would disturb seriously the refugee question or that could lead to increased incidents in the area would be a clear disservice to peace. I have talked recently with our ambassadors in the area. I believe they would state were they here on the floor today that any serious cut in these funds could drastically hamper their efforts toward building a peace and keeping the uncertain peace in the area.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I should like to compliment my colleague from New York. I agree with him completely on what he has said. It is a most important point. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] also is to be complimented on his amendment, which will add $20 million to the U.N. and its agencies. I intend to vote for it. The United Nations and its constituent agencies are deserving of support. And in order to support the legislative history being made here with respect to UNICEF, UNRWA and UNEF, I want to say that each of these operations is worthy of support. The U.S. contributions as authorized by the authorizing committees of the Senate and House are not by any means out of proportion to the needs and the danger in not attending to those needs. The United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East, for example, has successfully kept that explosive area in a state of relative peace. Were it not for UNEF and UNRWA I fear for the worst.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. The matter the gentleman has been talking about is a supplemental item to title II of this bill. It normally would go to Mr. ROONEY'S committee. It is $18,374,000, and we recommend every dime of it.

Mr. REID of New York. The gentleman believes that neither the funds of UNEF nor UNRWA would be touched, even though he does not believe in a line-item cut?

Mr. PASSMAN. The legislative history would not justify that action.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman, but I also rise in support of the Conte substitute because I deeply believe any cut in UNICEF or UNRWA or UNEF would be a disservice to the cause of peace.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know of any international organization that is not in arrears in its contribution to in this polyglot outfit known as the United Nations? Does he know of any foreign government that is fully paid up?

Mr. REID of New York. Having served in the area I am concerned with anything that would affect these two peacekeeping organizations. In my judgment, both psychologically and practically any apparent cut in these two would be inflammatory, irresponsible, and would not serve the cause of peace.

Mr. RHODES or Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, lest anyone feel that we are being less than generous with these international organizations, let me refer you to page 14. The U.N. Technical and Special Fund is in for $55 million; U.N. economic assistance to the Congo for $5 million; U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, $17,200,000. And so it goes. The Indus Waters is in for some $30 million.

We have been asked where you might possibly suggest that some cuts be made. The chairman has given the right answer when he said that this should be left to the agency. But just let me bring to your attention this fact. There is no one whose heart goes out to the homeless people any more than does mine. There is no one I know of who would like any more than I would to see the Palestine refugee situation in the Near East cleared up as soon as possible. Yet the facts are these. We have more refugees now than we did back when the refugee program first came into being after the formation of the State of Israel. The people are not leaving the refugee camps. They are not being resettled. Year after year after year we have this appropriation to take care of the Palestine refugees, and it will increase, not diminish. I suggest to you that as long as the United States of America is willing to pick up the tab for this one item, just that long we are going to have a refugee problem. But if the United States of America says, as I happen to think it soon must do, that this is mainly the problem of the Middle East, a problem that the nations involved must help to settle, then and only then will the refugee problem begin to be settled.

I certainly do not want to do anything to cripple the United Nations. If I thought we were, I would not be up here speaking as I am and opposing this amendment. But I suggest to you, we are not doing that. I suggest to you, we instead we are telling these other nations of the world that have a responsibility for the U.N. just as much as we have, that the time has come for them to pick up their share of this tab. The time has come for the United Nations to start making more sense than it is right now in certain areas of the world, including the Middle East. The time has come, in other words, when the people of the United States must realize that our American economy and our American taxpayers have gone just about as far as they can go in this effort.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a meat-ax cut but it certainly is at least an amber light—and maybe not a red light but an amber light, as a warning to those who think Uncle Sam is still "Uncle Sucker."

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Should we not state that under item No. 1, United Nations Technical Aid and Special Fund, in the amount of $55 million, there could be money in this appropriation for projects in Cuba and that we were never able to pin down just what amount would go into Cuba?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Not only Cuba but I think any other Communist nation that is a member of the United Nations.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES or Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I think the gentleman is persuasive in his arguments that there are some parts of the program where, perhaps, an amber light should be turned on. But I would like to remind the gentleman, here we are halfway through the fiscal year appropriating money, which had we done as we should have done and handled this matter some months ago—that would be one thing. But our representatives at the United Nations, of which I have been one, were led to believe, and with some reason, that there would be no sharp change of policy. The authorization bill did not, althought it cut many things, did not make any substantial cut here. And there is a very serious question, whether it makes any sense whatsoever to send the President of the United States tomorrow to make his first appearance at the U.N. with pledges that have been made and, I may say they have been made subject to our constitutional process, having been partially repudiated today by the House. This would be a most unwise thing to do.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. The agency came in in September, many months after the start of this fiscal year and said, in effect, "We now discover we asked for too much money and that puts it back to $127 million." Remember also that the President's contingency fund is available in the unlikely event that more money should be needed for this fund. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I feel that the President of the United States will be able to go to the United Nations with his head held high as head of the Nation which has and does give the most generous and consistent support to the United Nations. I hope he will say to the delegates assembled, "We support the United Nations, we hope you will do as well."

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment and to the original amendment. I think the supporters of the amendments have become unduly alarmed by the scarce headlines and the dire predictions of utter collapse of our foreign policy every time the Committee on Appropriations effects reductions in the foreign aid bill.

I point out to the Members of the House that the bill still carries $2.8 billion which is no small sum of money. The gentleman from New Jersey mentioned the Christmas season. When he did so, I did a little hurried calculation about how much $2.8 billion is.

I find from my mathematics—and I think they are correct—if we started spending $3,000 a day 1,963 years ago, at the birth of Christ, and spent $3,000 each day until Wednesday of next week, we would still have to spend $3,000 every day for 599 more years before we spent $2.8 billion. This bill will require the Executive to spend at the rate of $7,671,235 a day every day next year in order to spend the $2.8 billion. I cannot possibly vote for any amendment spending an additional $20 or $30 million of money which we do not have in the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, as I rise to voice my annual strong protest against our continued program of lavish handouts to virtually all of the nations of the free world—and to some who are not even of the free world—I am happy to know that my protest this year will fall on noticeably less deaf ears.

There is a changed atmosphere in this Congress, which apparently has at last waked up to the fact that the American people—the people whose Representatives we are—are sick and tired of this wastefully operated, shoddily managed, visionary, and frequently pointless program that we call foreign aid.

That the Congress is awake—awake at long last, because the evidence of widespread public discontent has for some years been plain to all who would look and listen—is obvious in our own actions this year. We have lowered sharply the authorization for foreign spending in this fiscal year, by a billion and a third dollars under the original budget request. And as significant as the cut itself, perhaps more significant, are the unprecedentedly narrow margins by which this House and the other body approved the authorization bill. Similarly significant of congressional awakening has been the insistence that restrictions be applied to foreign aid operations—and that before we again are faced with this annual problem, the managers of the program come up with something different in the way of concept and method of operation.

But despite the positive indication that the Congress has awakened to public clamor against this program, we still are faced—as we debate this bill to appropriate another $2.8 billion for foreign aid—with the walls of anguish from the diehard spenders. These diehards, keeping up the pretense that any dollars pared from the foreign aid program would be disastrous to the free world cause, pleadingly insist that the old grab bag must be kept full of Uncle Sam's dollars so that anybody who wants a few million dollars can be accommodated.

These visionary spenders, for reasons obscure to me, do not seem able to realize—even in the face of our 18 years of fruitless effort to buy friendship by dishing out more than $100 billion—that money does not do the job. If we are to continue our leadership of the free world, and if we are to lead it to success in the constant battle against communistic encroachment, we need a firm and dynamic foreign policy—not a continuation of dollar diplomacy in which our major policy weapon is a checkbook and the fiction that we have an inexhaustible bank account.

Those in the administration who are responsible for this program must look back to its beginnings—when, as the Marshall plan, it was aimed at the rebuilding of war-ravaged nations, nations whose peoples had had for centuries a background of stable government and recognized patterns of social order and culture.

Remembering that, those in the administration responsible should stop their efforts to make the Congress, and the people, believe this current program has anything to do with the Marshall plan. Instead—if they sincerely believe there is good reason for the taxpayers of the United States to finance the emergence of no one knows how many "emergent nations," they should formulate a program of know-how and initiative, and come before us to justify its approval. Most of the new recipients of foreign aid have no background for stable government—nor stable economy, either.

Thus, these nations cannot emerge with American dollars alone. They must learn to help themselves—and the only type of program which we can provide which will be of help to them—if indeed there is any prospect of really helping them—must be geared to the philosophy that we will help only those who help themselves, or to put it in homely fashion—"them that eat, must work."

I know that we are not going to defeat this bill today. But I hope we will not add a penny to the amount recommended by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and the hardworking members of his subcommittee. And I would pray that the other body would, for once, see fit not to increase an appropriation voted by this House.

Meanwhile, may I say that I hope the taxpayer, the general public, will become more clamorous in its demands that we wrap this program up as soon as possible. But I would warn them: Their outrage must be heard by more than the Congress. The people must, somehow, awaken the labor unions and the manufacturers' associations to the fact that foreign aid is not just a program for exporting taxpayers' dollars. It also is—as any textile worker—whether in labor or management—can tell you—a program for exporting the workingman's job and for exporting the manufacturer's know-how so that it can be used in foreign lands to create competition, destroying not only this country's foreign markets, but domestic industry's home markets as well.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee is to be commended for taking the initiative and the full committee for sustaining it, in cutting the foreign aid appropriation to $2.8 billion. I hope that this is the beginning of the phasing out of all foreign aid. If it is the beginning of the end of the foreign aid program, it is an historical turning point in U.S. foreign affairs. It marks the beginning of a new era that will produce new thinking, new foreign policies, and a new initiative for the United States in world affairs.

For nearly 20 years foreign aid has been used like a narcotic. We have replied to every challenge from abroad with a shot of foreign aid. When nations supported us, we rewarded them with a shot of foreign aid. When nations opposed us, we tried to soften them up with a shot of foreign aid. When they remained neutral, playing us off against our enemies, we lavished foreign aid upon them.

During these years we counted it a failure if a nation did not take our foreign aid. For example, when the Russians achieved the dubious honor of financing the Aswan Dam project by Egypt, it was generally considered a grave "set-back" by our foreign policy pundits. Our Secretary of State was taken to task for this "failure." But now, in retrospect, it is clear that we did not lose a thing and I do not think the American taxpayers have any regrets.

More recently, many State Department officials seemed baffled and horified when a tiny Southeast Asian nation announced that it would accept no more of our foreign aid. Our foreign policy experts were stumped. Foreign aid had become such a sedative to our foreign policy brains that they were completely at a loss when a country refused it.

Mr. Chairman, we have spent about $120 billions in foreign aid and some say that "it is only money" and that no amount is too much to pay for world peace. This is clever speech but phony reasoning.

There is no evidence that foreign aid as such has made any substantial contribution to world peace. To the contrary, the Korean war broke out when foreign aid was at a peak of intensity.

Peace today is maintained as it always has been, by military power. Perhaps Gibbon expressed it best in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." Of the Roman Empire, he said, "They preserved peace by a constant preparation for war."

Our recent history bears this out for the Korean war occurred when our military power was at its lowest point between 1941 and today.

As to the amount of foreign aid, too often we forget that the dollar figure is just a means of measuring. We should not say $120 billion. We should say $120 billion worth of American natural resources and productivity.

Natural resources cannot be replaced except by time and nature. The African and South American Continents are far richer in natural resources than the United States. When ours are exhausted will they send us theirs? I would not count on it.

Mr. Chairman, again I commend the committee for cutting foreign aid. Their action may precipitate some new and fresh thinking on U.S. foreign policy.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in part because the gentleman from Louisiana has repeatedly suggested that the contingency fund can be used as a source of funds if more money is needed to meet our obligations to various international agencies. Yet the committee report on page 19 indicates that the Committee on Appropriations was concerned at the use which has been made of these contingency funds. The statement is made there, that the contingency fund:

> Is to provide a source of funds for the President to meet unforeseen emergencies in the world which are important to the national interest.

The needs of these international agencies are not unforeseen emergencies, and presumably the contingency fund would not be available even if the President should desire to use it.

The gentleman from Arizona has indicated clearly that, in his opinion at least, the Palestinian refugees should have their funds cut back. I would suggest to the committee that this would be a very unwise way of showing that we feel other countries should share the financial load which we have carried for so long. It seems extremely shortsighted for us to argue that we are just simply going to starve certain programs to death, worthwhile as they may be, in order to show other countries that they should be meeting their responsibilities. Should this be done, we would have to reduce the daily allotment of 8 cents a day to support these Palestine refugees to 6 cents a day. This seems to me the most shocking kind of shortsightedness. I would urge that we increase the amounts recommended by the Committee on Appropriations so that we may discharge our obligations to these agencies.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I tried to protect this item as much as I could without exposing some of its hypocrisies and weaknesses. May I say to the gentleman that with regard to this Indus River project there is a $1 billion item for which there should not have been a dime. This is the Indus River waterway for India and Pakistan, which will cost over $1 billion. Would the gentleman agree that the Indus waterway, a $1 billion project, should have been reduced to $30 milion this year?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. On the contrary, I would certainly say that the amount requested by the administration should stand, unless the gentleman from Louisiana or anyone else on his committee could show us why not. If the gentleman from Louisiana is objecting to the $130 million because the Indus River project is too big, I would say his argument comes too late. He has failed to concentrate on any one area, and I say this is another reason why we should go slow in cutting these funds back. He suggested perhaps $88 million was enough. He suggested there was plenty of fat in these programs. If we had time, we could argue these points.

The point is made, as it is, with very limited debate, and we have not opportunity even to sense the significance of the recommendations. Insofar as we can find out what the committee's reasoning is, I for one, am not impressed. I would strongly urge that we do not, in this respect at least, abide by the recommendation of the committee.

The gentleman from Iowa just now suggested that anyone from New Jersey should vote against the foreign aid bill because a New Jersey railroad failed to get assistance and yet money was made available through some international agency, not the Congress of the United States, to provide aid to a railroad in Yugoslavia.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will not yield until I finish my statement.

The gentleman from Iowa and I both serve on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I hope he knows me well enough to know that I try not to be parochial about such matters. We should not kill a good program because we happen to be disappointed at not getting some kind of relatively minor assistance for a particular agency or activity in our own State. I certainly would never consider voting against a program of this substance on such grounds.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Does the gentleman know of any program in the entire foreign aid bill during the past 17 years that the Congress ever reduced in amount below its need?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think we may be about to do just that right now. The answer is that of course I do.

Mr. PASSMAN. The argument the gentleman is putting up we hear every year, the same argument. I still say that this bill is fat. The purpose of the contingency fund is to take care of contingencies if they should arise. This item is eligible for assistance from the contingency fund, if such a need develops.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We have an emergency, as an example, in the Congo. Yet the gentleman simply dismisses this program. In this area it is apparently being proposed that we should cut back even more than has been contemplated. This also may be very unwise.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to concur in the remarks made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser]. First, may I say that I should hate to see my new President go before the United Nations tomorrow with his coattails figuratively cut off by the committee action on this particular item.

Second, may I say that if we make this cut we are damaging our argument that other nations should help with our foreign aid burden, that they should help carry the burden of foreign aid because this is a contributory aid program in which many other countries participate.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] for three-quarters of a minute.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, we are not going to settle the differences of opinion which have been expressed here in three-quarters of a minute, or even in three-quarters of a day. But I want to quote the President's statement of yesterday on this subject. He said:

> The amount proposed for contributions to international organizations would mean that the United States could not keep its commitments and pledges.

Mr. Chairman, in light of the differences expressed here and the inability of this House to resolve them, I choose to stick with President Johnson and his predecessors and to help him make good on our international commitments.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] for three-quarters of a minute.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I urge the members of this committee to support the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota.

I also want to say that as one of the Members at the United Nations this year, and in view of the pledges that have been made, I urge that we give our support to the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, since there are so many outstanding members on this committee, I feel that proper consideration will be given to our views, and I am sure that they will help us by supporting the United Nations with adequate funds in order to carry out its operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] for three-quarters of a minute.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I agree that we are not going to settle any basic differences of opinion here in three-quarters of a minute. However, I wish to join my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], in her expressions. She and I have been for several months at the U.N. I think it is perfectly clear to me at any rate—and I think she would agree with me—that of all the places in this bill where there is less room to maneuver without vitally affecting our basic position in the U.N., it seems to me this is it. Actually, while the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], has told us that there are things wrong with various parts of the program, the gentleman has not suggested where it be cut.

Mr. Chairman, we do have commitments that we will be unable to meet if we do not restore a part of this money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] for three-quarters of a minute.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I happily devote my three-quarters of a minute to Israel. I am deeply concerned over the possibility that the reduction in the committee's bill might result in a fatal diminution of our aid to the refugees. Our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. REID] who won universal acclaim as our Ambassador to Israel during the Eisenhower administration, has raised this question with forceful logic and convincing validity. I support his position. This is not the time to beat retreat from the good works of the United Nations in building a world of understanding, of brotherhood, and of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both of these amendments and to commend the subcommittee and gentleman from Louisiana for bringing out the reduction in the appropriation for international organizations and programs. The House will recall that early this year I rose on roughly a dozen occasions under the 1-minute rule and extended my remarks to include exhaustive research on the voluntary programs of the U.N. Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Stevenson both agreed that there was no audit to these funds possible in the U.N. and no control by us, once they were volunteered. They further corrected errors in their brochures and statements concerning them after we had pointed them out. It was during these reports to the House that I first brought out the so-called "Agricultural Aid to Cuba" and the World Health Organization shipments of trucks to Cuba, to say nothing of the atomic reactor in Yugoslavia and the radioactive isotopes in Poland, and so forth.

My original thesis was a question of legality of the U.N.'s so-called voluntary funds being greater than the 32.02 percent authorized by the Congress, and I pointed out that the State Department counsel avoided this on the basis that voluntary funds in the U.N. are different from the U.N.'s projected annual budget, and misconstrued the intent of Congress. The Clay Committee subsequently confirmed my statement. Mr. Chairman, I properly appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee and subsequently before this House at the time of the Foreign Aid Authorization passage, and offered an amendment to limit the U.S. contribution to the voluntary funds of the U.N., and it failed this House by less than six votes. I am, therefore, delighted that the Subcommittee on Appropriations is nailing this down at this time.

In connection with the UNICEF funds and funds for the Gaza strip, the gentleman from Louisiana has spoken well and, indeed, pointed it out on page 14 of the committee report under title of "Summary of Proposed Fiscal Year 1964 Contributions," that these programs are not damaged. I would only add that I am tired of solicitations for UNICEF in the United States as a voluntary agency while we underwrite it in the U.N. and with taxpayers' money from the United States. Personally, and as first pointed out by Senator Sam Houston of Texas, I feel there is a constitutional question as to whether we representatives of the people can properly vote one dime of the taxpayers' money for any charity. On top of this UNICEF turns around and loans money to the U.N. programed budget because of its overcollections, yet we hear the "bleeding hearts of projected need" argue tensely that we are against little children, instead of U.S. bankruptcy.

Especially the U.N. technical assistance program and special funds are fat as stated by our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. After my study I can tell you where they are fat. One of the best examples was in a separate statement I made on this floor exemplifying the one incident where the U.N. helped the United States with a project; namely, the Chinese blue helmeted U.N. "expert" who was retained at a fabulous price—plus expense—to research Arkansas rice paddies toward growing fish therein while raising cereal and thus became the penetrating piscatorial paddy expert.

Mr. Chairman, I call for the defeat of these amendments toward excessive expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] for three-quarters of a minute.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat shocked by the words that have been spoken this afternoon, words which indicate a willingness on the part of this House not only to dishonor our international commitments, but to scuttle the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing more precious to peace and to the hope of all of us for a world of security and a world at peace than the United Nations. Stability in the Middle East should be a principal objective of our foreign policy. The slashing of funds for the U.N. Emergency Force in the Middle East will jeopardize the already precarious situation. I heard the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] calculate the daily cost of this bill. But did he calculate the daily cost of the $52 billion appropriated for the Defense Department? We can make no better investment for the future than to provide the funds under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], and also in support of the amendments to that amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, because I believe this House should rise above party politics and vote on a proposal which would be of bipartisan authorship.

The gentleman from Michigan has mentioned the support which President Johnson has given to this program.

I should like to recall to the House the words of the late President, John F. Kennedy, in a press conference given just before his death in which he said:

> I just want to say personally as President—and my predecessor said the same—this program is essential to the conduct of our foreign policy and, therefore, I'm asking the Congress of the United States to give me the means of conducting the foreign policy of the United States.
>
> And if they do not want to do so, then they should recognize that they are severely limiting my ability to protect the national interest. That is how important I think this program is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the morning papers inform us that yesterday the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. conducted a hastily summoned news conference. It is reported and I quote:

> He denounced as shocking the House Appropriations Committee in suddenly chopping off $36 million in contributions to nine international agencies and programs.

It is not clear from press accounts whether this news conference where Mr. Stevenson undertook to denounce his own Government took place in the north lounge, south lounge, or his own plush quarters at the Waldorf-Astoria where he is supported in the lavish style to which he has become accustomed at the expense of the overburdened American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I resent Mr. Stevenson's ill-tempered and undiplomatic blast at one of the great committees of this Congress. Of course, making a whipping boy out of Congress has lately become a favorite pastime of many. I wonder, however, if there are not some permissible limits for people on the payroll of the executive branch as Mr. Stevenson is and so long has been.

Mr. Stevenson's elegant and finely honed prose seems for once to have deserted him as he spoke of the "meat-ax approach" of the Appropriations Committee.

I do not call 800 hours of research and hearings a meat-ax approach.

I do not regard 11,000 pages of transcript and the taking of 4 volumes and 3,849 pages of testimony as a meat-ax approach.

The examination by the subcommittee of virtually every one of the 1,244 projects presented by the executive branch in its attempted justification of this program is not indicative of any meat-ax approach.

Mr. Stevenson so very conveniently forgets the Clay Committee report of only a few months ago—March 20, 1963. It said of U.S. contributions to U.N. assistance agencies:

> U.S. contributions to the budgets of these organizations should not exceed our proportionate share of our regular U.N. assessment.

Just 4 months ago our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], pointed out in a speech on the floor of this House that we are contributing in excess of 33⅓ percent to 10 of the 28 U.N. budgets. He added that if we held our contributions to the level recommended in the Clay Committee report we would be saving the taxpayers of this country $37,836,000 annually.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that this figure is within approximately $1.8 million of the recommended $36 million reduction in appropriated funds proposed in this bill by the House Appropriations Committee.

Where then, does Mr. Stevenson get the license from his privileged sanctuary in the U.N. to assail this effort to bring reason and order into this facet of the foreign aid program. Mr. Chairman, I hope this House will sustain its committee and rebuke this arrogant and uncalled-for attack on the legislative process.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, let me say I believe very deeply this Nation is engaged in a mission. It is one which is neither fun nor free. It is one which we must face up to, and if we are to do this, Mr. Chairman, it is necessary for us to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

I favor this amendment because I believe that foreign aid, despite mistakes that have been made in the program, is in the enlightened self-interest of this country and the global objectives which our foreign policy have been seeking to achieve under Republican and Democratic Presidents alike.

We have heard it said by the chairman of the subcommittee that more presidents and heads of state have been assassinated since the inception of our foreign aid program than in any other comparable period of history. Without commenting on the logic of this assertion, including events of recent weeks, I would simply respond by saying that to the best of my knowledge there has never been a period in history when the freedom of so many nations and so many hundreds of millions of human beings has been assured by this same program which we hear so mercilessly derided.

I regret the failures of American foreign aid, Mr. Chairman, as we all do, but I am deeply proud of its successes, and on the balance which history will record I feel certain that generations of future Americans will share this pride.

We have heard it said by the gentleman from Michigan that we should treat cautiously the support that is urged in favor of this program from the American Association of University Women, the AFL–CIO, the U.S. Chamber, the Cooperative League, and others, that a special interest may be involved. Well, of course, this may be true of any legislation which is acted upon in committee and which comes to the floor of the House. On balance, it would seem to me that these and other organizations have little direct or indirect pecuniary interest in foreign assistance, that chances may be quite good that they are simply speaking as interested groups and citizens who feel that their tax dollars should be used to support programs in the developing countries, both directly and through international organizations, because they believe this represents an important avenue to a stronger free world.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of this body long enough to become accustomed to the irony of the House passing $50 billion defense budgets practically by voice vote, then taking out its frustration on foreign aid. We approve authorizations for the program which have no meaning, because we know that the ax will be wielded by the Appropriations Committee, and the public is confused when we call this the legislative process.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, the House approved an appropriation of about $149 million for U.N. voluntary contributions. This year the administration requested about $131 million, a reduction of about $19 million. The committee bill is willing to allow $100 million.

This will necessitate cutbacks in the U.N. technical assistance program; reduction of economic assistance to the Congo, where such help is the only means of reducing military tensions; a decrease in UNICEF's child health program; serious cuts in the Palestine refugee program, which currently spends at the exorbitant rate of 8 cents per day per refugee; and, finally, delay in the Indus water project which bears so importantly on the relations of India and Pakistan.

Mr. Chairman, the amounts authorized for these activities which relate so directly to the lives of millions upon millions of unfortunate human beings throughout the world are not unrealistic. The truth of the matter is that it would be unrealistic and lacking in humanity to allow the 22-percent cut to stand which has been inflicted by the Appropriations Committee on the authorization bill which we approved only a few short days ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this afternoon we are not in the position of not being able to see the forest because of the trees. We are not here today debating simply a worldwide public works bill, though I like to think that some measure of humanitarianism is involved in our objectives, and I think it is.

But let us not forget for one moment that at the heart of this foreign aid program is the self-interest of the United States, and today our self-interest lies in a peaceful world, in expanding markets, in resisting and pressing back the Communist walls around the world, by whatever name they may be called.

One way we achieve this is by keeping our defenses strong. We have done this. We have voted almost $50 billion for military defense in 1 year. Can anyone say that there is not waste in the military? Yet the military budget is scarcely questioned on this floor and rightly so, because we must maintain our strength to maintain the peace, and we absorb the waste and the loss without condoning or excusing it.

But at the same time we seek peaceful solutions to our international problems and we seek international solutions to problems before they reach the brink of armed hostilities.

I consider this foreign aid bill to be just as important a part of our national defense as the national defense bill itself. And yet today, after a reduction in the authorization bill of some $1.3 billion, we are faced with another $800 million cut on an authorization not of almost $50 billion, but of only $3.6 billion.

I am concerned about stabilizing the economic situation in the Congo to avoid a potential recurrence of the open warfare that cannot help but involve us at far more expense than we are talking about today. I am concerned about the refugee problem in the Middle East—a problem that has brought us to the brink time and again since World War II. Time after time a Middle East crisis will arise and more often than not the refugee problem is a major issue. The crisis fades away and we forget the refugees as a burning issue. Now we propose to back out on even the palliative operation we have been supporting.

I do not pretend to have the detailed knowledge of this program, project by project, as do the members of the committee. No one feels stronger than I that the reexamination of foreign aid which we have had in connection with the authorization bill over the past few weeks has been a healthy and a desirable thing. I would say further that the chairman of this subcommittee performs a real service in questioning and probing continually the weakness which any program of this size is bound to develop.

It is the failures, not the successes of a Congressman that come to public attention. It is the failures, not the successes of foreign aid that have made the headlines and have made this the least popular program in the country today.

I have tried many a lawsuit on both sides of the table. It is easier to defend a case—to poke holes in the plaintiff's case—than it is to build up an affirmative case and plug every hole in the dike that develops under relentless cross-examination. And the opponents of foreign aid knows this, too.

Presidents of both parties have called foreign aid the most important weapon in their foreign policy arsenal. Only last month the new President, speaking from this very podium, assured our friends of the free world that the United States would stand by its commitments. Today we should underscore his statement. Today we are undercutting it.

After World War I the then President of the United States was undercut on his commitments for a League of Nations. Let us not renounce our commitments now, in a world made infinitely more dangerous than the world of the twenties and thirties.

Let us stop aid to the recovered nations of Western Europe. Let us insist on those restored nations shouldering their full share of the burden of helping the developing nations. Let us fight waste and unwise projects. But let us not endanger the safety of this Nation by cuts of the magnitude proposed here today after—I repeat after—the authorization bill has been so drastically cut. Particularly, let us cut in the area which this amendment involves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, this really points up how ridiculous this whole issue is in bringing a bill before the House after long hearings ending on August 19, and waiting until now to come in here and try to steamroll a bill through on Friday, Saturday, and today. We are now operating under the 45-second rule as to whether we should issue an additional $20 million to the United Nations.

Let us give President Johnson a vote of confidence as he prepares to make his first appearance before the United Nations. Let us make certain that President Johnson will speak for a truly united nation. As representatives of the people, Congress can give Lyndon B. Johnson the strength of U.S. purpose which a restored bill will indicate. In unity there is strength, and in strength there is a sense of greatness. Our new President needs our support. I urge the Congress to restore cuts in this program, an essential arm of U.S. foreign policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I did not believe this amendment would evoke so much discussion. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce testified in favor of the full amount before our Appropriations Committee. Many groups have testified in support of it. The amount of money involved is only a fraction of the entire bill. It only makes good sense to maintain the prestige of the United States before the eyes of the world by restoring the funds needed for the United States to carry out its responsibility as leader of the free world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we never reach the time when we are to let the United Nations write the legislation that we consider here in the Congress of the United States.

I ask for a vote on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONTE) there were ayes 99, noes 127.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CONTE and Mr. PASSMAN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 105, noes 149.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY of New York) there were—ayes 89, noes 149.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this may be an unpopular thing to do at this moment in view of the vote that just took place. Nevertheless it seems to me that the underdeveloped peoples of the world, the underdeveloped countries of the world should not be under the impression that they have been forsaken altogether, that not alone the President of the United States is doing what he can for them, but there are a goodly number of Members of this House who similarly recognize their plight and seek to do what they can.

Reducing foreign aid from $3.6 billion as authorized to approximately $2.8 billion seems to me to be sheer folly—$1 billion represents approximately one-fifth of 1 percent of our gross national product. So, reducing foreign aid by a few hundred million dollars does not seem to me to represent good sense when our world strategy is so dependent, as it is, on our foreign aid. Foreign aid started as a crash program, known as the Marshall plan. There is no question in my mind but that the Marshall plan saved Europe from communism.

Now we are dealing with approximately six times as many people as we dealt with in the Marshall plan. The underdeveloped countries of the world represent this many as compared to the people in Europe benefiting from the Marshall plan. When we appropriate the same amount as we did for the Marshall plan we only give one-sixth to the underdeveloped countries because of this population difference.

The total economic assistance appropriated is approximately $1.8 billion and $1 billion for military aid. Supporting assistance comes to $300 million. This is not economic aid but military aid in a sense since it matches the budget deficits of the aided countries resulting from military expenditures. What we are actually doing is, under grants and loans, providing for $1.5 billion for economic aid and $1.3 billion for military aid. I am not against military aid because I think it is necessary to aid those countries that are under threat of the Soviet Union, but I do say it is absolutely necessary also to aid economically the underdeveloped countries of the world. I say this because just as we kept Europe from going Communist, if we are going to keep the underdeveloped countries from turning away from the West, we have to assist them. I trust, therefore, that the sum appropriated will be increased to the sum authorized by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

It certainly is a sad state of affairs when we hear that we are contributing in the way of foreign aid less to all of South America than what the Soviet Union is contributing to the aid of Cuba. So I urge the Members for selfish reasons to think twice before they vote down any increase of moneys appropriated for this purpose.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 17:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

"Ryukyu Islands, Army

"Administration

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government of the Ryukyu Islands, as authorized by the Act of July 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 461), as amended (76 Stat. 742); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), of individuals not to exceed ten in number; not to exceed $4,000 for contingencies for the High Commissioner, to be expended in his discretion; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of six passenger motor vehicles, of which four shall be for replacement only; and construction, repair, and maintenance of buildings, utilities, facilities, and appurtenances; $10,000,000, of which not to exceed $2,000,000 shall be available for administrative and information expenses, and $2,000,000 shall be available for transfer to the Ryukyu Domestic Water Corporation for construction of a portion of the integrated island water system: *Provided*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made outside continental United States when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sections 355 and 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended, section 4774(d) of title 10, United States Code, civil service or classification laws, or provisions of law prohibiting payment of any person not a citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army to pay ocean transportation charges from United States ports, including territorial ports, to ports in the Ryukyus for the movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals residing in such areas: *Provided further*, That the President may transfer to any other department or agency any function or functions provided for under this appropriation, and there shall be transferred to any such department or agency, without reimbursement and without regard to the appropriation from which procured, such property as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate primarily to any function or functions so transferred."

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee a question. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate on this foreign aid bill very closely today and I want to ask the gentleman whether he intends to vote for the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. I might say to the gentleman that I have served as chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill for 9 years and I have not, of course, ever voted against our committee's bill. Certainly I am going to vote for this bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. The reason why I ask the question is because I have never heard the gentleman in the 48 minutes of time he took in general debate say anything here today in favor of the bill. I am just a freshman, but I have been listening very closely.

I have not heard the gentleman say one kind thing about the bill all day. There must be some reason why he is going to vote for it. Would he be good enough to tell me?

Mr. PASSMAN. As chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations, I represent the subcommittee and the full committee. I represent the committee's views and I act accordingly.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 1:

"LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"Not to exceed $3,500,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) shall be available during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals, purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only) at not to exceed $3,000, and not to exceed $9,000 for entertainment allowances for members of the Board of Directors: *Provided*, That (1) fees or dues to international organizations of credit institutions engaged in financing foreign trade, (2) necessary expenses (including special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Bank or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, or the investigation or appraisal of any property in respect to which an application for a loan has been made, and (3) expenses (other than internal expenses of the Bank) incurred in connection with the issuance and servicing of guarantees, insurance, and reinsurance shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: Page 16, line 24, strike the period and insert the following: "None of the funds provided herein shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation or hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Export-Import Bank is a respected U.S. taxpayer-supported institution. However, it has been forced of late to undertake a dangerous new policy. That dangerous new policy is guaranteeing credit for Communist governments. U.S. wheat sales to Russia are being negotiated with the possibility of Export-Import Bank guarantee. U.S. corn sales to Communist-bloc countries have already been cleared for credit guarantee by the Export-Import Bank.

These grain sales were presented to the American people as private-trade transactions, as distinguished from government-to-government transactions.

Mr. Chairman, the Export-Import Bank is not a private bank in any sense. It is a 100-percent-U.S. Government-financed institution. Transactions guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank are therefore subsidized by the U.S. taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, if we give credit to the Communist governments, the grain sales, to that degree, do not help our balance-of-payments problem, nor do they reduce our gold outflow.

The only possible way that we can benefit economically from sales to Communist governments is by insisting on cash on the barrelhead.

Mr. Chairman, the Soviet Union is not a good credit risk. It is already in default on long-standing multi-billion-dollar obligations to the U.S. taxpayers. U.S. taxpayers should be protected against holding the bag for deadbeat Communist governments.

The Export-Import Bank should be restricted from any further guarantees of credit for any Communist government. That is precisely what my amendment would assure.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentleman for bringing this amendment to us. Many of us have been concerned at the prospect that an instrumentality of the U.S. Government would guarantee the credit of Communist nations to purchase American commodities.

Mr. Chairman, I would strongly urge the adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. I now yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. I too want to join in commending the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]. The substance of the gentleman's amendment is similar to a bill which I introduced but which has not yet, of course, had legislative consideration by the appropriate committee.

However, I share the views of the gentleman from Illinois in relation to the issue of extending credit through an agency of our Government for the sale of these commodities to Communist countries.

I want to urge support of the amendment which the gentleman offered.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's views. I shall support his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have opposed sale of subsidized American wheat to Communist nations, especially the Soviet Union. I believe the proposed sale violates the law.

However, that is not the only reason. Especially I oppose shipping surplus grain because by furnishing this wheat the United States actually will be in reality helping communism and the collective farming system succeed. By making the sale possible—which an Export-Import Bank guarantee does—we will be strengthening the Communist bloc because grain and food is a strategic material.

This amendment to prevent the Export-Import Bank from guaranteeing payment by the Communists to private American banks should prevail. I hope it passes.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Under the gentleman's amendment the taxpayers would avoid the risk of nonpayment by the Russians?

Mr. FINDLEY. They would, indeed.

Mr. DOLE. Under present negotiations, as I understand them, present negotiations represent a departure in dealing with Russia. I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Is it true that we have never guaranteed 100 percent credit with any country?

Mr. FINDLEY. I believe that is correct.

Mr. QUIE. Even if Russia would pay back the loan as she probably would if she wanted to buy wheat again, it would be at a lower rate of interest than they would have to pay without an Export-Import Bank guarantee, the way the late President Kennedy said it would be?

Mr. FINDLEY. And to that degree, I might add, the taxpayers of the United States would be subsidizing credit for Communist governments.

Mr. QUIE. For that reason I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Let me say that the Export-Import Bank has an outstanding reputation.

In principle I like this amendment, and that is why I do not rise in opposition to it. But I am of the opinion that if the Congress should start putting language of such type in this bill we could get into complications.

However, I do not want to take the position of opposing the amendment. It is my understanding that its purpose is to keep the Export-Import Bank from guaranteeing credit to exporters which may ship to Communist countries. Is that the purpose?

Mr. FINDLEY. That is the purpose. I might say to the gentleman the language is somewhat different from the language which the other body turned down. From the language the gentleman has before him, I have deleted the words "heretofore" and the word following, "or", so that this could not be interpreted as being ex post facto or requiring the President to back away from any previous commitments. It applies only to future commitments with Communist governments, restraining the Export-Import Bank from providing any guarantee of credit on those transactions.

Mr. PASSMAN. I approve the principle of the gentleman's amendment, but nevertheless I have nothing but praise for the Export-Import Bank. I do not know of any instance where they have gotten us into trouble over a commitment. That is why I would like to have time to study this amendment and the implications involved, what the Export-Import Bank proposes to do. If they did not have a very excellent reputation I would not take the position I am taking.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Findley amendment.

The time to act is now while the issue is before us. We have all heard about the negotiations that have been going on in the proposed wheat sale to Russia. As a matter of fact, the former President of the United States, the late Mr. Kennedy, laid down some specific guidelines as to this deal. When it was first proposed last October, the late President in clear and specific language laid down some excellent terms. He said this would be a private, commercial transaction, the Government's role being limited to granting the necessary permission. The sale would be for gold or American dollars, either cash on delivery or "normal commercial terms." Basically, the Soviet Union would be treated like any other cash customer.

But now we find that the wheat deal is bogged down. President Kennedy said this wheat would be carried in American ships, and Khrushchev objected and everything now indicates that we will relax this part of the arrangement. After it developed that the Soviet Union did not want to pay cash for the wheat either in gold or U.S. dollars, and that they did not want to deal on "normal commercial terms," they started to negotiate, and the talk has been rather prevalent that the Import-Export Bank would finance the purchase by having the U.S. taxpayers guarantee the loan. There is great sentiment for this kind of an amendment.

Backing out on terms of the deal is just a typical Communist maneuver. First a proposal is made that is sound and reasonable, then a bargain was seemingly struck whereby Russia demanded a little more; then we talk about guaranteeing loans and soon Khrushchev will get exactly what he wanted in the first place. I challenge any Member of this body to stand up and tell us why we should be guaranteeing a Communist loan when we have to borrow the money to make the loan.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. I am not prepared to answer that because I agree thoroughly with the gentleman. There has been some discussion that perhaps this could be put off until we see what the intent of the Export-Import Bank is in this area. On November 5, 1963, there was an article in the Washington Post which indicated that the Export-Import Bank has already agreed to underwrite the sale of corn to Hungary and guarantee the credit 100 percent, not the usual 50 percent.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. If a deal has been made with Hungary for corn, would it not naturally follow that a loan would also be guaranteed for Russia?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Where do they get the authority to be guaranteeing shipments to Communist countries?

Mr. HOEVEN. I have no way of knowing where they get the authority. They do a lot of things without specific authority.

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman will yield, on page 21573 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 12, 1963, in debate in the other body the Senator from South Dakota, Senator MUNDT, mentions this article and more or less verifies all this.

Mr. FINDLEY. The source is an interpretation by the Attorney General. That is the real source.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let us get this down to the simplest denominator: Are we going to have the American wheat merchant have an equal opportunity in the world market or are we not?

This amendment will not keep other countries from getting the credits they need to sell their wheat in the world market. It will not keep Canadian merchants from buying wheat in the United States and having it financed with the help of the Export-Import Bank. Why should the American merchant be the only merchant in the whole world who cannot sell wheat to Russia on an equal, competitive basis? We are the country that has not yet sold our supply of wheat. We have an opportunity this year which may not come again soon to get rid of some of the wheat that is in storage at the expense of American taxpayers. Why should we relegate our merchants to the position of being the one group of merchants in the world that cannot sell their wheat on an equal basis?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. The point of this amendment is not whether the sales will occur, but whether the taxpayers will subsidize the credit. If it is a good deal, let them get the credit from a private bank.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Does this amendment keep other countries from getting the same kind of credit to sell their wheat?

Mr. FINDLEY. I know of no other country that has access to the funds of the Export-Import Bank to subsidize at the expense of the taxpayers any credit terms of any Communist country.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. My understanding is, and this is the conclusion I have reached after reading the debate in the other body, that other countries have sold their wheat or would not be prohibited from financing such sales and all we are doing is keeping our merchants from being able to finance their sales under certain circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FINDLEY) there were—ayes 106, noes 112.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. PASSMAN and Mr. FINDLEY as tellers.

The committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 133, noes 133.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 6:

"POSTAGE STAMPS

"For an additional amount for 'Postage stamps', to remain available until expended: first session of the Eighty-eighth Congress, $45,710; second session of the Eighty-eighth Congress, $45,710."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the language found on page 17, line 12 through line 24 and on page 18, lines 1 through 10.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, that language has already been read.

The CHAIRMAN. We have read down through page 18, line 10.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against this language.

The CHAIRMAN. To which language does the gentleman refer?

Mr. GROSS. Page 17, beginning on line 12, through line 24; and on page 18, line 1 through line 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The only paragraph now pending is the paragraph on page 18 beginning line 6 and going through line 10.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how you could make a point of order against this division of the bill without having the contingent expenses of the House read in its entirety.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mills). We are reading the bill by paragraphs, as all general appropriation bills are read, by paragraph. If any material is subject to a point of order, the point of order must be made on the reading of the paragraph.

Mr. GROSS. Very well, Mr. Chairman; I make the point of order against the language on page 18, beginning at line 6 through line 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GROSS. As not being germane to this bill. This is not a supplemental appropriation bill. This is a bill for the purpose of providing funds for foreign aid.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mills). This matter is a part of the bill reported to the House and now being considered in the Committee of the Whole, a general appropriation bill. The Chair cannot sustain a point of order on the basis that it does not relate to some other matter in the appropriation bill. It is part of the bill before the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GROSS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Are such fringe benefits as an additional amount for stationery, postage stamp increase allowance, telegraph and telephone allowances considered foreign aid?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not be called upon to pass on that.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

JOINT ITEMS

Education of Pages

For an additional amount of "Education of pages", $2,655, which amount shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Iowa rise?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I insist that the bill be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman insists that the bill be read.

The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—CLAIMS AND JUDGEMENTS, FEDERAL FUNDS

Claims and judgments, $12,982,095

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GROSS. The Clerk did not read the language in full, beginning on page 18, line 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will begin reading at line 11, page 18, and read the language in full.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 604. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any official, employee or other person serving in any office of any of the several States of the United States or any political subdivision thereof.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIPSCOMB

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Lipscomb: Page 21, line 6, after "in" insert "Title I of".

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, this is a clarifying amendment to section 604. As now written this section pertains to the entire bill. It is intended by this amendment that section 604 pertain only to title I of the act.

I have discussed this particular amendment with the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. Passman], and I understand it is agreed to by the chairman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is the gentleman tying this amendment to title I?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Title I, yes.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say to the gentleman that subsequent to the bill having been reported to the House, it was brought to my attention that if we enact this amendment it will apply not only to title I, but even under title I all contracts that the Federal Government has with States, and so forth, would go out of the window—university contracts, and others, under which we pay personnel in the foreign countries.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. You will remember this is a new program springing up with the AID agency whereby they are making contracts with State governments.

Mr. PASSMAN. I, personally, will accept this amendment inasmuch as we are improving it, at least. I do not have that right to agree, but I do not know of any member of the committee who would want to object to this amendment.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read a follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Broomfield as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Lipscomb: On page 21, strike out lines 6 through 10, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment is not a substitute amendment. The gentleman's amendment is to delete language. We must act first on the Lipscomb amendment, and then the gentleman's amendment would be in order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Broomfield].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Broomfield: Page 21, strike lines 6 through 10, inclusive.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out section 604 stating that:

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any official, employee or other person serving in any office of any of the several States of the United States or any political subdivision thereof.

I cannot hope to comprehend the reasons why this particular section was inserted in the bill last Saturday, and it is even further from human comprehension that a majority of the members of the committee would have seen fit to include this provision in the bill we have before us today.

Look what the language implies.

It says, in effect, that all State employees and elected officials, all city employees and elected officials, all county employees and elected officials, all presidents of land-grant colleges, all the professors at State universities, all the faculty at our city colleges and junior colleges are judged incompetent by Congress.

It prohibits a single nickel in salary or a single penny in expense money from being used to pay a State, city, or local employee for his services to his government.

There has been a great deal of talk about States rights, about too much Federal Government, about government getting too big and away from the people.

If there was ever a proposal which brought out this trend, this is it.

It is a direct order from Congress that the Federal Government is the keeper of all wisdom, all intellect, all that is good and righteous.

It is a repudiation of all the help and the hope which State and local governmental employees have given to our oversea aid programs in the past.

It is even contradictory of the report we received today in connection with this bill. On page 23, quoting from the Second Annual Report of the Inter-American Development Bank in connection with the Social Progress Trust Fund, which the committee states also applies to the criteria established for financial assistance under the Alliance for Progress program:

There has, however, been little significant progress in real property taxation.

And most certainly, ladies and gentlemen, there will be no further progress in equitable property taxation—one area in which Latin America can provide the revenues it needs for its own betterment—if this particular section is permitted to remain where it is.

I ask the members of the committee this question. Who are the experts on property tax? Who are the experts on land reform?

Do they come from the Federal Government? You bet they do not. They come from local units of government; from our individual States, from our cities, from our counties.

Who are best qualified to carry out educational programs? Who are most qualified to set up curriculums, conduct schools and training? The Federal Government, which the proponents of this program would have us believe?

I do not think so, and I am sure that this view is shared by the vast majority of my colleagues present today.

There have been few more critical of foreign aid than I have been. I have made my views known in no uncertain terms that I was dissatisfied with the approach and the methods we have been using in many parts of the world.

I sponsored a number of limiting amendments in the foreign aid authorization bill, some of which, I am happy to say, will become law shortly.

I have been critical of the Alliance and the way it has worked, or rather not worked, in many areas of Latin America.

But this section, if it is allowed to stand, would guarantee that the Alliance for Progress could not and never would work.

It would place the entire program completely in the hands of the theorists with little practical knowledge of what makes an economy grow, or what encourages political freedom, or what forces bring about the social justice we all seek.

If we want to turn this program completely over to those with little practical experience, then let us keep this section. But if we do, there is not a one of us who ever again would have the right to complain because the Alliance for Progress was not successful, or was not moving fast enough, or was not realizing its objectives.

Retaining this section would guarantee that there could never be progress in the Alliance for Progress. It would deny any competence at the State and local level in handling local problems efficiently and effectively, and it would preclude the use of these experts at the local level in helping solve similar projects abroad.

For better than 2 years, I have been attempting to convince the Agency for International Development that it was aiming too high, that it was basing its program in a morass of central government bureaucracy and redtape, emanating not only here in Washington but in the capitals of the countries we were attempting to assist as well.

For 2 years, I have battled within the Agency for International Development for a look at a new level of assistance, a grassroots level of aid, which could be cheaper, more effective and better understood by the people we are attempting to assist.

Only after repeated meetings and almost endless argument was AID convinced that it should give this approach a try. It will soon have that chance.

Two-thirds of the cost of this program will be paid for, not by the Federal Government, but by the local units of government involved. AID will only pay travel expenses for the experts and technicians participating in this program.

Private industry, local units of government, architectural and land-planning firms are donating their personnel and their know-how to this effort. The cost to the Federal Government is negligible.

It presumes that the best place to start on economic and political development is at the grassroots, with the people, rather than some faraway ivory tower with those who are unwilling to dirty their hands in honest labor.

If we want an efficient, economical approach to foreign aid, if we want to correct its deficiencies, then we had better start getting our programs down to a level where they can be of some direct benefit.

The Federal Government can obtain a million dollars worth of talent for every $10,000 it pays for travel expenses under this program.

If my colleagues want to make foreign aid fail, if they want to throw more money down a rathole, then I would suggest they retain section 604.

If they want to insult the local and State officials and employees in their own districts, then they should vote to retain this section.

If, however, my colleagues believe, as I do, that some of the efficiency, some of the knowledge our local units of government have used in the past has a place in teaching underdeveloped countries how to solve their own problems by themselves, then vote to eliminate this misguided section of the bill.

I have no idea what this section is supposed to do for the appropriation, but I can guarantee one thing. It would effectively block any efficient use of our foreign aid funds in underdeveloped countries. The money would still come out of the Federal Treasury, but the results would be meaningless and ineffective.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. In other words, if this section is to remain in the bill, this knocks out all contracts with universities.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS. You have to have a bureaucrat do the job instead of a university professor.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. That is true.

Mr. HAYS. I think it is fair to point out that it is my understanding this amendment was put in to settle a little factional fight out in California. I do not know whether the author realized that when he was settling that he was also taking care of others, making this apply to universities, all State and county officials who may be engaged on a part-time basis on tax reform, or agricultural experts in agricultural colleges who can assist in land reform. While this amendment might have the desired purpose in California, and I do not presume to get into that argument, it does a lot more which would do real damage.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I would just like to clarify the matter to the gentleman from Ohio. This amendment was not proposed because of any factional fight in California. It is true a contract has been signed between AID and California. This fact brought the matter to my attention; I had no thought in mind about any problems in the State of California. There is a principle involved here. Whether or not this amendment touches on it in a proper way may be in question. There is a principle that must be taken care of. While we debate this particular amendment, I hope the subject is not clouded by any thought it is to get at a factional fight in the State of California.

Mr. HAYS. If there was a principle involved, the right way to handle it is in a legislative way, not tacking it onto this bill, when members of the full committee said to me they did not realize how far this goes, what the implications were in bringing it up on Saturday, and then on Monday for the House to consider. I do not think that is practical. I think the gentleman himself would admit that it goes far beyond what he intended in the beginning.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it would be the part of wisdom for the committee to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. Although this language is obviously a restriction upon an appropriation, the point made by the gentleman from Ohio is valid. This is really far-reaching legislative language which should be considered, if it is to be considered, in the legislative committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I have talked to the Administrator of the AID agency within the past few minutes about this language, and he says he is sure it would have far-reaching consequences on the administration of this program. If the AID agency cannot draw upon the great land grant colleges and other institutions of education in the various States which have carried a lion's share of the work in the industrial and agricultural technical assistance programs, then the only other place to which it can turn to carry out the mandates of the Congress will be to an increased bureaucracy which nobody, of course, wants. This language, it seems to me, should therefore be deleted.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. My State is one which has first-hand experience in this matter. The Florida Agricultural Experiment Station and the College of Agriculture have contributed very materially to the improvement of agricultural programs in Latin America. Those contributions to hemisphere solidarity would be impossible if this section were to remain in the bill. The motive is good but the present language could be very harmful and should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is eminently correct. I am not here in the position of a critic, but I think a mistake has been made.

I would like to call the attention of the Members of the Committee to a speech made by the President on December 6, just a little over a week ago, pertinent to the California situation which has been mentioned here.

The speech is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, PREPARED FOR CEREMONIES MARKING THE SIGNING OF ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND REPUBLIC OF CHILE, DECEMBER 6, 1963

I have asked the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, to convey this personal message of greetings to those, both here and in California, who are participating in today's transcontinental signing ceremony.

Last February, President Kennedy and Governor Brown inaugurated a new dimension in the Alliance for Progress: the enlistment of the resources of one of our great States—California—in the effort to speed the development of one of our Alliance partners—the Republic of Chile.

Since then, dedicated and imaginative men from the State of California, in cooperation with the Agency for International Development have worked with our Chilean friends to convert that plan into a concrete program. They have succeeded. The documents signed today open the way for Chile to tap the superb resources of men and experience which California's private and public institutions have in such abundance. And California will be enriched by the experience. For it will be working with a country, as we saw recently in the image of Chile series, with a great cultural and intellectual heritage.

President Kennedy called this California-Chile plan a pioneering effort under the Alliance. I certainly agree. It is the first attempt to bring the full range of resources of one of our States to bear on the development problems of another nation. It is also a new initiative to bring the Alliance closer to our peoples. For under it, individuals and institutions within our two countries can now develop their own close patterns of cooperation under the Alliance.

Last week, in addressing the distinguished Latin American delegates and Ambassadors who had come to Washington to pay their last respects to our late President, I reaffirmed this Nation's continuing commitment to the goals of the Alliance for Progday taking this significant step to make this Alliance a living memorial to John F. Kennedy.

Thanks to the leadership of Governor Brown, and the fine cooperation between his representatives, the Republic of Chile and our AID mission in Santiago, we are today taking this significant step to make good on this pledge.

In asking the Administrator of the AID Agency, Mr. David Bell, to execute these documents, I want to express my sincere support and best wishes for the success of the program. I also ask Ambassador Gutierrez, who has done so much to help us understand and appreciate the country he represents, to convey to the Government and the people of Chile my assurance of our continued cooperation with them in the pursuit of the high objectives which Chile has set for itself under the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the language of the President is very persuasive. The argument made by the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Ohio is convincing. I trust that we will defer this matter to a time when the appropriate legislative committee, which I am sure is the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has ample time in which to pursue it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], has offered many valuable amendments to the Committee on Appropriations. As far as I know, they have been helpful, but I concur with the distinguished majority leader that this proposal could be a bit far reaching, involving, as it does, all contracts with colleges, and universities, and trade schools.

If I should give the gentleman assurance that, as chairman of the subcommittee, I will write to the AID Agency and state that we would be displeased if they should continue to make similar contracts and that they would have to account for them before the subcommittee or the full Committee on Appropriations, would that action satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. It is a fact, is it not, that the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Mutual Security did not have any testimony whatsoever in regard to this program or the expansion of this concept of foreign aid?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. It has been reported in the press that similar programs such as the California-Chile program may expand to all 50 States of the Union in one form or another.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is possible under the present legislation.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. If every State of the Union begins taking personnel from their staffs and putting them under an AID contractual program it is going to be a good-sized crew of a State's officers, employees or other people who will be working for AID under contract.

Mr. PASSMAN. Presently there is only one such arrangement in effect. We cannot believe that the AID agency will continue in the face of the legislative history we are making today.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I recognize what the gentleman is saying, Mr. Chairman, and what has been said here on the floor today.

Mr. PASSMAN. Certainly I shall counsel with the gentleman. However, I would not want to see legislation passed that would cancel all the contracts in the 50 States made by trade schools, colleges, and universities.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. The legislative history should show at this point that the Agency for International Development will not go into any further programs of this sort until your committee has had the opportunity to look into the proposals.

Mr. PASSMAN. We are going to insist that they not do so.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I would like the RECORD to show that on the minority side of the subcommittee there is certainly my personal agreement with the chairman's statement as to the way we feel about this very large proliferation of brandnew AID agencies. We do not need it. We have 1 agency in 101 nations now. I do not think we need more agencies to get into any more nations. I certainly will do whatever is necessary—sign a letter with the chairman, if that is necessary, or anything else, to stop that.

Mr. PASSMAN. We are in complete accord. Now is the time to stop it. But, in so doing, we should not cancel all the contracts outstanding.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of the subcommittee is doing the proper thing here in urging the elimination of the language. The matter should be looked into further at a later date and the proper decision reached with more information than we now have.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I trust that when the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee, gets around to writing this letter, he will include me out.

Mr. PASSMAN. I shall leave the gentleman out, of course, if that is what he wishes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. PASSMAN. We already have an agreement.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I do not think you need to make that agreement. I think you are going to win without it. Not everybody here is unanimously against State-Federal contracts for foreign technical assistance. As a matter of fact, if the State of Ohio wants to pick up part of the tab—I doubt that it will—but if they do, I am certainly not going to write any legislation that will prevent them. As a matter of fact, if there is any clarification needed, I propose to offer an amendment on the legislative side next year saying that under proper conditions they may enter into such contracts and we will let the House decide it.

Mr. PASSMAN. And we will bring the bill back with the same language that we have today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 21, after line 10, insert a new section as follows:
>
> "SEC. 605. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to conduct or assist in conducting any program (including but not limited to the payment of salaries, administrative expenses, and the conduct of research activities) related directly or indirectly to the establishment of a National Service Corps or similar domestic peace corps type of program."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Because of the tie vote of 133 to 133 on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], it may be helpful to Members of the House to have added background information about the role of the Export-Import Bank in any sale of any commodity to Russia or Communist-bloc countries.

Our late President announced the decision to allow the sale of wheat to Russia and its Communist satellites from a prepared statement at his press conference on October 9. He said at that time that he had "concluded that such sales by private dealers for American dollars or gold, either cash on delivery or normal commercial terms, should not be prohibited by the Government."

On November 5, in an article written by Vincent J. Burke for the Los Angeles Times and the Washington Post, it became apparent that financing arrangement for these sales to the Communist countries does represent a new departure—the U.S. Government and the taxpaying citizens of this country are assuming full credit risk for these sales. Any loss sustained by the seller of the grain or the banks financing the sales by extending credit to Russia, Hungary, or other Communist-bloc countries is insured by the Federal Government through its Export-Import Bank. The Federal Government, through the Export-Import Bank, is insuring payment by the Communist-bloc countries on terms of 25 percent down and 18 months in which to pay the balance.

I repeat, there is no risk for the shippers or the bankers. Full risk, full guarantee that the grain will be paid for is assumed by the taxpaying citizens of the United States through the wholly American-owned Export-Import Bank.

This guarantee is characterized as a normal extension of credit—as coming within the "normal commercial terms" the late President stipulated in his formal statement.

The Export-Import Bank in its "Memorandum: Export-Import Bank Guarantee of Sales to Bloc, November 6, 1963"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 12, 1963, page 21576—puts itself on record to that effect:

> The Export-Import Bank stresses that there is nothing new in these arrangements—aside from the fact that a short-term credit risk is being covered with respect to a Soviet-bloc country."

I submit this is a complete departure from the established practice of an institution and the embracement by that institution of a technique never before used is not normal.

These are not "normal commercial terms." Far from being "normal commercial terms" the Export-Import Bank has in fact never extended credit or credit insurance to Russia, to Hungary, or to any other Communist-bloc country.

They comprise, in fact, an entirely new departure in the credit insurance program of the Export-Import Bank. Since its inception in 1934, the Export Bank has never insured a credit risk for Communist Russia or Hungary. Except for Yugoslavia, which both Congress and the White House, treat in a special category, insurance of credit risks or direct extensions of credit have not been extended to Communist countries. The present decision constitutes an entirely new use of Government guarantee of credit and establishes a new national policy of far-reaching significance which should either be approved or disapproved by Congress. How are the interests of American taxpayers protected by compelling them to underwrite and guarantee a Communist dictator's credit rating in this manner.

Mr. Chairman, the question before us is not resistance to the sale of wheat or of other agricultural or commercial products, to Russia or Russia's European satellites. This decision was made at the administration level at the White House and announced on October 9.

Many are still concerned with the question whether it is right under prevailing world conditions for our Government to compel American taxpayers to underwrite trade with the Communists through the device of guaranteeing the good faith of Communist dictators in meeting their payments of principal and interest.

The Export-Import Bank is a Government-chartered institution. Its capital fund and operating expenses are of U.S. Treasury origin. Every dollar it has, in the last analysis, belongs to the Government of the United States—to the taxpayers of this country.

The new and unprecedented policy to use public funds to guarantee payment of private commercial accounts owed by Communist-bloc countries, in my opinion, is unwise. The question is, then, to determine whether or not this is wise policy and to further determine whether or not this new policy will become a precedent for a vast new allocation of American guarantees to strengthen and rescue the sagging economy of Communist countries.

We do not question the legality of any commercial transaction under any grain sale agreement, but the wisdom of the policy, and whether it is prudent to compel our citizens to assume every type of risk involved.

The Attorney General of the United States advised the Secretary of State, that, by his interpretation of the law—no infraction would be committed by private traders participating under this program within the procedures announced by the Government.

Thus the private traders and their commercial bankers have the legal right to sell their grain and other products to the Communists on credit instead of for gold or for American dollars. Private traders and commercial bankers are not willing to extend their own credit to Communist countries whose records of repayment and of broken promises has been so disappointing and disillusioning. This House has an obligation certainly to be as alert and energetic about protecting the finances of our taxpaying constituents as private firms have in protecting the investments of their stockholders and themselves.

I presume the Export-Import Bank was suggested to guarantee payment of the obligations assumed by Communist countries because commercial bankers or exporters are not willing to assume the credit risk of repayment involved in sales to Communist countries. The private exporters and bankers are reluctant to extend their own credit in order to get the profit and income they will receive from these transactions. They must, therefore, regard the transactions as a bad risk and the Communists as insecure debtors.

Russia, in the event you have forgotten, has obligations on loans from the United States which are still outstanding from its World War I loans. The outstanding principal as of last June 30 is $192,601,297.37. Interest due and unpaid is $428,819,108.19 and the total amount in default is $621,420,405.56.

The present Soviet Union Government insists these are not its obligations, but the czarist government's obligations instead. They were made by the Government of the United States to the Government of Russia, the entire amount is in default, and is now repudiated by the Government of Russia.

There are more modern obligations due us from the Soviet Union, stemming from World War II.

That Government agreed to accept and pay for the pipeline lend-lease which had been ordered for them and was scheduled to be delivered to them at the end of the war. The amount agreed to was $222,494,574. Of that, $205,709,633 remains due.

That debt has nothing to do with the main body of lend-lease shipped to Russia during the war. Congress appropriated in all about $11 billion and, as yet, no value of what is owed to us has been negotiated with the Russians. Our last offer, in 1960, was something like $800 million to settle it. Their final offer was something like $300 million and they demanded certain other trade concessions, at which point the negotiations broke down. Hungary also owes this country more than $9 million from previous loans or advances.

This is not an admirable credit record. The banker, dealing with the funds of his own bank would be rare who would advance very much money to such a credit applicant. This then appears to be the reason the guarantee of the Export-Export Bank has been called for, so that public money could be used to guarantee the payments stipulated by these private sales.

There are certain requirements of law placed on the Export-Import Bank, intended to take the place of, in operating this Government-owned bank, the element of risk which is weighed so carefully by the commercial banker as he determines whether or not to extend a loan.

Section B of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 provides that before the Board of Directors of the Bank agree to make a loan there must be reasonable assurance of repayment. This same express provision was not written a second time into the law in 1961 when the insurance program was begun, but neither was there express provision that the basic rules under which the Bank operates were being changed. This basic

rule must apply both to the making of loans and to the issuing of insurance, or there would have been express provision to the contrary. The Export-Import Bank functions as an institution making commercial loans and insuring credit and not as a eleemosynary institution.

A provision of law, 12 U.S.C. 635(b) states:

> **Functions as supplemental to private capital; restrictions on loans. It is the policy of the Congress that the Bank, in the exercise of its functions should supplement and encourage and not compete with private capital, and that loans, so far as possible consistently with carrying out the purposes of subsection (a) of this section, shall generally be for specific purposes, and, in the judgment of the Board of Directors, offer reasonable assurance of repayment.**

Mr. Chairman, on December 4, 1963, J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation stated before the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation in Washington, D.C.:

> **I have said this before and I would like to repeat it here: We are at war with communism and the sooner every red-blooded Amerian realizes this the safer we will be.**

While I represent a large, in fact the largest, wheat producing district in America I find it hard to reconcile the statement of Mr. Hoover with the growing casualty list in Vietnam, which now exceeds 140, and 9 of these killed during the past few days.

Where is the gold which was to be used in payment? Why is it the Government should take the risk? Why the retreat from sales for gold or cash to sales on credit—guaranteed by the American taxpayer. The Findley amendment will not prevent sales provided they are for gold or cash—American dollars—or providing the granting of credit to the Communists is privately extended. I therefore support the Findley amendment and would urge you to support the motion to recommit which includes the amendment.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to announce to the committee that it is the intention of the minority at the proper time to ask for recognition for the purpose of offering a motion to recommit with instructions, which will be the same Findley amendment to which the gentleman is about to refer.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried to do a good job with this bill. I do not want language put in the bill that would handicap the Export-Import Bank. I have nothing but the highest respect for the Export-Import Bank and its operations.

An amendment was offered which was defeated because of a tie vote. This amendment would place restrictions on the Export-Import Bank providing that it could not guarantee shippers of goods shipped to Communist countries. I do not think there is a Member who would not accept that provision on principle, but there are other elements which must also be considered.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman knows that he and I have been together on every portion of this bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is true.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. This amendment has been worked out in the other body. It is an amendment which I think everybody understands. It is not something which is taken out of the blue because a deal like this has already been made with Communist countries. It is not an attempt to weaken the Export-Import Bank. It is an attempt to strengthen its willingness or desire to not do something which would be a guarantee to Communist nations.

It would be my hope that the gentleman would not oppose the motion to recommit, although I recognize his strong feeling of responsibility as chairman of the subcommittee. I salute him. He is a great chairman.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman. I want to say that I support the amendment in principle, but I do not know just what the implications are.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman knows that the bill must go to the other body. There will be a conference and there will be an opportunity to work out any imperfections of language which might appear.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am doing my best to get the gentleman to vote against the motion to recommit. I do not want to say I approve of the Export-Import Bank guaranteeing shipments to Communist countries. I am against that practice. But I do not know how far this restriction could go.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

First, Mr. Chairman, I did not get an opportunity a moment ago to thank the gentleman for accepting the amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am very accommodating at times. I was very happy to accommodate the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Again, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of talk this afternoon about legislative history. I assume some legislative history has been made. Can the gentleman tell me how close to this $2,800 million figure he can hold this bill in conference with the Senate? Can he give us any idea?

Mr. PASSMAN. According to my understanding, I go to conference representing the House and I am supposed to do everything in my power to hold the House figure. I might say to the gentleman that if he will look at the record, in the 8 years I have gone to conference, he will know just how hard I am to get along with in conference.

Mr. GROSS. Can we hope the gentleman will come back with a conference report of $2,800 million?

Mr. PASSMAN. I will have to get more than that, because the bill calls for $2,810 million.

Mr. GROSS. A total of $2,811 million, then.

Mr. PASSMAN. I assure the gentleman that in all probability he will be very pleased with what we come back with.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, and advise him that I will be present when the conference report is called in the House.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended be passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JENSEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. JENSEN moves to recommit the bill H.R. 9499 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with an amendment as follows: On page 16, after line 24, insert the following paragraph:
>
> "None of the funds provided herein shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereinafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620 (f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 218, nays 169, answered "present" 1, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 242]

YEAS—218

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bates
Battin
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Carey
Casey
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Delaney
Derounian
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Fallon
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gary
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hemphill
Herlong
Hoeven
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Minshall
Montoya
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Konski
Ostertag
Pelly
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stephens
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman

NAYS—169

Albert
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bass
Beckworth
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Cannon
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Conte
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Farbstein
Fascell
Finnegan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Hanna
Harding
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Holifield
Holland
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara; Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Sheppard
Shipley
Sickles
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Toll
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Watts
Weltner
White
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Keogh

NOT VOTING—46

Avery
Becker
Belcher
Bray
Burke
Burkhalter
Cederberg
Cohelan
Derwinski
Ellsworth
Evins
Grant
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hansen
Hébert
Henderson
Hoffman
Laird
Landrum
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Pilcher
Pillion
Rains
Riehlman
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Roush
Shelley
Short
Sisk
Staggers
Sullivan
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tupper
Ullman
Van Pelt
Wilson, Bob
Younger

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Becker for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Nedzi against.

Mr. Younger for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.

Mr. Van Pelt for, with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Burke against.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Grant for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Hoffman for, with Mr. Cohelan against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Roush against.

Mr. Derwinski for, with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois against.

Mr. Henderson for, with Mr. Ullman against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Burkhalter against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

Mr. Landrum with Mrs. Hansen.

Messrs. MONTOYA and ROBERTS of Texas changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report back the bill H.R. 9499 with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 16, after line 24, insert the following paragraph:

"None of the funds provided herein shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereinafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 250, nays 135, answered "present" 4, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

YEAS—250

Addabbo
Albert
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brademas
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Harding
Hardy
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee

Keith
Kelly
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Sibal
Sickles
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Toll
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—135

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baker
Baring
Battin
Beermann
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bonner
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Casey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Cunningham
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Fisher
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fuqua
Gathings
Glenn
Goodell
Gross
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hemphill
Hoeven
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kyl
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Minshall
Moore
Morris
Mosher
Murray
Norblad
O'Konski
Poage
Poff
Pool
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scott
Secrest
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Stephens
Stinson
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Watson
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wyman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Findley
Harvey, Ind.
Keogh
Nelsen

NOT VOTING—45

Avery
Becker
Belcher
Bray
Burke
Burkhalter
Cederberg
Cohelan
Derwinski
Ellsworth
Evins
Grant
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hansen
Hébert
Henderson
Hoffman
Laird
Landrum
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Pilcher
Pillion
Rains
Riehlman
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Roush
Shelley
Short
Sisk
Staggers
Sullivan
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tupper
Van Pelt
Wilson, Bob
Younger

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Becker against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Cohelan for, with Mr. Findley against.

Mr. Nelsen for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Nedzi for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Tupper for, with Mr. Grant against.

Mr. Burke for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Hoffman against.

Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Avery.

Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Murphy of New York.

Mr. Burkhalter with Mr. Pilcher.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Roush.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Shelley.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see the House accept the amendment to the foreign aid appropriation bill offered by my able colleague from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] which would bar the Export-Import Bank from guaranteeing credit on any trade deal with a Communist country. Earlier this session I introduced a bill containing the same language as this amendment, which unfortunately was not acted upon by the House Banking and Currency Committee. It has been my hope all along that the House would have an opportunity to express itself on this question, and the amendment to the foreign assistance bill served this purpose quite adequately.

As I said at the time that I introduced my bill, those of us who participated in the conferences which resulted in a compromise extension of the charter of the Export-Import Bank and an increase in its authorization for credit insurance were given no indication that the Bank expected to change its policies toward credit guarantees for the Communist bloc. I am certain that if this change in policy had been made known, a prohibition, similar to the one passed by the House Monday, would have been contained in the new authorization bill. This change in attitude toward Red bloc trade is too important to be done without serious consideration by Congress, and rather than allow any precedents to be set prior to congressional review, a ban on credit guarantees is quite appropriate.

I do not agree with those who think that the only reason for extension of credit surrounds the proposed wheat deal with Russia. This is not a one-shot deal in my opinion, but rather the opening gambit in a drive for relaxed credit restrictions and greater trade with the West on the part of the Soviet Union. I am quite sure that the men in the Kremlin are not concerned with our balance-of-payments deficit, but rather with benefits that can be obtained by them in such a trade. I do not believe that the implications of the wheat deal coupled with credit guarantees has been sufficiently explored by the Export-Import Bank and the administration.

As for the wheat deal itself, despite the vote in the Senate which recommitted the Mundt bill to prohibit export guarantees, the Soviets have made no overt move of late to close the deal. Part of this is due, no doubt, to the fact that Premier Khrushchev has had to admit failure and a change in agricultural policy, and any additional push at this time for American wheat would only emphasize his problem and provide added ammunition for his political enemies within the Soviet Communist Party. Part of this is also due, I believe, to the fact that the pressure of grain purchases by Russia and other Communist countries has made shipping scarce, and driven up the world price closer to the price being asked by the United States. I would suspect that the Soviets will wait until the world shipping price begins another downward trend as Canadian wheat is delivered in order to improve their bargaining position with the United States. It is an unfortunate fact that the administration has backed down so much on the terms in the past that the Russians are undoubtedly willing to push that much further.

With the expression of opinion by the House on export credits, I think it is time for President Johnson to reconsider the terms of the wheat deal, and put it back on the right track. The purpose of this deal was, originally, to take advantage of the admitted Russian need for wheat and help satisfy our need for cash to improve the balance-of-payments position of the United States. The stress has now changed to a relief of a farm problem which should not have occurred in the first place, and an opportunity to increase the possibilities of a detente between East and West.

As evidence that the Russians are willing to go through with the deal if the one-shot businesslike approach is restored I would point out that on the 27th and 28th of November, the Russians dumped 25 tons of gold on the world market. This raised their total for the year to $365 million, double the amount of previous year's sales. If they truly need the wheat, they can and will pay for it.

An excellent summary of the events leading to our present position with respect to the wheat deal, and the opportunity now afforded for a change in direction was written by Eliot Janeway in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, December 1, 1963. I include this article as part of my remarks:

New Go at Chancy Wheat Deal

(By Eliot Janeway)

Events here and abroad in recent days may combine to give the new President an opportunity to renegotiate the wheat deal with the Soviets. This past week, negotiations were broken off over the question of shipping rates, a turn of events which gives President Johnson a breathing spell in which to look over the strange history of the negotiations, to see what went wrong and where, and to make plans to firm up the deal on the most advantageous terms for the United States.

The deal began to go sour at these points:

In Washington, the Kennedy administration began by backing away from a direct government-to-government deal, in which the Russians offered to pay gold bullion on the barrelhead, in order to escape the censure for "doing business with the Reds." Instead, the administration decided to route the deal through the private U.S. grain export trade.

The original Russian approach was apparently based on the assumption that a quick Government-to-Government deal could be made, as it was in Canada, and all gold was offered in payment.

In Ottawa, at the key negotiating meeting the U.S. grain export dealers were not clear as to the financial and political complications in the way of U.S. Government credits to the Soviets. Somebody, somehow, in the heat of competition, offered terms to the Russians. Understandably, the Russians promptly backed away from their original all-gold offer.

In New York, U.S. grain traders discovered to their shock that dealing with the Soviet Government was not the same as dealing with General Mills or General Foods, when banks refused to provide financing for the deals. Soviet credit is zero because of Russia's record of defaults. This meant the only way to finance the deal was to give Government credit.

Back in Washington, the administration found itself the victim of the initial publicity buildup it had launched to sell the deal to the country. The opportunity was too good to let go, but how could it now go to Congress to ask for Government credit to finance the deal after it had originally made no credit a condition of the deal?

President Kennedy's original decision to go through with the deal was made subject to a number of negative conditions; for example, in addition to the no-Government-credit proviso, export permits were to be scaled to actual Russian requirements and not to be authorized for reexport to China, to Cuba, to other satellites, or to our own friends or allies, thus injuring our own markets; there was to be no Government subsidy to the Russians; and no less than half the grain sold to be carried in U.S.-registered ships.

Now the deal has become so bogged down that the two chief Russian negotiators flew back home last week, leaving American officials to describe the negotiations as dormant.

However, the market for shipping the world over is on the rise, and if the United States will sit tight, its position on the shipping issue may well get stronger.

During the short period since the Soviets have turned grain buyers (and since the Russians have forced the Chinese to charter ships on their own), the asking price for Liberty ships in London has doubled; and the reserve of dry cargo tramps not in use has fallen to just 2 percent (mainly of prewar vintage).

The more grain the Soviets buy outside the United States, the higher freight rates outside the United States will rise; and the less uneconomic the cost of U.S. shipping will become. Both Russia and Europe, too, will have to buy more grain somewhere, since their population is increasing but not their grain-producing capacity. This means an increased need for shipping.

But the problem still waiting in the wings is credit.

The basic miscalculation at the beginning of the negotiations was not to recognize that there is only one way to do business with the Russians—that is, on a direct Government-to-Government basis. Not even the largest corporations can bargain as an equal with the Soviet Government, and certainly no private grain dealer can hope to do so. Moreover, the wheat deal involved the Soviet Government bargaining in three major marketplaces—the actual grain markets, the marine freight markets, and the money market.

As evidence of the great desire and the admitted need of the Russians for American wheat, in the last few months they have been dumping gold on the international markets at a greatly increased rate, to raise funds to pay for the wheat.

On Wednesday and Thursday, for example, the Russians dumped 25 tons of gold, bringing their year's total to 325 tons, worth $365 million, which is nearly double the amount of Russia's gold sales during all of the previous year. Most of this gold selling took place in September and October, when the Russians unloaded 275 tons.

Last week's dumping was caused by the sudden rise in the price of gold caused by President Kennedy's death. The price of gold is like a seesaw in relation to the U.S. stock market. When the stock market goes down, indicating a weakening of confidence in the American economy, the price of gold goes up, and vice versa. In particular, at the moment, the race issue is closely tied to the price of gold, largely because the largest producer of gold in the world is the Union of South Africa.

Just before President Kennedy was killed, the United Nations was about to take up the question of apartheid in South Africa. The chief political weapon by which South Africa defends herself is control of a major part of the new gold supply, and when the U.N. threatens sanctions against South Africa because of its racial policy, South Africa threatens to stop shipping gold to the world markets.

Without a continuing supply of new gold, the gold reserves behind the two free market reserve currencies, the dollar and the pound, would be threatened.

When South Africa threatens to withhold gold, the price goes up, and then Russia, the second largest producer of gold, moves into the market to sell gold and take advantage of the premium price. Eventually this causes the price to go down to the floor-price of gold, which is established by the U.S. price of $35 an ounce. Because of these maneuvers, the price of gold has fluctuated erratically.

The favorable reaction to President Johnson, as shown by the massive rise in the stock market this week, will inevitably drive the price of gold down toward its $35 floor. Russia's main source of foreign currency is to sell gold, and it is believed that Russia will go on selling gold on a large scale to meet these requirements. Consequently this pressure will continue to keep the price of gold down.

Now, given the breakdown in negotiations, the rise in world market shipping rates, the rise in the U.S. stock market, and the downward pressure on gold prices, President Johnson has a favorable set of circumstances through which to reset the wheat deal, take gold bullion directly from the Soviet Government, and avoid the problems caused by the confusion at first.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 9499.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7431, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tomorrow night to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 7431, making appropriations for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1964.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICAN CITIZENS BECAUSE OF RACE OR RELIGION IS REPUGNANT TO OUR PRINCIPLES

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the appropriations committee for again including in the foreign aid appropriations bill which just passed the House section 106. This section which was drafted by the gentleman from New York, Congressman Rooney, says that it is the sense of Congress that discrimination against American citizens because of race or religion is repugnant to our principles and in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state as a result of funds appropriated for foreign aid, these principles shall be applied.

The British Parliament the other day, sharply condemned the Arab boycott and blacklisting of the Norwich Union Insurance Co. which forced Lord Mancroft to resign as a member of its board of directors because he is Jewish. Despite being asked to return by the Norwich Insurance Co. he refused. The reaction of the country to this Arab pressure was one of indignation.

I trust that the State Department will take notice of an item that appeared in the daily press a few days ago that the Kingdom of Jordan, a beneficiary of our aid, blacklisted two American concerns for doing business with Israel. They are the Adams Carbide Co. and the Home Insurance Co.

I further trust that the State Department will take the necessary steps to implement the sense of Congress as stated on the foreign aid appropriations bill.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial from the New York Times and from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in the flood of events of the past few weeks, one of the most outstanding is the decisive manner in which President Johnson has moved to place among his highest priorities the question of our relations with our Latin American neighbors. The new emphasis was revealed over the weekend when the President announced his intention to appoint Thomas C. Mann, our Ambassador to Mexico, to the post he previously held as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

Even more significant, however, is the mandate which President Johnson presented to Mr. Mann. He placed his finger squarely on one of the most important problems that this Nation has encountered in its hemispheric relationships, the problem of coordination. He made it clear in a letter to the Ambassador that he intends to place under Mr. Mann's jurisdiction "all policies and programs of the U.S. Government, economic, social, and cultural, relating to Latin America."

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in many years that this responsibility will be clearly fixed. It would be difficult to find a better qualified person to assume this responsibility. Under Presidents of both parties Thomas Mann has demonstrated the qualities that are vital to success in this field. There can be no doubt of his firmness of attitude toward communism in every form, including the Castro variety. But at the same time he has exemplified the understanding which is essential in dealing with the intricate problems of this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many dedicated and able men working in this field. The program and the policies which have been devised have been imaginative and forward looking. What is needed and desired is not so much a change in direction as a shift in emphasis and a coordination of effort. This we can expect Mr. Mann to provide.

Mr. Speaker, when our late, great President took office, the Alliance for Progress captured the imagination of the whole Western Hemisphere. It was a grand design of the nations of this hemisphere marching forward arm in arm to create a better world for all of us.

The Alliance for Progress has been far more successful than its critics have claimed. It now receives a new shot in the arm which should help to bring it much closer to the noble goals conceived by President Kennedy. In the years that lie ahead it will become more and more apparent that no area of the world is more challenging to us than that of the Western Hemisphere.

There is a tremendous ferment throughout Latin America—a desire to expand the horizons of opportunity. This deep-seated desire on the part of our friends to the south cannot and should not in conscience be denied.

Mr. Speaker, the goals that they seek can be obtained through partnership. It is to our interest as well as to theirs to strengthen that partnership.

President Johnson summed up the situation when he said, "No work is more important for our generation of Americans than our work in this hemisphere. The American people have a deep desire to work together with our neighbors."

Mr. Speaker, our President is forging the tools through which this partnership can be maintained and we look forward to the progress that is essential.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks by inserting at this point editorials from the New York Times and the Baltimore Sun discussing President Johnson's moves in this field.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Dec. 16, 1963]

LATIN SHIFT

It is significant that President Johnson's first major nomination should deal with Latin America, for in the last several years this has been an area of tremendous inspiration and of deep disappointment. The need for a new relationship between the United States and the nations to the south was recognized by President Kennedy in his conception of the Alliance for Progress. More than 2 years after its proclamation the Alliance remains a grand design, still to be fully tested, not yet wholly understood or accepted.

With the appointment of Thomas Clifton Mann, now Ambassador to Mexico, as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, succeeding Edwin M. Martin, Mr. Johnson appears to be determined to push the Alliance forward. As coordinator "of all aspects of Latin American policy," Mr. Mann will have much broader powers than his predecessor. The United States obviously is undergoing a period of self-examination in its hemispheric policies, and it is probable that there will be other reassignments of personnel—not in repudiation of past performance but as a sign of shifting emphasis.

Thus far, despite its deep interest, the United States has found its southern neighbors hard to lead, impossible to drive and difficult even to understand. Over the weekend, for instance, Washington renewed its diplomatic ties with Honduras and the Dominican Republic—not because it wanted to, but because the "cold shoulder" treatment was no longer practical. Formal relations with both countries had been broken off when military cliques overthrew elected governments. The United States feels it cannot condone such violations of democratic procedure, and it withheld recognition until the new regimes promised popular elections. Washington has the promises, but there are no guarantees that the elections ever will take place.

As a region Latin America nevertheless is more challenging to Yankee ingenuity now than it was when the Alliance for Progress was founded. The Alliance itself under Director Moscoso has taken forward steps. Through the example of Cuba, communism in these last 2 years has been largely discredited. The success of the Venezuelan election, held despite Communist terror, is heartening proof. The desire for change, for improvement in economic and social standards, but without yielding to alien doctrine, has been awakened. The United States must gage the wind, and harness it.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 16, 1963]

NEW DEAL ON LATIN AMERICA

The announcement that Thomas C. Mann, our Ambassador to Mexico, is to return to his old post of Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs is good news. It is also an open recognition by the White House that something has been amiss in the administrative handling of Washington's Latin American policies. The changes now contemplated evidently involve much more than the replacement of Assistant Secretary Edwin M. Martin by Mr. Mann.

There is no need to seek scapegoats. Despite many able and expert individuals, the U.S. Government was poorly prepared when President Kennedy first took office, quickly and hopefully launched the Alliance for Progress, and then was brought—by the shock of the Bay of Pigs fiasco—to a study and realization of the fact that Latin America as he put it, was "the most critical area in the world today." It was his misfortune that no McNamara or Ball was available for Latin American affairs.

The fact that the area is so critical was outside the control or policies of the United States. The wisest policies, the best planning and the most expert administration could not have prevented the revolutionary ferment and the economic, political and social problems that were brought to a crisis by the Cuban revolution, although they were brewing for years. Yet, it should have been possible to avoid obvious mistakes, to show more understanding, and to work on policies that would meet the challenges of the 1960's and not those of years ago.

The Alliance for Progress remains a fine and hopeful concept, and it has been run well by its coordinator, Teodoro Moscoso. It needs more money. It also needs, and is in process of getting, a revamping that will, among other things, emphasize its hemispheric nature. How necessary this is was proved by the United States when it unilaterally withdrew the Alliance for Progress team in the Dominican Republic at the time Washington broke relations in September. Latin America critics of the plan as an instrument of U.S. policies were thus given apparent proof of their cynicism.

Thomas Mann is probably the best equipped State Department career officer in the Latin American field. No one will be able to accuse him of being soft on communism or Fidelismo, for his sentiments on these subjects are fierce. As Assistant Secretary under President Eisenhower he showed a flexibility and understanding which, combined with firmness, can make him the outstanding figure that U.S. relations with Latin America require today.

ADA ACCUSES HOUSE CHIEFS OF BETRAYAL

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MORRIS**. Mr. Speaker, I noted in the Washington Post over the weekend an article entitled "ADA Accuses House Chiefs of Betrayal."

The article went on to say that the Democratic leadership in this House is betraying the late President, John Kennedy, with regard to the signing of a discharge petition on civil rights. I want to say that personally I think this criticism is not only unjustified but is very intolerant.

The House Democratic leadership has stated publicly that they believe the civil rights bill will pass. I say to you that I believe they are speaking the truth. I have more confidence in the leadership of the House than I have in the ADA. When the civil rights bill is passed it will be passed through the efforts of the leadership in this House, and not through the efforts of such organizations as the ADA or any other extremist organization.

I might also point out to the House it has not been too long ago since this very organization—the Americans for Democratic Action—in fact, if my memory serves me correctly, immediately after the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles the ADA severely criticized our late President John F. Kennedy and the present President Lyndon B. Johnson because Democratic nominee Kennedy had chosen Lyndon B. Johnson to be his running mate.

I hope this intolerant attitude by organizations such as this in our country will cease.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 15, 1963]

ADA ACCUSES HOUSE CHIEFS OF BETRAYAL

Americans for Democratic Action charged the Democratic leadership in the House yesterday with betraying the memory of the late President Kennedy and rejecting the urgings of President Johnson by refusing to sign the civil rights discharge petition.

Meeting in Washington, the board of the liberal organization charged Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, Democratic Leader CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, and assistant Democratic Leader HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, with showing "a callous disregard for the urgency of civil rights legislation."

"Republican leadership in the House has, at least, been more candid in its admitted opposition to the discharge petition," ADA said.

The discharge petition represents an effort by some House liberals to force the stalled civil rights bill from the House Rules Committee and to the floor for a vote.

THE LEADERSHIP AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. **HECHLER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HECHLER**. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris] for his very timely remarks concerning the leadership of this House. The record is crystal clear on where the Democratic leadership stands on civil rights. President Johnson in his outstanding address to the joint session in this Chamber on November 27 stated:

> No memorial oration or eulogy could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory than the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill for which he fought so long.

Subsequently, President Johnson indicated his wholehearted support of the efforts of the Democratic leadership to obtain signatures on the petition to discharge the Committee on Rules so the House can work its will on this vital bill.

I never cease to be amazed at the failure of the Americans for Democratic Action to stay in touch with reality. I subscribe to the criticisms which the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris] has made of the Americans for Democratic Action. They are a noisy, ineffectual group whose statements are frequently not in accord with the facts. They have criticized the majority leadership for failing to push the discharge petition on civil rights. All they have to do is to examine the Record for December 13, 1963, when the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] clearly stated:

> There is a practical problem with reference to getting sufficient signatures on a discharge petition. We have been advised by sufficient Members, I think, that failing to get a rule in due time sufficient signatures will be affixed to the discharge petition. Mr. Speaker, I desire to advise the gentleman and the Members of the House that it is the sincere desire of the leadership—and I know it is the gentleman's sincere desire also—to get this bill to the floor as soon as possible.

What clearer statement can be made of the strong position of the majority leadership in support of the civil rights bill?

Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps too much to hope that the Americans for Democratic Action will pay more attention to facts. I do not agree with many of their positions on public issues. I am reminded of the antics of the ADA in 1948, the year when President Truman was renominated in Philadelphia and the ADA hysterically tried to lure General Eisenhower into the presidential race. As we all know, President Truman fooled the self-styled "pundits" and pollsters and won a surprise victory at the polls in 1948.

Reflecting on these events in a humorous way, President Truman composed a little poem in the form of a variation on Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's "Children's Hour." It went something like this:

> Between the Taft and the Dewey
>   When the night is beginning to lower
> Comes a pause in ADA's occupation
>   That is known as the Eisenhower.

I am pleased that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris] has called attention to the failure of ADA to come to grips with reality. I am also confident that the leadership of this House knows what it is doing on the civil rights bill.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise the remarks which I made in the Committee of the Whole on the appropriation bill today and to include the remainder of a speech by the President of the United States.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I take this time at the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] who was unavoidably absent today due to the fact he went to Los Angeles because of the serious flood damage in his district, where he is conferring with Mr. McDermott of the emergency committee. This is the only reason why the gentleman from California was not present to take part in the proceedings and the vote on the foreign aid bill today.

TO HELP THE WORLD'S CHILDREN

Mr. **REIFEL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BARRY**. Mr. Speaker, to help the world's children—this is the single purpose and function of the United Nations Children's Fund. UNICEF is one of the United Nations welfare programs which has been receiving increasing Government support since its creation in 1946. I believe that it is one of the most important programs of the world organization, and I urge approval of the $12 million allocation to UNICEF included in the appropriations for international organizations request currently before the Congress.

Why do I feel UNICEF is so important? UNICEF is engaged in a major children's welfare effort, a program much needed in a world where three out of every four children live in economically underdeveloped countries where hunger, disease, and ignorance daily threaten the welfare, if not the very life, of thousands of helpless children. These children must be aided if they are to grow up sound of mind and body. An important aspect of UNICEF assistance is that UNICEF requires all countries receiving aid to match the amount of UNICEF assistance by providing staff, buildings, and locally available supplies. Thus, if a country wishes to receive UNICEF assistance, it cannot sit back and let UNICEF do all the work. UNICEF assistance is a spur to the governments involved to step up their child welfare programs.

You may remember that in its early years UNICEF aid was directed toward Europe. It operated as a postwar emergency organization, and its effectiveness may be measured by the fact that by 1950 UNICEF was able to change the focus of its operations from emergency relief to programs of long-range benefit to children in economically less developed countries. It then began concentrating on health services, disease control, and nutrition programs in the less-developed areas. It has helped to equip over 23,000 maternity and child welfare centers throughout the world. To reduce the hazards of childbirth it has educated over 20,000 birth attendants in midwifery. Included among UNICEF's preventive health campaigns have been the large-scale inoculation of children against debilitating or deadly diseases such as malaria, yaws, trachoma, smallpox, tuberculosis, and leprosy. UNICEF's nutrition program has included the distribution of more than 1¼ billion pounds of powdered milk to children who previously were without milk. UNICEF has also tried to educate families in better nutrition practices.

In recent years UNICEF has broadened further the basis of its program in conjunction with the goals of the United Nations Development Decade. Assistance is now directed not only toward programs for the physical development of children but toward mental and social welfare projects as well. UNICEF is now assisting programs for the expansion of education and for the improvement of vocational facilities. It is helping to set up community centers, mothers' clubs, and day-care centers.

UNICEF's assistance goals recognize the fact that the physical and mental welfare of a country's children are an important determinant of the future development of a country. Poverty, disease, ignorance create an unhealthy and despairing atmosphere which lends itself to communism and violence. The $12 million contribution of the United States to UNICEF would be an investment in the world of the future, an insurance policy that the world will develop into the peaceful and democratic world Americans would like to see.

Accordingly, it is the sense of the House of Representatives, that of the sums appropriated for U.N. activities, $12 million is earmarked for UNICEF as a matter of legislative intent.

LET'S STOP THIS

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday December 12, 1963, the Herald of Westchester County printed a message entitled "Let's Stop This." It consists of a statement by Thomas J. Watson, board chairman of one of Westchester's most important corporations, on the need for America to readjust in the face technological change. I commend to my colleagues these very sound views:

[From the Herald, Westchester (N.Y.), Dec. 12, 1963]

LET'S STOP THIS

(Statement by Thomas J. Watson)

The following statement by Thomas J. Watson, board chairman of one of Westchester's most important corporations, has attracted widespread attention in the worlds of business and government. It is from testimony by Watson before the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"In a sense, our success may stem as much from what we stop doing, as what we do.

"Let's stop deferring adjustments we shall have to make in the hope that the need for them will disappear. The longer we put them off, the more they accumulate and the tougher they are to deal with.

"Let's stop pretending that this business of adjustment can be left solely to the individual or the normal course of events. Hardship is inevitable in the process of change. We must learn to share it as we now share the benefits.

"Let's stop thinking that we may be able to solve these problems with one grand solution that will take care of them forever. They are going to be with us forever in one form or another as technological change takes place, and what we must do is step up to each of them, find an answer and move on to another.

"And let's conclude the debate as to whether we have a problem. We have. The time has come to find workable solutions.

"If we do this, it will solidify us as a people and ensure our leadership in the world. If we fail, we may permanently alienate millions of citizens and possibly destroy our system while trying to defend some of its ideological details.

"It has often been observed that America cannot hope to survive as an island of plenty in a sea of international poverty. It must be even more true that a majority of Americans cannot survive in unworried affluence while a minority are doomed to lives of idleness and poverty."

The obvious good sense of the foregoing statement demonstrates why Mr. Thomas J. Watson has become one of the Nation's outstanding business leaders.

MEMORIALS TO THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a rash of bills and a scurrying to memorialize, even deify, our late President Kennedy.

This haste creates the impression that if these bills are not passed now, and the memorials are not created now, that several months hence the genuine interest will have waned. I believe the late President deserves more respect.

I suggest that those who are willing to submit their ideas for memorials to a duly established Memorial Commission for the purpose of selecting and perfecting an appropriate memorial, or memorials, will encourage a warmer reception, a better quality of memorial, and greater public support, than those who fall all over each other in trying to be first with the most.

Such a Memorial Commission has been proposed. There is precedent for such a Commission. We can help to create for Congress a better image of stability and judgment if we use the idea.

Years from now a hodgepodge of various and sundry memorials may not reflect the image his friends, admirers, and devotees wanted.

More thought should be given to the desirability and propriety of changing old historic names, places, and things. Perhaps the creation of new memorials—such as a missile center or the Center for the Performing Arts—would be more appropriate than changing the old—such as Cape Canaveral and the Franklin half dollar.

The face of a coin and the name of a cape are now only transitory, ephemeral commemorations. If we can change Franklin and Canaveral, others can change Kennedy. The precedent is set. Future changes will occur with greater and greater rapidity and with less and less resourcefulness.

Also, before we shunt into limbo Benjamin Franklin, one of our greatest patriots, who achieved the distinction during a time when it was tougher to be a patriot than it is now, I would like to remind my colleagues and fellow Americans of just one of the many, many treasures and assets Benjamin Franklin left for us; namely, a creed for better living contained in his "Thirteen Virtues":

1. Temperance.
2. Silence.
3. Order.
4. Resolution.
5. Frugality.
6. Industry.
7. Sincerity.
8. Justice.
9. Moderation.
10. Cleanliness.
11. Tranquility.
12. Chastity.
13. Humility.

Some concepts are so fundamentally good that time changes them little. I personally wish he had added a fourteenth, at least, "Kindness."

Benjamin Franklin was America's Leonardo Da Vinci, our Winston Churchill, our Manuel Quezon, one of the earth's greatest citizens.

Perhaps Benjamin Franklin needs no coin to commemorate his contributions.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—A DEFINITION

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John W. Hanes, Jr., former Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the Eisenhower administration made a significant speech on American foreign policy at Deerfield Academy on December 16, 1963.

I commend to the thoughtful consideration of Members of the House—his definition of a foreign policy in the U.S. interest during these days of great change.

Throughout his service in the Department of State, Mr. Hanes was a close and valued associate of John Foster Dulles and he can well quote the former Secretary of State to the effect that "change is the law of life, for nations as well as for men, and that no political, economic, or social system survives unless it proves its continuing worth in the face of ever-changing circumstances."

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—A DEFINITION

I

John Foster Dulles once outlined the foundation of our foreign policy by saying: "U.S. foreign policy is designed to protect and promote the interests of the United States in the international field. It is based upon certain facts and convictions, among which is * * * that change is the law of life, for nations as well as for men, and that no political, economic or social system survives unless it proves it continuing worth in the face of everchanging circumstances."

This era, as no other in recorded history, is the era of sudden and basic change. It is true, of course, that there have always been forces of change. The course of history has been determined by whether such changes could be absorbed and therefore came peacefully; or whether they demanded more flexibility than the particular society involved was capable of showing, in which case they came violently by war or revolution. This is a historic pattern, and is fundamentally not different today.

What is different, however, is that never before in history has the ability of communications, transportation, and technology been sufficient to permit the forces of change to affect more than a relatively small area of the world at any one time. Today, the implications and every effect of the great forces of change are immediately global.

Also, never before has there been more than one, or occasionally two, fundamental forces of change operating at any one time to alter the fabric of society. Today there are at least four which I think are clearly identifiable. How well we understand and meet them will determine whether our country will remain free in peace, or whether it will slip downward toward a position of ultimate encirclement and war or subjugation.

II

The movement of international communism is certainly one of the great forces of change. Within 45 years, a small group of violent men, starting in Russia, has seized control of all or major parts of 17 nations, with nearly 1 billion people.

The Communist military-power base and potential for aggression is enormous. Its resources are centrally controlled, and unswervingly used to further the original goal of world conquest.

International communism is implacably hostile to the freedom of men everywhere; but this is not universally recognized in unsophisticated nations where there are few standards of comparison or valid grounds for judgment.

In these countries, highly organized Communist cadres work skillfully to exploit the fiction that communism alone shows the quick way to progress and productivity. This illusion makes communism doubly dangerous; for it allows it not only to operate as a force of change in itself, but also to seek to incorporate all other forces of change toward its own ends. Its requirements seem simple and deceptively appealing when stated in words; they are only that all the resources of a society—of which human beings are just another one—be controlled and directed in accordance with a master plan to assure efficient conformity of thought and act; and which will eliminate the discords inherent in a society which gives freedom of choice to the individual.

It is a major challenge of American foreign policy to demonstrate the fundamental horror of what these words mean—and that they are neither the only nor the true path to progress.

The second great element of change in the world today is the march toward political and economic freedom of colonial peoples. One billion more people responsible for their own destiny—but also powerfully affecting ours.

This great force of change—this new nationalism—is a force which we, of all peoples, should not fear, since its basic motivations are the same as those which brought liberty and nationhood to us. And yet it may hold great potential dangers for us if our leadership and understanding are not sufficient to recognize its implications, to satisfy its legitimate aspirations, and to guide its developing influence into channels consistent with the welfare and peace of the world as a whole, as well as with the prosperity and freedom of the new nations themselves.

The third great force of change is, of course, the scientific revolution which we characterize loosely as the nuclear age. The discoveries of the past 20 years exceed, in their potential impact upon human life, all the developments of all the thousands of preceding years of human history. The implications of the atom alone stagger the imagination—unlimited, unending power for peace that could create a world without want; or unlimitable, all-ending power for war that can produce a world without life.

Science has offered us health and old age where formerly was sickness and disease and death. These blessings have come inextricably mixed with the new spectre of overpopulation. Every triumph in the laboratory spawns new problems in applying it to the affairs of men; and each one challenges the ability of existing social and political institutions to meet this ever-quickening tempo of change.

Our first halting steps into outer space are not less significant for the future. Today it is mechanical satellites and missiles on the fringe of our own world's atmosphere. But many of us will see the tomorrow when men travel to other worlds than our own. What this will mean, we can sense but dimly. But that its meaning will be one of infinite change we cannot doubt.

There is, of course, a fourth great current of change in the world which we must not underestimate simply because it is not new and we are close to it. That is the force of Western democratic thought, with its tradition of intellectual and personal liberty. It does not involve intimidation or fear. It holds forth the hope of achieving by peaceful means man's noblest aspiration—the progress under law of the individual toward a fuller life in freedom.

This great force of change has within it just as great a potential dynamic as any of the other three which I have mentioned. We must recognize clearly that whether this potential is to be realized in the world of today is a responsibility of leadership that has been inherited by the United States. And now we have come full circle, for how that responsibility is or is not carried out, is, by definition, U.S. foreign policy.

III

I want to emphasize again that the purpose of American foreign policy is to protect and promote the interests of the United States. No policy dedicated to any other objective—however noble—would command for long the support of our people nor should it.

But it does not follow that the attainment by our country of its objectives is inimical to the legitimate aspirations of others. On the contrary, it is our fundamental belief that liberty is indivisible. We are strengthened as it spreads in the world and whenever one nation or one island or one man loses his freedom, our own is diminished by a like amount. Lincoln recognized this when he said of our Declaration of Independence that it gave liberty "not alone to the people of this country, but hope for the world for all future time."

Within this framework, we have set certain broad objectives for our foreign policy which are supported by both political parties, although they frequently disagree upon the best methods to achieve them.

We seek to create a structure of international order which will allow for peaceful change in the world. This structure includes our support of the principles of international law, and of such organizations as the United Nations. It also includes the formal contact with other nations which we maintain through our State Department and our diplomatic missions, as well as the myriad other official and unofficial relationships we are constantly having with foreign peoples—from summit conferences by our Presidents to the people-to-people contacts of the Peace Corps, and of the more than a million individual American citizens who are abroad on every day of every year.

We demonstrate, by this structure of communication, a constant willingness honorably to negotiate any matter, any time, in the interests of peace with justice.

Since we recognize, however, that good will cannot in itself safeguard the peace or guarantee our own freedom, we must and do build strength elsewhere.

The first place we build is in our own Military Establishment. It will remain an absolute prerequisite to the peace and security of the world, to the preservation of our Nation and to the success of our diplomacy that our military power continue second to none.

Our armed strength today, however, is far more than national, and our Military Establishment is charged with a trust for the security of many other nations. It is dependent, in turn, for its effective functioning upon their cooperation.

The means by which we practice this cooperation is our worldwide system of alliances with more than 40 other nations.

Such political and military arrangements have formed the shield to meet, and largely to absorb the shock of overt Communist military and political aggression which has provided the major threat of the decade and a half just past. However, these more traditional instruments of foreign policy may maintain peace, but they do not by themselves build peace in the changing world of today. They do not meet the problems of poverty and hunger and illness that beset three-fourths of the world's population, and thereby press upon the stability both of the new nations and of all political institutions.

For these reasons, our diplomacy has devised a new dimension of economic assistance.

We have been hopeful that other peoples might regard with favor and adopt our essential institutions. We have never sought by force or subversion to remold the world in our own image. We have clearly recognized, however, that an interdependent world, the existence of Western institutions is imperiled unless the have-not countries are provided the knowledge, the incentive, and the means to choose some route other than that offered by communism to find economic freedom without sacrificing political liberty and human dignity.

Lastly, we are not content with a world where militarily we must strain just to preserve a minimum security and where the cost of maintaining a grim arms balance absorbs our best efforts, consumes our substance and prevasively shadows our future. So we strive for dependable disarmament.

It is easy to become discouraged in this search; and it is tempting to seek some progress—any progress—by agreeing to just a little more than is safe. But the stakes are too high for us either to stop trying, or to start gambling. The failure to find a sound basis for stopping the nuclear arms race may be as sure a way to end the world as agreeing to a wrong way. We dare not be more than reasonable, nor less than hopeful.

IV

These are the goals of our foreign policy. We seek to achieve them, not haphazardly, but following the clear moral direction of our cultural, political, and religious heritage. It is not always easy, however, to find the course of principle in foreign affairs. Indeed, in the infinitely complex decisions which arise from day to day, it is often next to impossible even to identify what is right and what is wrong. This does not relieve us of the responsibility constantly to try to do so—and to act accordingly.

Morality, fortunately, is not like bad-tasting medicine. There is not necessarily a difference between our own interests and the dictates of conscience. On the contrary, one of our distinguished statemen has concluded "that in doing 'good' we learn we can also do very well; and in seeking to do well, we find we do much good."

This is a simple and lucid way of saying that in a world where survival and success are dependent as much upon the rightness of what we fight for as whether we win, no policy will serve the United States which does not also serve the cause of a just peace in freedom for all men everywhere.

RETROCEDE PORTIONS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO MARYLAND

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress on Monday received a 43-page document from the Justice Department relative to my proposal which would retrocede the residential and commercial portions of the District of Columbia to Maryland. One reporter characterized the Department report as "a lengthy pedantic joshing" of me for presenting the idea. Frankly, I am amazed by the callousness of the report.

I introduced this legislation because it provides the only means of guaranteeing to every person in the District of Columbia the rights of citizenship which should be guaranteed to every citizen of the United States. It is the only means for guaranteeing the right to participate in city, county, school district, State, and Federal Government with representation in the House and the Senate.

Let us put this idea into the context of civil rights. During this year the Justice Department and the Congress have been engaged in a legislative struggle to grant full rights of citizenship to segments of American population. And the Attorney General himself has introduced legislation to give full rights to a million people in 5,000 areas of the United States because their citizenship is adversely affected by Federal jurisdiction. In this battle we are not content to give half rights or 99 percent rights. We want full, 100-percent citizenship.

Now comes the Attorney General saying that such civil and political rights are for other areas of the Nation, but in the District of Columbia we are willing to settle for something less. Here it is perfectly all right to deny participation in State government. Here it is all right to deny full, active representation in the Congress of the United States.

I am fully aware of the shattering of tradition which this retrocession suggests. I am cognizant of the difficult negotiations and the myriad problems we face if retrocession is our goal. But I also know that there is nothing more important than human rights, civil rights, political rights for all Americans and this includes residents of the District of Columbia as well as those in Mississippi, or California, or Iowa. In all my testimony on this subject, I have also insisted that the people of the District and the people of Maryland must have the right to vote on final determinations after they have been presented with concrete terms of retrocession.

Let us also view the situation historically. One of the compelling considerations leading to the American Revolution itself was taxation without representation. Those chapters of American history telling the story of the Boston Tea Party, Lexington, Concord, are stories of dedication to a cause. On television recently we saw the inspiring story of Washington at Valley Forge where men with only rags on their feet left bloody footprints in the snow, for a cause—the cause of free citizenship.

Are we to say now that because there are problems involved, because there is possible litigation involved, we are to abandon the idea of representation for more than 750,000 citizens in the District of Columbia?

This is not a problem to be solved by half-way measures. Either residents of the District have full citizenship or they do not. At this point I am unaware of any other proposals which would present a full citizenship.

Would the Attorney General, or any Member of Congress vote to give the citizens of his State only those rights guaranteed by any other home rule bill yet introduced?

Is retrocession absurd? I hope it is not, for to make such an admission would be to argue that the foundations of representative government are absurd. This I will never believe.

DISCRIMINATING AGAINST THE INDIAN

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, FRANK T. BOW, has issued a statement calling attention to the shabby treatment afforded the American Indians by the Federal Government. The particular incident occurs at the insistence of this Government to construct a project labeled "Knowles Dam." As the distinguished gentleman points out, this project is one of the most expensive efforts yet of this Government to force public power on the American taxpayer.

And furthermore it is done in complete derogation of the rights of the Indian as established by treaties with the Federal Government.

I include the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and urge my colleagues to read them.

I was under the impression this great Government of ours was opposed to discrimination. Apparently this does not apply to the Indians.

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

(By FRANK T. BOW)

WASHINGTON.—Attention, lexicographers, here are some new definitions:

Indian reservation: A tract of land set aside by the United States for the occupation, use and enjoyment of an Indian tribe for all time to come or until we decide we need it for something else.

Indian giver: One who gives to an Indian something that already beyonged to the Indian knowing that he is strong enough to take it away from the Indian if he wants it back.

Indian treaty: An agreement by which our forefathers managed to bring an end to the Indian wars, no longer considered binding by many Americans.

Hydroelectric power: Energy produced from falling water stored by a dam, considered by many Federal officials to be so desirable in and of itself that it must be produced wherever a dam can be built without regard to need or cost.

Knowles Dam: A proposed $300 million concrete memorial to infidelity, to be constructed on the Flathead Indian Reservation over the strenuous objection of the Indians, in violation of the solemn treaty obligations assumed by the U.S. Government 100 years ago, for the purpose of producing the most expensive hydroelectric power in the Columbia River Basin, to be paid for by all the taxpayers of the country for the benefit of a few.

The House of Representatives has consistently refused to authorize this power project in Montana which would flood many thousands of acres of the Flathead Reservation, one of the most productive and beautiful reservations in this country. The Senate has again voted to build the dam, and another vote is scheduled in the House. I hope we can bury this project once and for all.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the present administration in its foreign policy is following the terrible mistakes committed at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam by the Western Powers, which produced postwar control of Eastern Europe by the Soviet Union, and consigned millions of people to Communist tyranny.

I believe it is necessary to remind the Congress and the administration of the fallacy of a foreign policy based on trust and friendship with the Communists, and as timely evidence I include at this point as part of my remarks an article recently published in the Chicago Dziennik Zwiazkowy, discussing the historic aftermath of the Yalta Conference.

YALTA AND AFTER

(By S. Kleczkowski)

During the Crimea Conference, held in Yalta in February 1945 the Governments of the United States of America, Great Britain, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics made a number of historical decisions and assumed "serious responsibility" (President Roosevelt's words) on a number of international questions then arising, which have had the most tragic consequences for the whole world.

Their effects have been felt with increasing force during the past 18 years, and the "chain reaction" which they have produced in international affairs will be felt for a long time by this and future generations. They will be obliged to taste the bitter fruit of the blunders committed in Yalta, where, at the behest of Soviet Russia over 100 million East Europeans were deprived of their freedom and independence and subjected to a most cruel oppression.

Taking place, as it did, at the beginning of Russia's triumphal march westward, and on the eve of Germany's defeat, the conference thus sealed the fate of eight European nations, opening at the same time sluices through which the Russian hordes penetrated to the heart of Europe.

Its participants, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston S. Churchill and Marshal Joseph Stalin, took upon themselves the duty of settling the lot of half the European Continent and part of Asia, without the knowledge or consent of the interested nations. In so doing, they constituted themselves the sole judges and arbiters of life and death of old and highly civilized nations, such as Poland, Britain's first ally at the 1939 war. Without any legal mandate, but for one reason or another, they obliterated from the ranks of the free nations many old friends and faithful allies.

If Soviet Russia's motives were purely materialistic and carried out in the spirit of old Czarist imperialism, those of the Western Powers were prompted by the urge of opportunism and appeasement, in the avowed hope of ending the war more quickly, and of establishing bases for future peaceful coexistence with the U.S.S.R.

The war did come to an end in 1945, but no solid victory was gained. It was more of a "defeat in victory" than an outright triumph as in 1918. All Eastern Europe was sacrificed, and the Soviet empire expanded its frontiers as far as the Elbe.

Mr. Churchill, in spite of several brave speeches in defense of Britain's Polish ally, and aware of the probable outcry of public opinion in England when the truth about Poland's betrayal was found out, finally disposed of his Polish ally with the words: "I do not care for Poles * * * they are so quarrelsome." Thus lightly was the destiny of some 35 million people disposed of.

President Roosevelt asked for lenience toward Poland, "the inspirations of nations," on the plea that otherwise 6 million Polish-American voters would be displeased. The American President had less scruples than the British Prime Minister in giving away to Russia a land whose 180,000 soldiers, sailors, and airmen were fighting loyally throughout the war under the British operational command. In this manner, he made the United States of America responsible, for the first time in American history, for the future enslavement of a free and sovereign nation which fought, without counting losses, for the Allied cause, thus breaking not only the principle of the American Declaration of Independence, but also of the American Constitution, and the deeds of honor and justice due to Poland which suffered greater proportionate losses than any other during the war.

For Poland not only lost one quarter of its population and suffered enormous cultural and economic losses, but also was deprived of its freedom and independence, and was forced to accept a Moscow-sponsored government without any root or real support in the country.

Meanwhile, the legal Polish Government, which was allied to Britain and which, at the invitation of the British Government, officiated in London, enjoyed the full confidence and allegiance of the Polish fighting forces fighting under the British command, and of the Polish Home Army of some 300,000. Though these forces rendered Britain and the Allied cause invaluable services, especially, during the Battle of Britain, their government was derecognized, under Russian pressure, on the excuse that a new government of national unity, formed in Moscow, was going to replace it as the legal government of postwar Poland. This new government consisted of handpicked Moscow agents, and Mr. S. Mikolajczyk, a former Polish Prime Minister in London.

The role of Mr. Mikolajczyk in this deal was one of an unconscious accomplice necessary to mislead public opinion in England into thinking that a truly representative government would be formed in Poland, which would faithfully carry out the provisions for "free and unfettered elections." Neither provision was carried out. The whole administration of Poland was in Communist hands, while the country was entirely under Soviet military occupation. In these circumstances, Mr. Mikolajczyk was completely powerless and his participation in the new government was devoid of any real significance. He was eventually kicked out by his Communist colleagues, when his presence was no more needed for propaganda purposes, and had to flee for his life. As to the promised elections, they were held only in 1947, but were rigged in accordance with the well-known Soviet pattern.

I have dealt in this article more specifically with Poland, as from its fate stem all the disastrous political consequences which are confronting the West today. It is now quite clear that the Polish solution was more than a crime—indeed it was a serious international blunder (Talleyrand), which led to a policy of capitulation of the West before Russia's aggressive designs. All this was quite unnecessary. Soviet Russia was able to penetrate deep into the center of Europe only thanks to the gigantic economic and military aid provided by the United States and Britain, and because the allies, instead of either invading Europe from the South, as Mr. Churchill had proposed, or adopting Montgomery's direct thrust toward Berlin, opened the way for Russia to do so on her own account.

The consequences of the Yalta appeasement can now be listed as follows: the eradication of Poland as a free country upset completely the European balance, for, as Napoleon once said: "Poland is the cornerstone of the European edifice." With its forcible incorporation into the Soviet orbit, the independence of the whole Eastern Europe was jeopardized, and, as has been seen, it fell ultimately under Communist sway. The Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, which were forming fairly homogeneous states, united in the spirit of Christianity and more or less identical economic and cultural development, became, after the loss of Poland, defenseless, and thus an easy prey for Soviet aggression. Poland's abandonment at Yalta sealed their fate, because Soviet Russia quickly realized that if the West did nothing to save Poland, it would not lift a finger to fight for the independence of the rest.

We know this from the rape of Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. None of these countries received any material help from the West in their abortive struggle for independence, only pious good wishes and half-hearted prayers for their survival.

This is where the West committed its most serious psychological mistake. Instead of allowing General Patton to march in 1945 to their rescue, and so to offset the Soviet plans for their conquest, it permitted Soviet Russia to swallow them piecemeal without any opposition whatsoever.

What lay in store for Poland may have been surmissed as early as 1941, when under Soviet Russia's pressure, Mr. Anthony Eden was obliged to declare in the House of Commons that "Britain would not guarantee Poland's eastern (Riga) frontiers" (July 30). In the Maisky-Sikorski agreement of July 30, 1941, a further step was taken to undermine Poland's status and endanger the lives of many thousands of Polish soldiers and civilians who were taken by the Russian troops in 1939 as "prisoners of war," and later deported to Russia, after the perfidious Soviet "stab-in-the-back," and for whom Russia offered to grant an "amnesty." Both acts took place only 2 years after Britain and Poland concluded on August 25, 1939, a "mutual assistance agreement" stipulating mutual defense in case of war—Poland to act as a fully fledged ally, and its soldiers as brothers-in-arms of the British soldiers. Yet the secret protocol to the Anglo-Polish agreement states that "any agreement entered upon with a third party would not be prejudical to the sovereignty or territorial inviolability of the other contracting party" (art. 3).

Soviet Russia treated undoubtedly Mr. Eden's statement as the "green light" to proceed with her claims to eastern Poland at a propitious moment. This actually happened during the Moscow and Teheran Conferences and found full expression during the Yalta Conference, where the subjugation of Poland was sealed.

There is also the little known fact that when Mr. Eden was in Moscow in 1942, he consented to the Russian claim to incorporate the Baltic States, eastern Poland, and Rumanian Bessarabia. These claims were not included, however, in the Anglo-Russian treaty owing to President Roosevelt's opposition on the eve of an election.

The partition of Poland as arranged in Yalta was to run along the so-called Curzon line, which had never been an ethnographical or historical boundary, and was merely suggested during the Russo-Polish war of 1920 as a temporary "demarcation line." Yet it was adopted in Yalta as the eastern frontier of Poland, while a compensation for the lost Polish territories would be carved out from the lands of the defeated Germany.

Now, in the understanding of the Western statesmen, this new frontier was to form the outer limits of Soviet ambitions in Europe, whereas, as later events have shown, it was only a steppingstone for Russia's further advances westward. It thus transpired that while the Western policy was a purely passive and static one, that of Soviet Russia was offensive. The dream of the division of Europe into two peaceful spheres of influence was shattered. Britain believed that in making the settlement in Yalta it was establishing Eastern and Western zones equally divided between the West and the East, which would be loyally and peacefully administered by both interested partners. This showed a complete lack of understanding of the very essence of Soviet policy and its ultimate designs, which aim, step by step at the domination of the whole world.

Observed from this angle, the Soviet policy in Europe and in other parts of the globe is one of continuous advance wherever the Soviet rulers judge that there is a lack of strong opposition or foresight from the West. While the latter still contents itself to pursue a policy of "containment" toward Soviet Russia, she is using any and every opportunity to push forward its aggressive plans for the conquest of new territories. In this way, the "Curzon Line," which was to serve as a barrier against Soviet expansion, merely served as a prelude for its further penetration in Europe, with the result that the Soviet armies are now poised all along the Elbe, ready to pounce upon Western Europe when the right moment comes, or when the West is divided and unready, as it often is.

Western division and disputes have more than once provided Moscow with the golden opportunity to march forward to its all-embracing goals without hindrance. American electioneering methods periodically paralyzing American freedom of action, and Western economic troubles offer an excellent field for Soviet intrigues, while the Anglo-American rivalries in the East are a godsend for Soviet tactics of penetration and subversion. This is why the cold war, instead of subsiding, is on the increase, and the state of international tension is well nigh at breaking point. This costs the West much in prestige, confidence, and good will among the enslaved and still uncommitted nations, while damaging blows have been dealt to the principles and ideals for which the West stood, and which it took the trouble to embody in the Atlantic Charter. With the policy of capitulation initiated at Yalta, the forces of international communism are now reaching to the furthest confines of Europe, Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Australasia, and are threatening the peace of the world for generations to come.

S. KLECZKOWSKI.

The prelude to the Yalta capitulation which was heralded at the time as the triumph of farsighted statesmanship of the "Big Three" (Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin), was enacted during the secretive conference held in Teheran in December 1943; when the three leaders appropriated for themselves the right to solve not only the fate of defeated Germany but of still free Eastern Europe, including Poland, their first and oldest ally. They did so without any consultation and consent of the Polish Government in London with whom Britain concluded in 1939 a treaty of alliance, and also without reference to the peoples concerned, whether Polish, Ukrainian, and Byelorussian. In so doing, they broke the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which they pledged themselves to respect, and which promised to "do away with tyranny, slavery, oppression and intolerance" wherever it existed. In consequence, Poland paid with one-half of its historical territory and was later engulfed in an alien and barbarous system which is attempting to turn all its subjects into Godless and soulless robots tied hand and foot to Bolshevik slave empire. In popular parlance, "Poland was sold down the river" for all its immense sacrifices in manpower and treasure in the allied cause.

It is, therefore, obvious that such a treatment of an allied nation has dealt a shattering blow to the prestige and confidence in the powers which thus settled the fate of Europe, with the result that weakened the foundations of the British Empire and brought the menace of communism to the borders of America. Unless these terrible mistakes committed by the Western statesmen in Teheran and Yalta are rectified, there is no chance for a lasting peace of the world ever.

Mr. Speaker, the author of the article, Mr. Stefan Kleczkowski, is fully equipped to discuss the subject. He has been Paris and London correspondent for leading Polish newspapers, editor of the Polish Economic Bulletin in London, and contributed to leading English publications, including Financial Times and the Fortnightly Review. Between 1929 and 1934 he was editor of the Polish National Courier in New York, and from 1935 to 1939, Warsaw correspondent of the London Daily Mail and the Hearst Press.

The past is valuable, Mr. Speaker, to properly interpret the complications of the present, and since Soviet communism remains the greatest threat to world peace and freedom, it is most practical for us to review the history of World War II allies' diplomatic failures.

It is my hope, shared I am sure by all Americans, that the errors of the past will not be repeated.

THE USE OF ASC FARMER COMMITTEES

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a constituent of mine who reports that he had been elected by his neighbors to serve as an ASC community committeeman. This farmer wrote me a report of an orientation meeting of his ASC community committee which he attended together with two other farmers in his area. I ask that his report be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

NOVEMBER 18, 1963.

Congressman ANCHER NELSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ANCHER: This afternoon the other two township committeemen and I attended a meeting designed to acquaint us with our new duties.

From what we were told, the new duties are confined mostly to enabling the people of our township to get corn loans faster, i.e., one of the committeemen will, with the farmer, certify measurement of one or more cribs of corn so that a loan may be processed.

The above apparently was all the necessary information we were to receive.

However, it took from 1:30 to 4:30 p.m. to hold the meeting.

Why?

The meeting was almost entirely propaganda for continuation of Government farm programs.

These included:

1. Introduction (on film) by Orville Freeman welcoming us to our new duties (as newly elected committeemen) and mentioning a new diploma, recognizing our elections.

2. An outline of the organization of the USDA with emphasis on local, State, regional and Washington ASCS administration and administrators.

3. Talk by Milton Maxwell, State chairman and a very personable gentleman, on new duties of the community committee.

4. Film on why we need Government controls in agriculture.

5. Slides giving production figures with emphasis on how much better things have been since 1960.

6. Explanation of the genesis of the feed grain program. How its effects have slowed (obvious conclusion: Now more controls are needed) and how much more work has been thrown on high USDA officials in Washington to persuade big city Congressmen to continue controls in spite of the adverse vote in the wheat referendum.

7. Conclusion.

a. Distribution of special ASC committeemen folders enclosing:

1. Letter from H. D. Godfrey.

2. Sheet entitled "Duties of ASC Community Committeemen."

3. Certificate of election with the seal of the USDA and signatures of Freeman, Godfrey, Fitzgerald, and our county chairman.

4. Pamphlet entitled "The Farmer Committee System."

5. A sheet entitled "The Tax Dollar."

6. A questionnaire designed to give comments and constructive suggestions on the meeting.

I inferred that there would be at least one, and perhaps more, meetings to explain this rather simple procedure of sealing corn.

Throughout the meeting were urgings of the role of committeemen wooing the farmers to the program.

Now I ask—

Is it right to use our tax money to promulgate Government programs? In other words, a huge sales program to spend our money is now being financed with more of our money.

> I would say that funds of the USDA devoted to administration could be cut sharply with no appreciable loss in real function.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> ______ ______.
>
> P.S.—The cost of these meetings in payments to committeemen is not small—60 community committeemen per county at $10 equal $600. For the United States—2,200 counties at $600 equal $1,320,000.
>
> P.S.—Didn't Congress, since the wheat referendum, caution the USDA about using our money to sell their programs?

Mr. Speaker, the indoctrination to which these farmer committee members were subjected is of particular interest in view of comments which were written into the agriculture appropriation reports of the House and Senate this year. I realize that the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for this fiscal year has not yet been enacted, but the report of this farmer certainly indicates the need for careful scrutiny by the Congress of the use made of appropriated funds.

As a result of congressional criticism and pointed language in the House Appropriations Committee report, the Secretary of Agriculture revoked regulations requiring that these farmer committeemen sign statements that they would support the programs and policies of the Department. Further comments in the Appropriations Committee report indicate continued interest and concern with possible political activities of the farmer committeemen, however:

> The use of any funds provided in this appropriation bill in an effort to influence the vote of any participant in any referendum on any proposed farm program or pending agricultural legislation is not within the provisions of this act and in the opinion of the committee would be completely unauthorized.

No clearer language is necessary to emphasize that the Congress looks with disfavor on the use of taxpayers' funds for the building of a political empire by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Senate Appropriations Committee went a step further when it wrote prohibitive language into the text of the Agriculture appropriations bill, H.R. 6754. I quote from the Senate committee report where it treats of expenses for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:

> The following provision has been inserted in the bill, under this appropriation item, dealing with employee activity and the use of committeemen:
>
> ": *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act shall be used, (1) to influence the vote in any referendum; (2) to influence agricultural legislation except as permitted in 18 U.S.C. 1913; or (3) for salaries or other expenses of members of county and community committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for engaging in any activities other than advisory and supervisory duties and delegated program functions prescribed in administrative regulations."

I bring these matters to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize my concern and to encourage continued close scrutiny by the Appropriations Committees of attempts on the part of Department officials to use public funds for propaganda purposes.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I think many Members of this body will agree that the committee has done an excellent job in rendering much of the fat out of this bill. Others, perhaps feel that the cuts are excessive. In my own opinion, I think the committee has done a good job, but not good enough. In fact, the able chairman of the committee has so confessed. Time and again during this debate he has of his own volition pointed to areas that could be reduced without impairing the program. He has stated that the President of the United States should freeze all funds. That should be a warning to this body.

Anyone who reads the committee report will find that first, we are asked to give the foreign aid agency a blank check in the amount of $2.8 billion. How it is to be spent or where it is to be spent is in the discretion of those in charge of the program—none of them elected officials or responsible to the people of this country. I read from page 4 of the report:

> Mr. PASSMAN. You could, under the law, ignore every program, everything that you have justified in the book, and spend the money and obligate it for different purposes; could you not?
>
> Mr. MOSCOSO. That is right.

Second, since 1958, our gold supply has dwindled from $22.8 billion to $15.8 billion on June 30, 1963, and during that same period, nations who have received our assistance, purchased $6.8 billion of it. Third, as pointed out by the Clay Committee, we are attempting to do too much for too many. Out of 112 nations we are planning to give assistance in one form or another to 100 of them. I want to assist those in need to help themselves. However, I do not think it is the responsibility of this Nation to attempt on its own to raise the standards of every underdeveloped nation in the world.

I am not against all foreign aid, but I do think it should be selective. I think there is only one justification for it and that is to promote the best interests of this country.

Your country and mine is already $310 billion in debt and our foreign aid program is responsible for over a third of it. Our wealth and resources are not inexhaustible and unless we starting protecting our own interests we may wake up with no interests to protect.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that foreign aid has become an adjunct of our foreign policy but we have permitted it to become our foreign policy. Our whole foreign policy seems to rotate around our ability to buy our position throughout the world. I say to my colleagues that if your place in the family of nations depends only on American dollars we are indeed building upon a foundation of sand.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, Congress must set its house in order to assure adequate representation for all Americans, or have the courts take away the function and cause chaos.

Just recently a three-judge Federal court in Houston ruled that all 23 congressional districts as now drawn, are unconstitutional. Maryland has court cases pending regarding reapportionment. Illinois is facing a remap situation as population shifts from the city of Chicago to suburbia. Other States have inequities in representation that are drawing the interest of various groups who can throw the problem into the courts.

Under existing law the fair distribution of seats in the House of Representatives is guaranteed. Every 10 years, following the decennial census, the House redistributes its representation among States by taking seats away from slow growing States and adding new seats in states that show faster population growth. It is within the States themselves that unfair representation has been allowed to flourish.

Let me cite the State of Texas as an example. The Fifth District has a population of 939,845. Adjacent to it, the Sixth District has a population of only 245,554. The Fourth District on the other side has only 213,347 population. This simply means that voters in the Fourth and Sixth Districts are casting nearly four times as powerful a ballot as those in the heavily populated Fifth.

Texas has 6 districts with less than 300,000 population and 7 districts with more than 500,000. Clearly, a realinement of these districts is in order. Should the State legislature fail to redistrict next session, Texas Congressmen face the prospect of running at large; an unpleasant prospect in a State with 9,579,677 population scattered over an area encompassing thousands of square miles.

The States have not always acted responsibly on the matter of equal representation although the Congress has not interfered, but left designation of districts to the State government. There

have been examples of gerrymandering which have created octopuslike districts to insure the election of a Congressman of one particular party. This is unwieldy, but is not as serious a defect as population imbalance such as that of Texas.

Congress does have the power to change this system. Article 1, section 4 of the Constitution of the United States provides that:

> **The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for * * * Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State * * * but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations * * ***

The Congress has acted sparingly in the past in this field. However, with the increased amount of judicial activity in redistricting matters, the House faces the prospect of losing part of its coequal authority unless it acts decisively to secure fair representation. Among the 22 States which have redistricted since the 1960 census, 12 still contain from 1 to 9 districts which vary by more than 20 percent, greater or smaller, from the State's average district population.

The House is elected every 2 years because it is intended to be the body of the Government closest to the people. Its name bespeaks the intent of those who founded our system of government. It is, of course, impractical to suggest that all districts must have identical populations. However, when widespread divergence from the population averages are maintained, cause for action is apparent. In California, one district is short of the State average by 42 percent. In Colorado, one district is 49 percent larger and another 55 percent smaller than the average.

Several Members have introduced legislation to remedy the situation. Congress must act, be it more in sorrow than in anger. Leaving the job to the States in hope that they might accept the responsibility Congress has granted them, will no longer do. The Texas decision was a harbinger of a rash of court contests ahead as an irate citizenry is beginning to realize the injustice of maladministration of the districting privilege.

The remedy may be distasteful. It may raise considerable protest from State officials who want to guard jealously the political manipulations which congressional districting invites. Some of our own colleagues may oppose redistricting. Nonetheless the problem is there. Time is of the essence. If we do not do it the judiciary will, and we perhaps may not be pleased with the outcome.

THE LATE MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL J. GALVIN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, December 12, 1963, a great American, and a close valued friend of mine, Maj. Gen. Michael J. Galvin, died. In addition to being the commanding officer of the 94th Reserve Division, General Galvin was an outstanding member of the Massachusetts State Senate.

His death, with years of valuable service ahead for him, is a great loss to Nation and to State.

Gen. "Mike" Galvin typified to the highest extent humanly possible the citizen soldier of our country.

He loved our country, dedicating his life to our Nation's best interests, both in time of peace, and in time of war.

Enlisting as a private in the 94th Division in 1928, he rose through the different higher ranks to later become its commanding officer, with the rank of major general at the time of his death.

During World War II, then a colonel, he served with the 6th Armored Division in the famed 3d Army commanded by his long-time friend, Gen. George Patton. General Patton recognized his ability as a fighting commander and it was in this role—in the lead tank of General Patton's flying columns—that by his leadership and courage, he made a most impressive war record.

At the end of World War II, he emerged as a colonel, and for his bravery and outstanding leadership he was the recipient of the Silver Star and two Bronze Stars for gallantry, the Legion of Merit, and the Croix de Guerre, with gold combat star.

In 1959 General Galvin returned to the 94th Division as brigadier general. He helped turn it into a prototype Pentomic Division.

Assuming command of the 94th in 1959, under his leadership this division was recognized as the outstanding Reserve division in the country. Certainly, there were none better.

Gen. George Marshall once called Galvin the outstanding "reservist of World War II." Everyone recognized him as a warrior.

In time of peace, he dedicated himself in the service of Nation and State.

A close friend of the late Governor of Massachusetts and Secretary of Labor, Maurice Tobin, Michael Galvin served with great distinction as Under Secretary of Labor from 1949 to 1953. His services, on a very high level to carry out important assignments, were also utilized by former President Eisenhower. He was also a close and valued friend of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

In 1962, General Galvin was a candidate for the first time for an elective office, being the Democratic candidate for the State senate in what was considered a safe Republican District.

The confidence and respect of the people of his Senatorial district, Democrats, Republicans, and independents, was evidenced on election day by a surprising and convincing victory.

While his service in the Masachusetts State Senate, due to his death, was short, in that period of time he made a record that usually takes a number of terms to make.

His life is the story and the spirit of America where opportunity exists for all to go ahead and advance, if they have the ambition, the courage and the determination.

The life of Michael J. Galvin, as a soldier and as a citizen, is one of Americanism at its best—an example and an inspiration for all to follow, and one that the youth of America should strive to emulate.

In his death the Nation has lost a great American; Massachusetts one of its outstanding sons, and I have lost a most valued friend.

To Mrs. Galvin, her son and four daughters, Mrs. McCormack and I extend to them our deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

PARASITES IN THE AMERICAN THEATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by the evidence revealed at public hearings conducted last week by Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz of the State of New York. It is clear that the core of the American theater—the Broadway stage—has become the prey of adventurers, opportunists, and charlatans of the worst description. At a time when we in Congress are exerting every effort to encourage the American theater so that its cultural values can be brought to all our citizens, it is disheartening to learn once more that selfish parasites are draining it of all vitality.

The facts that have been disclosed are not surprising to me. In 1961 and 1962, at my urging, a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee held hearings in New York, California, and Washington that indicated an assortment of practices that caused great sums of money to be illegally siphoned away from those legitimately entitled to it—such as performers, authors, and investors. On several previous occasions and again today, I have asked that the Internal Revenue Service investigate the situation and prosecute those who took such money and failed to pay taxes on it. To my knowledge, no such action has been taken.

I again call upon the Internal Revenue Service and the law enforcement agencies of the Federal Government to act without delay. If tax money has been kept from the Government, I want to know of it. This Congress should want to know who the parasites are in the American theater and insist that every means be taken to root them out. If satisfactory action is not forthcoming soon from the Internal Revenue Service, I shall ask the appropriate congressional committees to conduct an investigation.

I am sure that many of us in Congress will continue our efforts to encourage the growth and development of the American theater. We believe that the living theater is an essential element of our Nation's cultural fiber and should be made available to all our people. It is my hope that we will redouble our efforts in behalf of programs that will make this possible. But in order to assure that our efforts will bear fruit, we must insist that the type of activity revealed by the hearings in New York be immediately stopped.

U.N. GENOCIDE TREATY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which the United Nations General Assembly recommended for ratification by member states in 1948.

This is a subject to which I have long attached the greatest importance, and have entertained the deepest hope that the United States would take positive action in showing to all the world its repugnance and strong opposition to the monstrous crime of genocide. Last year, in the 87th Congress, I introduced similar legislation, House Resolution 783, to attain this admirable goal. I regret to say that legislation was not approved, and so I once again bring before my colleagues a resolution calling for action against the scourge of genocide.

Mr. Speaker, this crime of genocide, which in essence is the calculated destruction of an ethnic group, was outlawed by the United Nations General Assembly. The United States played a strong and determined role in the U.N. in achieving this historic breakthrough for human rights. How bitterly ironic it is to find that over a dozen years later this same United States has faltered in ratifying the very treaty it worked so hard to initiate. It reminds one of the tragic historic precedent, admittedly on a grander scale, when President Wilson took the initiative in the establishment of the League of Nations, only to later find the international organization rejected by his own country. Such national inconsistency was tragic with regard to the League, and in our time it is certainly lamentable that we should now fail to take the final step in ratifying the genocide convention which we earlier worked so hard to bring into existence.

Genocide was defined in the General Assembly of the U.N. as a policy of deliberate acts intended to destroy a national, ethnic, racial or religious group. The acts constituting genocide were described as killing, causing serious bodily or mental harm, inflicting living conditions calculated to bring about physical destruction, imposing measures to prevent birth and forcibly carrying away the children of a national, ethnic, racial or religious group.

These acts constituting genocide are so obviously repugnant to the sensibilities of all civilized men that there should be no question that this Nation should fully and formally commit itself on this issue.

We have tarried for 13 years, and that, I respectfully submit, is quite long enough.

On many occasions we have professed on the world stage our interest and concern for the cause of human rights, both in the United States and throughout the world. My colleagues, it is high time we show that we mean what we say and put this Nation formally on record as opposed to the monstrous crime of genocide. I fervently urge your support to my resolution to this effect.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Burke (at the request of Mr. O'Neill), on account of illness in the family.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia, for Monday, December 16, on account of official business.

Mr. Roosevelt (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business—flood damage in Los Angeles.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Patman, for Wednesday, December 18, 1963, for 60 minutes; vacating his special order of 1 hour for today.

Mr. Giaimo (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Reifel), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Reifel) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Broomfield in two instances.

Mr. Alger.

Mr. McLoskey.

Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Ashbrook.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1322. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Eugenie II*, owned by J. C. Strout, of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2317. An act to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3005. An act to amend sections 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the requirement that an alien must make a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States before he may be enlisted or appointed in a reserve component;

H.R. 4338. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances for travel performed under orders that are canceled, revoked, or modified, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4839. An act for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.;

H.R. 4955. An act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, to extend for 3 years the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas), and for other purposes;

H.R. 9139. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 335. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December of each year as "Wright Brothers Day."

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1868. An act to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating to adult Indian vocational training;

S. 2139. An act to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3005. An act to amend sections 510 and 591 of title 10, United States Code, to remove the requirement that an alien must make a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States before he may be enlisted or appointed in a reserve component;

H.R. 4839. An act for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.;

H.R. 4955. An act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, to extend for 3 years the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas), and for other purposes;

H.R. 5179. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicle, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8720. An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962;

H.R. 8747. An act to making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9139. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 17, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1447. A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the Agency's reply to a report by the Comptroller General of the United States appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 18, 1963, as executive communication No. 1216; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1448. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, relative to scientific and professional positions established in the Library of Congress as authorized under Public Law 87–793, pursuant to Public Law 87–367; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1449. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the seventh report of the Attorney General on competition in the synthetic rubber industry for the calendar year 1961, pursuant to Senate Report 117, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1450. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on lack of effective supervisory controls over Federal and District of Columbia Government employees who are licensed to drive taxicabs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1451. A letter from the Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, relative to paying tribute to the late Congressman Francis E. Walter for his contribution to the work of the Migration Committee; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 6678. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain unneeded Federal lands of the Fort Miles Reservation, Del., to the State of Delaware for public educational and park purposes, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1042). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 592. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 4879, a bill to amend the Library Services Act to increase the Federal assistance for the improvement of public libraries; without amendment (Rept. No. 1043). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 593. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8190, a bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1044). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 594. Resolution for consideration of S. 1153, an act to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1045). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8000. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer-term financing in the United States and in markets abroad, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1046). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 9500. A bill to provide that the Mackinac toll bridge shall be operated as a free bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 9501. A bill to provide that the Mackinac toll bridge shall be operated as a free bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9502. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act regulating the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 9503. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9504. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9505. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 9506. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.J. Res. 876. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve and protect references to reliance upon God in Government matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 591. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should ratify the Genocide Convention recommended by the General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9507. A bill for the relief of Lilia Cortes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 9508. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Merrill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 9509. A bill for the relief of Mr. Seu Seng Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

526. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Peter E. Pappas, department adjutant, Department of Massachusetts, the American Legion, Boston, Mass., relative to paying tribute to the late President John F. Kennedy, declaring December 7, 1963, as John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Day; to the Committee on House Administration.

527. Also, petition of M. B. Wilson, minute clerk, Council of the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to concurring in an editorial written by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., recommending that Mrs. Jacqueline B. Kennedy be honored with the country's highest possible award for a woman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

528. Also, petition of Walter A. Holoz, deputy clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, Buffalo, N.Y., to set aside as a national holiday the 22d day of November as one of memory and remembrance and reevaluation and dedicated to the spirit of love and freedom throughout this great Nation and among our people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

529. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to appropriate enough money to permit the U.S. Post Office to hand out free to everyone and anyone asking for a copy of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

530. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to initiate a resolution congratulating President Johnson for his closing down of 25 domestic armed services bases and 7 foreign armed services bases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

531. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to ask the Joint Committee on Printing to change certain typography in the permanent bound volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

532. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to honor by appropriate plaque somewhere in the U.S. Capitol Building, the first recorded petitioners to the U.S. House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

533. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to appropriate a sum of money necessary to build an adequate statue to the late President Kennedy on Capitol Hill; to the Committee on House Administration.

534. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to legislate to require any Cabinet member in line for Acting Presidential succession to be a Cabinet member confirmed in his Cabinet post by the U.S. Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

535. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to President and Vice President succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

536. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting that there be formed a special "others" committee to define all the other rights referred to in the ninth amendment to the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hon. George A. Dondero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished American, an able and fearless legislator, and a good friend celebrates his 80th birthday today.

He is the Honorable George A. Dondero, a Member of the House of Representatives for 24 years, former chairman of the House Committee on Public Works.

I had the honor of succeeding Mr. Dondero after he voluntarily retired from the House in January 1957. He was, and is still, of great help to me, and I still count on his wisdom and his sage advice.

A great many of my colleagues here today count George Dondero as a good friend who fought relentlessly for what he believed.

It is no accident that one of the great channels on the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Wiley-Dondero Ship Channel, was named in his honor. Because Mr. Dondero often has been called "Mr. Seaway" for his persistent and victorious effort to win approval for the St. Lawrence Seaway, making our Great Lakes America's Seventh Sea.

Those of us in Oakland County, Mich., remember him for other things as well. He was village clerk of Royal Oak in 1905–06; then township treasurer, village assessor, and village attorney. He was assistant prosecuting attorney for Oakland County and was elected as the first mayor of the newly incorporated city of Royal Oak in 1921.

He was a member of the board of education in Royal Oak for 18 years.

Today, that sleepy little town which George Dondero helped to form and which he led so ably in its beginning years has grown into a dynamic, thriving metropolis in the heart of an area which has experienced rapid, almost explosive, growth.

I have lived in Royal Oak all my life, and I want to take this moment to congratulate this man, George Dondero, who has done so much for his community, his State, and his Nation.

In many ways, George Dondero is Royal Oak. He has many of the qualities of the tree from which the city took its name. He has shown the same strength, the same ability to weather the storms of life, the same strong heart and flawless character which has made this tree a symbol of integrity and principle.

Happily, like the oak, George Dondero does not seem to be troubled by the years. He is still as vital, as interested, yes, as enthused with life as ever and we count it a happy experience when he is able to visit us here in Washington.

On behalf of my colleagues and myself, I want to wish George Dondero a happy 80th birthday, and let us hope we will see more of him here in Washington in the months and years to come.

Depressing Effect of Beef Imports on Livestock Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK R. MILLER
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, for some time now, I have been concerned over the mounting beef imports into the United States, a situation which is having a depressing impact on livestock prices. I last called attention to this on the floor of the Senate, on November 19, and I have been doing so all year long.

Last Thursday, December 12, it was my pleasure to appear before the U.S. Tariff Commission in support of action in this area. At that time, I strongly recommended against any lowering of the already-low import duties on dressed beef and veal unless a percentage limitation is imposed.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my statement, along with one supporting table, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement and table were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JACK MILLER, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF IOWA

Senator MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I very much appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you, today.

My State of Iowa, as you no doubt realize, ranks first in the number of cattle marketed for slaughter and first in hog production. Most of the feed grains we produce is consumed within our State for these purposes, and feeder cattles are shipped into Iowa from the ranch country of not only Nebraska, South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming, but from as far away as Texas and Mississippi. The viability of our economy is directly affected by the strength of the livestock market; and it is evident that when the market is strong there is a directly favorable impact on the ranching operations of the States from which feeder livestock are shipped into Iowa, and when the market is weak, there is a reverse impact.

Slaughter livestock prices during 1963 have been disastrous, and I regret to say that there does not appear to be much prospect for any improvement in the near future if conditions continue as they are. The Department of Agriculture on November 18 released a report which forecasts that net farm income will decline by nearly $400 million in 1963, and by another $600 million next year—a total reduction over the 2-year period of nearly $1 billion. There is some reason to believe that the decline will be worse than estimated.

For the first 2 months of this year, the USDA estimates receipts at nearly $160 million below the comparable period of a year ago.

There are many livestock marketing experts who believe that the unrestricted beef and veal importation policy under which we are now operating is having a serious impact on cattle prices throughout the United States—between 25 and 30 cents per 100 pounds on the price of marketed choice steers and about 50 cents per pound on the price of marketed utility cows, for example. Some spokesmen for the Department of Agriculture have theorized that most of the imported beef and veal is of cheaper quality types not under price pressure here, and that such imports do not make a noticeable impact on our domestic prices of better quality products. These spokesmen have overlooked the fact that if the lower quality products are not available, people will buy better quality products which our own farmers produce. They also overlook such findings as the one compiled by the Research Division of USDA in its November issue of the "Livestock and Meat Situation"—an outlook for 1964—indicating that when imports equal about 10 percent of total domestic beef production, it would cause on the average a drop of about 1 percent in the price of choice steers and nearly 3 percent in the price of utility cows. Since 1960, when imports equaled about 5 percent of domestic production, beef and veal imports have increased to the point where last year they amounted to nearly 10 percent and for the first 8 months of this year, they averaged 11 percent. In August, they amounted to 12.3 percent.

According to official USDA estimates, then, livestock producers would otherwise have received an additional 47 cents per 100 pounds in the price of utility cows in 1961 and 1962, or an additional $6.6 million income for each of these years, and as much if not more for 1963. In this grade of beef alone, the loss of income will amount to some $20 million as a result of imports.

In the choice steer category, in 1961 the reduction as a result of the level of imports would have amounted to approximately 27 cents per 100 pounds; and in 1962, nearly 30 cents. This means that in 1961, the out-of-pocket loss to livestock producers amounted to $28 million, in 1962 to $31.4 million, and in 1963 at least $32 million—with a 3-year total of some $91.5 million.

In these two grades of beef alone, then, our cattle feeders have seen their receipts decline by $111.5 million over a 3-year period.

Here is a rundown on the receipt losses incurred in shipping to various markets on the one grade of Choice steer alone: Chicago: 1961, $2.8 million; 1962, $2.7 million; Omaha: 1961, $1.4 million; 1962, $1.4 million; Sioux City: 1961, $1.2 million; 1962, $1.3 million; St. Louis: 1961, $190,000; 1962, $208,000; South St. Joseph: 1961, $485,000; 1962, $547,000; Kansas City: 1961, $349,000; 1962, $312,000; Denver: 1961, $377,000; 1962, $289,000; Indianapolis: 1961, $190,000; 1962, $188,000; South St. Paul: 1962, $364,000; Sioux Falls: 1961, $235,000; 1962, $253,000.

Receipts from marketing of livestock and livestock products during the first 9 months of 1963 are reported down $50 million from the comparable period of 1962, even though the volume increased—according to page 6 of the Farm Income Situation for November publication to which I have previously referred; but this appears to be an error since on page 10 a comparison of receipts for the period January through September for 1962 and 1963 reveals a difference of $99 million, not $50 million. Additionally during October, receipts estimated at $2 billion were down 3 percent.

Meanwhile, livestock production expenses zoomed from $2.5 billion recorded in 1960 to more than $3 billion in 1962, with every indication borne out by official reports, that they will be even higher this year. The parity ratio—the relation between the prices farmers received to the prices farmers paid for goods and services—stood at 77 in October, compared to 81 in December of 1960, and compared further to 100, which the farm sector should have if it is to share fairly with other segments of our economy in the national net income.

I have a table from the 1964 Outlook issue of the Livestock and Meat Situation of November, which I ask to have placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Specified costs and net returns in 6 selected Corn Belt cattle feeding programs, 1961–62 and 1962–63 [1]

Feeding program	1961–62				1962–63			
	Price per 100 pounds			Net return per head [2]	Price per 100 pounds			Net return per head [2]
	Paid for feeder	Received for fed cattle	Margin		Paid for feeder	Received for fed cattle	Margin	
CALVES								
Heifer calves, short fed: Bought as Good and Choice, September-October. Sold as Choice, June-July	$25.01	$25.21	+$0.20	$29.88	$26.20	$23.40	−$2.80	$7.14
Steer calves, long fed: Bought as Good and Choice, September-November. Sold as Choice, August-October	27.86	29.18	+1.32	64.87	30.49	24.24	−6.25	1.46
YEARLINGS								
Medium yearling steers, short fed: Bought as Medium, September-October. Sold as Good-Standard, January-February	21.14	24.35	+3.21	18.34	21.89	24.33	+2.44	12.11
Good yearling steers, short fed: Bought as Good, September-November. Sold as Choice, April-June	23.79	26.24	+2.45	28.08	25.74	23.02	−2.72	−20.12
Yearling steers long fed: Bought as Good and Choice, September-November. Sold as Prime, July-September	24.68	30.14	+5.46	72.41	26.99	25.02	−1.97	−4.74
HEAVY STEERS								
Heavy steers, short fed: Bought as Good, September-November. Sold as Choice and Prime, March-May	22.44	28.23	+5.80	54.19	24.62	23.91	−.71	−17.14

[1] Feeding programs designed to be fairly representative of average feeding programs in the Corn Belt. Feeders are purchased in Kansas City and sold at Chicago.

[2] Net return over cost of corn, hay, protein supplement, pasture, transportation and marketing expenses. Does not include labor, overhead, cost of other feeds and death loss, or credit for manure and for hogs following feeders.

This table shows the net return per head on heifer calves dropping from $29.88 in 1961–62 to $7.14 in 1962–63; the net return on steer calves dropping from $64.87 to $1.46; the net return on good yearling steers dropping from $28.08 to a loss of $20.12; and the net return on heavy steers dropping from $54.19 to a loss of $17.14. These are conditions which require action—not just an expression of concern.

Few of us will deny that world trade is imperative to improvements in world economy. And it would be contrary to long-established policy to totally exclude certain imports as a means of resolving an economic problem in any one segment of our domestic economy. But it is economically untenable and suicidal to completely ignore the gradual strangulation of an industry through depressed prices induced to a significant degree by a policy of unrestricted imports—increasing faster than the rate of our own consumption.

I do not advocate elimination of beef and veal imports. Nor do I necessarily advocate a limitation on the basis of pounds—say the volume which existed in 1960. Rather, I have been advocating a limitation on the basis of percentage of our domestic production, to the amount which existed in 1960 which was 5 percent.

Because our increasing population demands increased domestic production, the volume or pounds of imports could be expected to rise while the percentage limitation remained constant. This would be fair to those countries which have been exporting beef and veal to us, because as our consumption expands, their volume would expand with it. It would be fair to our own domestic producers, because as our consumption expands, their volume would expand with it rather than being curtailed, as it now is, by an ever-increasing percentage from imports.

In any event, I strongly recommend against any lowering of the already low import duties on dressed beef and veal unless a percentage limitation such as I have referred to is imposed.

I recognize that there are limitations within which the Tariff Commission can act in response to the problem I have outlined, but I have set forth these views to assist the Commission in arriving at a fair and informed judgment on actions relating to this subject within the scope of its authority and the limited purpose of this hearing. Thank you.

Chairman DORFMAN. Thank you, Senator.

Moratorium on Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 16, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from our good colleague, BURT L. TALCOTT from the 12th District of California, is timely and intelligent. Certainly it is entertaining to see a newspaper that spews hate in articles and cartoons take on a "better than thou" attitude when anyone dares to disagree with them. Once again: What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

MORATORIUM ON HATE

Your editorial of December 6 calling Judge HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, a "tyrant" seemed mean, hypocritical and hateful.

I am sure that you do not presume that your paper can hate, or has a license to peddle hate, when it suits your purpose—but that every other person who disagrees or disapproves is a hatemonger or bigot. But you called a man a tyrant with sanctimonious abandon. Is not calling a man a tyrant as hateful as calling him a Communist? Which caller, really, is more bigoted or hateful?

If we are to invoke a moratorium on hate, should not it apply to everyone? Is not a person who piously decries "hatemongering" by others, but mongers hate himself, even more despicable because of the inconsistent hypocrisy?

Should not the editorial page of a newspaper be in the vanguard of those who eschew hate—even including the cartoonists and columnists it employs? Should not newspapers, as well as ministers and politicians, practice what they preach?

Does not one who has a typewriter and a paper have a higher obligation for truth, honesty, and consistency than one who screams from a mob on the street?

BURT L. TALCOTT,
U.S. Representative, 12th District of California.
WASHINGTON.

Impact of Foreign Beef Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the following is my statement before the U.S. Tariff Commission, December 16, 1963, which may be of interest to my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT T. McLOSKEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, DECEMBER 16, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues from the Congress who have testified before this Commission on behalf of the livestock industry of America in urging swift and fair action on the serious problem of foreign livestock imports and particularly beef imports.

The Commission is aware, I am sure, that in 1962, $20 out of every $100 in sales of agricultural products was derived from cattle and calves. Therefore, any impact on the price structure of the cattle market makes itself felt throughout this Nation's whole agricultural economy.

Imports of foreign beef have been increasing steadily and show no signs of declining.

In 1962 red meat imports increased 39 percent over 1961, and the importation of live cattle increased 15 percent. The picture in 1963 is much the same. While I do not put the entire blame for the sharp drop in the market on the foreign imports, it does appear obvious that these imports must shoulder a large part of the responsibility for the decline in prices on the American market.

I represent seven counties in west central Illinois. Almost the entire economy of my district is orientated to agricultural production and farm implement manufacturing. The cattle raising and cattle feeding industry is strong in all seven of the counties but especially so in two of them, where conservatively 50 percent of their economy is derived from the beef industry.

When the price of Prime beef drops from $30 per hundredweight to $22 per hundredweight in the period of a few months, which it did this year, it means something to the people in these areas. I know because I was an active farmer and cattle producer at one time.

The point is that something has to be done to rectify this problem. I have introduced a bill (H.R. 5870), as have many other Members of Congress who are vitally concerned with the present inequities imposed on the American livestock producer by foreign imports. My bill proposes a system of quotas to be established based on average imports over a 5-year period. Most of the other bills introduced use this same basic approach with minor variations.

I have repeatedly contacted Chairman Wilbur Mills, of the Ways and Means Committee in an effort to get a hearing on my bill and likewise have contacted Mr. Christian Herter, the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, in an effort to solicit his support for the American livestock producer.

To date I have been thwarted in my efforts to right this wrong, but it appears the public is becoming better informed on this problem and I am hopeful some constructive action will be forthcoming in the very near future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Albert Schneider

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to pay tribute to one among us who has been giving loyal service to the House for almost as long as I have been on this earth.

I am speaking of Mr. Albert Schneider who began faithfully recording the debate and discussion in the House and in committee 40 years ago today.

Mr. Schneider originally started working in the House of Representatives on a committee assignment after he won a contest conducted by then Speaker Gillett for the position.

He worked as a committee reporter for 30 years before becoming an Official Reporter of House Debates 10 years ago, and he is a former world champion shorthand writer.

I am sure my colleagues join me in congratulating Mr. Schneider and in thanking him for his able assistance. Let us hope he will be with us for many more years.

Representative Talcott Praised for Letter to Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with the daily diet of the Washington Post on the reading menu of most Members of this body, it is easy to get a jaundiced view of the state of affairs of the Nation and world. The Post has had a field day attacking conservatives and Americans of the political right for some time. Now this paper seems intent on eradicating hate from the American scene notwithstanding it is one of the prime apostles of "hate your neighbor" in this country today.

Some Herblock cartoons are venomous and among the most vicious attacks on political conservatives which can be found anywhere. They cannot be dismissed as mere satire. Human Events recently recalled three of the worst of the hate-Nixon and hate-Goldwater cartoons which, after being published, were reprinted untold millions of times by the Democratic National Committee and the AFL–CIO.

In word pictures, the three cartoons were as follows:

First. Nixon, looking like a plug-ugly, crawls out of a sewer, drenched with slime.

Second. Goldwater, towering over a starving mother with three small children, leers: "If you had any initiative, you'd go out and inherit a department store."

Third. Goldwater, obviously a monster, snarling at two helpless little illegitimate children: "I don't want my tax money spent upon your kind."

The AFL–CIO, along with the Washington Post is currently taking bows as a merchant of love and kindness and is fighting hate in this great Nation. In truth, the leaders of this organization have been at the forefront of those preaching hate of conservatives and those who do not agree with their big spending, big government blueprint for socialism. Trade union papers and periodicals daily extol the virtues of the Socialists and the left while excoriating conservatives. I am convinced that the rank and file of labor does not go along with their leaders in this effort.

A good example is this excerpt from the Allied Industrial Worker on January 1962, which is further indication of the Herblock tie. The Washington Post carries a vicious anti-Goldwater cartoon by Herblock and it is promptly reprinted in the Allied Industrial Worker, as well as other AFL–CIO and leftwing organs. As a comment on the cartoon reprint, in their column entitled "Washington Letter," this union paper asserted:

> Herblock's latest peeve is Senator Barry Goldwater who is currently straddling the fence between the John Birch Society and the rightwing of the Republican Party, if that's possible. Goldwater is not as bright as Taft, not as crude as McCarthy, and not as oily as Dirksen. Nobody has punctured his inconsistencies better than Herblock who savagely takes off on the dapper man with horn-rimmed glasses in a manner which is most upsetting to people accustomed to the social graces. Since Herblock couldn't care less about cocktail parties—he lets fly with cartoons which have shown up Goldwater for what he is—a sanctimonious mossback who, if he had his way, would hurl this country into utter social chaos, deprive orphans of their milk, and cast the helpless into the street.

Think of that, Mr. Speaker. Not only is this a blatant lie; it is calculated to engender more than mere opposition to or political dislike and scorn of the junior Senator from Arizona. I charge that it is an example of leftwing extremism calculated to foment hate—nothing but cold and calculated hate of this distinguished American.

It is with great interest, Mr. Speaker, that I read in today's issue of the Washington Post a letter to the editor from our colleague, Representative Burt L. Talcott of the 12th District of California. I commend it to the reading of everyone because it strikes a very responsive chord on the "do as I say, not as I do" approach of this local newspaper which has a strange but easily understood double standard:

> MORATORIUM ON HATE
>
> Your editorial of December 6 calling Judge Howard W. Smith, chairman of the House Rules Committee, a "tyrant" seemed mean, hypocritical, and hateful.
>
> I am sure that you do not presume that your paper can hate, or has a license to peddle hate, when it suits your purpose—but that every other person who disagrees or disapproves is a hatemonger or bigot. But you called a man a tyrant with sanctimonious abandon. Is not calling a man a tyrant as hateful as calling him a Communist? Which caller, really, is more bigoted or hateful?
>
> If we are to invoke a moratorium on hate, should not it apply to everyone? Is not a person who piously decries "hatemongering" by others, but mongers hate himself, even more despicable because of the inconsistent hypocrisy?
>
> Should not the editorial page of a newspaper be in the vanguard of those who eschew hate—even including the cartoonists and columnists it employs? Should not newspapers, as well as ministers and politicians, practice what they preach?
>
> Does not one who has a typewriter and a paper have a higher obligation for truth, honesty, and consistency than one who screams from a mob on the street?
>
> Burt L. Talcott,
> *U.S. Representative, 12th District of California.*
> Washington.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include the following newsletter of December 14, 1963:

DECEMBER 14, 1963.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND POLITICS

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The contest in the House this week may make some wonder just who is for civil rights legislation. The question was on the civil rights bill. Since the death of President Kennedy proponents of the legislation have made every attempt to get approval through emotional appeal, demanding the measure be passed as a memorial to the late President. Regardless of whether or not one supports the measure, it must be decided on its merits after reasonable and proper debate, and not on any other basis. Over the years, it has been suggested the civil rights issue was mainly political and has been an instrument through which some have been able to gain the votes of Negroes as long as the issue was kept alive. How political the issue may be can be seen in this week's developments.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee brought out a discharge petition with the claim this was the only way to get around the Rules Committee, which programs legislation, and bring the civil rights bill to the floor for debate.

As a matter of fact, this is not the case. The civil rights bill could have been brought to the floor at any time during the past 10½ months on any Wednesday. Every Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday in the House of Representatives. This means that any chairman of any committee may bring up a bill which has been reported out of his committee and is in the Rules Committee. The majority on the Judiciary Committee and the leadership of the House never tried to use Calendar Wednesday. This week, after the Judiciary Committee finally reported out a bill, the discharge petition was introduced only a few days after the bill went out to the Rules Committee before it would even be possible to schedule hearings.

Here are some interesting facts brought out in debate:

1. In the 1960 campaign the Democratic candidates promised that the first order of business would be a civil rights bill. The administration took office January 20, 1961, but it was not until June 1, 1963, after nationwide demonstrations, the killing of a number of people, and the bombings in Birmingham that the Judiciary Committee considered any civil rights legislation.

2. On January 9, 1963, the first day of this session of Congress, a number of civil rights bills were introduced. No bill was reported out of committee until October 29 and the report was not made until November 20.

3. The chairman of the Rules Committee announced that the bill would be reported under regular procedures early in January, the earliest any action could be taken. In spite of this the discharge petition was introduced and nationwide pressure was put on every Member of the House to sign it.

4. The House leadership attempted, as usual, to dispense with Calendar Wednesday, but this was objected to by Congressman CURTIS of Missouri who pointed out that Calendar Wednesday was a perfectly proper way to bypass the Rules Committee and bring the civil rights issue to the floor immediately.

5. On Wednesday, on an almost straight party-line vote (216 to 166) the leadership adjourned the House to prevent the bill from coming up.

What conclusion can be reached from this chronology? Doesn't it almost make you believe that some of the loudest proponents of the civil rights bill are not so anxious to have it passed as they are to keep it as a political issue?

POLITICAL MORATORIUM?

The possible political motivation behind this week's drive was highlighted by Congressman FRANK BECKER, of New York, speaking directly to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, "We are supposed to have a period of 30 days of mourning for our late President, John F. Kennedy. I wanted to respect that request that was made that we set aside politics during that period of 30 days of mourning. Nobody wanted to respect it more than I. But I have found out in my experience that when the Democrats ask for a moratorium on politics it is only to gag the Republicans, but not themselves. This, to me, is political demagoguery at its lowest level, to introduce a discharge petition within 1 week after a bill goes to the Committee on Rules."

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

The House backed down in four important areas in adopting the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill (195 to 164):

1. The authorization is some $121 million higher than the House approved.

2. We accepted favored-nation treatment for Communist-dominated countries including Poland and Yugoslavia.

3. We accepted a weakening of the House position on the 2-percent interest rate on loans.

4. The provision to prohibit aiding Cuba through the United Nations was knocked out. A slap at big Federal spending was contained in the overwhelming defeat of a proposal to spend $400 million for a subway system in the District of Columbia (278 to 76).

However, we approved the conference report on the Clean Air Act which calls for spending $95 million in Federal funds over the next 3 years to accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution. This, like water pollution control, should not be the responsibility of the Federal Government, but can be handled better and cheaper by State and local communities.

The large area of Federal aid to education is still being debated, but this week two additional side-door approaches were approved. The House approved amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 which would increase the cost and maintain sole Federal contributions for another year. On one hand we are spending money to urge young people to stay in school and this legislation extends to them an engraved invitation to drop out of school and to receive Federal payments of $20 a week for up to 70 weeks for so doing. The conference report to expand the scope of the Federal education program was approved.

While President Johnson is calling for economy his congressional leaders are demanding heavier Federal spending in every bill they are pushing toward enactment. You cannot expand and add new Federal programs and cut the budget at the same time.

BRUCE ALGER,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 15: 33: *Now the God of peace be with you all.*

O Thou who art the source and inspiration of every noble and worthy desire, may we daily be drawn together in that unity of spirit which seeks to make the doing of Thy will the goal of all our aspirations.

We humbly confess that our aims and ambitions are frequently so low vaulted and primarily concerned with the temporal and transient.

Help us never to presume and believe that the aspirations, cherished by our minds and hearts are too high and holy to be fulfilled by Thy grace and power.

Wilt Thou give us the light of faith to labor faithfully, walk circumspectly and live without anxiety or fear.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6756. An act to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2985. An act to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to venue generally.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2513) entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes."

AMENDING SECTION 1391 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2985) an act to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to venue generally, with an amendment of the Senate thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out lines 6, 7, and 8, and insert:

"(f) A civil action on a tort claim arising out of the manufacture, assembly, repair, ownership, maintenance, use, or operation of an automobile may be brought in the judicial district wherein the act or omission complained of occurred.".

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGE BAN ON CUBAN SHIPPING TO BENEFIT WHOM?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, wire services report that a change has been made in National Security Memorandum No. 220, issued February 5, 1963, in regard to United States blacklisting foreign shipping engaged in the Cuban trade.

On checking with the Maritime Administration and with the State Department I am unable to get a copy of this change immediately. But if news reports are accurate this matter should receive a review by all concerned. It reportedly would make it easier for foreign shipowners to remove certain of their ships from the Cuban run, in return for a pledge to pull all their other ships out as present contracts expire. Failure to do so would result in a blacklisting of all other ships of that company in or out of the Cuban trade.

Now this sounds just fine. I certainly hope it turns out to be as good as it sounds. But it deserves a little closer attention than a departmental news release gives it.

Is it possible that we are trying to make it a little easier on these foreign shipowners to permit them to switch from the Cuban run to take advantage of the proposed U.S. sale of wheat to Russia? The Cuban trade has been very profitable in the past, but is it now possible that these shipowners fear a loss of business in Cuba due to the utter failure of the Cuban economy and the Cuban sugar crop? Would they like to take some of their ships out of the Cuban trade and put them back in the U.S. trade without actually cutting off all their Cuban business?

We would like the answers to these and other questions before cheering this new action on Cuban shipping. The wire services indicate that the change is one which has been in process for some time. Perhaps the best interests of all would be served if it were thoroughly reviewed by the newly designated Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and others, before it is put into effect, to insure that it does not merely reduce the inconvenience now imposed on foreign shipping to Cuba and does in fact provide for a further reduction of Cuban trade.

THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, proposals on Presidential succession appear to be the current fad. I have one which I consider down to earth and realistic. I believe it will meet with the overwhelming approval of the majority of the Congress on both sides of the aisle. And, that is no inconsiderable matter. I believe it will also receive the endorsement of the American people. And, that is most important of all.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the distinguished and able Speaker of the House, is next in line for the Presidency of the United States. He is to all effects and purposes both Speaker and Vice President. To my mind, he is one of the great Speakers of all time. He is fairminded, able, persuasive, and eloquent. He has to a very fine degree an ability to understand the problems of the Members who make up the House. Because of that understanding, he gives and receives from them closer cooperation that most Speakers. And, through these traits, he has endeared himself to an unusual degree to the membership.

However much I would be reluctant to have him leave his work as Speaker, I feel that he should be offered the place of Vice President on the next Democratic ticket. There is little if any doubt that Lyndon Johnson will be the nominee for President. The team of Johnson and MCCORMACK has more knowledge of Government and of the workings of the Congress than any other two men in America. It would be a natural thing for them to be associated on the Democratic ticket in the same relationship they now enjoy as President and as Speaker-Vice President.

This is not a run-of-the-mill recommendation. This is a very serious proposal. The President reputedly would like a strong easterner to bolster his ticket. There is no easterner in the Democratic Party who is stronger than JOHN MCCORMACK. There have been some who have been critical of him. By and large, they are people who would have him turn the Nation and its legislative practices upside down for the advancement of their own proposals. They do not speak for the majority. JOHN MCCORMACK suits the big majority in and out of Congress. He should be Vice President, both in name and in fact—if he would consider the job.

RÉSUMÉ OF APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the last day of the session I may include in the body of the RECORD a résumé of appropriations proceedings with pertinent tables and data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the final issue of the RECORD for the session, when final figures are available I may include a complete résumé of the appropriations statistics of the session together with pertinent tables and data on the budget.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY IN SQUARE 758

The Clerk called the bill (S. 254) to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

SAINT-GAUDENS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, NEW HAMPSHIRE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4018) to authorize establishment of the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, New Hampshire, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LAKE ERIE SESQUICENTENNIAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1828) to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission so as to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ORGANIC ACT OF NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5838) to amend the act of March 3, 1901—31 Stat. 1449—as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

WATERS IMPOUNDED BY FLAMING GORGE DAM

The Clerk called Senate Joint Resolution 17 to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Flaming Gorge Dam, Utah, in the States of Wyoming and Utah, as "Lake O'Mahoney."

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **PELLY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

CARLSBAD CAVERNS NATIONAL PARK, N. MEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7458) to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Carlsbad Caverns National Park situated in the State of New Mexico shall consist of the following described lands:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

Township 24 south, range 23 east: south half section 35; section 36.

Township 24 south, range 24 east: sections 25 to 29, inclusive; sections 31 to 36, inclusive.

Township 24 south, range 25 east: south half southeast quarter section 19; south half south half section 20; south half south half section 21; southwest quarter southwest quarter section 26; sections 27 to 33, inclusive; west half section 34; northwest quarter northeast quarter section 34.

Township 25 south, range 22 east: sections 24, 25, 35, and 36.

Township 25 south, range 23 east: sections 1 to 33, inclusive; northwest quarter section 34.

Township 25 south, range 24 east: north half section 1; west half section 2; northeast quarter section 2; sections 3 to 8, inclusive; west half section 9; northeast quarter section 9; northwest quarter section 10; west half section 17; northeast quarter section 17; section 18; northwest quarter section 19.

Township 25 south, range 25 east: north half section 5; north half section 6.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: north half section 1; west half southwest quarter section 1; section 2; section 11; west half west half section 12; northwest quarter section 14.

Township 26 south, range 23 east: northwest quarter section 6.

All of which contains 46,786.11 acres, more or less.

And the tract of land, including Rattlesnake Springs, lying in section 23, township 25 south, range 24 east, New Mexico principal meridian, acquired by the United States for water right purposes by warranty deed dated January 23, 1934, recorded in Eddy County, New Mexico, records in deed book 64 on page 97, containing 79.87 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of acquiring the State-owned lands lying within the area described in section 1 of this Act, consisting of 2,721.12 acres, and described as follows:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

Township 24 south, range 23 east: section 36.

Township 24 south, range 24 east: section 32.

Township 24 south, range 25 east: section 32.

Township 25 south, range 24 east: lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, south half north half, southwest quarter section 2.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: south half section 2, the Secretary of the Interior may, subject to such terms, conditions, and reservations as may be necessary or are in the public interest, including the reservation of surface rights-of-way across Federal lands situated in township 25 south, range 24 east, New Mexico principal meridian, for the construction of roads and utility lines between park headquarters and Rattlesnake Springs, exchange the following described 2,719.80 acres of public land of approximately equal value:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

Township 24 south, range 25 east: southeast quarter section 34.

Township 25 south, range 24 east: south half section 1; west half section 11; west half section 14; section 15; southeast quarter section 17.

Township 25 south, range 25 east: south half section 5; lot 6, northeast quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter section 6.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: west half west half section 13; north half northeast quarter section 14.

(b) For the purpose of acquiring the private lands or interests in lands lying within the area described in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may, subject to such terms, conditions, and reservations as may be necessary, exchange on an approximately equal value basis any of the following described lands:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

Township 25 south, range 24 east: southeast quarter section 9; south half, northeast quarter section 10.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: south half, south half northeast quarter section 14.

(c) Notwithstanding section 2(a) of this Act, when an exchange involves lands in section 32, township 24 south, range 24 east, New Mexico principal meridian, which the State of New Mexico has leased, the Secretary may compensate a lessee for the reasonable value of his improvements to the lands. Reasonable value shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior by obtaining an impartial appraisal.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to convey to the State of New Mexico a right-of-way over lands between the western boundary of the southeast quarter of section 34, township 24 south, range 25 east, and the vicinity of the caverns for the use of the State in constructing a park-type road for public use thereon: *Provided*, That the State may construct a road which shall meet the general standards of National Park Service roads and shall agree to reconvey its interests in such lands and any improvements thereon, without cost to the United States, upon completion of such road. The location of the road shall be determined by the Secretary, after consultation with officials of the State of New Mexico.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 5. Section 4 of the Act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 279; 16 U.S.C. 407c), is repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, lines 20, 21, and 22, strike out all of section 4 and insert:

"SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $500 to carry out the purposes of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. **ASPINALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1175) to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes, a similar bill to the one the House just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Carlsbad Caverns National Park situated in the State of New Mexico shall consist of the following described lands:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

Township 24 south, range 23 east: south half section 35; section 36.

Township 24 south, range 24 east: sections 25 to 29, inclusive; sections 31 to 36, inclusive.

Township 24 south, range 25 east: south half southeast quarter section 19; south half south half section 20; south half south half section 21; southwest quarter southwest quarter section 26; sections 27 to 33, inclusive; west half section 34; northwest quarter northeast quarter section 34.

Township 25 south, range 22 east: sections 24, 25, 35, and 36.

Township 25 south, range 23 east: sections 1 to 33, inclusive; northwest quarter section 34.

Township 25 south, range 24 east: north half section 1; west half section 2; northeast quarter section 2; sections 3 to 8, inclusive; west half section 9; northeast quarter section 9; northwest quarter section 10; west half section 17; northeast quarter section 17; section 18; northwest quarter section 19.

Township 25 south, range 25 east: north half section 5; north half section 6.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: north half section 1; west half southwest quarter section 1; section 2; section 11; west half west half section 12; northwest quarter section 14.

Township 26 south, range 23 east: northwest quarter section 6.

All of which contains 46,786.11 acres, more or less.

And the tract of land, including Rattlesnake Springs, lying in section 23, township 25 south, range 24 east, New Mexico principal meridian, acquired by the United States for water right purposes by warranty deed dated January 23, 1934, recorded in Eddy County, New Mexico, records in deed book 64 on page 97, containing 79.87 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of acquiring the State-owned lands lying within the area described in section 1 of this Act, consisting of 2721.12 acres, and described as follows:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

Township 24 south, range 23 east: section 36.

Township 24 south, range 24 east: section 32.

Township 24 south, range 25 east: section 32.

Township 25 south, range 24 east: lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, south half north half, southwest quarter section 2.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: south half section 2, the Secretary of the Interior may, subject to such terms, conditions, and reservations as may be necessary or are in the public interest, including the reservation of surface rights-of-way across Federal lands situated in township 25 south, range 24 east, New Mexico principal meridian, for the construction of roads and utility lines between park headquarters and Rattlesnake Springs, exchange the following described 2719.80 acres of public land of approximately equal value:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

Township 24 south, range 25 east: southeast quarter section 34.

Township 25 south, range 24 east: south half section 1; west half section 11; west half section 14; section 15; southeast quarter section 17.

Township 25 south, range 25 east: south half section 5; lot 6, northeast quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter section 6.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: west half west half section 13; north half northeast quarter section 14.

(b) For the purpose of acquiring the private lands or interests in lands lying within the area described in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may, subject to such terms, conditions, and reservations as may be necessary, exchange on an approximately equal value basis any of the following described lands:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

Township 25 south, range 24 east: southeast quarter section 9; south half, northeast quarter section 10.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: south half, south half northeast quarter section 14.

(c) Notwithstanding section 2(a) of this Act, when an exchange involves lands in section 32, township 24 south, range 24 east, New Mexico principal meridian, which the State of New Mexico has leased, the Secretary may compensate a lessee for the reasonable value of his improvements to the lands. Reasonable value shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior by obtaining an impartial appraisal.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to convey to the State of New Mexico a right-of-way over lands between the western boundary of the southeast quarter of section 34, township 24 south, range 25 east, and the vicinity of the caverns for the use of the State in constructing a park-type road for public use thereon: *Provided*, That the State may construct a road which shall meet the general standards of National Park Service roads and shall agree to reconvey its interests in such lands and any improvements thereon, without cost to the United States, upon completion of such road. The location of the road shall be determined by the Secretary, after consultation with officials of the State of New Mexico.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 5. Section 4 of the Act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 279; 16 U.S.C. 407c), is repealed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1175 and insert the provisions of H.R. 7458 as passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 7458) was laid on the table.

CONVEY LAND AT CHINA LAKE, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 189) to authorize the conveyance of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif., to the county of Kern, State of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask someone who is knowledgeable about this bill whether the land has appreciated in value. I note that the Government started purchasing this land in 1942. I would be surprised if there is any land in California that has not appreciated in value, to some extent at least, since 1942.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. There will be no commercial exploitation of the property, I may say to the gentleman from Iowa. However, there will be great benefits that will come to the entire reservation from this action.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. However, I want to know whether this land has increased in value.

Mr. PHILBIN. Yes, I think the land has increased in value. But I think the benefits are going to come to the entire reservation as a result of the transfer, and these benefits are very significant.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a substantial reason why they cannot pay the fair market price for this land?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. According to the information supplied to the objectors, the land was acquired by the Government for the Navy at a cost of $531.

Mr. GROSS. Total?

Mr. FORD. As I understand it. The best use of the property at its appraised market value today would be $85,000. However, according to the committee, the so-called highest and best use of the property would conflict with the desires of the Department of the Navy. I do not know what the highest and best use would be, but this is a statement which I understand the committee has made.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to convey to the county of Kern, State of California, a parcel of land containing one hundred and seven acres, more or less, situated on the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California, metes and boundary description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

SEC. 2. Said property is to be conveyed to the county of Kern for the same consideration for which it originally was acquired by the Federal Government, with the understanding that the county intends to use the lands for park and recreation purposes.

With the following committee amendments:

1. On page 1, line 5, delete "one hundred and seven acres" and substitute in lieu thereof "one hundred five and one-half acres".

2. On pages 1 and 2, delete all of section 2 and substitute the following:

"SEC. 2. Said property is to be conveyed to the county of Kern for the same consideration for which it was originally acquired by the United States. The conveyance shall provide that the property shall be used and maintained for park, recreational, educational, and other public purposes and that in the event the property ceases to be used or maintained for such purposes, it shall, in its then existing condition, at the option of the Secretary of the Navy, revert to the United States and to the control of the Department of the Navy. The conveyance may contain such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined by the Secretary of the Navy to be necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN LANDS LOCATED WITHIN THE VICINITY OF FORT DEVENS, MASS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 393) to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whereas jurisdiction of a portion of West Main Street in the town of Ayer, Massachusetts, also known as the "Shirley Ayer Road," is in dispute between the United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and remains unresolved, the United States hereby makes retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of any exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction it may have acquired at any time and by any means over the following described land comprising the said portion of West Main Street:

Beginning at a concrete bound in the southerly line of West Main Street, said bound being in the division line between land of the United States and land, now or formerly, of John Narey, and being 25 feet distant southeasterly at right angle to about station 39+95 in the 1919 county layout of

West Main Street; thence along said southerly line of West Main Street, south 61 degrees 04 minutes 30 seconds west 547 feet, more or less, to a stone bound, southwesterly and westerly 247.68 feet along a curve to the right with radius of 363.17 feet to a stone bound, north 79 degrees 51 minutes west 177.21 feet to a stone bound, northwesterly and westerly 161.70 feet along a curve to the left with radius of 1,021.83 feet to a stone bound, north 88 degrees 55 minutes west 42.0 feet to a stone bound, south 85 degrees 22 minutes 30 seconds west 100.5 feet to a stone bound, north 88 degrees 55 minutes west 200.0 feet to a stone bound, north 83 degrees 12 minutes 30 seconds west 100.5 feet to a stone bound, north 88 degrees 55 minutes west 669.04 feet to a stone bound, northwesterly 96.39 feet along a curve to the right with radius of 977.45 feet to a stone bound and north 83 degrees 16 minutes west 780 feet, more or less to a point; thence north 06 degrees 44 minutes east 50.00 feet crossing West Main Street to a point in the northerly line of West Main Street at the division line between land of United States and land, now or formerly, of the Fitchburg and Leominster Street Railway; thence along the northerly line of West Main Street south 83 degrees 16 minutes east 780 feet, more or less, to a stone bound, southeasterly 91.46 feet along a curve to the left with radius of 927.47 feet to a stone bound, south 88 degrees 55 minutes east 1,111.04 feet to a stone bound, southeasterly 169.61 feet along a curve to the right with radius of 1,071.83 feet to a stone bound, south 79 degrees 51 minutes east 177.21 feet to a stone bound, southeasterly, easterly, and northeasterly 213.58 feet along a curve to the left with radius of 313.17 feet to a stone bound and north 61 degrees 04 minutes 30 seconds east 542 feet, more or less, to a point in the division line between land of United States and land now or formerly of Patrick Foley; thence southeasterly crossing West Main Street 50 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning.

Containing 3.6 acres, more or less.

Sec. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction herein contained shall take effect upon acceptance by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army may at such times as he may deem desirable, relinquish to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts all, or such portion as he may deem desirable for relinquishment, of the jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States over any lands within the Fort Devens Military Reservation, Massachusetts, reserving to the United States such concurrent or partial jurisdiction as he may deem necessary. Relinquishment of jurisdiction under the authority of this Act may be made by filing with the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a notice of such relinquishment, which shall take effect upon acceptance thereof by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in such manner as its laws may prescribe."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN PROPERTY AT FORT WALTON BEACH, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7248) to change the designated use of certain real property conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., under the terms of Public Law 86–194.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida a question or two. As I understand it, this land was made available to the community in the first instance for recreational purposes?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. The purpose now is to make this land available for educational purposes?

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is correct. There is need for additional land for educational facilities, including possibly a junior college. It is now hoped the Federal Government will concur in the request that the land can be used for educational purposes in addition to the present use for recreational purposes.

Mr. FORD. I do not intend to object to this legislation, but I want to ask a question which I think is very important: If the land is made available for educational purposes and a school is constructed, there is no danger that once the school is constructed a claim will be made for reimbursement because of aircraft operation on the air base?

Mr. SIKES. That is a very legitimate question. This land is several miles from the landing fields and is not in the flight pattern. There is very little likelihood any such claim would result. In the unlikely incident of damage I do not believe my people would seek reimbursement, but I will go one step further and assure the gentleman I plan to be around for some time yet, and I would not be a party to any such arrangement.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Florida. That satisfies any questions I have.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to concur in what the gentleman has said. We had a bill pending for the past 2 years—it has not appeared again this year—sponsored by a Member of the House, who is trying to get a new school built because of jet engine noise, the school new being located on the premises of a jet airbase. I am glad the gentleman from Michigan asked the question he did because I certainly would object if the school to be built under this bill, on a jet airbase or the immedaite vicinity of a jet airbase, would eventually have to be moved at Government expense.

Mr. SIKES. This reservation comprises approximately a half million acres. The site is removed from landing fields. It is not in the flight pattern. Of course, the school buildings are not to be built with Federal funds.

Mr. GROSS. One further question: How was this land obtained originally? Did the Government buy it?

Mr. SIKES. Many years ago the Government bought the land. First it was a national forest. The land was acquired by the Government at a very low cost. Many years later it was transferred to the War Department to become a military reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of August 25, 1959 (73 Stat. 423), is amended by substituting for the words "recreational purposes" wherever they occur, the words "recreation and educational purposes".

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Air Force shall issue such written instruments as may be necessary to bring the conveyance authorized by the Act of August 25, 1959 (75 Stat. 423), into conformity with the amendment made by the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on page 1, line 9, and ending on page 2, line 1, delete "(75 Stat 423)" and substitute "(73 Stat. 423)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE CITY OF OROVILLE, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7499) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey 0.25 acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed and without consideration to the city of Oroville, California, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of land consisting of 0.25 acre, more or less, and described as follows:

That land formerly owned by the city of Oroville and located within that certain tract known as "Map of South Thermoleto", Butte County, State of California; said map having been filed in the office of the recorder of the county of Butte, State of California, April 11, 1889, in book 2 of maps, at page 176, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the south boundary of lot 175 which point marks the junction of the south boundary of lot 175 and the northwesterly right-of-way of the Oroville-Willows Road, said point being described in a deed to the United States of America dated December 2, 1942, and recorded March 17, 1943, in volume 312 of official records, page 75; thence in a northeasterly direction along the northwesterly right-of-way of the Oroville-Willows Road, 870 feet, more or less, to a 1½-inch pipe stamped "No. 5", said pipe being the true point of beginning. Thence from said true point of beginning 71.5 feet in a southwesterly direction along the northwesterly right-of-way of the Oroville-Willows Road; thence at right angles to said right-of-way in a northwesterly direction, 110.0 feet; thence at right angles in a northeasterly direction 100.0 feet; thence at right angles in a southeasterly direction 110.0 feet, more or less, to the northwesterly right-of-way of the Oroville-Willows Road; thence in a southwesterly direction along said right-of-way 28.5 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning, containing 0.25 acre, more or less.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN CLAIMS IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7170) to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the author of the bill or a member of the committee a question or two about this bill?

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I will be glad to answer.

Mr. FORD. As I understand it, by this legislation they are wiping out claims the Federal Government would have to the extent of about $150,000.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Yes, but I would be pleased to respond more fully.

The Alaska public works program was carried out between 1949 and 1959. This was a program for financing useful public works in Alaskan communities on a 50-50 matching basis, while at the same time overcoming the military and other Federal impacts on those communities. During that 10 years there were 172 projects started and the last was completed in 1962. These had a value of $69 million, with 50 percent being repayable by the participating communities, and all are current as to all of the projects except three small communities. The exceptions are Skagway, Valdez, and the native village of Hoonah. The Skagway road project developed defects, and the Hoonah project involved a water system that did not become useable, for various reasons.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to solve or compromise such cases to the best of the circumstances in each particular case.

Mr. FORD. May I ask the gentleman from Alaska whether we are establishing a precedent here that would result in subsequent bills of a similar nature being submitted to the Congress?

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. The Housing and Home Finance Agency has had experience in resolving matters of this kind and it is better to follow this procedure than have the Attorney General foreclose on the project or community where the money is not forthcoming, anyhow.

Mr. FORD. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to be sure we are not setting a precedent; that we are not giving to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency power that he does not presently have to compromise and forgive claims.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Will the gentleman yield? I think that in the Housing and Home Finance Agency program there has been given similar power to the Administrator.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell the Members of the House whether the Administrator of the Housing and Home Financing Agency now has the power to compromise other claims by a stroke of his pen? Does he have the power you propose to give him under this bill?

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. The last paragraph of the bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to delegate this authority to an appropriate agency, which idea is approved in a report from the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency states that his agency has had long experience in this field.

Mr. GROSS. I understand about that. Certainly the Secretary of the Interior has authority to handle certain Alaskan real estate. But the question is, does he presently have the power you would give him under this bill, and to delegate it to another?

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. This is to give the Secretary of the Interior power he now lacks, I would say. I am not prepared to tell the gentleman the scope and extent of the Housing and Home Finance Agency's authority to compromise. I would be very glad to tell the gentleman, but I do not have the details.

Mr. GROSS. What you are doing in this bill is giving the Secretary of the Interior authority to delegate his power to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, if I understand the situation correctly. My question is, once more, does the Housing and Home Finance Agency presently have the power to compromise and forgive the Government's interest in real estate?

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I will yield to the gentleman from Colorado to answer the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. The answer is "No" as far as this particular operation is concerned. But the answer is "Yes" as to the general proposition—the Housing and Home Finance Agency has similar power in other operations as are proposed here. The Housing and Home Finance Agency closed out the work of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This legislation would give the organization responsibility for which it has had some experience. That is the only reason for the transfer of authority from the Secretary of the Interior, providing he sees fit to exercise it.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, that I just do not want to sit passively by here today if this is new and unusual power that is being given in this particular case to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. If the gentleman will say that this is not unusual power and that this is not setting a precedent, I would have no objection to the bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague will yield further, if he will look at page 3 of the report in the letter from Hon. Robert C. Weaver, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in the next to last paragraph it says:

> The Agency has had considerable experience in the negotiation and settlement of claims comparable to those covered under the bill in connection with the liquidation of several now terminated programs such as the public agency loan program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 5 of the Alaska Public Works Act (63 Stat. 627, 628; 48 U.S.C. 486c) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof: "*Provided,* That notwithstanding the requirements of this sentence, or any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to collect, or as he may determine to be justified by the special financial condition of the applicant or other unusual circumstances, to compromise or release any claim or obligation assigned to or held by him in connection with any such agreement until such time as such claim or obligation may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may delegate to the head of any other department or agency of the United States any of his functions, powers and duties with respect to such collection, compromise, or release of claims or obligations as he may deem appropriate, and may authorize the redelegation of such functions, duties, and powers by the head of such department or agency."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1756) to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act, a similar bill to the one just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 5 of the Alaska Public Works Act (63 Stat. 627, 628; 48 U.S.C. 486c) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof ": *Provided,* That notwithstanding the requirements of this sentence, or any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to collect, or as he may determine to be justified by the special financial condition of the applicant or other unusual circumstances, to compromise or release any claim or obligation assigned to or held by him on June 30, 1963, in connection with any such agreement until such time as such claim or obligation may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may delegate to the head of any other department or agency of the United States any of his functions, powers, and duties with respect to such collection, compromise, or release of claims or obligations as he may deem appropriate, and may authorize the redelegation of such functions, duties, and powers by the head of such department or agency."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Aspinall: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill, S. 1756, and insert the provisions of the bill, H.R. 7170, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 7170, was laid on the table.

CANCELING IRRIGATION CHARGES AGAINST NON-INDIAN-OWNED LANDS UNDER KLAMATH INDIAN PROJECT, OREGON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1713) to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I note this bill calls for the cancellation of $401,440.55 of reimbursable irrigation costs and any accrued interest charged to the lands of the Klamath Indian irrigation project in Oregon. This is a fairly substantial amount. The gentleman from Colorado knows my concern about these various proposals from time to time to cancel reimbursable costs. I am always suspicious that the Bureau of Reclamation has been overly optimistic in their original cost estimates and the payback features. I would like to hear the gentleman's comments.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to assure my colleague, I not only understand his feelings about this particular matter, but I too am sympathetic to the position he takes. First of all, this is not a Bureau of Reclamation project, and we must keep that in mind. This project was authorized and construction started before the act of 1902 came into existence. Further construction was continued after the act of 1902 was authorized and a great deal of money was spent upon the project. The difficulty here has been that the Indian lands and the non-Indian lands have been intermingled so that in trying to build an Indian project as was originally contemplated, non-Indian owners were affected. Therefore, we find at the present time there is this amount of $401,440.55 which is repayable for which there is no money or possibility of securing it to repay the amount.

In other words, under the act of June 22, 1936, the Secretary already has had to cancel these amounts which were due the United States, but the law provides he must bring them to Congress in order to get ratification of the Congress as provided in his act. It just so happens there is no payability present, and this is more or less of a bookkeeping proposition. If there were any other way to do it and if there were any other way to get all or a part of the amount, I would certainly be in favor of doing it. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has gone into this quite thoroughly, as it did on the Navajo matters last year. I do not know of anything else to do.

Mr. FORD. Can I be assured that your committee really gives the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, a hard time on these cancellation programs?

Mr. ASPINALL. May I suggest to my friend from Michigan he can be assured we not only have been, but we are at present and shall continue to give close supervision over these matters.

Mr. FORD. I share the gentleman's last comment.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in accordance with the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803, 25 U.S.C. 389), the order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling $401,440.55 of reimbursable irrigation costs and any accrued interest thereon chargeable to lands in the Klamath Indian irrigation project is approved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "costs", insert "and any accrued interest thereon".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ICE AGE NATIONAL SCIENTIFIC RESERVE, WISCONSIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1096) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on behalf of my colleague from Iowa [Mr. Kyl], a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I will have to object to this bill as he would do were he able to be present today. He has an amendment to this bill which I understand would make it acceptable to him. He is not able to be here to present the amendment, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]?

There was no objection.

MEDICAL AND DENTAL OFFICERS OF THE AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8507) for the relief of certain medical and dental officers of the Air Force.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill, H.R. 8507, and the next bill, H.R. 8937, are much similar in that they absolve certain people of liability or they waive the statute of limitations.

I would like to ask somebody on the Committee on the Judiciary how tough were you in trying to find out who was responsible for this error in this one case in H.R. 8507.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. Surely.

Mr. ASHMORE. The Committee on the Judiciary, the claims subcommittee, had the Air Force consider this matter on more than one occasion. I am speaking now of H.R. 8507. It was learned that the error came about through someone's mistake in the National Guard service. It went on for a number of years before anyone knew about the error. Finally, when it was discovered, it was found that the error had made it possible to credit certain officers with time for pay purposes which should have only been included for promotion purposes. That is the reason for the overpayment to these officers.

The law, as my friend knows, I am sure, authorized medical officers up to 5 years credit for civilian professional services, but this was not intended to grant equivalent benefits in the determination of time served for pay purposes. That was done in this case. One officer, the man who had been overpaid the larger amount, was notified that this error had been made and he would have to refund the payments. The Air Force reviewed the records and found that not only had this one officer been overpaid but some 15 others in smaller amounts, much smaller amounts, had also been covered in this same order. It all resulted from one order affecting these 16 officers.

Mr. FORD. Did the committee find out who was the officer who made the mistake that resulted in these overpayments?

Mr. ASHMORE. No; I could not say that we found out who the officer was. They had a great deal of difficulty in discovering and in reviewing some of these records.

Mr. FORD. It seems to me that the only way we can prevent these incidents happening is to pin down responsibility by name.

Mr. ASHMORE. We have attempted to do that. We had the Air Force review all of the records of these officers involved in an effort to determine who actually made the mistake, but we were not able to do it.

Mr. FORD. This is not an inconsequential amount.

Mr. ASHMORE. No, I understand that. For most of the officers it was inconsequential but in one case the amount involved was more than $5,000.

May I add that a complete audit was made by the Air Force to attempt to find the facts so that they might correct the situation and they have assured us that no such situation would come to pass again.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], I have long been concerned by these overpayments and the lack of putting responsibility on those who are responsible for the overpayments. I will say to my friend from Michigan that this is the first of several bills on the Consent and Private Calendars today in which thousands upon thousands of dollars of overpayments are proposed to be forgiven. The Comptroller General, Mr. Campbell, testified before a committee of which I am a member only a short time ago and pointed out that in the 5-year period 1957 through 1961 this Government expended $100 million to take care of overpayments to various people, that could not be and were not collected, or the amount would not have been $100 million.

This is a serious problem in Government. It is becoming more serious all the time, when over a 5-year period we expend $100 million to take care of overpayments to the military and civilian employees. This is a problem that must be met by the House and met soon.

I do not know the merits or demerits of this particular bill but I am afraid that the committee—and I regret to say this—among others, the Judiciary Committee handling these affairs is not getting down to what some of us suggested a year ago, and demanding that those who were responsible for these errors be held accountable.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I might say that I am concerned just as much as is the gentleman from Iowa about overpayments. But this is a matter of equity. These officers received this money in good faith. They performed their duties. It was not even known by any branch of the Government for long, long after it occurred. They were just not able to put their finger on the officer or person who made this error. A complete audit has been made. We kept after them for several months.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as I remember our discussion a year ago between the gentleman from Illinois and myself it was agreed that it was the responsibility of the Committee on Government Operations to get into these areas and try to pin the responsibility. Can the gentleman from Illinois give me any information as to whether or not the Committee on Government Operations has carried through as we understood they were to do?

Mr. LIBONATI. As I understand it, the Committee on Government Operations did make inquiries along this line; but in fact the change of official personnel subsequently in relation to this auditing work resulted in a finding that they had no trace of the officer who was personally responsible for the mistakes that were made. The figure of $100 million mentioned by the gentleman would include contracts with the Government.

We are under a certain jurisdictional policy under the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary to determine whether such necessitous circumstances are such, as in equity would allow the absolving of these men who were paid this money and, also, whether or not in good conscience they are in a position to pay it back.

Mr. FORD. I am surprised that my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI], would so circumscribe the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, or so cast some doubt about the investigative abilities of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary that they could not occasionally ask who made the mistake when these overpayments are brought to their attention. It would be a very simple question to ask.

Mr. LIBONATI. If the gentleman will yield further, yes; but in a complicated situation where men in the Government are unable to determine these functions, it would cost probably thousands of dollars to search it out and, certainly, the futility of that would answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. FORD. I must differ with my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois. It is amazing how the Army, the Navy and the Air Force can come up with pinning responsibility on people in certain areas, but they somehow lose the records, or they do not make any bona fide effort to find out the facts when they have an overpayment case where they are seeking cancellation of the responsibility.

Mr. LIBONATI. I am sure that the gentleman from Michigan will agree that we can only ask for this information. We have no operative jurisdiction in determining it. If they in their judgment cannot furnish it, we are at a loss to serve the gentleman in the capacity to which he has referred.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation and ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8937) for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN INHABITANTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8999) to provide for the settlement of claims of certain inhabitants of the United States living in the area inundated by the sudden floods of the Rio Grande as a result of the construction of the Falcon Dam, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States Commissioner on the International Boundary and Water Commission United States and Mexico (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commissioner") shall have jurisdiction to receive, adjudicate, and provide for the payment of any claim, which claim is not compensated for by insurance or otherwise, (1) by any person or his heirs at law against the United States for damage to or loss of personal property sustained on or after August 27, 1953, and before September 1, 1954, by reason of the sudden floods of the Rio Grande resulting from the construction of the Falcon Dam pursuant to a treaty between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, (2) by any welfare agency or municipal corporation or other political subdivision of the State of Texas, for actual expenses incurred on account of assistance rendered in the emergency relocation of any person or his personal property by reason of those floods, or (3) by any person against the United States for actual expenses incurred by him in the process and as a direct result of moving himself, his family, and their possessions, where such moving was made necessary by reason of the construction of such dam. In the consideration of claims filed under clause (1) of this section, the Commissioner shall take into account the difficulty to claimants of obtaining formal proof of all items of loss in claims presented to him, and shall not be bound by formal rules of evidence, but may rely on such presumptions and other methods of establishing losses as he may find to be equitable.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commissioner shall receive claims for a period of twelve months from the date of enactment of this Act. All claims not presented within that time shall be forever barred.

(b) The Commissioner shall not consider any claim—

(1) for damage or loss on account of death or personal injury, personal inconvenience, physical hardship, or mental suffering; or

(2) for loss of anticipated profits or loss of anticipated earnings.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commissioner shall give reasonable notice to the interested parties and an opportunity for them to be heard and to present evidence before making a final determination upon any claim.

(b) For the purpose of any hearing or investigation authorized under this Act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to examination of documentary evidence, attendance of witnesses, and production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 26, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49, 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Commissioner. Subpenas may be served personally, by registered mail, by telegraph, or by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or principal place of business of the person required to be served. A verified return by the individual so serving the same, setting forth the manner of service, shall be proof of service. The United States marshals or their deputies shall serve such process in their respective districts.

(c) A written record shall be kept of all hearings and proceedings under this Act and shall be open to public inspection.

(d) The provisions of section 10 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 95a) shall apply with respect to witnesses summoned to attend any hearing or investigation authorized under this Act.

Sec. 4. (a) The Commissioner shall adjudicate all claims filed under this Act by award or order of dismissal, as the case may be, upon written findings of fact and reasons for the decision. A copy of each such adjudication shall be mailed to the claimant or his attorney.

(b) No payment of any award on a claim for moving expenses under section 1(3) of this Act to the owners and tenants or their heirs at law of any parcel of land shall exceed 25 per centum of its fair value, as determined by the court proceedings in eminent domain or the Commissioner in the event no court proceedings were had. In any event, except for awards on claims by welfare agencies, municipal corporations, or other political subdivisions of the State of Texas, no payment of any award shall exceed $2,500 in amount. Subject to these limitations, the Commissioner may make payment of awards out of such funds as may be made available for this purpose by Congress.

(c) On the first day of each regular session of Congress the Commissioner shall transmit to Congress a full and complete statement of all adjudications rendered under this Act during the previous year, stating the name and address of each claimant, the amount claimed, the amount awarded, the amount paid, and a brief synopsis of the facts in the case and the reasons for each adjudication.

(d) The payment of an award shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of the law to the contrary, and shall be a full discharge of the United States and all of its officers, agents, servants, and employees with respect to all claims arising out of the same subject matter. An order of dismissal against a claimant, unless set aside by the Commissioner, shall thereafter bar any further claim against the United States or any officer, agent, servant, or employee thereof arising out of the same subject matter.

Sec. 5. The Commissioner shall complete the adjudication of claims and payment of awards pursuant to this Act not later than one year following the enactment of legislation making appropriations for the payment of awards and administrative expenses necessary for the settlement of claims.

Sec. 6. The Commissioner, in rendering an award in favor of any claimant, may as a part of the award determine and allow reasonable attorneys' fees, which shall not exceed 10 per centum of the amount allowed, to be paid out of, but not in addition to, the amount of such award.

Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with such claim any amount in excess of that limited by the terms of this section, if recovery be had, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000, or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

Sec. 7. For the purposes of this Act the Commissioner may—

(1) employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as he deems advisable and necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

(2) call upon any other Federal department or agency for any information or records necessary, and may utilize the services of experts from such Federal department or agency, on a reimbursable basis;

(3) secure the cooperation of State and local agencies, governmental or otherwise, and reimburse such agencies for services rendered;

(4) utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed and available;

(5) assist needy claimants in the preparation and filing of claims;

(6) make such investigations as may be necessary;

(7) make expenditures for witness fees and mileage and for other administrative expenses;

(8) prescribe such rules and regulations, perform such acts not inconsistent with law, and delegate such authority as he may deem proper in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 8. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for use of the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Pending the appropriation of such funds, not to exceed $20,000 of funds appropriated for the construction of Falcon Dam shall be available for the payment of administrative costs of the claims program provided for in this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISE THE PROCEDURES ESTABLISHED BY PUBLIC LAW 86–3

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8970) to revise the procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act, Public Law 86–3, for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill, S. 2275, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) (i) whenever after August 21, 1964, any of the public lands and other public property as defined in section 5(g) of Public Law 86–3 (73 Stat. 4, 6), or any lands acquired by the Territory of Hawaii and its subdivisions, which are the property of the United States pursuant to section 5(c) or become the property of the United States pursuant to section 5(d) of Public 86–3, except the lands administered pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended, and (ii) whenever any of the lands of the United States on Sand Island, including the reef lands in connection therewith, in the city and county of Honolulu, are determined to be surplus property by the Administrator of General Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") with the concurrence of the head of the department or agency exercising administration or control over such lands and property, they shall be conveyed to the State of Hawaii by the Administrator subject to the provisions of this Act.

(b) Such lands and property shall be conveyed without monetary consideration, but subject to such other terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe: *Provided,* That, as a condition precedent to the conveyance of such lands, the Administrator shall require payment by the State of Hawaii of the estimated fair market value, as determined by the Administrator, of any buildings, structures, and other improvements erected and made on such lands after they were set aside. In the event that the State of Hawaii does not agree to any payment prescribed by the Administrator, he may remove, relocate, and otherwise dispose of any such buildings, structures, and other improvements under other applicable laws, or if the Administrator determines that they cannot be removed without substantial damage to them or the lands containing them, he may dispose of them and the lands involved under other applicable laws, but, in such cases he shall pay to the State of Hawaii that portion of any proceeds from such disposal which he estimates to be equal to the value of the lands involved. Nothing in this section shall prevent the disposal by the Administrator under other applicable laws of the lands subject to conveyance to the State of Hawaii under this section if the State of Hawaii so chooses.

Sec. 2. Any lands, property, improvements, and proceeds conveyed or paid to the State of Hawaii under section 1 of this Act shall be considered a part of public trust established by section 5(f) of Public Law 86–3, and shall be subject to the terms and conditions of that trust.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the bill we have before us today, H.R. 8970, is an outgrowth of the Hawaiian Statehood Act of 1959. Its primary purpose is to provide a means for transferring title to the State of Hawaii of certain property within the State boundaries which is now being utilized by the Federal Government, if such property becomes surplus to the needs of the United States after August 21, 1964, the fifth anniversary of the Statehood Act. A secondary purpose is to convey to the State, Sand Island and adjacent coral reef lands in Honolulu Harbor when they become surplus to Federal needs.

Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues will recall that in section 5(b) of the Hawaiian Statehood Act, Congress granted to the State, "the United States title to all the public lands and other property within the State boundaries immediately prior to its admission to the Union." For clarification purposes Congress defined "public lands and public property" as that property which the Republic of Hawaii ceded to the United States at the time of its annexation and certain other property acquired in exchange for the ceded property.

Being realistic, Congress recognized that some of this property was being used by the Federal Government and could not be released to the State. Congress also recognized that it was possible that certain other properties might be set aside by act of Congress or Executive order of the President during the 5-year transition period. Finally Congress recognized that some property would undoubtedly become surplus during the transition period and directed all Federal agencies to inventory their needs and report to the President thereon as to surplus holdings that could be transferred to the State on or before August 21, 1964.

What Congress did not do was to cover the case of property that ceases to be needed after August 21, 1964. It is to accomplish this that makes desirable and necessary enactment of H.R. 8970.

When Hawaii was admitted to the Union, there were about 410,000 acres under Federal control. Of this acreage 230,000 were and still are in national parks and are excluded from the operation of H.R. 8970 by its own terms. The other 180,000 are made up of 60,000 acres of ceded land set aside for Federal use by Federal action and 120,000 acres used by the United States under various territorial permits and licenses.

Since statehood was granted, only about 400 acres of ceded lands have been earmarked surplus and turned over to Hawaii. Between now and August 21, 1964, more acreage may be declared surplus, but the bulk of the anticipated surplusage will not be so designated until after August 21, 1964. The provisions of H.R. 8970 will permit transfer of these surplus lands after the 5-year date. Since much of this property originally belonged to the Republic of Hawaii and came to the United States by cession, it seems reasonable that it should be returned to the State in accordance with the terms of H.R. 8970 rather than being subject to disposition under the surplus property laws.

Now let us look at Sand Island and its adjoining reef lands. Two questions are involved. The first is, do they belong to the United States either through cession or purchase? If the answer is "Yes," then does the disposition of the U.S. interest in the submerged portion of this land under the Statehood Act run afoul the provisions of the Submerged Lands Act of 1953, which the Statehood Act specifically made applicable to Hawaii?

At the time of annexation, Sand Island consisted of fewer than 10 acres but through dredging and natural accretion has now grown to about 550 acres of fast land, some of which is under water much of the time. An Executive order issued in 1920 assumed Sand Island to be public land. This assumption stems from the existence of several deeds by private parties purporting to convey to the United States part of the land. The copies of the deeds indicate the authenticity of the conveyance which are properly filed in Honolulu.

Enactment of this bill will permit whatever interest the United States has in Sand Island and its adjoining reef lands to be treated as are interests in ceded lands about which there are no title questions. Of the 550 acres on Sand Island and the reef, 125 acres have never been claimed by the United States and are presently controlled by the Hawaiian Aeronautics Commission pursuant to an executive order of the Governor. Another 202 acres were transferred to the territory prior to statehood. Some 260 acres of the fast land plus adjacent submerged lands constitute a military reservation; 242 of these acres are probably going to be declared surplusage to military needs. The remaining acreage will continue to be used by the military and the Coast Guard.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of H.R. 8970 does not involve the expenditure of Federal funds nor does it convey more property to the State of Hawaii than Congress anticipated in the Statehood Act. It does, however, permit the Federal Government to have time beyond August 21, 1964, to decide on property that may be transferred to the State when it is no longer needed. I urge favorable consideration of H.R. 8970 in its present form.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Gill] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, the final passage of this measure by the House is a source of great satisfaction to us from Hawaii. Land is a peculiarly valuable asset to an island State; it is essential that all that is usable be put to productive purposes for our people.

The ceded land, with which this measure deals, was originally government land of Hawaii, given to the Federal Government, without compensation, at the time of annexation. It is fitting that this land, when it becomes surplus to the Federal needs, be returned to Hawaii, free of charge, for the use of its people. This measure would allow this practice, which has been the rule since annexation, to continue after August 21, 1964, the end of the 5-year period established by the Statehood Act of 1959.

It has been said that this 5-year period, during which certain land matters were to be settled between the State and the Federal Government, was a mistake. Perhaps this is so. Certainly, the Congress at that time did not clearly foresee that set-aside ceded land in Hawaii would continue to become surplus to Federal needs for many more years in the future. In any case, this 5-year requirement has had a valuable effect. It has caused the various agencies involved to enter into a concentrated review of their landholdings and in many cases, justify them. This will be valuable in the years ahead, particularly in such doubtful areas as Bellows Air Force Base and similar parcels on the island of Oahu.

This bill has a prime, immediate importance to the State of Hawaii in that it clears the way for the return of all of the rest of Sand Island beyond that needed by the Coast Guard. The bill also includes connected or adjacent reef areas. This should open for State development not only the surplus fast land of Sand Island, but also much developable area on the reefs to the north and west of the island. I see this land and reef, now largely unused or underused, as a prime industrial and recreational area of great benefit to the State and the people of Honolulu.

No remarks on this bill would be complete without mentioning with gratitude the help that so many in the House have given to its passage. I would like to select for special mention the gentleman from Colorado, Wayne Aspinall, and the gentleman from New York, Leo O'Brien, for their skilled handling of the measure in the House Interior Committee and here on the floor. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, John Saylor, and the gentleman from Florida, Jim Haley, along with my other colleagues in the committee, deserve mention for their particular support.

To all of you, the people of Hawaii give their thanks, and aloha.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wish to thank the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien] for the expeditious manner in which the bill now under consideration was handled. I wish also to thank the ranking minority member of the Interior Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Haley] for their part in getting the bill through the committee.

Mr. Speaker, the bill now before us, H.R. 8970, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Gill], is identical in every respect to H.R. 8977, a bill which I introduced.

All that the proposed legislation does is to revise the procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act, Public Law 86–3, and provide for the conveyance of certain lands which rightfully belong to the State of Hawaii. Its basic purpose is to maintain the residual interest of the State of Hawaii in lands and property which were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii at the time of annexation or set aside for Federal use from land owned by the Territory of Hawaii—an interest long recognized in both Federal law and practice. In essence, the bill provides for a continuation of the 60-year practice of returning to the State such lands as are found to be surplus to the needs of the Federal Government.

The Hawaii Statehood Act fixed August 21, 1964, as the closing date for the United States to complete its review of all land holdings in Hawaii to determine which parcels, if any, are surplus to its needs. This closing date was intended to spur the Federal Government into its determination and declaration of surplus property. It has, however, become a restriction which may, unless removed, cast a cloud upon the legal title of lands returned to the State of Hawaii under the provisions of the Statehood Act. We are here seeking a correction of a situation which was never intended, through an elimination of the August 21 deadline.

To allay any misapprehension, it should be pointed out that the proposed measure does not in any way amend the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.). It only establishes a unique procedure applicable only to the State of Hawaii for returning surplus ceded lands to the State of Hawaii beyond the expiration date set in the Hawaii Statehood Act and provides for the return to Hawaii of that part of Sand Island which is now surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. Even after this bill is enacted into law it will still be necessary to follow all of the procedures contained in existing law, just as it has always been with regard to lands previously declared surplus under the Hawaii Statehood Act.

I ask your favorable vote on the bill under consideration so that Hawaii's just due may be forthcoming, nothing more.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 8970) was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE STANDARD CONTAINER ACT OF 1928

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9334) to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes", approved May 21, 1928 (15 U.S.C. 257), is amended—

(1) by striking out "One-eighth bushel" and inserting in lieu thereof "One-sixteenth bushel, one-eighth bushel";

(2) by inserting "seven-eighths bushel," immediately after "three-fourths bushel,"; and

(3) by inserting "one-and-one-eighth bushels," immediately after "one bushel,".

(b) The first section of such Act of May 21, 1928 (15 U.S.C. 257), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (a) as paragraph (aa) and by inserting immediately preceding such paragraph the following new paragraph:

"(a) The standard one-sixteenth bushel hamper or round stave basket shall contain one hundred and thirty-four and four-tenths cubic inches.";

(2) by inserting immediately after paragraph (d) the following new paragraph:

"(dd) The standard seven-eighths bushel hamper or round stave basket shall contain one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one and sixty-two one-hundredths cubic inches."; and

(3) by inserting immediately after paragraph (e) the following new paragraph:

"(ee) The standard one-and-one-eighth bushel hamper or round stave basket shall contain two thousand four hundred and nineteen and twenty-two one-hundredths cubic inches."

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 2 of such Act of May 21, 1928 (15 U.S.C. 257a), is amended by inserting "eleven-quart basket," immediately after "eight-quart basket," and by inserting "fourteen-quart basket," immediately after "twelve-quart basket,".

(b) Section 2 of such Act of May 21, 1928 (15 U.S.C. 257a), is further amended by inserting immediately after paragraph (b) the following new paragraph:

"(bb) The eleven-quart splint basket shall contain seven hundred and thirty-nine and two-tenths cubic inches."

(c) Section 2 of such Act of May 21, 1928 (15 U.S.C. 257a), is further amended by inserting immediately after paragraph (c) the following new paragraph:

"(cc) The fourteen-quart splint basket shall contain nine hundred and forty and eight-tenths cubic inches."

SEC. 3. That so much of the first sentence of section 5 of such Act of May 21, 1928 (15 U.S.C. 257d), which precedes the word "*Provided*" be amended to read as follows:

"That it shall be unlawful to manufacture for sale or shipment, to offer for sale, to sell, to offer for shipment, or to ship, hampers, round stave baskets, or splint baskets for fruits or vegetables, either filled or unfilled that do not have the capacity in bushels or quarts clearly stamped or marked thereon and do not otherwise comply with this Act, or parts of such hampers, round stave baskets, or splint baskets that do not comply with this Act:"

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING AN ACT TO ORGANIZE AND MICROFILM THE PAPERS OF PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8465) to amend the act entitled "An act to organize and microfilm the papers of Presidents of the United States in the collections of the Library of Congress."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to organize and microfilm the papers of the Presidents of the United States in the collections of the Library of Congress" (71 Stat. 368) is hereby amended by striking out section 2 by which there was authorized the appropriation of a sum of $720,000 to remain available until expended and by substituting the following:

"SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POLICING OF BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9036) to amend the act of October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 634; 40 U.S.C. 193(n)-(w)), as amended, relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(a) of the Act of October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 634), as amended (40 U.S.C. 193(n)-(w)), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and all other areas in the District of Columbia under their control."

SEC. 2. Section 7 of the Act of October 24, 1951, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and they may be furnished, without charge, with uniforms and such other equipment as may be necessary for the proper performance of their duties, including badges, revolvers, and ammunition."

SEC. 3. Section 9 of the Act of October 24, 1951, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. For the purpose of this Act 'buildings and grounds' shall mean—

"(1) The Smithsonian Institution and its grounds which shall be construed to include the following:

"(A) the Smithsonian Building, the Arts and Industries Building, the Freer Gallery of Art Building, the Air and Space Building, the Museum of Natural History, the Museum of History and Technology Building, and all other buildings of the Smithsonian Institution within the Mall, including the entrance walks, unloading areas, and other pertinent service roads and parking areas;

"(B) the National Zoological Park comprising all the buildings, streets, service roads, walks, and other areas within the boundary fence of the National Zoological Park in the District of Columbia and including the public space between the said fence and the face of the curb lines of the adjacent city streets; and

"(C) all buildings, service roads, walks, and other areas within the exterior boundaries of any real estate or land or interest in land (including temporary use) which shall hereafter be acquired by the Smithsonian Institution by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise, when determined by the Secretary of the Institution to be necessary for the adequate protection of persons or property therein and suitable for administration as a part of the Smithsonian Institution.

"(2) The National Gallery of Art and its grounds, which shall be held to extend to the line of the face of the south curb of Constitution Avenue Northwest, between Seventh Street Northwest, and Fourth Street Northwest, to the line of the face of the west curb of Fourth Street Northwest, between Constitution Avenue Northwest, and Madison Drive Northwest; to the line of the face of the north curb of Madison Drive Northwest, between Fourth Street Northwest, and Seventh Street Northwest; and to the line of the face of the east curb of Seventh Street Northwest, between Madison Drive Northwest, and Constitution Avenue Northwest."

SEC. 4. The Act of October 24, 1951, as amended, is further amended by adding a new section 11 as follows:

"SEC. 11. The special police provided for in section 1 of this Act are authorized to enforce concurrently with the United States Park Police the laws and regulations applicable to the National Capital Parks, and to make arrests for violations of sections 2 and 4, inclusive of this Act, within the several areas located within the exterior boundaries of the face of the curb lines of the squares within which the aforementioned buildings are located."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 7, after section 2, strike out the word "and" and insert the word "to".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUIRING CERTAIN LANDS, RIVERTON RECLAMATION PROJECT, WYOMING

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8171) to reauthorize the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, to include all the Riverton reclamation project except the Muddy Ridge area, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the general plan for the Riverton extension unit of the Missouri River Basin project, heretofore authorized under section 9 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887), is modified to include completion of construction, works, and lands rehabilitation, water conservation, fish and wildlife conservation, and relief to water users on the Riverton Federal reclamation project except the Muddy Ridge area, substantially in accord with the recommendations contained in the report of the Wyoming reclamation projects survey team as set out in House Document Numbered (Eighty-eighth Congress, first session), and as so modified is reauthorized under the designation "Riverton Unit of the Missouri River Basin Project".

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior (hereafter called the Secretary) is authorized to negotiate and execute an amendatory repayment contract with the Midvale Irrigation District covering lands of the first and second division of the Riverton unit. This contract shall supersede existing repayment contracts between the Midvale Irrigation District and the United States. The contract shall provide, among other things, that (a) the period provided in subsection (d), section 9, of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended (43 U.S.C. 485h) for repayment of the cost assigned to be repaid by the water users may be extended to fifty years from and including the year in which said contract is confirmed, or to as near that number of years as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a variable repayment plan; (b) during the period required to construct and test the adequacy of drains and other water conservation works the rates of charge to land classes and the acreage assessable in each land class shall be as established in the amendatory repayment contract dated June 26, 1952; (c) at the close of such construction and test period, and upon the Secretary's approval of a new land classification, the rates of charge to land classes and the acreages assessable shall be in accordance with amortization capacity and classification of such lands as determined by the Secretary; and (d) during the first ten years of the repayment period pursuant to said contract, the amount to be paid in any year by the Midvale Irrigation District shall be reduced by the amounts which the district has credited in the previous year to water users who have provided tile for the project drainage program: *Provided,* That the total of such reductions shall not exceed $50,000.

SEC. 3. (a) During the period of constructing, installing, and testing the canal lining and drainage works now or hereafter authorized for the lands of the North Portal, North Pavillion, and Cottonwood Bench of the third division of the Riverton unit, water for said lands shall be furnished on an individual temporary application basis at rates at least equal to the per acre operation and maintenance costs of the irrigable acreage of the third division. Operation and maintenance costs attributable to lands for which no temporary water application is filed shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable.

(b) When the Secretary is satisfied that an area of sufficient size to form an economically feasible subunit of the third division of the Riverton unit is capable of sustained production under irrigation use, he shall so announce subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section and he thereupon may enter into a repayment contract with an irrigation district representing those lands, which contract shall provide, among other things, that (a) the period provided in subsection (d), section 9, of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended (43 U.S.C. 485h), for repayment of the construction cost assigned to be repaid by the water users may be extended to fifty years from and including the year in which said contract is confirmed, or to as near that number of years as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a variable repayment plan, and (b) that repayment by the water users shall be in accordance with the amortization capacity and classification of said lands as determined by the Secretary.

(c) If there is no irrigation district satisfactory to the Secretary or if a repayment contract has not been executed by the time the Secretary makes the announcement provided for in the preceding subsection, the Secretary may, until a repayment contract is executed, continue to deliver water under temporary water applications, and, in that event, he shall include an appropriate construction charge component varied according to land class in the annual rates of charge announced each year for irrigation water. No payment of such construction charge component shall shorten the repayment period of fifty years, and such payments shall be credited to project costs not recovered by repayment contracts.

SEC. 4. (a) Construction and rehabilitation and betterment costs of the Riverton unit which the Secretary determines to be assignable to the lands classified as permanently unproductive shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable: *Provided,* That whenever new lands, or lands formerly classified as nonproductive, are subsequently classified or reclassified as productive, the repayment obligation of the repayment organization within which such lands are included shall be appropriately increased.

(b) Construction and rehabilitation and betterment costs of the Riverton unit allocated to irrigation which are not assigned to be repaid by irrigation water users shall be returnable from revenues derived from the marketing of power of the Missouri River Basin project.

(c) All miscellaneous net revenues of the Riverton unit shall accrue to the United States and shall be applied against irrigation costs not assigned to be repaid by irrigation water users.

SEC. 5. The limitation on lands held in single ownership which may be eligible to receive project water from, through, or by means of project works shall be one hundred and sixty acres of class 1 land or the equivalent thereof in other land classes as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary may acquire any interest in any tract of land, patented or unpatented, which in his opinion has been rendered unsuitable for sustained irrigation production because of seepage from the project irrigation system and which it is not feasible to reclaim by draining or leaching or both, including farm units that the Secretary determines to be incapable of supporting a family. Such lands shall be acquired at a price to be approved by the Secretary, representing their appraised value prior to becoming unsuitable for sustained irrigation production plus the appraised value of all improvements at the time of acquisition, and pursuant to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

(b) The Secretary may acquire lands, including farm units and improvements thereon, which the owners signify by written notice to the Secretary that they desire to convey to the United States. Such lands shall be acquired at their fair market value as determined by the Secretary.

(c) Property acquired by the United States under this section shall be available for disposal under the terms of the Farm Unit Exchange Act of August 13, 1953 (67 Stat. 566), or at public or private sale for not less than the appraised value at the time of sale. Costs incurred by the Secretary under this section which are not offset by returns from sales shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 7. As an alternative to the credit for payments of land development charges allowed by section 4(b) of the Farm Unit Exchange Act of August 13, 1953, supra, an owner or entryman, having made or making an exchange under that Act may be given credit on construction charges payable in connection with the lieu unit or may, upon filing of an application therefor within two years from the date of this Act, or within two years of the date of any relinquishment subsequent to the date of this Act, be reimbursed in cash for such credits.

SEC. 8. Appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for carrying on the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for credits, expenses, charges, and costs provided by or incurred under this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"(a) That the Secretary of the Interior shall negotiate with the entrymen on and the owners of land within the Third Division of the Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming, for the purchase of their lands, patented or unpatented, at a price equal to the appraised value thereof and of the improvements thereupon. In the case of any lands which were represented as being suitable for sustained irrigation production in the land classification in force at the time entry was made or the lands were acquired by the present owner (or, if the present owner acquired the same by descent or devise, by his predecessor in title), such value shall be determined without reference to any deterioration in their irrigability subsequent to the time of entry or acquisition arising from above-normal seepage and/or inadequate drainage. The Secretary is authorized to acquire options for the purchase of such lands in the name of the United States. He shall make a final report on the result of his negotiations and on options acquired to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives on or before June 30, 1964, and, upon the expiration of not less than sixty calendar days after the submission of this report, he may acquire such lands.

"(b) Property acquired by the United States under this section shall be available for disposal under the terms of the Farm Unit Exchange Act of August 13, 1953 (67 Stat. 566), or at public or private sale for not less than the appraised value at the time of such sale. Costs incurred by the Secretary under this section which are not offset by returns from sales shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to continue to deliver water to the lands of the Third Division during calendar years 1964, 1965, and 1966 as under the provisions of section 9, subsection (d)(1), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1195; 43 U.S.C. 485h(d)) but without regard to the time limitation therein specified. Water shall be furnished only upon individual application therefor and upon payment of an amount for each acre to which water is to be furnished to the applicant during the year in question equal to the estimated average cost per acre for all lands to be irrigated that year of operating and maintaining the

Third Division. Prior to the expiration of this three-year period (January 1, 1967), the Secretary shall determine whether there are sufficient lands capable of sustained production under irrigation use in the North Portal, North Pavilion, and Cottonwood Bench areas of the Third Division to form an economically feasible unit and shall report his findings thereon to the Congress.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the limitation of lands held in single ownership within the Third Division which are eligible to receive project water from, through, or by means of project works shall be one hundred and sixty acres of class 1 land or the equivalent thereof in other land classes, as determined by the Secretary.

"SEC. 4. Construction costs of the Third Division which the Secretary determines to be assignable to the lands classified as permanently nonproductive shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws: *Provided,* That whenever new lands, or lands formerly classified as nonproductive are subsequently classified or reclassified as productive, the repayment obligation of the repayment organization within which such lands are included shall be appropriately increased.

"SEC. 5. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any administrative regulation, or the terms of any mortgage or other security instrument, no real property on the Third Division which has heretofore been mortgaged or otherwise encumbered as security for a debt to the United States or any of its agencies shall be subject to foreclosure or other process of law for enforcement of the debt between the effective date of this Act and December 1, 1964: *Provided,* That nothing contained in the foregoing shall operate to discharge any obligation of the debtor to the United States.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any administrative regulation, no agency of the United States shall hereafter and prior to December 1, 1964, take as security for a debt to the United States or to that or any other agency of the United States any mortgage or other form of encumbrance on real property on the Third Division unless (1) the debt to the United States or its agency has heretofore been incurred and the security has heretofore been given and is required to be continued in connection with a renewal or refinancing of the debt or (2) the debtor specifically waives, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, the privilege of selling his land to the United States as provided in the first section of this Act.

"SEC. 6. Appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for carrying on the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available in an amount of not more than $2,000,000 for the acquisition of lands as provided in section 1(a) of this Act and for additional drainage facilities, canal lining, and structure replacements: *Provided,* That all miscellaneous net revenues received from the sale of lands under section 1(b) of this Act shall be applied against such costs."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of H.R. 8171 is intended to provide the basis for settlement of the physical, economic, and financial problems that have plagued the third division of the Riverton project in Wyoming almost since its beginning. The legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands, including farm units and the improvements thereon, from those settlers who want to leave the project and to continue to deliver water for 3 years to those settlers who want to remain on the project and to others who may wish to acquire lands in the third division. The committee believes that this 3-year period is sufficient time for the Bureau of Reclamation to determine whether an economically feasible unit can be formed from lands of the third division.

Although the legislation does not require authority for the appropriation of additional funds it authorizes the expenditure of not more than $2 million from funds already appropriated or from funds already authorized to be appropriated. It is estimated that about $1 million will be required for land acquisition and about the same amount will be needed for completion of the drainage system to serve the lands presently being farmed. It is expected that the cost of land acquisition will be partially offset by revenues received from the sale of lands acquired from those settlers who leave the project.

Mr. Speaker, the third division of the Riverton project has been in trouble from the time it was authorized. I have been very much concerned with the situation that has prevailed on this project over the last several years and my committee has spent a great deal of time trying to work out a solution. I have personally visited the project to examine firsthand the many problems and study ways of resolving them. Other members of the committee have also visited the project area for firsthand information. Resolution of the problems of the third division is urgently needed. The situation which presently exists not only leaves the settlers facing an uncertain future but it has given a black eye to the entire Federal reclamation program.

The Riverton project is located in Fremont County, Wyo., and includes three divisions. The third division, consisting of about 11,830 acres of land currently considered irrigable, was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944 and was developed soon after World War II to provide settlement opportunities for veterans. Drainage and soil conditions have plagued the project from its beginning. It was the problems of the third division which led to enactment of the Farm Unit Exchange Act in 1953. It had been hoped that the third division problems would be resolved by that enactment which provided and still provides authority to resettle homesteaders on other public land projects and to amend the farm units of those who remain by increasing their holdings or reforming their units. While many third division settlers took advantage of the Exchange Act, either by leaving the project or obtaining reconstituted farm units, the problems have not been resolved and in recent years the situation has grown worse.

The original development period expired in March of 1960 with respect to some of the lands of the third division and since that time Congress has provided temporary authority to deliver water to lands being farmed. Congress has done this by passing three different acts—one to provide for water deliveries in 1960 and 1961, one to provide for deliveries in 1962, and one to provide for deliveries in 1963. There is no authority to deliver water during the 1964 irrigation season unless H.R. 8171 or similar legislation is enacted.

Negotiations on a long-term repayment contract broke down in May 1961 when the board of commissioners of the irrigation district asserted that the lands did not have repayment ability and that further negotiations would be futile. Subsequently, the board's position has been that the settlers are unable to pay even operation and maintenance costs and that the third division should be abandoned. However, on the basis of water deliveries during the last few years and payments to cover operating expenses, it appears that a considerable number of the farmers, probably more than half, wish to continue the farming operations.

In an attempt to find a workable solution to the third division problems the Commissioner of Reclamation appointed two independent boards of consultants—one to study the repayment capabilities of the third division and the other to review the drainage problem and land classifications. Both boards of consultants reported that upon completion of canal lining and drains, the third division lands could support a sustained irrigation agriculture producing sufficient income to pay farm operating costs, family living expenses and water charges. However, these two reports did not improve the relationship between the Bureau and the district, and the situation continued to get worse.

In connection with the granting of authority for temporary water deliveries in 1962, my committee suggested the appointment of a review commission to make a special study of the problems, not only of the third division but of all the reclamation projects in Wyoming. As a result, the Wyoming reclamation projects survey team was appointed in August 1962. The survey team gave priority to problems of the Riverton project and its report on that project was completed and furnished to the committee on February 21, 1963. The Department accepted, for the most part, the recommendations of the survey team, and H.R. 8171, as it was introduced, was for the purpose of implementing these recommendations.

In its consideration of H.R. 8171, the committee decided that the problems of the third division and the problems of the first and second divisions, comprising the lands of the Midvale Irrigation District, should be handled separately. Several factors contributed to this decision but primarily it is because resolution of the third division problems is most urgently needed and because these problems can be resolved at nominal cost without getting into the broader question of reauthorizing the Riverton project as a unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

My committee wants to be sure that the settlers and landowners of the third division are treated fairly and equitably.

At the same time it wants to give the Bureau of Reclamation an opportunity to form an economically feasible unit from lands in this division if that is possible. The language which the committee has developed and adopted as an amendment to H.R. 8171, in the committee's judgment, will meet both objectives.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this legislation will, at last, start us on the road to a solution of the problems of the third division of the Riverton project and I urge its approval by the House.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands, including farm units and improvements thereon, in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, and to continue to deliver water for 3 years to lands of said division, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SUBPENA POWER FOR COMMISSION ON THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 852 authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, an identical bill having passed the House, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 852 be tabled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ESCAPE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1319) to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 751 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting the subsection symbol "(a)" at the beginning thereof, and by adding, immediately following subsection (a) of such section as hereby so designated, a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) Whoever escapes or attempts to escape from the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative, shall, if the custody or confinement is by virtue of a lawful arrest for a violation of any law of the United States not punishable by death or life imprisonment and committed before such person's eighteenth birthday, and as to whom the Attorney General has not specifically directed the institution of criminal proceedings, or by virtue of a commitment as a juvenile delinquent under section 5034 of this title, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to affect the discretionary authority vested in the Attorney General pursuant to section 5032 of this title."

SEC. 2. Section 752 of such title is amended by inserting the subsection symbol "(a)" at the beginning thereof, and by adding, immediately following subsection (a) of such section as hereby so designated, a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) Whoever rescues or attempts to rescue or instigates, aids, or assists the escape or attempted escape of any person in the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative, shall, if the custody or confinement is by virtue of a lawful arrest for a violation of any law of the United States not punishable by death or life imprisonment and committed before such person's eighteenth birthday, and as to whom the Attorney General has not specifically directed the institution of criminal proceedings, or by virtue of a commitment as a juvenile delinquent under section 5034 of this title, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

With the following committee amendments:

1. On line 10, page 1, before "shall" insert the following: "or from any institution in which he is confined by direction of the Attorney General, or from any custody under or by virtue of any process issued under the laws of the United States by any court, judge, or commissioner, or from the custody of an officer or employee of the United States pursuant to lawful arrest,".

2. On line 20, page 2, before "shall" insert the following: "or of any person arrested upon a warrant or other process issued under any law of the United States or from any institution in which he is confined by direction of the Attorney General.".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE OF APPEALS FROM ICC ORDERS IN JUDICIAL REFERENCE CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7508) to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish jurisdiction and venue for appeals from orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission in judicial reference cases.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1336 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by designating its present text as subsection (a) and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) When a district court or the Court of Claims refers a question or issue to the Interstate Commerce Commission for determination, the court which referred the question or issue shall have exclusive jurisdiction of a civil action to enforce, enjoin, set aside, annul, or suspend, in whole or in part, any order of the Interstate Commerce Commission arising out of such referral.

"(c) Any action brought under subsection (b) of this section shall be filed within 90 days from the date that the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission becomes final."

SEC. 2. Section 1398 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by designating its present text as subsection (a) and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) A civil action to enforce, enjoin, set aside, annul, or suspend, in whole or in part, an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission made pursuant to the referral of a question or issue by a district court or by the Court of Claims, shall be brought only in the court which referred the question or issue."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION ON THE DISPOSITION OF ALCATRAZ ISLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9341) to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 2364, an identical bill to the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a Federal commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island", approved October 16, 1963 (77 Stat. 247), is amended by striking out "December 31, 1963" and inserting "six months after the date on which all the members of the Commission have been appointed".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H.R. 9341) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING NAME OF U.S. OLYMPIC ASSOCIATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4732) to change the name of the U.S. Olympic Association to the U.S. Olympic Committee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the corporation known as the United States Olympic Association, which was incorporated by the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the United States Olympic Association," approved September 21, 1950 (64 Stat. 899), shall be known and designated hereafter as the United States Olympic Committee and any reference to such corporation under the name of the United States Olympic Association shall be held to refer to such corporation under and by the name of the United States Olympic Committee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARTER FOR LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9234), to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question about this bill. The Little League Inc. presently is a New York corporation with its headquarters in Pennsylvania. Last year a Little League sought to buy their insurance from a Pennsylvania contract at premiums higher than they would have to pay locally some places. When the eight local Little Leagues in Iowa purchased their coverage from other insurance companies, the Pennsylvania headquarters withdrew their charter. After they did this, the designated insurance company was prohibited from selling any insurance in Iowa at all. When the promoters of Little League were faced with the possibility that their designated insurance company could not sell any insurance in Iowa at all, they let local Little Leagues in Iowa buy their insurance locally. Would the passage of this act in any way mean that the general State laws, such as but not limited to laws prohibiting restraint of trade, would be waived, superseded or altered in any way?

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman has asked a good question and I will try to answer it. Refer to page 3, beginning with line 14. There the gentleman will notice the stipulation that while they can adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws, they cannot do anything that is inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which the corporation is authorized to operate.

I want to compliment the gentleman's State on taking the position it did take. It was a restraint of trade. Undoubtedly they could prevent them from buying insurance, as the gentleman has described.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There is no intent in this legislation to permit them to do that in the future?

Mr. FORRESTER. There is not only no intent for them to do it but they cannot do it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Is the common law right to use the name "Little League" by any association of boys in any way altered, prohibited, or affected by this act?

Mr. FORRESTER. Any rights acquired by this corporation, undoubtedly those rights exist. In addition, if the gentleman will notice on page 10 of this bill, lines 7 and 8 read:

> No powers or privileges hereby granted shall, however, interfere or conflict with established or vested rights.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. All this does is prohibit other Little Leagues from being incorporated under this name?

Mr. FORRESTER. That is right.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. I should like to correct the RECORD as to the question the gentleman raised about the insurance. I am familiar, I think, with this situation to which the gentleman refers.

My information indicates that the Little League sought competitive bids from various companies throughout the country. The requested policy provided a coverage which the officials of Little League thought was necessary for all participants in Little League baseball. The company to which the gentleman refers was the lowest competitive bidder for a group policy, and it was at a price which permitted these leagues within the United States to purchase this expanded coverage insurance at the lowest possible rates. There was no intention of favoring a single company nor was there any effort made to prevent any company from bidding. There was an interest on the part of the Little League, as I understand it, to see to it that the best possible coverage was granted at the minimum cost.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would say this same coverage could be obtained and was obtained from other companies at lower cost. It was indicated, at least in the case of Iowa, that insurance was available at a lower cost. For some reason the parent companies were so interested in making them take the designated insurance that they would rather not have them in the Little League than have their own insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That James E. Axeman, Williamsport, Pennsylvania; Colonel Theodore P. Bank, Chicago, Illinois; Nicholas C. Colombo, Galveston, Texas; John K. Conneen, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania; Yale A. Corcoran, Chicago, Illinois; Doctor Arthur A. Esslinger, Eugene, Oregon; Merrill Martin Galloway, West Columbia, Texas; George H. Harding, Lebanon, Tennessee; Edward B. Johnson, Port Chester, New York; G. Herbert McCracken, New York, New York; Peter J. McGovern, Chairman, Williamsport, Pennsylvania; Frank J. McGrath, Scarsdale, New York; Doctor Elmon L. Vernier, Baltimore, Maryland; Milton F. Ziehn, Sacramento, California; and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of the Little League Baseball, Incorporated (hereinafter called the corporation), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers and limitations contained in this Act.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. The persons named in the first section of this Act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with this Act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be—

(1) To promote, develop, supervise, and voluntarily assist in all lawful ways the interest of boys who will participate in Little League baseball.

(2) To help and voluntarily assist boys in developing qualities of citizenship, sportsmanship, and manhood.

(3) Using the disciplines of the native American game of baseball, to teach spirit and competitive will to win, physical fitness through individual sacrifice, the values of teamplay and wholesome well-being through healthful and social association with other youngsters under proper leadership.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

(1) to sue and be sued, complain, and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(2) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal;

(3) to choose such officers, directors, trustees, managers, agents, and employees as the business of the corporation may require;

(4) to adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(5) to contract and be contracted with;

(6) to charge and collect membership dues, subscription fees, and receive contributions or grants of money or property to be devoted to the carrying out of its purposes;

(7) to take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, bequest or otherwise any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject to applicable provisions of law in any State (A) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real or personal property by a corporation operating in such State;

(8) to transfer, encumber, and convey real or personal property;

(9) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, subject to all applicable provisions of Federal or State law;

(10) to adopt, alter, use and display such emblems, seals, and badges as it may adopt; and

(11) to do any and all lawful acts and things necessary or desirable in carrying out the objects and purposes of the corporation.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE; SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

SEC. 5. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Williamsport, Pennsylvania, or in such other place as may later be determined by the board of directors, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place and may be conducted throughout the various States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States, and in other areas throughout the world.

(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation, and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

MEMBERSHIP; VOTING RIGHTS

SEC. 6. (a) Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall, except as provided in this Act, be determined as the constitution and bylaws of the corporation may provide.

(b) Each member of the corporation, other than honorary and associate members, shall have the right to one vote on each matter submitted to a vote at all meetings of the members of the corporation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 7. (a) Upon enactment of this Act the membership of the initial board of directors of the corporation shall consist of the members of the board of directors of the corporation referred to in section 17 of this Act.

(b) Thereafter, the board of directors of the corporation shall consist of such number (not less than 13), shall be selected in such manner (including the filling of vacancies), and shall serve for such term as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

(c) The board of directors shall be the governing board of the corporation and shall, during the intervals between corporation meetings, be responsible for the general policies and program of the corporation. The board shall be responsible for the control of all funds of the corporation.

OFFICERS: ELECTION OF OFFICERS

SEC. 8. (a) The officers of the corporation shall be a chairman of the board of directors, a president, a vice president, and a secretary-treasurer. The duties of the officers shall be as prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

(b) Officers shall be elected annually at the annual meeting of the corporation.

USE OF INCOME; LOANS TO OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, OR EMPLOYEES

SEC. 9. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director, or be distributable to any such person during the life of the corporation or upon dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to officers of the corporation in amounts approved by the board of directors of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees. Any director who votes for or assents to the making of a loan to an officer, director, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such loan, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 10. The corporation, and its officers, directors, and duly appointed agents as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for office.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare nor pay any dividends.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having authority under the board of directors, and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 14. (a) The accounts of the corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than six months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements, as are necessary to present fairly the corporation's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the corporation's income and expenses during the year including (1) the results of any trading, manufacturing, publishing, or other commercial-type endeavor carried on by the corporation, and (2) a schedule of all contracts requiring payments in excess of $10,000 and any payments of compensation, salaries, or fees at a rate in excess of $10,000 per annum. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 15. Upon final dissolution or liquidation of the corporation, and after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets of the corporation may be distributed in accordance with the determination of the board of directors of the corporation and in compliance with the constitution and bylaws of the corporation and all Federal and State laws applicable thereto. Such distribution shall be consistent with the purposes of the corporation.

EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NAME, EMBLEMS, SEALS, AND BADGES

SEC. 16. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to use and to allow or refuse to others the use of the terms "Little League", "Little Leaguer", and the official Little League emblem or any colorable simulation thereof. No powers or privileges hereby granted shall, however, interfere or conflict with established or vested rights.

TRANSFER OF ASSETS

SEC. 17. The corporation may acquire the assets of the Little League Baseball, Incorporated, chartered in the State of New York, upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all of the liability of such corporation and upon complying with all laws of the State of New York applicable thereto.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 18. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUAL MEETING DATE FOR NATIONAL BANKS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2228) to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 5145 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 71) is amended by striking out all after the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof "and afterward at meetings to be held on such day of each year as is specified therefor in the bylaws."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 5149 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 75) is amended by striking out "articles of association" and inserting in lieu thereof "bylaws".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 9023) was laid on the table.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the present law national banks must hold their annual meetings in January. This requirement has been found inconvenient. S. 2228 would permit a national bank to hold its annual meeting date on any days of the year which may be specified in the bylaws of the bank.

Second, the bill would make a technical amendment to the statute to permit this change. It would remove the requirement that the annual meeting would be set forth in the articles of the association of the bank and permit the meeting date to be set forth in the bylaws.

The bill has been recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury, it has the endorsement of the American Bankers Association, and it was passed by our committee unanimously.

SEE AMERICA YEAR

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 658) authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1964 as "See America Year," and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating 1964 as "See America Year" and calling upon the people of the United States in their vacation and other nonbusiness travels during such year, to observe, use, and enjoy the scenic, historical, and recreational areas and facilities within the United States of America, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to publicize any proclamation issued by the President pursuant to the first section, and otherwise to encourage and promote vacation travel within the United States of America, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, both by American citizens and by citizens of other countries.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating 1964 as 'See America Year,' and inviting private industry and interested public and private organizations to undertake in 1964 a nationwide effort which will encourage the American people to see the United States, and to use and enjoy the scenic, historical, and recreational areas and facilities throughout the United States of America, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"SEC. 2. The President is authorized to publicize any proclamation issued pursuant to the first section and otherwise to encourage and promote vacation travel within the United States of America, its territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, both by American citizens and by citizens of other countries, through such departments or agencies of the Federal Government as he deems appropriate, in cooperation with State and local agencies and private organizations.

"SEC. 3. The President is authorized to appoint a National Chairman to coordinate the efforts of private industry in carrying out the purposes of this resolution. The National Chairman shall serve without compensation from the Federal Government."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. CUSTOMS YEAR

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 680) requesting the President to designate 1964 as "U.S. Customs Year."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to proclaim the calendar year 1964 as "United States Customs Year" marking the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Customs Service, in recognition of the one and three quarters centuries of dedicated service to the United States; and calling upon the American people to observe this anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT AMENDMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8459) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to allow Federal credit unions greater flexibility in their organization and operations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (7) of section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757) is amended (1) by striking out "or" immediately after "(D)", and (2) by inserting "; or (E) in obligations issued pursuant to Acts of Congress by Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, banks for cooperatives, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Federal National Mortgage Association" immediately before the period at the end thereof.

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 12 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1761) is amended by striking out "supervisory committee of three members" and inserting "supervisory committee of not less than three members nor more than five members".

SEC. 3. The third sentence of section 14 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1761b) is amended by striking out "December 31 in proportion to the interest paid by them during that year" and inserting "the last day of any dividend period in proportion to the interest paid by them during that dividend period".

SEC. 4. The last sentence of section 15 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1761c) is amended by inserting before the period: "and, subject to such regulations as the Director may prescribe, insurance obtained under title I of the National Housing Act shall be deemed adequate security".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 through 10 and insert the following:

"That paragraph (7) of section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757) is amended (1) by striking out 'or' immediately before '(D)', and (2) by adding at the end thereof 'or (E) in obligations issued by Banks for Cooperatives, Federal Land Banks, Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, Federal Home Loan Banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or any corporation designated in section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act as a wholly owned government corporation;'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULTER

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER:

On page 3, after line 3, add the following new section:

"SEC. 5. Section 1014 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out 'or of a Federal Reserve bank, or of a small business investment company,' and inserting 'a Federal Reserve bank, a small business investment company, or a Federal credit union,'."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is acceptable.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the amendment I offered has been submitted to all of the members of the House Banking and Currency Committee and with its permission is being offered here. I know of no objection to the amendment. Since the bill H.R. 8979, concerning this subject matter, was quite broad it was sent to the Judiciary Committee. I have discussed the matter with the chairman and ranking minority member of that committee, our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH]. Both of them have advised me that there is no objection to the House Banking and Currency Committee handling this matter so far as it applies to credit unions, since they are under the jurisdiction of that committee.

The amendment merely inserts in section 1014 of title 18 of the United States Code the words "a Federal credit union." It makes applicable to Federal credit unions the same criminal penalties with reference to false and fraudulent statements and conduct, as are now applied to other federally chartered institutions.

The Credit Union National Association advised me by letter dated November 28, 1963, that this is "a clarifying amendment highly desirable to remove any doubt as to whether Federal credit unions are to be treated the same as any other financial institution chartered by the United States."

Following is a copy of the letter dated November 26, 1963, sent by CUNA to Chairman CELLER:

CREDIT UNION NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D.C., November 26, 1963.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: On behalf of the Credit Union National Association and the more than 11,000 Federal credit unions in the United States which it represents, I would like to register firm support of H.R. 8979, a bill introduced by Congressman ABRAHAM MULTER to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit false statements or reports to Federal credit unions and referred to your Committee on the Judiciary.

As Mr. MULTER so aptly stated on the floor of the House on October 31, this clarifying amendment is needed to remove any doubt as to whether Federal credit unions are to be treated the same as any other financial institution chartered by the United States for purposes of section 1014 of title 18. Mr. MULTER went on to cite two test cases brought by the Justice Department against credit union members under section 1006 involving the forging of comakers' names in which the indictments were dismissed.

This points up the essence of the problem. Although section 1014 makes it a crime for anyone to make a false statement or report for the purpose of influencing action on the part of a number of financial institutions such as a Federal Reserve bank, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, a Federal savings and loan association or a small business investment company, there appears to be doubt as to whether similar action against a Federal credit union also currently constitutes a Federal offense under this statute. Enactment of H.R. 8979 would resolve any possible doubt on this point.

We hope that your committee will plan an early consideration of this legislation and respectfully request an opportunity to appear on behalf of the bill should a hearing be held.

Sincerely,
DAVID R. WEINBERG,
Director,
Legal and Legislative Department.

When I introduced my bill in the House on October 30, 1963, I said:

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit false statements or reports to Federal credit unions.

This is merely a clarifying amendment to remove any doubt as to whether federally chartered credit unions are to be treated the same as any other financial institution chartered by the United States for the purposes of section 1014 of title 18.

Section 1014 presently provides a penalty of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both, for anyone making a false statement or report for the purposes of influencing action on the part of a number of financial institutions such as a Federal Reserve bank, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, a Federal savings & loan association or—since 1956—a small business investment company.

There appears to be doubt as to whether misconduct by a member of a Federal credit union in falsifying an application for a loan, forging a cosigner's signature, and so forth, is a Federal offense. Section 1001 of title 18 provides penalties for making false statements or representations, but this section is considered by some to be applicable only to agencies or departments of the Government.

There has been an attempt to limit its application to corporations chartered by the Government as Government-owned corporations. This was not the intent of Congress.

Section 1006 of title 18 relates to penalties for those who attempt to defraud a credit association. By court action, it has been limited in its coverage to an officer, agent, or employee of such an association. The Justice Department brought two test actions against credit union members under section 1006 involving the forging of cosigners' names and in both instances the indictments have been dismissed.

This bill makes it quite clear that the penalties prescribed by statute shall also apply to Federal credit unions as well as other federally chartered organizations.

There is no reason why any financial institution should be excluded and I hope that this legislative loophole will be closed by the enactment of this bill during the 88th Congress.

The amendment offered today is much narrower than my bill.

The amendment is limited to Federal credit unions and broadens existing law only to the extent of adding them to the statute.

I urge the adoption of the amendment and the passage of the bill as so amended.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation which would allow Federal credit unions greater, and thoroughly warranted, flexibility in their operations.

By expanding investment powers, by permitting the enlargement of the number of members serving on supervisory committees, by authorizing the payment of interest refunds at the close of any dividend period, and by recognizing insurance obtained under title I of the National Housing Act as adequate security for loans, this legislation would enable credit unions to serve even more effectively the over 10 million families, residing in every State of the Union, who are members today.

This measure has been supported by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; it represents a constructive step forward in the legislation governing an institution which has made an important contribution to our economic and social welfare for the last 29 years; and I urge that it be passed today.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 8459 is to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to allow the Federal credit unions somewhat greater flexibility in their organization and operations, and greater flexibility as to the kind of securities in which they may invest their funds.

This is what the bill would do.

First, it would permit the Federal credit unions to have a supervisory committee composed of up to five members whereas present law permits only three members.

Second, it would authorize a payment of interest refunds at the close of any dividend period rather than as now only on December 31 of each year.

Third, it would recognize the insurance obtained under title I of the National Housing Act as adequate security for loans made by Federal credit unions.

Fourth, it would permit Federal credit unions to invest funds in the obligations of Federal agencies and wholly owned Government corporations. Federal credit unions are now authorized to purchase Treasury obligations, but they are not authorized to purchase obligations of other Government agencies carrying the same safety and backing of the U.S. Government.

The bill as introduced specifies three Federal agencies the obligations of which would be eligible for investment by Federal credit unions. The committee amended the bill to make such eligibility apply to any corporation designated in section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act as a wholly owned Government corporation.

The administration has recommended the bill as amended. It was recommended unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I urge that the bill pass.

SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK

The Clerk called the resolution (S.J. Res. 113) to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wonder if this resolution ought not to be amended so that it would have something to say about these year-long sessions of the Congress and the reading of I do not know how many dozen bills on the Consent and Private Calendars today, for example. I am in favor of saving vision, and I would like to see this session of the Congress end this year so that I can save a little of my own vision.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas vision is of the utmost importance to every individual and to the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas many Governors and mayors have, over the past thirty-six years, issued proclamations calling upon their citizens to give special attention to vision care during the first week in March of each year; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has supported significant research to protect man's priceless gift of vision; and

Whereas the United States Post Office Department has authorized the use of special cancellation stamps during that week and the preceding week for the purpose of reminding our citizens that their vision demands constant care: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week", and inviting the Governors and mayors of State and local governments of the United States to issue similar proclamations. The President is further requested to consider including in such proclamation an invitation calling upon the press, radio, television, and other communications media, the health care professions and all other agencies and individuals concerned with programs for the improvement of vision to unite during such week in public activities to impress upon the people of the United States the importance of vision to their own welfare and that of our country, and to urge their support of programs to improve and protect the vision of Americans.

With the following committee amendment:

On pages 1 and 2, strike all "Whereas" clauses.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN HEART MONTH

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 848) to provide for the designation of the month of February in each year as "American Heart Month."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the diseases of the heart and blood vessels constitute our Nation's foremost health problem in that they affect more than ten million people at all ages, are responsible for more deaths than all other causes combined, result in the loss to our economy of seventy-one million nine hundred thousand man-days of work annually, and are a major cause of rejection from military service; and

Whereas recent progress in treatment and prevention gives hope and assurance that the control of heart disease can be achieved through the expansion of heart research, education and community programs now being carried forward through voluntary public support of the American Heart Association, its direct affiliates and chapters, and through the Government by the National Heart Institute and the heart disease control program of the Public Health Service; and

Whereas February is by custom the month of each year during which public attention is focused on the medical, social, and economic aspects of this primary health problem: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation (1) designating February as American Heart Month, (2) inviting the Governors of the States and territories of the United States to issue proclamations for like purposes, and (3) urging the people of the United States to give heed to the nationwide problem of the heart and blood vessel disease, and to support all essential programs required to bring about its solution.

With the following committee amendment:

On pages 1 and 2, strike all "Whereas" clauses.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMS OF OFFICE OF MEMBERS OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8344) to amend the Railway Labor Act to provide that the terms of office of members of the National Mediation Board shall expire on July 1.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the third sentence of the initial paragraph of section 4 of the Railway Labor Act is amended to read as follows: "Each member of the Mediation Board in office on January 1, 1964, shall be deemed to have been appointed for a term of office which shall expire on July 1 of the year his term would have otherwise expired."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIRCRAFT TITLES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8673) to amend title V of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the validity of an instrument the recording of which is provided for by such Act shall be governed by the laws of the place in which such instrument is delivered, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) title V of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1401–1405) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"LAW GOVERNING VALIDITY OF CERTAIN INSTRUMENTS

"SEC. 506. The validity of any instrument the recording of which is provided for by section 503 of this Act shall be governed by the laws of the State, District of Columbia, or territory or possession of the United States in which such instrument is delivered, irrespective of the location or the place of delivery of the property which is the subject of such instrument. Where the place of intended delivery of such instrument is specified therein, it shall constitute presumptive evidence that such instrument was delivered at the place so specified."

(b) The table of contents of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by inserting after

"Sec. 505. Dealers' aircraft registration certificates."

the following:

"Sec. 506. Law governing validity of certain instruments."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall not take precedence over the Convention on the International Recognition of Rights in Aircraft (4 U.S.T. 1830).

(d) The amendments made by this section shall not be applicable with respect to any instrument delivered before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. Section 503(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Except as the Administrator may by regulation prescribe, no conveyance or other instrument shall be recorded unless it shall have been acknowledged before a notary public or other officer authorized by the law of the United States, or of a State, territory, or possession thereof, or the District of Columbia, to take acknowledgment of deeds."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. NATCHER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

FILING CONFERENCE REPORT ON STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, H.R. 7063, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, judiciary and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MARIA MEREGHETTI (MOTHER BENEDETTA) AND ANNUNZIATA COLOMBO (MOTHER CHERUBINA)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 1289) for the relief of Maria Merghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunciata Colombo (Mother Cherubina), with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 4, strike out "Merghetti" and insert: "Mereghetti".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act for the relief of Maria Mereghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTRICITY GENERATED AT FALCON DAM

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4062) to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 12, insert:

"SEC. 2. The Act of June 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 255), is amended by adding a new section 4 to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 4. The release of United States water from the Falcon and Amistad Dams for the production of hydroelectric energy shall be such as not to interfere with United States vested rights to the use of water for municipal, domestic, irrigation, and industrial purposes or with storage of water for these purposes.' "

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlefrom Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JOHN F. MACPHAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5145) for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

BRYCE A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6182) for the relief of Bryce A. Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal", approved May 29, 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 258; 60 Stat. 873), Bryce A. Smith, Saint Petersburg, Florida, shall be held and considered, as of the effective date of such Act, to have performed three years of service in the employ of the Isthmian Canal Commission during the construction period of the Panama Canal.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANNAH ROBBINS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1838) for the relief of Hannah Robbins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hannah Robbins may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* This section shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, after the words "of such Act" change the period to a colon and insert the following: "*Provided,* That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLY SAPUSCHNIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1182) for the relief of Willy Sapuschnin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Willy Sapuschnin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), Willy Sapuschnin shall be held and considered to have been paroled into the United States on the date of the enactment of this Act, as provided for in the said Act of July 14, 1960."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANISLAWA OUELLETTE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1355) for the relief of Stanislawa Ouellette.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stanislawa Ouellette shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mrs. Stella Ouellette, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stanislawa Ouellette may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, and a petition filed in her behalf by Mrs. Stella B. Ouellette, a citizen of the United States, may be approved pursuant to the provisions of section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TIBOR HORCSIK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4085) for the relief of Tibor Horcsik.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Tibor Horcsik, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Gabor Horcsik, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tibor Horcsik may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Gabor Horcsik, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRYSANTHOS KYRIAKOU

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4284) for the relief of Chrysanthos Kyriakou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Chrysanthos Kyriakou, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Nicolaou, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chrysanthos Kyriakou may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Harry Nicolaou, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER PALERMO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5982) for the relief of Peter Palermo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter Palermo may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Peter Palermo, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, strike out the name "Peter Palermo" and substitute the name "Pasquale Fiorica".

On page 1, line 7, strike out the word "citizens" and substitute in lieu thereof "a citizen and lawfully resident alien, respectively,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of Pasquale Fiorica."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANISLAW KURYJ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6313) for the relief of Stanislaw Kuryj.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stanislaw Kuryj shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), Stanislaw Kuryj shall be held and considered to have been paroled into the United States on the date of the enactment of this Act, as provided for in the said Act of July 14, 1960."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTANTINE THEOTHOROPOULOS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6591) for the relief of Constantine Theothoropoulos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Constantine Theothoropoulos may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Emile Pappas, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEMETRIOS DOUSOPOULOS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7533) for the relief of Demetrios Dousopoulos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Demetrios Dousopoulos may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided,* That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YOO SEI CHUN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 212) for the relief of Yoo Sei Chun.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yoo Sei Chun may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by Mr. and Mrs. Michael Fix, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said Yoo Sei Chun pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISAKO MORIYA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 697) for the relief of Misako Moriya.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Misako Moriya, the fiancee of George Snyder, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months, if the administrative authorities find (1) that the said Misako Moriya is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said George Snyder and (2) that she is otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Misako Moriya, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Misako Moriya, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Misako Moriya as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUKIO ISERI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 966) for the relief of Yukio Iseri.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yukio Iseri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SUSANNA GRÜN (SUSANNE ROTH)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1096) for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grün (Susanne Roth).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Susanna Grün (Susanne Roth) shall be held and considered to be a returning resident alien within the purview of that Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "section 101(b)(27)(B)" and substitute in lieu thereof "section 101(a)(27)(B)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESPINA J. SANIOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1097) for the relief of Despina J. Sanios.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Despina J. Sanios may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by Mr. and Mrs. John Sanios, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said Despina J. Sanios pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIKTOR JAANIMETS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1272) for the relief of Viktor Jaanimets.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **FEIGHAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 1272 be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DR. DEMETRIOS FLESSAS AND DR. EUGENIA FLESSAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1479) for the relief of Dr. Demetrios Flessas and Dr. Eugenia Flessas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Demetrios Flessas and Doctor Eugenia Flessas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of March 10, 1953, and April 22, 1950, respectively.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANA MURGELJ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1516) for the relief of Ana Murgelj.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ana Murgelj may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by Mr. and Mrs. John Miklich, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said Ana Murgelj pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DULCIE ANN STEINHARDT SHERLOCK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1570) for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the time Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock, daughter of the late Ambassador Laurence A. Steinhardt and Mrs. Steinhardt, was residing abroad with her parents, during her minority when her father was an Ambassador in the Foreign Service of the United States, shall be held and considered to be compliance with the physical presence requirements of section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U.S.C. 1254):

A–11698851, Kong, Yee Lum.

A–12269433, Lee, Bok Yee.

A–12084199, Ng, Chew Wing.

A–12646075, Yee, Sook Jane.

A–12255181, Doo, Sid-Lin.

A–12255180, Doo, Wai-Lin.

A–10441193, Chan, Kwog Chiu.

A–12617228, Jin, Ock-Tai.

A–11407445, Leong, Poy Fong.

A–12688041, Ng, Gum Foon.

A–12687858, Ng, Kum Tai.

A–12652905, Gee, Ming Dong.

A–12145774, Kin, Cheong Chin.

A–12643730, Wong, King Koon.

A–11410381, Huey, Bon Hom.

A–13121496, Lee, Quen Lim.

A–11813296, Yee, Yick Tong.

A–12125517, Lee, Do Pon.

A–12510515, Wong, Chuck Ming.

A–11598014, Hing, Lau Que.

SEC. 2. The Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U.S.C. 1254):

A–3679214, Fun, Leong.

A–1228254, Helenius, Einar Olavi.

A–2742166, Rodriguez, Alvaro.

A–1408824, Rodriguez de Torres, Josefa.

A–2886389, Vargas-Gomez, Ascencion.

A–2886388, Vargas-Gomez, Jose Eladio Jesus.

A–10130301, Tak, Wa Kwok.

A–5063060, Hung, Gay Chin.

A–5686658, Alberti, Antoinette Marie.

A–8961227, Kwai-ing, Wong.

A–15805587, Wo, Chan Lok.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, after line 15, add the following:

"A–12262419, Gee, Poy Jam.

"A–12358543, Lum, Cheung Yuen.

"A–11894360, Rodriguez-Blanco, Jose."

On page 3, at the end of the concurrent resolution, add the following:

"A–8538601, Wittenber, Jan Peter."

The committee amendments were concurred in.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JOYCE MARK BOUVIER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1014) for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 349(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

"SEC. 2. Upon the naturalization of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier, as provided for in this Act, her child, Paula Bouvier, shall be held and considered to be a national and citizen of the United States pursuant to section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, subject to the provisions of section 301(b) of the said Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier and Paula Bouvier."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARETI SIOZOS PAIDAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1384) for the relief of Areti Siozos Paidas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Areti Siozos Paidas, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. James Paidas, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Areti Siozos Paidas may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. James Paidas, citizens of the United States pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOZEFA TRZCINSKA BISKUP

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1520) for the relief of Jozefa Trzcinska Biskup.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jozefa Trzcinska Biskup, shall be held and considered to be the natural born child of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Biskup, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parents, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jozefa Trzcinska Biskup may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101 (b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Frank Biskup, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

"SEC. 2. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ivanka Stalcer Vlahovic may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101 (b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mrs. and Mrs. Josip Vlahovic, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendents were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Jozefa Trzcinska Biskup and Ivanka Stalcer Vlahovic.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSIP LUZIC

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1521) for the relief of Josip Luzic.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josip Luzic may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out the name "Josip Luzic" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Lovorko Lucic".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Lovorko Lucic."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VALERIANO T. EBREO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1886) for the relief of Valeriano T. Ebreo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Valeriano T. Ebreo, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Nicholas C. Ebreo a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Valeriano T. Ebreo may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Nicholas C. Ebreo, a citizen and national, respectively, of the United States, pursuant to section 205 (b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMITTING VESSELS TO AMERICAN REGISTRY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1211) to admit the vessels *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This requires two objections.

Is there further objection?

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding section 4132 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 11) and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 883), the following three Canadian-built vessels, owned by the Prescott Ogdensburg Ferry Company, Limited, a Canadian corporation wholly owned by the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, a public benefit corporation created by the State of New York, may, after their transfer to the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority and/or Ogdensburg Bridge and Port Authority, be admitted to American registry and documented under the laws of the United States, and shall be entitled to engage in the coastwise trade and to transport passengers and merchandise between points in the United States, including districts and possessions thereof embraced within the coastwise laws: Fort Town (Canadian official number 175,999), Maple City (Canadian official number 176,000), and Windmill Point (Canadian official number 198,041).

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, the Ogdensburg Bridge and Port Authority, having completed construction of the international bridge across the St. Lawrence River to Prescott, Ontario, finds itself in possession of three ferries that no longer are needed by the organization.

Since the vessels were constructed by a Canadian subsidiary of the authority, they are under Canadian registry, and legislation is required to transfer them to U.S. registry so they may be sold. The authority promotion agent, Joel M. Howard, reports the vessels are in excellent condition and are fast, economical, and efficient in operation. Since the Commerce Department has approved the use of a foreign-built vessel for Alaskan coastal trade, I can hardly see how there can be opposition to the registry transfer of the ferries *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point.* Most previous objections have disappeared, and the bill should be approved without delay.

This move would constitute no hardship to American domestic shipping and would be of great benefit to the authority.

The Ogdensburg Bridge and Port Authority was established by an act of the Legislature of New York State and the State loaned most of the money for the bridge so if these ferryboats are sold that money will be paid to the State of New York on its loan.

I sponsored an identical previous bill in the House, H.R. 4195, which I introduced February 9, 1961. Last year the Senate passed the same measure without dissent. Approval of the legislation is essential to permit the sale of the ferries to some agency that can use them instead of permitting them to lie idle and penalize the Ogdensburg Authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS B. AND EARLENE BOLLERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1129) for the relief of Thomas B. Bollers and Earlene Bollers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the time limitation prescribed for filing claims against the United States under section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to receive, consider, and act upon any claim filed under such section by Thomas B. Bollers and his wife, Earlene Bollers, if such claim is filed within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the said Thomas B. and Earlene Bollers having allegedly sustained financial losses as a result of the water supply for their house having been contaminated by the disposition of waste chemicals from the Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colorado: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall constitute an admission of liability on the part of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARIZONA MILLING CO., OF PHOENIX, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1269) for the relief of the Arizona Milling Co., of Phoenix, Ariz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Arizona Milling Company, Phoenix, Arizona, the sum of $4,880.05. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of such company arising out of certain expenditures made by it for labor, methyl bromide gas, and other materials and equipment purchased or rented by it in order to accomplish a fumigation process in the company's Tucson plant which was made necessary when the United States Department of Agriculture imposed a twenty-day quarantine on such plant on the basis of a mistaken determination by the Department that specimens of larvae collected at that plant were grain feeding insects known as khapra beetles, the Department having subsequently removed such quarantine after notifying such company that the specimens had been erroneously identified: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRVING M. SOBIN CHEMICAL CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1392) for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Irving M. Sobin Chemical Company, Incorporated, of Boston, Massachusetts, the sum of $16,016.58 in full settlement of all its claims against the United States for repayment of excessive customs duties erroneously collected by the Bureau of Customs on sodium perborate imported by the said Irving M. Sobin Chemical Company, Incorporated, between September 12, 1954, and August 16, 1961, entries of which were liquidated between September 15, 1954, and October 3, 1961: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, conditioned upon the abandonment of certain protests as listed in subdivision (c) below, relief from the payment of certain customs duties shall be granted the Irving M. Sobin Chemical Company, Incorporated of Boston, Massachusetts, as follows:

"(a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Irving M. Sobin Chemical Company, Incorporated, of Boston, Massachusetts, the sum of $11,216.02 in full settlement of all its claims against the United States for repayment of excessive customs duties collected by the Bureau of Customs on imported sodium perborate entered by or for the account of the said Irving M. Sobin Chemical Company, Incorporated between September 15, 1954, and June 20, 1961, entries of which were liquidated between June 27, 1956, and December 8, 1961, as follows:

"Consumption entry No.	Date of entry	Port of entry
938	Sept. 8, 1958	Norfolk Va.
1439	Oct. 6, 1958	Do.
1841	Oct. 31, 1958	Do.
2155	Nov. 21, 1958	Do.
2729	Dec. 29, 1958	Do.
3382	Feb. 9, 1959	Do.
3777	Mar. 9, 1959	Do.
4280	Apr. 3, 1959	Do.
4051	Mar. 24, 1959	Do.
4902	May 7, 1959	Do.
5378	June 5, 1959	Do.
5763	June 25, 1959	Do.
499	July 27, 1959	Do.
1183	Aug. 31, 1959	Do.
1944	Oct. 15, 1959	Do.
2323	Nov. 2, 1959	Do.
2805	Dec. 2, 1959	Do.
3073	Dec. 17, 1959	Do.
4008	Feb. 11, 1960	Do.
4300	Feb. 26, 1960	Do.
5025	Apr. 11, 1960	Do.
5246	Apr. 20, 1960	Do.
33362	Feb. 19, 1959	Los Angeles, Calif.
24891	Apr. 11, 1958	San Francisco, Calif.
32173	June 30, 1958	Do.
8483	Sept. 22, 1958	Do.
11552	Dec. 17, 1957	Boston, Mass.
4684	Sept. 8, 1958	Do.
15867	Jan. 21, 1959	Do.
519	July 7, 1959	Do.
3142	Aug. 4, 1959	Do.
8208	Sept. 28, 1959	Do.
10700	Oct. 27, 1959	Do.
14087	Dec. 2, 1959	Do.
33218	June 20, 1960	Do.
21246	Feb. 27, 1961	Do.
305	Sept. 15, 1954	Charleston, S.C.
1536	Apr. 7, 1958	Do.
1822	May 29, 1958	Do.
1998	June 26, 1958	Do.
185	July 29, 1958	Do.
379	Aug. 21. 1958	Do.
486	Sept. 10, 1958	Do.
960	Nov. 17. 1958	Do.
1313	Jan. 2, 1959	Do.
1640	Feb. 10, 1959	Do.
1863	Mar. 6, 1959	Do.
2040	Mar. 26. 1959	Do.
2300	Apr. 21, 1959	Do.
2677	May 26, 1959	Do.
3008	June 25, 1959	Do.
320	July 31, 1959	Do.
684	Aug. 31, 1959	Do.
1003	Sept. 30, 1959	Do.
2788	Feb. 24, 1960	Do.
2995	Mar. 9, 1960	Do.
3297	Apr. 5, 1960	Do.
3677	May 5, 1960	Do.
3774	May 16, 1960	Do.
4026	June 7, 1960	Do.
4171	June 16, 1960	Do.
326	Aug. 1, 1960	Do.
368	Aug. 5, 1960	Do.
443	Aug. 15. 1960	Do.
4151	Apr. 29, 1958	Norfolk, Va.
255	Aug. 10, 1960	Mobile, Ala.
20023	Jan. 12, 1959	San Francisco, Calif.
32734	May 11, 1959	Do.
9905	Sept. 17, 1959	Do.
21620	Dec. 8, 1959	Do.
671	Oct. 28, 1959	Wilmington, N.C.
688	Oct. 30, 1959	Do.
850	Nov. 30, 1959	Do.
948	Dec. 14, 1959	Do.
1014	Dec. 29, 1959	Do.
1243	Feb. 5, 1960	Do.
1555	Mar. 22, 1960	Do.
1619	Mar. 31, 1960	Do.
1746	Apr. 13, 1960	Do.
2054	May 25, 1960	Do.
139	July 25, 1960	Do.
194	Aug. 4, 1960	Do.

"(b) The collectors of customs at the various ports of entry shall waive the collection of unpaid assessments of liquidated increased duties, totaling $3,216.19, due from the said Irving M. Sobin Chemical Company, Incorporated, with respect to the following entries:

"Consumption entry No.	Date of entry	Port of entry
6044	June 6, 1960	Norfolk, Va.
6273	June 20, 1960	Do.
50	July 5, 1960	Do.
278	July 18, 1960	Do.
1877	Oct. 10, 1960	Do.
255	Aug. 10, 1960	Mobile, Ala.

"Consumption entry No.	Date of entry	Port of entry
22526	Mar. 13, 1961	Boston, Mass.
25710	Apr. 17, 1961	Do.
25711	----do--------	Do.
27184	May 1, 1961	Do.
28977	May 19, 1961	Do.
30377	June 2, 1961	Do.
31962	June 20, 1961	Do.
4255	June 30, 1960	Charleston, S.C.
309	July 28, 1960	Do.
830	Sept. 22, 1960	Do.
924	Sept. 29, 1960	Do.
1122	Oct. 14, 1960	Do.
1224	Oct. 27, 1960	Do.

"(c) *Provided*, That the said Irving M. Sobin Chemical Company, Incorporated, shall abandon its protests before the United States Customs Court claiming relief from assessments of increased duties, totaling $3,604.90, with respect to the following entries:

"Consumption entry No.	Date of entry	Port of entry
4151	Apr. 29, 1958	Norfolk, Va.
255	Aug. 10, 1960	Mobile, Ala.
20023	Jan. 12, 1959	San Francisco, Calif.
32734	May 11, 1959	Do.
9905	Sept. 17, 1959	Do.
21620	Dec. 8, 1959	Do.
671	Oct. 28, 1959	Wilmington, N.C.
688	Oct. 30, 1959	Do.
850	Nov. 30, 1959	Do.
948	Dec. 14, 1959	Do.
1014	Dec. 29, 1959	Do.
1243	Feb. 5, 1960	Do.
1555	Mar. 22, 1960	Do.
1619	Mar. 31, 1960	Do.
1746	Apr. 13, 1960	Do.
2054	May 25, 1960	Do.
139	July 25, 1960	Do.
194	Aug. 4, 1960	Do.

"(2) No part of the amount appropriated, or of the unpaid amounts forgiven, in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPITAL TRANSIT LINES, INC., OF SALEM, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1403) for the relief of Capital Transit Lines, Inc., of Salem, Oreg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of subsection (c) (relating to time for filing claims) of section 6421 (relating to gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and any other bar to payment on the ground of a period of limitations or lapse of time, are hereby waived with respect to any claims filed within one year after the date of enactment of this Act by Capital Transit Lines, Incorporated, of Salem, Oregon, under subsection (b) of such section for gasoline used by it after June 30, 1959, and before July 1, 1961.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 12, strike "June 30, 1959" and insert "February 1, 1959".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK MRAMOR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1451) for the relief of Frank Mramor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Frank Mramor, of Euclid, Ohio, and his claim for compensation on account of injuries sustained by him on April 6, 1939, while employed as an emergency relief employee with the former Works Progress Administration, shall be acted upon under remaining provisions of such Act if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within the six-month period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided,* That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period before the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELMER J. AND RICHARD R. PAYNE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2818) for the relief of Elmer J. and Richard R. Payne.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elmer J. Payne and Richard R. Payne, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the sum of $450. The payment of such sum shall be in the full satisfaction of all claims of said coowners against the United States for compensation for damages sustained by such coowners when, on August 5, 1959, a federally owned aircraft assigned to the One Hundred and Twenty-eighth Fighter Group of the Wisconsin Air National Guard, General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, crashed into a fishing boat owned by Elmer J. and Richard R. Payne while such fishing boat was docked in Milwaukee Harbor, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike "$450" and insert "$250".

Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. FRED T. WINFIELD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4682) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred T. Winfield.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 12 of the Act of September 1, 1916, as in effect on March 1, 1946, Mr. and Mrs. Fred T. Winfield of Arlington, Virginia, shall be deemed to have been legally married before March 1, 1946, the retirement date of Mr. Winfield from the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police force. Although Mr. and Mrs. Winfield had entered into a marriage ceremony on May 16, 1923, the marriage was not legal because Mrs. Winfield had inadvertenly not had her limited divorce from her previous husband merged into an absolute decree. When informed, in 1951, of the illegality of their marriage, the Winfields had the decree merged into an absolute decree and entered into a second ceremony on April 10, 1952.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. JOHN P. MANN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5500) for the relief of Lt. John P. Mann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lieutenant John P. Mann, United States Navy, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $1,100, which amount represents the total of overpayments made to him during the period beginning March 4, 1957, and ending April 2, 1962, such payments having been made as the result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "$1,100" and insert "$1,637.78."

Page 1, line 7, strike "April 2, 1962" and insert "June 30, 1963".

Page 1, following line 11, insert:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lieutenant John P. Mann, the amount certified by the Secretary of the Navy as the aggregate amount paid to the United States by the said Lieutenant John P. Mann, or withheld by the United States from amounts due him, on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. RANSOM C. APLIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5584) for the relief of Capt. Ransom C. Aplin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Captain Ransom C. Aplin, of Pasadena, California, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the amount of $3,494.47 representing overpayments of active duty pay as a member of the United States Air Force for the period from April 9, 1954, through December 31, 1962, which he received as the result of an erroneous computation of creditable service for longevity purposes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Captain Ransom C. Aplin, the sum of any amount received or withheld from him on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this bill.

No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "$3,494.47" and insert "$3,435.28".

Page 1, line 7, strike "April 9, 1954" and insert "June 8, 1955".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA LOCAL UNION NO. 746

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5858) relating to the effective date of the qualification of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America Local Union No. 746 pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America Local Union Numbered 746 pension fund which was established pursuant to an agreement and declaration of trust and which has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code, for taxable years ending on or after July 26, 1961, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under such section 401(a), and to have been exempt from taxation under such section 501(a), for the period beginning on May 1, 1960, and ending on July 26, 1961, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIAN A. ERSKINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5941) for the relief of Julian A. Erskine.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Julian A. Erskine, master sergeant, United States Army, retired, of Staples, Minnesota, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the amount of $601.07 representing overpayments of active duty pay as a member of the United States Army for the period from July 20, 1944, through August 9, 1959, which he received as a result of a typographic error made in the date of his original enlistment in the National Guard and subsequent longevity increases prior to entitlement.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Julian A. Erskine, the sum of any amount received or withheld from him on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this bill.

No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEXANDER HAYTKO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6092) for the relief of Alexander Haytko.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

WALTER L. MATHEWS AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6320) for the relief of Walter L. Mathews and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following employees and former employees of the United States Naval Ordnance Plant, Macon, Georgia, are hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States any overpayment they received as salary during the periods indicated, such overpayments having occurred as a result of administrative error:

Walter L. Mathews, beginning March 20, 1960, through June 3, 1961;

Roy A. Collingsworth, beginning June 10, 1962, through August 19, 1962;

Jack Guglieri, beginning June 26, 1960, through October 1, 1960;

James R. Saunders, beginning April 2, 1961, through September 17, 1961;

Clarence E. Hamilton, beginning October 30, 1960, through August 19, 1962;

Lowell S. Moran, beginning July 12, 1959, through October 14, 1961;

Marvin L. O'Neal, beginning January 24, 1960, through October 1, 1960;

David Francis, beginning March 20, 1960, through October 1, 1960;

W. B. Liles, beginning March 13, 1955, through August 25, 1956;

Robert A. Lowe, beginning August 12, 1956, through July 26, 1959;

William M. Moses, beginning January 13, 1957, through July 26, 1959;

Luther M. Barfield, beginning June 17, 1956, through June 1, 1957;

Leonard E. Deck, beginning August 20, 1961, through August 19, 1962;

Bennie T. Rogers, beginning April 3, 1960, through November 11, 1961;

Edgar J. Reynolds, beginning May 2, 1956, through May 2, 1957;

Marvin H. Grimsley, beginning January 3, 1954, through March 20, 1960;

William T. Bailey, beginning April 3, 1960, through August 20, 1962;

Homer Proctor, beginning June 10, 1962, through August 19, 1962;

Willie R. Noles, beginning January 3, 1954, through January 2, 1955;

Henry T. Hooper, beginning March 6, 1949, through October 1, 1950;

Lewis D. Oxford, beginning March 25, 1956, through March 11, 1958;

Eloise G. Reid, beginning October 31, 1960, through August 20, 1962;

In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, strike "September 17, 1961", insert "September 16, 1961".

Page 2, line 16, strike "August 25, 1956", insert "June 30, 1956".

Page 2, line 18, strike "July 26, 1959", insert "July 25, 1959".

Page 2, line 20, strike "July 26, 1959", insert "July 25, 1959".

Page 3, line 3, strike "May 3, 1956", insert "May 6, 1956".

Page 3, line 4, strike "May 2, 1957", insert "May 4, 1957".

Page 3, lines 5 and 6, strike lines 5 and 6, and insert "Thomas E. Wilson, beginning April 3, 1960, through July 20, 1963;".

Page 3, line 8, strike "August", insert "July".

Page 3, lines 9 and 10, strike lines 9 and 10.

Page 3, line 12, strike "January 2, 1955", insert "May 21, 1955".

Page 3, line 16, strike "March 11, 1958", insert "March 8, 1958".

Page 3, line 18, strike "August 20, 1962", insert "August 18, 1962".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. WILFRID E. GELINAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6876) for the relief of Capt. Wilfrid E. Gelinas, U.S. Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Captain Wilfrid E. Gelinas, United States Air Force, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the amount of $1,176.47 representing overpayments of active duty pay as a member of the United States Air Force in the years 1958 through 1961, which he received as a result of erroneous credit of service for longevity pay purposes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Captain Wilfrid E. Gelinas, the sum of any amount received or withheld from him on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this bill.

No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike "1958" and insert "1959". The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACK B. FISHER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7788) for the relief of Jack B. Fisher.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jack B. Fisher of Fairborn, Ohio, the sum of $190.80. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of his claim against the United States Government for commutation of subsistence, which claim was timely submitted to the United States Air Force but denied by the United States General Accounting Office because received after the expiration of the period of limitation provided by the Act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1061), as modified by the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1181) as the result of delay by the Air Force in forwarding the claim: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROY W. FICKEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8085) for the relief of Roy W. Ficken.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Roy W. Ficken of Hayward, California, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $7,813.26, representing the compensation received by him from February 6, 1961, to January 6, 1962, while employed at the Military Sea and Transportation Service, San Francisco, California, in violation of the Act of July 31, 1894 (U.S.C. 62). In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Roy W. Ficken an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike "$7,813.26" and insert "$7,941.60."

Page 2, line 10, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST LT. DAVID A. STAVER, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8323) for the relief of 1st Lt. David A. Staver, U.S. Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to David A. Staver, first lieutenant, United States Air Force, the sum of $2,403.42 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects destroyed on August 22, 1962, as a result of the crash of a United States Air Force F-100 jet fighter into his assigned Government quarters at Royal Air Force Station, Shepherds Grove, Suffolk, England: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LABORERS' PENSION FUND OF HUDSON COUNTY, N.J.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8392) relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Laborers' Pension Fund of Hudson County, N.J., as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled, That the Laborers' Pension Fund of Hudson County, New Jersey (created by escrow agreement and declaration of trust on September 1, 1957), which, by virtue of a collective bargaining agreement effective February 2, 1960, was converted on February 2, 1960, to the Hudson County District Council of Laborers' pension fund, which in turn has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and to be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code for the years ending on or after February 2, 1960, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under section 401(a) and to have been exempt from taxation under section 501(a) for the period beginning on September 1, 1957, and ending on February 2, 1960, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN T. COX

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8828) for the relief of John T. Cox.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Philip Y. Craig, of 1610 Hershey Lane, Alexandria, Virginia, the sum of $1,091.18. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Philip Y. Craig against the United States and John T. Cox, and in payment of the judgment and costs docketed in the municipal court for the District of Columbia on December 3, 1962, in favor of the said Philip Y. Craig against the said John T. Cox for false arrest, growing out of an incident at Washington National Airport on May 18, 1958, while said John T. Cox was on duty there as a member of the airport police force: *Provided*, That no part of the money appropriated in this Act in excess of 20 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. NICHOLAS A. STATHIS, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8849) for the relief of Lt. Col. Nicholas A. Stathis, U.S. Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lieutenant Colonel Nicholas A. Stathis AO928980, United States Air Force, Norton Air Force Base, California, the sum $7,164.70 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects destroyed aboard the United States Ship *Alcoa Planter*, a carrier under Government contract, which caught fire in the harbor at Bremerhaven, Germany, on February 1, 1963: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAROLINE G. JUNGHANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8878) for the relief of Caroline G. Junghans.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8930) for the relief of certain employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Jewel Ault Medlock, the sum of $251.10; to Vernon Joseph Goulette, the sum of $468.90; to Benjamin C. Jollie, the sum of $281.60; to Barney Leroy Ramsey, the sum of $399.10; to William Alfred Sullivan, the sum of $1,038.70. Such payments shall be in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for the loss of personal effects of the said persons in the fire which destroyed the building of the Bureau of Indian Affairs at Crownpoint, New Mexico, on February 7, 1962.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, following line 2, insert:

"SEC. 2. No part of each of the amounts appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. VICTOR R. ROBINSON, JR., U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8931) for the relief of Maj. Victor R. Robinson, Jr., U.S. Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Major Victor R. Robinson, Junior, 24801A, United States Air Force, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, the sum of $762.12 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire of undetermined origin on July 23, 1962, at the Bowell Storage and Transit Company warehouse, Dayton, Ohio, while the property was stored in a warehouse under a Government contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES AT HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE, HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7967) for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each individual named in section 3 of this Act is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the amount set forth opposite his name, which amount represents an erroneous payment of compensation received by him during the period set forth opposite his name, as a civilian employee of the Department of the Air Force at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, and was erroneously paid to him due to administrative error arising out of the conversion of his position of employment from a wage board position to a position under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each individual named in section 3 of this Act, the sum certified to him by the Secretary of the Air Force as the aggregate of amounts paid by such individual to the United States, or withheld from amounts due him from the United States, on account of the liability for which relief is granted by the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. The individuals referred to in the first section of this Act, the period during which each of them received erroneous payments referred to in such first section, and the amount of the liability of each of them, are as follows:

Name	Inclusive dates	Amount of overpayment
Koon Wah Au Young	Oct. 9, 1960, to Nov. 4, 1962	$136.32
George Braun	do	134.40
Andrew L. Ching	do	146.80
Charles O. Deitch	July 23, 1961, to Oct. 14, 1962	269.42
Marvin M. Dye, Jr	Sept. 3, 1961, to Oct. 14, 1962	229.94
Christine K. Furtado	Oct. 30, 1949, to May 28, 1950	50.40
Kiyoshi Furuichi	Oct. 9, 1960, to Nov. 4, 1962	136.32
Hemenis N. Ilac	do	135.20
Edmund L. Kirby	Mar. 25, 1962, to Apr. 8, 1962	4.80
Satoki Kisaba	May 20, 1956, to Oct. 21, 1962	1,123.02
Raymond Kissinger	Nov. 6, 1960, to Mar. 11, 1962	91.42
Masayoshi Kitamori	July 23, 1961, to Oct. 14, 1962	268.76
Haruo Kochi	July 23, 1961, to Oct. 14, 1962	267.20
Samuel K. Kupau	Oct. 9, 1960. to Nov. 4, 1962	$144.10
Rolf K. Macalister	Nov. 19, 1961, to Nov. 18, 1962	136.00
Frederico M. Madriaga	Oct. 9, 1960, to Nov. 4, 1962	125.92
Richard Mahuna	do	145.84
Tsukasa Matsumoto	do	286.90
James Pancho	do	137.28
George E. Soper	June 17, 1962, to Oct. 21, 1962	206.40
John Strenger	Apr. 12, 1953, to June 6, 1954	46.20
Nobuo Takamori	July 23, 1961, to Oct. 14, 1962	278.70
Toshio Tokunaga	Aug. 26, 1956, to Feb. 1, 1959	140.91
Chester A. Vause, Jr	Aug. 26, 1956, to July 16, 1961	771.67
Edward H. Yokomichi	Mar. 13, 1955, to Feb. 24, 1963	651.52
Juan J. Yuson	June 18, 1961, to Oct. 21, 1962	215.48

Sec. 4. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, strike the table of names, dates, and amounts, following line 14, and substitute the following table:

"Name	*Inclusive dates*	*Amount of overpayment*
Koon Wah Au Young	October 9, 1960, to February 23, 1963	$136.32
George Braun	October 9, 1960, to February 23, 1963	134.40
Domingo O. Bolosan	July 1, 1956, to February 8, 1959	182.72
Andrew L. Ching	October 9, 1960, to February 23, 1963	146.80
Charles O. Deitch	July 23, 1961, to March 2, 1963	269.42
Marvin M. Dye, Junior	September 3, 1961, to March 2, 1963	229.94
Christine K. Furtado	October 30, 1949, to April 1, 1950	36.96
Kiyoshi Furuichi	October 9, 1960, to February 23, 1963	136.32
Hemenis N. Ilac	October 9, 1960, to February 23, 1963	135.20
Edmund L. Kirby	March 25, 1962, to April 7, 1962	4.80
Satoki Kisaba	May 20, 1956, to June 6, 1959	426.05
Raymond Kissinger	November 6, 1960, to March 10, 1962	91.42
Masayoshi Kitamori	July 23, 1961, to March 2, 1963	268.76
Haruo Kochi	July 23, 1961, to March 2, 1963	267.20
Samuel K. Kupau	October 9, 1960, to February 23, 1963	144.10
Rolf K. Macalister	November 19, 1961, to February 23, 1963	136.00
Frederico M. Madriaga	October 9, 1960, to November 3, 1962	125.92
Richard Mahuna	October 9, 1960, to February 23, 1963	145.84
James Panchco	October 9, 1960, to February 23, 1963	137.28
George E. Soper	June 17, 1962, to May 18, 1963	216.00
John Strenger	April 12, 1953, to June 5, 1954	46.20
Nobuo Takamori	July 23, 1961, to March 2, 1963	278.70
Toshio Tokunaga	August 26, 1956, to January 30, 1959	133.70
Chester A. Vause, Junior	August 26, 1956, to July 15, 1961	783.86
Jerry Viskocil	July 29, 1956, to August 11, 1957	7.85
Juan J. Yuson	June 18, 1961, to February 23, 1963	215.48"

Page 3, line 2, strike out "one claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof" and insert "claim".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS IN THE NEWTON AREA, CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5302) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the Newton area, California, to Clarence J. Wilder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to Clarence J. Wilder, El Dorado, California, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land in the Newton area near Placerville, California, on which a small tract application Sacramento 045792 was filed March 25, 1952, being the same land occupied continuously by Mr. Wilder since prior to 1952.

Sec. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be made upon payment of the fair market value of the land as of March 25, 1952, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, exclusive of any value added by improvements to the lands made by Mr. Wilder or members of his family or their predecessors in interest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, lines 7 to 9 inclusive, strike out "on which a small tract application Sacramento 045792 was filed March 25, 1952, being the same land occupied continuously by Mr. Wilder since prior to 1952." and insert "lot 5, section 20, township 10 north, range 12 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, containing approximately three acres."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, after line 4, add a new section to read:

"Sec. 3. The execution of a conveyance authorized by section 2 of this Act shall relieve Clarence J. Wilder of any liability, existing on the date of said conveyance, to the United States for use of the conveyed lands."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAYLOR

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Saylor as a substitute for the committee amendment: In lieu of the committee amendment, insert:

"Sec. 3. The execution of the conveyance directed by section 1 of this Act shall not relieve any occupant of the land conveyed of any liability to the United States existing on the date of the conveyance for unauthorized use of the land."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor].

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT MILES MILITARY RESERVATION, DEL.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1767) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the State of Delaware, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to sell and convey to the State of Delaware, by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such federally owned lands of the Fort Miles Military Reservation, Delaware, which are now declared to be excess to the needs of the United States, excluding, however, approximately ten acres located within the town of Lewes, Delaware, known as the off-post housing area.

Sec. 2. The conveyance authorized herein shall be upon the following terms and conditions.

(a) That portion of the presently excess lands comprising approximately one hundred and fifty-five acres, more or less, which was ceded to the Federal Government by the State of Delaware without cost, shall be conveyed with the improvements thereon to the State of Delaware without monetary payment.

(b) Such lands, other than described in (a) above, as are presently excess shall be conveyed with the improvements thereon to the State of Delaware upon payment to the United States by the State of Delaware of the amount of money determined by the Secretary of the Army to have been paid by the United States for the acquisition of subject lands.

(c) The lands conveyed shall be used solely for educational and/or public park and recreational purposes and if such use shall ever cease, title to these lands shall revert to, and become the property of the United States which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon.

(d) The State of Delaware shall pay the cost of such surveys as may be necessary to determine the exact legal description of the real property to be conveyed.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Army shall include in the deed of conveyance authorized to be made by this Act a provision authorizing the Secretary of Defense, in any national emergency declared by the President or the Congress, to enter upon and use without cost to the United States the lands conveyed by such deed if such lands are considered necessary for national defense purposes by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of the Army may also include in the deed of conveyance such additional reservations and conditions he considers to be in the public interest.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 6678) was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 244]

Abbitt
Avery
Ayres
Becker
Belcher
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bray
Burkhalter
Cederberg
Celler
Cohelan
Dawson
Diggs
Ellsworth
Evins
Fallon
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Garmatz
Grant
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hansen
Hébert
Henderson
Hoffman
Holifield
Kee
Kelly
Knox
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Long, Md.
McMillan
Mailliard
Mathias
May
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Morton, Md.
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Reuss
Riehlman
Rooney, Pa.
Roush
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Sickles
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Van Pelt
Wallhauser
Wilson, Bob
Younger

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RIVER BASIN AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1019)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 28. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to sections 201 and 202 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874; 76 Stat. 1180), and the monetary authorizations for the following river basin plans, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, are hereby increased as provided in this Act. Penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized by this Act for construction by the Secretary of the Army on recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission and approval by such Secretary. The projects authorized in this Act shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"The proviso in the second paragraph under the heading 'Ohio River Basin' in the Flood Control Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-645; 74 Stat. 496) is amended to read as follows: '*Provided*, That construction of the project shall not be commenced until the power marketing agency has informed the Secretary of the Army that the power generated by the project can be sold at rates which will insure repayment within fifty years, with interest, of all costs allocated to power.' "

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 7, lines 20 and 21 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$100,000,000" an insert in lieu thereof "$16,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 26.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
ROBERT E. JONES,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
JOHN F. BALDWIN,
Managers on the Part of the House.
PAT MCNAMARA,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
LEE METCALF,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
HIRAM L. FONG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment provides the general statutory authorization applicable to the remainder of the act and includes the requirement that penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in the act on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission and approval of the Secretary of the Army. The amendment also provides that appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control are available for preparing plans, specifications, and preliminary works for any project authorized in the act. The House recedes with an amendment which deletes the provision making past appropriations available for this purpose as well as certain other clarifying technical changes.

WEST BRANCH SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

Amendment No. 2: This amendment authorizes an additional $2,000,000 for the comprehensive plan for flood control and for other purposes in the West Branch of the Susquehanna River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of September 3, 1954. The House recedes.

CAPE FEAR RIVER BASIN

Amendment No. 3: This amendment authorizes the project for Cape Fear River Basin, N.C., in accordance with House Document No. 508, 87th Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,143,000. It requires the Secretaries of the Army and Agriculture to conduct joint investigations and surveys of the upper tributaries of the Cape Fear River in the interests of watershed protection and flood prevention and the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water. These surveys and investigations and the report thereon are to be prepared and submitted in accordance with the act of September 5, 1962 (Public Law 87-639). The House recedes.

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

Amendment No. 4: This is a clerical amendment, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: This amendment increases the additional authorization for central and southern Florida from $4,000,000 provided in the House bill to $21,000,000. The House recedes.

APALACHICOLA RIVER BASIN, GA.

Amendment No. 6: This amendment approves the general plan for the comprehensive development of the Flint River Basin, Ga., in accordance with House Document No. 567, 87th Congress, and authorizes the construction of the Spewrell Bluff Reservoir substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $63,200,000. The House recedes.

BRAZOS RIVER BASIN

Amendment No. 7: This is a clerical amendment, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 8: This amendment increases the additional authorization for the Brazos River Basin from $14,000,000 provided in the House bill to $30,000,000. The House recedes.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

Amendment No. 9: This is a clerical amendment, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 10: This amendment increases the additional authorization for the Arkansas River Basin from $31,000,000 provided in the House bill to $157,000,000. The House recedes.

DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM

Amendment No. 11: This amendment further modifies the project for the Dardanelle lock and dam, Arkansas River, Ark., by providing that the United States shall assume the full cost of constructing the sewage outfall system for the city of Russellville at an estimated additional Federal cost of $404,000. The House recedes.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

Amendment No. 12: This is a clerical amendment, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 13: This amendment increases the additional authorization for the White River Basin from $1,000,000 provided in the House bill to $8,000,000. The House recedes.

RED RIVER BASIN

Amendment No. 14: This amendment authorizes the Waurika Dam and Reservoir on Beaver Creek, Okla., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 33, 88th Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,100,000, with a proviso that this is not to be construed as authorizing the acquisition of additional lands for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir. The House recedes.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Amendment No. 15: This amendment is a technical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 16: This amendment authorizes an additional $80,000,000 for the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin authorized in the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 17: This amendment modifies the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin to include such bank protection and rectification works at or below the Garrison Reservoir as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army may be found necessary, at an estimated cost of $3,000,000. The House recedes.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

Amendment No. 18: This is a clerical amendment, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 19: This amendment increases the additional authorization for the Ohio River Basin from $47,000,000 provided in the House bill to $150,000,000. The House recedes.

LAUREL RIVER, KY.

Amendment No. 20: This amendment revises a proviso in the Flood Control Act of 1960 which prohibited the construction of the project until the agency designated to market its power had entered into an agreement which would insure sale of the power at rates sufficient to repay, with interest, within 50 years all costs allocated to power, to prohibit instead that construction of the project should not commence until the power marketing agency has informed the Corps of Engineers that the power generated can be sold at rates which will insure repayment within 50 years, with interest, of all power costs. The House recedes with a technical amendment.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

Amendment No. 21: This amendment authorizes an additional $11,000,000 for the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Upper Mississippi River Basin authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented. The House recedes.

LOS ANGELES-SAN GABRIEL RIVER BASIN

Amendment No. 22: This is a clerical amendment, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 23: This amendment increases the additional authorization for the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin from $12,000,000 provided in the House bill to $30,000,000. The House recedes.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

Amendment No. 24: This is a clerical amendment, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 25: This amendment increases the additional authorization for the Columbia River Basin from $36,000,000 provided in the House bill to $195,000,000. The House recedes.

RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Amendment No. 27: This amendment adds a second section to the bill which authorizes an additional $100,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan adopted by section 9(a) of the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented, for continuing the works in the Missouri River Basin authorized to be undertaken under that plan by the Secretary of the Interior. The House recedes with an amendment which reduces the authorization from $100,000,000 to $16,000,000.

BUY AMERICAN

Amendment No. 28: This amendment provides that none of the funds authorized by, or appropriated pursuant to, this act shall be used for purchasing goods, commodities, machinery, equipment or facilities of foreign origin or foreign production if the price of a comparable domestic product made in the United States, whether done by negotiation or competitive bid or whether purchased directly or indirectly, does not exceed by 50 percent the price offered by a foreign producer or any agent acting in his behalf or by any contractor. The Senate recedes.

The committee of conference agree that if the principle expressed by this amendment is sound public policy, the application of this principle should not be on a piecemeal basis as would be provided in this bill but should be on a Government-wide basis. Therefore, the conferees hereby request that the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers examine the application of this amendment to the projects authorized by this bill and report to Congress his recommendations theron.

THE KNOWLES DAM AND RESERVOIR

The committee of conference have not agreed on Senate amendment numbered 26 which authorizes the Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont., in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 403, 87th Congress, and authorizes such project to be operated and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior. It includes an authorization of $50,000,000 for partial accomplishment thereof.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
ROBERT E. JONES,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
JOHN F. BALDWIN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we are approaching the end of a very long mile. It is interesting to recall that we passed a big authorization bill, carrying a money value of $2.3 billion, the night before we adjourned last year.

It is unfortunate that we come up to the last minute on this very important matter, and I can assure you it is extremely important. One hundred thirty-three Members of this House have an interest in this bill because they have basin authorizations which are without money or nearing depletion of money. It is highly important. We have worked very hard on this bill. It has taken us a solid year.

To summarize very briefly, when we discussed this matter under suspension I recalled that early in the summer we introduced this bill which would increase the basin authorization so that the work could continue. That bill was passed by this body and went to the other body. We provided in that bill enough authorization to permit the engineers to continue the work for 2 years, and that was considered absolutely satisfactory.

I should like to go back just for a second. I may skip around a little because there is so much involved.

Since 1927, when the first comprehensive river plan was adopted by the Congress, every 2 to 4 years we come back to the Congress to review these authorizations to see if the work still is economical and, I may say, to check again on the engineers to see if they are pursuing that work in an orderly fashion. This is important because the Congress retains in itself the absolute supervision every several years of these authorizations, and I think that is very important.

I want you to know also that when this bill went to the other body they reduced our authorization from a 2-year period to 1 year, and added a half billion dollars worth of projects. Many of these projects were discussed and were denied in the last bill last session. The House held hearings on these highly controversial projects and we could not go along.

Recognizing the extreme urgency of this matter, in October we introduced a second bill, H.R. 8667, wherein we followed the wording of the other body and made it 1 year instead of 2. When it got to the other body they came back to our understanding and made it 2 years, which of course was far better. But they wanted to add a number of these highly controversial projects. We were able to reduce that down to a single one, and, without seeking to go into a repetition of what I said when this bill was passed under suspension, but recognizing that five of these river basin projects ran out of money—and I may say that Los Angeles just suffered tragedy untold in recent days—it was a project that had to be stopped, and they had to go out and borrow $2.5 million, and that money has been expended. It gives you an idea of the extreme urgency of this whole matter.

So I want to pay my tribute to Senator McNAMARA, the chairman of the Public Works Committee in the other body. We were able to cooperate one with the other in the most courteous fashion, so we were able to resolve our differences for the time being on these very, very expensive projects, and we got down to just one.

I have the highest regard in the world for my colleague from Montana [Mr. OLSEN]. He is intensely interested in a project which the engineers say will cost $247 million. Much as I regret to say it, I cannot support my colleague on the committee on this project, because I sat there for 4 long days. We promised a hearing of 2 days but we sat there for 4 long days. The Indians came in in droves objecting to this project. I met Indians going into the committee room in the morning and they greeted me as I left in the afternoon. We had ranchers, representatives of the miners, we had little people, average people, big people, all sorts of people coming in to object.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Was that the smoke signal I saw here the other day?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. No, this was some months ago.

Let me sum up very quickly. When we have a project of importance, the engineers through the district office will give you a hearing.

Then that goes to the Chief of the Corps of Engineers. After that review, it goes to the Board of Review and then to the Bureau of the Budget, and after that it comes to the Congress and we have hearings in both Houses of the Congress.

This has been done in these projects. But I want to remind you that when all of these qualifications are met we have a human interest, and we must consider the interest of our colleagues here and the interest of the people they represent back home.

Now there is a project here, the Waurika project in Oklahoma, and I must say in the lifetime of Senator Kerr for whom I had the greatest respect and affection, in the last days of the last session, he said:

> CLIFF, I wish you would agree to put this project in.

I said:

> Senator, I simply cannot do it because we have not had hearings.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM], was then very much interested in that project and he said:

> I hope you will do better next year.

I got a telegram from Senator Kerr's son and, of course, I am not immodest enough to say what he said, but he did remind me of the respect his father had for me in the handling of these matters, and he said that this is one of the last projects his father had left unfinished and he said:

> I hope you will do what you can.

We found that project had been approved by all of the agencies of Government. By the way, I forgot to mention a moment ago that the Corps of Engineers must, in turn, contact the engineers of the States to see what the States feel about any particular matter.

So we come here today and ask you to authorize and agree to this conference report so that the engineers may proceed in these river basin projects that have run out of money and that are about to run out of money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, because of my reference to my colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] and recognizing his very great interest in this matter, I now yield to him 10 minutes.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wish to thank my chairman of my committee for this time and the opportunity to address my remarks to the Knowles Dam and Reservoir project.

But, before going into that, I want to say, without any reservations at all, I support the river basins bill and I support the Senate amendments that were made to that bill. I sat with my chairman, and throughout the hearings I listened to the testimony on all the projects and I found that they all qualified under the historical requirement qualifications adopted by the Congress of the United States. That means they must be reviewed and recommended by the Corps of Engineers, and these projects have been so reviewed and recommended, and by the Board of Rivers and Harbors and the Bureau of the Budget and the White House, all of whom concur on all these projects.

In addition to that, the committee of the other body, the Committee on Public Works passed all of these other projects on two different occasions and likewise the other body itself passed these projects on two occasions, and they have this year been heard by the House.

All of them qualify, if it be for flood control, by the historical method of qualifying through the benefit-cost ratio. If it be for hydropower development, then they must have qualified under the benefit-cost ratio required by this Congress. They must have qualified to pay the required amount of interest, which is the amount fixed by the Department of the Treasury under guidelines directed by the Congress of the United States. All of these projects, and including Knowles Dam and Reservoir, qualified under the same criteria as any project in the whole bill either now or at any time previous. This is a historical requirement, and Knowles Dam and Reservoir did qualify under it. As a matter of fact, Knowles Dam and Reservoir is unique in its qualifications in that here is a hydro dam that is high above sea level, being about 2,700 feet above sea level. It is a vast storage reservoir which will hold 3 million acre-feet of water. The storage at that elevation means that water will not only develop hydropower at site but will flow down through the Columbia River, through 17 dams and the same storage will generate electric energy 17 times. It qualifies, then, because of the enormous power that is developed by the water flowing from the mountains to the sea.

There are a lot of great rivers in the world. There are rivers in the world that have more water than the Columbia River and there are rivers that are longer than the Columbia River, but there is no river which compares with the Columbia River in this attribute of being capable of being controlled from the mountains to the sea. Nearly every foot of drop can be controlled. Knowles Dam and Reservoir is part of that program of control. Knowles Dam and Reservoir compares very favorably, although I do not have the figures in mind, with the kind of development we have in the Tennessee River Valley. Just as there is a kind of vendetta against the Tennessee Valley Authority—and I noted with great interest the comments of our colleague, the Congressman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] with respect to the vendetta against the Tennessee Valley Authority—likewise the charges with respect to the Knowles Dam and Reservoir are the same. The attack is made against the interest rate that is charged for the loan from the Federal Government to this project. The charge of 2⅞ percent is too small. The charge is that that interest rate should be the same as the interest rate paid by private power development. However, that has not been the policy of the Congress, and I submit that it should not be in this instance.

The other charge is that taxes forgone—yes, taxes forgone—should be paid by the project. Not a payment in lieu of taxes that were lost but that taxes forgone should be paid, or taxes similar to that of a private power development. However, that has not been the history of the criteria in this Congress, either. I simply want my colleagues to stay with the criteria and with the history of the development of the river resources of this country and give to this project as much credit and on the same basis as credit is given to all of the other projects in the river basin bill. Knowles Dam and Reservoir qualifies on that score.

I do not think anyone is going to challenge the integrity of the Corps of Engineers as to its computation. Rather, they will attack this interest rate or they will attack the question of taxes. They will want to change the system that has been the historic system of the Congress. I would cite the fact that in the hearings the Corps of Engineers submitted several different benefit-cost ratios for this reason: On the Columbia River there are many prospective hydro storage sites, hydro power sites and flood control sites. So the comparison must be made if this project were built before Canadian storage or after Canadian storage or before some other project is built or after some other project is built. The fact is, you see, flood control credit is going to be divided among the several dams, hydro storage credit, and hydro development credit downstream will also be so divided among the dams. The Corps of Engineers comes along with the benefit-cost ratios in every single instance whether it be a construction before Canadian storage or a construction after Canadian storage, but the best benefit-cost ratio shown is as high as 2 to 1 with a median at 1.7 to 1, that is, $1.70 of benefit for every $1 of investment.

The best is a ratio of $2 for every dollar invested. There is another one, $1.04 for every dollar invested and another one $1.03 for every dollar invested.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARSHA. The cost-benefit ratio the gentleman cites, is that not the ratio without Canadian storage added?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. It is.

Mr. HARSHA. And over how many years?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. That is over 100 years.

Mr. HARSHA. That is a 2⅞-percent interest rate?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. That is correct.

Mr. HARSHA. Is it not also a fact that the Corps of Engineers and the Member in the other body who sponsored this amendment agreed that this project should be considered and the testimony reveals that the economics of the project should be considered with Canadian storage added?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. That is one of the assumptions, yes.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that with respect to Canadian storage added first, that even then the benefit-cost ratio is favorable to the project. However, since that particular granting of an assumption of Canadian storage gaining first credit it has become more and more apparent that a United States-Canadian Treaty for Columbia River development is a long time coming and that this Knowles project could very well have been authorized and completed long before a treaty providing Canadian storage. Then any prospective agreement with Canada would have to be very much different from the present proposal. So we feel that we will have a project that could have a very high benefit-cost ratio, but in no event would we have a project that did not have a favorable benefit-cost ratio. I am citing from page 1123 of the hearings and the testimony of the Corps of Engineers:

A long time ago, I committed myself to the policy of Montana water for Montana people and the development of Montana resources first for the benefit of Montana people and, of course, then, secondarily, for the benefit of everyone in the Nation. It just seemed to me that the first benefit from the resources in Montana should go to the people of that area, and unless the development is beneficial to those people, it could not be beneficial to the country generally.

However, water is committed to running downhill. Therefore, if the water is to be developed for Montana people, it has to be developed before it gets out of the mountains. Unless we impound the water in Montana—not only does the State lose the water, but the water is frequently destructive. For many years now, excess runoff of water from Montana has been going to the seas undeveloped. The run of the river dams developed by private power companies has permitted a great waste of water by failure to corral the floodwaters. This is only natural inasmuch as the private power companies are organized for the profit of their stockholders and are not eleemosynary institutions organized to control the floodwaters, develop recreation, or irrigation and reclamation, or any of the other benefits of a great river such as the Clarks Fork of the Columbia River or this Flathead River.

Thus, it has been my philosophy, together with that of most people in my district, that we should commit ourselves to the development of the whole river—complete development—in cooperation with the whole basin of the river. Thus, I am completely committed to the development of the Knowles project—an at-site production of 256,000 kilowatts of prime power, together with approximately 700,000 kilowatts of downstream power. This is contrasted with the relatively small development of an at-site production of only 240,000 kilowatts at Buffalo Rapids Nos. 2 and 4.

I am not an engineer. But I think that my philosophy is the correct one to develop the whole river—especially if the benefit-cost ratio is satisfactory and compatible with the law. The Corps of Engineers has studied this project for 11 years. I am convinced that the members of the corps are dedicated public servants who have no private motive or personal regard to influence them. I am compelled to believe their statements of facts and conclusions as against the critics who have a profit motive or a personal ax to grind. The Chief of Engineers and Board of Rivers and Harbors recommended Knowles in their major water plans. The Secretaries of the Army and Interior approved the corps recommendation. The Bureau of the Budget has approved Knowles as part of the major water plan. The White House announcement included it in the recommendation sent to the Congress on April 11, 1962.

I am very happy that we have the recommendation of the Corps of Engineers to the effect that the benefits of the Knowles are such that the project pays for itself in 50 years on a benefit-cost ratio of 1.3 to 1. The law is conservative and thus is the Corps of Engineers conservative because this project, if constructed, would be fully beneficial for certainly more than 100 years.

It should be most enlightening to everyone that last year in the month of July, I mailed 90,000 questionnaires to the householders and rural boxholders in my district. One of the questions was as follows: "The U.S. Corps of Engineers has recommended a dam at Paradise Knowles at Clarks Fork River in Montana for cheap electric power, flood control, irrigation, and recreation. Do you vote "yes" or "no"? The answers received from almost 15 percent of the people queried were: Yes, 54 percent; no, 39 percent; undecided, 7 percent.

In other polls taken among the people affected, the results have been ascertained as follows: The results of the Plainsman, published at Plains by Don Coe; the Sentinel, published at Hot Springs by Dick Shirley; and the Sanders County Ledger, published at Thompson Falls by K. A. Eggensperger, showed 2 to 1 support for Paradise Dam. In May of 1962, radio station KOFI, an independently owned and operated enterprise ran a public opinion poll on the Knowles Dam question. KOFI is a 5,000-watt station and has the greatest coverage of any station operating in the Flathead Valley near the Knowles Dam site. The question asked was simply, "What is your opinion of Knowles Dam?" This poll was run on a Sunday. In reading the results on the air, the announcer stated that he was disappointed that more people did not put down their reasons for suporting or opposing Knowles Dam—102 people wrote in to the station—95 were for the dam, 7 against. None of the letters read over the air in support of the dam contained requests to withhold the author's name, and 3 out of 4 of those whose letters opposed the dam, asked that their names not be read on the air.

RESERVATION OF POWER

Together with the Senate leadership of the Montana congressional delegation, I plan to participate in obtaining a reservation of power for Montana similar to that obtained in the Hungry Horse power situation. There, a reservation of power has been made for all of Montana. However, the at-site power of Hungry Horse is a little more than 90,000 kilowatts—yet Montana has present committed use from Bonneville of more than 220,000 kilowatts. Thus, it is obvious that the reservation, while desirable, is not absolutely necessary because the national policies of our distribution have well compensated Montana for the storage services.

Montana's best self-interest is to serve the basin in its best capacity and likewise be paid in power availability for its service.

Electric power at most reasonable rates is attractive to industry and is thus a jobmaking proposition. This is best demonstrated in the case of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Bonneville Power Administration. However, it is also well demonstrated near at hand with the aluminum plant that was attracted by the power rates of Hungry Horse Dam to Montana.

An elemental phosphate plant is located 6 miles west of Butte, Mont., for two reasons: (1) the phosphate rock found in the mountains near there, and (2) the cheap electric power rates at Federal Bonneville Power Administration.

Other power developments in Montana by the Federal Government, such as Canyon Ferry and Fort Peck, have made rural electrification possible. The yardsticks afforded by these two projects made it a favorable proposition that cheap power, at postage stamp rates, could be demanded by the REA projects throughout Montana.

In a nutshell, Knowles would be beneficial to Montana and the Northwest:

1. Initial development at-site prime power 256,000 kilowatts.
2. Full storage development for downstream power of approximately 700,000 kilowatts.
3. Lower unit cost for total of almost 1 million kilowatts.
4. Firm up the dams on Columbia.
5. Cheap power inviting jobmaking industry to Montana. Bonneville postage stamp rate of 2.4 mills instead of private power rate of 6 mills per kilowatt.
6. Montana obtains its rightful share of National Government investment in natural resource development.
7. Increase in broadened tax base of local government with new industry, new families, and new homes.
8. Greatly enhance fish and wildlife resources.
9. Boost Montana recreation and tourist industry.

In our competition with the rest of the world, we must increase our National Government investment in natural resource development. In any event, Montana is entitled to a fair share of the national investment. Knowles qualifies under the law by benefit-cost ratio.

Because of some of the discussions that I anticipated at this hearing, I inquired of the Bonneville Power Administration (1) whether or not Knowles project would have an adverse effect upon system-wide power rates, and (2) whether or not power from nuclear powerplants could be produced at a cost equal to or less than from Knowles project in the foreseeable future.

The answer I received from the regional director is as follows:

"The answer to both questions is 'No,' and I have attached detailed statements bearing upon each one. You will note that the specific answer to the first question is that Knowles project will not only not have an adverse effect upon system power rates, but the reverse will be true in that if Knowles is developed along with other available hydropower sites in the Northwest, it will further postpone the day when higher cost thermal energy will need to be introduced into the system to meet the load growth of the Pacific Northwest as predicted by the Federal Power Commission.

"At a recent discussion of nuclear programs in this office, an official of the National Reactor Testing Station in Arco, Idaho, made a positive statement that while power produced from nuclear reactors would undoubtedly become competitive at some point of time with energy produced from other thermal sources, it would not be competitive with hydro. There are no generation cost figures from existing nuclear powerplants that come even close to the Bonneville system rate, as the attached statement brings out. Estimates for very large plants not yet built, for the period beyond 1980, indicate that nuclear thermal energy costs may at that time be competitive with other thermal sources, but only then would be barely comparable to Knowles project standing alone if developed after Canadian storage, the most severe criterion for Knowles."

Copies of the materials that were sent with those answers follow:

"IS NUCLEAR POWER COMPETITIVE WITH KNOWLES PROJECT?

"It is not expected that nuclear power will be competitive with the Knowles project. Nuclear plants now operating are not competitive with hydroelectric powerplants, nor would they be competitive with the proposed Knowles project. If present trends continue, nuclear power will probably start in about 1970 to become directly competitive in costs with coal-fired plants; but both of these would be higher cost than Knowles power. Figures released recently by the AEC indicate that, assuming relatively modest assistance from AEC, electric energy from 500,000-kilowatt nuclear-fueled plants completed in 1966 could be produced initially for 6.2 mills per kilowatt hour. For plants completed in 1975, 4.5-mill energy is expected; and for plants completed in 1980 the cost would be down to 3.8 mills. Costs are expected to decrease slightly after several years of operation.

"Present cost estimates indicate that if the Knowles project is developed before Canadian storage, it will add prime energy to the system at a cost of 1.24 mills per killowatt hour; and if the project is considered developed after Canadian storage, the prime energy added by the Knowles project would cost about 4 mills per kilowatt hour.

"AEC indicated in a report to the President that nuclear power would be competitive with conventional steam throughout most of the country in the 1970's, and estimated that by the year 2000 nuclear power would account for half the power production in the United States and all of the additions to generation capacity.[1] By 2050, it was estimated that all the energy would be of nuclear origin except for a small fraction from peaking and other special purpose plants.

"It is our view that the statements in the preceding paragraph assume that the hydroelectric potentials would continue to be developed since they would produce lower cost power, and that such development of the hydroelectric potential probably would be completed by the year 2000.

"EFFECT OF PROPOSED KNOWLES PROJECT UPON SYSTEM POWER RATES

"The present firm peak load of the Northwest Power Pool is about 13 million kilowatts. In another 10 years, the estimated requirements for power in this area will be in the order of 24 million kilowatts. This load growth will take place regardless of whether Knowles or any other projects are built.

"In order to supply this large increase of load, it will be necessary to construct as much more generating capacity in the next 10 years as has been installed in the last 60 years. This is nothing peculiar to the Pacific Northwest—this is true nationwide. And so we have to look ahead to those projects that can meet this great increase in the demand for power and meet it at the lowest possible cost to the area.

"In looking over the possibility for meeting this doubling of powerloads in the Northwest, it is clear that the cheapest way to do it is by adding as many feasible hydroprojects as possible before turning to thermal. About one-half of the firm power capability and only about one-fourth of the peaking capability of the Columbia River system have been developed. Most of the dams on the main stem of the Columbia River, with the exception of Grand Coulee, are just run-of-the-river dams. Yet, on the Columbia River, the normal flows vary tremendously. What this means is that if we are going to get the most power capability out of these downstream dams we have to impound the floodwater and hold it in storage for release in the low water season. This type of operation increases the firm capability of all downstream dams. So, in order to complete the development of the economical potential of the Columbia River system, it is necessary to build large storage projects on the tributaries.

"The Knowles project, like Hungry Horse, would have a large storage capacity in its reservoir, and thus it could add to the firm power capability of the downstream plants by releasing its water during the low water periods. Because of this feature, the Knowles project stands in a particularly good position in comparison with other power developments. If the Knowles powerplant is analyzed on the next-added basis, before the Canadian storage developments, it would add 953,000 kilowatts to the prime power of the system—267,000 kilowatts would be generated at the Knowles powerplant and 686,000 kilowatts would be added at the other powerplants of the system.

"When analyzed in this way, the cost of the prime energy added to the system by the Knowles project would be only 1.24 mills per kilowatt-hour.

"On the other hand, if the Knowles project is considered to be developed after the Canadian storage development, it would add 367,000 kilowatts to the prime power of the larger assumed system, and this added prime energy would cost about 4 mills per kilowatt-hour.

"On either of the above bases, the Knowles project power would cost less than the alternative cost of energy generated in thermal plants in the Pacific Northwest. Except where conditions are especially favorable with respect to the cost of fuel, the cost of power from thermal plants is more than 4 mills per kilowatt-hour."

I requested information from the Bureau of Reclamation concerning irrigation benefits that would be realized with Knowles Dam. The Bureau advised me as follows:

"From information now available, it is estimated that some 91,000 acres of inadequately irrigated lands and 169,000 of presently dry lands in Clark Fork Basin in Montana will require additional water supplies in future years. Moreover, a supply of low-cost pumping power and financial assistance will be required to assure their development. The area lying upstream from Kerr Dam has been excluded here since it appears that requirements of this area can be met from the Hungry Horse project.

"Considering areas adjacent to the potential Knowles Reservoir and extending downstream from the Knowles site along Clark Fork River to the State line, there are an estimated 5,000 acres of presently irrigated land requiring supplemental water and about 82,000 acres of presently dry land requiring a full water supply. The remaining 86,000 acres of irrigated land needing supplemental water and 87,000 acres of presently dry lands needing a full irrigation supply are scattered throughout the Clark Fork Basin on streams not directly controlled by storage at the Knowles site.

"Regardless of their location with respect to Knowles Dam, most of the nonirrigated arable lands occur on isolated terrace remnants and water supplies will have to be pumped to them. Typically, the tracts are too scattered to be served in large bodies by single-project canal systems. Thus, throughout the Clark Fork Basin a sizable amount of pumping power at the lowest possible cost will be required. Also, it is to be expected that unit costs relative to water users' repayment ability will be high and financial assistance will be required. These prime requisites for meeting future irrigation requirements in the Clark Fork Basin could be met as part of a multiple-purpose development at the Knowles site.

"Based on reconnaissance appraisals, present irrigation and potentially arable areas are listed in the following tabulation and their generalized location and extent are shown on the attached map."

[In acres]

Area	Irrigated lands needing supplemental water	Arable dry lands
Blackfoot River upstream from Garrison		1,900
Clark Fork above Garrison	22,000	32,300
Flint Creek drainage	4,000	10,400
Rock Creek drainage		900
Bitterroot River drainage	48,000	2,800
Clark Fork River, Missoula to Garrison		1,900
Blackfoot River and tributaries	11,000	24,800
Clark Fork River, Missoula to Paradise	1,000	11,800
Flathead River and tributaries, Kerr Dam to Paradise	5,000	56,000
Main stem, Paradise downstream to State line		25,800
Total	91,000	168,600

In behalf of Montana and my district, I strongly recommend that your committee act favorably on the Knowles project.

The State of Montana and the Pacific Northwest from which I come are very far distant from markets. They have some particularly attractive raw materials in those mountains and in those forests. We have minerals and forests. Where we need assistance, I think, is to develop hydroelectric energy that will permit us to beneficiate the raw ores and the minerals and beneficiate timber that we have there. This is the need. It would enhance the economy of the community and would create jobs. I am asking for a jobmaking electric power project for western Montana.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, there is one matter in controversy and only one in this conference report; that is the matter to which the gentleman from Montana just addressed himself, which is Knowles Dam, the merits of which will be discussed in detail by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] both of whom serve on the Flood Control Subcommittee. I shall limit myself on this point to the discussion in the conference report itself. I agree that this bill is of an urgent and emergency nature. The distinguished chairman of our subcommittee and chairman of the conference, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] stated that there are a number of basins that will run out or have run out of their authorization and therefore an emergency situation exists and additional authorizations are essential. He cited, for instance, the Los Angeles Basin authorization, which ran out of authorization in August of this year.

Mr. Speaker, there are many others. The Arkansas River Basin will run out in February 1964. The Brazos River Basin will run out in December 1963, very shortly, and the Central and Southern Flood Control District has already run out, in December of this year.

The Columbia River Basin will run out on January 15 of next year.

The Ohio River Basin ran out of authorization on December 10 of this year.

---

[1] Nucleonics, January 1963, pp. 19–20.

The White River Basin will run out in March 1964.

So, Mr. Speaker, the problem is a very simple one: This Congress is faced with the duty and responsibility of providing for additional revenue basin authorizations. That does not mean new authorizations. That means additions to present basins that have already been authorized.

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to carry out that duty.

In attempting to do so, on May 15 of this year, the House committee voted out a 10-river basin additional authorization bill, H.R. 6016, providing for $784 million worth of additional authorizations for the present basins.

On June 24 the House properly passed these additional authorizations so we could go forward on a planning and programing basis, as we should.

The Senate, on July 30 of this year, reduced these 2-year authorizations, which I think are essential. The 2-year authorizations are now contained in this conference report rather than the 1-year authorization.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate reduced those authorizations from 2 years to 1 year, reducing them to 1 year, thus not providing adequate planning and programing effort. By reducing them to 1 year, the other body reduced the authorization increase to $161 million; whereas, the House had provided $684 million for 2 years in order to make it appear that the dollar authorization itself in the total bill was less. The other body, however, also added nine new controversial—many of them—projects. They added nine new projects involving public power, involving multipurpose projects, flood control, and so forth. Those nine projects would have cost $448,547,000, for a total, as contained in that bill, of $609 million.

So, Mr. Speaker, in exercising its prerogatives as it did, the other body added nine projects in the form of a rider to the basin authorization bill. When that bill came back, it was objected to in sending it to conference. Thus the House was met with a hiatus situation. Therefore, the House committee, in carrying out its responsibilities, introduced the new bill and passed out a new bill, H.R. 8667, providing for $145 million worth of 1-year authorizations for these basins—seven basins—in an effort to prevent the period of time from running out. This was done by the committee on October 1 of this year. The House expeditiously took action on it on October 21.

Mr. Speaker, on December 3, the other body, acting again and exercising its prerogatives on these 10 basins, provided for a 2-year authorization of $784 million. But, again, the other body added five additional projects—five new projects—one of which is Knowles Dam, at a cost of a substantial increase over the House version, a cost of $166 million additional.

So, Mr. Speaker, the conferees had before them the question of approval of the 2-year basin authorization which also the House desired, because it was included in the House resolution previously passed. But, added to that, was $100 million for Missouri River Basin authorizations which represents the money needed for 2 years, but which is controversial in nature as to committee jurisdiction and reauthorization. Therefore, the conferees reduced the amount to $16 million and thus reduced the basin authorizations from $784 to $700 million.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis] yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. It is going to be difficult, but I shall yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate conferees accepted the Cape Fear River Basin, the Flint River Basin, the Dardanelle lock and dam, the Missouri River bank stabilization, the Laurel River project in Kentucky, and others. But, the conference objected to the Buy American Act. Also, I might say the minority House conferees were in favor of that restriction. The Knowles Dam and Reservoir were stricken in conference.

Mr. Speaker, that is what is in controversy at the present time. It has an authorizing amount in controversy of $50 million, although the total cost is going to be $247 million.

So, in effect, the conferees were able to strike $84 million out of the prior authorizations, $50 million out of the Knowles Dam and Reservoir, which really means $247 million.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a good conference report and I ask the support of the Members of the House of the conferees. I ask support of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis] in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen], to recede and concur on the Knowles Dam.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Public Works, pursuant to its commitment in conference on the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill in 1962, commenced hearings in February 1963 on the seven controversial projects added by the Senate to the bill of last year, and removed by the conferees, which projects are as follows: Cape Fear River Basin, N.C., Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir, Ga. and S.C., Flint River, Ga., Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla., Devils Jumps Dam and Reservoir, Ky. and Tenn., Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Mont., and Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Idaho. These hearings continued throughout portions of February, March, April, June, and August.

In recognition of the fact that 10 of the 21 river basins require additional authorization of funds during fiscal year 1964 and 1965—seven of which would run out of money during fiscal year 1964—the House Committee reported out on May 15, 1963, H.R. 6016, authorizing a total of $784 million for these 10 basins for 2 fiscal years 1964 and 1965. No new projects were included in this bill because hearings had not yet been completed on the seven projects on which the House committee was obligated to hold hearings.

H.R. 6016 was passed by the House on June 24, 1963. This bill was reported out by the Senate Committee on Public Works on July 18, 1963, and passed by the Senate on July 30, 1963, with the seven controversial projects added, and two additional projects identified as Dardanelle Lock and Dam, Ark., and Missouri River Bank Stabilization. The bill as passed by the Senate authorized a total of $448,547,000 for these nine added projects, but eliminated the river basin authorizations for fiscal 1965, thereby leaving only river basin authorizations for 1964 in the total amount of $161 million. Thus, the total amount in H.R. 6016 as passed by the Senate was in the amount of $609,547,000. A summary of the individual items contained in H.R. 6016 as passed by both House and Senate is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit A."

On August 6, 1963, Chairman Davis asked unanimous consent to go to conference on H.R. 6016, and it was objected to.

Since there appeared to be an impasse with respect to action on H.R. 6016, and since work in several river basins had either stopped or would be stopped soon, the House Committee on Public Works reported out on October 1, 1963, H.R. 8667. This bill was passed by the House on October 21, 1963, and provided an authorization of $145 million for seven river basins for fiscal year 1964. The $16 million authorization for Department of Interior projects in the Missouri River Basin, as contained in H.R. 6016, were not included in H.R. 8667.

H.R. 8667 was reported out by the Senate Committee on Public Works on November 21, 1963, and passed by the Senate on December 3, 1963, with amendments to provide authorizations for 10 river basins for fiscal years 1964 and 1965, in the total amount of $784 million—as originally provided in H.R. 6016 by the House. The Senate also added four projects including Knowles Dam, as follows: Cape Fear River Basin, N.C., Flint River, Ga., Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla., and Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Mont.

In addition thereto the Senate provided $3 million for the Missouri River bank stabilization and an additional authorization of $404,000 for Dardanelle lock and dam, Arkansas, and added a buy American provision with respect to authorizations contained in the bill. A summary of the provisions of H.R. 8667, as passed by the House and Senate, is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit B."

On December 5, 1963, the House agreed to a conference and a conference was held on December 9, 1963, at which time the House receded from and concurred in the Senate's amendments providing for 2 years' authorizations for the Corps of Engineers' projects in 10 river basins, and agreed with an amendment with respect to the Department of Interior authorization for the Missouri River Basin, which amendment would limit the authorization to fiscal year 1964 only, in the amount of $16 million.

The House receded from and concurred in the Senate amendments adding the following projects: Cape Fear River Basin, N.C., Flint River, Ga., Dardanelle lock and dam, Arkansas, Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla., Missouri River bank stabilization, and Laurel River, Ky.—language changed only.

The Senate receded from its amendment with respect to the buy American provision. The conferees are in disagreement with respect to the authorization of Knowles Dam and Reservoir project in Montana, which is the only matter in disagreement.

Knowles Dam is the issue in controversy, and I ask for support of the conference and opposition to any motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to authorize Knowles Dam.

EXHIBIT A

H.R. 6016 (basin authorization bill) as amended by the Senate Public Works Committee

(Ordered Reported by the Senate Public Works Committee, July 17, 1963)

BASIN AUTHORIZATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	Amounts in H.R. 6016, fiscal years 1964–65	As amended by Senate Public Works Committee, fiscal year 1964
West Branch, Susquehanna	2	0
Central and southern Florida	21	4
Brazos River	30	14
Arkansas River	157	31
White River	8	1
Missouri River (Corps of Engineers)	80	0
Ohio River	150	47
Upper Mississippi River	11	0
Los Angeles-San Gabriel River	30	12
Columbia River	195	36
Missouri River (Department of the Interior)	100	16
Total	784	161

PROJECTS ADDED

[In thousands of dollars]

	Estimated cost
Cape Fear River Basin, N.C	25,143
Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir, Ga.-S.C	78,700
Flint River, Ga	63,200
Dardanelle lock and dam, Arkansas	404
Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla	25,100
Missouri River bank stabilization	3,000
Devils Jumps Dam and Reservoir, Ky.-Tenn	151,000
Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Mont	50,000
Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Idaho	52,000
Total	448,547
Grand total as amended	609,547

EXHIBIT B

H.R. 8667

BASIN AUTHORIZATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Basin	Amounts in House bill, fiscal year 1964	Amounts in Senate bill, fiscal years 1964–65
West Branch, Susquehanna	0	2
Central and southern Florida	4	21
Brazos River	14	30
Arkansas River	31	157
White River, Ark.-Mo	1	8
Missouri River	0	80
Ohio River	47	150
Upper Mississippi	0	11
Los Angeles-San Gabriel River	12	30
Columbia River	36	195
Missouri River (Department of the Interior)	0	100
Total	145	784

PROJECTS ADDED BY SENATE

[In thousands of dollars]

	Estimated cost
Cape Fear River Basin	25,143
Flint River, Ga	63,200
Dardanelle lock and dam, Arkansas	404
Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla	25,100
Missouri River bank stabilization	3,000
Laurel River, Ky. (language)	0
Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Mont	50,000
Buy American Act (language)	0
Total	166 847
Grand total	950,847

Status of basin authorizations

[In millions of dollars]

River basin	Monetary authorization remaining as of July 1, 1963	Monetary authorization planned to be expended in fiscal year 1964	Additional monetary authorization required for fiscal year 1964	Number of projects utilizing remaining and requested authorization	Estimated cost of projects involved	Date work will cease if additional authorization is not provided
Arkansas	60	91	31	13	1,200	February 1964.
Brazos	10	24	14	4	100	December 1963.
Central and southern Florida	10	14	4	1	263	Do.
Columbia	50	86	36	13	1,200	Jan. 15, 1964.
Los Angeles [1]						
Ohio	31	78	47	19	529	Dec. 10, 1963.
White	13	14	1	4	127	March 1964.
Total	174	307	133	54	3,419	
Other basins						Fiscal year 1965.

[1] Authorization has been exhausted in this basin. (Ran out of authorization August 1963.)

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Florida have stated, the major portion of this conference report is not in dispute. There is one item primarily that is in dispute, and that is the project known as Knowles Dam in Montana. This is the only project that was added to the Senate bill upon which the State involved recorded an official protest.

If you will refer to the Senate committee report you will find that the State of Montana is recorded as being against this particular project. In addition to that, this project would flood between 19,000 and 20,000 acres of land in the Flathead Indian Reservation in Montana.

The Kootenay Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Indian Reservation came before our committee and testified against this project. They pointed out that they had taken an official position against this project repeatedly over the years. They pointed out, furthermore, that this project would be in clear violation of the Hell Gate Treaty with the Indians signed by our Government in 1855.

I have before me the official pamphlet issued by the Department of the Interior called "Handbook of Federal Indian Laws." In this handbook appears this statement:

> That treaties with Indian tribes are of the same dignity as treaties with foreign nations is a view which has been repeatedly confirmed by Federal courts and never successfully challenged.

So we have before us today the question of whether we, the U.S. Congress, are going to stamp and trample upon the rights of Indians guaranteed to them by the Treaty of Hell Gate of 1855.

It seems to me over the years the U.S. Government and this Congress have stamped and trampled upon Indian rights long enough. There are over 150 Members of the House who have signed a discharge petition on a bill which would guarantee civil rights to every person in the United States regardless of race, color, or creed. I happen to be one of those who signed the petition. But if we have signed that petition, is it not equally important that we protect the rights guaranteed to an Indian tribe by a treaty, a most solemn document?

That is the issue in this particular project. If we vote for this project we are trampling and stamping once again, as we have done many times before, on the rights of an Indian tribe who thought when the U.S. Government put its signature on a treaty that our Government would be guided by that treaty, we would preserve that treaty, and we would respect the rights which we gave that Indian tribe when we originally entered into that treaty.

I checked the platforms of the two parties in the 1960 election. The Republican Party unfortunately did not cover this issue, although I thought that they should. But I am reading now from the Democratic platform, and it has this statement on this particular point:

> Free consent of the Indian tribes concerned shall be required before the Federal Government makes any change in any Federal Indian treaty or other contractual relationship.

I think we should stand on this statement. I think we should be guided by this statement. I do not think we should trample on the rights of a group of innocent Indians who have said if we authorize this particular dam we will flood out the entire most valuable part of their Indian reservation and just give them the hills that are covered with snow and ice in the wintertime, and let them worry about finding a means for existing in the future.

This is basically the issue before us. We have before us in this Congress now a bill introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Haley] to compensate the Seneca Indians in New York for an equal violation of their treaty rights that this Congress unfortunately passed just a few years ago.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I take this time merely to keep the record straight. There is still a very controversial project in the bill now being considered. It is the Cape Fear River Basin project in North Carolina which, along with other highly controversial projects, was placed in the bill by the Senate. When the Senate, by amendments, placed several highly controversial projects in the bill and the bill came back to the House, the chairman of the subcommittee attempted to send the bill to conference. There was an objection. Thereafter, I was advised that the bill, as amended by the Senate, was discussed in the House Committee on Public Works and the vote was taken on the Senate amendments, and I was advised that a vote in the House committee was unanimous in opposition to the controversial Senate amendments. Thereafter, another bill was sent to the Senate and again the Senate attached amendments and that bill we now have under consideration. The Knowles project in Montana was not agreed to but apparently the House conferees capitulated on the Cape Fear River Basin project and it is now wrapped up in this package upon which we will soon take action. In opposing the Cape Fear River Basin project submitted by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, I am convinced that I was well and truly representing the residents of my district who live in the area to be affected. I have not been an obstructionist. Only once have I requested a continuance. Action on the project was delayed until appropriate hearings could be conducted. I sought only to provide a forum in which all persons might be heard. The chairman of the committee delayed action on the project until hearings could be held. Hearings were held and the proponents and opponents were given an opportunity to express their views before the legislative committee. When the matter was called up in the Senate committee for hearings and consideration, there was only 1 member of the 17-man committee present at the time the opponents to the building of the big dam were heard. It was merely an ex parte hearing.

I have never tried to avoid hearings but have at all times insisted upon full, frank, and forthright hearings before legislative committees of both the House and the Senate. At all times I have been perfectly willing for the project to stand or fall on its merits or demerits. All statements that I have made about the project have been thoroughly justified and substantiated by the record.

First, the project proposed by the Corps of Engineers is not needed and is not wanted in the community where the project would be built. The bill before you indicates that the cost of the project is slightly more than $25 million. We have heard a lot of talk about the work of the Corps of Engineers. Some people seem to think there is something sacred about the findings of that agency of the Government. If they are as inaccurate in their estimates in connection with the Cape Fear River Basin project as they have been in several other projects in the general area, the project would probably cost about $175 million instead of about $25 million. The record on seven southeastern projects indicates that the average inaccuracy in estimates was 257 percent over the estimates submitted to Congress.

If the big dam at New Hope in the Cape Fear River Basin is built as proposed, it will inundate 35,000 acres of fertile farmland and the record shows that the water impounded will be so badly polluted that it will neither be fit for human consumption nor fish and wildlife, and will not even be good for water skiing. The pollution cannot be abated. The record further shows that it will take more than 100 years to complete the project. When the water impounded is lowered behind the dam to 9,000 acres, as the record indicates that it will be when it reaches a minimum, certainly the mudflats around the lake would not be fit for recreation or for any other purpose except for breeding insects. When the water covers only 9,000 acres, the water at some times will be about 1 mile from shore. So, in that situation the impounded water would not even be available for boat rides.

No hydroelectric power is contemplated for the proposals.

The recommendation of the Corps of Engineers is opposed by hundreds of people in the community and all of the duly elected county officials in the county where the project will be built. The county attorney and other officials indicate that 40 percent of the taxable real estate in the county will be taken from the taxbooks and that the economic impact on the county would be disastrous. The soil conservationists of the State oppose the big dam. The State grange and the State farm bureau are on record in opposition to the big dam. College professors at Duke University and State college who have studied the problems involved are likewise opposed to the big dam.

At the time the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers were submitted, other recommendations of the Soil Conservation Service were likewise submitted. The Soil Conservation Service studies indicate that adequate flood control can be provided by a series of smaller dams which would impound pure water fit for human consumption and for all other purposes such as for fish and wildlife, recreation, irrigation, and industrial uses, and large areas would not be inundated. The total cost of plan B submitted by the Soil Conservation Service is estimated at $34 million and it would take only from 5 to 10 years to complete the project. This plan, we are told, would provide all of the flood control protection provided by the high dam, yet apparently little consideration has been given to plan B submitted by the Soil Conservation Service. Little consideration also has been given to that part of the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers which contemplates the building of $38 million worth of small dams in addition to the high dam which the Engineers say will cost $25 million.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it perfectly clear that I have not surrendered to forces pushing for congressional endorsement of the big New Hope Dam. Those whose views I have tried to reflect, have not changed their views; neither have I changed my views. I have maintained and I still maintain that the Soil Conservation Service plan is far better than the proposals submitted by the Corps of Engineers, but I realize that, just as has been said in this debate, there are many worthwhile projects involved and I appreciate the fact that if this bill is further delayed, work now being carried on on many important projects in different areas of the country may be paralyzed and thousands of people may be thrown out of jobs. Not wanting to be an obstructionist and not wanting to put stumbling blocks in the legislative path, I have refrained from objecting to the bill's going to conference. The approval of this project in the way it has been approved is an indictment of the parliamentary procedure which has been used. Unfortunately, the membership of this House has not had an opportunity to consider the proposals submitted by the Corps of Engineers on the controversial projects now before the House. We are in a position to have to "take it or leave it." I have served here long enough to know that under the circumstances the House will support the House conferees. As strange as it may seem, neither the study of the Corps of Engineers nor the study of the Soil Conservation Service has even been finished and yet here we are authorizing the approval of the plan of the Corps of Engineers and the expenditure of millions of dollars.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY].

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate and commend the conferees on H.R. 8667 in bringing this report to the House. It has a special significance and gratification for me, since one of the projects favorably reported by the conferees, the Cape Fear River Basin, has been one which has occupied a great deal of my time and attention since coming to the Congress.

The New Hope Dam project in the Cape Fear River Basin, which has run the whole gamut of necessary approvals from State and Federal agencies, is essential to the development of water resources and flood control in the State of North Carolina. This dam, and the two smaller dams encompassed in the plan at Howard's Mill and Randleman, will remedy a situation in our State which has long needed attention—the proper and orderly development of the Cape Fear River Basin, in conformity with a plan which has already been utilized in other portions of our State.

This is a good and completely defensible project and we need it in North Carolina, where in this section we have in the past few years suffered disastrous droughts. We might well call the Cape Fear River, with its major tributaries, meandering from the Piedmont section of the State to the Atlantic Ocean, the Mississippi River of North Carolina. This great water potential for our State has too long been allowed to flow unharnessed and undeveloped. The building of the New Hope Dam, and the two smaller reservoirs to follow, presents the solution to the many industrial, farming, and recreational and commercial capabilities of this rich and pleasant river valley, comprising the heartland of our State.

Also, the authorization contained in this bill will require the Secretaries of the Army and Agriculture to conduct joint investigations and surveys of the upper tributaries of the Cape Fear River—the Deep and the Haw Rivers—in the interest of watershed protection and flood prevention, and the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water. This action is of particular significance and importance to my own congressional district.

My office files are replete with endorsements of the development of the Cape Fear River Basin according to plan A advanced by the Army Corps of Engineers, from all the civic and governmental bodies of my congressional district who have formally communicated with me, and from countless individuals. I have had only a very few—and I emphasize few—letters endorsing plan B of the Soil Conservation Service envisaging a series of small dams, and only one group expression, that of a county grange, communicated to me by its lady officials in support of plan B. Full and complete evidence of the desirability of developing the Cape Fear Basin under the plan of the Corps of Engineers has been given to the appropriate committees of the Congress heretofore. The estimated total cost of the New Hope Dam is $25,143,000, with a benefit-cost ratio of 2.5 to 1. This is a significant ratio which it is imperative to consider. This project is but a drop in the bucket in terms of Federal expenditures, and its benefits, in comparison with cost, are tremendous and are concerned with the conservation of one of our most precious natural resources—water. Our water resources in North Carolina are not abreast of our tremendous population, industrial, and commercial expansion. Without the construction of the New Hope Dam, and the lesser reservoirs to follow, the vital water resources of my own congressional district, largely from the Deep and Haw Rivers, two of the major tributaries to the Cape Fear, are destined to flow uselessly into the confluence point of the Great Cape Fear River, only to provide flood waters for the farmlands of the lower reaches of the Cape Fear River Basin. We speak of Government waste, Mr. Speaker, and certainly I am personally deeply committed against this kind of waste, but here we would have failure to act resulting in tremendous and, to my mind, indefensible waste.

I am happy to see that the conferees have viewed the project in this light and have brought back approval of the project to the House and the Senate today.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on the river basins and flood control project authorization bill, H.R. 8667. Among other authorizations, it contains the initial authorization of the first project in the plan for the comprehensive development of the Flint River, Ga.

It authorizes construction of the Spewrell Bluff Dam and Reservoir at an estimated cost of $63,200,000.

Mr. Speaker, I have been especially interested in this development of the Flint River all of my life, and I have advocated its authorization ever since I was first elected to Congress. It was one of the projects which I specifically described and set out as being desirable for the future development of our State and district, when I became a candidate for the House of Representatives. Since 1954 I have, without intermission, worked for and urged favorable action on this project.

One of the first official calls which I made on an agency in Washington, after my election, was to the Director of Civil Works, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army. At that time I expressed my interest in both major rivers which flow through the Fourth District of Georgia, the Flint and the Chattahoochee. I offered my cooperation and at the same time I solicited the cooperation of the Corps of Engineers.

At no time was any effort made to bypass any procedural step from the initial request to the authorization which is subject to approval by the House of Representatives today.

I have at the appropriate times appeared before the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works to ask for this authorization.

The plan approved by the Chief of Engineers recommends authorization and construction of three dams and reservoirs which will be operated as a multidam complex, of which Spewrell Bluff is to be built first, with controlled water flow and operation. The report to Congress contained in House Document No. 567, 87th Congress, recommends this plan and describes it as economically feasible, justified by a benefit-cost ratio of 1.3 to 1. It will provide valuable flood control benefits to more than a hundred miles of downstream flood plain.

The Spewrell Bluff Dam will be located in Talbot and Upson Counties, Ga., between Manchester and Thomaston at river mile 263 of the Flint River, approximately 9 miles west of Thomaston.

The dam will be 1,950 feet long and will rise to a height of 180 feet. It will have a concrete gated spillway 440 feet long, with concrete overflow abutments 760 feet long across the main channel of the river.

Earth-filled dikes 125 feet long and 625 feet long will extend to the high ground on each bank of the river. The powerplant, to be built at the dam, will have a productive capacity of 100,000 kilowatts.

At the appropriate time I shall request the initial increment of appropriations for planning funds.

The action of the House of Representatives in approving this conference report today is not the end of a long struggle. It is the beginning of the realization of the plan for the comprehensive development of the Flint River.

I express my appreciation to the conferees for including this authorization in this conference report and I urge the approval of the conference report.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the conferees for their wise action in including the New Hope Dam project in the conference report.

On its merits this is probably the soundest flood control project this House has considered in many years. In the first place, its benefit-cost ratio based on a 100-year period of analysis is 2.5 to 1. This is unusually high. The controversy that occurs in so many flood control projects between the proponents of private versus public power is not applicable here because this project would not provide for the generation of electric power. When this factor is considered, the benefit-cost ratio becomes even more significant as it does not include any benefits for electric power.

While this project has incurred opposition from the gentleman representing the district where the dam would be built and lands inundated by the reservoir, it has the unanimous endorsement of virtually all other interests in the State of North Carolina including the Governor, both U.S. Senators, and all Members of Congress representing districts touching the Cape Fear River Basin except for the Member aforementioned.

The project has been approved by the Army Engineers as sound from an engineering standpoint. It is strongly supported by the other body and certainly deserved to be included in this conference report to the end that sorely needed action can be begun in the near future.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] such time as he may require.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, the Cape Fear River Basin flood control project we have considered and passed today embraces the heartland of North Carolina. It comprises 18 counties with a drainage area of 8,570 square miles—16½ percent of the total area of the State. The Cape Fear is North Carolina's largest river—about 320 miles in length.

Flood damage occurs annually throughout the basin, and the need for protection has long been recognized. The U.S. Corps of Engineers has estimated the average annual flood damage to crops, cropland, and forest lands at $521,000 and nonrural flood losses at $966,350—a total of average annual flood losses in excess of $1.5 million in the basin. It is estimated by the Engineers that a recurrence of a flood of magnitude similar to the disastrous one of 1945 would cause damages of over $9 million to the properties along the Cape Fear River. The most serious urban flood problem is at Fayetteville, a city in my district with outstanding industrial potential, where is is conservatively estimated that damages would amount to $4 million.

I have closely studied and vigorously supported the Cape Fear Basin project for many years, Mr. Speaker, making my first presentation before the Corps of Engineers in a meeting in Fayetteville early in February 1957. I have supported the project because:

First. Present policy and existing laws permit the construction proposed.

Second. The plan provides for both present and future needs in a logical construction sequence.

Third. Major benefits will accrue with the building of the New Hope Dam. This dam alone will reduce future flood damages by 80 percent. A large lake for recreation purposes will be provided. This large reservoir will store a quantity of water to be released gradually in a period of drought—a highly desirable function.

Fourth. Additional future dams will further reduce downstream flood damage.

This project is of prime importance to the economy of all North Carolina. It is essential to the development of the State's overall plan of water supply, flood control, and industrial growth.

I want to thank Chairman CLIFFORD DAVIS of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, the members of the Public Works Committee, and my colleagues from North Carolina, DAVID HENDERSON and HORACE KORNEGAY, as well as the members of the Cape Fear Basin Association and all others who have worked so effectively to make this project a reality. Citizens of North Carolina are grateful for the approval of a vital project to meet the flood and water conservation problems of the Cape Fear Basin. "New Hope"—the name of the dam to be built, signifies the feeling that our citizens now have.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee which took testimony on the Knowles project for 4 full days last June, I wish to call the attention of the House to six basic reasons why I am strongly opposed to authorizing this project, and ask my colleagues to join me in voting to reject it.

First. The cost of Knowles far exceeds its value. The $50 million authorized in H.R. 6016 is only the first installment on this costly project. Knowles has a construction cost estimated at from $257 million to $324 million. Yet this estimate does not include $1 of payment to the Flathead Indian Tribes for flooding their valuable powersites, which they value at over $100 million. Thus, the total cost of Knowles could well be in excess of $400 million. On any comparative basis, this project just is not worth that kind of money.

Second. Knowles will cause serious economic dislocation in the area. It will displace over 1,300 people; flood nearly 60,000 acres of land of which 9,000 acres is very productive irrigated land; destroy over 600 buildings; and flood out over 300 miles of railroad lines, roads and highways, utility and pipe lines. Relocation costs alone would be over $140 million. Thus, from 40 to 50 percent of total project cost is attributable to relocation. The flooding of lands and enterprises will cause a gross annual loss to the economy of western Montana of $2 to $2.7 million. This is an additional project cost which the Corps of Engineers did not even consider in estimating the cost of Knowles.

Third. Over 95 percent of the cost of Knowles is attributable to electric power. Yet, as a power project, Knowles is unsound and uneconomic. Power generated by Knowles, on site and downstream, will be marketed by the Bonneville Power Administration. The net revenue per kilowatt-hour under present Bonneville rates is 1.29 mills. This rate will bring annual power revenues from Knowles of $2,232,000, and when added to other benefits attributable to the project, will make total annual revenues of $2,737,000. The lowest annual cost figure for Knowles, testified to by the Corps of Engineers, was $9,549,000.

The corps also testified that the cost of power from Knowles would be 5.31 mills per kilowatt-hour with Canadian storage. Thus, on the most favorable basis, Knowles annual cost would exceed Knowles revenue by almost $7 million. On the basis of probable actual costs, Knowles annual loss would be at least several million dollars higher than this. From these figures, it is perfectly clear, that Knowles is a highly uneconomic project.

Fourth. Figured on the most favorable basis, which means ignoring several very large costs, Knowles has a benefit-cost ratio of 1.08 to 1 on a 50-year payout schedule. This ratio does not include the total moving and relocation costs testified to at the hearing, or any payment to the Flathead Indian Tribes for flooding their lands and powersites. When these moving costs and the value of the powersites testified to by the tribal engineer are considered, the benefit-cost ratio is reduced far below 1 to 1. Thus, in Knowles we are not even trading dollars.

Fifth. The Knowles project is not needed for flood control in the Columbia River Basin. The ultimate goal for flood control can be achieved in the Columbia River Basin from six projects having a much higher benefit-cost ratio. These six projects, two of which have already been authorized, when added to Canadian storage, will provide total storage well in excess of the ultimate goal, which has been set for flood control in the Columbia River Basin.

Sixth. Finally, Knowles would require violating the Hellgate Treaty of 1855 with the Flathead Indian Tribes. The 20,000 acres of Indian lands, and the powersites which would have to be taken, were reserved to the Salish and Kootenai Tribes by this treaty, and by several acts of Congress. To abrogate these solemn promises, would be a blot on the honor of the Congress. Moreover, how could we expect other nations of the world to keep their agreements with us, if we regard so lightly our own treaty obligations. Witnesses representing the tribal council came before our subcommittee, and earnestly objected to the construction of Knowles. These witnesses presented a plan to develop the powersites in a way which they feel will bring greater economic benefits to them and the area. This testimony valued these powersites at $116 million if Knowles is constructed, a very large item indeed, which the Corps of Engineers did not include in their estimate of Knowles costs. I think we in the Congress should recognize our moral obligation to respect the desire of the Flathead Indians to develop their resources in their own way, particularly in view of the bad economies of the Knowles project.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I ask that my colleagues join me in rejecting the Knowles project.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, included in the river basin and flood control project authorizations today, H.R. 8667, is the Waurika Reservoir project, a proposed $25.1 million flood control project. It was added in the Senate version of the bill and agreed to by the House conferees in conference.

At this time I certainly desire to express my appreciation to the House conferees, Representatives FALLON, DAVIS, JONES, CRAMER and BALDWIN, as well as other members of the committee, for their actions in including this badly needed project in the bill.

This is not a controversial project in any sense of the word. It has been approved by the Senate four times. Both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers have recommended that it be built, on two separate occasions. It has also been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, Department of Agriculture, Department of the Army, Department of Commerce, and the State of Oklahoma.

No other project has been so deserving for so long. It has been established beyond a doubt that the project is engineeringly sound and most economically feasible. The benefit-cost ratio is $1 cost to $1.90 benefit; $15 million of the $25.1 million would be repaid to the Federal Government, plus interest.

This project will protect thousands of people from almost annual devastating floods. It will provide water for six cities and an oil refinery, as well as water to irrigate 2,000 acres of land that lie parched between floods. Many, many people have worked to get this project approved. I know that they must be just as pleased as I am today to see this project get authorization approval.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA].

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I will direct my remarks to the Knowles project—that part of the conference report which remains in controversy.

Mr. Speaker, the question we have to ask ourselves on the Knowles project is whether it is economically and financially feasible. Will it be a good investment for the United States—does it represent the best value we can buy for our money? To this, I must answer positively and unequivocally "No." Everything this project represents is negative.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that not since I have been in the Congress have I encountered such a depth of confusion as surrounds the facts and figures on this Knowles project. The smog is almost impenetrable. Nevertheless, by persistent and painstaking digging, we have uncovered enough facts to tell us that Knowles is about as bad a project as has ever come before Congress.

We know, for instance, that by no conceivable juggling of the figures will Knowles pay out. The Corps of Engineers has stretched the period for evaluating the project from 50 to 100 years. The major effect that this has is to pyramid the losses from Knowles so that in 100 years it will cost the Nation well over $1 billion.

During the hearings before the Flood Control Subcommittee, the witness for the corps was taken through the figures it has developed for this project and we came up with the fact that if Knowles is to recover the $11.7 million annually that is attributed to power benefits, they will have to sell the power at 5.3 mills a kilowatt-hour, plus transmission costs. Now, that is a mathematical fact. Yet, the power will be sold by the Bonneville Power Administration which for 1962 received average revenue of 1.31 mills per kilowatt-hour, excluding transmission costs, for all the power it sold. This means that Bonneville will be taking into its system a product that will cost four times what it can be sold for.

Bonneville lost $17.5 million in 1962 and has been losing money steadily for the last several years. Knowles, therefore, must aggravate this deficit operation.

Although Knowles is strictly a hydroelectric project, the corps attempts to make a case for flood control benefits. In the justification, this is given as 3.8 percent of benefits annually. This flood control storage is part of the overall objective for the Columbia system. However, when we study the data presented by the corps for the treaty negotiations with Canada, we find that the ultimate flood control objective for the Columbia system can be attained through storage that will be available in Canada, at the already authorized Libby project, and at other projects in the United States which have a far higher benefit-cost ratio than Knowles. I might point out that one of these projects is High Mountain Sheep, which a non-Federal group wants to construct. Thus, we could obtain flood control benefits there at no cost to the Nation. The fact is that Knowles is not needed to meet the overall flood control objective for the Columbia system. Furthermore, the Indians have proposed a plan which is far superior and will provide the necessary flood control.

Since I have mentioned the High Mountain Sheep project, I would also like to mention another strange inconsistency here.

The Government's witnesses tell us that Knowles is needed, that its power production is needed in this area. Yet, the Interior Department has opposed the construction by private interests of the High Mountain Sheep Dam in this same general region and they have given as one of their reasons the fact that the power from High Mountain Sheep is not needed in this area. Let me quote what Interior Secretary Udall said in the opposition petition the Department filed with the Federal Power Commission in December of 1962:

> The total power resources of the area is, therefore, predictably in excess of all foreseeable requirements thereon for the period through 1968–69 and sufficient to meet all requirements until at least 1972–73 and potentially for years beyond that date.

This was an argument advanced by the Secretary to prevent the granting of license for the construction of High Mountain Sheep. Yet, High Mountain Sheep has all the good qualities that Knowles lacks.

It is a strange situation indeed when the country can obtain the benefit of a good power project, a power project which will contribute to our economic strength in many ways, which will provide flood control storage at no cost to the taxpayers of the country, and then see the Government go to great lengths to prevent its construction, while at the same time, they ask us to permit them to build something as bad as this Knowles project. The logic completely escapes me.

I would like briefly to mention just a few more of the strange facts involved with Knowles.

The construction of Knowles Dam would take some 59,000 acres of land off the tax rolls.

It would flood some 9,000 acres of irrigated production farmland and create a great economic loss to the people in the area who would lose the value of the crops from these lands.

It would destroy the National Bison Range which was financed partially through the nickels and dimes of the children of this country.

It would destroy feeding and nesting grounds of migratory birds.

Knowles would flood winter range and calving grounds of deer and elk and would destroy some of the finest game-fishing streams in the Northwest.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service opposes the building of Knowles.

It would displace 1,300 people, remove them from their homes and property.

It would violate a treaty of this Nation with the Indians.

It will flood 158 miles of utility and pipe lines.

It will inundate 35 miles of railroad and 115 miles of highway, and because of this great disruption to the communities and properties involved, one-half of the total costs of this project are consumed in relocation costs. Think of it—nearly $150 million spent for relocation of highways, utility lines, and railroads.

Knowles is a losing proposition for the country, costing over $300 million; yet, even that does not include all that it will cost the Nation. There is no allowance whatsoever for reimbursing the Indians for the loss of powersites which would be flooded out by Knowles. This is estimated by the Indians to be $116 million. Again, no matter how you juggle the books, this is a cost that must be attributed to Knowles; it is a cost to the Nation, and it is a cost that will be completely nonrecoverable.

Furthermore, private investor-owned companies will build dams which would have approximately the same power installation at no expense to the taxpayer, but to the contrary, would provide additional revenue to the Federal Government. In fact, over a 100-year life span, the time used by the Corps of Engineers, the private investor-owned project would bring into the treasuries of the Government over $300 million.

Furthermore, the Indians have proposed a plan for developing the area—thoroughly analyzed by competent engineers—which will provide approximately the same flood control, yet be less costly and have a much better benefit-cost ratio. This proposal would produce 37 percent more power than Knowles, and power benefits would be 28 percent higher than Knowles.

From beginning to end, look at it any way you wish, Knowles cannot pay out or pay off. The so-called benefit-cost ratios are based on hypothetical benefits and hypothetical costs, and do not represent a true picture of the burden placed on the taxpayer. Congress and the taxpayers have a right to know whether a project will operate without burden on the taxpayer or whether it will incur losses which the taxpayer must make up. On an actual profit-and-loss basis, on revenues derived from the sale of this power, this project will operate at a substantial loss.

Furthermore, in an effort to conceal the real merits, or rather, lack of merits of this Knowles project, the Corps of Engineers, in figuring its cost benefit ratio, has neglected to include the interest charged against this project, which is $28 million—using the rate 2⅞ percent.

With this figured in, the ratio is 1.04, instead of 1.3, and this does not include the allowance for Indian rights. If this allowance were figured in, the corps admits the ratio would not be favorable; yet, they maintain they would recommend it anyway. That's the philosophy behind this entire project. They have revised their figures several times in an effort to show on paper that it is feasible: yet, readily admit that even though it is not favorable, they are going to palm this project off on the Congress anyway.

This certainly contradicts President Johnson's request for frugality in Federal expenditures.

Eight thousand five hundred people lost their jobs last week because of economy measures of the President. It does not make sense to turn around and spend $300 to $400 million on an unjustified project that is not needed and one that will lose the taxpayers an additional $600 million, making a total cost of around $1 billion.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Senate amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this conference report and view it as a major achievement of this Congress.

The able chairman of the subcommittee has performed an outstanding job of legislative generalship and is due the appreciation of the entire House.

I particularly appreciate the conferees' agreement upon the 2-year extension of authorization for the great Arkansas River development program, so vital to the economic future of Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Kansas.

A great new chapter in water resource development is being written by this program, and it is heartening to see this renewed evidence of full congressional support for it.

I am also grateful for the approval of the long-needed Waurika project, of great importance in western Oklahoma.

This is a day of enduring historic importance to Oklahoma and the Southwest, and the entire Nation will be the beneficiary.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my Indian friend, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel]. He is one of the most conscientious Members of this House and one that I have shared a great confidence with since my arrival. His integrity is above reproach.

I have a number of Indian constituents in my district and I am concerned with the constant problem of Indians having their rights taken away without adequate investigation of those rights, and sometimes without adequate defense being raised as to the Indian's rights.

During committee hearings, the following questions were directed to the Corps of Engineers' witnesses during testimony and I think it pertinent to review these questions for the edification of our colleagues.

The questions were asked to determine the scope of Indian rights affected by the Knowles Dam project in Montana, the value of these rights, the effect of those rights, and the feasibility of the Knowles project.

The first question asked was this:

> The Indians of the Flathead Reservation claim there are two damsites on their property which will be flooded out if the Knowles Dam is built. Do you have any information as to whether that is so?
>
> Answer. That is correct.
>
> Question. I believe you have answered that in the affirmative. The second question: Has the corps investigated whether the Indians of the Flathead Reservation under their treaty with the United States in 1855 have any property rights in those two damsites? I think you have touched on that. Would you answer that again?
>
> Answer. We recognize the fact that there was an act of Congress which established the fact that reservoir sites were there. I think the total acreage listed in that act indicated that the area reserved was about 45,000 acres.
>
> Question. And this would constitute a property right so far as the Indian tribe is concerned?
>
> Answer. As I understand it; yes, sir.
>
> Question. The third question is: Has the corps considered the status of the case in the U.S. district court in the Yellowtail Dam case holding that under the treaty the tribe has ownership of the waterpower values in its tribal lands?
>
> Answer. I don't think that case has been resolved as yet, sir.
>
> Remark. The case is cited here, *U.S.* v. *5,677.94 Acres, Montana,* 1958, 161 F. Supp., 108.
>
> Question. Do you have any further comment on that point?
>
> Answer. No, sir. I understand that particular case is up before the Justice Department now for resolution.
>
> Question. The fourth question is, Has the corps made any calculations of what the water power values of the tribe of the Flathead Reservation would amount to on the basis set forth in the Yellowtail Dam case?
>
> Answer. No, sir.
>
> Question. Does the corps have any studies showing whether the Knowles project would be feasible if Indian tribal rights are compensated for on the basis of the waterpower value as provided by the Yellowtail case?
>
> Answer. Well, I think we have covered that earlier. We feel that the inclusion of powersite values in the determination of the benefit-to-cost ratio is not a sound procedure from the economic aspect. It is not in accordance with Senate Document No. 97 as we originally talked about.
>
> Question. How much could be allowed for the Indian rights without rendering the Knowles project infeasible?
>
> Answer. I am unable to answer that question. This requires a lot of negotiations and the resolution of a lot of touchy problems, I am sure. We have not progressed anywhere near that.
>
> Question. Would it be the position of the corps that if Indian tribal water rights are so great they would render the project nonfeasible, nevertheless would you still recommend it?
>
> Answer. We would still recommend the project, sir.
>
> Question. If it were not feasible?
>
> Answer. We are considering it as being feasible.
>
> Question. That would indicate that in effect you just would ignore any determination as to the Indian tribal rights other than the actual assessed valuation of the property or the land.
>
> Answer. Sir, I don't think we ignore them. We just don't have any way in which we can include such special compensation in our project cost. It is not one of the matters that we are permitted under our policy to include. It is something that would have to have special handling.

Mr. Speaker, throughout America, people are discussing the question of civil rights. There is no group in this country whose rights have been preempted and neglected any more than the original inhabitants of these United States—the American Indian. For too many years their personal considerations and rights have been overlooked. The Members of Congress must examine their own conscience—recognize the Indians' rights—then see that they are protected.

Mr. TUTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the conference report authorizing 11 river basins which includes Georgia's Flint River.

I am particularly pleased to have served on the Public Works Committee and to have participated in giving direction to the adoption of a very important project in my home State, the Flint River project, which is being adopted here and approved by the House.

This project will be of immense value to the country and to our State. Water resources is, in my opinion, one of the major interests of the Federal Government. I have supported and used my best efforts in improving the water resources not only in the State of Georgia but throughout the country. It has been a great privilege for me to serve on the Public Works Committee and to make some small contribution to this most primary and essential public endeavor.

I wish to congratulate the conferees on including Flint River project and I have great satisfaction in reporting to the people of Georgia that we are commencing a great river system.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows: Senate amendment No. 26: On page 7, line 15, insert:

> "The Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Montana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 403, Eighty-seventh Congress: *Provided,* That such project shall be operated and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and the sum of $50,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the partial accomplishment of said project."

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Davis of Tennessee moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate Amendment No. 26.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. OLSEN of Montana moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 26 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] and his committee for the constructive work that they have done on this bill. However, I rise in support of the preferential motion which has been offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. Speaker, I had wondered why some of the private power companies in my section of the country were opposed to Knowles Dam. Today I have discovered the reason. Apparently the reason is that they want to protect the poor Indians.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Knowles Dam should be constructed. I feel that we should develop our resources in this country. We are adding 3 million people to our population every year. We have people unemployed. Unless, in the spirit of George Norris and Theodore Roosevelt we set about to develop the resources of this country to their ultimate extent, we are not going to be able to provide the jobs and prosperity that this Nation needs.

Mr. Speaker, Knowles Dam and Reservoir is a sound project. It is controversial, but as the Members of the House will note there were other controversial projects included.

This is the one project that was taken out. Why? Because it is a giveaway? No. This project will repay 95 percent of its cost with interest in the same manner that other reclamation and Corps of Engineers projects have been repaid.

What is the reason for taking this project out? I have been unable to determine that. It has passed Senate committees three different times, the Senate has passed it twice, it has the support of the two Senators from Montana and the House Member from that district. It is supported by every agency of the Federal Government involved. There have been five favorable reports. I cannot understand why it was taken out.

Let me touch on this Indian business. The Indians are citizens of the United States. I am one who believes we ought to keep treaties with the Indians. I respect the views of the gentleman from California. He is as good a friend of the Indians as they have in this country. Treaties should not be broken. But they can be modified. Historically there has never been a case, if I am advised correctly, in which, before an authorization, an attempt has been made to renegotiate a treaty with an Indian tribe. The procedure has always been for the Congress to authorize a project that affects Indian lands, then go to the Indians and negotiate a modification of the treaty. This is not a case of turning your back on the Indian and abrogating a treaty and indulging in the other shameful things that have been described here. This is the historic way to proceed in a situation of this kind.

We bear a special responsibility to the Indians. These lands are Indian trust lands. They are not held by the individual Indians. They are held by the Government of the United States in trust for the Indians.

After the authorization is adopted by the Congress and is signed by the President, negotiations can be undertaken and if the Indians are not satisfied the project can stop at this point.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues, particularly on the Democratic side, to the fact this project was always supported by the late President Kennedy. Speaking in Montana, he said:

> We will not stand by and permit our resources to be wasted or taken for partial development for the benefit of special interests. We will not stand by, for example, and permit another Hells Canyon blunder in the Clark Fork Basin. I think the next President of the United States must support early authorization of the multipurpose project in the Paradise Knowles area.

I urge all Members to support the preferential motion, and put this one project back into the bill.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I represent the Seneca Indians. Is the gentleman saying if they are not satisfied with the negotiations of their treaty they can stop the dam project?

Mr. UDALL. No, indeed. I sat on the subcommittee of the Interior Committee which dealt with the problems of your Indians, and I think an injustice was done them.

Mr. GOODELL. There certainly was. This is the oldest treaty in this country with the Indians.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is correct. I would not want to have a similar injustice perpetrated here, and I do not intend to be a party to it.

Mr. GOODELL. Is the gentleman saying, then, we should authorize this project, but before making plans to go ahead we would try to negotiate?

Mr. UDALL. Yes. If we cannot work out something that is fair and just to the Indians we should not go ahead, but historically we have never undertaken to negotiate with an Indian tribe before a project is authorized.

Mr. GOODELL. Should the cost of negotiating that treaty be figured in the cost ratio of the project?

Mr. UDALL. All costs should be considered, including acquisition of the necessary Indian lands.

Mr. GOODELL. We would not have had the Kinzua Dam if that course had been followed.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a memorandum of agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, personally I wish to thank the conference committee for the report that it has brought before the House. This has been a most difficult matter for well over a year, and I commend them for their diligence in trying to solve a very difficult situation.

On the other hand, while commending them I must accept the responsibility of bringing before my colleagues the question of jurisdiction of committees. It is always a rather embarrassing matter to bring before your colleagues such a problem because jurisdictional matters in the House are rather difficult to understand, let alone decide.

First, I wish to speak for just a moment on the authorization of the Waurika project. This has already been accepted. The House has accepted as a flood control project authorization, a project that has only $2,059,000 of flood control, yet it has $3,549,000 allocated to the cost of construction of irrigation facilities. Inasmuch as this is a reclamation project, at least to such extent as I have set forth, I wish to advise my colleagues that if there is any attempt in the construction of this project to use moneys from the reclamation fund for the construction of irrigation facilities, there will be a letter from the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has jurisdiction over all irrigation projects funded by the use of any moneys from the reclamation fund requesting that construction be held up until the reclamation facilities are studied and authorized by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Bureau of Reclamation has made practically all of the study on the Waurika project. The authorizing legislation has been before our committee for only 3 years, which is a short time for a like project of its size to be before our committee before final authorization. I am sure that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] would have permitted us to continue our jurisdiction had it not been for the decision by the other body. The Secretary of the Interior on August 31, 1961, transmitted his feasibility report to the Congress on the Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma. This report, the product of several years of intensive investigation and study by the Bureau of Reclamation with some funds contributed by the local interests, was printed as House Document No. 232, 87th Congress, 1st session. S. 114 and H.R. 2084, bills to authorize construction of the Waurika project by the Secretary of the Interior, were introduced in the 87th Congress, and hearings were held by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Senate passed S. 114 on June 26, 1962.

Foreseeing that authorizing legislation would not be reported out by the House committee, congressional supporters of the project caused the Waurika reclamation project to be referred to the Public Works Committee of the Senate by insertion of authorizing language in the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill of 1962. Upon disagreeing votes of the two Houses the project was removed from the bill by the committee of conference. However, the managers on the part of the House made a commitment that the Public Works Committee would hold hearings as soon as the next Congress convened. On October 13, 1962, a resolution was adopted by the Senate committee directing the Corps of Engineers to review the Chief of Engineers report on the Red River with particular reference to Beaver and Cow Creeks to determine justification for a reservoir at the Waurika site in Oklahoma.

The corps prepared a report containing the Bureau of Reclamation's plan of development for its Waurika project, with only minor changes in design and a financial analysis which conformed to the then new procedures and policies for economic analysis. This analysis varies only in minor detail from a reanalysis prepared by this Bureau for compliance with these new policies and procedures.

On January 17, 1963, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman WICKERSHAM, introduced H.R. 2062, 88th Congress to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the Waurika reclamation project. That bill was referred to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Early in the 88th Congress, the Senate Committee on Public Works held hearings on legislation to authorize the Waurika project based on the Corps of Engineers' report of December 21, 1962. The Bureau of Reclamation was not asked to testify. After brief hearings the committee indicated it would not take further action unless and until the corps' planning report on the project had been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

The corps' planning report on the Waurika Reservoir was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget on May 13, 1963. In its letter to the Secretary of the Army dated July 1, 1963, commenting on the Corps of Engineers' report, the Bureau of the Budget noted the legislative activity and work of the Department of the Interior on the Waurika project and recommended that the project be authorized for construction by the Department of the Interior.

H.R. 8667, 88th Congress, authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, as reported by the conference committee and presently under consideration by the Congress, would authorize the Waurika Reservoir project for construction by the Corps of Engineers substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army—Senate Document No. 33, 88th Congress.

Practically the only Corps of Engineers' contribution to the studies and plan of development, as presently before the Congress, besides participation in comprehensive basin studies some years ago, was the determination of the flood control benefits which were furnished to the Bureau of Reclamation by the Corps in accordance with prescribed procedures. While municipal and industrial water supply is the primary project purpose, other functions of the project such as irrigation, conservation and development of fish and wildlife, and recreation are primarily responsibilities of the Department of the Interior. It was noted by the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee in its hearing of the Corps of Engineers' proposal that flood control represented only about 12 percent of the total costs allocated to the several project functions.

A revaluation of the Waurika reclamation project by the Bureau of Reclamation in June 1963 on the basis of the then existing procedures, standards, and policies for the formulation and evaluation of water resource projects resulted in the following allocation of the estimated construction costs for the project:

Municipal and industrial water	$11, 298, 000
Water quality control	4, 090, 100
Irrigation	3, 549, 000
Recreation	2, 059, 200
Fish and wildlife	1, 506, 000
Flood control	2, 059, 000
Total	25, 377, 000

This evaluation shows that only about 8 percent of the construction cost would be allocated to flood control, a function for which the Corps of Engineers would have the primary responsibility. The remaining 92 percent of the costs would be allocated to functions for which the Department of the Interior has primary responsibility.

For many years, the Bureau of Reclamation has worked with the local interests in their water problems, assisted them in the formation of the district organization, and has formulated this project from its inception. Essentially all of the field work necessary to move into the design and construction phase was accomplished by the Bureau of Reclamation. Two other projects in Oklahoma—Norman and Washita Basin—basically similar to the Waurika project have been authorized in recent years for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Norman project is now actively under construction, and construction of the Washita Basin project is functionally complete. It is well recognized by all project supporters that the Waurika project has been and is a Bureau of Reclamation project.

Now, to get to the Knowles project, I think my colleagues should understand what is involved in this project. I wish to answer my friend the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] and my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], who have made certain statements. This project has been approved by several different departments of Government. But I now wish to read to you from the memorandum of agreement dated March 14, 1962, signed by the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, and Secretary of the Army, Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., relative to this project.

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

The undersigned have carefully considered the complex problems of water resources development in Alaska, the Columbia River Basin and the Missouri River Basin, and have concluded that a division of responsibility between the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army is both necessary and desirable. The division of responsibility agreed to is intended to assure the most effective utilization of the capabilities of the two departments in the planning, construction, and operation of water resources projects, and these agreements will serve as a basis for administration recommendations for water resources development in these areas.

1. ALASKA

It is agreed that, because of its long standing interest in all natural resources development matters in Alaska, the Department of the Interior shall provide leadership in undertaking comprehensive studies for natural resources development in Alaska, including water and power development. Consistent with its responsibility for marketing of power produced at Federal hydroelectric projects, it is also agreed that the Department of the Interior shall be responsible for the operation and maintenance of completed hydroelectric power projects in Alaska.

It is agreed that, because it must maintain an organization engaged in civil and military planning and construction in Alaska, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers shall have responsibility for engineering design and construction of all water resources projects, including hydroelectric power projects, in Alaska. It is also agreed that the corps shall continue its studies of the Rampart Canyon project and shall complete its report.

It is agreed that the Department of the Interior shall make the necessary power marketing studies in connection with the Rampart Dam project and shall initiate, in cooperation with the State of Alaska and interested Federal agencies broad comprehensive studies of the effect of this project on all natural resources. This study shall be completed prior to any recommendations for authorization of the Rampart Dam project. The Department of the Interior shall also report as soon as possible on markets for power to be generated at any other major hydroelectric project in Alaska recommended for authorization.

This agreement will avoid the establishment of a duplicate construction organization in the State of Alaska and, at the same time, it will stimulate the broadest participation in comprehensive water resources planning.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS ON THE REVIEW REPORT ON COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

It is agreed that the projects proposed for authorization in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 31, 1961, on Columbia River and tributaries shall be recommended for authorization of construction by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, except that (a) Knowles Dam shall be recommended for authorization of construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and, (b) because further study is needed of major fish and wildlife problems and other conservation problems, the proposed Flathead Lake outlet improvement, High Mountain Sheep Dam, Penny Cliffs Dam, and Garden Valley Division shall not be recommended for authorization at this time. It is also agreed that, because of the close relationship to major program interests of the Department of the Interior, that Department shall undertake detailed studies of the fish and wildlife problems associated with the four projects mentioned in (b) above. In addition, it is agreed that the Department of the Interior shall undertake any further engineering and economic studies leading to a recommendation for authorization of High Mountain Sheep Dam (or any alternatives) and Garden Valley Division, and that these projects shall

> be recommended for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation; further, that the Corps of Engineers shall undertake any additional needed engineering and economic studies leading to a recommendation for authorization of Flathead Lake outlet improvement and Penny Cliffs Dam, and that these two projects shall be recommended for construction by the Corps of Engineers.
>
> 3. MISSOURI RIVER BASIN
>
> It is agreed that because both Departments have major program interests, a joint study and report should be made on the feasibility of multiple-purpose reservoir development on the main stem of the Missouri River between Fort Peck and Fort Benton, Mont. It is also agreed that, except for single purpose flood protection problems, planning and construction of multiple-purpose water resources development of the James River and the tributaries of the Missouri River above Gavins Point shall be the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation.
>
> STEWART L. UDALL,
> *Secretary of the Interior.*
> ELVIS J. STAHR, Jr.,
> *Secretary of the Army.*
>
> MARCH 14, 1962.

I wish to read once again the pertinent part of the memorandum as it relates to the Knowles project:

> It is agreed that the projects proposed for authorization in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 31, 1961, on Columbia River and tributaries shall be recommended for authorization of construction by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, except that (a) Knowles Dam shall be recommended for authorization of construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and, (b)—

This is an agreement between two agencies having jurisdiction in this field.

One of the difficulties in coordinating our water facilities operation is that when we do have agreements downtown or in the executive departments all too often they are upset by politics here on the Hill and we destroy any question of coordination.

I would most likely be for the Knowles project if it were properly studied, but it is my understanding that all of the problems that will arise because of the displacement of the Flathead Indians have not been taken into consideration by the study that has been made of this project to date. After going through what we have had on another major project, somewhat similar, it just seems to me that before we determine the feasibility of a project we had better be sure that all of the information of that survey and studies pertinent to the project are studied by the committee having jurisdiction under the rules to see whether or not the money of the taxpayers of the United States is being expended in accordance with the best operations of Government.

In the absence of congressional directive, and in order to insure efficiency and to avoid potential duplication of effort, the Secretaries of the Army and of the Interior entered into agreements regarding the responsibility of each Department for planning and building multiple-purpose water resources developments. The basic agreement affecting the Columbia River and tributaries was signed in April 1949. It specified clearly the specific projects and areas of predominant interest of the two agencies. With respect to future studies, it stated that the Bureau of Reclamation, because of predominant interest, should have primary responsibility in the Clark Fork Basin.

A supplemental agreement set forth herein heretofore was signed March 14, 1962, with regard to the recommendations to be included in the report of the Corps of Engineers on Columbia River and tributaries. Among other things, this agreement provided that "Knowles Dam shall be recommended for authorization of construction by the Bureau of Reclamation." Pursuant to that agreement, the omnibus flood control bill of 1962 (S. 3773, 87th Cong.) provided for construction, operation, and maintenance of the Knowles Dam and Reservoir by the Bureau of Reclamation. That provision was deleted in the House of Representatives on the grounds that the House Committee on Public Works had not held hearings on the proposal. In view of this background of executive action and legislative history, I have found with surprise that the conference report on the bill now under consideration (H.R. 8667), as passed by the Senate and as reported in disagreement by the conference committee, provides for construction of Knowles Dam and Reservoir by the Corps of Engineers and for operation and marketing of power by the Department of the Interior. This, of course, would be directly contrary to the letter, the spirit, and the purpose of the interdepartmental agreements and would negate the efforts of the executive branch to coordinate the activities of these two outstanding construction agencies in the water resources development field. The agencies themselves have lived up to the agreement and have attained effective, efficient planning, construction, and operating conditions in the Columbia River Basin. We should not overrule the President's recommendations in this respect without powerful compelling reasons.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Congress, I regret that my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona made the statement he did just a little while ago that he felt treaties could be broken. I have just finished 8 months of trying to pick up the pieces of the breaking of the oldest active treaty we have in this Nation, a treaty signed by the first President of the United States, George Washington, and ratified by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman misunderstood me. I said that treaties should not be broken. I said treaties could be modified by agreement of both sides to the treaty. I want to make that clear for the RECORD.

Mr. HALEY. All right, then, I apologize if I misunderstood the gentleman from Arizona, but I still say on this project there has been no attempt to deal with the Indians. As the gentleman well knows, the Governor of the State of Montana has appeared in opposition to this project. The Indians involved in this treaty have appeared in opposition to the breaking of the Hell Gate Treaty of 1855, and I say at a time when we are talking about treatybreaking, we had better look back at some of our own actions in these matters.

As I stated before, we broke a treaty by taking one-third of the reservation of the Seneca Nation, the oldest active treaty that we have in existence, and here if you build the Knowles Dam you again are going to violate a solemn, binding obligation of the United States of America.

When you take Indian land, let me show you just a little bit of what you do. As I say, I spent 8 months trying to pick up the pieces of the Seneca Nation, one of the nations and probably the one group of people who had more to do with us gaining our independence and winning the War of Independence than anybody else in the world except our own people. Now what do you do when you take this land—and the building of the Knowles Dam will take 19,900 acres of the lands of the Flat Head Reservation—you absolutely destroy the economy of that reservation which has been built up by the Indians over a long period of time—approximately 110 years. You have to make some provision for the care of the Indians. You have to make some provisions for them because you have the responsibility to do so. You know that when you build a dam in the Western States you take all of the bottom land and that is the best land the Indians have. So what will these Indians have to support the economy of their tribe? It costs the American people, based on the appropriations for this particular year, $835 per Indian annually to meet the obligations we have to them. So what are you going to do—destroy the economic base of the Indians which has been built up so laboriously over a long period of time? Are we going to do that? No; I say you should not do that. Furthermore, I do not think that the Knowles Dam is a meritorious project. I do not think you would think so if you went into the proposition. It is not an economically feasible project under any conditions, in my humble opinion. It would generate electricity—and that is all you have here, a power project—it would generate the highest priced electricity in that general area. From the figures I have been able to arrive at after a careful study, Knowles Dam standing alone and selling the electricity—which I do not think they have a market for—will lose approximately $11 million a year. I say to the Congress, I plead with the Congress not to again break a treaty. Let us honor these commitments that we have made. This dam is not necessary. The power is not needed. So let us support the committee's position on this project.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we are drawing to a close. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA], for 2 minutes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question.

Mr. HARSHA. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I know the gentleman is interested in economy by the way he votes. Will he explain to me why the Ohio River Basin was raised $103 million? I have 100 miles of the Ohio running by my district, and I do not see the need for it.

Mr. HARSHA. The Ohio River Basin authorization was raised by that much to meet a 2-year authorization. The original basin authorization bill, H.R. 8667, went through with only a 1-year authorization, so it was raised by the other body to meet the 2-year needs.

Mr. HAYS. The 1-year need was $47 million, and it is raised to $150 million. Is that correct?

Mr. HARSHA. One hundred fifty million dollars is the 2-year need.

Mr. HAYS. That is quite a substantial increase.

Mr. HARSHA. That includes the entire river basin from up above Pittsburgh down through to the Mississippi River and all the tributaries running into the Ohio. Several States are included.

Mr. HAYS. I was interested in economy, and I was just wondering.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend only a minute talking about the financial analysis of this program. The annual cost as estimated by the Corps of Engineers is $9.5 million. That is the annual cost to generate the power plus the cost of operating the project. The actual cost to the taxpayer amounts to $13.1 million using the interest rate of 4 percent as opposed to the Corps of Engineers who are using the interest rate of 2⅞ percent—4 percent is what it costs the Federal Government to borrow money. The annual returns to this project are only those that come to the project from the sale of power. The annual returns from the sale of all the power both upstream and downstream, including the 17 dams that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] mentioned, amount to only $2.7 million, leaving a net operating loss of $6.7 million per year. If you use the actual cost to the taxpayers, it comes to over $10 million a year. Thus, over a 100-year period the total loss in the operation of this project will amount to $675 million, using only the Corps of Engineers estimates or, if you use the actual cost to the taxpayer, it will be over $1 billion. This excludes all of the Indian rights estimated at $116 million.

I urge the defeat of the preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], for the report that he has brought out. I am not in favor of the motion made by the gentleman from Montana, although he is a very dear friend of mine and is one who is concerned about the welfare of the Indians. We all here in this Congress in one manner or another are concerned with the welfare of the minorities in our country. Among those, one of the smallest minorities, of course, are the Indian Americans. As has been so ably pointed out here on several occasions by the various speakers, this Government made a treaty with them on July 16, 1855, which was a solemn treaty entered into between the Government and the Indians. Then later in the history of our country it was decided by the Congress on March 3, 1871, that treaties may no longer be made with Indian tribes and that we legally could disregard them almost at will. In discussing this matter with one of the leading attorneys of this city dealing with Indian affairs, he said that there is not a single treaty that has been kept to the letter of the law by this Government dealing with Indians. There is in this House the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which is chairmaned by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], a great citizen. Along with him is the distinguished chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], who just spoke, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHN SAYLOR, the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. They have been the conscience of America in maintaining at least the moral obligation that this Congress has to the Indian tribes with whom treaties and agreements have been made.

Here we have an Indian tribe with about 4,100 members, that have a power dam on their reservation that produces now annually $328,000 a year that they would lose. Also they have something like 20,000 acres of very fertile river bottom lands which would go into the Knowles project.

The Indians of the Flathead Reservation could never be adequately repaid for these resources were the Knowles project approved.

Were this proposal to come before Mr. ASPINALL's and Mr. HALEY's committee and they found it feasible the interests of the Indians would be fully considered but even with their sympathetic understanding, however adequate the cash settlement might be, the experience has been that such payments have seldom left the Indians better off. I, therefore, strongly recommend that this proposal be permitted to go before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in order that a careful study be given all its aspects and particularly its impact on the Indians and the added costs to the Federal Government. I urge this House to vote down the preferential motion of the gentleman from Montana.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING].

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, my father has been a high school football coach in Idaho for over 30 years. When I was a boy he said, "If you ever have to get in a gang fight be sure to get in and help the little guy." As a result, I got a good many whippings when I was a boy. In this fight today, Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN is the little guy and many of us who have sat here and heard him explain the need for and the benefits to be derived from the Knowles project in Montana want to help him. Due to a limitation of time we cannot all speak; however, Congressman UDALL and myself have been selected by Congressman OLSEN's friends to say a few words supporting this project. It is not easy to be one-half of a two-man congressional delegation, as Congressman OLSEN is, and compete with the delegations from Pennsylvania, New York, California, and other large States for the limited dollars available for much needed multiple-purpose projects for your State. However, Congressman OLSEN is doing an excellent job in behalf of the people of Montana. He has pointed out that the Corps of Engineers support the Knowles project as a good project. Those of us from the Pacific Northwest where we must face the ravages of spring floods know how much 3 million acres of reservoir storage means for flood control. It cannot be discounted. It is difficult to measure it in dollars and cents. It has also been pointed out that at the Knowles dam there is going to be installed a 256,000-kilowatt powerplant to help pay for the cost of this project.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that Congressman OLSEN has done a magnificent job in pointing out the need for the Knowles project today. It is because of the fact that he has been standing almost alone that his friends have suggested that I take this opportunity to lend him our support. If I wanted to know about TVA I would go to our great chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]. If I wanted to know about a project in Pennsylvania, I would go to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who spoke earlier. If I wanted information on the San Francisco Bay area of California, I would seek out the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN]. However, when I wanted information on a project in western Montana, I inquired of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN]. He has convinced me and many others that this is a project worthy of our support. Therefore I am proud to join him in his effort to obtain congressional authorization of the Knowles project. I urge you, my colleagues, to support the preferential motion of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING] has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Knowles project is opposed by the Governor of Montana and has been opposed by the last four Governors of Montana, Democrat and Republican alike.

I have received resolutions from seventy organizations in the State of Montana and many resolutions from other areas opposing this project. Those resolutions include such organizations as the Montana State Water Conservation Board, Montana Fish and Game Commission, Montana Farm Bureau, Montana Reclamation Association, Montana Water Users Association, Montana

Stockgrowers Association, Montana Wildlife Federation, Montana Bankers Association, Montana Chamber of Commerce, Upper Columbia Development Council, the Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Association of American Indians, the Affiliated Tribes of the Northwest Indians, the National Congress of American Indians, as well as thousands of people who are directly affected by this project.

In addition to other opposition, the Northern Pacific Railway has strenuously objected to the relocation of 35 miles of their main line track at a cost of well over $100 million. This to be at taxpayers expense.

This project would flood three towns and displace the people. In addition, it would flood part of the National Bison Range.

Mr. Speaker, on August 19 I made a speech on the floor of this House, in which I pointed out to the Members that the proposed authorization of this project violated the treaty entered into by the United States with the Flathead Indians, the Hellgate Treaty of 1855.

I pointed out at that time that, in my humble opinion, we in the Congress, in authorizing this project and other like projects on Indian reservations without the consent of the tribes involved, were unilaterally violating the treaties made with the Indian tribes under the solemn seal of the United States and ratified by the U.S. Senate.

On page 23137 of the Congressional Record of December 3 of this year, the Army Corps of Engineers, by letter inserted in the Record, chose to criticize my position that the Hellgate Treaty merits the same concern and treatment as the test ban treaty. The corps stated that it was "unalterably clear that there is a basic difference between" a treaty with an Indian tribe of the United States and a treaty with a foreign nation.

Because of such statement by the corps, and in support of my position, I asked the Library of Congress to give me information as to the validity of the Hellgate Treaty as compared with a treaty with another nation; for example, the test ban treaty with Russia. The Library of Congress advised me as follows:

> The view that early treaties with Indian tribes were of the same caliber and status as treaties with foreign nations as far as they operate as domestic law or create vested rights for the Indians has been repeatedly confirmed by the Federal courts (*Holden* v. *Joy*, 17 Wall. 211; *Worcester* v. *Georgia*, 6 Peters 515; *Turner* v. *American Baptist Missionary Union*, 24 Fed. Cas. No. 14251).

It is interesting to note that the opinion quotes as the source of its information a "Handbook of Federal Indian Law" prepared by the U.S. Department of the Interior and printed by the U.S. Government Printing Office. That document sets forth in a very learned manner the fact that Indian treaties are of the same dignity as treaties with foreign nations and points out many, many Federal court cases which so state.

The Secretary of the Interior is charged by the Congress with the duty and high fiduciary position of being trustee for Indian tribes. It is his responsibility to protect and uphold the treaty rights of these Indian tribes.

I urge you, my colleagues, to support the position of the House conferees in their opposition to the Knowles project.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion to recommit the conference report on this bill, H.R. 8667, to the conference with instructions to reject the Knowles project and against the preferential motion. This project has been proposed for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation but the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee which has the primary legislative oversight responsibility for this agency has not been given an opportunity to examine the engineering and economic feasibility report on the project made by the Bureau. In fact, fantastic as it may seem, I do not believe the Bureau of Reclamation has even made such studies. Last year we saw a similar situation arise when the Corps of Engineers attempted to get authorization for Bureau of Reclamation construction for the infamous Burns Creek project. Fortunately, this body rose up in indignation at that obvious attempt at subterfuge and rejected the Burns Creek project by a substantial vote.

Today we have another opportunity to make it clearly understood that at least we in this Chamber will not accept another attempt at subterfuge by rejecting the Knowles project by an even greater vote.

Mr. Speaker, this proposed project will require the confiscation of several thousand acres of Indian lands and eventual compensation to these Indians of unknown millions of dollars. Yet the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, which is responsible for the relations of the United States with the Indians and Indian tribes, has not been given an opportunity to study this situation. The Knowles project will also flood out some 9,000 acres of presently irrigated lands, but the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee has not been consulted. In short, the Knowles project—regardless of who proposed it—should never have been before the Public Works Committee, but should have been before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, despite these facts I have just cited, the Knowles project is before us today; and, therefore, I would like to take just a few minutes to discuss the demerits of the project.

The estimate of the Corps of Engineers for annual power benefits of $11,211,000 represents a value of 6.2 mills per kilowatt-hour, excluding costs of losses and transmission. But, in 1962, the average total revenue received by the Bonneville Power Administration was only 2.36 mills per kilowatt-hour. After deducting the cost of transmission—1.05 mills per kilowatt-hour—revenues available to repay generating costs were 1.31 mills per kilowatt-hour. The BPA estimated transmission line losses at 4.5 percent. On the basis of these figures, the average annual revenue which could be expected from Knowles power would be $2,270,000 compared to the $11,211,000 value estimated by the Corps of Engineers. Of course, the best and only true value of something is what someone will pay for it. Nobody is going to pay 6.2 mills per kilowatt-hour at the bus bar for this power. Furthermore, the Corps of Engineers has stated that "there is presently a surplus of over 2 million kilowatts—of peaking capacity—in the system." The corps also stated that Knowles is not needed for peaking capacity but for energy. At the same time, we hear BPA Administrator Charles Luce complaining about his inability to sell all his surplus energy to California.

In a press release dated December 3, 1962, on the High Mountain Sheep project the Department of the Interior stated:

> The total power resources of the area [Pacific Northwest] is therefore predictably in excess of all foreseeable requirements until at least 1972-73 and potentially for years beyond that date.

The basis for any peaking benefit, let alone the extreme values presented, is lacking. The same appears to be true for energy. In either event alternate sources of power are available at appreciably lower costs than the estimates of benefits used by the Corps of Engineers. Thermal peaking capacity can now be built for roughly $60 or $65 per kilowatt installed compared to the approximate $1,200 per kilowatt that Knowles will cost. Even after allowance for high cost fuel in the area, peaking power can be supplied at a much lower cost than Knowles.

It seems that there is a great deal of flexibility in the claims made by proponents of the Knowles project concerning shortages of power, first capacity, then energy—neither of which is true or can be substantiated. It is obvious that they are fabricated completely out of whole cloth merely to confuse the issue and to try to justify an uneconomic and financially infeasible undertaking.

In the hearings the corps also stated that new plants were more expensive than existing plants and that average BPA rates cover the costs of both. While it stated that Knowles would not be operated at a loss it made no assertions that Knowles revenues would cover its costs. Rather, the corps attempted to justify the project on the basis that average rates, which would include use of surplus revenues from older projects subsidizing the newer projects, would cover the overall costs of the system. Of course, this is no longer true because such surpluses from older projects have already been overcommitted. BPA has been operating at a substantial loss over the last 6 years, with a deficit of $17,661,785 in the year 1962 alone and the surplus which was built up in the early years by the low-cost Bonneville and Grand Coulee powerplants has now been dissipated. Concurrently, in the electric power industry as a whole, costs per installed kilowatt and per kilowatt hour have been steadily decreased over the years.

In the House hearings on the Knowles project, the Corps of Engineers representative admitted that even though annual costs of Knowles would be at least $11 million, annual revenues, after allowance for transmission would be only about $2.3 million.

Mr. Speaker, a short while ago we joined our colleagues from the other body to hear a statement from President Johnson in which he called for a dollar's value for a dollar spent. Now, we are being asked to consider and approve perhaps the most wasteful and uneconomic hydroelectric project which has ever come before us.

Let us not forget one of the items of top priority on the legislative program of the late President—and reiterated by the present President—was the reduction of taxes. Furthermore, let us not forget the assurances given by the late President as recently as September 10 to the Business Committee for Tax Reduction. He said:

> This administration has pledged a tighter rein over expenditures.

He went on to say:

> We have pursued an intensive campaign to identify those existing programs which could be effectively carried out in the private economy.

He then pledged to exercise an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting outlays to those that met strict criteria of national need.

We cannot keep faith with the late President's pledge and goals by turning our backs so quickly and authorizing unknown millions of dollars for an unnecessary Knowles hydroelectric project. Oh, I know the Corps of Engineers has placed a figure of something like $258 million on the cost of Knowles, but this has about as much relation to reality as a proposal to abolish the Department of Defense.

The Corps of Engineers has said the project would cost $258 million, but their witness has admitted that no consideration has been given to the amount of money which must rightfully be paid to the Flathead Indian Tribes for this treaty breaking confiscation of some of their lands and at least two potential power damsites. No one knows exactly how much will have to be added to the total cost of Knowles for this one item. It could come to $116 million or more.

The Corps of Engineers has included approximately $83 million for relocation of railroad facilities of the Northern Pacific Railway Co. However, witnesses from this railroad have testified that this estimate is in actuality about $33 million short of what it would cost the railroad to relocate their facilities which would be flooded out by the unnecessary Knowles hydroelectric power project.

In addition to this increased cost to the railroad, the vice president for operations of Northern Pacific has said that this is the first time in the company's knowledge "that the main line of a transcontinental railroad serving local territory, as well as bridging the transportation gap between the Midwest and the Pacific coast, has been seriously threatened by a proposal that it be subjected to a major and damaging relocation to accommodate a water storage project." He should have said an unnecessary hydroelectric power project. This expert witness further said the relocated road would be more hazardous to operate and maintain and would handicap the railroad in an already fiercely competitive transportation industry.

If this project should be unfortunately authorized, there would also have to be major relocations of highways, pipelines, and transmission lines. When all these things are taken into consideration, we see the almost ridiculous spectacle of having to pay substantially more to relocate flooded out facilities than for the actual dam which would cause all the trouble. Does it not seem a little more intelligent for us not to build the dam in the first place?

I will not belabor the point any further that the cost suggested to this body for construction of the unnecessary Knowles hydroelectric power project is completely unrealistic. I think these brief points I have mentioned are sufficient to prove this fact. But, there are still other reasons for rejecting this project besides the cost of it.

It perhaps should be noted as an aside that this is one of the occasions, rare as they may be, when we have seen the Governor of one of our great States appearing before a committee of Congress to oppose an expensive Federal project for his State. But, Governor Babcock, of Montana, traveled to Washington to testify as to the undesirable consequences which would result from the authorization and construction of Knowles. The Governor pointed out the towns which would be inundated and the resulting loss of the tax base, the loss of thousands of acres of good irrigated croplands which would adversely affect the agricultural economy of Moiese County. This intentional flooding of irrigated lands should cause all of us who have fought so hard for more and better irrigation to rebel so vigorously that no one in the future would have the nerve to even suggest such a thing.

The Governor also referred to the hardship which would be worked on the Indian tribes and the forest products industry of Montana. He also pointed out the irreparable damage to the National Bison Range. It will be remembered that this haven for this vanishing American wildlife specimen was created by the donation of pennies, nickels, and dimes of the Nation's schoolchildren.

Are we even failing to keep faith with these little schoolchildren by proposing to flood this important bison range.

Mr. Speaker, a recitation of the shortcomings of Knowles could go on and on, but this will not be necessary. The question then seems to come to mind logically—if there is so much wrong with the Knowles project, why is it being pushed so hard? The answer is just as logical—for cheap, subsidized hydroelectric power. But, even here the need for Knowles breaks down. To repeat what I mentioned a few moments ago, Secretary Stewart Udall told the Federal Power Commission almost exactly 1 year ago that the total power resources of the whole Pacific Northwest area is predictably in excess of all foreseeable requirements until at least 1972–73 and potentially for years beyond that date. Therefore, it should be admitted that there is no power shortage in the area now nor will there be in the near future.

Referring back a moment to the statement of the late President that his administration was pursuing an intensive campaign to identify programs which could be carried out by the private economy it should be stated that the investor-owned electric company serving the area is ready, willing, and able to meet the power requirements of the area. In fact, it has license applications presently pending before the FPC to construct two dams on the Flathead River in cooperation with the Indians which would produce an equivalent amount of power at absolutely no cost to the taxpayers while paying about $3 million per year in taxes.

No, Mr. Speaker, we must not authorize this expensive, wasteful, and unnecessary Knowles hydroelectric power project. Therefore, I sincerely urge each of our colleagues to vote to instruct the conferees to reject the Knowles project.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, to close the debate I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, this is not a new project. This project has been studied by the Corps of Engineers for more than 11 years and for the past 11 consecutive years.

There are 256,000 kilowatts of power at site. That storage is used down through the Columbia River until it adds up to almost 1 million kilowatts of power. In doing that it firms up not only the public dams which are 7 in number, but it firms up 10 private dams on the way from the mountains to the sea.

That, Mr. Speaker, is why it is counted as being feasible, and economically feasible, because of this splendid productivity all the way down through the Columbia River that that storage at Knowles delivers.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some dispute about railroad costs.

Let me say that it has been the history of the Corps of Engineers and the history of these projects, not only to rebuild the railroad, but to rebuild it brand new, better than it was. And, so, are the plans in this particular case.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, with respect to my friends, the Indians, the Flathead Indians, I would submit to the Members of the House that they are located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. They vote for me and they vote for my colleagues, Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana, and Senator METCALF.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Members of the House to ask themselves who would be closer to knowing the desires of our Indian people, the rank-and-file Indian people, out on the reservation and in our cities and towns, who would be closer to knowing their desires than the great majority floor leader of the other body and the junior Senator from Montana, and myself who comes from that congressional district?

Mr. Speaker, I submit that I walk with them and talk with them whenever I am home. I am familiar with the position taken by the tribal council, but I am also familiar with the position taken by the rank-and-file Indians and with the position taken by the rank-and-file people of my district. I have polled them. I have polled the 90,000 households a year ago last summer on this very question, and a very overwhelming majority of 54 percent were in favor of the project and a very few, only about 30 percent, against it. The balance of the people expressed no opinion.

In every instance of Indian treaty change of this kind, the authorization was approved first and thereafter negotiation with the Indians were pursued. We contemplate agreement with the Indians. Our history of protecting the Indians in Montana has been the best. The Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Indians Affairs, has discharged his duty as trustee and protected the Indians. He has obtained for the Indian the best program for the Indian economy.

I think this project, like Yellowtail Dam in Montana, is the best program for our Flathead Indians.

Mr. Speaker, that is the situation as closely to a nutshell as it can be drawn. Here is a project which has been approved by all of the administrative agencies, under the same criteria as any other river basin project now contained in the bill, any of the TVA, any of the basins in the country, approved on the same criteria and shown to be economically feasible and favorable that it will pay back the loan, pay back the loan, mind you, with interest to the Treasury. Not, incidentally, like flood control pays it back; not, incidentally, as other programs like recreation pays back to the Treasury, but this will come back through the development and sale of power. Knowles is a sound investment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the preferential motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion of the gentleman from Montana to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. OLSEN of Montana) there were—ayes 66, noes 132.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] to insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 329, nays 41, answered "present" 1, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 245]

YEAS—329

Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Buckley
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Hemphill
Herlong
Hoeven
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young

NAYS—41

Ashley
Bolling
Brown, Calif.
Cameron
Corman
Dingell
Edwards
Elliott
Fraser
Gill
Gonzalez
Hagen, Calif.
Harding
Hechler
Johnson, Calif.
King, Calif.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Matsunaga
Miller, Calif.
Moss
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Colo.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Secrest
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Staggers
Thompson, N.J.
Udall
Ullman
White
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Aspinall

NOT VOTING—63

Abbitt
Avery
Ayres
Baring
Becker
Belcher
Bolton, Frances P.
Bray
Burke
Burkhalter
Cederberg
Cohelan
Diggs
Ellsworth
Evins
Fascell
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Grant
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hansen
Hawkins
Hébert
Henderson
Hoffman
Holifield
Kee
Kelly
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Leggett
Long, La.
Mailliard
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Morgan
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Riehlman
Rooney, Pa.
Roush
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Sisk
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Van Pelt
Watts
Wilson, Bob
Younger

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Milliken with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Burkhalter with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Burke with Mr. Becker.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Laird.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Cederberg.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Short.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Roush.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Barry.
Mr. Abbitt with Mrs. Hansen.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Grant with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Shelley.

Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. KING of California, and Mr. UDALL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, and Mr. BROOMFIELD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

RIVER BASIN AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 246), as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, is authorized and directed—

(1) On the first page, immediately after line 2, of the engrossed House bill, insert the following: "CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA".

(2) On the first page, immediately after line 8, of the engrossed House bill, insert the following: "BRAZOS RIVER BASIN".

(3) On page 2, immediately after line 3, of the engrossed House bill, insert the following: "ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN".

(4) On page 2, immediately after line 9, of the engrossed House bill, insert the following: "WHITE RIVER BASIN".

(5) On page 2, immediately after line 15, of the engrossed House bill, insert the following: "OHIO RIVER BASIN".

(6) On page 2, immediately after line 21, of the engrossed House bill, insert the following: "LOS ANGELES-SAN GABRIEL RIVER BASIN".

(7) On page 3, immediately after line 2, of the engrossed House bill, insert the following: "COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COINAGE OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY 50-CENT PIECES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9413) to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in lieu of the coinage of the 50-cent piece known as the Franklin half dollar, there shall be coined a silver 50-cent piece which shall bear on one side the likeness of the late President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and on the other side an appropriate design to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker on December 10 President Johnson sent a message to Congress requesting legislation authorizing the mint to coin 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The bill recommended in the President's message specifies that the other side of the coin shall bear an appropriate design to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. This will mean, however, that the reverse side of the coin must carry the image of an eagle, because that is a requirement of existing law.

H.R. 9413 is the bill that President Johnson recommended. It has not been amended.

In his message President Johnson urged that the bill be enacted promptly, in order that 50-cent pieces issued at the beginning of the calendar year 1964 be the new coin carrying the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The reason for this is that the mint must make new dies and have them ready for use at the beginning of each new calendar year. In any case, this would be true if the mint were to continue to coin the present half dollar. Therefore, the expenses of converting the half dollar to the Kennedy half dollar would be a great deal higher if the mint did not do this at the beginning of the year. It would mean making two sets of new dies instead of only one set of new dies. Furthermore, to change dies twice would reduce the production capacity of the mints.

We have been advised by the Director of the Mint that the total cost of converting the 50-cent piece will be less than $1,000. As I have said, new dies must be made in any case. Furthermore, the mint presently has in its possession the patterns that are to be used. So the only cost will be the cost of building a master die. The Director of the Mint has computed the salary time of the diemakers and the overhead for the purpose.

I should like to add that, since President Kennedy's assassination, our committee has received a great many letters and telegrams from people in all parts of the country suggesting that a coin of one denomination or another be made to carry the image of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The country and the free world have lost a great man and a great President. The bill was reported unanimously by our committee. I respectfully suggest that it would be only fitting that the House pass it unanimously.

FACT SHEET ON KENNEDY COIN

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury has the full authority at the present time to change the design on any coin after it has been used for 25 years. Thus, it would be possible, without legislation, for the Secretary to place the likeness of John F. Kennedy on the nickel, the quarter, the silver dollar, or the obverse of the 1-cent coin. The decision to place the likeness of President Kennedy on the half dollar requires legislation because the present design was adopted in 1948. The President requested legislation to use the half dollar so that all of our coins in current production would bear the likenesses of Presidents of the United States.

Silver dollars are not currently being minted. The Treasury has requested the appropriation of funds to permit the resumption of production of silver dollars for the first time since 1935. However, the idea of placing President Kennedy's likeness on the silver dollar, when and if production of this coin is resumed, was rejected by the Treasury "because the expected demand for the Kennedy memorial coin would be so heavy as to cause a drain on the Treasury's silver stocks." So many silver dollars are now being saved and treasured as collectors' items that stocks of silver dollar, once considered adequate to last for many years, are rapidly being depleted. A Kennedy silver dollar, it was feared, would aggravate the shortage of silver dollars because of their appeal to collectors or to individuals wanting to have a new coin as a memento of the late President.

Kennedy half-dollars undoubtedly would appeal to the collector instinct in many Americans but would go "twice as far" in meeting the demand for mementos while providing coins for general circulation. Production of the new coin is estimated about 60 million pieces per year. No special costs will be incurred in producing the new half-dollar, since it will be regular issue coinage. The design and dies can be adapted quickly from the Kennedy Presidential Medal, so that the new issue can be available for 1964 regular issue if the legislation is passed promptly. The coins will be distributed from the Denver and Philadelphia Mints to the 36 Federal Reserve banks and to the Main Treasury in Washington, thence to the 14,000 commercial banks throughout the country, from which they will be made available to the public at face value.

PORTRAITS ON COINS AND CURRENCY

The portraits of two of America's martyred Presidents, Lincoln and McKinley, have appeared on coins, and the portraits of all three Presidents martyred before Kennedy have appeared on currency. A McKinley memorial gold $1 coin was minted in 1916. McKinley appears on the $500 Federal Reserve note, now in current production. In 1902, shortly after his death, the portrait of McKinley was used on the $10 national bank note. The portrait of James A. Garfield went on the $5 national bank note, series 1882. The portrait of Lincoln has apeared on about 10 different currency denominations or series prior to 1928 and now appears, of course, on all $5 certificates and notes, as well as on the 1-cent coin.

Changing the design of an issue of paper currency, according to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, takes at least 9 months, and to replace the notes of a design now in circulation, usually takes several years. Such changes "are generally regarded as undesirable in that they tend to confuse the public in differentiating between genuine and spurious notes," Director H. J. Holtzclaw has reported. "Public confidence and faith in U.S. currency are closely associated with the present designs which are well recognized and accepted not only in this country but in foreign countries as well," he added. The portraits currently in use on currency were adopted in 1928 and include the following: $1, George Washington; $2, Thomas Jefferson; $5, Abraham Lincoln; $10, Alexander Hamilton; $20, Andrew Jackson; $50, Ulysses S. Grant; $100, Benjamin Franklin; $500, William McKinley; $1,000, Grover Cleveland; $5,000, James Madison; $10,000, Salmon P. Chase; $100,000, Woodrow Wilson—gold certificates.

John Quincy Adams, Benjamin Harrison, James Madison, James Monroe, Grover Cleveland, James A. Garfield, Ulysses S. Grant, Andrew Jackson, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, William McKinley, and George Washington had their portraits on various series of paper currency issued between 1861 and 1928 along with a great many other outstanding Americans who were not Presidents—for instance, Henry Clay, Stephen Decatur, Benjamin Franklin, Robert Fulton, John Marshall, George G. Meade, Robert Morris, Samuel Morse, Sioux Indian Chief "Running Antelope"—$5 silver certificate, series 1899—William Seward, Edward D. Baker, Edwin M. Stanton, and numerous others including Martha Washington, only wife of a President to be so honored—$1 silver certificate, series 1886, 1891, and 1896.

The Roosevelt dime was first issued January 30, 1946. It was issued on the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury under existing law. It is the practice of the Treasury not to change the design of a coin in the middle of any year of issuance. Hence, although President Roosevelt died in April 1945, under customary practice the new coin was not minted until the following calendar year. In the case of the Kennedy coin, it would be the only half-dollar design to be minted in 1964 if this legislation is enacted in time.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, 1963 marks the centenary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the delivery of Lincoln's immortal address dedicating the national cemetery in that city.

Individuals and organizations everywhere were interested in coining a commemorative 50-cent piece. Members of the Pennsylvania State Committee for the Centennial of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address were extremely interested in this project. Lincoln fellowships everywhere joined in the request. Bills designed to accomplish this purpose were introduced in both bodies of the Congress.

I should like to state there are differences between the bill we are considering today and H.R. 1611. Both, however, are commemorative coins and I believe it becomes the responsibility of the chairman of the committee to tell this House why one is desirable and the other denied.

Let us review the situation briefly. Hearings were held on H.R. 1611. Mrs. SULLIVAN, chairman of the subcommittee, made this statement at the start of the hearing:

> These bills are controversial in that the Treasury Department consistently opposes all such commemorative coin issues without exception, and every President in the past 25 or 30 years or more has opposed or vetoed such bills, although a great many such coins were issued in the first administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.
>
> Incidentally, I note from our old committee calendars that, while a Member of the House, Mr. Kennedy once sponsored such a bill, himself, to issue a special 25-cent piece, not a half dollar, as most of these bills call for, but a quarter, commemorating the 300th anniversary of the pine tree shilling of colonial days. However, it never saw the light of day in the Committee on Banking and Currency, a fate which was shared by many such bills over the years, and those which were approved were generally vetoed.

I have already said the chairman stated Treasury opposes special coins without exception. In her testimony, Miss Adams, Director of the Mint, made this statement:

> Since the enactment of Public Law 278, referred to above, no further commemorative coins have been authorized except for two provided for in acts signed on August 7, 1946, and an amendment to one of these in 1951.

She also stated manufacturing of commemorative coins is usually higher than the cost of regular coinage. The bill under consideration specifically stated the coin to be minted was to be done so at no additional cost to the Government but would be paid for by the sponsoring organization.

Miss Adams also expressed concern that a precedent may be set. Is there anything comparable to Lincoln's Gettysburg Address?

> I have not chosen to take George Washington off the quarter, nor Thomas Jefferson off the nickel, because I just sort of felt it would not be a very popular thing to do.

I should like to ask Miss Adams: Is it going to be popular to take the likeness of Ben Franklin off our half dollars?

Listen to Miss Adams' further testimony:

> As I understand it, the design in the past 25 years, has not been changed, and my delightful predecessor, Nellie Tayloe Ross, felt that Benjamin Franklin should be honored. It provides a delightful design, as you well know, as Benjamin had a great deal to do with establishing the coinage system of the country and the mint. I think Mrs. Ross did a delightful thing in deciding that he should be on this particular coin, and he is still there.

Those of us who were vitally interested in this legislation contacted individuals at various levels. We personally visited the Secretary of the Treasury and were given the same cost, precedent and what-have-you story that actually did not exist in this case. Those in the top echelon in the White House were also contacted with the same negative result.

Our present 50-cent piece was designed and first minted in 1948. Fifteen years later we are being asked to authorize a new design.

Let me read a statement made on this floor last Thursday by my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON].

To arbitrarily change the name of important American landmarks arousing local exasperation and resentment, to change the mint of one of our coins and make of it in this coming election year a campaign button—seems to me shabby treatment for the memory of a man who gave completely and finally of himself in his devotion to duty.

If we establish through rapid fire, fragmented action a system of memorials, in the presence of which many thousands of Americans are uncomfortable, we have indeed done a disservice to the man.

Since coming to the floor today I have learned that tomorrow a House committee will consider bills designed to set up a commission on memorials. This appears to be an orderly and sensible approach to this problem.

As I stated previously, I believe the Members of this House should be given some justification for this proposed change by the chairman of the committee which reported this bill when change has constantly been opposed by those responsible.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the aims and purposes of this piece of legislation. However, I do object to the tremendous haste in getting this legislation through. I exceedingly regret the failure of the Committee on Banking and Currency to accept my amendment, which would not have defeated the bill nor changed the bill except to defer the effective date to January 1965.

I believe that we are all in complete agreement and we are all in favor of proper memorials to our late President, for whom we have the greatest respect and admiration as a distinguished American, but the rash of memorials all at one time makes the effectiveness of this type of legislation and dignity attached to it almost meaningless. Let us honor the late President with proper memorials.

Let us provide for these memorials so that the honor and tribute we pay to the late President has the proper effect. The only way we can do that is to hold back on some of these memorials that are being suggested in such great number.

I understand that the Senate and House committees have come out with the new cultural center in memory of our late President, and we have had all kinds of suggestions for changes in the names of streets, towns, cities, villages, and so on. I think we are losing the real effect of these memorials if we start passing this kind of legislation in such tremendous haste.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. As a matter of fact, on November 29 of this year I introduced a bill, H.R. 9295, which would direct and authorize the Mint at the earliest practicable time to produce 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of the late President Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, I share the thoughts of the previous speaker that we should not act too hastily and in too many different fields. However, there is precedent for this action in issuing a commemorative coin. In the year following the death of President Roosevelt, a coin bearing his likeness was issued and is still in circulation.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a proper action for this Congress to take, and I urge my colleagues to vote favorably for it.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill at this time pending the report of an oft-called-for commission, which should be created by this Congress, to deal with the challenging but rewarding task of establishing proper memorials. These would then truly be the prized possession of all Americans—and people everywhere—rather than an action completed under the guise of mass psychological hysteria, or predicated upon snap judgment. For example, if the President can change the name of a local land mass or area as he did in the case of Cape Canaveral, why do we in the House of Representatives necessarily act precipitously on a deflated half dollar coin?

I commend the speech addressed to this House on December 12 1963, by the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable Rogers Morton, in this connection. Similarly I commend to your timely consideration and ultimate judgment, a speech by his brother the Honorable U.S. Senator Thruston B. Morton, of Kentucky, on the floor of the other body on the same date. To paraphrase the latter in part, "the soul, people, and future of America is sound. The cause, and the way of America is sound. Let these not be barred and blocked by those who forget that the great business of the Nation must be threshed in healthy discussion, in spirited debate, and in the great dialog of open dissent and open society. Cry heresy at such debate today, as some seem to cry, and we would memorialize tyranny and not liberty."

This Nation's genius is that our parties and our Government is greater than any one individual, recognizing the sobering thought that what is wrong prior to a catastrophe as horrendous as it may be, is equally wrong thereafter, and is not changed by the act itself. The business of Congress must be carried forward by the judgment of its membership faithful to the lessons of yesterday but fashioned for today and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, America will rise above the perversion that "all are guilty" and the attempt of the ultraliberals to make "all" apply to the body of conservatives, plus the realization that guilt is never collective but personal. The implication of the radical leftist will backfire against them. It is because we are in this state of dire uncertainty and unstable emotional situation that I would prefer to defer this act of coinage from the same year that we have demonetized the silver from our bank notes. As reported only this week by the First National Bank of New York the 50-cent piece does not have its full measure of silver therein, only the 5-cent piece—nickel—does, according to the latest silver values as computed from world resources and markets. Could this be related to its origin in the Bull Moose Party?

Further, I believe the last line of the bill as presented, and the last sentence of page 1 of the report of the committee is too inclusive and allocates too much authority to the Secretary of the Treasury. I ask, Mr. Speaker, are the words "In God We Trust" to be struck from this coinage on the obverse side because we herein authorize "an appropriate design to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury," in the same year that this House has insisted we place "In God We Trust" above the Speaker's dais? I respectfully recommend that this action be defeated and/or brought out by the Banking and Currency Committee after a period of dignified mourning for a gracious human being, made more intense by virtue of the treachery of his end.

Mr. Speaker, I reflect sadly at the fate of Benjamin Franklin who at the time of the Constitutional Convention was admittedly the most erudite of all our Founding Fathers, and was in fact the only one who had traveled in European capitals and reflected on history toward our evolution. Is he to be stricken from the coinage and at some future date are we setting the precedent for removing the Father of our Country from other coins? I say strike not one hair of this venerable head, and let us continue our coins as means of barter and not as memorabilia to other than Founding Fathers. This action is too soon, and to precipitous, and we need time for history and historians to decide and record. I believe the Banking and Currency Committee—which in this House's past action has been established to aid and abet the Ways and Means function assigned to the House of Representatives by the Constitution—has wisely acted in pondering and studying for long periods of time the various bills and resolutions for similar coinage memorializing, for example, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, immediate past Speaker of this House. Here history has had time to work its will and make just and timely decisions. Are we not surreptitious in leapfrogging such pious and judicious decisions? If it is right to so memorialize on coin our immediate past Presidents, it will be correct later on; yet just as much regretted if we act in haste whereas it is in truth a wrong concept. We will have demonstrated wisdom rather than lack of reverence in so acting. As a physician recognizing mass hysteria and psychological reaction when I see it, I strongly recommend that this be deferred by a negative vote or sent back to the committee with instructions to ponder and bring it forth after the conclusion of our national period of mourning and the first of next year.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that I favor this legislation for a memorial coin because President Kennedy was the President of all of us in the United States. He is a martyred President. We all are saddened and mourn his passing. As we Americans must, we should debate this legislation, but I request that we should debate this memorial bill with reverence and likewise with respect. When Jack Kennedy served in this House, many of us valued his friendship, and are deeply saddened over his death, at the height of his competence and career. I must say that President and Mrs. Kennedy never forgot their old friends. We in the House have lost a true and loyal friend.

Might I ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, because I have a bill in requiring that U.S. coins and stamps have the phrase "In God We Trust" on them, will the words "In God We Trust" that now appear on the 1963 50-cent piece and on the 1963 quarter be placed on this memorial coin for President Kennedy? I would strongly recommend it.

Mr. PATMAN. I call the gentleman's attention to the committee report.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the committee report at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. The report says:

> Under the statute of 1792, all gold and silver coins (not 1-cent pieces and nickels) must carry on the reverse side the image of an eagle. And under the law of July 11, 1955, all coins must carry the legend "In God We Trust."

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am glad to hear that, because I believe we should continue the phrase "In God We Trust" on the U.S. coins, and I am sorry this phrase is currently being left off U.S. stamps.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. I think we should point out the error in the report, because you mentioned just the penny and the nickel do not need the eagle. I understand the dime does not need the eagle as well, because none of the dimes in my pocket have an eagle on them.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. May I finish with this: Once the course on this bill for the memorial 50-cent piece for President John Kennedy has been taken unanimously by a nonpartisan vote by the House Banking and Currency Committee in reporting out the bill—I hope that the committee will be supported and that this bill will be passed with a large majority, without reserve and without political partisanship. If it is just a question of timing, I think there is no time better than the present.

Might I finish on this thought: We Republicans have a martyred President on a U.S. coin, and we Americans are all proud of our goodly heritage from Abraham Lincoln. In a bipartisan spirit, we should likewise have a second martyred President, our good President John Kennedy, who we all knew and with whom many of us served in this House, memorialized on a U.S. coin. I strongly recommend to my fellow members, prompt passage of this memorial bill.

HOUSE REPORT NO. 1038

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 9413) to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 9413 is to honor the memory of the late President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

On December 10, 1963, President Johnson sent a message to Congress requesting this legislation, saying:

"I strongly recommend the enactment of this proposed legislation at the earliest possible date in order that the likeness of President Kennedy will appear on the 50-cent coins issued at the beginning of the calendar year 1964."[1]

H.R. 9413, introduced on the same day by the chairman of your committee, is the same as the legislation proposed by President Johnson's message.

The committee concurs with the view that the bill should be enacted speedily, in order that 50-cent coins issued at the beginning of the calendar year 1964 will bear the likeness of President Kennedy.

The bill directs that there shall be coined a 50-cent piece which shall bear on one side the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and on the other side an appropriate design to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The consent of the Congress is required to make this change in view of the provisions of section 3510 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 276), which provides that no change in the design of a coin shall be made oftener than once in 25 years. The present design was adopted in 1948.

It should be said that since President Kennedy's death the committee has received a large number of communications from citizens urging that a coin of one denomination or another be minted to bear the likeness of the late President, and many Members of the House, including members of the committee, have introduced bills or resolutions for this purpose. The committee considered and adopted H.R. 9413 in order to carry out the request of President Johnson.

Coins of lesser denominations than the 50-cent piece currently being minted all bear likenesses of former Presidents: The one-cent pieces, Abraham Lincoln; the nickel, Thomas Jefferson; the dime, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and the quarter, George Washington. In contrast, the current 50-cent piece, first issued in 1948, carries the likeness of Benjamin Franklin; and the last minted silver dollar carries the image of a woman's head symbolizing "Liberty."

Under the statute of 1792, all gold and silver coins (not 1-cent pieces and nickels) must carry on the reverse side the image of an eagle. And under the law of July 11, 1955, all coins must carry the legend "In God We Trust."

The Director of the Mint informs us that the total cost of converting to the new 50-cent piece will be less than $1,000, as the patterns are already in possession of the mint and new dies must be made in any case, and only the cost of making a master die will be involved. The Department of the Treasury has recommended enactment of H.R. 9413 as is stated in a letter of December 12 from the General Counsel of the Treasury as follows:

DECEMBER 12, 1963.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 9413, to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The proposed legislation would authorize the coinage of a silver 50-cent piece bearing the likeness of the late President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in lieu of the coinage of the 50-cent piece known as the Franklin half dollar.

The proposed legislation incorporates a draft bill submitted by the President to the Congress on December 10, 1963. The Treasury Department recommends the enactment of H.R. 9413.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee and that enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,
G. D'ANDELOT BELIN,
General Counsel.

H.R. 9413 was unanimously adopted by the committee on December 12, 1963.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support the committee. I should like to make a correction of the RECORD. If I correctly understood the gentleman from Missouri, he referred to this body as a "conservative body." I would not like the American people to lose hope completely. I do not believe that this Congress is a "conservative body," in the context that the gentleman from Missouri is using the term.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD; and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a question to pose to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency That is this. I happen to be one Republican who was a great admirer of Woodrow Wilson and his memory. He has been dead for over 40 years. Has the Committee on Banking and Currency given any consideration to honoring his memory?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will submit a bill it will certainly receive early consideration.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] to ask him why there has been no action on the bill H.R. 2621, providing for the issuance of a 50-cent coin in memory of the late distinguished Speaker of the House, Mr. Rayburn, which was introduced and referred to his committee on January 24, 1963.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not in a position to answer the gentleman's question. I can look into it and advise him.

Mr. GROSS. Has it not been before the gentleman's committee since January 24?

Mr. PATMAN. We have several hundred bills before our committee. I cannot tell the gentleman right off the status of each one of them.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman said that he has received some mail in connection with the 50-cent piece to be issued under the terms of the bill now before the House; did he not receive mail urging him to pass the bill providing for the likeness of our late and beloved Speaker, Mr. Rayburn, on a 50-cent coin?

Mr. PATMAN. Possibly so.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman did nothing about it.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, the committee will take these bills up in proper order. If the gentleman has a specific request to make——

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman when he received the bill now pending before the House—on what date, if he has any idea?

Mr. PATMAN. The Rayburn bill is a commemorative coin bill, whereas the bill before us now merely changes the design on a regular coin.

Mr. GROSS. I am aware that the Rayburn bill was a commemorative bill. And so, in fact, is the pending proposal.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not have to remind me about honoring the late beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn. He will be looked after in appropriate fashion. That does not relate to this bill at all. Is the gentleman opposed to this bill?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman still has not answered my question as to why he leapfrogged this legislation over the legislation that has been pending for months concerning our late Speaker, Mr. Rayburn.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, we have several hundred bills in our committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. This bill came up by reason of the assassination of a President. It is to honor a late President who was assassinated less than a month ago. The bill came up at the specific request of the present President of the United States. It is in a different category.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, regular order. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

---

[1] H. Doc. 181, 88th Cong., 1st sess.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Mills). The gentleman is proceeding in regular order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Ohio like to have what remains of the 1 minute or so that I have after I say that I am opposed to this bill? Would the gentleman from Ohio like to take the floor?

Mr. ASHLEY. I have no desire to follow the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure you do not.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is brought to the House floor less than a month after the death of the late President Kennedy. No such precipitate action was taken in behalf of President Roosevelt. I doubt that in all the history of this country legislation has been rushed through Congress of this nature. I remind you that this legislation is being considered under parliamentary procedure which permits of no amendments. I further remind you that approval of this legislation means the striking from 50-cent coins the likeness of one of the Founding Fathers of this Republic. I cannot in good conscience, at this time, vote for this bill.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE SAM RAYBURN COIN BILL AND THE KENNEDY COIN BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is an important distinction between legislation to authorize commemorative coins and legislation to change the design on a regular coin.

Commemorative coins are minted for a short time and in limited numbers. They are souvenirs. They are sold by some private group, usually at a price above their face value, to raise money for some worthy cause. In approving a commemorative coin bill, the Congress must consider not only the greatness of the individual to be honored, but the appropriateness of the money-raising project; and a suitable committee must have organized itself to carry on the sales of the coins.

But the condition which makes all commemorative coin bills inappropriate at this time is that the present mints are operating at full capacity and cannot produce enough coins to satisfy the needs of the public for ordinary business transactions. As we all know, we presently have an acute shortage of coins. To mint commemorative coins at this time would contribute to the coin shortage for the very reason that commemorative coins are souvenirs and do not go into general circulation.

The bill to authorize a change in the design of the 50-cent piece to carry the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy does not authorize a commemorative coin. It merely authorizes a change in the design of a regular coin which will be continuously in circulation. There will be no special issuance of the Kennedy 50-cent piece, and no reason why anyone should take these 50-cent pieces out of circulation and save them as souvenirs. Every Kennedy 50-cent piece will be like every other Kennedy 50-cent piece except, of course, for differences in the years in which they are minted.

The Committee on Banking and Currency of the House has a great many bills to authorize commemorative coins for the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, to commemorate the centennial of the Gettysburg Address, and for other great men and great causes. But for several years now the Treasury has uniformly recommended that all commemorative coin bills be postponed until the new mint is built, and we have sufficient capacity to produce commemorative coins without making the coin shortage worse. The Treasury has recommended against the bill to authorize a commemorative coin in honor of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn for this reason.

In all modesty, I believe that my own admiration and affection for our late great Speaker, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas, are held as deeply and perhaps more deeply than by any other Member of the House.

I cannot presume to speak for President Lyndon B. Johnson, but I believe that no one needs to speak of his well-known admiration, devotion and loyalty for the late Sam Rayburn. I venture the guess, however, that in no waking moment of President Johnson's life has he been unmindful of Sam Rayburn, of Sam Rayburn's mark on the history of our country, or of Sam Rayburn's mark on Lyndon Johnson.

I believe that we can all rest with confidence that when the first appropriate moment arises to authorize a coin to commemorate Speaker Sam Rayburn, President Johnson will recommend that legislation.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, since the dastardly act of a sniper took the life of President Kennedy, there have been many, many proposals to honor the memory of this man who gave so much for his country. Buildings and highways already bear his name, and in time to come, the people will have the John F. Kennedy Cultural Center here in Washington to remember him by. These are all fine tributes to a great man.

Still, Mr. Speaker, since shortly after his untimely death, I have felt that there should be a memorial to President Kennedy that would daily remind Americans of the man and of the times upon which he left his mark. After much consideration, I concluded that a most appropriate and proper memorial to President Kennedy would be to put his likeness on a coin.

This idea was first suggested to me by a constituent, Mr. Jack Dossett, of Durham, N.C. Like so many other Americans, Mr. Dossett was deeply concerned over the tragic death of the President and thought a proper memorial should be prepared to him. He telephoned me and suggested the likeness of the President be put on the special issue of 50 million silver dollars to be minted next year. After thinking this over, I agreed. After all, such coins would come into daily contact with the majority of Americans.

With this idea in mind, I introduced a bill on November 27 to provide that silver dollars minted more than 6 months after the enactment of the legislation should bear on one side a likeness of President Kennedy.

As time passed, however, I realized that it might not be practical to put the likeness of President Kennedy on the silver dollars to be minted next year. These 50 million silver dollars were needed in circulation. However, with President Kennedy's likeness on them undoubtedly they would become collectors' items and would not be long in circulation. And, 50 million silver dollars would not go very far in supplying all the Americans who would want a keepsake of the late President.

Therefore, I concluded, it would be as proper and more practical to put the likeness of President Kennedy on some other donomination of coin. On the same day that President Johnson proposed that new 50-cent pieces be minted with the likeness of President Kennedy on them, I received a letter from the Director of the Mint pointing out that the half-dollar coin would minimize mint coinage problems and also would be more accessible to the public. I then introduced a new bill, similar to the one submitted to Congress by President Johnson, to put the likeness of President Kennedy on 50-cent pieces.

Today we have before us the bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which would have the likeness of President Kennedy on 50-cent pieces. It was unanimously adopted by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. It should be similarly adopted by the full House here today and sent on to the Senate. For this bill provides a fitting and proper living memorial to our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives, of which I am a member, voted unanimously to support this bill. Therefore I continue to concur with the committee.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the debate on H.R. 9413, I want to say that I am wholeheartedly in favor of this bill to place the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy on the regular 50-cent coin to be issued by the Treasury beginning in 1964. Numerous bills have been introduced in the House since the death of President Kennedy to honor his memory in this most distinctive fashion by placing his likeness on various denominations of coins or currency. These bills were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and were referred in turn by the gentleman from Texas, Chairman Patman, to my subcommittee.

Among the proposals were bills to place President Kennedy's likeness on silver dollars, quarters, regular-issue half dollars, commemorative half dollars and the $10 currency note. As chairman of the subcommittee, I consulted with Miss Eva Adams, Director of the Mint, on the various technical problems connected with changing any of the standard coins, and I also consulted with the Director of the Bureau of Engraving, Mr. Henry J. Holtzclaw,

I think the solution finally reached, and recommended to Congress by President Johnson, and incorporated in the bill now pending before the House, is an excellent one. The 50-cent coin is the only one now in production which does not bear the likeness of a President of the United States. It is certainly no dishonor to Benjamin Franklin to replace him on the 50-cent coin; we have honored and we are honoring his memory and his many great contributions to this country in many ways. It is my understanding that Benjamin Franklin's likeness was to go on only a limited number of 50-cent pieces in 1948 under proposals at that time for the striking of a commemorative coin. Instead, the design was accepted for general use on the 50-cent coin.

Mr. Speaker, the background information submitted for the Record by the gentleman from Texas, Chairman Patman, on the manner in which other Presidents were honored on our coins and currency, particularly those who, like President Kennedy, were the victims of assassins' guns, lends further weight to the appropriateness of this proposed coin issue.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is in no sense comparable to those previously referred to the subcommittee, and on which hearings were held on May 20, to issue commemorative 50-cent coins of limited volume for special fund-raising purposes. All such commemorative coin bills were indefinitely postponed. The Kennedy coin would not be a "commemorative" coin but a coin of regular issue. I think the distinction should be emphasized in view of some of the questions raised during the debate.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to address the House today in support of the legislation before us, to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, as I was privileged to introduce a bill for this purpose.

Our Nation has been blessed with greatness because we have been fortunate in having men to lead us to greatness. There have been many, but of these, certain ones have been outstanding. They stand head and shoulders above us all, and they have become symbols of encouragement for the generations that follow in their footsteps.

We, in this Nation, have acknowledged their abilities and retain their memories through the dedication of public lands, public buildings, highways, bridges, and such, bearing their names. We have also reproduced likenesses of some of these leaders on our coins and bills used as our media of exchange for goods and services that are needed. We are proud of these great men and well we should be.

Today we consider honoring another great leader, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, by providing for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing his likeness. It is true that there are many who could be honored in this manner, and I certainly would favor many of those who may be mentioned, but I believe that President Kennedy stands head and shoulders above the rest. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that he be the one we should honor. He is the modern day symbol of peace and equality for all mankind. His life was dedicated to this cause, and because of this dedication he sacrificed his life for these principles. He has become a martyr for love and understanding amongst all mankind. His memory should never be forgotten but should act as a daily reminder for us in this generation, and for future generations, to work for the goals he so carefully planned.

What better reminder could there be than a coin we handle daily. None that I can think of at this moment. So let it be that we, in this Congress, have given future generations a symbol to remind them that peace on earth and good will toward men should be their goal as it was the goal of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I ask for the overwhelming approval of the legislation now being considered.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak a word against precipitate action here this afternoon although I am well aware of the poignant feelings caused in this Chamber by the President's death. And although many Members may feel their loss is softened somewhat by this action to imprint President Kennedy's image on our coinage, to take this step in a headlong fashion hardly pays compliment to the calm, intellectual consideration with which Mr. Kennedy generally regarded legislation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit that this bill deserves more than cursory consideration. Would it not be seemly, I ask, to give it at least as much consideration as given similar proposals for a great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and a great Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Sam Rayburn.

May I point out that the business of our Nation is an infinitely complex and intricate one. More often than not therefore, we need the perspective of time in judging a man's greatness and right to commemoration. That is why Washington was judged great, Jefferson was judged great, and Lincoln was judged great; the principles and truths they stood for emerged bright and shining from the test of years.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I plead for more time on this proposal, time that we may properly judge President Kennedy's greatness and so commemorate it properly, and time to reflect upon and insure that all previous laws in respect to our coinage are respected and observed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9413.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Roosevelt) there were—ayes 148, noes 8.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

One hundred and ninety-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 352, nays 6, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 246]

YEAS—352

Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Buckley
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Grover
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Hoeven
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Keogh
Kilburn
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker

Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taft
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—6

Beermann
Gross
Hall
Lipscomb
Martin, Calif.
Teague, Calif.

NOT VOTING—76

Abbitt
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Becker
Belcher
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bray
Burke
Burkhalter
Cederberg
Cohelan
Cramer
Dawson
Diggs
Dowdy
Ellsworth
Evins
Fascell
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Grant
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gurney
Hansen
Hébert
Henderson
Hoffman
Holifield
Kee
Kelly
Kilgore
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Leggett
Lloyd
McClory
Mailliard
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Morgan
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Rains
Riehlman
Rooney, Pa.
Roush
Schadeberg
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Staebler
Staggers
Sullivan
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Van Deerlin
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watts
Wilson, Bob
Younger

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Burkhalter with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Burke with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Younger.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Griffin.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Cederberg.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Short.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Staebler with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Kilgore with Mr. Becker.
Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Roush.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Shelley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, during the rollcall on H.R. 9413, I was unavoidably detained in my office, to which I had gone to talk on a very important long-distance call. The call concerned public business which was both important and immediate. When I returned to the House floor, the vote had just been concluded. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that the statement follow the reporting of the vote in the RECORD.

VESSELS WHOSE LIFE HAS BEEN EXTENDED BY PUBLIC LAW 86-518

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1172) to amend Public Law 86-518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86-518.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8(c) of Public Law 86-518 is amended by adding the following to the end thereof: "Provisions in such contracts affecting vessels covered by this Act providing for refund of construction-differential subsidy for domestic operations under section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and costs of national defense features for commercial use shall be amended so that for such refund payments made for the period after December 31, 1959, the base upon which such refund payments are computed annually thereafter shall be the undepreciated amount of subsidy or the national defense feature, as the case may be, as at December 31, 1959, divided by the years of life of the vessels as provided under this Act, remaining after December 31, 1959."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to correct an oversight and inequity arising out of an amendment to section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 made in the 86th Congress.

At that time the operating life of certain vessels was extended from 20 to 25 years. Section 506 sets up a formula under which subsidized vessels operated in the foreign trade do not receive a subsidy for coastwise portions of their foreign voyages. Through oversight, the formula for the determination of the subsidy on the coastwise leg of the voyages was not corrected to conform to the overall change in the law and the purpose of this bill is to make the law consistent.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this does not change anything. The normal life of a vessel at the time the amendment was passed in the 86th Congress was 20 years. That amendment extended it to 25 years. During this 20-year period a vessel built under a construction subsidy and operated under a subsidy was required to pay one-twentieth of the proportionate subsidy on the coastwise leg of its foreign voyage.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides that they will continue to pay only one-twenty-fifth of their revenue on such a coastwise or coastal voyage.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the report on S. 1172 indicates, the bill was designed to correct an oversight in the 1960 Public Law 86-518 which amended the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to extend the statutory life of vessels from 20 to 25 years. The oversight resulted in a requirement on the part of subsidized operators to repay to the Government a larger portion of construction-differential subsidies than was intended, either by the 1936 act or the 1960 amendment. S. 1172 seeks to do no more than to correct the oversight.

The report refers to the Senate action in deleting sections 2 and 3 from the original version of S. 1172. A bill identical to the original S. 1172 was introduced in the House. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, on my motion, agreed not to act on sections 2 and 3, but to take the Senate bill with those two sections deleted. It was our intent not to endeavor to legislate with respect to the purposes of those sections, but to limit our consideration solely to section 1 of the Senate bill.

The deleted sections of the original Senate and House bills read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1156), is hereby further amended so as to add the following sentence after the first sentence thereof: "Such annual payments shall terminate at the end of the vessel's useful life for depreciation purposes as provided in section 607 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936."

SEC. 3. Any contract between the owner and the United States which was entered into prior to the date of enactment of this Act and which would be affected if the provisions of the amendment made by section 2 of this Act were applicable thereto, may, at the request of the owner be revised to be in accordance with the law as amended by this Act, with respect to such of the vessels covered thereby as may be designated by the applicant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of the RECORD, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], if I am not correct in my assumption that when we decided to delete sections 2 and 3 of the original version of S. 1172 and the identical House bill, was it not our intention to leave the situation with respect to repayment of construction-differential subsidies the same as it was when the statutory life for vessels was 20 years? In other words, all we did by the 1960 amendment was to extend the statutory life to 25 years, and today we are simply correcting the oversight of that amendment. Is that not so?

Mr. BONNER. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct. The gentleman understands that if we do not do this, they could be paying 110 percent.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I understand that.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman understands that they will be paying more than they should pay under the 1936 act?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The only question I wanted to clarify was the matter we discussed in the committee room at the time of the meeting and that was by this action we leave the determination of the length of time of payments the same as it was when the statutory life was 20 years?

Mr. BONNER. That is correct.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I have been informed that S. 1172 is being widely and incorrectly publicized as a bill to end the obligation of subsidized operators to make annual refund of construction subsidy when a vessel reaches the end of the 25-year life. It is said that some of the proponents of this bill hope to create a legislative history that Congress intends by this bill to terminate the proper refund to the Government.

I would like to corroborate and have the gentleman from Washington state if it is correct that, actually, the bill merely extends from 20 to 25 years the base upon which the formula is to be computed, thereby reducing but not terminating the refund?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct.

As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Bonner] indicated a moment ago, we failed to recognize in changing the statutory life of the vessels from 20 to 25 years that the change of repayment of one-twentieth per year to one-twenty-fifth per year resulted or could result in the repayment back of a larger sum than we intended, either in the 1936 act or in the 1960 amendment. This is designed to correct that oversight.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman and I think I have thereby brought the fact that no new interpretation could be made on the floor of the House during the consideration of this bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. The purpose of my asking the gentleman to yield was to associate myself with his remarks and that of the other gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] in stating that my understanding is exactly as they have stated it.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this bill in any way give aid, assistance, and comfort to Aristotle Onassis?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Not in any way whatsoever. It affects only subsidized lines which operate in domestic trade.

Mr. GROSS. So, it would have no effect one way or the other upon his nefarious operations?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. None whatsoever.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. I thought maybe speaking out of order would be proper since the headlines in the Washington Daily News seem to be out of order. I thought we would keep it in line with my talk.

The headline today states that "Powell Defers Junket to Puerto Rico After Republicans Attack It."

Mr. Speaker, pursuing Powell may be a very popular pastime for a few in this House, but in pursuing Powell let us not destroy the proper functions of the properly constituted committees of this House. In the words of one of the Members of this House, it was supposed to be a "pleasureful little journey." Another Member said the junket would hurt the image of a committee in the House.

I am at a loss to determine when it is a junket and when it is a real business trip of the House of Representatives, because the gentleman who said it would hurt the image still smells of the perfume of the leis on a trip to Honolulu paid for by the same committee which was sending this group into a troublespot that is a responsibility of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. You know, the gentleman who made that crack went to Hawaii. That was business?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. It could not possibly have been a junket.

Mr. DENT. I am one of these fellows who leaves every man to his own conscience.

Mr. HAYS. What do you do if you do not call it a junket?

Mr. DENT. Well, he calls it a business trip if he is on it.

I happened to have been placed on the Committee on Education and Labor when I came here as a Member of this Congress. I assure you I did not ask for this assignment because I had served my time in controversial work with 22 years in the Senate of Pennsylvania. I know that the Committee on Education and Labor is a double headache and a double controversy. I sought an easier berth and assignment when I came. In fact, I wanted to become a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, being a marine myself and having no fisheries, expecting there would be no controversy. However, I seem to have lit right in the middle of controversy. Today, as we have for the last years, we have witnessed small minds parading around here as advocates of the conscience of this Congress. Now, when you shoot at Adam Powell do not use a scatter gun, use a rifle. I have served 30 years in the work, and in those 30 years I have never had to apologize for one thing. I have done everything I planned to do, but this is the first time we are getting criticism for something that was supposed to have been planned.

Let me tell you what we were supposed to do.

Mr. HAYS. Did the gentleman mention the name of the fellow who went out to Hawaii to take a hula lesson?

Mr. DENT. As the gentleman knows, I have always stepped out of my way to help people. I have never backed up from a fight, but I have never tried to put my foot out to trip somebody. If this gentleman is here I am sure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres] will tell you what he was doing out there.

Mr. Chairman, his trip was at the suggestion of the Governor of Puerto Rico. There happens to be in Puerto Rico the Ramey Airbase, a SAC installation, with 3,800 schoolchildren who are supposed to be covered by impact legislation. This House knows the problems we have had with the impact legislation, and how we have tried to do what we could in order to get through legislation to bring in certain school directors all over the United States who are already 6 months overdue in the amounts of money provided under a law that expired in June.

During these last-day debates I, as the chairman of the committee, received from Ramey Airbase an urgent appeal because over 1,000 children living on that base were not provided for in the funds received by the Ramey Airbase.

If this House wants to restrict the actions of just one committee of this House so that its chairman and the members of the committee cannot investigate the validity of claims upon the Treasury of the United States, just proceed in doing what you are doing. I can assure you that it is no pleasurable junket to take a military plane from Andrews Field to Puerto Rico.

When we arrived at San Juan we were to take a helicopter and fly across the island to Ramey Airbase, have a 4-hour conference with the persons of the Government and the airbase involved, fly back to San Juan, P.R., rest overnight, and leave the next morning at 7 o'clock.

If my good friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] can have some fun doing that, I invite him to go along, and perhaps after this he will have a little more consideration for those who are trying to do their jobs in this Congress, instead of pursuing the gentleman who is not here to defend himself, but if he were, he would have the very reasons I have for calling this meeting. I can tell you they were valid.

Mr. Roosevelt was to go to the Virgin Islands because of a controversy down there over employing aliens without work cards while natives of the islands are unemployed. These things have to be taken care of. If you do not want us to, just tell us, because I would rather stay home anyhow.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. Mills]. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1172?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

VESSEL CONSTRUCTION RESERVE FUNDS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1698) to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the proviso at the end of section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided,* That until January 1, 1964, in addition to the extensions hereinbefore permitted, further extensions may be granted ending not later than December 31, 1964."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect December 31, 1963, or on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever date first occurs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded? If not, the question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1698?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, this bill would grant an additional year to the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. to proceed with the construction of vessels before payment of Federal taxes on the fund which has accumulated for that purpose under section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Steamship operators are exempted from the payment of Federal taxes on funds deposited in a vessel construction fund, which funds were derived from sales or losses of previously owned vessels. American-Hawaiian was one of the foremost intercoastal operators prior to World War II and subsequent to the war attempted to revive the trade with war-built vessels. This proved unsuccessful and the company made plans for the construction of modern vessels suited to the trade, which, for a number of reasons not under its control, they have been unable to start. Its most recent efforts entailed application for mortgage insurance for new vessels. After extended hearings, the Maritime Administrator indicated that the Administration would grant mortgage insurance on half the cost of such vessels and the company has presently revised its application in accordance with the suggestion of the Maritime Administrator.

The company will not be able to complete its application for action prior to the expiration of the present law and accordingly seeks an additional year.

The effect of this legislation will be to provide the Nation with three modern vessels which will in part revive the intercoastal trade. Since failure to construct the vessels will entail payment of taxes by the company at the expiration of the present law, I am convinced that passage of the bill will be beneficial.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 6868) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and ask that Senate amendments numbered 30, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, and 40 be laid before the House for consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 16, line 20, strike out "$121,930; for expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory, $1,600; in all,".

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Steed moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 22, line 2, strike out "$480,000" and insert "$442,500".

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Steed moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 27, line 22, strike out "$462,000" and insert "$454,500".

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Steed moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Is this an increase or decrease in appropriations? I am not able to keep up with this.

Mr. STEED. These are the same identical amendments that were approved when the conference report was before the House a few days ago. There is no change in the amounts.

Mr. GROSS. Do any of these amendments show an increase?

Mr. STEED. No, they are just exactly what was agreed upon by the conferees.

Mr. GROSS. That may be, but is any increase involved here?

Mr. STEED. These are Senate housekeeping items and we have to go through this formality of approving them in order to get this part of the conference report agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Is the so-called rule of amity between the two bodies involved in this proceeding at this time?

Mr. STEED. Not so far as these amendments that we have had so far are concerned. There is an amendment to be considered later, Senate amendment No. 40, where I will take the time to try to explain the matter to my colleagues.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 36: Page 28, line 23, strike out "$2,138,000" and insert "$2,099,000".

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Steed moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,119,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 29, line 14, strike out "$650,000" and insert "$670,000".

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Steed moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38. Page 33, line 9, strike out "$8,500,000" and insert "$3,550,000".

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 34, line 14, insert:

"SEC. 104. No part of any amount appropriated in this Act shall be available to finance, under authority of section 4167(a) of title 39, United States Code, the mailing and delivering of mail matter sent through the mails after October 2, 1962, with a simplified form of address under the franking privilege by any Member or Member-elect of the Congress to postal patrons, including those patrons on rural or star routes."

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 104. No part of any amount appropriated in this Act shall be available to finance, under authority of section 4167(a) of title 39, United States Code, the mailing and delivering of mail matter sent through the mails after October 2, 1962, with a simplified form of address under the franking privilege by any Member or Member-elect of the United States Senate to postal patrons, including those patrons on rural or star routes; nor shall any part of any amount appropriated in this Act be so available with respect to the mailing and delivering of such mail matter so addressed by any Member or Member-elect of the House of Representatives beyond the district which such Member or Member-elect was elected to represent."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, this amendment, relating to simplified addressing procedure, is the one that gave us the most difficulty in the legislative appropriation bill this year, and the proposed amendment in the pending motion is identical to what was agreed on in conference and approved by the House and rejected by the other body, except for the addition of a proviso that the use of the so-called simplified form of address for franked mail by Members or Members-elect of the House of Representatives would be restricted to the district from which a Member or Member-elect was elected to represent.

The history of this difficulty indicates that the opposition that caused the matter to come up in the first place when the other body had the bill before it, and which has caused some other very unpleasant difficulties in the time since, arises out of the fact that in those years when the use of this sort of addressing arrangement was permitted there were some abuses. I believe that the matters, as stated by Members of the other body in their consideration of the conference report which they rejected, have merit and that, therefore, to show its own good faith and to justify having this very necessary facility for Members of the House, the House ought to adopt this restriction, because any legitimate purpose for which this franking privilege could be used will be permitted in this amendment as presented in the pending motion.

It is my hope and belief that this is the fairest and most generous way that this matter can be attended to and that, having met what I think are the well-founded fears of Members of the other body, that it may be the means through which we can resolve the difficulties we are faced with and thus be able to dispose of the pending bill.

Since the first adoption of the restrictive amendment in the other body on this subject a great deal of newspaper, editorial, and other criticism has been heaped on Congress, especially the House of Representatives, about this so-called junk mail, which was the derisive title applied to this. I would like the RECORD to show that this privilege was taken away from the entire Congress in the bill last year and that from that time to this there has not been one single piece of that type of mail to go off Capitol Hill. I think it is about time that the press of the country found out what is being talked about is something that is not and has not been done for some 14 or 15 months. All the criticisms that the House has had to suffer these months have been most unfair and not founded on fact. A legitimate use for which the privilege of patron mail was so largely used back in the years when it was available was to distribute the farm bulletin catalog lists on the rural routes of the country. I do not know why people insist on calling that "junk." The first money and the first authority to issue and publish these bulletins for the benefit of American farmers and other American people who wanted to use them started in 1896, and from that day to the present the Congress has made available, I am advised, more than $200 million that has gone into the experimentation and all of the research and work in the publication of this long list of very valuable bulletins published by the Department of Agriculture and made available for distribution throughout the country by the Members of both Houses of the Congress.

No system to get this material into the hands of the American taxpayers who paid for it, and who want it, and can use it has ever been devised that is as economical and as justifiable and as feasible as the simplified address approach. It is the most effective—and it has been testified that it is the least costly.

When we appropriated in the annual legislative appropriation bill to reimburse the Post Office Department for the use of frank, the billing for that is based on a very accurate accounting system maintained by the Department. They charge Congress the actual cost, not the postage rate, and in their statements it is very evident that the cost of patron mail is just a fraction of the cost of any other type of franked mail. As I recall the figure, franked mail with a simplified address accounts for less than 1 percent of the total of such mail. Thus it is not a mountainous matter in volume but the right to so address is important.

The charge that the use of this privilege is expensive to the American taxpayer is simply not true. The Department testified that it costs less to handle patron mail.

Another fine use to which this privilege was devoted in years when it was available was to distribute questionnaires. I think anybody who has fully studied the matter knows that there is not one other thing that Members of Congress do of which the people back home approve more or participate in with more interest than these questionnaires, which are one of the best means devised for Members of Congress to advise themselves on how the people back home feel on various public issues. Those who want to call that "junk" and who try to create a situation that makes it more and more difficult for the Members of Congress, laboring under the handicaps and burdens that they have to get the opportunity to effectively keep in touch with the folks back home—well, I just do not understand them. We are not talking about something that is going to cost a lot of money. But unless Members of the House have this privilege and are allowed to use it there is no reasonable, logical, or economical way that these very important functions can be adequately carried out.

The fact that there were abuses in years gone by is something no one wants to condone or to defend. But we do recognize that it has happened. We have here what we believe is a reasonably certain means of seeing that it does not happen again.

I do not know any legitimate objection that anyone, anywhere, could make to this once this amendment in this form has been made effective. I hope that those in the other body who are dealing with this matter will agree that this does meet the situation.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma, the chairman of the subcommittee, on an outstanding job on this bill and particularly in the area he was just describing. There is one other matter in connection with the mailing privilege that I hope in the future the gentleman may give some attention to and that is the practice of various Members of the House of Representatives of making a speech to some organization or group who may prepare canned speeches for them and then insert those speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and mail them to all of those members all over the country. I think it is a very bad practice. I do not appreciate the practice of some of the other Members of Congress who make some silly little speech to a bunch of people paying dues to some organization, that is not necessary, and then sending these canned speeches out into my district and my State. It does not further the purpose of a Member of Congress in serving either his district or his State. I hope that this sort of thing will be given some attention by the gentleman and his committee in the future.

Mr. STEED. I might say to the gentleman that while I can agree with him about disliking this sort of thing, if this type thing is done where a name and address is on the envelope it would not be involved in the pending issue.

Mr. BASS. I understand that.

Mr. STEED. The only way I know that matter can be dealt with would be through the legislative committees writing an amendment to the basic franking privilege law itself.

Mr. BASS. I understand it is not in this area, but I think something should be done about it in the future.

Mr. STEED. I might say to the gentleman that the bill this year contains the funds to reimburse the Post Office Department for the cost of carrying franked mail off Capitol Hill for fiscal 1962—we reimburse after the fact—and that would include whatever may be involved in the sort of thing he talks about. But that is fully addressed mail. That is not this simplified address-type mail.

Mr. BASS. I understand.

Mr. STEED. Nothing in this bill or in this whole controversy would have any effect on fully addressed franked mail.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Does this special privilege that those of us in rural districts have apply to the general public? In other words, can anyone send out "occupant" mail, or is this a special privilege for rural Members of Congress?

Mr. STEED. The patron mail privilege which is available at the post office is available to anyone who wants to pay the rate. If this motion is adopted, patron mail could be mailed to anyone in a Member's district, whether they lived in the city or on the rural routes. There have been times in the past when only the rural routes were included, and there have been times in the past when both city routes and rural routes have been included. The idea here is to make it available to both city routes and rural routes throughout the district of the Member.

Mr. DOLE. If the gentleman will yield further, can anyone place "occupant" on the mail and have it delivered, or is this a special privilege, again, for a Member of Congress?

Mr. STEED. It just gives a Member of Congress the right to do whatever everybody else can already do if they pay the rate that is charged for that sort of service.

Mr. DOLE. If the gentleman will yield further, there are some in rural areas who feel that this is an affront to the intelligence of our farm people, and if we did not put a name on it, we should not send it out.

Mr. STEED. Of course, I can see that an abuse of this privilege can bring about that sort of thing and that some people could have that reaction. But we are primarily dealing here with two types of things which I think the gentleman will find the people who receive them will understand. Take, for example, a blanket distribution of a catalog list of farmers' bulletins or a questionnaire. That is the sort of thing where the name comes into it after the recipient indicates his interest in communicating with a Member about it. It is the only way they have found so that the average rank-and-file citizen in the district gets on the mailing list. And you get full coverage—which is precisely what you should get. It is the only way of having any contact with his Member or to have an opportunity to receive any of these publications for which his taxes have been used and to which he is entitled and that he very much wants.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. STEED. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. As I understand it, there is nothing in the law to require a Member of Congress to send out this type of mail. It just gives him the privilege, if he so desires; is that correct?

Mr. STEED. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will yield further, if any farmer in his district or if the voters in his district disapproved of it, he would not have to use this method; is that correct?

Mr. STEED. Yes, of course.

Mr. Speaker, I feel I owe this to the House and I would like for the Members of the House to grant me a personal indulgence. When the original action was taken by the other body I felt that the rule of comity had been violated and that the House had been affronted when the other body took action which in virtually so many words said that it had a right to tell the House what it could and could not do. You recall the committee in the other body urged that the action not be taken but was overruled on the floor.

I am sorry that in my efforts to protect the House and its privileges and its rights that I have been somewhat inept. After 4 months of trying to find a way, behind the scenes, to solve this difficulty and bring back comity and some order where we could get along and to make sure that the House maintained coequal status in the Congress, I suppose I got a little impatient and said some things that I now regret, these remarks being overplayed, distorted, and otherwise bandied about by our friends in the press. They have had the total effect of making me about as unpopular a person with the Members of the other body as it is possible for anyone to become.

Mr. Speaker, while I want to be fair and admit that I apparently did do grievous injury to them and believe that turnabout is fair play, I will say that I think the way they dealt with the matter on the floor of the other body more recently does in some measure somewhat equalize the debt.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. STEED. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I just want to say that I have been with my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], through all of this, although I did not participate in any of the interviews with the press. But I want to say that the gentleman conducted himself as a gentleman.

His loyalty to this House is unquestioned. I think we will get through this and I believe the matter of respect between the two Houses of the Congress has been bettered. There is more respect for the House now than there was 3 or 4 years ago. So, do not let anyone have any un-Christmaslike feelings toward your neighbor and colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. TOM STEED.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. I do want to say, while I admit that perhaps the grievance is somewhat justified, there is still the fact that on two occasions the other body has affronted this House of Representatives. I believe the House of Representatives has observed strictly the rule of comity throughout. There is no ground upon which the other body in this question can hold a grievance against the House of Representatives except that grievance that stemmed from the fact I happened to be a Member of the House. What I said and did was away from the House, and on my own responsibility, and I hope that our friends in the other body will not go along trying to punish the House of Representatives on my account.

Mr. Speaker, the absolute necessity for the two Houses of Congress to get along with each other makes this rule of comity important. It is something that will immediately impress itself on any Member who makes a study of the long years this Congress has existed. Problems of relations came up in the very early days of the Congress and almost destroyed it, before it got started. Down through the years problems have arisen but it has always been found that the two Houses could function on a coequal basis with each House doing its own housekeeping and staying in its own backyard and remaining accountable to the people who elect us for what we do or do not do. The purpose of this whole argument is to keep it that way.

I am sorry that any actions of mine or any words of mine have created a situation where our effort to get back to that basis has been handicapped; but I do hope we will in the new year and in the new session get on a new basis of being coequal and in comity with each other. We have learned from this that we will have a better understanding, and we want to keep it that way in the future. After all, this is but one of many bills on which we must cooperate each year.

There are many, many matters that get to be very difficult if we do not bring them up under the rule of comity. The sooner we get back to that and the sooner we find a way to settle our differences, the better it is going to be for everybody. The only victory that can come out of this a victory for every Member of both bodies. If there is a defeat in it, it will be a defeat for every Member of both bodies.

The plan we have today is fair, it is right, it is in line with the rule of comity.

It deals with a subject that is of the greatest need and importance to this House of Representatives. This far I am urging the House to go. If any more is demanded I personally will not agree to it. I will never be party to any action that makes this House of Representatives an institution subservient to anybody or to the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

AID THROUGH AUTOS

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the present difficulties of foreign assistance legislation emphasize the need for imagination and a new approach in this field. Our balance-of-payments problems and our lack of persuasiveness with vacillating foreign leaders has roused natural questioning about the objectives and procedures of the foreign aid program.

Eliot Janeway, the noted economist, has come forward with a novel and striking suggestion for achieving foreign policy objectives while, at the same time, taking steps to stimulate a sluggish area of the American economy.

He has suggested the export to undeveloped countries, through U.S. Government purchase, of American used cars and trucks. While bolstering up the American economy it would help to solve the transportation and commercial bottlenecks in countries in the earlier stages of development. I have visited some of these countries, myself, and have seen the character of their automotive rolling stock. I can testify, therefore, to the crying need for automobiles of this type. Even in such a relatively developed country as Argentina, the average age of automobiles is 15 years.

Mr. Janeway's article, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Monday, December 16, 1963, is hereafter included:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 16, 1963]

GIFTS OF USED AUTOS PROPOSED AS MEANS OF FOREIGN AID

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK.—The auto boom is providing solid evidence that what is good for General Motors Corp. and its two resourceful competitors isn't too bad for this country. Prosperity always depends upon prosperous leaders, and the auto boom has been leading the U.S. economy.

Two years ago, banner car sales were cheerfully welcomed. Last year, the sustained level of auto sales was as impressive as it was surprising. Now the third consecutive year of auto boom is well underway.

Two great car years back to back are a startling phenomenon. Three in a row break a jinx, and suggest that stable automobile prosperity—with all the dynamics of economic leadership which it brings—may be within our grasp: That is, given a bit of leadership and help from Government.

Any discussion of what the U.S. Government may be free to do by way of leading or helping the economy must reckon with present worries and doubts about the dollar and debt, both public and private. No question about it, the U.S. Treasury has been running out of spending money and, therefore, out of giving money as well.

Thus, the uncompromising attack led by Senator MORSE, of Oregon, against cash foreign aid was timely; and it expressed a general uneasiness towards the approach to foreign aid by way of spending. What's needed is not more money, but new ideas and new techniques.

The United States has taken on a great many responsibilities abroad, in the countries with less-than-mature economies which are on the fence, ready to choose between the East or the West depending on the deal. So far we have discharged these responsibilities, on the economic side, by sending cash.

But this has put us into a serious money bind.

Cash disbursements by Government do not represent the only way to meet our responsibilities and to rise to our opportunities in the world beyond our borders. Our unprecedented domestic auto boom—pinpoints a practical new idea and a workable new technique.

Exports of our used cars and trucks offer an obvious way to solve the nagging problem posed by the U.S. imbalance of payments with foreign countries and the resulting outflow of gold and pressure on the Treasury. We can't expect to do this on a straight commercial basis—as we did in the different world of the thirties.

But since we are committed to help underdeveloped and on-the-fence nations, we can help with industrial products, instead of simply giving more money away. What more appropriate American way of helping then by giving cars and trucks?

The strong-arm men operating juntas abroad, as well as the political opportunities, can't very well deposit used cars and trucks in personal Swiss bank accounts. Our used cars and trucks would do good in countries in need of foreign aid.

Giving them away abroad, in lieu of cash, would help our auto industry to do well at home. For the export of used cars would buoy the domestic demand for new cars. And thus keep Detroit's boom going.

THE BALDWIN HILLS DISASTER

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the disaster in the city of Los Angeles over this past weekend has been cause for alarm, but has also proved the worth and efficiency of many public agencies.

The Los Angeles City and County Fire and Police Departments have shown tremendous ability in the face of flood and devastation. The extremely low death rate is a tribute to the work of these dedicated public servants.

My district has suffered damage from the dam burst, but my colleague, Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, represents the district that has absorbed most of the destruction. Congressman ROOSEVELT has rushed home to do whatever he can to aid the victims of this natural disaster and I will join him in an appeal for Federal assistance if this should be needed.

The first cracks and leaks in the Baldwin Hills Dam were discovered just befor noon on Saturday, December 14. Immediately, local police agencies began to alert the residents in the surrounding area and urge them to evacuate their homes. Some residents refused to leave the area, and apparently could not accept the seriousness of the situation. Local authorities began the process of draining the reservoir and hopes were high that a disaster could be prevented. However, at 3:38 p.m. the dam broke and flood waters raced into residential districts.

An urgent call went out for helicopters to rescue families marooned on rooftops, and the response was heartening. I would like to commend the public and private agencies that so quickly filled this need. They were U.S. Marine Corps, El Toro, Calif.; U.S. Coast Guard, 11th district; Los Angeles County Fire Department; Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department; Los Angeles City Fire Department; Los Angeles City Police Department; Jet Propulsion Laboratory; and, National Helicopter Service.

While the helicopters were busy above the ground many public agencies were working frantically on the ground to remove people from the danger area, and to save property wherever possible. These workers deserve our attention too, and I would like to cite the following agencies for their dedication to duty: Los Angeles City Police Department; Los Angeles City Fire Department; Los Angeles City Department of Water and Power; Los Angeles City Department of Public Works; and the Red Cross.

We can be sure that many more deaths would have been caused if these workers had not been on the job, and we can assume that the damage to property would have been much greater. The total to date of 100 homes destroyed and approximately 1,500 homes damaged to some extent is incredibly light and speaks for itself.

Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty intends to hold a full-scale inquiry into the causes behind the collapse of the Baldwin Hills Dam, and this is as it should be. Another inquiry is to be held by the California State Assembly. Speaker of the Assembly Jesse Unruh is extremely concerned by the fact that police have no clear authority to evacuate an area when disaster threatens, or to prevent sightseers from rushing in, and this may be an aspect of the Los Angeles disaster that applies to many other communities across the country.

Helicopter crews and groundworkers risked their lives, in some cases, to rescue people who had ignored earlier police warnings to clear the area. It is fortunate indeed that no lives were lost in these rescue missions—they could very easily have ended in unnecessary tragedies.

What authority should police and fire officials have when danger threatens? Does a private citizen have the right to ignore clear warnings from responsible authorities? These and other questions are now being debated in California, and we can imagine how much more important these questions will be if our Nation is suddenly attacked with nuclear weapons.

The Baldwin Hills disaster has proved again that a city can rely on its public and volunteer agencies when the need arises. If, in the aftermath, we can tighten our protection and clarify the obligations and responsibilities of the private citizen we will have accomplished a great deal. I believe that other cities, both large and small, can learn from this experience, and they should study the case at hand with close attention. Learning from our mistakes now can result in our saving thousands of lives at some later date.

ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, ever since 1951 the Arab League has maintained an economic boycott of U.S. firms with branches in Israel or doing business with Israel. On December 16, 1963, the New York World-Telegram and Sun published the following list of 84 American companies which have been officially boycotted by one or more of the Arab States:

(From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Dec. 16, 1963)

LIST OF U.S. FIRMS BOYCOTTED BY ARABS

Here is the list of American enterprises officially boycotted by one or more of the Arab States:

Adams Carbide Corp.
Air Electric Corp.
American Biltrite Rubber Co.
American Latex Products Co. (California.)
American Levant Machinery Corp., Construction Aggregates, Chicago.
American Palestine Trading Corp.
William Bernstein Co.
Bulova Watch Co. and its parent, Bulova Foundation.
Cal Amer. Inc.
Chemical Construction Corp.
Clinto Institute, Los Angeles.
Clinton Co., Los Angeles.
Continental Import & Export Corp.
Dawes Laboratories, Inc.
Dayton Rubber Co.
Dow Chemical Co.
Elco Corp.
Elliott Import Corp.
Eliot Knitwear Corp.
Emerson Radio & Phonograph Co.
Empire Brushes, Inc.
Fairbanks Morse & Co.
Fairbanks Whitney.
Firestone International.
General Shoe Corp.
General Tire & Rubber Co.
George Ehart Co.
Glazier Corp.
Garcia & Dias, Inc. (maritime firm).
Hassenfeld Bros. Pencils Co.
Helena Rubenstein, Inc.
Helene Curtis International.
Herman Hollander Inc.
Home Insurance Co.
Hudson Pulp & Paper Co.
Imperial Chemical Co.
Import From Israel Co. (New York).
International Business Machine World Trade Corp.
International Latex Co.
Israel Coin Distributor Corp.
Israel Philatelic Agency In America, Inc.
Jacques Torczyner & Co.
Kaiser Industries (automobiles only).
Eli Lilly International Corp.
The Lock Joint Pipe Co.
M. Lowenstein & Son, Inc.
Mack Truck Co.
Herbert Marmoreck & Son Co.
Merck, Sharp & Dohme.
Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp.
Miles Laboratories.
Minkus Publications, Inc. (New York).
Mitenberg & Samton, Inc.
Moller Dee Textile Corp.
National Plastics Co.
P. E. C. Diamond Corp.
Philco.
Philipp Bros.
Pilot Radio Corp.
The Plough Sale Corp.
Pratt & Whitney Co. (Conn.).
Ragosin Industries & Beaunit Mills, Inc.
Revlon, Inc.
Re-Search, Inc.
Rothley, Inc.
Schering Corp.
Shell Chemical Co.
Sinclair & Valentine, Inc.
Sol Manufacturing Co. (Jamaica, N.Y.).
Sonneborn Associates Petroleum Corp.
O. L. Sonneborn & Sons.
Fred Stern Co., New York City.
Studebaker-Packard Corp.
Tarco Pharmaceutical Co.
Tel-Aviv Importing Corp.
Topps Chewing Gum.
Union Bagcamp Paper Co.
United States Near East Laboratories.
United States Wall Board Machinery Co.
Vintage Wines, Inc.
Vulcan-Hart Corp.
Wasserstein Bros.
Willys-Overland Corp.
Winthrop Products, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, this Arab boycott of American firms is a direct affront not only to members of the Jewish faith but to all Americans. Since I have been in Congress, I have brought this matter to the attention of the State Department on numerous occasions and have received assurances that in quiet ways the Department was attempting to end the boycott. I was, therefore, shocked to read in today's New York Times that State Department officials admitted:

> The State Department had entered into negotiations with the Arab nations to assist American concerns that wish to be taken off the boycott list. These negotiations have been undertaken at the request of companies that assert they have no direct dealings with Israel, the officials explained.

This report means that the U.S. Government grants de facto recognition to the Arab League boycott. Instead of bringing pressure to bear to end the boycott, the Government is facilitating it.

Congress has gone on record many times expressing its view that Arab discrimination, including the boycott, is repugnant to the United States. Only yesterday we did so again in the foreign aid appropriation bill, section 106 of which declared:

> It is the sense of Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is repugnant to our principles; and in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this title these principles shall be applied as the President may determine.

The willingness of the Department of State to recognize the Arab boycott is in direct contradiction to this expression of Congressional intent and a similar section in the foreign aid authorization bill.

Today I call upon the Department of State for a full explanation of its willingness to recognize the Arab boycott. The Department owes the American people a detailed report of its activities in regard to this affront to the American people.

MORE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF ANTIDUMPING ACT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago today I introduced a bill designed to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921 by providing for its more effective operation, and I had the privilege at that time of presenting before the House of Representatives the reasons which I felt were compelling as to why such a bill was vitally needed. Today I wish to reaffirm the views I expressed at that time and to stress once again the importance to this country of enacting constructive and responsible legislation which will help insure that international trade is conducted without injurious price discrimination.

It has become clear that time does not permit consideration of antidumping legislation by the Committee on Ways and Means before the close of this 1st session of the 88th Congress. It is my firm hope, however, that when we reconvene next January a high priority item on our agenda of the unfinished business which merits early attention and action by the Congress will be remedial antidumping legislation.

Six months ago, when I introduced H.R. 7064, I joined with a number of my distinguished colleagues in sponsoring this moderate legislation. As I pointed out at the time, a similar bill was cosponsored on a bipartisan basis by 27 Senators. Since then many Members have introduced identical bills and have expressed deep interest in achieving the early enactment of sound and workable legislation in this vital area of our trade policy. One of my fellow members of the Committee on Ways and Means who has lent enthusiastic support for this objective is the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG], who joined me in urging our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help champion this cause.

As a result of the surge of interest shown in this subject, I should like to point out with pleasure that in the House of Representatives, as of this date, a total of 50 Members—26 Republicans and 24 Democrats—have introduced bills with identical provisions. It is of special interest that 10 are Members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

During the intervening months since I introduced my bill, I have been concerned about certain developments in connection with the recent administration of the Antidumping Act. Moreover, I know that this feeling is shared by many interested, knowledgeable and objective individuals both in and out of Congress. It appears that some modification of the proposed amendment which has received such substantial bipartisan support will be needed to provide adequate guidelines for future determinations by the Department of the Treasury and the U.S. Tariff Commission. In any event, it is my expectation that this subject will be given close scrutiny during the next several weeks so that, when specific modifications are deemed advisable, they can be presented for consideration both to those who have introduced identical bills and those additional Members of Congress who have been mindful of the need to further modify or strengthen some provisions of our antidumping legislation.

It is evident that sponsors of legislation aimed at plugging loopholes and improving procedures cannot overlook the administrative interpretations which an act receives. Especially is this the case when there is a question of whether those interpretations at times may have frustrated the purpose of the act and tended to contravene the intent of Congress. I alluded to the latter point in my remarks to this body about the Antidumping Act when I introduced my amendment, and I believe that they merit reiteration. For all of the foregoing reasons, hearings on antidumping as early as feasible in the next session by the Committee on Ways and Means should prove both enlightening and salutary.

I should like, in the same spirit, to conclude these remarks by underlining the conviction I expressed 6 months ago today:

> Clearly, remedial action to curb injurious price discrimination in world trade is not a partisan matter. It is, on the other hand, a significant issue on which groups with widely divergent interests can and, in fact, have joined in efforts to stamp out its cancerous effects. Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, capital and labor, domestic manufacturers and importers—in fact, all Americans devoted to the perpetuation of the private enterprise system upon which our economy has flourished—should press for * * * a sound and workable measure of this type which will improve the effective operation of the Antidumping Act.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, may I first express my appreciation to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] for his outstanding and diligent efforts in spurring the enactment of legislation which is of such importance to our economy. I should like, also, to acknowledge his thoughtful remarks about any cooperation that I may have provided.

As the gentleman from Tennessee pointed out, I joined him 6 months ago in working toward amending our Antidumping Act to provide for its more effective operation. I should like to associate myself with his remarks today and I intend to pursue this objective with him and other interested colleagues at the outset of the next session of the 88th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, as a fellow member of the Committee on Ways and Means with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] who also has introduced the proposed amendment to the Antidumping Act, I wish to stress with them the need for enacting such legislation at the earliest possible date.

I have no doubt that, among the rising tide of imports into the State of Massachusetts, an increasing proportion are imported and sold at dumped prices. This disturbing matter has prompted me to press for corrective measures to relieve the damage which has affected the interests of both industry and labor. A situation which is true not only in Massachusetts, the unfair trade practice of dumping foreign products and merchandise in this country at prices less than in the exporting country threatens the livelihood of thousands of Americans.

I join with my distinguished colleagues in their determination to see sound and workable antidumping legislation enacted in the next session of Congress.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, as one who has joined with nine of his colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means in introducing proposed legislation to improve and strengthen the operation of the Antidumping Act, I endorse the views expressed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE].

Clearly, the continued dumping of goods in this country at less than fair value must be stopped. Otherwise, we face a disturbing and serious threat to fundamental principles inherent in our private enterprise system.

I am convinced that congressional action is sorely needed to clarify the U.S. position on dumping prior to any international negotiations at which we may become committed to ground rules that are unpalatable and unworkable. I trust that many Members of both sides of the aisle share this belief and will lend their efforts in the next session, as I will, to achieving this objective.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Times I read of a moving picture documentary made by two television men as a project for the U.S. Information Agency entitled, "Let Us Continue." This is to be sent throughout the world to explain President Johnson's position on several crucial issues. The article continues and says, "To indicate the harmonious relationship of different faiths in the United States, there was a shot of Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish clergymen. The rabbi was ordered deleted because of possible Arab objections."

I would like to know who is responsible for giving this cowardly order.

If we are going to portray a true picture of the United States to the world, we must show what we truly are. We must not try to curry favor by portraying a false picture; and we do not want as our friends those who would be attracted by this false picture. We do not want them. We do not need them. We will not have them. We stand as one people.

A failure by whoever is responsible for this foolish act is evidence that he does not understand our true heritage; and it is this heritage we are trying to portray to the world.

If this is the agency of our Government that is charged with the duty of telling the world about our spirit and our heritage, which involves our religious freedom, and they so easily fail, I fear for the image we are portraying to the world in these perilous times. This act is wrong and must be corrected.

After reading this item, I called the U.S. Information Agency and was told in behalf of Mr. Donald Wilson, the Acting Director, that there was no censorship exerted by USIA, nor is it true that one of three religious scenes were dropped. I was further advised that there never was any such scene incorporating members of any clergy except that which portrayed the funeral of our departed President Kennedy.

I hope the statement of Mr. Wilson's office is correct.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR DECEMBER 18

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to revise the program previously announced.

I desire to announce that we have been advised that three conference reports will be called up tomorrow, the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and H.R. 2513, from the Committee on Ways and Means, dealing with marking requirements for certain new packages of imported articles to indicate the country of origin.

The Committee on House Administration has advised that it will call up the following resolutions:

House Resolution 560, which comes from the Subcommittee on Printing, and has to do with a new seal and press for the use of the House of Representatives.

House Resolution 568, which has to do with the Committee on Education and Labor.

House Resolution 576, relating to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

House Resolution 588, with respect to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Can the gentleman give us any information as to when we might expect action on the foreign aid appropriation bill in the other body, and if action is had there, what we might expect here? Particularly can he give us any information as to the prospective time for a sine die adjournment? I have been asked by many Members about it. I recognize the difficulty of making any prediction.

Mr. ALBERT. I wish I could make a definite statement on that, but I cannot advise the gentleman when we will be ready to send the bill to conference. However, I can advise the gentleman that after conferring with the majority leader of the other body it is still our intention to adjourn sine die on Friday, December 20.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly hope that can come about, because many Members on this side of the aisle have already made their arrangements.

I would just make this further observation, which maybe is without my responsibility, but if the foreign aid appropriations bill cannot be resolved in the conference by Friday then it would be my idea we had better take it up first thing when we come back in January.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point to explain my absence on rollcall No. 240 and how I would have voted thereon if I had been present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was necessary for me to be in Pittsburgh to serve my constituents on Friday, December 13, 1963, when roll No. 240 was called on the final passage of the conference report on H.R. 9139, the Military Construction Act of 1964. I consulted with some 60 people in 2 very full days on Friday and Saturday, on firm appointments made ahead of time.

As the bill was noncontroversial, passing with 300 votes, there being only 4 votes in opposition, I was having personal interviews in my Pittsburgh congressional office with constituents, as well as interviews with young men and their parents, who are applying for current appointments to the U.S. Military Academies, from our congressional district.

Had I been present, I would have voted for the conference report on the bill, H.R. 9139, on roll No. 240.

REPORT ON AEROSPACE EDUCATION IN NEW JERSEY

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to report again to my esteemed colleagues about aerospace education in New Jersey. In each of my earlier reports, I urged that such a program was a vital need in all of the 50 States of our Nation, and voiced concern about the inadequacy of our plans to ready the youth of America for their roles in the aerospace age.

At the same time, I pointed out that a medium already existed for this task: The U.S. Air Force's aerospace education program for schoolteachers—through its civilian auxiliary, the Civil Air Patrol, with the assistance of its Reserve component. On all three occasions, I documented this opinion by reporting the progress that had been made in our New Jersey program. Now, in December 1963, Mr. Speaker, I am privileged again to report on this topic, and I am happy to say that we can report impressive progress. We have initiated a plan that could—on a national scale—give the tremendous acceleration needed to educate all of our people to the critical overtones of aerospace technology.

In my earlier reports, the emphasis was one of national defense, or survival. This need has not, in my opinion, been altered by events since my last report. But now, perhaps another can be added —one which might have a more tangible, immediate significance for some. I refer to our growing problem of the technically unqualified unemployed. This problem can never be resolved solely by retraining programs for adults. We must strike at the roots of the problem—by reorienting our youth before they go out into their vocations. In a free society such as ours, science can advance only to the extent its free citizens may choose to follow that demanding discipline as their lifework. Authoritative studies indicate that creation of facilities is not the full answer—that it does not result in a production of interest among students—and that a need exists for early motivation.

There can be little dispute today—6 years after Sputnik I first orbited the earth—that a large pool of science-trained youth is necessary to our society. It follows, then, that the desire for science study must be cultivated at an early age. To be specific, in the elementary and secondary grades of our formal education system. It is my considered opinion that a broad program of aerospace education for elementary and secondary school teachers, themselves, is an essential primary phase toward this overall objective. In the hope that a complete report on such a program will encourage others to quickly shake off their self-indulgent inertia and indifference, I submit the following facts, about the fourth year of this program.

In general, the fourth inservice orientation workshop conducted for public school teachers in Bergen County, N.J., followed the format developed since 1959. Its success was due, in large measure, to the continued sponsorship and support by the Bergen County Education Association and the New Jersey Wing, Civil Air Patrol. Based on a study of past experiences, the workshop committee decided to make several significant changes from the preceding projects. The first was to provide instruction in actual classroom use of knowledge and materials made available by the workshop. The committee also defined the program as essentially for teachers in grades 6 through 9.

As in past years, the workshop was comprised of 10 sessions, starting on March 6 and closing on May 15. Held again at the Paramus High School, in Paramus, N.J., these sessions included the following topics and guest speakers:

First session, March 6: "Status of Flight and Space Technology," by Mr. Hiram Haggett, education services officer, Northeast office, National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Chairman, Mr. George Hodgins, superintendent of schools, Paramus.

Second session, March 6: "Basic Theoretical Space Research," Dr. A. G. W. Camerson, Research Staff, Institute for Space Studies, NASA. Chairman, Mr. George Hodgins.

Third and fourth sessions, March 27: NASA spacemobile. Demonstration by Alfred Hulstrunk. Chairman, Dr. Mark Shedd, superintendent of schools, Englewood.

Fifth and sixth sessions, April 3: "The Economics of Flight to Main Street," produced in cooperation with the National Aeronautics Association. Chairman, Dr. J. Allan Campbell, superintendent of schools, Westwood Consolidated District.

Seventh and eighth sessions, April 10: "Use of Aerospace Materials in the Classroom," Dr. Robert E. Krebs, U.S. Office of Education; "Science," with Mr. John Callow, regional science coordinator, Valhalla, N.Y.; "Social Studies," with Mr. Robert E. Lewis, Springer Junior High School, Wilmington, Del. Chairman, Mr. Frank Hurley, superintendent, northern valley regional district and president, Bergen County Dept. of School Superintendents.

Ninth and tenth sessions, May 15: "Use of Aerospace Materials in the Math Classroom," Dr. Richard M. Harbeck and Miss Margaret Dunn, lieutenant colonel, New Jersey wing, CAP, and junior high school teacher, Bloomfield, N.J.; "Aerospace Literature and Teaching Material," James C. Sandilos, superintendent, Hopewell Township and vice president, National Aerospace Education Association; panel discussion on "The Teacher's Role in Aerospace Education," conducted by Dr. Richard M. Harbeck, with Mr. Sandilos, Miss Dunn; Miss Patricia Reid, School No. 5, Teaneck; Miss Laura M. Trexler, president, New Jersey Personnel and Guidance Association, and Miss Gladys Francis, physics teacher, Dwight Morrow High School, Englewood. Chairman, Mr. Eli Kane, superintendent of schools, Lyndhurst. Dr. Harold T. Shafer, superintendent of schools, Wyckoff, and general chairman, Aerospace Workshop, closed the program with "Final Summary of Workshop Accomplishments."

Undoubtedly, the highlight of the entire program was the panel forum on "The Economics of Flight to Main Street," held on April 3. For this double session, the teacher-registrants were joined by many business and civic leaders to serve as a grassroots reactor group. In addition to preparing teachers to guide our youth toward their place in our highly technological society, the Bergen County workshop served a second function: that of a sounding board for this newly conceived program for orienting the American public to the impact of aviation today.

Unfortunately the full potential of this town hall forum was not realized because of inadequate planning and coordination. In contrast, the contributions of the nine panel members were outstanding. Mr. Oscar Bakke, assistant administrator, eastern region, Federal Aviation Agency, deserves a note of special praise. During an aerial tour of the Greater New York metropolitan area, Mr. Bakke gave an excellent inflight orientation talk to a 60-man reactor panel. Later, as keynoter for the auditorium session, he summarized the aviation health and impacts on this area.

Other members of the panel were Hon. Robert T. Murphy, Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board; Brig. Gen. Joseph P. Adams, retired, Association of Local Transport Airlines; Mrs. Katherine A. Brick, National All-Womens Transcontinental Competition; Mr. William J. Schulte, Federal Aviation Agency; Mr. William A. Whitesell, Flying "W" Ranch, Medford, N.J.; Mr. Paul J. Rogers, Ozark Airlines, Air Transport Association; Mr. John A. Pope, National Business Aircraft Association; Mr. Gerald C. Merchant, Jr., National Association State Aviation Officers; Mr. Lincoln Walsh, National Pilots Association.

We acknowledge, with thanks, the cooperation of Eastern Air Lines for generously providing the jet airliner which was used for the aerial tour during this session.

The splendid cooperation that we have enjoyed from resource agencies, since our first workshop in 1959, reached its peak in this project. This was best typified last January, when representatives of the Government and private aerospace groups met at my office. These people agreed to support the workshop committee's requests for lecturers and demonstration units; further, they generously functioned as an advisory committee and reviewed the overall program proposed by our educator committee. Included in this group were: For the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—NASA—Mr. John Sims, Chief, Educational Services Branch, and Mr. Lloyd H. Aronson; for the Federal Aviation Agency—Mr. Ralph R. Lovering, air education officer; for National Aeronautics Association—Mr. Louis Davis; for U.S. Office of Education—Dr. Richard M. Harbeck, specialist for aerospace education.

Mr. Sims' personal support of our workshops dates back to 1961, when he first joined NASA's educational staff. I am confident that the advice and cooperation he and his associates have extended our group are typical of their efforts to encourage and develop public knowledge of our national space program.

Dr. Harbeck not only had an active role as a lecturer in the program, he also assisted in structuring this workshop as well as some of our other activities which I will cover later in this report. The transition to specific classroom application, mentioned earlier, was implemented by Dr. Harbeck and Dr. Robert E. Krebs, also of the U.S. Office of Education.

During the past year, two new activities were introduced—both in Englewood, N.J. It is fitting that Englewood be the site for these pioneering efforts in aerospace education—as it was here, at Dwight Morrow High School, that Comdr. Walter Schirra, one of our first astronauts, went to school.

The first of these projects was an experiment in presenting aerospace education to an organized adult education group. It served as a pilot operation in development of local and regional resources—to augment the national agencies which have been supporting our programs. In addition, it provided the base for a detailed guide on workshop programs to adult school groups and to single school systems. A third benefit was the initiation of active support from the New Jersey Department of Education—which was to prove even more significant later in the year. Richard Scheetz, Dean Laux, and William Guthrie—of that office—aided in the planning and the latter two volunteered as lecturers.

The second project in Englewood was a concentrated program for more than 100 selected high school students—with a guiding faculty committee, under the able leadership of Mr. Waldro Kindig, principal. For a full week, the first 2 study periods each morning were set aside—for a total of 10 lecture and discussion sessions. This was a unique experience for both students and faculty; it represented not only new educational content, but also exposed them, for the first time, to new, unfamiliar teaching methods.

Under the general title, "My Life in the Aerospace Age," the faculty-student committee had established six major areas of interest. The students were then polled for their preferences—and the top three were designated for implementation. It is encouraging to note that these young people named government and communications, along with the more glamorous exploration as the most important areas of concern. In its final form, this was the program:

Monday, May 6, session 1: "Your Life in the Space Age," Dr. Robert Krebs, specialist for science, U.S. Office of Education. Session 2: seminar groups, social impact of session 1 presentation.

Tuesday, May 7, session 3: "Your Communications in the Aerospace Age," Dr. J. D. Tebo, Bell Telephone Laboratories. Session 4: seminar groups, social impact of session 3 presentation.

Wednesday, May 8, session 5: "Your Exploration in the Aerospace Age," selected films from NASA. Session 6: "Language in the Aerospace Age," Dr. Neil Postman, professor of English education, New York University.

Thursday, May 8, sessions 7 and 8: "Your Government in the Aerospace Age," group discussions only.

Friday, May 10, session 9: "Your Life in the Aerospace Age," by selected panel of student leaders.

Session 10: Summary, Mr. Waldro Kindig, principal, and Lt. Col. John S. Edwards, Jr., Air Force Reserve Deputy for Aerospace Education, New Jersey wing, CAP, and resource consultant to the project.

This is believed to be the first time that aerospace education has been the subject for "team teaching"—one of the newer methods of instruction. It demonstrated the direct relationship of aerospace matters to the social sciences as well as to the physical sciences. And, finally, it emphasized the need for aerospace education for teachers and students alike. It is encouraging to report that practically all concerned regarded the project as "informative, thought-provoking and interesting"—and indicated an increase in their interest in aerospace matters.

Before proceeding to other parts of my report, it is appropriate to cite, here, those who served on the workshop committee for Bergen County. The following are but a few of the many who contributed to the project: Dr. Harold T. Shafer, superintendent, Wyckoff—who served as general chairman; Mr. Donald Duff, principal, Northern Valley Regional High School, Old Tappan; Mr. George Dykstra, principal, Tisdale School, Ramsey; Mr. William V. Dunn, assistant superintendent, Paramus; Miss Mary P. Foran, Ramsey High School, Ramsey, and member NJEA executive committee.

Also Mr. Waldro Kindig, principal, Dwight Morrow High School, Englewood; Mr. David Miles, West Brook Junior High School, Paramus; Mr. Balkom J. Reaves, vice principal, Pascack Valley Regional High School, Hillsdale; Miss Patricia Reid, School No. 5, Teaneck; Mr. Richard Skelton, Memorial Junior High School, East Paterson; Mr. William Trepicchio, principal, Donald Quarles School, Englewood; Dr. Gile Warren, Westwood High School, Westwood; Mr. Leslie Wilding, principal, School Street School, Ramsey—and chairman of the BCEA Professional Improvement Committee.

Working with them as the Air Force/Civil Air Patrol team were: Lt. Col. John S. Edwards, Jr., Oradell, Air Force Reserve, and deputy for aerospace education, New Jersey wing, CAP—as military coordinator; also Lt. Col. Harold A. Spencer and Maj. Maureen A. Jordan, both of CAP; and Capt. J. L. Humphrey, U.S. Air Force, liaison officer to New Jersey wing, CAP. It has been my privilege to serve as honorary chairman of this committee. We would be remiss if we did not, at this time, express our appreciation to the Borough of Paramus, N.J., for its hospitality and generous cooperation, in providing the school facilities for these giant workshops over the past 4 years.

Again this year, the Bergen County project developed its own satellite operations in other parts of New Jersey. The most advanced of these was in Mercer County, which is more than 75 miles south of Bergen County and embraces the city of Trenton, the State capital. Under the leadership of Mr. James C. Sandilos, superintendent of schools for Hopewell Township, a 1-day symposium was presented last May to nearly 200 teachers and school administrators from Mercer County's 11 school districts. The program included:

"Aerospace Education Workshops," by Lt. Col. John Edwards;

"Introduction to Aerospace Education," Mr. Antone Straussner, Director of Aerospace Education, North East Region, USAF/CAP;

"How To Get Free and Inexpensive Aerospace Education Materials for Classroom Teachers," Mr. James C. Sandilos;

"Application of Aerospace Education in the Classroom," panel discussion, led by Dr. Richard M. Harbeck;

NASA spacemobile space science demonstration, Mr. Alfred Hulstrunk.

Working with Mr. Sandilos in organizing this project were Mr. Jack B. Twitchell, county superintendent of schools; Mr. Earl L. Murphy, president of the Mercer County Education Association; Mrs. Jeanette C. Hodge, chairman of the Mercer County group's professional improvement committee.

Other projects are in the earlier planning stages; all confirm the widespread need of aerospace motivation and instruction for our professional educators. At the same time, they emphasize the critical shortage of qualified leadership—so essential for even the barest minimum attempt at the expansion to other parts of the State.

This brings us to the final part of my report: the plans for this expansion—and the need for aerospace education on a nationwide scale. Even while conducting these large-scale, centralized workshops, our CAP/Air Reserve planning group has been wrestling with the problems of statewide expansion. Their solutions could well be adapted in other States—to accelerate the telling of the full story to every American citizen.

Based on the experiences of the past 4 years, our planners have reached several conclusions. First, while the orientation-type workshops are valuable, there has been limited carryover directly into the classroom—except where predigested materials were included in the workshop program. Secondly, this is due to lack of time and specialized technical background needed for research by the individual teacher. Third, the educational community has little capacity for organizing and implementing a program alined to a pressing current need of society—rather than to the measured advance of the education art as a whole.

These conclusions lead us to an entirely new concept: That of developing instruction teams and workshop leaders at the local level—and to prepare and distribute complete teaching units ready for next day use in the classroom. The instruction personnel will be obtained from both the education community and the CAP/Air Reserve. The workshop leaders will be carefully selected from local teaching staffs.

When trained, the latter group will organize aerospace education for the entire teaching staff of their respective school systems. The instructor teams will be scheduled for presentations of specific subject matter—under the direction of these local leaders. They will lecture at the after-school training sessions and provide handout materials, for classroom use by the teachers undergoing instructions.

Upon completion of these phases, the emphasis will shift. Instruction of supervisory personnel would follow—along with continuous evaluation and upgrading of prepared materials and format. With the rapid advance of aerospace technology, this will be vital to keep the program current and meaningful.

Obviously, such a program requires an organization with the capacity to administer, coordinate, and operate it. The New Jersey wing, Civil Air Patrol, offers the framework around which to develop such an organization. The CAP has the organization structure in-being—with about 40 squadrons stationed convenient to practically all of New Jersey's 300 local school districts. Bolstered by qualified Air Force reservists and educators, they have the high degree of motivation and experience to contribute the continuity essential to the long-range success of the program.

Under their basic aerospace education mission from the U.S. Air Force, they have already developed the personnel structure for functioning with the educators. Their groups and squadrons can act as the bases for coordination and scheduling within their immediate areas—and for storage and distribution of teaching materials. At the wing staff level, they can coordinate the overall, statewide program—and maintain liaison with the national agencies and organizations involved in the national aerospace program.

An advisory committee has been formed to assist, at this top level. Its function is to study and advise on matters involving basic policies, broad direction and education technicalities—and to apprise their respective groups on developments in the program. Invitations to participate have been accepted by major education organizations and distinguished leaders in education and aerospace affairs.

These include New Jersey Education Association; New Jersey Council of Education; New Jersey Secondary School Administrators Association; New Jersey Elementary Principals Association; New Jersey Association for Supervision and Curiculum Development; New Jersey Science Teachers Association; New Jersey Elementary Classroom Teachers Association; Mr. Richard Scheetz, New Jersey Department of Education; Mr. Waldro Kindig, principal of Dwight Morrow High School, Englewood; Mr. James C. Sandilos, vice president, National Aerospace Education Council; Mr. George Brush, Academy of Aeronautics; Mr. Charles G. Latterner, Federal Electric Corp.; Mr. Leslie Wilding, elementary principal, Ramsey.

To better prepare them for their role, it is important that the committee be provided as many instructive aerospace experiences as possible. A series of field trips and visits to aerospace installations has been arranged for this purpose. One was to NASA's George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala. Our committee members were provided a fast-paced, informative tour of the research and development center for space vehicles.

We would like to thank the entire Center staff for outstanding efforts to make this tour so meaningful to our people, and single out two, in particular: Mr. Edwin L. Riddick and Mrs. Vivian Whitley—both of the Public Information Office. The Northeast Region Liaison Office, AF/CAP, furnished the airlift for this trip.

Throughout this report have appeared the names of some of the many whose labors were, in the final analysis, the major factor in the progress attained. I have reserved for the last, a special tribute to the small core of dedicated individuals whose initiative and determination have paced this program since its inception in 1959.

Three Air Force reservists head this list: Lt. Col. John S. Edwards, Jr., Air Force Reserve, and deputy for aerospace education, New Jersey wing, Civil Air Patrol, of Oradell, N.J., who has furnished overall leadership in every phase and has traveled up and down the State, telling of America's need for aerospace education; Lt. Col. John S. Gardner, Air Force Reserve, of Fanwood, N.J., who has ably assisted in workshop operations and has demonstrated outstanding ability and enthusiasm in outlining the coming phases for local instructor teams and workshop leaders. Also Maj. Harold T. Shafer, Air Force Reserves, of Wyckoff, N.J., who has already been identified as the educator-general chairman for the Bergen County projects. Major Shafer's dual interest—as educator and citizen-soldier—plus his recognized stature in the education field, have helped guide the planners around many of the technical pitfalls and difficulties which had, in fact, hindered earlier programs.

Working closely with these three were: Mr. Antone Straussner, aerospace education director, Northeast Region, AF/CAP Liaison Office, whose professional knowledge and resourcefulness have been of invaluable assistance in both planning and implementation of the complex, overlapping activities; Capt. Jackie L. Humphrey, USAF liaison officer with New Jersey wing, CAP, who has participated in the planning and procurement of speakers and materials for all of the projects; Mr. William V. Dunn, assistant superintendent of Paramus schools, Paramus, N.J., who ably served as vice chairman to Dr. Shafer in the planning and personally supervised all arrangements for facilities and equipment; Mr. Waldro Kindig, high school principal, of Englewood, N.J., who initiated and directed the unique teacher-student program conducted at the Dwight Morrow High School; and Mr. George Dykstra, school principal from Ramsey, N.J., who capably handled the administrative control of the Bergen County project.

These individuals all gave unstintingly of their time, usually at considerable personal sacrifice. There were many others who also willingly contributed toward the awakening of the American people to the challenges of aerospace. While their primary interest was provincial, their contribution to the larger scene cannot be slighted. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that their "opposite numbers" can be found in every State in our Nation—to carry forward this formidable educational task.

We have no choice. Unless we prefer to relinquish the privileges granted us by our proud heritage, we must have the vision and the perseverance today to insure America's preeminence in the scientific and cultural achievements of tomorrow. Our youth have shown their willingness. Our generation cannot do less than qualify ourselves to guide them.

SHOULD CONGRESS HAVE ITS OWN TEAM OF SCIENCE ADVISERS?

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been asked this year to budget $15 billion of the taxpayers' money for science and technology study. We are running a $15 billion foundation, in effect, for the benefit of all mankind. No private foundation would operate without a skilled and sufficient staff of advisors; no private foundation official would act only on the advice of those most interested in securing funds for their project. This, however, is precisely what Congress is doing in far too many instances.

No one can fault Congress for lack of interest in the promotion of scientific progress, a duty imposed upon us by the Constitution itself. Knowledgeable scientists, engineers and educators, however, can and do fault us for our lack of sufficient information when we approach the variety of questions raised by a $15 billion budget. An example of this may be found in the comments by the chairman of the Brown University Physics Department, Dr. Philip Bray, and the president of the Carnegie Institution, Dr. Caryl P. Haskins, noted in the Providence Journal of December 11, 1963, which I include as part of my remarks.

Dr. Bray questions a deep cut in the National Science Foundation appropriation, but he is particularly disturbed by what he feels to be a lack of comprehension by Members of Congress of the meaning and role of research and education. On the other hand, Dr. Haskins questions whether the Federal Government should be as deeply involved in the direction of scientific research as it is.

The comments by both these distinguished men illustrate two of the problems facing Congress which my bill, H.R. 8066, would attempt to solve through the creation of a Congressional Office of Science and Technology. First, these statements illustrate the growing concern within the scientific and technical community over the ability of Congress to legislate in the most intelligent manner on appropriations and programs in these fields. My bill would go far to alleviate this growing lack of confidence and would encourage, instead, a greater participation in the decisions made by Congress by those who may not belong to the executive department's scientific establishment.

Second, the conflict in philosophy and approach between Dr. Bray and Dr. Haskins, is indicative of the depth of the problems facing Congress, and illustrates again the need for obtaining the most complete and objective appraisals possible. An Office of Science and Technology, supplying advisers and liaison with outside sources, as well as "taxpayer advocates," would improve the capability of Congress to make the decisions which they must make in this field.

Congress has already decided that it must take steps to see that the Federal performance is the most effective that can be obtained. The excellent first report of the House committee set up to review our scientific research programs has called our attention to a number of questions which must be answered. There is another question which must be answered also. Should Congress, like the executive branch, have its own team of science advisers? I believe that the answer is contained in my bill, that the answer is a definite "yes," and that the answers to the questions raised by the House committee studying our scientific efforts will be more easily answered once the Congressional Office of Science and Technology is in existence.

The Providence Journal article follows:

[From the Providence Journal, Dec. 11, 1963]

SOME NATIONAL SCIENCE PROGRAM PROBLEMS

On the last day of October, the chairman of the Brown University physics department said that the House of Representatives had made "a terribly dangerous mistake" by cutting $323 million from the National Science Foundation appropriation.

"Simply but correctly put, some day in the next few years all bloody, screaming hell is going to break loose," said Dr. Philip J. Bray, suggesting that the cut gravely imperiled U.S. progress in its competition in science with the Soviet bloc.

The cut was in a particularly sensitive area. It abolished $25 million in training grants, $38 million in basic research, $59 million for scientific education facilities, $8.5 million for institutes for science and mathematics teachers, and $13 million for improving science and mathematics instruction.

Dr. Bray said that anyone reading the transcript of congressional hearings preceding the cut would be appalled by the lack of objectivity, and the lack of comprehension among Congressmen of the meaning and role of research and education.

His point of view was echoed by many college professors across the land, and it probably is the prevailing opinion of educators with respect to Government spending in that particular area. But the National Science Foundation is only one of more than a dozen agencies having their fingers in the research pie. The Foundation's original request for $589 million is only one-thirtieth of total Federal spending of $15 billion proposed for science and technology study in 1963–64.

Not all scientists agree that having the Federal Government so deeply involved in the direction of scientific research is a good thing. Dr. Caryl P. Haskins, president of the Carnegie Institution, which channels private funds into research, just the other day said he feared that massive growth of federally directed research (from $10 billion in 1962) is doing incalculable harm to science by directing too many scientists into research in what may be the wrong areas, and leaving not enough scientists for research in what may be the right areas.

In their different ways, Dr. Bray and Dr. Haskins were asking the same basic question: Does Congress have competency to judge how Federal funds should be spent for research, or how much should be spent?

The same question disturbs Congress. In March, the Senate passed a bill proposing a commission on science and technology to recommend more effective Federal performance of scientific and technological programs. The House, taking a different direction, created its own committee to consider whether the Government's science program is on the right track.

In its first report last weekend, the House committee gave no answers but it asked intelligent questions. Is organization of the Government's science program adequate? Do scientists have enough to say on matters of policy? Are any fields of science being neglected?

Some other questions are worth asking. Should Congress, like the executive branch, have its own team of science advisers? Should scientists instead of administrators direct the Nation's science program? Should Government get out of the area of scientific inquiry?

Where the House committee's line of inquiry will lead is not certain. But asking questions is the first step in getting at the truth. Since science looms larger than ever in all human affairs, not just in national defense, it is imperative that the committee find the right answers.

SUGARBEET ACREAGE FOR THE RED RIVER VALLEY OF THE NORTH

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my recent privilege to welcome a number of groups from Minnesota and North

Dakota who appeared at Department of Agriculture hearings into further allocations of sugarbeet acreage. These groups have worked diligently through the years to develop the sugarbeet industry in their Red River Valley of the North area and are to be commended for the local initiative they have shown. I joined with these local groups and appeared with them at the recent hearings. Under unanimous consent I include my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE ODIN LANGEN, OF MINNESOTA, CONVEYED TO THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SUGARBEET HEARINGS, BEGINNING DECEMBER 10, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the panel, first, permit me to thank you for the opportunity to appear and present briefly a statement in behalf of the many farm folks in my district and throughout the Red River Valley of northwestern Minnesota and eastern North Dakota, who are sincerely interested in the expansion of sugarbeet production in this area. Your interest in and response to their concern, I know, finds favor throughout all of this most productive agricultural area.

During the course of these hearings you will have the opportunity of hearing from several individual groups who I know will provide you with reliable statistical information indicating the extent to which the production and processing of sugarbeets is feasible and of economic significance.

For this reason, it will be my purpose to be as brief as possible and to provide you with a few observations that I hope are not repetitious, but which will indicate the extent to which the production of sugarbeets in this area will serve the best interests of potential producers, as well as consumers and taxpayers.

As one who has lived and farmed in the Red River Valley for all of his lifetime and has participated in the many endeavors to expand sugarbeet production for the past 30 years, I feel that this is a subject that I am thoroughly acquainted and conversant with. During all of these years there has been a continuous and dedicated effort on the part of many hundreds of people from one end of the Red River Valley to the other toward the cause of further developing this most desirable agricultural industry.

There have been almost countless organizations, and endeavors carried on entirely with local initiative and funds for the purpose of directing attention to the great possibilities that this fertile valley holds for sugarbeet production. These folks have held meetings, made surveys, traveled thousands of miles, published brochures, and used every means available to them in order to advance their cause.

The Red River Valley is a proven beet raising area—proven by the actual production of sugarbeets for the past 30 years; while on a limited basis when compared to the full potential that exists, thay have definitely established that they can raise a very high quality of sugarbeets with a production of sugar at a price that is most competitive to any other known area. This has been accomplished entirely by investments and endeavors by individual farmers and the American Crystal Sugar Co. The results of their endeavors to date amount to more than 100,000 acres with three processing plants now operating and a fourth under construction.

There is ample room for both expansion of existing facilities, as well as new factories and producers. The acreage could easily be more than doubled. This, I am sure, is due to the outstanding physical characteristics of the valley area; the combination of soil, water, and weather is ideal, with extremely smooth topography and some of the most fertile soil in the world. The low nitrogen content of the soil is conducive to high sugar-content beets. There are no stones, which provides for excellent cultivating and tillage conditions. The long hours of sunshine and relatively cool mean annual temperature of about 67° F. during the growing season all contribute to excellent beet production. The average annual precipitation ranges from about 19 to 21 inches with over one-half of the total falling in May, June, and July. These factors, I am sure, account for the most attractive records which indicate that the average losses during the years of their history has averaged at the most desirable figure of about 3½ percent of the planted acreage.

The fact that over the years growers in this area have consistently stayed with sugarbeet production, regardless of changing conditions, indicates the stability of the crop in the valley. Likewise, processing plants have been built and kept running to capacity during all of these years. These are factors which I am sure are most pertinent to any considerations that would be made with regard to future expansions.

There are other factors, however, of equal significance. Because the entire valley is strictly a farming, rural area with very little industry, it is almost entirely dependent upon agricultural production and income for its economic survival. Agricultural problems that have been characteristic throughout the Nation in recent years, of inadequate prices, surpluses, and a continual decline in farm population, are factors that have all contributed adversely to the economic future of this area. The need for restrictions and limited production of grain crops, together with inadequate prices, has created many economic hardships as well as great Government expense in maintaining programs of allotments and price supports.

There isn't anything that I know of that would contribute as much to alleviating this economic situation for the many people and business enterprises in the area, as well as reducing Government costs, as would the production of sugarbeets. Therefore, every expansion of beet production in the Red River Valley contributes to the best interests of the entire Nation.

It seems only just and proper that, in view of the many agricultural problems that presently confront the Congress, the Department of Agriculture, and the entire Nation, it would be most desirable to recognize with favor the indicated desires of the people in this area to improve their own economic well-being; while at the same time making a comparable contribution to the entire Nation. The benefits, I know, would be manyfold as compared to the monetary investments required.

It should be recognized that to do so has as great benefits to Government itself as to any segment of our economic society. I do not believe that it is necessary for me to further identify the many other direct and indirect benefits, for they have been enumerated by myself and others on so many previous occasions, and are almost glaringly obvious.

In my opinion, these are most convincing facts and would substantiate a favorable consideration under any kind of analysis. I am convinced that anyone contributing to sugarbeet production and expansion possibilities in the Red River Valley would find lasting regard among consumers and taxpayers nationwide.

Your usual dedicated concern and wisdom in behalf of the best interests and future welfare of the Nation would be well served by a favorable consideration of the requests to produce sugarbeets in the Red River Valley.

Permit me to express my gratitude to each of you for your patience and interest in these observations this morning.

COAL MINE EXPLOSION NEAR PRICE, UTAH

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at the point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in my congressional district tragedy struck when an explosion occurred in one of the coal mines near Price, Utah. This is the second major mine tragedy to occur in the State of Utah in the past year. Nine men were killed and a score of children left without fathers.

It seems that nearly every year, close to the Christmas season, mines somewhere in this great country experience disaster, and many wives are left widows and the children without fathers.

There have been, of course, no charges or even a suggestion that the operators of the mine in question have neglected to observe minimum safety regulations or standards. But as we all know—and certainly as the families involved know—accidents are very final. There is no turning back the clock for even a split second to correct an error, react differently, or rectify a safety hazard. Any action that can be taken must be taken before the disaster. Therefore, we should look again at legislation designed to give greater security and safety to the miners of our Nation. Safety cannot be overlooked because of inconvenience or cost.

Today there is a bill pending before the House Rules Committee, H.R. 9000, to extend the Mine Safety Act. I request that the committee clear this bill at the earliest possible date. Every hour of every day, we have men underground, digging the resources upon which our great industrial economy depends, and certainly they are deserving of our attention.

ICE AGE NATIONAL SCIENTIFIC RESERVE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my own regret that an objection has been made today to the passage of H.R. 1096. This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of an Ice Age National Scientific Reserve. It is my understanding that the proposed reserve would comprise 32,500 acres of land of which about 17,000 acres are located in the Kettle Moraine and Campbell sport area and that another 10,000 acres are located in the northwestern part of Wisconsin in what is referred to as the Bloomer area; about 3,500 acres in the Devils Lake area near Madison; and certain other small areas within the State. Perhaps the primary value from such a reserve would be the opportunities it would afford the scientific community for research as the suggested areas include what are commonly regarded as the best collection of remnants of the ice age to be found anywhere in the world.

It is my understanding that the many unusual geological features such as the drumlins, kames, eskers, kettle holes and lakes that exist in such profusion in these areas date back perhaps as far as 10,000 years to a period when this part of the United States was covered by a glacier. Although it is true that the reserves would be of inestimable value to the scientists, this should not obscure for us the fact that in the beauty of outdoor nature there would also be many opportunities for average citizens to enjoy recreational pursuits such as swimming, fishing, and hiking.

In a day and age when our vast wilderness areas are rapidly being ravaged by the advances of civilization, I think it is absolutely imperative that the Congress act in time to set aside for future generations these areas which otherwise may be totally lost to mankind if they are subjected to a normal commercial exploitation.

The North Central Ornithological Society which is an organization of bird lovers in my congressional district are deeply interested in seeing this legislation enacted. Theirs is not a superficial purpose but rather a deep desire to preserve these areas of natural beauty together with the native habitats of many of the birds that are indigenous to this part of North America.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I hope that the Congress in its wisdom will not long delay in seizing the opportunity to enact this legislation into law. I think it will be a wise investment for the future.

THE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE INDUSTRY PROPOSES ITS OWN BILL FOR WASHINGTON

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial and draft bill which appeared in the December 1963, edition of the Seaboard Beverage Journal, an independent magazine of the beverage industry.

I would like to point out that this proposed bill bears no resemblance whatever to H.R. 8920 which the House sent back to the District committee on November 5. This is the kind of bill the industry wants and they are not afraid to say so.

The editorial and draft follow:

INDUSTRY PROPOSES OWN BILL

Last month on the floor of the House of Representatives the beverage industry was accused of having "sponsored" the Multer bill. This charge was but one of many false and misleading charges used in opposing the measure. As a result, Congress was duped by a fantastic display of confusing polemics, propaganda, and pedantry, and sent the complicated bill back to its District committee.

Unlike those who grind out pompous newspaper editorials, to order, about the liquor industry—and everything else under the sun—the people in this industry don't pretend to know all there is to know about everything. But they do know their business and they are in daily personal contact with the consuming public. They know that "liquor ain't groceries." They know exactly what economic and social problems are involved. And we believe they have a more practical and more intimate understanding of what is necessary to insure the proper distribution of alcoholic beverages in the Nation's Capital than any selfish newspaper publisher or his deskbound wordmongers.

Many in the local industry have expressed the view that the root of the economic evil that plagues them today is the practice of loss-leader selling, because this closely borders on fraud, and is, in fact, destructive of competition and an abuse of the free enterprise system.

As was suggested by high officials of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission in the presence of this writer at a White House Conference for Business Magazine Editors and Publishers on September 26, 1962, a clean, uncomplicated bill that would effectively outlaw loss-leader sales of alcoholic beverages in the District—and do nothing more—has been drafted. It is printed in full on page 25.

All members of the industry are asked to study this draft thoroughly and then discuss in detail their own personal opinions of it at their respective association meetings.

If it is found that basically this is what the industry wants and will support without vacillation or equivocation, it can be presented to Congress as the need and desire of a united industry. Then for the first time an industry-sponsored bill can stand to win or lose on its own merits and the industry will find itself in a position to cope adequately with anyone who might choose to challenge its right or integrity in seeking suitable legislative relief.

Whatever its ultimate fate, one thing the Multer bill has already done for the industry is to separate the sheep from the goats; and if it also serves to unite its members behind their own loss-leader bill the anti-industry faction will very soon learn that—"We haven't even begun to fight."

RALPH CHASE,
Editor and Publisher.

PROPOSED LOSS-LEADER BILL

A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act for the purpose of prohibiting certain sales below cost.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 25–101 et seq.), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 42. (a) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'cost to the retailer' shall mean the invoice price of the alcoholic beverage to the retailer or the replacement cost of the alcoholic beverage to the retailer, whichever is lower, less all trade discounts except any discounts for cash; to which shall be added:

"(a) Freight charges not otherwise included in the invoice cost or replacement cost of the alcoholic beverage, as herein set forth; and

"(b) The cost of doing business by the respective retailer, which shall include the total outlay or expenditure by the retailer in the acquisition, processing and distribution of the specific alcoholic beverage involved, excluding invoice price or replacement cost and freight charges as set out above, and including all other elements of cost such as labor, materials, depreciation, taxes (except taxes on net income and such other taxes as are not properly applicable to cost), and all general overhead expenses incurred by the retailer in the acquisition, processing, preparation for marketing, sale and delivery of the specific alcoholic beverage involved. In the absence of proof of a lesser cost of doing business, such cost shall be 6 per centum of the cost to the retailer as herein set forth, after adding thereto freight charges, if any, but before adding thereto the cost of doing business.

"(2) The term 'replacement cost' shall mean the cost per unit for which the alcoholic beverage sold or offered for sale could have been bought by the seller at any time within thirty days prior to the date of sale or the date upon which it is offered for sale by the seller if bought in the same quantity or quantities as the seller's last purchase of the said alcoholic beverage.

"(3) 'Offered for sale, or sold', when one or more items are offered for sale or sold with one or more other items at a combined price, each and all of said items shall for the purpose of this section be deemed to be offered for sale or sold, and the price of each item named shall be governed by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this subsection.

"(4) The terms 'sell at retail,' 'sales at retail,' and 'retail sales,' shall mean and include any transfer, for a valuable consideration made in the ordinary course of trade or in the usual prosecution of the seller's business, of title to an alcoholic beverage to the purchaser for consumption or use other than resale.

"(5) The term 'retailer' shall mean and include each and every person, partnership, corporation or association licensed under the pertinent provision of section 11 of this Act and engaged in the business of making sales of alcoholic beverages at retail within the District.

"(b) It is hereby declared that the offer to sell, or sale of any alcoholic beverage, by retailers, at less than cost as defined in this section, with the intent, effect, or result of deceiving any purchaser or prospective purchaser, substantially lessening competition, unreasonably restraining trade, or tending to create a monopoly is an unfair method of competition, contrary to public policy, and in violation of the provisions of this section.

"(c) Any retailer who shall, in violation of the provisions of this section, offer to sell or sell at retail any alcoholic beverage at less than cost to the retailer as defined in this section, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500, and shall also be subject to the penalties provided in section 17 of this Act. Proof of any such offer to sell or sale by any retailer in violation of the provisions of this section shall be prima facie evidence of a violation of this section.

"(d) In addition to the penalties provided in this section, the courts of the District are hereby invested with jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violation of this section, and it shall be the duty of the corporation counsel to institute proceedings in equity to prevent and restrain violations. Any person shall be entitled to sue for and have injunctive re-

lief in any court of competent jurisdiction against any threatened loss or injury to such person by reason of a violation of this section, and any person suffering damages by reason of a violation of this section may sue for such damages in any court of competent jurisdiction and shall be entitled to recover the amount of damages sustained. If an injunction be granted or damages awarded, the person bringing such action shall also be entitled to recover the costs of such suit, including a reasonable attorneys' fee.

"(e) The provisions of this section shall not apply to sales at retail (1) where the alcoholic beverage is sold in bona fide clearance sales, if marked and sold as such and the seller, for a period of at least 1 year thereafter, discontinues any further sale of the brands sold in such bona fide clearance sales; (2) where the alcoholic beverage is imperfect or damaged, and is marked and sold as such; (3) where the alcoholic beverage is sold upon the final liquidation of any business; (4) where the alcoholic beverage is sold for charitable purposes or to relief agencies; (5) where the price of the alcoholic beverage is made in good faith to meet lawful competition; and (6) where the alcoholic beverage is sold by any officer acting under the order or direction of any court or by any fiduciary, or by any trustee in a deed of trust or deed of assignment for the benefit of creditors."

SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF POWERED FLIGHT

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today, December 17, is the 60th anniversary of powered flight. Kitty Hawk was a dramatic turning point in the history of flight. On that day Wilbur Wright flew a machine for 59 seconds.

Some of the events of that exciting day in 1903, and of the experiments that preceded it, are recounted in an address delivered at Kitty Hawk, N.C., by a longtime observer and historian of powered flight. He is Walter T. Bonney, director of public information for the Aerospace Corp. of Los Angeles, Calif., and author of "The Heritage of Kitty Hawk," published by Norton in 1962. Bonney, a resident of Pacific Palisades, Calif., has won awards for aviation writing and editing. He was the first director of the Office of Public Information for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and was information director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, NASA's predecessor organization.

Mr. Bonney's address follows:

SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF POWERED FLIGHT OBSERVANCE PROGRAM, KITTY HAWK, N.C., DECEMBER 16, 1963

(By Walter T. Bonney, "Heritage of Kitty Hawk")

Dreams, visions, creeping progress towards the goal * * * and then accomplishment. Untold millenniums when man paused from his plodding along the track to look enviously at the birds, soaring and wheeling in seemingly effortless flight.

Centuries when man had visions of "magical vapours" and other occult devices that would solve the secret of flight. Because of the primitive sources of power then available, it is not strange that the devices concocted for man-carrying flight were strange and wonderful indeed.

The United States of America was a lusty, adolescent nation when the time came for the dreams and visions of flight to assume the shape and substance of attainable possibility. It required hardly a century of creeping progress, then, during which developments crowded fast one upon another, until there came that crowning achievement above these shifting sands of Kitty Hawk.

On December 14, 1903, the *Wright Flyer* was ready for its first trial. It was a cold day and the winds across the Kitty Hawk sands were only about 5 miles an hour. Wilbur won the toss of a coin and made the try. He did not get off the ground quite right. The *Flyer* came down about 100 feet from the starting point after being airborne only 2½ seconds. The machine suffered relatively minor damage, but it was agreed—this performance didn't count as a real flight.

Four days later, the *Flyer* was ready for another trial. Now it was Orville's turn. The wind was about 27 miles an hour. The machine started slowly along the 60 feet of launching track. After 40 feet, it lifted into the air, to fly 120 feet.

Orville recorded the event: "This flight lasted only 12 seconds, but it was, nevertheless, the first in the history of the world in which a machine carrying a man had raised itself by its own power into the air in full flight, had sailed forward without reduction of speed, and had finally landed at a point as high as that from which it started."

There were three additional flights that bleak December day, with the brothers alternating at the controls. The longest and last, with Wilbur the pilot, was of 59 seconds' duration and was for a distance of 852 feet.

How was it, how could it be, that two young men without special training or special advantage, could succeed where all others had failed? Was it blind luck, some stroke of chance? Or could it be that the brothers possessed a priceless kind of genius that made them different from all other men, a genius that reserved for them alone the prize of accomplishment?

Neither of the brothers was a graduate of high school, but this was due to lack of interest in diplomas rather than failure to absorb knowledge. They early developed the habit of reading, to learn more about the many subjects in which they were interested. Fully as important, they read critically.

Even as they absorbed accounts of the faltering efforts by so many over the years to solve the problems of heavier-than-air flight, they pondered the "whys" of the unbroken succession of failures. They judged that Lilienthal had been correct in his approach, but that he hadn't done enough. The main reason why the problem had remained so long unsolved was that no one had been able to obtain adequate practice.

They saw that the calculations upon which all flying machines had been based were unreliable, and that all were simply groping in the dark. Having set out with absolute faith in the existing scientific data, they were driven to doubt one thing after another, till finally, after 2 years of experiment, they cast all aside. Truth and error were everywhere so intimately mixed as to be indistinguishable.

Disillusioned, they undertook to make their own measurements and chose the wind tunnel as their research tool. It was a happy decision because it provided the means of acquiring information that was gratifyingly accurate. For months they worked, collecting and analyzing a fund of information that later proved indispensable in designing their successful airplane.

They measured the aerodynamic forces on numerous wings of different shapes and aspect ratio arranged in monoplane, biplane and triplane combinations. They quickly noted the aerodynamic superiority of the monoplane over the biplane but continued to favor the latter for reasons of structural strength.

The design of their engine was straightforward enough; it conformed to the automotive practice of their day. Complete with accessories, it weighed only 170 pounds, developed 12 horsepower. It was a product characteristic of the Wright brothers; it was dependable if not fancy.

The problem of acquiring satisfactory propellers was fundamentally much more difficult. Orville and Wilbur looked to the shipbuilders for assistance but found that, after nearly a century, marine propellers were still being designed on a cut-and-try basis, and not too successfully at that.

So, starting with the then novel concept that the propeller behaved aerodynamically very much like a wing, they worked out a design which made every part of the propeller an airfoil. They achieved an efficiency of 66 percent which was at once remarkable and also essential to the success of their first flights.

The Wrights were sound thinkers. They were tenacious in their search for information which could be accepted without reservation. They possessed the energy and the patience necessary to conduct the systematic investigations leading to solution of difficult problems. Too, the bachelor brothers were free from family responsibilities that might have lessened the intensity of their concentration.

They possessed a quality ascribed to men more often than is deserved—ingenuity. It was natural for them to make things they lacked.

In their work, they possessed the characteristics and talents of many trades and professions. They were craftsmen, knowledgeable in the fabrication of parts from wood and metal; in the best sense of the word, they were mechanics. They learned how to plan and conduct the systematic research which marks the scientist. They could break a complex problem into soluble parts. Conversely, they could visualize the individual pieces that could be fitted together into a workable whole; they merited the name of engineer.

They were remarkably self sufficient. Working together, thinking together, they conceived and designed and built and flew the world's first successful airplane * * * on December 17, 1903 * * * from these sands of Kitty Hawk.

WASHINGTON POST EDITORIALS

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, we have all had, from time to time, the feeling, "I wish I'd said that." Yesterday morning, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California, the Honorable BURT L. TALCOTT, took the Washington Post to task for the tone of their series of recent editorials in which they have, with uncontrolled fury, lashed out at every person, section, State, newspaper, or organization which has ever criticized any aspect of the Federal Government.

As you know, the Post is noted for the acidity, the viciousness, and the venomous way it attacks everyone who disagrees with their position on any subject. They have, with fine impartiality, sprayed this hatred with increased vigor in recent weeks. In so doing, they have become the No. 1 hatemonger in the Nation in their attacks on those they have decided are the real "hatemongers."

A letter to the editor of the Post from the gentleman from California, Representative TALCOTT, sets the record straight and, as I read it, my thought was, "I wish I'd said that." BURT TALCOTT is a man of integrity who has the courage of his convictions. He not only preaches, he practices fairplay. What more could anyone ask?

This is the letter as it appeared in the Post of December 16:

> MORATORIUM ON HATE
>
> Your editorial of December 6 calling Judge HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, a "tyrant" seemed mean, hypocritical, and hateful.
>
> I am sure that you do not presume that your paper can hate, or has a license to peddle hate, when it suits your purpose—but that every other person who disagrees or disapproves is a hatemonger or bigot. But you called a man a tyrant with sanctimonious abandon. Is not calling a man a tyrant as hateful as calling him a Communist? Which caller, really, is more bigoted or hateful?
>
> If we are to invoke a moratorium on hate, should not it apply to everyone? Is not a person who piously decries "hatemongering" by others, but mongers hate himself, even more despicable because of the inconsistent hypocrisy?
>
> Should not the editorial page of a newspaper be in the vanguard of those who eschew hate—even including the cartoonists and columnists it employs? Should not newspapers, as well as ministers and politicians, practice what they preach?
>
> Does not one who has a typewriter and a paper have a higher obligation for truth, honesty, and consistency than one who screams from a mob on the street?
>
> BURT L. TALCOTT,
> *U.S. Representative,*
> *12th District of California.*
>
> WASHINGTON.

THE PAGES OF CAPITOL HILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great to-do about the Capitol Hill pages in recent days. The major morning newspaper in this city has exposed the private lives of these boys, and we have heard stories of wild parties, beer bottles, and midnight gambling sessions.

The newspaper concerned may well have increased its circulation, but in so doing it has allowed the vast majority of the dedicated young men that serve us so loyally on the Hill to be unfairly and improperly libeled.

I would estimate, and I am sure my colleagues will agree, that 98 percent of our pages are responsible, mature, young men who have willingly chosen to live and work under a schedule that very few of us could cope with or handle.

The page school begins at 6:30 a.m. every morning. Most boys, therefore, have to rise at 5 a.m. or 5:30 a.m. to insure they attend their classes on time. When school is over for the day the boys must begin their work, and they will be in attendance until the adjournment bell rings, no matter how late in the evening that may be.

Heavy assignments of homework are prescribed by the instructors at the page school, and we can find the boys hard at work on their studies long after the rest of us have gone home to relax. With this schedule there can be little opportunity for wild parties and gambling sessions, and I think these young men deserve a great deal of credit for their initiative and enterprise.

With so much talk and criticism of teenagers today, I believe the pages of Capitol Hill are an example for the youth of America. The artificial and childish world within which many of our young people live does not exist here on the Hill. Our teenagers are devoting themselves to work, study, and dedication to duty. At the same time they are acquiring a knowledge of government and the lawmaking process that will stand them in good stead for the rest of their lives.

I support the call for a dormitory for the pages. This is clearly necessary for their welfare and comfort, and I trust the House can speedily approve this measure. Let us at the same time say how proud we are of our pages, because I believe we do have every reason to be proud of them.

Mr. Speaker, I have had some research done on the history and background of the pages of Capitol Hill, and I feel sure my colleagues will appreciate this information. I call it to the attention of all concerned.

Among the important thousands of "extra hands" that help the Congress of the United States and the Supreme Court to function are the page boys. These young men, whose ages range from 14 to 18, come from practically every State in the Union. They are outstanding and deserve our gratitude for their services.

Pages are afforded excellent educational opportunities. They are given the chance to observe at firsthand the workings of our democratic institutions. While other students of the same age merely read about the manner in which Congress and the Supreme Court function, the young men who are pages see democracy at work with their own eyes.

Although the work of a page is varied, he serves principally as messenger, carrying material between the Capitol and the Members' offices or committees. On the floor of the Senate, the pages prepare the Members' desks and the cloakrooms for the day's legislative work. There are approximately 24 pages in the Senate, 50 in the House, and 4 in the Supreme Court. Importantly, the tenure of a page depends upon the following: age; ability to do his job well; ability to keep his school marks at average; a record of good conduct; and his sponsor's tenure in office.

It is a little-known fact that a page's day begins at 6:30 in the morning when he goes to school. Instruction is given at the Capitol page school, located in several rooms of the Library of Congress. There is a laboratory for physics students and a school library for general use. Many prepare for college entrance through the academic courses offered.

The Capitol page school is in session from September until June, although most pages out of State begin their school work at the school in January. If during any part of the year our pages attend school in their respective home communities, close liaison is maintained between the home school and the Capitol page school in regard to each student's progress.

Sixteen units are required for graduation and these units must include: four units in English, two units in mathematics, two units in language, one unit in science—either biology, chemistry, or physics—one unit in U.S. history, one-half unit in U.S. Government, and five and one-half units in elected fields.

Two types of certificates of graduation are issued: the regular board of education diploma which entitles members of the school to enter colleges requiring graduation from an accredited school; and a certificate signed by the President of the United States.

The Capitol page school at all times aims—and so states in its constitution—to bring about better cooperation and understanding between the student body and the faculty; to give the students of the school a greater share in the operation of their student government; and to provide the students a better opportunity in selecting a school program for themselves.

A fine student council exists. Pages have the opportunity to become members of the National Honor Society, a worldwide organization. Membership is based on scholarship, service, leadership, and character, as is the case for National Honor Society members in other schools across our country.

Extracurricular activities include the publication of the Yearbook and the Capitol Courier, the school's newspaper; dances at the Congressional Club held for sons and daughters of Members; the Key Club, a national organization sponsored by the Kiwanis Club with membership based on character and service to the school; the glee club; Hiltonian Society, including formal debates and chess tournaments; photography club; and the science club. In addition, basketball is supervised by a qualified coach. Letters for athletic participation are awarded each year by the faculty on the basis of the individual's ability, progress, cooperation, effort, attitude, spirit, and participation.

This is, indeed, a well-rounded program for any young man.

The need for congressional pages originated with the founding of our Government. We have a clue to the genesis of the page system from the following comment, contained in a report to the 27th Congress from a select committee:

> From the origin of the present Government in 1789, to the present time, they (messengers) have been employed under

> the orders and resolutions of the House and experience has attested the necessity of their services. The use of boys, or pages, was introduced at a later period; but from the first session of the Congress held at the city of Washington, they have continued to be employed with the approbation of the House.

We know that the first Senate page was Grafton Dulany Hanson, appointed at the age of 9. His nonpartisan appointment received the austere recommendation of Senators Henry Clay and Daniel Webster. This young lad was a direct descendant of John Hanson, president of the Continental Congress. Hanson grew up in the capacity of page boy, and served more than 10 years. He later became Postmaster of the Senate and while still comparatively young was decorated for bravery by Gen. William Jenkins Worth in the Mexican War. After Hanson had served as a page for several years, Isaac Bassett, also appointed by Daniel Webster, became the second page and served as Hanson's colleague.

Many, many young men who have served as pages have gone on to positions of great service to and eminence in the U.S. Government. Many have acquired positions we have not heard about, unspectacular, but they have served, and are serving, with great devotion.

Two Members of this Congress served as page boys: The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, of the 15th District of Michigan, and the Honorable COMPTON I. WHITE, JR., of the 1st District of Idaho.

Page alumni are found in responsible positions today on Capitol Hill: in the cloakrooms, in the Architect's Office, as legislative assistants and administrative assistants, as majority and minority employees. The superintendent of the Radio-TV Gallery was a page boy, as well as the present Senate secretary to the minority.

More recent Capitol pages are enrolled at the University of Copenhagen, the U.S. Air Force Academy, the University of Georgia, Rutgers University, Louisiana Tech, University of North Carolina, University of West Virginia, Florida State University, Baylor University, Miami University of Ohio, Harvard University, Columbia University, University of Virginia, Northwestern University, George Washington University, Stanford University, and the University of Maryland—an impressive list, indeed.

The professions and business are well represented among the page school alumni in law, aerospace engineering, merchandising, electrical engineering, pharmacy, communications, medicine, advertising, statistics, insurance, electronics, aeronautics, banking, hotel management, oil and gas industry, and manufacturing.

Some former page boys have elected to pursue a career in Government service, one is a Jesuit student, one a personnel officer with the U.S. Air Force, another a teacher of history, several are officers in the Armed Forces of our Nation, some were killed in action in World War II—making the supreme sacrifice—others are serving their States in elective and appointive capacities.

An official from the Young Men's Christian Association has said of Capitol pages and I quote:

> The opportunity to serve as a page in the House or Senate or Supreme Court, should be one of the country's most coveted honors for a boy of appropriate age.

It is my firm conviction that the boys who have served, and those who are now serving, will add their endorsements to that statement.

On June 12, 1961, at the Capitol page school commencement, President Lyndon B. Johnson gave a most inspiring speech. He was then our Vice President and had had a great deal of contact with the pages during his service in the House and Senate. I can think of no more appropriate manner in which to remind you of the worth of the young men who serve as pages than to leave with you the following quote from President Johnson's speech:

> You have been privileged to serve in one of freedom's greatest institutions—the Congress of the United States. You know the frailties of its Members, but you know the vastly greater strengths of all the institutions of our Government and our country.
>
> I urge you: stand against those who doubt and despair and never give in. Stand with those who believe and keep faith and never give in. Your strength is great. Give of it all your days. Duty whispers to each of you. "Thou must," and I am sure each of you will answer, "I can."

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] for his observations concerning this fine group of young men, the Capitol pages. In the short year that I have been privileged to be a Member of the House of Representatives I have learned to respect the devotion, the gentlemanly conduct and the cheerful service of the House pages. They are a fine part of our establishment.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my good friend for his very fine statement on behalf of a very valuable part of the staff of this Congress of the United States. As my friend indicated, I had the privilege of serving some years ago as a page in the House of Representatives. I want to say that I read the same articles that my good friend from California read. I found them not only repugnant, but frankly I think untrue in import; because, as my friend has indicated, the life of a page is also so demanding and physically hard, the requirements that are imposed upon our young men in terms of education and in terms of daily work exceed those which are imposed on almost any other group of our young people in this country. And indeed they exceed in terms of responsibility and hard work, I think, the demands that are made upon any group of young people anywhere in this world.

During the time that I served as page I had the opportunity to know my colleagues among the page force. I should like to say to my friend that these young men grew to manhood and served their country in the capacities indicated by my friend. Moreover, almost to a man they served their country in war. A large number of them were killed. Many of them were wounded. Many of them were decorated. All of them served honorably and well in the responsibility which the war placed upon them. Subsequent to that time pages served in the Korean conflict honorably and well and since that time I would point out that they have gone on into government, business, industry, into the labor movement, and into almost every field of endeavor which opportunity in this country offers to our young men. And in almost every instance, indeed almost without exception, they have covered themselves with the mark of honor and dignity which so well befits these young men of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out last of all that I know of no page who during his service has disgraced himself or has disgraced the Congress in which he plays such an important part. And I would point out lastly to the critics of our pages that, indeed, considering the opportunities for going wrong and, indeed, considering the expense to which the Congress is put to maintain them salarywise, they have done a remarkably good job.

I saw the article that mentioned beer parties and gambling. Let me say that while there may be some of this, I would point out that certainly the article gives an unfair impression. I know of no instance or of any circumstances in which that has taken place. I would go beyond this and point to my good friend that this is a wrong to a fine group of young men. I would say that in their responsibilities and in their lives these young men are in a fine example to all of the young men in the United States.

And I would point out to my friend that it is my experience that they lead a considerably more exemplary life than the other young people of this country, especially considering the very arduous circumstances under which they live, the long hours they spend in school, and the difficult life which they lead in carrying out heavy responsibilities which we in the Congress impose upon them.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. The remarks of the gentleman from Michigan are certainly appreciated. I know that they are well thought out and remarks which come from practical experience.

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to compliment the gentleman from California for his remarks on this subject and I want to say that I concur with the gentleman and also concur with the gentleman from Michigan as to the rigorous life of a page.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to have been a page myself for 3 years. At that time it was a real experience. The backbone of my experience that ultimately resulted in my taking on a political career was formed at that time and ended up in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I would like also to refer to the article which was published in the local newspaper with respect to pages and their activities. Pages are no different than any other group of young men or young boys.

I would like to second the suggestion of the gentleman from California [Mr. Wilson] as to the dormitory. I think it would represent a very much needed facility.

I certainly want to say that the pages in their service to the House of Representatives are a needed group of young men. They have done an excellent job.

I would also like to especially comment on the people who have taken on the responsibility of educating these young men at the Capitol page school, which is a part of the public school system of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I attended those schools as a boy and I know that the teachers are dedicated men and women who have done an excellent job of preparing these young fellows to go into the furtherance of their education after they leave the page service and that they will well acquit themselves when they go into the high schools and colleges of our country.

I think the unfair criticism that was heaped on the Capitol page school was unwarranted. I think they have done an excellent job.

Mr. Speaker, I again compliment the gentleman from California and thank the gentleman for giving me the opportunity to speak at this time.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF POWERED FLIGHT AND THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF AIR FORCE SILVER WINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Schenck] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, many years ago as a young lad who used to deliver groceries for my father on my bicycle, I took my bicycle to the Wright Cycle Shop on West Third Street in Dayton, Ohio, when it needed to be repaired or adjusted. It was here that I first met Wilbur and Orville Wright. Mr. Zorn, one of their mechanics and who was also a cabinetmaker who fashioned the wooden frames, struts, and other wood parts of their flying machine was my Sunday school teacher.

Neither of the Wright brothers had finished high school and they had no formal education in engineering. But they were skilled in the constructive arts, were perfectionists in whatever they did, and they had a driving determination to complete whatever they set out to do regardless of how insurmountable the task might seem to others.

In 1897 the Wright brothers decided to build a flying machine. They read and studied everything they could find on anything pertaining to flying. They tried and succeeded to calculate wind pressure and in their experiments developed the first wind tunnel ever to be constructed and they powered this small wind tunnel with a fan driven by a small gasoline engine. They increased and developed their knowledge of aerodynamics through reading, studying, talking, and experimenting. Frequently lying on their backs the Wright brothers carefully studied the flight of birds in soaring and maintaining their balance. The Wright brothers knew you could not learn to ride a bicycle by reading. Nor could one learn to fly that way and so they decided to practice gliding. They corresponded with everyone they could find who was interested in this subject and they exchanged ideas. And so it was that they took their first glider to the sand dunes and breezes of Kitty Hawk, N.C., in 1900. A Chanute double decker Wilbur called it, because it was named after Octave Chanute with whom they had corresponded extensively. They flew it first like a kite to study its behavior. Finally, Wilbur took the first tethered glider ride and later the Wrights glided for about 2 minutes without the rope. They experimented with and developed various kinds of controls and Wilbur decided the next step would be to build a gasoline engine for their flying machine. They called it an automobile motor simplified—it weighed 170 pounds, was water cooled, and made 1,200 revolutions a minute.

The work and progress of the Wright brothers in developing and finally flying their flying machine, Mr. Speaker, reads like a best selling novel.

Sixty years ago today, Mr. Speaker, on December 17, 1903, with only a handful of people around, and on the sand dunes of breezy Kitty Hawk, N.C., the first powered flight of man was made. It was Orville's turn. He lay down on the plane, he released the wire which held the machine to the wood track and with the motor driving the propellers, the machine started forward into the wind. After a 40-foot run, it lifted itself off the track and the flying machine was airborne, making it the first powered flight in history. This first flight lasted only 12 seconds and ended about 120 feet from the point at which it rose into the air. The second flight was about 195 feet, the third flight a little over 200 feet, and the fourth and last flight that morning lasted almost 1 minute and covered a little more than 850 feet of actual flight.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the first successful powered flight occurred just 60 years ago today at Kitty Hawk, N.C., in a flying machine developed and made by the Wright brothers, Orville and Wilbur, of Dayton, Ohio, and it was my privilege to know them both personally.

The development in air transportation in these short past 60 years has been fantastic. From this first flight 60 years ago today of a little over 120 feet, manned flight has orbited the earth many times continuously at unbelievable speeds. Manned flight in airplane-like vehicles has been accomplished by our own military aircraft at several times the speed of sound. Breaking the sound barrier has become quite commonplace, much to the annoyance of many people who have been startled by the resulting explosion-like noise which in some cases, no doubt, has also caused some damage to property on the ground.

The use of aircraft as a means of transporting people and goods also as a means of military use was recognized very early. Thus it was that our own military forces began to use aircraft 50 years ago and 1963 marks the 50th anniversary of our Air Force Silver Wings.

The scientific developments not only in the aircraft and their components, but also in guidance and navigational system has been so fantastic as to actually be almost beyond the ability of one to imagine.

Time will not permit me, Mr. Speaker, to indicate the development of aircraft and their use, but this is a multibillion-dollar industry today challenging still the imagination and the ability of the scientific capability of our Nation and the entire world. All this and more in the short span of 60 years, Mr. Speaker. Thus it should be understandable that those of us who live in the great city of Dayton, Ohio, and the wonderful Miami Valley, are justly proud that our area has become known throughout the entire world as the birthplace and cradle of aviation.

The Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce, for many years, has sought to draw attention to some of these developments by sponsoring an annual luncheon on December 17 to commemorate the anniversary of the first powered flight. For the past 2 years this luncheon has been cosponsored by the Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce and the National Aviation Hall of Fame, Inc.

This year, as the 60th anniversary of powered flight and the 50th anniversary of the Air Force Silver Wings, a luncheon was held today in Dayton, Ohio. Special arrangements were made to commemorate this special event which I had hoped to attend in person, as I have each year for many years. I was prevented from doing so today, of course, because of the important matters confronting us all here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Arthur Godfrey, famous radio and television personality of Leesburg, Va., and himself a famous airplane pilot, served as master of ceremonies.

Gen. Mark Bradley, commander of the Air Force Logistic Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base spoke on the Air Force Silver Wings and made a presentation to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, one of the first, if not the first, military officer to fly an airplane. The Very Reverend Raymond A. Roesch, S.M., president of the University of Dayton, gave the invocation.

Mr. Hans Belitz, president of Ledex Corp., gave a short speech of welcome after which Robert J. Simons, of Simons Cadillac, long a prime mover in these powered flight commemorative luncheons, gave a brief review of what has occurred in aviation during these past 60 years.

Mr. James Jacobs, president of the National Aviation Hall of Fame, told of the aims and purposes of that organization and recalled that the first two to be honored as members of the Aviation Hall of Fame at the first meeting of his organization last year were Wilbur and Orville Wright. Mr. Jacobs then announced that four had been selected to enter the Aviation Hall of Fame this year by the vote of the selection committee which is composed of some of the most famous people in the entire field of aviation and who are nationwide in their representation on this selection committee. The four recipients honored today and whose portraits will be enshrined in the Hall of Fame along with the story of their contributions to the science and growth of aviation are:

Octave Chanute whose great grandson accepted the appropriate commemoration; Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois accepted the commemoration in person; the commemoration for Frank Purdy Laham was accepted by his widow; and the commemoration for Samuel Pierpont Langley was accepted by Dr. Paul Garber, Smithsonian Institution.

Chamber of Commerce President Josiah B. Colley made a presentation to Mr. Godfrey for his participation in today's 60th anniversary program. Mr. Jacobs presented Mr. Godfrey with a charter membership on the board of directors of the National Aviation Hall of Fame and Mr. Weller gave Mr. Godfrey a certificate for the 50th anniversary of the Air Force Silver Wings.

Miss Barbar Fitzharris Schamel sang the national anthem. The benediction was pronounced by Lt. Col. Karl F. Schoper of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. Following the luncheon a motorcade proceeded to Woodland Cemetery and to the Wright Brothers' Memorial on a hill overlooking Wright Field, for the laying of wreaths with appropriate ceremonies and an Air Force flyover.

Thus ended the commemoration, Mr. Speaker, of the 60th anniversary of powered flight and the 50th anniversary of the Air Force Silver Wings in the great city of Dayton, Ohio, the birthplace and cradle of aviation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HALL, for Wednesday, December 18, and remainder of this week, and also Tuesday, January 7, 1964, if the 2d session of the 88th Congress is convened on that date, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SCHENCK (at the request of Mr. LANGEN), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. LANGEN), on December 19, for 30 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. ALBERT and to include a statement made by the President of the United States at the time of the signing of the higher education bill.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KUNKEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SKUBITZ.

Mr. HOSMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4276. An act to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 6756. An act to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9140. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4338. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances for travel performed under orders that are canceled, revoked, or modified, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 335. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December of each year as "Wright Brothers Day."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 18, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1452. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the fifth semiannual consolidated report of balances of foreign currencies acquired without payment of dollars, as of June 30, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 87–195; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1453. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the overpricing of spare parts purchased from Hughes Aircraft Co., Culver City, Calif., under fixed-price incentive contract AF 33(600)–38280 with the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1454. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense transmitting the report on real and personal property of the Department of Defense, as of June 30, 1963, pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1455. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the procurement of inaccurate radiation measuring instruments by the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works, House Joint Resolution 871. Joint resolution providing for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1050). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9436. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1958, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedures, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1051). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9435. A bill to improve judicial procedures for serving documents, obtaining evidence, and proving documents in litigation with international aspects; without amendment (Rept. No. 1052). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 741. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit schemes in interstate or foreign commerce to influence by bribery the outcome of sporting contests, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1053). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8316. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from making certain rules relating to the length or frequency of broadcast advertisements; without amendment

(Rept. No. 1054). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NATCHER: Committee of conference. H.R. 7431. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1055). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROONEY of New York: Committee of conference. H.R. 7063. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1056). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4361. A bill for the relief of the estate of Paul F. Ridge; with amendment (Rept. No. 1047). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4972. A bill for the relief of Robert E. McKee General Contractor, Inc., and Kaufman & Broad Building Co., a joint venture; with amendment (Rept. No. 1048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6748. A bill for the relief of the J. D. Wallace & Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1049). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 9510. A bill to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 9511. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on polyethylene imine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 9512. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to make that act applicable to smoking products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9513. A bill to establish the calendar year as the fiscal year of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.J. Res. 877. Joint resolution providing for a world conference on oceanography to be convened in the United States in 1965; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.J. Res. 878. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. POWELL introduced a bill (H.R. 9514) for the relief of Athanassia Eleni, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

537. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the election and succession of the President and Vice President as provided in the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

538. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to maintaining a truly honorable States rights under the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

539. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting passage of House Joint Resolution 789, to adopt a specific version of the Star Spangled Banner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the eternal source of the love that came down at Christmas, help us to see that the heart of what the world is celebrating these festive days is the opposite of most of this generation's priorities in the busy rush for success. Give us to comprehend the magnificent irony of His coming, with its reversals of the standards of men—that right past wealth and purple pomp and priestly pride, scorning kings and rulers and unworthy religious leaders, past church, past state, past throne and altars, the true word of God made flesh, compelling and revolutionary, came to the lowly manger, for there was no room in the busy inn.

Open our eyes to see that still today, as unpredictable as the Bethlehem inn, again and again the hands and feet and lips of Thy deepest purpose for the world are housed in some human life, and that when—

They all were looking for a king
 To raise their hopes and lift them high—
He came, a little baby thing
 That made a woman cry!

So may we thrill once more, as the silver trumpets of Christmas are heard, as with contrite hearts we confess—

I know not how that Bethlehem's Babe
 Could in the Godhead be;
I only know the manger Child
 Has brought God's life to me.

In that Holy Child's blessed name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., December 17, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

LEE METCALF,
Acting President pro tempore.

Mr. AIKEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 16, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONVENTION WITH MEXICO FOR SOLUTION OF PROBLEM OF THE CHAMIZAL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate, under its order of yesterday, will now proceed to consider, in executive session, the Chamizal convention with Mexico, under a limitation of 2 hours of debate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to the consideration of Executive N, 88th Congress, 1st session, the convention, Executive N (88th Cong., 1st sess.), a convention with Mexico for solution of the problem of the Chamizal, signed at Mexico City on August 29, 1963, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES FOR THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM OF THE CHAMIZAL

The United States of America and the United Mexican States:

Animated by the spirit of good neighborliness which has made possible the amicable solution of various problems which have arisen between them;

Desiring to arrive at a complete solution of the problem concerning El Chamizal, an area of land situated to the north of the Rio Grande, in the El Paso-Ciudad Juarez region;

Considering that the recommendations of the Department of State of the United States and the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Mexico of July 17, 1963, have been approved by the Presidents of the two Republics;

Desiring to give effect to the 1911 arbitration award in today's circumstances and in keeping with the joint communique of the Presidents of the United States and of Mexico issued on June 30, 1962; and

Convinced of the need for continuing the program of rectification and stabilization of the Rio Grande which has been carried out under the terms of the Convention of February 1, 1933, by improving the channel in the El Paso-Ciudad Juarez region,

Have resolved to conclude a Convention and for this purpose have named as their Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America, Thomas C. Mann, Ambassador of the United States of America to Mexico, and The President of the United Mexican States, Manuel Tello, Secretary for Foreign Relations.

Who, having communicated to each other their respective Full Powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

In the El Paso-Ciudad Juarez sector, the Rio Grande shall be relocated into a new channel in accordance with the engineering plan recommended in Minute No. 214 of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico. Authentic copies of the Minute and of the map attached thereto, on which the new channel is shown, are annexed to this Convention and made a part hereof.

ARTICLE 2

The river channel shall be relocated so as to transfer from the north to the south of the Rio Grande a tract of 823.50 acres composed of 366.00 acres in the Chamizal tract, 193.16 acres in the southern part of Cordova Island, and 264.34 acres to the east of Cordova Island. A tract of 193.16 acres in the northern part of Cordova Island will remain to the north of the river.

ARTICLE 3

The center line of the new river channel shall be the international boundary. The lands that, as a result of the relocation of the river channel, shall be to the north of the center line of the new channel shall be the territory of the United States of America and the lands that shall be to the south of the center line of the new channel shall be the territory of the United Mexican States.

ARTICLE 4

No payments will be made, as between the two Governments, for the value of the lands that pass from one country to the other as a result of the relocation of the international boundary. The lands that, upon relocation of the international boundary, pass from one country to the other shall pass to the respective Governments in absolute ownership, free of any private titles or encumbrances of any kind.

ARTICLE 5

The Government of Mexico shall convey to the Banco Nacional Hipotecario Urbano y de Obras Públicas, S.A., titles to the properties comprised of the structures which pass intact to Mexico and the lands on which they stand. The Bank shall pay the Government of Mexico for the value of the lands on which such structures are situated and the Government of the United States for the estimated value to Mexico of the said structures.

ARTICLE 6

After this Convention has entered into force and the necessary legislation has been enacted for carrying it out, the two Governments shall, on the basis of a recommendation by the International Boundary and Water Commission, determine the period of time appropriate for the Government of the United States to complete the following:

(a) The acquisition, in conformity with its laws, of the lands to be transferred to Mexico and for the rights of way for that portion of the new river channel in the territory of the United States;

(b) The orderly evacuation of the occupants of the lands referred to in paragraph (a).

ARTICLE 7

As soon as the operations provided in the preceding article have been completed, and the payment made by the Banco Nacional Hipotecario Urbano y de Obras Públicas, S.A., to the Government of the United States as provided in Article 5, the Government of the United States shall so inform the Government of Mexico. The International Boundary and Water Commission shall then proceed to demarcate the new international boundary, recording the demarcation in a Minute. The relocation of the international boundary and the transfer of lands provided for in this Convention shall take place upon express approval of that Minute by both Governments in accordance with the procedure established in the second paragraph of Article 25 of the Treaty of February 3, 1944.

ARTICLE 8

The costs of constructing the new river channel shall be borne in equal parts by the two Governments. However, each Government shall bear the costs of compensation for the value of the structures or improvements which must be destroyed, within the territory under its jurisdiction prior to the relocation of the international boundary, in the process of constructing the new channel.

ARTICLE 9

The International Boundary and Water Commission is charged with the relocation of the river channel, the construction of the bridges herein provided for, and the maintenance, preservation and improvement of the new channel. The Commission's jurisdiction and responsibilities, set forth in Article XI of the 1933 Convention for the maintenance and preservation of the Rio Grande Rectification Project, are extended upstream from that part of the river included in the Project to the point where the Rio Grande meets the land boundary between the two countries.

ARTICLE 10

The six existing bridges shall, as a part of the relocation of the river channel, be replaced by new bridges. The cost of constructing the new bridges shall be borne in equal parts by the two Governments. The bridges which replace those on Stanton-Lerdo and Santa Fe-Juarez streets shall be located on the same streets. The location of the bridge or bridges which replace the two Cordova Island bridges shall be determined by the International Boundary and Water Commission. The agreements now in force which relate to the four existing bridges between El Paso and Ciudad Juarez shall apply to the new international bridges which replace them. The international bridge or bridges which replace the two Cordova Island bridges shall be toll free unless both Governments agree to the contrary.

ARTICLE 11

The relocation of the international boundary and the transfer of portions of territory resulting therefrom shall not affect in any way:

(a) The legal status, with respect to citizenship laws, of those persons who are present or former residents of the portions of territory transferred;

(b) The jurisdiction over legal proceedings of either a civil or criminal character which are pending at the time of, or which were decided prior to, such relocation;

(c) The jurisdiction over acts or omissions occurring within or with respect to the said portions of territory prior to their transfer;

(d) The law or laws applicable to the acts or omissions referred to in paragraph (c).

ARTICLE 12

The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Mexico City as soon as possible.

The present Convention shall enter into force upon the exchange of instruments of ratification.

Done at Mexico City the twenty-ninth day of August, nineteen sixty three, in the English and Spanish languages, each text being equally authentic.

For the Government of the United States of America,

[SEAL] THOMAS C. MANN.

For the Government of the United Mexican States,

[SEAL] MANUEL TELLO.

NOMINATIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself one-half a minute, in which I call up the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The nominations will be stated.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

CONVENTION WITH MEXICO FOR SOLUTION OF PROBLEM OF THE CHAMIZAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of Executive N, 88th Congress, 1st session, a convention with Mexico for the solution of the problem of the Chamizal.

At this point, by request, as in legislative session. Mr. SPARKMAN introduced the bill (S. 2394) to facilitate compliance with the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed August 29, 1963, and for other purposes.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN relating to the above bill, which appear under a separate heading, following the vote on the pending convention.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time there may be a quorum call, and that the time required for it be not charged to the time available to either side under the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the time allotted under the unanimous consent agreement was placed in charge of the majority leader and the minority leader. I ask unanimous consent that the time under my control be transferred to the control of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to the minority leader be transferred to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Has the treaty been laid before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is before the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Convention With Mexico for Solution of the Problem of Chamizal, Executive N, 88th Congress, 1st session. The Committee on Foreign Relations favorably reported the convention to the Senate on December 13 by a vote of 16 to 0, following hearings during which the committee heard representatives of the executive branch and anyone else wishing to testify.

Ratification of this convention by the United States and Mexico will settle a longstanding boundary dispute between the two countries, a dispute that has been a thorn in their relations for almost 100 years.

Back in 1910, the United States and Mexico agreed to arbitrate this dispute over the Chamizal, which is an area of land situated to the north of the Rio Grande River, in the region of El Paso, Tex., and Ciudad Juárez, Mexico. While the arbitral award was to be "final and conclusive upon both Governments, and without appeal"—those words are taken from the arbitration treaty itself—the decision handed down was not acceptable to the United States. This Government refused to abide by the arbitral award. From that time on, each U.S. President has been plagued with the issue of the Chamizal. Diplomatic negotiations to settle the boundary dispute were to no avail until a new start was made in 1962 by President Kennedy and President López Mateos, of Mexico. Negotiations which began at that time took into account the entire history of the tract and reserved the juridical positions of the countries. Also mentioned were the views of the people whose interests would be affected in the event a settlement was reached.

Inasmuch as Members of the Senate have before them copies of the treaty and related documents, as well as the committee report and hearings, I shall not attempt to explain every provision of the treaty. Rather, I shall try to confine my comments to the most important features of the treaty and to important matters related thereto.

Under the treaty, the Rio Grande will be located in a new channel, the costs of which will be shared by the two Governments. The center line of the new channel will be the international boundary. The lands to the north of the center line would belong to the United States and the lands to the south of the center line would belong to Mexico.

The acreage now accepted by the United States and Mexico as that awarded by the 1911 arbitral award to Mexico is 437.18 acres, and that is the actual amount of land that would be transferred to Mexico pursuant to the treaty.

Of the 437.18 acres to be transferred to Mexico, 366 acres would come from the Chamizal tract and the other 71.18 acres from an area under the jurisdiction of the United States and located just below Cordova Island, a Mexican enclave. One additional quid pro quo transfer of lands would be involved: Mexico would receive 193.16 acres of U.S. territory next to the 71.18-acre tract already referred to; in turn, 193.16 acres of Cordova Island would be transferred by Mexico to the United States.

Boundary lands have been transferred between the United States and Mexico before. It might be noted that during the Rio Grande rectification project, 1934–38, the Rio Grande was straightened and stabilized in accordance with the provisions of the 1933 convention between the United States and Mexico. In order that the Rio Grande could remain the international boundary, many separate tracts of land were transferred between the two countries. And, pursuant to the Banco Treaty of 1905, the two countries have eliminated over 200 detached "banco" tracts along the river. Some 10,000 acres, formerly on the U.S. side, passed to Mexico, while nearly 18,000 acres formerly on the Mexican side, passed to the United States. Approval of the Chamizal Treaty, by eliminating the last two detached tracts claimed by Mexico in the El Paso-Juárez Valley, will make it possible to complete the rectification and stabilization project started in 1934.

The Department of State has estimated that the costs of implementing this treaty will be $29.3 million. However, the United States will receive a payment of $4.7 million from a Mexican bank for the value of structures which pass intact on lands transferred to Mexico. In addition, it is estimated that the market value of the 193.18 acres of Cordova Island which will be transferred to the United States will be $6 million. Thus, the net cost to this Government of implementing the treaty is estimated to be $18.6 million. Certain costs of compensating property owners might amount to an additional $4 million, and costs of relocating and expanding port-of-entry inspection facilities might reach $6.1 million more. Then, the appropriations required in connection with the treaty might total $39.4 million.

At the time the committee acted on the Chamizal Convention, legislation to implement the treaty had not been transmitted to the Congress. However, as stated in the report, the committee wishes to assure the people in the El Paso area whom the treaty will most directly affect—and the Senate as well—that it plans at the earliest possible date to take action on legislation to implement this treaty.

I add, parenthetically, that the implementing legislation has now been received in the Senate, as I stated a while ago. Furthermore, on behalf of the chairman of the committee, I have given assurance that the committee will consider the implementing legislation as soon as possible after the new session of Congress meets.

The Chamizal Convention, it should be emphasized, relates to a boundary dispute, a dispute which has long been an irritant in relations between the United States and Mexico. The committee is of the opinion that the settlement of this dispute is fair and equitable. And the committee believes that the settlement reached is in the interests of the community of El Paso, the State of Texas, and the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, in my judgment, history will record that the Chamizal Convention was one of the notable accomplishments of the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

The Committee on Foreign Relations strongly recommends that the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Chamizal Convention.

There is one thing I wish to mention, beyond my opening statement. I particularly ask for the attention of the two Senators from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH and Mr. TOWER].

This comment is based upon the point the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] presented to our committee. He did not oppose the treaty as such—he was not arguing against its merits—but he felt that there was a principle involved, that the State of Texas should consent to the transfer of the land on the Texas side. Our committee felt that the principle would not be applicable here because the Chamizal settlement falls into the category of a boundary dispute.

We have stated in the report—and I invite the attention of Senators to the statement in the report on page 7—that approval of this treaty by the Senate is no to be construed as setting any precedent in situations such as that mentioned by the junior Senator from Texas. This case involves a boundary dispute which falls in the same category as settlements under the banco agreement.

Furthermore, I would point out, as the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] pointed out in his testimony before the committee, that, in a treaty ratified by the Senate in December 1910, the United States agreed to submit the question to arbitration, and the first article of that treaty recited that the Chamizal was a disputed area. In other words, a boundary dispute is involved here. We admitted that in the treaty previously ratified.

Our committee believes that this case falls in the same category as other boundary dispute problems which have arisen in past years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me one-half minute?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum and that the time necessary for the call of the roll not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, there are three possible views of the proposed settlement.

It has been contended by my friends who support the treaty—and, as has been pointed out by my friend from Alabama, I do not oppose the treaty on its merits—that it would give effect to or recognition of the 1911 arbitration award which the United States refused to abide by on the grounds that the Commission had exceeded its instructions.

It is further looked to as a settlement of a presently existing boundary dispute.

Both these contentions would have some validity if it were not for the character of the settlement covered by the treaty.

It is my contention that because certain lands included in the treaty were not in dispute, it involves a cession of territory under the sovereignty of the United States and the State of Texas, and therefore flies in the teeth of what I consider to be an established principle that land may not be ceded or detached without the permission of the State involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the convention will be considered as having been passed through its various parliamentary stages up to the point of the consideration of the resolution of ratification, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention Between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the Solution of the Problem of the Chamizal, signed at Mexico City on August 29, 1963. (Ex. N, 88th Cong., 1st sess.)

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I call up my reservation to the ratifying resolution, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reservation of the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Before the period at the end of the resolution of ratification insert a comma and the following: "subject to the reservation, which is hereby made a part and condition of the resolution of ratification, that no exchange of instruments of ratification of the convention shall be entered into on behalf of the United States, and the convention shall not enter into force, until such convention shall have been submitted to and approved by the Legislature of the State of Texas".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the reservation to the resolution of ratification.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes.

If the United States takes the position that the 1911 award was invalid, it would appear to me that the dispute is the same as it was prior to the award. In other words, it is a boundary dispute properly within the jurisdiction of the International Boundary and Water Commission.

In such a case the International Boundary and Water Commission would appear to have the authority to settle the boundary under the treaty of 1889, without the necessity of a new treaty.

The Banco Elimination Treaty of 1905 does not apply to the Chamizal. The Chamizal is not a banco, and neither the United States nor Mexico has ever taken the position that it is a banco.

Included in the provisions of the treaty is an area east of Cordova Island, which is also included in the treaty. This area is not now in dispute. The Boundary Commission maps indicate that this area, or at least part of it, is part of what was known as the Weber Banco. The Weber Banco was awarded to the United States in 1930 by the International Boundary and Water Commission under the Banco Elimination Treaty of 1905, and in any event, the Rio Grande rectification project—convention of 1933—would seem to have finally eliminated any question as to the international sovereignty of the Weber Banco.

That is to say, the area of Cordova Island which is included in the settlement is not now in dispute, and must, therefore, be regarded as sovereign territory of the State of Texas.

I should like to address myself to the Banco Treaty of 1905.

The complete title of the so-called Banco Treaty of 1905 is: "Convention Between the United States and Mexico for the Elimination of the Bancos in the Rio Grande From the Effects of Article II of the Treaty of 1884."

Article II of the treaty of 1884 provided that the Rio Grande boundary should follow the center of the normal channel of the river, notwithstanding any alterations in the banks or course of the river, provided that such alterations be effected by natural causes through the slow and gradual erosion and deposit of alluvium, and not by the abandonment of the existing riverbed and the opening of the new one.

The minutes of the Boundary Commission and the work preliminary to the 1905 treaty indicate that the modification of the 1884 treaty was requested by the Boundary Commissioners. In attempting to apply the 1884 treaty, the Commissioners found that the nature of the bancos in the lower Rio Grande Valley rendered its application impractical. For example, at that time, the direct distance from Rio Grande City to the gulf was 108 miles, whereas the course of the river was 241 miles. Due to the problems created with reference to law enforcement and territorial jurisdiction, the Commissioners recommended to their respective Governments that the bancos be eliminated so that the boundary would always be the normal channel of the river. The 1905 treaty follows the recommendations of the Commissioners.

The 1905 treaty was designed to meet a specific situation caused by the erratic course of the river and it is not a precedent for the cession of U.S. land to a foreign power. The treaty refers to 58 surveyed bancos, which did not, of course, include the Chamizal, and further evidence of the limited application of the Banco Elimination Treaty is the fact that it specifically excludes bancos having an area in excess of 250 hectares—494 acres—or a population of over 200 persons.

The area east of Cordova Island is not in excess of 250 hectares, but it has a population well in excess of 200 persons.

What I am trying to point out is that the Banco Treaty of 1905 was really simply an amendment or settlement or clarification of the boundary treaty of 1884, and so was in effect a resolution of a boundary problem.

I note that the area east of Cordova Island, which is being included in the Chamizal Treaty, has not been in dispute. Any dispute that may have existed over that area has long been resolved, and it has been recognized as Texas, or American, soil. Mexico has not claimed it. Therefore, I suggest that we are ceding to the Republic of Mexico an area that is not currently in dispute.

I should like to say a word about the refusal of the United States to accept the arbitration award of 1911.

It has been repeatedly stated that the United States reneged or refused to accept an arbitral award after it had agreed to be bound thereby.

It is correct that the 1910 treaty establishing the Arbitration Commission provides that "the decision of the Commission, whether rendered unanimously or by majority vote of the Commissioners, shall be final and conclusive upon both Governments, and without appeal." It is not questioned that parties can renounce their right to appeal from a decision, but this is not to say that they have thereby waived any right to contest the validity of a decision. The Latin American viewpoint on this question of international law appears to be that parties may renounce their right to appeal but they cannot renounce in advance their right to contest the future award on the ground that it is a nullity.

The dissenting opinion of the American Commissioner in the 1911 Chamizal arbitration states as follows:

> It is axiomatic that "a clear departure from the terms of the reference" (Twiss, "The Law of Nations," 2d ed., 1875, p. 8) invalidates an international award, and the American Commissioner is constrained to believe that such a departure has been committed by the majority of the Commission in this case in dividing the Chamizal tract and deciding a question not submitted by the parties.
>
> But this is not all; as the Hague Court recently pointed out in the case of the Orinoco Steamship Co., "excessive exercise of power may consist not only in deciding a question not submitted to the arbitrators, but also in misinterpreting the express provisions of the agreement in respect of the way in which they are to reach their decisions, notably with regard to the legislation or the principles of law to be applied." *United States* v. *Venezuela,* before the *Hague Court*. AJIL, vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 232 and 233.)
>
> In the case concerning the arbitral award made by the King of Spain on December 23, 1906 (*Honduras* v. *Nicaragua*), ICJ reports, 1960, page 225, Judge Urrutia Holguin states in his dissenting opinion:
>
> "In America, on the other hand, the legal abuses to which these arbitrations gave rise resulted in the express recognition of the right of States to challenge the validity of arbitral awards in the eleven treaties signed between 1899 and 1912, mentioned above, and in all arbitrations regarding territorial boundaries where the awards were disputed, and which were the following:
>
> "(e) The United States disputed and today still disputes the validity of the award of 1910 [sic] in the Chamizal case with Mexico. Mexico still has not obtained either the carrying out of the award or agreement to submit the question of its validity to the consideration of another tribunal.
>
> "(f) In a matter where not only American countries were concerned, but also Great Britain, the United States disputed the King of Holland's award on the St. Lawrence River boundary; that country's objections were accepted by the other side and the award had no effects."

Mr. President, I point out that since 1947 both the United States and the Republic of Mexico have been members of the International Court of Justice. Mexico could have brought the case before the International Court of Justice in order to resolve the question of the 1911 award, but it has failed to do so.

Even if it be assumed that there is a legitimate boundary dispute connected with the Chamizal, and even if it were to be assumed that we should have submitted to the award made in 1911, it does not follow that we can freely convey to the Republic of Mexico land which is not now in dispute, without the consent of the State of Texas.

I should like, as a precedent for the contention that we should not or could not cede property belonging to a State without the consent of that State, to refer to the case of *Reid* v. *Covert* (354 U.S. 1).

This case involved the murder conviction of the wife of a member of the Armed Forces overseas. She was tried by a court-martial without a jury. In holding that Mrs. Covert could not constitutionally be tried by the military authorities, the Court stated:

> No agreement with a foreign nation can confer power on the Congress, or on any other branch of Government, which is free from the restraints of the Constitution. Article VI, the supremacy clause of the Constitution, declares:
>
> "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."
>
> There is nothing in this language which intimates that treaties and laws enacted pursuant to them do not have to comply with the provisions of the Constitution. Nor is there anything in the debates which accompanied the drafting and ratification of the Constitution which even suggests such a result. These debates as well as the history that surrounds the adoption of the treaty provision in article VI make it clear that the reason treaties were not limited to those made in "pursuance" of the Constitution was so that agreements made by the United States under the Articles of Confederation, including the important peace treaties which concluded the Revolutionary War, would remain in effect. It would be manifestly contrary to the objectives of those who created the Constitution, as well as those who were responsible for the Bill of Rights—let alone alien to our entire constitutional history and tradition—to construe article VI as permitting the United States to exercise power under an international agreement without observing constitutional prohibitions. In effect, such construction would permit amendment of that document in a manner not sanctioned by article V. The prohibitions of the Constitution were designed to apply to all branches of the National Government and they cannot be nullified by the Executive or by the Executive and the Senate combined.
>
> There is nothing new or unique about what we say here. This Court has regularly and uniformly recognized the supremacy of the Constitution over a treaty. For example, in *Geofroy* v. *Riggs,* 133 U.S. 258, 267, it declared:
>
> "The treaty power, as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the Government or of its departments, and those arising from the nature of the Government itself and of that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent."

That is the holding of the Supreme Court of the United States. Therefore my contention is that the cession of the area east of Cordova Island without the permission of the government of the State of Texas flies in the teeth of the Constitution. It does violence to the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States. It is my personal feeling that all of the transfer of land to Mexico without the approval of the Legislature of the State of Texas is of doubtful legality under the Constitution. Even assuming that the area called the Chamizal is indeed a part of the boundary dispute, there is no question about the area east of Cordova Island, which is not in dispute, and which is being ceded to Mexico under the terms of this treaty.

Mr. President, I intend to ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment. I will not suggest the absence of a quorum if my friend from Alabama has some questions to ask.

Mr. **SPARKMAN**. I wish to make a brief statement.

Mr. **TOWER**. I will yield the floor.

Mr. **SPARKMAN**. I wish to make a brief statement in connection with something the Senator said. He said that it had been contended that we had reneged on the treaty of 1910. I have never made that statement. I know that the United States felt it had good cause not to carry out the 1911 award because it felt that the Arbitration Commission had exceeded its authority. That was the reason why we refused to accept the award.

Mr. **TOWER**. The treaty creating the board of arbitration specified that the board should determine whether the Chamizal belonged to the United States or Mexico. Instead, the board proceeded with Solomon-like wisdom, and divided the Chamizal. We would not accept that award because we regarded the action as an abrogation of the terms by which the board was established.

Mr. **SPARKMAN**. We contended the decision was not within the frame of reference of the establishment of the board.

I yield 15 minutes to the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. Mr. President, I shall direct my remarks to the specific point under discussion, not to the merits of the treaty itself. I hope to have something to say generally on the treaty later in the debate.

I say to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama that I will shorten my remarks on this point because I shall make some remarks later, on the treaty in general. However, at this point I should like to address my remarks solely to the question of whether under the Constitution, this question of ratification of the Chamizal Treaty should properly be submitted to and approved by the Legislature of the State of Texas before the treaty can become operative.

By the Articles of Annexation of the Republic of Texas to the United States, in 1845, under which Texas gave up its sovereignty as an independent nation to become a State of the United States, it is provided:

> Said State shall be formed * * * "subject to the adjustment by this [Federal] Govern-

ment of all questions of boundary that may arise with other governments."

The reference to the Federal Government is clearly a reference to the United States of America.

There was a dispute at that time between the Republic of Texas and the Republic of Mexico over the southern and western boundaries. The right of settlement of those boundaries was expressly granted by the Republic of Texas to the United States. Or rather Texas gave up any claim to the right it had as an independent nation, to adjust boundaries with foreign nations.

The third article of that compact which the people of Texas often refer to, and regard as binding, was that one of the conditions of annexation was that Texas have the right to divide and create four more States out of its territory, and subdivide itself into a total of five States. Under the same article under which we have the right to divide into five States, we agreed that the Federal Government should have the right to adjust boundaries with other nations.

After the Mexican War, the treaty of 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo reaffirmed the boundary that the Republic of Texas had declared on the 19th day of December 1836 to be its southern boundary—that is, between the Republic of Texas and the Republic of Mexico—along the centerline of the Rio Grande, and along the center of the deepest channel, if there were more than one channel. This boundary was fixed by agreement between the United States and Mexico, in the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848.

That boundary was reaffirmed in the treaty by which the Gadsden Purchase was acquired in 1853. It was reaffirmed in 1884 by the treaty between the United States and Mexico, in which it was agreed that the line would remain fixed in the Rio Grande.

But by the treaty of 1905 between the United States and Mexico it was agreed that they would take up and settle the status of 58 of what were defined as "bancos." Those were territories of land either south of the Rio Grande or north of the Rio Grande that were cut off from one republic or the other by the action of the river and left on the opposite bank from the bank that was generally considered to be the bank of their territorial jurisdiction. Fifty-eight bancos were identified and named in the report in the treaty of 1905 between the United States and Mexico. Those 58 bancos were 58 territorial areas that existed, surrounded by the territory of a foreign nation partly north of the Rio Grande and partly south of the Rio Grande. Of the bancos north of the Rio Grande, many were separated from the river by land of the United States and were land islands of Mexico wholly surrounded by territory of the United States.

Conversely, south of the Rio Grande, by the action of the river, many bancos were territory indisputably of the United States, were owned by the United States, and owned by U.S. citizens, but were south of the Rio Grande. Many of them not only were south of the Rio Grande, but were separated from the Rio Grande by territory that was indisputably Mexican territory, and thus were U.S. land islands, entirely surrounded by Mexican territory.

Actually, more than the 58 bancos specifically identified in the treaty were involved. There were islands of Mexican territory north of the Rio Grande River, and islands of American territory south of the river in Mexico. There was Mexican territory in the United States, but north of the river. That is because the Rio Grande for a good part of its course between the United States and Mexico flows through an alluvial flood plain, over a sandy plain. That is true in the valley of El Paso and through most of the territory from Del Rio to Brownsville, which latter city is adjacent to the river near the Gulf of Mexico. The river constantly shifts as it flows through a wide, sandy plain with loose soil, where the banks of the river are in constant change.

As the distinguished junior Senator from Texas has said, the Banco Treaty of 1905 did not cover the whole Chamizal dispute, which had grown up in 1867. The Chamizal dispute was reserved for a later treaty, the treaty of 1910.

I hold in my hand a map that was a part of the testimony on behalf of the United States during the consideration of the Chamizal arbitration case. It gives some idea of the ambulatory nature of the river in the valley of El Paso. To the left of the map is the city of El Paso. The Chamizal area to the west of Cordova Island is shown on the map.

The river shown in green was the river surveyed in 1852. It was located by the Emory-Salazar survey, made by Major Emory, of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Colonel Salazar, of the Mexican Army Engineers, who jointly surveyed and monumented the boundary between the United States and Mexico.

The river shown in blue is the river of 1889. The river shown in yellow is the course of the river in 1899. The river shown in pink was the river of 1907.

Cordova Island is in this area. All four colors of rivers covered a part of the area the distinguished junior Senator from Texas mentioned, which lies to east of Cordova Island, a part which was adjusted in this treaty, as shown.

At one time, the rivers of 1852, 1889, 1899, and 1907 covered a part of the territory east of Cordova Island and east of the Chamizal as the river moved around.

In 1910, to settle the dispute over the Chamizal, in what was a business area of El Paso, the two nations entered into an arbitration treaty, separate from the Banco Treaty of 1905. In this treaty, it was agreed that the Chamizal tract in dispute was located at El Paso, Tex., and Juarez, Mexico. It was defined as the river valley area, west of Cordova Island and south of the boundary of 1852. The question was proposed to be submitted to arbitration. It was agreed, too, that the award would be binding, and that there would be no appeal.

That convention was ratified by this Senate on December 12, 1910. The significant part was that these two nations, by a treaty ratified in the Senate 53 years ago this month, agreed that this area was disputed territory, and by a treaty submitted the question to arbitration.

By a vote of 2 to 1—the Mexican commissioner and the Canadian commissioner decided against the United States, the U.S. commissioner having disagreed—it was attempted to fix the boundary line in the channel as the river flowed in 1864. The United States contended that the 1864 line was not within the terms of the convention. They were told to decide whether the Chamizal tract was in the United States or Mexico. The commission split and held that a part of the tract was in the United States, and a part in Mexico.

There seems to have been a rapid change in the river in 1864, but the river had not been surveyed that year—1864—or immediately thereafter. That was due to historic causes.

After the South seceded in 1861 and the Confederacy was established in 1862 a Confederate-Texan column invaded New Mexico and captured Santa Fe and Albuquerque. Although the column was victorious there, it was finally defeated in the battle of Glorietta Pass, partly because of a shortage of supplies, and partly because a California column had crossed the desert in their rear. The Confederate-Texan troops had gone far enough west into Arizona to see California territory, but the California troops advanced and occupied El Paso in 1862 and continued to occupy El Paso until the end of the war. They wrote their muster rolls in the deed records of the county in El Paso. I have seen them; I practiced law there for 3½ years. The California troops were stationed there on occupation duty.

Civil government was disrupted. No land grants could be made until after the Civil War had ended. It was some time before normal civil activities were restored. So there was a hiatus of time in which surveys were not made, and there was no actual identification of the channel of the river in 1864.

After the refusal or failure of the parties to settle the Chamizal arbitration by the treaty of 1910, which had followed a historic meeting between President Diaz, of Mexico, and President Taft, of the United States, on the bridge at El Paso, this matter remained as a thorn in the center of all negotiations between the United States and Mexico for more than 50 years.

Now a convention is before the Senate to settle the Chamizal dispute. I shall not discuss the terms generally, other than the proposed reservation that the treaty be not ratified unless the legislature of Texas first approves it.

I refer to the opinion of Martin Richardson, Assistant Attorney General of Texas, to whom the matter was referred. He has given the opinion of the State of Texas, as approved by Mr. Waggoner Carr, by numerous statements in the press that this was not a Texas matter.

A number of cases in the Texas courts have challenged the constitutionality of the Banco Treaty, because the territory in dispute, belonged, in the one case, to

Mexico, and in the other case to the United States.

All of it was a part of the adjustment of the boundary in this alluvial flood plain; and the Attorney General of Texas pointed to these four cases in the court of civil appeals of El Paso, in some of which writs were refused by the Supreme Court of Texas, in which the court held that these changes in sovereignty or dominion, as in the banco case did not invalidate the treaty. They were changes in which it is provided that the owners of the land shall retain their titles to the land and will retain the right to live on the land, retain their existing citizenship, or assume citizenship in the nation to which the land was granted. The court held that this was a constitutional treaty action and was an adjustment of the location of an international boundary; and four times those cases were upheld in the appellate courts of Texas, beginning with the first decision in 1932, out of the courts of El Paso. They have been uniformly upheld by those courts, which have held that the adjustments of boundaries, even in the case of the bancos, are not transfers of sovereignty, but merely adjustments in the location of an international boundary.

This present treaty is an adjustment in accordance with the terms of the 1910 agreement and within the meaning of the banco agreement of 1905, which did not specifically cover this tract, because of the number of people living on it. This adjustment is also within the terms of the holding of the courts that this is an adjustment of the location of an international boundary, and does not deal with a geographical boundary, in the sense of a meridian, and that it is not a mathematical boundary, but is a fluvial boundary which changes with the flow of the river. So, not being a geographical boundary or a mathematical boundary, but being a fluvial boundary, this adjustment or settlement is in keeping with those court holdings; and the matter of cession of territory is not involved. Therefore, the consent of the Legislature of Texas is not required or involved—just as the chief law officer of Texas has held that the question of Texas sovereignty is not here involved.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, none of the cases cited by the Attorney General of Texas deals with cessions; instead, they relate to boundary disputes. Therefore, while the power of the United States to settle an international boundary dispute may be conceded, the power to cede territory to a foreign power is an entirely different matter. In my opinion, the cases cited by the Attorney General of Texas would not apply to such a cession.

The joint resolution of March 1, 1845, which provides for the annexation of Texas to the United States, provides:

> Said State to be formed, subject to the adjustment by this government of all questions of boundary that may arise with other governments.

At the time of the resolution, the Republic of Texas had been engaged for a period of almost 10 years with Mexico in a dispute over the southern boundary of Texas. Mexico claimed all the land up to the Nueces River, and the Republic of Texas claimed that the Rio Grande was the true boundary. A virtual state of war existed in this area, and the seriousness of the dispute is further evidenced by the fact that the Mexican-American War broke out within a year following the annexation of Texas.

It was with this dispute in mind that the annexation resolution provided that the U.S. Government would have the power to settle boundary questions arising with other governments. It was with the specific dispute above referred to in mind that this language was put into the resolution; and it is not to be supposed that the U.S. Government thereby intended to have a continuing right to change the boundary of Texas at will. As far as we know, no such provision exists with reference to other States.

Mr. President, I also point out that I do not believe this convention relates to the Banco Treaty of 1905, which had to do with the rectification of a boundary, for, as my colleague [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has said, the bancos had been isolated on the wrong side of the river, and that was simply done subsequent to the treaty of 1884.

In this case we have no rectification of a river boundary involved in connection with the land in the Cordova Island which is in dispute. Therefore, I think it must be conceded that this is a cession of land to Mexico.

I ask unanimous consent that at this time there may be a quorum call, without charging the time required for it to the time available to either side under agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the reservation proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TOWER. I point out that the Republic of Mexico or many of the people of Mexico still claim some islands off the coast of California. For example, Catalina Island is one; San Clemente is another; and there are others. If we follow the bad precedent proposed in this case, by ceding to Mexico land belonging to Texas, we might be troubled later on by some other claims, not just from our good neighbors to the south, but also from our good neighbors to the north, who might get the idea that the United States is in a generous mood and is prepared to cede away a great deal of property, simply to mollify and placate our friends.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to have time yielded to him?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; 1 or 2 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have worked on this case, insofar as studying it is concerned, for a long time. I have previously spoken on the floor of the Senate in support of the treaty. So on this occasion, I shall not repeat those remarks, except to say that I think our Government is to be congratulated on the negotiated adjustment it has made to correct what I consider to be an inexcusable wrong that the United States committed against Mexico, when, after it agreed to go into arbitration and negotiation in regard to this matter, it walked out on the decision. That course of action cannot be justified, particularly when we profess to the rest of the world that we believe in the settlement of disputes by means of the application of the rules of law. When decisions go against us, we should go with the decisions.

In my judgment, there never has been justification for the position the United States took. I have been involved in a great deal of arbitration work during my lifetime; and it is a common technique for the losing side to claim that the arbitrator went beyond the terms of reference.

Mr. President, when we go into an arbitration and when we accept jurisdiction by a tribunal—as we did, and there is no question about the competency and high qualifications of the board of arbitration—we should stand by the results.

Ever since 1911, this matter has been a bone of contention between the United States and Mexico. It has not been helpful to our country, in connection with public opinion in Mexico. I do not know of a single time when I have been in Mexico when this matter has not been thrown into my face. So I am very glad that, at long last, we have negotiated an honorable settlement, as represented by this treaty with Mexico.

I highly commend our negotiators, and I enthusiastically support the treaty.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe the issue is being obscured. Regardless of the merits of the award of 1911, the fact remains that there is involved in the treaty the cession of territory that is not currently in dispute. If the award was a just award in 1911, why do we not abide by the award of 1911 and give up that portion of the Chamizal which was awarded to Mexico in 1911? We are going beyond that. Actually, this is a new ball game. We have drawn a new boundary, taking in land that was not comprehended in the deliberations of the original Chamizal arbitration commission. Therefore, I contend that we are ceding land that belongs to the State of Texas and the United States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I speak as an American, born in the State of California, whose State and whose people have been enriched over their long history by a culture from the people of Latin America, and most particularly by the people and the culture of Mexico.

I believe I know the Mexican people quite well. There is no more gallant race in this hemisphere or on this globe. In the years ahead, it would be my fervent prayer that the people of the United States maintain and strengthen the bonds of cordiality, of amity, and of brotherhood between our two closest neighbors, Canada to the north and Mexico to the south, for our aspirations as people are precisely the same.

In my judgment, it is regrettable that for almost a century problems which should have been solved long ago have continued as an irritant to the bonds of friendship we have been trying to strengthen with our neighbors to the south.

Today, the Senate has to shear away the type of dispute which should have been set at rest half a century ago.

The Chamizal dispute, which has now existed for almost a century should have been set at rest by the Government of the United States 52 years ago. For it was in 1910 that both of our nations signed a convention referring this matter to arbitration. In 1911, the International Boundary Commission awarded part of the Chamizal tract to Mexico. Regrettably, the United States failed to put this award into effect.

The Senate of the United States will now approve a convention which generally carries out the 1911 arbitral award. Various land will be exchanged. There will be a net transfer of over 437 acres to Mexico.

The people of Mexico, our beloved friends, may look upon this convention as one more binding tie between us to help make this Western Hemisphere a place for people to live together in happiness, in mutual assistance—loving their liberties and peacefully settling their disputes and their disagreements. There must not be unresolved issues between our two great peoples.

It has been said in debate that the Government of the United States entered into an agreement to arbitrate a dispute and then saw fit, when the arbitration award was made, to walk away from it. That is not the path which our beloved country should tread.

I wish my country to proceed in honor in all its diplomatic relations with all the nations of the world. I am delighted that the Government of the United States, at long last, acting under a two-nation Commission appointed by the chiefs of state of the two countries involved, has determined upon a reasonable and satisfactory manner in which to resolve the dispute.

In this connection, I recall that early this year I was a delegate to the Mexican-American Parliamentary Conference in Mexico. All of the American delegates had an opportunity to sit down with a distinguished civil servant, the then Ambassador to Mexico from the United States, Thomas Mann. I was singularly impressed with his qualifications and his dedication to his country. He traced the history of the Chamizal dispute. He gave his own frank recommendations as to what he thought should be the ingredients by which this disagreement should be set at rest. The treaty before the Senate follows the line of logic which he meticulously outlined.

Mr. President, I came away feeling that there was now an opportunity to bring the Chamizal dispute to a successful and fair conclusion. I am delighted, incidentally, that Ambassador Mann now takes his place as a high-ranking official in our Department of State charged with the prime responsibility of fostering good relations in this hemisphere with our neighbors to the south.

Thus, I look forward to voting for the treaty precisely as it came from the Foreign Relations Committee, and I look forward, too, to the settlement between our two countries of other disagreements between our two nations, particularly that with respect to the waters of the Colorado River, particularly to the usability of those which, by treaty, go to Mexico, for there, as here, we have a duty to proceed in honor and in fairplay.

At any rate, this is a happy day in the good relations of Mexico and the United States. The Senate is about to demonstrate its desires to strengthen the ties between these two great peoples.

I look forward hopefully toward a continuing strengthening of the friendship and the brotherhood between the people of the United States and the people of Mexico.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the question that my distinguished colleague from Texas raises can be clarified by reference to a map. Unfortunately, maps cannot be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, Senators will observe on the map which I hold in my hand that the area being adjusted is the area of the shifting channel in the alluvial fan of the Rio Grande. It is the area east of Cordova Island. Looking at the map one can see the river in various positions between 1852 to 1907. Cordova Island is immediately to the east. The map attached to the treaty shows what is being adjusted. All of what has been found to be in Mexico is far south of where the river originally was in 1889 and 1899, as shown on the colored map.

The hatched lines indicate that what is being awarded by the United States was indisputably south of the river in 1889 and 1899.

There was a great flood in 1899, and by agreement between the mayor of Juarez and the mayor of El Paso, an artificial channel was cut into the neck of Cordova Island because both cities were being flooded. Since that time, that area of land—approximately 400 acres—at Cordova Island has been land sticking up into the heart of El Paso, and it has been in dispute with Mexico.

That problem is being adjusted under the treaty. All of the territory is south of the land that is within the historic frame of reference of land whose location was covered by varying shifts of the channel of the Rio Grande River.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I do not question the merits of the treaty. This is a question which should be resolved. I have always hoped for good, amicable relations with our friends to the south. Indeed, I believe the treaty has much merit. What worries me is the precedent set in ceding what I consider to be land that is not in dispute, and therefore land belonging to the sovereign State of Texas and to the United States.

I merely ask for the concurrence of the Legislature of the State of Texas, which I believe would be forthcoming. I am reasonably sure that it would be. I believe with that consent we could proceed in an orderly way with a sound precedent, and establish and make effective the treaty, which I believe would remove a sore spot.

I should like to emphasize that I have not questioned the merits of the arrangement of the settlement. I merely raise a legal question which I believe should and must be raised.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the Tower reservation to the resolution of ratification. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the

Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting the Senator from Idaho [Mr. [Church], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Arkansas, [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] are absent on official business to accompany the President of the United States to the United Nations.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent on official business to attend the presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] is necessarily absent attending the funeral of a friend.

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 270 Ex.]

YEAS—13

Beall
Byrd, Va.
Curtis
Ervin
Goldwater
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Mundt
Saltonstall
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—64

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Fong
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—23

Allott
Boggs
Carlson
Church
Dominick
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Fulbright
Gore
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McClellan
Mechem
Monroney
Pearson
Randolph
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Walters

So Mr. Tower's reservation to the resolution of ratification was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I regretfully announce that I must vote against the resolution of ratification, because my reservation was not included in the ratifying resolution. I want it understood and indicated in the Record that I am not questioning the merits of the treaty. I believe it is a highly meritorious treaty, but I question the legal precedent which we are setting. For that reason I feel compelled to vote against the resolution of ratification.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening].

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this treaty is the fulfillment of a solemn obligation entered into by the United States 62 years ago. At that time we submitted the question to arbitration. The river changed its course, and under existing agreements and treaties, land that had been shifted from one side of the river to the other largely belonged to Mexico.

Mexico and the United States submitted the question to arbitration, and the board of arbitration, consisting of three members, included a distinguished Canadian jurist, who decided largely against the United States and for Mexico. All the historic precedents and the facts show that that was a correct decision. Mexico was in a state of revolution at the time the settlement should have been made in 1913, and it was difficult perhaps to comply with the arbitration award immediately, but it should have been done at the earliest opportunity, which was when stability and an era of peace were reestablished with the end of the revolution in 1920, and the inauguration of the regime of President Obergon. But it was not done.

It is one of the great achievements of President Kennedy that 50 years after the event he saw the importance of this issue and initiated proceedings by which the treaty has now been brought before the Senate. The treaty should be ratified. It is merely a fulfillment of the pledge by the United States. It is necessary to do this as a matter of justice and as a matter of vindicating our own honorable pledges.

Congratulations are due to the Chief Executives of both nations, to President Kennedy posthumously, to President Lopez Mateos, who brought the matter to President Kennedy's attention, and to President Johnson who, of course, completed his part of his predecessor's purpose. Congratulations are also due to Mexico's Minister of Foreign Relations, Manuel Tello, and to our Ambassador Thomas C. Mann, who conducted the negotiations with efficiency and good will.

The amicable settlement of this issue is, moreover, a cause for satisfaction to both our republics. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record two statements I made previously, the first entitled "The Settlement of the Chamizal Issue, a Great Kennedy Achievement"; and the second, "The Chamizal Settlement; an Act of Statesmanship" by President Kennedy.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Congressional Record, July 22, 1963]

THE SETTLEMENT OF THE CHAMIZAL ISSUE, A GREAT KENNEDY ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, the administrations of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy and of President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, of Mexico, are to be warmly congratulated on the pending and announced settlement of the nearly century-old Chamizal dispute.

The Chamizal is an area of some 600 acres which, owing to a change in the course of the river—known in the United States as the Rio Grande and in Mexico as the Rio Bravo del Norte—found itself north of that stream's flow and presumably de facto moved from Mexico to U.S. territory and sovereignty. In the intervening years it was deemed by Texans and North Americans to be a part of their city of El Paso, Tex., and by Mexicans to be a part of their city formerly called El Paso del Norte and later renamed Ciudad Juarez.

The issue wrought by these conflicting views was raised repeatedly by Mexicans in the 19th century as were other land alterations brought about by changes in the river's course.

Bearing upon this issue was the language in a number of treaties and conventions between the United States and Mexico. First, there was the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848 between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico which concluded the war between them.

That treaty fixed the boundary between the two nations. It established that as beginning 3 leagues from land opposite the mouth of the river's deepest branch and then up the middle of that river following the deepest channel, where there was more than one, to the point where it strikes the southern boundary of New Mexico—and the specifications in the treaty beyond that do not concern us here because the river ceases to be the boundary at El Paso and Ciudad Juarez. The Gadsden Treaty of 1853 reconfirmed that part of the boundary.

The river, however, was not keeping within bounds, and in 1882 a boundary convention was adopted to provide for the reestablishment of the monuments or markers which had been displaced or dislodged by unruly waters.

Two years later, in 1884, another boundary convention provided means for settling channel changes as they might affect the earlier established boundary. However, article one of that convention provided:

"The dividing line shall forever be that described in the aforesaid Treaty (of Guadalupe-Hidalgo) and follow the center of the normal channel of the rivers named, notwithstanding any alterations in the banks or in the courses of those rivers, provided that such alterations be effected by natural causes through the slow and gradual erosion and deposit of alluvium and not the abandonment of an existing river bed and the opening of a new one."

In 1889 there was another convention establishing the present international boundary commission, and two more conventions, in 1895 and 1900, extended its life, the latter of these, indefinitely.

In 1905 a convention settled the ownership of some 58 bancos or sandbars which the river's vagaries had detached from the shore by deciding that they should go to the country from whose shore they had been detached.

None of these conventions touched the larger issue of Chamizal. But in 1896 one Pedro Ignacio Garcia presented evidence to the two boundary commissioners that he had inherited some land in the Chamizal from his grandfather, Don Lorenzo del Barrio, who had acquired it by purchase, and that his grandfather had occupied it peaceably, as had his son, and that it had been occupied by Garcia himself until in 1873, "in consequence of the abrupt and sudden change of the current of the Rio Bravo," his land was left on the other side of the river in El Paso, Tex. He declared that since that change had taken place he had not dared occupy his land "fearful that some personal injury might befall from the part of a few North Americans, who supposing this land to belong to the United States of North America, pretended to come into possession of the same." Garcia added that he did not know which of the two governments, the United States or Mexico, he should recognize for the payment of taxes.

Garcia made a good point is raising the tax question. But his claim was not the only concomitant of this unprecedented and unique situation. The Commissioners—Col. Anson Mills, representing the United States, and F. Javier Osornio, representing Mexico—could not agree and felt that the issue involving so much personally owned property was beyond their capacity to adjudicate. But Commissioner Mills had written the Secretary of State, Richard Olney, that he was fearful that writs of ejectment might be demanded by American citizens who had occupied this area and that if the Mexicans should resist there might be bloodshed.

It may be cited, parenthetically, Mr. President, that this area lay west of the Pecos, where it was once believed and alleged that there was not much of any law, and in that day the border—as those who have followed the "westerns" have gathered—was a turbulent area where violence was often the rule. If the episode has not been portrayed in any westerns, it should make a TV or movie thriller—especially now that there is a happy ending—an idea I pass on for what it may be worth without claim to discovery or copyright.

In a letter to the Secretary of State of August 4, 1896, Commissioner Mills raised what would be the crucial question in the Chamizal case, namely, whether the Chamizal severance had taken place by gradual erosion and deposit of alluvium, which would bring it under the provisions of article 1 of the Convention of 1884, in which case it would stay with the United States, or whether the river had rapidly changed its course in which case it would go to Mexico. The Mexican Commissioner was contending that the latter was the case. The American Commissioner disagreed.

A lengthy correspondence between the Governments ensued. On December 4, 1897, Commissioner Mills, now a brigadier general, retired, wrote John Sherman, Secretary of State in President McKinley's Cabinet, suggesting that a third Commissioner, not a citizen of either the United States or Mexico be appointed to act as arbiter on issues on which the two Commissioners could not agree, adding that this was perhaps the most important case submitted for the Commission's consideration and "presented great provocation to the citizens of both countries for violence and disorder, where so many small tracts of land are claimed by citizens of both nations."

The Mexican Government, when this suggestion was made known to it, properly pointed out, through its Secretary of Foreign Relations, Ignacio Mariscal, that the existing boundary convention made no provision for a third member, and would, in any event, have no power to settle this issue, and proposed that it be approached with a new treaty to ascertain the pros and cons of the Chamizal issue and decide it. He said that the President of Mexico would, through his Department, so propose, and that the chief of one of the several nations be asked to serve as arbiter—mentioning the Presidents of the Republics of Chile, Colombia, or Ecuador or the King of Belgium.

Secretary Sherman replied, through U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Powell Clayton, that "while accepting the proposition in principle," Mexico's counterproposal gave "the matter an extension which was not at all contemplated in the original proposition of this Government," and that he was "not prepared to recognize the necessity for so elaborate a proceeding at this time. The question at issue is not so much one of international right or disputed interpretation of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, as it is the application to the matter of the ordinary rules and precedents of law with respect to changes in a fluctuating river boundary. The question being essentially judicial, and not involving the element of friendly compromise, which is so often apparent in the settlement of international disputes by a neutral arbitrator, I am still of the opinion that it can find a just and satisfactory solution without resorting to a new treaty, or appealing to the kindly offices of a third state, and that the simplest and most practical way to determine it is to enlarge the commission by the appointment of an American or Mexican jurist upon whom the two Governments may be able to agree. In this manner, the existing convention will be sufficient for the determination of the question."

Ambassador Powell Clayton transmitted the text of this letter to Secretary Mariscal and followed it up with a personal interview. He then wrote to Secretary Sherman:

"I confess that I was at a loss to answer his objections as to the lack of authority for the appointment of a third commissioner, article 2 of the treaty of March 1, 1889 having provided for the number of commissioners and having made no provision for the adding thereto."

What Ambassador Clayton was saying diplomatically to his boss, the Secretary of State, was that the Secretary was wrong and Mariscal was right. He could probably do this safely. A brigadier general in the Union Army, Clayton had been Governor of Arkansas, later was elected and reelected U.S. Senator, and to the end of his life was virtually the Republican boss of his State.

In any event, Mariscal renews his proposal for a new convention but the McKinley administration and the succeeding Theodore Roosevelt administration took no further steps in the matter.

Meanwhile, various incidents, such as the ejection by the El Paso authorities of Mexican citizens from what they considered their homes in El Chamizal and resulting official protests brought home the need of some action by the United States.

Renewing the effort to secure it, Mexico's Ambassador to the United States, Enrique C. Creel, wrote to Secretary of State Elihu Root on July 19, 1907, again requesting a new treaty or convention and proposing that it provide that a Canadian jurist be made a third member of the International Boundary Commission, saying:

"My Government believes that the universally recognized respectability of the Government of Canada and its preeminent impartiality toward the Mexican and American Governments are a sure pledge of the justice that will guide the acts of the Commission it may appoint and constitute the fullest guarantee for the high contracting parties."

The administration of President William Howard Taft acceded to the long-repeated Mexican pleas for a new treaty—and with a Canadian jurist as a third member—which was worked out in correspondence between Mexico's Ambassador Francisco León de la Barra and Secretary of State Philander Chase Knox.

The new convention between the United States and Mexico to deal with the Chamizal case provided that the existing International Boundary Commission be enlarged by the addition of a Canadian jurist, Eugene Lafleur. The two pertinent articles provided:

"ARTICLE III

"The Commission shall decide solely and exclusively as to whether the international title to the Chamizal tract is in the United States of America or Mexico. The decision of the Commission, whether rendered unanimously or by majority vote of the Commissioners shall be final and conclusive upon both Governments and without appeal. The decision shall be in writing and shall state the reasons upon which it is based. It shall be rendered within 30 days after the close of the hearings.

"ARTICLE VIII

"If the arbitral award provided for by this convention shall be favorable to Mexico, it shall be executed within the term of 2 years, which cannot be extended and which shall be counted from the date on which the award is rendered."

The Commission, on June 15, 1911, awarded the greater portion of El Chamizal to Mexico, Canadian Commissioner Lafleur and Mexican Commissioner F. B. Puga affirming, and U.S. Commissioner Anson Mills dissenting.

Based on the evidence which comprises several volumes of testimony, documents, records, and so forth, the Commission's opinion was "that the accretions which occurred in the Chamizal tract up to the time of the great flood in 1864 should be awarded to the United States of America, and that inasmuch as the changes which occurred in that year did not constitute slow and gradual erosion within the meaning of the Convention of 1884, the balance of the tract should be awarded to Mexico."

And so the conclusive paragraph of the award reads as follows:

"Wherefore the presiding Commissioner and the Mexican Commissioner, constituting a majority of said Commission, hereby award and declare that the international title to the portion of the Chamizal tract lying between the middle of the bed of the Rio Grande, as surveyed by Emory and Salazar in 1852, and the middle of the bed of the said river as it existed before the flood of 1864, is in the United States of America and the international title to the balance of said Chamizal tract is in the United States of Mexico."

Unfortunately—for the good name of the United States—the provisions of the treaty were not carried out. The treaty provided that the award of the Commission would "be final and conclusive upon both governments and without appeal" and that it should "be executed within the term of 2 years."

It was not done. For the first and only time in our history the United States failed to abide by an arbitral award. Why?

The political pressure from Texas was too strong. All the more gratifying, therefore, that it was a Texan, the able U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Thomas Clifton Mann, of Laredo, Tex., who was given the opportunity and charged with the responsibility of carrying the complex negotiations to the present point of pending settlement. He is carrying out his assignment with skill and dispatch.

A careful reading of the voluminous material which makes up the Chamizal case leads to the conclusion that based on equity Mexico had a good case from the beginning. After the Commission's painstaking sifting of the evidence, and its award based thereon, there should have been prompt compliance by the United States with the award. The United States regrettably cannot wholly erase a 50-year failure to fulfill its obligation but President Kennedy has now wiped this escutcheon clean and vindicated the good name and good faith of the United States.

There may be some individual hardships among those whom the carrying out of the award will affect. Had the United States acted as it should have on or before June 15, 1913, the damage and the dislocation as well as the cost to Uncle Sam would have been much less. There is now an obligation on our Government to deal generously and equitably with all affected. Whatever the costs, they are negligible when measured against the value of salvaging our Nation's honor. Moreover, there is a priceless spiritual dividend in demonstrating to the people of Mexico that the United States is determined to be a good neighbor.

So again, congratulations to President Kennedy and to all the people of our two adjacent republics.

I ask unanimous consent that three articles from the New York Times reporting on the Chamizal agreement, one under a Washington dateline by Henry Raymont, and two from El Paso and Ciudad Juarez by Jack Langguth, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"[From the New York Times]

"UNITED STATES AND MEXICO AGREE ON BORDER—WASHINGTON GIVES UP CLAIM TO EL CHAMIZAL AREA

"(By Henry Raymont)

"WASHINGTON, July 18.—The United States and Mexico announced today a final agreement for the settlement of the longstanding dispute over the El Chamizal, a border zone between El Paso, Tex., and Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua.

"The agreement was a major step in the Kennedy administration's efforts to end a troubled episode in relations with the neighbor Republic.

"President Kennedy said solution of the 50-year-old dispute would make a 'significant contribution' to relations between the two countries and to the development of the twin cities of El Paso and Ciudad Juarez.

"The accord, which came after nearly 6 months of intensive, complicated negotiations, was announced simultaneously by the White House in Washington and by President Adolfo Lopez Mateos in Mexico City.

"The terms of the agreement will be written into a convention in the next 2 months, officials said. The pact will then go to the Senates of the two countries, probably in October, for ratification.

"The document stipulates several shifts of territory, for a net transfer to Mexico of 437 acres of land. The Rio Grande, which can alternate from a trickle to a torrent depending on seasonal rainfall, will be diverted northward to mark a new boundary between El Paso and Ciudad Juarez.

"To purchase buildings and lands belonging to U.S. citizens in the area awarded to Mexico, the U.S. Government is expected to spend about $28 million. It must also relocate to other parts of El Paso about 3,500 persons who will lose their homes.

"The Texas city, on the other hand, will take over a bulge of 193 acres, about one-third of what was known as Cordova Island. The area, mainly barren land, was a major traffic bottleneck.

"Kennedy pledge fulfilled

"The drafting of the agreement fulfills a pledge Mr. Kennedy made during his visit to Mexico in June last year.

"In a private meeting with President Lopez Mateos, he is reported to have acknowledged that the United States had been wrong in refusing to accept the decision of a 1911 arbitration commission that awarded the El Chamizal area to Mexico. Mr. Kennedy is said to have promised he would make 'every effort' to correct that error.

"U.S. officials attached great significance to two other features of the settlement.

"First, it erased the only known case in which the United States had failed to comply with an international arbitration award. Mexico, like all Latin American states, has always been a strong supporter of arbitration.

"Second, it removed a major source of irritation in United States-Mexico relations. The El Chamizal issue had long been used by Communists and ultra-nationalists in Mexico and throughout Latin America in accusing the United States of 'colonialism' and of defaulting on its international obligations.

"The dispute dates back to 1864 when the Rio Grande, which marks the border between Chihuahua and Texas, changed its course. The El Chamizal area, which had been on the river's southern bank, was left on the northern Texas side by the change.

"[From the New York Times]

"INHABITANTS SHOW DISTRESS

"(By Jack Langguth)

"EL PASO, July 17.—The people of El Chamizal, whose property will be deeded to Mexico under the agreement announced today, were distressed to find themselves suddenly south of the border.

"While the 3,500 U.S. citizens directly affected by the agreement were reluctantly making plans to move, however, El Paso's civic leaders expressed satisfaction that a troublesome breach between the nations was at last being closed.

"The U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Thomas C. Mann, a former Laredo, Tex., attorney, is credited with having shepherded the proposed settlement past opposition from property owners in El Chamizal and political conservatives in southwest Texas.

" 'John Birch Society members and others opposed the agreement as some kind of threat to our sovereignty, but just about everybody else was behind Tom Mann from the beginning,' one leader said.

"Proponents of the pact said about 85 percent of El Chamizal's homeowners were pleased with the transfer. But conversation with men and women through the area showed attitudes ranging from resignation to bitterness.

" 'This is something between the two countries. We can't do anything about it,' Mrs. Marciano Carrasco said. She is the mother of four children, and her husband works at a nearby mine and smelter supply company, which will remain within the U.S. boundary.

" 'We were happy here, and we don't like to be uprooted. We were going to pay off all our house next year. Now we'll have to start all over again,' Mrs. Carrasco said.

"Residential neighborhoods cover about one-third of the 630 acres that will be turned over to Mexico if both countries' legislatures approve the settlement. The city of El Paso will receive 193 acres of vacant land on Cordova Island.

"NEIGHBORHOODS ARE VARIED

"El Chamizal is divided into four different sections, each with its own character and color. Along the existing border, near Santa Fe Avenue, the district is a welter of taxi stands, tam shops, and weather-beaten houses.

"Six blocks east, the residential neighborhoods, become more colorful and better kept. Painted orange, green, yellow, or pink, two-bedroom houses look out on tended lawns bounded by low fences.

"The corner stores in this area are clean but sparsely stocked, with a few dozen canned goods barely covering a wall shelf. At some, such as Los Alamos grocery store, the clerks speak only Spanish.

"Farther east is an industrial area with warehouses and manufacturing companies standing on sandy plots near the railroad tracks. In the vicinity of Cordova Island, where the United States will receive its 193 vacant acres, cotton is sometimes grown.

"There are also bare stretches of sand along the Rio Grande where patches of weed thrive in the 107° heat. El Chamizal was named for a desert weed, like tumbleweed, which grow in thickets over the entire region.

"Homeowners in the residential sections estimate that the average El Chamizal house and lot last sold for about $3,500. With replacement costs likely to be far higher in other neighborhoods, however, some residents are pricing their property higher.

"Peter Ramos, who built his own spacious and well-maintained house 8 years ago, worries that the Federal Government will pay him its assessed valuation, or about 35 percent of its market value. 'We'll move,' he said. 'They wouldn't let us stay if we wanted to. But we're all concerned. We don't know what is to come.'

"U.S. officials of the International Boundary and Water Commission, who will handle the relocation, insist that displaced families have nothing to fear. 'There is no question of course, that they will retain their American citizenship and that they will be paid fairly for their property,' one Federal spokesman said."

"MEXICANS HAIL AGREEMENT

"MEXICO CITY, July 18.—Mexican Government circles today described the El Chamizal settlement as a diplomatic victory for their country.

"The newspaper Excelsior carried the headline, 'Mexico Obtains the Greatest Diplomatic Triumph of Its History.'

"The agreement was the lead story in all newspapers. The Government newspaper El Nacional's headline was 'An Old Desire of Mexico Becomes Reality Today.'

"[From the New York Times, July 21, 1963]

"TRADE GAINS SEEN BY CIUDAD JUAREZ—EL CHAMIZAL TRANSFER ADDS SPUR TO BORDER PROJECT

"(By Jack Langguth)

"CIUDAD JUAREZ, MEXICO, July 17.—Officials of this border city, which grew this week by 437 acres with the transfer of the border zone of El Chamizal, expect it will give new impetus to an ambitious building program.

"The United States has long been reluctant to invest in construction or improvements on the northern side of the Rio Grande because of the Chamizal dispute. To the south, however, Mexico has proceeded with a $14 million border beautification project.

"A museum of arts and history was opened here last Sunday, the first of a proposed number of cultural and commercial buildings financed by the Mexican Government.

"Sixteen hundred visitors from both sides of the border attended the opening ceremonies. Many were more curious about the building than the exhibition of photographs of Mexican industry on display.

"Some Mexicans describe the museum's circular design, conceived by Pedro Ramirez Vazquez, as resembling an oven or an Indian hut. Most agreed, however, that the finished building, capped with a fiberglass dome and set off by Italian marble and a shallow moat, was an impressive addition to the city.

"A new, four-lane bridge linking Cordova Island with Ciudad Jurárez was also recently completed. The formal name for the 178-yard-long span is Friendship Bridge, but Mexicans refer to it as simply 'the new bridge.'

"The largest structure on the 250-acre border site will be a $360,000 convention center now under construction. When it is completed in October, the city plans to bid for conventions from the United States.

" 'Conventions will have to be joint enterprises with El Paso,' said Manuel de la Torre, an official of the Programa Nacional Fronterizo. 'Even with the 150-room hotel we're building, we couldn't house any large group.'

"Mr. de la Torre, a graduate of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in Troy, N.Y., said he would attempt to bring the college's midwinter reunion, often held in Havana in the past, here.

"The largest Mexican city along the border with the United States, Ciudad Juárez had a population of 309,337 in 1960. The population of El Paso County that year was 314,070.

"The frontier program also includes improvements in eight other northern border cities—Ensenada, Tijuana, Mexicali, Nogales, Piedras Negras, Nuevo Laredo, Reynosa, and Matamoros.

"About $4 million has been spent so far in Ciudad Juárez in the expectation that private capital will be attracted to the new commercial center and that downtown merchants will be persuaded to improve their shops.

"The project, headed by a former mayor of Ciudad Juárez, Antonio J. Bermudez, was chiefly designed to make the entire 1,600-mile border between Mexico and the United States a more attractive showcase for Mexican products.

"In El Paso, the tradition of shopping in Mexico is already firmly established. Many housewives make a weekly trip to Ciudad Juárez buying meat at about one-half the price at home and stocking up on sugar and fresh vegetables at substantial savings.

"The Mexican Government estimated before the development program began that the city was selling about $113,500,000 in goods annually to visitors from the United States, most of them from El Paso. The figure represents 19 percent of the total income of El Paso residents.

"So many Texans cross the border to save about 10 cents a gallon on gasoline that the Texas Legislature, in its most recent session, discussed putting a tax on the contents of car fuel tanks believed filled with Mexican gas."

THE CHAMIZAL SETTLEMENT: AN ACT OF STATESMANSHIP BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a few days ago the preliminaries for the settlement of the longstanding Chamizal dispute were concluded by the signing of an agreement by Mexico's Secretary of Foreign Relations, Manuel Tello, and U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Thomas C. Mann. I discussed this problem on the floor of the Senate on July 22, offering my congratulations to the Governments of our two neighbor countries and their people on the prospective settlement of a dispute which had marred our relations for nearly a century. I said then, and repeat now, that President Kennedy deserves the highest praise for his direct action to bring about a solution of a long, vexatious, and complex problem, which has become increasingly difficult with the passing of time and would become even more so if left unsettled any longer.

As the agreement will, in all probability, be presented in the form of a treaty for ratification by the Senate, a complete understanding of the history of this issue, its legal complexities, and the tangible and intangible values involved, is desirable.

Fortunately for this purpose a definitive and scholarly summary has just become available. It is found in an article by Gladys Gregory, for some time professor of government at Texas Western College, and the holder of a Ph. D. degree from the University of Texas. A resident of El Paso, she has, since her days as a graduate student at Austin, studied the Chamizal and other border issues. She writes with authority and with the combined expertise of a trained historian and of a living observer of the event. Her study is printed as No. 2 of volume 1 of Southwestern Studies published by Texas Western College and edited by Samuel D. Myles. It is a most valuable contribution.

The Chamizal Award in 1911 favoring Mexico was rejected by the United States although our Nation had agreed to abide by the arbitral award, which, by the terms of the agreement, was to be carried out within 2 years. It was the first time in our history that our Government has declined to honor an adverse verdict after agreeing to abide by the result. As President Kennedy said to the press in Mexico during his visit there earlier this year:

"There have been long negotiations about the Chamizal. This territory was awarded in 1911, but the United States did not accept it * * * but it is a matter that we cannot afford to continue to treat with indifference because the United States failed, after agreeing to arbitration, backed down, and did not accept the report."

This, while in essence the situation, was a slight but wholly warranted oversimplification, because there were technical grounds for believing that the Commission in 1911 which made the award, consisting of a U.S. commissioner, a Mexican commissioner, and a Canadian jurist, exceeded its instructions. A half century of deadlock resulted. But, as Professor Gregory points out, that deadlock could be broken only "by an act of statesmanship on the highest level—a decision that could cut through the accumulation of historical, legal and technical flotsam and lagan the Chamizal case had accumulated."

President Kennedy performed that act of statesmanship.

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Gregory's report "The Chamizal Settlement—A View From El Paso," be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE CHAMIZAL SETTLEMENT—A VIEW FROM EL PASO

"(By Gladys Gregory)

"July 18, 1963, was a great day in the El Paso-Juarez Valley, for on this date the Presidents of the United States and Mexico announced their historic decision respecting the Chamizal. Across the Rio Grande in Ciudad Juarez and throughout Mexico, the news was received with much satisfaction, as it signalized for the Mexicans a victory of right and reason that had been overdue for 50 years. The City Council of Ciudad Juarez met in special session to hear and acclaim the eloquent address of President López Mateos, carried from Mexico City by radio and television to all parts of the nation. On the day following, the 19th, full-page advertisements, signed by civic leaders of the State of Chihuahua, appeared in the leading newspapers of Mexico hailing the event as a demonstration of international friendship and cooperation at its best.[1]

"The response in El Paso

"In El Paso the reaction was naturally more restrained, but at the same time, it was favorable. Although there was some criticism of the so-called Kennedy giveaway and some apprehension among residents of the Chamizal area, the weight of opinion, as reported in the local press, accepted the proposed settlement as announced. The mayor and council of the city, members of the county commissioners court, and other local leaders viewed the outcome constructively. While they expressed concern that the interests of residents in the Chamizal should be fully protected, they welcomed the solution of an issue that had long disturbed the two border communities. They also recognized that the settlement would make possible the improvement and beautifying of an undeveloped area along the river, and that it would stimulate the economy of the entire area.[2] The prevailing attitude seems to have been summed up in the following statement of Federal District Judge R. E. Thomason who, as a former mayor of El Paso and Member of Congress, had gained an intimate knowledge of the problem:

" 'We wrestled with the Chamizal for 50 years and it would be an eyesore for another hundred years if we don't make a settlement now. I visualize the time when El Paso and Juarez will be the great twin cities of North America and there will be a tremendous development. I would like to see the agreement followed by a real drive to get rid of the slums, a fine beautification program, and a great monumental free bridge.

" 'The property owners in the area will get justice. Uncle Sam doesn't mistreat his citizens. If any of them don't get a fair value for their property and come into my court, I'll see that they get it.'[3]

"The latest stage in the long and tortuous negotiations seeking an agreement began during the meeting of June 1962, in Mexico City, between the Presidents of the United States and Mexico, John F. Kennedy and Adolf López Mateos. The joint communique issued in the names of the heads of state was brief and to the point: 'The two Presidents discussed the problem of El Chamizal. They agreed to instruct their executive agencies to recommend a complete solution to this problem which, without prejudice to their judicial position, takes into account the entire history of this tract.'[4] Thus another attempt was made—this time at 'the summit'—to deal with the exasperating issue.

"Intervention of President Kennedy

"While in Mexico, President Kennedy indicated the priority he gave the matter by saying to representatives of the press: 'As you know, there have been long negotiations about the Chamizal. This territory was awarded in 1911, but the United States did not accept it * * * but it is a matter that we cannot afford to continue to treat with indifference because the United States failed, after agreeing to arbitration, backed down, and did not accept the report.'[5]

"To carry out his commitment, President Kennedy promptly instructed diplomatic and executive officials of the United States to proceed without delay in working out the appropriate policies and details. Within a short time, on July 17, Thomas C. Mann, Ambassador of the United States to Mexico, arrived in El Paso and conferred with Joseph F. Friedkin, U.S. Commissioner on the International Boundary and Water Commission, and with officials of both the city and county of El Paso. Later Mr. Mann went to Austin, the capital of Texas, to meet with officials of the State who might be concerned.[6]

---

[1] See issues of July 18 and 19, 1963, El Fronterizo and El Mexicano (both of Juarez); also El Universal, Excelsior, La Prensa, and Novedades of Mexico City. Leading articles in Continente, July 1963; La Nación, Aug. 1, 1963; Todo, Aug. 1, 1963.

[2] The proposed settlement has aroused much interest and some controversy locally. For typical opinions, see the El Paso Times, July 11–21, 1963, and El Paso Herald-Post, same dates.

[3] The El Paso Times, July 19, 1963.

[4] United States-Mexico, joint communique, Mexico City, June 29–30, 1962.

[5] The El Paso Times, July 8, 1962.

"After further study of the problem, and after negotiations with Mexican officials, into which discussions members of the Department of State entered fully, Ambassador Mann returned to El Paso to explain to local leaders the proposals our Government would submit to Mexico. For 3 days during February of 1963, Mr. Mann and Commissioner Friedkin consulted with local authorities, with owners of property in the Chamizal zone, and with others who would be affected by the proposed settlement. The results of these talks seemed to indicate that fully 90 percent of the people contacted in El Paso were favorable to the project as it had been developed to this point.[7]

"While negotiations and discussions continued, President Kennedy on March 6 said that the United States should erase the black mark resulting from its failure to carry out the decision of the arbitral tribunal that had tried to effect a compromise in 1911. At the same time, the Secretary of Foreign Relations in Mexico City, Manuel Tello, stated that an agreement was now within a millimeter of achievement.[8] However, considerable more effort was necessary to work out the terms incorporated into the agreement.

"THE AREA IN DISPUTE

"The bone of contention that required the attention of the two Presidents, and the redoubling of effort on the part of many of their subordinates, is a small strip of territory lying on the border of the Rio Grande between the cities of El Paso, Tex., and Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. Taking its Spanish name from the scrubby plants that once covered the area, the entire Chamizal tract includes about 630 acres of land. It extends from the Levee Road and Charles Street on the west in a northeasterly direction to join Cordova Island which is the property of Mexico, as indicated on the map on pages 26 and 27 [not printed in the RECORD]. Thus, the western and southern boundary of the tract is formed by the present channel of the river; its northern boundary is the river as surveyed in 1852; its eastern boundary is Cordova Island, which, though belonging to Mexico, is located on the northern or American side of the river. Cordova Island contains about 386 acres.

"Several thousand persons live in the Chamizal zone. About 100 acres of the extreme western section are located within the downtown business district of El Paso. Two vehicular and pedestrian bridges cross the river in this area, connecting Stanton and Santa Fe Streets in El Paso with Lerdo and Juarez Streets in Ciudad Juarez, thus giving convenient access to the centers of both cities. This line of communication runs through the Chamizal for about three-tenths of a mile.

"Looking at this small strip of land on the map and taking into account its relatively limited economic value, as the interests of nations go, one might reasonably conclude that the task of determining its nationality should have been rather simple. But unfortunately, such a conclusion would be quite erroneous. The hope for a rational and amicable agreement respecting the ownership of this narrow plot has been shattered time after time. High expectations of disposing of the issues involved were raised during the administrations of President Taft in 1913, President Coolidge in 1925, President Hoover in 1931–33, and during the terms of F. D. Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. But in no instance could the baffling enigma of the Chamizal be resolved.

"The Capricious Rio Grande

"In some respects the failure may be ascribed to the limitations of diplomacy and to the stubborn persistence of nationalistic amour-propre on both sides of the Rio Grande, as we shall presently see in detail. But, in addition, we must recognize that the forces of nature have played a leading role in this international drama. Like the witches in 'Macbeth,' these forces seem to have brewed an evil influence destined to defeat the best of human intentions—a striking example of the mastery of matter over mind. The physical causes of the trouble can be traced directly to the vagaries of the Rio Grande. Never noted for consistency in staying within the low banks along much of its course, the river seems to have taken a special delight in wandering from its bed as it flowed through the level terrain in the Pass of the North. As one writer pointed out:

"'Sometimes, worn thin by drought and bled by irrigation, it [the Rio Grande] is not a river at all but only a wide strip of white sand baking and glaring in the sun. It becomes an impressive stream only in times of flood and then it runs in a red torrent often half a mile wide, lifting an angry crest of sandwaves, devouring its own banks, earth trees and all, as though in a furious effort to carry away the whole country and dump it into the sea.'[9]

"The river rises in the Rocky Mountains of southern Colorado and flows for about 2,000 miles on its way to the Gulf of Mexico. It is estimated that the total effective drainage area of the Rio Grande is 177,500 square miles.[10] For part of its journey to the sea, it pushes its way through miles of a broad sandy valley, where, before the building of Elephant Butte Dam in 1916 and Caballo Dam some 20 years later, it twisted and doubled upon itself like a great sea serpent. For centuries it coiled and recoiled in the shifting sands of the semiarid regions.

"Throughout its history, the great river has not always been friendly to man. Sometimes during a period of drought it has failed him altogether, and at other times of great flood it has washed away what he has built or planted. In spite of its treacherous character, however, crops have been grown in its valley for perhaps a thousand years. Probably the oldest irrigation in the United States was that of the native Indians found by the Spaniards when they entered the valley of the Rio Grande in New Mexico in the middle of the 16th century.[11]

"In 1827 when Jose Ponce de Leon received from Mexico his famous land grant that is now the heart of downtown El Paso, the river flowed in front of his house, considerably north of its present course. It wound through and across the area now occupied by the principal streets of the business district—Mills, San Antonio, and Magoffin—and continued on eastward through Manzana, Stevenson, and Rosa, passing along the present site of the Standard Oil and Texaco refineries, and on toward the town of Ysleta. At that earlier time all of this property was within Mexico. The Chamizal extended from the northern banks of the river southward to Calle del Chamizal in El Paso del Norte, now called Calle Mejia in Ciudad Juarez. Since colonial times this extensive area has been occupied by the Spanish and Mexican settlers and their descendants. Eventually the river was to shift its course southward, flooding and overflowing, forming and leaving various beds—all to the discomfort and dismay of the increasing population of the community.[12]

"The Rio Grande as boundary

"In spite of the instability of the river as a boundary, leaders in the United States have long looked to the Rio Grande as a natural line defining our western limits. Since 1804 when Thomas Jefferson decided that the Rio Grande should be claimed as the western boundary of the Louisiana Purchase, the river has held an important place in international affairs.[13] The early leaders of Texas had a similar fixation on the river. At its first session in 1836 the Congress of the Texas Republic set the southern boundary of the new nation at the Rio Grande.[14] Following the war of 1845 between the United States and Mexico, which was waged essentially over territorial interests and claims, the Rio Grande assumed greater importance than ever before, since it was designated as the permanent boundary between the two nations. The significant position of the river was indicated in article V of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848:

"'The boundary line between the two Republics [the United States and Mexico] shall commence in the Gulf of Mexico, three leagues from land, opposite the mouth of the Rio Grande, otherwise called Rio Bravo del Norte, or opposite the mouth of its deepest branch, if it should have more than one branch emptying directly into the sea; from thence up the middle of that river, following the deepest channel, where it has more than one, to the point where it strikes the southern boundary of New Mexico (which runs north of the town called Paso) to its western termination; thence, northward, along the western line of New Mexico; until it intersects the first branch of the river Gila; (or, if it should not intersect any branch of that river, then to the point of said line nearest to such branch, and thence in a direct line to the same); thence down the middle of the said branch and of the said river, until it empties into the Rio Colorado; then across the Rio Colorado, following the division line between Upper and Lower California, to the Pacific Ocean.'[15]

"Recognizing the need to define more precisely the course of the river, the framers of the treaty of 1848 provided for a Boundary Commission, 'who before the expiration of 1 year from the date of exchange of ratifications of this treaty shall meet at the Port of San Diego and proceed to run and mark the said boundary in its whole course to the mouth of the Rio Bravo del Norte. The boundary line established by this article shall be religiously respected by each of the two republics, and no change shall ever be made therein except by the express and free consent of both nations, lawfully given by the General Government of each, in conformity with its own constitution.

"'If unhappily any disagreement should hereafter arise between the governments of the two republics, whether with respect to the interpretation of any stipulation in this treaty, or with respect to any other particular concerning the political or commercial relations of the two nations, the said governments, in the name of those nations, do promise to each other, that they will endeavor, in the most sincere and earnest manner, to settle the differences so arising, and to preserve the state of peace and friendship, in which the two countries are now placing themselves: using, for this end, mutual representations and pacific negotiations. And if, by these means, they should not be enabled to come to an agreement, a resort shall not, on this account, be had to reprisals, aggression or hostility of any kind, by the one republic against the other, until the government of that which deems itself aggrieved, shall have maturely considered, in in the spirit of peace and good neighborship, whether it would not be better that such differences should be settled by the arbitration of commissioners appointed on each side, or by that of a friendly nation. And should such course be proposed by either party, it shall be acceded to by the other, unless deemed by it altogether incompatible with the nature of the difference, or the circumstances of the case.' [16]

---

[6] Ibid., July 18–22, 1962.

[7] Ibid., Feb. 19–24, 1963.

[8] Ibid., Mar. 7, 1963. See also El Fronterizo (Juarez), July 3, 1962; July 22, 1962; Aug. 14, 1962; June 5, 1963.

[9] H. Ferguson, Rio Grande (New York, 1933), 3.

[10] H. Rept. No. 359, 71st Cong., 2d sess., 9233.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Cleofas Calleros, "El Chamizal—Que Es?" (El Paso, 1963), 4.

[13] American State Papers, Mar. 31, 1804.

[14] Laws of the Republic of Texas, 1st Cong., 1st sess., 1836 (Houston, 1837), 133–34.

[15] 9 U.S. Statutes at Large, 922, art. V. Hereafter cited as statutes.

"The Boundary Commission, on which both the United States and Mexico were represented, got off to a disappointingly slow start. For various reasons, its first meeting at San Diego, Calif., did not occur until 17 months after the treaty was signed. Various difficulties plagued its work from the beginning. It suffered from inadequate funds, supplies, and military protection. Errors in the prescribed maps caused much controversy between the representatives of the two countries. Finally, however, in December of 1856, the boundary survey was completed. It was to be accepted as the best delineation of the dividing line that could be produced.[17]

"The Gadsden Purchase

"In order to rectify the boundary in the area of the Gila River, the United States agreed to buy from Mexico, for $10 million, a tract of land beginning some 40 miles north of El Paso. The territory involved was commonly designated as 'La Mesila,' and the transaction became known as the Gadsden Purchase in 1853.[18] Before this agreement had been reached, the Boundary Commission had completed a survey in 1852, establishing a firmer line between the United States and Mexico in the Chamizal zone. The Treaty of Mesilla of 1853 sought to make the treaty of 1848 (Guadalupe Hidalgo) conform to the new boundary resulting from the Gadsden Purchase. Article I of the new treaty provided for a mixed commission for the 'settlement and ratification of a true line of division between the two republics; that line shall be alone established upon which the Commission may fix, their consent in this particular being considered decisive and an integral part of this treaty.

" 'The dividing line thus established shall in all time be faithfully respected by the two governments without any variation therein, unless by express and free consent of the two.' [19]

"While the Boundary Commission and its surveyors were trying to establish an acceptable line, the Rio Grande refused to cooperate; it continued its erratic ways. Because of the sandy texture of the soil in the El Paso area and the torrential rains at certain seasons of the year, the eroding power of the river remained as always.

"A report by C. H. Ernst, major of engineers, U.S. Army, described the conduct of the river clearly:

" 'It is shifting from one position to another, eroding one bank and building up the opposite one, forming islands and bars, and then destroying them. The result of the natural changes is most noticeable in a bend where the erosion of the concave shore is sometimes continuous for many years, as appears to have been the case at El Paso. * * * The maximum distance between the shore at El Paso of 1855 and that of 1885 is about five-eighths of a mile and the total area added to the American territory is about 490 acres.' [20]

"Floods and treaties

"The river changed its banks again between 1853 and 1863 because of a serious inundation. Then in 1864 occurred the worst flood in the memory of the residents. The people north of the river were obliged to take refuge in the heights of Stormville, now Rim-Road, in El Paso; and the inhabitants of El Paso del Norte (now Ciudad Juárez), to the south, moved in mass to the safer ground on which stood the Mission of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe. Such floods continued periodically until the great dams were built up the river, in 1916 and later, to control them. The floods and resulting changes in the course of the river led the two riparian nations to seek a measure of security in a new agreement, the treaty of 1884. Articles I and II provided:

" 'The dividing line shall forever be that described in the aforesaid treaty and follow the center of the normal channels of the rivers named, provided that such alterations be effected by natural causes through the slow and gradual erosion and deposit of alluvium and not by the abandonment of the existing river bed and the opening of a new one.

" 'Any other change wrought by the forces of the current * * * shall produce no change in the dividing line as fixed by the survey of the International Boundary Commission of 1852.' [21]

"In this treaty an attempt was made to reach a decision regarding the general rules of accretion and avulsion, to specify conditions under which artificial changes in the course of the river could be dealt with, and to provide for property rights respecting lands affected by the creation of new channels. The treaty, however, did not specify how these objectives were to be achieved.

"To meet increasing problems, including confusion over the boundary and uncertainty as to public and private titles to land, a new treaty was negotiated and signed. This convention of March 1, 1889, provided 'for the creation of a Boundary Commission with the authority to investigate and determine the merits of each contest.' [22] Originally, the Commission was set up for a 5-year period then its life was regularly extended to 1910, when it was made permanent. The success of the Boundary Commission during its initial period was summarized by Anson Mills, U.S. Commissioner, as follows:

" 'During the 16 years of our active service (the revolution in Mexico in 1911 having put an end to activities) the Commission tried over 100 cases of all kinds, disagreeing only in the Chamizal case, and preserved the peace and quiet of the entire Rio Grande border for these long years, to the satisfaction of both Governments and the people of the two nations.' [23]

"Under capable leadership, the Boundary Commission continued to improve conditions along the frontier. Its work in rectifying the channel of the river from El Paso to Fort Quitman should prevent any problem arising in the future in this section of the boundary. In keeping with the treaty of 1933, the Boundary Commission has successfully undertaken a project of flood control costing $6 million. The program has involved the assignment of 16,704.6 acres of land to the United States and 9,625.5 acres to Mexico. In all, 216 parcels of land have thus been exchanged.[24]

"The work of the Commission has been aided greatly by the construction of the Elephant Butte, Caballo, and Falcon Dams, which have done much to control the distribution and use of water along the river. Another large dam, Amistad, is scheduled for completion in 1968. The Commission has had to deal with many difficult technical problems, but it has been largely successful in defining and stabilizing the river frontier between the two neighboring nations. One problem, however, long defied solution: What could be done about the Chamizal? For one reason or another, every effort to deal with this highly perplexing problem bogged down in the sands of the shifting river or in the conflicts of diplomacy and national self-interest.

"The Chamizal issue emerges

"As early as 1866 officials of both the United States and Mexico recognized the possibility that the devious ways of the Rio Grande could cause problems respecting the international boundary. The Secretary of Foreign Relations of Mexico, Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada, notified the American Secretary of State, William H. Seward, that Mexico was seriously concerned.[25] About the same time Maj. W. H. Emory, U.S. Boundary Commissioner, called to the attention of Robert McClelland, Secretary of the Interior, the danger of a threatened avulsive change in the course of the river near El Paso. As a result of these reports, Attorney General Caleb Cushing drafted an opinion summarizing the principles of international law that applied. This opinion served as a reply to the Mexican Government and a statement of policy that the United States would consistently follow in subsequent negotiations.[26] Cushing's views were to figure prominently in the effort at arbitration in 1911.

"The issue over the Chamizal first became troublesome in 1894 when the Boundary Commission met to establish the dividing line over the bridges between El Paso and Ciudad Juarez.[27] On learning of the move, the Mexican Secretary of Foreign Relations notified Washington that no one had been authorized to define a boundary between the two countries, but only between the two cities. The Secretary pointed out that the channel of the river had changed in area since the boundary was fixed in conformity with the treaty of 1848 and that the first question which must be decided was where the actual dividing line lay between the two countries. The Mexican authorities intervened to reserve the rights of Mexico, avoiding a possible later claim of the United States that the boundary agreed on was the line established over the bridges.[28]

"On June 21, 1894, the two Boundary Commissioners agreed on a line over the bridges, but they considered it to be provisional only. A week later, on June 29, the government of President Diaz notified the United States that Mexico could not approve this line as the boundary between the two nations. The Mexican note referred to the treaty of 1889 that created the Boundary Commission and declared that the agreement did not authorize the Commission to make such provisional arrangements. The note also referred to a claim that had been filed by Pedro I. Garcia, alleging that a plot of land called the Chamizal had previously been a part of Ciudad Juarez, the title to which plot he held through Mexico, but that his land had been joined to the territory of the United States by a violent change in the course of the river. Since the claimant declared that the tract still belonged to Mexico, the Mexican Government insisted that the Boundary Commission examine and decide the case of the Chamizal before fixing the dividing line between Ciudad Juarez and El Paso.[29] In this manner, the question of the Chamizal, which was to become increasingly complex, was converted from a routine matter of resolving border problems due to changes in the river, a matter under the control of the Boundary Commission, into a serious diplomatic question requiring the attention of the foreign offices of the two countries.

---

[16] Ibid., art. XXI.

[17] H. Rept. No. 247, 55th Cong., 2d sess., 55–56.

[18] 10 Statutes 1031.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Chamizal Arbitration, appendix to the case of the United States of America (Washington. 1911), II, 759. Hereafter, Chamizal appendix.

[21] 24 Statutes, 1011, art. II.

[22] 31 Statutes, 1936.

[23] Anson Mills, "My Story" (Washington, 1921), 301.

[24] United States Treaty Series (Washington, 1934), No. 864.

[25] Alberto Maria Carreño, México y los Estados Unidos de América (2d ed., Mexico, D. F., 1962), 274 ff.

[26] Charles A. Timm, "The International Boundary Commission" (Austin, 1941), 151-1961.

[27] Chamizal appendix, I, 347–348.

[28] Salvador Mendoza, "El Chamizal: Un Drama Juridico y Historico (Mexico, D. F., 1962), 11.

"The second claim of the Mexican Government respecting the Chamizal occurred in 1897 after a flood had caused extensive damage in both El Paso and Ciudad Juarez. The people of the two cities demanded that something be done to prevent future losses from the uncontrolled waters of the river. As a result, the mayor of El Paso, Joseph Magoffin, and the Governor of Chihuahua, Miguel Ahumada, sought the permission of their respective national governments to straighten the channel of the river. The inhabitants of the two cities agreed to pay the cost involved—$8,000. The U.S. Government readily accepted the proposal. Mexico agreed also, but on the condition that the territory north of the new channel should remain under Mexican sovereignty. The project was completed in 1899 with the full cooperation of the two city governments. As a result of this rectification, Cordova Island, which lies north of the present channel of the river, was created and was retained by Mexico.[30]

"Once the Rio Grande was thus brought somewhat better under control, and occupation of the Chamizal was made physically safe, its population began to increase rapidly. In 1892 construction of the Church of the Sacred Heart and a parochial school was begun. The Chapel of San Ignacio de Loyola was erected in 1905. These religious and educational institutions naturally attracted more people to the area, many of whom built permanent houses of brick. Within a short time much of the Chamizal was integrated into the city of El Paso and designated as the second ward. Legally, however, the owners of property in the area never were completely secure in their possession. Many deeds issued since 1900 have referred to the cloud on the titles resulting from the fact that the nationality of the property has been in dispute.[31]

"Litigation and diplomacy

"The problem of nationality lay dormant for some time, but it was brought to life again in 1907 when the El Paso and Northeastern Railway obtained a judgment in the Federal circuit court, authorizing the condemnation of land in the Chamizal for a right-of-way. On March 21, 1907, the Mexican Government protested to the American Secretary of State, Elihu Root, that the Chamizal was sub judice (in litigation) and the 'area had unquestionably been Mexican in other times.'[32]

"Secretary Root acted promptly on March 29 by addressing a letter to the Attorney General of the United States which reviewed the legal issues involved and asked for a stay of execution of the court's order. Root pointed out that the Chamizal was in dispute between the United States and Mexico and that the Boundary Commission, which had jurisdiction over the matter, had not yet rendered a decision. If the area was still Mexican, as it undoubtedly was in other times, the incompetence of the U.S. court would be evident. Since the court apparently did not know the facts mentioned, its decision had denied the sovereignty of Mexico and asserted the dominion of the United States. The effort to dispose of property that was involved in negotiations created a serious difficulty and placed the United States in an untenable position, since it was unjustifiable, after having agreed with Mexico to submit the question respecting the nationality of the tract to a special tribunal, to decide the issue ex parte and on our own account. Root therefore requested that the Attorney General instruct the Federal marshal at El Paso to desist at once from executing the order of the court and that the Federal district attorney be notified to suspend any further action in the case. The intervention of Secretary Root was effective: the interest of Mexico in respect to the Chamizal was thus recognized and protected.[33]

"In 1909 another local incident occurred that had diplomatic repercussions in the national capitals of Mexico and the United States. When the city of El Paso undertook to install a waste-disposal plant in the Chamizal, Mexico officially protested.[34] A series of notes was exchanged in 1910 between the Mexican Ambassador in Washington, Francisco León de la Barra, and the U.S. Secretary of State, Philander C. Knox.[35] The arguments advanced by each side in this correspondence were fully reviewed in the arbitral proceedings of 1911 and they will be taken up later in that connection.

"By now the controversy over the little strip of land in south El Paso, by no means the most desirable part of the city, had become quite serious. Both Governments recognized that the issue could not be settled by the exchange of diplomatic notes or by action of the binational Boundary Commission, each member of which would almost certainly continue to support the claims of his own Government. A new procedure was clearly called for, but what should it be?

"In search of a procedure

"As early as 1897 the two members of the Boundary Commission had agreed on at least one thing respecting the Chamizal. Since they realized that they could not dispose of the knotty questions involved, they mutually concluded that it would be well to add a third member to the Commission who should act as an arbiter in deciding this single issue.[36] The Department of State at Washington agreed to this recommendation, but the Mexican Secretary of Foreign Relations rejected it and declared that the case should be submitted to arbitration.[37] He proceeded to name several heads of state who might be suitable to serve on a special court of arbitration. To this proposal, officials at Washington replied that Mexico was broadening the question beyond the commitments of the United States—that the problem was not one of international law but of applying the ordinary rules respecting the effect upon a borderline of the change in the course of a dividing river. Wanting to avoid the formality of a new treaty and arbitral proceedings, the Department of State recommended the addition of a third member to the Boundary Commission, either American or Mexican, on whom the two nations could agree, to dispose of the matter.[38]

"The Mexican foreign office, however, referred to article II of the treaty of 18 9, which provided for only two commissioners, and denied that a third member would have legal competence to render a decision binding on the two Governments.[39] The United States did not reply to this last note, and the question lay at rest until Mexico revived it in July 1907, by submitting a new proposal. This time, the Mexican Government sought a compromise. Using article XXI of the treaty of 1848 and article V II of the Convention of 1889 as a base, Mexico recommended an ad hoc mixed commission consisting of the two members of the Boundary Commission, plus a third member to be named by the Government of Canada, who would have the authority to decide the questions on which the other two Commissioners could not agree. The decision of the mixed commission was to be definitive and unappealable.[40]

"While the Governments delayed a decision on the manner of dealing further with the dispute, they explored the possibilities of an exchange of territory. In a note of December 12, 1907, Mexico offered to trade the Bosque, the Cordova, and El Chamizal for the Isla de San Elizario and El Horcon.[41] The Mexican note also claimed that the Chamizal lay south of the course of the river of 1852, and therefore was in Mexican territory, a point the United States was not willing to concede.

"In his communication of January 15, 1910, the Mexican Ambassador, de la Barra, insisted on a new treaty that would recognize the claims of Mexico to the Chamizal—or failing this, that the two nations without delay submit the issue of ownership to arbitration.[42] In reply, Secretary of State Knox, on March 22, accepted in principle the Mexican proposal.[43] He suggested that each country submit a list of three Canadian jurisconsults and that from these six, the two litigants select an umpire to act with the two regular members of the Boundary Commission in deciding title to the Chamizal. In the event the two nations could not agree on the umpire, the Government of Canada would name one of the six, who would serve as the third member of the mixed commission, with the right to vote. On June 17 Secretary Knox submitted to the Mexican foreign office the initial draft of a special treaty of arbitration, or a compromise, providing for the membership of the arbitral body, delimiting the territory in dispute, and defining the issue to be settled. Mexico agreed in principle to the terms proposed, and both Governments ratified the treaty on which arbitral action would be based.[44]

"Agreement on arbitration

"Thus the two nations agreed that the case of the Chamizal would be decided in accordance with the well-established principles and procedures of international law. The method of settlement that the two Governments chose was used frequently by the ancient Greeks, and occasionally in medieval Europe. However, its use had lapsed for several centuries, and the process was not revived until the Jay Treaty of 1795, nor was it much in vogue until after the settlement of the Alabama Claims in 1872. In referring to the procedure as it was employed before the 17th century, one writer has observed that it 'is often very difficult, sometimes impossible, clearly to separate cases of mediation from those of arbitration, either because the terminology was not very definite, or the expressions used were equivocal, or because the distinction was not clear to the minds of the negotiators.' [45]

---

[29] Chamizal appendix, I, 347–348.

[30] Department of State, Proceedings of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico (Washington, 1903), I, 149–167.

[31] Calleros, "El Chamizal—Que Es?" 10.

[32] Chamizal, app., II, 701.

[33] Ibid., I, 454.

[34] Ibid., 508.

[35] Ibid., 433.

[36] Ibid., 347–348.

[37] Ibid., 353.

[38] Ibid., 355.

[39] Ibid., 361–362.

[40] Ibid., 368–371.

[41] Ibid., 365–388.

[42] Ibid., 398–404.

[43] Ibid., 421–424.

[44] 36 Statutes, pt. 2, 481.

"Many writers on international law have called attention to the distinction between arbitration and mediation. As one has noted: 'The essential point is that arbitrators are required to decide the difference: that is, to pronounce sentence on the question of right. To propose a compromise is not within their province, but in the province of a mediator.' [46] John Bassett Moore has explained the distinction by saying: 'Arbitration is a settlement of international disputes, according to legal rules and methods, by arbitors chosen by the disputant parties themselves. Arbitration is a legal procedure. Mediation is an advisory, arbitration a judicial function.' [47]

"As a result of long usage, the arbitral process has become well established, and the procedures used are as fixed as those of a court of law. One point recognized in international law is the need to have a clearly defined agreement or compromise so that there may be no question as to the subject in dispute or the authority of the tribunal.[48] The convention of 1910 appears to have fulfilled this requirement. Article I specifically located the Chamizal tract, and about this point there was no dispute.[49] Article III stated that the Commission should decide 'solely and exclusively as to whether the international title to the Chamizal tract is in the United States or in Mexico.' [50] The Convention also specified that the decision 'rendered unanimously or by a majority vote of the Commission shall be final and conclusive.' [51] The preamble stated that the decision should be in accordance with the various treaties and conventions existing between the two countries and in accordance with the principles of international law.[52]

"In compliance with article II of the convention, Eugene Lafleur of Canada was chosen as presiding Commissioner; Fernando Beltrán y Puga was named to represent Mexico, and Anson Mills, the United States.[53]

"Mexico submits her case

"On May 15, 1911 the Arbitration Commission met in the Federal courthouse at El Paso and it rendered its decision approximately a month thereafter.[54] In keeping with the terms of the convention of June 24, 1910, each Government submitted to each Commissioner a printed argument setting out the points it relied on in its case and its countercase.[55]

"Mexico claimed that the boundary between the two nations was a fixed and invariable line as determined by the treaties of 1848 and 1853, and that the boundary was not subject to changes caused by accretion. The Mexican argument called attention to the fact that the Treaty of Mesilla was signed in 1853 to make the terms of the treaty of 1848 conform to the new boundary as a result of the Gadsden Purchase. Article I of the treaty of 1853 provided for a mixed commission for the 'settlement and ratification of a true line of division between the two Republics; that line shall be alone established upon which the Commission may fix, their consent in this particular being considered decisive and an integral part of this treaty.'

"The dividing line thus established shall in all time be faithfully respected by the two Governments without any variation therein, unless by express and free consent of the two.[56]

"It was on the interpretation of these two treaties that Mexico based its claim that the boundary was at the place located by the survey of 1852, which, the Mexicans insisted, would mean that the Chamizal tract was Mexican territory regardless of the manner by which the river had changed its bed since 1852.[57]

"The legal arguments of Mexico had been developed earlier by Ambassador de la Barra, who had argued that by the terms of the treaties, the International Boundary Commission was authorized to determine the boundary, that the decisions of the Commissioners were to have the same force as the treaties themselves, and that such decision could not be modified except by the consent of both Governments. He had said: 'One of the direct consequences of that agreement is that the boundary was fixed in such a manner that it could in no wise be affected by a change in the course of the Rio Bravo or Grande, no matter what the cause might be.' [58] To emphasize his point, he had described the bed of the river by dividing it into three zones. The middle zone, he had declared, ran through three canyons; the upper and lower zones were the portions in which the 'river runs torrentlike across alluvium valleys, whereby its course is made unstable and subject to constant variations.' [59] As a result, he had concluded:

" 'The logical deduction from the foregoing data is that the provisions of the convention of 1884 were not directly applicable to the first and third zones of the Rio Grande, in those regions where its course had changed, since the invariable and fixed boundary line determined by the treaty of 1853 already deviated from the course of the river in 1884.

" 'The position of the dividing line during the period from 1853 to 1884 is clearly determined by the first of the conventions named * * * the line so established was in no wise affected by a change in the course of the river, whatever might be the cause of such a change. That is to say, from 1853 to 1884—and it should, as I will show, be so held from that to this date—all lands north of the dividing line established by the Commissioners in conformity with the treaty of 1853, were and remain American and all those south of that line are and remain Mexican.'

"The provisions of the convention of 1884 could only be applicable to cases which might arise subsequently; but not to those which had occurred before, because they came under the rule stipulated in the treaty of 1853.

"The convention of 1884 could not and cannot, like that of 1905, be applied to cases antecedent to the first of those two dates, which were regulated by the treaty of 1853.

" 'That some of the clauses of a convention had been superseded by the provisions of a subsequent treaty, cannot in the least impair or destroy rights created by the first instrument unless there be an express agreement to that effect in the later compact." [60]

"The communication that Señor de la Barra submitted to the Arbitration Commission ended with a summary of the correspondence between Mexico and the United States relating to the boundary, which correspondence, in his opinion, proved that the United States had also agreed to this principle of a fixed and invariable line.

"Reply of the United States

"The United States replied by summarizing the whole correspondence on the fixed-line theory and pointed out that 'during the earlier portion of the period from 1853 to 1884, the Government of Mexico apparently shared the views of the United States; that during the later period it apparently manifested at times a disposition to adopt the fixed-boundary theory; and it would seem that partially as a result of discussions growing out of this attitude on the part of the Government of Mexico, the convention of 1884 was negotiated and signed, whereby the two Governments agreed on a formal interpretation of the boundary treaties in the sense of Attorney General Cushing's opinion.' [61]

"Mexico had also contended that since the Chamizal tract had been formed before 1884, the interpretation of that treaty in no way affected the title of that tract.[62] The position of the United States was that a true interpretation of the treaties of 1848 and 1852 meant that in accordance with international law governing river boundaries, the boundary moved with the river when it changed its location by accretion; that between 1852 and 1911 the river moved south by accretion; and that under well-established principles of law, the present channel of the river should remain the boundary.

"According to the rules of international law, as the United States interpreted them, accretion occurs when a river eats into its its opposite bank, thus moving in the direction of the receding bank. Conversely, avulsion occurs when the river suddenly breaks out of its old channel and makes a new one; the old river bed can be easily seen. In the Chamizal tract no abandoned river beds were discernible between 1852 and 1911. The United States insisted that the various reports, documents, and testimonies before the tribunal proved that 'all the alterations in the banks and course of the river have been effected by causes which are natural to the Rio Grande, that the alterations have been through slow and gradual erosion and deposit of alluvium and that all the requirements specified in article I of the treaty of 1884 have been met at all times so that the dividing line has constantly followed the center of the normal channel of the river.' [63]

"The United States interpreted the treaty of 1884 as contemplating only two possible types of change, one by erosion, and the other by avulsion. It pointed out that the expression 'slow and gradual' modifying 'erosion' was in conformity with the doctrine laid down by Attorney General Caleb Cushing in his answer to a request from the Secretary of the Interior as to the effects of changes in the course of the river on the location of the boundary. In his opinion, given in 1866, Cushing quoted from many authorities on international law to prove his theory, which was as follows:

---

[45] J. B. Moore, "History and Digest of the International Arbitrations to Which the United States Has Been a Party" (Washington, 1898), V, 4831. Hereafter, Moore, Digest.

[46] L. F. L. Oppenheim (ed.), "The Collected Papers of John Westlake on Public International Law" (London, 1914), I, 354. Hereafter, Westlake.

[47] Moore, Digest, VII, 25.

[48] E. Vattel, "The Law of Nations of the Principles of International Law Applied to the Conduct and to the Affairs of Nations and Sovereigns" (Fenwick tr., Washington, 1916), II, 277.

[49] 36 Statutes, pt. 2, 2481, art. I.

[50] Ibid., art. III.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid., art. V.

[53] Mills, "My Story," 294.

[54] Chamizal arbitration, "Minutes of the International Boundary Commission: Award; Dissenting Opinions; Protest of the Agent of the United States" (Washington, 1911), 35–36. Hereafter Chamizal award.

[55] 36 Statutes pt. 2, 2481, art. V.

[56] 10 Statutes, 1031, art. I.

[57] Comisión Internacional de Limites entre México y los Estados Unidos, Sécción Mexicanna, "Memoria Documentada del Jucio del Arbitraje del Chamizal" (México, D.F., 1911), 3 vol. passim. Hereafter, Arbitraje.

[58] Chamizal, app. I, 405–406.

[59] Ibid., 407.

[60] Ibid., 407–408.

[61] Chamizal, U.S. case (Washington, 1911), 37.

[62] Arbitraje, passim.

[63] Chamizal, "Argument of the United States of America" (Washington, 1911), passim. Hereafter, Chamizal argument.

"'Whatever changes happen to either bank of the river by accretion on the one, or degradation on the other, that is, by the gradual, as it were, insensible accession or abstraction of mere particles, the river as it runs continues to be the boundary. One country may in process of time, lose a little of its territory, and the other gain a little, but the territorial relation cannot be reversed by such imperceptible mutations in the course of the river. The general aspect of things remains unchanged. And the convenience of allowing the river to retain its previous function, notwithstanding such insensible changes in its course, or in either of its banks, outweighs the inconvenience, even to the injured party, involved in a detriment, which happening gradually, is inappreciable in the successive movements of its progression.

"'But on the other hand, if, deserting its original bed, the river forces for itself a new channel in another direction, then the nation, through whose territory the river thus breaks its way, suffers injury by the loss of territory greater than the benefit of retaining the natural river boundary, and that boundary remains in the middle of the deserted riverbed. For, in truth, just as a stone pillar constitutes a boundary, not because it is a stone, but because of the place in which it stands, so a river is made the limit of nations, not because it is running water bearing a certain geographical name, but because it is water flowing in a given channel, and within given banks, which are the real international boundary. Such is the received rule of the law of nations on this point, as laid down by all writers of authority.'[64]

"The Mexican answer was that even if the boundary should be determined according to rules defined in the treaty of 1884, the disputed tract would still be Mexican territory, for 'slow and gradual' qualified the meaning of 'corrosion.' For some reason, the Mexican translation used the word 'corrosion,' rather than 'erosion,' as is found in the American original, meaning that the movement of the river must be similar to a corrosive change, as the rusting of iron.[65]

"Claims and counterclaims

"In addition to the issues of erosion and avulsion, a third point argued in the Chamizal case was that of prescription. The United States claimed international title to El Chamizal by reason of the undisturbed, uninterrupted, and unchallenged possession of 'said territory by the United States of America since 1836.'[66] Prescription in international law may be defined as 'the acquisition of sovereignty over territory through continuous and undisturbed exercise of sovereignty over it.'[67] This concept refers to long-continued possession in the face of a title held earlier by another. In the case of the Chamizal, the United States claimed a dual prescription, 'first, to the Rio Grande as a water boundary since 1836; second, to the Chamizal tract since it was formed, beginning in 1852.'[68] The question of how long a second country must occupy a territory in order to have clear title has not been clearly defined in international law. From 30 to 50 years has been given as the usual time of inactivity by the first nation.[69] The United States contended that Texas and the United States had had complete control over the tract from 1836 to 1895, when Mexico filed its first claim to the tract.[70] Mexico answered this contention by pointing out that the changes in the boundary had not been made successively but at times of great floods, and that on each occasion when such a change had occurred, the Mexican Government had called the attention of the United States to that section of the boundary, asking that notice be taken of the change.[71]

"After considering the arguments presented by both sides in the controversy, the Arbitration Commission voted on six questions. All three Commissioners agreed that the United States had no claim to the Chamizal tract on the basis of prescription. The Presiding Commissioner, Lafleur, and the American Commissioner, Mills, voted together on two issues: against the fixed-and-invariable-line theory, and for the theory that the treaty of 1884 applied to all changes in the river subsequent to the survey of 1852. The Mexican Commissioner, Puga, and the Presiding Commissioner voted together on three issues: that the whole of the Chamizal tract was not formed by slow and gradual erosion and deposit of alluvium within the meaning of article I of the convention of 1884; that before 1864 the formation was due to slow and gradual erosion; and that between 1864 and 1868, the formation was not due to slow and gradual erosion.[72]

"The American Commissioner refused to vote on the fifth question for two reasons. First, he claimed that by answering the question, he would be recognizing the authority of the Commission to divide the tract, a power which he insisted the Commission did not have, since article III of the convention of June 24, 1910, provided that 'the Commission shall decide solely and exclusively as to whether the international title to the Chamizal tract is in the United States of America or in Mexico.'[73] Second, he claimed that the question implied the recognition of a method of change in the riverbed due to means other than those provided for by the treaties between the United States and Mexico.[74] On the last question, the American Commissioner refused to vote because 'the location of the river in 1864 is wholly obliterated and its position can never be reestablished in any one of the points of its former location, and, therefore, even if the Commission were empowered to render a decision segregating that portion of the tract formed after 1864, provided the channel of 1864 could be located, a decision to this effect under the present circumstances when the channel can by no possibility be relocated, is void because it is indeterminate, indefinite, and impossible of accomplishment.'[75]

"The award and its rejection

"The convention of 1910 had provided that the decision 'whether rendered unanimously or by a majority vote of the Commissioners shall be final.'[76] All three Commissioners had voted together on one question, the U.S. Commissioner and the Presiding Commissioner on two, and the Mexican Commissioner and the Presiding Commissioner on three. Adding up the score, the result was a majority vote in favor of Mexico. Accordingly, on June 15, 1911, the Commission announced its award as follows:

"'The international title to the portion of the Chamizal tract lying between the middle of the bed of the Rio Grande as surveyed by Emory and Salazar in 1852 and the middle of said river as it existed before the flood of 1864, is in the United States of America, and the international title to the balance of said Chamizal tract is in the United States of Mexico.'[77]

"In the opinion of Lafleur, the river had moved by slow erosion before 1864 and by rapid erosion after that date. Therefore Mexico should have title to the tract south of the riverbed as it existed in 1864.[78] The position of the American Government, however, was that the contention of Mexico to the effect that the adjectives 'slow' and 'gradual' justified a special concept of erosion at El Chamizal was not consistent with international law.

"The Americans insisted that words must be understood in accordance with their subject matter; therefore, since 'erosion' and 'avulsion' were the only types of changes specified in the treaty, it was logical to deduce that the words 'slow and gradual,' which modified 'erosion,' indicated that no other form of erosion was possible, and merely distinguished between a 'slow and gradual' process as erosion, and a 'rapid process' as avulsion. 'Gradual' and 'rapid' might represent a difference in degree of erosive action but did not constitute two kinds of erosive action. It seemed clear to the American Government that if Mexico and the United States had intended to advocate a type of change unknown to international law, a definite statement to that effect would have been included in the correspondence relating to the treaty. There was no evidence of such correspondence. Furthermore, if three kinds of changes were recognized, why mention only two in the treaty? The treaty provided for locating the boundary as a result of 'slow and gradual' erosion and as a result of 'avulsion,' but it did not mention 'rapid erosion.'[79]

"As indicated in the minutes of the meeting of June 16, 1911, the Commissioners of the United States and Mexico were to submit their opinions on the points of the award from which they dissented. The Mexican Commissioner, Senor F. Beltrán y Puga, based his dissenting opinion on two points: first, that the findings of the majority were not supported by the record and the argument respecting the fixed and invariable line of 1852; and, second, that the convention of 1884 was not retroactive.[80] Mr. Mills advanced no new argument but reiterated the points he had previously submitted. He gave his reasons for dissenting as follows:

"'First, the Commission is wholly without jurisdiction to segregate the tract or to make other findings concerning the change at El Chamizal than "to decide whether it has occurred through avulsion or erosion, for the effects of articles I and II of the Convention of November 12, 1884" (and article IV of the convention of 1889). Secondly, because * * * the convention of 1884 is not susceptible to any other construction than that the change of the river at El Chamizal was embraced within the first alternative of the treaty of 1884. And thirdly, because * * * the finding of the award is vague, indeterminate, and uncertain in its terms and impossible of execution.'[81]

"To summarize, Mexico claimed the entire tract by right of a 'fixed and invariable line.' The United States claimed the entire tract by right of a 'fixed and invariable principle of changes made by erosion.' The Presiding Commissioner divided the tract between the two nations. Later Mexico agreed to accept the decision of Lafleur;[82] but the American Commissioner dissented, and his opinion was sustained by the Department of

---

[64] Opinions of the Attorney General of the United States (Washington, 1852), XIII, 175.

[65] Chamizal, app. I, 186–187.

[66] Chamizal argument, 113.

[67] L. F. L. Oppenheim, "International Law" (4th ed., London, 1928), I, 309.

[68] Chamizal argument, 114.

[69] S. Pufendorf, "Of the Law of Nature and Nations" (Oxford, 1703), IV, 385.

[70] Chamizal argument, 116.

[71] Arbitraje, 34.

[72] Chamizal award, 34.

[73] 36 Statutes, 2, 2481, art. III.

[74] Chamizal award, 4.

[75] Ibid.

[76] 36 Statutes, 2, 2481, art. III.

[77] Chamizal award, 4.

[78] Ibid., 30.

[79] Ibid., 42.

[80] Ibid., 49.

[81] Ibid., 36.

[82] Carreño, "México y los Estados Unidos," 383–392.

State of the United States.[83] The President of the United States, William H. Taft, expressed the same thought in his message of December 7, 1911, by saying: 'Our arbitration of the Chamizal boundary question with Mexico was unfortunately abortive, but with earnest efforts on the part of both Governments which its importance commands, it is felt that an early, practical adjustment should prove possible.'[84]

"The New York World, commenting on the decision of the Arbitration Commission in 1911, referred to the 'comic-opera conditions in El Paso,' and concluded:

" 'The decision of the Chamizal Arbitration Commission apportioning between Mexico and the United States a 3-mile strip of land five blocks wide, included in the city limits of El Paso, shows an astuteness worthy of the celebrated tariff ruling on frog legs. The difference between tweedledum and tweedledee was never before so accurately defined in diplomacy. By crossing a street or turning a corner, citizens of El Paso will find themselves under the dominion of another nation and what that will mean in the matter of conflict of laws and encouragement of license may be readily understood. A comic-opera librettist never created a more diverting situation.'[85]

"Legality of the U.S. position

"The problem of the Chamizal is of particular interest in the field of international law because it represents an instance in which a nation rejected an arbitral award. One of the prerequisites of arbitration is that the parties bind themselves to accept the decision of the judges. However, it seems to be a generally accepted principle of international law that under certain conditions the award may be repudiated; since 'an award outside the limits of the submission is not binding, for in such a case the tribunal acts in excess of tis powers.'[86] By the terms of the Chamizal award, the tract was divided between the two litigants. This action, the United States claimed, was not in compliance with article III of the convention of 1910, 'which provided that the Commission shall decide solely and exclusively as to whether the title to the Chamizal tract is in the United States of America, or in Mexico,' and for that reason, the U.S. Government felt it was justified in not accepting the decision of the Arbitral Commission.[87]

"In reaching this conclusion, the United States followed the reasoning of leading authorities on the subject. Charles Calvo enumerates six situations in which parties are justified in refusing to accept and execute arbitral judgments. These are:

" '1. Where the award was unauthorized, or rendered outside of and beyond the terms of agreement;

" '2. Where the arbitrators were under a legal or moral incapacity, absolute or relative, as where they were bound by previous engagements, or had in the formulation of their conclusions a direct interest unknown to the parties who chose them;

" '3. Where the arbitrators or one of the parties had not acted in good faith, as when the arbitrators were bought or corrupted by one of the parties;

" '4. Where one of the parties was not heard or enabled to vindicate his rights;

" '5. Where the award bore on things outside the submission;

" '6. Where the tenor of the award was absolutely contrary to the rules of justice and hence could not be the object of a compromise.'[88]

"Among the rules proposed by the Institute of International Law at its session in Geneva in 1874 and at its session at The Hague in 1887 is one relating to the requirement that an award be carried out. The rule is that the award 'must pronounce in accordance with the provisions of the agreement to arbitrate.'[89] J. B. Moore makes the same point when he says: 'The sentence of arbitration shall be void in case of the avoidance of the agreement to arbitrate, or of an excess of power, or of proved corruption of one of the arbitrators, or of an essential error.'[90]

"Secretary of State Bayard, in 1888, expressed the policy of the United States in regard to the validity of awards as follows:

" 'No matter how solemn and how authoritative may be a judgment, it is subject to be set aside by the consent of the parties. To the awards of international commissions * * * this position applies with particular force, since it is a settled principle of international law that no sovereignty can in honor press an unjust or mistaken award even though made by a judicial international tribunal invested with the power of swearing witnesses and receiving or rejecting testimony.'[91]

"There have been many instances in which states have recognized the right to reject awards of international tribunals. An outstanding example was the rejection of the award in the northeastern boundary arbitration. The convention of September 12, 1827, between the United States and Great Britain provided that the points of difference over the boundary were to be submitted to some friendly sovereign or state and that the decision should be considered final and conclusive. The arbitrator, the King of the Netherlands, held that 'neither the line claimed by the United States nor the line claimed by Great Britain so nearly answered the requirements of the treaty that a preference could be given to the one or to the other.' He therefore abandoned as impracticable the attempt to draw the line described in the treaty, and recommended a line of convenience. Since the line recommended did not conform to a line claimed by either of the parties and, therefore, was not within the special jurisdiction given the arbitrator, the Senate of the United States by a vote of 38 to 8, resolved that the award was not obligatory. The consensus seemed to be that the arbitrator had not confined his decision to the limits prescribed by the compromise, and that, therefore, either state was justified in not abiding by it.[92]

"Westlake, in discussing this award, says that 'the arbitrator did not adjudicate on the respective lines proposed by the parties, but proposed an intermediate one as a compromise, which the United States was not bound to accept and did not accept.'[93] Calvo, referring to the same case, says that the arbitrator, 'instead of laying down a true line, left this in suspense and confined himself to suggesting a basis for an entirely new and hypothetical arrangement, which the parties agreed in disregarding.'[94]

"Precedents and conclusions

"When in October of 1910, the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, in the case of the United States against Venezuela concerning the Orinoco Steamship Co., annulled a previous arbitration award, the Court pointed out that 'excessive exercise of power may consist not only in deciding a question not submitted to the arbitrators, but also in misinterpreting the express provisions of the agreement in respect of the way in which they are to reach their decisions, notably with regard to the legislation or principles of law to be applied.'[95] In an earlier case decided in 1884, although the award was in favor of the claim of the United States in a dispute with Haiti, the Secretary of State held that the arbitrator had 'misconstrued his powers,' and therefore the award was not binding.[96]

"If these statements of writers on international law and opinions of courts and arbitral tribunals are accepted as precedents, the United States had the legal right to declare void the award which divided the Chamizal tract. In the case of the Chamizal the subject in dispute was clearly defined, the question was clearly stated, and since the disputed tract was given neither to the United States nor to Mexico, the award rendered was outside of and beyond the terms of the convention of 1910, which controlled the proceeding.

"On the question of jurisdiction over the Chamizal tract, Mexico voted it belonged to Mexico, the United States voted it belonged to the United States, and the third Commissioner, Lafleur, voted that it should be divided between the two nations. It would seem that if the Arbitration Commission was authorized to decide solely and exclusively as to whether the title to the Chamizal tract was in the United States or Mexico, the only possible answer was that Mexico had title to the whole tract or that the United States had title to it.

"Because of the legal technicalities involved in the Chamizal arbitration, much confusion and misunderstanding have arisen over the outcome, especially the action of the United States in rejecting the award. On the surface, it has seemed to many persons that Mexico won the decision, since the vote on dividing the tract was 2 to 1. However, it is the author's view that this disposal of the case would not have been in accord with the instructions, to which both nations agreed, that the Commissioners were obliged to follow. This position is substantially the one adopted by the Department of State at the time.

"Opinions in Mexico

"As was natural, the reaction in Mexico to the award was entirely different than in the United States. The Mexican Government warmly welcomed the outcome and felicitated its representatives on their victory. But such good feelings and high hopes were short lived; they were dashed when the day for compliance with the award passed (June 15, 1913) without receipt of the territory. A leading contemporary authority, Licenciado Alberto María Carreño, voiced a broadly held opinion when he declared that Mexico had won a valid and binding judgment that should have been accepted and carried out. He believed that the arbitration failed only because the United States refused to respect its obligations under the convention of 1910. As for the contention of the American officials that the award could not be executed because it was physically impossible to locate the riverbed of 1864, Senor Carreño replied that this problem was not a legal one to concern the arbitrators but a physical one for surveyors and engineers, who could locate the line approximately and thus make possible substantial compliance with the decision of the tribunal. Senor Carreño detected in the rejection of the award the black hand of Yankee imperialism and later published two additional volumes to elaborate his broader thesis.[97]

---

[83] Department of State, "Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States" (Washington, 1870–1940), 1911, 598. Hereafter, "U.S. Foreign Relations."

[84] J. D. Richardson (comp.), "Messages and Papers of the Presidents" (New York, 1914), XVIII, 8038.

[85] Quoted in the El Paso Times, June 27, 1911.

[86] C. C. Hyde, "International Law Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States" (Boston, 1922), I, 581.

[87] 36 Statutes, 1910, art. III.

[88] Charles Calco, "Le Droit International" (Paris, 1896), III, 485, 486. Hereafter, Calvo.

[89] Moore, Digest, V, 5058.

[90] Ibid., 5062.

[91] U.S. Foreign Relations, 1887, 608.

[92] Moore, Digest, VII, 5960.

[93] Westlake, 415.

[94] Calvo, III, 485.

[95] *U.S.* v. *Venezuela*, "American Journal of Inernational Law" (January 1911), V, 230.

[96] U.S. Foreign Relations, 1887, 605–606.

"Another contemporary Mexican writer viewed the matter differently. Writing in June of 1911, shortly after the terms of the award were announced, Roberto A. Esteva Ruiz stated categorically that the decision was a nullity, contrary to law, and unjust for Mexico. He cited the rules mentioned by Calvo and the precedent in the Northeastern Boundary Arbitration to show that Mexico had the legal right to repudiate the award. In his opinion, Mexico lost its case at El Paso, for his country was entitled to, and should have received, all of the Chamizal. The treaties of 1848 and 1853, according to Senor Esteva Ruiz, placed all of the zone within Mexico. They also fixed an invariable line along the Salazar and Emory survey, which could be changed only with the consent of both nations. Since Mexico had never agreed to any change, the boundary must remain as established earlier. The judgment of the arbiters based on the Treaty of 1884 improperly applied international law by making the terms of the treaty retroactive in effect. In this way, Mexico was deprived of territory that belonged in the national domain; Mexico thus had a greater right than the United States to protest, and to reject the award.[98]

"Recent legal opinion in Mexico concerning the Chamizal arbitration is illustrated by the views of Licenciado César Sepúlveda, director of the faculty of law of the National University. While he believes that the United States was in error in rejecting the award, he credits American officials with sincere efforts to find a solution after the failure of the arbitration. On close examination, he finds untenable the two basic arguments that Anson Mills and the State Department submitted against the decision. He first brushes aside the contention that the award could not be physically carried out because the line of 1864 could not be located. This problem, he says, could not have concerned the Arbitration Commission, as it was a technical matter for surveyors. As for the second point—that the Commission exceeded its powers—Licenciado Sepúlveda insists that the arbiters acted within the limits of their authority. While article III of the convention of 1910 did restrict the Commission to the task of deciding 'solely and exclusively as to whether the international title to the Chamizal tract is in Mexico or the United States of America,' the purpose of this clause was simply to insure that the Commission dealt only with the territorial question, rather than with ancillary matters such as water rights. The compromise did not tie the hands of the Commission as the State Department contended; the Commission possessed the legal authority to decide the territorial issue involved, and its decision should have been respected. The best solution of the problem, he concludes, is for the United States to accept and implement the award of 1911, even if the American Government is 50 years late in doing so.[99]

"NEW EFFORTS AT SETTLEMENT

"Following the failure of the attempt at arbitration in 1911, the United States sought to find a solution by turning again to the processes of diplomacy. The Department of State now urged that the dispute be settled as speedily as possible without any discussion of the validity of the award or the possibility of scientifically relocating the channel in 1864. However, at that time, Mexican Ambassador de la Barra rejected the opinion of the American Commissioner, Anson Mills, that the award could not be executed; he added that, should the Commissioner 'find the course of the river in 1864 to be undiscoverable and thus prove the correctness of the position taken by the American Commissioner, he would go much further in meeting the wishes of the United States.'[100]

"On August 24, 1911, the Secretary of State suggested to the Mexican Ambassador that negotiations be undertaken to incorporate the following terms in a formal agreement:

" '1. A preamble reciting the pertinent articles of the present boundary treaties and conventions between the two Governments.

" '2. A recital of certain general differences as to the interpretation of these treaties as to the international title to the Chamizal tract in particular, and as to the validity of the recent award, and a statement of the desire on the part of both Governments to settle these differences in an amicable way.

" '3. Certain declaratory interpretation of the boundary treaties and conventions, particularly as to the following points: (a) The treaties of 1848–53 establish a fluvial or arcifinious boundary; (b) the treaty of 1884 is retroactive in scope; (c) two classes of changes only are contemplated in the treaty of 1884, i.e., erosion and avulsion, and these classes embrace all the changes which have taken place on the Rio Grande and Colorado Rivers, since by virtue of the treaties of 1848 and 1853 certain parts of the dividing line between the two countries have followed the middle of the channel of the Rio Grande and the Rio Colorado, as well as changes which may take place in the future; (d) provisions relating to the adjustment of the international boundary line at El Paso and Juárez through mutual arrangement by a declaratory interpretation of the boundary treaties and the elimination of the Horcón Bar above Brownsville; (e) possible provision for the indemnification of private individuals who may be thought by one or the other Government to be damaged through the adoption of the foregoing provision.'[101]

"In reply, however, Senor de la Barra was of the opinion that 'inasmuch as the matter is finally adjudicated by award, nothing remains but to carry out duly the said decision by means of such arrangement as may be made to run the dividing line in accordance with the sentence.' He also insisted that the award had placed Mexico in a different position by changing the legal situation—that, by the award, Mexico had acquired rights she could not surrender unless fully compensated therefor.[102] The State Department replied that the award was absolutely invalid, and that it would be impossible to locate the line of 1864. But the Department added that it did not ask the Government of Mexico to admit the invalidity of the recent award; it proposed only that these contentious matters be held in abeyance while the two Governments worked out through friendly negotiations a practical solution of their difficulties.[103] This approach, however, did not appeal to the Mexican Government.

"Projects to trade territory

"In 1913 the Department of State attempted again to effect a settlement. According to a plan submitted by Secretary Knox, Mexico would exchange the Cordova and the Chamizal tracts for the Horcon and a small area near El Paso and south of the river.[104] The bar of Horcon, which includes some 368 acres, was created by an artificial cut in the Rio Grande in 1900. The area is located near the mouth of the river. The first reports from Mexico indicated that these proposals were acceptable, but no one knows just how near a solution of the problem was at that time. When the United States refused to recognize the Huerta government in Mexico, the latter refused to consider the proposals further.

"Later, a plan of the State Department provided for the United States to cancel the Pious Fund obligation of Mexico in return for her granting the United States title to the Chamizal tract. The Pious Fund was established in 1697 by the Government of Spain and the Catholic Church for the benefit of Jesuit missions in California. When in 1848 Mexico took over the fund, it had grown to several million dollars. Since the United States claimed the fund as a national asset when she acquired California, it became a basis for arbitration. In 1902, the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague ruled that Mexico should pay the United States $1,420,682.67 cash and $43,050.99 annually in perpetuity.[105] No payments, however, have been made since 1914.

"On August 17, 1932, the Mexican Secretary of Foreign Relations, Senor Tellez, submitted the following draft agreements to the Ambassador of the United States in Mexico City: first, a convention covering the rectification of the river; second, a protocol covering the transfer of El Chamizal to the United States; and third, a protocol covering the release by the United States of the Pious Fund and its accrued and unpaid balance. Because of some technical points in the drafting of this document, J. Ruben Clark, the U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, submitted a counterdraft in which he combined El Chamizal with the Pious Fund. The Mexican Minister agreed to the change and said he wished to get the approval of President Ortiz Rubio and General Calles, and then submit the proposal to the entire cabinet.

"The second section of the protocol provided that the channel of 1864 be located either 'in fact or by computation' in order to arrive at the extent of territory which had to be equaled in making the transfer of the Chamizal tract. The inclusion of this provision indicates that something in addition to the Pious Fund was to be given to Mexico in exchange for El Chamizal. Mr. Clark felt that the United States had two alternatives: 'either to continue to repudiate the award and deal on that basis—a basis which had led us nowhere in 20 years—or to recognize that there was an award against us, and, while not relinquishing our own position regarding the award, secure from Mexico a relinquishment and transfer of her rights thereunder.'

"One suggestion was that the flood levee on the El Paso side of the river be taken as the northern levee of the rectified channel.

"This procedure would have thrown perhaps 10 acres of the Chamizal tract to the Mexican side of the river. Mexico requested that the possibility of moving the river north of the international bridges between the city of El Paso and Ciudad Juarez be considered so as to transfer some of the actual tract, rather than just the bed of the river, south of the rectified river channel, or to make a similar adjustment lower down the river. Respecting this plan, L. M. Lawson, U.S. Boundary Commissioner, on October 21, 1932, said that from the viewpoints of both engineering and cost, it would not be possible to relocate the river as suggested. Such alterations, he declared, would introduce 'reverse curves' in the river channel, which result would not be advisable. The estimated cost would be about $1,450,000 if the change was made at the bridges, or $670,000 if the change was made in the lower part of the Chamizal.[106]

---

[97] Alberto María Carreño, "México y los Estados Unidos de América" (1st ed., 1922), ch. XX. See also his "La Diplomacia Extraordinaria entre México y Estados Unidos" (1st ed., 2 vol., 1951), passim.

[98] Roberto A. Estuva Ruiz, "Ensayos Juridicos" (México, D. F., 1960), 241–253.

[99] César Sepúlveda, "El Chamizal y algunas cuestiones diplomaticas pendientes entre México y los Estados Unidos," "Revista de la Facultad de Derecho de México," (México, D. F., 1962), XII, No. 47, 487–491.

[100] U.S. Foreign Relations, 1911, 602.

[101] Ibid., 599.

[102] Ibid., 603. During these negotiations de la Barra became President of Mexico. The correspondence was carried on under his direction.

[103] Ibid., 604–605.

[104] Ibid., 974.

[105] House document, 2d sess., 1903, Pious Fund arbitration, 4442.

"When in 1930 the International Boundary Commission drew up a plan for rectifying the course of the Rio Grande, the Chamizal was included. The project called for exchanging about 10,000 acres of land between the two countries, beginning at the western point of El Chamizal and continuing to Fort Quitman. When the treaty of rectification was signed on February 1, 1933, it specified that work should begin south of Monument No. 15, on Cordova Island.[107]

"Breaking the deadlock

"These various approaches, however, proved fruitless so far as a settlement of the issue of the Chamizal was concerned. The attitude of Mexico was that the award of the Arbitration Commission should be implemented, whereas the United States remained firm in contending that the Canadian and Mexican Commissioners had exceeded their powers in seeking to divide the tract. All efforts at an exchange of territory for territory, or land for money obligations failed because equivalent values, in the eyes of the negotiators, could not be arrived at. Another impediment has been the fact that for the past 20 years or so, Mexico has insisted that a substantial part of the land it would receive should be in the Chamizal tract itself. Clearly, the deadlock could be broken only by an act of statesmanship on the highest level—a decision that could cut through the accumulation of historical, legal, and technical flotsam and lagan the Chamizal case had accumulated. The intervention of Presidents Kennedy and Lopez Mateos was aimed precisely at the stalemate that had persisted for 52 years. They directed their attack on the problem from the vantage point of confidence; they sought a practical compromise.

"In effect, President Kennedy abandoned the rigid legal position the U.S. Government had maintained since it rejected the award of the Arbitration Commission in 1911. The change in attitude of the executive department was emphasized in Kennedy's statements that the United States, 'after agreeing to arbitration, backed down, and did not accept the report,' and that the United States should erase the 'black mark' resulting from its refusal to comply. This approach in effect, though not technically, recognized the legal claims of Mexico to most of the Chamizal tract, broadly in keeping with the decision of the majority of the Arbitral Commission, Lafleur and Puga, and it overruled the position of Mills and the State Department. But by now, the problem has become much more difficult. During the half century since the award, many changes have taken place in the Chamizal. Whereas in 1911 the total area was valued at $500,000, the part now assigned to Mexico is estimated to be worth between $25 and $30 million.[108] As a result, the adjustment of the interests involved will be decidedly more complex and costly.

"In deciding the new American policy, the Government at Washington was obliged to weigh such costs, plus any opposition that might develop in the country and in Congress, against the broader and more intangible benefits of good faith, good will, and national prestige. President Kennedy and his advisers doubtless concluded that with the passing of time the problem would become worse rather than better, and that the best way out would be to settle the issue once and for all, even though some loss of territory would be involved. The decision of the U.S. Government as announced on July 18 was thus a diplomatic or practical, and not a legal disposition of the problem. The present position of the Department of State is as follows:

" 'The United States has a proud record of complying with its international obligations and faithfully executing treaties to which it has agreed. * * * Our disagreement with the Chamizal award, even though based on valid arguments held in good faith, seems inconsistent, after we had agreed in a treaty to accept the result "without appeal" with our historical position and goals as a nation.'

"There would be specific advantages in our relations with Mexico:

" 'A source of irritation which has troubled United States-Mexican relations for almost 100 years would be removed;

" 'Arbitration would be restored as a means of peaceful settlement of disputes between the United States and Mexico;

" 'The Chamizal as an emotional issue in Mexico, which distorts what otherwise might be a favorable view of the United States, would be removed. Settlement would eliminate use of the Chamizal as the basis for propagating the view, even through the education system, that the United States does not live up to its treaty commitments; and

" 'The Communists and other enemies of the United States in Mexico would be denied one of the propaganda weapons they are using to injure United States-Mexican relations.

" 'The settlement should also have significant advantages for El Paso:

" 'An international dispute which has seriously impeded the natural direction of growth of El Paso would be removed and harmonious relations between the sister cities of El Paso and Ciudad Juarez would be strengthened;

" 'The development of El Paso, especially traffic circulation and the provision of public utilities, would be materially improved with the incorporation into El Paso of the upper half of Cordova Island;

" 'The cloud on the title to the lands in the Chamizal tract remaining in the United States, which has plagued property owners for some 100 years, would be removed;

" 'The revenue base in El Paso would be considerably enhanced because a blighted area in El Paso would be improved and contribute its fair share to the cost of municipal government;

" 'Settlement of the dispute will at last permit execution of the international flood control measures essential for the proper protection of El Paso;

" 'The international bridges at El Paso could be replaced with structures in harmony with the needs of the over 600,000 people who live in the El Paso-Ciudad Juarez area; and

" 'The reestablishment of the Rio Grande as the boundary would facilitate border control, health control, and other inspection measures, as well as beautify the riverfront on both sides of the river.' [109]

"The terms of settlement

"The settlement on which the two Governments agreed has a double purpose: to end the dispute with Mexico and to establish a fixed river boundary between El Paso and Ciudad Juarez. The negotiators of the agreement have also had in mind the protection of existing property interests in the area. As a result, the settlement calls for the transfer to Mexico, and the exchange between Mexico and the United States, of several different parcels of land inside and just outside the Chamizal. Specifically, the agreement incorporates the following provisions:

"1. The United States will transfer to Mexico a net amount of 437 acres of territory now under American jurisdiction, approximately the area that the Arbitration Commission awarded in 1911. Of this amount marked for Mexico, 366 acres will come from the disputed Chamizal zone and 71 acres from U.S. territory east of Cordova Island.

"2. Cordova Island will be divided equally between the United States and Mexico. Each nation will have 193 acres. This transfer of territory to the United States is to equalize the transfer to Mexico of land necessary to establish the river as the boundary.

"3. The Rio Grande will be relocated, beginning at a point marked "A" on the map included in this study. The new channel will be concrete lined, and will make possible an improvement of properties on both sides.

"4. Both Governments will acquire title to all the land and improvements in the areas assigned to them, 'free of any limitation on ownership or encumbrance of any kind including private titles.' No payments will be made, as between the Governments, for the lands transferred.

"5. The United States will receive compensation for the 382 structures in the Chamizal zone and to the east of Cordova Island that will be transferred to Mexico. However, payment will be made by a Mexican bank (Banco Nacional Hipotecario Urbano y de Obras Publicas) and not by the Mexican Government. The value of the improvements passing to Mexico has been set at $4,675,000.

"6. The two Governments will share equally the cost of relocating and constructing the new river channel, as well as the cost of building the new bridges. Each Government, however, will assume the expenses that will arise on its side of the river in the course of making these improvements.

"7. After both Governments have approved the convention and passed the legislation necessary to implement the agreement, the Government of the United States will acquire by purchase or condemnation the properties to be transferred to Mexico. This process will take place within a period of time upon which the two Boundary Commissioners agree.

"8. When all acquisitions and arrangements have been completed, the U.S. Boundary Commissioner will certify to this effect. Both Commissioners will then proceed to demarcate the new boundary. The record of their action will be submitted to both Governments for their approval.

"9. The International Boundary Commission will be 'charged with the relocation, improvement, and maintenance of the river channel, as well as the construction of the new bridges.'

"10. The nationality of present or former residents in the areas to be transferred will not be affected, nor will the jurisdiction of the Governments over legal proceedings or over the laws applicable to acts or conduct in the areas before the exchange, be altered.[110]

"To clarify for the reader the transfers and exchanges involved in the settlement, the map on pages 26 and 27 has been divided into three sections. Section 1 includes all of the Chamizal lying south of the line of 1852. Of this area, 366 acres are to be cut to Mexico. About 1,750 persons live in the part to be transferred, most in the narrow western region. The land in this section assigned to Mexico contains about 233 single dwellings, many of them owner-occupied. Several factories and business establishments are in the zone and will be affected by the transfer. It is through this section that the streets of

---

[106] These negotiations were not fully documented. See U.S. Foreign Relations, 1932, V, 824.

[107] U.S. Treaty series, No. 864.

[108] The El Paso Times, July 11, 1963.

[109] Department of State, "The Chamizal Settlement," July 1963, 5–6.

[110] Department of State, press release, July 18, 1963.

El Paso lead to the international bridges over the Rio Grande and directly into the center of Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. Almost all of the people in the area are American citizens of Mexican descent. Because the tract is disputed territory, clear titles have not always been given to the landholders.

"Section 2, which is to be transferred to the United States, consists entirely of undeveloped land. According to plans, about 50 acres will be used for various Federal installations, and, depending on the action of Congress, the remainder may be given to the city of El Paso for a recreational area and for other purposes relating to the general welfare, or sold for private enterprises.

"In section 3, which will go to Mexico, there are about 248 dwellings. The population is about 1,775. A new elementary school is in this area, and most homes are more modern and of greater value than those in section 1.

"Of the entire acreage to be transferred to Mexico, more than half consists of agricultural land and stockyards. All the area marked for the United States is in section 2 and all is now undeveloped.

"Questions to be resolved

"The settlement involves various legal and political questions, some of which have not yet been resolved. For example, the U.S. Government does not admit, nor can it admit, that the Chamizal is Mexican territory in keeping with the arbitration award of 1911. Legally, the United States must insist on its ownership of the entire tract, for otherwise it could never acquire title to the properties involved in the settlement, especially through condemnation proceedings. Again, since all American titles to land and buildings will become void as soon as they are transferred to Mexico, it is necessary for the United States to own them up to the moment of transfer. Leading court decisions hold that when two states or nations agree on a boundary, even though it be a compromise line, the conclusive presumption is that such line has always been the true boundary. The courts have accordingly ruled that titles held under grants from one country to land placed by a compromise in another country are entirely void.[111] For these reasons, all property claims and all details involved in moving the river channel must be completed before the title to any tract is transferred to Mexico.

"In its present form, the agreement between the Governments of the United States and Mexico is a memorandum based on diplomatic discussions and an exchange of notes. It is technically a modus vivendi that must be converted into a convention or treaty before the two Governments may formally approve it. But since the memorandum contains the essential details of the agreement, there is no reason to anticipate difficulty in negotiating the necessary convention.

"The next step will require action by the legislative branches of both Governments to confirm the convention and pass the measures necessary to put it into effect. First, the Senates of the two nations must approve the convention, then their Congresses must enact the proper enabling legislation and appropriate the funds necessary to carry out the terms of the convention.

"The outlook in Mexico is favorable, since the majority of leaders in the country appear to regard the settlement as a diplomatic victory. According to the Mexican Constitution, treaties are confirmed by a simple majority of the Senate.[112] Because of the special position of leadership the President occupies in the Mexican political system, he should have no trouble under normal conditions in securing this majority.[113] Although the Constitution of Mexico proscribes certain types of treaties,[114] boundary settlements are not specifically forbidden. Article 27, however, declares that 'the national domain is inalienable and imprescriptible.' Yet this restriction has not been applied in respect to rectifications along the boundary and settlement of water rights. The convention of February 10, 1933, for the rectification of the Rio Grande in the Valley of Juarez-El Paso, and the treaty of February 3, 1944, respecting the distribution of waters between Mexico and the United States, both of which Mexico has faithfully carried out, are precedents for the action of the Mexican President in the present case.[115] As head of the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI), which controls both branches of the Congress,[116] President Lopez Mateos should have no problem in securing such legislative measures as may be necessary to carry out Mexico's part of the agreement, unless there is some unusual and unexpected development.

"The prospect in Washington

"The outcome in Washington is less certain. What action the Senate and Congress will take is anyone's guess at this moment. The proposed disposition of national territory—or territory that many persons in the United States consider to be national—could arouse deep feelings of opposition in Washington and throughout the country. The two U.S. Senators from Texas are sharply divided. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, approves the agreement in full and has pledged his support in its behalf. As a former resident of El Paso, Senator YARBOROUGH sees many benefits that the agreement will bestow on this border area. On the other hand, the Republican Senator from Texas JOHN TOWER, strongly objects.[117]

"The position of Senator TOWER is interesting and important. He says that his opposition to the settlement is based primarily on the belief that a State of the Union must not be 'dismembered' without its consent. He therefore insists that the people of Texas, acting through the legislature, must approve the settlement before he votes in favor of it.[118] Of course, the Senator is entirely within his rights in defining the conditions under which he will vote pro or con; legally, however, there is a question as to whether the people or the government of Texas has any control over the ultimate decision. When Texas was voted in the Union on March 1, 1845, the Congress at Washington agreed to annexation on this condition: 'said State to be formed subject to the adjustment by this Federal Government of all questions of boundary that may arise with other governments.'[119] In a recent opinion, the Attorney General of Texas has concluded that the approval of the people of Texas is not necessary to legalize the transfer of the Chamizal territory to Mexico.[120]

"Once the Senate of the United States has confirmed the convention, if it decides to do so by the necessary two-thirds vote, both Houses of Congress must pass legislation appropriating the funds necessary to buy the acreage that will go to Mexico and to effect the changes and improvement on the American side of the river. At this moment when other aspects of President Kennedy's legislative program are in doubt, it is not possible to make safe predictions.[121] The outcome respecting the Chamizal agreement would seem to depend in part on the right timing in submitting the issue to Congress for action.

"In the event that opposition arises in the Senate and the two-thirds vote required to confirm the convention does not materialize, does that kill the Chamizal agreement? Not necessarily. Another approach is still available, although the treaty route appears to be better in the present case. The agreement may be approved by means of a joint resolution passed by a simple majority in both House of Congress. This method has been used on various occasions when action on treaties has been blocked by a Senate minority—for example, in the annexation of Texas in 1845 and Hawaii in 1895. The so-called Green-Sayre formula, according to which a subcommittee of the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations acts closely with the executive department in working out the details of a foreign-policy project to be adopted by a joint resolution, may afford an effective method of overcoming obstructionism.[122] It must be borne in mind, however, that in keeping with article **VI**, paragraph 2 of the Constitution, a joint resolution, as a 'law,' must 'be made in pursuance' of the Constitution, and it would be subject to stricter limitations than a treaty made 'under the authority of the United States.' Given this important constitutional distinction between laws and treaties, method remains as a possibility if the convention would be a safer procedure to use in transferring to a foreign country territory under the jurisdiction of a State in the Union.[123] Even so, the joint-resolution method remains as a possibility if the convention encounters strong minority opposition in the Senate.

"The task ahead

"After the hurdles in Washington and Mexico City have been overcome, much work lies ahead in El Paso. The Federal Government must buy or legally condemn all the properties in the area destined for Mexico, plus land on the north side of the river, estimated at 56 acres, needed for the right-of-way of the channel.

"The channel of the river must be moved and rebuilt. Plans should be drawn up to develop, utilize, and serve the territory along the north bank of the river, and these plans must be put into effect. The issue concerning a suitable highway along the north bank of the river must be disposed of.[124] Some 3,725 persons must be moved out of the area affected and provided with housing, schools, and other facilities elsewhere in El Paso. It is estimated that the cost to the Federal

---

[111] *Henderson* v. *Poindexter's Lessee,* 12 Wheaton 530; *De la Croix* v. *Chamberlain,* 12 Wheaton 599.

[112] Constitution of Mexico, 1917, art. 76, par. I.

[113] William L. Tucker, "The Mexican Government Today" (Minneapolis, 1957), chs. 4 and 7.

[114] Constitution of Mexico, 1917, art. 15.

[115] Rodolfo Cruz Miramontes, "Derecho Internacional Fluvial" (Mexico, D.F., 1958), passim. Also see his discussion in "Lectures Juridicas" (Universidad de Chihuahua, Escuela de Derecho, 1962), No. 10, 75ff.

[116] Robert E. Scott, "Mexican Government in Transition" (Urbana, 1959), chs. 6, 7, and 8.

[117] El Paso Herald-Post, July 18, 1963; the El Paso Times, July 17, 1963. Senator GRUENING, of Alaska praises the Kennedy settlement, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 109, pt. 10, pp. 13074–13077.

[118] The Dallas Morning News and the El Paso Times, July 19, 1963.

[119] Joint resolution, Mar. 1, 1845, 5 Statutes, 797.

[120] The El Paso Times, July 17, 1963. The Attorney General has refused to file suit to test the validity of the Chamizal agreement. See El Paso Herald-Post, July 31, 1963. A suit is pending respecting the constitutionality of the transfer of territory from Texas. See the El Paso Times, Aug. 6, 1963.

[121] See U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 5, 1963, 44; the El Paso Times, Aug. 6, 1963.

[122] Elmer Plischke, "Conduct of American Diplomacy" (Princeton, 1961), 400–403.

[123] C. Herman Pritchett, "The American Constitution" (New York, 1959), 333–336.

[124] The El Paso Times, July 24, 1963.

Government could finally amount to between $30 and $50 million. The city of El Paso and El Paso County must assume additional costs and responsibilities. At best, between 3 and 5 years may be required to complete the project in its various phases.[125]

"Measured in any terms, the Chamizal settlement is a major undertaking, and it is of special significance to the inhabitants of the El Paso-Juarez area. From the local point of view, regardless of other considerations, the settlement offers an opportunity, long overdue, to eliminate a kind of no man's land, much of it vacant and unimproved or occupied by substandard houses. The settlement opens the way for a beneficial program of rebuilding, unique because of its international aspects. It matches on the American side of the river the ambitious undertaking of Mexico in its Programa Nacional Fronterizo that is rapidly changing the face of Ciudad Juarez and other Mexican cities along the border. The social and economic interdependence of El Paso and Juarez has been firmly established during the many interesting years of their history as twin cities facing each other across the low banks of the Rio Grande. It finally put into effect, the accord that Presidents Kennedy and Lopez Mateos have reached should materially advance the well-being of both communities at the Pass of the North, reducing the physical barriers between them and stimulating the development of mutual interests, both economic and cultural."

THE CHAMIZAL TREATY OF 1963—THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Chamizal dispute has been inflaming the relations between the United States and Mexico for too many years. Now, thanks to the determination of the late President Kennedy to solve this problem, and the continuation of this policy by President Johnson, we are approaching an equitable settlement of the Chamizal dispute.

As a lawyer, and former judge, it has long been a matter of regret to me that the United States had the burden of defending its rejection of an arbitration award it had earlier agreed to accept. What an issue this made for Communist and other anti-American propaganda south of the border. The composition of this dispute by the treaty will be a forward step in improving our relations with all Latin America.

This type of exchange is in principle not novel or unique; it sets no precedent. This treaty follows a pattern of many years by which tracts of land along the Rio Grande have been ceded to one country or the other as the river channel shifts. In accordance with the provisions of the treaties of 1884 and 1905 between Mexico and the United States, over 30,000 acres of land have been transferred between the two countries. This present settlement is well within these precedents for land exchange with Mexico in the alluvial valley of the Rio Grande.

There seems little occasion here for abstract questions of whether a State's territory could be ceded to a foreign nation without its consent. The southern boundary of the State of Texas at its annexation was placed at "the principal stream" of the Rio Grande, the same boundary as the Republic of Texas. By the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848 the boundary is described as "up the middle of that river—the Rio Grande—following the deepest channel where it has more than one, to the point where it strikes the southern boundary of New Mexico." Necessarily when one describes a boundary in terms of "principal stream" or "deepest channel" there is a latent uncertainty and a contemplation of later adjustments and more certain demarcation.

Even without this general power, we find that Texas specifically gave up its authority over its foreign boundaries by the terms of its annexation agreement with the United States in 1845. The State of Texas was formed "subject to the adjustment by this Government—the United States—of all questions of boundaries that may arise with other governments." Reluctant as any Texan to relinquish any of our sovereignty, this contract between the United States and the Republic of Texas conclusively settles the question of whether Federal authority is exclusive on this matter.

This type of adjustment has in fact gone on along the Rio Grande by treaty and Boundary Commission action without the question of State sovereignty or consent being involved. If this problem involved lands not within the scope of historical channels of the Rio Grande, a different question might be posed, but all this land is within the alluvial flood plain of the Rio Grande where it has always been understood that border changes would take place both naturally and through the U.S. treaty power to locate and define the "deepest channel" of the Rio Grande. There is no substantial legal question involved here. On page 30 of the hearings, an opinion prepared in the Texas attorney general's office appears which comes to the same conclusion. I am not aware of any contrary views being expressed by officials of the Texas State government.

The responsible officials of the community most affected, El Paso, have expressed their support of the treaty. A wire from the mayor of El Paso states:

> The city of El Paso supports the ratification of the Chamizal Treaty as we believe it is necessary to settle this longstanding dispute.
>
> Individuals and businesses who will be dispossessed by action of the treaty must be given full relocation values and the treaty itself must be properly symbolized along the area of the relocated river channel. All of the points for this proper symbolization have been officially made by us to the bureaus in Washington with the full knowledge of our late President Kennedy, and these studies are underway now.
>
> JUDSON F. WILLIAMS,
> *Mayor, City of El Paso.*

A wire from the county judge of El Paso County states:

> El Paso County government recommends Chamizal Treaty ratification. We have already proposed to various bureaus and agencies of Federal Government plans for compensating our displaced persons and the county and city for their respective losses. We have also presented plan for symbolizing settlement and monopolizing upon it toward strengthening the ties of understanding and friendship between the United States and Mexico.
>
> GLENN E. WOODWARD,
> *County Judge.*
>
> EL PASO COUNTY, TEX.

These supporting telegrams from the officials of El Paso bring up the principal difficulty in this settlement: That it would require the eviction of all the residents and users of a thickly settled urban area. Special factors make it impossible to handle this problem as a typical eminent domain taking. The extended existence of this controversy and the sporadic negotiations have tended to keep much building in the Chamizal at a substandard level. For many of these people to be evicted, fair market value compensation might hardly make a down payment to purchase replacement dwellings. Unless fully adequate compensation is provided, the U.S. Government will be creating a grave social problem in El Paso by this transfer and eviction of the residents. The Congress will be called upon next year to act on enabling legislation for the treaty in which the residents of the Chamizal can be dealt with equitably. The 4,500 American citizens living in the Chamizal must be treated with as much consideration as the international problems involved receive. Only with full and adequate compensation can this Nation discharge its obligation to its own displaced citizens.

I am confident Congress will act fairly in providing solutions for the problems that will be created for El Paso by implementation of this treaty. On that basis, I urge its ratification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the opinion of Milton Richardson, assistant attorney general of the State of Texas.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EL CHAMIZAL

(By Milton Richardson, assistant attorney general, State of Texas)

Question: Can the United States settle the Chamizal dispute between the United States and Mexico without in any manner obtaining the consent or approval of the State of Texas to the settlement?

The settlement of the Chamizal problem might possibly involve the State of Texas in two ways. First, as a sovereign exercising jurisdiction over a geographical area and second, as an actual owner of land in the disputed area.

To properly understand the problem and to ascertain the answer to the above question it is necessary to consider a part of the history of the boundary between the United States-Texas and Mexico. It is likewise necessary to define or state just what El Chamizal is and how it came to be.

WHAT IS EL CHAMIZAL?

El Chamizal is an area of land several hundred acres in extent located between the downtown area of the city of El Paso, Tex., U.S.A., and Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua, Mexico. It is an area that lies between the current bend of the Rio Grande as it turns southeast after coming down the Paso del Norte in a north-south direction and the bend of the Rio Grande as it turned toward the southeast after coming down the pass in 1852. Generally speaking, during this interval the bend of the river and the river have moved to the south.

PERTINENT HISTORY OF BOUNDARY BETWEEN UNITED STATES-TEXAS AND MEXICO

The first official pronouncement of the boundary between the Republic of Texas and Mexico was made by the Congress of the Republic of Texas in 1836 when it defined the limits or boundaries of the Republic (1 Laws of the Republic of Texas 133, 1 Gammel 1193). The portion of the boundary line fixed thereby with which we are primarily concerned, ran in the Gulf of Mexico from the Sabine River three leagues from land, "to the mouth of the Rio Grande, thence up the principal stream of said river to its source." (Ordinarily unless specifically stated otherwise, when a river is made the boundary between States or sovereign States the center thereof is considered to be the boundary between the States or the sovereign States. Such a boundary moves with changes in the course of the river which are caused by erosion and accretion but said boundary remains in the old bed and does not follow the river if the course change thereof occurs by avulsive action. *Nebraska* v. *Iowa*, 143 U.S. 359; *Virginia* v. *Tennessee*, 148 U.S. 503; Henry Wheaton, Elements of International Law (6th ed.), I, 353–354; Henry Halleck, International Law (4th ed.), I, 183; Christian Wolff, Jus Gentium Methodo Scientifica Certraccatum, II, 63–64; William E. Hall, A Treatise on International Law (5th ed.), pp. 121–122; Samuel Pufendorf, De Jure Naturae et Gentium Libro Octo, II, 594; Grotius, II, 217–218.) The Texas Supreme Court has specifically held that the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the State of Texas extends to the center of the Rio Grande. *Tugwell* v. *Eagle Pass Ferry Co.*, 74 Tex. 480, 9 S.W. 120, 13 S.W. 654.

---

[125] El Paso Herald-Post, July 18, 1963.

On December 29, 1845, Texas entered the United States of America as a State. By the terms of the articles of annexation, the State of Texas was to be formed "subject to the adjustment by this government [the United States] of all questions of boundaries that may arise with other governments";—joint resolution, March 1, 1845, 5 U.S. Stat. 797.

The resolution of March 1, 1845, also provided that the State of Texas should retain the ownership of her public lands. (This would include the north half of the Rio Grande. Article 5302, V.C.S.; *Heard* v. *Town of Refugio*, 127 Tex. 349, 103 S.W. 2d 728; *Chicago, R.I. & G. Ry. Co.* v. *Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District*, 123 Tex. 432, 73 S.W. 2d 55; *Maufrais* v. *State*, 142 Tex. 559, 180 S.W. 2d 144; *State* v. *Bradford*, 121 Tex. 515, 50 S.W. 2d 1065.)

In 1848 at the conclusion of the war with Mexico, the United States and Mexico signed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (9 U.S. Stat. 926). Among other things, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo established the boundary between the United States and Mexico. Section 5 of this treaty reads in that part pertinent to the boundary between the United States-Texas and Mexico as follows:

"The Boundary line between the two Republics shall commence in the Gulf of Mexico, three leagues from land, opposite the mouth of the Rio Grande, otherwise called Rio Bravo del Norte, or opposite the mouth of its deepest branch, if it should have more than one branch emptying directly into the sea; from thence, up the middle of that river, following the deepest channel, where it has more than one, to the point where it strikes the southern boundary of New Mexico; * * *

* * * * *

"In order to designate the Boundary line with due precision, upon authoritative maps, and to establish upon the ground landmarks which shall show the limits of both Republics, as described in the present Article, the two Governments shall each appoint a Commissioner and a Surveyor, who, before the expiration of one year from the date of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty, shall meet at the Port of San Diego, and proceed to run and mark the said boundary in its whole course, to the Mouth of the Rio Bravo del Norte. They shall keep journals and make out plans of their operations; and the result, agreed upon by them shall be deemed a part of this Treaty, and shall have the same force as if it were inserted therein. The two Governments will amicably agree regarding what may be necessary to these persons, and also as to their respective escorts, should such be necessary.

"The Boundary line established by this Article shall be religiously respected by each of the two Republics, and no change shall ever be made therein, except by the express and free consent of both nations, lawfully given by the General Government of each, in conformity with its own constitution."

In 1852 the special commissioners and surveyors, Emory and Salazar, marked the boundary along the Rio Grande in the El Chamizal area as well as other places. Thus we know today from their work where the bed of the Rio Grande lay in 1852.

Between 1852 and 1864 accretion accrued to the north bank of the Rio Grande in the Chamizal area accompanied by its companion, erosion, which ate into the south bank of the Rio Grande. The result was a gradual movement of the bed and stream of the Rio Grande to the south.

In the year 1864 the bed of the Rio Grande moved farther south by the action of accretion and erosion; however, it moved at a very rapid rate of speed.

In the year 1884 the United States and Mexico entered into another convention or treaty regarding the boundary between the two countries. 23 U.S. Stat. 10011. The Treaty of 1884 which is pertinent to the boundary between the United States-Texas and Mexico reads in part as follows:

"Whereas, in virtue of the 5th article of the Treaty of Gudalupe Hidalgo, between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico, concluded February 2, 1848, and of the first article of that of December 30, 1853, certain parts of the dividing line between the two countries follow the middle of the channel of the Rio Grande and the Rio Colorado, to avoid difficulties which may arise through the changes of channel to which those rivers are subject through the operation of natural forces, the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United States of Mexico have resolved to conclude a convention which shall lay down rules for the determination of such questions, and have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries: * * *

* * * * *

"Article I

"The dividing line shall forever be that described in the aforesaid Treaty and follow the centre of the normal channel of the rivers named, notwithstanding any alterations in the banks or in the course of those rivers, provided that such alterations be effected by natural causes through the slow and gradual erosion and deposit of alluvium and not by the abandonment of an existing river bed and the opening of a new one.

"Article II

"Any other change, wrought by the force of the current, whether by the cutting of a new bed, or when there is more than one channel by the deepening of another channel than that which marked the boundary at the time of the survey made under the aforesaid Treaty, shall produce no change in the dividing line as fixed by the surveys of the International Boundary Commissions in 1852; but the line then fixed shall continue to follow the middle of the original channel bed, even though this should become wholly dry or be obstructed by deposits.

"Article III

"No artificial change in the navigable course of the river, by building jetties, piers, or obstructions which may tend to deflect the current or produce deposits of alluvium, or by dredging to deepen another than the original channel under the Treaty when there is more than one channel, or by cutting waterways to shorten the navigable distance, shall be permitted to affect or alter the dividing line as determined by the aforesaid Commissions in 1852 or as determined by Article I hereof and under the reservation therein contained; but the protection of the banks on either side from erosion by revetments of stone or other material not unduly projecting into the current of the river shall not be deemed an artificial change".

In 1889 the International Boundary Commission was authorized by the treaty of 1889 between the United States and Mexico. 26 U.S. Stat. 1512. It was created for the special purpose of administering the treaty of 1884 which had adopted for the water boundary between the United States and Mexico the commonly accepted rules of accretion avulsion, and the thalweg.

By the convention or treaty of 1905 between the United States and Mexico the two countries adopted a different rule from that of accretion, erosion, and avulsion in regard to their common river boundaries. 35 U.S. Stat. 1863. By this convention the rule of the transfer of cutoffs (bancos) was adopted. (A cutoff or banco is that area of land enclosed by an oxbow bend of the old river channel and a new bed or channel which has been avulsively cut, thereby eliminating the oxbow or bend of the river.)

The convention of 1905 reads in part as follows:

"Article I

"The fifty-eight (58) bancos surveyed and described in the report of the consulting engineers, dated May 30, 1898, to which reference is made in the record of proceedings of the International Boundary Commission, dated June 14, 1898, and which are drawn on fifty-four (54) maps on a scale of one to five thousand (1 to 5,000), and three index maps, signed by the Commissioners and by the Plenipotentiaries appointed by the convention, are hereby eliminated from the effects of Article II of the Treaty of November 12, 1884.

"Within the part of the Rio Grande comprised between its mouth and its confluence with the San Juan River the boundary line between the two countries shall be the broken red line shown on the said maps—that is, it shall follow the deepest channel of the stream—and the dominion and jurisdiction of so many of the aforesaid fifty-eight (58) bancos as may remain on the right bank of the river shall pass to Mexico, and the dominion and jurisdiction of those of the said fifty-eight (58) bancos which may remain on the left bank shall pass to the United States of America.

"Article II

"The International Commission shall, in the future, be guided by the principle of elimination of the bancos established in the foregoing article, with regard to the labors concerning the boundary line throughout that part of the Rio Grande and the Colorado River which serves as a boundary between the two nations. There are hereby excepted from this provision the portions of land segregated by the change in the bed of the said rivers having an area of over two hundred and fifty (250) hectares, or a population of over two hundred (200) souls, and which shall not be considered as bancos for the purposes of this treaty and shall not be eliminated, the old bed of the river remaining, therefore, the boundary in such cases.

"Article III

"With regard to the bancos which may be formed in future, as well as to those already formed but which are not yet surveyed, the Boundary Commission shall proceed to the places where they have been formed, for the purpose of duly applying Articles I and II of the present convention, and the proper maps shall be prepared in which the changes that have occurred shall be shown, in a manner similar to that employed in the preparation of the maps of the aforementioned fifty-eight (58) bancos.

"As regards these bancos, as well as those already formed but not surveyed, and those that may be formed in future, the Commission shall mark on the ground, with suitable monuments, the bed abandoned by the river, so that the boundaries of the bancos shall be clearly defined.

"On all separated land on which the successive alluvium deposits have caused to disappear those parts of the abandoned channel which are adjacent to the river, each of the extremities of said channel shall be united by means of a straight line to the nearest part of the bank of the same river.

"Article IV

"The citizens of either of the two contracting countries, who, by virtue of the stipulations of this convention, shall in future be located on the land of the other may remain thereon or remove at any time to whatever place may suit them, and either keep the property which they possess in said territory or dispose of it. Those who prefer to remain on the eliminated bancos may either preserve the title and rights of citizenship of the country to which the said bancos formerly belonged, or acquire the nationality of the country to which they will belong in the future.

"Property of all kinds situated on the said bancos shall be inviolably respected, and its present owners, their heirs, and those who may subsequently acquire the property legally, shall enjoy as complete security with respect thereto as if it belonged to citizens of the country where it is situated."

With this treaty or convention of 1905 several questions arise. Does the treaty or the commission transfer sovereignty? Is the transfer an act of cession, an adjustment and location of an international boundary, or a mere relinquishment of a claim by one State in favor of the other State over a disputed area? What is the date on which the change takes effect? These questions and the treaty of 1905 were to be dealt with by the Texas courts in 1932 (to be treated later in this brief).

As soon as the International Boundary Commission had been set up (1895) as authorized by the treaty of 1889, Mexican claims regarding land in the Chamizal area were presented to it which claims related to Rio Grande bed changes that occurred in the 1860's and 1870's. These claims were never satisfactorily answered by the Commission. The consequence of the continuing dispute concerning El Chamizal was that the United States and Mexico entered into the Arbitration Convention of 1910 (36 U.S. Stat. 2481). By the terms of the Arbitration Treaty of 1910 the United States and Mexico agreed to submit their controversy over El Chamizal to a Commission composed of three persons, Gen. Anson Mills for the United States; Senor Fernando Beltrain y Puga, of Mexico; and Mr. Eugene Lafleur, of Canada.

Mexico claimed that the boundary between the United States and Mexico (El Chamizal) follows the channel of the Rio Grande of 1852, and that it was a fixed boundary not subject to change or changes brought about by accretion. The United States claimed that this boundary being a river boundary moved with the river when the river changed its location by accretion, in accordance with the universal rule of law governing river boundaries between private individuals, States, and nations. The United States further claimed that the river had, between 1852 and 1911, moved south by accretion and that under well-established principles of law, the river should remain the boundary.

The United States introduced evidence before the Commission showing conclusively that the Rio Grande did move from its 1852 position to its 1911 position by accretion. Mexico did not attempt to meet this evidence. Instead Mexico relied upon its claim that this was a fixed boundary following the center of the river of 1852 as shown by the Emory and Salazar Survey.

The opening words of the Arbitration Agreement of 1910 read:

The United States of America and the United States of Mexico desire to terminate in accordance with the various treaties and conferences now existing between the two countries, and in accordance with international law, the differences which have arisen between the two Governments as to the International Title of the Chamizal Tract * * *"

The agreement further provides:

"The Commission shall decide solely and exclusively as to whether the International Title to the Chamizal Tract is in the United States of America or Mexico. The decision of the Commission, whether rendered unanimously or by a majority vote of the Commissioners shall be final and conclusive upon both Governments and without appeal."

The treaty does not provide that the Commissioners could reach any decision placing a portion of the tract in Mexico and a portion of the tract in the United States. This is understandable, since Mexico is claiming that the entire tract was in Mexico because it was south of the fixed boundary (according to Mexico's theory); namely, the position of the river in 1852, and the evidence was overwhelmingly to the effect that if it was not a fixed boundary, the river had moved to its 1911 location by accretion. When the case was closed and the Commissioners made a decision, the Commission decided that this boundary was not a fixed boundary, as Mexico claimed, but was a river boundary to which the general principles of accretion and avulsion applied. The Canadian Commissioner then applied a doctrine which was theretofore unknown to the law. He found that the river moved by accretion from 1852 until 1864. He then held that in 1864 the river moved rapidly by accretion, and that so rapid was this accretion that it should be given the same treatment as though it had been an avulsive change.

He therefore held that the true boundary was the middle of the river as it ran in 1864. There was, however, no evidence introduced to fix the location to the river in 1864. There was nothing on the ground to show where it was, and no one then or since was or has been able to see where the river was in 1864. The Mexican Commissioner joined with the Canadian Commissioner in this novel and wholly incomplete decision, and the two Commissioners proceeded to hold: "* * * that the International Title to the portion of the Chamizal Tract lying between the middle of the bed of the Rio Grande as surveyed by Emory and Salazar in 1852 and the middle of the bed of the said river as it existed before the flood of 1864, is in the United States of America, and the International Title to the balance of the said Chamizal Tract is in the United States of Mexico."

Gen. Anson Mills filed a sound and convincing dissenting opinion pointing out the following reasons why the decision was not binding on the parties:

1. The Commission was wholly without authority or jurisdiction to segregate or separate El Chamizal. The Commissioners were authorized to decide only whether the entire Chamizal area was in the United States or in Mexico and were not authorized to place a part of the tract in the United States and a part of the tract in Mexico.

2. The Commission had rendered a decision that was contrary to the rules set out in the arbitration treaty of 1910 requiring that any decisions rendered by said Commission be made in accordance with the various treaties and conventions then existing between the two countries and in accordance with the principles of international law. In fact, the decision was based upon a principle theretofore unknown to the law and was not supported by any of the treaties and conventions theretofore existing between the United States and Mexico. Nor was the decision in accordance with the general principles of international law.

3. The Commission rendered a decision that was so vague, indeterminable, and uncertain in its terms and provisions, so as to be impossible of execution.

Thus the United States refused to accept the decision of the Arbitration Commission authorized under the treaty of 1910. Thus, the Chamizal dispute remained with us.

In the year 1922, the Congress of the United States granted sovereignty over the bancos transferred by the treaty of 1905 to the United States and any bancos that might be formed in the future on the left side of the Rio Grande under the treaty of 1905 to the State of Texas (42 U.S. Stat. 359). In 1923, the State of Texas accepted this grant of sovereignty from the United States by legislative acts (Acts 38th Legislature, R.S. 1923, ch. 101, p. 200).

In 1932 three cases were decided by the Texas Court of Civil Appeals, El Paso, in which the court apparently recognized the right of the United States to enter into the treaty of 1905 with Mexico and thereby in effect to transfer dominion and sovereignty over bancos on the American side of the new channel of the Rio Grande to the United States from Mexico without consulting with the State of Texas in regard thereto. *San Lorenzo Title and Improvement Co.* v. *Clardy*, 48 S.W. 2d 315, affirmed 124 Tex. 31, 73 S.W. 2d 516; *San Lorenzo Title and Improvement Co.* v. *Caples*, 48 S.W. 2d 329, affirmed 124 Tex. 33, 73 S.W. 2d 516; *San Lorenzo Title and Improvement Co.* v. *City Mortgage Co.*, 48 S.W. 2d 310, affirmed 124 Tex. 25, 73 S.W. 2d 513. In the above-cited cases the court, by acknowledging the validity of the treaty of 1905, also recognized by implication the right of the United States to transfer sovereignty and control over bancos on the Mexico side of the new channel to Mexico. The court in effect held that, by the terms of the treaty of 1905, such transferals were brought about by the adjusting or ascertaining of an international boundary.

In 1934 in the case of *Willis* v. *First Real Estate and Investment Co.* (C.C.A. 5), 68 F. 2d 671, the court held that, by the treaty of 1905, a banco on the north side of the Rio Grande became Texas territory. The court stated that this change of sovereignty and dominion was not a cession of territory, but was a definitive boundary decision as to all banco lands involved. Stated another way, the court held the treaty of 1905 to be an adjustment and location of an international boundary.

In 1941 the court of civil appeals in El Paso held in the case of *Fragoso* v. *Cisneros*, 154 S.W. 2d 991, error ref. w.o.m., that, by the treaty of 1905, the United States and Mexico adjusted and located their common boundary. The court also held that from the date of the treaty the eliminated banco in question had become a part of Texas and had been subject to its civil and criminal laws.

CURRENT ACTION ON SETTLEMENT OF CHAMIZAL DISPUTE

Currently there is renewed effort on the part of the United States and Mexico to reach a settlement on El Chamizal. This settlement is proposed to be by treaty between the two countries and would amount to a compromise of both the claim of the United States to land and sovereignty thereover in the El Paso area and the claim of Mexico to land and sovereignty thereover in this area. Roughly stated, the United States would give up claim to the south portion of El Chamizal and Mexico would give up a claim to the north portion of Cordova Island, a banco adjacent to El Chamizal and owned by Mexico.

The Rio Grande would be rectified so as to mark, and in fact be, the new boundary between the United States and Mexico in the compromised area of El Chamizal and Cordova Island. It is also in the proposed plans to have the owners of American claims to property in the transferred area of El Chamizal reimbursed for their property losses at replacement costs (this is higher than fair market value in this area).

CAN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO, BY TREATY, PLACE THEIR COMMON BOUNDARY (RECTIFY THE RIO GRANDE) SO AS TO RUN THROUGH THE MIDDLE OF THE CHAMIZAL TRACT WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE STATE OF TEXAS?

(*A*) *Settlement considered as the adjustment and location of a boundary*

The United States, under the treatymaking powers of the Constitution of the United States, can settle the Chamizal question through a treaty with Mexico by which the Rio Grande is rectified so as more or less to divide the Chamizal area and Cordova Island, thereby placing part of each under the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the United States and Mexico respectively (as currently proposed). The north part of Cordova Island would thereby become a part of Texas as to State sovereignty and jurisdiction. Considering the proposed settlement by the United States as an adjustment and location of a boundary, the following Texas and Federal court authorities would sustain the proposition that the State of Texas need not be consulted about the El Chamizal settlement. *San Lorenzo Title and Improvement Co.* v. *City Mortgage Co.*, 124 Tex. 25, 73 S.W. 2d 513; *San Lorenzo Title and Improvement Co.* v. *Clardy,* 48 S.W. 2d 315, affirmed 124 Tex. 31, 73 S.W. 2d 516; *San Lorenzo Title and Improvement Co.* v. *Caples,* 48 S.W. 2d 329, affirmed 124 Tex. 33, 73 S.W. 2d 516; *Willis* v. *First Real Estate and Investment Co.* (C.C.A. 5), 68 F. 2d 671.

The case of *Fragoso* v. *Cisneros,* 154 S.W. 2d 991, error ref. w.o.m., is to the same general effect. In the Fragoso case, the court of civil appeals held that, from the effective date of the Banco Treaty of 1905, eliminated bancos on the north side of the Rio Grande became a part of Texas and that such territory was at that time subject to both the civil and criminal laws of the State. The court did say, however, that it was wise for the United States to cede jurisdiction and sovereignty over bancos already formed or to be formed on the Rio Grande to Texas and for Texas to accept such cession of sovereignty and jurisdiction as was done by the U.S. Congress in 1922 and the Texas Legislature in 1923 thereby forever putting to rest any question as to the true status of such territory.

We consider that the proposed settlement of the Chamizal problem could be handled as an adjustment and location of a boundary.

(*B*) *Settlement considered as a cession of territory*

The following authorities would hold that, under the treatymaking powers of the United States, paragraph 2, section 2, article II of the Constitution of the United States, the proposed settlement could be entered into by the United States and Mexico without the consent of the State of Texas even if this should be considered a cession of territory. Alexander Hamilton as reported in "Ford's Writings of Jefferson," volume 5, page 443; Chief Justice John Marshall as reported in Moore's International Law Digest, volume 5, page 173; Charles Henry Butler, "Treaty Making Powers of the United States," II, page 393; T. D. Woolsey, "Introduction to the Study of International Law," pages 167–168; Chancellor Kent, "Commentaries on American Law"; lecture 8.1, page 167.

However, dicta in three U.S. Supreme Court cases indicates that before the United States can cede State territory under the treatymaking power of the United States, State acceptance must be obtained. *Downes* v. *Bidwell,* 182 U.S. 244 (1929); *De Geofray* v. *Riggs,* 133 U.S. 258 (1889); *Fort Leavenworth* v. *Lowe,* 114 U.S. 525 (1884). In the *Downes* case the Court (dicta) did indicate that it was of the opinion in cases of "the exigency of calamitous war or the necessity of a settlement of boundaries" State territory might be ceded by the United States without the consent of the State.

(*C*) *Texas as an actual owner of land in the disputed Chamizal area*

A search of the general land office records indicates that Texas has granted to private parties all of the former State-owned, upland, public land in the Chamizal area. However, the State has claimed ownership of the bed of the Rio Grande from its north bank to the center of its stream. This claim is based upon the following reasoning: (1) The United States and Mexico, under the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (1848), recognized and established the Rio Grande as the boundary between the two countries (center of the stream or riverbed); (2) Texas retained the ownership of her public lands upon coming into the United States as a State in 1846; and (3) the Republic of Texas claims sovereign ownership of the bed of navigable streams (i.e., streams with an average width of 30 feet) within her boundaries.

If the bed of the Rio Grande arrived at its present location in the Chamizal area by the process of accretion and erosion then the State of Texas owns the bed from its north bank to the center of the stream as presently located in this area. If this present bed is abandoned and the boundary between the United States and Mexico moved to the north then the State of Texas has lost its claim to one-half of the river bed. This land and Texas' claim thereto probably has little value but it is something that the State would be losing or giving up. It seems unlikely that the United States would object to giving to the State of Texas title to the north half of new river bed and this should be requested.

CONCLUSION

Upon the theory that the action proposed to be taken in settling the Chamizal question is an adjustment and location of the boundary between the United States and Mexico, the consent of the State of Texas is not necessary.

In order to eliminate any doubts as to the sovereignty of Texas attaching to the territory to be acquired by the United States, United States and Texas legislative action might be considered advisable. However, the Texas Supreme Court by approving the opinion of the court of civil appeals in the case of *San Lorenzo Title and Improvement Co.* v. *Clardy,* supra, seems to have recognized that Texas sovereignty and jurisdiction attached immediately to territory acquired by the United States under the treaty of 1905. The present proposed settlement seems to be a similar situation.

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Chicago, R.I. & G. Ry. Co. v. *Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District,* 123 Tex. 432, 73 S.W. 2d 55.

De Geofray v. *Riggs,* 133 U.S. 258 (1889).

Downes v. *Bidwell,* 182 U.S. 244 (1900).

Fort Leavenworth v. *Lowe,* 114 U.S. 525 (1884).

Fragoso v. *Cisneros,* 154 S.W. 2d 991, error ref. w.o.m.

Heard v. *Town of Refugio,* 127 Tex. 349, 103 S.W. 2d 728.

Maufrais v. *State,* 143 Tex. 559, 180 S.W. 2d 144.

Nebraska v. *Iowa,* 143 U.S. 359.

San Lorenzo Title and Improvement Co. v. *Caples,* 48 S.W. 2d 329, affirmed 124 Tex. 33, 73 S.W. 2d 516.

San Lorenzo Title and Improvement Co. v. *City Mortgage Co.,* 48 S.W. 2d 310, affirmed 124 Tex. 25, 73 S.W. 2d 513.

San Lorenzo Title and Improvement Co. v. *Clardy,* 48 S.W. 2d 315, affirmed 124 Tex. 31, 73 S.W. 2d 516.

State v. *Bradford,* 121 Tex. 515, 50 S.W. 2d 1065.

Tugwell v. *Eagle Pass Ferry Co.,* 74 Tex. 480, 9 S.W. 120, 13 S.W. 654.

Virginia v. *Tennessee,* 148 U.S. 503.

Willis v. *First Real Estate and Investment Co.* (C.C.A. 5), 68 F. 2d 671.

Articles and statutes

Acts 38th Legislature, R.S. 1923, ch. 101, p. 200.

Art. 5302, V.C.S.

Articles of Annexation, joint resolution, Mar. 1, 1845, 5 U.S. Stat. 797.

Art. II, sec. 2, par. 2, U.S. Constitution.

1 Laws of the Republic of Texas 133, 1 Gammel 1193.

9 U.S. Stat. 926, sec. 5.

23 U.S. Stat. 1011.

26 U.S. Stat. 1512.

35 U.S. Stat. 1863.

36 U.S. Stat. 2481.

42 U.S. Stat. 359.

Texts

Butler, Charles Henry—"Treaty Making Powers of the United States," II, p. 393.

Grotius, II, 217–218.

Hall, William E.—"A Treatise on International Law" (5th ed.), pp. 121–122.

Halleck, Henry—"International Law" (4th ed.), I, 183.

Hamilton, Alexander, "Ford's Writings of Jefferson," vol. p. 443.

Kent, Chancellor—"Commentaries on American Law," lecture 8.1, p. 167.

"Moore's International Law Digest," vol. 5, p. 173.

Pufendorf, Samuel, "De Jure Naturae et Gentium Libro Octo," II, 594.

Wheaton, Henry, "Elements of International Law," (6th ed.), I, 353–354.

Wolff, Christian, "Jus Gentium Methodo Scientifica Certraccatum," II, 63–64.

Woolsey, T. D.—"Introduction to the Study of International Law," pp. 167–168.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. TOWER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time for debate has been yielded back. The question is on advising and consenting to the convention with Mexico for solution of the problem of the Chamizal. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the aforenamed Senators would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are absent on official business to accompany the President of the United States to the United Nations.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business to attend the presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is necessarily absent attending the funeral of a friend.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 79, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 271 Ex.]

YEAS—79

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—1

Tower

NOT VOTING—20

Allott
Boggs
Carlson
Church
Dominick
Ellender
Engle
Fulbright
Gore
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mechem
Monroney
Pearson
Randolph
Scott
Simpson
Walters

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 79 and the nays are 1. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification on Executive N is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, when the late President Kennedy made an official visit to Mexico last year, I was privileged to accompany him. During the course of this mission, he held a number of conferences with one of the leading statesmen of this hemisphere, the President the United Mexican States, the Honorable Adolfo Lopez Mateos.

At one of these meeting the question of the Chamizal was discussed in great detail and at that time President Kennedy made a commitment to the effect that he would do everything within his power, subject to senatorial approval, to bring about a settlement of this question which had strained relations between our two countries for so many decades.

As one who was sitting in on these meetings at the request of President Kennedy, I can state they were conducted on a frank, detailed, and understanding basis and that the decision by President Kennedy to expend every effort to bring about an equitable settlement was approved wholeheartedly by those in attendance. As a result of many months of negotiations, an equitable agreement was arrived at. This agreement has now been ratified by the Senate and, in my opinion, it marks a milestone in good relations between our two countries. I, personally, am very happy that this question has at long last been settled and it is my hope that it will be another indication of the bright and friendly path on which we and Mexico have traveled in recent years and will continue to travel in the future.

On behalf of the Senate, I extend congratulations and a "well done" to the three Chiefs of State responsible for this settlement. I refer, of course, to His Excellency the President of the United Mexican States, the Honorable Adolfo Lopez Mateos; our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy; and our present President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, all of whom made significant contributions to this convention and all of whom deserve full credit for their understanding, their tolerance, and their desire to be mutually cooperative in this most important matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the action of the Senate in agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of December 12, 1963,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore on December 16, 1963, signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives on December 16, 1963:

H.R. 4338. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances for travel performed under orders that are canceled, revoked, or modified, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 335. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December of each year as "Wright Brothers Day".

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. SPARKMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Real and Personal Property of Department of Defense

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on real and personal property of that Department, as of June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Foreign Currencies in the Custody of the United States

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign currencies in the custody of the United States, fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Lack of Effective Supervisory Controls over Certain Government Employees

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the lack of effective supervisory controls over Federal and District of Columbia Government employees licensed to drive taxicabs in the District of Columbia, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Procurement of Inaccurate Radiation Measuring Instruments

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the procurement of inaccurate radiation measuring instruments, Department of the Army, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Overpricing of Spare Parts Purchased From Hughes Aircraft Co.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overpricing of spare parts purchased from Hughes Aircraft Co., Culver City, Calif., under fixed-price incentive contract AF 33(600)-38280, Department of the Air Force, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Review of Economic Aspects of Loan for Construction of Water Supply System in Saigon, Vietnam, Development Loan Fund

A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Agency's reply to the Comptroller General of the United States, relating to his report on a review of economic aspects of loan for construction of water supply system in Saigon, Vietnam, Development Loan Fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Competition in Synthetic Rubber Industry

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on competition in the synthetic rubber industry, for calendar year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF CITY OF TUCSON, ARIZ.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the mayor and council of the city of Tucson, Ariz., relating to the death of the late President John F. Kennedy, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to provide for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefore (Rept. No. 784).

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 2394. A bill to facilitate compliance with the Convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed August 29, 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

TO FACILITATE COMPLIANCE WITH CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to facilitate compliance with the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed August 29, 1963, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Department of State and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comment.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

However, I do believe that we ought to have a measure before us to start on. Therefore, I am introducing the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State and a statement entitled "Program for Implementation, With Cost Estimates."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair.) The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and statement referred to by the Senator from Alabama will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2394) to facilitate compliance with the Convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed August 29, 1963, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964."

SECTION 1. In connection with the Convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the Solution of the Problem of the Chamizal, signed August 29, 1963, the Secretary of State, acting through the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is authorized:

a. To conduct technical and other investigations relating to: the demarcation or monumentation of the boundary between the United States and Mexico; flood control; water resources; sanitation and prevention of pollution; channel relocation, improvement and stabilization; and other matters related to the new river channel.

b. To acquire by donation, purchase or condemnation, all lands required:

(1) for transfer to Mexico as provided in said Convention;

(2) for construction of that portion of the new river channel and the adjoining levee in the territory of the United States;

(3) for relocation of highways, roadways, railroads, telegraph, telephone, electric transmission lines, bridges, related facilities and any publicly owned structure or facility, the relocation of which, in the judgment of the said Commissioner, is necessitated by the project.

c. For the purpose of effecting said relocations:

(1) to perform any or all work involved in said relocations;

(2) to enter into contracts with the owners of properties to be relocated whereby they undertake to acquire any or all properties needed for said relocations, or undertake to perform any or all work involved in said relocations;

(3) to convey or exchange properties acquired or improved by the United States under this Act or under said Convention, with or without improvements, or to grant term or perpetual easements therein or thereover.

SEC. 2. The United States Commissioner is authorized to construct, operate and maintain all works provided for in said Convention and this Act, and to turn over the operation and maintenance of any of such works to any Federal agency, or any State, county, municipality, district or other political subdivision within which such project or works may be in whole or in part situated, upon such terms, conditions and requirements as the Commissioner may deem appropriate.

SEC. 3. The United States Commissioner, under regulations approved by the Secretary of State, and upon application of the owners and tenants of lands to be acquired by the United States to fulfill and accomplish the purposes of said Convention, and to the extent administratively determined by the Commissioner to be fair and reasonable, is authorized to:

a. Reimburse the owners and tenants for expenses and other losses and damages incurred by them in the process and as a direct result of such moving of themselves, their families, and their possessions as is occasioned by said acquisition: *Provided,* That the total of such reimbursement to the owners and tenants of any parcel of land shall in no event exceed 25 per centum of its fair value, as determined by the Commissioner. No payment under this subsection shall be made unless application therefor is supported by an itemized and certified statement of the expenses, losses and damages incurred.

b. Compensate the said owners and tenants for identifiable, reasonable, and satisfactorily proved costs and losses to owners and tenants over and above those reimbursed under the foregoing subsection in the categories hereinafter provided, and for which purpose there shall be established by the Commissioner a Board of Examiners, consisting of such personnel employed and compensation fixed as he deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Said Board may hold hearings, and shall examine submitted evidence and make determinations, subject to the Commissioner's approval, regarding all claims in said categories, as follows:

(1) For properties:

(a) For non-conforming abodes and minimum forms of shelter for which there are no comparable properties on the market in the City of El Paso and concerning which fair market value would be inadequate to find minimum housing of equal utility, compensation to the owner up to an amount which when added to the market value allowed for his property, including land values, would enable purchase of minimum habitable housing of similar utility in another residential section of said City.

(b) For commercial properties for which there are no comparable properties on the market in or near El Paso, Texas, compensation to the owner up to an amount which when added to the total market value of his properties, including land value, would enable the owner to provide minimum facilities of reasonably equivalent utility in or near said city.

(c) For loss in business:

(a) Loss of profits directly resulting from relocation, limited to the period between termination of business in the old location and commencement of business in the new, such period not to exceed thirty days.

(b) Loss to owner resulting from inability to rent to others housing or warehouse space that can be reasonably related to uncertainties arising out of the pending acquisition of the owner's property by the United States, such losses limited to those incurred after July 18, 1963, and prior to the making by the United States of a firm offer to purchase.

(3) For penalty costs to property owners for prepayment of mortgages incident to acquisition of the properties by the United States.

SEC. 4. Application for reimbursement or compensation under section 3 of this Act shall be submitted to the Commissioner within either one year from the date of acquisition or the date of vacating the premises by the applicant, whichever date is later. Applications not submitted within said period shall be forever barred.

SEC. 5. Payments to be made as herein provided shall be in addition to, but not in duplication of, any payments that may otherwise be authorized by law. The means employed to acquire the property, whether by condemnation or otherwise, shall not affect eligibility for reimbursement or compensation under this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any legal right or cause of action against the United States or as precluding the exercise by the Government of the right of eminent domain or any other right or power that it may have under this or any other law; nor shall this Act be construed as precluding an owner or tenant from asserting any rights he may have under other laws or the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 6. As used in this Act, the term "land" shall include interests in land, and the term "fair value" shall mean fair value of the interest acquired. The provisions of this Act shall be exempt from the operations of the Administrative Procedure Act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 237), as amended (5 U.S.C. secs. 1001–1011).

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for the use of the United States section of said Commission such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of said Convention and this Act and for transfer to other Federal agencies to accomplish by them or other proper agency relocation of their facilities necessitated by the project. The provisions of section 103 of the American-Mexican Treaty Act of 1950 (22 U.S.C. 277d–3) are hereby expressly extended to apply to the carrying out of the provisions of said Convention and this Act.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. SPARKMAN are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 12, 1963.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: President Kennedy submitted to the Senate on October 7, 1963 for advice and consent to ratification the "Convention with Mexico for Solution of the Problem of Chamizal." The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations scheduled hearings on this Convention for December 12 and 13. So that the Congress will have before it the administration's plan for carrying out the Convention, I transmit herewith a draft of a bill entitled "The American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964." This bill is presented to authorize the U.S. Commissioner on the International Boundary and Water Commission to execute the Convention in accordance with its terms.

Under the Convention the Governments of the United States and of Mexico would relocate the Rio Grande in the vicinity of El Paso in a concrete-lined channel. The centerline of the new channel would be the international boundary. The effect would be to transfer from the north to the south of the river 823.5 acres of which 386.32 acres are already under Mexican jurisdiction or are being exchanged with Mexico for territory already under its jurisdiction. The net area of 437.18 acres passing to Mexico represents the acreage estimated to have been awarded to Mexico by an arbitral commission in 1911. The ratification of the Convention and the enactment of the proposed legislation will bring and end to a territorial dispute that has concerned both Governments for almost a hundred years.

There is also enclosed a statement entitled "Program for Implementation, with Cost Estimates." This statement explains the content and purpose of the proposed legislation.

The Department of State recommends enactment of this legislation as soon as possible after ratification of the Convention by both Governments.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, it has no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

CHAMIZAL CONVENTION: PROGRAM FOR IMPLEMENTATION WITH COST ESTIMATES, DECEMBER 11, 1963

1. GENERAL STATEMENT

The convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the solution of the longstanding Chamizal boundary dispute, signed August 29, 1963, provides for relocation of the channel of the Rio Grande in the El Paso, Texas-Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua sector, and that the center of the new channel shall be the international boundary. The relocation would have the effect of transferring from the north to the south side of the Rio Grande a total of 823.50 acres, of which 193.16 acres are already under Mexican jurisdiction, being a portion of Cordova Island.

Subject to ratification of the convention by the two Governments, the United States will acquire the remaining 630.34 acres in the south part of the city of El Paso, Tex., for transfer to Mexico. Mexico will transfer 193.16 acres of its lands, comprising the northerly half of Cordova Island, to the United States, so that the net transfer to Mexico would be 437.18 acres. The United States, in addition, will acquire 102 acres to provide for the U.S. right-of-way for the new channel and relocation of existing railroad tracks, and about 38 additional acres for the relocation of public school and Federal facilities.

The new boundary was located so as to minimize the number of people and value of properties affected. However, there are now more than 4,500 people residing in the affected area of 770.34 acres. Nearly 750 improvements would be acquired, including about 487 residences, mostly 5- to 6-room single-family dwellings of moderate construction, 90 shelters or shacks of 1 to 2 rooms, 21 tenement or low-rent apartment buildings, 130 commercial and 15 Government buildings, and one public school. Also involved are agricultural lands, stock pens and some vacant lots, public utility systems, and a portion of the lands of the city's main sewage treatment plant. Railroads, a stretch of an irrigation canal, and the inspection facilities of several agencies of the Federal Government will have to be relocated.

The International Boundary and Water Commission is charged by the Convention with responsibility for determining the period of time required for acquisition of the lands and evacuation of the residents (art. 6). The U.S. section would acquire the properties in its country for transfer to Mexico and the properties required for half of the new channel and for the relocations. After acquisition and evacuation of the properties and after payment to the United States by the designated Mexican Bank of the estimated value of the structures passing intact to Mexico ($4,676,000) pursuant to the Convention and to notes exchanged with the Government of Mexico, the Commission is charged: (a) with demarcation of the new boundary and preparation of a minute to record the new boundary, upon approval of which the transfer of lands between the respective countries would take place (art. 7); (b) with determination of the location of the new bridges to replace the Cordova Island bridges (art. 10); (c) and with construction of the new bridges, relocation of the river channel, and the maintenance and preservation and improvement of the new channel (art. 9). The construction of the new channel and bridges will be paid for in equal shares by the two Governments.

2. ESTIMATED MINIMUM COSTS

Preliminary and tentative estimates of the minimum costs for implementation of the treaty are as follows:

[Estimated cost in millions]

1. Market value of 770 acres of land (with 750 improvements) to be acquired for transfer to Mexico and for relocation of the river channel and local public facilities	$20.8
2. Relocation of 4.3 miles of the channel of the Rio Grande, the new channel to be concrete-lined, and relocation of 6 existing bridges across the channel. The total cost is estimated at $6.4 million, and by the treaty the United States will pay 50 percent, or	3.2
3. Relocation of 8.9 miles of railroad tracks	3.0
4. Relocation of public facilities:	
(a) As a part of the lands to be acquired there will be the city of El Paso's Navarro primary school and a part of the grounds of the Bowie High School, costs of which are included in the estimates of properties to be acquired. However, their relocation would require additional costs for land and construction tentatively estimated at	$0.6
(b) There will be acquired a part of the lands of the city's main sewage disposal plant, which will require replacement to permit equal utility of existing facilities, the increased cost of which is tentatively estimated at	.6
Subtotal	1.2
Total	28.2
5. Administration costs—estimated at 4 percent	1.1
Estimated treaty cost	29.3
6. Less payment by Mexico pursuant to the Convention for value of structures which pass intact to Mexico	−4.7
Estimated net minimum cost	24.6
7. Less the estimated market value of the 193.18 acres of Cordova Island which will be transferred to the United States	−6.0
Net minimum effective cost	18.6

3. ADEQUATE COMPENSATION TO PROPERTY OWNERS AND TENANTS

The preliminary and tentative cost estimates are based upon acquisition under present minimum Federal authorizations for public projects.

Surveys show that there would be an adverse social and economic impact on most of the occupants. To some 90 families there would be very serious impact in that under present Federal authorizations for public projects, compensation which they would receive for their substandard dwellings would be inadequate to purchase another home, for the reason that there are few, if any, like dwellings on the market. Moreover, such compensation would not be sufficient to prevent loss for a number of special-purpose commercial enterprises in the affected area whose owners would have to build new plants to stay in business, requiring otherwise unnecessary expenditures without reimbursement. Further, present authorizations do not allow reimbursement for penalty costs for prepayment of mortgages, and loss of business during a move or due to pending acquisition of properties.

The Department of State and the U.S. Commissioner on the International Boundary and Water Commission recommend in this unique and unprecedented situation where private properties in the United States would be acquired for transfer to another country to settle an international dispute, that the enabling legislation for implementation of the treaty include provisions to protect the property owners and tenants against resulting economic hardship and loss by allowing reimbursement to cover reasonable, just, and identifiable costs over and above those for which minimum Federal authorizations now provide payments; i.e., reimbursement for moving expenses not to exceed 25 percent of the fair value of the lands, for loss of business directly resulting from and during relocation, for penalty costs for prepayment of mortgages on properties to be acquired; and on private properties for which there is no active market, reimbursement up to an amount which, when added to the market value of the properties, would enable purchase of minimum facilities of similar utility. A Board of Examiners would be created to pass on most of these reimbursable items.

The preliminary and tentative estimated cost of providing the reimbursements outlined above to protect property owners and tenants against economic hardship and loss amounts to $4 million.

4. RELATED FEDERAL FACILITIES

Implementation of the Convention will require relocation of three U.S. port of entry inspection facilities at El Paso, which are located in the area which would pass to Mexico. These include facilities for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Customs Service, Plant Quarantine Division of the Department of Agriculture, and Public Health Service:

1. Port of entry facilities at Santa Fe Street, for entries from Mexico: This facility consists of leased property and buildings which will pass to Mexico.

2. Inspection facilities at Stanton Street, where people cross from the United States into Mexico: Inspection facilities here are housed in one leased building which will be eliminated by the river relocation project.

3. Port of entry facilities at the Cordova Island crossing: Facilities here consist of temporary shelters and trailers, since this is a recently established crossing. Building of a permanent structure, authorized at an estimated cost of $1,100,000 has been deferred pending outcome of Chamizal negotiations and the General Services Administration is holding in reserve funds which had been appropriated for construction of the permanent Cordova Island border station.

4. Border Patrol facilities: The Immigration and Naturalization Service maintains its Border Patrol headquarters and detention camp for illegal entrants in the area to be transferred to Mexico.

The El Paso port handles the largest volume of traffic on the entire Mexican border, now estimated at 30 million people and 6.5 million vehicles annually, and progressively increasing traffic would, in all probability, necessitate some future expansion. But prior to announcement of the Chamizal settlement there were no plans for enlarging or relocating the Santa Fe Street, Stanton Street, or Border Patrol facilities.

The new facilities should, of course, be designed according to estimates of traffic growth but their construction at this time will be a direct result of the Chamizal settlement. Preliminary and tentative estimates by the General Services Administration indicate that providing new facilities will require acquisition of: (1) about 7.5 acres of land on Santa Fe Street, (2) 0.5 acres of Stanton Street adjacent to the new river channel, and (3) about 20 acres for the Border Patrol Sector Headquarters and Detention Camp. Lands required for customs and other inspection at the Cordova Island crossing—some 20 acres—would be available from the Cordova Island lands which pass from Mexico to the United States.

There is also under consideration location of lands in the Cordova area for the Border Patrol Headquarters and Detention Camp, which would negate the need for the 20-acre land purchase mentioned above. In any event, however, the required inspection facilities construction program will be considerably greater than that previously contemplated. Estimates indicate the following:

	Million
1. Land acquisition for new facilities	$1.2
2. Cost of buildings	6.0
3. Less appropriations already available for new facilities	−1.1
Net total for Federal facilities (preliminary and tentative)	6.1

The U.S. section of the Commission should acquire the lands for the facilities so that all acquisitions can be properly coordinated and conducted under the same policies and authorizations.

Estimated appropriations required

	Million
1. Estimated treaty costs	$29.3
2. Compensation to property owners to avoid injury	4.0
3. Estimated costs, relocation and expansion port-of-entry inspection facilities	6.1
Total estimated appropriations required	39.4

5. PROGRAM—TIME SCHEDULE

The schedule for the procurement of lands and improvement contemplates the acquisition and vacating of properties in 2.5 years—by approximately July 1967, at which time the new boundary line would be demarked by the two Governments and territories transferred. There would follow the construction of the channel, levees and miscellaneous structures scheduled to require 1¼ years.

During the first 2½ years it will be necessary, however, to construct certain of the relocated works in order that there will be no interruption of traffic flow between the two countries: (1) the railroad and railroad holding yard; (2) the bridges across the site of the new channel; (3) and at least some of the port-of-entry facilities. The design and preparation of plans and specifications for these works are to be accomplished in fiscal year 1965. The invitations for bids, award of contract and initiation of construction are scheduled for early in fiscal year 1966 looking to completion midyear 1967.

The design and preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of the channel, levee and miscellaneous structures are scheduled to get underway late in fiscal year 1965 and will be completed in fiscal year 1966. The invitations for bids, award of contract and the beginning of construction of the channel, levees and miscellaneous structures are programed for fiscal year 1967 with completion scheduled for fiscal year 1968, 15 months being allowed for the construction.

Mr. YARBOROUGH and Mr. TOWER addressed the Chair.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will yield first to the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and then to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

Mr. TOWER. Could the Senator from Alabama give some indication as to when the Committee on Foreign Relations will act on this measure?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would say it will probably be the first matter that we will take up after the new year.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator realizes that we do not have time to act on the legislation during this session.

Mr. TOWER. I realize that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But I can assure both Senators from Texas that it will be one of the early pieces of legislation—perhaps the first piece of legislation—that we will take up in the new session of Congress.

I now yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The purpose of my question to the Senator from Alabama is whether hearings on the bill introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would be held expeditiously, and whether the bill being introduced is the bill which would compensate the 4,500 citizens who would be displaced by the rectification of the boundary as a result of the settlement of the disputed territory?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. The Senator realizes, of course, that there are other things to be considered separately. For example the city of El Paso made four requests.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct. But the people who are being dispossessed come first. As a condition of obtaining the consent of El Paso and El Paso County, a road which the Federal Government promised to build, along the north bank was requested and also the straightening of the channel of the Rio Grande.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

I wish to say to both Senators from Texas that the Foreign Relations Committee, in considering the treaty, what action we should take, and our recommendations to the Senate, expressed interest and concern over the matter.

I thought it was highly important that the proposed legislation be before us when we started discussion of the treaty.

I invite the attention of both Senators from Texas to the last paragraph of page 6 of the report:

> The committee is aware of, and understands, the concern of the owners or tenants of the land and properties which would be transferred to Mexico by the United States pursuant to the treaty. People who have resided in the Chamizal area for many years will particularly be faced with difficult adjustments. The committee wishes to assure the people whom the treaty will affect—and the Senate as well—that it intends to act promptly on legislation to implement the Chamizal Convention. In connection with its consideration of that legislation, the committee also wishes to assure the Senate that it will make every effort to insure that provision is made for the payment of adequate and just compensation to the persons who will be dispossessed.

The language is in the report of the committee. I discussed the subject with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and he has assured me that implementing legislation will be expeditiously handled by the Foreign Relations Committee.

NATIONAL PARKWAY IN SHAWANGUNK-KITTATINNY MOUNTAINS (AMENDMENT NO. 363)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT], I send to the desk an amendment to Senate bill 1971.

Our bill, originally introduced on August 2, authorized a survey of a proposed national parkway in the Shawangunk-Kittatinny Mountain Range, extending from the vicinity of Stroudsburg, Pa., northeast to Kingston, N.Y. It was our intention that this parkway be modeled after the Blue Ridge Parkway—that is, a scenic road, free of undesirable commercial development, which would in no way destroy the natural wilderness character of the area. Our bill had the support of many local organizations and government officials in all three States.

However, in the past few months many conservationists have expressed concern that a six-lane highway was contemplated which would totally change this beautiful mountain country. We offer this amendment today to clarify our position and state more fully the objective of our bill.

To begin, I would like to reiterate that our bill does not authorize any construction, but merely a feasibility survey.

Second. Under no circumstances do we intend to ruin the wildernesslike character or change substantially the geographic features of the area. Our primary objective, in fact, is to preserve the area, while making it more accessible to those people who cherish the undeveloped outdoors.

Third. We most certainly have not taken a "parkway or nothing" stand, and in the event a parkway is not feasible, or would destroy the scenery, we have asked the Departments of Interior and Commerce to recommend the best means of preserving the area from undesirable commercial development and providing appropriate protection of the natural beauty of the area. Our amendment clarifies all these points, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Congressional Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred, and, without objection, will be printed in the Record.

The amendment submitted by Mr. Keating, for himself and other Senators, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

On page 2, line 15, immediately after the period, insert the following:

"In determining the exact location of any such parkway, the Departments of the Interior and Commerce shall make every effort to route such parkway in a way which would avoid the altering or changing of the wilderness-like character and geographic features of the area comprising the Shawangunk-Kittatinny Mountains. In the event that the Departments determine that a scenic parkway is not feasible in this location, or would necessarily destroy the wilderness character of the area, they are directed to make recommendations on the best means of preserving this area from undesirable commercial development and providing appropriate protection of the natural beauty of the area."

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

Address entitled "Flaxseed and Farm Policies," delivered by Senator McGovern before the Flax Institute of the United States, Fargo, N. Dak., on November 15, 1963.

OREGON DUNES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter which I received from Mrs. Paul H. Waggener in support of my position on the condemnation amendment in the Oregon Dunes National Seashore bill; also an editorial published in one of the newspapers, entitled "Morse Stands by His Word on Dunes Bill"; and also an editorial published in the Siuslaw News of December 12, 1963, entitled "For the People."

There being no objection, the letter, article, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Gardiner, Oreg.,
December 14, 1963.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Your stand against condemnation in the Oregon Dunes National Seashore bill is certainly in accord with views of your constituents. Last summer we talked with many Oregon residents, who came here to fish, about this national park issue. They were all vehemently opposed to condemnation and the vast majority were opposed to a national park in the area. The frequent comment was "Why do they want to spoil it with a national park?" Your stand is greatly appreciated and has gained you many friends. I am enclosing editorial and news items from the Siuslaw News, Florence, regarding your views.

In a news item in the Oregonian, November 22, 1963, the concept of the 500 feet of "buffer zone" was explained, stating that property owners "would be required to keep the land in its natural state." We would be included in that buffer zone. We have a business. Most people think our property very attractive, but its "natural state" would be a thick growth of brush. Also, how would one operate a business with any feeling of security with a Government scenic easement hanging over their heads.

This article also states: "This feature is designed primarily to apply to the stretch of highway south of Lake Tahkenitch, where the road bends eastward and both sides of the highway are outside the park." This stretch of property is owned by the E. G. Sparrow family and we have a letter in our file from Mr. Sparrow which states the property is not for sale and will be kept in a tree farm for future generations. Hence we see little need for any "scenic easement." We also feel that it is such a waste of taxpayers money to spend over $6 million when there is really no need to preserve the area for future generations or to provide recreation. It is already preserved and recreation is now being provided.

I was delighted to read in the Oregonian of your support for the Mundt bill re sale of wheat to Russia and your resentment over the inference of disloyalty to the President if you voted for it. When we reach the stage in America when we cannot criticize our President's views, we are too far on the road to dictatorship. I thought one of the most significant things President Johnson said in his address to Congress was that he would respect the independence of the legislative branch.

Your diligent work in cutting foreign aid has evoked much favorable comment in this area also. Most people are not against foreign aid but they are getting mighty tired of the waste and ill chosen use of it. Your efforts resulting in the establishment of the Indian School at Tongue Point are very commendable.

A merry Christmas to you and all your family. I enjoyed the picture of Judy in your newsletter some time back.

Sincerely,

Florence E. Waggener.
(Mrs. Paul H.)

Morse Stands by His Word on Dunes Bill

(By Jack Parker)

Telegrams, letters, and postal cards were sent from the Siuslaw area and from other parts of Oregon during the past week to Senator Wayne Morse thanking him for his stand on the dunes park bill, which recently cleared the Senate Interior Committee. The messages came from individuals as well as organizations.

Senator Morse told his colleagues that he was absolutely opposed to the condemnation provision in the bill. He stated, "We could create an adequate park with public property only. In fact, it is more park than the public would ever use." More than 4 years ago Senator Morse announced his stand against condemnation of private property at a luncheon meeting in Florence.

Although he is not a member of the Interior Committee, as the senior Senator from Oregon and as a vigorous spokesman, he is expected to play a major role in determining the fate of the latest park proposal. Already he has asked Senator Mike Mansfield, majority leader, to delay action on the bill until "more negotiations can be accomplished at both the Federal and State level."

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall was severely criticized by Senator Morse. The Secretary, he stated, "took it upon himself to ignore me and to ignore those people of Oregon who share the viewpoint of their senior Senator with regard to the dunes park."

Also opposed to condemnation as well as the purpose of the bill are four members of the committee: Senators Gordon Allott, Edwin Mechem, Milward L. Simpson, and Len B. Jordan. In a minority report they stated, "We have serious misgivings about the necessity of a national seashore area in Orgeon. We are opposed to including in our national park system lands which are properly being administered by the National Forest Service and lands which are within the jurisdiction of State government." The report stated that the area is now being wisely managed under a multiple-use concept with "adequate recreation facilities being provided."

Features of the bill (S. 1137) include the following:

Honeyman and Umpqua Lighthouse State Parks would be included, the boundaries following closely those proposed in the Duncan bill.

Estimated cost of acquiring private lands is set at $1,392,000.

Estimated cost of headquarters and other facilities is $6,274,000.

The Secretary of the Interior may conduct sand dune stabilization and erosion control programs as he deems necessary.

The boundaries include 15 private residential properties and 2 commercial enterprises. The boundaries in the bill as first introduced by Senator Maurine Neuberger included 264 residences and 39 commercial enterprises.

In his report to the Senate committee, Acting Secretary of the Interior, John A. Carver, stated that the boundaries omitted 3 clusters of property on which 37 houses or business structures are located. "It would be well," he declared, "if these properties could be obtained and authority has been granted by amendment to section 2 to permit the acquisition of such contiguous tracts by purchase, exchange, or donation where the owner desires to convey and Congress appropriates the necessary funds."

He did not indicate the location of the "clusters of property."

Because of objections by Senator MORSE, it is not expected that the Senate will vote on the bill until next session, if then. If the measure is approved by the Senate, it will then be necessary for the House of Representatives to take similar action. Congressman ROBERT B. DUNCAN has promised a hearing on the House dunes bill in Florence.

It is recommended by those opposing the park that Florence area citizens as well as other Oregonians write to both Senator MORSE and Congressman DUNCAN. The only address needed is Washington 25, D.C.

[From the Florence (Oreg.) Siuslaw News, Dec. 12, 1963]

FOR THE PEOPLE

If there had ever been any question about Senator WAYNE MORSE, our senior Senator, standing by his word, those questions had to be dispelled by his remarks this past week concerning the newest bill proposing a Sand Dunes National Park.

Over 4 years ago, Senator MORSE said he would oppose the inclusion of any "condemnation" feature included in any Dunes National Park legislation.

Last week, when the most recent bill was reported out of the Interior Committee it included condemnation provisions, which MORSE immediately spoke out against. Our senior Senator left no doubt in anybody's mind how he viewed this particular legislation and how strongly he felt his obligation to protect his constitutents who would be affected by this legislation.

It is refreshing to know that there is one of our national legislators who feels he should consider the feelings of those directly involved and who elected him.

Too often, when an individual is elected to public office, they take it as carte blanche to do as they "see fit" without considering the feelings of the voters who elected them. It appears that upon election, representatives soar to a lofty perch and are above what the voters want—"I am not doing this for votes"—"I would do differently if this was to make the voters happy." I ask, what does an elected representative do? He is elected to do what the voters who elected him want him to do—not what he wants to do particularly.

Senator MORSE beyond all doubt understands his responsibility to the voters. This is emphasized by his remarks recently in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when he spoke on the subject of the Oregon Dunes. MORSE said: "As the senior Senator from Oregon, I serve notice tonight that I shall oppose the bill.

"I believe the Senate should think a long time before it proposes to subject a State to the establishment of a Federal park under such fact situations as exist in connection with the Oregon Dunes, and particularly when there is not a united delegation, and when the State government also has some interest in the matter."

Senator MORSE's remarks went on to say: "Mr. President, if we write into the bill the provision of condemnation, we in effect take great property value away from present owners of property. We pull the rug out from under some of the most important aspects of land ownership. We depreciate the value of that property to the tune of large sums of money.

"It is that kind of conduct on the part of the Federal Government, acting through the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, that I resent. I shall do what I can, as the senior Senator from Oregon, to protect the private property interests of my constituents involved in this controversy."

The above stand on behalf of the voters, the so-called little people, is what encourages us in our belief that we all have rights under the Constitution of the United States, and that we have someone in the Congress of the United States that is going to represent us and fight for us.

[From the Florence (Oreg.) Siuslaw News, Dec. 12, 1963]

SENATOR MORSE RAPS DUNES BILL

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, has served notice he will oppose the Oregon Dunes National Seashore bill unless it is amended to forbid condemnation of private property, according to an article appearing in a daily paper.

MORSE submitted to the Senate last Tuesday night an amendment which would bar condemnation action either to acquire title or scenic easement on property within the 30,000-acre proposed park boundary except by consent of the property owner.

MORSE said he has urged the Senate Democratic leader, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, to consider postponing Senate action on the bill "until more negotiating can be accomplished at both the Federal and State level."

[From the Florence (Oreg.) Siuslaw News, Dec. 12, 1963]

MORSE SAYS FUNDS ARRIVED

Senator WAYNE MORSE has notified the Siuslaw News that $80,000 has been appropriated for dredging the local harbor.

The funds were approved by the Senate on December 9.

Senator MORSE's letter follows:

"Senate Appropriations Subcommittee has approved $80,000 in dredging funds for Siuslaw Harbor for current fiscal year.

"Subcommittee has also approved $9,000 for navigation investigation, Siuslaw River.

"In June I testified in support of these appropriations. Will urge their approval in Senate Appropriations Committee and Senate."

JESUS, THE PERFECT MAN

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the late C. P. J. Mooney was longtime editor of the Memphis Commercial Appeal and wrote many excellent editorials which were both an inspiration and an enlightenment to his many readers throughout the mid-South. One of Mr. Mooney's editorials, "Jesus, the Perfect Man," has continued to enrich the spiritual and religious thought and life of the people for more than half a century. It has been reprinted in the Commercial Appeal each year prior to Christmas Day for the last 51 consecutive years, and, as I understand, will also appear this year. I hope the practice continues for many years to come.

This editorial was read and discussed by the leader of the Senate breakfast group at a recent meeting when many of those in attendance requested that the editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Mooney's editorial is as true today as when written in 1912.

In order that the worth and spirit of this Chrismas message may be shared throughout the Nation I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Commercial Appeal, Dec. 22, 1912]

JESUS, THE PERFECT MAN

There is no other character in history like that of Jesus.

As a preacher, as a doer of things, and as a philosopher, no man ever had the sweep and the vision of Jesus.

A human analysis of the human actions of Jesus brings to view a rule of life that is amazing in its perfect detail.

The system of ethics Jesus taught during His earthly sojourn 2,000 years ago was true then, has been true in every century since, and will be true forever.

Plato was a great thinker and learned in his age, but his teachings did not stand the test of time. In big things and in little things times and human experience have shown that he erred.

Marcus Aurelius touched the reflective mind of the world but he was as cold and austere as brown marble.

The doctrine of Confucius gave a great nation moral and mental dry rot.

Mohammed offered a system of ethics which was adopted by millions of people. Now their children live in deserts where once there were cities, along dry rivers where once there was moisture, and in the shadows of gray, barren hills where once there was greenness.

Thomas Aquinas was a profound philosopher, but parts of his system have been abandoned.

Francis of Assisi was Christlike in his saintliness, but in some things he was childish.

Thomas a Kempis' Imitation of Christ is a thing of rare beauty and sympathy, but it is, as its name indicates, only an imitation.

Sir Thomas More's Utopia is yet a dream that cannot be realized.

Lord Bacon writing on chemistry and medicine under the glasses of the man working in a 20th century laboratory is puerile.

* * * * *

Napoleon had the world at his feet for 4 years, and when he died the world was going on its way as if he had never lived.

Jesus taught little as to property because He knew there were things of more importance than property. He measured property and life, the body and soul, at their exact relative value. He taught much as to character, because character is of more importance than dollars.

Other men taught us to develop systems of government. Jesus taught so as to perfect the minds of men. Jesus looked to the soul, while other men dwelled on material things.

After the experience of 2,000 years no man can find a flaw in the governmental system as outlined by Jesus.

Czar and kaiser, president and Socialist, give to its complete merit their admiration.

No man today, no matter whether he follows the doctrine of Mills, Marx, or George as to property, can find a false principle in Jesus' theory of property.

In the duty of a man to his fellow, no sociologist has ever approximated the perfection of the doctrine laid down by Jesus in His sermon on the mount.

Not all the investigation of chemists, not all the discoveries of explorers, not all the experience of rulers, not all the historical facts that go to make up the sum of human knowledge on this day in 1912 are in contradiction to one word uttered or one principle laid down by Jesus.

The human experiences of 2,000 years show that Jesus never made a mistake. Jesus never uttered a doctrine that was true at that time and then became obsolete.

Jesus spoke the truth; He lived the truth, and truth is eternal.

History has no record of any other man leading a perfect life or doing everything in logical order. Jesus is the only person whose every action and whose every utterance strike a true note in the heart and mind of every man born of woman. He never said a foolish thing, never did a foolish act, and never dissembled.

No poet, no dreamer, no philosopher loved humanity with the love that Jesus bore toward all men.

Who, then, was Jesus?

He could not have been merely a man, for there never was a man who had two consecutive thoughts absolute in truthful perfection.

Jesus must have been what Christendom proclaims Him to be—a divine being—or He could not have been what He was. No mind but an infinite mind could have left behind those things which Jesus gave to the world as a heritage.

INCREASING IMPORTS OF CATTLE PRODUCTS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, during the past 6 years imports into the United States of various cattle products, particularly beef and veal, have experienced a large increase. In 1957, for example, these imports amounted to 3.9 percent of domestic production; in 1962, this figure increased to 11 percent; and imports of these items during the first 8 months of 1963 were approximately 22 percent above the level of the first 8 months of last year. Within this overall category, imports of manufacturing meats are now equal to approximately 40 percent of domestic production.

Although the Department of Agriculture has consistently treated these facts lightly, the spokesmen for the cattle industry insist, and have proven, that this increase of imports is a significant contributing factor to the continually declining prices which have been experienced in our market during the past few years. Although our prices should be stable and our market strong because of our steadily increasing consumption of beef and veal, which now equals about one-third of the total world supply, exactly the opposite situation prevails. It seems very clear to me that the high level of these imports is certainly an important factor in these market conditions.

The Trade Information Committee and the U.S. Tariff Commission are currently conducting hearings with reference to the forthcoming international tariff negotiations to be held in Geneva. Beef and veal are among the items on which existing duties will be subject to possible reduction during the negotiations, and testimony on these items has already been presented to the Trade Information Committee and the Tariff Commission.

In addition, the Senate Committee on Finance has directed the Tariff Commission to investigate the various factors affecting competition between domestic and imported beef and beef products. Under the terms of the resolution directing this study, the Tariff Commission is to report its findings by June 30, 1964. In the light of the evidence which is readily available, however, it is clear that steps must be taken immediately to secure some measure of relief to our domestic industry.

In the face of these facts, our trade representatives will go to the forthcoming negotiations armed with authority to reduce the present tariffs on these meat products by 50 percent, or even to zero. I strongly suggest that we should maintain the existing duties on these imports; and I have, accordingly, requested the President to instruct our representatives to these negotiations not to grant any concessions on these items.

We cannot solve this problem, however, by simply maintaining our import duties at the current rate. Because of the rising production costs incurred by our domestic producers and the general price level in the United States, together with lower production costs and various governmental incentives in foreign producing nations, a 3-cent per pound tariff on beef and veal does not constitute sufficient protection. The existing duty has been in effect since 1947, and it cannot be disputed that the level of these imports has increased significantly since that date.

What is needed, Mr. President, is the imposition of some type of restrictive barrier to prevent these imports from continually increasing. By this, I do not mean that we should stop all imports of these products; but we do need to establish a reasonable import quota.

Discretionary authority is now vested in the President to immediately initiate action which would be of significant value to the cattle industry. This authority is found in section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 which provides:

> The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign governments in an effort to limit the export to the United States of agricultural commodities or products.

Pending the report of the Tariff Commission, as ordered by the Senate Finance Committee, I have requested President Johnson to initiate consultations with the major cattle producing nations, in an effort to reach a type of moratorium agreement limiting any further increase in the level of these imports. Upon a final determination of the impact of these imports on the domestic market, long-range agreements should be negotiated to establish an import quota for each foreign producing nation. These agreements should grant to these nations a reasonable, but limited, access to our market, but simultaneously guarantee to our domestic producers their rightful share of the continually increasing demand for these products in the United States. In my opinion, the consummation of such agreements would constitute the most effective and appropriate action available to us, consistent with the intent and purposes of the Trade Expansion Act.

The cattle business is one of the last in this Nation, Mr. President, to be largely free from Government subsidy, control, and regulation. This situation will not long prevail, however, unless steps are taken immediately to protect the industry from the competitive advantage of certain foreign producers. It is time now to take a realistic look at our trade policy in this respect; and I am hopeful that the President will move in this direction without delay.

MRS. ALINA F. BRIDGES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I know that every Member of the Senate who served with my late beloved senior colleague from New Hampshire, Styles Bridges, will have a deep interest and find poignant significance in the death of his mother, Mrs. Alina F. Bridges, who passed away on December 14 at Lake Worth, Fla., at the age of 88.

Most men of character and of achievement in this life owe much to their mothers, but the case of Mrs. Bridges surpasses most. Left a widow at an early age with three small children, she raised them magnificently with no resources but her earnings as an elementary school teacher. We who knew Styles Bridges do have some perception of how she inspired greatness in all her children.

A remarkable news report in the Boston Herald of December 15, 1963, traces her life and the careers of her children eloquently and succinctly and far better than I could recount them. I ask unanimous consent that it appear at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. BRIDGES IN FLORIDA, 88—MOTHER OF SENATOR, BURIAL RITES IN MAINE

Mrs. Alina F. Bridges, 88, a former resident of Milton and mother of the late U.S. Senator H. Styles Bridges, Republican, of New Hampshire, died yesterday at home in Lake Worth, Fla., after a quiet life personified by self-sacrifice.

Born in West Pembroke, Maine, and a graduate of its high school, she taught elementary school in that area for 30 years not only because she placed an irreplaceable value on education but also because her husband died shortly after they were married and she had three young children to raise.

ALL TAUGHT SCHOOL

That she succeeded was obvious. Styles went on to the U.S. Senate after rising to the governorship of New Hampshire. Another son, the late Ronald P., earned an M.A. degree from Harvard, after attending Bates and Bowdoin Colleges, and was president of the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, Calif.

A daughter, Miss Doris, with whom she resided both on Pine Grove Street in Milton and later in Lake Worth, was graduated from Boston University and Columbia and retired 2 years ago as head of the English department at Milton High School.

Ironically, all her children launched their own careers teaching in the same little schoolhouse in the Young's Cove school district of Maine where she first taught.

For the past 25 years, although she still maintained the Bridges' family home in West Pembroke where she summered, she lived mostly in Milton where she was a member of the East Congregational Church and a member of the church's women's society.

In 1954 the soft-spoken, silver-haired Mrs. Bridges was named "Maine Mother of the Year," and in 1947 she was named "Maine State Mother."

The latter award, conferred upon her by the American Mothers Committee of the Golden Rule Foundation in New York City, was received by her with a warm smile and a gentle thrust of her Yankee wit.

"Don't believe for a minute that they're not honoring my two sons and my daughter, too," she said. "Why, where would I be without them? I wouldn't even be a mother."

Both Ronald and Styles also went on to be listed in "Who's Who" and on one public occasion after another they paid tribute to their mother.

When Styles became Governor of New Hampshire, his first official act was to jot a note of gratitude to her. It said: "The first stroke of a pen made by the new Governor goes to you, mother."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire in the remarks he has made about our late beloved colleague, Styles Bridges, and his mother. We, too, extend our sympathy to this magnificent family.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator.

CLEVELAND PROTESTS SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Cleveland leaders of all faiths and political persuasions have joined together to protest the increasing manifestations of anti-Semitism within the Soviet Union. This group, the Cleveland Committee on Anti-Semitism, has as its cochairmen Msgr. Lawrence P. Cahill, president, St. John College; Rabbi Philip Horowitz, Brith Emeth Congregation; Hon. Leo A. Jackson, Cleveland City Council, and Rev. B. Bruce Whittemore, Cleveland Area Church Federation. I have previously spoken on this subject, but in view of recent developments, more should be said.

Mr. President, late last month, the members of the Soviet cultural delegation visiting this country were in Cleveland as part of their national tour. The Cleveland Committee on Soviet Anti-Semitism sought to interview the Soviet visitors with respect to anti-Semitism within the U.S.S.R. but the Russians steadfastly avoided the confrontation. While on the one hand they issued public denials of Jewish persecution in the Soviet, on the other hand they adroitly sidestepped the opportunity of being faced with the evidence on anti-Semitism in their homeland in the possession of the committee.

On November 27, the Cleveland committee inserted in the Cleveland Plain Dealer an appeal to the conscience of Soviet leaders to halt the oppression of Russian Jews. This appeal cited the facts to which the Soviet delegation had turned a deaf ear. I append that appeal hereto as a part of my remarks. The facts speak for themselves. I join with the concerned citizens of Cleveland in voicing my own deep concern in the prayerful hope that the Soviet leaders will recognize that they offend the conscience of the world by their actions and will revise their policy accordingly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of an advertisement appearing in the Cleveland Plain Dealer Wednesday, November 27, 1963, be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Octahobntecb (Halt!)

(An appeal to the conscience of Soviet leaders to halt oppression of Russian Jews.)

SEVEN-POINT APPEAL PREPARED BY CONFERENCE ON THE STATUS OF SOVIET JEWS, NEW YORK, OCTOBER 12, 1963

1. Eliminate the anti-Jewish character of the official campaign against economic crimes (in which an attempt has been made to blame the Jews for the economic and moral breakdown in Soviet internal affairs. The death penalty has been meted out to hundreds of persons, most of whom have been identified as Jews in the Soviet press).
2. Permit Jewish emigration to reunite separated families.
3. Permit cultural and religious ties between Soviet Jews and Jews of other lands.
4. Reopen closed synagogues and lift the ban against the performance of religious Jewish observance.
5. Reopen Jewish schools.
6. Revive Jewish institutions in Yiddish and Hebrew.
7. Launch a vigorous educational campaign against anti-Semitism, directly attack endemic anti-Jewish feelings and cease campaigns of vilification in the press and other mass media.

SUPPORTING THIS APPEAL ARE MANY AMERICANS WHO DEPLORE PERSECUTION WHEREVER IT EXISTS

Nationally: Justice William O. Douglas, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Senator Herbert H. Lehman, Bishop James A. Pike, Mr. Walter Reuther, Mr. Norman Thomas, Mr. Robert Penn Warren, and Dr. Moshe Decter.

In Cleveland: Prof. George W. Albee, Rev. Amos A. Ackerman, Ralph M. Besse, Rev. Edward Bergstraesser, Rev. Joel Bladt, Rev. Charles H. Bright, Dr. John Bruere, Rev. H. Richard Bucey, Rev. Samuel H. Cassel, Mayor Paul W. Cassidy, Dr. Kenneth Clement, Rev. Stephen Csutoros, Rev. Duane L. Day, Rev. M. Richard Drake, pastor, Dr. Bernard H. Eckstein, Rabbi Louis Engelberg, Dr. Gerald Tauber, Msgr. Daniel T. Gallagher, Mr. Victor Gelb, Dr. David Gitlin, Bishop Joseph Gomez, Rev. Ralph M. Gray, Rabbi Jack Herman, Mr. Clarence Holmes, Judge Perry B. Jackson, Dr. Emerson Jacob, Mr. Russell W. Jelliffe, Mr. Stanley B. Kent, Rev. Albert Kokolwsky, Rabbi Louis H. Lieberworth, Rev. W. Chave McCracken, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Anthony V. Mechler, Rev. Henry L. Noffke, Dr. Paul Olynyk, Rev. A. M. Pennybacker, Rabbi I. Pickholtz, Rev. V. A. Peterson, Rev. Isaiah P. Pogue, Jr., and Chief Justice August Pyratel.

Dr. Louis Rosenblum, Rabbi Milton Rube, Rabbi Benjamin Rudavsky, Dr. Abe Silverstein, Mr. Ralph Rudd, Mr. William E. Sanborn, Rev. Peter H. Samson, Dr. Oliver Schroeder, Jr., Rabbi Jacob Shtull, Rabbi Myron Silverman, Judge Samuel Silbert, Mr. John B. Blade, Mr. James H. Sivard, Rabbi Marvin Spiegelman, Dr. Benjamin Spock, Mr. Robert Stafford, Dr. Thomas G. Stampfl, Dr. Harry B. Taylor, Mr. George J. Urban, Hon. Carl V. Weygandt, Judge Theodore M. Williams, Prof. Harvey Wish, Rev. Howard B. Withers, Msgr. Louis A. Wolf, Very Rev. Hugh E. Dunn, S.J., Mr. Jay D. Feder, Mr. Irving Levine, AJC., Mr. Ben Zevin, Rabbi Daniel Litt, Prof. Michael S. Pap, and hundreds of others.

Sixty U.S. Senators have issued their own appeal to the U.S.S.R. in Senate Resolution 204. Lord Bertrand Russell this year sent a personal appeal to Premier Khrushchev calling for an end to Soviet anti-Jewish practices.

Cleveland Committee on Soviet Anti-Semitism—Cochairmen: Msgr. Lawrence P. Cahill, President, St. John College; Rabbi Philip Horowitz, Brith Emeth Congregation; Hon. Leo A. Jackson, Cleveland City Council; Rev. B. Bruce Whittemore, Cleveland Area Church Federation.

ROSS COUNTY DISTRICT LIBRARY, CHILLICOTHE, OHIO, RECIPIENT OF DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER MEMORIAL AWARD

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this year the Ross County District Library, Chillicothe, Ohio, has been selected to be the recipient of one of the Dorothy Canfield Fisher Memorial Awards of $1,000 which is presented by the Book of the Month Club.

Previous winners in Ohio include the Preble County Library, Holmes County Library, and the Public Library of Ironton.

I should like to take this opportunity to commend the Book of the Month Club for providing this award, and to express my congratulations to the small libraries who have been the recipients, in particular the Ross County District Library.

I wish the libraries continued success in their efforts to provide more and better library services for the citizens of their communities.

OUR SPIRITUAL HERITAGE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Kiwanis International Council, meeting in Chicago in October, passed a nonpartisan and nondenominational resolution on a matter of real concern to all Americans.

This succinct and penetrating resolution speaks to the topic of those who would have us interpret freedom of religion as freedom from religion and separation of state and church as separation of state and God.

I commend to my colleagues' close attention this Kiwanis Council resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Spiritual Heritage

(Resolution presented to the international council, Chicago, Ill., October 23, 1963)

The United States of America is a nation founded upon belief in God and maturing under a trust in God. In return for that trust, He has blessed us beyond all other nations and protected us from our national follies and errors.

From Him we have derived certain inalienable rights, among which are personal and religious freedom. We in turn have shared those with all who have come to the golden door seeking personal, religious, or political freedom. We have guaranteed religious freedom by providing that there shall be a separation of church and state while at all times being committed to belief in God and His will.

Whereas there are those who would have us interpret freedom of religion as freedom from religion, separation of state and church as separation of state and God; and

Whereas certain individuals and groups seeking to deny the dependence of this Nation and its people on God have emarked on such campaigns as to effect removal of

"Under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance and "In God We Trust" from our coinage: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President and the Congress of the United States be solemnly requested to reaffirm recognition of the spiritual heritage of this Nation and its people and to oppose and prevent further attempts however well intentioned which tend to deny our national and personal trust in God or to remove God from the corporate body of our Government.

REDUCTION OF MILITARY SPENDING

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I support President Johnson's efforts to reduce military spending wherever possible without doing injury to national security. His objective is dictated by sound logic and efficient management of the public's business.

At the same time, I am well aware that military and defense plants often are the economic foundation of many communities. When these establishments are curtailed or when contracts are ended, the result can be disruptive to these communities. Many communities have had military installations and defense plants for so long that they have come to regard them as permanent. But we all know that times change and defense requirements change too. In view of the recent announcement of the closing of a number of facilities and with the likelihood that other installations will be shut down, new attention is being focused on what can be done by the affected communities and by the Government to ease the blow and to seize the advantage for new economic opportunities. This is why I am especially pleased with the efforts Roswell, N. Mex., is making to look ahead and build a backstop against any eventuality at nearby Walker Air Force Base. Walker, a Strategic Air Command base, contributes about one-third of Roswell's annual $200 million income. So it is understandable why the people of that fine community should be thinking about alternative sources of income.

There are no plans that I know of to close Walker Air Force Base. Nevertheless, the Roswell Chamber of Commerce has been doing some long-range thinking and now is doing some future planning to attract new industry and to improve the agricultural economy of the area. I think the future will find Roswell well prepared, and other communities might look to Roswell as an example of what can be done to prepare for possible changes in the defense picture.

A fine article in today's Wall Street Journal describes the effort at Roswell, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE BASE CLOSINGS SPUR ROSWELL, N. MEX., TO DIVERSIFY ECONOMY—THOUGH AIR FACILITY FACES NO IMMEDIATE THREAT, CITY GETS U.S. HELP IN SHAPING PLANS

(By William Beecher)

ROSWELL, N. MEX.—This dynamic little city of 45,000 in the heart of the Pecos Valley is enjoying the bounty of prosperity but acting as if the wolf were at the door.

Roswell's biggest single industry is national defense, specifically income generated by Walker Air Force Base, a sizable Strategic Air Command bomber and missile base here. The SAC base contributes about one-third of Roswell's annual $200 million income.

In this dependence on defense, Roswell is more or less typical of hundreds of U.S. communities. Right now a number of towns and cities, from Schenectady to San Diego, are complaining about the damage to their economies feared from the cutbacks and closings of military bases announced last week by Defense Secretary McNamara.

But unlike most defense-dependent communities, Roswell is actively preparing for the day when defense dollars spent here may dry up. Even though Pentagon planners have assured the city that the base should hum along at full tilt for a least 5 years and probably much longer, Roswell's business and civic leaders have launched a determined effort to diversify the city's economy now. They've hired city planning consultants to propose a modernization plan for their business district and they've taken on other outside specialists to draft proposals for attracting new industry.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT

The city's first move was to Washington, to a little-known corner of the Defense Department quartering the Office of Economic Adjustment. This Office was set up in the first days of the Kennedy administration to help cushion the blow in places where heavy spending military installations had to be closed or big defense orders curtailed. Though its staff numbers only five persons, it can call on specialists throughout Government for aid. Among other communities, Presque Isle, Maine, was assisted in luring new industry when a missile base there was closed. Wichita, Kans., got help in seeking new Government business when B-52 bomber production there was shut down.

A delegation from Roswell trekked to Washington last May and asked for Government suggestions. "We went to Washington not for a subsidy or a handout," insists A. J. Armstrong, 49-year-old manager of a meat-packing plant and a member of the Roswell Chamber of Commerce. "We weren't looking for money; we were looking for ideas and help in shaping plans for a more broadly based economy."

Recalls Donald Bradford, director of the Pentagon's Economic Adjustment Office: "Till then our efforts had pretty much been confined to assisting communities already in trouble. The idea of anticipating this problem and doing something well before it became critical attracted us. We thought we might make a model of Roswell, showing what could be done with a little advance planning and local self-help."

The heavy economic impact of shifts in defense spending is hardly new; after both World War II and the Korean War, defense procurement sank sharply, if temporarily. But officials see added need to cushion the blows during a period when fast-advancing technology causes military buyers to flit from one new weapons system to an even newer one, and when total defense spending is expected to decline by as much as $5 billion a year by 1968.

NEW COORDINATING GROUP

To coordinate Government aid to companies and regions likely to be affected, Secretary McNamara recently named his special assistant, Adam Yarmolinsky, to chair a new high-level working group. It will coordinate efforts within the Defense Department and among other interested agencies such as the Arms Control and Disarmament Administration.

Too, the Pentagon plans to develop an early warning system for alerting defense industries and regions of the country about impending economic dislocations. A long-range program is just getting under way to identify the prime contractors and subcontractors who share in the combined $57-billion annual expenditures of the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to determine the areas most directly affected by defense business; and to project defense spending in each industry 5 years ahead.

Already the Census Bureau has agreed to conduct a special survey of manufacturers to determine precisely where defense work is done, the value of such work by company, and the share of each company's work force devoted to defense activity. And a major economic-impact study contract to cost $750,000 in the next 2 years has just been awarded to the Institute for Defense Analysis, a private research outfit.

Defense Department Comptroller Charles Hitch, while optimistic about developing tools with which to predict economic problems arising from cutbacks, cautions that "it will take several years before we can hope to obtain reliable data," particularly on possible defense shifts from one location to another. In that sizable segment of defense business awarded competitively rather than negotiated, "there is no feasible way to forecast which firm will receive a particular contract," he notes. "But we do hope, eventually, to be able to make some rough projections by regions."

Once an industry or region has been alerted, there is little the Government can do beyond explaining what aid is available through normal channels and encouraging self-help. When a Federal installation closes, the Government does give first crack at new jobs in the area to displaced workers. But in the case of a contract termination, it may not legally shunt fat new contracts to the community merely to soften the blow.

In Roswell's case, the Economic Adjustment Office organized a task force of 15 specialists from the Departments of Defense, Labor, Interior, and Agriculture. Along with counterparts from New Mexico State and county agencies, they took part in a day-long "brain-storming" session in Roswell on September 27. Most of the key business, labor and farm leaders of this area attended; so many wanted to be present that the meeting had to be shifted from a downtown motel to the nearby airbase.

As an aftermath of the meeting, community leaders took a look at the downtown business district which has not been drawing in many people from rural areas and has been losing business to numerous little shopping centers on the fringes of town. The main business strip sprawls along 3½ miles of main street, a rather spotty area plagued by lack of one-stop shopping opportunities and a shortage of parking space. They decided to hire Harland Bartholomew and Associates, a St. Louis-based city planning firm, to propose a modernization plan; the chamber of commerce agreed to pick up the $25,000 tab.

The local leaders examined their industrial picture. The Glover Packing Co., with only a little over 200 employees, is the largest commercial enterprise; other plants making such things as prefabricated houses, cinder blocks, and neon signs are all quite small. It was decided that another outside specialist would be hired to make proposals for attracting new industry; the city agreed to pay for a $16,000 study by Fantus Area Research, Inc., of New York.

Roswell also reviewed local agriculture, dominated by cotton, cattle, and sheep raising. If some of the land now committed to cotton could be converted to sugarbeets, perhaps a $20 million sugar refinery could be attracted. Some thought already had been given this possibility and more than 400 farmers had pledged to devote 32,000 acres to sugarbeets; the community decided to push to obtain the necessary acreage allocation from the U.S. Agriculture Department.

Attention was given to possible establishment of a petrochemical industry in Roswell. A special study group was formed including a petrochemical engineer with Humble Oil & Refining Co., and a geologist with Atlantic Refining Co.

Some possibilities broached at the September seminar seemed far out. One suggestion that synthetic alcohol produced from petroleum might be used in setting up a liquor industry was greeted by laughter; but, after some checking, it was learned that such alcohol can indeed serve to speed the fermentation of grain.

Says Bill Deane, 48, a retail merchant and chairman of the meeting: "One idea hitchhiked on another; we got a pretty fair notion of where we are and where we ought to be going." Adds Bill Armstrong, 43-year-old roadbuilder and chamber of commerce president: "The Government people didn't hand us anything, but by their presence they convinced the community we were serious about improving our condition. They gave us the necessary impetus to really get moving."

In Washington, Mr. Bradford expresses genuine pleasure at the strides being made in Roswell. "It establishes a pattern that other communities might well follow," he says. "Already two Congressmen who heard about Roswell have come to us suggesting similar programs in a couple of cities, one in the Northeast, another in the Midwest. Until we can develop some kind of workable early warning system, this represents the best interim approach."

PROJECT NEPTUNE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the late President Kennedy had a keen appreciation of the importance of scientific research, and one of the fields in which he felt we needed much more knowledge was the ocean. Oceanographic studies form a relatively new area of comprehensive research and many nations are engaged in it. There is much more that we can do in this search for information; and in a letter to the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce, President Kennedy had reviewed the Federal Government's role up to the present as well as his plans for the future. This is an extremely important statement, and we should be grateful to our former colleague, Ambassador Luce, for making it public together with the letter she wrote which elicited President Kennedy's reply.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address by the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce entitled "The New Frontier of the Ocean," containing these letters, which she delivered at the annual dinner of the Stritch School of Medicine, Loyola University, November 26, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW FRONTIER OF THE OCEAN

(Address by the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce, at the annual award dinner, the Stritch School of Medicine, Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.)

Last spring, when your committee extended the flattering invitation to address the annual Cardinal Stritch Award dinner of the Loyola Medical School, though pride tempted me to accept with alacrity, prudence counseled otherwise. First, this annual dinner has increasingly come to be known as one of the most distinguished and important charity events in America, attended by an audience of considerable intellectual distinction and wide knowledgeability. And I was somewhat painfully aware of my limitations as a speaker on so significant an occasion. Second, I realized that this was to be a strictly nonpolitical event, and that my subject must be one quite free of any partisan overtones. As you well know, ladies and gentlemen, it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a speaker of known political convictions to avoid political imputations, if not implications, in a presidential campaign year.

But in the end I accepted your wonderful invitation, because happily I thought I had found in "The New Frontier of the Ocean" a politically nonpartisan subject. It was my intention to tell you tonight that we are entering the new ocean age; that our Nation's destiny will be linked ever more closely with the success of our national oceanographic efforts and research plans.

And because of the special interest of this audience, a good part of that talk was to have been concerned with the many extraordinary advances being made in marine biology and underwater medical research.

That talk you will not hear tonight.

You see, last Friday, at 1 o'clock, I was sitting writing on a jet plane, en route from Arizona to New York. I was struggling with my briny topic, trying to give it a few light, salty touches when the pilot's voice, urgent and somber, abruptly filled the plane with the terrible news that our President had been assassinated. I wrote no more on the talk that day. The pages that lay on my lap were suddenly dampened with real salt water—the salt of one American's tears. My mind and heart, like yours, have since been full of horror and grief.

Tonight you will hear not just my words on the importance of an oceanography program to our Nation's destiny. You will hear President Kennedy's words—words which have never been heard before. The correspondence I shall read to you, between the President of the United States and myself, a private citizen, no longer belongs to me. It belongs to you the people, and to the Nation's archives.

I would prefer not to read my own letter, but I must because it initiated the exchange, and it is essential to your understanding of the President's response.

On August 2 last, I wrote President Kennedy the following letter:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On the 4th of July last, in Philadelphia, I had the honor to keynote the fourth annual convention of the Underwater Society of America. The invitation to address this gathering of distinguished underwater oceanographers, archeologists, photographers, engineers, biologists, ichthyologists, and submarine researchers, fell to me no doubt consequent to the regrettable fact that the convention could think of no other available public figure who was deeply interested in the overall question of inner space exploration.

"In that address, I expressed the fervent hope that our Government would, before too many years passed, undertake a Project Neptune, dedicated to the total underwater proposition that man can and will explore, research, hunt, farm, mine, colonize, and tour earth's inner space for the increasing enrichment of mankind. I was not aware when I spoke, Mr. President, that you had for some time been considering a beginning to just such a vast undertaking.

"Surely your proposed $2,300 million plan to explore the sea, announced this week, will rank as one of the greatest achievements of your administration. I even venture to predict that 10 years from now, if your Project Neptune goes energetically forward under a coordinating Oceanographic Agency of the Government, it will be recognized throughout the world as the single most exciting and profitable scientific undertaking of your administration.

"Certainly there is no nation so geographically, scientifically, economically favored as we are for this challenging and richly rewarding undertaking. In a great hydrospace thrust we can, in a matter of a few years, outdistance all the oceanographers of the U.S.S.R. and other nations, whose original contributions to underwater exploration have, unhappily, so far been greater than our own.

"The very fact that our only deepsea craft, the 10-year-old, secondhand *Trieste*, was the private invention of a poor and humble Swiss professor of physics, August Picard, has so far seemed the measure of our own lag in abyssal exploration. The many pronged hydro-space thrust your program envisages will swiftly change our underwater posture, and it calls for loud cheers from the entire Nation.

"Unhappily, Mr. President, for certain psychological and superstitious reasons (which I touched on in my convention address), the tremendous significance and importance of your inner space project has not been grasped by the American public, or the press. For example, the announcement of it appeared in the New York Times on page 9, and it probably received even less attention from the rest of the country's press.

"May I respectfully suggest that no one but yourself can assure Project Neptune the headline attention it deserves. I hope you will consider sending a special message to Congress about it.

"Few Americans seem aware of the tremendous advances that have been made, or of the even greater ones still to be made in the whole field of oceanography. Only you can focus the Nation's attention on the many challenges of the inner space proposition: The farming and mining of our undersea resources; the possibilities of mineral, archeological and meteorological discoveries; the possibility of fresh water recovery; and the finding of a new range of antibiotics for human use. Only you can bring together for all to reflect upon, the many sciences—geology, physics, biology, mathematics—which are being today applied to inner space exploration. Only you can paint the comprehensive picture of the military, commercial, and scientific purposes your program will serve.

"I feel sure that such a message will become a document of historic significance whose luster can never be dimmed by any political event or consideration. No President, perhaps, in all American history has proposed a national undertaking more challenging and more potentially fruitful for our country and for mankind than Project Neptune.

"With renewed expression of admiration,
"Respectfully,
"______ ______."

On August 23, just 3 months ago, the President responded:

"DEAR CLARE: Your inspiring talk on the exploration of inner space certainly strikes a responsive note. I share your conviction that exploration of the seas and the life it nurtures can be one of the most challenging and rewarding activities of this decade. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance that the ocean resources and an understanding of the effects of the physical phenomena associated with the seas holds for our future.

"As you note, we have made a determined effort with considerable success in my administration to stimulate research in oceanography. We have set our sights to comprehend the world ocean, its boundaries, its properties, its life, and its processes, motivated by the very same prospects that you describe.

"In 1961, when we made our first review of the Nation's research activities in oceanography, we noted two serious shortages—trained scientists capable of specialized work in oceanography and research facilities. Research ships, computers, adequate instruments, and laboratory buildings were badly needed. Existing facilities were sparse and mostly obsolete. Furthermore, the lack of facilities made it impossible to increase substantially the number of students who were studying at any one time. Impressed by these facts, we have concentrated our resources during these first years on efforts to improve the facilities for research and to increase as rapidly as possible the number of oceanographers being educated. We are replacing obsolete ships, modernizing laboratories and providing additional support for research programs.

"In 1960, the Federal Government's expenditures for oceanography amounted to only $39 million. My budget submitted to the Congress for 1964 requests $156 million for oceanographic research and facilities.

"I am enclosing two reports prepared by the Interagency Committee on Oceanography, the Government group responsible for planning our activities in this field. One describes our plans for 1964 and the other outlines the 10-year program for oceanography which prompted the news report that you saw. Incidentally and perhaps inevitably these reports lack the sparkle and enthusiasm that punctuates your paper. As you will see, the program is already substantial and the 10-year plan calls for continued growth which should give the United States the preeminent position you desire.

"You call attention to the modest scale of our effort in deep diving vehicles. This may indeed be an area that should be enhanced. Our disheartening effort to locate the lost submarine, *Thresher*, shows how inadequate is our ability to explore the very great depths. Stimulated by the *Thresher* tragedy the Navy is currently developing a research program whose purpose will be to achieve a major improvement in our ability to work in the deep sea.

"I share also your concern over the fact that the tremendous challenge and importance of these activities is not generally appreciated. This stems in large part, I believe, from the fact that the research necessarily consists of a very large number of interrelated activities of which no single one fires the imagination. I am considering adopting your descriptive phrase, "Project Neptune," wihch would serve to focus attention on the scope and significance of these activities. Possibly too, I will have the opportunity to incorporate a message on oceanography into one of the talks I plan to make before scientific groups during the fall.

"Thank you very much for your encouraging letter and please let me have any further thoughts that may occur to you on the problem of creating a public awareness of these research opportunities.

"Sincerely

"JOHN KENNEDY."

Ladies and gentlemen, President Kennedy did not live to find the hoped for occasion to draw America's attention to Project Neptune. I think he would be happy tonight to know that the Cardinal Stritch Medical School has given his brilliant ideas this posthumous platform of your hearts and minds.

I must add one further footnote to the history of President Kennedy's profound interest in his oceanographic program. On September 26, 1963, with the President's approval, a team of six Government oceanographers, including Dr. James H. Wakelin, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, and Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., assistant to the President's science adviser, Dr. Jerome Wiesner, came to New York to dine with my husband and me, and a group of writers and editors. Until midnight they expounded the President's deep desire for America's writers and America's press to publicize and bring about a better understanding of Project Neptune.

Yes, our President has put out upon the mightiest ocean of all, the one we, too, shall all explore in time—the ocean of eternity—bounded by the unknown and unknowable height and breadth and depth of God. But the oceans John Kennedy has left behind, he has bid us to explore, to exploit, to conquer for the security of America and for the benefit of all mankind.

RALPH R. BORMAN

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, Mr. Ralph R. Borman, one of our Fargo citizens was singularly honored this past week for his outstanding contribution to North Dakota and the U.S. Army. For the past 4 years he has rendered extraordinary service to the Secretary of the Army as civilian aid. In recognition of his contributions, he received the Outstanding Civilian Service Medal by the Department of the Army, and the city of Fargo, N. Dak., adopted a resolution commending Mr. Borman for his role in furtherance of our national defense and more particularly the promotion and strengthening of the Army.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the citation and the resolution printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY: RALPH R. BORMAN IS AWARDED THE OUTSTANDING CIVILIAN SERVICE MEDAL

Citation: For outstanding service as civilian aid to the Secretary of the Army for the State of North Dakota during the period August 17, 1959, to August 17, 1963. His guidance, support, and participation in an organized program to welcome home returning Reservists called up during the Berlin crisis and smooth their return to civilian pursuits were instrumental in the success of this program in his State. He consistently supported Army manpower programs to include the Army's position on ROTC. He personally made public speeches on the Army's behalf, participated in seminars, and secured Army speakers for influential audiences. His conspicuous service over a 4-year period has been of great value to the Department of the Army.

CYRUS VANCE,
Secretary of the Army.

Whereas the Honorable Ralph Borman has served as civilian aide to the Secretary of the Army for the State of North Dakota for many years last past and in this capacity Mr. Borman has worked closely with the Armed Forces and the city of Fargo in furtherance of our national defense and more particularly the promotion and strengthening of our Army; and

Whereas the Honorable Ralph Borman has been instrumental in the development of the U.S. Army's program in this area and particularly in the city of Fargo as is attested to by the successful recruiting campaigns and by the development of a number of military buildings, more particularly the U.S. Army Recruiting Center and the U.S. Army Reserve Training Center and other installations and their successful undertaking and completion were in large a result of the leadership, perseverance and hard work of the Honorable Ralph Borman; and

Whereas the Honorable Ralph Borman has participated actively in the community and city life of the city of Fargo and has at all times been helpful in the advancement of worthwhile civic programs which have been beneficial to the citizens of the city of Fargo and has given generously of his time, energy, and talents in the promotion of the development of the city of Fargo and at all times has been a good, conscientious and friendly neighbor and good citizens whose services are deeply appreciated by his city government and his friends and neighbors in Fargo: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the city commission of the city of Fargo on behalf of the citizens of Fargo does hereby express its deep and heartfelt appreciation to the Honorable Ralph Borman for his dedicated years of public service and to the city of Fargo as citizen, civic leader and as civilian aid to the Secretary of the Army: and be it further

Resolved, That this expression of gratitude and appreciation to the Honorable Ralph Borman be spread upon the permanent minutes of the Fargo City Commission's proceedings and that certified copies of this resolution be presented to the Honorable Ralph Borman, his family, and also be forwarded to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army and to Members of the North Dakota Congressional delegation in Washington, D.C.

Second by Oakey.

On the vote being taken on the question of the adoption of the resolution Commissioners Markey, McCannel, Oakey, Lashkowitz, and Hagen all voted "aye."

No commissioner being absent and none voting nay the vice president declared the resolution to have been duly passed and adopted.

HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ,
Mayor and President, Board of City Commissioners.

A FUTURE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, is the American way of life irrevocably changing? I ask my colleagues to reflect on the status of small business.

We are a nation of many people. We are the leader of the free world. We are young and virile. But, we are great today not solely because of our machines—our technology—the sheer weight of our numbers. We are great because of little men, individuals who had the courage and wisdom to confront the future and say, "I will shape your course."

The early giants of industry, government and the arts were not the product of well oiled, well heeled corporations. They were the products of themselves, of individuality, of singleness of effort. They rose to greatness because they were once given the chance to be small. Ford, Edison, Carnegie—these were small businessmen, yes, small businessmen who became big businessmen in a future much of their own design. Where would this Nation be today if that old-fashioned kind of individuality had been forced out of business by some superior force?

The world of Ford and Edison and Carnegie is no more. America is fully industrialized, but the need of inventive spirit lives on. If these men were alive today could they conquer high taxation, mergers, and capital shortage?

Small business is in a predicament. Retailers, service industries, and small manufacturers all face tremendous odds in starting and operating small businesses. Small business is treated as dangerous by its larger rivals, risky by lending agencies accustomed to the high finance operations of established concerns, and inefficient by sophisticates accustomed to wide variety, high volume, high discount management. In fact small business is none of these; it is an old and honored form of business full of the tradition and purposefulness which molded our present leaders in industry and government. Customers and clients are not statistics but real persons with individual desires and whims to which only small business can be responsive. Product and service quality are personal warranties of the seller. Management reliability and experience, not dollar volume, is the measure of businesses' responsibility.

No single item tells all of small businesses' difficulties. But it can be easily demonstrated that small business is waging a constant battle for the right to be small.

In this battle the almighty dollar is a force for both good and evil. It takes money to make money. When you are big, you have money or access to it. When you are small, you neither have it nor ready access to it. The big get bigger and the small get squeezed. The financial disparity of size can be that simply stated.

Under the Small Business Act, some businesses otherwise unable to raise funds have been aided through direct or participation loans by the Small Business Administration. The total dollar volume of these loans rises daily. For fiscal 1963 the SBA made 6,073 business loans totaling $314 million.

A business with no credit record or a definitive history of profitable operation may not obtain SBA money. New businesses with high potential but little financial background have difficulty obtaining needed funds. Present programs should be reviewed to determine if the Small Business Administration can be put in a position to assume greater risks. Eugene P. Foley, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, is cognizant of this problem and has indicated that he will review the loan risk policy of the Administration.

Meanwhile, as the total dollar volume of small business loans increases, small business growth is otherwise thwarted. Its participation in military prime contract awards has fallen off severely. The small business share of such awards declined more than $320 million between fiscal 1962 and fiscal 1963. So, while $313,900,000 was being pumped into small business by SBA loans, $320 million was being bled off by the decline in the small business share of prime military contracts. We are getting nowhere. In fact, we are losing ground at an alarming rate.

There are 19,000 fewer small manufacturers than there were in 1957, a decline of 5.8 percent, while the national economy expanded at half that rate every year.

On a percentage basis more people than ever before are entering the labor force as employees than as proprietors. Stimuli for becoming your own boss are engulfed in the quest for bigness. No more can a man honestly say that his future is with himself. That desk among many in the office downtown is replacing the old backroom laboratory which spawned the likes of Marconi, Pasteur, and the Wright brothers. Only a modern-day David could take on our present Goliaths and he would have no historical guarantee of success.

Let me, for a moment, touch on a note that is not often enough discussed by those concerned with the future of small business. When small business declines, personal freedom declines. No man is so free as the man who is his own boss.

There are those who cannot stand the strain of self-employment. For them there is profit and reward working for somebody else. That is the freedom and flexibility of our system.

But it is equally as essential to that freedom and that flexibility that the door be left open for those who choose self-employment. When this opportunity is foreclosed a piece of the American dream vanishes.

Bigness in business, bigness is labor, and bigness in Government are byproducts of our growing country. War and the threat of war have created new technological demands on Government and business. Each has grown to meet the challenge. And, as business grows, labor grows. So, we must not view bigness itself as a mortal enemy. But we cannot condone bigness to the exclusion of individuality—bigness to the exclusion of smallness.

Government, business, and labor have the obligation to come to the aid of small business. Small business is not a helpless dependent of affluent parents. It is a forefather of our present greatness. If it is left to wither by disinterested heirs, the arteries of national commerce will harden, springs of industrial creation will run dry, and the body politic may be forced to socialize small business to keep vital machinery running.

We cannot and must not acknowledge the demise of small business as a natural consequence of the new nuclear world. Small business is the bedrock of private enterprise. It is capitalism's shield against creeping socialism. We must not let it down.

On January 15, 1963, I introduced Senate Resolution 30, a resolution designed to give the Senate Small Business Committee legislative status and continuity. Small business needs a champion here on the Hill. It needs a protector. It needs a willing ear in Congress. It needs someone to take the fight forward.

The resolution was referred to the Senate Rules Committee. Fifty-four Senators declared in support of it but no action has been taken by the committee to date. I urge the Members of this body and the public at large to ask the Rules Committee to consider this resolution at the committee's earliest convenience.

The future of small business slips a notch in passing every day. We can no longer afford to defer its problems to the future. For small businessmen across this great country their only hope for a future is the hope for action today.

DECEMBER 17, 1963, WRIGHT BROTHERS DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, "The dream of yesterday is the hope of today and the reality of tomorrow." These words from Dr. Robert Goddard, a native son of Massachusetts and the father of modern day rocketry, characterize man's effort to fly, an effort that has yielded a menagerie of dreams, designs, and devices. Even a $50,000 launching device could not bring triumph to Samuel Langley in 1903. A few days later, however, two unknown men from Dayton, Ohio, launched their *Flyer* and the minutes which followed are enshrined in our Nation's history.

Ten years of experimentation and $5,000 in expenses had brought not only success, but also immortality to Wilbur and Orville Wright. Today we celebrate the 60th anniversary of powered flight by heavier-than-air craft. It is indeed fitting that the day be known as Wright Brothers Day.

We are all familiar with the event 60 years ago in North Carolina. Many of us, however, do not realize the extensive experimentation which enabled these two men to succeed where countless others had failed. To us the principles appear elementary and the equipment rather simple. Both, however, were revolutionary for that time. For example, through thousands of wind tunnel experiments with various wing shapes, the Wright brothers developed entirely new air pressure tables. They discovered that by moving various aircraft surfaces in flight they could control balance, elevation, and steering. As a result, the Wright brothers devised a hinged rudder and ailerons and they linked movable parts together. This "linkage" system, the basis of control of all aircraft today, is considered to be one of the most significant inventions in aviation history. In addition, the Wright brothers developed a special lightweight motor and a new kind of propellor which proved to be 66 percent more efficient. The attention to detail and the years of experimentation were fundamental to the triumph which we commemorate on Wright Brothers Day.

The pioneering spirit, the determination, and the ability exemplified by the Wright brothers are the essence of human progress. They were neither inhibited by the predictions of failure from those who had not tried, nor were they dissuaded by the tragedies of those who had tried. As we recall that historic day, let us draw inspiration from the two men who made this aged dream a reality. In this space age, our efforts must also be a combination of bold design and prudent preparation.

PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, last week I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 139, a proposed amendment to the Constitution which would: first, provide for the selection of a new Vice President to fill any vacancy in that office, second, change the order of succession, and third, establish machinery for the resolution of problems arising out of temporary Presidential disability.

Subsequent to introduction of that amendment—which has been cosponsored by Senators Burdick, Long of Missouri, Moss, Pell, and Randolph—I have had placed in the Record articles by such distinguished writers as Walter Lippmann, Richard Neustadt, James Reston, Richard Morris, and Arthur Krock, dealing with the general problem of succession. Today I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted at this point in the Record a number of editorials which have appeared in recent weeks dealing more specifically with the important question of Presidential inability.

I would like to include columns by Marquis Childs, Roscoe Drummond, Arthur Krock, and Neal Stanford, as well as an editorial from the Washington Post and two from the New York Times.

Generally speaking, these articles and editorials propose no definitive solutions to the problem of disability; but they are unanimous in their concern that something be done soon to formalize procedures in this matter. I believe that sections 3, 4, and 5 of my amendment deal effectively with this problem.

There being no objection, the articles and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 29, 1963]

THE SHAKY LINE OF SUCCESSION

(By Marquis Childs)

No one who has spent even a brief time with President Lyndon B. Johnson can doubt his remarkable vigor. Even for the auditor a conversation with the man who was Senate majority leader and then Vice President is a physical exercise. While the visitor sits beside his desk he takes not one but two telephone calls simultaneously, speaking first on one extension and then another.

He bounces up and prowls the room with restless energy. His points are made with sharp emphasis as he speaks with machinegun intensity. By way of underscoring what he is saying he pounds the desk and, leaning forward, he grips the arm of his listener to accentuate the gravity of his words.

The drive, the pace, as the last few critical and demanding days have shown is unflagging. Yet, when this is said, the fact remains that, in the cliche so often used, one heartbeat separates the Presidency today from House Speaker John McCormack. McCormack, who does not appear to be in the most robust health, will be 72 years old next month.

The fact, too, is that in July 1955, Mr. Johnson suffered a severe heart attack. It was announced that he would be unable to resume his duties as majority leader during the current session of Congress. The acting leadership role was taken over by Senator Earle C. Clements of Kentucky. Two months after the attack Johnson was discharged from Bethesda Naval Hospital after a report of steady improvement.

When he had been in office only 2 months upon inheriting the Presidency on the death of Franklin Roosevelt in April 1945, Harry S. Truman sent a special message to Congress on the presidential succession. The Succession Act, which had not been amended since 1886, provided that following the Vice President the office should pass to the President pro tempore of the Senate and then to the Speaker of the House. Third in line would be the Secretary of State, with the other Cabinet officers following in the order of their rank.

The then President pro tempore of the Senate—the majority member with the longest service—was Senator Kenneth McKellar of Tennessee. McKellar, who concealed his age, had begun his service in the House in 1911, in the Senate in 1917. His increasing irascibility and arbitrary exercise of authority in key committee posts led to the belief he was suffering from senility.

Truman proposed that the order of 1886 be reversed and the Speaker of the House put first in line with the President pro tempore second. Speaker Sam Rayburn was then 63 and regarded as one of the wisest and most knowledgeable men in the entire Government. One of his principal allies in the House was a rising young Texas Congressman named Lyndon Johnson.

Under the Truman plan a successor would hold office until the next congressional election or until a special election had been called. The House, eager to endorse this tribute to Rayburn, adopted the Truman proposal almost at once, omitting the special election provision. Not until June 27, 1947, did a reluctant Senate follow suit.

Jealousy, sentiment, indifference have stood in the way of any realistic and far-reaching action on the succession. The issue has been cloudy and confused from the beginning. The Founding Fathers were unhappy with the Succession Act approved in 1792 when many of the authors of the American system were still in Congress or the executive branch.

The President pro tempore of the Senate today is Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona. He is 85 years old. Neither McCormack nor Hayden has had any experience in foreign policy. Surely they must both feel a sense of dread that the Presidency in a time of fearful responsibility and extraordinary peril might by some tragic mischance devolve on them.

Surely, therefore, this is the time to adopt a carefully thought out plan of succession. Congressional committees have piled up reports on the subject and political scientists gaiore have analyzed it. A broad range of proposals is at hand. They could be considered without lengthy committee hearings.

"You assume," a wise foreign observer once remarked, "that your Presidents are immortal. In view of the record it is a false assumption as well, in view of the need for continuity of government, as a dangerous assumption."

So much is conveniently ignored, including what happens when a President is disabled. Woodrow Wilson lay paralyzed for a year and a half and the Government, too, was paralyzed. The risks today are infinitely greater than they were then.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 7, 1963]

DISABILITY PROBLEM: A CONSTITUTIONAL GAP

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It is immensely valuable that the President's bipartisan commission, headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren, is studying, appraising, and preparing to report to the country all the evidence bearing on the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

This needs to be done. By virtue of the stature of the panel, it is going to be done well.

But there is something equally vital and urgent—in fact, because it concerns the present and the future, more vital and more urgent—than this useful inquiry into the past.

I refer to the necessity of repairing at the earliest possible moment the gaping hole in the Constitution as to what happens when a President is temporarily unable to discharge his duties because of illness or any other emergency.

In the wake of President Eisenhower's heart attack and subsequent illnesses, Congress walked right up to this problem—and stopped. At this time only one voice is being raised in behalf of beginning now, without delay, the action needed to correct the constitutional defect which can no longer be safely left as it is. This is the voice of Senator Kenneth Keating, Republican, of New York.

Let me state the problem briefly. The Consitution provides in article II that in case of the inability of the President "to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the Same shall devolve on the Vice President * * *."

This leaves unclear and unsettled so many matters that twice in our history, in the last exacting times of Presidents Garfield and Wilson, the Government was paralyzed for months. In today's world, the U.S. Government cannot afford to be paralyzed for minutes.

Here are the matters which the Constitution leaves unanswered:

Who shall decide when a President is for any reason unable to discharge his duties and how?

Who shall decide when a President is ready to assume his duties and how?

What is to be done if a disabled President seeks to assert his authority before he has recovered?

In case of the disability of the President, does the Vice President—or the man next in line—succeed to the office of President or only to the duties of the Presidency?

This latter question is moot. Some distinguished constitutional scholars hold that the Vice President would merely act as President temporarily. Others hold that he would in fact become President for the remainder of the term.

This is not an academic question. Because of this uncertainty, two Vice Presidents refused to discharge the duties of President during long inability for fear the President would think they were trying to seize the office from him. When Garfield was ill and when Wilson was paralyzed for months, the real difficulty was not to determine inability. In each case the Vice President either did not wish or did not dare to move because he was not sure that the President could then take back the office again.

Bear in mind that three out of the last four Presidents have been the targets of an assassin's bullets—Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy. Each could have suffered long disability.

Bear in mind that President Johnson as well as President Eisenhower have suffered serious heart attacks.

It is not ghoulish to face this problem openly and candidly. It is recklessly irresponsible not to do so.

Senator Keating is making the right beginning by proposing a constitutional amendment authorizing Congress to enact that necessary clarifying legislation.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 24, 1963]

THE CONTINUUM: KENNEDY'S DEATH POINTS UP ORDERLY PROGRESSION IN U.S. GOVERNMENT

(By Arthur Krock)

Washington, November 23.—There are two great tragedies to mourn at the bier of the young President of the United States. The supreme tragedy is the untimely death of the elected chief of the Nation in the flower of his prime and of his extraordinary attainments. The other is the failure of even advanced democracy and self-government to extirpate in mankind the resort to anarchy that has violently sundered the lives of 4 of the 35 men who thus far have served in the highest office of the Nation.

As on those four previous occasions, and also when President Truman, President Jackson, and President-elect F. D. Roosevelt were the targets of unsuccessful attempts at assassination, the bullet which struck down John Fitzgerald Kennedy was forged in conditions of intense political controversy. Only Czolgosz, the murderer of President McKinley, declared that service to the political cult of anarchy was the purpose of his crime. The other three were moved by crazed emotional reaction to the violence with which Americans still express their differences over how to deal with national and international problems—the latest instance having apparently been generated in the international left wing.

MET UNUSUAL TESTS

But, whatever the source of the impulse to express it by assassination of the citizen who is the symbol of the American state, the melancholy fact remains that one bullet fired by a madman has consigned to dust the heart and mind that gallantly met unusual tests of war, rebuffed encroaching death in critical illness and overcame hitherto insuperable obstacles to attainment of the Office of President.

But, as they mourn the unreckonable liabilities of their loss and ponder the black recesses of the human mind that resist all the enlightenment of democratic self-government, the American people again have cause for gratitude to a few lines in the Constitution that were written 174 years ago. It is these lines which have made the Government of the United States a continuum that calamities like this, even in times of deep internal controversy, cannot interrupt or break. The lines occur in clause 6, section 1, article II of the Constitution:

"In case of the * * * death [of the President] [the] powers and duties of the said office * * * shall devolve on the Vice President."

But, foresighted as were the makers of the Constitution in 1789, they left loopholes in this insurance policy of continuous government. And it is Congress, most lately in 1947, to whom the American people owe the Acts of Succession that provide for this continuity when, as on the succession of Mr. Truman to the vacancy created by the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, there was no Vice President on whom the "powers and duties of the office" could devolve.

The writers of the Constitution had anticipated this situation in part, but only to the extent of authorizing Congress to decide what "officer of the Government shall act as President" in the event of the deaths of both the President and the Vice President. And, in 1886, Congress had exercised this authority by a statute providing that, in these circumstances, presidential succession should begin with the Secretary of State and proceed in order through other members of the Cabinet.

But the potential effect of this was to turn over the Presidency to a person not elected by the people, since the members of the Cabinet serve by appointment. So, in 1947, Congress changed the line of succession as follows, if both the two highest elective posts were vacant: the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate (both elected national officers), and thereafter members of the Cabinet beginning with the Secretary of State.

ADEQUATE PROVISION

But clause 6, section 1 of article II is adequate provision for continuity of the U.S. Government, in the circumstances created by the death of President Kennedy, because there is a living Vice President. Hence the administration of the Presidential oath to Lyndon Baines Johnson, of Texas, was automatic constitutional procedure. If conditions had made it necessary, this could have been done the moment Mr. Kennedy was pronounced dead in the hospital at Dallas. But, since the delay was only 1 hour 39 minutes, there was virtually no "interregnum."

However, Congress has permitted another serious loophole in the Constitution to remain throughout the 174 years it has existed. This is the failure of the national charter to provide for incidents when the Presidential incumbent, for physical, mental, or other reasons, is unable to "discharge the powers and duties of the office." Left wholly unsettled are these momentous questions:

If the President declares his "inability," does the Vice President exercise the powers and duties as President or as acting President during the period of the inability, whether or not that endures for the remainder of the term to which the President was elected?

QUESTIONS RAISED

What is "inability"? Who raises the question of when it has occurred and when it has ended, and who resolves these questions when they have been raised?

Suppose a disabled President refuses to certify it, or, if he asserts it, proclaims the end of his disability when it still exists, how is the Government crisis to be met?

One of the best studies of the subject was published by John D. Ferrick in the October 1963 issue of the Fordham Law Review. His solution is a constitutional amendment. It would authorize the Vice President, after consultation with the Cabinet, to make a determination of Presidential disability when the President is unwilling or unable to do so. But, even in these circumstances, the President alone could declare the end of his disability. And this still does not cover current situations when there is no Vice President.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 7, 1963]

The Line of Succession

(By Neal Stanford)

Washington and the country are gradually becoming aware that there are some gaps and uncertainties in the law governing succession to the Presidency.

Naturally, then, there is increasing talk of the need to clarify the situation quickly, now that the United States has no Vice President.

Under a 1947 law, the line of succession runs from the Vice President to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, and then through members of the Cabinet—State, Treasury, Defense, and on down.

Thus, President Johnson's immediate successors would be, first, Speaker of the House, John W. McCormack, Democrat, of Massachusetts, who is 71; then, presumably, President pro tempore of the Senate, currently 86-year-old Carl Hayden, Democrat, of Arizona.

But a close reading of the 1947 law, it now appears, would not have Senator Hayden succeeding Representative McCormack, but rather Representative McCormack succeeded by whomever would have been named Speaker of the House when McCormack became President.

Thus, the line of succession would normally actually never go further than the Speaker of the House, for a new Speaker would always be named, presumably, when the old one moved up into the White House.

There are two conditions, however, under which this would not happen: One, if the death of the President who had been Speaker came at a time when the House had not yet elected a new Speaker; two, if the new Speaker, because foreign born or too young for the Presidency was ineligible.

Several proposals have been made these last few days to clarify this matter of succession. One is to clearly make the President pro tempore of the Senate successor to the Speaker of the House, should the latter be elevated to the Presidency. Another is to have the people elect a second Vice President who could immediately take over the duties of the Vice President, not leaving that post vacant—as it is now.

The other matter involving succession that seems to require attention concerns the question of what happens in case of temporary disability of the President.

President Eisenhower had an agreement with Vice President Nixon, and President Kennedy with Vice President Johnson, providing for the temporary assumption by the Vice President of the full powers of the Presidency in case of physical disability, with the President resuming full powers when he declared himself able to do so. At the moment President Johnson is discussing some comparable agreement with Speaker McCormack to cover the present situation.

But this matter of succession in case of disability is more complex than at first appears. Those who have closely examined the 1947 law say that it would require Speaker McCormack to resign from the speakership and the House, if he were to assume the powers of the Presidency even temporarily. Were Mr. Johnson to recover, he would resume the powers of the Presidency, but that would leave Mr. McCormack with no job as Speaker or a seat in the House. This is obviously a situation that needs to be anticipiated and provided for. It does not arise in the case of a Vice President who would automatically return to being Vice President since no one steps into his job. The Government can operate without a Vice President, but not without a Speaker of the House.

In the case of temporary presidential disability it is conceivable that a Speaker of the House would decline the job of temporary Chief Executive to save his House post. Such a possibility spotlights the need for this whole question of presidential succession (particularly in the case of temporary presidential disability) to be thrashed out and resolved.

One situation that some in Washington are saying also needs study and clarification is what happens to succession in case of a national disaster, when the entire top layer of American officialdom might be wiped out?

There has been talk of making State Governors temporarily responsible for Federal authority.

The more immediate task, though, is to make sure the arrangement for presidential succession is what the country and Congress wants, and that it covers presidential incapacity as well as the death of a Chief Executive.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 14, 1963]

Possible "Acting President"

There is nothing more than academic interest in the suit filed in New Mexico to have President Johnson demoted to "acting President." Every time a Vice President succeeds to the White House some scholars revive the assertion that the Founding Fathers never intended that the Vice President should acquire all the prestige and panoply of the Presidency itself. They may be right so far as the original intent is concerned. But an unbroken line of precedents since Vice President Tyler succeeded President Harrison in 1841 has established an almost unchallengeable constitutional usage that is not likely to be altered.

This interpretation has been pointedly confirmed, moreover, by the 20th amendment, which provides that "if, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President-elect shall have died, the Vice President-elect shall become President." Certainly this settled view best serves the national interest. It would be most unfortunate for the country to limp along with an "acting President" for possibly 3 years or more. The chief mitigating factor about the recent tragedy is the firmness with which the new President has taken over the reins of power.

What is true of the Vice President's escalation to the role of President would not be true, however, of a Speaker of the House suddenly called upon to exercise the Presidential powers. The Constitution itself seems to draw a distinction between the Vice President and other officers placed in the line of succession by act of Congress. It says that in case of death, resignation, impeachment, or inability on the part of the President the powers and duties of the office "shall devolve on the Vice President." In the absence of both a President and a Vice President, an officer designated by Congress may "act as President" until the disability of the man entitled to the office be removed or a President shall be elected.

Whether or not this difference in language is significant, Congress itself has provided that the title of a Speaker exercising the Presidential powers should be "acting President." In its succession act of 1947 Congress steered clear of the concept that it had written into the 20th amendment in regard to the Vice President. Not only does it say that the Speaker should "act as President" when there is neither President nor Vice President; it also provides that if there is no Speaker or if "the Speaker fails to qualify as acting President," then the President pro tempore of the Senate shall "act as President."

Here is another major reason for repeal of this misguided statute. If a double tragedy should occur early in a presidential term, this law would leave no alternative to the toleration of an "acting President" for an extended period. Certainly if the successor is to be kept in an "acting" role, a special presidential election should be provided on the next regular congressional election day. This aspect of the 1947 law buttresses anew our feeling that it should be repealed and that a major study of presidential succession should be undertaken.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 1, 1963]

If the President?

The present Congress in its session next year must face a pressing subject that has baffled the Founding Fathers and at least seven Congresses in the last century and this: the contingencies of presidential disability and succession.

The Constitution and the United States Code tell us—up to a point—the sequence if a President dies. But this leaves open the question of what happens if a President (or his successor by law) is gravely ill or disabled. Who is to decide inability to function? What happens when recovery occurs after a disability? How can the Office of the President be safeguarded against encroachment by a willful group in or outside the Government?

After the serious illnesses of President Eisenhower, the Senate and House held hearings on this aspect of succession. A number of serious proposals were made then and thereafter: creation of an Inability Commission, including members of the Supreme Court; a decision by the Vice President, if possible after consulting with the President, otherwise after consulting members of the Government; decisions by the Cabinet or by both Houses of Congress. Both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy entered into private agreements with their Vice Presidents, permitting the President to make the inability decision himself or, if unable to do so, throwing the terrible burden of decision on the Vice President and the Cabinet.

The Congress must recognize that private arrangements are, as we noted a few days ago, unsatisfactory. What is called for now is a renewed effort at legislation that would lead to a constitutional amendment or a clarifying resolution by both Houses of Congress.

We are asking much of the present Congress in asking it to solve a problem that the Founding Fathers left unresolved. The deaths of Presidents and the illnesses of Presidents have caused confusion and dissension in the past. The time to clarify presidential inability or disablement is now—when the subject of succession is in the forefront of the thoughts of a shocked nation.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 7, 1963]

Stopgap on Succession

President Johnson's agreement with Speaker John W. McCormack about carrying on the duties of the Presidency when the incumbent becomes disabled is probably as good a stopgap arrangement as could be devised, but it is no adequate solution for this difficult problem. It provides that the Speaker would become Acting President if the President became disabled. The President would resume his powers when he determined that his disability had ended.

There is no provision, however, for a situation in which the President might be unfit to serve, but insisted on retaining his powers. In this juncture of the world's history, when the fate of the Nation and the world may hang on an instant decision of the Chief Executive, there must never be the least doubt about who is exercising his powers and responsibilities.

The questions of what constitutes Presidential disability; who decides when it exists; whether the next person in line of succession becomes President or merely Acting President, and how the President may resume his powers when his disability has ended are not defined with any degree of precision. Congress has before it a constitutional amendment, approved by a Senate Judiciary subcommittee after extensive hearings, that would delegate to Congress authority for determining the proper procedures. It should receive prompt consideration.

There is no question of the power of Congress to determine the line of succession to the Presidency after the Vice President. It has exercised that power three times. From 1792 until 1886 the President pro tempore of the Senate was designated; from 1886 until 1947 the Secretary of State was next in line; the Presidential Succession Act of 1947 named the Speaker, on the theory that an elected official should be preferred to an appointed one, even though it might result in the elevation to the Presidency of a member of a party opposed to the President's.

Now it is noted that Speaker McCormack would have to resign his congressional seat if he became Acting President. He would then revert to private life if the President resumed office. Is this a proper penalty for the holder of one of the chief offices in the Government to have to pay for temporarily serving his country in its highest post?

The question of the presidential succession is a quite different question from that of the President's inability to serve. Both questions are extremely important and both deserve careful reconsideration now.

REVENUE ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last Friday I submitted an amendment—amendment No. 361, intended to be proposed by me to the pending tax revision bill H.R. 8363 which is before the Committee on Finance. My amendment would add a new subsection 11 to section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code and would permit domestic corporations to include U.S. citizens employed abroad in their qualified benefit plans insofar as they are included for U.S. social security purposes. The following is an explanation of this amendment and an account of the background that led to it.

The retirement benefits of U.S. employees flow principally from two sources—the public plan of U.S. social security and the private plan of the U.S. employer. These two sources of retirement income are in most cases "integrated" so that the private plan pays an amount adjusted for the amount to be received under the public plan. In a real sense, therefore, the private and public plans are interdependent and are considered together in providing the total retirement benefit.

Since 1954 the Internal Revenue Code has permitted a domestic corporation to extend U.S. social security coverage to U.S. citizens employed by its foreign subsidiaries, such employees being deemed to be employees of the domestic parent company for this purpose. Under the present law, U.S. citizens working outside the United States for foreign subsidiaries of domestic corporations may be covered under old-age and survivors insurance by means of agreements between the parent company and the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate. Coverage is available only to U.S. citizens who are employed either by a foreign subsidiary in which the domestic corporation holds 20 percent or more of the voting stock, or by another foreign corporation in which such foreign subsidiary holds more than 50 percent of the voting stock.

There is no comparable method for extending the coverage of the private plan to such U.S. citizens. If the U.S. citizen becomes an employee of the foreign subsidiary, he is no longer eligible to participate in the plan of the domestic parent corporation. Furthermore, the foreign subsidiary cannot establish a private plan identical with the domestic plan, and obtain the approval of the Internal Revenue Service, unless it includes in the plan the foreign nationals on its payroll. This is not only a heavy cost burden because the employees of such subsidiaries are predominantly foreign nationals, but experience has proved that the foreign nationals are interested in different patterns of retirement benefits depending on their local customs. The practice has been to develop separate plans for foreign nationals in keeping with their concepts. On the other hand, the U.S. citizen has close economic and personal ties with the United States, expects to return home, and wishes to stay within the retirement benefit pattern and funding arrangements of the domestic corporation.

The purpose of the proposed amendment to section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code is to enable U.S. employers to include in their qualified benefit plans U.S. citizens working abroad in the same manner that such employees may be included for U.S. social security purposes. This is no more than extension to private plans of a procedure now in effect for the public plan of social security.

There is, however, one important distinction. Under the public plan of social security, the domestic corporation is allowed to pay and deduct both the employer and the employee contributions for social security—section 176. Under this amendment with respect to qualified private plans, the domestic corporation would be allowed—in applying section 404—to deduct only the employer contributions to the qualified plan. It is contemplated that arrangements will be made under which such employees will bear the cost of their own contributions, where the plan so requires, and will receive the same tax treatment on distributions as other employees of the domestic corporation.

The amendment is limited to the qualified pension, profit sharing and stock bonus plans of the U.S. employer because these benefits are most closley related to U.S. social security benefits. It is a condition precedent to the operation of the amendment that the Secretary or his delegate have by agreement approved such an arrangement for social security purposes, and the status of the employee for qualified plan purposes is coterminous with his status for social security purposes. The amendment operates on an elective rather than mandatory basis to provide each U.S. employer with latitude of action in this matter.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE HAGUE CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 762, House Joint Resolution 778.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 778) to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 778) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 763, House Joint Resolution 779.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 779) to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after the word "year", to strike out "1964" and insert "1965", and in line 2, after the word "year", to strike out "1965" and insert "1966".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 779) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder for the fiscal years 1965 and 1966."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 782), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The South Pacific Commission, created in 1948, is composed of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, and New Zealand. The U.S. territories of American Samoa and Guam, as well as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, are covered by the Commission's activities, which are primarily in the fields of economic development, social development, and health.

At present, there is a $100,000 annual limitation on the U.S. contribution to the South Pacific Commission. House Joint Resolution 779, as reported, would authorize the appropriation of $150,000 for fiscal year 1965, and $150,000 for fiscal year 1966, for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the Commission and its auxiliary and subsidiary bodies. The fiscal year of the Commission is the calendar year. Therefore, the committee amended the joint resolution to make clear that the authorization of appropriations in the joint resolution is to provide for the U.S. share of the costs of the South Pacific Commission for calendar years 1964 and 1965.

The proposed increase would make possible a moderate increase in the Commission's work program and would also enable the United States to raise, from 12½ to 20 percent, its contribution to the total budget of the Commission. A reapportionment of percentage contributions was made necessary by the withdrawal of the Netherlands from the Commission after it ceased to administer Netherlands New Guinea. It is believed equitable that the United States assume half of the 15-percent share formerly contributed by the Netherlands. Since the time when the U.S. share was set at 12½ percent, additional U.S. territory (Guam and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) has been placed within the scope of the Commission. The increased U.S. contribution would also reflect the benefit derived by the U.S. territories from the work of the Commission and a recognition of the primary importance of the Pacific islands to the security of the United States and the free world.

CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 764, H.R. 7044.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 7044) to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 7044) was considered, orderd to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 783), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 7044 authorizes the appropriation of $1,500,000 for the purpose of developing Corregidor Island in Manila Bay as a memorial site to the Philippine and American soldiers, sailors, and marines who lost their lives while serving in the Pacific area during World War II. The memorial site is to include twin flagpoles from which the American and Philippine flags would fly, a building or buildings suitable for use as an auditorium and tourist center, and a contiguous battlefield park with appropriate markers and mementos of the Pacific phase of World War II.

BACKGROUND

The Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission has attempted since the date of its establishment in 1953 to bring to a conclusion its task to cooperate with a similarly appointed Philippine commission in a "study for the survey, location, and erection on Corregidor Island of a building and other structures, and the use of Corregidor Island as a memorial to the Philippine and American soldiers, sailors, and marines who lost their lives while serving in the Pacific area during World War II." Several plans put forth by the Commission during this period failed to win sufficient support for enactment. The most recent of these was a proposal to finance a substantial memorial, estimated to cost $7,500,000 through the sales of U.S. surplus naval vessels.

The basis for the present proposal was laid in June of 1962, during a visit of Philippine Vice President Pelaez with President Kennedy, at which time agreement was reached to proceed along the lines contemplated in H.R. 7044. Subsequently, in a note dated July 20, 1962, the Philippine Government accepted the responsibility for the continual maintenance of the battlefield site when restored with the assistance of the United States.

As evidence of its good faith, the Philippine Government has already begun to clear the site, which has become overgrown through the years, and has authorized the appropriation of 4 million pesos (approximately $1,500,000).

EXEMPTION FROM INDUCTION FOR SOLE SURVIVING SON OF A DECEASED VETERAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 755, H.R. 2664.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2664) to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], or the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], might wish to be present for the discussion on the bill. I know that the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] desires to comment on the bill. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the pending business is Calendar No. 755, House bill 2664, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The first committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 4 after the word "amended", it is proposed to insert "to read as follows:".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that the able Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] wishes to be heard on this committee amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. KEATING. I wish to be heard in opposition to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which would substitute new language for the text voted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from New York desires to object to the second committee amendment, not the first committee amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I am not concerned about the proposed addition of the words "to read as follows:", although sometimes "to read as follows:" may cover several pages of text. The material on the second page is that to which I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The second committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, beginning in line 6, it is proposed to strike out the following:

> (1) by inserting the words "the father or" after the word "Where"; and
>
> (2) by inserting the words "unless he volunteers for induction" after the words "of this title".

And to insert in lieu thereof:

> The sole surviving son of a family shall not be inducted under the terms of this title unless he volunteers for induction (1) where one or more sons or daughters of such family were killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service, or (2) except during the period of a war or national emergency declared by the Congress subsequent to the date of the amendment of this subsection, where the father of such family was killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is the second committee amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the second committee amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I seek recognition to speak in opposition to this committee amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the text voted by the House would be drastically changed by the committee amendment on page 2.

In July, I introduced Senate bill 1857, the purpose of which was the same as that of House bill 2664, as originally passed by the House; namely, to exempt the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service.

House bill 2664 was passed by the House and was sent to the Senate. As that bill is now before the Senate, it has been reported with this committee amendment on page 2, which provides that this exemption shall not be effective in a period of war or national emergency hereinafter declared by Congress. In my judgment, this modification is unnecessary, and is at variance with the exemption provisions now in the draft law.

We all fully recognize that in this period of continuing international tensions there is need for a strong Defense Establishment, including both materiel and manpower. I would not press for the exemption of any group from military service if I thought that would in any way weaken our defenses.

Reference to the letters from the Department of the Army, expressing the views of the Department of Defense, and the Selective Service System in the committee report reveal that they have no objection whatever to House bill 2664 in its original form, as passed by the House.

Although any precise estimate as to the number of persons involved cannot be made, the Department of Defense suggests that probably the number would range between 6,000 and 11,000. The Selective Service states that the number would be what it calls minimal. So this measure does not affect a large number of men; and both the Department of Defense and the Selective Service are convinced that the exemption written into House bill 2664 would not, in a time of emergency, affect our defense. Should there ever arise a situation which would require us to engage in hostilities, Congress will always be in a position to withdraw all exemptions.

If there were to be some special provision under this exemption, I see no reason why it should not apply to all exemptions. We can—and most likely would, in a case of a great holocaust—withdraw all exemptions if we did not have the necessary personnel.

A basic consideration today is what, if any, exemptions from military service we are going to provide. Certainly there are some who believe, and with good reason, that everyone should serve for a period of time in one branch of our Armed Forces. And yet the idea of universal military training has never been accepted. Our legislation reflects a belief that the call to arms is an honor for every young citizen but that fulfillment of the military obligation imposes a greater sacrifice on some individuals and families than others.

Recognizing that the proper function of government in a free society is to serve the individual rather than the individual serving the state, we have provided certain exemptions in the Universal Training and Service Act to offset the burdens of extraordinary sacrifice. Thus, we have provided for deferment in cases of extreme hardship. By section 6(o) of the act, there is an exemption for the sole surviving son of a family where one or more sons or daughters were killed or died the line of duty. Recently, a September Executive order provided that all married men be exempt from induction until all available single men have been taken into the military.

Heretofore there has been no specific exemption for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service. H.R. 2664 is designed to remedy this oversight and inequity by extending the exemption of the act to include the sole surviving son of a family whose father was killed in action or died in the line of duty. Certainly, if we are going to exempt or exclude anyone from military duty the sole surviving son of one who dies in connection with military service should be afforded an exemption—recalling the bill provides an opportunity for these men to volunteer for induction.

The Defense Department wanted to make sure that if such a sole surviving son volunteered for induction, he would be able to go into the service. In a number of instances it has been called to my attention that a widow whose husband was killed in service has a son who may not be able to qualify under the hardship provision, but understandably she feels that, having given her husband to the service of his country, she should not be called upon to give her only son as well. But the bill as reported today cuts away the impact of the exemption in a time of national emergency without changing the exemption granted to others. For in this single exemption, which I feel is as meritorious as others written into the law, or as others which have been incorporated in the Executive order, an express provision is written in to provide that it shall not take effect in the case of a national emergency.

Mr. President, this strikes me as completely inequitable and unjustifiable. In my judgment H.R. 2664, as passed by the House, is a fitting tribute to the fathers who made the supreme sacrifice to their country.

I hope that the amendment will not prevail, and that the language of the House bill will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the second committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the second committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the last amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I shall not oppose that motion under the circumstances, and shall not move to table it, because I understand there is difficulty bringing to the Chamber certain Senators who favor the amendment. I would not want to take undue advantage of them.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator never does. He is always gracious and cooperative.

Mr. KEATING. May I ask what the intention is following the reconsideration? I am still opposed to the amendment. Will the debate on the subject continue at this time?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; and we shall try to get a vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the second committee amendment was rejected.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am just as much opposed to this amendment as ever. Inasmuch as the Senate voted once on the proposal and defeated the amendment inadvisedly inserted by the Senate Armed Services Committee, and no Senator has advanced any reason why it should be changed, and since it is desirable to have more Senators present, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and shall ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow there be a half hour on the pending measure, 15 minutes under the control of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and 15 minutes under the control of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as later reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, December 18, 1963, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2664) to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service, further debate on all amendments, motions, or appeals, and the bill shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]: *Provided,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION AND THE OPERATION OF THE KERR-MILLS MEDICAL PROGRAM

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the political witch doctors of the American Medical Association have made another typically deceptive "contribution" to the public debate over medical care for the elderly.

In the pages of the current edition of their house organ, the American Medical Association News, the "medicrats" of the American Medical Association hierarchy have attempted to refute the well-documented conclusions of the recent report of the Health Subcommittee of the Senate Special Committee on Aging on the operation of the Kerr-Mills medical assistance to the aged program.

This subcommittee report, it may be recalled, cited seven basic defects of the Kerr-Mills medical assistance to the aged program. The American Medical Association editorial, which has the misleading title "Kerr-Mills a Success," attempts a point-by-point rebuttal of these seven major points of criticism.

In the interests of accuracy, I wish to make a point-by-point analysis of this so-called rebuttal.

The first major defect cited by our subcommittee report stated that after 3 years, Kerr-Mills was still not a national program nor was there any reason to expect that it would become one in the foreseeable future.

The American Medical Association "rebuttal" to this statement was to hail as "a conspicuous accomplishment" the fact that after 3 years operation of the Kerr-Mills Act, there are still more than 7½ million elderly Americans living in States where Kerr-Mills still is not available at all, to say nothing of the millions of elderly people living in States where Kerr-Mills is in effect who are disqualified by the rigid and unrealistic eligibility tests.

It is interesting to note further that the American Medical Association in its most optimistic estimate, sees a maximum of 40 jurisdictions out of 54 utilizing the medical assistance to the aged program by some time next year.

Even the American Medical Association apparently dares not predict the date in the distant future when older Americans in all 50 States will have available to them the inadequate protection of Kerr-Mills medical assistance to the aged program.

Thus our criticism that Kerr-Mills medical-assistance-to-the-aged program is not now a national program nor is it likely to become one in the foreseeable future remains quite valid despite the fulminations of the American Medical Association editorialists.

Secondly, the American Medical Association editorialists in a frantic bit of figure finagling blandly assert that since an estimated 440,000 persons a year are receiving some help from Kerr-Mills that the program is fulfilling the congressional intent.

I would like to contrast this dubious 440,000 estimate concentrated in 29 States with the more than 17 million older people who would be eligible for assistance under the King-Anderson social security approach throughout the United States.

In this connection, the American Medical Association editorial erroneously asserts that our report overlooks and ignores the old-age assistance program, the medical assistance phase of which has been in effect since 1950 and was modified in part by the Kerr-Mills Act of 1960.

Admittedly, the emphasis of the report was on the medical assistance-to-the-aged program, because the purpose of this study was to evaluate this new program. However, the report does explore the relationship between the two programs with particular emphasis on the shifting of persons from the old-age assistance program to the medical-assistance-to-the-aged program to take advantage of more generous Federal matching fund formulas.

But for the American Medical Association to blithely assert, as it does, that "the 2.2 million elderly who are entitled to old-age assistance medical care, do not need the medical-assistance-to-the aged program" is to ignore the facts. If this were the case, why have nearly 100,000 old-age-assistance recipients been transferred to the medical-assistance-to-the-aged program by the various States?

Third, the American Medical Association concedes that Kerr-Mills benefits vary widely from State to State, as pointed out in our report, but then insists that "this can hardly be called a defect. The States have differing needs and economies and they have other aid programs."

Carrying this American Medical Association argument to a conclusion, one could assume that the more than 20 States which have not implemented Kerr-Mills either have no need or their economies cannot afford the burden of matching funds. While the latter may well be true in some instances, to assume that the 7½ million elderly people in the States without Kerr-Mills medical assistance to the aging have no need for the program is absurd.

Fourth, the American Medical Association apologists concede the accuracy of our report's statistics on administrative costs, that they go as high as 59 percent and average 6.9 percent. But they insist that administrative costs are always high in a new program.

What they fail to point out, as stressed in our report, is that administrative costs for a social security financed program would amount to only 3 percent, or less than half the medical-assistance-to-the-aged average.

Fifth, the American Medical Association resorts to figure juggling in an attempt to justify the grossly disproportionate distribution of Kerr-Mills medical-assistance-to-the-aged funds. Conceding that the five States got 88 percent of medical-assistance-to-the-aged funds through 1962, the American Medical Association tricksters assert that these five urban States contain almost 60 percent of the aged in medical-assistance-to-the-aged States.

Now this is a typical example of American Medical Association deception and distortion, because the honest comparison here is not with the States that have adopted medical-assistance-to-the-aged programs but with the entire Nation. Under this equation, the five States receiving 88 percent of Kerr-Mills moneys, have only 32 percent of the Nation's older citizens.

On the sixth point—the frustration of congressional intent through the transfer of nearly 100,000 persons from old-age assistance to medical-assistance-to-the-aged programs—the American Medical Association editorial studiously ignores the fact that the intent of Congress in approving the Kerr-Mills law was to extend assistance to a new type of medically indigent persons. Instead, they attack the committee report for not recommending a change in the program.

The final and most outrageous assertion in the AMA News editorial is contained in these words:

> A basic conclusion of the (subcommittee) report, that low usage of medical assistance to the aged means inadequacy of medical assistance to the aged is a fallacy; low usage, by any reasonable interpretation, suggests that the vast majority of the elderly do not need aid or are receiving it through other programs.

Thus, the American Medical Association, in the final analysis—and in the face of overwhelming statistical evidence to the contrary from every conceivable reliable source—falls back upon the shopworn, discredited argument that further action on medical care for the elderly is not necessary.

To me, this confirms the judgment that the blind opposition of the American Medical Association "medicrats" to medical care for the elderly under social security has separated them from reality.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY POLICIES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate, an article appearing on page 50 of the New York Times by Murray Schumach. The article describes a documentary film on President Johnson, his background and policies, which is to be distributed around the world to acquaint the people of other nations with the new President of the United States. Let me quote from a part of this story:

> The film had to be cut to fit the time limit, and on one point the USIA exercised censorship.
>
> To indicate the harmonious relationship of different faiths in the United States, there was a shot of Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish clergymen. The rabbi was ordered deleted because of possible Arab objections.

Mr. President, this kind of censorship would be absolutely repugnant to the people of the United States. Kowtowing to Arab prejudice in an official public document to be circulated around the world would be an incredible act of appeasement. Designed to indicate the harmonious relationships of different faiths, it would instead be an advertisement to the world of religious prejudice and discrimination.

Mr. President, I have checked this matter with the U.S. Information Agency. I am informed that the story is not accurate. I am informed that there was consideration of opening the film on President Johnson with a sequence showing a priest, a minister, and a rabbi in their respective places of worship, but that for a number of reasons this opening was discarded and a wholly different approach used in which neither priest, minister, nor rabbi appear.

I am informed, however, that USIA has certain general policies with regard to scenes which they feel would offend the viewing audience in different countries. For instance, they give as an illustration the fact that care is taken never to show films of cattle slaughter in India, since such activities are contrary to the Hindu religion. Whether it is equally right to delete all pictures or references to rabbis or the Jewish religion on any films shown in the Arab world is an entirely different question which deserves most serious consideration and review to insure that a distorted and discriminatory picture of American life and customs is not projected abroad. I am asking for a full written report on this incident and on general USIA policies in this field.

Let me point out, however, that USIA does not censor articles, films, or newscasts to make them more palatable to other nations. In fact, I am informed that in the civil rights march on Washington stories, views were shown of Protestant ministers, Catholic priests, and Jewish rabbis marching together. All three religious groups were referred to by name in a broadcast that went to all the world, including Arab countries.

Mr. President, the entire world has read in the last few weeks of the unfortunate incident in Great Britain where Lord Mancroft resigned from the board of an insurance company in order not to offend Arab sensibilities or lose business for the firm. This action was rightly pilloried throughout Britain and the British Government has clearly indicated that it will support British firms to the hilt in their opposition to religious and racial discrimination of the type preached by the Arab League.

Mr. President, how much more important it is for the Government of the United States to lean over backward to present a fair and unbiased picture of U.S. life and not to take actions of any sort which could be interpreted as yielding to the pressure of discrimination overseas.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, have looked into the question which my distinguished colleague from New York has mentioned, dealing with the alleged censoring of a motion picture by USIA, in eliminating what was thought might antagonize Arab nations if it were shown in those nations.

I am pleased to learn that the USIA assures us that there is nothing to the story. I am glad there is not. I am very proud of the USIA. I hope very much it will be keenly sensitive to this question, as it has shown in the past that it has a capacity for discernment and respect for questions of this character as they affect our own institutions, which are so very clear upon that subject.

RELATIONS WITH ARAB STATES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the newspapers recently have raised the general question of our relationships with the Arab States.

Recently there appeared a front page article in the New York World-Telegram on the question of the effectiveness of the Arab boycott of firms which are allegedly doing business with Israel. Approximately 84 firms were mentioned. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Eighty-four American Firms Blacklisted by Arabs but Israel Is Not Hurt by Boycott

Eighty-four American enterprises, including some of the country's leading corporations have been boycotted by one or more Arab States for trading with Israel, a World-Telegram survey showed today.

But the boycotts are not doing the Arabs any good.

And two dozen world-famous entertainers—Harry Belafonte, Helen Hayes, Eartha Kitt, Frank Sinatra, and Elizabeth Taylor among them—also are on the blacklist.

The survey, to determine the extent of Arab boycott pressures on America, was prompted by England's Lord Mancroft affair.

FORCED TO RESIGN

Lord Mancroft, a Jew and former Minister Without Portfolio in Harold Macmillan's government, was forced to resign from the board of the $750 million Norwich Union Insurance Societies because of Arab pressure.

Norwich Union relented under sharp blasts from the British Government and public, and invited Lord Mancroft back to his position on the board. The 49-year-old peer, a World War II hero and director of enterprises which have wide business connections in Israel, refused to rejoin the board. Two other directors of the firm quit last week.

Among American companies officially boycotted by one or more of the Arab States are the Bulova Watch Co., Dow Chemical Co., Fairbanks Morse & Co., Firestone International, General Tire and Rubber Co., the cosmetics firms of Helena Rubinstein and Helene Curtis, International Business Machines, World Trade Corp., Kaiser Industries, Mack Truck Co., Pratt and Whitney Co., Revlon, Inc., and Studebaker-Packard Corp.

U.S. FIRMS REBEL

The World-Telegram survey further revealed:

American firms, in almost every instance, angrily refused to knuckle under to threats of loss of Arab business if they continued trading with Israel.

The boycott has turned out to be more bluff than reality. The Arab States' worldwide blacklisting operation has failed to weaken Israel's economy to any appreciable degree.

Many American and European companies which at first bowed to Arab demands have reversed their policies and have publicly announced they would disregard the boycott.

The economic effect on American industries, businesses and maritime and entertainment interests which held firm against boycott threats has been virtually nil. When Conrad Hilton, for example, received an Arab pitch against going ahead with plans for his Tel Aviv Hilton, he told the Boycott Office sharply to mind its own business—that Israel did not protest when he erected the Nile Hilton in Cairo.

Principal holdouts against the trend toward defying the boycott are major oil companies highly active in Arab lands and shipping interests whose operations to a large extent are with Arab countries.

That the boycott is more bluff than reality will be confirmed within a few weeks in an official documentation by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, which keeps close tabs on blacklisting of American companies by members of the Arab League.

ISRAEL UNAFFECTED

The ADL's Bulletin will state: "Despite threats, blacklists, propaganda and even subterfuge, it (the boycott) has failed to weaken Israel's economy."

Loopholes have developed in the operation, which is directed by a central Arab Boycott Office in Damascus, Syria. The office, a nongovernmental agency, is responsible to the Economic Council of the Arab League. Its aim is to undermine Israel's potential by ruining its economy. The boycotts generally take the form of barring the products of blacklisted companies and forbidding them to set up plants in Arab nations.

Several American firms said when interviewed that while they still are, or had been, boycotted by one or more of the Arab States, they have gone right on doing business with other Arab lands which apparently blink at the restrictions.

Breaches also have developed from within the boycott wall. Recent reports from Jerusalem indicated that Lebanon was growing cool to the boycott. Jerusalem said economic sources in Beirut contended the operation was hurting Lebanon and other Arab States more than it was damaging Israel.

RENAULT CHANGED PLAN

Renault Automobile Co. of France, which yielded in 1959 and bowed out of a plan to deliver parts for assembly in Haifa, has had second thoughts and decided to manufacture in Israel.

Der Spiegel, the German publication, reported several weeks ago that a United Arab Republic proposal to let Renault build a plant in Alexandria, Egypt, never came off. The concession went instead to the Italian Fiat concern.

In addition, Renault's bowing out of Israel apparently angered so many Americans that in 1960 the company sold 60,000 fewer cars here than in 1959, Der Spiegel said. The United States is Renault's biggest foreign market.

The boycott suffered another blow last Wednesday when Republic Steel Corp., third largest steel manufacturer in the United States, entered into partnership with the United Saran Plastic Corp., Ltd., an Israel company, to make metal products.

The American Express Co. which had suspended operations in Israel, has resumed work in the country, and Brown & Williamson, an American-British tobacco company, has resumed sales there.

The American Machine & Foundry Corp. of New York rejected an Arab demand that it decline to service the atomic reactor the company had helped Israel build. Yet AMF was removed from the Arab boycott list after being on it for 14 months.

Howard James, head of Scherr-Tumico, Minneapolis optical firm, sent a bristling reply to the boycott office's effort to dissuade him from setting up a plant in Israel.

Washington has taken an active role in many cases—including that of the AMF—in persuading companies not to give in to boycott threats.

The boycott even reached such a silly stage that firms whose wares bear the Star of David as a trademark—although many companies with no Jewish connections use such a trademark—were blacklisted.

The Jordan Government last spring lifted the ban on importing a specific brand of Swiss watches on the assurance that the makers would stop using the Star of David in their trademark.

ENTERTAINER BLACKLIST

As for famous Hollywood stars: The late Marilyn Monroe was blacklisted; Jordan banned all records of Belafonte; the Arab League shut out all Sinatra movies and records.

Other entertainers officially boycotted are Eddie Cantor, Sammy Davis, Jr., Eddie Fisher, Juliette Greco, Jascha Heifetz, Danny Kaye, Jerry Lewis, Yehudi Menuhin, Arthur Miller, Sal Mineo, Edward G. Robinson, Esther Williams, and Joanne Woodward.

Thirteen American vessels are boycotted. Five others have been removed from the blacklist.

List of U.S. Firms Boycotted by Arabs

Here is the list of American enterprises officially boycotted by one or more of the Arab States:

Adams Carbide Corp.
Air Electric Corp.
American Biltrite Rubber Co.
American Latex Products Co. (California).
American Levant Machinery Corp., Construction Aggregates, Chicago.
American Palestine Trading Corp.
William Bernstein Co.
Bulova Watch Co. and its parent, Bulova Foundation.
Cal. Amer., Inc.
Chemical Construction Corp.
Clinto Institute, Los Angeles.
Clinton Co., Los Angeles.
Continental Import & Export Corp.
Dawes Laboratories, Inc.
Dayton Rubber Co.
Dow Chemical Co.
Elco Corp.
Elliott Import Corp.
Eliot Knitwear Corp.
Emerson Radio & Phonograph Co.
Empire Brushes, Inc.
Fairbanks Morse & Co.
Fairbanks Whitney.
Firestone International.
General Shoe Corp.
General Tire & Rubber Co.
George Ehart Co.
Glazier Corp.
Garcia & Dias, Inc. (maritime firm).
Hassenfeld Bros. Pencils Co.
Helena Rubenstein, Inc.
Helene Curtis International.
Herman Hollander, Inc.
Home Insurance Co.
Hudson Pulp & Paper Co.
Imperial Chemical Co.
Import From Israel Co. (New York).
International Business Machines World Trade Corp.
International Latex Co.
Israel Coin Distributor Corp.
Israel Philatelic Agency in America, Inc.
Jacques Torczyner & Co.
Kaiser Industries (automobiles only).
Eli Lilly International Corp.
The Lock Joint Pipe Co.
M. Lowenstein & Son, Inc.
Mack Truck Co.
Herbert Marmoreck & Son Co.
Merck, Sharp & Dohme.
Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp.
Miles Laboratories.
Minkus Publications, Inc. (New York).
Mitenberg & Samton, Inc.
Moller Dee Textile Corp.
National Plastics Co.
P. E. C. Diamond Corp.
Philco.
Philipp Bros.
Pilot Radio Corp.
The Plough Sale Corp.
Pratt & Whitney Co. (Conn.).
Ragosin Industries & Beaunit Mills, Inc.
Revlon, Inc.
Re-Search Inc.
Rothley, Inc.
Schering Corp.
Shell Chemical Co.
Sinclair & Valentine, Inc.
Sol Manufacturing Co. (Jamaica, N.Y.).
Sonneborn Associates Petroleum Corp.
O. L. Sonneborn & Sons.
Fred Stern Co., New York City.
Studebaker-Packard Corp.
Tarco Pharmaceutical Co.
Tel-Aviv Importing Corp.
Topps Chewing Gum.
Union Bagcamp Paper Co.
United States Near East Laboratories.

United States Wall Board Machinery Co.
Vintage Wines, Inc.
Vulcan-Hart Corp.
Wasserstein Bros.
Willys-Overland Corp.
Winthrop Products, Inc.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Israel Holds Arab Boycott Has Failed in Object of Enlisting World's Aid," published in this morning's New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Israel Holds Arab Boycott Has Failed in Object of Enlisting World's Aid

(By W. Granger Blair, Jr.)

JERUSALEM (Israel sector), December 14.—The Arab League boycott of Israel as an overall strategy has been a failure, although it has had some tactical successes, in the opinion of Israel officials.

The object of the boycott, it is held here, has been to associate the international community as a whole with the Arab policy of diplomatic, political, and economic hostility to Israel.

That it has been a failure at the diplomatic and political level can be measured by the fact that Israel today has diplomatic relations with 86 countries, officials observe.

They remark that only a few non-Arab countries, such as India, West Germany, Indonesia, and Pakistan, have withheld the establishment of diplomatic relations with Israel out of consideration of Arab enmity with this country. Indonesia and Pakistan are predominantly Moslem.

On the economic front, in which the League's activities are most manifest, the hope of the Arab nations was to strangle Israel as a trading nation, Israelis say.

As Abba Eban, Deputy Premier and Acting Foreign Minister, observed, "Our exports have gone from $48 million in 1948 to more than $600 million this year."

A further indicator of the small overall impact of the boycott on Israel's growth is the rate of foreign investment. This increased from $35 million in 1960 to $52 million in 1961 and $85 million in 1962.

Nonetheless, as Mr. Eban observes, the boycott is significant as a symptom of political hostility. "It is politically and morally important to stop the boycott from succeeding in any individual case, because this can weaken our position politically," he said.

Boycott Run Haphazardly

LONDON, December 16.—Three out of every five British companies blacklisted for trading in the Arab world because of their connections in Israel had no dealings in the Arab world in the first place.

One director, blacklisted under a boycott report issued yesterday, died last February at the age of 86.

In appraising the impact of the Arab boycott of Israel on British companies, the capricious and haphazard qualities of the boycott stand out.

The damage to British companies is considered by most observers here to be slight.

What has aroused concern is the ease with which the Arabs are able to have certain demands met by British companies simply in threatening boycott action.

This was shown in the recent capitulation to Arab pressures by the Norwich Union Insurance Societies. Lord Mancroft, who sat on the big mutual company's London advisory board, was found objectionable because of his association with a known benefactor of Israel, Sir Isaac Wolfson.

The company, given the choice of Arab blacklisting or Lord Mancroft's resignation, chose to have him resign. Part of the settlement he got from the company is going toward the building of a new synagogue in Norwich.

Maurice Orbach, secretary of the Trades Advisory Council, which seeks to combat discrimination in business, said today that the embargo threat was "accepted here to an unwarranted degree."

One reason for this, he contended, is that companies are not getting sufficient guidance and help from the British Government. The council wants the Government to issue a directive against the boycott.

Yesterday, according to reports from Amman, 49 additional British companies were put on the Arab blacklist. Of these, 25 were associated with Charles Clore, a British financier whose sympathies for Israel are well known. Last year he donated $1 million to the Weizmann Institute of Science in Israel.

The Amman announcement brings to more than 100 the number of British companies on the blacklist. In addition, 33 officers and directors of the Clore group were personally blacklisted.

Before leaving for New York by air today, Mr. Clore termed the boycott "a whole lot of bloody nonsense." He said it would not make the "slightest difference to my attitude about doing business in Israel."

United States Helps Companies

The U.S. Government grants what amounts to de facto recognition of the Arab League boycott of American companies that do business with or in the State of Israel.

State Department officials said yesterday that the United States did not recognize the Arab boycott as valid under international law.

However, the officials acknowledged that the State Department had entered into negotiations with the Arab nations to assist American concerns that wish to be taken off the boycott list. These negotiations have been undertaken at the request of companies that assert they have no direct dealings with Israel, the officials explained.

One official said: "From a practical viewpoint, we can't prevent individual Arab countries from boycotting individual companies or products."

It is not known exactly how many U.S. concerns are on the Arab boycott list. An official of the Arab League here said the list was at the Boycott of Israel Committee's central office in Damascus, but could not be made available here.

A Jewish organization here has prepared a list of 59 American companies that are or have been on the Arab boycott list.

A spokesman for the organization said the list was constantly changing, as American concerns resisted Arab pressure or yielded.

Several companies on the list had no comment when asked if they were under the Arab boycott. The IBM World Trade Corp., whose name was included, said it had no knowledge of being on any boycott list.

Companies questioned yesterday told of many loopholes in the Arab boycott. One oil company official said that although shipments of Arab oil to Israel are strictly prohibited, Arab oil often reaches Israel through third-country brokers.

A spokesman for Trans World Airlines said his company scheduled regular flights to Tel Aviv and to Cairo, and that the airline was on good terms with the United Arab Republic and with Israel.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the article quotes British and United States sources in respect to the effort of the Arab states to boycott anybody who does business with Israel. It is a subject with which I have lived for a long time. It deeply affects our country and its policy. Not only have we been subjected to this kind of indignity through American firms which happen to have Jews either in their ownership or management; we are now subjected to it by firms that do business with Israel, a country with which we enjoy most friendly relations. We have experienced it in the effort of many Arab countries even to bar admission to Americans of Jewish faith who serve in our Armed Forces and are assigned to military bases. That is true in connection with the Dhahran Air Base.

It raises the whole question of what ought to be the U.S. posture with respect to the continuing determination of the Arab leadership—mainly given voice by President Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, that the state of war with Israel shall continue; that war shall be made in every way upon Israel, and in every part of the world.

The United States enjoys very friendly relations with Israel. It seems to me that we have now given President Johnson a clear mandate with respect to what ought to be the posture of the United States as it is contained in the foreign aid bill amendment which the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and Representative FARBSTEIN, of New York, brought up in the Senate and in the other body, and which was supported by my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], by myself, and by other Senators on the floor of the Senate. This provision is now a part of the law. In order to be certain that it would be a part of the law, we did not amend it in any way in the Senate, but actually copperriveted it into the bill by adopting the same language as the other body had adopted.

This amendment bars assistance to any country which is engaged in or is planning aggressive action against the United States or any other country aided under the Foreign Assistance Act. I am bold enough to say that this is a very important place from which to begin. It extends to matters which we have been discussing today and which have come to the fore. I believe it is high time that the United States began to make it clear that it will have no truck, in any way, shape, or form, by aid, by diplomatic friendship, or by tolerance, with any situation in which the fundamental rules of conduct of the civilized world are violated.

There are no actual hostilities between Israel and the Arab States. The state of armistice, to say the least, has continued over many years. There have been problems, but there is no war. The Arab activity represents an effort to continue a situation which, de facto, does not exist. It is very disturbing to the world. It crosses over normal trade and other patterns. It is time that we stopped temporizing and that the United States, at least, as the leader of the free world, should say it will not countenance any of these activities by its own aids.

I hope that the President will take seriously and literally the mandate which Congress has placed in the foreign aid bill, and will not extend aid to President Nasser and the United Arab Republic, or to any other Arab States which continue to carry on this vendetta against Israel, especially as it extends into commercial channels and the supplying of goods and services, and continues boycotts which have no standing whatever in international law, and are nothing but a harassing effort.

We participate in some way, both by aid, which I have already referred to, against which we turned our face in the foreign aid bill, and through the use of our diplomatic establishment. For example, the New York Times article states:

> The U.S. Government grants what amounts to de facto recognition of the Arab League boycott of American companies that do business with or in the state of Israel.
>
> State Department officials said yesterday that the United States did not recognize the Arab boycott as valid under international law.
>
> However, the officials acknowledged that the State Department had entered into negotiations with the Arab nations to assist American concerns that wish to be taken off the boycott list.

The article continues in that vein. It is high time that American policy be made very clear upon that score. Let it be understood that the United States will not give any aid to any of the policies of boycott or aggression, directly or indirectly. Let it be understood that we will not be a party to such conduct, and that we will not lend the machinery of the State Department for the purpose of its continuation. We will let the Arab States stand or fall upon the basis of their ability to maintain themselves. We know very well from our experience that the boycott will not last very long or mean very much if allowed to rest upon that base.

The United States is the most powerful nation in the free world. We are the leaders of the free world. We have temporized long enough with this embarrassing situation, caused by nations which persist in living in the Middle Ages, in terms of carrying on a vendetta with the long established world nations. It is time it came to an end.

We cannot coerce or direct any Arab State to bring these vexatious, extralegal practices to an end; but we do not have to help them. We do not have to help them by aid. We do not have to help them by diplomatic activity. It is to that subject that I address my plea today. Let our new President say, "Congress has given me its clear view, not only this time, but before, that we must unite and fulfill our obligation."

Let us, therefore, halt any aid, direct or indirect, of policies which are both extra-legal, vexatious, and vindictive, in a way which is so contrary to the policy of our Nation and the Charter of the United Nations. It can be done. It has not been done. Amendment after amendment has been offered in this field. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] together sponsored an amendment. It did no real good. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I together sponsored an amendment. It did no real good. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and Representative FARBSTEIN sponsored an amendment, in which other Senators and I joined, and it is now the law.

It is high time that some good was done. The issue is clear. The way the situation has been handled has not been good. Nasser has sent his troops into the Yemen and is maintaining hostilities there in violation of his pledge to the United States to withdraw his troops. That was his thanks to us for bailing him out of his trouble with the Suez Canal, when we provided hundreds of thousands of dollars of aid. That was the thanks Nasser gave us for all of our assistance to him.

Let us try another policy, a policy of not countenancing this situation any further. We cannot direct it; we cannot coerce its end; but we can assist by not giving aid or comfort.

I hope very much that the old lesson is the lesson we shall draw from a continuation of the pressure that is put upon us and that will continue for a long time. It has been impossible to get the corporations of the Arab States in the resettlement of Palestine refugees. I say this unilaterally, but I am convinced that in the context of a peace settlement Israel will take back a fair number and will make compensation for their property, where it is disturbed, for those who remain or go to other places. But all this must be included in the ethics of the overall peace settlement.

All these matters have a connection. It is high time for the United States to take a much stronger attitude in the Middle East than it has ever taken before, and decide that it will no longer countenance a temporizing with this situation in any way. The situation has not become better; it has grown worse. There must be an effort to make it better. It is high time for the United States to adopt a policy consistent with the constantly reiterated congressional mandate, a point of view reiterated in the foreign aid bill, which I hope, at long last, the President and the administration will take seriously to heart and act upon it as Congress intended it should.

CLOSING OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have not spoken previously on the floor of the Senate with respect to the administration's plans to close or curtail the operations of 26 military installations in 14 States. The heaviest impact of these closings will fall upon the State of New York, because seven such installations are located in our State.

One must be careful about how he approaches an action of this kind, which is invoked in the name of economy. The President has said he needs this economy in order to hold the budget to the $100 billion level. However, we have not yet learned whether he will or will not.

There are two basic principles that I believe we must observe. The first one is that there cannot be any naked opposition to the curtailment of inefficiency or obsolete military installations which do not contribute to our national defense posture. I state that as a fundamental proposition.

I do not believe any Member of Congress would wish to be in that position, because otherwise our entire Military Establishment would be inflexible and never would be subject to change or to economy, and I believe all Senators agree that this sector of Federal expenditures can stand economy.

On the other hand, we clearly have a right to ask whether or not it is true that a particular installation contributes to our national defense posture. In short, there is nothing infallible about the Department of Defense. I am sure it proceeds in good faith, and tries to use its best judgment; but it is not infallible.

Second—and equally important—we have a right to question whether any overall effective economies will really be obtained. My colleague [Mr. KEATING] has argued this point most eloquently—namely, that the Department of Defense must not consider solely its own possible savings, because that does not represent the total economy to the Government. Instead, the Department must determine whether, on total balance, taking into account all the activities of the Government, the proposed closings or moves will or will not result in economy. In short, when the Department of Defense closes an installation, it closes it in behalf of the entire Government of the United States, not merely on behalf of the Department of Defense. Therefore, the right hand must know what the left hand is doing. Otherwise economies will be illusory.

In the State of New York, there is considerable controversy about Griffiss Air Force Base in Rome, where it is proposed to eliminate and transfer to other places the functions of the Rome Air Materiel Area. It is also proposed to transfer certain important activities from the Schenectady Army Depot to other places.

In the case of the Schenectady proposal, it is our deep conviction—and we intend to continue to argue it with all the strength we possess—that no meaningful overall economy will result, but that, on the contrary, a loss will result.

We believe the same is true in regard to the Griffiss Airbase proposal, as regards the contemplated transfer of the activities of the Rome Air Materiel Area installation there. We believe a very strong case is to be made in opposition to the proposed closing and transfer of the activities at the Griffiss Air Force Base. We believe the proposed transfer would not be in the interest of our national defense system, but, on the contrary, would be opposed to it.

This is a very serious matter. I have personal information about that base.

I have been there a number of times, and have been briefed time and again as to the acitivities there, and have been able to see at firsthand the contributions this installation makes to the support of the Air Force ground-based communications and electronics systems throughout the world. I have been advised that the Air Materiel Area establishment at Rome procures, stores, and transports virtually all the component parts of 22 ground-based communications and electronics systems now used by the Air Force, including the major defense lines, BMEWS, DEW line, and SAGE as they affect the protection and security of the United States, and that a material disruption of the logistical support for these systems inevitably would result from the dispersal of these functions to other areas in the United States.

Mr. President, inasmuch as we feel very deeply about this matter, I hope the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee will feel that this is a subject which it should examine, for this is one of the major grounds on which we have a right to question the findings and determination by the Department of Defense.

I also wish to express my support of the proposed legislation—which was introduced a few days ago—to require a study to be made by the Area Redevelopment Administration of the impact of such action by the Department of Defense, before the actual closing of any of these bases. This is on the basis of the question of the overall economy involved, as well as whether their closing will contribute to or prejudice our national defense posture.

Mr. President, I have made these remarks because I think it very important that our position be clearly understood publicly. This is not a matter of attempting to prevent an economy, for it is our duty to promote economy. This is not a matter of keeping open inefficient or obsolete defense establishments, for it is our duty to aid the Defense Department in closing them.

But when we encounter a direct challenge which relates to the basic and fundamental grounds for these decisions, which may or may not be justified, and when we believe that the Department of Defense is wrong, it is also our duty to challenge the decisions. That does not mean parochialism or an attempt to keep open an establishment which should be closed. If the closing of such an establishment is the only way in which the paramount national objective can be sustained consistent with our national defense posture, we should not question the decision. But certainly we have a right to question it on proper grounds. We have a right to know the full justification for the Department of Defense's proposed actions.

I feel that by being a party to that questioning, I am doing my duty in regard to the Defense Establishment of the Nation. I say here and now that if the evidence reasonably demonstrates that these installations are actually inefficient or obsolete and do not contribute to our national defense posture and if it is found that the closing of these establishments or their transfer will represent, in the overall view, more of an economy than an expenditure to the Federal Government, then I shall have to—like every other Senator who is doing his duty—concur in the decision of the Department of Defense. However, the record and the facts do not demonstrate that that is the case. So I think this proposal is open to serious challenge. We have not even received the very basic figures in regard to the alleged saving involved; and one would certainly think the Department of Defense would have ascertained them, and revealed them first.

Therefore, Mr. President, both because of the cost factor and because of the national defense factor, I believe it is our duty to determine that the Defense Department must be required to present its proof. In view of the fact that the interests of the Nation's security and its taxpayers are seriously affected by the activities of the Department of Defense, nationally and with respect to the State of New York, I feel that the matter of requiring the Defense Department to submit its proof is a duty equal to any other duty of a Senator, in connection with this situation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PROPOSED CLOSING OF GOVERNMENTAL NAVAL SHIPYARDS—PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, this morning an attack was made by the junior Senator from New Hampshire on my personal integrity. I shall not dignify the low level of his attack with a reply. As for the reliability and authoritative character of my source of information concerning the closings of government naval shipyards in the future, I am quite willing to identify that source to the Secretary of Defense—should he so request—and let him judge for himself as to the reliability and authority of that source and whether he wishes to disclose publicly the identity of my source.

It is common courtesy and long-established senatorial practice for a Senator to notify another Senator in advance of such personal attack. It is interesting that the junior Senator from New Hampshire did not do so.

He is entitled to his personal opinion about me. I am gratified that there are those who do not share his opinion. An example is an editorial, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Nation, Apr. 15, 1961, vol. 192, No. 15, pp. 314 and 315]

The Lady From Maine

Many a citizen in many a State must wish he were a resident of Maine, so that he could be represented in the Senate of the United States by Margaret Chase Smith. Many a Democrat would be glad to vote for Mrs. Smith, a Republican, and no doubt many a Maine Democrat does so. Her reputation among her colleagues is high, and with good reason. When a majority of Senators cowered before Joe McCarthy, she was one of the group that spoke out against him. She has never lacked either good sense or courage. But now she has done something that is nearly unprecedented in either branch of the Congress. On March 30, the Department of the Air Force notified Senator Smith that it had decided to close the Snark missile base at Presque Isle, Maine. This would normally have been the signal for the aggrieved Legislator to rise in the Chamber, rend his garments, throw ashes on his hair and demand that the order be rescinded so that the survival of the United States would not be jeopardized and, survival aside, his faithful constituents would not be deprived of their livelihood. In this case, Mrs. Smith rose indeed, but what she said was, "The far easier course for me to pursue politically would be to demand that the now outmoded Snark program be continued, so that the Presque Isle Airbase (could) be kept operating, to aid the economy of the area. * * * But in all good conscience I cannot do this, for this would simply be playing politics with our national security, our national defense, and our taxpayer's dollar. It would be submitting to the economic philosophy that our National Defense Establishment and our national security program must be operated primarily for the local economy." Senators Mansfield, Morse, and Kuchel were moved to commend Senator Smith from the floor. Now it remains only for more Senators and Representatives to follow Mrs. Smith's example.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 18, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 17, 1963:

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Edwin M. Martin.

In the Navy

Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of vice admiral under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 17, 1963:

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

The nominations beginning Robert J. Francis, of Tennessee, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, consul general, and secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, and ending Charles B. Sebastian, of the District of Columbia, Foreign Service Staff officer, to be a consul of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 10, 1963.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Postal Pay Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, October 31, 1963, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, upon which I have the honor to serve, formally approved H.R. 8986, an omnibus pay raise proposal to include Federal, postal, executive, and judiciary personnel as well as Members of Congress. The measure, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, JAMES H. MORRISON, was approved by a majority vote following 3 long months of extensive hearings on every phase of this significant issue.

Witnesses from Federal agencies including the Bureau of the Budget, Civil Service Commission, Post Office Department and others, together with representatives of most employee organizations and various other witnesses representing public and private organizations, submitted testimony on the salary bills that were under consideration at that time.

During committee deliberations on October 31, 1963, I introduced an amendment to the Morrison bill, H.R. 8986, to carry out the provisions of related legislation that had been proposed through H.R. 4800, also by the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman MORRISON, H.R. 5119 by the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman JOSEPH KARTH, and H.R. 8205 that I had introduced earlier.

The purpose of these bills cited above was to provide restoration of the anniversary dates for related pay increases that had been established for postal employees under prior legislation. There was no intent to grant unearned salary increments to personnel involved nor was there any design to legislate unreasonable emoluments to any segment of the postal family. Rather it was my intent, as shared by those of my colleagues that had introduced comparable legislation, to provide full and justified credit for time that had actually been served, work that had been performed, by postal personnel under the previous postal field service salary act embodied in Public Law 68.

Since adoption of my amendment by the House committee, several efforts have been made by various individuals and groups to completely misrepresent the nature and purpose of this legislation. In one instance, a spokesman for the Post Office Department stated that it would require a staggering outlay of funds to evaluate the amount that would be due each employee eligible for such benefit. Recently, the Washington Daily News has come forward in an article by one of its columnists to the effect that the proposal constitutes a huge salary windfall to some personnel while denying such consideration to others. This latest comment also includes what I consider to be a highly erroneous price tag on the amendment amounting to more than $48 million.

In my opinion those postal employees who actually performed service under Public Law 68 in such a way as to earn advanced salary levels should receive full credit for such service. I contend that the cost would be far, far below the $48 million indirectly attributed to this proposal by the Department. Furthermore, I know that the amount of time and effort required to properly recognize these deserving employees would be negligible. In addition all employees would not gain such credits at the same time thereby enabling the Department to amortize the cost over a period of 1 to 6 years.

To illustrate the discrepancy that has now developed, through the Post Office Department's implementation of the last pay bill, Public Law 87-793, I am presenting the following explanation to clarify the inequities described hereinabove.

In the Postal Pay Reform Act of 1962, we established 20 salary levels to cover all variety of positions. The first 6 levels contained 12 steps to cover years of service and the higher levels were assigned a correspondingly lesser number of steps since they are figured at higher rates to compensate for supervisorial and administrative duties.

In the implementation of the act, a cutoff date of October 13, 1962, was established that deprived many postal workers of full and proper credits for their prior service. For example, employees in the first four levels, who had not progressed beyond step 5, were able to retain their anniversary dates for step increases. In many instances such employees received an additional step increase within weeks or months after the act of 1962 was approved. On the other hand, employees in the first four levels in step 6 or above, and employees who had already earned longevity step increases under the former law, Public Law 68, did not retain their anniversary dates and were compelled to start new periods toward their next step increases.

The following specific examples will clarify the detrimental effects on some employees with many years of service:

1. A level 4 employee who entered the postal service on October 1, 1956, was placed in step 8 on October 13, 1962, at an annual wage of $5,685. An employee in the same level who entered the postal service 2 weeks later on October 15, 1956, was placed in step 7 and received an annual wage of $5,525. The latter employee will be required to serve 3 years in step 7 before going to step 8, thus earning $160 per annum less than the first employee. For the next five step increases over a period of 15 years the employee who entered the service 2 weeks later will be out-of-pocket at least $2,400.

2. An employee who entered the postal service October 1, 1950, was placed in step 9 at $5,845 per annum. An employee who entered October 15, 1950, 2 weeks later, was placed in step 8 at $5,685.

3. An employee who entered the postal service October 1, 1945, was placed in step 10 at $6,005 per annum. An employee who entered 2 weeks later on October 15, 1945, was placed in step 9 at $5,845 per annum, the identical salary of the employee who entered almost 5 years later on October 1, 1950.

4. An employee who entered the postal service on October 1, 1938, was placed in step 11 at a salary of $6,165 per annum. An employee who entered 2 weeks later on October 15, 1938, was placed in step 10 at a salary of $6,005 per annum, the identical salary of an employee who entered the service 7 years later.

In conclusion, I respectfully submit that hard-working and conscientious postal personnel are entitled to justice and equality, particularly in those instances where salary credits and pay boosts have been enacted into law and offered as payment for work performed. I request the retention of my amendment and its approval with the balance of the committee's recommendation contained in H.R. 8986.

Berks County Historical Society Honors Gen. Carl Spaatz—Honors President John F. Kennedy in Memorial Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday evening, December 15, the Berks County Historical Society honored Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, who was commander of the U.S. Air Force during World War II.

I had the honor of introducing General Spaatz, who is a native of Boyertown, Pa., in the Sixth District of Pennsylvania, which I represent. A renowned Berks County historian and world traveler, J. Bennett Nolan, presided at this meeting in the society building in Reading. It was attended by many prominent citizens and members of the historical society.

The meeting adopted a resolution in memory of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Mr. Speaker, with permission of the House, I include the resolution with my remarks:

RESOLUTION IN MEMORY OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, ADOPTED BY THE BERKS COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY, READING, PA., DECEMBER 15, 1963.

Whereas the members of our Historical Society of Berks County in common with the citizenry of this Nation and of all nations have recently suffered an incomparable and most unexpected shock in the insensate and brutal assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, late President of the United States; and

Whereas President Kennedy has a particular hold on the fealty and interest of our society in that he was himself a zealous and learned student of our American history and the author of books and brochures upon historical subjects:

Therefore, we, the members of this society, do hereby attest to a memory which looms across the whole spectrum of American life, economic and social, bequeathing to us a program, a practical dream whose fulfillment will be his lasting memory.

We direct that a minute of this resolution attesting our sense of loss of Mr. Kennedy's death be forwarded to the Secretary of State of the United States and be made a perpetual minute in the archives of our society.

The society also paid tribute with appropriate resolutions honoring Col. Frederick A. Muhlenberg and General Spaatz. General Spaatz had an illustrious career as one of cur country's outstanding war heroes.

Colonel Muhlenberg represented Berks County in the 80th Congress. He is a direct descendant of the first Speaker of the House of Representatives, Frederick A C. Muhlenberg. He is one of the five direct descendants of the first Speaker to serve in the Congress. Colonel Muhlenberg addressed the meeting, citing reminiscences of World War I.

For his distinguished service, General Spaatz has received many citations and awards. He graduated from West Point in 1914.

In 1917 he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross as commander of a pursuit squadron. In 1925 he became Chief of the Air Service. He was Chief of the Air Staff in 1941; Chief, Air Force Command, 1942; and adviser to Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in north Africa. In January 1944 he led U.S. Air Forces in Europe; and against Japan in July, 1945. In 1946 he was commanding general of the Army Air Forces.

Among his many awards are the D.S.M. with 8 oak leaf clusters; D.S.C. Legion of Merit; D.F.C. Bronze Star, Mexican Service, World Wars I and II; Victory; European-African-Middle East; Asiatic-Pacific campaigns; American Defense and American Campaign Medals; Grand Officer Legion of Honor; Croix de Guerre and others.

As a native of Berks County, he has a Pennsylvania Dutch background. With his wife Ruth he now resides in Chevy Chase, Md.

Retired U.S. Employees' Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on December 4, recognizing the heavy burdens President Johnson now carries, retired Post Office Clerk Frank A. Winslow offered the following resolution at a meeting of chapter No. 21, National Association of Retired Civil Employees:

Regardless of beliefs and regardless of our affiliations, I move this chapter No. 21, National Association of Retired Civil Employees go on record that we offer a silent prayer that whosoever has taken the helm now, or in later years, for the future of our country, that it be successfully charted for the everlasting existence of a nation whose only hope and belief is for a world of peace.

The resolution was adopted unanimously and spread upon the record of that chapter's deliberations. Should anywhere in the world there be doubt of the strength and continuity of the United States of America, actions such as this by its citizens on their own initiative should dispel it.

Flaxseed and Farm Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague from South Dakota, the Honorable George McGovern, one of the most knowledgeable men in agriculture in Congress, gave an address in Fargo, N. Dak., last November 15. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent commentary, before the Flax Institute of the United States be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FLAXSEED AND FARM POLICIES

(Address by the Honorable George McGovern, U.S. Senator from South Dakota)

It is indeed a pleasure to attend your 33d Annual Flax Institute. It is always good to be in the Dakotas at this time of the year—right after a bountiful harvest.

It is gratifying to see farmers, government, and industry meet together to encourage better agronomic practices and production of flaxseed—a crop which in my opinion offers promise of an expanding market for our farmers.

I am especially gratified to have this opportunity to speak to you because I have been told that while industry and government would be well represented, this audience would be mostly farmers who produce flaxseed. It is obvious that the welfare of this great industry is dependent upon adequate domestic farm production and availability of flaxseed. We need proper government legislation and policies to assure this adequate production and availability.

Since statistics and technical subjects are covered in other presentations, my comments today are addressed primarily to the general items of legislation and policy. My comments are based both upon experience as a legislator and as Food for Peace Director.

First, however, I would like in a truly bipartisan manner to second some remarks made by my senior colleague, Senator Mundt, at another Flax Institute held here in Fargo a few years back. We invite you to meet in South Dakota. We hope our flaxseed production will expand and that you will see fit to meet in one of our fine cities. You will be welcome, I assure you.

Now on a more partisan basis—you all must be well aware that our present administration has twice increased the price support for flaxseed. Among other reasons this was done to encourage and insofar as possible assure production adequate to meet domestic needs for linseed oil and for linseed meal.

These increased support prices were recommended by the Flax Institute in resolutions adopted in 1959. Those of you who produce flaxseed should know that flaxseed processors also recommended the increases made so far. In fact the processors recommended a higher support price for the 1961 crop than the price finally announced by USDA.

I can tell you, too, that the higher price support and other actions to assure adequate supplies of flaxseed and products have had full congressional support from both parties.

Coupled with higher supports, the present administration in the Department of Agriculture revised its flaxseed policy to hold any stocks acquired under the loan program until it is evident that production from the new crop is adequate. This is a continuing policy and has been so confirmed to users of linseed oil. These steps have been effective—flaxseed production has been adequate and the long downward trend in linseed oil consumption has now been arrested. In fact it has turned up and we confidently expect the increase to continue.

While farm program policy to assure linseed oil consumers of a continuing domestic supply has been an important factor, other things have contributed to this desirable development. Research programs by Government and industry have developed some new uses for linseed oil. These research programs are expected to develop other new uses. Two major items so far are the use of linseed oil to protect concrete from winter damage and water-thinned linseed oil house paints.

Flaxseed processors, through the National Flaxseed Processors Association, have spent many thousands of dollars promoting the use of linseed antispalling compound for concrete protection. The association has a large-scale national advertising campaign underway to begin next spring to promote the use of linseed oil house paint.

As you know, such promotion efforts benefit both processors and farmers. It is good to note that research and promotion not only continue, but are expanding. The flaxseed industry is to be complimented on fighting back with hope against the synthetic nonfarm products which have taken over so much of the linseed oil market since World War II. Producers might well consider contributing to the research and promotional programs which obviously benefit both farmers and industry.

In assuring supplies of flaxseed by holding inventories until the new crop is available, CCC has this year come in for some criticism for selling its stock for export while the new crop is being marketed. To those offering such criticism I would suggest only that they note that world market prices have been below the domestic price and that they carefully weigh the alternatives. If CCC sells flax ahead of the new crop, the market impact is about the same and if a shortage results it may seriously jeopardize the continued expansion of this farm market. Shortages in the past are the reason consumers sought for and found nonfarm substitutes for linseed oil. If CCC waits until after harvest and marketing is completed, the additional storage charges add to the cost of our farm programs. There are disadvantages either way.

To CCC I would suggest exploring whether a substantial portion of any flaxseed acquisitions can be marketed through some arrangement which would permit processors to export the surplus in the form of oil around the year. This would make more needed linseed meal available to our farmer feeders here in the Northwest and use normal trade channels.

Now for some general comments on the farm situation.

In thinking about our modern miracle called agriculture, I believe it essential to point out that all Americans—all the world—should extend more recognition to the contributions of U.S. agriculture. Our outstanding farm production record is a reflection of agriculture's continuance as a dominant force in or economic development. In the past 10 years the average annual increase in output per man-hour on farms was three times the rate of increase in nonfarm activities. One American farmer now produces enough food for 27 people, whereas only 20 years ago he produced only enough for 11.

This productivity has meant much to the economy of the United States. The American consumer has been provided with more and better food at lower cost than others have ever enjoyed. It has given us an opportunity to export tremendous quantities of food and fiber both for dollars and under the food-for-peace program.

At the same time production has been increasing, employment in the agricultural labor force has declined rather sharply, and this has meant that sufficient workers to account for one-fourth of the growth in civilian nonagricultural employment have been released farmworkers. Not only did farm output increase by one-third in the 1947–61 period, but meat, animal and other livestock products went up by about the same amount. There has been a dramatic increase in the per capita consumption of meat of about 17 percent, or 30 pounds. Meanwhile, per capita production and consumption of frozen fruits and vegetables have multiplied by three during the last 15 years.

In the midst of this tremendous improvement in the quantity and quality of U.S. food consumption, we have been witness to a sharp increase in export of food and fiber.

While diets were being upgraded, expenditures for food and fiber have dropped from 27 percent of consumers' disposable income in 1947 to only 19 percent in 1963. This percentage is the lowest cn record and the lowest in the world relative to the earnings of consumers. Thus, we must agree that by any standards, the American farmer has done his job well, not only for the American economy, but also for the entire world.

I think that we do not take the time often enough to count the blessings which have accrued to this Nation from the outstanding production record of the best farmers in the world—the 8 percent of our population who make this abundance possible.

During the period when I was fortunate enough to serve as the Director of Food for Peace, I was most impressed by the single basic fact that it was our farmers' productive ability that made the entire U.S. foreign assistance effort possible in the food field. Let me cite a few basic facts to convey to you the magnitude of the work which made possible the food-for-peace program.

Witness the following:

1. In the 9 years that the food-for-peace program has been in existence, we have been able to ship overseas a grand total of almost $13 billion worth of food. During that same period dollar sales amounted to $26 billion.

2. Our food donations are providing supplemental feeding for 100 million undernourished people. Three-fourths of all the commodities are now programed for children through organized school lunch efforts, through other nutritional feeding, and through family feeding plans in which the parents may participate by exchanging work for food.

3. One of the food-for-peace programs which has given me the greatest pleasure has been the fact that school lunch programs have now been extended to 40 million children in 91 countries. This program is growing every day. This food-for-peace school lunch in many areas of the world is the only square meal that the child gets all day. It may amaze you to know that many children have been encouraged to go to school just to get that one meal. Educators in the affected areas have told me that the learning capacity of many, many children has been increased tremendously.

4. We initiated a program under which we used food for wages. We used the food to pay for the building of roads and schools, the establishment of irrigation systems, the construction of homes and public buildings, and the settlement of new areas. Here we have a program under which the workers get food that is needed to feed their families at the same time that they work to better their communities.

5. American foods are being used to provide a stabilizing catalyst in many new emerging nations which are attempting to grow within a democratic format. Food prevents riots and violent revolution.

6. As economic conditions permit, food-for-peace nations graduate to dollar markets. Witness Japan which has become the largest single purchaser of American farm products, and which not many years ago was a beneficiary of the food-for-peace program. Spain has become a $70 million a year cash market for U.S. farm products. Market development funds generated under Public Law 480 were used to build this demand.

I believe that fundamentally when the history of the 20th century is written that the development and the expansion of the food-for-peace program will be looked upon as one of the most constructive steps ever undertaken by any nation. At the same time we must recognize that in the absence of our farmers' abundant productivity this could not have been possible.

Wheat has played the largest commodity role in the food-for-peace program. I think it is especially dramatic that since July 1, 1954, exports under Public Law 480 have been made amounting to almost 3 billion bushels of wheat. This represents 63 percent of our total wheat exports during this period. It would be well to stop for a moment and think about the internal explosion which would have occurred in U.S. agriculture if these markets had not been made available. Certainly, we must all agree with President Kennedy when in addressing the 1963 World Food Congress he stated, "We are grateful for the opportunity our agricultural abundance offers us to share our food resources."

Recently, the President announced what I consider a wise decision—the agreement to sell wheat and flour and other commodities to the Soviet Union. While this decision was bound to stir some controversy, I am sure that it was right.

We had a situation under which every other exporting nation was selling wheat to the Soviets. We had a situation under which several friendly Western European nations were importing wheat from us and selling flour to the Soviets. We had a situation where the Russians were willing to buy the wheat and flour at world prices for gold or dollars. We had a situation where we were already selling them small amounts of food at world prices. We had a situation—and still have it—where we were paying 26 cents per bushel per annum in storage, handling, and interest charges to store the surplus. We had a situation where such increased demand generated by the Russian purchase would add hundreds of millions of dollars to the plus side of our balance of payments. We had a situation under which we could take advantage of an opportunity to improve farm prices and income. We had a situation under which we could show the Russian people the miracle of U.S. agriculture, and use it as a force for peace. We had a situation in which we had a moral obligation to feed those in need. We had a situation in which we could advance the cause of peace by sharing our abundance of a noncritical commodity.

There is an argument presented, and it is made conscientiously, that we are subsidizing the Soviets because they can buy at the world price. Those of us who understand farm programs realize quickly that the subsidy is to the U.S. farmer, not the exporter (as a national magazine incorrectly stated recently) nor the importing nation. Such subsidized sales are made to other nations every working day.

The Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc nations may be buyers of grain and other commodities in the future. Their agriculture has not achieved anything approaching the efficiency of ours. In good years, they have barely enough. In bad years, they will need to import, probably for a number of years.

As you know, farmers voted in May in a wheat referendum affecting the 1964 crop. Although the Dakotas voted favorably by almost 2 to 1, the wheat certificate program failed to carry. In July, I introduced a voluntary wheat certificate plan for 1964.

Fundamentally, I feel that our wheat growers deserve better of the Congress than inaction. I think that farmers really did not vote to have no program at all, but for a different program.

From my mail and other indicators, I believe farmers support the voluntary certificate plan. I also find support for permitting use of diverted acres for the production of flaxseed and other needed oilseeds. Payments would be reduced on such authorized usage with savings to the U.S. Treasury. I prefer a constructive use of the land. To the extent that diverted acres can be used for needed flaxseed or other oil crops, or as pasture, without creating surplus, or lower price problems, I think it should be allowed.

I am not wed to a certificate program. I will support a better program if one is offered. But I am sure farmers want—and Congress should enact—a constructive wheat program before the price of wheat is allowed to drop from a level based on its food value to a level based on its value as feed.

Even though wheat exports this year will set a new record, the U.S. stocks will remain large. And, our surplus productive capacity is even larger.

Flaxseed offers an opportunity to utilize some of this surplus productive capacity for a crop which has an expanding market for domestic use. Surplus flax, as history demonstrates, can be moved into export channels with nominal losses, if any. I want to assure you all that I shall do everything within my power to see that future legislation and policies encourage domestic production of flaxseed and utilization of linseed oil and meal to meet these expanding requirements.

Congress Must Redouble Its Efforts To Solve the National Capital's Transportation Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last week the House decisively buried the White House's rapid transit proposal for the District of Columbia. But we could not bury the National Capital's traffic problem, which will get worse before it gets better.

Only yesterday Washington had its first snow of the year. As usual, the result was to disrupt the city. Snow also fell in Chicago yesterday, but Chicago's rapid transit system continued to function; people got to and from work safely and swiftly.

Congress 3 years ago in the National Transportation Act recognized that it was the responsibility of the Federal Government to see that a rapid transit system was constructed here.

Congress needs to redouble its efforts to solve the National Capital's transportation problem. It is not a question of either good highways or a rapid transit system. Both are essential.

A question asked by many Congressmen in the debate on the Washington rapid transit bill last week was: Why vote rapid transit help to the District of Columbia when the nationwide mass transportation bill, which has already passed the Senate, now continues to await action by the House Rules Committee? The question is a good one. The answer is for Congress to get busy and enact transit legislation applicable to the 50 States and to the District of Columbia as well.

Remarks of the President of the United States Upon the Signing of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the remarks of the President of the United States on December 16, 1963, at the time of the signing of the Higher Education Facilities Act. The President pointed out the paramount importance of this far-reaching measure and gave due recognition to the great work which our colleagues who managed this bill put into it. The President's statement follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING H.R. 6143, THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963, IN THE CABINET ROOM

I am proud and happy to approve at this time the Morse-Green bill, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and to especially compliment Chairman POWELL, Congresswoman GREEN, and their colleagues in the House, Senator MORSE and his colleagues in the Senate, and everyone else who worked so hard for the passage of this very important legislation.

A great former President of the Republic of my State said "The educated man is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that free men recognize and the only ruler that freemen desire." So this new law is the most significant education bill passed by the Congress in the history of the Republic. In fact, this session of the Congress will go down in history as the education Congress of 1963, and every person here this morning who has been invited to come to the White House at the request of the President can be very proud, and their children can be very proud, of the part they played in the enactment of this legislation.

Working together, the Congress and the executive branch have made possible the enactment of a series of legislative landmarks in the field of education. Under these various measures:

1. We will help to provide college classrooms for several hundred thousand more students who will nearly double college enrollment in this decade.

2. We will help to build 25 to 30 new public community colleges every year.

3. We will help to construct the technical institutes that are needed to close the gap in this crucial area of trained manpower.

4. We will help to build graduate schools and facilities in at least 10 to 20 major academic centers.

5. We will help to improve the quality of library facilities in our own universities and colleges.

6. We will increase the number of medical school graduates and we will relieve the growing shortages of physicians and dentists and other needed professional health personnel.

7. We will enable some 70,000 to 90,000 additional students to attend college each year under an expanded loan program.

8. We will modernize and expand our Federal-State programs for vocational education in order to train for the changing world of work the 8 out of 10 young people who will never obtain a college education.

9. We will reduce the shortage of qualified personnel for the training and teaching of mentally retarded and other handicapped children.

10. We will expand our manpower development and training program to meet the growing problem of untrained, unemployed school dropouts.

11. We will expand programs for teaching science and mathematics and foreign languages, while extending the other valuable provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

12. We will continue the program of Federal financial assistance for the construction and the maintenance and the operation of schools that are crowded by the presence of children of Federal personnel.

13. And finally, we will, under legislation to be passed shortly, provide public libraries for the residents of cities and counties all over this great country who now have only antiquated library facilities and some have no libraries at all.

This legislation is dramatic, and it is concrete evidence of a renewed and continuing national commitment to education as the key to our Nation's social and technological and economic and moral progress. It will help meet the demands of our economy for more skilled personnel; it will enable many more of our young people to cope with the explosion of new knowledge and to contribute effectively in a world of intellectual, political, and economic complexity.

But these new measures will still not do the whole job of extending educational opportunities to all who want and can benefit by them, nor in meeting our growing national needs. I, therefore, strongly urge the Congress to take early, positive action on the unfinished portion of the National Education Improvement Act, particularly those programs which will assist elementary and secondary schools. In addition, I urge prompt action on proposed programs for combating adult illiteracy, for expanding adult education, for improving the quality of education at all levels.

President Kennedy fought hard for this legislation. No topic was closer to his heart. No bill was the object of more of his attention. Both his life and his death showed the importance and the value of sound education. The enactment of this measure is not only a monument to him, it is a monument to every person who participated in passing it, and most of you are in this room today.

It clearly signals this Nation's determination to give all of our youth the education they deserve, and as long as we have a Government, that Government is going to take its stand to battle the ancient enemies of mankind, illiteracy, and poverty, and disease, and in that battle, each of you are soldiers who wear the badge of honor.

Statement of Congressman Joe Skubitz Before the U.S. Tariff Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, on December 10, 1963, I appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission and called attention to the disastrous effects that beef imports are having upon the livestock producers in this country. I urged that a system of quotas be established and a substantial increase in our importation duties be made effective. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including the statement which I presented before the Commission. The statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, my State of Kansas is one of the leading States in the Nation in the production of cattle. Kansas ranks fourth in cattle population with an inventory of 5,222,000 head on January 1, 1963. Kansas is an agricultural State and livestock production makes up the largest segment of agriculture in Kansas. Cash receipts from livestock and livestock products in 1962 totaled $683,102,000. This equals 53 percent of all cash farm receipts during 1962.

I represent the Fifth Congressional District which includes 18 counties in the southeastern corner of the State. Four of the top cattle producing counties in Kansas are in my district. Five others have a total population of over 50,000 head. My district has a total cattle population of approximately 1 million head with an estimated value of approximately $130 million.

Net farm income in Kansas was down about 14 percent in 1962 when compared with 1961. Lower livestock prices and increased farm production costs were largely responsible for this decrease in net income. The report in the December 6 issue of the Daily Drovers Telegram, an official livestock price reporting publication, shows that the cattle feeding ratio in November 1963 was 20.1. This is the lowest feeding ratio since 1956 and represents a decrease of 27.7 percent. This would indicate approximately 30 percent decrease in the cattle feeder's income. Such a big reduction in producers' income, which covers the entire Nation as well as the State of Kansas and my district in Kansas, is nothing short of disastrous.

I would also like to point out here that my district in Kansas suffered one of the most severe droughts this past season that has ever been recorded. Grass and feed crops were short which means increased feed costs, the livestock water situation was critical in many places, which caused forced liquidation of some cattle that would not have sold normally. This means these producers have suffered additional severe financial losses.

Beef imports have increased the last 2 years far beyond anything we have ever seen in the past. The quantity of beef imports has doubled since 1960 and figures indicate that these imports represented 11 percent of the total quantity of beef consumed in the United States during 1962. This rapid rise in imports has continued through 1963. U.S. Department of Agriculture figures show that these imports totaled 712.5 million pounds the first 8 months of this year. Indications are that total imports during 1963 will pass the 1½-billion-pound mark. Actually imports of beef and veal during the first 8 months of 1963 were 17 percent above the first 8 months of 1962. The red meat imports for 1962 exceeded imports in 1961 by nearly 39 percent.

When we compare these import figures to domestic production of manufacturing beef, we find that they equal approximately 40 percent of our total consumption. The major concern of beef producers in my State is the fact that we are becoming a dumping ground for world surpluses for meats, particularly beef and veal. Authorities who have studied this situation firsthand are confident that the situation will continue to grow worse unless we proceed to do something about it.

The economic well-being of the livestock producer and all agriculture is vital to the entire economy in Kansas. Agriculture is the largest user of steel, fuel oil, and other petroleum products. Without the market furnished by agriculture for supplies and services, business in Kansas could not prosper. This all means a profitable livestock industry is essential if Kansas is to prosper.

Thirty years ago, the tariff on beef was 6 cents a pound. In 1947, this import tariff was reduced to 3 cents. The tariff on live cattle and other meat products was also reduced comparably. During this same 30 years, livestock prices and production costs soared to well over double the figures at that time. As a result of this tremendous increase in the price level, present tariffs are not effective and offer little or no protection to the cattle industry from foreign imports. Rather than further reduction in tariffs at this time, we should have substantial increases as well as quotas. We should point out that it would take an increase of several hundred percent applied to the present tariff rates to catch up with the present economic levels and requirements.

In spite of the fact that the U.S. tariffs offer little or no protection to the livestock and meat industry, records show that other countries not only maintained but have increased their import duties, as well as using other import controls.

The American livestock producer is willing to compete on a fair and equitable basis but with the U.S. cost of production much higher than costs in our importing nations, and with these nations maintaining relatively high import controls, he realizes that he is at a disadvantage.

Dr. Willard W. Cochran, one of the chief economic advisers to Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, in his book "Farm Prices, Myth and Reality" published in 1958, stated that the demand for food is highly inelastic. Dr. Cochran continues, "A 2 percent increase in the amount of food offered will drive prices down by 25 percent. The farmer is truly at the crack end of the whip."

The increase in per capita consumption of beef and increased population has taken care of the increase in domestic production. If we use Dr. Cochran's formula we can readily see that when the equivalent of 10 to 12 percent of our consumption in foreign beef is dumped on the U.S. market a terrific pressure will be put on cattle prices. Excessive imports during recent months are directly responsible for the severe break in livestock prices and financial losses by producers. Unless this situation is corrected, our entire economy will suffer.

The United States is the best fed country in the world. Its supply of meat and animal meat products is not only nutritious but a healthy supply of livestock means a healthy, nutritious food supply. It is therefore imperative that during future negotiations, our present quarantine measures and other requirements which protect our domestic animals from foreign diseases be rigidly maintained.

In the forthcoming negotiations, it is imperative that rather than removal or reduction of present tariffs, action must be taken which will protect our livestock producers from this recent flood of imports.

I urge that a system of quotas be established based on average imports over a period of years. Quotas should be established and substantial increases in our import duties be made effective as import volumes increase. The livestock industry feels that import duties should be at least equal to those of our competitive importing nations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 1: 23: *His name shall be called Emmanuel, which means, God with us.*

O Thou great God of all love and mercy, we thank Thee for this hallowed and joyous Christmas season, commemorating the birth of our blessed Lord.

We are again calling to mind and pondering the beautiful and oft-repeated story of the shepherds bowing in adoration and humility at the manger of the Christ Child and the story of the wise men following in the wake of natural piety and worshiping at the same shrine.

Fill us with rejoicing and praise for when there was no eye to pity and no arm to save them in the fullness of time Thou didst send Thy Son to be the Saviour of the world.

Grant that the Christ of prophecy and of history may become for us the Christ of our personal experience. May there be in us and in the heart of all humanity a new nativity of His spirit of peace and good will.

Hear us in the name of our Saviour, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7044. An act to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission; and

H.J. Res. 778. Joint resolution to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 779. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

PRESIDENTIAL ETHICS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend President and Mrs. Lyndon Johnson for placing their personal financial holdings in trusteeship. This timely action on the part of the President and Mrs. Johnson, inaugurated by his own initiative, is most commendable and reassuring to the American people. The President specified that the trustees of his assets cannot accept any Federal subsidy such as price supports, soil bank, conservation payments, or any Federal subsidies to industry.

Mr. Speaker, I also commend Mrs. Johnson for placing her radio and television holdings, consisting of 52.8 percent of all stock in the LBJ Co., under the trusteeship.

This is an example of ethics and high moral standards in our President and our First Lady which will meet the overwhelming approval of the American people.

The times demand the very highest standards of ethics and the highest moral conduct by those charged with the administration of public affairs. Personally, I think it would be beneficial to the cause of good government if all elected Federal officials would list their financial interests with some designated official authority. I believe that no Federal official elected or appointed should benefit financially from any Government agricultural program or subsidy to business while serving in a public office of trust, nor should they have a conflict of interests.

The American image of democracy warrants at all times the very highest ethical, moral, and spiritual standards from the Congress, the executive branch, and the judiciary.

The Founding Fathers of this Nation placed on the altar of freedom "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor." If our Nation is to continue its growth and world leadership, we can do no less today.

A SHAMEFUL RECORD

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ASHLEY**. Mr. Speaker, newspapers throughout the country and the world yesterday reported that much of the real significance of President Johnson's appearance before the United Nations General Assembly lies in what he did not and—because of the foreign aid slash by the House—could not say.

Citizens of this country and the world learned yesterday that our President could not threaten to limit American support of the United Nations as a means of persuading the Soviet Union and other defaulting members to pay their bills because American support had already been limited by the House.

Mr. Speaker, the country and the world learned yesterday—just a week before Christmas—that the self-proclaimed "greatest deliberative body in the world" had voted to slash its contribution to the Children's Fund, which feeds millions of hungry children; to cut back on the Palestine refugee fund which currently sustains nearly 1 million destitute Arabs at a cost of 8 cents a day for each refugee; to reduce economic aid through which the United Nations is trying to save the Congo from slipping back into chaos.

And today, Mr. Speaker, the country and the world will read of the antics of this august body yesterday, of the carping opposition to a proposal to memorialize President Kennedy by issuing 50-cent coins bearing his likeness.

What will people say of this House and this Congress, Mr. Speaker? Will they say that it was enough that we carved "In God We Trust" over this dais, or will they say that we might better have followed the Golden Rule in what we have said and done these past 11 months?

I know what they will say. They will say that we have done things that we ought not to have done and that we have not done, or not done quickly enough, those things that we ought to have done, and that the country is not healthy as a result.

The fault, they will say, rests with this body, with Democrats and Republicans, with leadership and membership, with an institution and instrument of representative government which is no longer representative. And, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion they will be right.

Mr. **ROONEY** of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **ASHLEY**. Not at this time.

Mr. **ROONEY** of New York. Mr. Speaker, is it not the gentleman's understanding that the full amount was allowed by the House for UNICEF?

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. **PASSMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PASSMAN**. Mr. Speaker, the U.N. Children's Fund was not reduced in the House by as much as a dime. Also, the House did not reduce the Palestine relief program. The amount for international organizations was reduced from $128 million to $100 million. But may I remind the House that in the $100 million which we did appropriate there was $30 million for the Indus waterways, a billion-dollar project. The $30 million should not, in my opinion, have been included in the appropriation. Also included was $55 million for technical aid, which I think should have been $30 million. So those amounts for the Children's Fund, and so forth, are completely intact, regardless of what the people downtown may put out to the contrary.

I ask all Members to read the report that accompanied the bill for a better understanding of the facts.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. **RYAN** of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RYAN** of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was shocked to read in the New York Times a report that the U.S. Information Agency had objected to including in a documentary about President Johnson a section of film which showed Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish clergymen. The report said:

> The rabbi was ordered deleted because of possible Arab objections.

Yesterday I protested this action to the Director of USIA, and I have also spoken to the coproducer of the film, Rod Serling. He informed me of a meeting held on November 25 in the Washington offices of the USIA. The producers of the film said the use of a shot of the three clergymen was under consideration for the opening. Several representatives of USIA informed them that they "had better not use the face of a Jewish rabbi if they ever want this film shown in the Middle East."

The producers decided on a different opening which seemed to them more dramatic. Although there was no change in the written script and no actual deletion, it is clear that the USIA has a policy of not including pictures of Jewish life in America in their films.

This policy represents appeasement and a willingness to conform to the abhorrent discriminatory policies of the Arab nations. Such a policy, Mr. Speaker, by the USIA permits Arab prejudices to dictate the content of U.S. films.

Once again I call on the USIA for a full explanation.

I challenge the USIA to produce a documentary film on the freedom of religion in the United States which would depict all aspects of U.S. life, including portrayals of Jewish cultural and religious life and then show that documentary in the Middle East.

NATIONAL TAX FOUNDATION CITATION TO HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House a very signal honor that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES, received from the National Tax Foundation a few weeks ago in New York City in a special citation honoring him for a splendid career of public service, particularly in the field of taxation. I know the entire House of Representatives appreciates that the honoring of one of its distinguished Members brings honor to it. No one is more deserving of honor than the gentleman from Wisconsin, JOHN W. BYRNES. His career of dedicated public service is an outstanding one and fortunately for us it has by no means yet reached its peak.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a reprint of this citation which is as follows:

> Presented to the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES, U.S. Representative from Wisconsin, in recognition of his distinguished service to his State and Nation, his devotion to principles of fiscal responsibility and his outstanding contributions to sound tax and expenditure policies, by the Tax Foundation, New York, December 3, 1963.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROSWELL MAGILL

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. Speaker, at this time I sadly call to the attention of the House the passing of a man who I thought was one of this Nation's distinguished experts in the field of taxation and economics, former Under Secretary of the Treasury Roswell Magill, who served under President Roosevelt. Mr. Magill among his many public services was president of the National Tax Foundation. In many ways throughout his distinguished life he had exhibited his public spiritedness, aside from his special field which was taxation and economics.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I note his passing and extend to his family my deepest sympathy. Our Nation can ill afford to lose men like Roswell Magill and yet, it is a consolation to contemplate the great benefit his full and distinguished career has been to his fellow man and to know that these benefits will continue to flow to us for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues, because I know there are many who would like to express their regrets and eulogies on the passing of Roswell Magill, I ask unanimous consent that they may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the passing of Roswell Magill.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the award of the Tax Foundation of its distinguished service citation to our friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES, in recognition of his "outstanding service to the State and the Nation, his devotion to the principles of fiscal responsibility, and his contributions to sound tax and expenditure policies," is an announcement of particular interest to all of us. As chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and as an individual who has sat on that committee with JOHN BYRNES for many years, I can say without reservation that he has contributed outstanding legal ability, deep knowledge of the tax laws, and conscientious attention to the work of the committee, and he has certainly at all times been greatly interested in the maintenance of fiscal responsibility and in the establishment of sound tax and expenditure policies.

In our discussions of those often intricate and complex tax, social security, and tariff problems which come daily before the Committee on Ways and Means, it has been my observation that JOHN BYRNES always has questions which demonstrate deep knowledge of the subject and ability to get to the heart of a problem quickly. This has contributed greatly to the work of the committee. I am very pleased that he has received this award and I congratulate the Tax Foundation upon their selection.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable TOM CURTIS, who has just preceded me, in his remarks has referred to the announcement in today's press concerning the passing of Mr. Roswell Magill. It is to be regretted that one who has been so active in the Tax Foundation and who has had such a prominent part in these awards over the years has passed so suddenly. This is a matter of sorrow to all of us and I join others in expressing my deep regret over hearing this sad news. Roswell Magill is familiar to members of the Committee on Ways and Means in particular because of his work with respect to tax legislation over the years. I extend my sympathy to his family.

LET HISTORY JUDGE JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the six Members of the House of Representatives who voted against removing the face of Benjamin Franklin from our half dollar and replacing it with that of John F. Kennedy.

With all appreciation for the undeniably many fine qualities Mr. Kennedy possessed, and with full remembrance of the tragic circumstances surrounding his death, it is still too soon to decide that he should be given equal recognition as one of our historically great Presidents, along with Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, who are the only former Presidents whose images are on our coins.

Congress is prejudging history in rating John F. Kennedy ahead of Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, and Teddy Roosevelt, each of whom was a courageous, progressive Chief Executive, rated by historians after scores and scores of years as truly great.

Mr. Kennedy, in his own right, was a fine historian and a humble realist. Were he here to counsel with us, I believe he would affirm that he should not so soon be placed on the same pedestal with Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, and, consequently, well above Jackson, Wilson, and Teddy Roosevelt, each of whose greatness has been recognized with the passage of years and the fulfillment of many objectives that they advocated.

VOLUNTARY PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it disturbs me that Congress has not proposed a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayer in the public schools of this country as well as to assure the constitutional right to continued reference to God Almighty in public places and in public institutions throughout our land. On July 31, 1963, I introduced House Joint Resolution 603 proposing such a constitutional amendment in language that I believe would be acceptable to persons of whatever shade of the political spectrum.

This proposal does not use the word "voluntary." Instead it declares in part simply that:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution it shall be the right of all persons attending or otherwise participating in public schools, in public institutions, and in other public places, throughout the United States, its territories and possessions, to participate or to decline to participate in prayers, prayerful meditation or the reading of sacred scriptures or the Holy Bible and the right to decline to participate shall include the right, upon request, to be excused from the presence of participants.

Proposals including the word "voluntary" seem to me to be vulnerable to the criticism that the construction and meaning of the word "voluntary" in such event will still be open to determination by the U.S. Supreme Court.

I have been very pleased to learn that in the city of Cincinnati in the great State of Ohio, the Committee To Protect the Right of Prayer has petitions signed by 14,000 persons urging adoption of House Joint Resolution 603.

Such petitions require a great deal of time and I am glad to know that these thousands of good citizens approve the language that has been used in House Joint Resolution 603.

I hope that the Judiciary Committee will hold hearings on a prayer amendment early next month. Failure to act to propose a prayer constitutional amendment is failure to accede to the wishes of an overwhelming majority of the American people. Continued congressional inaction in the face of this is not representative government.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file reports on H.R. 7332, granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes, and H.R. 8853, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1056)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 7, 11, 12, 29, and 38.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 9, 14, 15, 16, 20, 22, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 37, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $18,500,000 named in said amendment insert "$18,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$42,625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$29,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$28,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$216,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$465,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$134,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

John J. Rooney,
Robert L. F. Sikes,
Clarence Cannon,
Frank T. Bow,
Glenard P. Lipscomb,
Managers on the Part of the House.

John L. McClellan,
Allen J. Ellender,
Warren G. Magnuson,
Spessard L. Holland,
Margaret Chase Smith,
Leverett Saltonstall,
Karl E. Mundt,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of foreign affairs

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $18,125,000 for acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad instead of $18,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $2,750,000 for acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad (special foreign currency program) as proposed by the House instead of $3,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

International organizations and conferences

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $2,500,000 for missions to international organizations as proposed by the House instead of $2,545,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $365,000 for international tariff negotiations as proposed by the Senate instead of $450,000 as proposed by the House.

International commissions

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $6,500,000 for construction, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $2,000,000 for international fisheries commissions instead of $1,910,000 as proposed by the House and $2,053,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Educational exchange

Amendment No. 7: Provides a limitation of $1,000 for official entertainment as proposed by the House instead of $2,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $42,625,000 for mutual educational and cultural exchange activities instead of $42,250,000 as proposed by the House and $43,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Provides that not less than $15,000,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,515,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $5,100,000 for center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West instead of $4,460,000 as proposed by the House and $5,439,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $18,573,000 for salaries and expenses, general legal activities as proposed by the House instead of $18,717,000 as proposed by the Senate. Any additional lawyers for the Civil Rights or Tax Divisions that have been justified before the Senate or House Committee on Appropriations and that are needed can be funded within the amount allowed.

Federal prison system

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $53,000,000 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons, as proposed by the House instead of $53,084,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $9,525,000 for buildings and facilities instead of $9,425,000 as proposed by the House and $9,875,000 as proposed by the Senate. The additional $100,000 is for preliminary work for the replacement of the National Training School.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $13,650,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,000,000 as proposed by the House.

International activities

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $9,230,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Provides that $2,410,000 shall remain available for trade and industrial exhibits until June 30, 1965, as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Patent Office

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $29,250,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $29,000,000 as proposed by the House and $29,525,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $28,700-000 for research and technical services instead of $28,075,000 as proposed by the House and $29,575,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Makes $175,000 available for the working capital fund instead of $550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Weather Bureau

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $64,527,100 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $63,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have included the funds for ocean station weather service with the understanding that hereafter this activity will be funded by the Department of Defense.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $10,400,000 for research and development instead of $9,500,000 as proposed by the House and $11,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have included funds for certain aviation weather research with the understanding that hereafter this activity will be funded by the Federal Aviation Agency as has been done in the past.

Amendment No. 22: Deletes the appropriation for meteorological satellite operations as proposed by the Senate.

Maritime Administration

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $216,500,000 for operating-differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authorization) instead of $225,000,000 as proposed by the House and $208,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Provides for the transfer from research and development of not to exceed $800,000 for administrative expenses instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House and $825,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Public Roads

Amendment No. 25: Deletes the appropriation for control of outdoor advertising as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $15,000,000 for the Inter-American Highway as proposed by the Senate instead of $19,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Transportation research

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $2,000,000 for transportation research instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House and $2,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission

Amendment 28: Provides a limitation of $50,000 for expenses of travel instead of $37,000 as proposed by the House and $79,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $1,455,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $1,555,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Provides that $607,000 be derived from the appropriation "Payment of Philippine War Damage Claims" as proposed by the Senate instead of $575,000 as proposed by the House.

Small Business Administration

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $7,000,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 32: Provides that not to exceed $30,000 may be transferred from the appropriation "Trade adjustment loan assistance" for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33: Provides that not to exceed $27,300,000 may be transferred from the revolving fund for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $27,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $1,500,000 for trade adjustment loan assistance as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $90,000,000 for the revolving fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $115,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Special representative for trade negotiations

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $465,000 instead of $450,000 as proposed by the House and $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $7,500,000 for arms control and disarmament activities as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,669,000 as proposed by the House.

U.S. Information Agency

Amendment No. 38: Provides a limitation of $500 for entertainment as proposed by the House instead of $1,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $134,000,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $131,000,000 as proposed by the House and $138,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $750,000 for the informational media guarantee fund instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANK T. BOW,
GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
Managers on the Part of the House

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I must say that this conference report which is now before the House is quite novel. This bill H.R. 7063 making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies, now before the House contains $1,820,093,000 in direct appropriations. This total amount agreed upon by the conferees is below both the amount of the House bill and the amount of the Senate bill. It is $1,250,000 below the amount of the Senate bill and $31,176,900 below the amount of the House bill. The conference figure is $323,333,841 below the total fiscal year 1963 appropriations. Finally, it is $339,798,900 below the total budget estimates presented to the committees of the House and Senate, which is a reduction of approximately 16 percent in the total amount of these budget estimates.

This bill also includes a total of $3,249,650,000 for the Bureau of Public Roads, which is to be derived from the highway trust fund.

Another unusual occurrence in regard to the action of the conferees is that there are no amendments in disagreement, technical or otherwise.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am not quite clear as to what the gentleman's committee did with respect to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The House receded to the Senate amount. The House action last June was only in the amount $1,600,000 and some odd, as I recall, for the reason that there was no authorization in law at that time to permit the committee to make appropriations above that figure. Authorization was subsequently enacted into law and the Senate increased the figure to $7.5 million. The House conferees concurred in the Senate figure.

Mr. GROSS. That is $7.5 million per year?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes; $7.5 million for the fiscal year that began last July 1.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes, of course.

Mr. GROSS. I think I should compliment the gentleman from New York upon this conference report and say to the gentleman that I hope the foreign aid bill—foreign handout bill—will come back with the same kind of a settlement that is below both the House and Senate figures.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I must say to my distinguished friend from Iowa that I certainly would hope not.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a table showing a breakdown of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows:

Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary and related agencies appropriation bill, 1964

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimates	House	Senate
Department of State	$359,721,000	$305,051,000	$325,033,000	$322,696,000	−$37,025,000	+$17,645,000	−$2,337,000
Department of Justice	355,506,000	343,799,000	344,477,000	343,899,000	−11,607,000	+100,000	−578,000
Department of Commerce	996,572,000	833,818,000	798,300,100	804,500,100	−192,071,900	−29,317,900	+6,200,000
Bureau of Public Roads (highway trust fund)	(3,250,500,000)	(3,249,650,000)	(3,249,650,000)	(3,249,650,000)	(−850,000)		
The judiciary	67,140,900	65,927,900	65,927,900	65,927,900	−1,213,000		
American Battle Monuments Commission	1,820,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	−20,000		
Commission on Civil Rights	995,000	985,000	985,000	985,000	−10,000		
Federal Maritime Commission	2,898,000	2,575,000	2,575,000	2,575,000	−323,000		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	2,320,000	1,455,000	1,555,000	1,455,000	−865,000		−100,000
Small Business Administration	145,350,000	126,700,000	98,500,000	98,500,000	−46,850,000	−28,200,000	
Special representative for trade negotiations	510,000	450,000	500,000	465,000	−45,000	+15,000	−35,000
Subversive Activities Control Board	448,000	425,000	425,000	425,000	−23,000		
Tariff Commission	3,375,000	3,145,000	3,145,000	3,145,000	−230,000		
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	15,000,000	1,669,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	−7,500,000	+5,831,000	
U.S. Information Agency	208,236,000	163,470,000	170,620,000	166,220,000	−42,016,000	+2,750,000	−4,400,000
Total	2,159,891,900	1,851,269,000	1,821,343,000	1,820,093,000	−339,798,900	−31,176,900	−1,250,000

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. Rooney] has again submitted a conference report, the content of which bespeaks his skill in negotiating, and his understanding of the appropriation bill he handles.

Mr. Speaker, on many items of legislation the gentleman from New York and I do not agree, but in most instances as relate to this bill, we are in accord. Our distinguished chairman at times suffers in silence because of his loyalty and his fairness to other members of the subcommittee. There have been times when he has favored a different figure than the committee reports, but he has yielded to the majority of the members. But as chairman he has had to bear the brunt of attacks of press, radio and public speakers. This has been unfair, but without complaint he has borne this burden as a part of the penalty of leadership.

On behalf of the minority may I thank the gentleman from New York and his colleagues on the majority side of the committee for their courtesies and the fairness extended to us. We look forward to a continued relationship of mutual understanding and service together in the spirit of which we consider to be in the best interest of the Nation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield a couple of minutes to me at this time?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of discussion about the civil rights bill. I know that it is a matter of great interest to all Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say to the Members of the House what my intentions are with respect to calling the committee to consider the bill.

I think the earliest time that we could conveniently do this would be on Thursday after the House meets on Tuesday, January 7. That date will be on January 9.

Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to call the committee together and consider the bill at that time.

Now, there are a good many Members, to be frank about it, who want to be heard on this bill on both sides of the issue. Under our rules, that is the rule that a Member of Congress shall not be denied an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not encourage any dilatory tactics on the matter.

I know something about the facts of life around here and I know that many Members want this bill considered. I think it should be considered soberly and seriously.

Mr. Speaker, I think I should say that the bill we are going to consider—now, remember there were three bills considered by the House Committee on the Judiciary and there were three different bills. Hearings were held on two of those bills. The third bill, which is the one that the Members of the House are going to consider, had no hearings before the Judiciary Committee. The undeniable fact is that hearings were refused. No member of the committee even was permitted to ask a question or submit an amendment.

Under those conditions, certain Members of the House have expressed a request that they be heard before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to see that the rules of the House are carried out and that they are heard, as far as I can do so. Of course, if the committee takes it away from me, and they can do it any minute they want to, but I hope they will not do it. I hope they will permit at least a fair opportunity for the Members of the House especially members of the Judiciary Committee to be heard so that the provisions of this bill which really contains seven separate and distinct bills—I hope that they will do the Members of the House the courtesy to permit them to be heard briefly.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia, and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 1055)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities charegable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 10, 11, 15, 26, 44, and 51.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 7, 12, 14, 16, 22, 23, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38, 39, 40, 45, 46, 52, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$37,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "following funds: general fund, $11,300,000 and sanitary sewage works fund, $8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,882,878"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,971,660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "seven"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$63,860,593"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,066,861"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$70,526,048"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,407,984"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,465,584"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "new junior high school in the vincinity of 16th and Irving Streets Northwest, new junior high school in the vicinity of Bruce and Robinson Streets Southeast, new elementary school in the vicinity of Wheeler Road and Mississippi Avenue Southeast, West End Branch Library, Washington Cottage addition at the Maple Glen School and Industrial Arts Building at the Youth Center;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "; for conducting preliminary surveys for the construction of a juvenile facility, and the installation of a sprinkler system at the District of Columbia jail"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$46,536,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,755,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,199,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "One hundred and forty-three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference reports in disagreement amendments numbered 8, 17, 24, 25, 42, 48, and 49.

William H. Natcher,
Robert N. Giaimo,
Clarence Cannon,
Earl Wilson,
Louis C. Wyman,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Robert C. Byrd,
Carl Hayden,
E. L. Bartlett,
Hubert H. Humphrey,
Alan Bible,
Clifford P. Case,
Norris Cotton,
Leverett Saltonstall,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommend in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $37,500,000 to the general fund instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the House and $45,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5: Authorize a total of $19,300,000 to be borrowed from the Federal Treasury instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House and $20,800,000 as proposed by the Senate; include citation of authority for loan to the general fund as proposed by the Senate; provide authority to advance $11,300,000 to the general fund instead of $12,800,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide authority to advance $8,000,000 to the sanitary sewage works fund.

OPERATING EXPENSES

Amendment No. 6—General operating expenses: Appropriates $17,882,878 instead of $16,910,000 as proposed by the House and $18,156,384 as proposed by the Senate. In this item, as in all subsequent cases, reductions proposed by the Senate due to late passage of the bill have been agreed to as have increases proposed by the Senate for postal rate and wage board increases. Other increases proposed by the Senate have been agreed to except for the following: (1) $48,000 for Downtown Progress; (2) $15,000 for the Washington Convention and Visitor's Bureau; (3) $7,922 and two positions for the Commissioners' Youth Council; (4) $25,500 for the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments; (5) $11,995 and two positions for operations, administrative services; (6) $78,735 for space rental, administrative services which was unbudgeted; (7) $9,939 and two positions for budget; (8) $44,386 for finance; (9) $16,809 and three positions for internal auditing; (10) $5,000 and contractual services for management; (11) $2,582 and one position for filing and recording property and corporation papers; (12) $3,407 and one position for occupations and professions; and (13) $4,231 and two positions for the public library.

Amendment No. 7—General operating expenses: Provides $375,000 for District of Columbia employees' disability compensation as proposed by the Senate instead of $350,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8—General operating expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 9, 10, and 11—General operating expenses: Provide (1) $164,200 payable from the highway fund as proposed by the House instead of $201,695 as proposed by the Senate; (2) $23,900 from the water fund as proposed by the House instead of $31,900 as proposed by the Senate; and (3) $6,400 from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the House instead of $14,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—Public safety: Provides for the purchase of 72 passenger motor vehicles (including 61 for police-type use) of which 70 are for replacement as proposed by the Senate instead of 54 (including 44 for replacement for police-type use) and 10 for other replacement as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13—Public safety: Appropriates $65,971,660 instead of $65,032,000 as proposed by the House and $66,074,353 as proposed by the Senate. Increases proposed by the Senate have been agreed to except for the following: (1) $13,410 and three positions for the appellate and civil proceedings divisions, Office of the Corporation Counsel; (2) $4,500 for an increase in lieutenants in lieu of sergeants, Metropolitan Police Department; (3) $45,994 and 15 positions for the Fire Department; (4) $8,816 and two positions for the Office of Civil Defense; (5) $15,869 and three positions for the youth guidance project, juvenile court; (6) $8,853 and three clerical positions for the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions; (7) $2,876 and one position for maintenance and operation of institutions, Department of Corrections; and (8) $2,375 and one position for housing, Department of Licenses and Inspections.

Amendment No. 14—Public safety: Provides $119,700 for the Legal Aid Agency as proposed by the Senate instead of $109,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16—Public safety: Provide that (1) $3,355,000 shall be payable from the highway fund as proposed by the House instead of $3,369,695 as proposed by the Senate and (2) $1,688 shall be payable from the water fund and $1,689 shall be payable from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17—Public safety: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 18—Education: Provides for the purchase of 7 passenger motor vehicles instead of 16 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19—Education: Appropriates $63,860,593 instead of $61,670,000 as proposed by the House and $64,226,172 as proposed by the Senate. Increases proposed by the Senate have been agreed to except for (1) $324,579 and 86 positions which were unbudgeted; (2) $41,000 and 10 counselor positions. The conferees are agreed that the 10 remaining counselor positions are for junior and senior high school only.

Amendment No. 20—Parks and recreation: Appropriates $9,066,861 instead of $8,853,000 as proposed by the House and $9,076,881 as proposed by the Senate. Increases proposed by the Senate have been agreed to except for $10,020 and one position for the research and development program, National Zoological Park.

Amendment No. 21—Health and welfare: Appropriates $70,526,048 instead of $66,316,000 as proposed by the House and $71,203,242 as proposed by the Senate, including $498,157 and six additional positions for the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. All increases provided by the Senate have been allowed except for the following: (1) $3,450 and 1 position for vocational rehabilitation; (2) $2,928 and 1 position at Glen Dale Hospital; (3) $21,925 and 2 chaplain positions at District of Columbia General Hospital; (4) $669,086 and 92 positions for the Department of Public Welfare which were unbudgeted; (5) $9,532 and 2 chaplains for District of Columbia welfare institutions.

Amendments Nos. 22 and 23—Health and welfare: Provides that the inpatient rate and outpatient rate for contract hospitals and for services rendered by Freedmen's Hospital shall be $34 per diem and $5.75 per visit, respectively, as proposed by the Senate instead of $32 and $5 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24—Health and welfare: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25—Highways and traffic: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 26—Highways and traffic: Provides for the purchase of 50 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the House instead of 60 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 27, 28, and 29—Highways and traffic: Appropriate $12,407,984 instead of $12,138,000 as proposed by the House and $12,427,853 as proposed by the Senate, of which $8,465,584 shall be payable from the highway fund instead of $8,365,000 as proposed by the House and $8,470,453 as proposed by the Senate (including $2,804,300 from the motor vehicle parking account as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,418,300 as proposed by the House).

Amendments Nos. 30, 31, 32, and 33—Sanitary engineering: Appropriate $21,851,100 as proposed by the Senate instead of $21,205,000 as proposed by the House. Of this amount $7,220,300 shall be payable from the water fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,053,000 as proposed by the House; $4,165,990 shall be payable from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,050,000 as proposed by the House; and $32,760 shall be payable from the metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,200 as proposed by the House.

REPAYMENT OF LOANS AND INTEREST

Amendments Nos. 34 and 35: Provide that $149,000 of the funds to be reimbursed to the United States shall be payable from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $148,900 as proposed by the House, and delete, as proposed by the Senate, the proposal of the House that $64,400 shall be payable from the metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Amendment No. 36: Provides for the preparation of plans and specifications for the following buildings and facilities: New junior high school in the vicinity of 16th and Irving Streets NW.; new junior high school in the vicinity of Bruce and Robinson Streets SE.; new elementary school in the vicinity of Wheeler Road and Mississippi Avenue SE.; West End Branch Library, Washington Cottage addition at the Maple Glen School; and Industrial Arts Building at the Youth Center.

Amendment No. 37: Provides for conducting preliminary surveys for the construction of a juvenile facility and the installation of a sprinkler system at the District of Columbia jail.

Amendment No. 38: Deletes unnecessary language.

Amendment No. 39: Provides for the erection of the following structures: Rabaut Junior High School, North Dakota and Kansas Avenues NW.; Roper Junior High School, 48th and Meade Streets NE.; Hine Junior High School replacement; Bunker Hill Elementary School addition; Southwest Branch Library; Engine Company No. 18 replacement; Dog Pound replacement; a children's cottage at the Junior Village; and street cleaning toolhouses replacement.

Amendment No. 40: Provides $388,000 for the purchase of equipment for new school buildings as proposed by the Senate instead of $358,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $46,536,500 instead of $27,173,000 as proposed by the House and $51,582,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 43: Provides that $10,755,400 shall be payable from the highway fund instead of $10,737,500 as proposed by the House and $10,835,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Provide that $2,970,000 shall be payable from the water fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,711,000 as proposed by the House and $8,674,000 shall be payable from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,052,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 47: Provides that $1,199,600 shall be available for construction services instead of $257,000 as proposed by the House and $1,643,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 48 and 49: Reported in disagreement.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 50 and 51: Provide 143 allowances for privately owned automobiles instead of 125 as provided by the House and 171 as provided by the Senate, of which 50 are for investigators in the Department of Public Welfare, as proposed by the House instead of 78 as proposed by the Senate, and 18 for venereal disease investigators in the Department of Public Health as proposed by the Senate.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
EARL WILSON,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include summary tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on July 11 the House passed the "A" budget of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1964. We considered estimates totaling $289,581,800 submitted in a separate budget message by the President on January 16, 1963. This submission commonly referred to as the "A" budget was based on current authorizations and did not take into consideration pending legislation to increase the Federal contribution and to provide additional loan authority for the financing of capital outlay projects. The House approved the sum of $284,286,800.

The Federal contribution at this time provided for a maximum of $32 million and the House approved a Federal contribution of $30 million.

Subsequent to the passage of the "A" budget the Congress passed Public Law 88–104 which was approved on August 27, 1963. Under this act the Federal payment was increased to a maximum of $50 million and the loan authority for financing of capital outlay projects was increased to $175 million.

After passage of Public Law 88–104 and before the Senate Appropriations Committee started hearings on the House bill the Bureau of the Budget sent up Senate documents 32, 37 and 41 which totaled $39,142,200. The amount contained in the Senate documents was then referred to as the "B" budget.

The Appropriations Committee in the Senate then had before it the "A" and "B" budgets and after hearings presented a bill providing for the sum of $319,582,825 which was subsequently amended in the Senate to a total of $319,587,785. This was an increase of $35,300,985 over the House bill. The amount of the Federal payment approved by the Senate was $45 million. The amount of borrowing authority approved by the Senate in addition to the $8 million approved by the House was $12,800,000.

The Senate bill provided for 1,468 new employees and a great number of these were unbudgeted. The managers on the part of the House refused to yield on the unbudgeted employees and unbudgeted items and projects in the Senate bill. This conference report strikes all of the unbudgeted employees, items, and projects and reduces the Federal payment from $45 million to $37,500,000. The total amount of the bill as agreed upon in conference is $313,093,424.

Three hundred and forty-three new teachers were approved and 100 police officers and 25 man-dog teams were also approved.

The hearings on both sides disclosed that in the District of Columbia we are faced with a large public welfare caseload, a difficult crime situation and increasing governmental costs. In addition we need teachers, police officers, and additional classrooms. All of these problems are serious but not insurmountable.

We receded on a number of items but with the exception of only a few items those upon which we receded were in the "B" budget.

During the hearings it appeared that the partisans of rapid transit and the proponents of the highway program are using every possible source of opposition to bring about confusion and disorder.

The recent action of the House is the best example that I can give concerning confusion and disorder at this time insofar as a proposal for a rapid transit system is concerned. Rivalry between these two groups is dangerous and certainly not in the best interest of our Capital City.

We will continue to have problems insofar as our Welfare Department is concerned. Under no circumstances should we permit the children in the Nation's Capital to go hungry. I would like to call to your attention the fact that since fiscal year 1961 the cost of operating expenses in the investigation and collection sections of the Welfare Department has increased from $261,300 to $1,504,800. This is an increase of $1,243,500. The cost of operating the Public Assistance Division has increased $192,900; the cost of operating the Child Welfare Division has increased $951,800; the cost of payments for board and care have increased $647,400; the cost of operating Junior Village has increased $1,440,500 and the building program at Junior Village has increased $1,825,400.

The operation of the Welfare Department is of great importance at this time and we must carefully consider any and all new proposals concerning the operation of this Department.

It has been a pleasure serving with the members of this subcommittee and it is always a pleasure to serve with the Members of the other body in conference.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in my remarks tables relating to the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1964.

District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1964

Item	Budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
FEDERAL FUNDS							
Federal payment to District of Columbia—							
General fund	$50,000,000	$30,000,000	$45,000,000	$37,500,000	−$12,500,000	+$7,500,000	−$7,500,000
Water fund	1,924,000	1,924,000	1,924,000	1,924,000			
Sanitary sewage works fund	944,000	944,000	944,000	944,000			
Total, Federal funds	52,868,000	32,868,000	47,868,000	40,368,000	−12,500,000	+7,500,000	−7,500,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS							
Operating expenses	267,493,000	252,124,000	263,015,985	261,567,124	−5,925,876	+9,443,124	−1,448,861
Repayment of loans and interest	4,990,000	4,989,800	4,989,800	4,989,800	−200		
Capital outlay	56,241,000	27,173,000	51,582,000	46,536,500	−9,704,500	+19,363,500	−5,045,500
Total, District of Columbia funds	[1] 328,724,000	284,286,800	319,587,785	313,093,424	−15,630,576	+28,806,624	−6,494,361

[1] Includes $39,142,000 in supplemental estimates submitted in S. Doc's. 32, 37, and 41.

Loan authorizations

Item	Budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Loans to District of Columbia for capital outlay, general	[1] $12,800,000		$12,800,000	$11,300,000	−$1,500,000	+$11,300,000	−$1,500,000
Loans to District of Columbia for capital outlay, sanitary sewage works fund	8,000,000	$8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000			
Total, loan authorization	20,800,000	8,000,000	20,800,000	19,300,000	−1,500,000	+11,300,000	−1,500,000

[1] Supplemental estimate submitted in S. Doc. 32.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. Wilson] such time as he may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I should like the Members of the House to know that it is a distinct honor and privilege to serve on this committee and in conference with my friend, Earl Wilson, and the other Member on his side, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman], also with the conferees and Members on this side, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Giaimo] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am going to save some time for the Members of the House by dittoing the splendid statement made by my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher]. He explained the bill very thoroughly. He has pointed out the differences between the House and the Senate and the agreement in which we all concurred. I think we came back from the Senate with one of the best deals we have ever been able to get out of them in conference since I have been a member of this committee.

It is a pleasure to serve with my chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher].

I served under a previous chairman from Kentucky, by the name of Joe Bates, whom many of you people remember. He was quite a horse trader himself. But when we send our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher] over to the other body to bargain with them as to the differences between the two bodies, you can rest assured that we are not going to come back without our hair and our hides.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have a wonderful conference report, that we are extremely fortunate in bringing back to the House a conference report which contained no unbudgeted items. There were persistent folk in the conference on the other side who insisted on not only going as far as the budget director had requested in the way of supporting our schools, but who wanted to go way beyond that. I do not know what their motives were and I would not want to impugn their motives. But we gave them everything they asked for and could possibly justify for their public schools. We felt that that was enough.

As they prove to us that they are going to be able to utilize additional teachers to a high degree of efficiency, we will certainly be willing to consider giving them those teachers. But due to the lateness of the year, we felt it would be almost impossible to recruit the budgeted teachers requested and added by the Senate—and there were about 343 of them—let alone including the unbudgeted ones, with the year already half gone.

We all have the interest of the District of Columbia at heart. The District of Columbia is the seat of our States government. I would say it belongs to all of the States. Certainly, I shall never be a party to voting away our States control over our Nation's Capital. But I do feel, along with such authority as the people of the various States demand that we exercise under the Constitution, we also assume the responsibility that goes with that authority; and I, for one, am willing to assume that responsibility to make our Nation's Capital one of the greatest. We want the best schools. We want the best government. But we want to do it economically and in a very discreet way.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. This is about $7,500,000, is that not correct, above the appropriation for the District of Columbia last year?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman if he can estimate—if he has the figure at his fingertips—the amount that the Nation's taxpayers are expending for interest on the bonds that were issued privately to construct the Washington, D.C., Stadium at a cost of nearly $20 million.

Mr. NATCHER. The amount is approximately $876,000 a year. I also want my friend to know that last year we had to borrow that amount to pay on this white elephant which was supposed to cost between $6 and $7 million and the cost has now gone up to $18,500,000.

Mr. GROSS. And would the gentleman be good enough to repeat the figure on the interest payment?

Mr. NATCHER. Approximately $876,000 is the amount of the interest each year on the bonds. None of the bonds have been retired so far. Under the original legislation, as the gentleman well knows, this stadium is to be turned over to the Department of the Interior in the year 2007.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for the information. I would like to ask him one further question. What is the percentage of contribution on the part of the Federal Government to the support of the District of Columbia?

Mr. NATCHER. The percentage is approximately 12 percent.

Mr. GROSS. This is increasing, I take it?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct. As the gentleman knows, this bill, as reported back by your conferees in the conference report, is $6 million-plus less than the amount approved by the other body. But as the gentleman has pointed out, the Federal payment is $7,500,000 more than last year. But it is under the new authorizing legislation that was passed by the House in August.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman and want to compliment him and the members of his subcommittee for refusing to accept the unbudgeted items on which attempts were made to force into this bill. I compliment the gentleman and his colleagues.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his statement.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO].

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate conferees on the District of Columbia budget have agreed on a appropriation for fiscal 1964 which is, I believe, adequate to finance the District government for the 6 months which remain in this fiscal year.

I wish to commend the chairman of our committee and our subcommittee on their efforts to adjust equitably the substantial areas of disagreement between the House and Senate. The chronology of the District budget is a matter of record, and we all regret the fact that it has taken this length of time to arrive at a solution to the knotty problems which confront our Federal city. In June of this year, when the House passed the so-called bare bones budget for the District, I remarked that Congress has a great responsibility to assure that the citizens of the District of Columbia are given every possible consideration. We have attempted to do this, and I believe that the results of our work will materially improve many facets of the District's functions.

The District of Columbia is a municipality with the same problems that face every city and town in every district represented in this Congress. Too often, we tend to forget that there are children to be educated, roads to be repaired, people to be fed and housed in this city, just as in every city. Because Congress has the responsibility to act as a supercity council for the Federal City, we must act with responsibility. Our subcommittee has endeavored to do just that.

The distinguished chairman of our subcommittee has outlined to this House the provisions of this appropriation. There are many areas which we endeavored to change, the most significant being public welfare. There are many areas in which I think we have made improvements. We have increased the city's education budget as well as expenditures for parks and recreation and general operating expenses. I do wish, however, to indicate two particular items about which I am concerned.

First is the deletion of funds for teachers of the severely mentally retarded. As many of my colleagues know, I have been the sponsor of several bills to provide for the training of teachers of exceptional children. Title III of the mental health bill, which is now law, contained substantially the provisions of my bill and I am extremely gratified that this program, for which many of us have long fought is now a reality. Having been so closely identified and concerned with this problem, I am disappointed that provisions could not be made for teachers of the mentally retarded in the District. Several problems were involved, and the decision was made to disallow all items which had not been specifically budgeted. The provision for teachers for the mentally retarded fell under this category. Although I supported the funds for these teachers, I understand the reasons for this deletion. It is my hope that the Commissioners will include this item in their request for fiscal year 1965, for I feel that this is a program which is badly needed.

I am also concerned about the problem of public welfare in this city. I believe that the District of Columbia should be included in the aid to dependent children program. I believe that the "man in the house" rule deprives many children of proper care and sustenance. It is my hope that the argument over this will be resolved in the very near future. Each week that it continues causes untold suffering to many innocent people.

Again, I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee. It has been a pleasure to work with him and I believe that the citizens of the District should know that they have a dedicated and sincere champion in our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

I recommend the adoption of this conference report and assure both this House and the citizens of the District that we will continue to exert every possible effort to resolve the problems which face the District of Columbia. As the Capital of this Nation and the hub of the free world, Washington, D.C., has a unique position, and Congress must do everything possible to recognize and solve the District's problem.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES].

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I take this time first to commend the chairman of the subcommittee as well as the members of the conference committee for the work they have done; but also to express my displeasure with respect to one item of the budget which was cut and to explain my reason therefor. The request by the District of Columbia for the contribution of its share to the cost of Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, which is that group which represents the local governments in this Metropolitan Washington area, was for $47,500. That was the District of Columbia's share of the council budget. This conference report comes up with the figure of $22,000, which is a cut of $25,500.

The reason for the Council of Governments is to bring the communities together in order to cut the cost of Government in each of the local jurisdictions by combining and doing some of the projects together.

One of the major projects this year is a solid waste study which will enable the governments of this region, particularly the District of Columbia, to cope with the serious problem of disposing of tons of solid waste. If sites are not located within this area, the District will soon have to spend over $2 million to transport solid waste outside the area for disposal.

The net result of the cut, of course, is that the subdivisions are paying their full share but the District of Columbia will not be able to do so. Not only will the studies have to be cut back but possibly the council may have to return some of the contributions of other local jurisdictions. So that all it does is merely to cut the operation as of this point, so that for the balance of the year, the Council of Governments will not be able to operate as planned.

I think this is extremely unfortunate. A primary purpose for the Council of Governments is to cut the cost of government. Now the local jurisdictions may have to do some of these projects themselves, and the total cost will be larger.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 3, line 20, insert: "and $250,000 shall remain available until December 31, 1964, for the purpose of conducting the 1964 Presidential election in the District of Columbia,".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: On page 5, line 15, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the Fire Department is authorized to replace not to exceed five passenger carrying vehicles annually whenever the cost of repair to any damaged vehicles exceeds three-fourths the cost of the replacement.".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: On page 7, line 12, insert the following: *Provided further*, That the authorization included under the heading 'Department of Public Health,' in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, for compensation of convalescent patients as an aid to their rehabilitation is hereby extended to the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation."

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: On page 7, line 19, insert "$70,466".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$68,247".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: On page 10, line 21, insert the following: "$7,200,000 shall not become available for expenditure until July 1, 1964,".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,700,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 48: On page 11, line 9, insert the following: "*Provided*, That $228,271 of funds heretofore appropriated under the heading "Capital Outlay, Public Building Construction" in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, is hereby rescinded".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 49: On page 11, line 12, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $49,000 of funds heretofore appropriated under the heading "Capital Outlay, Washington Aqueduct," in such Act shall be available for improvement at the Dalecarlia Plant.".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

MARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN IMPORTED ARTICLES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1035)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(e) Section 304(a)(3)(J) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1304(a)(3)(J)) is amended by striking out the proviso therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '*Provided*, That this subdivision shall not apply to sawed lumber entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after March 31, 1964; and no trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with this proviso;'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
THOMAS J. O'BRIEN,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
HOWARD H. BAKER,
Managers on the Part of the House.
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Section 304 of the Tariff Act requires (with certain exceptions) articles of foreign origin to be marked in such manner as to indicate to an ultimate purchaser in the United States the English name of the country of origin. Under subdivision (J) of section 304(a)(3) of such Act, the Secretary of the Treasury may by regulations authorize the exception of any article from the requirements of marking if the article is of a class or kind with respect to which the Secretary of the Treasury has given notice by publication in the weekly Treasury Decisions within two years after July 1, 1937, that articles of such class or kind were imported in substantial quantities during the five-year period immediately preceding January 1, 1937, and were not required during such period to be marked to indicate their origin. This subdivision (J) includes a proviso under which the exception was to be inapplicable in certain circumstances.

The effect of the Senate amendment is to substitute for the existing proviso a new proviso under which the subdivision (J) exception is not to apply to sawed lumber. The Senate amendment further provided, in effect, that no trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States is to be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this new provision.

The House recedes with an amendment substituting new language for the language of the Senate amendment. Under the conference agreement, this subdivision (J) exception will be inapplicable to sawed lumber entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after March 31, 1964; and no trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States is to be applied in a manner inconsistent with this new provision. For this purpose, the term "sawed lumber" is intended to include rough, dressed, or worked lumber.

W. D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
THOS. J. O'BRIEN,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
HOWARD H. BAKER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House will recall, on February 26, 1963, the House passed unanimously H.R. 2513, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin. The other body left unchanged the original House language but added new matter in the nature of an amendment.

The effect of the conference agreement, as more fully indicated in the conference report and the statement of the managers on the part of the House, is to accept the amendment of the other body but with a change in the effective date.

I will explain the language which was added, and the agreement which was reached, in the following manner. In nontechnical language, the amendment will require that sawed lumber imported into the United States be marked so as to indicate the country of origin. This will be accomplished by substituting for the existing proviso under subdivision (J) of section 304(a)(3) of the new Tariff Act a new proviso under which the subdivision (J) exception is not to apply to sawed lumber. Under the conference agreement, this subdivision exception will be inapplicable to sawed lumber entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after March 31, 1964; and no trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States is to be applied in a manner inconsistent with this new provision. As also indicated in the statement of the managers, for this purpose, the term "sawed lumber" is intended to include rough, dressed, or worked lumber.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, requires that articles of foreign origin imported into the United States be marked in such way as to indicate to the ultimate purchaser the name of the country of origin. I do not know of any justifiable objection to this requirement.

As a matter of fact, I would think that many foreign manufacturers would favor the requirement that products show the country of origin. Otherwise, the manufacturers of a country wherein there has been established a reputation for quality and reliability of products, can be irreparably damaged by the importation of similar but inferior products from another source. Foreign manufacturers, as well as American consumers, are entitled to protection from such deception.

H.R. 2513, as reported by the Ways and Means Committee, and passed by the House, was intended to prevent a practice, which had developed under the existing law, whereby the marking requirement was being circumvented. Articles will be imported in containers showing the country of origin. After the articles have cleared the customs, they are repackaged and sold without showing the country of origin on the new packages.

Under existing law, there is provision for the granting of exceptions to the marking requirement in certain types of cases. An exception had been granted in the case of lumber. When the bill was before the Senate, an amendment was added to require that sawed lumber would not be excepted from marking after June 1, 1963. The bill then went to conference on this amendment.

Your conferees agreed to the lumber-marking amendment adopted by the Senate, with a change in effective date. The amendment provides that the exception to the marking requirement shall not apply to sawed lumber entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after March 31, 1964.

Accordingly, under the Senate amendment, as modified by your conferees, any sawed lumber which is imported or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after March 31, 1964, must show by appropriate marking the country of origin.

I have received a considerable volume of correspondence—both favorable and opposed—with respect to the requirement that sawed lumber be designated to show the country of origin. Undoubtedly, many other Members of the House have received similar correspondence. Frankly, I do not see any cause for alarm on the part of those opposed to this bill.

The designation of source with respect to lumber certainly is not an unreasonable requirement. Unless some of the lumber which is presently being imported is, in fact, inferior to the domestic product, I do not know why a designation of the source of the product should be presumed adversely to affect the sale of imports.

On the other hand, this is a free country. The consumer has every right, if he so chooses, to exercise a preference for the products of a specific country of origin, or to "Buy American." I see no reason why lumber should be an exception, and the consumer denied that right. The marking requirement provided for in this bill merely seeks to protect the right of the consumer to make the choice.

As is usually the case, the State Department opposed the lumber-marking requirement on the ground that the enactment of the bill would bring about retaliatory action on the part of Canada, the principal exporter of lumber to the United States. During the past few years, Canada has acted arbitrarily to restrict imports from the United States without regard to its trade agreements. In fact, at present, Canada is seeking to curtail imports of automotive parts from the United States to assembly plants in Canada. Our State Department too often is prepared to "turn the other cheek" to such action on the part of other countries.

I do not regard the marking requirement as any restriction on trade. It merely preserves to the American consumer the right of choice, to which I believe he is fully entitled. I see no reason why the State Department should have to apologize or to provide compensation to any country for this action. On the contrary, the State Department should place greater emphasis on removing the impediments to U.S. trade which have been imposed, directly or indirectly, both by the Common Market and Canada.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am highly gratified that with House agreement to this conference report there is every reason to anticipate that in future, imported sawed lumber will be marked to indicate the country of origin.

I am sure when this provision of the Tariff Act becomes effective the American people, and especially the members of the building trades, home builders, and construction workers, will be amazed and shocked to find out how much lumber used by them comes from Canada.

There has been complaint and ever-growing demand for a quota on such imports. Others have called on the administration for a protective tariff. However, from a practical standpoint, the statistics and records of growth of foreign competition from Canada have not been sufficient to attract popular support for our American industry and American jobs. Yet our lumber industry is badly hurt.

I am hopeful that when all imported sawed lumber has to be marked, public interest and indignation will be aroused so that the force of public opinion will get action and some agreement limiting imports.

So, as I have indicated, I am greatly pleased at the prospects of removing the exemption under which sawed lumber has entered the United States without being marked to show the country of origin. This is a step in the right direction to protect our industry.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Westland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the managers on the part of the House for the manner in which they have negotiated the differences between the two Houses concerning H.R. 2513. I believe the recommendation of the conferees improves this legislation, and if accepted by the House will contribute toward the improvement of our hard-pressed lumber industry.

The recommendation simply requires that lumber imported into the United States be stamped or marked with the name of the country of origin. I can assure you, as a Representative of a district where the harvesting of timber and the manufacture of lumber is the most important source of income, the marking of imported lumber is important. It is an industry faced with a highly competitive situation in which Canadian timber interests have an advantage.

Lumber is not marked today as to country of origin. Therefore, it is difficult for the consumer to compare grades, because grading rules of one nation will not necessarily correspond with the grading rules of the American industry. This often leads to complaints by domestic consumers against domestic grading agencies. Absence of a mark as to the country of origin makes it difficult to establish to whom to turn for redress.

Acceptance of the conferees' recommendation would help place our domestic producers on a competitive level with the Canadians who are able to outsell our lumber producers in their own market. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this body to support and accept the recommendation of the conferees on this legislation.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY], in connection with H.R. 2513. The Committee on Ways and Means is to be commended for the action that it has taken on this meritorious proposal. I am sincerely hopeful that it will be helpful to the U.S. lumber industry.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 871 PROVIDING FOR THE RENAMING OF THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER "THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS"

Mr. YOUNG, on behalf of Mr. O'NEILL, of Massachusetts, by direction of the Committee on Rules, filed the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 595, Rept. No. 1060), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 871) providing for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE GREAT SEAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 560 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall procure a new seal and press for the use of the House of Representatives, which shall possess fifty stars, emblematic of the fifty States of the Union, and shall depict the Capitol as it currently appears.

Resolved, That upon approval of the new seal by the Committee on House Administration, the chairman shall notify the Speaker and it shall then become the official great seal of the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That the Clerk shall furnish an impression of the new official great seal of the House of Representatives to the Administrator of General Services.

Resolved, That the necessary expenses for procuring the new seal shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers signed by the Clerk and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATION AND STUDY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 73

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 576.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by H. Res. 73 of the Eighty-eighth Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $90,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all meetings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "$90,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$85,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES, INVESTIGATIONS, AND INQUIRIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 17

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 588.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That for the second session of the 88th Congress, the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 17, Eighty-eighth Congess, as amended, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $319,000, including expenditures for employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditures in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How much was appropriated to this committee in the first session of this Congress?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The amount was $278,500.

Mr. GROSS. This takes it up to $319,000?

Mr. FRIEDEL. They have appointed another minority member for continuation of work already underway, and will start from January 1. We increased the amount by $8,000.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY PAYS TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include at this point of the RECORD the verbatim proceedings of a special meeting held in Geneva, Switzerland, on October 16, 1963, in the course of the 20th Session of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration for the purpose of honoring the memory of the late Francis E. Walter, chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

I wish to add that the members of the congressional delegation attending the meeting were profoundly touched by the

eloquence and sincerity of the homage paid our departed colleague.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION

(Verbatim record of the memorial meeting of the Council held in honor of the late Congressman Francis E. Walter, Palais des Nations, Geneva, October 16, 1963)

The CHAIRMAN. (Mr. Huidobro (Chile)). It is with mixed feelings that I declare this meeting, held to pay tribute to the memory of Mr. Francis E. Walter, the distinguished member of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, who has just died. On the one hand, I share with you all our profound regret at his decease, but on the other I am grateful for the privilege of presiding at this commemorative act of the Council of the institution to which he made so generous a contribution of his time and labor. It is not for me to sketch an outline of his career. We all know that we are meeting here today largely owing to the fact that his initiative, strength and dedication gave life to ICEM and guided its early steps. His imposing presence at meetings, his experience and knowledge of each one of the problems with which we were faced made a decisive contribution to the robust character of the organization from which we hope so much. In declaring open this commemorative meeting, while at the same time renewing to his Government our condolences, I should like to express the wish that the spirit of Mr. Walter, who was last with us in person in 1962, may continue to remain with this institution as an inspiration for its work and a help in times of difficulty.

The following participants have asked for the floor: The representatives of Greece, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, the Director, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the representatives of the International Council of Voluntary Agencies and the United States of America.

I call on the Greek representative.

Mr. VLACHOS (Greece). Mr. Chairman, the Council is meeting today in special session to pay tribute to the memory of Francis Walter, who in the course of a brilliant career devoted a large part of his efforts to the creation and development of our organization. It was he who together with George Warren (the doyen of our body) held the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration at the baptismal font. It is to his initiative, labors and careful attention at all times that we largely owe the establishment of our organization, which has been a considerable factor in alleviating demographic pressure in Europe, in channeling the movement of migrants, in humanizing the migration movement and in assisting refugees to benefit by ICEM's services.

He whose memory we are honoring today did not wish to confine himself to launching ICEM. He was concerned to assist in its growth, to supervise and support the activities of his godchild and to spare neither time nor trouble, thus personifying American generosity.

My country, which has benefited and continues to benefit by the existence of ICEM and its activities, wishes to take this opportunity to express its deep gratitude for all Francis Walter has done for this organization.

You are doubtless aware that my Government has undertaken to set up an emigration center in Greece. That center will comprise a group of buildings. The Greek Government intends to give to the central building, which will house the administrative services, the name of Francis Walter as a perennial token of its gratitude.

Mr. BURLONGER (Australia). Mr. Chairman, this is the second session of the Council at which we have been without Congressman Walter. Last session he was struggling with the illness which eventually took him from us. This time last year he was with us, and demonstrated the same interest and sympathy in ICEM's work which he had always shown since the creation of the organization over a decade ago, largely through his own efforts and those of Mr. Warren.

While all of us share a feeling of sadness and loss that Congressman Walter is no longer here, it seems to my delegation that the best memorial to his great services lies in the way in which we carry on the work for which he laid the foundation. I believe that, had he been with us at this session, he would have been heartened and encouraged by the discussion we have had on the present and future policies of the Migration Committee. I, myself, based on a very much shorter experience with ICEM, feel more than ever before that there has been at this present session a readiness to examine critically what we have been doing; to see whether we were really achieving what we had set out to do; and to draw whatever conclusions might have been necessary for improving, within our original concepts and area of activity, the services we provide for migrants and refugees. All of this is evidence of a vigorous and healthy organization, and provides much encouragement for the future. I am sure that Congressman Walter, if he had been with us, would have drawn the same conclusion.

The record of this great American whom we are commemorating today is well known to all of us and there will be no need to recapitulate it here. I would only recall that his 30 years of distinguished service in the U.S. House of Representatives was a very long one. I would recall his very impressive record of public service on many congressional committees, including the House Judiciary Committee and its Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee, which latter committee brought him, as chairman, into such close touch with our work. I would also recall his consistent interest in the welfare of refugees and migrants, as well as the many international, as well as American, honors conferred upon him for his long and distinguished record of public service.

All of this is well known, Mr. Chairman, and I will not enlarge on it any further. One point which is perhaps less well known is that "Tad" Walter had a specially intimate link with the British Commonwealth through his having gone over to Britain in the First World War to become one of the early members of the adventurous band of young men who formed the Royal Flying Corps.

In Australia, some 40 years after all this, we had the great pleasure of confirming this longstanding link when he visited Canberra in 1956 to attend the Annual Citizenship Convention and to see something of the execution of the program for settling refugees and migrants, which his vision had helped to make a practical reality. Among the many wise things Congressman Walter said at that convention was one which might well be a motto for this organization. These words were the following:

"I can express," he said, "my firm conviction that the development of sound immigration policies, the determination of the number to be admitted and the qualifications required, and the political administration of immigration laws are functions of prime importance to the well-being and security of the state, and constitute a challenge to the best in service to his government on the part of the legislator and the administrator."

My Government, Mr. Chairman, is honored to take part in this memorial session for a man who not only gave of his best in service to his own and other governments, but also provided a challenge to others to do likewise. I have been asked by Mr. A. R. Downer, the Australian Minister for Immigration, to convey to this meeting and to Congressman Walter's relatives, a message of our deep appreciation for all that Congressman Walter did to provide a brighter and happier future for so many people scattered throughout our various member states. The message from Mr. Downer reads as follows:

"It is fitting that the Council of ICEM should pay tribute to the late Congressman Francis E. Walter.

"While Congressman Walter's service was widely recognized in the United States, he also gained renown in the international sphere for his untiring work and efforts for migrants and refugees.

"The creation of ICEM was due in large measure to the foresight of Congressman Walter, who saw how the war-devastated countries of Europe and the developing countries of the New World could mutually benefit from the free movement of people within the framework of intercontinentally planned migration.

"As Minister for Immigration, I express gratitude for Congressman Walter's initiative and for what ICEM has meant to Australia, and at the same time reaffirm our support for ICEM." Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KUIJBURS (Belgium). It is not without emotion that my delegation has the honor to associate itself with other countries of ICEM in the well-merited tribute rendered by the Council to the outstanding work and personality of Francis Walter. All those who have in any way been concerned with the migration problem have met that noble representative of the American parliamentary system, either in person or, more often, through his work and the influence he never ceased to exercise in that field. ICEM could not be an exception to that rule, all the more as Francis Walter was one of the pioneers who made so great a contribution to the establishment and development of this international organization. It is by giving proof of his dynamism and vitality in the accomplishment of his work that ICEM will remain faithful to Francis Walter's memory and will best pay him a tribute worthy of his deep attachment to an eminently social and humanitarian cause.

It is with that pious idea in mind that we pay our tribute to the memory of the late Francis Walter.

Mr. FARIA (Brazil). Mr. Chairman, for many reasons the Latin American delegations, and mine in particular, could not have failed to express their profound regret at the death of a personality whose name has been associated with the Committee since its beginning and whose memory is dear to us all—Congressman Francis Walter. I need not remind you of his dynamic life, inspired by the constant concern to help refugees to find a new life sheltered from the sufferings and insecurity of the camps.

That explains the unfailing interest which Congressman Walter devoted to the activities of ICEM. His intense work in the international field showed a humanitarian spirit deeply rooted in a farseeing mind. He was therefore all the more conscious of the reasons for protecting the unfortunate people who are unable to lead a peaceful existence until they find a new country which they can call their own.

I am convinced that at a time when one inclines to wonder about the future of ICEM we all have a duty to ponder the ideas which Francis Walter has developed on the Committee's role, the measures that he often took, and has left us as an example of an open mind ready to accept the demands of reality and to seek ideas and plans of more use than inefficient and outworn formulas.

On several occasions we had the opportunity of discussing with Francis Walter the prospects of more vigorous action for this committee in the problem of land development in Brazil and other Latin American countries. His pragmatic, quick, and objective mind encouraged us to pursue our efforts in submitting to the Administration a plan for constructive cooperation enabling ICEM to meet realistically the needs of Latin America. Indeed, the results of the committee's work in Latin America will no doubt be instrumental in shaping the future of our organization.

This is why Francis Walter, having understood the great importance of the development of the agricultural economies of Latin American countries—although he was not an agricultural expert—gave his wholehearted support to the participation of ICEM in land settlement projects in Latin America.

We are glad to note that Congressman Walter, several years before his death, had succeeded in transforming his motivation into a policy now followed by his country's delegation.

Because of the identity between Francis Walter's work and the most worthwhile aims of the committee, because of his attachment to alleviating, to seeking solutions for refugee problems, because of his foresight as to the future of our institution, Francis Walter will always have our esteem and respect. He should stand as an example to be followed whenever we are faced by the difficult task of tracing a path for the committee in the years to come. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. von Haeften (Federal Republic of Germany). Mr. Chairman, the German delegation is eager to join the other delegates who have already taken the floor and to pay tribute to the memory of the Honorable Francis E. Walter. Indeed, my country is most grateful to this great American. We are indebted to him for the efficient help which he gave us after the war. Many millions of refugees, expellees, and displaced persons had flocked to Germany. My country was defeated, destroyed, and ruined. Our people had lost courage, they were depressed and starving. We could hardly manage to keep alive ourselves and it was most difficult to find food, lodgings, clothes, and employment for the German refugees and the international refugees. In this terrible stress we heartily welcomed the efforts of Congressman Walter to resettle hundreds of thousands of refugees in countries outside Europe.

Already in 1946, 1 year after the end of the war, Mr. Walter visited Germany. In 1947 he returned to Germany for 3 months and made a thorough study on the problem of displaced persons and refugees. A report on that study which, if I am rightly informed, was addressed to the Congress of the United States, was published and gave rise to widespread interest. In the subsequent years the United States facilitated the emigration of refugees—other states followed in this way.

As all of you know, Mr. Walter, together with Mr. Warren, sponsored the foundation of ICEM. Without the strong support of the United States of America our organization could never have been founded. Mr. Walter, during his lifetime, followed with keen interest the activities of ICEM. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration in the House of Representatives, Mr. Walter used all his influence in order that ICEM could continue its useful work. Most of you knew him personally. I also had the privilege to meet Mr. Walter during the spring season of 1962 and I was most impressed by his kind personality. As a true American Mr. Walter combined lofty idealism with a sense of reality. Prompted by idealistic motives he wanted to help the refugees and the surplus population in Europe, but he knew the limits of his possibilities and he kept within these limits, thus insuring a lasting success and avoiding failure.

During decades Mr. Walter greatly influenced the shaping of the immigration policy of the United States of America which is of such great importance for the European countries. Steering a safe course he kept the stream of immigration flowing even in times when there was large-scale unemployment in America.

As Congressman Walter himself told me, he was of German descent. His ancestors came from the region of Frankfurt where members of the same family still live. Although he maintained a sympathetic attitude toward his country of origin and toward Europe as a whole, he was not influenced by this attitude in his political action. As a great patriot he always worked for the best for his beloved country, the United States of America. At the same time, as a convinced humanitarian, he helped many thousands of poor distressed people from all countries of the world to find a new life and to regain new hope. Germany is proud to have given such an offspring to America.

We shall never forget Francis Walter.

Mr. Iaor (Israel). Mr. Chairman, others of our colleagues have already spoken and will speak of Congressman Walter as a politician and his relations with our organization. I intend to add only a very few words of personal touch in speaking of "Tad" Walter. If I may say so, we—ICEM—lost, and are mourning, a father. But my country, and especially myself, we are mourning a friend. I was more than proud hearing him often call me his friend, and as friendship is always mutual, I was struck dumb when the news of his passing away reached me. May I ask now, at this opportunity, the U.S. delegation to convey to their Government and to his family my government's and my deepest sympathy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Maccotta (Italy). Mr. Chairman, the Italian delegation wants to associate itself to the homage that the whole council of this committee is so rightly paying to the memory of Congressman Francis Walter. Congressman Walter has been, through all his life, a great American and a great citizen of the world. His contribution to international cooperation has always been extremely valuable, and no one could be better aware of this than members of this committee who have worked with him on so many occasions and have been constantly helped by him in the accomplishment of the various and important tasks of the committee. My delegation wants to remember particularly that Congressman Walter presided with his usual tactfulness, good humor and energy over the session of the council held in Naples in May 1960, an important moment for the life of ICEM.

The Italian Government held in high esteem Congressman Walter, and the distinction of knight commander of the Order of Merit conferred upon him proved in a complete way the appreciation of our authorities for his work both in the field of international cooperation and in bilateral relations. I have personal recollections when our Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs offered the decoration to Congressman Walter, as well as of several occasions on which I had the honor of meeting him in Italy or here in Geneva.

I beg the delegation of the United States of America, as well as the honorable Members of the American Congress here present, to accept the expression of the deepest sympathy of the Italian Government and delegation. The memory of Congressman Francis Walter will last for a long time in our hearts.

Baron van Boetzelaer (Netherlands). Mr. Chairman, the Netherlands delegation desires to pay tribute to the great American whom we are commemorating today. In trying to express our heartfelt appreciation of the late Congressman Walter, and the deep gratitude with which we remember him, words that would do him justice are failing. The gap left by his passing brings home to us clearly the nature and extent of the loss we have sustained.

Mr. Chairman, it would be beyond me to enlarge adequately here upon the devotion with which this gifted man placed his time and his political talents at the service of the country he loved above all, or upon the prominent role he played in American politics during the past 30 years. It is given to very few to hand in such an honorable record when he has to answer the last call.

Congressman Walter's inspiration and perseverance have made themselves felt far beyond the frontiers of his fatherland. We who had the privilege of coming into contact with him, have experienced this throughout the years.

Looking back, we realize the tremendous debt we owe to the man who possessed the vision, energy, and persuasive power to tackle as a joint international responsibility the solution through migration of the deeply human problems that arose when, at the end of the Second World War, a continuous stream of refugees poured into the free Western World.

It is obvious that those activities resulted in the formation of an international organization—ICEM—and that Congressman Walter was its soul and the pushing power behind it. If there is any place where the shock of his passing is severely felt, it is in this circle, which can hardly do without the guidance and support of that born leader.

Mr. Chairman, the countless ways in which we miss him constitute the most eloquent testimony to Mr. Walter's outstanding significance. The forum that the creation of ICEM provided for governments who felt themselves responsible for tackling the problems of migration multilaterally, has also had a beneficial influence in consolidating existing contacts and forming new ones. For example, our joint work in ICEM has given a new and deeper value to our migration relations with the United States. And this, Mr. Chairman, was a very special reason for the value my government placed upon the understanding always shown to us by the man who molded the U.S. migration policy.

For us Dutchmen, Mr. Chairman, Walter's name will always be connected with the Refugee Relief Act that came into being, thanks to his initiative, and with the Pastore-Walter Act, which enabled 25,000 Dutch nationals from Indonesia to build up a new livelihood in the United States. Those laws were enacted in periods not always economically favorable for the United States, but it was the great merit of the author of the initiatives that, with him, humanitarian considerations weighed more heavily than temporary economic difficulties. In that respect also, Francis Walter took the right view.

Mr. Chairman, when I touched upon Mr. Walter's understanding and support for aspects of our own national emigration policy, I did so partly because I am sure that other members of our organization will have had similar heartwarming experiences in their dealings with him. As recently as May 5, 1958, Her Majesty Queen Juliana expressed to Mr. Walter her cordial appreciation of all he had done in the humanitarian and migration fields. It did not occur to us at the time that his work would be laid down so soon.

My delegation wishes to give utterance to the profound regret of those concerned in Dutch migration at the loss of this internationally respected statesman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Director (Mr. Haveman). Mr. Chairman, it was just 12 years ago that I first met our friend the late Congressman Francis E. Walter. He was on his way to Brussels, to the Brussels Conference, and on November 29, 1951 he came to see me in The Hague in my capacity as chief of the Netherlands delegation to the forthcoming meeting in Brussels.

He introduced himself, sat down, and then launched straight into the purpose of his

visit. He said to me: "Young man, let's have a practical discussion. Your country and mine, and many others, both emigration and immigration countries, are interested in moving people. Besides nationals there are thousands of refugees from Communist countries who need resettlement. The United States is prepared to share, with other governments, the responsibility for the orderly movement of these people—but with one proviso that must be clearly understood, that a supervision direct and indirect of such activities must be confined to the nations of the Western World. If you agree with this basic concept, I am asking you to help me to establish the organization that can do the job."

By the cooperation of quite a number of governments, the organization some weeks later was established.

From that point on, the records of ICEM itself tell the story.

When I attended the funeral service of Mr. Walter, while discussing the Congressman's work, I mentioned to a general of the U.S. Air Force the important role Congressman Walter had played in the lives of more than 1½ million refugees and national migrants. Further, I told him the story of Mr. Walter's initiative in bringing the governments of 29 nations together in an international organization to be practical, by recognizing—and I am quoting now Mr. Walter's statement in Brussels—the fact that one of the greatest assets in the world today is being dissipated through a failure realistically to place people where they are needed in the struggle for peace. I added that I did not know of any international politician who had succeeded in fortifying his ideas to the same degree and in such an efficient manner as Congressman Walter did. He not only influenced the thinking of a great number of governments but he brought them into joint action and good results. The general was amazed to hear all this, he said: "We are too used to judging our politicians only from the domestic point of view. All of us recognize Congressman Walter's stature as an American political figure, but the role he played internationally is much less known here."

Although Mr. Walter had extremely strong basic ideas to which he remained faithful in all circumstances, as a great politician he showed that magic, keen discernment of being able to distinguish between possibilities and impossibilities. By his pragmatic approach, his great command of facts, his prestige and his power of persuasion, he often knew how to shift the borderline between them and to change a political impossibility into a concrete reality.

When Francis Walter took the lead in drafting the Walter-McCarran Immigration and Nationality Act, and later the Pastore-Walter Act (through which, as the delegate of the Netherlands already mentioned, so many of my own countrymen were enabled to enter the United States), he little knew that he was taking part in constructing his own monument. But Americans old and new were quick to recognize what he had done for them and his country. Patriotic societies, veterans' associations, religious communities, all honored him by awarding him their medals, plaques, or citations. Even more, the measure of his worth was recognized abroad, among others by the Japanese, Italian and Netherlands Governments. Small wonder then that Francis Walter was known and revered by untold numbers of new Americans.

His interest in the problems of refugees and in helping them to settle in the United States was, however, no narrow preoccupation. It came from a burning desire to help his fellow men. The cost to his country was enormous, and to himself too, in the outpouring of his agile mind and his boundless energy. He worked away at the ideals he had set himself for the benefit of others. Both in and out of Congress he pleaded the cause of those who could be helped to a better life through migration.

Francis Walter saw migration not only as a humanitarian activity in which the migrants themselves were to receive benefits, but also as a means of enriching the life of his own countrymen, by bringing in new people, by enabling different cultural experiences to be shared by all. He never overlooked or forgot that his country's greatness had been built up over 300 years by the energy and drive and the intermingling of old and new Americans.

But we in ICEM must also pay a broadly based tribute to our late friend. We know he was a good American, proud of his nation and jealous in his guardianship of his national heritage. Even more, for us he was of that rare breed of human beings who are visionaries with their feet firmly planted on the ground. No dreamer, Francis Walter, but a man who saw clearly what needed to be done for the world's unfortunates and for the underprivileged. The fact that he not only recognized the needs but led his countrymen to play a vital role in meeting them will stand forever as his greatest achievement. Francis Walter would have been the first to pay tribute to what other members of ICEM have done for our common cause, but, as Director, I must emphasize my conviction that the spark of genius, the all-embracing mind that conceived and brought our Committee into existence, belonged to Francis Walter.

Francis Walter never hesitated to intervene when he felt strongly about what the ICEM family was doing or, sometimes, failing to do. His interventions were brief but forceful. I remember a fairly recent one most particularly. It had just been my pleasure, as representative of the Netherlands, to announce that the Board of the Netherlands Migration Foundation had conferred the Olivier van Noort gold medal on Congressman Walter in recognition of the services rendered by him in pioneering the resettlement of refugees and national migrants after the war. Modestly he accepted the award as an expression of appreciation to the Congress of the United States and then went on in a few words to set the stage for ICEM's forward movement. He left us in no doubt that, in his own words, "ICEM was lagging behind the fast pace at which the international situation was developing." His statement was a masterpiece of brevity, but it did put us on a new road, a road along which a flow of skilled manpower toward the developing countries has since begun to move.

Francis Walter will be remembered by many of us for his ability to keep abreast of his times and his uncanny perception in sensing changes in world affairs and their effect on our work. Like the early pioneers in his own country, Francis Walter was tireless in seeking new horizons for the ICEM family of nations and in passing them on to us. Let us go ahead in the work he helped to start and continued to foster. If we do that, if we remain faithful to the ideal of service to our fellow men with the same fervor and intensity that we appreciated in "Tad" Walter, we can pay him no finer tribute. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SCHNYDER (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). Mr. Chairman, at the last meeting of the ICEM Council I had an opportunity to say a few words of appreciation for the work carried out by the Honorable Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, and to express my regret that he who was such a friend of uprooted people could not be with us on that occasion. We then hoped that good health would soon be restored to him but, alas, we are now denied his good counsel and support.

His death is cause for grief to all who are engaged in refugee work. Time after time during the postwar period he brought his great influence to bear in favor of refugee legislation and, when it was passed, he took an active personal interest in its administration.

The highly significant recent expression of his and of his great country's willingness to help in resolving the residual refugee problem in Europe was the fair-share principle embodied in Public Law 86-648, under which the United States agreed to admit up to 25 percent of the number of refugees accepted by other countries over a given period. This formula, so typical of Congressman Walter's practical approach, has proved not only of importance in itself, but also has served to stimulate the active concern of other countries toward a truly international effort.

Seldom have the homeless had a more doughty or a more canny ally than the Honorable Francis E. Walter, and we shall miss his help sorely in the years to come. I wish therefore to associate myself and my colleagues of the United Nations Office for Refugees with the memorial tributes that have been paid today to this outstanding man.

Mr. JAMES P. RICE (executive director of United Hias Service). Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to pay tribute to the late Congressman Francis E. Walter, on behalf of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc. Our council, established in 1944, is composed of Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and nonsectarian American voluntary agencies operating throughout the world in the field of relief, rehabilitation, resettlement, community development, and technical aid programs.

The officers and members of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies maintained a close working relationship with Congressman Walter on every significant refugee aid and migration program throughout the turbulent postwar period. We want to acknowledge our debt to him for his leadership in our Congress and in the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, which made possible indispensable U.S. support of these humanitarian programs.

It was a measure of Congressman Walter as a man, that despite his heavy responsibilities in his leadership position in the Congress, and despite the fact that he did not always share the views of the voluntary agencies, his door was always open to us as representatives of the American council or of our own individual agencies. It was my privilege to have participated in many such meetings with Congressman Walter in Washington, New York, and here on the shores of Lake Geneva. The member agencies of the ACVA believe that these meetings often played a part in Congressman Walter's decision to take the leadership in passage of a number of important humanitarian pieces of legislation, including the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, already mentioned here, which provides indefinite continuation of special refugee immigration legislation and permanent U.S. participation in the work of ICEM, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the U.S. escapee program, and other refugee aid programs.

Permit me to add, Mr. Chairman, that the members of the ACVA are deeply gratified that Congressman Walter's successor as chairman of the important U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, Congressman MICHAEL FEIGHAN of Ohio, has already demonstrated that he desires to carry on this tradition of cooperation with the American voluntary agencies.

And now, Mr. Chairman, may I ask my friend and colleague, Mr. James Norris of the Catholic Relief Services of the NCWC, to bring you a message from the honorary chairman of the ACVA, Bishop Edward E. Swanstrom.

Mr. JAMES J. NORRIS (assistant to the executive director, Catholic Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference). Mr. Chairman, the hundreds of thousands of refugees and immigrants who entered the United States under legislation sponsored and furthered by the late Congressman Walter are represented here today, in a sense, by the private agencies which helped them to settle in their newly adopted homeland. These voluntary agencies worked closely with Congressman Walter in connection with the passage of special legislation on behalf of these men, women, and children.

On the occasion of the death of Congressman Walter, the honorary chairman of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies, Bishop Edward Swanstrom, wrote a tribute to the Congressman which I have been asked to read on behalf of some 40 agencies associated in the American Council of Voluntary Agencies:

"A TRIBUTE TO HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER: A GREAT AMERICAN

"By the Most Reverend Edward N. Swanstrom, executive director, Catholic Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference

"I should like to pay a well-deserved tribute to the late Congressman Francis E. Walter, more affectionately known as Tad by those of us who were fortunate enough to have won his friendship and affection, all of whom held him in the same high regard.

"I came to know Congressman Walter quite well during the critical years after World War II, and I was among those who dropped in at the hospital in Washington now and then during his last long illness to offer him a word of consolation and cheer. I felt privileged, too, to be among those who were at his burial service when his mortal remains were laid to rest in Arlington Cemetery.

"The fact that the U.S. immigration law is commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act often tends to cast a shadow on the records of these two great gentlemen whose action in Congress, to my mind, was motivated more than anything else by devotion and loyalty to their country. The McCarran-Walter Act was primarily a recodification of the multitude of immigration and naturalization acts which had been placed on the statute books since the turn of the century. Both of these men were quite adamant in their insistence that they did not mean it to be nor wish it to be anything more than just that, even though they did endorse and include some very desirable amendments in the final act. They were not the authors of the 'national origins quota system' and as I look back on it now I am sure that at that time they thought that the Congress and the people of the United States were not yet prepared to accept a change in our basic immigration policy.

"Mr. Walter was convinced that under the law as written and with the help of emergency legislation a substantial number of citizens could find a home and freedom in our country. The facts seem to justify his conviction.

"In the 10 years after the McCarran-Walter bill became law, 2,500,000 refugees and immigrants were admitted to the United States. It is of some significance that of this number, 1,600,000 were admitted as nonquota immigrants, whereas only 900,000 arrived under regular quotas. It was of necessity an era of emergency legislation and it was principally under Mr. Walter's leadership that additional men, women, and children were admitted to the United States on that basis. It was under Mr. Walter's leadership also that the so-called "fair share" immigration act was enacted in 1960 and later extended and made a permanent part of our legislation in 1962. Under this act the United States has accepted and will continue to accept a quota of refugees in a given ratio to those accepted by other countries.

"Nobody liked the so-called piecemeal character of this emergency immigration legislation but to be realistic about the situation one must conclude that it was the only basis upon which, during those years, victims of the war's dislocation and of demographic inequalities could have been brought into our country in additional numbers.

"It seems to me that the enlightenment and understanding regarding our present undesirable basic immigration policy, which is a heritage of the 1920's that has now come to our Nation have made us ripe for a change more in keeping with our traditional sense of fair play and justice. I believe that Mr. Walter realized this, and I would like to believe that if he were alive today he would be in the forefront of leadership for change; a change that the next decade would inevitably produce.

"It is regrettable in a way that these prospects for change were not more propitious in the last few years of his life. I have heard it said by those close to him that Mr. Walter was thinking of offering just such a change. That is not really important now. What is important is that in fairness to his honored memory, we keep the record straight. Those of us who have been in the forefront of postwar resettlement programs will always be conscious of the great debt our country, and we ourselves, owe to his understanding and leadership."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

TELEGRAMS READ BY THE SECRETARY TO THE COMMITTEE

Mr. OSCAR JOSEPH (president, International Council on Jewish Social and Welfare Services). Wish to join ICEM in paying posthumous tribute to late Francis Walter. His work as architect of ICEM and for the cause of refugees will long be remembered by all who knew him and worked by his side. Our people have special reason to be grateful for his lifesaving efforts.

Mr. CHARLES JORDAN (American Joint Distribution Committee). Regret inability to attend ceremony honoring late Representative Francis Walter but wish to associate myself with tribute ICEM is paying him. He was truly devoted friend to refugees and his leadership in humanitarian cause to which he devoted so much of his career will not soon be forgotten.

Mr. CHARLES JORDAN (in his capacity as President, International Council of Voluntary Agencies). On behalf of all voluntary agencies who knew the late Francis Walter and esteem his memory as a great humanitarian, may I express our wish to participate in the ceremony honoring him for his services in guiding U.S. assistance to refugees and migrants and his work in building ICEM.

Mr. ABBA P. SCHWARTZ (United States of America). Mr. Chairman, I should like to first express the gratitude of my Government and of the members of the U.S. delegation for the action of the Government of Greece in honoring the late Congressman Walter by giving his name to the new emigration center in Athens. I should also like to thank the member governments, the Director of ICEM, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and all of the voluntary agencies for their kind references to Congressman Walter this morning. I am sure that all the members of the U.S. delegation are deeply moved, as I am, by these evidences of respect and affection for Congressman Walter.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, before proceeding further I should like to present to the Council a member of our delegation who is a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr., of New Jersey. Mr. RODINO is also a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, and has a message for the Council from the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, and he would also like to speak on his own behalf.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr. (House of Representatives, U.S. Congress). Mr. Chairman, it is a real pleasure to occupy once more the U.S. delegate's seat around this table. Last spring I left Geneva with the full appreciation of the importance of the work done by the Council and by ICEM, and I conveyed this impression to my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

I have the honor to read to you now a few remarks from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER.

"I regret deeply that my duties as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary forced me to cancel my plans to attend this session of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. The importance of the work of the committee cannot be exaggerated. It discharges tremendous responsibilities in a manner which I am sure has earned the respect, and I might even say, envy, of many another international group. Because its work is so well done, there may be some who believe the committee has already served its purpose and that the time has come to disband. I emphatically disagree.

"In a rapidly changing world where political and economic stability cannot be taken for granted, there is every compelling reason that this committee, having acquired the indispensable knowledge and techniques in the movement of people, continue in existence. What is needed now is planning, wider in scope, imagination and vision. I, and many of my colleagues in Congress, send encouragement to the committee for the work it has already done and for the contribution it has yet to make.

"I join my colleagues in acknowledging how altogether fitting it is that the emigration center in Greece be named the Francis E. Walter Emigration Center. In a very firm sense, Francis E. Walter was the father of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. It was he who kept all of us in the Congress informed of the 'what,' 'where,' 'when,' and 'why' of the committee's activities. He supported it vigorously within the Judiciary Committee and on the floor of the House of Representatives. Nobody understood better than he why the committee came into existence and it was his fondest hope, as he so often told me, that the committee could move forward to newer horizons and meet one of the basic challenges of this age.

"I know I speak for my colleagues when I say that we all appreciate this recognition of his work. You will miss his guiding hand, as we do in the Congress, but there is a consolation in knowing that you have acted to provide for him a living memorial."

We are profoundly touched and grateful to you, gentlemen, for your remarks about our departed friend and colleague, Francis E. Walter. It is gratifying to us to see that his great contribution to the work of ICEM is so widely recognized and appreciated. The naming of the proposed emigration center in Athens, in his memory, will be, I am sure received with gratitude by the entire House of Representatives. The presence of a congressional delegation here today serves to confirm once more the unabating interest of the U.S. Congress in the continuation of ICEM's mission. More than that, the fact that our chairman, the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, is heading our group, attests to the continued interest of the United States in the existence and development of ICEM. Mr. FEIGHAN was a prominent member of the U.S. delegation to the Brussels Conference and one of the coauthors of the original resolution under which this organization was established. Thus there is stressed a direct link between the early and the present days of ICEM.

In emphasizing this important link I would also like to point to the fact that while we all want to keep ICEM as a most valuable instrument of international cooperation in the field of migration, we also want it to intensify its own efforts and to stimulate the efforts of the member nations so as to become a key element of cooperation between overpopulated countries on the one side and those countries of Latin America whose economic development depends upon a steady supply of trained manpower.

I discussed this point in the course of your 19th session in the spring of this year, and I wish to reemphasize again the need for more active efforts destined to open up barriers of agricultural resettlement in those countries of Latin America which simply must produce more food and train their own nationals together with immigrants in agricultural endeavors so as to produce enough food to cope with the needs of their rapidly increasing population. This is an imperative task, I submit.

Refugees and national immigrants provide in equal share the type of manpower most needed in Latin America. In this domain ICEM's task is clearly outlined, its constitution offers the necessary authority without any changes and in these important endeavors we wish you success. Thank you.

Mr. ABBA P. SCHWARTZ (United States of America). Mr. Chairman, it is indeed fitting that we should have honored Congressman Walter at this session this morning which he so looked forward to attending despite his illness. It may be said that Congressman Walter devoted his life to the better organization of migration.

His contributions to immigration laws in the United States were outstanding. The basic immigration law of our country bears his name. He had great foresight in the field of immigration and he sensed the needs to be met by legislation and better international organization long before his colleagues in government and those professionally engaged in this field.

In 1948, for instance, he began calling for the creation of the organization which became ICEM in 1951. Congressman Walter attended the Brussels Conference, and he took great pride in seeing the organization which he had envisaged come into being. His record of attendance and active interest at subsequent sessions of the Council are well know to all of you. Congressman Walter was a master of the legislative process and an outstanding parliamentarian. He presided on many occasions over the U.S. House of Representatives. His skill, resourcefulness, and leadership in securing legislative action were universally recognized.

As a person, Congressman Walter was warmhearted, loyal to his friends, and buoyant in spirit. His memory and achievements will live long in our hearts. He has won and richly deserves a respect shown here to him today.

The U.S. delegation, Mr. Chairman, would appreciate a verbatim record of the discussion this morning for deposit with the papers and other effects of Congressman Walter which are being assembled in his memory in the United States.

And now, Mr. Chairman, it is with great personal pleasure and a deep sense of pride that I have the honor, on this occasion, to share with the Council a special message from the President of the United States. The message reads as follows:

The WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 11, 1963.

DEAR MR. SCHWARTZ: I am pleased that you are to attend the forthcoming session of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration as the U.S. representative.

Please extend to the members of the Council our appreciation of the many warm expressions of sympathy which we received following the death of Congressman Francis E. Walter. Congressman Walter was one of the principal architects of ICEM when it was established over 10 years ago and, throughout that time, he followed ICEM's progress closely, even during the days of his illness.

The continuing need today for the migration committee's work in resettling refugees, reuniting families and placement of workers in oversea areas where they are needed and desire to immigrate constitutes a lasting tribute to Congressman Walter's concern for the problems of refugees and separation of families. His contribution found expression in many of the legislative actions taken by our Congress following the Second World War. Among the more recent bills which he sponsored is the Refugee and Migration Assistance Act of 1962, which provides the continuing authority for appropriation of funds for U.S. contributions to ICEM, as well as to Cuban and other refugee programs.

I hope that we might bring to the attention of the Council a new immigration legislation which I have recommended to the Congress. This would perpetuate our policy of effecting the reuniting of families and admitting refugees and immigrants without discrimination, matters which I know are of deep interest to the members of the Migration Committee.

On previous occasions I have referred to ICEM's potential for assisting Latin American countries in selecting, recruiting and receiving the skilled and semiskilled immigrants who can contribute so much to the growth and development of the economies of these countries. I am confident that you will urge your colleagues in the Council to continue to develop and expand ICEM's efforts in this area, which hold such promise for Latin America.

Please convey to the Council the strong continuing interest of the U.S. Government in the important work of the migration committee and my personal wishes for a fruitful outcome of the discussions at this session.

Sincerely,
JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. GARCIA LAHIGUERA (Spain). The proposal having already been made, I will confine myself to seconding it and asking that it be published and distributed to all members.

Mr. FURLONGER (Australia). I know that I speak on behalf of all members of the Council and all member governments of ICEM when I express their deep appreciation for this very important and very challenging message which Mr. Schwartz has delivered to us from the President of the United States. It is a matter, I think, for deep satisfaction to all of us that among the many other duties which the President has, he has found time to deliver this message to us. And I myself, and I know I speak for all of us, are very grateful for this. We are also, I think, very grateful to Congressman RODINO for the message which he brought to us from Congressman CELLER and I myself derive great satisfaction from these messages. It is quite clear to us that I think from them that the interest in our work was started by Congressman Walter is still maintained at a very high level in the United States. And in expressing appreciation to Mr. Schwartz for those messages I think I may take the liberty of associating other members of the Council with my words. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Honorable ABBA P. SCHWARTZ (United States of America). Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the honorable delegate of Australia and to assure him that I will convey to the President the expression of thanks of which he has just given to us. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Huidobro) (Chile). I believe that I have the consent of the meeting to proceed in accordance with the proposal of the representative of the United States of America, seconded by the Spanish representative, for the publication of all the expressions of sympathy made at this meeting. May I suggest to the Council that it transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America a record of all the sentiments to which expression has been given here today in the form of a resolution the text of which could be submitted, and if thought desirable approved, at a later meeting.

It is so decided, before the Council rises I suggest that representatives observe a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of Francis Walter. The Council will rise.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION

COUNCIL 20TH SESSION, OCTOBER 23, 1963

(Resolution No. 306 (XX), special resolution paying tribute to the late Honorable Francis E. Walter (adopted by the Council at its 181st meeting on October 18, 1963))

The Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, pursuant to the memorial meeting at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on October 16, 1963, at which representative of member governments, the Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and representatives of voluntary agencies paid tribute to the humanitarian work of the late Congressman Francis E. Walter, and, in particular, to his tireless efforts in promoting the objectives of ICEM,

Resolves:

1. To publish the verbatim texts of the statements of respect and regard for Congressman Walter made at the memorial meeting;
2. To invite the representative of Greece to inform the Royal Greek Government of the warmth of its unanimous welcome of that Government's decision to name the central building of the new emigration center the Francis E. Walter Building;
3. To invite the representative of the United States of America to convey to the President of the United States of America their grateful thanks for his message of encouragement and inspiration dated October 11, 1963;
4. To request the representative of the United States of America to transmit the text of this resolution, together with the expression of the Council's deep sympathy to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America.

REGISTRATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, in 1961 the Supreme Court held that Congress had the right to compel the Communist Party to register with the Attorney General and reveal the names of all its officers and members. It found the registration provisions of the Internal Security Act constitutional.

Now, the court of appeals has, in effect, nullified the Supreme Court decision by the ruling it handed down yesterday.

Under regulations issued by the Attorney General pursuant to the Internal Security Act, the Communist Party may register with the Department of Justice the information required by the act through one of its officers or members, or through an "attorney, agent, or other person." The court of appeals has not only held that Communist Party officers or members would incriminate themselves if they were to register the Communist Party, but it has bought the phony argument of the Communist Party that no one, not even an attorney or agent, could register for the party without providing information that might involve him in a criminal prosecution.

Certainly, if the Communist Party had any intention of complying with the law, it could readily have found an attorney or agent who was not a party member to prepare the registration papers for it. The services of attorneys are normally available for such purposes. It is clear that the Communist Party has had no difficulty in obtaining attorneys to represent it in the past in legal proceedings of all types, including the present litigation. Moreover, it is a settled principle of American law that there is no inference that an attorney is a criminal merely because he represents a criminal—or a Communist because he performs some legal service for the Communist Party.

Many attorneys have represented the Communist Party without incriminating themselves in any way by doing so.

The truth of the matter is that the Communist Party has raised a smokescreen to make the Supreme Court decision meaningless, and the court of appeals has apparently permitted the Communist Party to get away with this. This is indeed a fantastic decision.

The decision is also frustratingly vague. It remands the case to the district court with instructions for it to grant a new trial if the Government so requests, or else to hand down a judgment of acquittal. At the same time, it says that the Government must prove that a volunteer representative who would have acted for the party in registering it was available in the fall of 1961 during the time the party was supposed to register.

But it does not state what kind of a volunteer it is talking about. Does it mean anyone at all who was willing to perform the registration act for the party?

If this is its meaning, I am certain that many thousands of attorneys would have been willing to perform the simple task of filing the registration statement with the Department of Justice. I also believe a number of past presidents of the American Bar Association would have been willing to do the same thing.

But the court does not say whether this volunteer must simply be willing to perform the registration act or whether he must have in his possession all the information which the law demands shall be included in the registration form. This includes not only the names and addresses of every single officer and member of the Communist Party, but details of the party's finances and a list of all printing presses and machinery of any type which are in the possession, custody, or ownership of the party or in which its officers and members have an interest.

Obviously, there is no one in the Nation outside the top officials of the Communist Party who have this information. Rank-and-file members and lesser officials do not possess it. Therefore, if the court demands that the volunteer have this information, it is setting up an impossible condition and granting the Communist Party immunity from the registration provision which the Supreme Court itself has upheld in no uncertain terms.

Of course, if a few top officials of the Communist Party decide that they would make all this information available to the volunteer registrant, this would not be so. But the court does not say whether or not the party must make such information available to anyone who volunteers.

Suppose it refuses to do so? As far as can be determined from the decision, it is an open question whether or not the party must accept, and make the required information available to any volunteer registrant. Is the party free to reject any volunteer not to its liking? If so, the decision would appear to give to the Communist Party itself the final say on whether or not it will obey the Supreme Court of the United States, for, through this veto power, might it not reject all proffered volunteers?

This case has been before the courts for 10 years. It simply must be brought to a head. We cannot tolerate pussyfooting, foot dragging or winking at contrived loopholes in what is today our country's major antisubversive law.

REPRESENTATIVE, NOW JUDGE, HOMER THORNBERRY—A TRIBUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this statement I shall make concerns Congressman HOMER THORNBERRY, who is retiring from Congress to be a U.S. district judge at El Paso, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed to insert anything they consider germane in the RECORD today, and may have 5 legislative days in which to make insertions in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are few comforts to be derived from a long and strenuous participation in the affairs of this House that are so reassuring to an old legislative hand as the tone and character of the younger men who are being elected to serve in this Chamber. Easily among the most outstanding of these is our colleague, Representative HOMER THORNBERRY, who is about to resign to accept a Federal judgeship. There are those who will no doubt discover political strategy in the resignation of Representative THORNBERRY and his appointment and confirmation to his new post on the bench of the U.S. district court for western Texas. Indeed, I offer the opinion that if political consideration entered into the appointment which the U.S. Senate has endorsed by voice vote, they were motivated by the highest regard for the public interest.

Emphasis for this high motivation, if any were needed, comes from no less a source than two of the most distinguished Members of the other body. One of them is Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, a fellow member of Representative THORNBERRY's own party, and the other, the formidable Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the respected and politically prudent minority leader of the party in opposition. I hold that it is no little thing for Mr. THORNBERRY to have so remarkably won the approbation and the applause of his colleague legislators since his election to this House for the first time in 1948 with the 81st Congress, and his repeated election to all Congresses since.

Of course when I say younger men, I mean the term relatively, for Mr. THORNBERRY, born in 1909, can hardly be described as a youthful novice in political affairs. In the early twenties, I was privileged to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Legislature of Texas. My deskmate was Sam E. Johnson, one of the best men I ever knew, who was the father of our great President, Lyndon B. Johnson. Lyndon B. Johnson was at that time 12 years old and HOMER THORNBERRY, who was a popular and outstanding page boy in the Legislature of Texas, was 6 months younger than Lyndon. I have known Congressman THORNBERRY practically all of his life. It has been a great pleasure to me to have observed this former page boy become one of America's greatest and most outstanding citizens and statesmen. He had already matured politically long before he entered this Chamber. Moreover he had built a successful and brilliant career on the foundation of a sound and thorough education. This—formal education—more and more, is recognized as an all but indispensable need for modern, informed and judicious leadership in the field of legislation, and especially Federal legislation. For Federal legislation means decisions for 190 million people in the field of war and peace, decisions in the field of defense and decisions on a budget reaching into more than $98 billion. Whether Representative THORNBERRY served on the Rules Committee of the House, or on any other committee, he represents the school of politics in our time upon which the whole world, to say nothing of Texas merely, depends for the progress of freedom and the recognition of the dignity of the individual.

Those of us who have been close to him through his service in every Congress to date from the 81st Congress, know the meaning of his kind of effectiveness in committee, in conferences, and on the floor of this Chamber. His education and his political background constituted resources that he called upon when important issues had to be decided. Thus, as a graduate from the University of Texas and the recipient of a degree from Gallaudet College he employed his training to his own credit and the credit of the institutions where he had acquired his learning. He could not, of course, have foretold his own future but when he won the right to practice law in Texas in 1936, he really mounted the ladder that was to lead to the judicial post to which he has just been appointed and confirmed.

When he became a member of the Texas Legislature a year later—in 1937—he was laying the foundations for his service in this House. I can testify to the usefulness of service in the Texas Legislature because I was myself at one time, as heretofore stated, a member of that body. Then, his duty as district attorney for the 53d judicial district of Texas in 1941 and 1942 seems to have been designed as if some organized force in his destiny was directing his career precisely to the place which he is about to assume on the Federal bench. When World War II broke upon the world scene he volunteered for the Armed Forces and saw service that again, it seems to me, rounded out his education and training for a meaningful tour of duty since then and today on behalf of his fellow Americans. If I am any judge of men and their talents and character, I would say from having observed Mr. Thornberry at work in the House since 1948, and prior to that back to the time he was a page in the Texas Legislature in the late twenties, that he regarded every performance in his life, every diploma and every degree, every duty, every civil and military function, as just so much background to be put to use for the betterment of his service to the people of his State and his country.

It is these qualities that I believe drew attention to his abilities and led to the dignified and important post to which President Kennedy named him.

In legislation, of course, but even more so as a judge, one of the most sacred duties to which a citizen can aspire, the primary requisites are an essentially objective understanding, and a combination of compassion and firmness. Mr. Thornberry's erudition as an educated man, and his experience testify to his technical qualifications. But much more, I believe, his character as an individual, makes him ideal material for so solemn and dignified a position in our society.

For his is the stuff great judges are made of.

He has not only the desire to learn all the facets of a given situation, but he also has the good sense and the balance, the judicial temperament, that will enable him to arrive at a verdict or a decision charged with fairness and decency.

It does not detract from Mr. Thornberry's eminence to point out that, as is so often the case in our American society, his distinctions are also the reflection of the great and varied abilities and charm of his wife Eloise. Mrs. Thornberry, homemaker and companion, together with their three wonderful and spirited children, Molly, David, and Kate, are a close-knit family group who have sustained and given inspiration to Homer Thornberry.

It is a matter of no little regret for me that this Representative has been taken from this House to fulfill another and perhaps more important role in his career, and yet I rejoice in the advantage that accrues to the judiciary.

Representative Thornberry on the Federal bench, as in this House, is bound to make a reputation for himself that will do credit to him personally. He will, by the same token, do honor to his State, just as he justified the confidence his constituents have in him. Mr. Speaker, the Federal judiciary has acquired a great and honorable talent and a jurist of the first magnitude of probity and distinction.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, may I join our senior Member and the dean of our delegation in his remarks about our beloved colleague, Judge Thornberry.

I recall when our colleague, Homer Thornberry, first came here. We of the Texas delegation always pick the youngest to do our delegation work for us. Of course, we immediately elected Mr. Thornberry. He performed his duties so beautifully that he worked his way not only into the hearts of our delegation but of everyone else who came in contact with him. Through the years he has grown and grown and grown and grown. I do not think there is a man in the House who has grown more than Homer Thornberry.

He is very diligent. He attends to his people's business, he attends to his own business, and he attends to his committee work. Those things have endeared him to the membership. While he was doing those things he would go out of his way to be nice, courteous, and helpful to every Member from any delegation who sought his advice.

The judiciary is gaining an outstanding man. I am getting just a little bit weary of that distinguished third body of our Government. There are too many able and distinguished members we have trained here. We are losing a gem. But the national interest is also gaining a gem. So we really will not be suffering too much. We are going to suffer the personal loss of not having the privilege and pleasure of associating with him every day, but the judge will make an outstanding record for himself just as he has done as a Member of the House of Representatives.

May I join my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, in wishing Homer Thornberry well and wishing for him the best of everything, and I am sure he will indeed have nothing but the best.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] to preside in my absence.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to our able and distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished dean of the Texas delegation [Mr. Patman] and our distinguished colleague who is now occupying the well of the House, in paying a word of tribute to one of the finest, ablest men I have ever known not only in the House but anywhere in my lifetime. I do not known of any one who has more outstanding traits of character and mind. These qualities have made Homer Thornberry a great Member of this House and they will make him a great judge.

Speaker Rayburn used to say that it did not make much difference how much sense a man had, if he did not have any judgment. If I ever met a man if my life who has judgment, that man is Homer Thornberry. He will perform the duties of the office of judge as he has performed his duties on the Committee on Rules and as he has performed them on the floor of this House, with the sound judgment required of a man occupying a position of such importance.

Homer Thornberry has integrity. There has never been the faintest question as to his honor, his character, and the integrity of his approach to the many and arduous tasks of public service. He is a kind and considerate man. I have benefited immeasurably from having served with him. He has been my friend and I hold him in as high esteem as I have ever held any friend I have ever had.

Mr. Speaker, we hate to lose Homer. He has been a very, very valuable Member of this House. He is a good soldier. He is a rock. But we wish him and his fine family all the blessings that life can bring in the new and high calling which he will now pursue. We hope he will come back and see us often and that he will always consider himself one of us.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join our distinguished colleagues from Texas and my other colleagues of the House in paying tribute to our distinguished friend and colleague, Homer Thornberry, who leaves us, I am sure, with reluctance and no doubt with mixed feelings.

It has been my pleasure to have known him since he came to Congress. I have enjoyed this most pleasant association.

We have observed his valuable work in this House and in the Congress, and we are going to miss him. I know that he regrets leaving us. Certainly we regret to see him go. However, as has already been said, we know that he will continue to render outstanding service to his Nation in the new duties that he will undertake in the next few days. For him and his family we wish the blessings of life, good health, and happiness, not only during this Christmas season but throughout the remaining years that he continues to serve his Nation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, HOMER THORNBERRY, has been one of the truly fine and exceptionally able Members of this House over a period of quite a long number of years. As our majority leader has said, he has been a pillar—he has been a pillar of strength. He is a strong man; he is a man of good will, and he is a team player. HOMER THORNBERRY has been a partisan of the Congress in defending its prerogatives through the years. He believes in representative government; he believes in our country, and he believes in his colleagues. HOMER THORNBERRY has made a tremendous contribution to the cause of good government. He is going forth now to write a new chapter in his life, and I predict that he will make an outstanding jurist.

I join my colleagues and others in congratulating him. He will leave in Washington a host of friends who wish him and his family great success and happiness. I know that at this very moment the President of the United States is here in the Capitol in the Speaker's dining room, to join in paying honor to this outstanding Texan.

Thank you.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our able and distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, among the treasured gems acquired in my service here in the House of Representatives has been my acquaintance and friendship with the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY.

I well remember the likable and personable HOMER when he first came to the House of Representatives on January 3, 1949. The people of the 10th District of Texas then recognized his many fine qualities and unusual ability and have since returned him to Washington in each succeeding Congress.

I know that HOMER will be just as successful in carrying out his duties as a Federal judge of the western district of Texas as he was as a U.S. Representative. When he takes the oath of office as a Federal judge on Saturday he will enter another phase of service to his country and one for which he is eminently qualified.

I treasure HOMER THORNBERRY's friendship and shall certainly miss him in these Halls of Congress. I am grateful for this opportunity to join my colleagues in wishing our good friend HOMER THORNBERRY and his lovely wife Godspeed as they return to their great State of Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to pay tribute today to a great Texan who truly exemplifies the opportunity afforded every individual citizen of the United States of America. I refer to the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY, Member of Congress from the 10th District of Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY will henceforth be known as Judge THORNBERRY, as he will become Judge of the U.S. district court for the western district of Texas by appointment by the late John F. Kennedy, President of the United States.

I join with his many friends and colleagues in saying that no one more richly deserved the appointment than did HOMER THORNBERRY.

It was my pleasure to meet him for the first time many years ago when we were both students in the law school of the University of Texas. It was at a time when the country was faced with economic disaster, when jobs were hard to come by, and people felt very fortunate to be able to keep body and soul together. It was not the most opportune time for anyone to be working his way through college. However, the trials, tribulations, and difficulties did not deter HOMER THORNBERRY any more at that time than they have since.

My very first impression of HOMER was that I had met a gentleman and a scholar. This impression has endured through the years and has been confirmed many times. He has done great honor to the House of Representatives and to the country by his service, in time of war and in time of peace.

We will all feel a great loss when HOMER leaves the legislative branch of the Government and assumes his duties in the judicial branch. We all know that the judicial branch will be much the richer by having this fine man don its robes. I join with all in expressing to HOMER, his lovely wife Eloise, and his children Molly, David, and Kate, my very best wishes that their future will be as bright, as fruitful, and as productive as has been their past.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely appropriate that we all meet today with mixed emotions in paying tribute to our colleague from the 10th District of Texas for we are losing from the counsels of this House one of our most valued Members.

HOMER THORNBERRY has served his people faithfully and well throughout more than a quarter of a century—in peace and in war—as a public official in his city, his county, his State, and his Nation.

Although he is resigning at the height of his distinguished career in the Congress, we can be grateful that he is not here ending his service to our people and I am confident that the years of experience which our colleague has gained here in the House of Representatives will be put to exceptionally good use on the bench of the U.S. district court in west Texas.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that it is the sincerest wish of each of us that our friend and colleague continue in public service throughout a long and constructive life, and that the people he serves continue to have a deep appreciation of the contribution HOMER THORNBERRY has made to the lives of each American.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel I would be missing an opportunity if I did not join with the friends of Mr. THORNBERRY in paying my respects to him at this time. Some time ago I was named on the board of directors of Gallaudet College. Mr. THORNBERRY serves on that board also. As you know, Gallaudet College trains and educates deaf mutes. Mr. THORNBERRY has shown his very great compassion for people afflicted in this way and for this school by serving on the board for many years. It is my understanding that his parents were similarly afflicted, and Mr. THORNBERRY has made great contributions in trying to do something for those who have been handicapped in this manner. I think that is a great tribute to anyone who does such an act.

While I have not served with Mr. THORNBERRY on any committee I want to say that if there were no other quality but this, in my judgment, it would be a great tribute to a great American. I salute him at this point.

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our very genial friend from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I recall the day Judge HOMER THORNBERRY came to the Congress. He succeeded the present President of the United States in his congressional seat. We marked him then as a promising and outstanding legislator.

After he progressed through the committees to the very important Committee on Rules, I had occasion many times to appear before that committee on which he has served with such great and profound distinction. He is a deep and an indefatigable student of legislation and of the law.

He impresses one with his capacity to sift the wheat from the chaff. He has an admirable attribute in this regard and also a capacity for endearing himself to those with whom he comes in contact, particularly his colleagues in the Congress.

It is not surprising that he, with his outstanding abilities, would return to his first love, the law. As he leaves the legislative branch of the Government and goes to the judicial, we know that he will build for himself the same great affection, the same distinction, the same magnificent reputation in that field which he has earned here in the Congress.

We shall miss him, Mr. Speaker. The Congress has been a better place because HOMER THORNBERRY, a great Texan, and therefore a great American, has herein served his country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, so often when we rise in this Chamber to pay tribute to a man who has served with us the occasion is one of sadness because he has been called by our Creator from the walks of human life. But that is not the case with respect to the man of whom we rise to speak today.

Yet this occasion is one of mingled regret and joy—regret that our friend, HOMER THORNBERRY, is leaving this House—joy that he has been called to a task for which his talents uniquely qualify him to perform.

HOMER THORNBERRY was here when I entered the House 9 years ago. He has been here, in all, 15 years, representing the 10th District of Texas, the congressional district that formerly was represented by President Lyndon Johnson. When HOMER became a Member of the House of Representatives he had large shoes—large, indeed—to fill. That he has not found them oversize is not only a tribute to his own ability but a tribute as well to the people of the 10th District who exercise such great good judgment in selecting their Representatives.

We will miss HOMER THORNBERRY—a simple statement, but how heartfelt, how meaningful to those of us who have known him so well, who have worked with him on legislative matters, who have admired him as a statesman and hold him in deep affection as a man.

We know that, entering upon his new duties, he will grace the Federal bench as he has graced the House of Representatives.

To such a friend as this we do not say goodby. We say, instead—So long, HOMER, for a while; good luck, always.

I would like to say that I have here statements which would have been delivered in person by many of the members of our delegation in tribute to Mr. THORNBERRY. These members are now participating in another ceremony honoring Mr. THORNBERRY in another part of the Capitol.

I ask unanimous consent that their statements be included in the RECORD following my own.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **KILGORE**. In connection with my own remarks, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a letter from a former distinguished Member of this body, now Chief of the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the Honorable Eugene Worley.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

DECEMBER 16, 1963.

DEAR JOE: I would like to join you and other Members of the House in paying tribute to HOMER THORNBERRY on his leaving the legislative for the judicial branch of our Government.

The new judge and I were in law school together, in the Texas Legislature, and in Congress. My life has been all the richer for those associations.

HOMER will take to the judiciary the same honesty, ability, and good sense which have been so much a part of him all of his life. I have no doubt he will measure up to the same high standards of his predecessor, our friend and former colleague, Judge Ewing Thomason.

My family and I wish for HOMER, his fine and gracious wife, Eloise, Molly, David, and Kate the greatest success and happiness in their new undertaking.

Sincerely,

GENE WORLEY.

Mr. **POAGE**. Mr. Speaker, all too often we hear the cry of "politics" in connection with the appointment of a Federal judge, and what is worse, all too often there has seemed to have been justification for the cry. Possibly there have been other factors which led the public to gradually lose much of the respect in which our Federal judges were once held, but, whatever the reasons, and regardless of the merits or demerits of the complaints, we have recently witnessed the appointment of a Federal judge in the western district of Texas without one voice of dissent. I think this is a remarkable thing.

Mr. Speaker, I live in the western district of Texas. My friends include their share of ambitious lawyers who would like to be Federal judge, but I have not heard one word of criticism, nor have I had one letter of complaint in connection with the appointment of our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. HOMER THORNBERRY. I think this magnificent testimony to his character, ability, and qualifications speaks louder than anything which any of us can say.

Now I do not mean for a moment that Judge THORNBERRY's appointment was not political. In fact, it was just as political as an appointment can get to be. He was supported by politicians of every range and shade from the dream world of the radical left to the petrified intellects of the reactionary right—from the President of the United States to the president of the Friday afternoon debating society. In short, his selection was good politics in its best sense. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the widespread and enthusiastic acceptance of Judge THORNBERRY's appointment should be adequate proof that a good judicial appointment is always good politics.

This does not mean that every good man would make a good judge. I have always been too egotistical to class myself as other than a good man, but since before I got out of law school, I have recognized that I entirely lack the judicial temperament, so needed in any judge, and especially in one who is to hold the office for life. HOMER THORNBERRY has that temperament. He has the ability to see all sides regardless of his preconceived ideas.

Of course, it goes without saying that a judge should be an able lawyer. At least he should be enough of a lawyer to pass intelligently on the matters of law which the lawyers present in his court. Judge THORNBERRY is a good lawyer. Naturally, he may for a few months find himself a little rusty, but this is a passing handicap and one which can be overcome by hard work and he has repeatedly proven that he both can and will work. I predict that there will be very few reversals of the El Paso division.

But far and away beyond and above all of the technical qualifications are the qualifications of the heart. Mere learning in the law, mere ability to analyze a question never made a great public official—and HOMER is still to be an official and a very important official of our Federal Government. No, I would not stand here this afternoon and commend this man were it not for the fact that I know him to be one devoted to a square deal for every human being. Sometimes I have disagreed with him as to the best, the most effective, and yes, the legal and constitutional method of securing that full measure of justice, but I have never questioned his determination to get justice for the weak or for the great. As a judge, he will, I am confident, follow the law as the best, and over the long run, the surest method of getting justice for all. I know that his goal will always be "justice under law."

So today I feel that it is appropriate that we all express our gratitude to our martyred leader, President John F. Kennedy, who named our colleague to this position of honor and responsibility. Nor would I overlook the fine perception of our present great leader and President. I recognize that the then Vice President Johnson had little difficulty in convincing Mr. Kennedy of the desirability of naming our colleague.

So HOMER, as one of your closest congressional neighbors—as one who has worked with you for many pleasant years in behalf of the fine people of central Texas, as one who has valued and appreciated your never failing courtesy and cooperation; as one will feel your loss in a very personal way, may I say, as I know all your friends and colleagues can say—although I regret to lose you as a colleague, I take pride in your new assignment, and I wish for you and for your fine family every success and good fortune.

May God be with you.

Mr. **BURLESON**. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure is the case with all of you, it is with mixed feelings I see our colleague and esteemed friend, the gentleman from Texas, HOMER THORNBERRY, leave the Halls of Congress.

He returns to the law, which by training is his first and foremost interest. He assumes a responsibility of great importance, but in my opinion, no greater than that which he has so ably exercised as a member of the legislative branch. It is, of course, different and has its advantages. For all this, I am exceedingly glad he is assuming the bench as a Federal judge.

On the other hand, it is with a genuine sense of loss which surely we must all feel, because of HOMER's leaving. Those of us who have served with him through the years have found in him an inspiration to do a better job. We have found in him an able and conscientious leader, as he has represented our Nation, our State of Texas and his own 10th Congressional District. It is not an exaggeration to say that I have never observed a more dedicated public servant than HOMER THORNBERRY. I have always believed that if a man in public sought the truth, exercised commonsense judgment and wholly dedicated himself to serving his Nation and his people, in the final analysis he was usually right in his actions. I believe this description to be wholly and unreservedly applicable to him.

In additon to these sentiments, Mr. Speaker, it is fitting to mention and include a reference to his very fine and most attractive family. To his wife Eloise, and his children Molly, David, and Katie, may they know that they hold a warm and fond place in the hearts of all those who were privileged to know them and to have their association. They, too, will be in our memories often and to all of them, and to Judge THORNBERRY, may the best of all things be theirs.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, there are some men whom you hear about for many years before you ever have the privilege of knowing them. You instinctively know that you would like him and that you would be honored to have him as a friend, should the occasion ever arise for you to become associated with him. HOMER THORNBERRY is just such a man.

Long before I ever met HOMER and his lovely family I had heard about his ability, his fine character, and his warm understanding for his fellow man that made me want to be his friend and gave me the desire to be associated with him.

Not until I became a Member of this distinguished body did I have the realization of this desire, and, Mr. Speaker, my association with Mr. HOMER THORNBERRY has been all that I thought it would be and then some. My beginning days in this body were made considerably easier due to the help and understanding of HOMER THORNBERRY, and I will say, Mr. Speaker, that this help and understanding has continued up to this very day. It is because of this that I view his departure from this body with mixed feelings.

I will truly miss the daily visits with my good friend on the floor of the House, his fine sense of humor, and his keen analysis of the problems that arise in the Halls of this Capitol. My selfish viewpoint would be that he remain here where I could continue to benefit from his company. The other feeling is one of pride and happiness that our late President John F. Kennedy recognized his great ability and chose him to serve in the Federal judiciary.

I can assure the people of the western judicial district of Texas that no better selection could have been made for this high post, because HOMER THORNBERRY will uphold the highest traditions of the bench of this country. He has not only a tremendous background, educationwise and experiencewise, but he also has the proper temperament to ably fulfill the position of U.S. district judge.

The qualities that he has displayed in this body will continue to serve the people of this country on the bench. I have never seen HOMER THORNBERRY fail to recognize that those in disagreement with him were not only entitled to their viewpoint, but had justification for such difference of opinion. His careful analysis of a proposal before reaching a decision has earned the respect of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to put into words the feelings that I have on this occasion, but to paraphrase a famous quotation, we are here today to praise our distinguished colleague, not to bury him, and I know that he is looking forward with eagerness to the new task before him.

Therefore, I say to him and to his lovely wife, Eloise, and to his lovely children, my sincere best wishes and God's blessings as you start this new career in this new home, and although your seat may be empty on the floor of this House, each and every one of our hearts will remain filled with love and affection for the Thornberry family.

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues to pay honor to an outstanding Member of this House—Judge HOMER THORNBERRY.

In my efforts to represent the Fourth District of Texas, no man has been more helpful, no man has been wiser in his counsel. HOMER THORNBERRY was a devoted friend of my predecessor, the distinguished Speaker, Sam Rayburn. As his friend and confidant, HOMER THORNBERRY knew the manifold problems that the Speaker's successor was to face as a freshman Congressman. He was generous with his help, patient and thorough in his counseling, and wise and understanding of my problems.

I am grateful for his guidance and wish for him and his lovely wife happiness and success in his new service to his fellow man.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, this week the House of Representatives will lose a Member whose excellence as a man and as a citizen has added a rich patina to the reputation of this body. When the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY, of Austin, came from Texas to move into the House seat which Senator Lyndon Johnson had left, he was already deeply committed to the principle of law by which we live. As a city councilman, district attorney and member of the Texas Legislature, as a wartime naval officer, and in private law practice, he had shown his belief in order as a way of life for the community of man. We who are his fellows in the Texas delegation to the House of Representatives will feel a special loss, for while he is above all a complete citizen of his country, HOMER THORNBERRY is also a complete Texan.

Certainly the waning days of this 14th year in Washington have been awful ones for HOMER THORNBERRY, for John F. Kennedy was his friend as Lyndon Johnson is his friend. Though we shall feel the loss of HOMER THORNBERRY's presence, we cannot help but be pleased that one of the acts which it was given to John F. Kennedy to perform in his last allotted year among us was the selection of HOMER THORNBERRY for the work which now takes him.

No one could be better prepared, practically or philosophically, than HOMER THORNBERRY is prepared for his assignment as jurist to the people of western Texas. May I join my colleagues and offer my best wishes for the fruitful years which lie ahead for the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, words are weak in expressing the feeling a Member of this House holds for another Member who has served long, honorably, and ably in discharging the responsibilities of his high office. It is doubly difficult in saying au revoir in this instance to our friend and colleague, the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY, of Texas, who holds and merits the unbound admiration and affection of the entire House of Representatives. His devotion to duty, his exceptionally high standard of morality, character, and sense of justice have fashioned a Congressman for whom we have the deepest respect and in whom we have the utmost confidence and pride. His many great attributes along with the almost sacred reverence in which he holds the institution of Congress has inspired many of his colleagues to refer to him as "a Congressman's Congressman."

Mr. THORNBERRY's innate love for his fellow man, his kind understanding of the other man's problems, his tolerance of weakness in others, and his constant willingness to help have inspired us all and have given us all real understanding and personal meaning to the description—"a Congressman's Congressman." His kind, warm hand of friendship has been appreciated by all, but by none more than the new and somewhat frustrated first-year man who has found in it reassuring evidence of the cordial, human, personal side of the House of Representatives.

We sorrow, Mr. Speaker, at HOMER THORNBERRY's departure from this House and we will miss him much. But, nonetheless, we rejoice with him in that he is going to a new and highly exalted position in his profession for which he is professionally and personally exceedingly well qualified. There are few Federal judges better equipped professionally and there are none who possess to such a high degree the kind understanding of people plus the conscientious determination to serve, at all costs, the ends of justice which are indispensable to the composite structure of a great jurist.

We are indeed sad to see Congressman THORNBERRY leave this body, Mr. Speaker, and we realize that we will not soon see a Member with his great capacity, his brilliance or his ability. No one could realize this more than I who has been chosen to succeed him on the Committee on Rules. But our sadness is coupled with a great joy in seeing his outstanding ability recognized and in seeing him attain to the distinguished position aspired to by so many in our legal profession.

We are immensely proud of our colleague, Congressman HOMER THORNBERRY, his lovely wife, Eloise, and his wonderful family.

Mr. Speaker, we wish them well.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the wonderful tributes being paid here today to our colleague, the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY, as he leaves the legislative scene to assume the important position of a U.S. district judge.

All of us who know the gentleman from Texas, HOMER THORNBERRY, and most importantly the people of the 10th District of Texas, recognize him as a legislator of great skill and competence and a man of tolerant and humanitarian instincts who has effectively served his Nation, State, and district during his 15-year career in the Congress.

We shall all miss him but are happy in the knowledge that he will be serving our Nation in another position of great importance. My best wishes for continued happiness and success go to the gentleman from Texas, HOMER THORNBERRY, and to his lovely wife and family.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to one of the senior members of the Oklahoma delegation, our beloved friend, Mr. EDMONDSON.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I welcome this opportunity to join in the tributes being paid to one of the outstanding Members of this body and one of the finest Americans I have ever known.

If I could hand pick the qualities that I would like to see in a judge before whom I was trying a case I think I would want most of all the qualities that HOMER THORNBERRY has personified in his service in the House of Representatives; the quality of fairness, the quality of good judgment, the quality of commonsense, the quality of a keen interest in facts and in the truth, the quality of courage and the quality of unimpeachable integrity. All of these are qualities that HOMER THORNBERRY has lived and personified as a Member of this body. It has been a great privilege to know him. It has been an even greater privilege to call him a friend.

Mr. Speaker, I wish for him and for his wonderful family all the happiness in the world as our able colleague follows a new and highly interesting pursuit in the years ahead.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to our able and genial friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I want to applaud him for affording the Members of the House an opportunity to pay tribute to a very great American and a very distinguished Member of this House, the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is in the air or in the water in the neighborhood of Austin, Tex. But somehow it seems very often to produce very great men. HOMER THORNBERRY has held the seat that was once occupied in this body by the now President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson. Both of them have shown the same traits of character, honesty, industry, and ability to reconcile different points of view and an ability to work with their fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to miss HOMER here in the House of Representatives. I have been privileged to know him, to know his wife, and to know his family. I concur wholeheartedly in what the gentleman from Oklahoma has said. If one were to make an index of the traits of character one would want to see in a Federal judge: character, honesty, love of the law, a keen insight, fairness, and commonsense, all of these traits one will find that HOMER THORNBERRY has in a great abundance.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I express the sentiments of all when I say I hate to see him go. I regret that we are losing this great Member of the House of Representatives. I wish him and his family well. I think the people of west Texas and the U.S. judicial system are fortunate to be obtaining an outstanding judge. This body and this country are better places because HOMER THORNBERRY served here.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Texas and the other Members of the Texas delegation, as well as a great many of the Members of this House, in this tribute to an outstanding American.

Mr. Speaker, all of us recognize the fact that his loss here to the legislative branch of Government is, of course, a gain for the judicial branch of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, all of us realize that he brings to his new duties a magnificent personality, a fine judicial demeanor, and a very keen intellect.

Mr. Speaker, during the time that I have served with HOMER THORNBERRY I have come to know him as one of the finest men in this Congress. He is always the same. He is never ruffled. He has been constantly diligent in the service which he has given to this House. All of us know of his very keen and deep understanding of the problems of people and, of course, the problems of this great Nation of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I join with all of my colleagues in wishing him well in the very great judicial future that will be his. I congratulate him and wish for him and his charming, gracious wife and children many, many years of health and happiness.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to HOMER THORNBERRY.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know this distinguished colleague and to know him is to like him.

I also have a very deep appreciation for the great service which he has rendered not only to his district and his State, but to his country.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great privileges of serving in the House of Representatives has been the opportunity to get to know men like HOMER THORNBERRY.

I certainly want to wish him and his wonderful family great happiness and much success. I know he will be an excellent judge and will make a real contribution to our Federal judicial system.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to our able and genial friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I join with the other Members of the House in paying tribute to HOMER THORNBERRY, a great American and a truly outstanding individual.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving with him in the House of Representatives for 16 years.

Many, many times I have said that one of the great privileges in being a Member of Congress is the opportunity it affords us to meet, to work with, and to know on both a business and personal basis, men and women of quality. We make friendships we cherish with individuals such as HOMER THORNBERRY.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to associate with HOMER not solely as a colleague in this House, but as a person. I always enjoy being in his company.

HOMER and his wife are good friends of the Arends. I could not let this opportunity pass without wishing them the very best in life. God's richest blessings for them always.

HOMER is one of those individuals who makes a success of whatever he undertakes, and I know he will prove to be an outstanding Federal judge. To hold such a position attests to his character and ability.

We are going to miss him here in the House. His was a contribution beyond measure. While we are glad to see him take on an assignment that has probably been a life ambition to have, we are sorry to have him leave here. I will miss him personally, more than I can possibly tell him.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our beloved minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, when I got out of law school at Indiana University I thought first I wanted to practice law. Second, I had some thoughts about the judiciary. Then in the back of my mind I had some ideas about a political career.

I did practice law for 10 years, with some success, and took some part in local politics. Then I had the opportunity to run for Congress. As a result I was elected to the House of Representatives in 1935 and I have been here since.

As I look back, it has been for me a rewarding, challenging, and pleasant experience. I am sure, however, that many who have been here have looked with some favor on a judicial appointment. I must say that I am not altogether certain HOMER THORNBERRY has made the right decision, but he has made it, and all I can say is God bless him, because he has been an able Congressman, dedicated to his country and to the people who sent him here, a man of unimpeachable integrity, friendly, generous, and fine. I know he will carry with him to the bench those same high qualities that endeared him to all who knew him as a colleague in the House of Representatives.

Let me offer a personal note. He has served on the other side of the aisle as a close personal friend of his fellow Texan, the late Sam Rayburn. So have I served on this side of the aisle as a great friend and admirer of Sam Rayburn.

Many, many times, by reason of our friendship and association I have had the opportunity to know HOMER THORNBERRY's character. Believe me, he has always demonstrated his inherent greatness. So while he has chosen to leave us voluntarily—I say voluntarily, not involuntarily—I wish him well because, as

I indicated a moment ago, I know that on the bench he will do the same magnificent job for the people who come before him there that he did in the House of Representatives for the people who sent him here, as well as for his State and our beloved country.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for allowing me to join in expressing my good wishes to HOMER THORNBERRY and with others to tell of his virtues and his great work in the House of Representatives.

When HOMER THORNBERRY came here he was assigned to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I was a member. We formed a friendship in those days that has lasted throughout the years.

There is a part of his service here very little known to the Members of the House. He was on the Board of Visitors of the Gallaudet College. During the time he has been on that Board a new inspiration was given to this great school, and advancement was made in a field in which he had a personal, genuine interest. I am certain that he carries with him the love and affection of the Members of this House and their best wishes for his future success and happiness.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our genial friend, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING].

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] for reserving this time to enable us to pay tribute to one of our colleagues who is leaving us to become a Federal judge.

As a new Member of the House of Representatives I found HOMER THORNBERRY to be a man with a great mind and a great heart. He not only had the keen intellect and the ability to analyze legislation that enabled him to do an outstanding job on the Committee on Rules; he also had the heart and the love of people that enabled him to make friends easily. He was willing to take the time to teach, counsel, and advise newer Members of the Congress.

I am sure that all of the Members of this body are going to miss the presence of HOMER THORNBERRY in the committees and on the floor of this House in the future, but at the same time it is a satisfaction to know that his great mind and his great heart will still be serving the people of Texas and the people of the United States of America on the Federal bench.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to a very able Member of the great Alabama delegation, my personal friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I, too, express my appreciation of the fact that the gentleman from Texas has reserved this time so that we may pay our tribute to HOMER THORNBERRY, who is to leave us to serve on the Federal bench.

I had the pleasure of serving with this fine Member several years on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As the gentleman from California mentioned, aside from his splendid legislative record on that great committee and on the great Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] took a lot of time for what I am sure was a labor of love, his work with the deaf, and particularly with Gallaudet College.

I recall that on one occasion one member of our committee referred to the people who are deaf as being deaf and dumb. I remember very distinctly that the gentleman from Texas corrected the last part of that reference. Certainly I was glad to see him do it, because for many years I lived in the city of Talladega, Ala., which is the location of the Alabama School for the Blind and Deaf. These people who are so afflicted have had the love and devotion of this Member of Congress, and he has done a great deal for them. I know it has been a labor of love with him.

All of us will miss this fine Member. I know that he will bring to the bench the same high distinction that he has brought to his service as a Member of this great body.

Our best wishes to his lovely wife, Eloise, and the children, Molly, David, and Kate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the very able and distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN].

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the tribute being made to HOMER THORNBERRY. He has been especially kind, helpful, and considerate to myself and other freshmen Congressmen. I went to Gallaudet College graduation last June and you can imagine my surprise to see Judge THORNBERRY addressing the audience in sign language as he delivered his commencement speech. He was truly an ambassador of good will for Texas. As a member of the bar, I can say that he will be a credit to the bar as a Federal judge.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN].

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to Congressman, and now Judge, HOMER THORNBERRY. We are pleased, indeed, to welcome him and particularly his charming wife and lovely family to west Texas, the 16th Congressional District and international sun city of El Paso. I salute HOMER THORNBERRY, and extend to him the warm hand of friendship and welcome from the good folks of El Paso, Tex.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, saying goodby to a dear old friend of many years is never easy. The gentleman from Texas, HOMER THORNBERRY, came to Congress very shortly after I did. He and I became immediate friends. Our families were congenial and exchanged frequent visits. As time went on I found that HOMER's thinking was almost invariably parallel to my own. We used to compare notes on many important issues. His calm analysis was always helpful and whether or not he knew it, he was a pillar of strength to me as I studied my own problems.

I hate to see him go, and yet, certainly no friend of his would begrudge him the appointment to the Federal bench. He will make a wonderful judge because he has that type of mind. He will be fair and just, and those of us who have been so fond of him will have many occasions to be very proud of his new work. We wish for him and his lovely Eloise continued good health and complete success and satisfaction in the new field.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, WILLIAM HOMER THORNBERRY in his long service in the Congress exemplified the highest qualities of character and ability. His gentle approach to legislative problems presented before the Rules Committee reflected the keenness of his classical and analytical intellect.

His loyalty to party was unquestioned—and his adherence to principle was unswerving. The gentleman from Texas, Congressman THORNBERRY, always knew what he was doing—he never hesitated in making a determination on critical problems. He was trained in parliamentary procedures and occupied the chair many times in the Committee of the Whole House. His popularity added to the importance of the distinguished Texas delegation. We of Illinois are sorry to lose his valued services—the Nation has lost the great influence of his contributions of thought and action in legislative matters but the Federal bench has gained an advocate of stature and great judicial judgment. May God's blessing go with him and his family.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on this the occasion of the retirement from the House of Representatives of my old friend and well-beloved colleague, the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY, I wish to extend my heartfelt congratulations and best wishes as he leaves this body to assume his duties as U.S. district court judge in the western district of Texas. The House of Representatives is losing a man who possesses in abundance every attribute that we associate with a true gentleman, and who, in addition, is one of the most capable and dedicated Members that ever served in this body. His nobility of character is an inspiration for all others to emulate.

We will miss him here, but our loss is certain to be the gain of the Federal judiciary. Those of us who have known and worked with the gentleman from Texas, HOMER THORNBERRY, can testify to the strength of his intellect and the depth of his wisdom. We know that he will be a splendid jurist. HOMER THORNBERRY has the qualities of character, compassion, and human understanding that will bring honor to the Federal bench. He is a fine and noble man who will serve the cause of justice with the same sense of diligence and duty which won him the respect and admiration of the House of Representatives.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to express my best wishes and, I am sure, those of my colleagues to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY], who is leaving us after 15 years of honorable service in the

House to become U.S. district judge for the Western District of Texas.

Judge THORNBERRY will bring to the Federal bench in Texas a learning and wisdom that has been enhanced by over a quarter of a century at the bar. His legislative experience at the local, State and Federal levels will prove extremely valuable to him in carrying out his judicial functions with respect to statutes.

We shall miss him here in this body, but we know that his service on the bench will be most rewarding. I wish for him all the success he so eminently merits.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is an unusual pleasure to have the opportunity of joining my colleagues in paying a deserved tribute to Judge HOMER THORNBERRY.

We who have had the privilege of serving with him in the House know at firsthand of his quiet, dignified, but firm demeanor on all occasions. We have been courteously treated by him whenever we appeared before the Rules Committee, of which he was an outstanding member and we found his judgments to be fair and equitable. On the occasions when he presided over the House, as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, he was not only an excellent presiding officer, but always fair to each and every Member.

I shall miss him as a personal friend and as a coworker, and I hope that he will find it possible to visit with us frequently.

Our loss is a great gain for the judiciary.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my good friend and colleague, the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY of Austin, Tex., who will depart this great body for the purpose of accepting an appointment as a Federal judge. I have had the pleasure of serving in the Congress with HOMER THORNBERRY for 15 years, and I can think of no one who is more deserving of such an appointment.

When he became a Member of the House of Representatives he was in the most unenviable position of representing a district which not only was the seat of the State government of Texas, but also the home district of the newly elected Senator who later turned out to be the Senate majority leader and subsequently our President, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson. The gentleman from Texas [HOMER THORNBERRY] himself had been a member of the house of representatives in the State legislature prior to his election to the U.S. Congress and had represented a portion of his U.S. congressional district in the State legislature. In spite of these conditions, HOMER THORNBERRY did a wonderful job in providing excellent representation for his constituents.

In January 1955, 1st session of the 84th Congress, HOMER THORNBERRY was assigned to the Rules Committee. Since that date, this committee has become most controversial in the press and many of its members have been subjected to great pressures and strains. In spite of these pressures, HOMER THORNBERRY has continued to perform in a most capable manner and has proven himself to be a most capable, efficient, wise, and trustworthy Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to wish him well in his new undertaking, and I know there is no question but what he will carry out this new assignment in the same manner which he performed as a Member of Congress. We will hear more from HOMER THORNBERRY.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, whenever one of our colleagues in the House reaches a decision to leave this body and move on to another endeavor, it always is a matter of regret on the part of those of us who have had the opportunity to associate with him closely and have the benefit of his friendship. It is, therefore, with mixed reaction that I view the decision of our esteemed and respected friend and colleague, HOMER THORNBERRY, to leave the House of Representatives in order to accept an appointment as a U.S. district judge. It can truly be said that the judiciary's gain is the legislative branch's loss.

We have had the privilege of associating with HOMER THORNBERRY for some 15 years, and in that period of time his legal and legislative ability, his friendly personality, his patience, his judgment, his commonsense, and wisdom have impressed all of us. I truly regret HOMER's decision to leave the legislative branch, but I am likewise impressed with the strength that his presence in the judicial branch will lend to that third great branch of our Government. I think it is extremely important that individuals with the legal ability, the legal training, the legal experience, and the wisdom and judgment such as possessed by HOMER THORNBERRY be given appointments to the judicial branch of the Government, particularly in those positions which I regard as the most difficult of all to fill—the courts of original jurisdiction, the U.S. district judgeships.

I join in all of the fine things that have been said today about our friend and colleague, and I wish him and his family Godspeed and best wishes in his newly chosen field of endeavor.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I hasten to join my colleagues in saluting the great services of our distinguished legislator from Texas, the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY. I have known him since I first came to the Congress and I have been one of those who have admired him and watched with continuing appreciation his legislative ability and production.

This Nation will always be a great Nation when the Halls of Congress attract leaders like HOMER THORNBERRY. We can well follow his many examples of dedication, courage, patriotism, and unselfish service.

We all wish for him the happiness of continued service to his people and to his Nation as a member of the U.S. judiciary. Everyone I know predicts for him a continuation of the greatness and service he has exhibited here. We wish him well and we wish him happiness. In behalf of a grateful Nation we express our appreciation for the service he has rendered as a Member of Congress.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my other colleagues in expressing regret over the resignation of our good friend and colleague HOMER THORNBERRY. I have greatly enjoyed my association with HOMER and I am sorry to see him leave the House.

HOMER always had a friendly greeting for everyone. It was a real pleasure to visit with him on legislation and matters of interest to the House. HOMER was able and capable in every way, and was recognized as one of the outstanding Members of this body.

I want to wish HOMER continued success and much happiness as he leaves Congress to take up his duties as U.S. district judge. I know he will be a fine judge and will be fair and impartial to every person appearing in his court.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Judge HOMER THORNBERRY.

We were sworn into Congress on the same day and were assigned to the same committee. At the outset it was obvious that here was one to be an outstanding Member of Congress, and he has certainly lived up to that promise.

We are going to miss his service here very much, but our loss will be the judiciary's gain. I know he will serve with equal distinction as a U.S. district judge.

I join with all of you in wishing him and his wonderful family Godspeed.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, HOMER THORNBERRY leaves this body with the warm friendship of all his colleagues. The qualities of mind and of heart that have established his preeminence in this Chamber, and have instilled among us a respect, admiration, and affection for him in the highest measure, will make a contribution of immeasurable richness to the Federal bench of this Nation.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives does not accord automatic respect to any of its Members. The regard and esteem any Representative receives in this body he must earn through a thousand acts of hard work, a thousand tests of character, and a thousand demonstrations of tact and ability. HOMER THORNBERRY, of Texas, has survived 15 years of such exacting scrutiny. It is only fitting and proper that on the occasion of his retirement from the House his colleagues should give public testimony to the magnificent record he has compiled here and to the respect they have for him both as a legislator and as a man.

When HOMER THORNBERRY first arrived here in 1949 to represent the former district of President Lyndon Johnson, he had already compiled a solid record of public achievement. He had served in the Texas House of Representatives, as a district attorney, as a member of the Austin City Council, and as a mayor pro tem of Austin. He had also served his country during World War II as an officer in naval intelligence. This service, however, was merely a prelude to the distinguished career he enjoyed in the House of Representatives.

He interested himself in a wide range of legislation during that career. He served for a number of years on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Then, in 1955, he was appointed to the Committee on Rules, a position for which he was particularly well suited and in which he earned great distinction and well deserved praise.

One facet of his activities is little known, and yet it is perhaps the best measure of his humanitarian instincts. HOMER THORNBERRY was a devoted supporter of programs to aid the deaf. He gave a great deal of his time and energy to that cause. In particular, he has served for many years on the board of directors of Gallaudet College, an institution which trains and educates deaf students.

Congress will not soon forget HOMER THORNBERRY. We know he will bring luster to the judiciary. We congratulate him on the success we know he will achieve in his new position.

A tribute to the Congressman by President Leonard M. Elstad, of Gallaudet College, follows:

> Gallaudet College pays affectionate tribute to Congressman HOMER THORNBERRY, who has long seen the necessity for extending to all deaf persons the very best education that the Nation is able to provide.
>
> The son of deaf parents, he has an insight into the nature of deafness possessed by few lay persons. Appointed to the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College in March 1949, he brought to the position the talents that have raised him to prominence in the Government of the United States of America.
>
> In appreciation of his dedicated devotion to the cause of the deaf, Gallaudet College bestowed on him an honorary doctor of laws degree at its 90th commencement, June 5, 1954.
>
> In 1959, the college named its new hearing and speech center the Mary L. Thornberry Building in honor of his mother, a noted teacher of the deaf, who died July 10, 1958. President Leonard M. Elstad, of Gallaudet, said that the college, in honoring the memory of this devoted deaf mother and teacher, would also be honoring her illustrious son, "who continuously maintains his interest in the education of the deaf and who is one of those most responsible" for the expansion and improvement of the college.
>
> Congressman HOMER THORNBERRY is an eminent example of the public man who has devoted his life and talents to his country and to all good works.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'BRIEN of New York). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, both Houses of the Congress have passed unanimously the bill, H.R. 4157, to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," which is now awaiting the approval of the President. This act will become effective on January 1, 1964.

Because of the importance of this act codifying titles 11 through 17 of the District of Columbia Code, and because it will not be possible to publish for some time the supplement of that code, I am having prepared a committee print for the Committee on the Judiciary, containing the text of the law, the revision notes for each section, and distribution tables showing where provisions of the existing law will be found in the revised titles. This publication will be indispensable to the bench and bar of the District of Columbia.

Since the committee supply will be extremely limited, I suggest that members of the public who wish copies, purchase them from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, who will have copies for sale as soon as it is off the press.

RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR A WORLD CONFERENCE ON OCEANOGRAPHY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a House joint resolution providing for a world conference on oceanography to be convened in the United States in 1965.

The resolution follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the National Science Foundation, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Director of the Office of Science and Technology, and representatives from the other interested Federal agencies, is authorized and directed to take all necessary steps to convene in the United States in 1965 a world conference for the purpose of exchanging with other nations scientific and technical information relating to oceanography.

The oceans cover 71 percent of the earth's surface; they furnish our rain and determine our climate; they provide 90 billion pounds of the world's food each year; their value to our national security is inestimable—yet we have sadly neglected the potential capabilities of our seas. We are spending billions of dollars each year, and more in the years to come, exploring the vast unknowns of outer space; I believe this is necessary if we are to maintain a position of leadership in this increasingly competitive race, but at the same time, we must not be left behind in the race for greater knowledge in marine research and oceanographic exploration—our "ocean space."

There is much evidence at hand, Mr. Speaker, that the Russians are not neglecting this immense, untapped source of wealth and knowledge, and what could very well be the greatest threat to our national security. The U.S.S.R. has more than 70 ships available for oceanographic research and a fishing fleet of over 3,000 vessels covering the fishing grounds of the entire world. It is considered likely that these, too, collect oceanographic data. In addition, they have a merchant fleet consisting of more than 1,000 ships taking observations of oceanographic and meteorological conditions. Some of the research vessels were built fairly recently and carry as many as 16 oceanographic laboratories with space for 75 scientists.

Occasionally, an odd-appearing Russian submersible named *Severyanka* has been sighted in northern waters. It is not a submarine but a unique underwater research vessel with windows and sampling devices and an ability to cruise at 100 fathoms with great maneuverability. It makes our one bathyscaphe, the *Trieste*, look like a wallowing elephant beside a slippery eel.

The Soviet oceanographic fleet completely overshadows that of all Western nations combined and comprises about 1,000 senior oceanography researchers and a large number of technicians.

For years, Mr. Speaker, the United States has considered itself as an "island" surrounded by water or friendly nations on our land borders. Yet in reality, next to Mexico and Canada, Russia is our nearest neighbor—only 58 miles from Alaska. We have always considered the seas as protective barriers; but now, for the first time, they can be seen as critical threats to our survival. Enemy missiles launched far offshore in international waters can easily reach our large midwestern cities. It is estimated that the Russian submarine fleet numbers between 400 and 500, all relatively new, while the United States has 196 submarines, only 116 of which are operational.

Aside from the self-preservation and defense aspects of oceanographic research, we must also concern ourselves with the economic benefits to be gained.

Less than 2 percent of the sea floor has been mapped. However, it is a fact that the ocean bed holds mineral deposits containing high concentrations of manganese, cobalt, nickel, and copper. Production of oil from offshore deposits has already been realized, but some 400 billion barrels of oil remain untouched under the continental shelves.

Commercial fishing today supplies over a million tons of food each year for our population; more than half a million people depend on it for their livelihood. Increasingly, competition from foreign fisheries is becoming troublesome. To meet this competition we must have a superior knowledge of the sea and its inhabitants. In addition, we must have more modern and capable oceangoing fishing vessels and more efficient techniques for locating and capturing fish.

Russia's huge diesel trawlers carry scientists, sonar, temperature gages, and underwater lights to draw fish. To meet the demands of a growing population, they operate with a deadly seriousness.

They are now developing fully automated ships of 5,000 tons where everything is done by pushbutton—the navigation, fish finding, hauling, and processing—in one continuous operation.

Mr. Speaker, while we are still only pioneers in the heretofore unexplored depths, I am pleased to say that the United States is taking measures to step up our progress in oceanographic research.

Many of our Federal agencies are already involved in oceanographic activities; these include the U.S. Navy, Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Commerce, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of the Interior, National Science Foundation, U.S. Army, Department of Defense, and others. The Interagency Committee on Oceanography, since its establishment in 1959, coordinates the programs of these various agencies in marine sciences following the goals established by the Federal Council for Science and Technology.

The United States also participates in some degree in various international organizations concerned with the oceanic sciences. It would seem fitting, therefore, that noted scientists and researchers of these groups be invited to participate in the World Conference on Oceanography which I have proposed, along with our own experts in this field.

One survey project of significance is the cooperative tropical Atlantic investigation planned by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Office of Naval Research, Navy Hydrographic Office and the Weather Bureau. This is a program conceived to explore living resources in one of the more productive oceanic areas.

I was deeply pleased and proud when just recently the Department of Interior selected Miami as the site of the proposed Tropical Atlantic Oceanographic Laboratory of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The letter announcing the decision stated:

> Several considerations entered into selection of a location, but the most important was the opportunity to associate with a large and strong oceanographic research organization of international repute.

The research organization referred to, of course, is the Institute of Marine Science of the University of Miami, which has achieved an outstanding reputation in the field of oceanographic research.

The Interagency Committee on Oceanography has named six objectives or fundamental questions about the sea, around which all agencies of the Federal Government and the many private institutions can direct their programs:

First. To describe the distribution of physical and chemical properties of the oceans and to understand the dynamic processes which affect this distribution.

Second. To determine the interrelationships of the ocean and the atmosphere.

Third. To determine the distribution, kind, and adaptation of the living populations of the sea and to understand the interrelationships of the marine organisms to the physical and chemical properties of the sea.

Fourth. To describe the sea floor and to understand its long-term and short-term evolution, including the topography, geophysical nature, and subsurface structure with particular interest in the sea floor's relation to the surrounding landmasses.

Fifth. To determine how the oceans can be exploited to benefit mankind.

Sixth. To determine the effect of radioactivity and pollution on the physical, chemical, geological, and biological properties of the oceans.

These projects and their budgets have been underwritten with the avowed intention of obtaining the following long-range results:

First. Rebuff of the Soviet marine/submarine threat.

Second. An understanding of the biological and mineral resources of the seas which may be needed to supplement rapidly depleting continental resources.

Third. Development of new knowledge about the sea, particularly in the light of contemporary events which make scientific achievement an element of public affairs.

Fourth. A better understanding of the origin of the earth, which is necessary for the exploration of other planets and for understanding the evolution of life itself.

Fifth. Development of information to assure safety of disposal of radioactive wastes which man has chosen not to accumulate on land.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the world has only begun in its quest for knowledge and understanding of its "ocean space." The United States must take every precaution to remain in the forefront of marine research and technology. We cannot afford to lag behind in this field of research any more than we can afford it in the field of space science.

Our late President John F. Kennedy said:

> We are just at the threshold of knowledge of the oceans * * *. Our very survival may hinge on it.

FREQUENCY AND LENGTH OF COMMERCIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS IN BROADCAST MEDIA

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that most of the Members of Congress have small radio and local television stations within their districts. With this in mind, I would like to share with my colleagues remarks I recently made before the Federal Communications Commission, which has been holding hearings relative to the Commission's proposed rule change concerning the frequency and length of commercial announcements in the broadcast media. I ask unanimous consent to include these remarks in the Record.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I am pleased that the Commission is seeking comments on its proposed adoption of rules to require all AM, FM, and TV broadcasting stations to observe limitations in advertising time.

In your notice of the proposed rulemaking, I note that you do not desire to limit your consideration of proposed policies in any way, but rather to obtain public comment on the widest range of alternatives, so that you may have an adequate basis upon which to adopt the policies that can best serve the public interest in this area.

I would agree that the public interest is of prime concern. However, I question the wisdom of putting such rules into effect at all, and do not believe there is even a satisfactory alternative to the Commission's proposal. We in the Congress have been concerned with this proposed action and a number of bills are being considered relative thereto.

My personal concern stems from a considerable volume of mail received from broadcasters and other interested parties in my district. I have copies of a number of excellent statements prepared by broadcasters for these hearings, which graphically tell of the hardships and other losses these stations would sustain if the Commission goes through with its proposed regulations. Many of these statements go into considerable detail as to the legal aspects and other technicalities. I will not reiterate this information, but will rather discuss some of the personal aspects that have occurred to me while considering these proposals.

The Seventh District of Minnesota, which I represent, has many small radio stations and a number of local television stations. I have personally visited a number of these stations during recent months to better acquaint myself with the problems they currently face and would subsequently face under the proposed rulemaking.

These stations serve limited areas and because of the limited amount of revenue they take in they, in turn, are necessarily limited in staff to as few as two or three persons in the smaller stations. Even with these handicaps, I believe they are doing a conscientious and commendable job of serving the public. They are dedicated servants who work long hours far beyond the monetary rewards that come their way. But it is my opinion that if these proposed rules are put into effect, it would constitute discrimination against these smaller stations and would drive some of them out of business.

To understand the tragedy of such a loss to a community, consider for a moment the services their listeners have come to expect and would indeed demand if their local station should broadcast no more.

Consider the announcer who, on a blizzardy morning in Minnesota, answers the constantly-ringing telephone with one hand while playing records with the other, pausing only long enough to read the list of schools that will be closed that day. This is an emergency message to those people. Indeed, it's a lifesaving message, preventing a small child from standing on a windswept country road in 20-below temperatures waiting for a bus that isn't coming. The storm worsens and the rural phone lines break under the strain of ice and snow. A woman worries about her husband, 3 hours overdue from town, until her local TV or radio announcer tells her he's safe.

Rural America doesn't have the triple-A or the highway department at its immediate command, so you get your driving conditions and road information from your local station. Many a criminal has been apprehended and many a stolen car recovered because someone remembered the description provided by your local radio or TV announcer. Then there are the broadcasts of the local basketball games, the church choirs at Christmastime, and, yes, the price of bananas at Joe's grocery this morning and the price of wheat at the grain elevator, all important services to rural America, services they can get no other way.

The Government would lose, too, if some of these stations went out of business. The stations in my district contribute many hours a year to public service announcements, and the Federal Government is the biggest customer in this free department.

Even if the proposed FCC ruling caused only one station in my district to go off the air, it would be too much, because it would deprive one community of these important services. And I believe I know the answer we'd get if we went out and asked the people which choice they'd make.

These small stations, with their limited staffs, are already bogged down in paper work, and these proposed controls would add to that burden and result in an extra cost to the station in administrative work plus the possibility of reduced income because of the restrictions on commercials. The result, when you consider the small margin with which they operate now, is obvious.

There is the additional possibility, of course, that the proposed ruling could have a completely reverse effect from the stated aim of the Commission. Some stations which now severely limit commercial material out of deference to their listeners or viewers, would be encouraged by the ruling to increase the amount of advertising aired. The Commission, in these cases, would be in the strange position of promoting commercials rather than limiting them.

These stations also have unique problems due to the nature of the market areas they serve. For instance, we have a station located in a sparsely populated area that does not even break even throughout most of the year, but still provides a valuable service to its listeners. But a tourist influx during the summer months enables the station to make a profit. Another station in my district is of the same size, but serves a farm area where most of the revenue comes during the winter months. But this second station can operate daytime-only, which means it must leave the air by as early as 4:30 in the afternoon during its most lucrative months. No rule from Washington could be interpreted to the satisfaction of these two stations, or to the satisfaction of the people served by them.

I note in the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that it maintains that case by case treatment of the so-called problem of overcommercialization has not been satisfactory. At the same time, the Commission's notice further recognizes that the provisions of the proposed rules may not be appropriate for across-the-board application to all broadcast stations, "for example, the need for separate standards to be applied to certain special categories of stations, such as standard stations licensed to operate only during daytime hours or stations licensed to sparsely populated communities, or stations located in communities with season economies, etc."

It is my opinion that these proposed rules would necessitate more case by case treatment than is presently experienced in analyzing complaints or other problems.

Competition of the various media is certainly a factor that shouldn't be disregarded. I believe any unhappiness on the part of the listener or viewer will be readily transmitted, not only to the licensee, but also to the advertisers who use the media. This combination of competition and listener response is where the control of broadcast media should and does come. This is where it should remain. The survival of every station is dependent upon the response of listeners and communities whose needs and requirements are unique from all others. That is one of the great reasons why an all-encompassing rule from the Commission creates nothing but a hardship on the broadcaster and the area which he serves.

BEEF IMPORTS AND THE DECLINE IN FARM INCOME

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that we have been cowed by the Department of Agriculture long enough. It is long past time when we should steer a course on a new policy on imports of cattle and beef. I have written the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee asking that hearings be scheduled to consider the impact of beef imports on the domestic market conditions and the income of American ranchers and farmers. This course of action becomes necessary since I have been unable to obtain any indication from the Secretary of Agriculture as to what will be done or is being done in his Department concerning this matter.

In a letter addressed to the Secretary on October 11, I brought my concern over the price-depressing effects of increased beef imports to his attention. Again on November 19 I wrote the Secretary. I have yet to receive a report.

In public statements, however, the Secretary has consistently played down the importance of record levels of beef imports on prices in the domestic market.

The Department of Agriculture publication "Demand and Price Situation" for April 1963, contained the following statement on page 22:

> Imports of beef and veal totaled a record 948 million pounds (product weight) in 1962, over 40 percent above the previous record a year earlier.

According to the Department's own statement, then, we have witnessed two record years for imports of beef.

I include at this point a table which was prepared by the Livestock and Meat Products Division of the Foreign Agricultural Service. I might comment that the totals listed in the table include the "Other meat" category which in 1962 amounted to 23,126,000 pounds and brings the grand total in 1962 up to the figure 970,945,000.

Beef and veal—U.S. imports, product weight basis, by country of origin, average 1951–55, annual 1958–62

[In thousands of pounds]

Country	Average, 1951–55	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
New Zealand	12,990	182,002	160,937	130,695	154,329	213,556
Argentina	97,562	91,350	62,911	47,553	56,467	45,818
Mexico	35,435	73,740	48,541	39,042	53,336	59,233
Canada	25,360	53,200	22,321	18,747	32,119	19,143
Ireland	7,187	23,741	41,977	43,615	61,098	70,725
Australia	1,411	16,928	223,941	144,665	232,164	444,730
Brazil	2,828	10,835	20,805	8,417	13,960	13,539
Uruguay	15,612	9,501	8,911	10,753	14,781	16,117
Paraguay	610	8,911	8,863	9,732	10,081	8,167
Dominican Republic	3,119	4,142	5,368	5,488	3,829	739
Costa Rica	--------	2,794	9,759	15,334	8,713	8,106
Cuba	8	153	2,262	293	--------	--------
United Kingdom	66	0	1,698	2,988	1,312	6,891
Nicaragua	--------	40	5,764	10,033	14,577	15,795
Honduras	311	409	1,500	3,391	5,525	9,324
Others	51	75	682	550	3,415	15,936
Other meat [1]	[2] 4,234	141,402	96,099	21,309	23,866	23,126
Total	206,784	619,223	722,348	512,605	680,572	970,945

[1] Other meat, canned, prepared or preserved. (See following table for a country breakdown of this item.)

[2] Excludes estimated amounts of boneless beef included in this category prior to 1954.

The Department has given recognition to the substantial increases in beef imports and as long ago as April 3 of this year issued a special report on the livestock situation with special reference to beef cattle. Secretary Freeman, in commenting on this report, stated that total beef imports, although they were at record levels for 1962, had little or no effect on the declining beef prices in the first months of this year.

I wonder if Secretary Freeman still thinks so. If he would bother to check livestock marketings for the first 10 months of this year, he would find that his own Department estimates receipts at nearly $160 million below the comparable period of last year.

And, if he bothered to check, he would find that the open-end, unrestricted beef importation policy of this administration is having a serious impact on cattle prices throughout the United States—a fact which the Department's own reports in November admitted.

The publication of the National Livestock Feeders Association does not agree with Mr. Freeman's point of view. In an editorial in the Livestock Feeder, the statement made by Secretary Freeman is looked upon as having been "more than a slight disservice to the cattle feeding and growing industries." The editorial goes on to state that the Secretary's comments are "misleading and obviously are the result of an incomplete analysis of the situation. It would appear that the Department is attempting to cover up for deficiencies on the part of the Federal Government in foreign trade negotiations. Others have committed similar errors of conclusion."

I ask that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks in its entirety.

[From the Livestock Feeder, April 1963]

THE WHOLE STORY ON IMPORTS

More than a slight disservice was rendered the cattle feeding and growing industries early this month when the Department of Agriculture released its special report on the cattle situation, and stated, "While the volume of imports (of beef) does have an influence on the grades and classes of cattle slaughtered primarily for processing beef, it is not an important factor affecting the price of our high-quality beef and hence the prices of fed cattle." The release accompanying the report said, "Imports of beef have sometimes been cited as a cause of the price break for fed steers and heifers. The report finds no evidence that this is true."

These statements are misleading and obviously are the result of incomplete analysis of the situation. It would appear that the Department is attempting to coverup for deficiencies on the part of the Federal Government in foreign trade negotiations. Others have committed similar errors of conclusions.

Before refuting these statements and conclusions, let's review the figures and trends on imports of beef and veal, the relationship to domestic production, and other pertinent information. We are not talking about imports of pork in this case at all because the volume is of less significance. We are, though, talking about boneless beef and veal, fresh, chilled or frozen, of manufacturing and processing quality.

Prior to 1958, the U.S. tariff on imports of these products amounted to 6 cents per pound. From 1953 and including 1957, imports of all beef and veal, carcass weight equivalent, ranged from 211 million pounds to 395 million pounds per year, or from 1.3 percent to 2.5 percent of our domestic production of these same items. All of this data is taken from the U.S. Foreign Agricultural Service Reports.

In 1958, though, the Government lowered the tariff to 3 cents per pound, a reduction of 50 percent. That very year, imports of beef and veal jumped to 909 million pounds equivalent to 6.3 percent of domestic production. In the years following, the volume and percentage went like this: 1959—1,063 million pounds, 7.2 percent of domestic production; 1960, 775 million pounds, 4.9 percent of domestic production; and 1961, 1,037 million pounds, 6.3 percent of domestic production.

Imports in 1962 set an alltime record of 1,454 million pounds of beef and veal, amounting to 8.9 percent of a domestic production figure of 16,297 million pounds, only slightly below the record production in 1961.

At the same time, it is noteworthy to examine the trend of imports of beef and veal from the three major countries exporting to the United States, keeping in mind that 1958 was the year the United States reduced the tariff by 50 percent. The figures are set out in the table below:

Imports of beef and veal from 3 countries (product weight basis)

[In millions of pounds]

	Australia	New Zealand	Ireland
Average, 1951–55	1.4	13.0	7.2
1958	16.9	182.0	23.7
1959	223.9	160.9	42.0
1960	144.7	130.7	43.6
1961	232.2	154.3	61.1
1962	444.7	213.6	70.7
1962 as a percent of 1951–55	31,764.0	1,643.0	982.0

Some have said, yes, but we also export considerable in volume of livestock and meat products. The truth of the matter is that prior to 1958, the United States was a net exporter of livestock and meat products. In the past 5 years, however, the relationship has changed and the value of U.S. exports has been considerably below the value of imports. In 1962 the dollar value of U.S. exports of all livestock and meat products came to about $320 million, whereas our imports amounted to approximately $670 million, plus about $209 million of wool, making the total import value of approximately $879 million.

With the facts and figures before us, let's move to the argument that since imports of beef and veal are largely manufacturing products, they have little or no effect on the price level of the better quality fresh beef produced in the United States and the prices of fed cattle.

This large volume of imported beef and veal does supplement domestic production of lower grade processing beef—cows, bulls, steers and heifers—creating a much larger quantity of such items as luncheon meats, sandwich meats, wieners, sausages, and hamburger, and also making it possible to offer these products through retail outlets at lower prices.

Disregarded by the Department of Agriculture is the fact that the source of manufacturing beef from domestic production is not confined solely to nonfed animals. Also, with a more moderate volume of imports, there would be more downward substitution of the cheaper cuts from domestic carcasses of other grades. Processors are not going to use these domestic cuts, however, if they can obtain imported beef at more attractive figures.

Hence, it must be recognized that this supplementation of domestic manufacturing beef goes beyond the area of cow beef and to some degree, at least, is supplementing our domestic production of the higher grades.

Then there is the matter of competition. It has been argued that the products from manufacturing beef do not exert any pressure on the price level of fresh beef offered to consumers. At the same time, though, those making such a statement readily admit that other meat products—pork, broilers, etc.—are competitive with fresh beef. It is absolutely fallacious to contend that products manufactured from beef, usually offered in the same counter and in close proximity, are not competitive with the better quality of beef produced domestically.

The contention that a lower volume of manufactured products is apt to drive consumers away from the meat counter and cause them to use substitute products is absolutely without foundation. Yet these are some of the arguments that are being inaccurately used to justify a continued high level of imports.

Domestic production of beef and veal, in terms of consumption, came to about 90 pounds per capita in 1962. With imports of beef and veal at 8.9 percent of domestic production, it means that 8 pounds of additional product per person are offered in our domestic market from foreign sources. It is a foregone conclusion that if we were to suddenly increase domestic production to the extent of 8 pounds per capita, we would have serious repercussions in our market, almost regardless of the type of beef involved in the increase. We fail to see what special set of circumstances makes our domestic market immune from the same impact of 8 pounds of foreign beef per person.

There are some other factors in this import controversy that have not been brought out. First of all, there are reliable reports of a larger volume of better quality beef cuts, suitable for sale as fresh beef, coming into the United States from Australia and New Zealand. Beyond this, we understand advance commitments on imports of boneless beef have been made at least through midyear.

Then, there is the change in the attitude of the foreign exporters of this beef to the United States. Previously, they were not interested in overloading the U.S. market and indicated, at least, some measure of restraint in order to protect the privilege being enjoyed.

That attitude has changed and it now appears as though exporters are intent on getting as big a slice of the American market as they can obtain with less and less regard for the position of the U.S. producer and taxpayer. It may very well be that the past policy of the United States in international trade negotiations has encouraged these countries to the point where they no longer have any fear of either quotas or higher tariffs on imports of the United States.

This is the story on the import situation. No one wants to cut them off entirely. Trade with foreign countries is a recognized necessity. However, the supply of beef on the domestic market, including beef from foreign sources, is still the important price determining factor. The industry is entitled to a better deal than it is getting now.

Since 1960, when imports equaled about 5 percent of domestic production, beef and veal imports have increased to the point where last year they amounted to nearly 10 percent, and indications are that for the current calendar year the percentage will be even higher, possibly over 11 percent. According to the farm income situation for November compiled by the Department of Agriculture, receipts from marketing of livestock and livestock products during the first 9 months of this year are reported down $50 million from a comparable period of 1962.

Since approximately $23 out of every $100 in sales of agricultural products are derived from cattle and calves, it is evident that the disastrous decline in beef marketing receipts during 1963 has been a major contributing factor in establishing the 77 and 78 percent of parity figures which have been in effect throughout this calendar year. I might point out that the parity ratio figure of 77 percent for the month of November is the lowest for the month of November since 1933.

Secretary Freeman in his April 3 statement on the livestock situation admitted that the Department has been called upon to take steps to restrict imports of beef. He said at that time:

> Aside from the fact that evidence does not point to imports as causing the price decline, the Secretary of Agriculture has no authority to limit imports for economic reasons.

Since there is no price support program in the livestock industry, it has been said that section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act does not apply to the imports of livestock products.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act provides that the Secretary can intervene when the level of imports impairs a domestic price support program "or other program * * * with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof."

Although the Government does not support meat prices, this law would cover the situation, for the Government does support dairy prices.

Indications are that farmers are contributing to dairy surpluses by making a choice between dairy production and meat production. Because of the Government supports on dairy products, the farmer finds dairying more profitable than meat production.

In this case the level of meat imports is definitely impairing a domestic price support program—the dairy support program.

While the farm income parity ratio stays at a low of 77 percent for 2 months, and while the Department of Agriculture is looking and studying, the United States has risen to a place of prominence among meat-importing nations of the world. A few years ago we took 26 percent of the world's trade in beef. Today, we take over 50 percent. We have replaced the United Kingdom as the leading beef-importing nation.

Mr. Speaker, this situation is of great importance to the State of Minnesota and especially to the Second Congressional District which I represent. Cash receipts from sale of cattle and calves accounts for one-fourth of Minnesota's agricultural income. Sales amounted to $358 million in calendar year 1962. Minnesota ranks fifth in the Nation in cash receipts from the sale of livestock and livestock products and seventh in receipts from sales of cattle and calves.

This is why I am disturbed when one of the Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture suggests that "those who think that the Government should 'do something' immediately about holding down imports of beef, take a longer look." How long must we look?

ANNIVERSARY OF A 36-HOUR WAR—THE ARMED SEIZURE OF GOA

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today is the second anniversary of a flagrant and shameful act of armed aggression against a virtually defenseless people, an act more to be deplored because its perpetrators struck from behind the mask of nonviolence, neutrality, and a self-proclaimed nonaggression policy.

On December 18, 1961, India's "Man of Peace," Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, gave the orders that set in motion a three-pronged attack against the tiny Portuguese trading centers of Goa, Damao, and Diu. To overwhelm Goa's 3,500 Portuguese defenders, a modern force of 45,000 troops, jet bombers and fighters, and a fleet that included a cruiser and various destroyers was used. The defenders put up a gallant but hopeless fight. One small Portuguese sloop, for example, took on the cruiser and two Indian destroyers in a 45-minute gunbattle before the little vessel was hit and beached by its captain.

By military conquest, in complete violation of the Charter of the United Nations, Nehru abruptly ended 451 years of Portuguese rule. The effect was more far-reaching, however, than the conquest of the three tiny Portuguese enclaves. It put an end to the myth that Nehru's India opposed aggression, as we had so often been told, and it threatened the very existence of the United Nations. Newsweek, on January 1, 1962, had this comment:

> The heaviest blows dealt by Nehru's attack on Goa last week fell not on the Portuguese colony and its tiny sister enclaves, but on two far more substantial institutions: The symbol of India as a nation of peace, and the symbol of the United Nations as an instrument for preventing war.

While India was being congratulated by Russia and Red China for the liberation of Goa, Newsweek noted, President Sukarno drew the most direct inspiration from the attack—he mobilized 500,000 troops to invade Netherlands New Guinea.

The implication was obvious, Mr. Speaker, when the U.N. failed to counteract, in anyway, this blatant aggression. If this world organization, created to establish and foster world peace, sanctions by inaction such an act, then there will be no basis in precedent for future action by the U.N. should armed attacks occur elsewhere in the world. Mr. Nehru tried to justify his war on Goa and India's claim to this ancient Portuguese territory by the fact that it was geographically a part of India. The extension of this principle, apparently accepted by the United Nations, would permit Panama, for example, to occupy the Canal Zone, or Spain to seize Gibraltar. There is little doubt that the inaction of the U.N., in this case, served as an inducement to President Sukarno.

On this occasion of the second anniversary of the attack on Goa, it seems to me most appropriate to call attention to India's unlawful conquest and to note that to 700,000 Goans this did not mean liberation but only a change from the long-accepted rule of Portugal to the unwanted control by India. This change did not come with their consent, as indicated in the recent rejection of Nehru's handpicked candidates for the proposed local assembly.

Ever since the forcible occupation of Goa, Goans all over the world have been deeply concerned about the fate of their fellow countrymen in the occupied territories of Goa, Damao, and Diu. They have been reduced from the status of free citizens in a free country to that of displaced persons in their own land. This concern crystallized earlier this month at a conference in Paris, where Goans from all over the world met and unanimously resolved to send a delegation to the United Nations, which has a special committee to hear petitions from oppressed peoples—the Trusteeship Committee of the General Assembly.

A four-man delegation appeared before the Committee on December 10. The following story from the December 11 edition of the New York Times will explain that they were denied an audience before the Committee and that an effort was even made to expunge their initial remarks when the Committee discovered they were not there to condemn Portuguese colonial policy, but in fact to protest that Goa was now a colony of India:

> [From the New York Times, Dec. 11, 1963]
>
> ### FOUR SILENCED IN U.N. IN PROTEST ON GOA—COMMITTEE RESTRICTS DEBATE TO PORTUGUESE COLONIALISM
>
> (By Thomas J. Hamilton)
>
> UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., December 10.—African delegates silenced four petitioners today after the petitioners had protested India's seizure of Goa, a Portuguese colony, in December 1961. A motion to expunge their testimony from the record was dropped, however, as a result of opposition by the United States and other Western members and Liberia.
>
> The petitioners, all former residents of Goa or of Goan descent, apparently had received a hearing in the Trusteeship Committee of the General Assembly in the expectation that they would denounce Portuguese colonial rule.
>
> All four were silenced by the Committee Chairman, Achkar Marof of Guinea. He cut their statements short on the ground that they had been given a hearing solely to express their views on Portuguese nonself-governing territories included on the list approved by the United Nations.
>
> Goa, which was annexed by India after occupation by Indian troops, is not on the list.
>
> #### PROPAGANDA AIM SEEN
>
> Diallo Seydou, the Guinean representative, said that the Committee's "sad experience" of yesterday, when another petitioner, Henrique M. Galvao, declared that Angola and Mozambique were not ready for independence, showed that it was being used for "propaganda purposes."
>
> Meanwhile, Ghana, Morocco, and the Philippines introduced a resolution in the Security Council criticizing Portugal's noncompliance with a resolution, adopted last July 31, that urged Portugal to give immediate recognition to the right of the people of her colonies to self-determination and independence.
>
> The earlier resolution also called on Portugal to withdraw all military forces employed for "repression" in her colonies and urged all states to stop exports to Portugal of arms and military equipment for such use.
>
> Today's resolution urges all states to comply with the previous resolution, but does not call for additional measures against Portugal. However, it says that recent talks between African representatives and Dr. Alberto Franco Nogueira, the Foreign Minister of Portugal, has not succeeded because of disagreement over the meaning of "self-determination."
>
> #### THE 1960 DECLARATION CITED
>
> It cites the definition of self-determination contained in the General Assembly's anticolonial declaration in 1960:
>
> "All peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development."
>
> The resolution asks the Secretary General, U Thant, to report on developments by next June 1.
>
> The first petitioner heard by the Trusteeship Committee, Antonio da Fonseca, started by saying that self-determination could never be compatible with armed invasion of a territory, referring to Goa. He was interrupted by the Chairman when he was about to ask what guarantee there would be that other non-self-governing territories would not be invaded if the United Nations did not condemn such action.
>
> Mr. Marof allowed Mr. da Fonseca to say a few more sentences, but he cut short the

three other petitioners, Wolfgang Doss de Souza, Leo de Sousa, and Remeo da Silva, as soon as it became clear that they also were protesting against the seizure of Goa.

Having been silenced in the United Nations, the delegation hoped to earn the sympathy of the American people in their resolve to win self-determination for Goa. They wrote me on December 13, from New York, asking if I would meet with them to hear their story and help arrange for them to talk with officials of the State Department. The following is a copy of that letter:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
December 13, 1963.

Hon. HASTINGS KEITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Three representatives of Goan communities around the world and myself appeared before the Fourth Committee of the United Nations on December 10, 1963, to ask help in getting self-determination for the people of Goa, Damao, and Diu. As you know, our homeland is now under the military domination of the Government of India. The Chairman of the Fourth Committee, Achkar Marof, of Guinea, refused to permit us to speak about Goa.

Mr. KEITH, we are official representatives of communities of people of Goa, Damao, and Diu. A conference of representatives of all these communities, held in Paris on December 3, 1963, issued a declaration of rights, demanding self-determination for the people of Goa, Damao, and Diu. The conference vehemently condemned the Indian aggression and occupation of our homeland and asked the United Nations, and all governments who believe in the charter of the United Nations, to help us attain self-determination.

We know, sir, that you represent many Portuguese people in the United States. We know of your great interest in and sympathy with the Portuguese people. Printed copies of the articles about Angola by the great American correspondent, Robert Estabrook, which you placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, have been circulated among Portuguese people around the world. We also have seen in this record of the American Congress editorials from the Standard-Times newspaper in New Bedford—articles that are sympathetic to the captivity of the people of Goa, Damao, and Diu and articles that you put in the RECORD.

We therefore request an audience with you in Washington on December 18th, which is the day of infamy to us. It is the day the Indian army invaded our homeland. We feel we must keep alive the conscience of the world about the conquest of a free province of Portugal. We solicit your help in presenting our communique of the declaration of rights to the State Department of the United States, so the great American people will realize that the people of Goa, Damao, and Diu still sorrow and are resolved to secure the right of self-determination which is being granted elsewhere around the world.

Please receive our request favorably.

Respectfully,

ANTONIO DA FONSECA,
Secretary General, Goa Freedom Movement.

I felt the Indian attack went far beyond a question of colonialism and was an act that should not go unchallenged. I notified the delegation I would be glad to meet with them and do whatever I could to bring their cause to the attention of my colleagues in Congress and appropriate officials in the Department of State.

Three members of the group met with me in my office today: Prof. Leo Anthony de Sousa of Karachi, Pakistan; Antonio da Fonseca, a Goan who now lives in Lisbon, and Romeo de Silva, a former resident of Goa who now lives in Nairobi, Kenya.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this point, an excellent statement prepared by Professor Sousa for delivery at the United Nations—a statement which the so-called Committee on Colonialism refused to hear. It is an eloquent statement in defense of the principles of self-determination and due process of law, which the Indian Union contemptuously flounted when it sent troops into Goa, Damao, and Diu 2 years ago today:

STATEMENT OF PROF. LEO A. DE SOUSA

Mr. President and distinguished delegates, members of the Fourth Committee of the United Nations, I join my colleagues in thanking you for having permitted us to appear before you. You would like to know my credentials. I present them to you. By race I am a Goan. My dear father hailed from the village of Assagao, nestling amidst the hills of Goa. By birth, I am a Sindhi. I was born in Karachi, when it was the capital of Sind in prepartition India. By law established, I am a citizen of Pakistan. By the grace of God, I am a Roman Catholic. Please don't ask me the reasons for my coming here. The heart has its own reasons which the head may not understand. I have come here to address you on the accepted principle of the right of self-determination for all peoples including those listed in the permission very kindly granted to us as petitioners. I have come here because I have been greatly perturbed by the manner in which this principle is being applied in various cases. I do believe that the small countries and peoples in the world live in the hope that the United Nations is there to guarantee their safety against the appetites of bigger nations, who might engage with impunity in land-grabbing escapades.

It is true that colonialism is done for. It is a remnant of the past. But this does not mean that the law of historical evolution should be allowed to obviate the international law represented by the U.N. Charter. History may consign colonialism to oblivion but the charter provides that the remains be disposed of according to due process of law. We are witnessing today a new form of anticolonialism which can have disastrous consequences and serious repercussions on world peace.

Sir, I respectfully submit that whatever may be the mechanics of self-determination there can be no doubt that the principle of self-determination emphasize the right of such distinct groups, irrespective of whether they be large or small, to determine their own future freely and without pressure from any other group.

I submit that the U.N. can survive the baffling twists and turns of its fortunes in the protected territories. It can survive the almost paralyzing use of the veto by a certain great power. It can survive its present financial crisis. But the greatest threat to its existence is the fact that it is becoming more and more frequent that world peace is being subordinated to national self-interest—that the use of force is being condoned in the seizure of colonial territories. If this continues and I have grave apprehensions that it will, it will sound the deathknell of the U.N. I appeal to you, sir, and to the distinguished members of this august Committee that the peoples of the territories listed as being under Portuguese administration and which have been the subject of debates here since 1957 must be given the right to determine their own future freely, without let or hindrance from any other people.

I have great faith and confidence in the U.N. and mankind has placed high hopes in its charter. If, however, nations bound together by this charter follow those nations who have, as they claim, liberated their smaller neighboring peoples from their erstwhile masters by recourse to force of arms, they shall thereby renounce their charter pledge not to use force "save in the common interest." The charter, sir, was designed to save men from the scourge of war and not to condone the enslavement of one people by another in the name of self-determination.

If the U.N. can condone such grave violations of the rights of man then the very purpose for which the U.N. was established shall have ceased to exist.

I have said all this because I am still deeply mindful of what happened in the case of Hyderabad, Manavade, Junagadh and Kashmir and recently in Goa, Damao and Diu, which were annexed by armed invasion by a member of the United Nations. I am unable to believe how the U.N. could have acquiesced in the manner of its annexation.

If the principle of self-determination is accepted as sacrosanct by the peoples of the United Nations I appeal to you to help the peoples of not only Goa, Damao and Diu, but all those territories annexed by force of arms to achieve their freedom to decide their own future. This applies equally to the Portuguese territories listed in the permission given to us.

I thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I have seldom read a finer plea in defense of the principle of self-determination or a sounder warning against the consequences of disregarding the law of nations as embodied in the Charter of the United Nations—principles and laws that were coldly rejected in favor of greed and self-interest and of bolstering a faltering domestic political situation 2 years ago by India.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this point a copy of a communique issued by the Goan Conference in Paris earlier this month, which calls for the withdrawal of Indian occupation forces and the right of self-determination for Goa, as well as a copy of the statement the delegation issued on its arrival in Washington today.

COMMUNIQUE BY GOA FREEDOM MOVEMENT

Delegates representing the various groups of the peoples of Goa, Damao and Diu met on the 3d day of December 1963 at Hotel de Palais d' Orsay in Paris, to consider practical steps to meet the situation which has arisen as a result of the armed invasion and occupation of those territories by the Indian Union. The Conference convened by the Goan Association of Nairobi, Kenya was attended by delegates representing the communities of peoples of Goa, Damao and Diu in Macau, the Far East, Ceylon, Pakistan, Indian Union, Arabian Gulf area, Ethiopia, Uganda, Tanganyika, Mozambique, Angola, Iraq, United Kingdom, Germany, Portugal, Brazil, and Kenya.

The Conference issued a Declaration of Rights of the peoples of Goa, Damao and Diu vehemently condemning the Indian aggression and occupation and notifying the Government of India to quit the occupied territories on or before the 18th day of December 1963 by withdrawing all its civil and military personnel as well as Indian civilians who entered the territories after the respective dates of invasion. The declaration calls upon the United Nations to uphold the inalienable right enshrined in the Charter and Resolutions of the United Nations Organization by virtue of which the peoples of Goa, Damao and Diu are entitled to the right of self-determination. The declaration further appeals to all governments to support the just cause of the peoples of Goa, Damao and Diu. Finally this declaration serves notice upon the Government of India that, should the Government fail to comply with the terms of the declaration, the peoples concerned will use all means to secure this right.

The preamble of the declaration stresses that the people of Goa, Damao and Diu are a distinct community in the Indian subcontinent and inhabit territories with well-defined and universally respected frontiers.

Over the centuries of European influence these peoples have evolved a distinct and unique culture. It also emphasizes that the peoples of these territories always repudiated and resisted interference of the Government of India in their way of life.

The conference adopted a constitution and set up an organization called the GOA freedom movement to carry on the struggle for the liberation of the territories under Indian occupation. Membership of the organization is open to all persons born in Goa, Damao and Diu or to their descendants in the male line, provided they repudiate Indian rule and stand for free and unfettered self-determination.

The organization will have a secretariat and as many other branches as may be deemed necessary in the different parts of the world. The organization will be run by a supreme council of seven members elected by the conference. The council has been vested with powers to co-opt two other members. The names of these persons may be kept in strict confidence for reasons of their personal safety.

The supreme council has unanimously elected Mr. Antonio da Fonseca to hold the appointment of the Secretary-General of the organization. The venue of the headquarters of the organization will be made known shortly.

The conference also adopted several other resolutions among them one on the unity and solidarity of the peoples of Goa, Damao, and Diu and another protesting against the high-handed methods of social, cultural, and economic strangulation adopted by the Indian authorities with the calculated design of rapidly exterminating the peoples of Goa, Damao, and Diu.

The conference passed a resolution condemning the failure of the Indian Union to obtain a mandate from the peoples of Goa, Damao, and Diu to rule these territories on the assumption that those peoples acquiesced in the integration of those territories with the Indian Union. This resolution further condemned the proposed elections to be held in these territories as a calculated attempt to vest aggression with respectability and further reiterates an unswerving resolve to demand the right of self-determination.

The conference decided to light a torch in the Castle of Navarre, the home of St. Francis Xavier, patron of Goa, Damao, and Diu and invoked his blessings on the just cause of the movement.

M. DA GAMA ROSE,
President.
S. L. SIRVOICAR,
Vice President.

STATEMENT OF THE DELEGATION OF THE GOA FREEDOM MOVEMENT

As representatives of the Goa Freedom Movement, we are asking for the United Nations and the United States to support self-determination for the people of Goa, Damao, and Diu. We appeared before the Fourth Committee (on colonialism) at the United Nations on December 10, but we were not permitted to discuss Goa. The Fourth Committee Chairman, Achkar Marof of Guinea, objected because he said our homelands were no longer considered non-self-governing territories.

We apparently were permitted to appear before the Fourth Committee because the Chairman thought we planned to speak against Portugal. When he discovered we were seeking self-determination for Goa, Damao, and Diu, he denied us the right to be heard.

We have come to Washington today to ask the United States to help place the subject of Goa, Damao, and Diu before the United Nations. The United States has consistently supported the principle of self-determination, and this right has been denied to the people of our homeland. We have been made a colony of India.

Today, December 18, 1963, marks a Day of Infamy in international relations and human rights. It is the second anniversary of the brutal and unprovoked invasion of Goa, Damao, and Diu by the armed forces of the Indian Union. Since then, these areas have remained under subjugation.

On the third day of this month in Paris, France, delegates representing Goa, Damao, and Diu, met and formed the Goa freedom movement. The conference was attended by representatives of the peoples of Goa, Damao, and Diu and also of Goan communities in Macao, the Far East, Ceylon, Pakistan, the Indian Union, Arabian Gulf area, Ethiopia, Uganda, Tanganyika, Mozambique, Angola, Iran, the United Kingdom, Germany, Portugal, Brazil, and Kenya.

The attached communique outlines the declaration of rights and the decisions taken at the Paris Conference.

Following the Paris meeting, a delegation was chosen to appear before the Fourth Committee of the United Nations at its current session in New York. The delegation came to plead the rights of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, for the peoples of Goa, Damao, and Diu.

The delegation was promptly and brutally shut off from speaking on the grounds that Goa, Damao, and Diu—which had been a part of the Portuguese world for over 400 years and had developed their own distinctive culture and civilization—were no longer considered non-self-governing territories. This ruling was made despite the fact that our homeland was conquered by the Indian Army, and has been under the colonial rule of the Indian Government ever since. The people of Goa, Damao, and Diu never were given an opportunity to choose under what principles they want to live. This act is colonialism at its worst.

The subjugation is contrary to the charter of the United Nations, and to the noble principles for which the United Nations stands.

We were grateful when the American Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, gave his verbal support to Goa at the time of the aggression 2 years ago. We appreciate the spirit of his condemnation of this most aggressive act, and we recognize that India would have been condemned in the Security Council except for the veto by Russia. However, we cannot let the world forget this tragic violation of human rights guaranteed by the United Nations Charter.

The world recognizes that the people of the United States have helped a great many peoples to attain freedom in and since the past World War. They have helped make it possible for United Nations member states to grow from 55 to 113.

The people of Goa hope that the people of America will not forget them, even though 2 years have passed since our homeland felt the conqueror's heel.

Doubtless our country and our people are small in the context of world problems, but the moral and political issues involved are those on which the United Nations was founded—the protection of the weak and poorer peoples of the world.

In the name of our people, we demand a free plebiscite. We ask a plebiscite in the name of the same moral and political concepts which gave birth to the United Nations.

We request the United States to rescue us from alien oppression. We ask that the United States, as a champion of justice for free men in the world, insist that the rights of the people of Goa, Damao, and Diu be recognized in the United Nations.

The whole world is aware that the United Nations is already obsessed by colonial problems. But let us not forget that colonialism by the Indian Union is just as oppressive as any other type of colonialism.

Not only did the Indian Union forcibly subjugate the people of Goa, Damao, and Diu by violent means, but it is actually forcing on them political, economic, social, cultural, and religious institutions which they detest and which they wish to repudiate.

We reject the false contention that Goa should become a part of India because of geography. If geography should pertain, why should not Pakistan, Ceylon, and other nations of the Indian subcontinent also be annexed? Why should not Alaska be a part of Canada? Politically, Goa, Damao, and Diu had nothing to do with the old British Indian Empire except to live as good neighbors. Economically, we were far ahead of the Indian Union. We have never depended on her patronage and, on the contrary, we have prospered in every way. And now India has wrecked our economy and ended our prosperity.

We do not speak in behalf of Portugal. We do not predict what the people of Goa, Damao, and Diu would choose under a free plebiscite. But we do insist that it is our right as human beings to choose how we shall live, whether as an independent nation, as a part of the Portuguese nation, or as a part of India. The people of Goa should make the choice.

Having failed to gain a hearing or a forum before the United Nations, this delegation appealed to Members of the Congress of the United States to hear their case so they could make an appeal to the conscience of the free world. This time we were not disappointed. True to the traditions of your great country, which is looked to as the champion of freedom by all mankind, representatives of your Congress answered our appeal, and that is why we are here today.

We wish to express our deep thanks to Congressman KEITH and the representatives of the press who have honored us by coming here.

The day following the attack on Goa, our Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, made clear the reaction of the United States:

> It is a question of the use of armed force by one state against another and against its will, an act clearly forbidden by the Charter (of the United Nations).
>
> We have opposed such action in the past by our closest friends as well as others. We opposed it in Korea in 1950, in Suez and in Hungary in 1956, in the Congo in 1960, and we do so again in Goa in 1961.

When Russia, the same day, vetoed a U.N. resolution calling for cease-fire, Indian withdrawal from Goa and peaceful negotiations, Ambassador Stevenson warned that "we are witnessing the first act in a drama which could end with its—the U.N.'s—death."

The United Nations has not died, but its voice could only have been seriously weakened and its high purpose undermined by the failure to challenge India's aggression.

It is my sincere hope that this Government will come to the assistance of the people of Goa, Damao, and Diu in helping bring this matter before the United Nations. The passage of 2 years has not lessened the crime. To allow Goa to be forgotten would not be consistent with our role as the leader of the free world and could only breed a further contempt for the peace and order.

CATERPILLAR ACHIEVES RECOGNITION FOR HIRING HANDICAPPED

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to announce to Members of this House that a Presidential Committee has named the Caterpillar Tractor Co. of Peoria, Ill., in my district as "Employer of the Year" in recognition of their hiring handicapped persons. I would ask unanimous consent at this point, Mr. Speaker, to include the news story from the Peoria Journal Star under date of Monday, December 16, together with two articles from the August-September 1963 issue of Caterpillar News and Views, telling the story of two of the handicapped persons presently employed by the company.

NATIONAL CITATION GIVEN CATERPILLAR FOR HIRING HANDICAPPED WORKERS

Caterpillar Tractor Co. of Peoria which has approximately 3,000 handicapped persons among some 33,800 workers on its payroll has been named Employer of the Year by President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

This award, sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers, is given annually by the President's Committee to give national recognition to one employer in business or industry for outstanding service in facilitating the useful and suitable employment of handicapped persons.

The award consists of the President's Committee Seal, a plate bearing the recipient's name, and the facsimile signature of the President of the United States and another plate bearing the name of the award, all mounted on a mahogany shield.

Nominated by the Illinois Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Caterpillar has had a policy of hiring the handicapped for a number of years. However, the company also feels it has an obligation to its own employees who become disabled through occupational or nonoccupational illness or accidents.

Among the major types of handicapped workers employed by the firm are persons with marked deformity, loss of one or both arms or legs, loss of one or both eyes, cardiac disease, loss of hearing or speech, and arrested tuberculosis.

The company takes into account an applicant's disability, his work record, the possibility of future transfer, and the need for medical approval in the event of a transfer.

In addition the company's personnel director, medical director, safety director, and supervisory personnel make a careful study of each job to determine suitable positions for handicapped persons. After employment, periodic followup checks are made by officials of each plant responsible for coordinating the firm's hire-the-handicapped program to be sure each handicapped person hired is making a satisfactory adjustment.

The firm credits its medical director, Dr. Harold A. Vonachen, for the success of the program. He convinced top management there are many jobs a disabled person can do and was instrumental in developing the company's policy.

The award will be presented at the sixth annual national meeting of the employer committee of the President's Committee. However, the time, date, and site of this meeting has not been set.

THANKS TO PEORIA PRODUCTION SHOP JACK GRIDER IS A WORKINGMAN

Jack Grider is a husky, round-faced fellow of 28, pleasant, quiet. He is the father of three active children, lives in Pekin, Ill., and 5 days a week wheels his 1958 Olds through 15 miles of heavy traffic to his job in Peoria Heights.

When he gets home from work he romps with the youngsters, enjoys a can of beer, reads the evening paper while he waits for dinner, watches a little TV and putters with his guns. A typical workingman's routine.

But Jack is not a typical workingman. He is a double amputee, lost both his legs at the hips in a railroad switching accident 5 years ago. Since then a wheel chair has been his legs.

Vigorous, not one to brood, Jack is still doing his best to earn a living for a family he's very proud of. He works at Peoria Production Shop, a workshop employing handicapped persons. Jack is one of several employees making abrasive cones which the shop sells to Caterpillar. Caterpillar uses these cones to remove burrs from oil holes in crankshafts and final drive shafts, buys 35,000 cones a week—has been buying them since the shop started in 1941—and other items. These products are used at all of Caterpillar's Midwest plants.

Last year two-thirds of Peoria Production Shop's total business was done with Caterpillar.

Caterpillar also deals with two other organizations providing employment and training for handicapped persons. The Peoria Area Blind People's Center does some small parts packaging for Morton Parts. Remin Laboratories in Joliet provides clean shop cloths to Joliet and Aurora plants.

Peoria Production Shop sells to many others besides Caterpillar. Tireless Henry Johnson, the shop's one-man personnel manager, production superintendent, buyer, salesman, and designer, is out daily drumming up business. As a result, the workshop produces a wide variety of merchandise, ranging from canvas boat and trailer covers, filter bags, special head halters used by hospitals to pallets for beer kegs. Big seasonal items have been plastic Easter eggs and whisky decanter stoppers which the employees assemble.

Customers include boat and camping fans, cleaning plants, food processors, utilities, hospitals, machinery manufacturers, a distillery, a brewery, a plastics company.

The Federal certificate permits the payment of less than the minimum wage.

"But our rates are in line with those paid by some profitmaking organizations doing our kind of work," explained Henry. "We're not out to undercut other companies for business—we bid for jobs like anybody else * * * some we get * * * some we don't.

"We have to figure our costs mighty close. For instance, we had to hold our costs of assembling 6 million plastic Easter eggs down to four-tenths of a cent per egg to keep from losing money * * * we didn't quite do it. Anyway, it looks like we've lost that job * * * someone invented a machine that can assemble eggs cheaper."

While cones, plastic eggs and bottle stoppers are big volume jobs, most of the jobs are short-run items. The shop also does considerable custom work.

Caterpillar's relationship with Peoria Production Shop has been a long one. Former Caterpillar Vice President J. V. Munro, now deceased, helped the late Dr. Maxim Pollack, one-time director of the Peoria Municipal Tuberculosis Sanitarium, establish the workshop as a business to help rehabilitate former tuberculosis patients. Mr. Munro served as president of the corporation for several years.

Since its incorporation in 1951, the shop has always had at least one Caterpillar man on its 11-man board of directors which includes representatives of industry, business, civic and professional groups. Present Caterpillar member is Willard May, methods and controls manager in Peoria plant purchasing.

"There are several reasons we do business with Peoria Production Shop," Willard explained. "We can contribute to the employment and rehabilitation of the handicapped who are not yet able to work in industry, trades or retail business. Such sheltered workshops often do jobs other companies aren't interested in doing, and they do excellent work. And their prices are competitive."

While making abrasive cones or assembling plastic eggs might be a boring job to most people, to a handicapped person like Jack Grider, it is a challenge.

He is showing he can be a useful member of the community—not a burden. He is earning a salary. He is doing useful work. He is a breadwinner. And through his work he is developing work habits and abilities that may some day help him compete with nonhandicapped workers in an industry or a business.

One with Jack's handicap could resign himself to a bitter or frustrated, wheelchair life * * * especially if he were young and filled with dreams and energy. But not Jack.

"I've got to keep busy," he mused. "I'd go nuts just sitting around looking out the window."

"I like working here," he added with a wave of his hand. "Keeps me from feeling sorry for myself."

Cones are just one item Caterpillar buys from this businesslike, well-run organization. The company also buys protective hand pads, iron pourers' aprons, canvas seat covers for engineers' stools, tractor cab side curtains, sand blast capes, welding curtains, drawing board covers, mailbags, plastic envelopes, protective boots for hydraulic cylinders.

Employment varies. Said Henry, "Right now we have 20 people working, but during the Christmas and Easter seasons we may have as many as 40."

People are referred to the shop by several health, social and employment agencies. Almost half are recommended by the Peoria Municipal and Tazwell County Tuberculosis Sanitariums. A third is referred by the local rehabilitation office of the Illinois Public Aid Commission. The balance comes from the Illinois State Employment Service, Peoria's Mental Hygiene Clinic, Institute of Physical Medicine and Heart Association.

While most of the employees are persons with arrested tuberculosis who must do light work, other handicapped persons who work full time or part time at the shop include blind persons, deaf mutes, spastics and amputees like Jack Grider.

The Peoria Production Shop is 1 of 800 such workshops in the United States providing employment and rehabilitation for handicapped persons. Called "sheltered workshops," they are not-for-profit organizations operating under State laws and certificates issued by the Federal Government.

For Essay on Handicapped, Karen Lind Wins National Honor

To Karen Lind, of Joliet, her town is a better town because of a special group of citizens—its handicapped.

So convinced of this was Karen that judges awarded her second place in a nationwide essay contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. She won a $600 prize, a trip to Washington (including her parents) and the thrill of receiving a citation and handshake from President Kennedy.

In her essay, "How My Community Benefits From the Abilities of Handicapped Workers," Karen described the ways they can aid a community—by becoming economically independent, making themselves truly useful by their productive capacity, working more safely than nonhandicapped workers, by the example they set for their nonhandicapped fellow citizens.

"Leading businessmen assert that, productionwise, the handicapped worker increases productive capacity," Karen wrote. "Sampling interviews with large and small industries in Joliet emphasize that the handicapped worker has developed special skills that help the community. The Joliet plant of Caterpillar Tractor Co. employs 200 handicapped workers."

She quoted Ed O'Connell, Joliet plant safety supervisor, who told of deaf mutes performing as machine operators, assemblers and welders, one-legged employees using their hands skillfully at mills and lathes, one-armed persons doing well as hand truckers or welders. She related Ed's description of a blind employee repairing safety goggles. The employee would hold a lens over a lighted bulb and determine by the amount of heat passing through the lens whether it was plain glass or tinted.

She also paid tribute to an industrial towel service where all 20 employees are handicapped persons and not one accident has befallen an employee; a blind teacher in the Joliet school system; a sightless lawyer who had become a civic leader; an arthritic county official; a paraplegic Boy Scout leader.

Karen believes Joliet's activities in rehabilitating handicapped persons are one reason it was named an All America City in 1955.

"Eagerly our community observes the complete personality development of our handicapped persons," she said in conclusion. "For only from this do we, the nonhandicapped, better appreciate the handicapped workers' services and our own gift of freedom from disability * * * as handicapped persons plan life ahead and around their handicaps, so can a community learn from such individuals to plan ahead and around deterrents to community progress."

The smile and handshake from President Kennedy were the climax to a gratifying and well-spent high school career for Karen. Interested in journalism, Karen served in her senior year as editor in chief of the Joliet Township High School newspaper and student correspondent for the Joliet Herald-Review. She was a debater and a member of the National Forensic Society. With all her activities she was still good enough student to become a member of the National Honor Society.

Karen will enter Knox College next month and plans to major in medical journalism.

TO PROVIDE COINAGE OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY 50-CENT PIECES

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I have complete respect for the memory of our late President John F. Kennedy and am in full accord that his service to our great Nation, so tragically cut short by an assassin, should be duly recognized and honored. We should do and will do no less. My vote on H.R. 9413 in the House of Representatives on December 17, 1963, should in no way be interpreted as opposition to our Nation's honoring his memory.

But as suggestion after suggestion is put forth containing proposals for ways to honor President Kennedy, I think that we can all agree that though they are well meaning, sooner or later a point is reached when it becomes exceedingly difficult to determine which would be a proper and fitting tribute to show our appreciation and respect.

I believe we have reached that point and should not rush into circulation coins bearing the likeness of President Kennedy until all the proposals are properly evaluated. We must be guided by both our heart and our sense of what is reasonable, proper, and just.

On December 12 I introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of a John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission. The Commission would be composed of four Members from the House, four from the Senate, and five appointed by the President. It would be the duty of the Commission to make a full and complete study with regard to plans proposed with a view toward memorializing the late President, and to submit to Congress its findings and recommendations.

On December 13 I requested that the House Administration Committee hold hearings on the measure so that the Commission could be immediately created to begin its work of deciding on an appropriate, dignified, and lasting memorial to be planned and instituted in memory of our late President. This I feel is the appropriate way to go about this matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. Halleck) for Thursday, December 19, for personal reasons to attend a funeral in Lenoir, N.C.

Mr. King of New York (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for the balance of the week, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Rogers of Colorado, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. Langen (at the request of Mr. Beermann), for 10 minutes, on December 19.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina and to include an article, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $202.50.

Mr. Libonati.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Beermann) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Gubser.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 19, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1456. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the construction of new low-rent public housing projects without adequate consideration of available Government-owned housing in the program administered by the Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1457. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the fourth semiannual report on activities of the U.S. Travel Service, pursuant to the International Travel Act of 1961; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1458. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of this Department on the activities and transactions of the Administration from July 1, 1963, through September 30, 1963, pursuant to the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 560. Resolution to provide for a new seal and press for the use of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1057). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 576. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 73; with amendment (Rept. No. 1058). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 588. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 2d session of the 88th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1059). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 595: Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 871, a joint resolution providing for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1060). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 7332. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1061). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 8853. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1062). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 9515. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 9516. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9517. A bill for the relief of Margherita Di Matteo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 9518. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Gimnicher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9519. A bill for the relief of Young Soon Kim and Tai Ung Choi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1, of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

540. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ingrid E. Laws, secretary, Windham County Democratic Association, Canterbury, Conn., to declare November 22 as President Kennedy Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

541. Also, petition of Floyd G. Marcusson, president, Bellflower Democratic Club, Bellflower, Calif., to change the method of determining chairmen to a method which would assure chairmanships in the hands of those who support party policy and work for its speedy enactment into laws; to the Committee on Rules.

542. Also, petition of Floyd G. Marcusson, president, Bellflower Democratic Club, Bellflower, Calif., relative to going on record as approving the passage of a bill providing for adequate hospital and medical care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

543. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to printing certain material in the Congressional Record Appendix relating to the tax bill, H.R. 8363; to the Committee on House Administration.

544. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting that the members on the Joint Committee on Printing try and improve the format of the Congressional Record; to the Committee on House Administration.

545. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to require the American Printing House for the Blind, Louisville, Ky., to select one representative copy each week of the Congressional Record to be printed in braille, and then to be made available for distribution to all the English-reading blind anywhere in the world; to the Committee on House Administration.

546. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to have the House Committee on Ways and Means publish a document showing the amounts of money received from each State "for the use of the Treasury of the United States" from various State taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God: In times of stillness, such as this hallowed moment, as we pause in the midst of rushing cares, we hear—like bells at evening pealing—the call of the better angels of our nature: we come seeking wide horizons around our noisy lives. 'Midst all the busy shuttles of legislation, as here is woven the fabric of law and order, shielding the life of our democracy and of free peoples everywhere, may we not be so enmeshed in the immediate mechanics of our solemn tasks as to lose sight of the total pattern shown in the mount of vision.

We are grateful that, once more, over an earth grown old with its burden of care, the voice of the Christ Child rings out, with its cheer that mankind are the children of God. May we realize with a new urgency that He does not stay in a manger, but that He walks in our world of pretense and greed and self-seeking, and that where He goes the judgment of God goes with Him. Bending low through the gate of the child heart, may we find the simplicity, the freedom, and the truth that sword and tongue and pen can never give. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 17, 1963, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 11, 1963,

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, on December 17, 1963, reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 785) thereon, which was printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 212. An act for the relief of Yoo Sei Chun;

S. 697. An act for the relief of Misako Moriya;

S. 966. An act for the relief of Yukio Iseri;

S. 1097. An act for the relief of Despina J. Sanios;

S. 1129. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Bollers and Earlene Bollers;

S. 1172. An act to amend Public Law 86–518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86–518;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of the Arizona Milling Co., of Phoenix, Ariz.;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Dr. Demetrios Flessas and Dr. Eugenia Flessas;

S. 1516. An act for the relief of Ana Murgelj;

S. 1570. An act for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock;

S. 1698. An act to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds;

S. 1767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the State of Delaware, and for other purposes;

S. 2228. An act to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks;

S. 2275. An act to revise the procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act, Public Law 86–3, for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; and

S. 2364. An act to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1289) for the relief of Maria Merghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina).

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House.

H.R. 2985. An to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to venue generally; and

H.R. 4062. An act to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 to the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, covering House bill 2664, to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, to provide a certain exemption, be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 766, House bill 9499, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after "section 212", to strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$175,000,000".

On page 2, line 6, after the word "hospitals", to insert "and schools", and in line 8, after "section 214(c)", to strike out "for hospital construction,".

On page 2, line 13, after "section 302", to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$130,903,000".

On page 2, line 15, after "section 402", to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$380,000,000".

On page 2, line 17, after "section 451 (a)", to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$32,900,000".

On page 2, line 19, after the word "the", to strike out "Act of September 8, 1960" and insert "Latin American Development Act", and in line 21, after the word "amended", to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$180,000,000".

On page 2, line 24, after "section 252", to strike out "$350,000,000" and insert "$425,000,000".

On page 3, line 2, after "section 252", to strike out "$80,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000".

On page 3, line 4, after "section 202(a)", to strike out "$600,000,000" and insert "$800,000,000".

On page 3, line 9, after "section 637 (a)", to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$54,000,000".

On page 3, line 20, after the word "appropriated", to insert "and amounts certified pursuant to section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, as having been obligated against appropriations heretofore made under the authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, for the same general purpose as any of the subparagraphs under "Economic Assistance", are hereby continued available for the same period as the respective appropriations in such subparagraphs for the same general purpose: *Provided*, That such purpose relates to a project or program previously justified to Congress and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate are notified prior to the reobligation of funds for such projects or programs."

On page 11, after line 9, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 118. None of the funds made available by this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used for the financing, in whole or in part, of any project in any foreign country where persons other than nationals of such country or citizens of the United States will be employed to perform any work in connection with such project, except when such nationals or citizens of the United States are not available and qualified to perform such work.

On page 12, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$89,000,000" and insert "$98,100,000", and in line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$19,500,000" and insert "$20,300,000".

On page 12, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,300,000".

On page 14, line 8, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to strike out "$56,000,000" and insert "$39,717,137".

On page 15, line 11, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of authorizing legislation".

On page 17, after line 8, to strike out:

None of the funds provided herein shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national.

On page 17, after line 17, to insert:

SENATE

On page 17, after line 18, to insert:

For payment to Nancy P. Kefauver, widow of Estes Kefauver, late a Senator from the State of Tennessee, $22,500.

On page 17, after line 21, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Miscellaneous Items

For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items", fiscal year 1963, $190,000.

At the top of page 18, to insert:

Miscellaneous Items

For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items", $215,000: *Provided*, That effective January 1, 1964, the paragraph relating to official long-distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" in Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress (2 U.S.C. 46c), as amended, is amended by striking out the words "one hundred and twenty" and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred and sixty" and by striking out the words "six hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight hundred".

On page 18, after line 11, to insert:

Postage Stamps

For an additional amount for air mail and special delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate, $6,060: *Provided*, That the maximum allowance per capita of $550 for air mail and special delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate is increased to $610 for the fiscal year 1964 and thereafter.

On page 18, after line 18, to insert:

Stationery (Revolving Fund)

For an additional amount for stationery, $60,600: *Provided*, That commencing with the fiscal year 1964 and thereafter the allowance for stationery for each Senator and the President of the Senate shall be at the rate of $2,400 per annum.

On page 20, after line 15, to insert:

TITLE V—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSIONS

NEW JERSEY TERCENTENARY CELEBRATION COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 2, 1960 (74 Stat. 730), including transportation and entertainment of participants, $150,000, to remain available until expended.

On page 21, in the heading in line 1, after the word "Title", to strike out "V" and insert "VI".

On page 22, line 8, to change the title number from "VI" to "VII".

On page 22, line 9, to change the section number from "601" to "701".

On page 22, line 13, to change the section number from "602" to "702".

On page 23, line 11, to change the section number from "603" to "703".

On page 23, line 21, to change the section number from "604" to "704".

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the provisions of Public Law 86-42, 86th Congress, the Chair announces the appointment of the following Senators to serve as members of the U.S. delegation to the Canadian-American Interparliamentary Conference to be held in the United States on January 14-18, 1964:

Senator AIKEN, chairman; Senators MANSFIELD, DODD, MORSE, HOLLAND, BARTLETT, HART, PASTORE, MUSKIE, MUNDT, YOUNG of North Dakota, and JORDAN of Idaho.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 48)

A letter from the President, National Forest Reservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

REPORT ON U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the U.S. Travel Service, for the 6-month period ended September 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the 6-month period ended September 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF NEW LOW-RENT HOUSING PROJECTS WITHOUT ADEQUATE CONSIDERATION OF AVAILABLE GOVERNMENT-OWNED HOUSING

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the construction of new low-rent housing projects without adequate consideration of available Government-owned housing, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON FINANCIAL POSITION, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the financial position, Missouri River Basin project, December 1963 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the continued operation of the Philadelphia Naval Base, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1017. A bill for the relief of Angelo Coppola (Rept. No. 799);

S. 1328. A bill for the relief of Woo Zee-Ching (Rept. No. 800);

S. 1445. A bill for the relief of Archie L. Dickson, Jr. (Rept. No. 801);

S. 2073. A bill for the relief of Roza Feuer (Rept. No. 802); and

H.R. 1560. An act for the relief of Constantinos A. Grigoras (Gregoras); (Rept. No. 803).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Jose L. Rodriguez (Rept. No. 805).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2071. A bill for the relief of Nina Maria Carmela Fiore (Rept. No. 806); and

H.R. 1887. An act for the relief of Yon Ok Kim, Chang In Wu, and Jung Yol Sohn (Rept. No. 807).

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 6468. An act for the relief of Harold J. Burke (Rept. No. 786).

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution designating the period from January 12 to January 18, 1964, as International Printing Week (Rept. No. 787).

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 4505. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and determine a motion for a new trial on the claim of Robert Alexander (Rept. No. 788).

By Mr. HRUSKA, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 2772. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer (Rept. No. 789).

By Mr. BAYH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Herbert R. Schaff (Rept. No. 790);

H.R. 2292. An act for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee (Rept. No. 791);

H.R. 2364. An act for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind. (Rept. No. 792);

H.R. 4099. An act for the relief of Jesse Leigh Jr. (Rept. No. 793);

H.R. 4759. An act for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, Frank Grove, Harry P. Nash, Jr., and Michael J. Neofitou (Rept. No. 794);

H.R. 5746. An act for the relief of Robert H. Bagby (Rept. No. 795);

H.R. 6181. An act for the relief of Mr. Rudolph Sanderson, of Meriden, Kans. (Rept. No. 796);

H.R. 6807. An act for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co., Inc. (Rept. No. 797); and

H.R. 7019. An act to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land and improvements in the village of Odanah, Wis., taken by the Federal Government (Rept. No. 798).

By Mr. GRUENING, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2125. A bill to revitalize the American gold mining industry (Rept. No. 804).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 236. Resolution to print additional copies of hearings on S. 815, to adjust legislative jurisdiction over certain Federal enclaves (Rept. No. 808).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 469. A bill to admit the vessels *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade (Rept. No. 811).

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H.R. 5377. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol and for other purposes (Rept. No. 812).

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE TRIBUTES BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO THE LIFE, CHARACTER, AND PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69), and submitted a report (No. 809) thereon; which concurrent resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document all remarks by Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives in the Halls of Congress which constitute tributes to the life, character, and public service of the late President John F. Kennedy.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed and bound as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies of such document, of which ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and twenty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE, MICHIGAN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 810)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 792) to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators KUCHEL, ALLOTT, JORDAN of Idaho, and DOMINICK, and the additional minority views of Senators SIMPSON, MECHEM, DOMINICK, and JORDAN of Idaho.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of September 1963. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report and statement presented by Mr. BYRD of Virginia are as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, SEPTEMBER 1963

INTRODUCTION

This is the 46th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories. It is for the month of September 1963.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior, and the General Services Administration.

The cost value of materials in inventories covered in this report, as of September 1, 1963, totaled $14,465,338,281, and as of September 30, 1963, they totaled $14,537,174,286, a net increase of $71,836,005 during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, but the cost value figures are summarized by major category, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories by major category

Major category	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile [1]	$5,804,537,900	$5,791,239,900	−$13,298,000
Defense Production Act	1,493,255,200	1,491,620,400	−1,634,800
Supplemental—barter	1,345,059,356	1,347,267,417	+2,208,061
Total, strategic and critical materials [1]	8,642,852,456	8,630,127,717	−12,724,739
Agricultural commodities:			
Price support inventory	5,367,471,967	5,472,127,710	+104,655,743
Inventory transferred from national stockpile [1]	126,369,680	126,232,170	−137,510
Total, agricultural commodities [1]	5,493,841,647	5,598,359,880	+104,518,233
Civil defense supplies and equipment:			
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense	35,430,457	11,818,287	−23,612,170
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	190,348,652	191,466,181	+1,117,529
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	225,779,109	203,284,468	−22,494,641
Machine tools:			
Defense Production Act	2,208,600	2,208,600	
National Industrial Reserve Act	89,665,700	89,797,300	+131,600
Total, machine tools	91,874,300	92,005,900	+131,600
Helium	10,990,769	13,396,321	+2,405,552
Total, all inventories	14,465,338,281	14,537,174,286	+71,836,005

[1] Cotton inventory valued at $128,409,100 withdrawn from the national stockpile and transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal, pursuant to Public Law 87-548, during August 1962.

Detailed tables in this report show each commodity, by the major categories summarized above, in terms of quantity and cost value as of the beginning and end of the month. Net change figures reflect acquisitions, disposals, and accounting and other adjustments during the month.

The cost value figures represent generally the original acquisition cost of the commodities delivered to permanent storage locations, together with certain packaging, processing, upgrading, et cetera, costs as carried in agency inventory accounts. Quantities are stated in the designated stockpile unit of measure.

Appendix A to this report, beginning on page 23, includes program descriptions and statutory citations pertinent to each stockpile inventory within the major categories.

The stockpile inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1.—Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), September 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month).

Table 2.—Agricultural commodities inventories, September 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 3.—Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, September 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 4.—Machine tools inventories, September 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 5.—Helium inventories, September 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

New stockpile objectives

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new objectives for strategic and critical materials. Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives for 12 materials.

Appendix B, beginning on page 25, contains excerpts from the Office of Emergency Planning statement setting forth the new policy with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials.

STORAGE COSTS—FISCAL YEAR 1963

The cost of storing materials in Federal stockpile inventories under the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior and the General Services Administration, totaled $392,767,145 in fiscal year 1963.

These costs are set forth in table 6, page 19. The figures in this table should be read with close reference to the footnotes accompanying the table. This is necessary in order to understand the bases on which the information was submitted by the reporting agencies.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), September 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Aluminum, metal:									
National stockpile	$487,680,600	$487,680,600		Short ton	1,128,989	1,128,989			
Defense Production Act	432,989,500	433,096,700	+$107,200	do	857,587	858,124	+537		
Total	920,670,100	920,777,300	+107,200	do	1,986,576	1,987,113	+537	[2] 450,000	1,537,113

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), September 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Aluminum oxide, abrasive grain:									
Supplemental—barter	$14,569,297	$14,827,844	+$258,547	Short dry ton	47,894	48,757	+863	(3)	48,757
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude:									
National stockpile	21,735,100	21,735,100		do	200,093	200,093			
Supplemental—barter	22,747,400	22,747,400		do	178,266	178,266			
Total	44,482,500	44,482,500		do	378,359	378,359		200,000	178,359
Antimony:									
National stockpile	20,488,000	20,488,000		Short ton	30,301	30,301			
Supplemental—barter	12,575,753	12,635,191	+59,438	do	21,582	21,673	+91		
Total	33,063,753	33,123,191	+59,438	do	51,883	51,974	+91	70,000	(4)
Asbestos, amosite:									
National stockpile	2,637,600	2,637,600		do	11,705	11,705			
Supplemental—barter	6,789,574	6,847,459	+57,885	do	27,365	27,619	+254		
Total	9,427,174	9,485,059	+57,885	do	39,070	39,324	+254	45,000	(4)
Asbestos, chrysotile:									
National stockpile	3,356,200	3,356,200		Short dry ton	6,224	6,224			
Defense Production Act	2,102,600	2,102,600		do	2,348	2,348			
Supplemental—barter	3,934,500	3,934,500		do	5,532	5,532			
Total	9,393,300	9,393,300		do	14,104	14,104		11,000	3,104
Asbestos, crocidolite:									
National stockpile	702,100	702,100		Short ton	1,567	1,567			
Supplemental—barter	7,278,290	7,278,290		do	27,438	27,437	−1		
Total	7,980,390	7,980,390		do	29,005	29,004	−1	(3)	29,004
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type:									
National stockpile	13,925,000	13,925,000		Long dry ton	879,740	879,740			
Defense Production Act	18,168,000	18,168,000		do	1,370,077	1,370,077			
Supplemental—barter	89,398,758	89,398,758		do	5,780,590	5,780,590			
Total	121,491,758	121,491,758		do	8,030,407	8,030,407		2,600,000	5,430,407
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type:									
National stockpile	78,552,500	78,552,500		do	4,962,706	4,962,706			
Supplemental—barter	45,294,200	45,294,200		do	2,927,260	2,926,260			
Total	123,846,700	123,846,700		do	7,889,966	7,889,966		6,400,000	1,489,966
Bauxite refractory grade:									
National stockpile	11,347,800	11,347,800		Long calcined ton	299,279	299,279		137,000	162,279
Beryl:									
National stockpile	9,768,400	9,768,400		Short ton	23,230	23,230			
Defense Production Act	1,425,800	1,425,800		do	2,543	2,543			
Supplemental—barter	22,788,000	22,739,500	−48,500	do	11,321	11,321			
Total	33,982,200	33,933,700	−48,500	do	37,094	37,094		23,100	13,994
Beryllium metal:									
Supplemental—barter	15,363,012	15,363,012		do	132	132		(3)	132
Bismuth:									
National stockpile	2,674,300	2,674,300		Pound	1,342,402	1,342,402			
Defense Production Act	52,400	52,400		do	22,901	22,901			
Supplemental—barter	5,540,200	5,540,200		do	2,506,493	2,506,493			
Total	8,266,900	8,266,900		do	3,871,796	3,871,796		3,000,000	871,796
Cadmium:									
National stockpile	19,760,500	18,631,000	−1,129,500	Pound	10,065,810	9,490,475	−575,335		
Supplemental—barter	12,327,600	12,327,600		do	7,448,989	7,448,989			
Total	32,088,100	30,958,600	−1,129,500	do	17,514,799	16,939,464	−575,335	6,500,000	10,439,464
Castor oil:									
National stockpile	50,914,000	50,433,500	−480,600	do	194,194,997	192,119,777	−2,075,220	[2] 22,000,000	170,119,777
Celestite:									
National stockpile	1,412,300	1,412,300		Short dry ton	28,816	28,816			
Supplemental—barter	225,646	225,646			5,416	5,416			
Total	1,637,946	1,637,946			34,232	34,232		22,000	12,230
Chromite, chemical grade									
National stockpile	12,288,000	2,288,000		do	559,452	559,452			
Supplemental—barter	21,841,249	121,836,449	−4,800	do	699,654	699.647	−7		
Total	34,129,249	34,124,449	−4,800	do	1,259,106	1.259,099	−7	475,000	784,099
Chromite, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	264,565,500	264,565,500		do	3,759,292	3,795,292			
Defense Production Act	35,879,900	35,879,900		do	985,646	985,646			
Supplemental—barter	224,759,700	224,757,400	−2,300	do	1,543,113	1,543,100	−3		
Total	525,205,100	525,202,800	−2,300	do	6,324,051	6,324,048	−3	[2] 2,970,000	3,354,048
Chromite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	25,149,300	25,149,300		do	1,047,159	1,047,159			
Supplemental—barter	5,039,000	5,039,000		do	179,775	179,775			
Total	30,188,300	30,188,300		do	1,226,934	1,226,934		1,300,000	(4)

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), September 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Cobalt:									
National stockpile	$169,205,200	$169,205,200		Pound	76,711,860	76,664,297	−47,563		
Defense Production Act	52,074,600	5,075,300	$+700	do	25,194,122	25,194,122			
Supplemental—barter	2,169,000	2,169,000		do	1,077,018	1,077,018			
Total	223,448,800	223,449,500	+700	do	102,983,000	102,935,437	−47,563	19,000,000	83,935,437
Coconut oil:									
National stockpile	11,341,500	10,408,700	−932,800	do	74,839,083	68,679,523	−6,159,560	(3)	68,679,523
Colemanite:									
Supplemental—barter	2,636,400	2,636,400		Long dry ton	67,636	67,636		(3)	67,636
Columbium:									
National stockpile	23,919,200	23,919,200		Pound	7,505,853	7,507,959	+2,106		
Defense Production Act	50,238,900	50,238,900		do	8,222,684	8,222,684			
Supplemental—barter	799,100	799,100		do	388,877	388,877			
Total	74,957,200	74,957,200		do	16,117,414	16,119,520	+2,106	1,900,000	14,219,520
Copper:									
National stockpile	522,749,800	522,800,300	+50,500	Short ton	1,008,273	1,008,266	−7		
Defense Production Act	59,181,800	58,763,600	−418,200	do	105,463	104,765	−698		
Supplemental—barter	8,170,000	8,218,500	+48,500	do	12,381	12,382	+1		
Total	590,101,600	589,782,400	−319,200	do	1,126,117	1,125,413	−704	[2] 775,000	350,413
Cordage fibers, abaca:									
National stockpile	7,740,300	37,739,800	−500	Pound	149,736,028	149,732,545	−3,483	150,000,000	(4)
Cordage fibers, sisal:									
National stockpile	42,775,900	42,809,700	+33,800	do	316,123,573	316,366,880	+243,307	320,000,000	(4)
Corundum:									
National stockpile	393,100	393,100		Short ton	2,008	2,008		2,000	8
Cryolite:									
Defense Production Act	7,024,700	6,956,700	−68,000	do	25,439	25,193	−246	(3)	25,193
Diamond dies:									
National stockpile	489,100	496,800	+7,700	Piece	16,231	16,487	+256	25,000	(4)
Diamond, industrial, crushing bort:									
National stockpile	61,609,500	61,609,500		Carat	31,113,411	31,113,411			
Supplemental—barter	15,800,500	15,800,500		do	5,550,579	5,550,579			
Total	77,410,000	77,410,000		do	36,663,990	36,663,990		30,000,000	6,663,990
Diamond, industrial, stones:									
National stockpile	100,501,500	100,501,500		do	9,315,183	9,315,183			
Supplemental—barter	186,324,500	186,324,500		do	15,425,827	15,425,827			
Total	286,826,000	286,826,000		do	24,741,010	24,741,010		18,000,000	6,741,010
Diamond tools:									
National stockpile	1,015,400	1,015,400		Piece	64,178	64,178		(3)	64,178
Feathers and down:									
National stockpile	37,481,000	37,083,300	−397,700	Pound	9,047,078	8,951,101	−95,977	[2] 3,000,000	5,951,101
Fluorspar, acid grade:									
National stockpile	26,167,500	26,167,500		Short dry ton	463,049	463,049			
Defense Production Act	1,394,400	1,394,400		do	19,700	19,700			
Supplemental—barter	33,530,700	33,530,700		do	673,232	673,232			
Total	61,092,600	61,092,600		do	1,155,981	1,155,981		280,000	875,981
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade:				Short dry ton					
National stockpile	17,332,400	17,332,400		do	369,443	369,443			
Supplemental—barter	1,508,100	1,508,100		do	42,800	42,800			
Total	18,840,500	18,840,500		do	412,243	412,243		375,000	37,243
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous limp:									
National stockpile	937,900	937,900		do	4,455	4,455			
Supplemental—barter	341,200	341,200		do	1,428	1, 28			
Total	1,279,100	1,279,100		do	5,883	5,883		3,600	2,283
Graphite, natural, Madagascar, crystalline:									
National stockpile	7,056,200	7,056,200		do	34,233	34,233			
Supplemental—barter	230,343	230,343		do	1,907	1,907			
Total	7,286,543	7,286,543		do	36,140	36,140		17,200	18,940
Graphite, natural, other, crystalline:									
National stockpile	1,896,300	1,896,300		do	5,487	5,487		2,100	3,387
Hyoscine:									
National stockpile	30,600	30,600		Ounce	2,100	2,100		2,100	(4)
Iodine:									
National stockpile	4,082,000	4,082,000		Pound	2,977,648	2,977,648			
Supplemental—barter	1,066,000	1,066,000		do	994,920	994,920			
Total	5,148,000	5,148,000		do	3,972,568	3,972,568		4,300,000	(4)
Iridium:									
National stockpile	2,525,800	2,525,800		Troy ounce	13,937	13,937		4,000	9,937

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), September 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Jewel bearings:									
National stockpile	$4, 110, 500	$4, 129, 600	+$19, 100	Piece	51, 387. 563	51, 626, 565	+239, 002	57, 500, 000	(4)
Kyanite-mullite:									
National stockpile	794, 500	794, 500		Short dry ton	9, 190	9, 190		4, 800	4, 390
Lead:									
National stockpile	319, 298, 100	319, 298, 100		Short ton	1, 050, 370	1, 050, 370			
Defense Production Act	1, 668, 100	1, 221, 600	−446, 500	do	4, 403	3, 225	−1, 178		
Supplemental—barter	78, 398, 600	78, 398, 600		do	327, 998	327, 998			
Total	399, 364, 800	398, 918, 300	−446, 500	do	1, 382, 771	1, 381, 593	−1, 178	[3] 0	1, 381, 593
Magnesium:									
National stockpile	130, 253, 600	129, 803, 800	−449, 800	do	179, 420	178, 801	−619	107, 000	71, 801
Manganese, battery grade, natural ore:									
National stockpile	21, 025, 500	21, 025, 500		do	144, 485	144, 485			
Supplemental—barter	13, 621, 900	13, 621, 900		do	137, 700	137, 700			
Total	34, 647, 400	34, 647, 400		do	282, 185	282, 185		50, 000	232, 185
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide:									
National stockpile	3, 095, 500	3, 095, 500		Short dry ton	21, 272	21, 272			
Defense Production Act	2, 524, 700	2, 524, 700		do	3, 779	3, 779			
Total	5, 620, 200	5, 620, 200		do	25, 051	25, 051		20, 000	5, 051
Manganese, chemical grade, type A:									
National stockpile	2, 133, 300	2, 133, 300		do	29, 307	29, 307			
Supplemental—barter	7, 917, 200	7, 917. 200		do	117, 607	117, 607			
Total	10, 050, 500	10, 050, 500		do	146, 914	146, 914		30, 000	116, 914
Manganese, chemical grade, type B:									
National stockpile	132, 600	132, 600		do	1, 822	1, 822			
Supplemental—barter	6, 665. 700	6, 665, 700		do	99, 016	99, 016			
Total	6, 798. 300	6, 798, 300		do	100, 838	100, 838		53, 000	47, 838
Manganese, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	248, 240, 300	248, 240, 300		do	5, 851, 264	5, 851, 264			
Defense Production Act	176, 474, 400	176, 474. 400		do	3, 056, 691	3, 056, 691			
Supplemental—barter	238, 019, 670	239, 729, 058	+1, 709, 388	do	3, 555, 080	3, 606, 987	+51, 907		
Total	662, 734, 370	664, 443, 758	+1, 709, 388	do	12, 463, 035	12, 514, 942	+51, 907	6, 800, 000	5, 714, 942
Mercury:									
National stockpile	20, 039, 500	20, 039, 500		Flask	129, 525	129, 525			
Supplemental—barter	3, 446, 200	3, 446. 200		do	16, 000	16, 000			
Total	23, 485, 700	23, 485, 700		do	145, 525	145, 525		[2] 200, 000	(4)
Mica muscovite block:									
National stockpile	27, 630, 800	27, 631, 200	+400	Pound	11, 621, 031	11, 609, 000	−12, 031		
Defense Production Act	40, 856, 900	40, 746, 400	−110, 500	do	6, 456, 024	6, 446, 722	−9, 302		
Supplemental—barter	5, 266, 011	5, 287, 250	+21, 239	do	1, 585, 807	1, 594, 635	+8, 828		
Total	73, 753, 711	73, 664, 850	−88, 861	do	19, 662, 862	19, 650, 357	−12, 505	8, 300, 000	11, 350, 357
Mica muscovite film:									
National stockpile	9, 058, 100	9, 058, 100		do	1, 733, 083	1, 733, 083			
Defense Production Act	633, 300	633, 300		do	102, 681	102, 681			
Supplemental—barter	1, 033, 612	1, 053, 033	+19, 421	do	105, 640	107, 687	+2, 047		
Total	10, 725, 012	10, 744, 433	+19, 421	do	1, 941, 404	1, 943, 451	+2, 047	1, 300, 000	643, 451
Mica muscovite splittings:				Pound					
National stockpile	40, 598, 300	40, 598, 300		do	40, 040, 294	40, 159, 938	+119, 644		
Supplemental—barter	6, 225, 800	6, 225, 800		do	4, 826, 257	4, 826, 257			
Total	46, 824, 100	46, 824, 100		do	44, 866, 551	44, 986, 195	+119, 644	21, 200, 000	23, 786, 195
Mica phlogopite block:									
National stockpile	303, 600	303, 600		do	223, 239	223, 239		17, 000	206, 239
Mica, phlogopite splittings:									
National stockpile	2, 580, 500	2, 580, 500		do	3, 079, 063	3, 079, 063			
Supplemental—barter	2, 399, 384	2, 400, 115	+731	do	1, 985, 474	1, 986, 907	+1, 433		
Total	4, 979, 884	4, 980, 615	+731	do	5, 064, 536	5, 065, 970	+1, 433	1, 700, 000	3, 365, 970
Molybdenum:									
National stockpile	84, 196, 800	83, 679, 000	−517, 800	do	79, 513, 992	79, 038, 361	−475, 631	59, 000, 000	20, 038, 361
Nickel: [5]									
National stockpile	181, 978, 100	181, 974, 500	−3, 600	Short ton	167, 137	167, 131	−6		
Defense Production Act	102, 053, 500	101, 536, 400	−517, 100	do	53, 421	53, 133	−288		
Total	284, 031, 600	283, 510, 900	−520, 700	do	220, 558	220, 264	−294	[3] 50, 000	170, 264
Opium:									
National stockpile	13, 661, 700	13, 661, 700		Pound	195, 757	195, 757		[2] 141, 280	54, 477
Palladium:									
National stockpile	2, 079, 000	2, 079, 000		Troy ounce	89, 811	89, 811			
Defense Production Act	177, 300	177, 300		do	7, 884	7, 884			
Supplemental—barter	12, 170, 200	12, 170, 200		do	648, 124	648, 124			
Total	14, 426, 500	14, 426, 500		do	745, 819	745, 819		340, 000	405, 819

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), September 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective[1]	Excess over maximum objective
Palm oil:									
National stockpile	$4,409,400	$3,962,700	−$446,700	Pound	24,497,878	22,016,098	−2,481,780	(2)	22,016,098
Patinum:									
National stockpile	56,879,900	56,879,900		Troy ounce	716,343	716,343			
Supplemental—barter	4,024,500	4,024,500		do.	49,999	49,999			
Total	60,904,400	60,904,400		do.	766,342	766,342		165,000	601,342
Pyrethrum:									
National stockpile	415,100	415,100		Pound	67,065	67,065		66,000	1,065
Quartz crystals:									
National stockpile	69,060,700	68,587,800	−472,900	do.	5,598,672	5,560,319	−38,353		
Supplemental—barter	3,200,900	3,200,900		do.	232,352	232,352			
Total	72,261,600	71,788,700	−472,900	do.	5,831,024	5,792,671	−38,353	650,000	5,142,671
Quinidine:									
National stockpile	1,942,800	1,912,800	−30,000	Ounce	1,684,377	1,658,377	−26,000	1,600,000	58,377
Quinine;									
National stockpile	3,622,600	3,622,600		do.	5,727,732	5,727,732		(2)	5,727,732
Rare earths:									
National stockpile	7,134,900	7,134,900		Short dry ton	10,042	10,042			
Supplemental—barter	5,774,409	5,787,811	+13,402	do.	6,264	6,355	+91		
Total	12,909,309	12,922,711	+13,402	do.	16,306	16,397	+91	5,700	10,697
Rare earths residue:									
Defense Production Act	657,800	657,800		Pound	6,085,327	6,085,327		(2)	6,085,327
Rhodium:									
National stockpile	78,200	78,200		Troy ounce	618	618		(2)	618
Rubber:									
National stockpile	760,533,100	755,759,700	−4,773,400	Long ton	983,668	977,521	−6,147	750,000	227,521
Ruthenium:									
Supplemental—barter	559,500	559,500		Troy ounce	15,001	15,001		(2)	15,001
Rutile:									
National stockpile	2,070,100	2,070,100		Short dry ton	18,599	18,599			
Defense Production Act	2,725,100	2,725,100		do.	17,410	17,410			
Supplemental—barter	1,061,300	1,061,300		do.	11,632	11,632			
Total	5,856,500	5,856,500		do.	47,641	47,641		65,000	(4)
Rutile chlorinator charge:									
Defense Production Act				do.	2,923	1,877	−1,046	(2)	1,877
Sapphire and ruby:									
National stockpile	190,000	190,000		Carat	16,187,500	16,187,500		18,000,000	(4)
Selenium:									
National stockpile	757,100	757,100		Pound	97,100	97,100			
Supplemental—barter	1,070,500	1,070,500		do.	156,518	156,518			
Total	1,827,600	1,827,600		do.	253,618	253,618		400,000	(4)
Shellac:									
National stockpile	8,589,000	8,535,700	−53,300	do.	17,132,260	17,025,923	−106,337	7,400,000	9,625,923
Silicon carbide crude:									
National stockpile	11,394,500	11,394,500		Short ton	64,697	64,697			
Supplemental—barter	26,802,700	26,802,700		do.	131,805	131,805			
Total	38,197,200	38,197,200		do.	196,502	196,502		100,000	96,502
Silk noils and waste:									
National stockpile	1,441,200	1,401,000	−40,200	Pound	1,112,950	1,087,321	25,629	970,000	117,321
Silk, raw:									
National stockpile	$486,600	$486,600		do.	113,515	113,515		120,000	(4)
Sperm oil:									
National stockpile	4,775,400	4,775,400		do.	23,442,158	23,442,158		[3] 23,400,000	42,158
Talc, steatite block and lump:									
National stockpile	496,800	496,800		Short ton	1.274	1.274		300	974
Talc, steatite ground:									
National stockpile	231,200	231,100		do.	3,901	3,901		(2)	3.901
Tantalum:									
National stockpile	10,992,700	10,992,700		Pound	3,443,657	3,445,169	+1,512		
Defense Production Act	9,734,400	9,734,400		do.	1,531,366	1,531,366			
Supplemental—barter	21,100	21,100		do.	8,036	8,036			
Total	20,748,200	20,748,200		do.	4,983,059	4,984,571	+1,512	2,420,000	2,564,571
Thorium:									
Defense Production Act	42,000	42,000		do.	848,354	848,354			
Supplemental—barter	17,590,648	17,665,758	+75,110	do.	8,481,100	8,521,525	+40,425		
Total	17,632,648	17,707,758	+75,110	do.	9,329,454	9,369,879	+40,425	(2)	9,369,879

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), September 963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net charge during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net charge during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Tin:									
National stockpile	814,755,400	811,089,300	−3,657,100	Long ton	335,081	333,536	−1,545		
Supplemental—barter	16,404,000	16,404,000		do	7,505	7,505			
Total	831,159,400	827,502,300	−3,657,100	do	342,586	341,041	−1,545	[2] 200,000	141,041
Titanium:									
Defense Production Act	176,361,200	176,178,800	−182,400	Short ton	22,403	22,381	−22		
Supplemental—barter	32,097,700	32,097,700		do	9,021	9,021			
Total	208,458,900	208,276,500	−182,400	do	31,424	31,402	−22	(3)	31,402
Tungsten:									
National stockpile	369,127,300	369,127,300		Pound	120,071,339	120,071,339			
Defense Production Act	318,813,900	318,813,900		do	78,186,563	78,186,563			
Supplemental—barter	18,651,400	18,651,400		do	5,774,827	5,774,827			
Total	706,592,600	706,592,600		do	204,032,729	204,032,729		50,000,000	154,032,729
Vanadium:									
National stockpile	31,567,900	31,567,900		do	15,730,893	15,730,893		2,000,000	13,730,893
Vegetable tannin extract, chestnut:									
National stockpile	11,932,800	11,932,800		Long ton	42,770	42,770		30,000	12,770
Vegetable tannin extract, quebracho:									
National stockpile	49,169,700	49.169,700		do	198,728	198,728		180,000	18,728
Vegetable tannin extract, wattle:									
National stockpile	9,826,900	9,826,900		do	38,962	38,962		39,000	(4)
Zinc:									
National stockpile	364,346,400	364,345,400	−1,000	Short ton	1,256,848	1,256,845	−3		
Supplemental—barter	79,588,400	79,588,400		do	323,896	323,896			
Total	443,934,800	443,933,800	−1,000	do	1,580,744	1,580,741	−3	[2] 0	1,580,741
Zirconium ore, baddeleyite:									
National stockpile	710,600	710,600		Short dry ton	16,533	16,533		(3)	16,533
Zirconium ore, zircon:									
National stockpile	181,800	159,200	−22,600	do	3,072	2,690	−382	(3)	2,690
Total:									
National stockpile	5,804,537,900	5,791,239,900	−13,298,000						
Defense Production Act	1,493,255,200	1,491,620,400	−1,634,800						
Supplemental—barter	1,345,059, 56	1,347,267,417	+2,208,061						
Total, strategic and critical materials	8,642,852,456	8,630,127,717	−12,724,739						

---

[1] Maximum objectives for strategic and critical materials are determined pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h). The Office of Emergency Planning is currently in the process of revising stockpile objectives. (See app. B, p. 23761.)

[2] New objective. (See app. B, p. 23761.)

[3] No present objective.

[4] Not in excess of maximum objective.

[5] The Office of Emergency Planning has established a new maximum objective for nickel and has changed the stockpile unit of measure from pound to short ton. As a result, this report for September shows all quantity figures for nickel in terms of short ton for the first time. Previous committee reports have shown the quantity of nickel in terms of pounds; future reports of this series will show nickel in terms of short tons.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, September 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month
Price-support inventory:							
Basic commodities:							
Corn	$771,731,750	$986,849,082	+$215,117,332	Bushel	627,434,170	802,646,840	+175,212,670
Cotton, extra-long staple	9,815,842	9,813,121	−2,721	Bale	37,075	37,073	−2
Cotton, upland	1,230,378,231	1,192,057,160	−38,321,062	do	7,453,137	7,216,630	−236,507
Peanuts, farmers' stock	6,119		−6,119	Pound	55,507		−55,507
Peanuts, shelled	11,492,722	10,447,249	−1,045,473	do	67,641,033	60,801,536	−6,839,497
Rice, milled	170,244	389,704	+219,460	Hundredweight	17,024	39,877	+22,853
Rice, rough	9,804,101	9,534,842	−269,259	do	1,840,260	1,789,772	−50,497
Wheat	2,132,036,542	2,098,338,617	−33,697,925	Bushel	1,064,042,832	1,046,971,226	−17,071,606
Wheat, rolled		1,792	+1,792	Pound		27,144	+27,144
Bulgur	213,372	216,075	+2,703	do	3,945,790	3,983,612	+37,822
Total, basic commodities	4,165,648,923	4,307,647,651	+141,998,728				
Designated nonbasic commodities:							
Barley	43,577,332	43,064,761	−512,571	Bushel	50,427,635	49,724,492	−703,143
Grain sorghum	681,970,484	675,136,619	−6,833,865	do	619,186,434	612,122,821	−7,063,613
Milk and butterfat:							
Butter	212,620,464	187,751,083	−24,869,381	Pound	365,695,138	323,043,857	−42,651,281
Butter oil	87,325,166	87,239,345	−85,821	do	110,572,609	110,729,453	+156,844
Cheese	23,568,300	24,661,343	+1,093,043	do	62,539,239	65,283,365	+2,744,126
Ghee	1,545,175	1,187,530	−357,645	do	1,914,331	1,471,240	−443,091
Milk, dried	106,515,273	106,354,165	−161,108	do	723,099,301	722,289,144	−810,157
Oats	11,597,158	11,516,120	−81,038	Bushel	19,333,144	19,192,160	−140,984
Rye	1,722,504	1,517,824	−204,680	do	1,664,075	1,475,730	−188,345
Total designated nonbasic commodities	1,170,441,856	1,138,428,790	−32,013,066				

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, September 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month
Other nonbasic commodities:							
Beans, dry, edible	7,024,418	5,208,564	−1,815,854	Hundredweight	912,423	688,397	−224,026
Cottonseed oil, refined	622,250	828,060	+205,810	Pound	3,685,928	4,821,678	+1,135,750
Flaxseed	15,964,633	14,736,713	−1,227,920	Bushel	5,384,798	4,974,977	−409,821
Soybeans	5,859,143	3,847,853	−2,011,290	do	2,507,711	1,653,717	−853,994
Vegetable oil products	1,910,744	1,430,079	−480,665	Pound	11,854,299	8,926,685	−2,927,614
Total, other nonbasic commodities	31,381,188	26,051,269	−5,329,919				
Total, price support inventory	5,367,471,967	5,472,127,710	+104,655,743				
Inventory transferred from national stockpile: [1]							
Cotton, Egyptian	102,640,561	102,528,200	−112,361	Bale	121,494	121,361	−133
Cotton, American-Egyptian	23,729,119	23,703,970	−25,149	do	47,178	47,128	−50
Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile.	126,369,680	126,232,170	−137,510	do	168,672	168,489	183
Total, agricultural commodities	5,493,841,647	5,598,359,880	+104,518,233				

[1] Transferred from General Services Administration pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548. (See app. A, p. 23761.)

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, September 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Sept. 1. 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense:							
Engineering equipment (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings)	$10,022,623	$10,019,104	−$3,519	10-mile units	45	45	
Chemical and biological equipment	1,806,793	1,799,183	−7,610	(1)			
Radiological equipment (2)	23,601,041	(2)	−23,601,041	(1)			
Total	35,430,457	11,818,287	−23,612,170				
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:							
Medical bulk stocks, and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses	136,925,874	137,835,586	+909,712	(1)			
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations	5,330,284	5,326,895	−3,389	(1)			
Civil defense emergency hospitals	37,330,782	37,255,680	−75,102	Each	1,930	1,930	
Replenishment units (functional assemblies other than hospitals)	486,864	469,716	−17,148	(1)			
Supply additions (for civil defense emergency hospitals)	10,274,848	10,578,304	+303,456	(1)			
Total	190,348,652	191,466,181	+1,117,529				
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	225,779,109	203,284,468	−22,494,641				

(1) Composite group of many different items.

(2) No longer reported as stockpile item. (See appendix C, p. 23762.)

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—*Machine tools inventories, September 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month
Defense Production Act:							
In storage	$21,400	$21,400		Tool	7	7	
On lease	2,144,300	2,144,300		do	103	103	
On loan	42,900	42,900		do	7	7	
Total	2,208,600	2,208,600		do	117	117	
National Industrial Reserve Act:							
In storage	79,487,200	79,645,200	+$158,000	do	7,172	7,238	+66
On lease	27,500	27,500		do	1	1	
On loan to other agencies	2,176,600	2,150,200	−26,400	do	225	225	
On loan to school programs	7,974,400	7,974,400		do	1,917	1,917	
Total	89,665,700	89,797,300	+131,600	do	9,315	9,381	+66
Total, machine tools	91,874,300	92,005,900	+131,600	do	9,432	9,498	+66

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration.

TABLE 5.—*Helium inventories, September 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Sept. 1, 1963	End of month, Sept. 30, 1963	Net change during month
Helium:							
Stored above ground	$231,806	$318,139	+$86,333	Cubic foot	21,000,000	28,000,000	+7,000,000
Stored underground	10,758,963	13,078,182	+2,319,219	do	1,188,300,000	1,399,000,000	+210,700,000
Total helium	10,990,769	13,396,321	+2,405,552	do	1,209,300,000	1,427,000,000	+217,700,000

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of the Interior.

TABLE 6.—*Storage costs* [1]—*Federal stockpile inventories by commodity and program, fiscal year 1963*

Commodity	Strategic and critical materials inventories			Agricultural commodities	Other inventories	Total, all inventories
	National stockpile	Defense Production Act	Supplemental—barter			
Strategic and critical materials;						
Aluminum, metal	$195,486	$110,331				$305,817
Aluminum oxide, abrasive, grain			$417,461			417,461
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	2,797		18,871			21,668
Antimony	16,852		51,306			68,158
Asbestos	63,942	5,551	354,644			424,137
Bauxite	155,110	1	488,964			644,075
Beryl	3,047	911	2,520			6,478
Beryllium copper master alloy			233			233
Beryllium metal			61,586			61,586
Bismuth	804	11	4,137			4,952
Cadmium	8,040		6,733			14,773
Castor oil	174,872					174,872
Celestite	6,237		11,470			17,707
Chromite	352,113	449	402,990			755,552
Cobalt	46,294	19,118	648			66,060
Coconut oil	105,896					105,896
Colemanite			7,367			7,367
Columbium	16,051	12,106	1,143			29,300
Copper	142,053	12,044	8,557			162,654
Cordage fibers	1,223,078					1,223,078
Corundum	2					2
Cotton	39,816					39,816
Cryolite		22,746				22,746
Feathers and down	73,530					73,530
Fluorspar	53,804	217	96,980			151,001
Graphite	119,680	4	20,383			140,067
Hyoscine	48					48
Iodine	5,253		−1,228			4,025
Kyanite-mullite	4,975					4,975
Lead	115,196	776	86,532			202,504
Magnesium	124,495					124,495
Manganese	200,927	68,503	502,115			771,545
Mercury	7,059		872			7,931
Mica	83,715	9,316	42,073			135,104
Molybdenum	75,735					75,735
Nickel	82,420	21,385				103,805
Opium	225					225
Palm oil	21,834					21,834
Pyrethrum	199					199
Quartz	8,231		2,390			10,621
Quinidine	1,474					1,474
Quinine	4,189					4,189
Rare earths [2]	19,179	2,605	81,469			103,253
Rubber	3,452,066					3,452,066
Rutile	5,436	40,191	13,756			59,383
Selenium	173		280			453
Shellac	39,098					39,098
Silicon carbide, crude	32,183		83,757			115,940
Silk	11,788					11,788
Sperm oil	22,668					22,668
Talc	4,434					4,434
Tantalum	1,402	639	3			2,044
Tin	64,870	54	1,439			66,363
Titanium		38,278	15,287			53,565
Totaquine	911					911
Tungsten	119,739	69,655	6,100			195,494
Vanadium	34,577					34,577
Vegetable tannin extracts	628,212					628,212
Zinc	122,090		31,795			153,885
Zirconium ore	6,137					6,137
Miscellaneous:						
Precious metals and stones, etc	[3] 138,840		328			139,168
Other	[4] 256					256
Total, strategic and critical materials	8,230,538	434,891	2,822,961			11,497,390
Agricultural commodities:						
Price-support inventory:						
Basic commodities:						
Corn				$93,187,883		93,187,883
Cornmeal				391		391
Cotton, extra long staple				94,193		94,193
Cotton, upland				22,564,346		22,564,346
Peanuts, farmers' stock				1,084,912		1,084,912
Peanuts, shelled				353,549		353,549
Rice, milled				32,884		32,884
Rice, rough				201,666		201,666
Wheat				144,905,193		144,905,193
Wheat, rolled				9		9
Wheat flour				2,380		2,380

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—*Storage costs*[1]*—Federal stockpile inventories by commodity and program, fiscal year 1963*—Continued

Commodity	Strategic and critical materials inventories			Agricultural commodities	Other inventories	Total, all inventories
	National stockpile	Defense Production Act	Supplemental—barter			
Agricultural commodities—Continued						
Price-support inventory—Continued						
Designated nonbasic commodities:						
Barley				$3,979,956		$3,979,956
Grain sorghum				85,299,411		85,299,411
Honey				9,265		9,265
Milk and butterfat:						
Butter				8,548,797		8,548,797
Butter oil				738,568		738,568
Cheese				1,576,755		1,576,755
Ghee				14,384		14,384
Milk, dried				4,270,150		4,270,150
Oats				1,548,919		1,548,919
Rye				180,998		180,998
Other nonbasic commodities:						
Beans, dry, edible				1,198,805		1,198,805
Cottonseed oil, refined				35,095		35,095
Flaxseed				131,576		131,576
Soybeans				3,798,200		3,798,200
Turpentine				34,282		34,282
Vegetable oil products				1,674,966		1,674,966
Total, price support inventory				375,467,533		375,467,533
Inventory transferred from national stockpile:						
Cotton, Egyptian				372,477		372,477
Cotton, American-Egyptian				123,492		123,492
Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile				495,969		495,969
Total, agricultural commodities				375,963,502		375,963,502
Civil defense supplies and equipment:						
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense					$993,261	993,261
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare					4,028,129	4,028,129
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment					5,021,390	5,021,390
Machine tools inventories:						
National Industrial Reserve Act					253,000	253,000
Helium inventories:						
Stored underground					31,863	31,863
Total	$8,239,538	$434,891	$2,822,961	375,963,502	5,306,253	392,767,145

---

[1] It should be noted that while the title of this table is general, reporting agencies submit the information on different bases:

(a) Agriculture Department figures are for "storage and handling" and the Department notes its tabulation as follows: "Storage charges are paid to commercial warehouses for the care and preservation of Government-owned commodities. Storage charges are also allocated to commodities that are stored in Government-owned or leased facilities, based on the actual costs of owning or operating the facilities. Handling charges are paid to commercial warehouses for receiving, loading out, weighing, inspecting, etc."

(b) General Services Administration figures are for "cost of storage," exclusive of handling costs involved in delivery, rotation, removal, etc., of materials. The Administration notes its tabulation as follows: "Includes: (1) cost of operation and maintenance of General Services Administration storage depots, (2) reimbursement to the Department of Defense for storage at military facilities, and (3) storage cost at commercial warehouses."

(c) Department of Defense figure is for "warehousing and management" and it is noted as follows:

"Covers warehousing and management of engineering, chemical, biological, and radiological defense equipment under control of the Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense.

"Warehousing and management includes providing of warehouse space, transportation, salaries of warehouse management-operating personnel (manager, clerk, guards, laborers, and mechanics) incident to the maintenance and care of the supplies and quipment inventory. This cost includes the preparation of items into kit assembly for issue in the various OCD programs which include shelter stocking, radiological monitoring, training, and education. Cost accounting records are not maintained on a functional or project basis.

"Maintenance and management responsibility for these inventories is assigned to the Defense General Supply Center of the Defense Supply Agency. Many of the storage locations are still jointly utilized with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in connection with their civil defense mission of medical stockpiles."

(d) Department of Health, Education, and Welfare figure is for "storage and warehousing," and it is noted as follows: "costs of storage and warehousing of medical supplies and equipment in the civil defense stockpile include rentals of warehouse space, salaries of warehouse employees, warehouse maintenance and operating costs, repacking, assembly, inspection teams, preservation and surveillance of stock."

(e) Department of the Interior figure represents "storage costs," and is noted as follows: "Storage costs are capitalized and included in the reported value of helium in underground storage as of June 30, 1963. We have not included the cost of operating the pipeline that transports the helium to the underground storage reservoir."

[2] Includes storage costs for thorium.

[3] Cost of vault storage of diamonds, jewel bearings, iridium, palladium, platinum, ruthenium, sapphire, and ruby, etc., for the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile. Breakdown by inventory not available.

[4] Cost of storage of diamonds by the Department of Agriculture price-support exchange inventory only.

[5] Storage costs of empty drums and flasks.

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM DECRIPTIONS AND STATUTORY CITATIONS

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

National stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The General Services Administration is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, the General Services Administration is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Supplemental—Barter

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A CFR, ch. I, DMO (V–4) the General Services Administration is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1966. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purposes of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producers' commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgaged collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loans, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Inventory transferred from national stockpile

This inventory, all cotton, was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation at no cost from the national stockpile pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548. The proceeds from sales, less costs incurred by CCC, are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; therefore, such proceeds and costs are not recorded in the operating accounts. The cost value as shown for this cotton has been computed on the basis of average per bale cost of each type of cotton when purchased by CCC for the national stockpile.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Civil defense stockpile

The Department of Defense conducts this stockpiling program pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended. The program is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

Civil defense medical stockpile

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducts the stockpiling program for medical supplies and equipment pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as delegated by the President following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare plans and directs the procurement, storage, maintenance, inspection, survey, distribution, and utilization of essential supplies and equipment for emergency health services. The medical stockpile includes a program designed to pre-position assembled emergency hospitals and other medical supplies and equipment into communities throughout the Nation.

MACHINE TOOLS

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration has acquired machine tools in furtherance of expansion of productive capacity, in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

National industrial equipment reserve

Under general policies established and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense, the General Services Administration is responsible for care, maintenance, utilization, transfer, leasing, lending to nonprofit schools, disposal, transportation, repair, restoration, and renovation of national industrial reserve equipment transferred to GSA under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462).

HELIUM

The helium conservation program is conducted by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Helium Act, approved September 13, 1960 (Public Law 86-777; 74 Stat. 918; 50 U.S.C. 167), and subsequent appropriations acts which have established fiscal limitations and provided borrowing authority for the program. Among other things, the Helium Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to produce helium in Government plants, to acquire helium from private plants, to sell helium to meet current demands, and to store for future use helium that is so produced or acquired in excess of that required to meet current demands. Sales of helium by the Secretary of the Interior shall be at prices established by him which shall be adequate to liquidate the costs of the program within 25 years, except that this period may be extended by the Secretary for not more than 10 years for funds borrowed for purposes other than the acquisition and construction of helium plants and facilities.

This report covers helium that is produced in Government plants and acquired from private plants. Helium in excess of current demands is stored in the Cliffside gasfield near Amarillo, Tex. The unit of measure is cubic foot at 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute pressure and 70° F.

APPENDIX B

NEW STOCKPILE OBJECTIVES

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new objectives for strategic and critical materials. Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives for 12 materials: aluminum, castor oil, chromite (metallurgical grade), copper, feathers and down, lead, mercury, nickel, opium, sperm oil, tin, and zinc.

The following excerpts from OEP statements dated July 11 and 19, 1963, set forth the new policy with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials:

"The Office of Emergency Planning is now conducting supply-requirements studies for all stockpile materials which will reflect current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. On the basis of recently completed supply-requirements studies for the foregoing materials, the new stockpile objectives were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by the Office of Emergency Planning and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy to establish a single objective for each stockpile material. They have been determined on the basis of criteria heretofore used in establishing maximum objectives, and reflect the approximate calculated emergency deficits for the materials for conventional war and do not have any arbitrary adjustments for possible increased requirements for other types of emergency.

"Heretofore, there was a 'basic objective' and a 'maximum objective' for each material. The basic objectives assumed some continued reliance on foreign sources of supply in an emergency. The former maximum objectives completely discounted foreign sources of supply beyond North America and comparable accessible areas.

"Previously, maximum objectives could not be less than 6 months' normal usage of the material by industry in the United States in periods of active demand. The 6-month rule has been eliminated in establishing the new calculated conventional war objectives.

"The Office of Emergency Planning also announced that the present Defense Mobilization Order V-7, dealing with general policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling, is now being revised to reflect these new policies. When finally prepared and approved, the new order will be published in the Federal Register.

"New conventional war objectives for the remaining stockpile materials are being developed as rapidly as new supply-requirements data become available. They will be released as they are approved.

"The Office of Emergency Planning is also making studies to determine stockpile needs to meet the requirements of general nuclear war and reconstruction. Stockpile objectives for nuclear war have not previously been developed. Some commodity objectives may be higher and others may be lower than the objectives established for conventional war.

"After the nuclear war supply-requirements studies are completed, stockpile objectives will be based upon calculated deficits for either conventional war or nuclear war, whichever need is larger.

"The Office of Emergency Planning stressed that any long-range disposal programs undertaken prior to the development of objectives based on nuclear war assumptions would provide against disposing of quantities which might be needed to meet essential requirements in the event of nuclear attack. While the disposal of surplus materials can produce many problems which have not heretofore arisen, every effort will be made to see that the interests of producers, processors, and consumers, and the international interests of the United States are carefully considered, both in the development and carrying out of disposal programs. Before decisions are made regarding the adoption of a long-range disposal program for a particular item in the stockpile, there will be appropriate consultations with industry in order to obtain the advice of interested parties."

APPENDIX C

RADIOLOGICAL EQUIPMENT

The radiological equipment item in the civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense (table 3, p. 16), will no longer be reported as a stockpile item pursuant to the following correspondence between the Department of Defense and the committee:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
Washington, D.C., October 28, 1963.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: * * *

The radiological equipment inventory is no longer considered a stockpile inventory containing commodities delivered to permanent storage locations. When the monthly reports to the committee were initiated in 1959, this equipment was stockpiled at such locations for emergency use. Changing policy, incident to the authority granted by the Congress in Public Law 85–606, has resulted in distributing these materials, after purchase and assembly, to other Federal agencies and to the States as quickly as they can be accepted for use in radiological monitoring stations and public shelters, and in training State and local personnel. This distribution is essentially on a grant basis, and title vests in the States as the radiological equipment is received by them.

As confirmed by my letter of transmittal dated April 4, 1962, other supplies procured for stocking shelters are excluded from the report by mutual agreement; i.e., water containers, food, and sanitation and medical kits. In view of the similar conditions now applicable to radiological equipment, as explained above, the elimination of radiological equipment from future reports is proposed. Your response to this proposal will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
STEUART L. PITTMAN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES,
November 12, 1963.

Hon. STEUART L. PITTMAN,
Assistant Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PITTMAN: I have your letter of October 28, 1963, relative to stockpile inventories of civil defense items.

I understand the Federal Government is no longer acquiring radiological equipment under the current civil defense program for Federal stockpile purposes. Due to changing policy incident to Public Law 85–606, the Federal Government is now purchasing these items for redistribution to States and localities on a grant basis, and the title is transferred from the Federal Government to the recipient governmental units. The items purchased are not for Federal stockpile purposes at any point in the procedure and are to be held only temporarily pending assembly and transshipment.

On this basis, the committee is agreeable to the elimination of this item from its monthly reporting requirements and subsequent inclusion in its report on "Federal Stockpile Inventories."

Please continue reporting on the remaining items on the present basis under prior instruction.

With my very best wishes.

Faithfully yours,
HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman.

ERRATA

The following changes in previous committee reports of this series are necessary due to a change in the stockpile unit of measure from pound to short ton for the new maximum objective established for nickel by the Office of Emergency Planning:

Reference	Change figures for quantity of nickel	
	From—	To—
July 1963, Committee Print 44, p. 10:		
Maximum objective	50,000	100,000,000
Excess over maximum objective	441,272,183	341,322,183
August 1963, Committee Print 45, p. 10:		
Maximum objective	50,000	100,000,000
Excess over maximum objective	441,066,779	341,116,779

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of Federal stockpile inventories as of September 30, 1963, totaled $14,537,174,286. This was a net increase of $71,836,005 as compared with the September 1 total of $14,465,338,281. Net changes during the month are summarized by major category as follows:

Major category	Cost value, September 1963	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Strategic and critical materials	−$12,724,939	$8,630,127,717
Agricultural commodities	+104,518,233	5,598,359,880
Civil defense supplies and equipment	−22,494,641	203,284,468
Machine tools	+131,600	92,005,900
Helium	+2,405,552	11,396,321
Total	+71,836,005	14,537,174,286

These figures are from the September 1963 report on Federal stockpile inventories compiled from official agency data by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, showing detail with respect to quantity and cost value of each commodity in the inventories covered.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

So-called strategic and critical materials are stored by the Government in (1) the national stockpile, (2) Defense Production Act inventory, and (3) the supplemental-barter stockpile.

Overall, there are now 94 materials stockpiled in the strategic and critical inventories. Maximum objectives—in terms of volume—are presently fixed for 76 of these 94 materials. Of the 76 materials having maximum objectives, 61 were stockpiled in excess of their objectives as of September 30, 1963.

Increases in cost value were reported in 13 of the materials stockpiled in all strategic and critical inventories, decreases were reported in 25, and 56 materials remained unchanged during September.

National stockpile

The cost value of materials in the national stockpile as of September 30, 1963, totaled $5,791,239,900. This was a net decrease during the month of $13,298,000. Larger decreases were $4,773,400 in rubber and $3,657,100 in tin.

Defense Production Act inventory

The cost value of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory as of September 30, 1963, totaled $1,491,620,400. This was a net decrease of $1,634,800. Larger decreases were in nickel, lead and copper.

Supplemental barter

The cost value of materials in the supplemental-barter stockpile as of September 30 totaled $1,347,267,417. This was a net increase of $2,208,061. The largest increase was in manganese.

OTHER STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Among the other categories of stockpiled materials covered by the report, the largest is $5.6 billion in agricultural commodities. The major increase in agricultural commodities during September was in corn, partially offset by decreases in cotton, wheat, milk, and butterfat.

Inventories of civil defense supplies and equipment showed a net decrease primarily in radiological equipment which is no longer being reported as an item in the civil defense stockpile; the machine tools inventories showed a net increase; and the helium inventories showed an increase during September.

STORAGE COSTS—FISCAL YEAR 1963

Storage and related costs incident to stockpile inventories covered by the report totaled $392,767,145 in fiscal year 1963, according to reports submitted by agencies having jurisdiction over them. Inventory cost value figures in this report refer to the month of September 1963; these storage figures are on an annual basis and are carried as a special separate table.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Ninety-four postmaster nominations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 2395. A bill to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. BEALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 2396. A bill to revive the office of General of the Armies of the United States and to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to such office; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2397. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 2398. A bill relating to the carrying out of Federal projects in areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 2399. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American Sokol Organization; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 2400. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 2401. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT TRIBUTES BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS RELATING TO THE LIFE, CHARACTER, AND PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late President John F. Kennedy, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960.

The purpose of this bill is to end the ban on parkway and freeway construction in Northwest Washington, D.C., which was imposed by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960. That act contains the following language:

> No freeway, or new parkway more than two lanes in width, shall be built within the District of Columbia west of 12th Street, Northwest, and north of either the north or west legs of the proposed Inner Loop Freeway, the proposed Potomac River Expressway, or the proposed Palisades Parkway before July 1, 1965; and the Agency shall not later than January 10, 1965, submit to the President, for transmittal to Congress, its recommendation as to whether any such freeway or parkway should thereafter be built.

This language establishes what has become known as the freeze on highway construction in Northwest Washington.

I have introduced this bill on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. BREWSTER] to strike that language from the National Capital Transportation Act, not because we favor any freeway or parkway being constructed in this area but because that language effectively prevents, not only highway construction, but highway planning and research. Its effects are not confined to Northwest Washington but reach into Montgomery County in Maryland. Indeed, it is a hindrance to all highway planning in the metropolitan area of Washington, D.C.

The Bureau of Public Roads, the Engineer Commissioner, and the Highway Department of the District of Columbia, the Maryland State Roads Commission, the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the Maryland Legislature, have all urged that this freeze be thawed. The Bureau of Public Roads has informed Senator BREWSTER and myself that it is unable to approve the expenditure of any funds for planning or traffic research in this area of the District of Columbia and Maryland until this ban is lifted.

This so-called freeze was placed in the National Capital Transportation Act by the advocates of rapid rail transportation to preserve the Wisconsin Avenue corridor into the District of Columbia as a possible route for a subway or some other form of rapid rail transportation. Recent events have foreshadowed great difficulty for any attempts to construct a rapid rail transit system in the District of Columbia. We must, therefore, reexamine the effects of this ban on highway planning in the light of these recent events. It is for this reason that Senator BREWSTER and I are introducing this bill. We are not necessarily committed to the construction of freeways in this area nor even to the revocation of this freeze but we do wish to have the opportunity to hold early hearings on this bill in order to reevaluate the results of this highway construction ban, both in the District of Columbia and in our own State of Maryland.

The transportation needs of the Washington metropolitan area are already critical. As the population increases, the situation will worsen unless we have imaginative traffic and transit research and planning now. We need rapid mass transit and we need an expanded but sensible highway program. We are not likely to get either by restricting the highway and transit experts and denying them the tools they need to meet present and future transportation needs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2395) to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, introduced by Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DOUGLAS MacARTHUR, AMERICAN PATRIOT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as the years pass, we are able to view the great events of recent history with more acute perception and deeper understanding. Our vision of yesterday is often more sure than our grasp of today.

As World War II and the era of rehabilitation recede, the men and the deeds that marked the crucial turning points in that momentous chapter of history fall into focus, and we are richer in the wisdom we need for coping with the present and the future.

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, a towering figure of those times, has been accorded many honors by his countrymen for a lifetime of service, and dedication in war and peace. Yet today, though no longer a member of the active Military Establishment, he is still growing in stature and in the place he holds in the minds and hearts of free men everywhere.

Thus, it has become eminently fitting that we should pay an ultimate tribute to this unique American.

The honor which many of us believe is most appropriate to his achievements, and in recognition of the respect and affection which our Nation feels for him, is to confer on this great military leader the rank of General of the Armies.

Congress has a precedent in the six-star grade approved for Gen. John J. Pershing, the commander in chief of American forces in World War I, after the successful conclusion of that conflict. Surely we can do as much for the American general who led the Allied forces to victory in the Pacific in World War II, who as supreme commander in the occupation converted Japan from a fierce enemy to a warm ally; and who later, as the commander in South Korea, directed the campaign that saved that country from communism and demonstrated our determination to resist Communist aggression.

Several other American generals and admirals were accorded five-star grade during World War II for their achievements to that time. After the war, some earned still further distinction in the field of civilian endeavor, and all were recipients of special honors from our Government.

In the case of General MacArthur, several of his most memorable contributions—particularly as supreme commander in Japan and in the conduct of the Korean war—were made in the period after World War II.

At Inchon, we recall with pride that the forces led by General MacArthur destroyed the vastly superior Communist armies from North Korea. The British

Chiefs of Staff said in a message to General MacArthur at the time:

> We believe that the brilliant conception and masterly execution of the Inchon counterstrike which you planned and launched whilst holding the enemy at bay will rank among the finest strategic achievements in military history.

Later, the forces of General MacArthur drove the flower of the Red Chinese armies back to a position of stalemate on the 38th parallel, where they are still held in check today.

To many students of military history, these and other services by General MacArthur, long after his promotion to the grade of General of the Army, were the most distinguished in a career that seemed from the start to reflect a particular genius for military command and leadership of men.

For another measure of General MacArthur, we need only to look to his farewell address last year to the cadets at West Point. Its title, "Duty—Honor—Country," suggests his nobility of purpose, his compassion, and his dedication. Every young American should listen to that magnificent speech, fortunately recorded, delivered without a note, at the age of 82.

In itself it shows how much more than just a military hero is represented in the character of this American patriot.

Last year the Congress gave unanimous approval to a richly deserved resolution expressing the gratitude of the United States for General MacArthur's "outstanding devotion to the American people, his brilliant leadership during and following World War II, and the unsurpassed affection held for him by the people of the Republic of the Philippines which has done so much to strengthen the ties of friendship between the people of that nation and the people of the United States."

A final accolade remains, the honor which I am sure would now be most meaningful to General MacArthur—to confer on him the grade of General of the Armies and thus to manifest our esteem not only for this leader but for all who have served with such skill and zeal in the defense of their country and of freedom.

It is not easy to realize that his career spans so many years. Douglas MacArthur was graduated from West Point, at the head of his class, 60 years ago this June 11. To the best of my knowledge, he has served longer, and in more positions of authority than any other commander in our history. His deeds are among this Nation's most glorious.

Generations to come will be inspired by his courage, his valor, his fortitude. In our own time, should we do less than accord him the highest rank within our power?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the able and distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in 1933, when a military bill came before the House of Representatives, and I was then a freshman Congressman, I thought the place to go for advice would be to the Chief of Staff. That was Douglas MacArthur. As a newcomer in Washington, I went there, thinking that perhaps, at best, I would receive rather cool treatment. However, never did I find such a congenial person who was willing to spend a whole hour with an uninformed freshman Congressman, discussing the questions he had in mind. That was my first contact with Douglas MacArthur.

I have watched him serve this Republic from that day to this. Truly, he is one of the great and distinguished soldiers, not only of this country, but of the whole, wide world.

I think the least a grateful Republic can do is accord him the honor of conferring a sixth star; and I hope the distinguished Senator from Missouri will let me associate myself with him on the bill he proposes to introduce; I trust he will add my name to it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader for his fine tribute to a great American.

I introduce, and send to the desk, a bill to give General MacArthur his sixth star; and I ask that the bill be received, and that it be held at the desk until January 15, for cosponsorship.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, will be held at the desk for cosponsors, as requested.

The bill (S. 2396) to revive the office of General of the Armies of the United States and to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to such office, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the able junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I warmly commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri for the proposed honor for one of our truly great military leaders.

It was my privilege to meet the then Brig. Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the spring of 1919, immediately after his return from Europe. At that time he was the youngest brigadier general ever to serve in our Army. Soon thereafter he was appointed Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy, at West Point, where he was one of the youngest, if not the youngest, officer ever to hold that important position.

In January 1920, at the annual Lee-Jackson dinner of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, I was asked to speak on the influence of the strategy of Stonewall Jackson on World War I. Although I had served for several years during World War I, and had reached what I regarded as the desirable rank of major, and although I knew Jackson's influence on me, I did not know just what his influence was on the strategy which was followed in World War I. So I wrote to General MacArthur, and asked him. He gave me wonderful help—so much so that on that occasion, I made a speech which was highly regarded by my old professor, Dr. S. C. Mitchell, one of the truly great scholars, who inspired me to make politics a career. After hearing that speech, he commended it very warmly. It was based on the material General MacArthur had given me.

Mr. President, we in Virginia are very proud of the fact that Douglas MacArthur's mother was born in Norfolk, Va. Of course, we cannot claim all the credit for what has since happened; but we feel that in a sense he belongs to us—so much so, that in Norfolk we are developing a MacArthur Memorial Foundation, to which General MacArthur has promised to send all of his wonderful medals, citations, and so forth, so that in the future all the world will be able to find assembled at that one place these memorials to Douglas MacArthur, a great soldier. And only a year ago we were proud to issue a gold medal to General MacArthur, with copies to be sold for the benefit of the foundation.

I assure the Senator from Missouri that I shall take great pleasure in supporting the bill he is introducing, when it is acted on by the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia for his equally articulate remarks about a very great military leader of this country.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the able Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to join my distinguished colleague from Missouri, Senator SYMINGTON, in supporting his bill to award a sixth star to Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I hope the bill will speedily be passed by Congress; and I shall be honored to join—following the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]—in cosponsorship of the bill.

Mr. President, to millions of people at home and around the globe, Douglas MacArthur has seemed a symbol and almost a personification of America in its finest aspects.

Outwardly, there was the unforgettable surface picture—the striking countenance, the confident stride, the legendary hat and glasses and corncob pipe, the resonant, authoritative voice, the grand phrase, the dramatic gesture; and behind this surface picture were all the attributes of excellence, the supreme competence, the serene confidence, the intellectual power, the noble purpose, and the complete commitment to the vision of an America that was unconquerable in the service of a just cause.

General MacArthur must always have felt in his bones the electric current of excitement which America and things American brought to the world two centuries ago; and he has had the rare capacity to radiate that current to the people of his time.

Here is a man with a sense of history, with a flair for what is honestly and genuinely dramatic, and with an ability to surround himself with an aura of romance and mystery, all effectively and wisely used to advance our national interest.

The name of Douglas MacArthur causes to flash through the mind unforgettable images which are an essential part of the history of World War I and, as the Senator from Missouri pointed out, of World War II, and of the Korean war. The gallant, magnificent defense of Bataan and Corregidor against hopeless odds; the promise to return, and the depth of conviction that made men believe the promise would be kept; the vast, brilliant, island-hopping campaign, stretching from Australia to Tokyo, which ever will remain a marvel of military genius; the wading ashore at Leyte; the incomparable scene on the battleship *Missouri*, where General MacArthur accepted the surrender of our enemy, appropriately concluding a victory so awesome, so complete, so seemingly final; and then the restoration of that fallen enemy to freedom, social justice, and prosperity.

The Korean war once again demonstrated General MacArthur's preeminent qualities of leadership in time of national danger: the brilliant defense at Pusan, the bold landing at Inchon, the swift triumphant march northward, which brought General MacArthur to the Yalu River and to the beginning of the greatest controversy of his life and to a critical turning point in American history.

When the Chinese Communists entered the Korean war, it became an entirely new conflict. General MacArthur was prevented from taking the steps he felt were necessary to win the new Korean war. He made it clear that while he would carry out the policy dictated in Washington, he was opposed to a policy which accepted a military stalemate in Korea.

He was dismissed. His policies were rejected by both the Democratic and Republican administrations. I believe that history has already proved General MacArthur right, and that as Chinese Communist aggression spreads throughout Asia, each year we are paying the price for not doing what we should have done in Korea.

For more than a decade, General MacArthur has remained aloof from the storm center of political controversy. Many honors have come to him, all of them richly deserved.

It can be truly said that in this century, in peace and in war, when the vital interests of our country have been placed in the hands of this great man, they have been preserved and advanced. The esteem and love and thanks of a grateful Nation go out to him for what he has done, for what he is, and for what he means to our generation and to all generations.

I commend the Senator from Missouri for his bill, and I hope it will speedily be passed by a grateful Congress.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his kind remarks in regard to this great American.

DOUGLAS MAC ARTHUR—MASTER AMERICAN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I commend and congratulate the Senator from Missouri for introducing his bill, and I join in the tributes being paid to this great American, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. President, six simple words—"Arranged in order of relative rank"—precede the listing of general officers in the U.S. Army Register. Although the Army Register is unfamiliar to many persons, these six words speak volumes whenever and wherever soldiers gather.

Those who open the Army Register to the table of relative rank will see, as I did, that the name of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur heads the list, which is made up of the most distinguished leaders of our time. On that list in the Army Register, the name of General MacArthur is followed by the names of Generals of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower and Omar Nelson Bradley. Then follow the names of the generals, the lieutenant generals, the major generals, and brigadier generals who make up our Military Establishment today.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur deserves the honor proposed by the bill introduced here today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be listed as a cosponsor of the bill to confer the rank of six-star general on Douglas MacArthur. He has earned the honor through decades of service to his country. Since the day when he entered the Military Academy in 1899, he has served his country with honor and distinction.

His list of decorations and awards is legion. There is no need to read it here. Suffice it to say that it runs from the Congressional Medal of Honor through the Distingiushed Service Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Navy Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star with six oak leaf clusters, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Bronze Star Medal, the Air Medal, and the Purple Heart.

His outstanding service in World War I, following the war and as Chief of Staff, in the Philippines, in World War II, in Japan after the war, and in the Korean conflict added chapter after brilliant chapter to the MacArthur story.

Merely to list the highlights in his career would fill several chapters in a book.

He was already a hero when he stalked splendidly ashore in the Philippines and kept his "I shall return" promise to the people who had come to know and love him during his years of service in their country.

He was already an old campaigner, much decorated for valor, when he was called on to once again lead American boys into battle in Korea.

In addition to his military genius, Douglas MacArthur will always be remembered as an orator. Here again, arranged in order of rank, he must be included with Churchill, Roosevelt, Madam Chiang Kai-shek and the other great speakers of our time.

Many there are in this Chamber today who remember the grandeur of his eloquence as he addressed a joint session of Congress after he was called home from the Pacific. We politicians are not much given to sentiment but there was sentiment in the Chamber that day. Admiration for the returned warrior enveloped the country and almost overnight "Old Soldiers Never Die" became a national hit song.

Years later, he journeyed to his beloved West Point and once again stirred the Nation with his "Duty, Honor, Country" speech to the Corps of Cadets.

Military genius, statesman, orator are but a few accolades that have been conferred on Douglas MacArthur through the years.

Small incidents can characterize the love and affection felt for this great leader. In my office reception room hangs an oil portrait of Douglas MacArthur presented to me by a friend many years ago. My executive secretary, Roberta Van Beek, arranged for a small light to be hung above the portrait and every workday begins for her after she turns on the light illuminating the features of Douglas MacArthur.

I do not believe she has ever met the general, but like millions of Americans she loves him.

The honor proposed by my colleague today is most fitting, and I hope the legislation will be acted on expeditiously.

It is indeed a happy occasion that, through the leadership of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], Senators are speaking their minds about Douglas MacArthur, and proposing six-star general recognition for him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from South Dakota for his eloquent remarks. I, too, heard the speech of Douglas MacArthur at the time he made his farewell address at West Point; and wish every American youth could also hear that talk as I stated, without notes—and at the age of 82.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to commend the Senator from Missouri for introducing the excellent bill. I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to join as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Reference has been made to the magnificent speech of General MacArthur at West Point. I was so impressed with it—as was everyone who heard or read it—that I took the liberty of having it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at that time. It is one of the great classics of oratory in the history of the American people. It deserves perpetuation with a few of the other—and very few—equally memorable addresses.

Much has already been said—and I shall not repeat—about the military genius of General MacArthur. But I should like to cite a personal experience, of my own knowledge, which indicates that in addition to being a great general and a great military leader, he also had a broad interest in other affairs.

In the middle 1940's, as Governor of Alaska, I was engaged in promoting the cause of statehood for Alaska. At that time the cause did not look too promising. I sought to form a nationwide committee of 100 distinguished citizens who would endorse the cause because they felt it was in the national interest, would demonstrate that America still was young and on the march, and that we were doing the right thing in extending the frontiers of democracy and self-government to the farthest territory north and the farthest territory west.

While I found some supporters, I also found some who, for one reason or another, thought it inadvisable at that time to join the movement and give their names to a cause which they had not fully studied. No so with General MacArthur. I was in Tokyo at the time. I talked with him and explained our cause. I did not have to complete my argument. Before I had finished, he interrupted me and said, "I shall be glad to 'lead all the rest,' like Abou Ben Adhem." His name was added to that distinguished list, which contained the names of such outstanding military leaders as Gen. "Hap" Arnold of the Air Force, and Adm. Chester Nimitz of the Navy. What a distinguished trilogy that was to support this great movement for statehood, along with Eleanor Roosevelt. People of all walks of life—including authors, poets, writers—who felt as we did at the time, joined in pointing out that statehood for Alaska and Hawaii was in the national interest.

I cite that incident to show that General MacArthur is not only a military man but also a versatile man in every sense of the word.

Again, I wish to applaud the Senator from Missouri for introducing the proposed legislation. I hope it will be enacted. It is a deserved tribute to the superlative service of Douglas MacArthur in wartime and in peacetime.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska for the fine tribute he has paid to one of America's greatest military leaders.

Mr. President, I yield to the distintinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and ask unanimous consent that he may proceed for 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri for his statements and for his introduction of the bill. I ask unanimous consent to have my named as a cosponor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, our country has no greater example of dedication, patriotism, and unselfish service than is exemplified by the life and career of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Although he first took the oath of service when he entered West Point in June 1899, he was actually a member of the military service from his birth. He was born at Fort Little Rock, Ark., January 26, 1880, the son of then Capt. Arthur MacArthur, later Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, the 12th man in the U.S. Army to reach the rank of lieutenant general.

Douglas MacArthur, therefore, began his military experience and service with the U.S. Army on the frontiers during the Indian wars.

His dedication was early apparent. At West Point, he was both first captain and first in scholastic standing among his classmates. After graduation in June 1903, his first assignment was in the Philippines, and it was during this first assignment that he gained his first combat experience. Since that first assignment, he has served his Nation in practically every conceivable military assignment. He was an observer with the Japanese Army in the Russo-Japanese War in 1905. He was present at the Battle of Mukden. He served as military aide to President Theodore Roosevelt. He distinguished himself in the punitive expedition against Villa in Mexico, and he completed combat service in World War I as commander of the famous Rainbow Division.

General MacArthur served for 5 years as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. For more than 10 years prior to his retirement in 1951, he served as U.S. Commander in the Far East as well as Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in the Far East.

General MacArthur has been the recipient of practically every military decoration and honor his Nation could bestow, including the Congressional Medal of Honor.

General MacArthur has been more than a faithful and devoted soldier to the United States. He has been a dedicated servant of his Nation throughout his life. The lifelong purpose which he has successfully attained has been to excel in service.

In whatever way our Nation honors this dedicated servant, it honors itself, for we are but holding up the highest and best example which our Nation can produce in the hope that others will be inspired by his exemplary record to attempt to emulate his dedicated service, just as Gen. Douglas MacArthur was inspired by the shining example of his own father, Gen. Arthur MacArthur.

In closing, Mr. President, again I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri upon initiating the remarks this morning in honor of General MacArthur and for the bill he has introduced.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from South Carolina, and I know, especially because of his own outstanding military record, that General MacArthur will especially appreciate the remarks the Senator has made this afternoon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], be added as cosponsors of this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri if my name may be added as a cosponsor to the bill he has just introduced?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague and ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] be added as a cosponsor to the bill. Again, may I say, the bill, by unanimous consent, will be laid on the desk until January 15 for additional cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I wish to join my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], in support of this bill.

This country has repeatedly responded to challenges forced upon it by producing leaders capable of inspiring and leading our great people to meet and to overcome these challenges.

By S. 1088, General MacArthur would be elevated to a six-star rank. This man, however, became more than just a leader; he emerged as a giant among the great and certainly one of the most illustrious men of our times.

Who among us cannot recall General MacArthur's courage during dark days of the battles in the Pacific? Who among us can forget those courageous ever-inspiring words, "I shall return," which seem to turn even defeat into victory? I do not intend to fill the records with the re-creation of General MacArthur's glorious return which paved the way for our ultimate victory in the Pacific. History sufficiently establishes those facts.

Who among us can forget General MacArthur's work in postwar occupation of Japan? The fact that Japan is the most prosperous country in the Far East, as well as a showplace for democracy, evidences the remarkable groundwork laid by the general.

Who among us can forget General MacArthur's leadership as Commander of the United Nations forces during the Korean conflict. His efforts helped to impress upon the Communists the determination of the free world in preventing the spread of communism.

When history renders its final judgment on the services and the accomplishments of this great leader, I am confident a decision by the Congress to bestow the six-star rank upon the general will be applauded.

VETERINARY MEDICAL EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1964

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize a 3-year program for matching grants for construction and expansion of capacity of veterinary medical education facilities, and for student loans for such personnel.

In its construction phase the bill would provide for each of the 3 fiscal years, commencing July 1, 1964, first, $15 million for grants for "construction of new or expanded teaching facilities for the training of veterinary medical personnel"; and second, $2 million for "grants to assist in the replacement and rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities for the training of veterinary medical personnel."

The program would be administered by the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service.

This bill is a new version of legislation which I offered in the 87th and 86th Congresses. On those occasions, I had proposed a 10-year program for matching grants. A longer-range program is indeed necessary. Construction of a new institution or improvement of an existing institution does take many years of advance planning. Nevertheless, I have revised and limited the bill, in order that it be in accordance with, first, the overall need for reasonable economy in Federal expenditures; second, the need to assure reasonably equal treatment to the various health professions.

THIS BILL DOVETAILS WITH PUBLIC LAW 88-129

In this latter connection, I point out that on September 24, 1963, the late President John F. Kennedy signed one of the great landmark laws of the present Congress—the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963—Public Law 88–129. This law increases the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel such as pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses or "other public health" personnel.

THE PREVIOUS OMISSION OF THE VETERINARY PROFESSION

Veterinary medical education was not included, unfortunately. It had been my hope that it could have been included and that certain other improvements could likewise have been made in the bill, H.R. 12. The bill, as enacted, was an excellent bill, but it was necessarily a compromise and a reasonable one.

Now, I believe, we should proceed to rectify the omission of veterinary science from the law's provision. That, in essence, is what my bill, today, would do.

I should like to commend the veterinary leaders and organizations of this Nation for the deep understanding which they showed in awaiting their turn. They did not press for immediate inclusion of their vital profession in the version of H.R. 12 which came to the Senate. They felt that their profession more than merited inclusion. But they recognized that had many amendments been proposed to the health professions bill, the chances of prompt enactment might have lessened. So, veterinary leaders indicated that they would, in effect, stand in line, awaiting future action as soon as the Congress felt that it would be in a position to enact supplementary legislation.

I earnestly hope that we will fulfill this splendid profession's reasonable expectation early in the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

PERSONAL BACKGROUND AS TO VETERINARY SCIENCE

It is my personal privilege to represent a great agricultural State with a great college of veterinary medicine—at the University of Minnesota.

But I am sure that my colleagues representing States with the other 17 schools of veterinary medicine also realize the essential role played by this profession in modern health.

IMPORTANCE OF VETERINARY SCIENCE IN INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL COMPETITION

In addition, I base my personal judgment on experience as chairman of a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee which has considered the problems of veterinary science. This subcommittee published, for example, as 1 of 11 major studies on international health problems, a comprehensive committee print entitled "Veterinary Medical Science and Human Health." That print of August 10, 1961, was kindly characterized in this way by a distinguished veterinary leader, W. T. S. Thorp, D.V.M., chairman of the joint committee on education of the American Veterinary Medical Association:

> This publication by the Senate committee and staff is considered by the veterinary medical profession as an encyclopedia of veterinary activities. It includes work of the veterinary medical profession not only in the United States but from an international standpoint.

Dr. Thorp, who is, I am proud to say, dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine at the University of Minnesota, kindly recalled:

> In April 1960 during the preparation of the report, Senator HUMPHREY stated in introducing legislation to construct veterinary medical schools that, "The two are inseparable, human health and the health of animals, whether most laymen recognize this fact or not."

The print underlined, among other points:

First, the indispensability of veterinary science to agricultural productivity;

Second, the need for increased international veterinary cooperation;

Third, America's world-recognized preeminence in this field—a preeminence, I may say, which is understandably envied by the Soviet Union;

Fourth, America's important role in assisting veterinary science in the developing countries in order to increase production of food and fibers; and

Fifth, America's urgent research need to learn more about the biological processes of animal life as a crucial means of understanding and meeting man's own health problems.

ASSURING SAFETY IN ANIMAL DRUGS

In addition, I may add that, as I told the noted Animal Health Institute earlier this year, our subcommittee has seen some little bit of the important role of veterinary biologicals and drugs.

Indeed, speaking personally, from days in my father's drugstore onward, such medications have been almost as familiar to me as the healthful drugs we dispensed for humans.

I might add, at this point, parenthetically, that I am personally impressed by the stalwart stand of the Food and Drug Administration and the American Veterinary Medical Association against—I repeat—against any weakening of protection of safety standards on new animal drugs, as provided under present law. For such weakening, whatever its announced and high-sounding purpose, could set an alarming precedent which might endanger present protection on human drugs and biologicals, including batch-by-batch certification on antibiotics, as well.

I, for one, would like veterinary science, as I am sure FDA and AVMA would, to continue to be in the vanguard of strengthening safeguards of public health. The veterinary field should not become—as some sources might otherwise end up making it—a "battering ram" for opening up loopholes in existing drug safeguards.

Surely, we can work toward the wise goal of increased efficiency in the processing of new animal drug applications without opening such unsound loopholes.

ROLE OF MODERN VETERINARIAN

Today's and tomorrow's veterinarian is a health leader in his community. To the farmer, he is indispensable; to tens of millions of Americans with household pets, in cities or on farms, he is an invaluable friend.

IMPORTANCE OF VETERINARIAN

Today's veterinarian spends 6 to 8 years in acquiring his education, 2 years minimum preveterinary work and 4 years in the colleges and schools of veterinary medicine. Today's veterinarian serves the human population. I emphasize, serves man himself, in four broad areas.

First. Removal of animal reservoirs of infection to man through the eradication and control of those many diseases which are transmissible to man.

Second. Development of preventives or treatments for animals that can be adapted for use in human medicine.

Third. Supervising programs in food hygiene that protect the consumer against food-borne diseases.

Fourth. Participating in the basic medical sciences in studying disease processes in animals, especially analogous or similar to those in man.

SHORTAGE OF VETERINARIANS

There are at present 21,565 veterinarians in the Nation. That is far too few right now. But, by 1980, to meet the needs of increased activities in public health and related fields in North America, we will need 1.75 veterinarians per 10,000 population or approximately 47,250. It is estimated that of this increased number, 35,000 will be required by the United States. We cannot have this many veterinarians unless we are willing to enact legislation such as I submit today.

CONSTRUCTION NEEDS IN YEARS TO COME

A recently completed survey of each of the 18 colleges of veterinary medicine indicates that the firmly estimated needs for construction and facilities for the next 10 years will total $145 million. These range from $500,000 to $31 million, most approximating $5 million to $10 million.

NEED FOR MANPOWER

But we need more than money for "bricks and mortar," as important as that is. We need to attract and retain talented manpower. We need many more young people with ability and dedication in this area of medicine. We need to double the opportunity for high school graduates to avail themselves of this type of professional education. These graduates should not be discriminated against, as regards unavailability of loan funds, as compared with loans available for students in other branches of medicine.

In the 1962-63 academic year there were 4,016 students studying for the doctor of veterinary medicine degree enrolled in the 18 veterinary medical schools. I welcome these young people's interest.

NEEDS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

So does the U.S. Government and State and local governments. There is a current shortage of about 535 veterinarians reported by State and local health departments and the U.S. Public Health Service.

A study by the Agriculture Science Advisory Committee, appointed by Secretary Orville Freeman, examined, I might note, the animal disease and parasite research program and other programs of agricultural research service needing veterinarians. It found a marked shortage of veterinary medical personnel available to the Department of Agriculture. The total needs in this area are approximately 400 within the next 5 years.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY DEAN THORP

I should like to quote now the concluding comments by Dean Thorp in his testimony on August 26, 1963, before the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

> This statement of the joint committee on education of the American Veterinary Medical Association has attempted to point out a few of the interrelations with human medicine in a large number of areas, many of which are highly technical. Aid to veterinary medical education is not a matter of building or expanding each medical school or more veterinary schools but is one of meeting the Nation's health needs.
>
> The American Veterinary Medical Association is of the firm belief that the maximum medical and scientific potential of this country cannot be reached without meeting the needs of teaching and research for their branch of the health profession. While the research, teaching, and professional activities in the field of veterinary medicine are closely related to and in many instances inseparable from the problems of human medicine and public health, there is a rapidly expanding demand for the services of highly trained veterinarians in disciplines falling within the broad definition of public health. To meet these needs of the Nation, it is necessary that the educational facilities first, and in turn the research facilities, be expanded.

CONCLUSION

This Nation believes in paying the price for progress. It is a much smaller price, I may add, than the price of inertia or stagnation. Progress in veterinary science is essential. We must be willing to pay the relatively small price this progress requires.

I may add, 1963 marks the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American Veterinary Medical Association. This association has given 10 decades of honored service to man by contributing to the health of animals on which he depends so vitally, as well as the health of man directly.

It is my hope that as its centennial year draws to a close, this great organization, AVMA, will be able to look forward confidently to enactment in the near future of this legislation. The decision is now in our hands.

I should like to conclude by conveying my felicitations on these 100 years of the association's service to H. E. Kingman, D.V.M., executive secretary of AVMA, and to his colleagues throughout the country, including B. S. Pomeroy, D.V.M., secretary-treasurer of the Minnesota Veterinary Medical Association, and all other officers and members.

So, too, I should like to commend the overall contributions by American manufacturers of veterinary drugs and biologicals—for they constitute the most important such animal drug industry in the world—an industry on which much of our Nation's well-being vitally depends.

This proposed legislation today can, I hope, enable the profession, industry, agriculture—all of us—to enjoy a still better, healthier, tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2397) to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COORDINATION OF FEDERAL ACTIONS IN DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, for myself and my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], a bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to maintain a general oversight of new Federal activities with a view to determining whether any such activities could appropriately be performed in areas of labor surplus. Particularly where Federal installations or activities are being abandoned, it is important that the Federal Government, along with State and local interests, consider how it can contribute to a better economic picture.

What this bill calls for is nothing more or less than a little coordination among Federal agencies. Strange as it may seem, with all the money that has been appropriated for Federal employment creating activities of one kind or another, there has been no effort that I know of to encourage new Federal projects to come into these areas, with the possible exception of the activities in West Virginia.

The Defense Department in particular takes the rather lordly view that it is not a WPA program and has no responsibility at all to consider employment prospects that may be affected by its activities. This seems to me a most shortsighted outlook. Our defense basically depends upon a healthy economy, and arbitrary activities of the Defense Department with its $50 billion budget have tremendous impact.

Mr. President, it is also not the direct responsibility of the Defense Department to encourage integration or to work for the elimination of segregation policies in our communities. Yet in recognition of its responsibilities and of the important national objective of equal rights, the Defense Department has taken action in this field—and rightly so.

Full employment, like the full enjoyment of civil rights, is a vital national objective. There is no agency of the Government that should consider itself too important to cooperate in achieving these goals.

The purpose of this bill is not only to remind all Federal agencies of their obligations in this regard, but also to provide a method of coordinating empty facilities in depressed areas with new needs—perhaps at an even greater overall benefit to the economy than merely by abandoning them.

Some of the projects that come to mind in this connection are research activities of NASA and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These are currently sought, at great cost, all over the country. There is great concern for the design and prestige of the project but relatively little Federal consideration of what such facilities can themselves contribute to the area ultimately selected, particularly an area which has recently lost other Federal activities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2398) relating to the carrying out of Federal projects in areas of substantial unemployment, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of Commerce shall hereafter consult and maintain a close liaison with the heads of all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States in order that he may be better informed concerning those projects to be carried out or administered by such departments, agencies, and instrumentalities which will provide jobs for civilian personnel; and the Secretary shall, in appropriate cases, recommend to the head of any such department, agency, or instrumentality that any such proposed project be carried out in an area of substantial unemployment if such project, in the opinion of the Secretary, would help alleviate the unemployment problem and could reasonably be performed in such area.

(b) In making recommendations to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary of Commerce shall give due consideration to any area of substantial unemployment in which any Federal facility or activity has been, or is being, terminated.

(c) The heads of all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States are authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Commerce to the maximum extent possible.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "area of substantial unemployment" means an area which is eligible for assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act or the Public Works Acceleration Act.

COMMEMORATION OF SOKOL CENTENNIAL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the issuance of a series of postage stamps to commemorate the centennial of the American Sokol Organization.

On February 8, 1962, it was my pleasure to call to the attention of the Senate the 100th anniversary of the Sokol International Organization. When this organization was formed at Prague, Czechoslovakia, on February 16, 1862, the organizers were inspired by the principles of freedom and liberty. Led by men well versed in history, they knew the virtues of a democracy and were determined to instill them in the membership of the Sokol Organization. In their dedication to such a cause, they sought the development of the whole individual, physical, mental, moral, and spiritual. Convinced of their inseparable connection, they designed a magnificent system of calisthenics and gymnastics for individual discipline and development.

These ideals and goals spread quickly to America. It was on February 14, 1865, that the first Sokol unit was established at St. Louis, Mo. Today Sokol units reach from coast to coast, from Canada to Mexico. The record of its members in the military service is proverbial. Less than one-sixteenth of 1 percent have been rejected by the military services for physical infirmities.

On November 20, 1963, I referred, in some further remarks in the Senate, to the success of the Sokol Organization in America. From one unit in 1865, it has grown to a total membership of over 250,000. They have built and supported their own gymnasiums, community centers, and children's camps and continue to expand their activities.

In tests comparing the fitness of European and American youth, the success of the Sokol program was dramatically demonstrated: 9 percent of the Europeans failed, 60 percent of the Americans failed, while significantly only 3 percent of the Sokol children failed.

Many national leaders, including several Presidents of the United States, have recognized the need and emphasized the importance of physical fitness programs modeled after the Sokol organization.

The issuance of a commemorative stamp would give further recognition to the importance of the Sokol movement in a free society.

It is for this reason that I urge the issuance of a series of postage stamps to commemorate the centennial of the American Sokol Organization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2399) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American Sokol Organization, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special series of postage stamps, of such appropriate design and denomination as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American Sokol Organization. Such stamps shall be first offered for sale to the public on February 14, 1965, the date of such anniversary.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 301(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which defines who shall be citizens of the United States at birth. Clause 7 of this section states that, if a person is born outside of the United States of parents, one of whom is an alien and the other a citizen of the United States, the citizen parent, prior to the birth of the person, must have lived in the United States for at least 10 years, 5 of which were after attaining the age of 14.

It came to my attention some time ago that this part of our Immigration and Nationality Act could work an undue hardship on certain naturalized American citizens who were serving in the Armed Forces abroad. In one particular case, a naturalized American citizen who was a sergeant in the Air Force stationed overseas with his noncitizen wife became the parent of a baby boy. He soon learned that his son was not an American citizen by birth and that his son could become only a naturalized citizen. This was due to the fact that the boy had been born overseas and that his father had not, prior to going overseas, lived in the United States 10 years. If the boy had been born in the United States, regardless of the fact that one of his parents was an alien and the other was a citizen who had not lived in the United States 10 years prior to his birth, he would have been a citizen of the United States at birth.

I do not believe that, because one is assigned by an arm of the U.S. Government to a post overseas rather than to a post in this country, he should be discriminated against as far as the citizenship of his children is concerned. In the case I have related, I introduced a private bill for the relief of the affected party. The bill was not acted upon by a previous Congress. However, I believe that, rather than introduce a private bill again this year, it would be better to amend the act so that others will not be affected similarly by this unusual set of circumstances.

Therefore, the amendment I introduce today would add another proviso to the current law to state that the physical presence requirement shall not apply to any citizen parent who, at the time of the birth of his child, is required to serve and is serving outside the country in the Armed Forces of the United States, or in the employment of any other department or agency of the United States.

In other words, in the case I have related of the Air Force sergeant who was a naturalized citizen married to an alien and who had not lived in the United States 10 years prior to the birth of his son, it would not matter whether the sergeant were stationed in the United States or overseas, and, thus, whether the son were born here or abroad. Such a child would still be declared a citizen at birth.

In all fairness, I cannot see how it should be any other way. The parents had no control over the situation. They were assigned to a base outside the country rather than to one in the country. This happenstance should not serve as the basis for discrimination against the child.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2401) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMPROVEMENT OF NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 364)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], an amendment to S. 1062, the administration's transportation bill to provide for the strengthening and improving of the national transportation system. This amendment would specifically allow financially hard-pressed U.S. railroads to apply to the World Bank for financial and technical assistance. Under section 10(d) of the bill as presently written, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to guarantee loans from "any public or private financing institution" to aid common carriers subject to the Interstate

Commerce Act, but there is doubt as to whether the World Bank would qualify under this language.

This amendment would make it clear that U.S. railroads may apply to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—World Bank—for financial and technical assistance to help carry out a comprehensive plan for rehabilitation and modernization. The amendment would accomplish this objective by expressly including the World Bank within the bill's definition of "public financing institutions" to which the railroads may apply for loans. Without the amendment, some doubt may exist as to whether a World Bank loan would be eligible for guarantee under section 10 of the administration's bill.

The present ad hoc approach of patchwork solutions to the railroads' financial problems must be remedied by a long-range comprehensive planning program. Under a version of section 10(d) which was in the law between 1958 and June 30, 1963, and which would be revived under the Commerce Department by the bill, 14 American railroads received approximately $220 million in assistance from both public and private financing institutions within the United States. However, it is apparent that such financial assistance has not by itself solved railroad difficulties.

I believe that the expertise in the transportation field for which the World Bank is well known, and the Bank's stringent requirements for long-range and comprehensive planning as a condition to financial assistance, will significantly contribute to the solution of railroad financial problems.

The idea of utilizing the World Bank to assist U.S. railroads was first incorporated in legislative form in H.R. 8897, the Railroad Redevelopment Act of 1963, recently introduced in the House of Representatives by my distinguished New York colleague, Congressman Ogden Reid. A careful examination of this concept had also been made by Mr. Arne Wiprud, formerly director of the New York State Office of Transportation and presently a consultant to New York State in transportation matters.

The World Bank would be a particularly appropriate institution to assist U.S. railroads because of its long experience in extending loans for the rehabilitation of railroads. Since its establishment, the Bank and its affiliate, the International Development Association—IDA—have loaned $1,171,300,000 to foreign countries to construct, improve and modernize their railroads.

In fiscal year 1961–62 the Bank financed project and sector assistance studies in a number of countries, including a general transportation study in Colombia, a highway and transport study in Peru, a railroad survey in Bolivia, and a general transportation study in Ecuador.

Although the World Bank has never made a loan to the United States, which is its largest stockholder with 31 percent of its capital, it has made a number of significant loans to industrialized countries for purposes of modernizing railroads, including $80 million to Japan in 1961 to aid the Japanese National Railways in the construction of a modern, high-speed 320-mile railroad line between Tokyo and Osaka; $7,500,000 to France in 1954 for railroad modernization; $61 million to Mexico in 1959 for railroad rehabilitation; and 9 loans to India between the years 1949 and 1961 totaling $379 million for purchase of diesel locomotives, for electrification of 1,300 miles of track, for acquisition of large-capacity freight cars and for improvements in rail operations. Loans from the World Bank to member countries for use on railroads have never been in default and have provided a basis for significant improvement of their railroad systems.

Since there is no legal bar either in the Bank's charter or in U.S. law against such assistance to American railroads, our railroads should have the same right to obtain loans as those in other member nations do. The World Bank's vast resources and skills in transportation planning should not be denied to this country's railroads.

One of the U.S. lines most in need of financial assistance is the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, which serves as the only direct rail link between southern New England and the South and as a principal rail link between southern New England and the West. The maintenance of the New Haven's operation is essential to all the New England States. The assistance given by the Federal Government, under the now expired predecessor of section 10 (d) of S. 1062, in the form of Interstate Commerce Commission guarantees for loans totaling $35,600,000, has enabled the New Haven at least to maintain its operational capacity.

But, just as with many other U.S. railroads, the financial assistance already received has been part of only a patchwork approach as contrasted with the comprehensive planning utilized by the World Bank. At this point, the continued life of the New Haven and other New England railroads is dependent upon a comprehensive approach which will assure complete modernization. By tying in with the capital and technical expertise of the World Bank, the guarantee provision in section 10 of S. 1062 will gain new life and new meaning for hard-pressed U.S. railroads, for the commuters and shippers who use them, and for the economy of the Nation.

I urge the Commerce Committee to give this new concept its prompt consideration and to hold hearings on this amendment separately or in connection with other legislation before it even if the committee decides not to take further action on the underlying bill. I believe the concept is worthy of the committee's careful study.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

On page 19, on line 21, insert after the word "purposes," the following: "pursuant to a comprehensive plan for redevelopment prepared jointly by the applicant carrier and the financing institution and designed to give reasonable assurance that such carrier will become economically viable and financially sound".

On page 20, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(5) The term "public financing institution" shall include the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or any of its affiliates in any case where financing guaranteed under the provisions of this section is unavailable on reasonable terms from any other financing institution.

On page 24, line 10, strike out "1963" and insert in lieu thereof "1968".

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I submitted earlier today for World Bank assistance for United States railroads may lie on the desk for additional cosponsors until the close of business on Friday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. Bible, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Cooper) submitted amendments (Nos. 365 and 366), intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committe on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. Bible, and Mr. Saltonstall) submitted an amendment (No. 367), intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 8363, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments (Nos. 368, 369, and 370), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8363, supra, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted an amendment (No. 371), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8363, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL (AMENDMENT NO. 372)

Mr. PASTORE submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, on page 18, line 3, insert the following:

"STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

"For an additional amount for stationery, $60,600: *Provided*, That commencing with the fiscal year 1964 and thereafter the allowance for stationery for each Senator and the President of the Senate shall be at the rate of $2,400 per annum."

Mr. PASTORE also submitted an amendment (No. 372), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 9499, making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. PASTORE also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, on page 18, line 3, insert the following:

"MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

"For an additional amount for 'Miscellaneous items,' $215,000: *Provided*, That effective January 1, 1964, the paragraph relating to official long-distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, under the heading 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' in Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress (2 U.S.C. 46c), as amended, is amended by striking out the words 'one hundred and twenty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'one hundred and sixty' and by striking out the words 'six hundred' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eight hundred'."

Mr. PASTORE also submitted an amendment (No. 373), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 9499, making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. PASTORE also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, on page 18, line 3, insert the following:

"POSTAGE STAMPS

"For an additional amount for air mail and special delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate, $6,060: *Provided*, That the maximum allowance per capita of $550 for air mail and special delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate is increased to $610 for the fiscal year 1964 and thereafter."

Mr. PASTORE also submitted an amendment (No. 374), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 9499, making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ADDITIONAL TIME FOR COSPONSORSHIP OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 139, PROPOSING CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on Thursday, December 12, I introduced an amendment to the Constitution. This measure has now been designated Senate Joint Resolution 139.

At the time of introduction, Mr. President, I asked that Senate Joint Resolution 139 be held at the desk until Wednesday, December 18, 1963, in order that other Senators would have an opportunity to join me in cosponsoring this amendment.

Because of the intense interest being shown in this entire matter of Presidential succession and the complexities of the various proposals, I have received several requests from Senators to extend the time during which this measure will be available for cosponsorship. Therefore, Mr. President, to allow Senators an additional amount of time to review this measure, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 139, previously held at the desk, at my request, until December 18, 1963, be allowed to remain at the desk until January 12, 1964.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL SPONSOR OF AMENDMENT TO SENATE BILL 1975

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] to Senate bill 1975.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30, 31, 35, 37, and 38 to the bill (H.R. 6868) making appropraitions for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 36 and 40 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9413) to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

H.R. 4276. An act to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 6756. An act to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9140. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ADDRESS AT THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on yesterday, President Johnson appeared at the General Assembly of the United Nations. He spoke to the assembled delegations of the world's nations in words which were eloquent in simplicity, sensitivity, and sensibleness.

In the light of the recent tragedy, there was a need to reassure our neighbors on this planet that the influence of the United States would remain committed, as it was under President Kennedy, in a deep concern for the advancement of peace, human rights, and the economic and social welfare of the human race.

That reassurance has now been given by the President of the United States. He spoke to the United Nations in the language of a new administration, but in a spirit rooted in President Kennedy's policies.

Certain editorials—published in the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Baltimore Sun, and other newspapers—make clear that President Johnson's statement was an affirmation to the world that what was so well begun for peace and progress will continue, that we will move forward with any and all nations to build for peace in the many ways in which peace must be built. At the same time, these editorials also make clear that we will stand with the special relationships which link us with Western Europe so long as the Western Europeans are prepared to do the same.

I ask unanimous consent that three of these editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 18, 1963]

The New Era

President Johnson used his first appearance before the United Nations General Assembly to emphasize the continuity of the policy of this country. It was a good thing to do and his words and his act demonstrated not only American policy, but in addition the usefulness of the General Assembly as a forum, in this kind of situation.

It was clearly the object of this appearance to show that the old policies are still in effect and not to disclose new policies departing from those of his predecessor. This intention put the President into a framework that did not permit either innovation or particularization. He managed, however, to restate the purposes of this Government with force and conviction. Both his words and the serious and earnest delivery of the President must have made an impression upon an Assembly in a better position than anybody in the world to disseminate to the four quarters of the globe an estimate of the new President of the United States.

While the President was primarily concerned with making it plain that the old era goes on, he achieved, by the force and vigor of his utterance, a new emphasis on this country's concern with poverty everywhere in the world.

He did not proclaim any new policy or outline any direct measures to wage the war against want. He did not set out in detail any plan to carry to the whole world the national New Deal policy that Franklin Delano Roosevelt enunciated in the 1930's with his famous phrase about the one-third of the Nation that were "ill housed, ill clad, ill nourished." But he nonetheless left a clear impression that the evidences of poverty in many countries he visited as Vice President made a profound impression on him. And he made it evident that it is his intention to place the eradication of this kind of human misery high on his list of national objectives. If the strong words he used are followed by strong measures he will have added to "New Deal" and "New Frontier" a "New Era" in human affairs.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 18, 1963]

The Road to Peace

At a moment when assertive nationalism is again raising its head and even old alliances begin to fray, President Johnson has issued a new call for collective international action to ease tension, to end the cold war and all war, and to fight the real enemies of man—hunger, poverty, and disease.

The President sounded his call in messages to the two principal pillars on which American policy is based—the United Nations and the North Atlantic alliance. He made it plain, first, that the policies and purposes of the United States remain unchanged; and second, that foreign policy will not be subordinated to parochial domestic concerns.

Mr. Johnson's personal appearance before the United Nations so early in his administration gave special emphasis to both points. He pledged unswerving support to the United Nations as the best instrument yet devised to promote peace and the well-being of mankind. He asked all nations to work together for a peaceful revolution—not to impose a new way of life on all—but to make the world safe for diversity under the rule of law. What particularly impressed and pleased the delegates from the new nations was his espousal of the rights of man for all men, irrespective of color, at home and abroad, and his stress on collective machinery to help the less-developed countries to build modern societies and a better world. The neo-nationalists and isolationists in Congress who would wreck the foreign aid program might well take note.

The theme of collective action and peace also ran through Mr. Johnson's message of steadfast support for the North Atlantic alliance. He stressed collective action by urging, in contrast to the views of President de Gaulle, both a united Europe and an Atlantic partnership as keys to Western security and to peace.

While the President enunciated no new policy, his vigorous reaffirmation of American determination to achieve a genuinely peaceful world—coupled with his explicit plea for an end to the cold war—can leave no doubt in Mr. Khrushchev's, or anyone else's, mind just where we stand. As Mr. Johnson said, we know what we want—and what we want is a world in which every nation can live its own life in peace, security and independence, while recognizing its interdependence with every other.

AND TO WESTERN UNITY

President Johnson's message to NATO makes it clear that West-West relations are going to get at least as much attention as East-West relations in 1964. The new President went beyond NATO's military issues to the broader political, economic and psychological problems confronted by the Atlantic world. He addressed himself briefly but eloquently to the central task we must fact if Atlantic unity is not to succumb to the nagging, low-grade fever that now is debilitating it. That task, as Dean Acheson has phrased it, is "to get the Atlantic community moving again."

Movement requires, first of all, European confidence in American purposes and perseverance. Europe has become the eastern frontier region of one Atlantic world. Nothing erodes confidence there more abrasively than querulous talk about withdrawing American troops. Such withdrawals would not reduce our involvement in Europe. They might actually increase it. And such talk, one may hope, will now be halted by the President's firm statement, going beyond Mr. Kennedy's pledge, that the six American divisions in Europe would remain "so long as they are needed." Mr. Johnson emphasized that "there is no doubt" that these forces will continue to be needed under present circumstances.

To this constancy in the American military commitment, President Johnson has added a rededication to imaginative programs designed to unite Europeans among themselves and with America for an attack on "all the great and burdensome tasks of building and defending a community of free nations." He talked of the problem of "a balanced NATO defense" by nonnuclear and nuclear forces—toward which Europeans are to contribute through an eight-nation multilateral missile fleet. He evoked "the goal of Atlantic partnership" in monetary affairs, aid to the developing areas and in trade.

The President, who hitherto had addressed himself primarily to the Nation's domestic problems, has now let it be known that he intends to move with equal authority in world affairs. His message was that despite the coming Presidential campaign, there will be no interregnum—for there can be none—in America's role in the world.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Dec. 18, 1963]

The Johnson Speech

Any new President of the United States must appear as soon as possible before the United Nations, to reaffirm our faith in the United Nations and restate this country's broad policy in world affairs. It is the obvious thing: it is one of the duties. When the new President has come suddenly into office, taking the place of a predecessor widely known and notably trusted, the duty becomes urgent, for it then carries with it the requirement of a special reassurance. That reassurance President Johnson provided yesterday, making clear again the fact that in the world we have no Kennedy policy and no Johnson policy—and no Eisenhower or Truman policy—but a national policy, a policy, to put it at its briefest, of peace, strength, and reasonableness.

Mr. Johnson did that yesterday, and he did more. He said what he had to say, indeed, yet said it in terms that carried his address beyond the merely dutiful and ritual. Other American Presidents, in speeches before the United Nations, have offered proposals more dramatic than any Mr. Johnson offered yesterday. None has spoken with deeper conviction, nor has any touched more intimately and surely the thinking and the aspirations of his listeners.

To proclaim that the motivations of the United States are humanitarian is one thing. To note specifically that they are is another thing, and a better. When Mr. Johnson went back into our own domestic history, and our domestic history of not so long ago, to talk of too few jobs, and inadequate housing, and insufficient food, of soil conservation and river valley development, he was talking in terms that all peoples know, and he was talking not from a lofty peak of national wealth and military might—rich and powerful though we are—but from a point of historical perspective, not in pride but in grateful humility. The United States in the thirties, Mr. Johnson said, had effected a peaceful social revolution—a rather startling word, perhaps, to some of his domestic hearers, but an accurate word, and a word sure to be noted by other nations themselves in the process, each in its own way, of social revolution, they hope peacefully.

Not only was it required that Mr. Johnson reassure the world as to the policies of his country. He had also to reassure the world about himself. In a sense he stood yesterday on trial. He was obligated to say who he was, and what he was. In our opinion his revelation of his own thinking, shown in the particular terms and form he chose for a speech he had to make, will do a good deal to inform other peoples who have been asking what the new President of the United States is like.

We in this country, who have been asking the same question in our own way, have been further instructed, too.

LIVESTOCK PRICES AND BEEF IMPORTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the present livestock prices, and particularly fat cattle prices, are ruinous to our livestockmen.

Livestock prices are 25 percent lower than they were a year ago, and this is disastrous. Recently, Roderick Turnbull, farm editor of the Kansas City Star, wrote an article in which he called attention to the fact that livestock prices had dropped 25 percent, and suggested that a 25-percent drop in steel prices would not only cause national concern, but also would get immediate attention on the part of the Government.

I think this has merit, and urge that the Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Tariff Commission advise the President of this situation, and request him to immediately place a limitation on beef imports.

I ask unanimous consent that the article which appeared in the December 8 issue of the Kansas City Star be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Livestock, on Farm and Market—Cattlemen Bitter at Beef Imports

(By Roderick Turnbull)

Around the cattle pens at the stockyards the gloom is about as thick as a London fog.

The slightest effort to raise prices brings in more cattle and the price then falls lower than it was before. In such a situation pessimism flourishes and you hear the commission men, who reflect the feelings of farmers, say that things may have to get worse before they get better.

One Kansas farmer with some fat heifers ready to go, said he didn't send them to market 2 weeks ago because he hated to face the loss that he would have encountered at the prices then. Last week his losses would have been even greater.

When will the change for the better come?

The obvious answer is, when the amount of beef coming to market is sufficiently less than now to come nearer matching demand at a higher price.

No one at the yards knows when that time will be. But a lot of the cattlemen and commission men, too, believe it would arrive much sooner if something were done quickly to halt or cut down on the imports of beef coming in from Australia and New Zealand.

COMPLAINTS ARE GENERAL

It is a common thing to hear a farmer or commission man say, "You can't make me believe that imports to the extent of 10 percent of our total beef consumption don't hurt our market; I don't care what they say about the quality of the meat coming in."

"They" in this case is the Department of Agriculture which at least until recently was seeking to show that the frozen beef imported was all used as hamburger or in processed meats and did not compete with the higher quality U.S. meat. The imported meat, it was contended, was the equivalent of U.S. cow meat and cow prices, it was contended further, had not dropped as much as prices on fed beef.

But around the yards, when they are talking about beef prices 25 percent lower than a year ago, they are not inclined to be overly reasonable. They ask, what other business could take a 25-percent cut in the prices on its product and survive?

"Suppose steel prices took a drop of one-fourth, wouldn't there be a howl in this country?" one veteran commission man asked, adding, "And wouldn't the Government be doing something about it, too?"

Said another:

"If something doesn't happen to improve this market pretty soon, you're going to see a whole new crop of people in the cattle business."

All the while such conversation is going on, they all know that the cattle business will continue, that it has had its bad periods before, that many oldtimers have lived and operated through several such periods.

But that doesn't make the low prices now any more palatable. Nor does it keep the cattlemen from cussing the imports.

SNIPE AT CHAINSTORES, TOO

The chainstores come in for some words, too. Talk to farmers for awhile and likely they'll argue that they can't see where prices on beef at the store have dropped anywhere near as much as the prices on live animals in the market. They're interested in lower prices at the store, because they assume that if people would eat more beef—which presumably would be a result of lower prices—the excess beef would be used up sooner and prices would get back to the profitable level.

Farmers will agree, however, that beef consumption is pretty good right now. It will perhaps set a per capita record this year.

This question of beef imports will get a full airing at the convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association the latter part of January in Memphis. At least four experts on foreign trade in beef will be among the speakers on the program.

One commission man at the yards has it figured out that at current prices heavy feeder cattle are a better buy than the lighter kinds. He is so informing his customers. This comes about, he contends, because prices on the heavier feeder cattle have dropped more than on the light cattle. The beef a feeder buys on 800-pound cattle as compared to that on 550-pound animals costs him less than it would cost him to put the same weight on the lighter animal, he says.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier; and

S. 1319. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grun (Susanne Roth);

S. 1175. An act to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

S. 1756. An act to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act;

S. 1838. An act for the relief of Hannah Robbins; and

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week."

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 246) relating to the enrollment of H.R. 8667, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE DALLAS STORY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, all Americans—indeed, people the world over—were deeply shocked by the tragic assassination of President Kennedy.

Americans will recall that only a few weeks before the assassination, Adlai Stevenson was spat upon and mauled by residents of Dallas when he spoke in that city on the 18th anniversary of the United Nations. Ambassador Stevenson strongly urged President Kennedy not to include Dallas in his Texas trip. It was in this city that the now President and First Lady were assaulted in the 1960 campaign. Mrs. Johnson's hat was nearly knocked from her head. The chief of police advised the then candidate for Vice President against walking through the lobby of a Dallas hotel. He refused saying:

> The time will never come when Lyndon Johnson is afraid to walk his lady through the lobby of a Texas hotel.

John F. Kennedy now belongs to the ages—to his country always. The Special Commission appointed by the President and headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren is now at work trying to determine all the facts as to exactly what happened in Dallas. I am sure that this report will be thorough and complete.

However, no matter what rationalization is offered, Dallas is a city which fostered a climate wherein the President of the United States could be assassinated and his killer murdered in jail. Cities which tolerate this atmosphere without concern eventually must pay a heavy price for their negligence. Dallas did. Dallas does not stand alone. There are too many places in our Nation where hatred, intolerance, and extremism has been allowed to flourish uncriticized, unhampered, and unchecked. Let us hope that the terrible events at Dallas will make all of us more aware of the dangers of intolerance and hatred.

Mr. President, on December 16, in the Plain Dealer of Cleveland, one of Ohio's great newspapers and one of the great newspapers of the Nation, there appeared an editorial entitled "The Dallas Story." I commend this to my colleagues and request unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Dallas Story

The Plain Dealer, through a series of on-the-scene background stories by reporter Doris O'Donnell, has painted a picture of Dallas.

No matter what rationalization is offered, Dallas is a city which fostered a climate wherein the President of the United States could be assassinated and his killer murdered in jail.

It is a city where political figures have been roughed up and spat upon, where sanctity of human life is in low esteem.

People who tolerate this atmosphere without concern, who nurture it even indirectly, are enemies of mankind. They are, no matter how they see themselves, the enemies of true freedom which has no boundaries and knows no differentiation based on race, color, religious belief, or political creed.

Dallas does not stand alone.

Medgar Evers was shot down in Jackson, Miss., by the very same hate, the very fanaticism he was seeking to remove.

But Dallas had prided itself on a self-applied reputation for freedom. It has spawned all kinds of fervent groups of political-patriotic nature. But it also gave birth to the extreme standard that a man either is a super-patriot or a Communist—using the Dallas yardstick. It gave sustenance to hate.

Good leadership might have saved Dallas.

> But good leadership was not there in the period when this boiling hate, this frontier type of six-shooter justice, was permitted to expand.
>
> The leadership could have come from an influential press but, in the case of the Dallas Morning News, this was sadly lacking. It accepted and printed malicious advertising.
>
> With a chance to be a leader of men, the newspaper instead followed a crowd.
>
> It has been quipped that the shot which triggered Dallas' greatest tragedy came from the left but the applause came from the right.
>
> But being conservative, elsewhere, hasn't meant hating to the degree it has developed in Texas and environs.
>
> It would be a wrong to condemn all Dallas for the act of one mentally deranged killer.
>
> But there must be a vicarious guilt because the right forces were unable, either from lack of conviction or lack of effort, to dispel a sinister emotional atmosphere. It was this atmosphere the Plain Dealer has portrayed in an effort to help explain a situation which needs altering so much, and so quickly.

MEDICARE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is once again hearing testimony on the late President Kennedy's proposal for medical and nursing home insurance for the elderly under social security coverage, commonly termed "medicare."

Frankly, there is no need for additional hearings. More than four volumes of testimony have already been taken by the Ways and Means Committee. New hearings will mean only additional delay. These hearings are likely to add little, if anything, to the debate on medicare which has been going on since 1960. Now, almost 3 full years later, all sides have been heard. All arguments have been made. It is time to settle down to the business of enacting this needed legislation into law.

There are more than 17 million Americans over 65 years of age, most of them less able to pay the high costs of hospital and nursing home care than they were in their younger years. One serious illness can swiftly wipe out the lifetime savings of an elderly person. Furthermore, many Americans, regardless of age, have parents or relatives who have little or no financial resources, and are likely to be ill at one time or another. These families desire—in fact find it necessary—to save for their children's education and for other necessary expenditures. If prolonged illness should afflict a parent or other elderly relative, and surgery is required, or specialized nursing home treatment, average American families should not be compelled to incur colossal debt or pay from savings accumulated for other purposes.

It is, indeed, a tragedy that here in the richest nation in the world millions of our citizens live in constant fear that their savings will be washed away by prolonged illness or injury.

It is unbelievable that many Americans spend what should be golden years in darkness and despair, and some meet tragic deaths because of disinterestedness and neglect. In Fitchville, Ohio—only 7 miles from Norwalk where I was born and reared—a fire recently destroyed the Golden Age Rest Home.

Sixty-three elderly invalids burned to death. All of these unfortunate citizens were placed in the rest home by relatives who would not or could not afford to keep them, or by a State whose officials were apparently not really concerned about them. Many were forgotten elderly men and women whose relatives did not even know they were there. With savings exhausted and heavy medical expenses these former workers, farmers, businessmen, and housewives were living in what was originally an abandoned toy factory, with cinderblock floors, wooden walls, and a tar roof. There were no fire prevention measures or protection from the raging flames which destroyed the home. In addition, inexcusable and tragic negligence resulted in an increased number of horrible deaths of many of the inmates of this rest home, so called. The locked door to the home could not be opened from the inside by elderly residents lacking the key, and they were too feeble to crash it open in this moment of terror and horror.

It is unfortunate that every time the Congress has sought to solve the problem of hospital and nursing home care for the elderly and thereby to eliminate the possibility of a tragedy such as that of Fitchville, the American public has been subjected to a barrage of high-priced propaganda designed to surround the medicare proposal with a smokescreen of misinformation. The 227 ruling members of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association haul out their big guns and spend big money to denounce medicare as "socialized medicine." This charge is, of course, false. Nevertheless, I am sure I can safely predict that we shall hear it again shortly. It is well known that the American Medical Association maintains a powerful lobby in Washington.

I, for one, cannot take the absurd charges of the AMA too seriously, for I remember well the long list of progressive legislation which was noisily resisted by this group and tagged as "state socialism" or "socialized medicine"—social security, free diagnostic centers for persons afflicted with tuberculosis and cancer, Red Cross blood banks, voluntary health insurance, Blue Cross, and school health services.

I am reminded of a story told in my State of Ohio a few years ago, concerning one of the two applicants for welfare that year who were over 100 years of age. The man had retired at the age of 70. He ran out of money at 92. This man then went to live with his daughter, but 8 years later his son-in-law retired. There was, then, not enough money to care for both families. So the old man applied for relief at the age of 100. I suppose officials of the American Medical Association would accuse him of poor planning.

Mr. President, the American people have not swallowed the propaganda pills prescribed for them by a few political medicine men who control the American Medical Association. The majority of Americans overwhelmingly support hospital and nursing home care for the elderly under social security as the only realistic and fair means of dealing with this problem.

Programs other than that embodying the social security approach to the problem have been tried and have met with little success. One of these is the Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged program signed into law by President Eisenhower. It is a personal, happy recollection that my vote was cast against enactment of that bill in 1960. The fact is that not one elderly individual in my State of Ohio, as well as in 22 other States, has been even remotely aided by the operation of the Kerr-Mills Act.

Only 28 of our 50 States presently have Kerr-Mills medical assistance programs. Benefits vary widely among them. Eligibility for assistance also varies widely. Whether medical assistance will be forthcoming for the elderly citizen has become a matter of geography—a matter of where he happens to live. However, regardless of geography, every elderly person and every taxpayer pays for the Kerr-Mills program which is financed by tax dollars from general Federal revenues. Because of this, the program is supported by many citizens who can never benefit from it, as their States are nonparticipants.

In contrast to this, a social security "medicare" program would enable every citizen to receive needed assistance, regardless of where he or she lives. The program would be paid for by all participants out of their own premiums and by slightly increased payment of premiums also from employers paid into the social security trust funds during their economically productive years rather than by increased Federal spending or from general revenues.

Recent reports by individual investigatory groups have confirmed the arguments of opponents to the Kerr-Mills law as an inequitable and inadequate program. After thorough consideration, a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging, headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], termed Kerr-Mills "ineffective and piecemeal." In addition, a lengthy study of Kerr-Mills by the New York State Department of Social Welfare concludes—

> There appears little doubt that the soundest approach to providing medical care for the aged is for basic care to be covered by old-age survivors and disability insurance—social security.

Adding hospital and nursing home insurance for the elderly to the present social security system would be a simple matter. The employer and employee, by the payment of only one-quarter of 1 percent each during the time when the employee is working, would cause enough additional revenue to flow into the social security fund to keep it actuarially sound to accommodate the new program. Self-employed persons would pay three-eighths of 1 percent from their earnings. This program would be self-financing, and would protect men and women at age 65, following their retirement from employment.

Mr. President, we must be realistic and legislate in recognition of the fact that medical and surgical expenses for older people are three times the expenses incurred by those in their forties, or even those in their fifties. It is a fact that medical expenses rise sharply with increasing years. At the same time, for most people, the ability to meet them declines rapidly once they are off the payroll.

Mr. President, in view of overwhelming evidence in support of the need for hospital and nursing home care for the elderly under social security coverage, further delay on the part of the Congress is unwarranted. To satisfy the reactionary leaders of the AMA, additional hearings and additional delay may be "just what the doctor ordered." Meanwhile, the patient, so to speak, suffers. Meanwhile, elderly citizens and their relatives continue to bear the burden of huge medical costs.

Hospital and nursing home care for the elderly under social security coverage will help all of those who need help—instead of only those who are already poverty stricken. It will prevent poverty from becoming the necessary result of prolonged illness or serious accident. Unlike the Kerr-Mills program, it will be soundly financed by the earnings and savings of those who receive benefits rather than by bigger Federal spending of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, all Americans ask that the Ways and Means Committee this time send the medicare bill to the floor of the House of Representatives where a vote may be taken by the elected representatives of the American people. The problem of hospital and nursing home care for the elderly is of extreme importance. Neither the powerful AMA lobby, nor a single small group of legislators, should be permitted to sit in supreme judgment on this or any other issue.

No committee of the Congress should reduce itself to a permanent pigeonhole for any sound and widely supported piece of legislation. I do not ask that the members of the Ways and Means Committee report the medicare bill favorably if they do not choose to do so. I only hope they report the so-called medicare bill. Only if and when the bill is reported can definite action be taken, one way or another.

If and when a proper and representative vote on medicare is taken, I am confident that it will be passed. Medicare can and will become as much a part of the American scene as our very sound and successful social security insurance system itself.

Medicare was an issue in 1960. It was again an issue in 1962. For 1964, we do not need a medicare issue—we need a medicare program. This will be a victory for all Americans. My hope and my belief is that hospital and nursing home care for the elderly legislation will become law before this Congress adjourns. I am certain that we in the Senate have the affirmative votes to pass this needed legislation when we are given that opportunity.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON EXPORT EXPANSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, President Johnson has just issued an Executive order establishing the Interagency Committee on Export Expansion. This committee has been formed to advise the Secretary of Commerce with regard to finding means for developing and stimulating a more effective export expansion program. I believe this is all to the good.

I invite attention to the fact that I have had a bill pending since May 27 calling for exactly the same thing—for the establishment of a National Advisory Council on Export Expansion Policy and Operations, a bill which is sponsored by myself and Senators CASE, COOPER, ENGLE, HUMPHREY, KEATING, LONG of Missouri, MORSE, MOSS, SCOTT, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

The membership, objectives, and organization of the Council that would be provided under my bill are practically identical with that of the Interagency Committee established by the President's Executive order.

My reason for speaking today is that I believe the President should consider whether or not it would be better, nonetheless, to have the bill passed. I thoroughly join with the President in the purpose of export expansion and coordination of Government agencies charged with it.

By passing the bill the Interagency Committee provided for could have staff and might be given other authority it would not have by Executive order. It might even qualify for an independent appropriation.

I believe this matter is of such importance that it would be a mistake to sink the committee into the departmental budget of some department like the Department of Commerce. I hope very much that, notwithstanding the issuance of the Executive order, the administration will nonetheless support the bill and give such an important committee as this a statutory basis for being.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, at the conclusion of these brief remarks I shall read into the RECORD a list of treaties, bills, and resolutions approved by the Senate that were reported from the Foreign Relations Committee.

The list speaks largely for itself. Perhaps, the most unique features of this year's activities have been the thoroughness of the foreign aid bill examination and the hearings and debate on the limited nuclear test ban treaty. If I were asked to characterize the activities of the committee during this past year, I would say that it was a year of reexamining and carrying forward of established programs rather than of great innovations other than the limited test ban treaty and perhaps the coffee agreement.

The one special study carried on by the committee during this period was that of the effectiveness of the Foreign Agents Registration Act and this was brought to a successful conclusion with the introduction of strengthening amendments to this act, which the committee will consider early next year.

I take this opportunity to thank the members of the committee for their devotion to duty, their conscientiousness and perseverence. Especially without the untiring efforts of the ranking majority and minority members [Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. HICKENLOOPER], this record would not have been possible.

TREATIES ACTED ON

First. Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater, signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963, on behalf of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Approved September 24, 1963, by a vote of 80 to 19.

Second. Convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the solution of the problem of the Chamizal, signed at Mexico City on August 29, 1963. Approved on December 17, 1963, by a vote of 79 to 1.

Third. The International Coffee Agreement, 1962, which was opened for signature in New York on September 28, 1962, in the English, French, Russian, Spanish, and Portuguese languages, and was signed on that date in behalf of the United States of America and a number of other countries. Approved May 21, 1963, by a vote of 69 to 20.

Fourth. Consular convention between the United States of America and Korea signed at Seoul on January 8, 1963. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Fifth. Protocol dated at Rome September 15, 1962, to amend the Convention on International Civil Aviation done at Chicago on December 7, 1944. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Sixth. Consular convention between the United States of America and Japan, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Tokyo on March 22, 1963. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Seventh. Convention on extradition between the United States of America and Sweden, together with a related protocol, signed at Washington on October 24, 1961. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Eighth. Additional protocol to the treaty of extradition on January 13, 1961, between the United States of America and the United States of Brazil, which additional protocol was signed at Rio de Janeiro on June 18, 1962. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Ninth. Convention on extradition between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the State of Israel, signed at Washington, December 10, 1962. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

First. H.R. 7885, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended and for other purposes. Authorizes $3.6 billion for fiscal year 1964. Public Law 88–205. Approved December 16, 1963.

Second. H.R. 9009, to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended. Authorizes $102 million for fiscal year 1964. Public Law 88–200. Approved December 13, 1963.

Third. S. 777, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees. Authorizes $20 million for 2 years. Public Law 88–186. Approved November 26, 1963.

Fourth. S. 1627, to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control of Laos (ICC) as provided in article 18 of the Protocol to the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos. Passed Senate July 16, 1963.

Fifth. S. 1512, to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes. Passed Senate July 16, 1963.

Sixth. H.R. 5207, to amend the Foreign Service Building Act of 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes and to amend the Philippine War Damage Claims Act of 1962. Public Law 88–94. Approved August 12, 1963.

Seventh. H.R. 7405, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for an increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock. Public Law 88–178. Approved November 13, 1963.

Eighth. S. 2213, to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency. Amended and passed Senate December 6, 1963.

Ninth. S. 949, to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended (63 Stat. 734–736). Amended and passed Senate December 6, 1963.

Tenth. H.R. 7044, to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission. Passed Senate December 17, 1963.

Eleventh. House Joint Resolution 778, to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law, and authorizing appropriations therefor. Passed Senate December 17, 1963.

Twelfth. Senate Joint Resolution 60, providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization. Public Law 88–65. Approved July 17, 1963.

Thirteenth. House Joint Resolution 405, to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property. Public Law 88–69. Approved July 19, 1963.

Fourteenth. House Joint Resolution 779, to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder. Amended and passed Senate December 17, 1963.

Fifteenth. Senate Joint Resolution 72, favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968. Public Law 88–124. Approved September 16, 1963.

Sixteenth. House Joint Resolution 324, extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States. Public Law 88–95. Approved August 12, 1963.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Senate Concurrent Resolution 58, to print 5,000 additional copies of hearings on Executive M, 88th Congress, 1st session. House amendment agreed to by Senate on October 28, 1963.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS

First. Senate Resolution 168, accepting an invitation to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Association to be held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaya. Agreed to July 11, 1963.

Second. Senate Resolution 25, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine, investigate, and make studies of matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration. Agreed to March 14, 1963.

Third. Senate Resolution 26, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals. Agreed to March 14, 1963.

Fourth. Senate Resolution 152, to print as a Senate document the study entitled "Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership—II." Agreed to June 17, 1963.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS

Seventy-five nominations for appointments as Ambassadors, officials in the State Department, and so forth, were confirmed as well as 1,420 nominations in the Foreign Service.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit the following summary of activities of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, 88th Congress, 1st session:

Public Law 88–28, authorizing appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. Authorizes appropriations for these purposes in the amount of $15,314,291,000.

Public Law 88–2, extending the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Extends for a period of 4 years, from July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1967, the following provisions of law: first, the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces; second, the authority to issue selective service calls for physicians and dentists and allied specialists; third, the suspension of permanent limitations on the active duty strength of the Armed Forces; fourth, the authority to pay a quarters allowance to all enlisted members of the Armed Forces with dependents, irrespective of rank, if the dependents are not furnished Government quarters; and fifth, the authority for special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians.

Public Law 88–132, military pay increase. Provides increases in pay for members of the uniformed services totaling $1,213 million over a full fiscal year.

Public Law 88–174, military construction authorization, authorizes military construction and provides authorization for housing construction and maintenance in a total of $1,642,253,380.

Public Law 88–110, extension of 6-month training program. Revises, consolidates, and extends the laws under which the so-called 6-month training program and other special Reserve enlistment programs have been operated.

Public Law 88–63, improvement of promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of major to the grade of lieutenant colonel. Extends for 2 years—until June 30, 1965—temporary authority for an additional 4,000 officers in the grade of lieutenant colonel in the Air Force.

Public Law 88–77, award of medals for heroism and gallantry. Expands authority for award of the Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, the Air Force Cross, and the Silver Star to permit award of these medals for heroism and gallantry that occur in cold war situations.

NOMINATIONS

Considered 62,026 nominations. Ten committee meetings required for consideration of civilian and military officials to statutory offices traditionally involving personal appearances by nominees before committee.

SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

Held hearings on Cuban military buildup, arms control, and disarmament questions, and the award of research contracts for V/TOL and S/TOL aircraft.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY SUBCOMMITTEE

Performed legislative oversight over Central Intelligence Agency, and the policies and programs being carried out by that Agency under the National Security Act and the Central Intelligence Act of 1949.

NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES SUBCOMMITTEE

Conducted study and investigation of the national stockpile and began hearings on legislative recommendations it formulated to revise and consolidate stockpile laws and to permit orderly disposal of stockpile excesses. Recommended legislation authorizing disposal of excess quantities of cadmium and waterfowl feathers and down from the national stockpile.

STATUS OF FORCES SUBCOMMITTEE

Conducted hearings and issued report on the part of the NATO Status of Forces Treaty relating to criminal jurisdiction not waived by host countries in which U.S. forces are stationed.

OFFICER GRADE LIMITATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Considered reports submitted by military departments on officer grade distribution.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUBCOMMITTEE

Conducted hearings on H.R. 8200, which would authorize contributions toward cost of construction in public buildings incorporating fallout shelter space.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, FIRST SESSION, 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as of today, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and its subcommittees have conducted 137 days of public hearings and have met in executive session on 30 days. The committee has met in conference with the House 13 days. Thirty bills and four Senate resolutions have been reported by the committee.

Twelve bills reported from the committee have been enacted into law or are awaiting the President's signature. Seventeen bills reported by the committee have been passed by the Senate but not finally acted upon by the House. Two bills reported by the committee are pending on the Senate calendar. One of them, S. 2379, the arts bill, is expected to be considered by the Senate tomorrow afternoon, on December 18. One bill awaits House approval of Senate amendments.

EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE

H.R. 4955, expansion of vocational education, and extension of National Defense Education Act and impacted areas legislation—awaiting President's signature.

H.R. 6143, grants and loans for construction of academic facilities in institutions of higher learning—enacted into law December 16, 1963. Public Law 88-204.

S. 2265, to amend the Library Services Act in order to increase the amount of assistance and to extend such assistance to nonrural areas. Passed the Senate November 26, 1963.

HEALTH SUBCOMMITTEE

H.R. 12, construction of medical school facilities and loans to medical students—enacted into law September 24. Public Law 88-129.

S. 1576, construction of community mental health centers, mental retardation facilities and training of teachers of handicapped children. Enacted into law October 31, 1963. Public Law 88-164.

S. 2220, to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists. Passed the Senate December 9, 1963.

Senate Joint Resolution 103, increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. Passed the Senate November 20, 1963.

LABOR SUBCOMMITTEE

S. 910, equal pay for women. Enacted into law June 10—Public Law 88-38.

MIGRATORY LABOR SUBCOMMITTEE

S. 521, educational opportunities for migrant workers and children. Passed the Senate June 10.

S. 522, day care for migrant children. Passed the Senate June 10.

S. 523, extending child labor provisions of FLSA to children in agriculture. Passed the Senate June 11.

S. 524, crew leader registration. Passed the Senate June 11.

S. 525, National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor. Passed the Senate June 10.

S. 526, sanitation facilities for migrant workers. Passed the Senate June 10.

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS SUBCOMMITTEE

S. 1321, creating a National Service Corps. Passed the Senate August 14.

VETERANS' SUBCOMMITTEE

S. 5, cold war GI bill, reported from committee July 2.

S. 625, hospital care for veterans in Alaska and Hawaii. Passed the Senate June 19.

S. 330, extending authority of State approval agencies under war orphans educational assistance program. Enacted into law September 23—Public Law 88-126.

H.R. 249, extending program of grants to the Philippines for certain veterans. Enacted into law June 13—Public Law 88-40.

H.R. 4549, relating to employment of chief medical director in the VA. Enacted into law May 8—Public Law 88-18.

H.R. 242, veterans waiver of indebtedness. Enacted into law October 17—Public Law 88-151.

S. 384, amending Sailors' and Soldiers' Civil Relief Act. Passed the Senate May 28.

S. 449, automobiles for disabled veterans. Passed the Senate May 28.

S. 2064, to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guarantee revolving fund.

H.R. 5691, to allot the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the chief medical director authority to act upon recommendations of disciplinary boards.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

S. 729, amending the Railroad Retirement Act and related statutes. H.R. 8100 passed in lieu thereof, enacted into law October 5—Public Law 88-133.

EMPLOYMENT AND MANPOWER SUBCOMMITTEE

S. 1, Youth Conservation Corps and youth employment. Passed the Senate April 10, 1963.

S. 1967, extending the Juvenile Delinquency Act. Passed the Senate September 25.

H.R. 8720, amending and expanding the Manpower Development and Training Act. The Senate agreed to the House amendments on December 13 in lieu of the provisions of S. 1716 and S. 1831, which passed the Senate on September 4 and September 6, respectively. The bill is awaiting the President's signature.

Nation's manpower revolution—no specific bill—hearings begun May 20, extending until December 5, on 49 days.

NOMINATIONS

Fourteen major nominations were reported by the committee, all of which were confirmed by the Senate.

LIST OF MEASURES FAVORABLY REPORTED TO THE SENATE BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY—88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported 20 bills as shown on the attached list.

Twenty-two days of hearings have been held in connection with these and other bills being studied by the committee. We considered and reported 6 nominations and approved approximately 25 watershed projects.

A number of bills are pending before the committee which may receive early consideration during the second session beginning in January 1964.

The list is as follows:

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. 51, partially retrocedes jurisdiction over the Pole Mountain district of the Medicine Bow National Forest. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture June 26, 1963.

S. 277, increases number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year from 100 to 150. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture August 28, 1963.

S. 400, provides penalties for misuse of feed made available to relieve distress or preserve foundation herds. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture June 26, 1963.

S. 581, extends for 2 years the authority for leasing tobacco acreage allotments. Approved July 19, 1963—Public Law 88-68.

S. 582, extends for 2 years the exemption of "boiled peanuts" from marketing quotas. Approved July 19, 1963—Public Law 88-76.

S. 623, provides for payments to assist agricultural producers in Alaska to carry out farmland development measures. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture June 26, 1963.

S. 692, authorizes establishment of an agricultural program for Guam. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture December 9, 1963.

S. 762, provides for increased 1963 wheat acreage allotments in Tulelake area of California. Approved July 17, 1963—Public Law 88-64.

S. 1388, extends Cache National Forest to include lands in and near the Pineview Reservoir site, Weber Basin project. Approved August 19, 1963—Public Law 88-99.

S. 1588, authorizes extension of conservation reserve contracts through 1965, and increases annual limit on cropland conversion program to $20 million. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture October 14, 1963.

S. 1604, permits rice producer withdrawing from rice production to transfer his production history for allotment purposes without transferring his land. Passed Senate July 22, 1963.

S. 1605, amends Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to abolish registration under protest and permit registration number to be shown on label. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture October 23, 1963.

S. 1703, extends Mexican farm labor program 1 year. Approved December 13, 1963—Public Law 88-203.

S. 1915, makes it clear that Secretary of Agriculture may provide for allotments under milk marketing orders so that instead of receiving a uniform blend price, producers will receive a higher return on allotment milk and a lower return on excess milk. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture October 14, 1963.

S. 2218, transfers 360 acres from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior for the Foothills Parkway. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture December 9, 1963.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

H.R. 40, provides for grants for the construction of research facilities at State agricultural experiment stations. Approved July 22, 1963—Public Law 88-74.

H.R. 4997, extends the 1963 feed grain program through 1965. Approved May 20, 1963—Public Law 87-26.

H.R. 5067, permits limited transfers of 1963 cotton acreage allotments which could not be planted because of natural disasters. Committee was discharged from further consideration of this bill on the day after the day it was referred to the committee. Approved April 26, 1963—Public Law 88-12.

H.R. 5860, amends the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 to permit deductions for promotion and research activities. Approved July 8, 1963—Public Law 88-61.

House Joint Resolution 192, validates certain rice acreage allotments for 1962 and earlier years. Approved October 28, 1963—Public Law 88-160.

House Joint Resolution 403, extended time for filing of leases of 1963 tobacco acreage allotments until 20 days after its enactment. Approved July 30, 1963—Public Law 88-80.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the Committee on Government Operations has reported 27 bills and resolutions, all of which have been approved by the Senate. Of these, six are presently pending in the House.

Two of the latter bills are of major importance.

S. 537, proposing the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget, which was reported unanimously by the committee on April 15, and passed the Senate without opposition on May 20, 1963. It was then referred to the House Committee on Rules, where no action has been taken. The purpose of this bill is to provide the Congress with the machinery necessary to enable it to meet its constitutional responsibilities in connection with the appropriation of funds required for the conduct of the Federal Government. The bill, if enacted, would accomplish this objective by establishing a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, which would assist the Congress in exercising adequate control over the expenditure of public funds by the executive branch of the Government.

S. 537 is designed to provide the same kind of expert staff facilities and detailed technical information for the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, on a 12-month basis, as the Bureau of the Budget provides for the executive branch. Precedent for this action is found in the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation which has provided joint expert staff facilities and technical information for the revenue committees of both Houses of the Congress for more than a quarter of a century.

The enactment of this bill would, in my opinion, provide a method of expediting action on appropriation bills and permit the Congress to authorize the funds necessary for the efficient operation of the Government at the beginning of the fiscal year; thus avoiding the delays that have developed in the present Congress.

Another important bill, S. 816, provides for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology. This bill was reported by the committee on March 4, 1963, and passed the Senate on March 8 without opposition. The objective of the bill is to provide for the creation of a Hoover-type commission composed of members of the legislative and executive branches, imminent scientists and engineers, and other outstanding experts in the field of science and techology, in order that a complete study might be made of all phases of the scientific and technological activities of the Government, with a directive to submit appropriate recommendations to the Congress and the President for the reorganization of existing agencies, with the objective of properly coordinating and effecting efficiency and economy in the operations of Federal research and development programs.

S. 816 was referred to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics on March 11 where no action has been taken. The ranking minority member, Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE of Texas, also introduced a companion measure in the House which is also pending before that committee.

In addition to the bills reported by the committee, extensive hearings have been held either by the full committee or by one of its subcommittees, which cover matters of major importance, such as S. 815, adjustment of legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes; S. 855, to provide for more effective utilization of certain Federal grants by encouraging coordinated local review of State and local applications for grants; S. 2114, to provide for periodic review of Federal grants-in-aid to States and local units of government; H.R. 4638, to promote the orderly transfer of Executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President; and providing further controls over Government competition with private enterprise.

The committee expects to give consideration to these bills in the next session of the Congress, as well as to a number of other bills proposing amendments to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act; the further extension of the Reorganization Act of 1949; a number of bills relating to the disposal of surplus Federal property for public purposes, including Ellis Island and Mitchel Field, in New York, and various properties in other sections of the United States; and for the coordinating and promotion of efficient leasing and maintenance of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies.

Where hearings have not yet been held, such as on the last named proposal (H.R. 5171) and the extension of the Reorganization Act, it will be necessary for the committee to hold rather extensive hearings in view of the interest that has been manifested.

In connection with its consideration of legislation pending before it, the committee, including its subcommittees, has issued a number of special reports on "A Joint Committee on the Budget," Senate Report No. 141; "The Authority of the Senate to Originate Appropriation Bills," Senate Document No. 17; "Establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology," Senate Report No. 16; "Government Competition With Private Enterprise," committee print; "Federal Disaster Relief Manual," committee print; and others relating to intergovernmental relations; national security; staffing procedures and problems; the Ambassador and the problem of coordination; drug research and regulations; and U.S. foreign aid in the Middle East and Africa.

The committee has also given consideration to 96 separate proposals submitted to it by the General Services Administration for the disposal of surplus property by negotiated sale, 236 audit and other reports forwarded to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States, and to 40 other executive communications referred to the committee.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES IN 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Banking and Currency Committee has been active during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. The committee and its subcommittees have held hearings on 51 days involving 26 bills and 4 nominations. Twenty-four bills have been reported, of which 12 have become law. One of the remaining bills, S. 2310, Senator MUNDT's bill to prohibit Government guarantees of credit on sales to Russia, was finally acted on when the Senate tabled it on November 26, 1963. One—S. 2228, relating to annual meetings of national banks—passed the House on December 17 and will undoubtedly become law within the next few days. The 10 remaining bills are pending in the House.

In addition, it is perhaps appropriate to mention that the members of the committee have considered the proposed 50 cent pieces to commemorate the late President Kennedy, and have come to the conclusion that the House bill H.R. 9413 should be considered today and acted on by the Senate, without formal reference to the committee.

The bills the Banking and Currency Committee has handled include several major proposals. Among those which became law were S. 874, now Public Law 88–102, authorizing the construction of much needed mint facilities to relieve the shortage of coins; H.R. 5389, which became Public Law 88–36, repealing the Silver Purchase Acts and the related tax on transfers of silver bullion; and H.R. 3872, which became Public Law 88–101, the Export-Import Bank Act extension.

The committee has also acted on a number of major pieces of legislation which have not yet become law—S. 6, the proposed Urban Mass Transportation Act, which passed the Senate April 4, 1963; S. 1163, proposed amendments to the Area Redevelopment Act, which passed the Senate June 26; S. 1642, the legislative proposals of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which passed the Senate July 30; and S. 298, proposed amendments to the Small Business Investment Act, and S. 1309, proposed amendments to the Small Business Act, both of which passed the Senate on November 21.

The committee and its subcommittees have held hearings on a number of bills which have not been reported, including hearings in New York, Pittsburgh, Louisville, and Boston on S. 750, Senator DOUGLAS' bill to require disclosure of finance charges. Other hearings in this category included hearings on proposed secondary market mechanisms for conventional mortgages, housing for domestic farm labor, housing for the elderly, payment of claims for defects in FHA-insured homes, and a proposed International Home Loan Bank.

Among the nominations considered by the committee were those of Philip N. Brownstein to be Federal Housing Commissioner, John Prior Lewis to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, Manuel Frederick Cohen to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, John E. Horne to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Eugene P. Foley to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and J. Dewey Daane to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

BILL NUMBER, DESCRIPTION, AND FINAL ACTION (DECEMBER 18, 1963)

S. 6, Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963, Senate Report No. 82; passed Senate April 4, 1963.

S. 874, additional mint facilities, Senate Report No. 163; Public Law 88–102.

H.R. 5389, repealing certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, Senate Report No. 175; Public Law 88–36.

S. 1163, Area Redevelopment Act Amendments, 1963, Senate Report No. 250; passed Senate June 26, 1963.

H.R. 3872, Export-Import Bank Act Extension, Senate Report No. 262; Public Law 88–101.

S. 1125, Nevada 100th Anniversary Medal, Senate Report No. 290; Public Law 88–147.

S. 743, Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Medal, Senate Report No. 291; Public Law 88–143.

House Joint Resolution 467, 2-year extension of FHA section 221 mortgage insurance authority, Senate Report No. 304; Public Law 88–54.

S. 879, Battle of Lake Erie 150th Anniversary Medal, Senate Report No. 314; passed Senate June 27, 1963.

S. 1642, Securities and Exchange Commission Legislation, 1963, Senate Report No. 379; passed Senate July 30, 1963.

S. 1952, extension of authority to insure mortgages under sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act, Senate Report No. 487; Public Law 88–127.

H.R. 772, transfer of certain property purchased for low-rent housing project in Detroit, Mich., Senate Report No. 508; Public Law 88–141.

H.R. 4842, amendments to the Federal Credit Union Act, Senate Report No. 509; Public Law 88–150.

House Joint Resolution 724, housing for the elderly, Senate Report No. 561; Public Law 88–158.

S. 2228, annual meetings of national banks, Senate Report No. 622; passed Senate November 5, 1963; passed House December 17, 1963.

S. 1241, annual reports under the RFC Liquidation Act, Senate Report No. 628; passed Senate November 5, 1963.

H.R. 3488, Indiana statehood commemorative medals, Senate Report No. 630; Public Law 88–184.

H.R. 7193, ILGWU Health Center 50th anniversary medals, Senate Report 631; Public Law 88–185.

S. 2079, New York Historic Shrine Medals, Senate Report No. 633; passed Senate November 8, 1963.

S. 2032, study of Federal financial assistance to victims of flood disasters, Senate Report No. 634; passed Senate November 8, 1963.

S. 298, Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1963, Senate Report No. 639; passed Senate November 21, 1963.

S. 1309, Small Business Act Amendments, Senate Report No. 640; passed Senate November 21, 1963.

Senate Joint Resolution 129, additional funds for section 702 programs-reserve of planned public works, Senate Report No. 643; passed Senate November 19, 1963.

S. 2310, Government guarantees of credit, Senate Report No. 659; tabled by Senate November 26, 1963.

SPACE COMMITTEE'S ACTIVITIES, 1ST SESSION, 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there has been much carping this year about the manner in which the Congress has proceeded to carry out its responsibilities. Many sources have indicated that the Congress has been lax in its duties and unproductive. I agree with our esteemed majority leader in that the record of the 88th Congress, 1st session, will speak for itself.

Many people have the mistaken opinion that all of the work of the Senate is carried out on the Senate floor. Those who are informed realize that this is far from being the case and that much of the work of the legislative branch is carried on through its committee actions.

I would, therefore, like to take this opportunity to briefly set forth the activities of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, of which I am the chairman, during this calendar year.

The committee was chaired during the 87th Congress by Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma. Due to the unfortunate and untimely death of this truly great Senator on January 1, 1963, the committee was not formally organized until I was appointed chairman on February 25. During this period, however, committee business did not lie dormant. Members were concerned with the numerous reprograming letters by NASA and therefore an informal committee meeting was called on January 24 and the Administrator of NASA, with other members of his staff, appeared to explain the reasons for the numerous reprograming actions initiated by NASA prior to the convening of the 88th Congress. The staff of the committee was busily engaged in compiling much of the information relative to NASA's reprograming activities for the benefit of the committee members and all of NASA's reprograming actions subsequent to 1961 were analyzed. At the same time the staff was busy analyzing NASA's budget request for fiscal 1964.

Also prior to my appointment, in order to comply with the timetable for the Rules Committee of the Senate relative to the special resolutions, Senate Resolution 74, authorizing the committee to make a study of matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies, was introduced by Senator RUSSELL and myself on January 28. Shortly after my appointment, the committee formally met in executive session on February 28 and unanimously agreed to favorably report out the resolution with amendments. I appeared before the Rules Committee early in March to justify this request and the Rules Committee on March 6 favorably reported the resolution. The resolution was thereafter agreed to by the Senate on March 14, 1963.

On March 19, 1963, the committee met to consider the nominees of the President as incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corporation. The committee reported these nominations favorably and defended then on the floor on April 24 and 25. The nominations were subsequently confirmed by the Senate on April 25.

On April 1, Senator SMITH, the ranking minority member of the committee, and I, introduced by request, NASA's budget request for the authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1964. This request was for $5,712 million, which was almost double NASA's request for fiscal 1963, and the committee felt that exhaustive hearings were necessary in order to carefully anlayze NASA's needs. Furthermore, for the first time questions were being raised with respect to the administration's policy in pursuing a vigorous and heavily funded space program primarily directed toward a lunar landing and return. The committee recognized that with a budget request of this magnitude it was literally impossible to go into detail with respect to each individually funded item. While it carefully analyzed NASA's needs and questioned NASA's programs in detail, major emphasis was placed upon the managerial aspects of NASA's programs and the submission of detailed information on NASA's programs and projects. The committee was especially interested in establishing procedures whereby NASA informed the committee prior to any changes intended in its programs and plans. To this end additional restrictive requirements were placed in the Authorization Act so that the committee could be kept currently informed on programmatic changes made by NASA.

The committee held open hearings on the scientific and technical aspects of NASA's programs on April 24, 25, 26, 29, and 30. These hearings were then edited, bound, and made available to the committee for analysis during the next month. Because of questions raised as to the relative scientific value of NASA's programs, the committee on June 10 and 11 held open hearings and testimony was received from ranking scientists relative to the goals of the Nation's space programs. While there was, of course, some divergence of opinion I believe that the net result of these comments was favorable to the manner in which our space programs are being conducted.

On June 12, 13, 17, and 18 further hearings on NASA's authorization were held with the major emphasis placed on program detail. The committee was aware of comments made with respect to the balance between military and civilian space programs and on June 14 held executive and classified hearings during which time classified testimony was received from the Department of Defense on various aspects of the military space program.

After an opportunity to again analyze the testimony received by the committee, it met in executive session for markup of the NASA authorization on July 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, and on August 1. On August 2 the committee reported out its bill as an amendment to H.R. 7500, which had been passed by the other body. The bill was debated on the Senate floor during the first week in August and was finally passed on August 9. Conferees were appointed and met on August 23 to resolve the difference between the House and Senate versions. Agreements were accomplished and on August 26 a conference report was submitted authorizing a total of $5,350,820,400. The conference report was approved on August 28.

NASA's appropriation is contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act and members of the committee participated with the Senate Appropriations Committee in connection with such appropriation. Hearings were held by the Senate Appropriations Committee during October and the Independent Offices Appropriation Act was reported out on November 13. This act was debated on the floor during the week of November 18 and subsequently passed, appropriating a total of $5,100 million. The conference report on this act was submitted and adopted during the week of the 9th of December.

During the hearings on NASA's appropriation, considerable attention was paid to NASA's university grant program, both as to its scope and the manner in which it fitted into the Government's policy on aid to education. Due to this interest, the committee held hearings on November 21 and 22 on NASA's university grant program and the manner in which it was coordinated with the overall educational programs of the Government. Because of the sustained interest in this program, the committee expects to hold further hearings during the next calendar year in order to keep currently informed.

During the calendar year 1963 the staff of the committee was kept busily engaged in performing services for the committee in connection with its numerous activities. A large part of the time of the staff was taken up analyzing NASA's budget request for fiscal 1964. Various members of the staff have visited each of NASA's facilities in order to be currently informed on NASA's activities for fiscal year 1964 and also to acquaint themselves with NASA's needs and requirements in connection with its fiscal 1965 budget request. The committee has also been extremely interested in the international aspects of space and NASA's participation. Procedures have been developed under which NASA keeps the committee completely informed of its international activities. The committee has also contacted the Secretary of State in an effort to establish a workable procedure whereby State Department activities are made available so that the committee can keep informed on this important aspect of space.

During the calendar year the staff of the committee prepared a Senate report on all of the astronauts selected for the space program, both civilian and military. The staff is also coordinating with the Library of Congress a comprehensive report on the international aspects of outer space which should be available early in 1964.

The committee, as I have mentioned previously, is interested in any change in scope of NASA's plans and programs and has written in more restrictive provisions relative to reprograming in NASA's 1964 Authorization Act. Because of this further requirement the committee is now engaged in establishing a mechanism whereby it and the staff can be kept currently informed on any prospective future program changes by NASA even before such program changes requests are made formally by NASA. In order to keep currently informed of NASA's activities, the staff is in almost daily contact with various headquarters elements of NASA.

Mr. President, I have only recounted in skeleton form the activities of the committee during the past year, but I feel that it at least gives proper emphasis to the manner in which much of the work of the Senate is carried on. When one recognizes that this is merely one of many committees of the Senate it perhaps gives a little better picture of the amount of time which committee members give to their legislative responsibilities.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in the 9½ months since the Senate organized in February 1963—the Senate Committee on Public Works has reported 34 bills and resolutions, 20 of which have become law. This bare statistical analysis, however, hardly indicates the extent of the committee's work.

At the beginning of the session, four major legislative tasks faced the committee.

We had to consider major proposals with far-reaching effect on water pollution and air pollution. We had a substantial river basin bill to study, and we had a highly technical, if not major, omnibus highway bill.

We completed our work on all four of these measures.

To accomplish this, we held 11 days of hearings, 12 days of executive sessions, and produced two major staff studies, and a 30-minute filmed report on water pollution.

All told, the committee held 25 days of public hearings on all its measures considered. Four substantial staff studies were printed, two of which went out of print within 2 months as a result of heavy demand. These two were the air and water pollution studies.

In addition to the major bills—the committee considered legislation in the field of rivers and harbors—which may not have been big money bills or had a wide geographic effect, but which were major to the people affected and needed careful consideration before reporting.

The committee also considered prospectuses for 215 buildings at an estimated value of $343,169,900, and 12 proposals for watershed development at a total of $45,721,535.

The committee considered and reported a bill to change the Beach Erosion Board of the Corps of Engineers into a research program. It authorized construction of bank protection in West Virginia and modified a flood control project in Illinois.

Another bill reported by the committee defines the interest of local public agencies in Federal reservoirs to which the local agencies contributed financing.

Our river basin bill provided 2 years of continued authorization on 11 major river systems, and authorized new starts on 6 other projects.

Our road legislation included continuing control of outdoor advertising, changing the dates of fixing apportionment, increasing the percentage that can be allocated to engineering, extending the period of planning, and authorizing development at the State level.

Hearings have been begun on bills to extend the Accelerated Public Works Act.

The Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds held hearings on a bill authorizing construction of a residence for pages. Prior to final action, the matter has been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for a policy determination.

Our final action of this session has been the consideration of changing the name of the Cultural Center as a memorial to the late President, John F. Kennedy, and authorizing Federal funds so that the memorial may be rapidly built. The measure has been reported and is on the Senate Calendar.

In short, Mr. President, the Committee on Public Works has completed all the work it set out to do when the session began.

All members of the committee—on both sides of the aisle—have been most cooperative in seeing that the committee completed its tasks.

I would especially like to thank Senator RANDOLPH, chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads; Senator YOUNG of Ohio, chairman of the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds; and Senator MUSKIE, chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, for the expeditious manner in which they carried out the business of their subcommittees.

ACTIVITIES OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I desire to submit a report on the activities of the Senate Committee on Commerce during the 88th Congress, 1st session.

Mr. President, the workload and accomplishments of the Senate Committee on Commerce thus far in the 1st session of the 88th Congress has been of major proportions. This is evident from a glance at the following computations:

Bills—Senate and House—and resolutions referred to committee, 215.

Bills upon which the committee held hearings, 66.

Number of days of hearings, 155.

Hearings on nominations, 19.

Bills reported, 38.

Bills passed by the Senate, 35.

Bills that have become public laws, 14.

Bills and subjects upon which hearings have begun and are still open:

S. 774, quality stabilization.

S. 1975 and S. 2324, firearms control.

S. 222, jurisdictional disputes in maritime industry.

S. 1161, repeal of section 13(a) of Interstate Commerce Act.

S. 1250 and S. 1251, use of pesticides.

Subject and study: Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

A clearer understanding of the committee's efforts this past year is afforded by a brief analysis of the committee's handling of legislative proposals in the major areas of its jurisdiction.

AVIATION

The committe favorably reported and the Senate passed on August 26, S. 1153, a bill to amend the Federal Airport Act. The bill would extend the Federal aid to airport program for an additional 3 years, expiring June 30, 1967. The total authorization would amount to $225 million for the 3-year period with $75 million available annually. Aside from extending the program an additional 3 years, the committee amended the act in only one significant respect; namely, it included a provision requiring the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to satisfy himself that reasonable effort, including enactment of zoning laws, has been made to restrict the use of land adjacent to airports so as to make it compatible with the operation of the airport.

As a result of the international fare controversy of last summer and threats by foreign countries to ground U.S. aircraft, the committee conducted hearings on S. 1539 and S. 1540, bills to amend the Federal Aviation Act so as to provide for regulation of rates and practices of U.S. and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation. The Committee reported and the Senate acted favorably on S. 1540, proposed by the administration, which gives the Civil Aeronautics Board discretionary authority to prescribe rates and practices and to suspend tariffs in international air transportation to and from the United States under the same standards now applicable in interstate transportation. It would empower the Board to require just and reasonable rates and practices in foreign air transportation.

Extensive hearings were conducted by the Aviation Subcommittee on the proposed U.S. commercial supersonic aircraft development program. All aspects of this program were thoroughly reviewed, including its feasibility, economics, and willingness on the part of industry to financially participate in the program. The committee may conduct further hearings with regard to specific legislation authorizing Federal participation in this program.

The subcommittee also considered a number of aviation bills of a strictly technical or clarifying nature upon which it expects to act early in the next session of Congress. As a result of the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board not to renew the authority of Northeast Airlines to operate south of New York, many congressional leaders expressed the view that air service to New England might be adversely affected. Consequently, the committee held several days of hearings to determine means of insuring adequate and continued air service in the New England area.

COMMUNICATIONS

When the Congress enacted the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, it provided guidelines and criteria that were designed to meet the objectives set forth by the President of the United States for U.S. participation in a global communications system. The Senate Committee on Commerce at the time this legislation was being considered, indicated that it would follow the implementation of the legislation very closely. Consequently, hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Communications in February 1963, at which progress reports were received from various agencies and common carriers involved in this program. In addition, hearings were held on the confirmation of the 14 incorporators selected by the President to serve as directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation. The policies of this organization, as they were then being developed, were carefully set forth in a public record.

Progress reports were received from various Government agencies with regard to the important Administrative Radio Conference that took place in Geneva, Switzerland, in October 1963. This Conference concerned negotiations regarding the allocation of frequencies among foreign countries, particularly as they apply to space communications and radio astronomy. The Conference was completed in November 1963, and the treaty resulting therefrom was recently submitted to the Senate for ratification.

After extensive hearings and debate in the 87th Congress, S. 205, the so-called educational television bill, was enacted. It provides for the further utilization of television facilities in our public schools and colleges. The committee held a hearing to receive a progress report from the FCC in February 1963, at which time the entire subject of educational television was explored.

An extensive hearing was held in February 1963, regarding the procedures and manner in which the FCC was regulating interstate telephone rates.

Hearings were conducted by the committee on the nominations of two persons who became FCC Commissioners. During these hearings the committee explored various policies and problems, such as allocation of television channels, overcommercialization, community antenna services, boosters, and so forth.

The committee also held extended hearings regarding political broadcasting and reported favorably House Resolution 247, which suspended section 315 of the Communications Act so as to permit debates by the presidential and vice-presidential candidates in the 1964 campaign. The Senate passed this measure on October 2, 1963.

In addition, hearings were held on S. 708, a bill that would provide that the FCC, in considering applications made by any person for any construction permit or station license or any modification thereof, may not weigh as a factor that the applicant is a Member of Congress or that any Member of Congress has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in the application.

S. 920, a bill that would permit alien amateur radio operators to operate in the United States if there is an agreement between the United States and the alien's government for such operation by U.S. amateurs in that country, was reported by the committee and passed on October 16, 1963, by the Senate.

S. 1005 was requested by the FCC to authorize that Commission to grant special temporary authorization for a period of 60 days for certain nonbroadcast operations. At present, paragraph 2(g) of subsection (c) of section 309 of the Communications Act exempts from the public notice a 30-day waiting period requirement of subsection 309(b) its applications for a special temporary authorization for nonbroadcast operations not to exceed 30 days where no application for regular operation is to be filed or pending the filing of an application for such regular operation. This bill was also passed by the Senate pursuant to the committee's recommendation.

Hearings were also held on S. 1193, a bill that would require petitions for intervention in FCC proceedings that have been designated for hearing be filed not more than 30 days after notice of the hearing in the Federal Register. This bill passed the Senate on September 25, 1963.

A review and complete evaluation of the allocation of frequencies must be made and the committee has been in constant contact with the appropriate agencies in an effort to work out the necessary guidelines and criteria. This work is continuing.

This committee has been interested also in advertising practices and the efforts of the Government in this area. Conferences with the appropriate agencies and industry representatives have been held and are continuing in an effort to work out established procedures.

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

A total of 33 bills were assigned to the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 18 of which were subjects of committee hearings.

Twenty bills were reported to the full committee, of which 19 have received Senate approval, 1 is pending, and 10 have become public law.

In the field of ship operation, bills were approved by the full committee and the Senate as follows: First, removing certain restrictions on war-risk insurance coverage of subsidy built vessels; second, governing payment of excess costs resulting from allocation by the United States of vessel construction contracts for reasons of defense; third, adjusting the rate of recapture of construction subsidy for domestic operation; fourth, Jones Act amendments to permit use of non-U.S. vessels temporarily for lumber shipments in Puerto Rico; and, fifth, to provide for exemption of certain terminal lease penalties.

A series of hearings were initiated, and will be resumed in January, on bills to aid domestic shipping, and to help resolve costly interunion maritime disputes. The committee's study of cargo preference administration was brought up to date.

Important Coast Guard bills given Committee and Senate approval included first, revised promotion and retirement provisions affecting officers, and revision of enlisted men's retirement provisions; second, regulations for preventing collisions at sea; exemptions from rules of navigation on inland waters, and revised rules on anchor lights and fog signals. H.R. 79 (S. 82), which requires approval by this committee of certain Coast Guard appropriations, was enacted into law pursuant to the recommendation of the Committee on Commerce.

Other bills handled covered Coast and Geodetic Survey retirees' rights; the status of professional nurses aboard passenger vessels, and extension of time for commitment of vessel construction funds, and for review of dual-rate agreements by the Federal Maritime Commission.

The Senate Commerce Committee reported favorably and the Senate passed this session four important legislative proposals to assist the U.S. fisheries. Early in this session the Senate passed S. 978, which restored to self-employed fishermen the eligibility for medical care under the Public Health Service. In July the Senate passed S. 627, which establishes a new program of assistance to State commercial fishery development and authorizes an expenditure of $28,250,000 over a 5-year period. On October 1 the Senate passed S. 1988, which prohibits foreign fishing vessels from operating within the territorial waters of the United States or from taking Continental Shelf fishing resources belonging to the United States. On October 2 the Senate passed S. 1006, a bill extending and expanding the present subsidy program of fishing vessel construction and authorizes an annual appropriation of $10 million. In addition the Senate added fish products to the food-for-peace program in an amendment to the foreign aid authorization and as a substitute for S. 702, which was before the Commerce Committee. Hearings were concluded on S. 744 which would authorize the construction of two experimental stern ramp trawlers, and on S. 1135, which would clarify the bargaining status of fishermen's organizations. S. 1250 and S. 1251, which concerned the effect of the use of pesticides and insecticides on commercial fisheries, were also the subjects of committee hearings.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

The railroad work rules dispute threatened essential transportation services of the Nation. Because all procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act had been exhausted without settlement, it became necessary for Congress to consider emergency measures.

The President in his message to the Congress relative to the railroad-labor dispute pointed out that the Nation was on the brink of a nationwide rail strike which would, in very short order, create widespread economic chaos and distress. The cost to the national interest of an extended nationwide rail strike would be clearly intolerable, and the President stated that no responsible government could accept the present situation with complacency. In this century, because in the past both sides have recognized the serious consequences involved, there have been only two brief national rail strikes. Confronted with this extraordinary situation, the executive branch having exhausted all statutory and other tools available, the President called upon Congress to enact recommended legislation.

To avoid delay in reporting from the subcommittee to the full committee, the hearings were held in the first instance before the full committee. Over 9 days of public hearings, including many night sessions, and a number of executive sessions, were held on the measure proposed by the President. The committee reported favorably Senate Joint Resolution 102, which provided means for the settlement of this dispute and averted a nationwide rail strike. This measure was enacted as Public Law 88–108.

The Surface Transportation Subcommittee during this session held 19 days of hearings on S. 1061, and S. 1062. These two bills were introduced to implement the President's transportation message. S. 1061 would exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers. S. 1062, often referred to as the Transportation Act of 1963, is designed to strengthen and improve the national transportation system.

The subcommittee also undertook consideration of various bills to provide assistance for urban mass transportation. Testimony was received by the subcommittee during 4 days of hearings on all bills touching this subject, including S. 6, introduced by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey for himself and 23 Senators; S. 807, introduced by Senator LAUSCHE on behalf of 3 other Senators; and S. 917, introduced by Senator WILLIAMS at the request of the administration. The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963 reported favorably by the subcommittee and the full committee was passed by the Senate. In addition, the subcommittee also held 1 day of hearings on S. 1161, to amend Section 13(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and 2 days of hearings on S. 1063, to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply.

Because of the demand placed on the time of the members of the subcommittee by the railroad work rules dispute, and S. 1732, the public accommodations bill, it was not possible for the subcommittee to complete its consideration of all measures concerning the Nation's transportation needs prior to adjournment.

OTHER MAJOR AREAS OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

In addition to the committee work outlined above, the Commerce Committee has engaged in extensive consideration of legislation outside the areas above defined.

Public accommodations bill: The committee held 23 separate hearing sessions hearing 40 witnesses, and held numerous executive meetings to complete consideration of a bill to prevent public establishments, labor unions, and professional organizations affecting interstate commerce from discriminating on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. Hearings ran from July 1 to August 2 of this year, and on October 8 the committee voted 14 to 3 to report favorably S. 1732, as amended, to the Senate. This report has not yet been filed due to the pendency of the omnibus civil rights bill in the House of Representatives. The report will be filed when such action is cleared by the Democratic leadership.

Sale of firearms in interstate commerce: The committee commenced hearings December 13, 1963, on S. 1975 and S. 2345, bills to amend the Federal Firearms Act to provide additional control over the sale of firearms in interstate commerce. Hearings are being continued this week, and will resume again in January 1964.

Uniform time legislation: The committee favorably reported S. 1033, as amended. This bill is designed to modernize and overhaul the 45-year-old Standard Time Act, and to achieve a greater uniformity and consistency in timekeeping practices across the Nation. The bill provides that time zones established by the ICC would be binding on all common carriers in interstate commerce, and would thus encourage States and local units of government to conform to the federally set time standards.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway: A special subcommittee to study transportation on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway was appointed by Chairman MAGNUSON. This subcommittee is studying the present status of transportation in this area, with a view to learning its achievements, its problems, and the needed remedies. Two days of hearings have been held, and additional hearings are scheduled beginning in January of 1964.

Quality stabilization: Six days of hearings have been thus far held on S. 774, commonly referred to as the quality stabilization bill, by a special subcommittee appointed by the chairman. Additional hearings are planned for early in the next session.

SUMMARY

In summary, 1963 has been a year of accomplishment for this committee. This is so whether its efforts be measured by the quantity of legislation it has studied, or by the complexity and importance of those measures. In addition, this year has seen the completion of study in many areas affecting this Nation's economy, thus enabling the committee to be fully informed for consideration of several legislative proposals in executive session early in 1964.

ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to submit for the RECORD a summary of the activities and accomplishments of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during this session.

This year has marked my first session as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and I am deeply indebted to my colleagues who serve with me. We have enjoyed what I believe to be a fine spirit of cooperation from all members without partisan considerations. I especially want to thank the chairmen of the five subcommittees who have acted with care on legislation that fell within their jurisdiction, while at the same time gave prompt attention to our committee program.

Mr. President, I want to say that our committee has received at every step complete cooperation from the leadership of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. If our program has been successful, it is in no small part due to the help and advice we have received from the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD. No single individual has been of more assistance. I also want to express the appreciation of the committee to our colleagues on the minority side who have helped to expedite our legislative program.

In view of the fact that Senator MANSFIELD placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 16 a complete summary in detail of the legislative accomplishments in this session, I will not elaborate on all of the measures our committee has considered and acted on.

Let me say briefly that I believe our committee has a primary, although not exclusive, duty to oversee the proper development and utilization of our Nation's natural resources. This is a tremendous responsibility, and much of the country's future will depend on how we meet it. I am thankful that the people of the United States give every indication of realizing the importance of the full and complete development and advancement of knowledge of our land, water, mineral, and recreational resources. In the face of our ever growing population and requirements for these resources, this national awareness of the necessity for the proper conservation and wise utilization of our resources will make our future tasks, although difficult, much more rewarding.

Now I would like to summarize briefly some of the major legislative highlights accomplished by our committee.

The 1st session of the 88th Congress has been a very productive one from the standpoint of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. There has been a total of 52 Senate bills reported from our committee and passed by the Senate. Thirty-six House bills have also been reported and passed. We have acted favorably on six Senate resolutions. There have been a total of 40 public laws and 8 private laws which have been enacted this year after having originated in our committee.

RESOURCES GENERAL

In the field of water resources perhaps the single most important legislative accomplishment of our committee has been the reporting and subsequent passage by the Senate of S. 2, the water resources research bill. This legislation will establish water resource research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities and is intended to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence. Most importantly, if enacted, this program will promote and coordinate more adequate national activity in water research.

Another measure of major significance in the field of water resources is S. 1111, the River Basin Planning Act. The goal of this legislation is to help the States and the Federal Government provide for the maximum development of our water resources through coordinated planning and by the establishment of river basin commissions throughout the land where they are necessary, and to establish a Cabinet-level Water Resources Council. This bill has passed the Senate and is now pending in the House of Representatives.

Again this year, the Senate Interior Committee reported S. 4, the wilderness bill, and the Senate adopted it. This bill has as its purpose the establishment of a national system of wilderness preservation. We are hopeful that during this Congress we will be successful in finally enacting this much-needed legislation.

Early this year we reported and the Senate passed S. 20, the Organic Recreation Act. This bill is intended to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation. This measure became Public Law 88-29, and it gives a statutory authority for the activity of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior. It is expected that the committee will tackle the companion bill, the land and water conservation fund proposal, early in the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

Another important measure which has passed the Senate is S. 1007, a bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. This legislation passed the Senate last April. It has been in a conference with the House of Representatives. We are hopeful of early enactment in the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Perhaps the most significant legislation affecting Indian affairs was the passage of S. 1049, the heirship bill which was reported from our committee. Senator FRANK CHURCH, chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, has worked long and diligently in an effort to solve this problem of Indian heirship lands. We are hopeful that the bill the Senate has passed is a long step in the right direction. This measure is now pending in the House of Representatives.

Another proposal of importance to Indians concerns the bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to finance the testimony of expert witnesses who testify before the Indian Claims Commission. This legislation is important to facilitate the work and eliminate backlog of the Indian Claims Commission.

We also reported legislation amending the act of August 3, 1956, relating to adult Indian vocational training. We have expanded this program which has proved to be one of great importance to our Indian citizens. This bill, S. 1868, with House amendments, has been sent to the President.

To help meet the need for economic development on reservations, the Senate passed S. 48, to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act by extending the maximum term to 55 years instead of 50. This amendment will facilitate loans to developers for construction and improvements on reservations.

More than 20 bills donating Federal lands to tribes, or amending existing law to improve administration of Indian affairs, were passed in this session of the Congress.

PUBLIC LANDS AND RECREATION

Probably in no other area has our committee been more successful than in the consideration of bills relating to the establishment of national parks and recreational areas. The committee has reported four bills which would provide for major additions to the national park system. The Senate has passed three of these bills. They include S. 16, establishing the Ozark National Rivers in the State of Missouri. This is the first time that the unique concept of a national river area has been introduced to our national park system.

We have also passed S. 27, a bill to establish the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah.

We approved legislation to consolidate the Vicksburg National Military Park in Mississippi by adjusting the boundary line. This was necessary to provide for the installation of a park tour road at this park and to permit the orderly growth of the city of Vicksburg.

An adjustment of boundaries at the Carlsbad Caverns National Park, permitting exchange of lands with the State and consolidation of the Federal holdings for better management, was approved.

The committee reported and the Senate passed a bill to provide a statutory basis for the administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area in Arizona and Nevada. This is a new classification of a national park component and it is likely that many more recreational areas will be established in the future.

The committee has reported to the Senate S. 792, a bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. This legislation will establish an area near a large center of population where the public may forever have access to a national lakeshore for recreational purposes.

We have also reported a bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore. This legislation is in line with the three national seashores established in the 87th Congress at Cape Cod, Point Reyes, and at Padre Island. The Oregon Dunes bill is now pending on the Senate Calendar.

Numerous other bills relating to the administration of our national park system were acted upon by our committee this year. In addition, it is our intention to take up early in the next session measures dealing with the establishment of the Indiana Dunes Lakeshore, Fire Island National Seashore in New York, Tocks Island National Recreation Area in Pennsylvania and New York, and other proposed areas of national significance.

TERRITORIES

One of the most important bills enacted during this session of Congress affecting our offshore territories was H.R. 6225, Public Law 88-170, authorizing up to $45 million in loans and grants to help Guam finance public works and community development projects. The need for the legislation arose because of a devastating typhoon which struck the island in November 1962, causing millions of dollars in damage to public and private property.

A second bill, H.R. 6841, Public Law 88-171, authorized the Territory of Guam to create a public agency empowered to carry on urban renewal and housing activities and to participate in Federal programs in this field. This legislation is supplemental to that authorizing the rehabilitation program.

To assist the Virgin Islands in financing a number of vital projects, Congress enacted H.R. 1989, Public Law 88-180, which reinstates the authority of the local government to issue general obligation bonds for schools, firehouses, slum clearance, water systems, et cetera.

Questions have been raised in recent years about the political future of the island of Puerto Rico. H.R. 5945 was introduced, providing for the settlement in a democratic manner of the island's political future. The Senate and House amended the bill providing for the creation of a Commission to study all factors relating to the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico. The Commission will submit a report no later than the opening of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, containing findings and recommendations. Senate amendments to H.R. 5945 have not been agreed to by the House.

Public Law 88-183 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain tracts of submerged lands surrounding the territories of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, upon request of the respective Governors, when the lands are required for a specific economic development or to satisfy a compelling public need, and grants these governments concurrent jurisdiction over persons found, acts performed, and offenses committed on lands which are owned, controlled, or reserved by the United States in and around these islands.

MINERAL RESOURCES

After consideration of the President's Study Commission and Attorney General's reports, the committee approved and the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 33, granting consent for an extension of 4 years of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas. This became Public Law 88-115.

The committee also reported S. 1534, a bill designed to bring stability to the domestic lead-zinc industry for both domestic producers and for refiners through a quota system based on domestic production and consumption. In accordance with the unanimous consent agreement, the measure was referred to the Committee on Finance. All segments of the domestic lead-zinc industry support this measure, one of the first on which producers and refiners have been in agreement.

In addition, the committee initiated studies for formulation of national policies to stimulate and expand our domestic minerals industries with emphasis on increased discovery and production. Hearings are planned for early in the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Senate 1111, the Water Resources Planning Act of 1963, originated in the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee. In addition to authorizing establishment of river basin planning commissions to plan the optimum development of water and related land resources in the Nation, the bill would establish a Federal Water Resources Council composed of four Cabinet members and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and authorize a 10-year program of aid to States for water resources planning by the States.

This measure, originally proposed by the late President John F. Kennedy, has been under study and refinement for 3 years and completed Senate action to implement the major recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.

A major irrigation project, the Dixie project in Utah, was handled by the subcommittee and subsequently approved by the Senate. Hearings were also held on three others, the large Garrison diversion project in North Dakota, the central Arizona project, and the Auburn-Folsom project, South Unit, in California's Central Valley. Final action on these projects will come in 1964.

The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, with 6 years of successful operation as a guide, was revised to meet current needs in S. 283, passed by the Senate, and reclamation law was amended to make the cost of preliminary studies of projects nonreimbursable, in accordance with the standard practice in other agencies.

A fruitful experiment in water conservation through phreatophyte control in the Pecos River Basin was authorized to be continued in Senate-approved Senate Joint Resolution 49.

Extension of the Department of Interior's Federal power marketing operations to include Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande was approved in S. 851, passed by the Senate.

A number of amendments and adjustments in reclamation project acts were processed, including amendment of the Klamath Reclamation Project Act to promote the conservation of wildlife resources in the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. SENATE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, during the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary has approved and reported 38 nominations, which are as follows:

U.S. district judges, 11.
U.S. circuit judges, 4.
Associate judge of Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, 1.
Assistant Attorneys General, 2.
U.S. attorneys, 5.
U.S. marshals, 7.
Board of Parole, members, 2.
Subversive Activities Control Board, members, 2.
Examiner in Chief, Patent Office, 1.
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, members, 3.

A number of the general bills approved and reported by the Committee on the Judiciary are as follows:

S. 603, relating to the appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

S. 741, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit schemes in interstate or foreign commerce to influence by bribery the outcome of sporting contests, and for other purposes.

S. 979, to amend section 332 of title 28, United States Code, in order to provide for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit.

S. 1057, to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States—public defender.

S. 1319, to amend chapter 35, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents.

S. 1451, to amend section 41(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

S. 1466, to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies.

S. 1664, to provide for continuous improvement of the administrative procedure of Federal agencies by creating an Administrative Conference of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1832, granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1049, to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI—arrangement—proceeding to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n).

H.R. 1709, to establish a Federal commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island.

H.R. 2833, to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceedings—attorney fees.

H.R. 2835, to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service.

H.R. 2837, to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311).

H.R. 2842, to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code—venue of prosecution.

H.R. 2845, to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business.

H.R. 2849, to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act.

H.R. 2985, to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to venue generally.

H.R. 4157, to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4374, to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

H.R. 4715, to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.

In addition to the foregoing, the committee approved and reported other general legislation as well as 177 private immigration bills and 72 private claim bills.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART SHOWS "MODERNS"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to a very important breakthrough in the field of art and culture, which seems to be having some attention at long last, and which should have more, by reason of the fact that the citadel of Renaissance and other representative art of an established character, the National Gallery of Art in Washington, is now exhibiting "moderns."

The Modern Art Museum of New York, which will be closed for 5 months for repairs, has loaned 153 paintings to the National Gallery of Art in Washington. These paintings represent the most outstanding examples of modern masters of the arts—Rousseau, Matisse, Braque, Picasso, Max Weber, Kandinsky, Pollock, Motherwell, and de Kooning among them.

There was once a time, when this issue was raised—and I raised it in the other body—when it was considered a laughing matter, or someone would try to present as subversive or Communist propaganda the discussion of an art gallery. So it is with great pleasure and pride that I see the recognition which is now accorded to the works of the modern masters.

I hope very much that my colleagues will visit this exhibit. I believe they will find it stimulating and provocative. I assure Senators that they will not be bitten by any bug of subversion or radicalism. On the contrary, they will see provocative, exciting modern minds in action, developing a culture of which, three or four centuries from now, our people, after we leave them, will be as proud as we are today of Rembrandt, El Greco, and the great artists of the Renaissance.

I hope very much that this great cooperation between the National Gallery of Art in Washington and the Modern Art Museum of New York will be consummated by the honor of receiving, as viewers of this great collection, Members of Congress and governmental officials.

I ask unanimous consent that the article on this subject published in the New York Times of this morning may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Capital Gallery Shows Moderns—New York Museum Lends 153 Landmark Paintings

(By Henry Raymont)

Washington, December 17.—The National Gallery of Art opened its doors today to the most comprehensive collection of modern art ever shown in the Capital.

The collection is composed of 153 paintings from the Museum of Modern Art in New York, all of them well-known landmarks in the development of painting schools and "isms." It ranges from the French impressionism of the 1880's to American pop art.

Among the masterpieces lent by the New York gallery, which is closed for 5 months for expansion are some of the outstanding works of Rousseau, Matisse, Braque, Picasso, Max Weber Kandinsky, Pollock, Motherwell and de Kooning.

The paintings, representing 122 artists from 25 countries, were selected by Alfred H. Barr, Jr., director of collections of the Museum of Modern Art. It offered to Washingtonians the first broad, representative survey of modern and contemporary art.

KNOWN FOR OTHER PERIODS

The National Gallery, famous for its collection of Rennaissance. barque and roccoco paints, has only sporadically exhibited modern works, which it has felt belong more properly in the newer, private galleries of the Capital.

John Walker, the director of the National Gallery, noted with shy amusement that only a decade ago many of the paintings he will exhibit for the next 3 months would have been considered too shocking and unorthodox for the National Gallery.

Although the visiting collection was historic on many counts, the exhibition opened without any special ceremonies.

A gala opening planned for last night was canceled because of the month-long period of mourning for President Kennedy. Mrs. Kennedy, Members of Congress, diplomats and many of the artists whose works are on display, were to have attended.

Gallery officials estimate that 500,000 persons will view the exhibition before it closes on March 22. Many tourists, especially high school and college students who stream to the capital during the Christmas vacation, are expected to visit the gallery especially for the visiting collection.

Mr. Walker appraises the importance of the modern art show both in symbolic and practical terms.

Symbolically, he said, it signifies a breakthrough in the usually staid policies of Federal agencies toward new, controversial art works. The National Gallery, although heavily endowed by private sources, falls under the jurisdiction of the Smithsonian Institution, which also operates the Museum of Natural History, the Washington Zoo and the Canal Zone Biological Area.

In practical terms, the exhibition is expected to attract the general public as well as the more sophisticated art lovers and thus help develop new tastes and wider interests in contemporary works.

Mr. Walker, an intense, silver-haired man who has been head of the National Gallery since July, 1956, is a stanch advocate of the modern art movement.

When the Museum of Modern Art closed for remodeling Mr. Walker saw the possibility of hanging in the National Gallery "a representative selection from perhaps the most comprehensive international collection of contemporary paintings in the world."

There was quite a problem in logistics. Since some spectacular thefts of art treasures, museums have become as security conscious as some of the most sensitive Government agencies here.

The Museum of Modern Art entrusted its shipments to the Seven Santani Bros., a trucking firm in New York. Museum officials would not disclose the insurance value of the paintings, but it was known to total many millions.

The paintings were brought to Washington in three separate trips. In each case, the trucks left New York at 2 a.m. to avoid traffic.

"There has been absolutely no damage or deterioration as a result of the trip," Mr. Walker said today with a reassuring smile.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE MORNING SESSIONS ON THURSDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1963, AND FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the strong possibility that the Senate will meet early tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the morning tomorrow and Friday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE TAX BILL NEEDS TO BE REVAMPED AND IMPROVED TO CARRY OUT PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PURPOSES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, early in the next session of this Congress we shall be debating on the floor of the Senate one of the most significant pieces of legislation destined to be enacted in the foreseeable future. I refer to H.R. 8363, the general tax revision bill now under deliberation in the Senate Finance Committee.

We are all concerned that this Congress enact measures to cure the serious malaise in our economic system which finds our country burdened with an unemployment rate of 5.9 percent—today, more than 4 million of our employable citizens are unemployed and without work. We all know we must act to rescue our economy from the doldrums in which we now find ourselves, with our gross national product decreasing while in other countries of the world—Germany, Japan, France, Italy—there has been an astonishing growth of production, with concomitant benefit to the citizenry. Our rival for world power, the Soviet Union, also is increasing its wealth through ever more concentrated production of goods, with corresponding strengthening of its position in the world.

For all these reasons we understand the importance of enacting legislation that will give our economy a shot in the arm.

The bill that will be before us shortly has been proposed as a means of using tax policy in a highly sophisticated manner to relieve the distress of economy, to stimulate investment of capital, to produce more jobs, to increase the income of our citizens through general stimulus of our productive capacity; thus, culminating in an increase in revenues to the Federal Government.

The economic objectives of H.R. 8363 are well conceived, and without doubt, must be achieved by this and such other means as are available. The wise use of taxes as a tool to repair the segments of our economic system now working poorly is commendable, and is certainly a very important attack on the problems we face.

My study of the matter, however, leads me to question whether the particular tool of tax reform represented by H.R. 8363 is properly designed to accomplish the repair job before us.

As passed by the House of Representatives, H.R. 8363 is designed to revise our tax structure primarily by decreasing the effective rate of taxation at the highest levels of income. The theory of this, as I understand it, is that it is in the upper brackets of earnings that an increase in disposable income will provide the greatest stimulus to the economy.

Before it is too late, I believe serious attention should be given to the views of such distinguished economists as Leon Keyserling, and to spokesmen for organized labor, whose view it is that the approach of H.R. 8363 will not accomplish the desired result.

It is the opinion of many of us that the premise on which H.R. 8363 is based is in error. It is our view that, in fact, the stimulus needed by our economy can come only if there is additional income available to those of our society who are not in the highest income brackets. I believe the proposition can be defended that the highest percentage of consumer spending in relation to income is that of individuals in the middle and lower income brackets. People in high income brackets whose income is augmented by such means as are proposed in H.R. 8363 are far more likely to save their money, place it in relatively nonproductive investments—in terms of accelerating consumer demand for goods—or otherwise use the increased funds at their disposal in ways that are contrary to the objectives of H.R. 8363.

On the other hand, additional income to individuals in the lower income brackets will almost certainly be spent for consumer goods—for better food, a better dwelling, more clothing, and, where possible, for luxuries, theater tickets, a trip to a resort, and long-deferred purchases never accessible before. To me, the logic of increasing the money available for expenditure by those who will spend it as a means of accelerating the economy is unassailable.

Therefore, I believe it is a grave weakness of H.R. 8363, as it stands now, that the important tax benefits it will bring are concentrated in the highest income brackets.

An analysis of a table appearing in the Senate Finance Committee's description of H.R. 8363, as passed by the House—page 2—shows graphically that for calendar year 1965, after allowing large percentage decreases in tax rates in the very lowest income brackets—$500 to $2,000—the rate of decrease of tax declines from 20 percent in the $1,500 to $2,000 bracket to 13.6 percent at the $200 to $4,000 bracket.

In the middle income brackets—from $10,000 to $25,000—the rate of tax benefit in 1965 declines steeply, beginning to rise again at the $50,000 level. For taxpayers at the $200,000 income level, the percentage saving in taxes over present rates is at a rate of 23 percent, as compared with a 15.8-percent saving to a taxpayer at the $10,000 level.

It seems to me this is a mistaken way of improving our sick economy through the use of tax policy.

In his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. Leon Keyserling pointed out that, of the proposed tax cut of approximately $11 billion, which is the objective of H.R. 8363, some $4 billion, representing about 45 percent of proposed personal tax cuts, is allocated to taxpayers with incomes of $10,000 or more per annum, which group represents but 12½ percent of all taxpayers. It is Mr. Keyserling's view and that of the AFL–CIO that a far greater percentage of the personal tax cuts proposed should be allocated to those in the lower income brackets, a view with which I am in agreement.

While there are many aspects of the tax bill that I believe should be improved to insure that its benefits accrue to those who need it most, I believe there is particular merit in revamping the proposals of the measure with respect to personal income tax deductions. I believe the legislation should be redrawn to allow a much higher percentage of decrease in taxes at the lowest and middle income levels, thus truly freeing money for investment in consumer goods and stimulating our sluggish economy.

To accomplish this, I would suggest the Finance Committee give careful consideration to the following possible changes in the bill:

First. A complete revision of the tax rates to accomplish a meaningful redistribution of the tax burden. The effective rate of tax at the lower and middle income brackets should be adjusted to maximize the benefits of the bill at these levels. At the same time, the rate of tax on higher incomes could, I believe, be increased substantially over that now proposed without impairing the purposes of the bill.

Taxpayers in higher income brackets are able to avail themselves of tax-saving devices implicit in almost every section of the Internal Revenue Code which are not available to individuals earning at a lower rate. Attention has been repeatedly drawn by other Members of this body to the so-called tax loopholes—tax credits, deductions, allowances, conversion of income to capital gains, and other tax advantages which can only be employed by those of large means. It is no secret that the statutory tax rate loses meaning as applied to those in the higher brackets whose actual taxes are often far less, proportionately, than those of low-income taxpayers.

Thus, I believe the rates of taxation as set out in the bill can be readjusted so there is no actual loss of revenue beyond that contemplated and so the benefits will be spread more equitably.

Second. Especially for taxpayers in the lowest income brackets there would be a significant benefit derived from increasing personal exemptions. While this is of relative unimportance to an individual in the $50,000 income bracket, the allowance of an additional $1,000 in exemptions to the head of a household in the $10,000 income range would be of sufficient significance to allow expenditure of income otherwise taxed for such items as college education for a child, purchase of a new refrigerator, a new car, or some long coveted luxury.

Third. Another means of accomplishing the objective I believe is intended by H.R. 8363, but which I do not believe it will achieve in its present form, would be by an increase in the minimum standard deductions. This is a remedy that presents tax relief almost exclusively for taxpayers in the lowest income brackets who do not use the long form of tax return and who find an advantage in the standard deduction over itemization of deductions. Again, it is the low- and middle-income taxpayer who is least able to take advantage of highly beneficial tax deduction provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

I would, then, urge my colleagues on the Finance Committee to give careful consideration to these provisions with the view in mind of revising the measure now before them so it will accomplish the objectives it is intended to accomplish.

Meanwhile, I believe we must not lose sight of the fact the underlying cause of the economic depression with which we are confronted is, basically, a failure in our system to maintain a sufficiently high rate of employment. Unemployment is our most serious domestic problem. The enactment of a skillfully designed tax bill will help solve this problem. But, there is still need for enlightened expenditure of public funds that will put our people to work. The unemployment problem is one that must be attacked on all fronts. H.R. 8363 is but one way of curing our economic diseases. All the other tools of public spending for public works, the availability of increased educational opportunities, and imaginative stimulation of our industrial plant must be put to work.

It is my hope that, in the next session of this Congress, we shall see the enactment of all the measures that are needed to make this land prosperous and strong.

Now that Members of Congress are planning to go home for Christmas where they will have an opportunity to discuss with their friends the great measures which are to be enacted at the next session of Congress, I suggest there will be excellent opportunities to explain, where this is required, the significance of the pending tax reform bill and enlighten the citizenry as to its effect. The people of the United States who pay taxes are most immediately concerned that any tax bill enacted is equable and that it will, in fact, improve our economy. I urge Members of this body to take the opportunity now presented to them to discuss the pending tax legislation with the home folks.

Recently I inserted, following some remarks on the need of improving the current version of the tax bill, an article by T.R.B. from the New Republic, and one by Stewart Alsop from the Saturday Evening Post. The latter, in particular, exploded the myth that under the existing tax legislation the wealthy were heavily taxed. He proved that quite the contrary was the case. He repeats this in another article in the current issue appropriately entitled "More on the Great Tax Myth." I recommend its reading and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

More on the Great Tax Myth

(By Stewart Alsop)

Washington.—Barry Goldwater has said that the progressive income tax ought to be abolished. Like most of the rest of us, he is doubtless unaware that above a certain level it has already been abolished.

As previously reported in this space, a Treasury analysis showed that the lucky fellow with an income of a million dollars a year typically pays a smaller percentage of his income than a man with a twentieth of his income. But the million-dollar-a-year man, according to a second analysis by the same authoritative source, pays a higher percentage of his income than those even richer. In short, while almost everybody assumes that our income tax system is steeply progressive, the percentage of income paid in taxes actually tends to decrease as income increases in the highest brackets.

This second Treasury analysis concerns itself with the taxes paid by a happy band of exactly 1,002 persons. These are the persons who, in the year 1959, reported adjusted gross incomes (incomes after business and other deductions) of more than $500,000 a year. Actually, there are many more than 1,002 people with that kind of real income. Since income from many State and municipal bonds is free of Federal tax and need not even be reported, most very rich people have a high proportion of their capital invested in them.

For this reason the officially reported percentages of real income paid in Federal taxes are certainly on the low side. In certain cases, however, they could not be lower, since according to the Treasury analysis there were 20 very rich people who paid no income taxes at all. The distribution of these nonpaying rich is interesting.

There were 529 people who reported incomes ranging between $500,000 and $750,000 a year. Of these relatively poverty-stricken citizens, a mere three—a fraction of 1 percent—paid no income tax at all. Four of the 529—no doubt they made the mistake of earning taxable income—paid at the highest rate, between 80 and 85 percent.

There were 19 Americans with incomes of more than $5 million a year. Among the lucky 19, 5, or more than 25 percent, paid no income tax at all. None of the 19 paid in the 80- to 85-percent bracket. Only one paid more than 70 percent on his income. (Perhaps that one, whoever he may be, will read this report, recognize himself and growl at his secretary, "Get my damn tax lawyer on the telephone.") Of the 19 richest of the rich, 12 paid less than 50 percent of their income in taxes.

Most people suppose that taxes in the really high brackets are confiscatory. But is a tax of less than 50 percent on an annual income of $5 million really confiscatory?

The word is certainly accurately applied to the 8 people—8 among the whole happy band of 1,002—who paid more than 80 percent of their income to the Government. It is accurately applied to the 54 citizens who paid 70 to 80 percent, probably even to the 89 who paid more than 60 percent. But considering how much the other 851 citizens had left after taxes, below the 60 percent level, the tears of sympathy turn somewhat crocodilian.

How do 20 very rich people manage to avoid paying any income tax at all, and stay out of jail? Alas, the answer, as supplied by reputable tax lawyers, is above the head of a mere political reporter. The answer has to do with something called the "Philadelphia-nun" ruling. It seems a goodhearted Philadelphia nun liked to give away all her income every year. To help the kindly lady, a tax ruling was made which permits a person who gives the equivalent of his or her entire taxable income to charity in 8 years out of 10, to avoid paying all Federal income taxes in those years. For complex reasons, the very rich can save very large sums in taxes by giving to charity, from properties which have greatly increased in value, sums equal to their annual income. In other words, if your taxable income is $1 million, and you also provide a hospital with a long-held piece of land now valued at a million dollars, your tax bill is zero. That, at any rate, is what the tax lawyers say.

There are numerous other devices which make it possible for people who derive very big incomes from capital to avoid the taxes which those who earn their money must pay. This may sound outrageous. A person with a moderate income who discovers that he is paying more taxes than someone with an income 100 times as big is tempted to man the barricades and call for revolution.

This reaction is irrational, as the reader can prove by asking himself a question: "If I could legally get away with paying less, would I or wouldn't I?" Moreover, as previously pointed out in this space, the capitalist system, which has served the country well, would collapse if a capitalist really had to hand over to the Treasury $9 out of every $10 earned on his capital.

Even so, the facts and figures cited above raise a question: Should President Johnson reconsider President Kennedy's decision to abandon virtually all the reform aspects of his original tax program? The program as first proposed would have combined generous cuts in upper-bracket tax rates with the closing, or at least the narrowing, of various tax loopholes. For example, the top rate would have been lowered from a totally unrealistic 91 percent (which literally no one in the country pays) to less than 70 percent. At the same time, devices like the Philadelphia-nun gimmick would have been eliminated. In short, the Kennedy program would have made a modest move in the direction of fixing taxes at a rational rate, on the basis of income actually at the disposal of the taxpayer. In the tax-cut bill which has passed the House, and which the Kennedy administration endorsed, virtually all the major reform aspects, as they affect the upper brackets, were dropped.

Perhaps this was inevitable. Any tax system creates enormously powerful vested interests. To cite one example, all the major foundations, museums and other charities would be seriously hurt by a repeal of the Philadelphia-nun ruling. But the consequences, in political terms, are ironical.

If a Republican had proposed such legislation, all the liberal Democrats would be hollering their heads off against the rich man's tax bill. As things stand, the only effective opposition comes from the conservative budget-balancers, like Senator HARRY BYRD. In the words of one of the Senate liberals, "We'll hold our noses and go along." Those five fortunate fellows who had more than $5 million in income and paid no income tax are probably all Republicans. But they should thank their lucky stars that this administration is Democratic.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 17, 24, 48, and 49 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 25 and 42 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PLANS FOR CERTAIN RIVER BASINS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of December 17, 1963, p. 24804, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, H.R. 8667 passed the House of Representatives on October 21, 1963.

It included additional authorizations for carrying construction forward on projects in seven river basins.

The total amount included in the House bill was $145 million, the amount believed necessary to cover estimated appropriations for fiscal year 1964.

The Committee on Public Works of the Senate considered the bill in conjunction with a commitment made by the House conferees during consideration of the Flood Control Act of 1962, and included several projects deleted by the conferees on that bill.

The committee also increased the basin authorizations to an amount believed adequate to cover anticipated appropriations for fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

The amounts included in H.R. 8667, as reported by the committee and passed by the Senate on December 3, 1963, total for 11 river basins, including $100 million for the Department of the Interior for the Missouri River Basin and $166,847,000 for 6 individual projects.

One amendment relating to the purchase of machinery or equipment of foreign origin with funds authorized in H.R. 8667 was added on the Senate floor.

In conference the House conferees accepted all the Senate amendments except three.

First. The funds for the Missouri River Basin for the Department of the Interior were reduced from $100 million to $16 million, an amount believed necessary for fiscal year 1964 only.

Since there was some controversy over provisions of this amendment, and since it properly belonged in the jurisdiction of another committee, the conferees agreed to provide funds for 1 year and let the controversial provisions be settled in the proper committees.

Second. The floor amendment on the purchase of foreign products was deleted. The House conferees considered this amendment unworkable and discriminatory against the projects for which authorization is included in the bill.

The statement of managers on the part of the House includes their attitude on this amendment.

Third. The project for the Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont., was reported in disagreement by the House conferees.

On December 17, 1963, the House adopted the conference report, but supported the House conferees in their disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The conference report as approved by the House includes $700 million additional basin authorization for 11 basins, and 5 additional projects having an estimated cost of $116,847,000, a total of $816,847,000.

The major amendments approved by the Senate and sustained in the conference are the following: Cape Fear River Basin, N.C.; Flint River, Ga.; Dardenelle lock and dam, Arkansas; Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the Flood Control Act of 1962, as reported by the Committee on Public Works and passed by the Senate, included an authorization for the New Hope Dam and Reservoir, Cape Fear River Basin, N.C.

At about the same time, the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1963, Public Law 880, 87th Congress, included an amount of $100,000 for planning on the New Hope Dam and Reservoir. The act provided "That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law."

The project for the New Hope Dam and Reservoir was deleted in the conference on the Flood Control Act of 1962; thus, the project was not authorized at that time, and the appropriation for planning could not be used.

The project for the New Hope Dam and Reservoir was again included in H.R. 8667, as reported by the Committee on Public Works and passed by the Senate. The project has been approved by the conferees on the bill, and is in the conference report now before the Senate.

In the conference, a proviso was deleted from the general language of H.R. 8667, which would permit the prosecution of plans, specifications, and preliminary work on any project authorized in the act with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program.

The Public Works Appropriation Act, 1964, includes $180,000 for planning on the New Hope Reservoir project.

I have been concerned about the use of the appropriations for fiscal years 1963 and 1964 for the New Hope project, and especially with the deletion of the language from H.R. 8667 which would permit the use of funds appropriated "heretofore or hereafter" for projects authorized in the act.

The Senate legislative counsel advises that it is his belief that enactment of H.R. 8667 as approved by the conferees would permit the use of the appropriations made for the project. His opinion was concurred in by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. Tofani, programs officer in the Civil Works Division, Office, Chief of Engineers, advises that the $100,000 appropriated for the New Hope Reservoir project for fiscal year 1963, has been set aside for use when the project is authorized.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The report was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on a certain amendment of the Senate to House bill 8667, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8667) entitled "An act authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins."

Resolved, That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26.

Mr. **McNAMARA.** Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from amendment No. 26.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. **MILLER.** Mr. President, the motion is subject to debate. I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan what the subject matter of the amendment is.

Mr. **McNAMARA.** Knowles Dam.

Mr. **MILLER.** I am thoroughly in accord with the motion of the Senator from Michigan. The Senate knows that I have been speaking out on this project for the past couple of years. I regret that the Senate saw fit to include Knowles Dam, particularly in light of the current policy of President Johnson to try to curtail expenditures of the Government as much as possible and to at least postpone projects which might be feasible but which otherwise might cause a further deficit situation in our Treasury. I commend the Senator from Michigan for requesting the Senate to recede with respect to this project. I certainly intend to support the motion.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan that the Senate recede on amendment No. 26.

The motion was agreed to.

THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

Mr. **ELLENDER.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for about 6 minutes.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. **ELLENDER.** Mr. President, on May 28, 1963, the late President Kennedy wrote these words in a memorandum to the heads of the executive departments and agencies concerning the raising of funds for the proposed National Cultural Center:

> To secure the necessary funds to build the center, which will be a $30 million structure of theater and concert halls, a nationwide fund raising program was authorized through which the American people are given an opportunity to demonstrate their voluntary support for the creation of this type of national institution.

President Kennedy was aware that if the Cultural Center could be constructed entirely through private contributions, it would have much more meaning for the people all over the country. These persons and groups—the schoolchildren who have already made donations, for instance—could all feel that they had a part in the building of a national center. It would have more meaning and significance to all the citizens of America.

President Kennedy realized this, and attached great significance to the raising of private funds. He and his devoted wife worked hard at this, as we all know. He made it the subject of White House messages. He and Mrs. Kennedy spearheaded a nationwide closed circuit TV presentation which had the effect of raising a large sum of money not only for the cultural center, but for many other artistic and cultural groups throughout the country who helped the first family sponsor the show and benefited from the proceeds. Mrs. Kennedy allowed her paintings to be used on Christmas cards and stipulated that funds raised on this project would be applied toward the cultural center.

In these and many other ways, they made it plain that the construction of the center was a project dear to their hearts. Though the idea was an old one, both breathed life into it. At President Kennedy's death, the raising of funds necessary for construction, on grounds donated by the Government, was well on its way.

I think it is most apropos that the Center be named in honor of our late President. It is something he and his wife brought to life; it is something in which he was vitally interested in, and as he conceived it, it is something in which people all over the Nation can take pride.

But, a move is now on to have Federal money appropriated for the Center's completion. I have heard of proposals to have the Treasury match the private contributions collected, while others call for appropriations of far greater amounts to take care of parking and maintenance needs far into the future.

I do not believe that these proposals do honor to the memory of our late President. Instead of financing the Center through voluntary contributions from the public at large, I repeat, many are now proposing that every taxpayer make a contribution through the appropriation of public funds. Instead of being built and maintained by private subscriptions, some are now saying it should become a drain on the taxpayers.

As I see it, Mr. President, rather than becoming an institution in which all Americans could justifiably take pride, the Center may well become another white elephant, built and maintained in the District of Columbia, at a loss to the taxpayer all across the country. We have been assured that this will not be the case, but one must not look very far to note other Federal ventures in the District which have turned out to be flops so far as the taxpayer and the National Treasury are concerned.

We were assured, for example, that the District of Columbia Stadium would be a paying proposition. On the basis of these assurances, Congress granted the borrowing authority to allow the Armory Board to raise the $20 million needed for its construction, and the Treasury stands behind the bonds that were issued. The stadium was constructed on a tract of land containing 102.2 acres donated by the Interior Department. This year's District of Columbia appropriation bill, for the first time, includes the sum of $856,655 to pay the interest due on those bonds. I believe that this will become a yearly charge, and in 1980, when the bonds fall due, the Treasury will doubtless have to step in and make them good.

The Carter Barron Amphitheatre is another example. There the Department of the Interior also made the land available, and the Treasury supplied the funds for its construction. The operation of the theater has rarely broken even, and we are fortunate to find a concessionaire who has agreed to operate it at his own expense.

So, I say again, if the Cultural Center is to be constructed, let us make it a fitting memorial of our late President. Let us build it through private contributions, as he believed could be done, and as he desired it to be done. Let us assist in the construction of a memorial that all America can take pride in as being ours and theirs, and not something which the taxpayers may come to resent. I applaud the proposal to name the Center for our late President. I abhor the idea of using his tragic death as a means to obtain public funds for the construction of the memorial.

THE CLOSING OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. **HART.** Mr. President, one of the happiest feelings that can come to a Member of Congress occurs when he can run his finger down a list of military installations that are being phased out and finds that his State or district is not mentioned.

This is what happened to me last Thursday and consequently I am now prepared to take a dispassionate and objective look at military economy. Before I am done, I may even be bold enough to support economy in government.

Having government work cut out from under us is an extremely trying situation. I feel qualified to comment on it because I am not without experience in that regard.

The wisdom of phasing out our cavalry corps has always been clear to me but I confess when the emphasis on Michigan-built tanks and trucks began to fade away I started to have an occasional doubt.

Jobless men, I found then, have only a minimal interest in the intricacies of military logistics. And nothing can match the agitation of a community that feels itself wounded in its prestige and economy.

And when such a community—or perhaps several—is snapping at his heels, it is very hard for a Senator to speak approvingly of the men who planned the shutdown.

On the other hand, it is also tough to speak disparagingly of economy-minded planning. As I recall, the best recourse is the word "but": "Certainly, I am for enonomy; 'but' this installation is essential to the defense effort."

Of course, I do not want to stand in the way of long-range planning but this move will cripple the economy of this section of the State.

The word "but" has ever since had bad associations for me. When I find it creeping into my press releases, I know I am in trouble.

Yet the general problem of military contracts is one that certainly deserves what we are fond of calling bold and imaginative thinking. The problem, really, is a good deal more simple when dissected.

The thing that so often puts us in a bad spot, I find, is that bases are eliminated because there is no need for them—and too often Secretary McNamara can prove it.

On the other hand, we are faced with understandably restive constituents at home. Unemployment is no laughing matter—least of all to the unemployed. And we find the local chambers of commerce and newspapers equally agitated.

I know that I have found that newspapers that whack away at me for advocating Government spending will, when local Federal jobs are threatened, thunder with equal vigor that I am not protecting local interests by forcing continuance of whatever program is under the ax. Many will reaffirm their demand for economy in Government but—and somehow they always conclude that the closing of a local installation is an affront to good management.

So two possible solutions present themselves. The first obvious one is to see that bases and material never become antiquated.

Surely, an imaginative Secretary of State could enter into various agreements with various nations, depending on each nation's capability. With a poor nation we could agree that, in case of conflict, we would never fight them with anything more powerful than cavalry.

Another nation, tanks and trucks. And, of course, we could always depend on Russia to keep our space and electronics industries going.

This plan has an obvious defect: It would not contribute much toward economy in Government. And it would be equally ineffective in diminishing the military-industrial complex that we have been warned about so often and so soundly.

So let us abandon that solution for a moment.

The other source of trouble is that restive constituency. What can be done about that?

Well, I suggest that we all live in the midst of the solution. How about creating a Federal district—not unlike the District of Columbia—around every major military complex. Residents of these districts, naturally, would not be allowed to vote in national elections.

This would have to be planned carefully. Naturally, the districts would not be set up until the bases had been established or the defense contracts awarded. This would give each of us the pleasurable experience of announcing new contracts and new installations for our States.

But once having dispensed with this formality, the lines of a Federal district would be drawn up, forever insulating us from the dread prospect of a phaseout.

Mr. President, tragically every day citizens of this Nation are denied the right to vote and here is a way to put that principle to a practical use.

Such a system certainly would brighten the prospects of disarmament which—like economy—is loved everywhere except on the local level. Nothing can match the agitation of a community that is forced to disarm unilaterally.

Surely, we all know that the concern over this problem is a great one—so great that I run the risk of having someone take this speech seriously.

The situation is at once ridiculous and grave. No wonder the cartoonists have so much fun with it and us.

Being so detached from the Thursday announcement, I am tempted to go on with more suggestions for the solution to the problem. But I am not going to. Because after writing this much of this speech I noticed an extremely sobering sentence in the news stories about phaseouts—a sentence that drained me of my good natured objectivity.

The sentence quoted Secretary McNamara as saying that more phaseouts are planned for other sections of the country sometime in the near future.

Now, however, there is one serious point I would like to make, even if only as a footnote. Beginning in the 86th Congress, I have asked for the creation of a select committee to study the economic impact of defense spending.

Surely, last week's episode emphasizes once again the influence that military spending has on the Nation's economic structure. I will not at this time cite all the arguments in favor of such a select committee. They are already in the Record.

I intend only to jog the memory of my colleagues in the hope that some might agree with me that it would be well to blow the dust off the proposal and consider it at an early date.

CILKA ELIZABETH INGROVA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 667, S. 579.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 579) for the relief of Cilka Elizabeth Ingrova.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point an excerpt from the committee report in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to bestow a gratuity of $15,000 upon Mrs. Cilka Elizabeth Ingrova, the widow of Gen. Sergej Jan Ingr, in recognition of the outstanding services the said General Ingr rendered the cause of freedom before, during, and subsequent to World War II and, in particular, his services to the United States from the date of his employment by this country in 1949 to the date of his death, June 17, 1956.

STATEMENT

A similar bill, S. 1441, was reported favorably by the committee in the 87th Congress. On September 18, 1961, it passed the Senate as reported by the committee.

The facts as contained in a letter from the Honorable Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Ambassador to Spain, to Senator Chavez, of New Mexico, show that General Ingr was born September 2, 1894, at Sikes, Czechoslovakia, and in 1919 was married to Cilka Masinova, of Roudnice, Czechoslovakia, who is now a resident of Washington, D.C.

The letter of Ambassador Biddle further shows the military service of General Ingr to be as follows:

1913–15: Austro-Hungarian Army (Russian front); platoon and company commander.

September 1915 to March 1916: Prisoner of war in Russia.

March 1916 to December 1916: Serbian volunteer division at Odessa (Russia) campaign: Dobrudza; platoon and company commander.

January 1917 to September 1917: Czechoslovak brigade in Russian campaign: Zborov and retreat from Halic: company commander.

October 1917 to August 1918: Czechoslovak legion in French campaign: Champagn; company commander.

August 1918 to July 1919: Czechoslovak legion in Italian campaign: Alps and action in Slovakia against Hungarian Communists; battalion commander.

1919–22: War academy in Praha (staff college).

1922–38: Commander: Battalion, regiment, brigade, division, corps, general staff.

1927–28: French Staff College, branch Versailles (infantry course).

1939: After the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Germans: Organized underground movements.

General Ingr then departed for France, where he headed the military administration of the National Committee in Paris. Later, in World War II, he went to England and served as Minister of National Defense and commander in chief of the Armed Forces of Free Czechoslovakia, located in England. Because of his well-known and unyielding anti-Communist attitude, Soviet pressure and influence were exerted on the postwar government of Czechoslovakia which prevented General Ingr from assuming a leading role in the Czech military establishment. In January 1948 General Ingr was appointed Czech Minister to the Netherlands. He resigned from this position 1 week after the Communist coup d'etat in February 1948.

Immediately following the coup d'etat, General Ingr assumed an active and effective role in organizing resistance to the Communist government in Czechoslovakia. General Ingr conceived and in large part personally implemented the concept of organizing a free Czech intelligence service in the West and established the framework of close coordination with the official intelligence organizations of Western governments. General Ingr was instrumental in selecting qualified personnel to staff this free Czechoslovak intelligence service. General Ingr served as the driving force of the Czech resistance movement abroad and at the same time was highly successful in establishing close working relationships between the Czech resistance movement and the Western governments concerned.

Between 1948 and the time of his death, General Ingr's intelligence activity made a valuable and substantial contribution to overall objectives of U.S. Government policy. Officers who worked intimately with General Ingr were unanimous in their assessment of him as an individual of democratic convictions who worked with energy and dedication and displayed outstanding qualities of leadership and statesmanship.

A few of the military decorations and awards which General Ingr received are as follows.

Czechoslovak War Cross, World War I.

Czechoslovak War Cross, 1939.

Medal of Merit, first class.

American Legion of Merit, commander's class.

K.C.B.: Knight Commander of the Order of the Bath.

Legion d'Honneur, commander's class.

Croix de Guerre.

Polonia Restituta.

Yugoslav St. Sava Order.

Yugoslav White Eagle.

Roumanian Crown.

General Ingr was employed as a consultant by the U.S. Government from 1949 to June 17, 1956. On May 21, 1956, he traveled to Europe on a temporary oversea assignment as an employee of the U.S. Government to coordinate activities there in connection with his work. General Ingr died on June 17. 1956, at the private home of a friend, where he was spending the weekend. The physician who was called at that time stated in a report that General Ingr's death appeared to have been sudden and in conjunction with heart failure.

Mrs. Ingrova was informed of her right to file a claim for death benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act if she believed her husband's death to be attributable to her husband's Federal employment. She was also informed about applying for social security benefits, and her claim was approved awarding her a monthly annuity of $87.

Mrs. Ingrova filed a claim for benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act on March 6, 1957, which claim consisted of the required forms, narrative statements by Mr. Ingrova and the employer, the medical summary, and a death certificate. Mrs. Ingrova's claim was based on her belief that her husband's apparent heart failure and consequent death occurred as a result of his employment.

In a letter from the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Department of Labor to Senator Chavez it was pointed out that after that Bureau's review of the information furnished, they informed the Government employer, who was in direct contact with Mrs. Ingrova, that the evidence was not sufficient to warrant the payment of benefits. This letter also explained the requirement of the law and the need for evidence which identifies the specific factors in the employment believed to be the proximate cause of death. It was also stated that in this respect the claim was quite inadequate and only general expressions and personal opinions were submitted to support the allegations.

The Department of Labor in its letter to the chairman of the committee stated that although Mrs. Ingrova alleged that her husband's death was causally related to his employment by the United States, no autopsy had been performed and the exact cause of death was not confirmed. After review of the evidence of record, the Bureau of Employees' Compensation determined that the alleged causal relationship had not been established, and rejected the claim. Mrs. Ingrova did not apply to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board for a review of the Bureau's decision.

The Department of Labor, in opposing enactment of the legislation as introduced in the 87th Congress stated that a legislative determination that a causal relationship existed between the decedent's death and his employment with the Government, notwithstanding the failure of his widow to establish this fact, could be inconsistent with the systematic and orderly procedure established by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for the investigation and adjudication of claims, and would create an undesirable precedent.

In a statement submitted by Mrs. Ingrova, it was stated that her husband had a very strict medical checkup from an official doctor which the Government agency he had been employed by sent him to; that this doctor found him absolutely healthy, and 4 weeks later he was dead. Mrs. Ingrova stated that she never knew the nature of her husband's work but that she did know from what little times they were together that he had to work continuously, and that his work was a constant strain on him.

Mrs. Ingrova came back to this country in 1958, and her financial condition has been such that she has had to seek employment. She has been employed as a governess and at the present time she is a companion to an elderly lady. Her weekly salary is $40. She also receives her room and board from this elderly lady. Because Mrs. Ingrova receives an annual income of around $2,000, she is not entitled to receive social security benefits.

This committee recognizes the great contribution to the cause of freedom which General Ingr gave to the world, and the tremendous asset our Government received from the benefit of his employment. He was the type man who would work both day and night in devotion to his work.

As was pointed out in the letter from the Department of Labor to the chairman of the committee, no autopsy was performed and the exact cause of General Ingr's death was not confirmed. This leaves his death as possibly being causally connected with his work open for question. However, regardless of there being some possibility that his death was causally connected with his employment, this committee can think of no better way to honor this outstanding figure than to provide assistance to his widow in her hour of need and, accordingly, recommends that the bill, S. 579 be considered favorably.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000 to Cilka Elizabeth Ingrova, widow of General Sergej Jan Ingr, in recognition of the outstanding services the said General Ingr rendered the cause of freedom before, during, and subsequent to World War II and, in particular, his services to the United States from the date of his employment by this country in 1949 to the date of his death, June 17, 1956: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

THE NATIONAL BELLAMY AWARD—ADDRESS BY RUSSELL BARNEY OF WEST HIGH SCHOOL, WATERLOO, IOWA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, one of the finest programs for high schools in the United States is the Bellamy Award competition. I am pleased to point out that the National Bellamy Award recipient last year was West High School of Waterloo, Iowa. I am also pleased to state that I have received information that Central High School, Chattanooga, Tenn., was the recipient of the 1963 award.

I take this opportunity to extend the congratulations of my State to the State so ably represented by the distinguished Senators from Tennessee on this very happy and proud occasion.

Present at the award, which was made at Chattanooga, Tenn., on October 11 of this year, were 16 delegates from the State of Iowa, including Mr. Russell Barney, representing West High School of Waterloo, Iowa, who delivered the Bellamy Award address.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

National Bellamy Award

(Address by Russell Barney, of West High School, Waterloo, Iowa)

On behalf of the West High School student body and faculty, I would like to congratulate Central High School on becoming the 22d National Bellamy Award recipient. It was just a year ago that West High received this award in a deeply moving ceremony which will long and proudly live in our memories.

West High and the Bellamy Award advisers took great pride in the fact that West was the first Bellamy school to have on its stage the Governor and both U.S. Senators, the first live television coverage, and the first color cartoon editorial.

West High is one of three high schools in Waterloo, a city with a population of approximately 78,000 people. Our present school building is less than 9 years old, but this year a 17-classroom addition (including a well-equipped foreign language laboratory) was opened to handle our rapidly increasing enrollment. Our auditorium can seat the entire student body, and plays to standing-room-only crowds for every performance of our annual variety show.

In addition to excellence in scholarship and citizenship, West High has distinguished itself in athletics. Last year we were the only large school in the State of Iowa to go undefeated in football. Five of our players made the all-State football team and one of them was elected to the all-American prep team. We are also very proud of our music and speech departments which rank high in the State of Iowa.

Our school motto is "Duty, Honor, Service." West High's student body is proud of this motto and strives to uphold these ideals in every phase of school life.

It is my pleasure to present to the student body of Central High School our last year's annual, the Wahawk. And also on behalf of the student senate of West High School, I am very happy to present this plaque of friendship to the finest high school in the South. Again may I congratulate you and wish you continued success in holding to the high standards which you have established

KIDNAPING

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, an editorial in the Washington Daily News of December 16, 1963, pays a deserved tribute to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the swift cracking of the Sinatra kidnaping case.

Every time there is a kidnaping, and the paying of a huge ransom, criminal minds all over the Nation begin thinking of trying it themselves. It seems so easy. Had the Sinatra kidnaping been successful, it might well have touched off other kidnapings.

But in this case, as in almost all others, the FBI moved quickly and within a week the accused kidnapers were in jail awaiting trial and perhaps life imprisonment.

So the net effect on the criminal world is another demonstration that this type of crime does not pay, and every home in the land owes a debt of gratitude to the FBI.

The Daily News editorial pointed out that this is a standard performance for the Bureau. Since the Lindbergh kidnaping law was passed in 1932, the FBI has solved all but three kidnap cases it has investigated. There were 22 such cases in the past year—all of them solved.

I think there is a lesson in this for all of us: Kidnaping is one crime that the public will not tolerate. And so our laws are severe and our police machinery is thoroughly mobilized to fight this type of crime.

If public opinion was as adamant against other kinds of crime, if our laws in other areas were more severe, if our police authorities were given more moral and financial support, I believe that the crime rate would be severely reduced all across the board.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the editorial entitled "Kidnapers" which appeared in the Washington Daily News on December 16, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Dec. 16, 1963]

KIDNAPERS

One of the most hazardous ways to make a fast buck, it should be obvious to any jerk; is to try kidnaping and ransom.

But every so often some "masterminds" think they have worked out the perfect scheme. They almost always wind up in deep trouble.

The FBI has under arrest three California characters who are accused of snatching Frank Sinatra, Jr., son of the entertainment star, and collecting $240,000 in ransom riches. Young Sinatra was abducted a week ago Saturday, the payoff was made Tuesday night, and by last Saturday the three alleged culprits were in jail. Most, if not all, of the money already has been recovered.

The law is tough on this type of enterprise. The penalty goes as high as the gas chamber, or life in the pen, depending on circumstances and the attitude of the convicting jury. Getting off with a mild rap is almost impossible in these cases.

Yet, as the Sinatra case has just shown, we still breed people stupid enough to try it. In the full knowledge, if they had any brains at all, that catching kidnapers is an FBI specialty. Since the so-called Lindbergh kidnapping law was passed by Congress in 1932, the FBI says it has solved all but three of the kidnap cases it investigated. (There were 22 in the year ended last June 30.)

All this suggests not only that we have a highly effective agency in the FBI but that if the laws and the public attitude toward other serious crimes were as adamant as they are on kidnaping the general crime rate might be markedly lower.

THE LATE JOHN W. MURPHY, MAYOR OF NEW HAVEN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last week one of the outstanding mayors in the long history of Connecticut, Mayor John W. Murphy, of New Haven, passed away at the age of 85.

Mayor Murphy served in office from 1931 until 1945. During these 14 years he gave the people of New Haven an administration that was honest, sound, enlightened, and progressive.

In the words of the New Haven Register:

> John W. Murphy preserved and protected the municipal foundations others had built. But he did more than that. He shored them up and strengthened them so that those who came after him could build and enlarge the structure those foundations supported.

Mr. President, Mayor Murphy was one of those who reflects credit on the American political process, one of those who inspire young people with honest motives and high purposes to enter politics.

He will long be remembered and his passing saddens the hearts of all who knew him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the editorial entitled: "Mayor John W. Murphy," which appeared in the New Haven Register, December 15, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, Dec. 15, 1963]

MAYOR JOHN W. MURPHY

A bit of the New Haven of yesteryear died this week with the passing of John W. Murphy. But the history which he wrote during his 14 years as this city's mayor always will be with us.

During his years in office, from 1931 until 1945, his was a stewardship geared to the times and conditions and worthy of the best of our proud traditions.

John W. Murphy preserved and protected the municipal foundations others had built. But he did more than that. He shored them up and strengthened them so that those who came after him could build and enlarge the structure those foundations supported.

He took over as New Haven's chief executive in a trying period and during dark hours. The city was plunged deep into the depths of the great depression and was tottering on the brink of municipal bankruptcy. Seeking and obtaining excellent financial advice and carrying this advice into execution, he brought the city out of those depths and gradually restored it to even financial keel. He did this with unswerving courage and determination and in the face of heavy criticism and carping complaint. He was New Haven's leader during World War II years. Here, too, he marched in step with the times, did what had to be done, with courage and with an unswerving honesty of purpose.

Throughout his 14 years in office Mayor Murphy carried the endorsement—the respect and the admiration—of the Register in a succession of political campaigns which saw his programs challenged by a series of Republican opponents.

Despite the problems with which he was burdened, John Murphy never lost the human touch. He loved people and people loved him, both for his kindly, considerate manner and for his kindly deeds. He was a religious man and put into daily practice the tenets of his faith. During his many years of unflagging service as a church choir singer and soloist his renditions reflected not only the excellence of a trained voice but something of his inner convictions and fine principles.

John Murphy, then, was a man who long should be remembered by those privileged to know him—and long will be, with fond respect.

INTEREST RATES CONTINUE TO RISE SLOWING ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the best résumé of the developments which have occurred in the past year in the monetary field was published in the November issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin. I ask unanimous consent that this résumé, entitled "Recent Interest Rate Trends," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the conclusion of this article as stated in the first paragraph comes as no surprise.

> Interest rates rose in most sectors of the U.S. money and capital markets during the first 10 months of 1963.

The article then goes on to point out that most of this rise was attributable to factors affecting the supply of funds. Now as we all know, the supply of funds is determined in large part—in fact, entirely—by the Federal Reserve Board. Therefore, while an article which appears in the Federal Reserve Bulletin cannot be critical of the Board, it nevertheless is clear from this article that the upward trend in interest rates during 1963 has been the result in large part of monetary practices followed by the Federal Reserve Board.

In a number of ways this conclusion is reinforced in the article. For example, under the heading "Factors in the 1963 Rate Advance," virtually the first statement made is that "the posture of monetary policy shifted further toward less ease."

The article then goes on to point out that "in light of all these developments the commercial banks and other lenders began to adjust their outlook on interest rates and tended to hold back in the commitment of funds until rates advanced to higher levels. The increases in the Federal Reserve discount rate are also prominently mentioned.

The discussion of the increases in short-term rates is not surprising. These, of course, have been repeatedly justified on the grounds that they were needed for balance-of-payments reasons, arguments which I think we have refuted conclusively. However, this article also indicates clearly that long-term interest rates have risen as well.

Mr. President, much has been said throughout the last 2 or 3 years, especially about the need to stimulate the economy. Yet while these statements continue to be made, the actual facts with respect to increases in interest rates seem to be generally ignored. There can be no question, however, but these facts have had a certain and clear-cut consequence of repressing economic growth within our Nation.

EXHIBIT I

RECENT INTEREST RATE TRENDS

Interest rates rose in most sectors of the U.S. money and capital markets during the first 10 months of 1963. This was in contrast to 1962 when long-term rates declined generally and short-term rates showed only small net advances.

Short-term rates fluctuated in a narrow range during the first 4 months of 1963, but from mid-May to mid-November they rose by around five-eighths of a percentage point. Monetary and other policy actions taken to help reduce the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments contributed to the uptrend.

Yields on State and local government, Treasury, and high-grade corporate bonds turned up in late 1962 or early 1963, but their subsequent advances were characteristically smaller than those of short-term rates. While rates on mortgages and yields on lower quality corporate bonds extended their 1962 declines during the first part of 1963, they subsequently tended to stabilize.

Since both the magnitude and in a few instances the direction of yield changes were different in different sectors of the money and capital markets, spreads within the total structure of interest rates changed. The gap between short- and long-term rates narrowed, as is typical when money conditions firm and interest rates rise. And spreads between rates on mortgages and yields on U.S. Government and high-grade corporate bonds also narrowed. While yields on U.S. Government and high-grade State and local government bonds followed roughly the same pattern of advance, those on Treasury issues advanced more than yields on seasoned high-grade corporate bonds. Over the longer period from the fall of 1961 to the fall of 1963, yields on Treasury bonds rose relative to those on all other capital market instruments, as the preceding chart shows.

RATES IN CAPITAL MARKETS

To a considerable extent both the general decline of long-term interest rates during 1962 and the subsequent advance of most of these rates during 1963 were attributable to factors affecting the supply of funds. These factors included changes in flows of funds to financial intermediaries, changes in monetary policy, and revisions in the interest rate expectations of lenders, as their outlook on likely business and financial developments changed.

Although net new borrowing in mortgages and State and local government bonds rose to record highs during 1962 and the first 9 months of 1963, a significant part of the growth in both types of debt was probably induced by the ample supply of funds seeking investment in these sectors.

Likewise, in the U.S. Government securities market, additions to public holdings of new issues maturing in more than 5 years were unusually large in both 1962 and the first 3 quarters of 1963, due chiefly to the increased interest of lenders in long-term investments. More than half of the total growth in public holdings of such issues occurred in Treasury advance refundings.

Borrowing via long-term corporate securities in 1962 and the first 9 months of 1963 was less than in 1961. This reduced demand for funds from corporations reflected their increased ability to meet cash needs from internal cash flows. In previous cycles corporate cash flows leveled off or declined after the early recovery period. In the present cycle, however, they have continued to rise, partly because of the new investment tax credit and the Treasury's revised depreciation guidelines but also in reflection of a continued gradual expansion of earnings.

FACTORS IN THE 1962 RATE DECLINE

Long-term interest rates turned down in 1962 because the flow of funds to capital markets tended to outstrip growth in demands for funds from long-term borrowers. The supply element that contributed most significantly to the decline was the accelerated flow of funds into time and savings deposits at commercial banks. Flows to mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions also continued to grow at a brisk pace.

Aggregate savings flows to all of these institutions rose sharply in the 1960–61 recession, as they had in the 1957–58 recession. But contrary to previous cyclical experience, they continued to grow rapidly in 1962, along with economic activity, as the uppermost section of the accompanying chart shows. For reasons that are developed below this countercyclical growth in savings flows to financial intermediaries added to the supply of funds in capital markets.

The particular factor initiating the sharp increase in flows to financial intermediaries in 1962 was the joint action of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation raising the maximum rates commercial banks may pay on time and savings deposits. These higher ceilings gave commercial banks leeway to pay rates competitive with those available on direct investments in marketable securities. In particular, they made it possible for banks to offer rates on time deposits and certificates that were competitive with yields on money market instruments.

During 1961 several security dealers had established a secondary market for trading in time certificates of large city banks. As a result, investor interest in these negotiable instruments had grown rapidly. After ceiling rates were raised at the beginning of 1962, growth in time CD's accelerated further, accounting for nearly three-eighths of the growth in total time and savings deposits at weekly reporting banks in 1962.

As commercial banks took advantage of the higher rate ceilings, some other savings institutions responded with increases of their own. The step-up of rates available on time and savings accounts greatly enhanced the attractiveness of such investments and channeled a larger proportion of total savings into this form. To some extent the appeal of these fixed interest returns was further enhanced by the impact on investor sentiment of the sharp break in stock market prices in 1962 and by the general tendency for investors to downgrade the inflation psychology that had been carried over from the 1950's.

The importance of commercial banks in the expanded flow of funds to capital markets in 1962 is indicated by the middle panel of the following chart. In addition to the sharp growth in time and savings deposits, the combination of stimulative monetary policy and a slower than usual cyclical growth in business loan demands also left banks with resources that could be allocated to longer term investments.

Faced with the accelerated growth and higher costs of their time and savings deposits, commercial banks began early in 1962 to place more emphasis on yield and less on liquidity in their investment policies. They reduced their holdings of lower yielding Treasury bills and invested actively in long-term capital markets. At first their interest was centered in State and local government securities in order to obtain high after-tax yields. This brought about a sharp decline in yields in the State and local government market. As deposit growth continued, banks began to invest heavily in mortgages as well and to lengthen their portfolios of U.S. Government securities.

Responding to this large bank appetite for longer-term investments, the Treasury in its 1962 financings offered nearly $13 billion of new issues with maturities of more than 5 years to the public. While the relatively high coupon rates on these new bonds attracted other investors as well as banks, banks took the lion's share of most issues.

Despite the accelerated flow of funds to commercial banks in 1962, savings accounts at other financial intermediaries also continued to grow at a rate about in line with past trends. Flows to all institutions accepting time and savings balances thus rose sharply in relation to total private long-term borrowing, as the preceding chart shows.

As is usual, funds available to these other savings institutions went largely into the mortgage market. With commercial banks also showing an increased interest in mortgages, lenders generally found it difficult to put available funds to work at the yield levels which prevailed in early 1962. Accordingly, to keep fully invested they eased mortgage rates and other lending terms.

It is difficult to ascertain whether the funds that accounted for the rapid general rise in time and savings balances during 1962 were funds that would otherwise have remained in idle demand deposits or would have gone directly into particular short- or long-term market instruments or into spending. To the extent the funds were merely diverted from direct investment in such instruments as State and local government bonds, the total flow of funds to capital markets was of course not changed, except perhaps in particular subsectors.

However, a large share of the funds channeled into time and savings balances clearly represented liquidity reserves which, in the absence of these alternatives, would very likely have been either invested in short-term debt instruments, such as Treasury bills, or held in the form of money. The very large amounts of funds placed in marketable time certificates of deposit of commercial banks, for example, were diverted chiefly from direct investment in money market instruments.

In practice, therefore, the higher rates on time and savings balances established in 1962 channeled a large volume of short-term funds that would otherwise have been invested in short-term assets into the capital markets, where they helped to satisfy the demands of long-term borrowers. Other things being equal, this tended to depress rates in the capital markets and to raise rates in short-term markets.

The general decline of long-term interest rates in 1962 was accentuated by lender expectations. In the face of the stock market break and of uncertainties created by a slowing of the economic expansion, lenders tended to view current rates on long-term assets favorably in relation to those that might be available in the near future. Therefore, they bid actively to obtain such assets.

FACTORS IN THE 1963 RATE ADVANCE

By early 1963 it began to become apparent that the 1962 rate decline had gone too far. Better business news dissipated some of the earlier uncertainty on the economic outlook, and psychology was further improved by the rapid rise in stock prices starting in late

1962. Around the turn of the year the posture of monetary policy shifted further toward less ease. At the same time, security offerings in capital markets by governmental units—Federal and State and local—remained unusually large. Later, the rate of growth in time and savings balances showed signs of slackening.

In light of all these developments commerical banks and other lenders began to adjust their outlook on interest rates and tended to hold back in the commitment of funds until rates advanced to higher levels.

As the year progressed, these early rate influences were reinforced. A sharp deterioration in the U.S. balance-of-payments position during the second quarter led to further Government measures for dealing with the deficit—including an increase of one-half a percentage point in the Federal Reserve discount rate to 3½ percent and some further firming of open market policy. With short-term interest rates rising generally in response to these monetary actions, yields on most bonds also rose, but only moderately. Finally, as economic activity continued to move up, business demands for bank credit gathered additional momentum, and business optimism became more widespread. In the face of all of these developments lenders tended to view further interest rate advances as likely, which in itself tended to augment the rise.

The volume of time certificates outstanding at city banks increased after the interest rate ceiling on deposits maturing in 3 months to 1 year was raised in July to 4 percent. Still the annual rate of growth in commercial bank time and savings deposits was less in the first 10 months of this year than last, and flows of funds to savings and share accounts at other institutions in the first 9 months were below the advanced rates of late 1962. While banks continued to absorb about 90 percent of the heavy volume of new State and local bond offerings during the first 9 months of 1963, several developments—including the further firming of monetary policy during the summer, rising rates on short-term money market instruments, and the general reduction in bank liquidity—raised questions among market participants as to whether banks would continue to absorb State and local government securities in such volume. These uncertainties led to some congestion in the municipal securities market and to a further rise in yields.

Interest rates on short-term debt instruments, as the uppermost section of the accompanying chart shows, have advanced in three stages since the recession: The initial advance, ranging from roughly three-eighths to one-half a percentage point, occurred in the latter half of 1961 as the domestic economy moved out of the recession. Over the next 17 months there were net increases, but they were small. Then in late May 1963 rates turned upward, and in less than 5 months rose about as much as in the previous 24 months.

IMPACT OF DISCOUNT RATE CHANGE

Just before the mid-July increase in the Federal Reserve discount rate, short-term interest rates recorded a sizable advance. During this period the press reported preliminary estimates indicating that the payments deficit had become much worse in the second quarter. At the same time money market data began to show some lessening of marginal reserve availability in the banking system. These developments, along with testimony by Treasury officials at congressional hearings on possible ways of dealing with the payments deficit, led to market expectations that a change in monetary policy was imminent. Thus, by mid-July the 90-day Treasury bill rate had already risen about one-third of a percentage point from its mid-May level of 2.90 percent.

Because of this anticipatory advance, Treasury bill rates at first showed little additional response to the increase in the discount rate. Within a short time, however, the higher costs of reserves borrowed at Reserve Banks were further reflected in other money market rates, particularly in rates for Federal funds, and in rates paid by Government security dealers for financing their security inventories. Subsequently the 90-day bill rate also pushed higher and by early November exceeded the discount rate by a small margin.

OTHER FACTORS IN THE RECENT RATE ADVANCE

Other factors that contributed to the rise in short-term rates after May were the continued expansion of economic activity and the increased business optimism it created, the further firming of bank reserve policy, and the mid-July action of the Federal Reserve and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation raising maximum permissible rates on time deposits at commercial banks.

The further firming of money conditions after May caused banks to liquidate some holdings of U.S. Government securities and forced them to rely more on borrowings at the Federal Reserve to meet their marginal reserve needs. In the 6 months from mid-May through mid-November, borrowings of all member banks at the Federal Reserve averaged more than $300 million, about double the average for the preceding 6 months; and their net free reserves averaged $130 million compared with $325 million in the earlier period.

The increase in ceiling rates on time deposits made it possible for commercial banks to offer more competitive rates on time certificates—particularly those with maturities of from 3 to 6 months, on which the ceiling rate had previously been only 2½ percent. Banks moved promptly to take advantage of this greater leeway, and the resulting competition for short-term funds operated to reinforce the general advance in short-term rates.

Seasonal deficit financing by the Treasury usually exerts upward pressure on short-term interest rates during the last half of every year, but in the 4 months ending with October, the Treasury covered a large part of its cash needs out of existing balances. Net cash borrowing thus amounted to under $2.5 billion, less than in the equivalent period of other recent years and less than previously expected.

Nevertheless, gross Treasury cash borrowing of $6 billion was spread over five successive special Treasury bill auctions of $1 to $2 billion each—running from late August to late October. Three of these represented the start of a new monthly cycle of 1-year Treasury bill auctions. The other two were a bill strip auction and a tax anticipation bill auction. Since none of these operations permitted commercial banks to make payment by crediting Treasury tax and loan deposits, Government security dealers had to provide most of the underwriting. This operated to keep bill rates under upward pressure.

ROLE OF PUBLIC POLICY

Looking more broadly at the economic upswing since 1961, the movement of short-term rates in the period was particularly affected by three influences. One was the large transfer of funds from short- to long-term markets, already described. The other two were Federal Reserve open market policy and Treasury debt management policy.

Policy actions of the latter two types were directed at minimizing downward pressure on short-term rates during the earlier part of the period and later at exerting upward pressure on these rates. Higher short-term rates—particularly for Treasury bills—were considered desirable both to restrain interest-sensitive outflows of short-term capital and to bolster confidence in the dollar among participants in foreign exchange markets. While the Federal Reserve and the Treasury have pursued these objectives jointly, the relative roles they have played changed somewhat as the economy moved to higher levels of activity.

The Federal Reserve has consistently pursued a policy designed to encourage bank credit expansion. Within the framework of this policy, it has conducted open market operations in a manner designed to minimize the downward impact of its purchases on short-term rates. To this end, in February 1961 the system extended its open market buying to include longer term securities, provided the market supply of such issues was sufficient to permit buying without pressing prices to unsustainable levels.

As the economy moved out of the 1961 recession and advanced to new high levels of activity, the Federal Reserve gradually modified the posture of active ease it had adopted in the recession. Each of these moves to less ease was intended to moderate slightly the rate of expansion in bank reserves, and thus to exert some upward pressure on short-term rates. Each was taken when unfavorable developments in the balance of payments were creating concern about the possibility of an accelerated outflow of short-term capital and when favorable developments in the domestic economy indicated further expansion was likely.

The rate on 90-day Treasury bills responded to these policy modifications, as the preceding chart shows, although the response in mid-1962 was distorted for a short time by expectations of possible, more drastic policy moves prompted by the Canadian balance-of-payments crisis and by talk of a possible quickie cut in U.S. income taxes. For the period from mid-1961 to early 1963, when the effective rate on Federal funds remained generally below the Federal Reserve discount rate, the pattern of change in the funds rate provides a more striking indication of the relative impact of monetary policy on money market conditions.

Although successive system policy modifications thus contributed to the rise in short-term rates, they did not keep bank credit from continuing to grow substantially. The total expanded at the unusually rapid rate of nearly 9 percent during 1962 and 7.4 percent (annual rate) in the first 9 months of 1963. Moreover, although average borrowing at the Federal Reserve rose after May 1963, member banks as a group continued to show net free reserves. This contrasts sharply with the cyclical expansions of the 1950's when the banking system showed a large net borrowed reserve position.

TREASURY DEBT MANAGEMENT

During most of the economic advance the Treasury has used debt operations to exert upward pressure on short-term rates. Its principal means of achieving this objective has been to finance the bulk of the continuing Federal cash deficit in the Treasury bill market. In setting the terms and the timing of these bill auctions, the Treasury has sought to maximize their upward impact on market rates.

Since 1961, however, the Treasury has also stressed debt extension in its other financing operations. Its ability to do this without compromising short-term rate objectives was due in large measure to the willingness of banks to hold a larger proportion of their Government security portfolio in longer-term issues.

Prompted by a desire to rebuild secondary reserves—depleted in the 1955–59 period of economic expansion and monetary restraint—commercial banks had expanded their holdings of short-term Treasury issues during late 1960 and 1961 by more than the net increase in such debt available to the public. But when economic expansion in 1962 failed to fulfill expectations—with monetary policy remaining easy, and with the large inflow of time and savings deposits—bank demands for liquidity declined. In the 2 years ending with September 1963, they reduced their holdings of short-dated Treasury debt by $8.9 billion. Some of this represented net liquidation of Treasury bills, but much of it reflected takings of the longer-term issues offered in Treasury refinancings.

Public holdings of short-term U.S. Government securities

[In billions of dollars]

Type of holder and issue	Change in 12 months ending—		
	September 1961	September 1962	September 1963
Commercial banks:			
Treasury bills	+5.4	−3.1	+1.0
Coupon issues	+7.1	−.9	−5.9
Total	+12.5	−4.0	−4.9
Nonbank holders:			
Treasury bills		+4.0	+3.7
Coupon issues	−.6	−.5	−2.5
Total	−.7	+3.5	+1.2
All holders:			
Treasury bills	+5.4	+.9	+4.7
Coupon issues	+6.5	−1.4	−8.5
Total	+11.9	−.5	−3.8

NOTE.—Changes are calculated from Treasury survey of ownership data. Public holdings exclude securities held by Federal agencies and trust funds and the Federal Reserve. Survey data for commercial bank holdings were adjusted by Federal Reserve to obtain an estimate of total bank holdings.

Short-term issues are those with maturities of less than 1 year; partially tax-exempt issue is to 1st call.

With banks reducing their bill holdings and the Treasury adding to the total supply, nonbank holdings of bills rose by $7.7 billion, more than offsetting a $3 billion drop in their holdings of short-term Treasury coupon issues, resulting from Treasury efforts at debt extension.

Over the same period the supply of bank time certificates of deposit grew by well over $5 billion, and that of commercial paper and bankers' acceptances by more than $2.5 billion. Thus, despite the Treasury emphasis on lengthening of the debt in its refunding operations, the supply of short-term money market instruments that were available to meet demands for liquidity was substantially increased.

SHORT- VERSUS LONG-TERM RATES

Since the 1961 recession, changes in the spread between yields on short- and long-term Government securities have received considerable attention. This interest has been prompted largely by the efforts of economic policy to promote domestic economic growth, while at the same time exerting upward pressure on short-term interest rates.

The chart shows changing relationships within the term structure of Treasury yields over the past three cycles. In all three cycles spreads within the yield structure were widest when monetary conditions were easy. Because money remained easy longer during the current economic upswing, yield spreads also remained wider over a longer period.

Treasury bill rates in the 1961 recession never reached the extreme lows of the two previous recessions, due in part to official efforts to restrain declines. Nevertheless, the spread between yields on bills and long-term bonds was about the same in both the recent recession and the 1954 downswing.

In the first 5 months of 1961 and again in 1962 the yield spread between Treasury bonds and Treasury bills narrowed as long-term rates declined. In earlier periods when long-term rates declined on any similarly sustained basis, short-term rates usually declined by more. Narrowing of the spread in the 1961 period reflected in part the fact that bank and other demands for liquidity were met with a greatly expanded supply of short-term Treasury securities, chiefly as a result of the Treasury financings. At the trough of the two earlier recessions, the supply of short-term debt had been substantially reduced by Treasury debt lengthening operations.

The supply of short-term issues available to the public in the first 5 months of 1961 was also augmented by net sales of about $1.7 billion from the portfolios of the Federal Reserve System and of Federal agencies and trust funds. At the same time, these official accounts made offsetting purchases of longer term securities, including over $1.1 billion of issues due in more than 5 years. These purchases, and the expectations of further purchases they created, contributed to the decline in yields on longer maturities and thus helped to reduce the yield spread between short- and long-term Treasury obligations.

The tendency for spreads to narrow within the Treasury yield structure in 1962 was due chiefly to the large transfer of funds from short- to long-term markets by financial intermediaries. In addition, the decline in long-term rates reflected changed expectations, while the net advance of short-term rates in the face of these expectations reflected system policy shifts to slightly less ease.

During 1962 the Federal Reserve and Federal agencies and trust funds made net market purchases of $0.6 billion of Treasury bonds due in more than 5 years. To a limited extent this buying helped to cushion the impact on rates of the large additions to public holdings of such issues in Treasury financings.

The marked further narrowing of the spread between short and long rates during 1963 has occurred as short-term rates have risen more than long-term. This pattern of change is typical in periods of generally rising rates. But, as the chart shows, the relative magnitude of the advance in long-term rates through mid-November was less than in some earlier periods of rising short-term rates, when money conditions were tight. Although Treasury offerings to the public of new issues with maturities of more than 5 years totaled about $15 billion in the first 10 months of 1963, two-thirds of this increase occurred in advance refundings, which have the smallest immediate impact on market rates per dollar of financing of any type of Treasury operation. Moreover, in this period, Federal agencies and trust funds acquired $1.5 billion of such issues in the market, and the Federal Reserve acquired about $0.6 billion.

THE LATE HONORABLE HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a number of eloquent and moving statements have been made in the past few days about the late and great former Governor and Senator, Herbert H. Lehman. One of the finest expressions of liberal philosophy ever voiced was given by former Governor and Senator Lehman in an interview given over NBC television on May 4, 1958. Senator Lehman was interviewed by Martin Agronsky, of the national broadcasting system. Agronsky is as competent and sensitive an interviewer as there is in the business. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this excellent interview, which so beautifully reflects the philosophy, life, and work of Mr. Lehman, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 13, 1958]

Mr. AGRONSKY. Good afternoon; I'm Martin Agronsky. Welcome to "Look Here." This is the Manhattan office of a man who has served his State of New York as Lieutenant Governor when Franklin D. Roosevelt was Governor; as a four-term Governor himself in the thirties; and more recently as Senator. And for his conduct of these offices the Honorable Herbert Lehman is regarded by New Yorkers as one of the great public servants of their State's history. And for his many good works he is one of their cherished citizens. Governor Lehman.

Mr. LEHMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Agronsky; I'm very glad to be here with you today.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, thank you, sir. Governor, I can't help noticing all these boxers; are they related in any way to your public service?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, not a bit; but Mrs. Lehman and I were the first people to introduce the boxer breed to this country. We brought the first boxers over for breeding purposes 46 years ago and made the first American champion. I'm devoted to the breed and we've had a lot of fun in raising them.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Do you consider that a contribution, sir, in public service?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think it was a contribution to the happiness of a great many people.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor, you've just observed your 80th birthday. Now such a milestone I would imagine would give a man pause. Would it give one pause to reflect as much as when you turned 30 as a young man?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well, I did have an 80th birthday celebration. It was a very happy one. I was honored by my family and my friends and my associates. Mr. Agronsky, I've been asked whether I miss my work in the Senate. I want to say that I, of course, miss my work and I particularly miss my friends and associates from Washington, but I've kept just about as busy since I retired as I ever was before; and it has been a great source of satisfaction to me to know that I still can make some kind of a contribution to the welfare of the people of my State and Nation.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Do you find that over the years, sir, from the time you first entered political life and public service that your views and your philosophy have changed as much as the world has changed?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well, I know that the views and philosophy of many people have changed. As far as I'm concerned I was surprised when my wife in emptying our attic when we moved from the country to New York a year or two ago found some compositions which I had written 60 years ago in college in which I dealt with many of the questions now of interest—civil rights, immigration, and other questions.

Mr. AGRONSKY. When?

Mr. LEHMAN. When I was at college. And I found my views had not changed very greatly from that time to this.

Mr. AGRONSKY. That's a remarkable statement, Governor; how do you account for that? Were you so prescient?

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I don't think so, except I was brought up in a liberal atmosphere, and it had its great impact on me. My parents were liberals. My father was an immigrant, my mother was also. They came over from Germany to find their new life here and to some extent to escape from the rigors of restrictions in their native country; so I heard continuously as a boy liberal points of view. And then later I, of course, became very much interested in liberal issues, questions, and problems because my parents encouraged me to do so. So I don't think it's so difficult to understand why I have remained a strong liberal ever since. And there are other factors of course.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor, I wonder if we could talk about another of your interests and your obligations aside from liberalism and politics that you've assumed since you've retired as a Senator. You're now heading the American Committee for the 10th Anniversary of Israel. Do you think that Israel's problems are greater or less than they were 5 years ago or 2 years ago?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well let me speak to you about that for a minute. I think Israel has made almost miraculous progress in the past 10 years. It has become a strong industrial nation, the only industrial nation in the Middle East. It has developed its agriculture and its social consciousness to a marked degree. It has admitted twelve hundred thousand new immigrants, party people, devoted people, dedicated people, to Israel, who have been a great asset to Israel. There's no doubt at all about it that from the material aspects, physical aspect, and the social aspect, Israel has made very great progress. But I don't want to give you the impression that I do not believe that Israel is in a very critical condition; it is, very critical.

Mr. AGRONSKY. And do you think that Israel can survive, considering the critical conditions?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think it's going to survive under any circumstances. But I believe that its difficulties will be tremendously reduced and the security of the world will be served without question if our country and the other great powers make it crystal clear to the world that Israel is there to stay under all the circumstances. And that they should take measures to assure the security of Israel within its present boundaries. If that is done I think there will be no grave danger there.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, by raising that point, sir, you, of course, indicate that there is some prospect that this will not be done. Do you think that is so?

Mr. LEHMAN. I don't know. I'm always an optimist and I hope that our Government will redeem the assurances which they have given time and time again to Israel. When I say our Government, I include other countries like Great Britain and France.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, what do you consider is the major threat to Israel's survival today? The Arabs?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well, I think obviously the major threat to Israel is the Arabs, but a new factor has entered into the situation, and that is the injection of itself by Russia into the Middle Eastern situation. Russia has encouraged almost fanatical nationalism among the Arab leaders and among the Arab people. And by doing so I think it has strengthened the intransigence of the Arabs to be willing to work together, live together, prosper together with Israel; and I think that if Israel prospers, I believe the entire Middle East will prosper; and I want to emphasize the fact that I believe the Middle East should be developed on a regional basis not only for the benefit of Israel but for the benefit of the entire Middle East, and if that is done I think our chances of maintaining security in the world and lasting peace will be greatly enhanced.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor, I wonder if you'd permit me to put a question—perhaps in the role of Devil's advocate. There are, after all, millions of Arabs in the area, more than 40 million; I believe it's 44 million, and so few Jews, just a little over 2 million. Wouldn't it be in the best interests of American policy, considering that particular ratio, that the United States should support Arab interests?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I emphatically deny that.

Mr. AGRONSKY Why do you think that, sir?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well, because in the first place, I don't think you're going to placate the Arabs by making concessions. In the the second place, I've never known a country permanently for any great length of time to prosper unless they maintain principles. I believe that if we continue to yield and yield and yield to the demands and to the representations of Nasser and some of the Arab leaders we may very well find ourselves in the same situation that we did when we placated and yielded in every degree to Hitler. If the great powers of Europe had stood up firmly for principle, for agreements, for understandings in 1935 and 1936, I doubt if we ever would have had a second World War.

Mr. AGRONSKY. You think then, Governor, that in the situation that Israel is in today in relation to the United States that the issue is one between principle and expediency again?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the issue is between principle and security in the first place, but in the second place—and I think that that must be taken very greatly into consideration and I hope it will be by our Government—is that the security of Israel is directly connected with the security of the United States and of the entire free world. If you have an explosion in Israel—and it's the most explosive and critical situation in the entire world, the Middle East—it will inevitably, in my opinion, affect the security of the entire peace-loving world.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor, can we return again to your own career? You entered public life, sir, under rather unusual auspices for a middle-aged Wall Street banker, under the Democratic-Liberal banner. I wonder if we could look back a minute? How did it all begin? What brought you into public life under those auspices?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well as I said before, Mr. Agronsky, of course, my parents were liberals. I grew up in that liberal atmosphere. I had a teacher at school, Frank Irwin, who was very much interested and for whom I had a very high regard and who was very kind to me; and he and my father used to take me down to the slum areas and I saw how the people down there lived and it was terrible. I saw the workshops, the sweatshops in which all decent conditions were completely disregarded. I saw men and women working for 12 and 14 hours a day for miserable pittances. You can't even call them wages.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Let's set a date on that, Governor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Well that was about 1892 or 1893, one of those years. And then I also was very much influenced by a great settlement worker and I think the settlement houses had great influence on the entire liberal movement in this country. Lillian Wald who was head of Henry Street and who I knew for a long time, and as a matter of fact I later became very closely associated with her. For many years up to the present time I'm still a director of Henry Street. I became connected with many other settlement houses. Then I became acquainted and in some cases made strong friends of some of the liberal legislators such as Al Smith and Robert F. Wagner and Jim Farley and others of like views. That affected me very much.

Mr. AGRONSKY. And they brought you into politics?

Mr. LEHMAN. Then I became acquainted with a great many of the social and labor leaders of the State and of the country as a matter of fact; all those things strengthened my determination and my inclination to take as strong a part in the liberal movement as I possibly could. It's an amazing thing how I was able through their eyes possibly under their guidance to see the real conditions with which the average young man did not have an opportunity to become acquainted with.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor, you raised the name of Al Smith. It has been 30 years since Al Smith was defeated in his effort to become President of the United States. Do you think, Governor, that our country has matured in the intervening period to a point where such a man—when I say, such a man I mean a man of Catholic religion—could run without jeopardizing his party's chances?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well I think the situation has very greatly improved. At that time it was a tragic period. I was very active in that campaign. At headquarters we had a room and on the wall of the room we pinned up, pasted up many of the cartoons and editorials attacking Al Smith because of his religion, and it was a terrible, terrible tragic situation which affected me very deeply. I think a great deal of that has disappeared and I think a great deal of the opposition to a Catholic candidate would be lessened today.

Mr. AGRONSKY. You do. Do you think that the country then has become more tolerant?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think it has become more tolerant, very definitely.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Governor let me ask you perhaps a mean question. Suppose you lived in Mississippi or Alabama—and at one point in your life I believe you did live in Alabama—what would you do at election time? Would you vote Republican as a protest vote or would you vote Democrat in the hopes of getting a little accomplished through your own party, or would you not vote at all these days?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well let me put it this way. I'm going to be very frank. If I were a politician, an officeholder whose whole life depended on his holding office I'm not sure that I would have courage enough to vote against the views of my constituents. But if I were a citizen I'm certain that I would have no hesitation in voting on the liberal line; in other words, to do away with all disabilities and all civil deprivations that have been exercised for so many years against Negroes.

Mr. AGRONSKY. You would leave your party on that?

Mr. LEHMAN. I would if necessary leave my party. At least I hope I would have courage enough to do it. I've never lived in Mississippi; I've never lived in Alabama, although my parents lived there for many years. I hope I would have courage enough to do it and I believe I would. But I want to say this in justice to some men in the Senate who are liberals in every other way except on civil rights. They do realize that an adverse vote against their constituents would mean their complete annihilation from the political field, and it takes a tremendous amount of courage to do that.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Are you prepared to justify their political schizophrenia on these grounds?

Mr. Lehman. I'm not prepared to excuse it but I believe I'm realistic enough to know that it must have a great effect on them. You're talking now about people whose career, whose life depends on their political careers. It's not a noble thing to do but I believe that some of them probably are affected by that.

Mr. Agronsky. Well Governor, perhaps it helps to have independent means then when you're in politics?

Mr. Lehman. I think it does to some extent help. On the other hand I think it's sometimes a handicap. It's a help because any man of independent means can be much more independent of his own job——

Mr. Agronsky. As you've indicated.

Mr. Lehman (continuing). Than otherwise. It's a handicap to the extent that I think many times men of means have to vote or are confronted with the problem of voting against their own interests in order to uphold their own principles. I can say that from a matter of experience.

Mr. Agronsky. Yes. Governor, you've just laid down very vigorously a policy of independence and liberalism. Now you are a four-term Governor of your State as a Democrat, and former Senator as a Democrat. You're an elder statesman. Now you said, too, you'd be prepared to leave the Democratic Party on this particular issue of principle, on this issue of racism in effect. Now does that mean, sir, that you are a liberal first, and a Democrat second?

Mr. Lehman. I would say so, although I've been a very loyal Democrat. I have voted for—I did vote for—Theodore Roosevelt because I thought the principles which he espoused and for which he fought—and they were important principles—were just and right and in the interests of the country. I believe if I had to face that issue I would say, "Well, I'm a liberal first and a Democrat second." And I say that not because of differentiation between liberalism and party affiliation but because I believe that the liberal faith is the right faith. I believe we have to have it in this country. I think that liberals have to stand firm. I think that the things that they have espoused are sound and right and will help the country. I would rather put it on the ground that I'm going to vote for what I think, and stand by what I think, is of the interests of the country than the interests of any differences between one particular point of view and philosophy.

Mr. Agronsky. Governor, I think you'd probably accept that that's a rather unique way for any man in political life to talk. I wonder if you'd give your definition of a liberal?

Mr. Lehman. Mr. Agronsky, it's awfully hard to give a specific definition of a liberal or of liberalism because there's neither dogma nor doctrine in liberalism. So I would rather characterize it than try to define it. I believe that the liberal movement is a great humanitarian spirit. It differs—the interpretation of that humanitarian spirit of liberalism, of course, differs among different people. But so far as I'm concerned, I interpret a liberal as one who loves freedom and equality, exact equality, one who has concern with the problems of the underprivileged; one who has a passionate respect for justice; and, finally, one who believes strongly in the universal brotherhood of man.

Mr. Agronsky. Well, I think that's a very stirring definition, Governor. I wonder, looking now at contemporary political life, who in public life today do you think would best reflect such qualities as you speak of?

Mr. Lehman. Well, I can't answer that question, because I believe there are a great many people who would fit that description; and I wouldn't want to mention a few particular individuals, for fear of omitting others who deserve that characterization as much as any.

Mr. Agronsky. Well, I accept that, Governor. I won't press you on that. I wonder if we can return then to liberalism in the general sense. Wouldn't you say that liberals are really a marginal force, though, in our national politics today?

Mr. Lehman. I think they're absolutely necessary.

Mr. Agronsky. But marginal, sir? Certainly in the great minority.

Mr. Lehman. Oh, very great minority. There's no doubt about it. Well, the militant liberals are in a great minority. I believe that the great mass of the American people are liberal. I wouldn't have been elected as often as I have been elected to office if that wasn't the case, because I wasn't elected exclusively by Democratic votes. Of course, they helped, but I was helped by a great army of Independents, Republicans of liberal point of view, and of members of the Liberal Party. I believe that the great majority of the American people are liberal at heart and in mind, and so far as they have an opportunity in expressing themselves.

Mr. Agronsky. Governor, let's take your own experience in the Senate as a liberal and as a Democrat. Invariably when issues came up, various legislative measures arose that required that you compromise in order to be on the winning side or to get the legislation passed, invariably you refused to compromise, and I've often wondered, didn't this reduce your own effectiveness as a Senator?

Mr. Lehman. I don't think it lessened my effectiveness as a Senator and as a leader—political leader. I use the world "political" in the broadest sense. I think probably it lessened my chances of getting legislation through very frequently. I took that chance. I had to make the choice when I went to the Senate of going out for the whole loaf or only a slice, and I decided to go for the whole loaf. Now, I think there may be instances where a legislator should compromise to some degree, but I think he should do so only after the case has been completely presented to the people of the country.

Mr. Agronsky. Then what is the function of the liberal, to get the whole case presented? Is that it?

Mr. Lehman. Well, yes. I think this, my feeling is this, that I think the liberals should not concern themeselves nearly so much or exclusively at least with exerting power as with upholding principle. I think that's the important thing. I think somebody has got to uphold principles unless this country is going to revert to a situation which now exists, would have existed unless we had had some liberal leaders and which does exist now in many countries of the world. I believe he has to uphold principle. I think that has been one of the great difficulties of our country both in their domestic and in their foreign policies. We haven't sought to uphold, we haven't fought to uphold principles.

Mr. Agronsky. Governor, can you cite an occasion along these very lines in which insistence on a whole loaf won the day in legislation?

Mr. Lehman. Oh, I could if I had time, cite many examples. I'll cite one in my own experience. This happened in 1935 and 1936. When I was Governor I recommended the enactment of a social security act by the Legislature of the State of New York. The Republicans strenuously opposed that. I fought for it in 1935 and again throughout 1936. I appeared before joint sessions of the legislature three times. I sent many messages to the legislature; I appeared on the radio—it was before television—and I didn't win: but I made it a main issue in the campaign that year. I was elected by a vote so large that people considered it a mandate and the bill went through after 2 years struggle almost by unanimous vote. That is why I say no problem is beyond hope of redemption.

Mr. Agronsky. Good for you, Governor Lehman. Thank you, Governor Lehman. Since last September it has been my privilege to conduct "Look Here" at this time, and this is the last program in the current "Look Here" series. I would like to express my thanks to all of you now who found these interviews worthy of your time and your interest. Good afternoon.

ARMS AID TO INDONESIA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the foreign aid appropriation bill will be under consideration by the Senate in an hour or two. The bill provides military assistance to Indonesia—not much, but some.

This morning's newspapers report that Great Britain has asked her allies to halt arms aid to Djakarta and has pointed out the serious nature of the relations between Indonesia and Malaysia.

I invite attention to an article entitled "Sukarno Seeks To Crush Malaysia," written by R. H. Shackford, a Scripps-Howard staffwriter, and published in the Washington Daily News of October 16, 1963. I read a portion of the article:

> This small and resource-rich country—meaning Malaysia—is the brightest and most hopeful spot—politically and economically—in southeast Asia.
>
> Most of the others are harassed by tinpot dictators, eccentric princes, extreme chauvinism, and Communist warfare.
>
> And Malaysia's bright futures is the major reason Indonesia's dictator, Sukarno, is threatening to crush it.
>
> Having wrecked his own country economically, Sukarno apparently can't stand the example of a prosperous and stable neighbor.

I ask unanimous consent to have that article and one entitled "Britain Asks Allies To Halt Arms Aid to Djakarta," written by Peter Grose, and published in the New York Times of today, December 18, 1963, printed at the conclusion of my remarks. I hope the Senate will give consideration to this particular situation when the foreign aid appropriation bill is considered a little later today.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News,
Dec. 16, 1963]

Dim View of Bright Future—Sukarno Seeks To Crush Malaysia

(By R. H. Shackford)

Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, December 16.—This small and resources-rich country is the brightest and most hopeful spot—politically and economically—in southeast Asia.

Most of the others are harassed by tinpot dictators, eccentric princes, extreme chauvinism, and Communist warfare.

And Malaysia's bright future is the major reason Indonesia's dictator, Sukarno, is threatening to crush it.

Having wrecked his own country economically, Sukarno apparently can't stand the example of a prosperous and stable neighbor.

The cold war between Malaysia and Indonesia (with the Philippines aiding Indonesia) isn't so cold any more in Borneo and Sarawak, where Sukarno's army is helping guerrillas and terrorists.

The situation is so bad Malaysian officials openly say Sukarno is guilty of aggression and anyone helping him there is his accomplice.

To Malaysians, Sukarno is southeast Asia's Hitler—megalomaniac, aggressor, expansionist, envisioning a personal fuhrership over all territory from Thailand to Australia.

WIDE SPLIT

United States and Malaysian attitudes toward Sukarno couldn't be farther apart.

Although the United States is taking a new look, until now the American view has been that Sukarno is a fact of life who must be lived with and that the alternative would be worse—a takeover by the Indonesian Communist Party, with close ties to Red China.

DUPE?

Malaysians say the American attitude is preposterous, that if Sukarno leaves the scene Communists couldn't take over more than the island of Java, where their strength lies, and that the rest of Indonesia would break up into separate entities—Sumatra, Celebes, and so on.

Malaysians see Sukarno as a dupe, if not an actual tool, of the Communist Chinese.

But if not brought to heel, he could provoke a disastrous situation which would make Vietnam look like a preliminary bout, they feel.

It is pointed out the Indonesian Communist Party is the biggest and most influential in this part of the world.

Furthermore, it sides with Peiping in the row with Moscow over the issue of advancing communism by violent revolution.

From here and Singapore it is easy to understand how these people consider themselves on the front line of the struggle against communism.

And they are not a little annoyed that most of the rest of the free world, especially the United States, doesn't appear concerned about Sukarno.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 18, 1963]

Britain Asks Allies To Halt Arms to Djakarta

(By Peter Grose)

Paris, December 17.—Britain warned the Western alliance today that British forces in Malaysia were threatened by a long campaign as dangerous as the United States struggle in South Vietnam.

The British Defense Minister, Peter Thorneycroft, urged members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization not to permit shipments to Indonesia of arms that could be used against British troops. Before this meeting of the NATO Council, which ended today, British officials feared that the smaller European countries might make military contracts with Indonesia, not realizing the immediacy of the danger to the British in Malaysia.

The British Foreign Secretary, R. A. Butler, made a similar appeal yesterday against military assistance to Indonesia.

BELIEVE DANGERS ARE KNOWN

Both ministers indicated their belief that their partners in the Atlantic alliance now fully realize the dangers to Western interests in southeast Asia.

British officials considered this new awareness one of the most satisfactory results of the semiannual meeting.

They emphasized that the British Government was worried by the mounting threat from Indonesia, coming at the same time as recent anti-Western moves by Cambodia, and the continuing struggle in South Vietnam.

In his formal speech to the Council, Mr. Butler urged a more "outward-looking" Atlantic alliance, to take account of these challenges even though they come from far beyond the European scope of the organization's activity.

The U.S. attitude toward aid to Indonesia has been hesitant, although shipments of military equipment and new military training programs have been halted in the face of the threat to Malaysia.

The subject came up in talks between Mr. Butler and Secretary of State Dean Rusk just before the Council meeting of the alliance began, and may be discussed again when Mr. Rusk goes to London tomorrow.

QUESTION MAY ARISE AGAIN

Mr. Rusk was responsive to Britain's warnings, officials said, but expressed the hope that neither side in the conflict would be pushed into an open war.

Longstanding programs of American technical aid to Indonesia are continuing, the officials said, but no new commitments are being made.

The British maintain a force in Malaysia under a defense dependent nation, made up of the former British territories of Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak and Sabah (North Borneo).

Indonesia has opposed the federation on the ground that it is an attempt to maintain British influence in southeast Asia, and has declared a policy of "confrontation," including an economic boycott, against Malaysia.

British End Indonesia Project

London, December 17.—Britain halted the construction of a multimillion-dollar radar system in Indonesia today because of the Djakarta Government's "hostility" toward neighboring Malaysia.

Peter Thomas, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, said in the House of Commons that the construction was stopped after a request for help from Malaysia under the British-Malaysian defense agreement.

He said that Decca Radar, Ltd., was being asked to cease work on the construction of its extensive radar network, and that the Fairey Aviation Division of the Westland Aircraft Co. was being asked to cease work on its contract to service 18 antisubmarine Gannet patrol planes. Both companies will be indemnified for any losses.

These were the last two British contracts with the Indonesian armed forces. The radar installation was by far the largest and most important of the contracts. Thirty Decca employes and their families will be returning home. Westland employed only two men in Indonesia.

The cancellation will affect a touchy situation that has developed between Washington and London over the supplying of equipment to Indonesia's armed forces. The British have asked the United States to stop arms shipments to Indonesia, but American officials have pointed out that British companies also had contracts with the Indonesians.

Officials at Decca described their installation, which was started in 1959, as a "radar defense system," but an official said it was also obviously intended for commercial aviation in the widely scattered islands of the southeast Asia nation.

Unlike the servicing for the patrol planes, which a Westland Co. official said could be taken over by the Indonesians, the installation of the radar system was an intricate project that required detailed training and teamwork. It was unlikely that the work could be resumed quickly.

Mr. Thomas told Members of the House that "if the Indonesian Government would stop its confrontation policy, Britain would be only too happy to resume the friendliest of relations."

The Decca and Westland contracts were signed 4 years ago with the British Government's endorsement.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES BEARING THE LIKENESS OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 9413, a bill to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hart in the Chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 9413) to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9413) to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the acting majority leader has obtained unanimous consent for the present consideration of H.R. 9413. That bill is in accordance with the request of our distinguished President made last week that there be stricken off a 50-cent coin bearing the likeness of our late lamented President, Mr. Kennedy.

The chairman of the House committee promptly introduced a bill and held limited hearings. The House passed that bill, with only six dissenting votes. And not all those votes really were against the bill; some Members thought it would be wise to have hearings and more extended consideration.

In keeping with established protocol, when the President requests legislation which would go to a committee, the chairman of the committee introduces such a bill by request. That is the action I took.

The majority leader asked me whether I would object to his calling up the bill as it passed the House without reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I replied that I would not object because I had received a report on the bill pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency which stated that the Treasury Department did not object to passage of the bill, provided it was passed before the 1st of January.

It appears that there is a shortage of small silver coins and of minor coins. The Philadelphia Mint is working day and night and still cannot meet the demand. That is why we have authorized a new mint in Philadelphia, and why we hope it will soon be under construction.

Whenever a new coin is issued, all the coin collectors want one or two of them for their collections, so if we do not provide for the coin in this session of Congress there will be in 1964 one 50-cent piece carrying the likeness of the great Benjamin Franklin and another carrying the likeness of the late John F. Kennedy. And the collectors will want one of each of these 50-cent pieces, making the present coin shortages much worse.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I presume a case can be made for removing Benjamin Franklin from the half dollar and substituting the likeness of the late President Kennedy. Since we have the Lincoln penny, the Washington quarter, the Jefferson nickel, and the Roosevelt dime, the half dollar is the only fractional coin that does not carry the likeness of a President.

While I do not believe there would be any objection, this action will require a modification of the 1890 act, which provided that a change cannot be made before 25 years have elapsed, since Ben Franklin has been on the half dollar for only a period of 15 years.

I do not say that this is a particularly hasty action, but I wish to shed a few tears for Benjamin Franklin.

When the President came before the joint session on November 27, the one thing for which he received the greatest applause was his statement that the Government would be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality. Benjamin Franklin has historically, classically, and traditionally been the great apostle of thrift and frugality. Poor Richard's Almanac has been printed, I understand, in 75 languages. Therein are contained all the great epigrams for economy, for thrift, for providence and for frugality. It is no wonder that Thomas Jefferson, in writing to a friend long ago, had this to say of Franklin:

> He was the greatest man, an ornament of the age and the country in which he lived.

In German, in French, in Italian, in English, and most probably in oriental languages, Poor Richard's Almanac is still being published as the bible of thrift and frugality.

But I suppose the times have changed. New philosophies abound. This is, after all, the decade of the deficits. There is a belief that we can spend ourselves rich.

Balanced budgets are old fashioned. Why mind a rising public debt, since we owe it to ourselves? Thrift is for children with piggy banks, and frugality is "old hat."

So in the decade of deficits perhaps Mr. Franklin's idea that "A penny saved is two pence clear, a pin a day's a groat a year," is considered as modern twaddle.

It seems to me, if Franklin must go—and it distresses me—I should shed a tear for Poor Richard. When the Federal deficit for fiscal year 1964 and the projected deficits for 1965 and for 1966 are announced, let us ponder that it was Franklin who said:

> Get what you can, and what you get hold;
> 'Tis the stone that will turn all your lead into gold.

We do not have the philosopher's stone. Perhaps George Washington, who admired Franklin so much, might be willing to share the 25-cent piece with him.

So, as we make this change, I say, "Goodby, Benjamin Franklin, apostle of thrift and frugality. Evidently you are not so popular in the age of the deficit."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I fully endorse all the eloquent sentiments expressed by the distinguished minority leader concerning the late Benjamin Franklin. However, I feel certain that the names of some men have been carved so high on the scroll of fame that there is little we in this day and generation can do to add to their luster.

Incidentally, it was the great President from Illinois whose picture first appeared on one of our coins—Abraham Lincoln. I am glad he received that honor.

I am the chairman of the subcommittee which handles the appropriation bill for the Post Office Department. I watch that department go in the red about $800 million a year, though it should be self-supporting. I have frequently mentioned that Benjamin Franklin was the first Postmaster General. He balanced his budget; and he said that the Post Office Department should always be self-supporting.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the interest of historical accuracy I hope my friend from Virginia will check that remark, because Benjamin Franklin was not the first Postmaster General under the Constitution. That was Samuel Osgood. Benjamin Franklin was the Postmaster General under the Articles of Confederation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But not under the Constitution.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. He was the architect of the provision for the only socialistic scheme in our Constitution—that the Government own and operate the Post Office Department.

Mr. President, I wish to absolve our great President of any intention to detract in the slightest from the great Benjamin Franklin by cutting short the time his picture is shown on the 50-cent piece by 10 years.

It is true that normally Franklin's portrait would be on the 50-cent piece for 25 years. He has been on it for only 15 years. I am sure our great President did not intend any disrespect of Benjamin Franklin whatever in making the recommendation.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point a report submitted to me by the Treasury Department, showing that it had no objection provided it were done before the first of the year. In order to do that, I informed our distinguished majority leader and our distinguished minority leader that I would not object if they brought up the measure, because I did not know of any objection that would be offered either in the committee or on the floor. I have been told it would cost the taxpayer only $1,000.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The General Counsel
of the Treasury,
Washington, December 13, 1963.

The Honorable A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on S. 2377, to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The proposed legislation, which is identical with H.R. 9413, would provide for the coining of a 50-cent piece bearing the likeness of the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in lieu of the coinage of the Franklin half dollar. The bill would thus authorize a change in the design of the half dollar now being minted for general circulation.

The proposed legislation incorporates the draft bill submitted by the President to the Congress on December 10, 1963, and the Treasury Department recommends its enactment.

The Department would like to emphasize that the enactment of this legislation during the present session of Congress is of great importance. Such early enactment would greatly facilitate the operations of the mints in the changeover to the new design. The mints could begin the preparation of the necessary dies immediately and take other steps in connection with coin production to insure that the new design will appear on all 50-cent pieces coined in 1964. Otherwise, the mints would be required to continue the coinage of the Franklin half dollar after the end of this year. Should there be a limited coinage of Franklin half dollars in 1964 these coins would become collector's items and would be removed from general circulation thereby aggravating the shortage of coins.

As is well known, the mints are operating on a round-the-clock basis to meet the growing demand for coins. The operations of the mints are further hampered by their limited facilities. The Congress recognized this lack when it enacted legislation last spring authorizing the construction of a new mint.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee and that enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,
G. d'Andelot Belin,
General Counsel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 9413) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

STOCK OPTIONS IN CHRYSLER CORP.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times report today that a small group of insiders of Chrysler Corp. have engaged in a stock option manipulation from which large and quick profits have been realized. As I see it, this kind of deal cheats other stockholders and at the same time compensates them far beyond their approved salaries, by way of restricted stock option, and in such manner that only a low tax rate, if any, is paid.

I should like to read two paragraphs from the New York Times story:

> Most of the shares disposed of by the Chrysler officers probably were obtained under the company's stock option plan. Mr. Townsend, president of the Chyrsler Corp., on February 28 had outstanding options on 24,100 shares at an average price of $24 a share, while the officers as a whole held outstanding prices ranging from $21 to $31 a share on the present stock. Chrysler was split 2 for 1 in April and has been selling recently in the $85 to $90 range. It closed today at 95⅛, up 5⅞.
>
> This means that if the stock involved was bought under the option plan and sold outright, Mr. Townsend would have realized about $800,000 from resale and the total officer group would have realized upward of $4.5 million. The stock apparently was disposed of recently, since the transaction did not show up in the latest "insider" reports filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission and the New York Stock Exchange.

Mr. President, this is a wrong that must be corrected; an abuse that must be stopped; a loophole in the tax law by which corporation executives receive large compensation and avoid paying normal taxes thereupon.

I am happy to report to the Senate that I called this matter to the attention of the Senate Finance Committee this morning, meeting in executive session. After some discussion, the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], without objection from the committee, directed the Treasury Department and the technical staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue to inquire into this operation and report to the Senate Finance Committee after the holidays.

It is an example of tax avoidance schemes which must be dealt with when a revenue measure comes to the floor of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Wall Street Journal and the article in the New York Times to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 18, 1963]

CHRYSLER OFFICERS' SALE OF OPTION STOCK COULD STIR TAX BILL DEBATE—IT'S LIKELY TO GIVE AMMUNITION TO SENATORS WHO PLAN FIGHT TO TAX OPTIONS MORE HEAVILY

(By Frederick Taylor)

DETROIT.—Chrysler Corp. stockholders were told yesterday that President Lynn A. Townsend had sold or given away 12,780 Chrysler shares and that other Chrysler executives had disposed of 64,743 shares.

That seemingly matter-of-fact report is likely to touch off another round of a controversy that has raged off and on since 1950—a controversy about stock options, their use and alleged misuse. And it may very well have an impact on the treatment of options in the tax bill Congress is expected to pass early next year.

George Love, Chrysler chairman, devoted the bulk of his prepared remarks to the stockholders, who were called to the special meeting to approve a 2-for-1 stock split, to the dealings of Chrysler executives in the company's stock. He reported that since February 28 Chrysler executives—a company official later said between 20 and 25 of them—bought 205,498 shares, and sold or gave away 77,523 of them. Mr. Love said he personally had bought 40,000 shares, bringing his holdings to 42,000, and hadn't sold any. But, he said, Mr. Townsend had purchased 18,800 shares and sold or given away 12,780 of them. Mr. Townsend later said his gifts had amounted to nearly 1,000 shares.

HELD ABOUT MINIMUM TIME

Mr. Love did not say so yesterday, but the bulk of the shares that were sold were originally purchased, through exercise of stock options, in mid and late May, and sold in early December. This means they were owned just a little longer than the holding period of 6 months required to allow the executives to keep the profit on the sale, rather than having to pay it to the company. That fact alone seems certain to stir a fuss even aside from the large profits the options and sales meant for the Chrysler executives involved.

Under the type of stock option plan Congress authorized in 1950, a company can grant executives options to buy stock at 95 percent of the market price on the day the option is granted. The executives have up to 10 years to exercise the options; it is to their advantage, of course, to do so if the market price rises.

If the executives then wait 6 months and sell the stock they have bought under options, their profit on the sale, if any, is taxed at capital gains rates, which never go above 25 percent, rather than ordinary income rates, which can range up to 91 percent for a high-salaried executive. An executive is effectively barred from selling his stock in less than 6 months, not by option rules, but by a provision of the 1934 Securities Exchange Act. This requires an executive making a profit on transactions in stock of his own company held less than 6 months to pay that profit to the company.

Proponents of stock options argue that they are needed to provide a way for a heavily taxed executive to buy his company's stock. They also say that options give the executive an incentive to work hard, since if company profits improve and the price of the stock rises his option can become very valuable.

CRITICS' ARGUMENTS

But critics—who include Congressmen, Senators, and some academicians and small shareholders—contend that options too often become a device to allow an executive to make a quick stock-market profit as a sort of lightly taxed addition to his regular pay. The tax-cut bill that passed the House last summer contained provisions for tougher tax treatment of options. Washington sources say the Chrysler transactions are almost certain to provide ammunition for such option opponents as Senator GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, to argue for still tougher rules when the Senate Finance Committee begins considering this section of the bill, probably in January.

Last May 13, Chrysler officers exercised their option rights to purchase 93,000 shares of Chrysler stock. They included Mr. Townsend, who bought 17,000 shares, raising his ownership to 21,200 shares.

These shares were bought at option prices ranging from $21 to $31 a share. The market price of Chrysler stock at the time these shares were purchased, which was between May 10 and May 24, according to forms filed with SEC, ranged from $53.62 to $58.25. The options had been granted, but not exercised, at least 2 years before the stock was bought.

The stock was disposed of in early December, and full details on who sold how much won't be available until the January reports of the SEC and the New York Stock Exchange are published. But Chrysler stock in early December ranged between $84.37 and $90.25.

Assuming that at least 75,000 of the 77,523 shares were sold rather than given away, the selling stockholders made a gross profit of more than $4 million—possibly a great deal more, since potential profit ranged from $53.37 to $69.25 a share. President Townsend's gross profits alone were, at minimum, more than $600,000—or more than three times his 1962 salary and bonus.

Chairman Love told stockholders that Consolidation Coal Co., of which he also is chairman, had bought 59,000 shares of the optioned stock sold by Chrysler executives. These were among purchases that have boosted Consolidation Coal's interest in Chrysler to 1,406,000 shares from 1,272,000 shares last April.

Mr. Love said Consolidation Coal had paid the then prevailing market price for the stock bought from Chrysler executives, but the transaction was made privately rather than on a stock exchange. This means the Chrysler executives did not have to pay brokerage commission on the sale. It also means they were able to dispose of the 59,000 shares sold to Consolidation Coal at a single price; sale of that many shares on an exchange might have caused the price to drop.

DEFENSE OF SALE

While relatively quick and profitable sales of stock bought under options are entirely legal, some companies lately have shown signs of becoming sensitive to the criticism such sales often have sparked. Mr. Love yesterday gave Chrysler stockholders what seemed to be one defense of the sales by company executives. He said participants in the Chrysler stock option plan usually had to borrow the money to buy the optioned stock. To eliminate the debt, he said, it was generally necessary for officers to sell a portion of the shares once the 6-month period was up.

Some companies have added provisions to their option plans requiring executives to hold their shares longer than 6 months—for 2 years in the case of General Foods Corp., which last year revised its option plan. Chrysler itself once required an executive to put in writing his "intention to acquire the optioned shares for investment and not with a view to distributing them"—that is, selling them or giving them away. But that provision of its option plan was quietly dropped before the last regular stockholders' meeting in April.

Congressional critics have been getting much tougher. The House, as part of the tax-cut bill, has passed a measure which would force an executive to hold optioned stocks at least 3 years, not 6 months, to obtain full capital gains benefits from a subsequent sale. If he sold the stock after 6 months, but before 3 years, the tax treatment would be less favorable. As the bill now stands, it will apply to new options granted after June 11, 1963.

SENATE VOTING SCHEDULE

The Senate Finance Committee is not expected to vote on stock option provisions of the bill until next month, with Senate floor action expected in late January or early February.

On the floor, Senator GORE intends to fight to have all profits from stock options treated as ordinary income to be taxed at regular rates, no matter when the stock is sold; this of course would make option plans far less desirable. Senator GORE and his staff are known to be searching for examples of option abuses to cite in the floor debate.

Options have not lacked for defenders in the congressional debates. They usually have taken the line of Henry Ford II, chairman of Ford Motor Co., who told the House Ways and Means Committee earlier this year that "restricted stock options make it possible for stockholders to take executives in as partners and give them a potential proprietary interest in the business. A proprietary interest leads the executive to think and act less as a hired hand and more as an owner-manager."

Even some defenders of options, however, have questioned the wisdom of providing favorable tax treatment for sales of optioned stock held only the required 6 months. Prof. Don Throop Smith of the Harvard Business School, in a statement to the Senate Finance Committee, said that "stock options and special tax treatment of them appear justified if the options really lead to long-continued proprietary interests." But he added: "Their use for quick profit by prompt sale of stock purchased under options has no justification."

RISE OF CHRYSLER STOCK

Chrysler itself alluded mainly to desire for its managers to own a piece of the business when it originally set up its stock option plan in 1952. The company then said "One of the considerations underlying the adoption of such plans is that under tax conditions prevailing in recent years it has not been practicable for salaried officers and key employees of corporations either to acquire any substantial number of shares out of what they have left out of their salaries or to pay taxes on them if received as bonuses."

The question of Chrysler executives profiting from stock options has been academic until lately. As recently as June 1962 Chrysler stock was selling for only $38.75 a share, well below the option prices then existing. But it began to rise, reflecting a sharp improvement in the company's car sales, and by the end of the year hit $75. In February, when the stock topped $80, directors voted a 2-for-1 split, effective April 19. And in October, with the split shares being quoted at $90 each, directors voted a second split, which stockholders yesterday approved, effective Friday.

The last time an auto company president sold a big block of stock bought on options, the resulting furor caused him to call a special press conference. In early 1960 an SEC "insider's" report showed that George Romney, then president of American Motors Corp., had sold 10,000 shares. The price on the New York Stock Exchange broke sharply, and Mr. Romney called a press conference to explain that in 1958 he borrowed money to exercise options of $9.56 a share granted to him in 1954. He sold at $90 a share.

Out of the $900,000 this brought in, Mr. Romney said, he had $430,000 left after paying capital gains taxes, repaying his loan and other debts, and giving $70,000 to his church. He said that as soon as regulations permitted he would use most of this profit to buy more stock under option. And after 6 months he did.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 17, 1963]

Chrysler Chiefs Dispose of Stock—President Sells Two-thirds of Recent Purchases Under Option Plan—Move Called "Normal"—Holders Approve 2-for-1 Split—They Hear Sales Will Show Gain This Year

(By David R. Jones)

DETROIT, December 17.—Lynn A. Townsend, president of the Chrysler Corp., has disposed of two-thirds of the stock he recently bought in the company. And Chrysler officers as a whole have disposed of more than 30 percent of their recent purchases.

George H. Love, Chrysler chairman, disclosed this at a special stockholder meeting today in the company's headquarters here. Stockholders approved a 2-for-1 split in Chrysler's stock, effective Friday—the company's second split this year.

Mr. Love said that Mr. Townsend had recently purchased 18,800 Chrysler shares, but had later disposed of 12,780 through sales, charitable contributions, and other gifts. He said the officers as a whole had recently increased their holdings by a total of 250,264 shares, but had disposed of 77,523 shares, to leave a net gain of 172,741.

OBTAINED ON OPTION PLAN

Most of the shares disposed of by the Chrysler officers probably were obtained under the company's stock option plan. Mr. Townsend on February 28 had outstanding options on 24,100 shares at an average price of $24 a share, while the officers as a whole held outstanding prices ranging from $21 to $31 a share on the present stock. Chrysler was split 2 for 1 in April and has been selling recently in the $85-$90 range. It closed today at 95⅛, up 5⅞.

This means that if the stock involved was bought under the option plan and sold outright, Mr. Townsend would have realized about $800,000 from resale and the total officer group would have realized upward of $4.5 million. The stock apparently was disposed of recently, since the transactions did not show up in the latest "insider" reports filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission and the New York Stock Exchange.

Mr. Love said stock dispositions of the type made by the Chrysler officers "result from the normal operation of the stock option plan." Officers using the plan usually have to borrow funds to meet the option price, he said, and to retire this debt "it is generally necessary for officers to sell a portion of the shares after having held them for at least 6 months to comply with Internal Revenue and Securities Exchange rules. The proceeds of such a sale can then be used to pay the taxes incurred by the sale, to retire the debt, or in some cases for personal obligations."

Despite the recent disposition of stock by Chrysler officers, Mr. Love said, the option plan has encouraged them to raise holdings and, as of yesterday, they still held 190,073 shares against an equivalent of 17,332 shares in the spring of 1961. Mr. Love said he has not disposed of any shares, but has increased his own holdings by 40,000 shares to 42,400 shares. He said Mr. Townsend's net holdings have risen by 6,020 shares to 8,420 shares.

Mr. Love said Consolidation Coal Co., of which he also is chairman, has continued to buy Chrysler stock. He said the company now holds 1,406,000 shares, or about 7.7 percent of the total Chrysler shares outstanding, against 1,272,000 shares last April.

Mr. Townsend told 54 shareholders at the meeting that it appeared that sales of Chrysler and its wholly owned subsidiaries will top $3 billion this year, up sharply from the $2.38 billion posted of 1962 and the highest level since 1960. He declined after the meeting to forecast 1963 earnings, saying only that Chrysler would have a "pretty good" fourth quarter.

Auto sales are holding up "very, very well," Mr. Townsend said. He said Chrysler had skilled laborers being laid off as Studebaker Corp., ends auto assembly at South Bend, Ind., this week. Chrysler employment now is about 98,000, which is the highest since September 1960, he said.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I read the article this morning with much interest. I wonder if the Senator could enlighten me and other Senators as to how it is possible, when a man makes a substantial profit, as indicated by the transaction, running perhaps into hundreds of thousands of dollars, not to have it added to his taxable income for income tax purposes. How is such an evasion made possible?

Mr. GORE. As I understand the law, it provides that a corporation may give restricted options to a few at less than the market value; those options may be exercised or not exercised in the future by such corporation officers. Moreover, when such an option is exercised, no tax liability accrues under the law.

I do not suggest that those individuals have violated a law. They have taken advantage of a provision of favoritism in the law.

The senior Senator from Tennessee does not know the exact amount of profits realized by the few corporation insiders. The article points out that perhaps 20 of the highest ranking officials are involved and that, as a total, they have made a profit, within less than a year, of $4½ million. This $4½ million rightfully belongs to the stockholders of the Chrysler Corp. These officials, being in the position they hold, have obviously taken advantage of their authority as officers of the corporation and have sponsored this plan—which I take it has been approved by the stockholders. As the Senator knows, this is usually done by proxy. So the $4½ million, according to the estimate of the article which I have asked to have printed, has gone, not to the general stockholders, but to a few corporation insiders who were given, or who arranged for themselves, the privilege of buying a restricted stock option.

As the Senator will recall, I read the statement that the Chrysler stock was split in April. What was paid for it, I do not know, but an estimate is made that if one corporation official had sold within the past few weeks the stock which he had optioned earlier this year, he would have realized a profit of $800,000. Even though that be true, and even though it be given to him as compensation for his services to the corporation, he would not pay a tax on such reward as a laborer in the Chrysler plant would pay on his wages.

Indeed, at the time he exercises this option he pays no tax whatever.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that after the passage of the currency bill the Senate returned to the consideration of morning business under a limitation of time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Tennessee may have an additional 3 minutes yielded to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his explanation. I am still shocked to learn of this tax windfall, which seems a windfall for the very few who are in the privileged position of being at high corporate levels, and of having such a bonanza handed to them, a privilege which is not enjoyed by the run-of-the-mine citizens. I hope that this situation will be corrected in committee. I congratulate the Senator for his vigilance and for calling the situation to the attention of the Senate. Senators will be interested to see what the result will be in committee. I hope loopholes such as these will be closed in the committee, so that they may be eliminated once and for all in common justice to the many taxpayers who pay their taxes without avoidance.

Mr. GORE. I point out to the Senator that there is a provision in the law, unfortunately, which would permit the insider who bought for $21 a stock which now is selling on the market for $95 to donate the stock to a so-called charitable foundation or other charity, and to take tax deduction for the current value of the stock without having to pay tax on the gain.

Mr. GRUENING. Earlier today I made a few remarks on the tax bill and had printed in the RECORD a second article by Stewart Alsop, published in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post. It is entitled "More on the Great Tax Myth." It brings home what so many people do not know; namely, that those in the higher income brackets do not pay higher taxes, and that in many cases a man with an income of millions of dollars actually pays less in tax than a person who makes a few thousand dollars.

If such a situation exists, it is my hope that it will be corrected in the pending bill. If it is not corrected in committee, I hope it will be taken care of on the floor when the Senate considers the bill. I hope that when our colleagues in the Senate go home they will be in a position to explain the situation to their constituents. The bill is complicated, and I doubt whether many Members of the House or Senate are familiar with all its details. I hope that their constituents will ask them the kind of questions that will elicit from their Representatives in the House and in the Senate the kind of responsive answers to which constituents are entitled.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I agree with him. I should like to point out one additional fact. The newspaper article points out that Mr. George Love, chairman of the board of the Chrysler Corp., has not sold any of his stock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The additional time allotted to the Senator has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. GORE. If he is in a position to hold the stock, he can pass it on to his son or to grandson without paying either income or capital gains taxes. Neither son nor grandson would be required to pay income tax or capital gains tax. Meanwhile, every worker who draws a salary or wage on Friday afternoon has the heavy hand of the Government taking a portion of his paycheck.

This is not fair. This is not right. This is not social justice. This situation must be corrected.

I know that those who speak for big business try to say that these are only paper profits. A person can sell the stock. Consider this new Federal Reserve note that I have in hand. It is not supported by silver or gold. It is paper, too. The man who works for $1.25 an hour receives a "paper" reward for his services. So do the beneficiaries of restricted stock options.

If corporation insiders of Chrysler Corp., and others have received compensation, they should pay taxes on their income at the time they exercise their option. This will be one of the major amendments to the tax bill when it reaches the floor.

Mr. GRUENING. I commend the Senator from Tennessee on bringing out the underlying facts of the proposed tax legislation which should be known to all our constituents before the bill is finally disposed of in the Senate.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICE. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the total of the bill as agreed to by the conferees is $1,820,093,000.

This sum is $1,250,000 below the total recommended by the Senate, and is $31,176,900 under the total allowed in the House bill.

Furthermore, the bill as reported by the conferees is about $340 million under the total budget estimates submitted.

I think it is a good bill and one in which I believe there are ample funds to meet the necessary expenses of the various activities this fiscal year.

Some of the changes recommended by the conferees, and in which I believe Members may be interested, relate to the following:

For the east-west program at the University of Hawaii, an appropriation of $5,100,000 is provided. Although this sum is $339,000 below the Senate recommendation, it is $640,000 above the should be sufficient to meet the essential amount proposed by the House and operating and capital outlay expenses proposed by the Center this fiscal year.

For the Justice Department, a total appropriation of $18,573,000 is provided for the salaries and expenses of the Department's general legal activities. This is the amount proposed by the House but is an increase of $1,477,350 over the 1963 appropriation. I call attention to the conference report at page 5, which has this to say concerning the item:

> Any additional lawyers for the Civil Rights or Tax Divisions that have been justified before the Senate or House Committee on Appropriations and that are needed can be funded within the amount allowed.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will yield briefly. However, if the discussion continues for any length of time on the conference report, I have agreed to yield to a Senator who has been waiting for quite a long time to obtain the floor to make an address. With that in mind, if this discussion can be expedited, I will yield.

Mr. KEATING. I shall be very brief. As I understand, the conferees have agreed to strike out the amendment adopted by the Senate, which was for $60,000 more, and also to eliminate the $84,000 which the Senate committee had added. Therefore, the total is $144,000 less than the amount which was in the Senate bill for this item. But the language in the conference report, which the Senator has just read, will supersede the language in the Senate report. So far as the legislative history is concerned, the result would be that if the Attorney General desired to employ additional lawyers for the Civil Rights Division, and his request were justified before either the Senate committee or the House committee, he would be free to do so. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Within the amount of money appropriated. That means, as I indicated on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, that when he thinks authority is not needed, he can employ them anyway. But now the requirement is spelled out in the report, so there can be no question about the intent of Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Has the Attorney General justified before any committee the employment of additional lawyers for the Civil Rights Division?

Mr. McCLELLAN. He has justified it in this way: He has requested additional counsel for that Division. Whether that can be called justification or not, I do not know. I assume that from the standpoint of the Department, the request has been justified. The representatives of the Department appeared and testified on the subject. I do not believe they would be authorized to employ attorneys they had not requested before either the House or the Senate committee; but within the request, and according to the testimony they gave, I believe they would be justified in doing so.

Mr. KEATING. As I recall, the Department requested eight more attorneys than were allowed in the request which the Senate passed upon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct; and the House had allowed that number, so I take it that that would sustain their position that they had justified that number. The House found that they had justified that number; and the language provides that until the request had been justified before either the House or the Senate committee, the Department would not be authorized to do so.

Mr. KEATING. There is an item in the newspapers today to the effect that this provision would allow the Department to add 15 new lawyers. The Senator does not agree with that statement, I take it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think that would be so. That is not my final judgment at the moment, but I do not think so. To the extent that the Department made a showing, the House recognized it, and it was justified, because the House allowed at least eight additional attorneys. Under this language, if the Department justified such a request before the House, it would be entitled to employ such attorneys.

Mr. KEATING. This is a news item.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not familiar with the news item.

Mr. KEATING. I desired to ask the Senator what he knew about a factual statement to the effect that Department officials said they were satisfied with the compromise.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not been advised whether they are satisfied or not, I regret to say.

Mr. KEATING. The language in the conference report that includes the Civil Rights Division relates to one of the divisions in which the additional lawyers contemplated will be employed, and did not eliminate the Civil Rights Division, as the Senate report did, is a satisfactory disposition of the matter, provided the number is such that the Attorney General can live with it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] on this subject. The conference report is a distinct improvement in having eliminated the implied exclusion of the Civil Rights Division which was in the Senate committee report. The situation is now up to the Department of Justice, and the Department has indicated its views and intentions.

It will be up to people like ourselves to see that they stick to the idea and that they get enough personnel in that Division to enforce the civil rights statutes—not that they are now inhibited, but we would have liked to see them get the additional money.

INFORMATIONAL MEDIA GUARANTEE FUND

Amendment No. 40 relates to the informational media guarantee fund, a question about which I exchanged some views with the Senator when the matter was before the Senate for debate. I notice that $750,000 has been allowed. Can the Senator state the basis of the rationale for that sum?

Mr. McCLELLAN. With respect to the additional $100,000, the House Members felt that the sum should be increased, and that was the amount agreed upon. No major issue was involved. When we go to conferences, there are always differences. Every Member has his own honest opinion as to what is needed and what is not. A little matter like this was resolved without any serious discussion. We agreed upon an amount that was mutually satisfactory.

Mr. JAVITS. I realize that a relatively small sum is involved. Actually, it is substantial, but it is relatively small. The Senator will recall that the use of the appropriated $650,000 as reflected in the committee report was for the payment of interest on the debt owed the Treasury. The added $100,000 would, I assume, therefore, be available, small as it is, for the general purposes of carrying out the program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. So the basis for compromise allows, even to a minuscule extent, but at least to some minor extent, the program "to continue."

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, included in the allowances for the Commerce Department, I would like to mention that in the transportation research appropriation it was agreed that $2 million would be sufficient this fiscal year to cover the proposed program expenses in this activity. This sum is $500,000 over the House allowance and $250,000 below the amount proposed by the Senate.

For the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency the sum of $7,500,000 is allowed. This amount is three-fourths of the authorization and is considered sufficient to meet the programs planned by the Agency this fiscal year. Last year $6,500,000 was provided for the Agency.

For the U.S. Information Agency, the sum of $134 million is allowed for salaries and expenses, instead of $131 million proposed by the House and $138,500,000 proposed by the Senate.

For the Agency's informational media guarantee fund, an appropriation of $750,000 is provided. This is $100,000 over the amount recommended by the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last Thursday a number of my colleagues—including at least three members of the Committee on Foreign Relations—questioned certain language in the Senate report on H.R. 7063, which directed the phasing out of the informational media guarantee program conducted by the USIA. Because of other urgent legislative business, I was unable at that time to make the statement I had prepared on that subject. Let me take this occasion to subscribe to the sentiments voiced by Senators in favor of continuing the IMG program. I am glad to note that the conferees on the bill provided at least a modest increase for the program over the figure in the Senate bill.

However, the Senate Appropriations Committee report on H.R. 7063 contained other language of the same character which is equally important, and which—to my knowledge—has not as yet been discussed in this Chamber. The report, on page 23, makes the following statement about U.S. Information Agency operations:

> The committee notes that the Agency is initiating some reductions in its Western European programs pursuant to previous committee recommendation. The committee insists that drastic reductions be made in this area and that funds and personnel be transferred from this area to areas of higher priority.

Frankly, I am baffled by this foreign policy directive in an Appropriations Committee report. Certainly I—and, I believe, many other members of the Foreign Relations Committee—had been under the impression that Western Europe has the highest priority in the strategic plans of the United States. Perhaps it might be suggested that Europeans are too knowledgeable about our policies to require any information, or so sophisticated as to be impervious to it. The record sustains neither point. We need not look beyond France to find misunderstanding or misinterpretation of U.S. policy. And we have no evidence that USIA activities are not effective; on the contrary, we have good reason to believe they are.

I understand that, since fiscal year 1957, the U.S. Information Agency has reduced its annual expenditures in Western Europe by almost 40 percent, it has eliminated or converted to binational status 13 posts, and it has cut out a rough average of 45 percent of the positions held by American and local employees. It is my firm conviction that this process has already gone far enough—if not too far—and I do not believe that any case can be made for further "drastic reductions."

I had the honor and privilege of having been named as a conferee on H.R. 7063. Owing to President Johnson's invitation to accompany him to the United Nations yesterday, I was unable to attend the conference and to raise this issue in person. However, my distinguished senior colleague from Arkansas, with his usual courtesy and generosity, made available to the conference committee a letter on this subject I received from the Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the December 16 letter to me from Acting Secretary of State George W. Ball.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

DECEMBER 16, 1963.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the Senate report which accompanied the 1964 appropriations bill covering various departments and agencies, including the Department of State and USIA, language was included concerning USIA's West Europe program as follows: "The committee insists that drastic reductions be made in West Europe and that funds and personnel be transferred from this area to areas of higher priority."

This matter has been discussed here at the Department and is of great concern to us. We very much feel that the role of USIA in giving the United States its own voice into important segments of European opinion is as great if not greater now than it has been in the past. As we get into the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations and as debate with respect to NATO and to our relationships with Europe increases, it is even more important that we have channels for directly putting our own point of view to Europe. USIA has an important part to play in this and we would be very reluctant to see its role further reduced.

Thus, we would appreciate any help which you may be able to give in the conference committee and in the Senate to assure that the effectiveness of USIA in Europe is not further impaired.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BALL,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the summary of the bill for the fiscal year 1964, which shows the various appropriations concerning the departments and agencies included in the bill, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF BILL

Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill, 1964 (H.R. 7063)

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	Bill		Conference action
			House version	Senate version	
ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS					
Salaries and expenses	$147,548,500	$162,800,000	$153,000,000	$153,000,000	$153,000,000
Representation allowances	950,000	996,000	973,000	973,000	973,000
Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad	10,000,000	27,000,000		18,500,000	18,125,000
Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad (special foreign currency program)	2,205,000	3,900,000	2,750,000	3,900,000	2,750,000
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	1,800,000	1,600,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Total, administration of foreign affairs	162,503,500	196,296,000	158,223,000	177,873,000	176,348,000
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES					
Contributions to international organizations	69,227,000	81,821,000	81,305,000	81,305,000	81,305,000
Missions to international organizations	2,321,800	2,745,000	2,500,000	2,545,000	2,500,000
International conferences and contingencies	3,117,000	2,170,000	1,943,000	1,943,000	1,943,000
International tariff negotiations		495,000	450,000	365,000	365,000
Loans to the United Nations	100,000,000				
Total, international organizations and conferences	174,665,800	87,231,000	86,198,000	86,158,000	86,113,000
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS					
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					
Salaries and expenses	691,850	729,000	715,000	715,000	715,000
Operation and maintenance	1,971,850	2,043,000	2,015,000	2,015,000	2,015,000
Construction	11,000,000	8,354,000	8,000,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
Total, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico	13,663,700	11,126,000	10,730,000	9,230,000	9,230,000
American sections, international commissions	415,000	500,000	430,000	430,000	430,000
International fisheries commissions	1,910,000	2,053,000	1,910,000	2,053,000	2,000,000
Total, international commissions	15,988,700	13,679,000	13,070,000	11.713,000	11.660,000
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE					
Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities	41,950,000	55,975,000	42,250,000	43,000,000	42,625,000
Center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West	8,340,000	5,690,000	4,460,000	5,439,000	5,100,000
Total, educational exchange	50,290,000	61,665,000	46,710,000	48,439,000	47,725,000
OTHER					
Rama Rd., Nicaragua	1,500,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	850,000
Total, title I, Department of State	404,948,000	359,721,000	305,051,000	325,033,000	322,696,000

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses, general administration	$4,428,000	$4,778,000	$4,660,000	$4,660,000	$4,660,000
Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	17,095,650	19,173,000	18,573,000	18,717,000	18,573,000
Alien property activities, limitation on general administrative expenses	(690,000)	(874,000)	(690,000)	(690,000)	(690,000)
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division	6,218,850	6,600,000	6,600,000	6,600,000	6,600,000
Salaries and expenses, U.S. attorneys and marshals	28,167,000	29,580,000	29,230,000	29,230,000	29,230,000
Fees and expenses of witnesses	2,500,000	2,400,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
Salaries and expenses, Administrative Conference of the United States	100,000				
Total, legal activities and general administration	58,509,500	62,531,000	61,363,000	61,507,000	61,363,000
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION					
Salaries and expenses	135,925,000	146,900,000	146,900,000	146,900,000	146,900,000
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE					
Salaries and expenses	66,272,050	70,000,000	69,011,000	69,011,000	69,011,000
FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM					
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons	50,241,850	54,100,000	53,000,000	53,084,000	53,000,000
Buildings and facilities	3,545,000	17,775,000	9,425,000	9,875,000	9,525,000
Support of U.S. prisoners	4,100,000	4,200,000	4,100,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
Total, Federal prison system	57,886,850	76,075,000	66,525,000	67,059,000	66,625,000
Total, title II, Department of Justice	318,593,400	355,506,000	343,799,000	344,477,000	343,899,000

Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill, 1964 (H.R. 7063)—Continued

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	Bill		Conference action
			House version	Senate version	
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses	$3,952,000	$4,520,000	$4,000,000	$4,000,000	$4,000,000
AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION					
Operations	12,416,250	14,800,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	13,500,000
Grants for public facilities	35,000,000	35,000,000			
Area redevelopment fund	115,050,000	190,000,000	132,000,000	132,000,000	132,000,000
Total, Area Redevelopment Administration	162,466,250	239,800,000	145,500,000	145,500,000	145,500,000
BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses	5,058,750	6,250,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS					
Salaries and expenses	1,868,750	2,350,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS					
Salaries and expenses	12,830,000	17,220,000	14,000,000	13,650,000	13,650,000
1962 census of governments	1,050,000	370,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
1963 censuses of business, transportation, manufactures, and mineral industries	3,071,250	8,575,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
1964 Census of Agriculture	700,000	1,345,000	1,345,000	1,345,000	1,345,000
Modernization of computing equipment	4,000,000	4,640,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Preparation for Nineteenth Decennial Census		740,000	740,000	740,000	740,000
National housing inventory		210,000			
Eighteenth Decennial Census	38,000				
Total, Bureau of the Census	21,689,250	33,100,000	29,435,000	29,085,000	29,085,000
OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES					
Salaries and expenses	3,445,000	5,000,000	3,725,000	3,725,000	3,725,000
INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES					
Salaries and expenses	7,191,250	15,400,000	9,500,000	9,230,000	9,230,000
Export control	3,837,500	4,100,000	4,100,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
Total, international activities	11,028,750	19,500,000	13,600,000	13,330,000	13,330,000
OFFICE OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT					
Trade adjustment assistance	25,000	700,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Trade adjustment loans and guarantees		1,000,000			
Total, Office of Trade Adjustment	25,000	1,700,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE					
Salaries and expenses	3,350,000	4,200,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
CIVILIAN INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY					
Expenses	625,000	7,400,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY					
Salaries and expenses	22,987,500	27,900,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Construction of surveying ships	14,400,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
Total, Coast and Geodetic Survey	37,387,500	40,900,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	38,000,000
PATENT OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	27,545,000	32,300,000	29,000,000	29,525,000	29,250,000
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS					
Research and technical services	28,165,000	33,250,000	28,075,000	29,575,000	28,700,000
Research and technical services (special foreign currency program)	500,000	1,000,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Fire technology		1,200,000			
Plant and facilities	2,000,000	6,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Construction of facilities	30,000,000	16,000,000	7,713,000	7,713,000	7,713,000
Total, National Bureau of Standards	60,665,000	57,450,000	39,288,000	40,788,000	39,913,000
OFFICE OF TECHNICAL SERVICES					
Salaries and expenses	47,500	1,700,000	1,020,000	1,020,000	1,020,000
WEATHER BUREAU					
Salaries and expenses	60,735,000	67,200,000	63,000,000	64,527,100	64,527,100
Research and development	11,118,750	13,500,000	9,500,000	11,300,000	10,400,000
Research and development (special foreign currency program)		1,000,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Establishment of meteorological facilities	4,325,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
Meteorological satellite operations	40,000,000	23,000,000	18,000,000		
Total, Weather Bureau	116,178,750	109,500,000	95,550,000	80,877,100	79,977,100
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION					
Ship construction	64,200,000	112,500,000	112,500,000	112,500,000	112,500,000
Operating-differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authorization)	220,400,000	225,000,000	225,000,000	208,000,000	216,500,000
Research and development	3,550,000	8,250,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Salaries and expenses	15,249,250	15,752,000	15,500,000	15,500,000	15,500,000
Maritime training	3,319,000	3,495,000	3,495,000	3,495,000	3,495,000
State marine schools	1,375,000	1,405,000	1,405,000	1,405,000	1,405,000
Total, Maritime Administration	308,093,250	366,402,000	364,900,000	347,900,000	356,400,000
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS					
Limitation on general administrative expenses	(38,177,500)	(44,650,000)	(43,800,000)	(43,800,000)	(43,800,000)
Federal-aid highways (trust fund)	(3,249,200,000)	(3,250,000,000)	(3,249,150,000)	(3,249,150,000)	(3,249,150,000)

Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill, 1964 (H.R. 7063)—Continued

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	Bill		Conference action
			House version	Senate version	
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS—Continued					
Improvement of the Pentagon road network (trust fund)	($2,000,000)	($500,000)	($500,000)	($500,000)	($500,000)
Forest highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	36,900,000	33,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000
Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	2,500,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Control of outdoor advertising	2,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	--------	--------
Inter-American Highway	--------	22,000,000	19,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Study of highway program for Alaska	400,000	--------	--------	--------	--------
Total, Bureau of Public Roads	41,800,000	62,000,000	58,000,000	52,000,000	52,000,000
TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH					
Expenses	625,000	2,500,000	1,500,000	2,250,000	2,000,000
Total, title III, Department of Commerce	805,850,750	996,572,000	833,818,000	798,300,100	804,500,100

TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES					
Salaries	$1,503,000	$1,588,000	$1,588,000	$1,588,000	$1,588,000
Printing and binding Supreme Court reports	138,000	141,000	138,000	138,000	138,000
Miscellaneous expenses	79,000	87,000	85,000	85,000	85,000
Care of the building and grounds	323,400	353,600	348,000	348,000	348,000
Automobile for the Chief Justice	6,800	7,400	7,400	7,400	7,400
Books for the Supreme Court	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
Total, Supreme Court	2,085,000	2,212,000	2,201,400	2,201,400	2,201,400
COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS					
Salaries and expenses	369,550	390,000	388,000	388,000	388,000
CUSTOMS COURT					
Salaries and expenses	931,350	989,000	989,000	989,000	989,000
COURT OF CLAIMS					
Salaries and expenses	1,034,500	1,114,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Repairs and improvements	9,500	9,500	9,500	9,500	9,500
Total, Court of Claims	1,044,000	1,123,500	1,109,500	1,109,500	1,109,500
COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES					
Salaries of judges	11,048,341	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
Salaries of supporting personnel	27,988,000	31,480,000	30,650,000	30,650,000	30,650,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners	5,800,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
Travel and miscellaneous expenses	4,670,000	4,550,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts	1,530,000	1,640,400	1,590,000	1,590,000	1,590,000
Referees, special account:					
Salaries of referees	(2,552,500)	(2,600,000)	(2,550,000)	(2,550,000)	(2,550,000)
Expenses of referees	(4,897,500)	(5,456,000)	(5,250,000)	(5,250,000)	(5,250,000)
Total, other courts and services	51,036,341	54,370,400	53,440,000	53,440,000	53,440,000
Total, title IV, the judiciary, excluding annual indefinites	55,466,441	59,084,900	58,127,900	58,127,900	58,127,900
Total, title IV, the judiciary, including annual indefinites	62,916,441	67,140,900	65,927,900	65,927,900	65,927,900

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	$1,580,000	$1,820,000	$1,800,000	$1,800,000	$1,800,000
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS					
Salaries and expenses	959,500	995,000	985,000	985,000	985,000
FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	2,300,000	2,898,000	2,575,000	2,575,000	2,575,000
COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE					
Salaries and expenses	10,000	--------	--------	--------	--------
FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION					
Payment of Philippine war damage claims	73,000,000	--------	--------	--------	--------
Salaries and expenses:					
Appropriation	737,500	2,320,000	1,455,000	1,555,000	1,455,000
Transfer	(530,000)	--------	(575,000)	(607,000)	(607,000)
Total, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	73,737,500	2,320,000	1,455,000	1,555,000	1,455,000
SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses:					
Appropriation	5,916,250	7,350,000	7,200,000	7,000,000	7,000.000
Transfer from revolving fund	(27,000,000)	(28,900,000)	(27,800,000)	(27,300,000)	(27,300,000)
Transfer from trade adjustment loan assistance	--------	(100,000)	(100,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)
Trade adjustment loan assistance	--------	8,000,000	4,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Revolving fund	300,000,000	130,000,000	115,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000S
Total, Small Business Administration	305,916,250	145,350,000	126,700,000	98,500,000	98,500,000

Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriations bill, 1964 (H.R. 7063)—Continued

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	Bill		Conference action
			House version	Senate version	
SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS					
Salaries and expenses		$510,000	$450,000	$500,000	$465,000
SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	$395,000	448,000	425,000	425,000	425,000
TARIFF COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	2,950,000	3,375,000	3,145,000	3,145,000	3,145,000
U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY					
Arms control and disarmament activities	6,500,000	15,000,000	1,669,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY					
Salaries and expenses	123,145,000	145,971,000	131,000,000	138,500,000	134,900,000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	8,500,000	11,950,000	11,750,000	11,750,000	11,750,000
Special international exhibitions	7,600,000	7,230,000	7,200,000	7,200,000	7,200,000
Special international exhibitions (special foreign currency program)	375,000	500,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
Acquisition and construction of radio facilities	16,150,000	38,625,000	12,070,000	12,070,000	12,070,000
Informational media guarantee fund	1,000,000	3,960,000	1,000,000	650,000	750,000
Total U.S. Information Agency	156,770,000	208,236,000	163,470,000	170,620,000	166,220,000
Total, title V, related agencies	551,118,250	380,952,000	302,674,000	287,605,000	283,670,000
Total, Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies excluding special accounts	2,135,976,841	2,151,835,900	1,843,469,900	1,813,543,000	1,812,293,000
Total, Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies including special accounts	2,143,426,841	2,159,891,900	1,851,269,900	1,821,343,000	1,820,093,000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, despite the fact that the hour of 2 o'clock has not quite arrived, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the foreign aid appropriations bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

BEEF, VEAL, MUTTON, AND LAMB IMPORTS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, most Senators are aware of the fact that because of the amount of business being transacted on the floor, I have been waiting for some time to speak upon the subject of meat imports, especially beef and lamb imports. I expect to speak for about 20 or 25 minutes, and I shall try to conclude within that time, because I am fully aware of the exigencies of the legislative situation and the fact that a foreign aid appropriation bill is before the Senate and requires immediate attention.

Senators who desire to attend to other matters can count on my speaking for at least 20 or 25 minutes.

Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] spoke in regard to the situation in the livestock industry. He called attention to the fact that in the past year livestock prices have decreased as much as 25 percent. He also stated that if the price of any other commodity in this country had decreased by 25 percent during 1 year, Congress and the executive branch of the Government would be up in arms in an attempt to find a way to solve the problem.

First of all, let me point out that approximately one-third of the value of total U.S. farm and ranch production is represented by meat from cattle, hogs, and sheep. Cattle and calves accounted for nearly 23 percent of the receipts from farm marketing in 1962.

The gross income for the United States from live cattle and calves in 1940 was $1.4 billion, and by 1962 that amount had increased to $8.3 billion. So we are not discussing a matter of minor importance to the economy of the United States.

The inventories of cattle in the United States in 1958 were 93.4 million head. On January 1, 1963, they were 103.8 million head—an increase of 4 percent from 1962. It is estimated that on January 1, 1964, the total inventory will be 107 million head.

It is hard to imagine, in terms of any reasonable argument, that a 4-percent increase in the number of cattle in the United States could cause a 25-percent decrease in the market price.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I commend the Senator from Colorado for his most apropriate speech in behalf of the cattle industry. The imports of beef have doubled during the past 2 years. With an already saturated market, that was enough to break the price of cattle. The same thing would happen to any other market if such a situation occurred. If we wish to save the cattle industry, we must do something about these imports.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator from North Dakota is correct, and I agree entirely with him.

Mr. President, as I have already pointed out, when the number of cattle has increased only 4 percent, it is hard to account for a 25-percent decrease in price.

The basic industry of Colorado is livestock. Eighty percent of the area of Colorado is grazing land, and Colorado ranks 10th in the total number of beef cattle in the United States, and ranks 12th in the range and stock beef cattle. In 1962, Colorado ranked fifth in the Nation in marketing feed cattle—with a total of 815,000 head marketed.

For 1961, the income—that is to say, cash receipts—from livestock in Colorado was $414,418,000. From cattle alone, the cash receipts amounted to $320,751,000.

On January 1, 1962, the livestock on farms in Colorado included 2,333,000 cattle and 1,932,000 sheep. Forty-nine thousand family and 19,000 hired workers engaged in farming in 1961 in Colorado.

In 1962, the income in Colorado from the sheep industry, including the sale of sheep, lambs, and wool, was approximately $41,165,000. In only one county in Colorado—Moffat County—the total income from the sale of sheep, lambs, and wool was $2,528,185.

On January 1, 1963, there were 2,560,000 cattle in Colorado—an increase of 7 percent over the number on January 1, 1962. The inventory of cattle in Colorado increased steadily since 1957.

Imports have been increasing steadily for many years, but they have skyrocketed since 1958. The general situation can be seen from the following figures, which pertain to all meat:

An average of 329 million pounds a year was imported in the period 1951–55. An average of 613 million pounds a year was imported in the period 1956–60. But in 1962, the imports amounted to 1,253 million pounds. In short, the imports, which during the years 1951–55 amounted to 329 million pounds, have now reached the astronomical figure of 1,253 million pounds in 1962. These figures show that the import level doubled, roughly, approximately every 5 years.

In the first 6 months of 1962, red meat imports were 552 million pounds. In the first 6 months of 1963, red meat imports were 651 million pounds—an increase of 21 percent or more.

Before 1958, the United States was a net exporter of livestock, meat, and livestock and meat products. However, today that situation has changed entirely; at the present time the United States is a net importer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a table I have prepared, showing the balance of trade with respect to beef, veal, lamb, and mutton.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Balance of trade table

[Carcass weight, millions of pounds]

Year	Imports	Exports	Net imports
Beef and veal:			
1960	775	58	719
1961	1,037	58	979
1962	1,445	53	1,392
Lamb and mutton:			
1960	87	2	85
1961	101	2	99
1962	143	3	140

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, imports of beef and veal have increased steadily since 1958, and the volume has reached 10.6 percent of domestic production, including livestock meat equivalent.

For 1962, imports were more than twice the 1956–60 average, and more than four times the 1951–55 average. During the period 1958–62, imports increased 60 percent; and for the period January to August 1963, the imports increased 22 percent, as compared with the imports for the corresponding period in 1962. Percentagewise, the imports accounted for 3.9 percent of domestic production in 1957, as compared to just under 11 percent in 1962.

In 1962, imports increased 41 percent over those in 1961.

The per capita consumption of imported beef increased 81.8 percent between 1960 and 1962—from 4.4 pounds per capita in 1960 to 8 pounds per capita in 1962. During those years the total consumption per capita increased 4.3 percent.

In 1962, imports of beef and veal, in absolute numbers, were 1.45 billion pounds carcass weight. During the first 6 months of 1963, the United States imported 1.09 billion pounds carcass weight, as compared to 0.89 billion pounds in the first 6 months of 1962.

Today the United States is the world's largest importer of beef.

The Colorado Cattlemen's Association estimates that in Colorado they are now receiving 160,000 pounds of foreign boned beef a week. The majority of this goes to make hamburger, is used in restaurants, and for fresh beef products.

As for the imports of lambs and mutton, mutton imports have increased from 1.7 million pounds in 1957 to 65 million pounds in 1962—an increase of 3,724 percent—an astronomical and unbelievable gain. Yet the U.S. Tariff Commission and every other agency of the executive branch have failed to provide any protection for the livestock producers of the United States. Imports of lambs and lamb meat have increased from 3.3 million pounds in 1957 to 79 million pounds in 1962. These figures include the meat equivalent of live animals.

In 1957 imports of lambs and mutton accounted for 0.7 percent of the domestic production; but in 1962, the figure increased to 17.8 percent; and for the first 8 months of 1963 it is 22.9 percent—almost 23 percent. These figures show why the remarks the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] made a few minutes ago are so pertinent and so important, for they make clear that at a time when livestock production in the United States has increased, with the result that the people of the United States can be better fed and can have more proteins, it does not require large amounts of imports to break the price in this country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator realizes that the great increase in imports of beef and other farm commodities is a part of a program to get the United Kingdom into the Common Market. If we succeed—and we are pushing for it—in getting the United Kingdom into the Common Market, the countries which have customarily looked to the United Kingdom for their market will lose the advantage they have had, and they will have to look elsewhere for markets.

If the Senator goes further into this question, he will find that about 2 years ago exporting countries decided to try to get the United States to absorb exports of meat and several other commodities which had previously been sold in the United Kingdom. I refer particularly to Australia and New Zealand, although I understand that the New Zealand world market has improved since then. I believe that much of the increase in meats is coming from Australia.

It is only natural that countries depending upon the United Kingdom for a market wish to develop other markets before England goes into the Common Market. It is as simple as that. We are increasing our imports from these countries. Our recompense comes in the fact that we are, in effect, exchanging goods like airplanes with Australia in return for meat. In other words, American agriculture is being traded off for the benefit of our industries.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is exactly correct. Today, as for several years past, we have been trading agriculture for other forms of industry.

Mr. AIKEN. These countries are now exporting much more heavily to the United States. I understand they made an appeal to us about 2 years ago to absorb their exports, which had previously been sold to the United Kingdom, so that the effect of the United Kingdom going into the Common Market would not fall so heavily upon them. Instead of that, it is falling upon our farmers. I have no doubt that Australia and other countries are getting increased dollars and spending them here. They placed a large order for airplanes in this country not more than 2 or 3 months ago which normally would have gone somewhere else. So, industry has benefited at the expense of our agriculture.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes. I thank the Senator for that statement.

Mr. AIKEN. There is much more to it than that, of course.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator will find in the foreign aid appropriation bill which will come before the Senate this afternoon—I cannot mention any figures—a sum for Australia. That figure may be accounted for, in part, by the meat which is being imported here while we are selling them airplanes.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. So, in this country we are not only trading off one industry—the agricultural industry—for the heavy industries, but also we are trading off this country.

I believe I have great consideration for Great Britain and Australia and their problems. There is no reason why I should not have. However, when it comes to the question of whether I am going to take care of the United States first or take care of other countries, I am certainly going to take care of the United States, so far as my ability will permit. When it comes to trying to take care of a particular industry, I am going to try to take care of the agricultural industry, which constitutes the major portion of the economy of Colorado, more than I am going to try to take care of some industry elsewhere.

We are indebted to the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and to other Senators for remarks on the floor about the situation. But we have to bring the country, the Executive, and the Tariff Commission to the realization that what they are doing is breaking an industry in our country. When they do so, we will pay through the nose. That is to say, the American taxpayer, the ordinary individual, will pay through the nose for the beef, lamb, and mutton which will come into this country from other countries.

We have done it from time to time. We have broken industries in this country. Every time we have done it, we have ended by paying through the nose to other countries for their products.

I think of the situations in respect to fluorspar, lead, zinc, and many other fields.

I should like to say a word about prices. I have so much material here that I could speak for at least 4 or 5 hours. But I realize the serious situation in the Senate and its desire to get to the important bill which we have to consider. However, I wish to say a word or two about prices.

The average price of cattle as of October 15 of this year is $19.50 per hundredweight compared with $21.70 per hundredweight October 15, 1962.

I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to have printed in the RECORD as if stated by me a short table which sets forth a comparison of the 1962 and the 1963 figures.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Prices per hundredweight

Comparison of prices of choice steers at Chicago:	
November 1962	$30.13
May 1963	22.61
July 1963	24.72
Late October 1963	under 24.00
Average 1st quarter 1963	25.28
Good feeder steers at Kansas City:	
November 1962	25.74
October 1963	22.92
Choice feeder steers at Kansas City:	
November 1962	30.88
October 1963	27.05

Mr. ALLOTT. Recently, fat cattle were off $5 per hundredweight; feeder cattle off $3 to $6 per hundredweight, feeder cattle down $2 to $4 per hundredweight average in the last year; calves down about $6 per hundredweight in Denver in 1963. The average price of beef steers in early December was $21.20 per hundredweight, which is the lowest price in 6 years.

The price break on lamb has not been so pronounced in recent months, but the steady downward pressure on prices from imports, which started about 4 years ago, is causing a great many ranchers and feeders to operate at a loss.

I am not speaking merely for the cattlemen and the stockmen in Colorado. I am talking about stockmen, cattlemen, feeders, ranchers, and breeders all over the United States. That statement particularly encompasses all of the Mississippi Valley and every area west of it, although it does not necessarily, by any means, eliminate the Eastern States.

What is the relationship between increased imports and lower prices? As to beef, it has been argued by Secretary Freeman that most import beef is low-quality processing beef. Therefore the imports would not affect the quality beef price. But as the price disparity between grades becomes greater, more people shift to the lower grade, thus bringing down the price of quality meat as well. From 1954 to 1956 canned beef constituted 72 percent of the total imports; now, however, 81 percent is boneless and only 14 percent is canned. Boneless beef can be used for hamburger as well as for manufacturing and processing; and it is so used.

About 40 percent of the processing beef consumed in the United States is imported. It is estimated that roughly 30 percent of domestic cattle production winds up as hamburger.

Therefore, it is not hard to see that the imported product, even though it be of a cheap quality, not only competes directly in this country with our cheaper qualities of beef, but also helps to lower the price of good beef and quality beef.

Let us take a look for a moment at the lamb situation. During the past 2 years foreign lamb has been coming into east coast ports for 5 cents to 20 cents per pound below the average domestic wholesale price, including tariff. I believe we should ask ourselves how much we owe to other countries to support their imports into this country at the expense of breaking our own farmers and ranchers, feeders and stockmen. It is no secret that in the last 10 to 12 years our agricultural producers have been up against the situation of constantly increasing labor and other costs day after day. A tractor that could have been purchased for $1,200 to $1,400 in 1950 now costs $6,500 or $7,000. That is the sort of costs they are up against. They are constantly increasing costs. Yet we permit the import of lamb and beef; we permit it to come into this country without providing our people with some kind of protection. The Department of Agriculture has recognized that these conditions have a depressing effect on prices, and says in a report, "Livestock Meat Situation," of November 1963:

> If imports are a larger proportion of domestic production, the effect on prices is greater.

It certainly required a great "brain" to figure that out and put it in a Government report. It is something that every schoolboy ought to know. It is a fact.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I agree with the Senator's comments on this problem. Is it not correct that, as early as last March and April, when it became apparent that imports of beef and veal had doubled since 1960, the explanation for depressed livestock prices and the import impact given by the USDA was that imports were not having any significant impact, and that the real reason for the depressed livestock prices was because of greater numbers of cattle in feedlots?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is entirely correct. At least within my own knowledge and reading, this is the only excuse the Department of Agriculture has ever offered. It is the contention of the Department that the depressed prices today are due primarily to that cause.

Mr. MILLER. The statement the Senator just quoted from one of the reports indicates that at least some of the researchers of the U.S. Department of Agriculture recognize this fact of life, although I fear that some of those who have access to those reports in the USDA either do not read them or do not believe them.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator for his contribution. The Senator is entirely correct.

Imported beef can be sold for 5 to 10 cents a pound cheaper than American beef can be produced and marketed, so the cattle feeder has operated at a loss of about $11.86 per head since 1962, considering only the cost of feeder cattle, feed, marketing, and transportation. However, other estimated costs bring the total loss per head up to as much as $40.

The average retail price of beef is down 6 cents in the past year, but the farmers' share of the price is down nearly 10 cents.

Mr. Don Foster, of the First National Bank of Paonia, Colo., sent me a letter which contains figures on the production costs per cow, prepared by our own great Colorado State University. In summary, 12 ranches were used. The average cost of production per cow was $100.22. The average return from sale was $108.31. Taking into account change in inventory, the net average return was $115.34. However, no management return has been allowed in the above figures. The average management return was a net loss of $6,541 per ranch, for the 12 ranches studied.

I submit to my colleagues in the Senate that these figures are only illustrative of the situation in all the great States of this country which have a vital interest in livestock production and feeding.

In the same letter Mr. Foster gives figures with respect to lambs, on the cost per ewe of producing a lamb crop. In summary, the average cost per ewe was $23.86. The average return from the sale of wool, of sheep, and from incentive payments on the wool, without inventory change, was $18.34. Adding the inventory change, the net return was $17.77. This was a net loss per ewe of $6.09.

The net income on the sheep ranches studied by the Colorado State University averaged a loss of $949 per year, with no return allowed for management or for wages for the people who operated the ranches.

I ask unanimous consent that tables 1 and 2 may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*1962 ranch summaries for 12 mountain ranches in Archuleta, Garfield, Rio Blanco, Moffat, and Routt Counties*

A. Average number of cows on these 12 ranches was 197. Average production costs per cow during 1962 were:

Machine and equipment repairs	$1.24
Fuel and oil	1.74
Utilities	.83
Labor	6.00
Auto	.60
Pickup and truck	1.01
Building repairs	.69
Livestock expenses	7.61
Feed purchased	15.21
Home-raised feed fed	47.64
Miscellaneous	.85
Rent	.34
Taxes	3.39
Interest	7.88
Machine depreciation	2.11
Building depreciation	2.03
Average production costs per cow	100.22

B. Average return per cow in 1962 from sale of cattle was $108.31. When any change in inventories plus cash sales was taken into consideration, the net increase per cow was $115.34. With $100.22 average costs per cow on these ranches, the net return per cow in 1962 was $15.12. For most of these same ranches in 1961, their production costs per cow were $117.77.

C. Average investment per ranch as of January 1, 1962, in feed and livestock was $48,390; machinery and equipment was $7,867; and land and buildings was $158,687.

D. The average net income on these ranches in 1962 was $5,402. Two of the twelve ranches showed a net income loss in 1962. Net income per ranch varied from a loss of over $10,000 to a net income of over $20,000.

Only 1 of the 12 ranches in 1962 had any return for the management of these over $200,000 capitalized businesses. Management return is figured by deducting from the net income figure a 6-percent return on the amount of capital invested in fencing, livestock, and machinery; 5 percent on amount invested in land and buildings; $200 a month for the labor performed by the operator and $150 a month for any family labor used to help in the production of livestock and crops. The average management return on these ranches was a loss of $6,541. Management return varied from a plus $11,000 to over an $18,000 loss.

E. The average number of acres on these ranches was 3,761 acres. This excludes the acres of Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service grazing permit acres.

F. The average number of crop acres per ranch in 1962 was 418 acres. Average production costs per crop acre were:

Machinery and equipment repair	$1.96
Fuel and oil	2.27
Utilities	.66
Labor	3.52
Auto	.26
Pickup and truck	.41
Building repairs	.28
Crop expenses	3.22
Miscellaneous expenses	.33
Taxes	1.76
Interest	3.81
Insurance	.50
Machinery depreciation	2.57
Building depreciation	1.06
Average production costs per crop acre	22.63

G. The average value of crops produced per crop acre in 1962 on these ranches was $25.70.

TABLE 2.—*1962 ranch summaries of 6 mountain sheep ranches on the western slope of Colorado*

A. Average number of breeding ewes per ranch in 1962 was 841 head. Average costs per ewe to produce a lamb crop were:

Machinery and equipment repair	$0.65
Fuel and oil	.94
Utilities	.28
Labor	2.72
Auto	.26
Pickup and truck	.33
Building repairs	.10
Livestock expenses	1.01
Feed purchased	4.47
Value of home-raised feed fed	8.49
Miscellaneous expenses	.38
Taxes	.67
Interest	1.19
Insurance	.24
Machinery depreciation	.63
Building depreciation	.60
Average costs per ewe	23.86

B. Average return from sales of wool, sheep, and incentive payments per ewe in 1962 was $18.34. When the changes in inventory were taken into account and added to these sales the average net increase per ewe was $17.77. The average cost per ewe in 1962 on these ranches was $23.86.

C. Average number of crop acres per ranch was 361 acres.

D. Cost of producing an acre of crops was:

Machinery and equipment repairs	$1.47
Fuel and oil	1.86
Utilities	.48
Labor	4.55
Auto	.22
Pickup and truck	.53
Building repairs	.28
Crop expenses	4.38
Miscellaneous expenses	.55
Rent	.40
Taxes	2.78
Interest	2.56
Insurance	.36
Machinery depreciation	1.89
Building depreciation	1.58
Average production costs per crop acre	23.89

E. Average value of crops produced per crop acre was $17.05.

F. The average investment managed by each operator was $125,945 with $22,952 invested in feed and livestock; $4,725 in machinery and equipment and $98,268 in land and buildings. Net income on these sheep ranches averaged a loss of $949. Their net income varied from a loss of over $9,000 to a net income of over $5,000. None of these sheep ranches were able to show any return for management in 1952. Average management return per ranch was a loss of $9,031. The management return loss varied from $2,000 to $19,000.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have a word or two to say about the comparison of U.S. protection of agriculture and protection by other countries.

The United States and Canada are the only two major countries without nontariff protection for domestic agricultural production.

The Common Market countries are using import duties, gate price systems, import certificates and deposits, quotas, and intervention measures as protection for their agricultural products.

Australia and New Zealand together account for 80 percent of our beef and veal imports. Those countries protect their agricultural products much more than we protect ours, by nontariff control. New Zealand protects its industry 100 percent; Australia, 41 percent. Further, Australia prohibits the importation of live cattle and sheep from the United States under health restrictions. It is hard to believe that their lamb and mutton come into this country to be fed to our people, but that the lamb and mutton raised in this country cannot go there because of health restrictions. I hope the people of this country do not find out about it.

Ireland, the third largest exporter of beef and veal to the United States, restricts livestock and meat products by requiring import licenses, and also has high tariffs.

Mexico is one of the two largest exporters of cattle to the United States. However, into Mexico an import permit is required, and Mexico has a high tariff. Slaughter livestock imports are prohibited.

The European Economic Community common external tariff on beef and veal is three times the ad valorem equivalent of the U.S. tariff.

U.S. protection of agriculture has been very little. We have no quota system. On live animal imports the duty goes up after a certain number is reached, but there is no prohibition against unlimited numbers.

The United States cut tariffs, in 1948, on fresh, chilled, or frozen beef and veal from 6 to 3 cents a pound; on mutton, from 5 to 2½ cents per pound; and on lamb from 7 to 3½ cents a pound. All of these tariffs were cut 50 percent.

All duties for cattle and beef are listed in a statement which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1930 the tariff on beef and veal was 6 cents per pound and this was reduced in 1947 to the present 3 cents per pound. The United States reduced the tariff on cattle under 200 pounds from 2½ to 1½ cents a pound on the first 200,000 head coming into this country annually. The rate on cattle weighing 200 to 700 pounds is 2½ cents; on those weighing over 700 pounds it was reduced from 3 to 1½ cents per pound for not over 400,000 head entering in a 12-month period with not more than 120,000 head entering in any one quarter. Cattle entering in excess of this number carry a duty of 2½ cents per pound. Preserved meats and those not otherwise specified were reduced from 20 to 10 percent on an ad valorem basis.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the future looks no better for our domestic industry than the immediate past.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Colorado for again bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. This serious situation has been discussed for a period of months.

Last week stock growers in all parts of the country—I am sure some from Colorado, I know some from South Dakota, and others from many other areas—were in this city, and made representations to the Tariff Commission.

When the Trade Expansion Act was being debated in the Senate, its proponents assured us that there was a built-in mechanism for meeting exactly this kind of problem, and that the Tariff Commission had the capacity to act and would act to protect the solvency of a basic American industry.

Illustrative of how important is the subject with which the Senator from Colorado is dealing so effectively this afternoon, I point out that in 1962 the total cash sales of calves and cattle amounted to $8,146 million. The other six "basics" combined had a total cash sale value of only $7,993 million.

It is clear that we are dealing with the biggest single segment of the agricultural problem, a segment so large that it is greater than all the other six so-called "basics."

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt at this point, because this is so important, I add that most people do not realize that the income to our farmers from livestock, no matter what kind, greatly exceeds the general value of all other crops which are raised.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no question about that. I am talking now only about cattle and calves. The income from those exceeds the income from the other six "basics." We must add, of course, pork, lamb, and poultry products.

In 1962 the total cash sales value of wheat was $2,087 million; of corn, $1,781 million; of cotton, $2,303 million; of tobacco, $1,316 million; of rice, $309 million; and of peanuts, $197 million; for a total of $7,993 million, exceeded by the value of calves and cattle alone, the total for which was $8,146 million.

So, when we are talking about doing something to protect the income of the livestock industry, and when we are talking about beef alone, we have a problem so serious that, unless it is corrected, the results can be devastating not only to that part of the economy, but to the entire economy.

It is a well recognized American economic axiom that income from raw materials—income from farms and ranches and the forest industry—multiplies itself seven times in terms of national income.

So, we are whittling away at the vitals of our economy and increasing unemployment and economic distress because of the failure of the administration to take action which, under the Trade Expansion Act, we were assured would be taken when conditions became this serious.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. That representation has been made. That is the reason why the Senator from Colorado thought it necessary today to call attention to these facts and to the fact that we are really destroying an industry. People talk about tax reduction. I do not think we shall need tax reduction, because, unless something is done with respect to the cattle industry, there will be a real reduction in income.

Mr. AIKEN. I was particularly interested in the Senator's calling attention to the disparity of duties between the United States and other countries. I have an illustration of duty disparities relating to a small volume, but very important, agricultural commodity; namely, maple products. The duty on maple products entering our country from Canada amounts to 3½ percent ad valorem. The duty on maple products from the United States to Canada is 17½ percent ad valorem. Our own officials of Government have never offered any explanation for that wide disparity or demonstrated any sympathetic attitude for the plight of our own producers.

Mr. ALLOTT. Am I correct that the Senator's figures show about a 300-percent disparity?

Mr. AIKEN. About 500 percent. Our duty amounts to 3½ percent ad valorem. The Canadian duty is 17½ percent ad valorem. Ours is on a poundage basis, but it amounts to 3½ percent ad valorem. The United States and Canada are the only two producing countries in the world that have any maple products to sell.

As I said, I have never received an explanation from our own Government officials as to why there was that wide disparity or why our producers did not get much sympathy from them in efforts to correct the disparity. However, a few months ago I communicated with a friend of mine, who is an official in Canada, and he told me that, at the time the United States reduced the maple duty to 3½ percent ad valorem, somebody in the United States got a corresponding benefit by a reduction on some other product going into Canada. In other words, it was a case of a small agricultural commodity being traded off for some other product of our economy.

This is happening today in a big way. We are being traded off. American agriculture is deemed expendable by our trade negotiators. I do not say that Americans do not make money overseas, because there is now nearly a hundred billion of U.S. dollars invested in other countries. Our meatpackers, our dairy products corporations, and other establishments have plants in other countries in the world that are now exporting into the United States. I maintain that if we are to continue to sell out our agricultural producers in the United States for the benefit of international investors, or for other factors of our economy, we are weakening the strength of the country.

Mr. ALLOTT. I could not agree more with the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I thank him for his contribution.

I yield now to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, already the sheep industry has been pretty well liquidated, as many people know. The State of the distinguished Senator from Colorado is one of the main sheepraising States of the country. The present situation has been brought about because of our failure to protect U.S. sheepmen from imports of lamb and mutton, as well as wool.

If we do nothing about the cattle industry—and this is by far the biggest segment of our agricultural industry; it affects every State—we shall be in serious trouble.

I hope Members of the Senate will take an active interest in this problem, along with the cattle producers, who are doing their best, so that we obtain help and action from the Tariff Commission.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

I yield now to the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

Mr. FONG. I congratulate the Senator for his illuminating and excellent talk on this subject of beef and mutton imports. I think it is very timely.

Every State in the Union is a producer of livestock. My State of Hawaii, although it is a great producer of cattle, imports approximately 55 percent of its beef requirements. Most of it used to come from the mainland of the United States. But today most of the imports come from the Antipodes.

Since the importation of beef and cattle products from the Antipodes—that is, New Zealand and Australia—and these importations have increased greatly within the last few years—our cattle and sheep ranchers have found it difficult to make a profit.

For example, the Parker Ranch which is one of the largest ranches in the world with approximately 35,000 head of white-faced Herefords and many thousand head of sheep, last year went out of the sheep business. For several years, now it has made very little in the cattle business.

It is not possible to make a reasonable profit in the cattle business in Hawaii with Australian and New Zealand beef undercutting the price of our beef by about 10 cents a pound. This problem of being unable to make a reasonable profit has been felt throughout the State of Hawaii, and as a consequence many ranches have closed.

Ranching is our third largest agricultural industry, ranking after the production of cane sugar and pineapples. It is a vital industry in the State of Hawaii and very important to our economy.

I have written letters to the Secretary of Agriculture, pointing out the fact that we have been injured by the large unrestricted importations of beef products from the Antipodes. I have implored him to help us. So far nothing has been done by the Secretary.

I wish to congratulate the senior Senator from Colorado for bringing this problem to our attention.

I know the Senator agrees with me that we should not cut off all importations. I am asking only that a quota for imports be established. We are asking only that our markets be not flooded.

I wonder if the able Senator agrees with me that we are not asking for a complete prohibition of beef and mutton imports.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would not contend that there should be a complete prohibition; but, as I have tried to point out, in relating prices to cost of production—and I intend to go into that subject in a moment—it is very obvious that we cannot compete with the sort of cost structure existing in competing areas.

I was careful to point out, in the beginning, that while I was concerned with how this problem affected Colorado stockmen and agricultural producers, the problem was not peculiar to Colorado. It affects the distinguished Senator's State of Hawaii; and it is important to the greater portion of the United States. We must find a method for protecting our people from cheap imports. We cannot let the imports break our market.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator. I agree with him. The Tariff Commission and the executive department should look into this problem, and arrive at some kind of formula to protect our livestock business. This is a great business, and it should not be allowed to go on the rocks.

I again thank the Senator for calling this matter to our attention. He should be commended for his fine and excellent talk.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. I know of his great interest in the agricultural industry of Hawaii.

Mr. President, the colloquies have consumed more time than I had anticipated. I wish to have some consideration for my good friend the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who has been very patient. I hope I can conclude in about 5 minutes.

Apropos of what the distinguished Senator from Hawaii has said, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that in 1960 the sheep industry appealed to the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission, on a technicality, refused it any assistance. Such action has gone a great way toward destroying the sheep and wool industry. The question that we shall have to decide is whether we will permit the same thing to happen to the cattle industry; whether we shall permit the cattle industry to be destroyed.

Let me speak for a moment about costs. This is an example: Mr. C. W. McMillan, executive vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, went to Australia. I shall not go into all the detailed figures, but he found that it was possible to rent land from the Crown at a cost of about 11 cents per head per year for grazing.

Based upon the studies made at Colorado State University, which I commented upon earlier, it is easy to see that about $30 a year is chargeable in Colorado to land use in producing one cow, as contrasted with the Australian figure of 11 cents a cow.

It is not hard to understand from figures like this why prices have been depressed and why we are having difficulty with meat products being imported into this country. Eighty-one percent of the Australian production is exported to this country. Apparently it is planned to have such exports continue to grow and expand. Anyone who examines a graph of the figures on importation will see that in the past 2 years the line rises almost perpendicularly.

The question is whether we shall tolerate such a situation and whether we shall tolerate the destruction of this industry.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled "Crisis in Beef Imports," written by Mr. C. W. McMillan, to whom I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, there are several things we might do. We might take livestock off the proposed list for negotiations in the upcoming General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade talks. Further, this is something which should be considered under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. Under that provision the President is authorized to negotiate with foreign governments to limit shipments if exports to the United States are detrimental to our producers. I suggest that the President do so.

Also, the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] introduced S. 2168, requiring the President to negotiate such agreements. S. 557 was introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming, and other Senators, including the Senator from Colorado, to place quotas on beef imports and raise the tariff on imports in excess of those quotas.

I have received a letter from Mr. W. C. Crew, president and general manager of the Denver Union Stockyard Co., who for many years has been a student of markets, prices, supplies, cattle, and all kinds of stock. I consider his letter to be a fine analysis of the picture we face today, with some suggestions. Only the press of time prevents me from discussing this very important subject in greater detail. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks so that my colleagues may read it and have the benefit of the suggestions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, as well as to other Senators for speaking on this subject. The question we shall have to face in the next few months is whether Congress and the Chief Executive have the will to form some kind of protective barrier against the importation of cheap beef, which can only ruin the beef market in this country; and whether we have the will to do the same thing for our sheep, lamb, and mutton products.

I felt it necessary to call this problem to the attention of the Senate today. I hope my colleagues will see to it that one of the first things next year will be the initiation of action on one or the other of the bills referred to.

Exhibit 1

Crisis in Beef Imports

(By C. W. McMillan)

We saw lands of paradox and contrast.

We saw some of the best livestock production and potentials—and some of the worst—in the world. Some fine animals, but some real scrubs.

We dined, argued, laughed and exchanged notes with men like ourselves, equally concerned with the elements, their "beasts," local conditions, taxes, and the world markets for beef.

And we came home convinced that livestock production in the United States, more than ever before, needs more realistic protection from foreign meat.

"We" were a group of U.S. beef producers and feeders representing the American National Cattlemen's Association on a special study tour of New Zealand and Australia.

We all wanted to see firsthand whether the tremendous increase in their beef exports was temporary—due to relatively higher prices here—or whether they were forerunners of a deliberate buildup aimed at the U.S. market.

And we also wanted to see if we could show the Australia and New Zealand stockmen, on a producer-to-producer level, that they are wrecking our market and, at the same time, endangering their own.

Frankly, we found little to reassure us. As long as our tariffs remain low and tonnage unrestricted, there'll probably be little slackening of imports. Rather, we can expect them to grow over the years.

Producers in both countries were sympathetic. But many—especially exporters—are more fascinated with the gold in the U.S. market. Even if prices drop here, this is a far better market for them than any place else. It looked so good to them that they only now are making token effort to find alternate consumers at home and elsewhere in the world.

The chart below gives you an idea how fast beef imports have been increasing. While almost everyone recognizes that foreign beef has an adverse impact on U.S. producers, a few figures help to emphasize the danger signs—and the rapidity in the buildup of the problem.

Total beef imports, including live animals, accounted for about 11 percent of all the beef we ate in the United States last year, an all-time high. Another record will be set this year—imports for the first 8 months of 1963 were 122 percent of the same period last year.

And what a beachhead the Aussies and New Zealanders have established. From only a smattering 6 or 7 years ago when their exports were committed to Great Britain, their shipments now amount to over 80 percent of all our beef imports.

Don't let anyone tell you that this tonnage has no direct bearing on fed-cattle prices. True, most of the shipments are of "manufacturing beef"—a lean, boneless product. However, more than one-fourth of every one of our fed-beef carcasses becomes ground beef, and 60 percent of the beef from Australia also goes into ground beef here.

And, realizing that beef competes most with other beef, rather than pork or poultry, say, then any extra tonnage can't help but depress total and specific prices.

Economists figure that recent import levels have cut some cattle prices—or held others down from expected levels—as much as $3 per hundredweight.

You also have heard that all the U.S. cattleman has to do is become "more efficient" or just raise more and more animals, then he'd be able to compete with anyone in the world.

It's simply not so. No matter how hard our stockmen work or how many miracles come from the laboratory, there is no way that he can cut costs today to equal those of the Australian, for example.

Our study group, all knowledgeable ranchers and feeders, estimated that the Aussie could raise a "beast" on his "station," trek it hundreds of miles to slaughter and still make money at prices roughly half what most American ranchers would have to have for a comparable animal.

And exporters can ship the beef 8,000 miles (or more), pay duty of 3 cents per pound and still make money when our beef market is too low for profit to American stockmen.

Basic is the cost of leasing or owning land.

In western Queensland and the northern territory, most of the land is owned by the Crown. It is available on 50-year leases with an annual rental payment ranging from 65 cents to $1 per square mile. A good carrying capacity might be seven or eight animals per square mile. Stations in this drought-vulnerable vastness are big. One we visited was 6,159 square miles in size. That's nearly 4 million acres.

By way of contrast, we saw smaller operations in New Zealand where pastures carried up to four ewes and one cow to the acre. The year-around carrying capacities are astounding by our standards. They're blessed with a well-distributed 40 inches of rainfall a year and they fertilize generously, a lot of it by airplane.

The Angus breed dominates, with Herefords and Shorthorns battling it out for second place. The quality is excellent. Because of the high cost of grains, nearly all of the beef is finished on grass with little or no drylot feeding.

New Zealanders like the sheep-cattle combination, and it is unlikely that there will be a big shift away from sheep to cattle. Sheep and wool are their big sources of income and will undoubtedly stay No. 1, with beef and dairy next.

But Australia has a fantastic potential for increased beef production, and its numbers are building fast.

In southeastern Queensland we saw land being cleared in a 24-inch rainfall zone. The rough land cost about $10 per acre. It took another $22 to chain and burn, plow and seed. Planted to sorghum alum, they're fattening one steer per acre. There is a 15-million acre potential of this kind of land.

Further development in the vast "outback" must await more capital, but the bigger potential lies in the higher rainfall areas of the east.

The outback must develop more stock water and transportation facilities. A cow might have to go 15 miles for water, and some cattle still are driven as long as 6 months to reach market.

On one station we saw cattle that cost the rancher $7 for annual maintenance, but he needed another $14 to get each animal to market.

Outside capital is being encouraged to come into Australia for development of its beef industry. There are some meaningful incentives. For example, there is no capital gains tax, and the depreciation allowed to encourage capital improvements is such that at the end of 5 years it amounts to 120 percent.

Australia is a young country, a growing country, not unlike the United States a number of years ago. You can't help but feel after being there and talking with their people that they will overcome their problems. They will improve their cattle, their pastures, and their management.

We saw few signs that the whole meat industry "down under" is trying very hard to cushion itself against growing cost-price squeezes or possible disappearance of the U.S. market. Stockmen are concerned, and are pushing for more consumption at home or in other export markets. But exporting packers—and U.S. importers—have their sights set this way.

And this leads to the question: Will they continue to arouse the ire of American stockmen, political and business leaders so that severe restrictions are imposed? Already several bills calling for markedly higher tariffs or quotas have been introduced in Congress by alarmed lawmakers.

No American stockman wants to cut off reasonable competition. But his patience—and pocketbook—are worn mighty thin.

Exhibit 2

The Denver Union Stockyard Co.,
Denver, Colo., November 15, 1963.

Hon. Gordon Allott,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: I am sure that you are aware that Rocky Mountain area cattle producers and feeders are suffering severe financial losses. Cattle feeders are caught between increased costs of production on one hand and the market-depressing effects of growing imports on the other; and this pressure is being passed on to the producer of feeder livestock. Cattle prices have been under the most sustained downward pressure at any time since 1952.

Last year I wrote you that I didn't feel that imports were the prime cause of the sharp decline in fed beef prices, at least to the degree that was being attributed to it by some livestock spokesmen. Since that time the picture has changed rapidly.

We estimate that as much as 13 percent of our total consumption originates with foreign producers. Imported tonnage of beef has risen dramatically each year, and trade sources believe that the trend will continue into 1964. At the same time fed cattle production will reach a record high domestically, and total cattle population is expected to reach a record 107 million head.

Until recently the efficiency of livestock producers was able to offset much of the effect of imports on prices. Now it has become apparent that if many of the elements of the industry are to survive, there must be Federal intervention in the manner and volume of movement of imported meat and meat products. We are not suggesting a complete ban of competitive meat, but we do believe a quota system should be instituted so that foreign importation will complement rather than conflict with our domestic production.

The effect of imports is particularly onerous because nothing has been done to effectively regulate food chain procurement and merchandising practices. The results of recent months demonstrate conclusively—if any doubt existed before—that food chains are able to exert unusual economic pressures on livestock products. It is no accident that food chain earning reports reflect sharply higher profits during the same period that livestock feeders were suffering severe losses. In Colorado and Wyoming many of your constituents have lost from $20 to $70 per head on the last two crops of cattle, and few in the industry have any optimism concerning price improvement for the next crop. While some relief is available through a tax carryback provision, we are aware that many cattle feeders are in a precarious financial position, and unless some relief is immediately forthcoming, we may expect a rash of bankruptcies, and, perhaps, a march of cattlemen on Washington.

As you are aware, there is before the Congress a joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 71, which would direct the Federal Trade Commission to make a comprehensive investigation of chainstore practices. In the light of recent events, we think that this could be most helpful in establishing cause and effect in the marketplace in the livestock industry. There is ample authority under title IV of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, for the Secretary of Agriculture and the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission to conduct joint investigations in the livestock and meat industry. We have suggested action in this direction to the responsible officials of both agencies, but there has been no inclination on their part to do anything.

We alerted some of our Representatives in Congress earlier about the appointment of Dr. George L. Mehren as an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. We believed that his choice for such a sensitive position, responsible for the Packers and Stockyards Division and other regulatory divisions of the Department, was unfortunate in the light of his background and ideology. He has been a frequent and outspoken champion of food chain interests, and at one time was privately retained to present their case. He has characterized the farmer "as a sort of peasant type of business organization, which is dying out," and has suggested that "if you want to get the obvious benefits of large-scale business you have to take the bankruptcy and decline of the old to get the new." With such an individual in charge of Packers and Stockyards we see little hope for independent and unbiased investigation of food chain practices. For this reason, we hope that you will support Senate Joint Resolution 71, and do everything in your power to see it out of committee and passed during this session of Congress.

You will be hearing from many of your constituents during the next few months concerning the import problem and other troubled areas of immediate concern to the livestock industry. You will also be hearing from my associate, John F. O'Dea, who is preparing a brief and factual statement concerning these issues that may be helpful to you in replying to the letters you may receive.

Sincerely yours,

Walter Crew,
President and General Manager.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I join my associates in congratulating the Senator from Colorado for his very comprehensive statement on this very troublesome and critical problem. The Senator from Nebraska has spoken at length. One of the most important items mentioned in the latter part of the Senator's remarks has to do with the fact that a year or 2 ago a committee from the American National Cattlemen's Association went to Australia for the purpose of surveying the situation there. A fellow Nebraskan, Mr. Earl Monahan, went along. He has told me that the surface has not been scratched so far as the volume of imports from Australia to this country is concerned. The Australians are opening new territory and adopting new methods of feeding and raising, which will bring their costs down. They are using new lands by way of reclamation projects and otherwise. Therefore, the future looks even more bleak than the present situation is. That factor should be taken into consideration in the determination that Congress do something about this whole problem.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am grateful to the Senator from Nebraska for emphasizing this matter because it is discussed in the article that Mr. McMillan wrote, which I have asked to have printed in the Record. He is exactly correct. We have not been looking at the worst of our problem. We must look for the worst of it as being still ahead so far as countries like Australia and New Zealand are concerned. Unless we move, and move promptly, the situation 6 months from now will be much worse than it is today.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Gruening in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the bill as recommended by the conferees provides for the appropriation of $313,093,424 for fiscal year 1964. This is $6,494,361 under the Senate bill. It is $28,806,624 over the House bill. It is $15,630,576 under the budget estimate.

The bill allows for a Federal payment of $37,500,000. The House had allowed $30 million. The Senate had appropriated $45 million.

It is estimated that there will be a surplus in the general fund, as of June 30, 1964, amounting to $2,048,000. The Senate bill allowed 1,063 additional positions. The conferees' action allows 831 additional positions, a reduction of 232 positions.

In conference, 96 positions for the Department of Education were dropped, but 86 of these were unbudgeted.

Ninety-two positions for the Departments of Health and Welfare were dropped in conference, but 92 unbudgeted positions had been added by the Senate.

Overall, I believe this is a good bill. The conference report is signed by all the conferees of both Houses.

I regret to say that the unbudgeted positions for the Department of Welfare were dropped in conference. This means that the 37 positions added by the Senate in the Child Welfare Division were dropped. It means that 42 positions for the Office of Investigations and Collections were dropped. The three additional positions included by the Senate for the purpose of assisting employable mothers to find employment were dropped. The unbudgeted moneys for foster home payments were eliminated.

So far as the Department of Education is concerned, the 44 additional elementary school teachers added by the Senate were dropped. The 25 additional teachers provided by the Senate for severely mentally retarded children were eliminated.

The 17 supporting positions added by the Senate in connection with the educational needs of severely mentally retarded children were dropped in conference.

The provision for two chaplains for the District of Columbia General Hospital was dropped.

The Senate conferees met with the House conferees upon five occasions. We did the very best we could. The House conferees were adamant in their opposition to the inclusion of unbudgeted positions and unbudgeted appropriations. The Senate conferees did, however, make some gains for the District by virtue of the fact that the budgeted positions for elementary school, junior high school, and senior high school teachers have been included. Also included were certain budgeted positions for the Department of Welfare, the Department of Health, and the Metropolitan Police Department.

I express appreciation to my fellow conferees who worked with me in our efforts to reach agreement with the House conferees. I particularly wish to express my gratitude to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I feel that perhaps it was he who first initiated the movement toward a breakthrough in the conference. I pay tribute to him for the fine assistance he rendered.

I also wish to express my thanks to the majority whip, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], for the fine support he gave me in the conference.

Again, I express gratitude to all of my fellow conferees and I also thank our faithful clerk, Mr. Harold E. Merrick.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virgina yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. It seems to me that we have turned our backs on the hungry children of the Nation's Capital. Only 1 month ago, the Senate had before it a budget for the District of Columbia that took some constructive steps on behalf of the poor and the hungry of Washington, D.C. I was glad to give full credit to the distinguished Senator from West Virgina [Mr. BYRD] for the work he had done to make these constructive improvements.

I know that the Senator from West Virginia has been severely criticized—in many instances unjustly—because in many of the steps he had taken he had really made some leaps forward to help the people of the District.

I thought we should take one additional step and provide funds for needy children of unemployed parents, but by a seven-vote margin, it was the decision of this body that this improvement should not be added this year. But surely that close vote indicated there was broad support for adding this improvement and overwhelming support for keeping the improvements already made by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Now we find that the conference committee has taken a disastrous backward step. It is unfortunate that the unemployed parent program was not added. But it is a genuine tragedy that important parts of the Senate improvements for public welfare were cut out. This conference report cuts out the increased foster care payments provided by the Senate. It cuts out the additional Welfare Department personnel, 37 of whom were to be hired for child welfare services. It cuts out the rule that a woman who has made arrangements for care of her children has at least 3 months to find employment. Under this bill, we go back to the 1-month rule. So the woman with the initiative to learn a skill who started 1 month ago to find a job and has not found one in that time—her Christmas present from the Welfare Department and from the Congress will be notification that she is technically employable and no longer entitled to assistance.

Mr. President, I can vote for this bill only after having assured the Senate that my effort to provide the District of Columbia with adequate welfare funds will be renewed next year with all my energy.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with much of what the Senator has said. I hope these problems will be considered next year.

The conferees were up against the fact that there were a number of unbudgeted items in the bill. Under the leadership of the Senator from West Virginia, the Senate provided the full amount of the budgeted items, but the House strongly opposed the unbudgeted items. So the Senate conferees had to yield.

However, we succeeded in having the Federal payment for the District increased by $7,500,000. The Federal Government owes that to the District. That was a compromise in the right direction.

I am most sympathetic toward everything the Senator from Connecticut has said; but as a conferee who sat through a number of conferences, I can testify to the fact that we were up against the obstacle of unbudgeted items, and it was on them that we finally yielded.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I appreciate the position in which the conferees found themselves; but I believe it is important that we study these problems and bring public opinion to bear on them next year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree.

Mr. RIBICOFF. As I said during the debate on my amendment, and as I have said today, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and other members of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee made some important advances. They recognized the constructive approaches that had to be taken if dependency was to be reduced and some of the basic problems in the District of Columbia were to be attacked. That is why I believe it is unfortunate that in conference the House insisted on deleting the forward steps that the Senator from West Virginia had achieved and accomplished. I hope that next year we can write these provisions, and others besides, into the bill, and that next year the House will yield to the position of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. One of the most important provisions that the Senator from West Virginia was successful in having included in the report, and which we stood out for, was the provision for 343 new teachers in the schools. That is fundamental in the whole problem.

Mr. RIBICOFF. It is fundamental. I have spoken privately with the Senator from West Virginia about this subject. It seems to me that the problems in the field of education in the District of Columbia are about as different from those which exist anywhere else in the United States as they could be. Not only is there the question of additional positions; but the whole problem of curriculum emphasis, of what we are to do with youngsters to make certain they are self-supporting and self-sufficient and get as much out of their education as possible—all of this presents a strong challenge.

I am aware of the interest of the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Massachusetts in the problems of the District of Columbia. I am sure they will continue their constructive efforts to make certain that Congress, which in the final analysis has the additional burden and responsibility of the problems of the District—because we really run the District of Columbia, when all is said and done—will approach these problems in the years ahead just as if we were approaching them as problems of our respective States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut. I thank him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was my privilege to serve on the conference committee. I commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]; and I thank the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for his helpful endeavors. He was exceedingly cooperative and did much to bring about the report.

I deeply regret that it was necessary for the Senate conferees to retreat from some of the Senate positions, because the action of the Senate and of the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], was most desirable and forward-looking and could have been exceedingly helpful in solving many of the problems of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, before we vote on and approve the conference committee report on the District of Columbia budget—and approve it we must, if the District is to get any funds this fiscal year—we should pause and see what has happened. We should not delude ourselves as to what we are doing for the District.

As we all remember, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Senator ROBERT BYRD, did an admirable job in providing funds over and above the budget request to increase the welfare aid available to needy District residents. He increased the foster home payment, increased the number of welfare investigators, increased the staff of Junior Village, extended the time mothers could have to seek work after receiving training, and in other ways generally improved the welfare system in the District.

To those of us who desire the inclusion of an aid for the dependent children of unemployed parents—ADCUP—program in the District, the argument could be validly made, "You do not have aid for dependent children of unemployed parents but you do have all these other things. Let us not try to do it all at once."

I still voted for ADCUP, but I realized that much had been done.

Now we have neither ADCUP nor the other advances. All the increases above the budget request were slashed by the conferees. I am incensed at the treatment that is being meted out to the District in the name of welfare.

I am hereby serving notice that next year I am going to fight vigorously for ADCUP and all the other welfare reforms needed here. I understand that ADCUP was the lever used by the House to knock out the other measures. If I have my way next year, ADCUP will not be a subject of controversy between the House and the Senate. It will be in, and so will the rest, so far as we are concerned.

Mr. President, I regret particularly that we had to retreat from the Senate position on the extra teachers—an unbudgeted item—and the necessary teachers for retarded children. This is an area of great need, and we should place extra emphasis on it.

The supplemental appropriation bill will come before us in January; and I hope the efforts made by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and his committee will be carefully considered by the executive branch and that steps will be taken—as so well outlined by the Senator from West Virginia—in terms of the foster care program, the teachers for the mentally retarded, the extra help needed at the Junior Village, and the other positions taken by the Senate.

I have signed the conference report because I believe it is the best we can do; but I think the other body, in driving us to this position, was quite shortsighted.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in regard to the point made about the program of aid for the dependent children of unemployed parents, I wish to state that a great deal has been published in the press to the effect that this item was in conference. However, it was not in conference, for it was not included in the version of the bill passed by the House of Representatives and it was not included in the version of the bill passed by the Senate and sent to conference. The amendment offered by the able and distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], which would have included this program for the District of Columbia, was rejected by the Senate on a yea-and-nay vote. Consequently, the conferees took up the bill in conference without this item.

I wish to read into the RECORD—in view of the fact that there has been so much misunderstanding and confusion about this subject—paragraph 2 of rule XXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

> 2. Conferees shall not insert in their report matter not committed to them by either House, nor shall they strike from the bill matter agreed to by both Houses. If new matter is inserted in the report, or if matter which was agreed to by both Houses is stricken from the bill, a point of order may be made against the report, and if the point of order is sustained, the report shall be recommitted to the committee of conference.

This item was not in either the House version or the Senate version of the bill; and paragraph 2 of rule XXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate provides that conferees shall not insert in their report matter not committed to them by either House, and that if that is done or if matter agreed to by both Houses is stricken from the report, a point of order may be made against it.

I have maintained all along that this item was not in conference; and if the conferees had inserted moneys for the ADCUP program, it would have constituted new matter in their report, and a point of order could have been made against the report. I have no doubt that a point of order would then have been made in the Senate. Whether a point of order could have been made in the House of Representatives, I am not prepared to say.

It would have been a vain and futile thing to attempt to insert this item in the conference report, and, in my judgment, the House conferees never at any time seriously contended that this subject was legitimately in conference.

I regret that certain very worthy items were not agreed to by the House conferees; but, as I have said, we did the very best we could, and I hope the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1964.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Summary of appropriation bill (H.R. 7431)

FEDERAL PAYMENT

[Out of the general revenues of the Federal Treasury]

Item	Appropriations, 1963 [1]	Budget estimates, 1964 [2]	House bill, 1964	Senate bill, 1964	Conference action
Federal payment to the District of Columbia (general fund)	$30,000,000	[3] $50,000,000	$30,000,000	$45,000,000	$37,500,000
Federal payment to the District of Columbia (water fund)	1,938,000	1,924,000	1,924,000	1,924,000	1,924,000
Federal payment to the District of Columbia (sanitary sewage works fund)	961,000	944,000	944,000	944,000	944,000
Federal payment to the District of Columbia (metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund)	300,000				
Total Federal payment	33,199,000	52,868,000	32,868,000	47,868,000	40,368,000

See footnotes at end of table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—Continued

Summary of appropriation bill (H.R. 7431)—Continued

LOAN AUTHORIZATION

[Out of the general revenues of the Federal Treasury]

Item	Appropriations, 1963 [1]	Budget estimates, 1964 [2]	House bill, 1964	Senate bill, 1964	Conference action
Loans to District of Columbia for capital outlay (general fund)	$18,700,000	[4] $12,800,000	....	$12,800,000	$11,300,000
Loans to District of Columbia for capital outlay (highway fund)	1,600,000	....	....	....	....
Loans to District of Columbia for capital outlay (sanitary sewage works fund)	3,242,000	8,000,000	$8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Loan to metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund	2,500,000	....	....	....	....
Total, loan authorizations	26,042,000	20,800,000	8,000,000	20,800,000	19,300,000
OPERATING EXPENSES					
General operating expenses:					
Executive Office	796,778	1,290,500	758,300	1,188,902	1,092,480
General administration	7,011,286	7,911,600	7,204,600	7,725,237	7,558,373
Regulatory agencies	1,920,511	2,076,300	2,016,300	2,065,712	2,063,130
Occupations and professions	455,383	478,900	467,500	475,220	471,813
Public Library	3,201,370	3,513,300	3,449,100	3,482,626	3,478,395
Veterans' affairs	119,600	111,700	110,000	111,800	111,800
Buildings and grounds	2,678,822	2,911,700	2,692,400	2,895,087	2,895,087
Surveyor's Office	204,000	212,000	211,800	211,800	211,800
Total, general operating expenses	16,387,750	18,506,000	16,910,000	18,156,384	17,882,878
Public safety:					
Corporation Counsel	980,053	1,122,000	1,056,000	1,078,933	1,065,523
Metropolitan Police	28,306,965	31,163,000	30,402,220	31,032,543	31,028,043
Fire Department	13,740,565	15,488,900	15,329,030	15,408,524	15,362,530
Civil defense	95,000	156,000	101,550	131,666	122,850
Courts	6,402,371	6,921,300	6,695,000	6,796,185	6,771,463
Corrections	7,957,457	8,663,500	8,241,000	8,406,783	8,403,907
Licenses and inspections	2,816,342	3,036,800	3,009,000	3,021,519	3,019,144
National Guard	191,847	198,500	198,200	198,200	198,200
Total, public safety	60,490,600	66,750,000	65,032,000	66,074,353	65,971,660
Education: Public schools	59,504,750	65,271,000	61,670,000	64,226,172	63,860,593
Parks and recreation:					
Recreation Department	3,415,247	3,703,400	3,605,000	3,656,005	3,656,005
National Capital parks	3,643,806	3,824,900	3,713,500	3,813,500	3,813,500
National Zoological Park	1,504,997	1,637,700	1,534,500	1,607,376	1,597,356
Total, parks and recreation	8,564,050	9,166,000	8,853,000	9,076,881	9,066,861
Health and welfare:					
Vocational rehabilitation	401,800	595,700	443,000	471,880	498,157
Public health	44,022,800	47,214,500	44,010,000	46,934,389	46,909,536
Public welfare	21,488,301	25,526,800	21,863,000	23,796,973	23,118,355
Total, health and welfare	65,912,901	73,337,000	66,316,000	71,203,242	70,526,048
Highways and traffic:					
Department of Highways and Traffic	9,624,500	10,520,500	10,152,700	10,445,481	10,430,481
Motor vehicles	1,624,175	1,793,000	1,767,000	1,764,072	1,759,203
Motor Vehicle Parking Agency	205,100	218,500	218,300	218,300	218,300
Total, highways and traffic	11,453,775	12,532,000	12,138,000	12,427,853	12,407,984
Sanitary engineering:					
Department of Sanitary Engineering	18,155,838	18,987,200	18,263,000	18,838,600	18,838,600
Washington aqueduct	2,894,700	2,943,800	2,942,000	3,012,500	3,012,500
Total, sanitary engineering	21,050,538	21,931,000	21,205,000	21,851,100	21,851,100
Miscellaneous (claims, suits)	36,600	....	....	....	....
Total, operating expenses, by funds:					
General fund	224,231,190	243,534,500	228,871,300	239,276,415	237,900,613
Highway fund	6,227,801	9,239,000	8,329,700	9,101,343	9,044,284
Highway fund (parking account)	2,006,460	3,169,800	3,783,500	3,169,500	3,169,500
Water fund	6,950,018	7,257,700	7,076,900	7,253,888	7,245,888
Sanitary sewage works fund	3,985,555	4,239,800	4,056,400	4,182,079	4,174,079
Metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund	....	52,200	6,200	32,760	32,760
Total, operating expenses, by funds	243,400,964	267,493,000	252,124,000	263,015,985	261,567,124
REPAYMENT OF LOANS AND INTEREST					
General fund:					
Construction loan	....	1,018,445	1,018,445	1,018,445	1,018,445
Stadium loan	....	856,855	792,355	856,655	856,655
Total, general fund	....	1,875,300	1,810,800	1,875,100	1,875,100
Highway fund—construction loan	....	1,841,700	1,841,700	1,841,700	1,841,700
Water fund—construction loan	....	1,124,000	1,124,000	1,124,000	1,124,000
Sanitary sewage works fund	....	149,000	148,900	149,000	149,000
Metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund	....	....	64,400	....	....
Total, repayment of loans and interest	....	4,990,000	4,989,800	4,989,800	4,989,800
CAPITAL OUTLAY					
District debt service	2,468,278	915,500	915,500	915,500	915,500
Public building construction	24,709,197	24,236,900	2,757,000	21,986,400	18,940,900
Highways and traffic	9,978,525	12,310,900	10,737,500	11,280,400	11,280,400
Sanitary engineering	12,235,000	16,921,700	11,107,000	15,543,700	13,543,700
Washington aqueduct	....	1,856,000	1,656,000	1,856,000	1,856,000
Motor Vehicle Parking Agency	60,000	....	....	....	....
Potomac interceptor sewerline	2,800,000	....	....	....	....
Total, capital outlay, by funds					
General fund	30,748,169	31,353,500	3,672,500	29,102,600	24,137,100
Highway fund	9,811,142	11,865,500	10,737,500	10,835,400	10,755,400
Highway fund (parking account)	60,000	....	....	....	....
Water fund	1,748,053	2,970,000	2,711,000	2,970,000	2,970,000
Sanitary sewage works fund	7,083,636	10,052,000	10,052,000	8,674,000	8,674,000
Metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund	2,800,000	....	....	....	....
Total, capital outlay, by funds	52,251,000	56,241,000	27,173,000	51,582,000	46,536,500

See footnotes at end of table.

District of Columbia—Continued

Summary of appropriation bill (H.R. 7431)—Continued

LOAN AUTHORIZATION—Continued

[Out of the general revenues of the Federal Treasury]

Item	Appropriations, 1963 [1]	Budget estimates, 1964 [2]	House bill, 1964	Senate bill, 1964	Conference action
RECAPITULATION BY FUNDS					
General fund	$254,979,350	$276,763,300	$234,354,600	$270,254,115	$263,912,813
Highway fund	16,038,943	22,946,200	20,908,900	21,778,443	21,641,384
Highway fund (parking account)	2,066,400	3,160,800	3,783,500	3,169,500	3,169,500
Water fund	8,698,071	11,351,700	10,911,900	11,347,888	11,339,888
Sanitary sewage works fund	11,069,191	14,440,800	14,257,300	13,005,079	12,997,079
Metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund	2,800,000	52,200	70,600	32,760	32,760
Total, all funds	295,651,964	328,724,000	284,286,800	319,587,785	313,093,424

[1] Includes $6,629,014 contained in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963 (Public Law 88-25)

[2] Includes $39,142,000 in supplemental estimates, as follows: S. Doc. No. 32 (B budget). $38,030,200; S. Doc. No. 37 $804,000; S. Doc. No. 41, $308,000.

[3] Includes $18,000,000 supplemental estimate. S. Doc. No. 32.

[4] Included in S. Doc. No. 32.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7431, which was read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 17, 24, 48, and 49 to the bill (H.R. 7431) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes", and concur therein.
>
> *Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$68,247".
>
> *Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$6,700,000".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate amendments Nos. 25 and 42.

The motion was agreed to.

ARAB BOYCOTT PRACTICES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the news ticker and the news reports show a very considerable preoccupation on the part of the press with what is happening in connection with Arab boycott practices and the efforts to utilize the Arab situation in order to suppress various kinds of activity, including films to be shown by the U.S. Information Agency in Arab countries.

The U.S. Information Agency has denied reports of film censorship of scenes involving a rabbi which is alleged to have resulted in order to avoid offending Arab governments, and has clarified the circumstances which gave rise to the newspaper articles. These reports demonstrate, however, the extent of the influence regrettably exerted by the Arab boycott practices.

The U.S. Information Agency has no such policy pertaining to its material, nor will it ever adopt one, the Agency said.

The Agency pointed out that TV film clips showing world reaction to President Kennedy's death were sent worldwide on November 27. These TV clips, which showed the burial scene at Arlington National Cemetery, also depicted commemorative services in a Jewish synagogue, as well as in a Catholic church and in a Protestant church, and were sent to those Middle East countries not receiving American commercial TV service. These were the United Arab Republic, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait.

Among the Agency's recent movies that were sent to the Middle East were ones titled, "Making of Champions," which showed Israeli athletes in pre-Olympic competition; the "Herald-Tribune Youth Forum," which included Israeli participants; and "With These Hands," the film produced by the International Garment Workers Union.

Other Agency films sent to the Middle East were on Artur Rubinstein, the pianist; Jascha Heifetz, the violinst; the "Family of Man" which featured Albert Einstein; and "Assignment Children," the story of Danny Kaye's world travels for UNICEF.

A 20-minute Agency TV program on the civil rights march on Washington on August 28, noted that Catholics, Protestants and Jews participated in this event. This program also went to Middle East countries.

Year after year since 1956, Congress has adopted to the foreign aid bills strongly worded amendments firmly pronouncing its repugnance and opposition to the Arab boycott and to the blacklisting and other discriminatory practices affecting Americans, and calling for their termination. But year after year those positive expressions of congressional direction have been watered down by the negativism of the Middle East policy carried out by the Department of State.

Mr. President, this morning there came from Damascus, Syria, the following news item:

> Damascus.—Eighty-four American business companies and 10 U.S. entertainers have been blacklisted so far by the Arab League's movement to boycott Israel.
>
> The U.S. companies and entertainers were on the Arab League's blacklist during the past 3 years. No blacklistings against Americans have been made since the Mancroft affair in England, an Arab spokesman said.
>
> The Israel boycott central office said it banned these American entertainers: Frank Sinatra, Elizabeth Taylor, Jerry Lewis, Joanne Woodward, George Jessel, Eddie Cantor, Paul Newman, Edward G. Robinson, Harry Bellafonte, and Danny Kaye.
>
> The entertainers were banned from entering any of the 18 Arab nations and their films were barred from Arab movie screens.
>
> Among the American companies banned by the Arab League were Studebaker Packard, Kaiser Frazer, and Willys. The companies are not permitted to sell or operate in the Arab world.
>
> World attention was drawn to the Arab League's boycott of Israel this month when Lord Mancroft, a Jewish peer in London, was forced to resign from the Norwich Insurance Co.'s board of directors because of Arab pressure, provoked by Mancroft's business interests in Israel.

This is the first time to my knowledge that anyone has said that Harry Bellafonte is Jewish. This boycott is extended not only against Jews, but also against Negroes.

This situation is becoming somewhat ridiculous, especially when we learn from the news from Great Britain that a very distinguished man, Lord Mancroft, was forced to leave the London advisory board of a very large insurance company because of his friendship with Sir Isaac Wolfson, a British merchant-financier and benefactor of the Zionist cause. The situation is becoming so ridiculous that I believe the Government of the United States should use this as an occasion to change its policy in the whole situation.

On the whole, the United States has been trying to placate and appease the Arab States, and has been cutting and trimming in an attempt to do so. But that policy does not work. Neither does it work with President Nasser of the United Arab Republic, as the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] will inform the Senate in a few minutes, in connection with the foreign aid program and his outstandingly fine amendment, as now contained in the bill; and it does not work with the Arab League or with any of the Arab States. It is demeaning to have the U.S. Information Agency put in a position of apologizing to the Jewish citizens of the United States because of what it did or did not do in connection with a particular motion picture film.

There has been a long protestation.

This policy continues to deprecate any broad initiatives in the Arab-Israel dispute because the State Department believes that these measures would boomerang and create new tensions. That negative policy is responsible for the slap-on-the-wrist kind of action that our diplomats administer to Arab governments who discriminate against American citizens and boycott American business firms. It is responsible for our failure to make President Nasser live up to his promise to open the Suez Canal to the shipping of all nations—he still bars Israel's shipping to this day.

We will continue to miss the boat in the Middle East as long as the Department of State refuses to accept the realities behind Arab threats and confines its actions to pious intentions and quiet diplomacy. In this foreign aid appropriations bill and in the foreign aid authorization bill also, the Congress has made its intentions on this issue crystal clear, and the Department of State should carry out that mandate to the best of its ability.

The Arab boycott must be resisted as a threat to world trade and world peace. It will continue to spread only if we continue our soft policy toward it. Yesterday, I pointed out the extent of the Arab boycott in the United States. Today, I should like to show the extent of its influence abroad.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the survey by Clyde H. Farnsworth entitled "Arabs' Economic Influence Wide" which was published in the New York Times, December 15. Also the report headlined "Arab League Assails Britain Over Israel" which was published in the New York Times, December 18.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 15, 1963]

ARABS' ECONOMIC INFLUENCE WIDE—MANCROFT AFFAIR POINTS UP POWER WIELDED WITH BOYCOTTS

(By Clyde H. Farnsworth)

LONDON, December 14.—Arab economic influence reaches into the board rooms of many of the world's corporations.

The furor created by one big British company's capitulation to an Arab demand to discriminate lifted the veil over the Arabs' chief weapon, an economic boycott.

But other more subtle measures exist and are all brought to bear against what the Arabs say is their implacable enemy, the 15-year-old state of Israel.

Much of the world's oil comes from the Arabian lands of sand and sun surrounding Israel. The oil is produced by large, internationally minded companies and profits are split roughly 50–50, although the trend is now for the companies to get less.

The Royal Dutch Shell group sold the Shell Oil Co. of Palestine in 1958 because of commercial considerations. But there were trade reports that the Arabs had threatened trouble for the group unless it got rid of the Israeli marketing company.

Later in 1958, Shell and the British Petroleum Co., controlled by the British Government, sold a jointly owned refinery at Haifa.

LIVING STANDARDS

With their oil royalties, Arab heads of state have moved desultorily in the direction of expanding their peoples' living standards and at the same time they have built up huge personal fortunes.

Some of their funds have gone into the world's stock markets, particularly London, where no rules force disclosure of the identity of major stockholders. Important stockholders may use subtle or not so subtle pressures to achieve their ends.

The Mancroft affair has been a blatant example of Arab pressure brought to bear by the threat of economic boycott.

As far as anyone knew, it was the Arabs' first attempt to blackball a man because of his associations with a private benefactor of Israel.

Lord Mancroft, a 49-year-old former Conservative Minister, had sat on the London Advisory Board of the $750 million Norwich Union Insurance Societies since 1939.

The job involved him in no foreign dealings, but only in advising on insurance in the London area. He attended one meeting a month and was paid $2,800 a year.

Lord Mancroft is Jewish, but this, according to all parties in the dispute, had nothing to do with the Arab demands for his resignation.

The cause, instead, was his "other business interests," which involved close association with Sir Isaac Wolfson, a British merchant-financier and benefactor of the Zionist cause.

The Arab League's boycott of Israel office in Damascus told the Norwich Union that unless Lord Mancroft went, the company's policies would not be honored in the Arab world.

The company sells few policies in Arab lands, but it does insure companies with business there. It also sells worldwide transit coverage which would probably be affected by an Arab boycott.

The company yielded, but tried to do so quietly, making the resignation announcement as brief as possible and describing it as a "normal business announcement."

When the circumstances became known, howls of resentment filled the air. Jewish groups and others termed the company weak-willed and deplored the use of Arab pressure on the internal affairs of a British company.

Observers pointed out that West German and Dutch concerns had long resisted the Arabs' boycott pressures and appeared to be none the worse for it.

The foreign office, when the furor was the loudest, publicly rebuked the Arabs. This was a marked departure from its position over the years of quietly making representations on behalf of British concerns threatened by the Arab boycott.

The foreign office resented not only the pressures on Norwich Union to discriminate, but the role of Arab embassies here in exerting pressure on many companies.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

After the Government statement, Norwich announced that Lord Mancroft could rejoin the board, but he refused.

The Government maintained throughout that it was taking no sides in the Arab-Israeli dispute. It also maintained that an economic boycott was the right of sovereign states and that the Arab embassies were free to seek information from British concerns to enforce the boycott.

Where does information-seeking end and undue pressure begin? There is no exact guide, but the Government indicated that Arab embassies had clearly overstepped reasonable bounds.

The boycott of Israel office in Damascus, established in 1951 by the Arab League, has since its inception put economic pressure on companies to get them to limit or cease trade with Israel.

Companies suspected of enhancing the Israeli economy or alleged warmaking potential are asked, in effect, to show cause why they should not be barred from commerce in the Arab world.

Blacklisting follows if the companies are unable to give the 13 regional commissioners of the boycott committee and the Commissioner General, Mohammed Mahgoub of Egypt, satisfaction.

The committee meets twice a year to determine whether to add or delete a company from the blacklist. But the committee does not necessarily get all the Arab states to respect the embargo. Some refuse to ratify the committee's decisions. Others ratify and still trade with a blacklisted company when it suits their purpose.

Information about which companies do business with Israel, how much, and who sits on their boards is gathered through a worldwide intelligence network, including the commercial attachés at Arab embassies.

THE BLACKLIST

Hundreds of companies are on the blacklist, including about 50 in Britain. The Arab League says the names of 80 British companies have been deleted from the list by their compliance with certain requests.

The league consists of Algeria, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, the United Arab Republic and Yemen.

Although some groups would like to see the British Government condemn the boycott, there is little likelihood of this for then it would apparently have to condemn all boycotts, including the U.S. embargo on goods to certain Communist countries.

Prime Minister Sir Alec Douglas-Home says the companies themselves must decide their own policies. If they find themselves in difficulties, then, he said, the Government is at their disposal to help.

There is little doubt, however, that the companies' resolve to resist Arab pressures has been strengthened. The strong foreign office stand lessens the likelihood of material disadvantages from resistance.

At the same time the companies will remember for a long time the experience of the Norwich Union, pilloried in the press, a loser of both good will and business, and a new symbol in Britain for capitulation.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 18, 1963]

ARAB LEAGUE ASSAILS BRITAIN OVER ISRAEL

CAIRO, December 17 (Reuters).—The Arab League Economic Council adopted today a resolution denouncing Britain's attitude "concerning the Zionist campaign against Arab boycott machinery."

The resolution said that interference by the Government of Britain or any other country to hamper the Arab boycott of Israel would "Inevitably lead to reconsideration of the Arab States' economic relations with that country."

The council, which ended meeting here today, declared that "support from any country for the policies of world Zionism is considered support for Israeli aggressive acts."

In another resolution dealing with the Arab stand toward the European Economic Community the council called on Arab States "to observe their obligations and not to make any commitments that would conflict with the proposed Arab Common Market or Arab economic unity agreement.

"Arab states should not grant any privileges to European Common Market countries," the council decided.

Mr. JAVITS. We go through the list of boycotts—which have no validity in international law and are honored more in the breach than in the observance—of American companies and outstanding

American entertainers, yet we maintain allegedly cordial diplomatic relations with those countries, and in many cases we give them aid such as we give President Nasser. We give hundreds of millions of dollars in the way of food and other aid and comfort to the Arab countries.

I believe the Foreign Office of Britain, which has often been accused of backing down, this time has given us the lead. The Foreign Office publicly rebukes the Arabs in the case of Lord Mancroft. It is high time the United States began to take a much harder line than it has heretofore pursued in this situation.

The amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 which has been adopted shows what the attitude of Congress has been since 1956. I hope that, together with President Johnson, the administration will listen at long last and that it will enforce the amendment and cut off aid to Nasser if he insists on continuing the completely artificial state of war with Israel, blockading Israeli ships moving through the Suez Canal, preaching acts of aggression against the Yemen and other Arab States, and preaching aggression against Israel. I believe that would be one salutary lesson.

The other lesson would be to make it perfectly clear to the other Arab States that we will not tolerate the manner and the treatment of American citizens or American business concerns for reasons which have absolutely no basis in fact, in rationale, in history or in international practice with respect to boycotts.

For too long, the Arab States have been indulging in these fictions. The boycott worked to bring about peace in the Middle East we could say that we do not like it, but at least it works. It has worked completely in reverse. The situation is worse now than ever before—and more dangerous, as is evident by Nasser's intercession in Yemen, in Jordan, in Syria, and in Iraq.

Therefore, I urge the administration to adopt a much harder line than it has adopted up until now.

This amendment in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 will give it the key and the ability to do so.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to applaud the remarks of the junior Senator from New York and to associate myself with them. I believe the action now provided in the amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act gives the President the opportunity to put an end to this belligerence, this warmongering, this threatening of peaceable states, this incitement to assassination, and this aggressive warfare which the United Arab Republic has carried on for 16 months in Yemen at a cost of approximately $200 million, which is approximately the amount of money which we have poured into Egypt presumably to take care of its impoverished people while their boss, the absolute dictator of Egypt, spends the money in military ventures.

I believe it is high time we did our part to stop the inevitable arms race which is being precipitated by lack of action. We know that Nasser is now engaged in an elaborate buildup with the assistance of Nazi technicians and with the assistance of Soviet Russia. He is building supersonic jet planes, submarines, and missiles and other weapons which can be intended for aggressive warfare. It is inevitable that the countries which know they are being threatened by this prospect, feel obliged to spend their funds, which they need for economic development, in corresponding buildups.

The United States holds great responsibility for the situation if it does not take advantage of legislation which is now in the act, and act upon it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

THE RESIDUAL FUEL OIL PROBLEM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senate will indulge me for 1 more minute I should like to address myself to the residual fuel oil problem. On December 9, President Johnson decided to turn over to the Interior Department authority to determine national oil policy—including the operation of the residual fuel oil import controls—which prompts me to focus public attention once more on the plight of the New York consumer under this program.

As a direct consequence of existing residual fuel oil import controls, suppliers in the New York harbor area are short of supplies; there is not one major supplier which has not been forced to borrow during the current fuel oil quarter ending December 31 from other suppliers to keep their customers supplied; existing controls have caused chaos requiring that costly arrangements be made, including the borrowing of stocks against future allocations and conversion of several electric generating plants from oil to coal at a great cost to commercial and industrial users.

The existing import control program—the use of historic pattern as the principal basis of allocation—has resulted in the creation of fundamentally anticompetitive conditions in this country with great injury to consumers—schools, hospitals, industrial plants, electric utilities, office and apartment buildings; it has inhibited the normal process of growth and change through competition, and has resulted in growing concentration and increasing domination of the industry by the principal historical importers. The major portion of the total imported residual fuel oil allocation on the east coast is in the hands of 4 oil marketers which between them have a 59-percent share of the total import allocation, the remaining 41 percent being allocated among the 44 independents.

The problem created by existing fuel oil import controls is clearly illustrated by the plight of two major electric utilities in New York. Consolidated Edison of New York is faced with a deficiency of approximately 3 million barrels of residual fuel oil between now and the first of April 1964. This volume is needed to supply their new Ravenswood power station which commenced operation in April 1963. The total demand of this station during the next allocation year, beginning April 1, 1964, will be 5½ million barrels and will increase to 14 million barrels by 1968. The New England Petroleum Corp., being one of two suppliers to Consolidated Edison, has notified the Oil Import Administration that unless some means is found by February 1964, to alleviate Consolidated Edison's residual fuel oil problem, it will be unable to meet its contractual commitment and the good and welfare of New York City will be seriously threatened. That the volume of fuel available under the overall residual fuel oil quota is inadequate to cover new requirements, such as Consolidated Edison's, is evidenced by a survey made of the market by New England Petroleum to determine the availability of residual fuel oil to Consolidated Edison from other sources. Only two cargoes, approximately 210,000 barrels, were found available and only at a prohibitive price of $2.35 per barrel. Similar surveys conducted by both Consolidated Edison and Long Island Lighting Co. to find this fuel at an acceptable cost have been unsuccessful.

The case of Long Island Lighting Co. is somewhat similar in that they have constructed a new 185,000-kilowatt generating station in Island Park, Long Island, which will require annually 1,600,000 barrels of residual fuel oil. In the absence of assistance from the Department of the Interior, despite frequent requests from the company, including one addressed by me to the Department on November 20, it became necessary for the Long Island Lighting Co. to convert two of their generating units from oil to coal at a cost of $135,000. Incremental costs of burning oil versus coal are approximately $200,000 per annum additional. A portion of the latter increase will immediately be reflected in the bills of larger commercial and industrial users, whose rates are subject to a fuel cost adjustment. Here is an illustration of a utility being forced to convert from one energy fuel to another, inconsistent with what it deems to be good and prudent judgment.

The demand for residual fuel oil import has gone up rapidly in the postwar years for several reasons, primarily because of the increased energy needs of industrial consumers and utilities in the past couple of decades, and air pollution which caused conversions in densely populated areas from coal to oil. Residual fuel oil is competitive with domestic gas and, in a narrow area, with domestic coal. This competitive market amounts to approximately 6 million tons of coal which matched against an annual production of 400 million tons is a very insignificant amount.

In coastal States, which are far removed from domestic sources of coal and gas, imported residual fuel oil is an essential source of energy. Domestic production of residual fuel oil has fallen each year since the war, from over 20 percent per barrel of domestic crude oil to just over 8 percent today and is insufficient to supply domestic needs. High costs of the domestic raw material—crude oil—and better technological and engineering refinery processes, which produce a product with a higher value per each barrel of oil refined, will further diminish the availability of this fuel from domestic sources. Imported residual fuel oil thus has been and will increasingly become essential to fill the gap between domestic supply and demand.

The domestic coal industry has undertaken an energetic effort to protect its domestic markets by putting steady pressure on the White House, the Congress, and the Interior Department, to maintain or even restrict the existing import program. Americans are, of course, sympathetic to the problems of the domestic coal industry. I wish to point out, however, that the well-known memorandum of the Office of Emergency Planning for the President of February 13, 1963, stated that the difficulties confronting the domestic coal industry cannot be justifiably charged to residual fuel oil but instead to various patterns of change and fuel uses, for example, increased consumption of natural gas and diesel oil in place of coal by major users.

The fuel oil import quota set for the year ending March 31, 1964, underestimated the energy needs of the east coast—containing a vital portion of the industrial capacity of this country—the result of which has been a retardation of economic growth in this area, in direct contradiction with the country's current needs and the oft stated policy of this administration.

I firmly believe that the most desirable action from the point of view of the consumer—as well as the requirements of the domestic economic growth of our country—would be to dismantle the present quota system on residual fuel oil imports and to allow the normal competitive forces of the marketplace to prevail.

I have, therefore, joined with Senator KEATING, in a letter sent today to Secretary Udall outlining the problem facing New York and the east coast and requesting that the existing controls be eliminated.

I have also addressed a letter to Senator SPARKMAN, chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, asking that the committee, at the conclusion of its study of the crude oil import allocation problem, undertake a full investigation of the economic consequences of residual fuel oil import controls to the American consumer.

I strongly urge the chairman that the hearings to be undertaken as early as possible in the next session, so that the results of its findings and recommendations may be made known to Secretary Udall before the start of the next fuel oil import year on April 1, 1964.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter addressed to the Secretary of the Interior.

There being no objection, the letter sent to have printed in the RECORD the as follows:

DECEMBER 18, 1963.

The Honorable STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On March 27 and again on May 15 of this year, we addressed a letter to you which contained a series of pertinent questions concerning the residual fuel oil import control program. To date, we have never received a satisfactory answer to our several queries. Since the economic conditions governing the supply of this product to the residents of our State, and in fact all consumers of energy in all the Atlantic Coast States, have in the interim seriously deteriorated to the point where the major utility companies in the New York metropolitan area are being forced to convert their plants from the consumption of residual fuel oil to high cost, inconvenient and high air pollution coal, we deem it incumbent on us to once again draw your attention to this important issue and also to once again ask for satisfactory answers to our questions.

To review the past. On May 22, 1961, the then Office of Civil and Defense Management announced that it would conduct an investigation to determine the effect, from the national security standpoint, of the import controls on residual fuel oil. In spite of the fact that OCDM was required to effectuate a prompt study of such questions, it was not until February 13, 1963, that the successor to OCDM, namely, the Office of Emergency Planning, released its covering memorandum to the President. In this report, it cited the "authority to regulate imports is limited to the control deemed necessary to prevent imports of an article from threatening to impair the national security."

In spite of the following statements that were a part of the memorandum for the President of February 13, 1963, controls were continued and in fact the conclusions of the memorandum are hard to justify in the face of these official views. That "a careful and meaningful relaxation of controls would be consistent with national security and the attainment of hemispheric objectives which contribute to national security." Ever this relatively modest recommendation has not been implemented to date.

Statements made by various government departments underscore the OEP's recommendation regarding national security and competition. Under Secretary of State Mr. Ball said: "It has been particularly difficult in the case of residual fuel oil to relate, with any effectiveness, the framework of our restrictions to clearly demonstrated security needs." The Department of Defense stated: "As residual fuel oil production continues to decline in continental U.S. refineries we feel that imports should make up the deficit, which will have to be done in national emergencies * * * we cannot see wherein residual fuel oil imports can seriously endanger the national security."

On the question of competition the GSA stated: "We believe that our experience in the procurement of residual fuel under the oil import program has restricted full and free competition in our procurements and has resulted in this agency, in the main, paying prices in excess of that which would have been obtained, if there were no restrictions on the import of this product." In this regard GSA has had to enlist the help of the Department of the Interior Oil Import staff to request the Paragon Oil Co. into negotiating a supply contract for the current fiscal year—the argument used was that Paragon received the import quota for this business based on deliveries made in the base period. Paragon in turn, we understand, was forced to cancel contracts they held in New England. Further, if the local supplier of this fuel in the Washington area could have obtained an import license he could have quoted a price that would have meant a savings of around $300,000 to the taxpayer.

The Department of Justice stated in the memorandum that the present controls of residual imports are detrimental to existing and future competition particularly in fuel oil marketing. Present regulations have eliminated competition and the east coast consumer is in a straightjacket that makes him a captive of the supplier who has received the import tickets covering that consumer's fuel needs. In addition the independent small businessman who markets this product is also captive to the major supplier that has received the import credit and license for that independent's market requirements.

The memorandum further stated, "Accordingly, in terms of east coast availability in emergencies, there is relatively little difference whether the residual is of domestic or foreign origin, provided the source is within this hemisphere." Since the inception of this control program over 70,000 barrels per day have been diverted by the regulations from Venezuela to a Persian Gulf source. We have read in the press that foreign oil interests have been negotiating the purchase of one of the largest importers which, if successful, would mean another diversion of over 40,000 barrels a day from the Western Hemisphere to the Persian Gulf.

The comments you made that were reported in the memorandum, and we quote excerpts: "In the short run, through generating lower prices, it would tend to lower refinery revenues and, therefore, to reduce the ability of the industry to conduct exploration, and, perhaps, have a minor impact on the price of crude," were rather contradictory. On what basis do you conclude that lower prices would be generated and how do you justify such an argument when this program is not supposed to be a price control program but in fact can only be justified on the basis of national security? You then went on to state: "It would be almost impossible, however, to isolate the moderate effects which might be anticipated from decontrol from normal changes in market conditions stemming from variations in the balance between demand and supply." We find your argument with no real basis of fact—in the light of President Johnson's program of getting a dollar value for a dollar spent as well as his commendable program to reduce the Government's operating expenses. We can see no case for maintaining a program just to keep an agency (OIA) in existence. We agree with the views of the Department of Commerce, "the continuation of the residual fuel oil import quota plan as a method of increasing exploration, drilling, reserves and crude oil outputs appears rather tenuous."

Further, Mr. Secretary, your views are 100 percent contrary to the views of the oil industry, regarding the impact of residual fuel oil on the domestic oil industry. At the hearings before the subcommittee No. 4 of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, (87th Cong., 1st sess., pursuant to H. Res. 46) conducted in November 1961, Frank Porter (since deceased), president of the American Petroleum Institute, publicly stated: "I have always contended there should be no inhibitions at all on the bringing in of residual fuel oils. If it were not processed by American refiners—if it was brought in simply for fuel—I don't see, I never seen any real reason to have any restrictions on it whatsoever."

This clearly indicates that residual fuel oil imports were of no concern or impact on domestic production. At the annual meeting of the Independent Petroleum Association of America held in Dallas in November 1963, the resolution on crude oil imports specifically excluded residual fuel oil. I would draw your attention to a very excellent and detailed analysis of this subject that was included in the Congressional Record dated August 6, pages 14314 and 14315 by Representative Foreman of Texas.

Next year Governor Herter, our trade negotiator, and his team will sit down with the other GATT countries and attempt to negotiate trade and tariff concessions. We are in a difficult enough negotiating position without compounding our problem by maintaining a nontariff barrier for which there is no honest justification from a strictly national security standpoint. Imports of residual fuel oil are running in excess of $700 million a year and not only will this compromise and embarrass our negotiating team, but it will give a valid reason to the other countries at the conference to set aside a comparable reserve list—only it is safe to assume that these countries will choose items of our trade that will represent far greater economic value to us such as the products of our industry. Further, the tariff of 2½ percent on residual is one of our lowest tariffs and it is an item that we could effectively trade off in the bargaining process with little loss of revenue.

In the light of the overwhelming arguments against the continuation of the import controls program on residual fuel, how can you justify the continuation of a program that is causing serious harm and hardship to the over 50 million consumers of energy in the Atlantic Coast States?

In our State alone two of the largest public utilities in the country, Consolidated Edison and Long Island Lighting, are being forced to convert from the consumption of residual fuel oil to coal as a result of this program. These conversions will cost many millions of dollars in added capital expenditures, countless millions in the years ahead due to added fuel costs, grave and expensive problems of storage facilities for coal and serious increase in air pollution. These latter are just two examples of what this program is and will force the consumer to do in the years ahead—by 1965 east coast demand for energy will nearly double present levels. At a time when our Nation is fighting for foreign markets while at the same time maintaining a high standard of living based on good wage levels, you are forcing the east coast industrial machine to use a high cost and inconvenient form of energy thereby directly and adversely affecting our competitive position in world trade.

Don't misunderstand us, we are not advocating the disregard of the interests and welfare of the coal miner. His problems, in our view and in the view of the Office of Emergency Planning, are due to reasons other than residual fuel oil, e.g., automation and conversion to diesel fuel from coal by the railroads and household heating fuel from coal by the household consumer. We urge that every assistance be given the coal industry to expand exports since U.S. coal can now compete with any foreign produced coal in any corner of the free world. We do not condone the sacrificing of the rights and interests of the over 50 million east coast State consumers for false issue. We deeply sympathize with the 170,000 coal miners of this country but firmly believe that "depressed area" programs and increased coal exports can solve their problems.

On behalf of all consumers of energy on the east coast, we once again ask you to frankly answer the following question: In view of the facts that exist in the marketplace as well as the findings of the memorandum to the President dated February 13, 1963, why have you not removed all restrictions on the importation of residual fuel oil?

If for reasons unknown to us you insist on continuing controls, why have you not revised the governing regulations so as to eliminate the present effects of the program toward creating a monopolistic situation in this industry aind return to a market economy wherein the consumer has freedom of choice not only of form of energy source but also of supplier?

Sincerely,

Jacob K. Javits,
U.S. Senator.
Kenneth B. Keating,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. From the point of view of New England, what the two Senators from the State of New York have said and the position they are taking are, of course, equally true of the Senators from New England on both sides of the aisle who have protested this action a number of times. I hope that the letter from the two Senators from New York will have some effect, although I am not too hopeful.

Mr. JAVITS. We must continue to fight—and we shall. This matter is extremely important. I am grateful to the Senator for his support.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am also in complete sympathy with what the Senator has said concerning Nasser and the foreign aid program.

Mr. JAVITS. I am honored, and I thank the Senator for his support for which I am grateful.

ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 8667

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 246, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A concurrent resolution relating to the enrollment of H.R. 8667.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS OF ZANZIBAR

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I take pleasure in announcing to the Senate that we have with us on the floor, this afternoon, two distinguished visitors—the Prime Minister of Zanzibar and the Minister of External Affairs of that country.

Zanzibar is the most recent country in Africa to win independence and to become a member of the United Nations. Zanzibar's day of independence was the 10th day of this month.

Mr. President, the Senate is fortunate in having as visitors, today, Prime Minister Muhammed Shamte and the Minister of External Affairs, Ali Muhsin. Both of them are standing in the rear of the Senate Chamber; and I wish to extend the appreciation of the Senate for this opportunity to greet them. [Applause, Senators rising.]

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NOS. 365, 366, AND 367)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I submit three small business amendments to H.R. 8363, the Revenue Act of 1963. Joining me as cosponsors of these amendments are the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Texas of the Senate Small Business Committee, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the ranking minority member of the full committee. In addition, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], who is ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Taxes, is a cosponsor of two of the three amendments. Our amendments are the result of recommendations made by the Senate Small Business Committee in a report which the committee filed on August 15, 1963—Senate Report No. 397.

The Small Business Committee has often expressed the view that small business firms need a reduction in tax liabilities to enable them to survive in our rapidly changing economy. We were encouraged by the recognition given this fact by the late President Kennedy in his message to the Congress of January 24, 1963, when he stated:

> Small firms which have less ready access to the capital markets, must depend more heavily for capital on internally generated funds and are generally at a financial and competitive disadvantage.

This brief statement by the President, with its recognition of the general plight of small business, and with its special emphasis upon the capital shortage endured by small firms, is an accurate description of the problems faced today by 95 percent of the businessess in America.

Mr. President, several of the provisions of H.R. 8363 were carefully reviewed at hearings held by the Subcommittee on Taxes of the Small Business Committee in April of this year. At that time, of course, we were dealing only with the recommendations contained in the President's message of January 24. Our purpose was to determine the impact of these recommendations upon small businesses. The findings and conclusions of the subcommittee were published in the report of the full Small Business Committee.

Back in November of last year, at the time the administration was putting together its tax program for this year, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], joined with me in recommending to the President for inclusion in the tax program a reversal of the corporate normal and surtax rates and an increase in the surtax exemption from $25,000 to $50,000. I am happy to say that the proposal to reverse the corporate rates was included in the administration's program and, as you know, is a part of H.R. 8363. This measure will provide meaningful relief for small corporate businesses and is strongly endorsed by the Small Business Committee.

With regard to increasing the amount of the surtax exemption, it is a well-known fact that many truly small businesses have annual incomes of more than $25,000. This is especially true of small manufacturing corporations. Such a firm, having income, for example, of $50,000 or $100,000 per year, suffers from the same lack of access to outside capital and the same inability to retain capital from earnings as does a company earning $25,000. The relative impact of these problems may be greater upon those firms toward the bottom of the small business size scale, but they remain very real and very burdensome for all small businesses. One of the amendments, which I offer, would increase the amount of the surtax exemption for small corporations, from $25,000 to $50,000. This would simply mean that the first $50,000 of a corporation's taxable income would be subject to a tax rate of 22 percent, and everything over that amount would be taxed at 48 percent, when H.R. 8363 becomes fully effective.

The Small Business Committee devoted much study and consideration to the administration's proposal to eliminate multiple surtax exemptions. The surtax exemption was provided by the Congress out of recognition of the fact that the financial burden of the surtax does not fall with equal weight upon both large and small businesses. The exemption was designed for the purpose of equalizing this burden. What was intended as a relief measure for small businesses, however, has become, in practice, a tax benefit for large businesses. This result has been accomplished through multicorporate organization of large concerns. In his testimony before the Finance Committee, Secretary Dillon presented a number of examples illustrating the tax benefits derived from multiple incorporation by essentially large enterprises consisting of a number of separately incorporated outlets.

These examples provide strong support for the Small Business Committee's conclusion that the present availability of multiple exemptions has added to the competitive advantage which large businesses have over their smaller competitors. This additional advantage is one which small business can ill afford. In trying to meet the situation, many small firms have utilized multicorporate organization—to a much lesser degree, of course, than large firms. The evidence presented to our committee revealed that approximately 20 percent of the corporations falling within the Small Business Administration's definition of "small business" are organized into two or more corporations, and approximately 10 percent of these claim multiple exemptions. The evidence further established that few small firms have more than five affiliates. Our committee recognized that the full benefit of the surtax exemption would be denied to these small firms if the administration's proposal to eliminate multiple exemptions entirely were enacted. These small firms have utilized multicorporate organization because the nature of their business required that they do so. This is in accordance with the law, which denies multiple exemptions if there are not sound business reasons for the existence of separate corporate entities within the business structure. They must compete with large businesses, which, for the same or similar sound business reasons, have utilized multicorporate organization. As between two such multicorporate business organizations—one small and one large—the tax burden is not equalized by limiting both to a single surtax exemption. The larger firm retains the advantages of financial strength and access to external sources of capital. It was for these reasons that our committee recommended that surtax exemptions be limited to a number which would more realistically reflect the pattern of organization within the small business community. The number of available exemptions should be sufficiently large to permit full utilization by small business, and yet, sufficiently small to avoid as nearly as possible any unfair advantage for large firms. My amendment would set the number at five.

The provisions of H.R. 8363 which treat the subject of multiple surtax exemptions were not, of course, available to the Small Business Committee at the time of its consideration of this matter. However, according to the report of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, it is the purpose of H.R. 8363, as it relates to multiple surtax exemptions for groups of controlled corporations, to leave such groups in approximately the same relative position they are in under present law. In my opinion, and for the reasons stated in the report of the Small Business Committee, this falls far short of what is needed in this area of our tax laws. As the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] pointed out in his speech to the Senate on October 16, the availability of multiple surtax exemptions has been the subject of severe criticism by students of our tax system. If my amendment is adopted, meaningful reform will be accomplished and small business will be restored to its rightful place as the beneficiary of the surtax exemption. With regard to the revenue effect of this reform, I do not have any exact figures. However, I daresay that the additional revenue to be derived from placing a small business limitation upon the number of available surtax exemptions might well be sufficient to justify a significant increase in the amount of the surtax exemption.

It was a matter of major concern to my committee that our high rates of income and estate taxation are providing positive inducements to the sale or merger of small business firms. The relief provided by section 303 of the Internal Revenue Code allowing redemption of stock in closely held corporations without ordinary income tax consequences, and by sections 6161 and 6166, which provide for extensions of time for payment of estate taxes under certain circumstances, have been helpful in many instances, of course, but these relief measures have not been effective in counteracting the inducements to sell or merge.

A recent study by Dr. Chelcie C. Bosland, professor of political economy at Brown University, which, incidentally, was made possible by a research grant from the Small Business Administration under Public Law 699 of the 85th Congress, indicates clearly that our tax laws provide strong inducements for small firms to sell out or merge. This is found to be true for two reasons. First, it is extremely difficult for a small firm to maintain a sufficiently liquid position to meet the obligations imposed by the estate tax. This liquidity problem is aggravated by, and in many instances directly caused by, our high rates of income taxation. The second factor—and one explored more fully by Dr. Bosland—is the fact that a great deal of uncertainty faces the owner of a small business as to just what value the Internal Revenue Service will place upon his business interest. Dr. Bosland confirmed that this uncertainty, itself, induces sales and mergers.

In view of these inducements to sales and mergers, one of my amendments adopts the President's original proposal to liberalize section 6161 of the code. Section 6161 provides for payment of estate taxes in installments for up to 10 years in cases of undue hardships, and this has served to alleviate to some extent the liquidity problem which I mentioned earlier. It has enabled many small firms to preserve their independence following the death of a principal owner rather than sell out or merge with another firm.

The administration recognized, however, that there was a need to liberalize this section of the code, and it was proposed that section 6161 of the code be amended to provide that circumstances involving a sale of a family business to outsiders, or a forced sale on a depressed market, be considered to be an undue hardship, and thereby regarded as sufficient reason for granting an extension of time for the payment of the estate tax. I realize that this proposal was made as a part of the recommendation to impose a tax on accrued gain on inherited capital assets. However, the administration specifically recommended that section 6161 be liberalized in its application to the existing estate tax, and I should not think the Treasury would object to the enactment of this amendment. It will be helpful to small family-owned businesses and I hope that the Senate will see fit to add my amendment to H.R. 8363.

Mr. President, H.R. 8363 has many provisions which will be extremely helpful to small businesses. The reversal of corporate normal and surtax rates, the income averaging provision, and the lower individual rates will certainly benefit small firms. With the three amendments that I have offered, this bill will enable small businesses to retain a larger share of their earnings and thereby finance their growth and expansion. It will enable them to preserve their independence. These are matters of vital importance not only to the well-being of small business, but to the well-being of our entire economic system.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I join in the amendment which I believe is advantageous to small business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. May I ask, at 20 minutes past 3, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business before the Senate is H.R. 9499, making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the foreign aid and related agencies appropriation bill, which is now before the Senate, recommends appropriations in the amount of $3,604,364,000.

Title I of this bill is the mutual security program, and the committee has recommended an appropriation of $3,508,500,000. This is an increase of $497,800,000 over the House bill.

The largest single increase recommended by the committee is $200 million for development loans. The authorization bill, which was agreed to last week in the Senate, authorized an appropriation of $925 million for development loans. The House bill allowed $600 million and the Senate committee has increased this by $200 million to a figure of $800 million. It will be observed that the committee figure is still $125 million less than was agreed to in the authorization bill last week.

For the Latin American programs, the committee has recommended a restoration of $175 million. The authorization bill for these programs was in the amount of $705 million, and the House reduced these sums to $530 million. The committee recommendation increases the Latin American programs back to the full amount of the authorization of $705 million.

For the first time in recent years, the House effected a cut of $36,100,000 in the appropriation for international organizations and programs. The committee has restored $30,900,000 of this reduction, which is the full amount of restoration requested by the Department of State.

The committee, insofar as title I is concerned, has concurred in the House action of reappropriating $209 million in unobligated balances. The committee report is available, on the desk of each Member, and I believe the tables in this report will give the complete breakdown which is needed.

I ask unanimous consent that page 2 of the committee report, which is a summary table for each title, be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of bill

Title	Item	Authorization	Bill as it passed House	Recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—	
					Authorization	Bill as it passed House
I	Foreign aid (mutual security)	$3,602,075,000	[1] $2,801,700,000	[1] $3,299,503,000	−$302,572,000	+$497,803,000
II	Foreign aid (other)	327,079,000	295,580,000	288,397,137	−38,681,863	−7,182,863
III	Export-Import Bank (limitation on Treasury borrowing authority)	1,317,866,000	1,317,866,000	1,317,866,000		
IV	Legislative branch	3,014,235	2,838,275	3,332,435	+318,200	+494,160
V	Independent offices	150,000		150,000		+150,000
VI	Claims and judgments:					
	Federal	12,982,095	12,982,095	12,982,095		
	District of Columbia	(22,238)	(22,238)	(22,238)		
	Total	5,263,166,330	4,430,966,370	4,922,230,667	−340,935,663	+491,264,297

[1] And in addition reappropriation of $209,000,000 in unobligated balances.

Mr. PASTORE. I also ask unanimous consent that a table showing the comparison between the House and Senate figures on title I may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE

Title I of foreign aid and related agencies appropriation bill, fiscal year 1964, H.R. 9499

[In millions of dollars]

	House bill			Senate committee bill			Senate bill over/under House bill		
	New funds	Reappropriation of unobligated balances	Total	New funds	Unobligated balances	Total	New funds	Unobligated balances	Total
Economic assistance:									
Development grants	150.0	47.4	197.4	175.0	47.4	222.4	+25.0		+25.0
American schools and hospitals abroad	14.3		14.3	14.3		14.3			
American schools and hospitals abroad (special foreign currency program)	4.7		4.7	4.7		4.7			
International organizations and programs	100.0	.4	100.4	130.9	.4	131.3	+30.9		+30.9
Supporting assistance	300.0	6.0	306.0	380.0	6.0	386.0	+80.0		+80.0
Contingency fund	50.0	127.1	177.1	32.9	127.1	160.0	−17.1		−17.1
Inter-American social and economic cooperation program	100.0		100.0	180.0		180.0	+80.0		+80.0
Alliance for Progress:									
Development loans	350.0		350.0	425.0		425.0	+75.0		+75.0
Development grants	80.0	2.7	82.7	100.0	2.7	102.7	+20.0		+20.0
Development loans	600.0		600.9	800.0		800.0	+200.0		+200.0
Administrative expenses (AID)	50.0	2.0	52.0	54.0	2.0	56.0	+4.0		+4.0
Administrative expenses (State)	2.7		2.7	2.7		2.7			
Surveys of investment opportunities		1.1	1.1		1.1	1.1			
Subtotal, economic assistance	1,801.7	186.7	1,988.4	2,299.5	186.7	2,486.5	+497.8		+497.8
Military assistance	1,000.0	22.3	1,022.3	1,000.0	22.3	1,022.3			
Limitation on administration expenses (military assistance)	(24.0)		(24.0)	(24.0)		(24.0)			
Total, title I, foreign aid	2,801.7	209.0	3,010.7	3,299.5	209.0	3,508.5	+497.8		+497.8

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, under title III of the bill, a language provision was included on the floor of the other body prohibiting the Export-Import Bank from guaranteeing the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase of any product by such country. The committee has stricken this provision from the bill.

For the Senate, the committee recommends an additional appropriation of $60,600 and has included language in the bill increasing the stationery allowance for each Senator from $1,800 to $2,400 per annum. The committee likewise increased the airmail and special delivery stamp allowance for Senators from $550 per year to $610 per year. It has also increased the number of long-distance telephone calls allowed to each Senator from 120 to 160 per month. These recommendations conform with recommendations already contained in the bill for Members of the House of Representatives.

In my written statement I have not, up to this time, mentioned the President's contingency fund. I point out that in the contingency fund the appropriation, in toto, is to be $160 million.

We deducted $17.1 million from the amount authorized by the House, a sum of $177.1 million. In new money we would appropriate $32.9 million, and there would be a new appropriation of unobligated balances of $127 million, making the grand total of $160 million.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, except for the amendment on page 17 relating to the Export-Import Bank, which is the so-called wheat amendment, and that the bill, as thus amended, be regarded as original text for the purpose of amendment; provided, that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason thereof.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a careful study—a study in depth—which I made last year and early this year in 10 Middle Eastern countries for the Committee on Government Operations, has convinced me that the alarm about the reduction made by the House of Representatives in the overall appropriation figure, as voiced, for instance, by the Washington Post and Times-Herald in an editorial this morning, is wholly unjustified and unfounded.

In discussing H.R. 9499, the foreign aid appropriation bill for 1964, it should be noted in the first place that there is more than $6½ billion in the pipeline.

This means that a large amount is still unspent and available. If not a single cent were appropriated by the Congress this year, the foreign assistance program desired by its administrators could continue for a full year, with at least $2 billion left over.

Furthermore, the critics of the reduction in foreign assistance made in the Senate in the foreign aid authorization bill, thanks to the vigilance of the senior Senator from Oregon, and now by the House in the appropriation bill, take no account of what would be shown by a realistic country-by-country analysis as to which nations, for one valid reason or another, should no longer receive our aid.

If we total the amounts intended by the AID administration for those countries, and subtract that amount from the total appropriation figure which they seek, it will be found that $2.8 billion, the amount voted by the House of Representatives, will be more than ample.

The list would include the countries of Western Europe and Japan, long since made prosperous by our aid, and, indeed, not even facing the grave and mounting unemployment problem which confronts us at home in the United States.

Then there is the little island of Taiwan, better known as Formosa, into which we have poured to date, under our foreign assistance program, $4.5 billion in economic and military aid. By this time it should be able to get along without a continuation of the sums so lavishly provided year after year for the greatest variety of enterprises of which the mind of man can conceive.

In Taiwan there are not only powerplants, but also jute plants, paper plants, ceramic plants, and chemical plants; and there has been a rehabilitation of their fisheries. Everything of which the mind of man can conceive has been done for Formosa. Is it not about time this island was on its own?

So far as the defense of the island is concerned—which is, of course, an important part of our global strategy—not only has that been provided for lavishly in the form of all kinds of equipment and training for Chiang Kai-shek's army; but the defense of the island, if that should become necessary, would be provided by the 7th Fleet.

That is one additional economy that could be made. One figure should be eliminated from the conjectures as to what is needed under the foreign aid program for next year.

There are other countries—such as Israel, Lebanon, and Greece—which have been brought to a point of reasonable self-sufficiency. Foreign aid administrators always wish to go beyond self-sufficiency, for long after a country has received what it needs and is on its own, they wish to provide aid.

I congratulate the people in certain countries for a very intelligent and honest application of aid. It has been well administered in Israel, Greece, and Lebanon, and has done its work, but the time has come for those countries to be cut off, because they are on their own.

Then there are the aggressor nations, the United Arab Republic and Indonesia, to which, under the provision adopted by the Senate and the House, and now in the bill, aid should be denied immediately. I notice that that is not in prospect, unless there is a change of heart and a change of mind on the part of the administration and on the part of those who so generously "dish out" our foreign aid.

The former of these two nations, the United Arab Republic, should be denied aid until it at least withdraws its 28,000-man army from the Yemen, where Nasser has kept it now for 16 months at a cost of approximately $200 million to date, and ceases the export of violent revolution to neighboring countries, recipients of our foreign aid, which are being forced into an arms race to the detriment of their economy and of the purposes of our aid program.

Nasser is likewise building up a formidable arsenal of weapons, tanks, missiles, supersonic jet fighters, and submarines, obviously intended for aggression against Israel, whose destruction he has never ceased to demand and promise as his goal. To date, we have given Nasser almost a billion dollars and we have repeatedly saved him from destruction and have rehabilitated him. As a result, we now have a totalitarian dictator in the Middle East who is one of the greatest threats not merely to peace in that region, but to world peace, because he has never ceased to make preparations for aggressive war. It is time we exercised the power and authority now given in the foreign aid authorization bill and cut out these annual appropriations of hundreds of millions of dollars to him.

Likewise, Sukarno in Indonesia, to whom we have given to date nearly $1 billion, is promising to destroy the new, democratically oriented nation of Malaysia, and is making use of the arms the United States has given him.

I was shocked to see, after the long debate in the Senate, when there was no dissent as to the aggressiveness and the past history of this dictator, who, to our regret, by using the threat of force of arms, compelled us—which we did not have to do—to turn over this primitive principality of West New Guinea to his control, when it should have been made a mandate of the United Nations for a decade, until the people could decide what their political status should be. He was able to do this by the threat of force and use of aid which we had given him. We abdicated inexcusably.

The example of Cambodia should be a lesson to us with respect to other nations in the Far East. How much longer shall we continue to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into these nations, where the money is not only likely to be wasted, but, far worse, where it is used for training and for arms which may be turned against us by the Red Chinese, for example, which is happening in Cambodia?

We see no change of heart or policy in that part of the world.

Then there is the case of Libya, which had a very high percentage of illiteracy, about 90 percent, but which is now an oil rich country, and should be happy to pay for such technical aid as we have in the past been giving it. We want to help Libya, but the Libyan dynasty should be willing to help itself.

There are new nations in Africa, in whose behalf we have a right to expect major support from their recent colonial masters, and whose economies are much more integrated with their former mother countries than with ours.

In Latin America are the countries of Brazil and Argentina. Brazil has been the recipient of nearly $2 billion in aid of one kind or another, for which there is nothing to show. It has repeatedly promised fiscal reform to stop its galloping inflation, but has never lived up to its repeated promises. It was on the basis of these promises, never fulfilled, that the United States had given that rich country repeated budegt support, only to see our dollars go down the drain.

Until Argentina has demonstrated its stability and its willingness not to expropriate U.S. property without prompt and adequate compensation, it should not be the further recipient of our foreign aid.

Moreover, we shall not know for some time to come what stability there is in the Argentine. The present incumbent in the Presidency owes his presence there to the assent of the military. We should wait and see how permanent his regime may be and how secure we may be in the promises of reforms and adherence to the principles laid down at Punta del Este.

I have not by any means exhausted the list of countries which should be carefully scrutinized before we rush in with our aid, as we have done in the past.

We need to stop military aid to the new nations of Africa. That is the way to chaos. That is no place for us to start what could be an arms race. We already have evidence of that policy in Somalia, where there has been an invasion from Abyssinia with arms furnished that country by the United States. If we continue with this program, there will be similar wars all over Africa, and the very aims of the AID program will be defeated.

Moreover, there are pressing domestic needs—the needs of our own home folks, the American people—that cry for attention. They should be our paramount consideration. They need attention because a steadily increasing number of them are unemployed. That figure has now risen to 5.9 percent of our population. Those are not mere statistics—those are living people, who, in this land of power and plenty, in this so-called affluent society of ours, are, through no fault of their own, in dire poverty; their tiny resources, if, indeed, they ever had any, have long since been exhausted; their unemployment insurance vanished long ago.

In this morning's New York Times is a thoughtful column by the distinguished Washington bureau chief, James Reston, on the need of attention to the home front. I quote this pertinent sentence from the column:

> The foreign front was President Kennedy's major problem, but the home front is likely to be Johnson's, and the need for some effective way to convert from the cold war to the slum war is likely to be more urgent with every passing month.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reston's column be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday President Johnson delivered a magnificent address before the United Nations in New York. It was a historic address, and it was enthusiastically received, as it deserved to be.

In the course of his speech President Johnson referred to the regime of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in which President Johnson received much of his early inspiration and guidance, and to which also as a young legislator he contributed his support. President Johnson in his speech of yesterday recalled President Roosevelt's plea in behalf of "the one third of the Nation ill housed, ill clad, and ill nourished."

President Johnson pointed out that, as a result of President Roosevelt's peaceful, revolutionary policies, that portion of our indigent population has been greatly reduced. Its reduction was continued under the wise policies of President Roosevelt's successor, President Harry Truman. But, unfortunately, while it is no longer one-third of the Nation, it is today at least one-tenth of our Nation; and unless we address ourselves to this serious fact, that fraction of one-tenth will increase.

But that one-tenth—representing close to 20 million Americans—should be our first and prior concern. While President Johnson has pledged continued U.S. aid in meeting international commitments, to the extent that our resources permit, the needs of the victims of hunger, disease, and ignorance in foreign lands, for which he urged the support of other nations, our own home task for these 20 million Americans is ours, and ours alone. We cannot, and do not, expect aid from foreign nations. This is our responsibility. I feel that it is highly pertinent to call attention to it and to stress it at this time when we are being asked to restore $500 million to the foreign aid program.

At the time we are being asked to do this, our principal domestic program to diminish unemployment is stymied for lack of funds. I refer to the accelerated public works program, for which a mere paltry $900 million was appropriated 2 years ago, and which funds for some months past have been completely exhausted. That was an admirable program, sponsoring throughout the Nation worthwhile public construction projects, projects worthwhile in themselves, which put unemployed people to work not only in their own communities, but in the communities where the factories supplying the materials are located, and aiding the unemployment problem among the transportation industries which conveyed those materials from factory to project.

But that $900 million, one-fifth of the amount dedicated that year to the foreign aid program, was totally inadequate, as its rapid expenditure has demonstrated. But there was not in the case of our great domestic need the unvarying continuity of the foreign aid program, which continues without interruption. In every State of the Union today hundreds of worthwhile projects are ready to go. They have been processed and approved. But not only is there no money to carry them out and to help relieve our unemployment, but the prospect of securing sorely needed funds is not imminent.

Last week I sat as a member of the ad hoc committee appointed by the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] and presided over by the ranking Democratic member of that committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who has done so much to call attention to the tragic unemployment in his home State and to the pathetic plight of these coal miners who have been trained in one activity.

The plight of similarly unemployed in virtually every State of the Union, including Alaska, where there is a higher rate of unemployment than the national average, calls for the kind of executive and legislative support that both branches of our Federal Government have consistently given, for more than a decade and a half, to the tune of over $100 billion to the less fortunate in what has now become the staggering figure of 107 foreign countries. Why have we not done as much for our own?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Assuming that the foreign aid program is necessary for the welfare of this Nation and the peace of the world, as four Presidents have already stated, why is the Senator making the argument that we must make a choice between a foreign aid program and a domestic program? Why can we not have both a domestic and a foreign program, if both are necessary? Why are the great shortcomings of our domestic program thrown at us as argument against a foreign aid program, if both are necessary? If the foreign aid program is not necessary, we should eliminate it. On the other hand, if it is necessary for the peace of the world, I do not see why we are obliged to make a choice between a domestic program and a foreign program, if both are necessary.

Mr. GRUENING. I shall be very happy to answer my friend from Rhode Island. He asks, Why can we not have both? The brutal fact is that we do not have both. We do not have a domestic aid program, but we do have a foreign program, which is thrown at us and which, we are told, is essential for the peace of the world. I do not share the view that such a program is essential to the peace of the world if it means throwing away millions of dollars to dictators like Sukarno or Nasser; and that does not help the peace of the world but, instead, helps to destroy the peace of the world. That is the kind of program to which I am opposed.

Mr. PASTORE. That is the Senator's position. I am sure the Senator will admit that that is not the position of four Presidents. It was not the position of President Truman. It was not the position of President Eisenhower. It was not the position of President Kennedy. It is not the position of President Johnson. I realize that sometimes we take upon ourselves in our individual capacities—and I am not finding fault with it—in the Senate the decision as to the foreign policy of the United States, even though at times we admit that it is the prerogative of the Chief Executive, as prescribed in the Constitution. I am sure President Johnson is conscious of the money we are using. I believe he is conscious of the money we are spending. I believe he is conscious of the expense of these programs. The question is, Do we need the program at all? That is the first question. The second question is, If we need it, how large should the program be?

Mr. GRUENING. That, I would say to my good friend from Rhode Island, is precisely where it becomes the duty and the constitutional mandate of Congress to exercise vigilance and control over the expenditure of money. It has been traditionally true that foreign affairs are left wholly to the Executive. However, in the past 15 years, we have injected an entirely new and unprecedented element into the conduct of foreign affairs. That new element is the use of vast sums of money as an instrument of foreign policy. That did not exist before the advent of the Marshall plan or the Truman Doctrine. Up to that time the function of Congress was limited to appropriating funds for the State Department and for the Foreign Service and the Consular Service. The Senate limited itself to advising and consenting to treaties and the confirmation of nominations of diplomats and ambassadors and other State Department officials.

Up to that time there was not the factor of the massive injection of, first, hundreds of millions of dollars, and then billions of dollars annually into our foreign relations program.

Therefore, since that time it has become the duty of the Senate, which it has not fulfilled, but is now, I hope, beginning to fulfill, its function to exercise the power of saying how that money will be spent, and to have some voice in deciding how the money shall be spent, and the extent to which it shall be spent.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator has paid tribute to the splendid address delivered by President Johnson before the United Nations. I agree with him. I commend to his reading the part of the address which deals with the new era ahead. If anyone can read that paragraph without realizing that what the President of the United States is talking about is international relationships, which my friend from Alaska is more or less playing down, and the obligation of the rich nations, wherever feasible and reasonable and equitable, to come to the assistance of the depressed and underdeveloped nations, all I can do is to commend a reading of that paragraph to him. At some point during the proceedings, if no one else will do it, I shall repeat it myself.

Mr. GRUENING. I have read it carefully, and I have quoted from it. Perhaps the Senator did not notice my doing it. I approve it highly. I praised that speech as a magnificent speech. It is a historic utterance. I am all in favor of it.

However, I call attention to the fact that, while we are helping the unemployed and the hungry and the underhoused all over the world, we are neglecting the same type of people at home.

While President Johnson addressed his appeal to the other nations of the world to do their share to help the miserable people in 107 foreign countries, no one will come to our rescue or take care of our unemployed. That is the point I am making.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator taking the position that for 3 years President Kennedy neglected the hungry and unemployed of this country?

Mr. GRUENING I wish the Senator would not put words in my mouth. I never mentioned President Kennedy.

Mr. PASTORE. That is exactly what the Senator has said. He said we have neglected them. Who has neglected them?

Mr. GRUENING. Congress.

Mr. PASTORE. How about the President of the United States?

Mr. GRUENING. Congress has appropriated a measly $900 million for our domestic aid program.

Mr. PASTORE. Then I suggest to my friend from Alaska that rather than voting to cut down foreign aid, he ought to vote to increase some of the domestic programs.

Mr. GRUENING. If the Senator will allow me to proceed, I should like to tell him that last March I introduced a bill to raise the amount of domestic aid under the accelerated public works program to the equivalent of what would be appropriated for foreign aid. Not long thereafter the distinguished Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Public Works Committee [Mr. McNamara] introduced a bill to provide $2.4 billion for that purpose. That is a very desirable piece of legislation.

My remarks were addressed to the point that we do not act on that legislation. The Senator from Michigan has moved forward as rapidly as possible. He has appointed an ad hoc committee, which met all last week. We listened to the testimony of Governors and mayors and State and county officials as to the tremendous number of projects that were waiting and ready to go ahead. My point is that there is not anything like the kind of support or emphasis or enthusiasm for a domestic program that there is for the foreign aid program.

Mr. PASTORE. Would not the Senator say that the very individuals who are allied with him in cutting down the foreign aid program have been voting against increasing any domestic programs?

Mr. GRUENING. No; I would not say that.

Mr. PASTORE. If he will look at the record, he will find that to be true. The budget cutters in the Senate are the same ones who cut almost anything that comes before it.

Mr. GRUENING. I would also say to the Senator from Rhode Island——

Mr. PASTORE. All one has to say is, "We do not need it," and without further ado it is possible to obtain a vote to cut it.

Mr. GRUENING. I am in favor of foreign aid, but I am not in favor of some of the waste and extravagances and follies that have been committed under it. If the Senator followed the various amendments which I proposed when the authorization bill was before the Senate, he would have noticed that I seldom stressed the question of the total amount of money, but tried to reform some of the abuses. A few of those amendments have remained in the bill. The conferees could not take all of them out, although they tried.

We substantially improved the bill. If the bill can be improved along those lines, I shall continue to support the program enthusiastically, as I did in the authorization bill when it finally came to a vote.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield for a further observation?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure. The Senator's interruptions are helpful. They help me to bring out my points in greater detail than I would otherwise be able to do.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not for one moment think that because it has become my responsibility to manage the bill on the floor of the Senate, it is perfect. I believe in the foreign aid program.

Mr. GRUENING. So do I.

Mr. PASTORE. I believe there have been some abuses in it. There have been abuses in almost every program initiated by Congress, especially those in which large sums of money are involved. I readily admit that there have been frustrations. I admit that there have been failures. I admit that there has been disappointment over Cambodia. I admit that there have been disappointments in many other parts of the world.

But predicated upon the testimony before the committee, not only from the State Department, but also from the Joint Chiefs of Staff and correspondence we have had with the President—and I have a letter from President Johnson that I shall read into the Record—we have taken into account everything that was said on the floor of the Senate after the 3 weeks during which the authorization bill was before the Senate. The members of the committee were properly conscious of the attitude of the Members of the Senate and their desire to cut the bill down to the bone. We were conscious of our common desire to do away with the fat and preserve the muscle. That is the reason why the committee weighed and analyzed the testimony of all the witnesses who appeared before it. We scrutinized every single item in the bill, and came forth with the final figure.

The Senator from Alaska knows that this will not be the final figure after the conference.

I say further to the distinguished Senator from Alaska that we also paid heed to the admonition that was given by the President several days ago, when he said that if the amount were cut further, it would weaken his position.

After all, the committee has the responsibility of sitting hour in and hour out to listen to witnesses. We cannot come to the floor of the Senate and indulge in cliches or in phrases that sound good. Our responsibility is beyond that.

Everything the Senator from Alaska has said has been very much on the minds of Senators who worked on the bill. It is no particular glory to me to come forward and handle this particular bill on the floor of the Senate. I have done my task. I have assumed my responsibility to my State and to my country in the best way I could. I do not believe that the committee tolerated any waste in the budget.

While I have the highest respect for the opinion of the Senator from Alaska with regard to certain items, I also want him to understand that we who have had the responsibility to prepare the legislation have tried in good conscience to do the best for our country.

Mr. GRUENING. I have no doubt of that. I know that everything the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island does is motivated not only by conscience, but also by his very conscientious desire to do the most effective job possible, both for his State and for the Nation.

We differ in certain details. I believe our underlying purposes are the same. Nevertheless, I am confident that if we placed a little more emphasis on our neglected domestic needs, which contrast so glaringly with the great emphasis that is being given to the foreign aid program, we would be in a better position to handle both the domestic problem and the foreign aid situation.

I wish to continue my discussion of the present plight of our domestic unemployed.

The distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Public Works, has called attention to the tragic problem of unemployment in his State. He was chairman of the ad hoc committee appointed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

Repeatedly, on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere, the Senator from West Virginia has called attention to the plight of his constituents, chiefly family men, men having wives and children who depend on them, and who find themselves automated out of employment.

The plight of these men and their families, the plight of similarly unemployed persons in virtually every State of the Union, including Alaska, where there is a higher rate of unemployment than the national average, calls for the kind of executive and legislative support that the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government have consistently given for more than a decade and a half to the tune of over $100 billion to the less fortunate, in what has now become the staggering figure of 107 foreign countries. I ask again, Why have we not done as much for our own? This is our major problem, our No. 1 priority, our first and foremost objective and responsibility.

I find no enthusiasm for voting an additional $500 million for foreign aid when I know, first, that the figure established by the other body is more than adequate; and second, when I confront the tragic double standard, of which I have spoken before, under which we give first and foremost consideration to the needy of foreign lands and neglect our own.

Two very significant articles have been published recently, calling attention to the tragic plight of our destitute Americans. One, entitled "One Out of Ten Americans Lives in 'Abject Poverty,' Study Reveals," was written by Eve Edstrom and published recently in the Washington Post. Its opening paragraph states the stark fact that "20 million Americans exist in such 'abject poverty' that they must do without bare necessities."

Let me repeat that. The stark fact is that "20 million Americans exist in such 'abject poverty' that they must do without bare necessities."

These are the plain facts which both indict and challenge us to move effectively in the domestic fields; to move with the same concern, the same unremitting and continuous concern, with which we press all authorizations and appropriations for the disadvantaged in foreign lands.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield briefly, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request to the effect that at the conclusion of the speech now being made by the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] there be a time limitation of one-half hour on each amendment, 15 minutes to a side, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] and the Senator offering the amendment; 2 hours on the Mundt amendment, 1 hour to be under the control of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] and 1 hour to be under the control of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore]; and 1 hour on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That, effective immediately, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment (except the committee amendment on page 17 to strike lines 9 through 16, which shall be debated 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] and the Senator from Rhode Islnad [Mr. Pastore], motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore]: *Provided,* That in the event the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the unanimous-consent agreement will not take effect until I have concluded my remarks?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is clear under the unanimous-consent agreement that the time will begin to run after the Senator from Alaska has concluded his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, mine may be a narrow, old-fashioned, obsolete, even reactionary view. But I feel that the plight of 20 million Americans deserves at least as much attention, concern, and action as we are giving the billions of people in Asia, Africa, South America, Europe, Oceania—indeed, everywhere on the globe—but not at home.

I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Eve Edstrom and published in the Washington Post be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Twenty-Six Million Others Have Bare Essentials—1 Out of 10 Americans Live in Abject Poverty, Study Reveals

(By Eve Edstrom)

Twenty million Americans—about 1 out of 10—exist in such abject poverty that they must do without bare necessities.

Another 26 million—which adds up to almost one out of four Americans—live at minimum adequacy levels.

These are the conservative estimates upon which the National Policy Committee on Pockets of Poverty focused yesterday at the opening of a 2-day session here.

Its meetings come at a time when the Johnson administration is considering programs to eradicate mass poverty in affluent America.

The committee, which includes such distinguished political economists as Harvard's Seymour Harris, warned that "even with a more affluent America," the number of poor will increase substantially during the next two decades unless remedial steps are taken.

Furthermore, the committee released material drawn from a 2-year study which emphasizes that poverty will not be done away with "by policies aimed at bringing about full employment."

This is because today's impoverished families sit outside of the marketplace; their lot is not the direct result of inadequate economic growth rates because they are not part of the economic structure.

"Their poverty is the result of special circumstances rather than of the rate of economic activity," it was stated.

In setting forth the "special circumstances," the committee put forth a formula for not being poor, as well as for being poor.

To not be poor, it was stated, one must be a white Northern city resident between the ages of 25 and 45 who is married with no more than two children, who has attained as much education as possible, and who is in good physical and mental health.

The "surest" way to be poor is to be nonwhite, live in a rural area and be a female who is over 65 and is the head of a household.

In the above circumstances, 84 out of every 100 of these nonwhite rural families live at lower than subsistence levels.

Actually, the committee emphasizes that all nonwhites whether they live in the city or on the farm, all families headed by young or old females, all residents of rural areas and the South, and all persons over 65 have high-risk poverty rates.

AGED MAKE SOME PROGRESS

However, in the last decade and because of social security, the aged have made the most progress in moving out of the "abject poverty" state.

Another proverty-prone segment of the population involves the young—male family heads between the ages of 14 and 25—and their numbers are increasing.

"The honor of being called 'family head' bestowed too soon brings with it a greater likelihood of poverty, particularly since 1957," it was said. "For most, low income is no momentary detour but the foreshadowing of a life of poverty.

"Their situation is worsening and * * * the problem of the young in contemporary America typifies the problem of the poor; submerged like an iceberg."

Poverty also attacks those with less than 8 years of education and families which have more than six children under 18.

Such groups now comprise a "new class of Americans—those split off from our affluent society," said James G. Patton, chairman of the 28-member national policy committee.

"They constitute a shocking paradox in American life. When the economy dips their plight worsens but when it rises they benefit little if at all."

This is why programs must be developed to tackle the special problems of the underprivileged, in addition to programs to stimulate the economy, he said.

Poverty can be eradicated by the year 2000, Patton said, but only if the United States embarks on new or expanded educational, housing, public works, medicare, conservation corps, and food stamp programs.

Patton, who also is president of the National Farmers Union, said he and other committee members had consulted with the late President Kennedy on ways to eliminate poverty and will consult with President Johnson after firm recommendations are adopted.

The committee, founded 2 years ago by the Farmers Educational Foundation, includes former President Truman and foremost economists, scientists, sociologists, business and professional leaders from every region of the country.

Much of the committee's data on poverty is based on a study which economist Oscar Ornati directed for the Twentieth Century Fund. It will be published next spring.

LESS THAN $2,500 INCOME

In explaining his economic groupings, Ornati stated that families of four, with income of less than $2,500 annually, were placed in the "abject poverty" group. Families of four, with annual incomes of less than $4,500, were included in "minimum adequacy" group.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I congratulate the Washington Post on printing the article, and I suggest that in its editorial columns it show as much concern for the 20 million Americans who live in abject poverty, without hope or help, as it does for the hundreds of millions in other lands. I have read the Post's impassioned editorials in their behalf—editorials repeated in strident tones on every occasion; but I have not noted corresponding editorial effervescence for the accelerated public works legislation, which has now languished for over half a year, or for other legislation to lift our 20 million Americans from abject poverty.

I also recall attention to a very moving article which was published in the December 21 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. The article is entitled "The Invisible Americans." It was written by Ben H. Bagdikian, and it includes photographs which make these destitute, disadvantaged Americans visible. I hope their visibility will reach the Federal levels, executive and legislative, where action is needed and is long overdue.

The article, entitled "The Invisible Americans," has the subtitle:

> Poverty: A Special Report.
>
> We are the richest nation on earth, yet one American in five is without adequate food or shelter or medicine, and nobody seems to care.

Mr. President, it is high time that we started to care as much for these Americans as we are caring for the similarly disadvantaged in other lands.

In Alaska, there is chronic unemployment among the Eskimos and the Indians. Part of their unemployment is due to Federal action and inaction. Under Federal mismanagement, when Alaska was a Territory and when Alaskans were helpless colonials, their greatest natural resource, the Pacific salmon, and perhaps the Nation's greatest fishery resource, was steadily depleted by Federal mismanagement, over the increasing but unavailing protests of the people of Alaska. This wrecking of this great fishery resource, this flagrant conservation failure, brought destitution, poverty, and even hunger to the inhabitants of the villages along Alaska's farflung coastline—a coastline longer than the combined Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coastlines of the 48 older States. It devolves upon our young State of Alaska to undertake the difficult task of rebuilding and rehabilitating an almost vanished resource.

I may say that Alaska has made a most commendable start. Our State's department of fish and game is striving mightily, devotedly, and with much knowledge, to recover from the depletion visited on Alaska's fishery resource by the mismanagement of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, which had absolute control of the management of Alaska's fishery resource during the 1940's and 1950's. It was during this period that, despite the unceasing protests of Alaskans, this agency presided over the decline of our salmon fishery from a high of more than 6 million cases, in 1940, when it took charge, to the lowest point in 60 years, in 1959, the last year of Federal control, when the salmon pack had dwindled to approximately 1,500,000 cases. So serious was the economic impact of this conservation flasco that President Eisenhower felt obliged to declare part of Alaska's fishing communities to be a disaster area.

Although Alaska has improved the situation somewhat, under its wiser management, the economic blight remains. Thousands of our fishermen are among the Americans who live in abject poverty. Thousands of our Indians and Eskimos and Aleut population are among "the invisible Americans" dealt with in the article by Ben Bagdikian, which has been published in the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. President, I feel that the Indians of Alaska and wherever else in the United States they are without adequate food, shelter, or medicine, are entitled to as much consideration as are the Indians of India. But they are not getting it.

The article by Mr. Bagdikian begins with a paragraph which should challenge the attention and concern of every American. It should particularly challenge the attention and concern of the Congress, which needs to authorize a new and substantial appropriation for our accelerated Public Works Act.

The bill introduced last July by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] calls for an authorization of $2,400 million. The bill I introduced last March calls for an appropriation equal to the one we make for foreign aid. If we accept the amount voted yesterday by the House of Representatives, that will be $2.8 billion. If we accept the figure voted by the Senate, the amount will be somewhat larger.

Mr. President, I wish to point out what is needed in order to help these "invisible Americans." The following steps—a long and torturous route—must be followed:

First, our ad hoc committee, which has heard the impressive testimony of State Governors, mayors, State officials, municipal officials, county officials, labor union representatives, and chamber of commerce officials, who have presented unanimously favorable and urgent testimony in regard to the need for action on accelerated public works, must first report one of the two bills now before it to the Public Works Committee. That is the first step.

Second, the Public Works Committee must act to report the bill to the full Senate.

Third, the Senate must act to authorize this appropriation.

Fourth, the House must go through a similar procedure, consisting of not less than three steps.

Fifth, the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee must hold a hearing on the appropriation. If it reports favorably, then comes the sixth step.

Sixth, the full House Appropriations Committee must act.

Seventh, the full House must act on the appropriation.

Eighth, the Senate must go through the same appropriation procedure.

Mr. President, it is clear that we shall be lucky if action to make available these funds for accelerated public works is taken in 3 months' time. In fact, we shall be lucky if it is taken by next June, although the urgency is great and the projects are waiting.

I point out that, on the other hand, we find that no such delay is encountered in connection with the authorization, appropriation, and expenditure of funds under our foreign aid program, for the benefit of the millions of non-Americans in 107 other countries.

Mr. President, I was going to quote the opening paragraph of the article written by Mr. Bagdikian, and published in the Saturday Evening Post, under the subheadline "Poverty: A Special Report"—an article in which he deals with poverty in the United States. This is what he states in his opening paragraph:

> There is a world inside the United States where the American dream is dying. It is a world where, when it rains at night, everyone gets up to move beds away from the leaks. Where there is no electricity—but refrigerators are valued to keep food safe from rats. Where regularly at the end of the month whole families live on things like berries and bread. Where children in winter sleep on floors in burlap bags and their lung X-rays at age 12 look like old men's. Where students drift hungry and apathetic through school and their parents die 10 or 20 or 30 years earlier than their countrymen.

I wish these lines in the opening paragraph could be engraved on the consciousness of every Senator.

Now we come to the second paragraph:

> These are the poor. They are not just the psychological cripples. Nor are they located only in small, isolated pockets. They are everywhere in the country. Every city, every region has them. In a few places there is scarcely anyone else.

The third paragraph goes far beyond Eve Edstrom. She says:

> One out of ten Americans is living in abject poverty.

Bagdikian says in the third paragraph:

> At least 36 million Americans, 1 in every 5, are poor.

If Mr. Bagdikian's figure is correct and it makes no difference whether one-tenth or one-fifth of our people live in misery—whatever their number, whatever their proportion percentagewise to the total—this is an imperative challenge.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alaska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, knowing that, owing to the inaction of Congress on this matter of caring for our own destitute citizens, I know of only one service I can render temporarily—while continuing to work for action on either the bill of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] or my bill to restore funds to the accelerated public works program—and that is to cast my vote—one of very few, no doubt—against the Senate's multimillion-dollar increase in foreign aid. Then, when we have taken care of our own, I shall feel disposed to support a reasonable foreign aid bill.

I voted for the foreign-aid bill when it came to action, and the authorization bill after 3 weeks' debate, because I felt it had been substantially improved by the amendments, some of which I sponsored. Regrettably, many of the amendments were deleted in conference. The conference, taking out amendments which had the overwhelming support of the Senate and the House, and conforming with overwhelming public sentiment, made a cut which in my judgment—as I believe I have demonstrated by the specific fact—is ample to allow the program to continue on a generous basis.

I am in favor of foreign aid. I shall continue to work to improve the program. I shall continue with some of the fervor which others have given to the foreign aid program, I hope, to insist that our first, foremost, and prior obligation is to the destitute, the unemployed, and the people of the United States living in abject poverty and in misery. That is our first, foremost, and prior objective.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 18, 1963]

WASHINGTON—WE KNOW WHAT WE WANT—BUT ARE WE READY?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, December 17.—President Johnson told the United Nations today that "the United States wants to see the cold war ended, once and for all." But what if it happened, or even began to happen? Would the United States be ready?

There is already trouble ahead for a great many American communities, because the U.S. Government's plans to cut military expenditures are running ahead of the plans to convert to useful civilian occupations.

The recent decision to close some military bases and the ensuing cries of anguish from the communities involved are merely an indication of the problems ahead.

Secretary of Defense McNamara has given a dramatic estimate of the Nation's military superiority over the Communists within the last month. He has said that it should be possible for the United States to maintain this superiority "without overall increases in our defense budget. * * * The defense budget will level off and perhaps decline a little."

THE UNEMPLOYED

Meanwhile, the unemployment figure for November was 4,292,000, or 5.9 percent of the work force—up from 4,177,000 in January of this year—and while 80 percent of the people are enjoying unprecedented prosperity, about 20 percent, or over 30 million, are living on what the Government calls poverty standards.

This confronts President Johnson with two questions: First, whether the coming savings on defense are to be allocated to human needs for jobs, houses, schools, and hospitals in the city and country slums; and second, whether the defense cutbacks are to be cushioned by an effective plan of reconversion.

There are small reconversion committees scattered through the various departments and agencies of the Government: in the Department of Defense, the Disarmament Agency, and the Council of Economic Advisers, to mention only three.

Walter Heller, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, talked to President Kennedy last summer about pulling these committees together into a Presidential Conversion Commission, but no decision was taken on this before the assassination.

Meanwhile, Senator McGOVERN has introduced a bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and Negro leaders have talked to President Johnson about using the defense cutbacks as a means of dealing with the plight of the slums.

The defense cutbacks have started, however, and a look ahead at the production of nuclear weapons indicates just how serious this problem is likely to be as time goes on.

CURRENT SPENDING

At the present time the Government is spending over $1.5 billion a year to mine uranium, convert it into U^{235} and plutonium, and process it into nuclear weapons. President Kennedy announced that we had a nuclear capacity in being to kill over 300 million human beings in a single hour. Secretary McNamara has said that we now have "more than 500 operational long-range ballistic missiles" in addition to the Strategic Air Command, over 500 bombers on quick ground alert, and "in stockpile or planned for stockpile tens of thousands of nuclear explosives for tactical use."

The need for the raw materials and the production of these raw materials into fissionable material for weapons will accordingly decline over the rest of this decade. Already this year savings of "tens of millions" are planned in the production of fissionable material, though the mining costs and weapons production costs will remain about the same.

Eventually, however, whole towns will be affected. The Hanford, Wash., plant for example, now employs over 6,000 and is the sole economic support of Richland, Wash., a town of over 25,000.

THE APPALACHIAN PROBLEM

Other towns likely to be affected are Oak Ridge, Tenn., Paducah, Ky., Portsmouth, Ohio, and Savannah River, Ga., among others. This is not an emergency problem. Nobody here is talking about closing up these plants in the foreseeable future, but conversion takes a long time.

The Atomic Energy Commission is the biggest user of electrical power in the country (6 percent). Its purchase of coal is a major factor in keeping the coal mines going in some of the poorest regions of Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, and Illinois, and therefore plans for the future of these already depressed areas are important.

This is the kind of problem that is likely to plague President Johnson. The foreign front was President Kennedy's major problem, but the home front is likely to be Johnson's, and the need for some effective way to convert from the cold war to the slum war is likely to be more urgent with every passing month.

"Hunger, disease, and ignorance," the President said, were the enemies of the United Nations. But they are also the enemies of one-fifth of the people of the United States.

EXHIBIT 2

THE INVISIBLE AMERICANS

(By Ben H. Bagdikian)

There is a world inside the United States where the American dream is dying. It is a world where, when it rains at night, everyone gets up to move beds away from the leaks. Where there is no electricity—but refrigerators are valued to keep food safe from rats. Where regularly at the end of the month whole families live on things like berries and bread. Where children in winter sleep on floors in burlap bags and their lung X-rays at age 12 look like old men's. Where students drift hungry and apathetic through school and their parents die 10 or 20 or 30 years earlier than their countrymen.

These are the poor. They are not just the psychological cripples. Nor are they located only in small, isolated pockets. They are everywhere in the country. Every city, every region has them. In a few places there is scarcely anyone else.

At least 36 million Americans, 1 in every 5, are poor. They are the men, women, and children who don't come close to living under minimal standards of food, shelter, and medical care. They are not basically different from their fellow Americans. But they have had the bad luck to be born in a poor region, or to be trained for a dying or automating industry. They may have dark skins. They may be sick. They may have lost their jobs after they were 40 years old—too old to find new jobs but not old enough to die. Or, like the American Indians and the small farmers, they may merely have been born into an obsolete culture.

The poor in 1963 are largely invisible. They are concealed by modern apparel—all Americans tend to dress casually and, with modern dyes, most old clothes remain unfaded. They are also hidden by the new shape of the metropolis, where the most wretched people are unseen in the central cores of cities while their comfortable compatriots are gone to the suburbs. Finally, the poor are obscured by the national average. Since World War II it has been taken for granted that the United States, with the world's highest standard of living, has eliminated poverty. For 80 percent of the population this is true, and this 80 percent assumes it is the same for all.

The American poor are incomparably luckier than the poor of Asia and Africa and the Middle East, who die by the hundreds on the streets. But poverty is measured according to the standards of a man's own community.

If most of America is well fed, the man who can't find three meals a day for his family is poor. If most of America has modern weatherproof housing, the man whose home is leaky and has no piped water is poor. If most of America has enough medical care to stay alive until age 70, the man who can't afford to live beyond age 55 is poor. Such a man is poor statistically. But he is also poor in a far more damaging way: He is a failure in his neighbor's eye and in his own.

Most of the poor are helpless victims of a social upheaval they could neither foresee nor control. Farms are becoming great mechanized operations, surviving through science, size, and big investment. In the process, country people are being squeezed off the land—more than a million a year—and are fleeing to the cities.

The traditional urban foothold for the novice from the country is the unskilled job, and this is being eliminated by automation. Nevertheless, the city has much excitement, some jobs, and a tradition that the starving shall be fed. At this moment, millions of rural Americans are merely waiting for the busfare or the hint of a job, or for the last vestige of family loyalty to die so that they can flee the rural misery they know for the risk of urban misery unknown.

Willie Johnson is a short, stocky West Virginian. He is 55 years old, which means that society expects at least 7 more years of work from him before he qualifies for a social security pension. Like his father, he went into the coal mines at age 13 and worked steadily. Twelve years ago he was earning more than $100 a week. Today, he earns nothing. He will probably never work again.

"If a man looks hard enough," the middle-class belief goes, "he will find some work." This is hard to believe in Logan County. It is one of the 230 counties of southern Appalachia, the beautiful mountain region that runs from West Virginia to northern Alabama, where 7 million Americans are gasping from economic suffocation. In all of Appalachia the three main ways to earn money—farming, lumbering, and mining—need ever fewer men. In Logan County, where mining is the sole source of money, there were 14,000 men in the mines in 1954 when Willie Johnson last held a job. Now there are only 3,500.

With 10,000 families out of work in one small county, the men who get no welfare because they are not crippled or have no dependents live in abandoned shacks or friends' woodsheds, and no one is sure how they stay alive.

Willie Johnson's family is on maximum relief in the county. Each month they get $165. Rent is low, $27 a month (four rooms, leaky roof, no running water). Electricity is $7.50. This leaves $130.50 for everything else.

With eight children at home, it is not an easy choice between shoes, books, and food. Books in the public high school cost $28 a year; this can be prohibitive. When he was in the ninth grade, the oldest son, young Willie, dropped out of school so the younger ones could stay in.

"First 2 weeks we have it right smart," Willie Johnson says of their diet. Breakfast is eggs, salt pork and brown gravy. Lunch is a bowl of pinto beans. Supper may be 2 fryers for 10, potatoes, beans, milk for the children and coffee for parents.

The last 2 weeks bring a pinch known to millions of the poor. By then, small catastrophes have occurred—a schoolchild's shoes have literally fallen apart and one has to spend $4 for a new pair that will disintegrate in the first rain, or $8 for a pair that will last. The night they had an unexpected visitor the 10 Johnsons were having berries picked from the back hill, mixed with flour. It was the 25th of the month, with a week more to go before the next welfare check.

For two Christmases there have been no presents in the Johnson household. The children have never seen a movie. An old television set is broken. The last time a doctor was in the house was 1951. Recreation? "I don't know the meaning of it," Willie Johnson said without rancor.

He mostly sits on his sagging porch in a sagging tubed chair, looking at the melancholy hills around him. From his chair he can see, high and shadowy on a distant ridge, a strip mine that produces 40 railroad cars of coal a day. When he was young, it employed 500 men. Today it produces the same amount of coal with 20 men. Young Willie spends at lot of time sitting on the porch too.

Johnson goes to bed at sundown, in one of the 4 beds in which the 10 members of the family sleep.

"I pray every night. My boy, he wants to be a mechanic. This girl of mine, she's 14, she wants to be a teacher. They talk about this and while they're talking I'm hoping and at night I pray: They've got to get out of here."

The farmer has always been the folk image of the perfect American—hardworking, self-reliant, prospering from his own labor and beholden to no man. Farmers and farmworkers are today among the poorest people in the United States. Forty acres and a mule no longer will support a family. It takes at least 325 acres for an average American standard of living, plus good credit at the bank and heavy investment in fertilizers, weed killers and complicated machinery.

The brutal fact is that most farmers are not really needed anymore. Fifty years ago each one grew enough food and fiber for 7 people; today he provides for 24. It is not surprising that in the last 10 years 8 million Americans left their farms for the cities. At this moment there are over 1.5 million young men between 10 and 19 growing up on farms, but in the next 10 years there will be only 150,000 openings for farm operators. Yet most farmers still retain their compulsive desire to make things grow, and their bitter love for the land.

Columbus Cooper is 57 years old. His father owned his own farm and divided the land among his male children. Cooper started clearing his 26 acres when he was 16 years old. He built his present house with his own hands, an unpainted pine clapboard cottage. On a rainy day recently he looked out on his land in Sumter County, S.C., at the sagging tobacco shed, the drizzle glistening on the small tractor and moistening the rust on his 6-year-old car. For him, too, the revolution was a perpetual puzzle.

"Things are kind of standing still. That's what's worrying me. I'd like to redeem myself, but the expenses are growing. Things could break bad for me if I can't stop this expense and pay back my indebtedness. * * * Sometimes I can't sleep nights trying to solve my problems."

It is generally agreed that a farmer in the United States, if he wants to live at an ordinary standard of living, needs to gross at least $10,000 a year cash income. Columbus Cooper, with a family of 12, grosses $1,500.

He is no rarity in American farming. There are 350,000 full-time family farms that average $438 a year in sales. Because he is a Negro he is worse off than most. More than 40 percent of all Negroes in rural areas have less than $1,000 a year income. Rural whites are better off, but not much; 50 percent earn less than $3,000; 20 percent, less than $1,000.

Cooper, a thoughtful man who dresses neatly and looks out steadily through shell-rimmed glasses, cannot quote national statistics. But he knows that 4 years ago he had to mortgage the farm for the first time for $2,000 at 7-percent interest. Since then he has reduced it to $1,500, sometimes with bales of cotton. But each year he has less money to start the next crop and has to borrow for seed, fertilizer and fuel to cure his tobacco.

He grows most of the vegetables they eat—cabbage, collards, turnips, peas, beans—and spends $600 a year for store food: rice, flour and occasionally stew meat. If the cow is milking, the children get milk. In summer he and the boys may catch pike, bream or catfish. In winter and fall they hunt for squirrel, which Mrs. Cooper boils and then fries.

He pays $400 a year on his tractor, $85 for kerosene to cure his tobacco, $200 for fertilizer. Clothes, mostly shoes, cost about $150 a year. All his older children finished 12th grade and the rest plan to; he carries heavy insurance—at $200 a year—to try to guarantee it. But this already is $1,635, and provides nothing on his mortgage or on the $300 he still owes on his car. Nor for medical and dental bills. Or anything else.

Mrs. Cooper is a younger, round-faced, serious woman who thinks she works harder than her mother, who worked very hard. "I do a lot of mending and altering hand-me-downs, but you know older girls in school."

Their living room was neat (the roof leaks in two or three places but not bad) with clean yellow curtains on the windows, an old but scrubbed linoleum, two sofas used for sleeping in summer (there are seven beds for 12 people), and a piano given them by an aunt in North Carolina.

"Jo Earl, she's 15, takes lessons. They cost 60 cents a week. It's a lot for us, but I think the girls ought to have something like that," Mr. Cooper said.

At Christmas they spend about $2 for each child. "Birthdays, there aren't presents, but we do eat something special, like chicken or sweetbread."

A doctor was last in the house 4 years ago. When toothaches are unbearable the children go to a dentist in town at $3 a visit.

When Cooper wishes out loud, he wishes he could pay cash to start each crop instead of going into debt. He wishes he could get a Government loan to clear 20 more acres and thus increase his income.

"But mostly I hope my kids do better than I'm doing. They'll have to achieve something on their own, and they'll have to study for that, learn modern farming, or a trade like brickmasonry. But I hope they won't have to leave home. Oh, I hope they won't. But I want them to do better than I have."

"Those who labor in the earth," wrote Thomas Jefferson, "are the chosen people of God."

But Jefferson didn't know the migrant workers, the 2 or 3 million Americans who work on other people's farms. They move like nomads from farm to farm and from State to State. They live in the worst squalor, the most hopeless family chaos, and the most ignored poverty of the American poor.

Theirs is a strange existence. Their seasonal movements are charted on maps like those of the birds, but more is known about birds than about these human beings. They are almost outside the normal workings of American society—except that their hands pick the Nation's fruit and vegetables.

They are constantly crossing State lines, but are exempt from Federal minimum wage laws for workers in interstate commerce. They are almost never eligible for welfare, since they do not live long enough in one place. They do not get unemployment compensation when they are out of work, or workmen's compensation when they are injured.

In 1960 the average migrant worker earned $1,016. Where there are families, they all work. It is hard to get anyone to admit there is still any child labor, but in 1959 a special U.S. census showed 457,000 children between the ages of 10 and 15 employed in agriculture.

If you drive north from Miami on route 441, you will see no sign of migrants unless, somewhere along a 30-mile stretch north of Fort Lauderdale, you turn off onto dirt roads, bump into still smaller roads and run into one of the 90 clusters of shacks in the tall grass where 35,000 migrant workers work during the winter. They hope to earn enough money to move north for picking in the summer, and then have enough at season's end to get back south again.

This year desperation ran through the camps. One Thursday it began to rain in flooding sheets, and 2 days later the last of the bean crop was ruined. It was a severe financial loss for the farmers, but it meant starvation for the pickers.

Mildred Mason—not her real name—is 18 years old. She had an illegitimate child when she was 15, but the baby died of dysentery. This is not unusual. She now is legally married, has two healthy children and appears to be in firm control of her life. This is unusual.

She and her husband Joe live in a one-room shack. There are no windows, only hinged boards. Fleas and flies are so thick nobody troubles to brush them off anymore. The only source of heat and cooking is an open fire outside their doorway.

Water comes from a pump that serves 11 other shacks.

Mr. Mason can make $36 or $42 a week, and Mildred makes $20 or $30. But they do not make this every week. In 1959 the average days worked by all migrant workers was 143, and work gets harder to find as automatic machinery learns to plant, weed, and pick. Cotton used to be a $6-a-day crop 6 months a year. Now it is closer to 60 days.

Yet migrants continue to appear, like the Masons, coming mostly from sharecropping, where there is now no work whatever.

The Masons see the handwriting on the wall but do not know what to do about it. Last May they left Florida after 6 months' work with $25 to show for it. They arrived, 2 days and nights of continuous riding later, in Cedarville, N.J., with $14 left. The strawberry crop in New Jersey was 10 days late, so they—two adults and a child, with one on the way—tried to stretch the $14 until the crop was ready. After a summer of picking—with time off while she was sick—they returned to Florida with $3.

Mildred Mason is slender, solemn, and possessed of an uncommon poise. But now she spoke in a rush: "I don't want my husband picking crops anymore and I don't want my children to. I'm tired of worrying about crops being ready, worrying if it's going to rain, worrying if there'll be a storm. I want food for my kids, a house that doesn't have rats or bugs, that has windows in it, a house where the wind won't come through the wall and the rain won't come in like there was no roof at all. I want my kids to have an education. It's awfully hard to get a job without an education. We're good pickers. But I never in my whole life had more than $40 cash at one time. Right now I don't have a single penny."

Her eyes filled and she looked fierce as her 6-month-old child crawled to her feet and stuck a fist into his mouth.

"I don't have a single penny and no food. But I don't care. I don't want to go up that road anymore."

Jose Chico is a powerful, barrel-shaped American Indian who calculates that he is 61 years old. During the first 30 years of his life he lived pretty much as his forefathers did in the year A.D. 1500. Like others in the Papago tribe in southern Arizona, he dwelt in adobe houses, grazed cattle, coaxed crops out of the grudging soil, hunted deer and rabbit in the mountains. The tribes were ruled by village elders in remote family clusters in what is still some of the most lonely and inaccessible inhabited land in the United States. Their ancestors have been there for about 5,000 years and, like most of the 500,000 American Indians, his people are repulsed by personal aggressiveness and by failure to work for family and tribe. The mastery of the quiet Indian was his instinct for catching deer, his ingenuity in trapping flash-floods to sustain desert gardens, the incredible sensitivity to the austere land and its life. But now this is all wrong. The lack of personal aggressiveness in a competitive labor market becomes apathy and laziness. The sensitivity to nature becomes quaint confusion in the city. Family and tribe are no help on the paved streets of Phoenix and Chicago. In less than a lifetime, Jose Chico's world has leaped ahead 500 years.

Jose Chico, cataracts forming over his eyes, peers over the desert range, at the giant cactus, the golden paloverde trees, the scarlet punctuations of the ocotillo, the purple mystery of mountain and mesa—the visible evidence that the tribe is rich in nature, since they own 4,000 square miles of this land. Yet starvation is endemic among them.

Like his father, he still coaxes a usable garden out of the desert, he still does some herding of cattle for others. In addition, he picks some cotton to make about $500 a year to support his wife and five children. He gets surplus Federal foods. But still there is not enough cash.

Two of his sons attend a mission high school in New Mexico, their tuition and board paid by the church. But he got a letter saying they needed shoes. The $30 he had saved for food for the month of May went by return mail.

Jose Chico stood by the corner of the well-made adobe house and the neat ocotillo-branch corral he has proudly maintained his whole life. He was somber. What did his children plan to do to make a living after they finished high school in New Mexico?

He stared at the questioner as long as it is courteous for an Indian to look at anyone without speaking. Then he looked back at the shadows stretching out over the desert.

"I don't know," he said. "Come back home with me, I think. Maybe, I hope."

"George, you obscenity head. You know what today is? You know, you dumb bastard? Today is Sunday, April 14. Easter. And you know what that means? That means a bottla wine is gonna cost you 85 cents."

A half-human sound: "All I got is an obscenity 70 cents."

"Thass what I'm tellin' ya, you cheap obscenity. The only way you're gonna get a bottle today is from the bootleggers. There ain't no 50-cent bottles today. There ain't no sales."

The animal sound came plaintively again. "All I got is 70 cents."

"Why, you cheap bastard. You got 5 bucks downstairs advance rent. Go get it, you cheap bastard. You know today's Easter."

From a distant cage a voice groaned.

Nearby someone vomited.

Another voice cried out in sleep.

You walk down both long flights of stairs, past the flophouse sign that reads, "Clean, quiet, no drunks." Outside, a man's body was sprawled across the curb, half in and half out of the gutter, an empty wine bottle near his hand.

The Easter sun was just up, pouring yellow, horizontal and thick down West Madison Street like a searchlight. There was no sound, but moving ghostlike through the blinding light were dozens of men, shuffling, wandering, moving noiselessly in the middle of the street, along the side of buildings, men who walk all night because they have no place to sleep or who have slept in doorways and are in the sun trying to warm muscles gone stiff from sleeping on concrete. A few purposeful men already rifle the trash barrels for the treasured empty bottles, worth half a cent each toward the golden goal of 50 cents, the price of 1 pint of red fluid marked "port," which acts on foodless bodies to produce a strange narcosis through which some men choose to die slowly, all for 50 cents a pint. Except that this was Easter and you would have to spend at least 85.

This was Skid Row in Chicago, one of the areas in the country's 100 largest cities where men congregate to accompany each other over the edge of civilized life and then over the edge of life itself.

But these wrecks are not typical of the poor. They are only a few hundred thousand of the more than 30 million poor. Actually, they constitute only 60 percent of Skid Row inhabitants. The rest are aging bachelors, maybe former seamen or truck drivers, who have come to Skid Row to live as cheaply as they can or because they prefer its naked drama to life in a respectable middle-class rooming house.

My flophouse "room" was a steel cage, a windowless hole with ugly mustard-colored corrugated steel walls. It was 8 feet long, too narrow to stretch the arms wide in, and 8 feet high, the top covered with chicken wire. Inside was a locker, a broken wooden stool and a cot with one sheet, one blanket and lice On the whole floor of the building—where my cage was No. 270—the stench was solid, sticking in the throat for days after, a mixture of urine, vomit, dirty socks, sweaty bodies, and smells unidentifiable. It was a place easy to leave for the rough excitement of Saturday night on Skid Row. For the huge bar—"Full shot beer, 25 cents"—where a casual inquiry brought a cold, "You ask too goddam many questions." For the all-night movie: "It's a good joint; they let you sleep but you gotta watch out you don't wake up and maybe your shoes is gone." Or the mission where a lugubrious sermon on Sodom and Gomorrah was preached to 18 soundly sleeping men.

Back in the flophouse the sounds are much like those of men dying. The maids usually find one man dead each morning among the 38 flophouses.

"O Lord," an old man's voice cried out in the night. "O Lord, have mercy on my soul. O Lord, I'm sick. I'm dying. Please O Lord, please have mercy on my soul."

A voice from the next cubicle barked, "Shut up, you bastard."

Other men got the shakes as they lay on their cots, the terrible shivering of a man addicted to wine and now having withdrawal symptoms cured only by a new drink. Only during their fitful sleep do fragments from the past float to the surface of men's minds, like the cry in the night, "Where's my dad? Where's my dad?" and the wild sobbing.

Edmund MacIntosh had been depending on the theory that hard-boiled eggs and opened cans of meat need no refrigeration. And he was sick.

He had also depended on the theory that if you work hard, live frugally, and mind your own business you will get by without help. And now he was 74 years old and needed help.

MacIntosh, to use a descriptive but not a real name, depended on hard-boiled eggs because his Los Angeles hotel room has no refrigerator, and he cannot afford to eat out. He is trying to live on his $50-a-month social security check. Room rent is $38.50 a month, which provides a room with clean linen every 2 weeks and clean towels every day. The remainder goes for food and chewing tobacco. Every week friends on the same floor do his shopping for him: two dozen eggs, seven small cans of V–8 juice, two cans of meat, a carton of dry cereal and his tobacco. He boils the eggs at once and eats them morning and evening. He stretches a can of meat for 3 days or so. He has just discovered that hard-boiled eggs and canned meat need refrigeration in warm weather.

MacIntosh has a solid, dignified manner, even as he lies on his bed, propped on an elbow, his square-jawed face ashen. He looks vital, but he has dizzy spells, and so fears to walk outside. "I'm afraid I'll fall down, and the cops will think I'm a wino. That happened to a friend of mine, and when I couldn't find $21 bail money for him he got 30 days."

His response to the present problem is one of hurt rather than anger. He was always able to earn money. He finished high school in North Carolina and 2 years in a military institute. He was in the Navy in World War I, married a Georgia girl, had a daughter, and after the war bought a newsstand on Times Square in New York and made $2,500 a year. When the depression ended that, he worked in a Baltimore hospital, then in the late 1930's got back to newspaper distribution in Washington at $3,000 a year. He joined the Navy the day after Pearl Harbor and was on a troop transport at Midway when he got a letter saying his wife was getting a divorce.

After the war be became a watchman at a California airbase for $38 a week with free room; then a railroad guard at $80 a week, until 1954, when the railroad began laying off men.

Then he came to Los Angeles—"because it's warmer here, and that helps"—and began doing a variety of odd jobs. He had a regular clientele for lawn cutting until automation reached him in its own way. "People began getting those power mowers. That was the end of me."

He had known he was eligible for social security but let it pile up. When the power mowers took over, he collected an accumulated $1,250 and began his $50 a month. He bought a suit of clothes and prepared for the rest of his days. But it became apparent $50 a month would not care for the rest of his days. He sold his TV set when he was economizing. But this only brought $15.50. He is down to $250 of his nest egg and needs medical care for his stomach, his dizziness, his failing eyesight. And he needs something to help through his loneliness. "I got a letter a year ago. It was from the bank telling me how much I had left."

Edmund MacIntosh is one of 8 million Americans who form the aged poor. He lives, or tries to, on $600 a year. There are 1.5 million lone individuals who live on less, tucked away in the cheapest rooming houses. Millions of others live in poverty as couples. These are the lonely old people known mostly to welfare workers, to postmen delivering the social security checks on the first of the month, and to the firemen who carry the elderly outdoors when an alarm flushes them out of the geriatric warrens.

When Edmund MacIntosh was a boy, there were fewer than 4 million Americans over 65. Today there are more than 16 million. In 1920 more than 30 percent of the aged were working, today only 20 percent work. Science is keeping them alive longer but it is taking away their jobs, making them obsolete.

MacIntosh did nothing wrong in planning for his old age, but his plans were not good enough. And now he needs help.

"What I need most is medical attention. I need a suit of clothes. I'd like to go to church. I'd love to go to a picture show. And if I had some good company, I guess that would be pretty good."

Into the cities they pour, refugees from a silent revolution.

We are in the midst of a great upheaval in American life. In the last four decades 27 million people have flocked to Metropolis. It is a greater migration than the one from Europe, which at its height—from 1880 to 1920—brought 21 million newcomers to America's cities.

In Chicago the white folk from the countryside come mostly by Trailways bus, carrying all they own—a suitcase tied with rope, an old trunk, three shopping bags, a folded baby buggy, a bag of grits—and clutching a letter from a relative, who came earlier, with an address and a warning: "Don't take the cabs, they'll cheat you."

If they are colored, they come mostly by that great iron artery in southern Negro life, the Illinois Central Railroad, getting off in awe under the largest building they ever saw, carrying their old suitcases and trunks, cardboard boxes with clothes and pans—and they, too, bring a carefully written address, an address that may no longer exist, because newcomers go to the slums, and massive redevelopment is turning numerous urban slums into vacant lots or luxury apartments.

If they are American Indians, they may come in rickety old cars from the Dakotas and Utah and Arizona, fleeing the hunger of the reservations, making Chicago the fourth-largest concentration of Indians in the United States.

But it is not just Chicago. It is the same in New York, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland, Washington, Atlanta, St. Louis—all the great cities. Almost all of the newcomers are poor, and most of them remain poor.

There are enoromous differences in each person's response to adversity, and this has led to the assumption by some people that poverty makes one more noble. This was never true for most of the poor, nor is it now. Yet the belief persists that the poor, compared with the affluent, ought to be more honest, more resourceful, more puritanical, more disciplined, more resilient against despair, more emotionally stable and simultaneously more aggressive and more submissive. They are not. Poverty is the pressure of living at the bottom of the social sea, and this pressure finds the weakness in every personality. Poverty is dirty, hungry, cold in winter, broiling in summer, and worst of all it is lonely and self-reproaching.

The modern American immigrant comes at an unhappy time. The unskilled job, foothold for the newcomer, is being replaced by machines. From 1947 to 1961, twice as many new people entered the labor force as there were new jobs to be had. From 1957 to 1962, industrial production went up 20 percent, but there were 1 million fewer factory jobs. The new openings are in white-collar, professional and managerial work, and these are the jobs for which the untrained poor are totally unsuited.

Today's cities are stranger to the American rural poor than were Boston and New York to the European immigrants of the turn of the century. All Americans two generations ago were learning to live in the city, and the Europeans often were city folk of long standing. Today's rural migrant comes from simple homes and shacks. Back in the small towns whole lifetimes were spent in face-to-face personal relations that stayed stable. But in the city these are replaced by impatient people who talk fast, and demand applications in triplicate. The punctuality and impersonality of city jobs seem depressing.

In school the children of newcomers are in the fifth grade, two grades below city children of the same age, a reflection of the slower-paced education that existed where they came from.

The final irony is that today it costs more to be poor. Children must go to school: thus law as well as custom demands a higher standard of living. And the family without a car is lacking what has become a basic tool of American living. The factories and shopping centers have fled to the suburbs, as have the experienced city dwellers. The poor find it harder to compete for jobs, and they pay more for their food than those with cars. They feel more isolated than ever.

"You mean you want to take a look at a hillbilly?"

Homer Burleigh, 33, out of Anniston, Ala.—hefty, frecklefaced, and sandy-haired—stood in the doorway of his flat, dressed in T-shirt and slacks, immobile with resentment. Like 20,000 other southern whites now living in the 2½ square miles of Chicago's Uptown, he has his troubles, his pride, and an innate suspicion of the city slicker.

But he is too good-natured to stay sullen. Inside, four of his five children, ranging from 2 to 7 years old, ran about in underpants. His wife, a wan, tired woman, was pregnant. The 5-year-old chanted at the visitor, "You got on a necktie. You got on a necktie."

Once Homer Burleigh decides he likes you, he is an engaging man. His mother had died when he was 3. As he tells it, he had fought with his stepmother, gone with an uncle to Detroit; and, by persistent trial and a winning honesty about his lack of experience but his desire to learn, was soon earning $100 a week. Two years later, with a 1940 Chevrolet and $3,000 in savings he went back to Anniston. "Between me and the car and a few goodlooking women, that $3,000 didn't last 10 months."

Like many southern white men, he shifted from the North, when plants shut down or work slackened, to the $40-a-week jobs back home in Alabama. Then he met his wife, a waitress with a child by a previous marriage. They decided to get married and try Chicago. Four days after his arrival he was earning $100 a week on a punch press.

In the next 7 years there were four more children, more rent, more food, more medical bills. They learned to make his pay stretch fairly well until work began to slacken. He couldn't support his family on less than 40 hours' work, so when his plant went on short time he went out and found another job working full time. But this meant he built up no seniority, and when the new plant had to lay off men, he, being the last hired, would be the first fired.

A familiar set of walls moved in on him. Machine shop work in the city went on shorter time. He had the almost universal desire for a car and the $60 a month on his 1954 Pontiac became harder than ever to squeeze out of his $300 take-home pay. He developed running sores under his arms that interfered with his work. The finance company attached his pay. So Homer Burleigh committed folly. He got a new social security number and drew his pay under another name, to balk the finance company.

A doctor gave him a letter saying he should not work. He applied for welfare aid, which would take about 2 weeks to be processed and during those weeks he kept on working.

When I saw Homer Burleigh, his welfare had been cut off because of fraud. He did not know what would happen about the social security number. He said the finance company had seized the car. Because he was out of work and without welfare aid for a month, he had fallen behind in his rent, and he was going to be evicted in 4 days. Already the furnishings of normal life were beginning to fall away. One room of the flat was bare except for a sewing machine in the middle of the room, one chair and a caged parakeet in the corner. The living room had two pieces of furniture, a sofa and a TV set.

"If the arm continues this way and if they don't give me assistance," he said gloomily, "I'm going to have to put the kids in a home."

Homer Burleigh is a likable man who reacted foolishly to a crisis. Whether society punishes him is yet to be seen. But there remain his wife, five children and a sixth expected, and whether they head down the road to perpetual dependence upon others will be governed by how farsighted society is in dealing with the poor, the foolish, and the unlucky.

I'm going to be a lawyer," said Harry, aged 6. "Lawyers make good money. I'm going to keep my money."

"I'm going to be a doctor," said his 7-year-old brother firmly, "and I'm going to take care of my family."

Their 8-year-old sister announced serenely, "I'm going to be a nurse in a big hospital and wear a real uniform and help people."

The sweet optimism of youth could have been heard in millions of American homes, but this home was rather special.

Though it was midafternoon, the tenement was dark. Gray plastic sheeting was tacked to the insides of the windows. Plaster was off part of the ceiling and walls, and strands of hair on laths trembled with the passing wind from outside. Double doors opened onto the kitchen, which was almost invisible. Its windows, too, were sealed with opaque plastic, presumably to preserve heat. But the darkness was thickened by a crisscross of clotheslines that filled the room with hanging rags of clothes. In one corner of the kitchen was a table with three legs and one chair. In another was a stove bearing a pan of cold soapy water with clothes soaking, next to it a pan of cold beans and beside that a crusted frying pan bearing one single short rib congealed with fat. Through one kitchen door was a bathroom with the toilet boarded over; it had frozen and burst in the winter cold. Through another door was "the kids' room," two beds for seven children. Neither bed had a mattress; the children slept on the springs.

"Look at this book I got from school," Harry said. "Want to hear me read?"

Harry read about Dick and Jane and their dog, Spot. Dick and Jane were cleancut, well-dressed Anglo-Saxon children who lived behind a white picket fence in a red-roofed cottage with geraniums in the window. Their mother was a smiling blonde with clear, square teeth. Their father wore a snap-brim hat, a conservative suit, and carried a briefcase. And they all lived happily in a schoolbook called "Friends and Neighbors."

Little Harry might as well have been reading science fiction. His own family had never in his memory eaten a meal together—there were not enough chairs, dishes or forks. The mother's role or the oldest daughter's at mealtime was to watch as each child took a portion of the pot on the stove to make sure no one took more than his share.

But Harry was still eager to please. He had not yet learned that other people expected him to be like Dick and his sister to be like Jane, to have parents like Dick and Jane's, to live in a house like Dick and Jane, and that as a Negro slum kid all of this was as remote to him as the canals of Mars. And unless he were uncommonly lucky, this book and the school would soon seem as remote.

The Martins—a fictitious name—are living off welfare. They came from McCrory, Ark., 6 years before, and Martin got a job at $84 a week in a meatpacking plant. Last year the plant moved away, and the family went on welfare. Last winter a newborn child whose crib was a supermarket basket died of pneumonia, Martin began drinking and has been more or less drunk ever since.

Mrs. Martin looks weary and bewildered, huddling in the perpetual twilight of their tenement, fearful of the outside world. She was hard to picture as a young woman entering a new city with excitement—until I asked when she had last bought a dress. She stared blankly and then for the first time her eyes lost their emptiness and she smiled. Her voice had a kind of life it had not had before, so much so the children stopped talking and listened in amazement.

HER LAST GOOD DRESS

"It was 6 years ago. We was making good money at the meat plant and he took me out to a dress shop. When he saw how much I liked that dress, he said, 'Honey, you get it.' It cost $30. Oh, that was a dress, I mean it really was a dress. It was pink, and it was cut a lot lower than this one and it had sequins all over, and they shined and shined and the pink was so pretty."

The girl from McCrory, Ark., was for the first time identifiable as a woman with a range of emotions. Then the face began to sag again. She wiped her hands automatically on the side of her stained dress, and one could see that her slip was held up with pieces of knotted twine.

Outside, Sister Mary William, the young, tall, indomitable Irish nun who strode through Chicago's West Side, looked down the endless line of row houses, at the trash barrels lolling on their sides, the broken glass laid like a glistening carpet as far as the eye could see. It was the sight her own father had looked at when he first visited from St. Louis and asked his daughter in dismay, "What was it you did that was so bad they sent you here?"

She crunched the broken glass under her awkward black shoes and said, "You figure out what's going to happen to Harry Martin when he finds out he's never going to be a lawyer. And his brother's never going to be a doctor. And his sister's never going to be a nurse. The worst most of us have to resign ourselves to is that there's no Santa Claus. Wait until this hits those kids."

Poverty is like cancer. Left to itself, it will generally get worse. There is no simple cure. And elementary humanity requires that the sufferer be cared for.

Welfare payments are inescapable. Families in the city cannot create their own food and shelter without work, and in a rapidly developing industrial country it is inevitable that some men will have their work suddenly withdrawn. If the poverty that follows is not to be multiplied by the deprived children, and if industrial society is to remain civilized, such families cannot be left to starvation and exposure.

Yet simple money payments do not solve the problem. What is needed is intelligent work to help the poor to self-sufficiency. Many need to be taught the subtle skills of city living. The unemployed have to be kept in touch with jobs and new skills, for the poor live in isolation from the world of success.

The best work among the poor is done by those who live among them. The poor are submissive, but they are also suspicious. It is "us" and "them," and the social worker who is one of "them" seldom gets anywhere.

It is impossible to cross the United States in pursuit of poverty without being impressed by its paradox: the continuing vigor of the land and the strong pulse of humanity among its people. And yet poverty continues to be the fate of one American in five. This does not mean that America is callous about its poor. It means that most comfortable Americans have come to believe that the poor do not exist at all.

This belief is dangerous. It is easier than ever to avoid seeing the poor, but it is also more perilous. Each year the poor become more densely packed into the centers of our cities, ever more isolated from the hopes and satisfactions of normal American life. While this is happening, the demands increase for education and skill in order to earn a living. Thus, the poor get packed tighter together while their hope of rising becomes dimmer. There are persistent rumors that Communists are running food and propaganda into the starving populations of Kentucky and West Virginia. It would be ironic if they should undermine a proud people's faith in the future, and in the midst of a country that has a strong tradition for helping the unfortunate.

Time is running out on the fuse of poverty. To look into the faces of the poor in America is heartrending but the situation is not yet hopeless.

There is not yet the frozen, bitter cynicism of the Old World poor. Their children are not yet taught to hate those who have money. Their parents, most of them, still feel a sense of obligation to work for something better. The look on Jose Chico's face was one of obstinate hope, on Homer Burleigh's of belligerent pride, on Columbus Cooper's of quiet courage. They still expect—without much proof—that it is abnormal for them to be poor. When that expectation goes, this country will have changed.

"Poverty in the midst of plenty," the late President Kennedy said shortly before he was killed, "is a paradox that must not go unchallenged, because there are men, women and children who need intelligent help.

"But comfortable Americans have another reason for challenging poverty, for to turn their backs on those in need would tarnish the noblest element in the American character."

WHO ARE THE POOR?

Average family income in 1960 was $6,800, certainly not poor. But average is an abstraction. If a man with an income of $200,000 a year lives in a mansion and the only other house on the block belongs to his chauffeur, with $4,000 a year, the average income for that block is $102,000—which tells nothing about either inhabitant. Something like this has happened nationally.

Half of all American families earn less than $5,600. Almost one-third earn less than $4,000; 22 percent earn less than $3,000; 13 percent earn less than $2,000; and 5 percent of our families earn less than $1,000.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics regards $1,500 in cash and benefits—free food and fuel, for example—as necessary for a lone individual to live modestly. And in 1959 the U.S. Department of Labor surveyed 20 American cities to find what is a "modest but adequate" family budget. The average was about $6,000, of which a family of four spent about $4,000 for food, shelter, taxes, medical and working expenses.

If the lowest adequate income for an individual is $500 and that for a family $2,000, there are still 20 million Americans who fail to meet those standards. As the standards rise, so do the totals. If the minimums are raised to $1,000 and $3,000, there are 36 million poor. If to $2,000 and $4,000, there are 54 million.

Assuming that 36 million qualify as poor, one can identify a number of groups composing this total, some of them overlapping. About 8 million live in rural areas, mostly on farms. About 8 million are aged poor. About 7 million fall into that group of obsolescent citizenry, the "unskilled workers"—people who wash dishes, work in hospitals, drift in and out of similar simple labor. About 500,000 are American Indians. A few hundred thousand are derelicts on skid rows. Among these groups are the semipermanently unemployed: coal miners, steelworkers, meatcutters, autoworkers—families of men who once worked for the most respectable wages in industry but who have now been replaced by machinery.

Most noticeable of the poor is the Negro, once concentrated in the rural South, now two-thirds in the cities. Many went from field to factory during World War II and the Korean war, when labor was in demand; but being the last hired, they were the first fired when automation or recession came. Negroes still average 40 percent less than whites in wages and have double the white unemployment rate. They are 22 percent of the American poor—double their proportion of the population. But, numerically, the great majority of the poor are white.

Poverty is not particular to any region. It is a normal reservoir in all rural areas. It is a migratory stream of desperation headed for the cities. And it is now a festering concentration in every metropolis in the land.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1211. An act to admit the vessels *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade;

H.J. Res. 658. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1964 as "See America Year," and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 680. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate 1964 as "United States Customs Year"; and

H.J. Res. 848. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of February in each year as "American Heart Month".

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bill and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 1211. An act to admit the vessels *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade placed on the calendar.

H.J. Res. 658. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1964 as "See America Year," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. First, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader and the acting minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The Chair reminds the Senator from Oregon that consideration of his amendment has not yet been reached.

Mr. MORSE. First, I am seeking to get parliamentary clearance before I offer my amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time required to propound the parliamentary inquiry I have raised shall not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. The pending amendment is the Mundt wheat amendment. The understanding among the leadership is that the Mundt amendment will not come up until tomorrow. That is the agreement we entered into with the Senator from South Dakota. Therefore, it is necessary to agree to lay aside, for the time being, the Mundt amendment and to take up the next amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment, the Mundt amendment, be laid aside for the time being.

Mr. PASTORE. Reserving the right to object, the Mundt amendment has not been called up. It is not the pending amendment at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is automatically stated as a committee amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Then I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Oregon is agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield, provided the same arrangement holds, and that the time will not be charged to either side.

Mr. PASTORE. I will take 1 minute on the bill.

Mr. MORSE. That is not necessary when one propounds a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD a letter from the White House. I believe it is fitting that it should be placed in the RECORD at this juncture:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 17, 1963.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your committee is now considering appropriations for economic and military assistance for the current fiscal year.

I recommend to the committee, in the strongest terms, favorable consideration of the maximum appropriation authorized under the enabling legislation. A candid look at the situation in Asia, Africa and Latin America reveals no diminution in the continuing intensive thrust of Communist penetration and subversion. The interests of the United States are deeply engaged in the effort to establish freedom and progress in those areas. In my judgment, as in the judgment of Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower and Truman before me, the future welfare and security of the American people require us to support the struggle of the peoples in the developing countries to achieve and maintain their freedom.

In the conviction, therefore, that the future of our own country is at stake, I strongly urge that the committee provide funds needed for a continuation of the strong U.S. economic and military assistance effort. I am conscious of the necessity for improving the efficiency of our aid program—of requiring more self-help from aid recipients, of trimming excess staff and of taking other measures needed to accomplish the results we seek at minimum cost. I assure you that we have already undertaken and will intensify our efforts to make this program effective and efficient.

I am also fully in accord with the view of the Members of Congress that we should urge other advanced countries to provide more assistance for underdeveloped nations. I pledge to continue and strengthen our efforts in this direction.

When full account is taken, however, of the opportunities for greater efficiency and for greater participation by other nations, the need remains and cannot be escaped, for a major effort by the United States. It would be false economy to cut funds which are needed for our own security and future wellbeing. I, therefore, urge the committee's favorable consideration of the appropriation request before it.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my first amendment, which is an amendment to strike out the proviso clause on lines 12 and 13 on page 15. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the proviso down to and including line 13, as follows:

> *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of authorizing legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am glad that the letter of the President of the United States was read into the RECORD. I completely disagree with practically every premise contained in the President's letter.

The President should be sending to the Senate specific proposals for reform of the foreign aid bill. He knows full well that the foreign aid program, as presently operated, is full of inefficiencies. It is full of hundreds of millions of dollars of waste. I would much rather read a letter from the President giving the American people his assurance that he will take note of what he knows is a fact—namely, that the American people are demanding that waste in the foreign aid program be eliminated. He has a great opportunity, in my judgment, to make recommendations for specific reforms. It would be much better than the letter he has sent to the Senate, which adds up to one thing. He advocates, for the time being, the continuation of the shocking waste and inefficiency in the foreign aid program which in so many parts of the world is causing downright corruption. We should end American support to corruption in the administration of the foreign aid bill by some of the countries abroad.

I come to the amendment before the Senate. We have agreed in the Senate to postpone action on the proposal to add $50 million to the American subscription to the Inter-American Development Bank. If that language had been adopted in the Senate Appropriations Committee report, it would be subject to a point of order, for it would amount to legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Parliamentarian advises me that the language is not subject to a point of order because of the fact that it is in the House bill.

It is a very bad legislative practice and policy, for it is an attempt to build up a sort of backlog pressure support for the adoption on January 14 of the bill the consideration of which the Senate agreed by unanimous consent to postpone until January 14.

We should not appropriate any money for a program that is not yet even authorized. In my judgment, that would involve a legislative practice and policy to which we should call a halt this afternoon in the Senate.

It does not follow that the money for the program could not be obtained by way of a supplemental appropriation bill after January 14, if the authorization is approved on January 14.

I am advised by the staff of the Appropriations Committee that Mr. Dillon sent word to the committee that he was going to Latin America, I believe to Venezuela, early next year and was particularly anxious to have this item in the bill. My question is, So what? It is not for Mr. Dillon to decide the legislative policies of the Senate.

In my judgment, the Appropriations Committee should not bring to us a request that we in effect approve an appropriation subject to subsequent action on an authorization bill involving the subject matter. I believe we should stop this procedure.

That is why I offer my amendment. We should strike out the language. If the authorization bill is passed on January 14, there will be no question about the ability to obtain an appropriation for the program.

I believe the proposal involves bad policy. I believe we ought to strike it out now.

Mr. LAUSCHE rose.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Ohio wish some time?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Am I correct in my recollection that in the Inter-American Development Bank bill, which was before the Senate a few days ago, this particular item of $50 million was included?

Mr. MORSE. It was. That is what the bill was all about.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill which was before the Senate, which was by agreement postponed until January 14, envisioned the expansion of the capital structure of the Inter-American Development Bank by another billion dollars?

Mr. MORSE. We are talking about the $50 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. $50 million for the special fund?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill also contemplated a billion-dollar expansion in all, of which about $350 to $400 million was to be subscribed by the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Speaking from memory, I believe it was some such figure. My concern and interest now relate to the question of the $50 million for the special fund, because that is what is involved in my amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Forgetting the other item of the increase in the capitalization, it is positive that the $50 million item was in that bill?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes yielded by the Senator from Oregon have expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor, for the time being.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I do not know what may be said about Secretary Dillon talking to members of the staff or staff members talking to Mr. Dillon. Secretary Dillon called me directly and talked with me personally.

The $50 million item was in the appropriation bill which came from the House. The authorization bill has been held up in the Senate. It was held up this past week at the request of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who suggested that consideration of the authorization bill go over until January 14.

We all understand that the money could not possibly be spent until such time as it is authorized to be spent.

No one has any guarantee that a supplemental appropriation bill will come to the Senate the first part of January, or the latter part of January, or even February. Our commitment will become due in the early part of this spring.

All that the provision would say is that the money be provided in the bill, to remain available until expended, "*Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of authorizing legislation."

What is so wrong with that? All we would say is that when the bill which, on the motion made by our distinguished friend from Oregon, was put over until January 14, is resolved one way or another, the money will be available. Certainly the Senate is not to be handcuffed or committed in any way. Then and only then could the money be spent.

We can "shadowbox" until the cows come home, but that is the clear situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. This is a simple thing not at all involved. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to add to what the Senator from Rhode Island has said. It is my understanding that the authorization bill passed the House. The House provided the appropriation. The bill has been held up. The Senate committee put the authorization bill before the Senate. That will be debated on January 14. A proviso was put in by the Appropriations Committee, since both the authorization bill and the appropriation item had passed the House. We put in the proviso because we believed that on January 14 this matter would be decided.

I understand this item is quite necessary for the Inter-American Development Bank. If we do not put in a provision now, we cannot tell when it would come before the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. If we do not put in the proviso now we will have to take out the $50 million.

The argument of the Senator from Oregon is that it could be put in a supplemental bill, and that the supplemental bill will come to the Senate in January, but no Senator knows—heaven only knows—when that bill will come to the Senate. If we consider the experience of this year, as to what will happen next year, perhaps the bill will not be considered until May or June, and the fact then will be we could not meet our commitment. That is how much the whole program could be disrupted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. In view of the argument made by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. President, I modify my amendment to strike out the language on line 7 through line 13, page 15, to eliminate the whole item, until the Senate makes its decision as to whether there shall be any authorization for the expenditure at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

The language proposed to be stricken is as follows:

> FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
>
> *Investment in Inter-American Development Bank*
>
> For payment of subscriptions to the Inter-American Development Bank for expansion of the Fund for Special Operations, $50,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of authorizing legislation.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say, most respectfully, I could not disagree more with the Senator from Rhode Island in respect to what the Appropriations Committee should do. I do not believe the Appropriations Committee ever should bring to the Senate a proposal to appropriate money in regard to a subject matter for which we have not even passed an authorization bill. If there ever was a sloppy way to legislate, that is it.

I believe the Appropriations Committee needs to be brought under some checks. This is one of the checks; namely, that the Appropriations Committee remember at all times that it is not a legislative committee. I do not care how we look at it, this amounts in effect to the Appropriations Committee legislating for the Senate, because it would write in a proviso clause that something become effective by way of appropriations at some time in the future if the Senate authorizes a project. I do not believe that is a proper way to legislate.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota rose.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I was going to request 7 minutes from the time on the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. There is an amendment pending, if the Senator does not mind waiting a minute.

Mr. President, how much time remains on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has 10 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Oregon has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe all has been said that needs to be said. We are in complete disagreement. I categorically disagree with the Senator from Oregon and he disagrees with me categorically. That is where it stands. Let us leave it to the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment, as modified.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I now yield 7 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. MORSE. I am perfectly willing to yield the Senator some of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. We have plenty of time.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the provision in the House-passed foreign aid bill prohibiting the Export-Import Bank from insuring commercial credit for the sale of wheat or any other commodity or goods to Russia and Communist-bloc countries was ill-advised and will do far more harm than good. I can see no advantage accruing to us from this provision from either a military or security standpoint. The greatest Nation in the world in its role of promoting peace throughout the world has much to lose by hoarding its food supplies while people go hungry. Desperate, hungry people never understand the technical reasons why we refuse to make our food available.

Withholding wheat sales to Russia and Communist-bloc countries could mean some hungry people during the months to come. The hungry people will be the non-Communists who want to be our friends. The Communist Party members themselves will not lack food. The anti-Communist people such as those in Hungary who desperately tried to overthrow the Communist yoke a short while ago are the kind of people who would suffer.

Canada and all of our other allies are willing and able to supply all the wheat needs of Russia and her bloc countries. If Russia had available the fertilizers, insecticides, and herbicides of American farmers, she could easily expand her production by one-third or more. Russia presently is embarking upon a 7-year $46 billion program to expand its chemical and fertilizer industries. Any nation which can put the first man into space can find the means of producing adequate supplies of fertilizer and chemicals. They already have huge land resources.

This objectionable provision in the foreign aid bill only prevents us from making sales to Russia and her satellites on commercial terms, which in trade channels has always been considered the same as cash. Twenty-five percent of these purchases have to be paid in cash at the time of the sale and the balance in quarterly payments not later than 18 months thereafter. The governments of all our allies, in their trade transactions with these Communist countries, do provide insured commercial credit. The Export-Import Bank advises us that these Communist countries have been very prompt in meeting these payments.

We have a chance to unload some of our burdensome surpluses and at the same time gain many advantages here and abroad. All of our allies are doing a flourishing business with Russia and Communist-bloc countries. It is costing the United States dearly to carry on this futile one-nation blockade.

We have already given Yugoslavia $2.4 billion in grants, loans, and in sales of agriculture commodities for Yugoslav currency. There is nothing in this proviso in the foreign aid bill to prevent continued grants and outright gifts of money or the sale of commodities for local currencies to Yugoslavia or other Communist countries. All of these countries are willing and able to pay us dollars now in place of these outright gifts of the past for the commodities they need. Why prohibit this more sensible approach through amendments such as the one now in the foreign aid bill?

The United States had made available over $450 million worth of agricultural commodities to Poland through the Public Law 480 program, under which we accepted their currency, which is of little value to us. There is nothing in the provisions of this amendment to stop more of these kinds of sales and agreements. It would, for all practical purposes, only prevent sales for U.S. dollars. Have we gotten into such a rut with our giveaway programs that we shy away from business transactions where we can realize some good hard currency?

I hope the House provision restricting sale of wheat and other commodities will be deleted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Further conference with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and with the Parliamentarian presents a very novel situation as far as the language is concerned. The Parliamentarian tells me this proviso clause is subject to a point of order, but if it is stricken on the basis of a point of order, then we shall be in a position in which the Senate Appropriations Committee would have approved the expenditure of the $50 million of appropriated money before there was an authorization act covering it enacted.

Technically, apparently the Appropriations Committee can do it—which bears out my point that that is no way to appropriate. It has raised the point that, if that procedure is possible, we must change the rules of the Senate and make clear to the Appropriations Committee that it cannot exercise that kind of discretion, because its effect is legislation, and the legislative process is involved in the authorization process of the Senate, and not in the appropriation process of the Senate. This means that indirectly, through a back door, an appropriations committee could exercise legislative functions by way of passing legislation rather than straight appropriations. That puts those of us who are in opposition in the position of perhaps having to raise a point of order in order to get the precedent established, although I think the legislative history I am making now creates the precedent.

We certainly do not want the money spent before it is authorized. We certainly ought to change the rules so no appropriations committee can bring back this kind of arrangement, whereby it is passing an appropriation prior to authorization.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, after all, the Appropriations Committee does not go out of its way to do this sort of thing. This is just as obnoxious and objectionable to us as it is to the Senator from Oregon. But here we were met with a question of expediency. The problem of expediency arose because the Senator from Oregon obtained a unanimous-consent agreement to bring this authorization matter before the Senate on January 14.

I realize that we have an appropriation without an authorization, but, after all, it will expire if the authorization is rejected. Yes, it can be continued, but no one knows when the supplemental appropriation bill will come before the Senate. That is the reason why we left it in in this way. It was not the best way, but it was the only way under the circumstances, because we were defending the reputation and name of the United States to meet its commitment. True enough, if the authorization is never passed, this $50 million cannot be spent. We thought that, while it was not the best way, it was the only way under the circumstances.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to join in what the Senator from Rhode Island has said. The Senator from Oregon is the one who delayed consideration of the authorization bill which was before us this week, as has been stated. That put the committee in a position of having it resort to this kind of procedure. Under the circumstances, it was the only thing it could do to give some support to a policy which is established and to which the country is committed. Granted that the commitment is moral and that all such commitments are subject to the authorization and approval of Congress, they are commitments as far as they can be made, and this money is appropriated for the continuation of a special fund to which the country is committed.

In this case I think the Appropriations Committee was entirely correct in following this procedure. I hope the Senate will not strike the provision.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I want to say that the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island or of the Senator from Arkansas does not change my position one iota. The unanimous-consent agreement was entered into within the parliamentary rights not only of the Senator from Oregon, but of other Senators who supported that move, such as the Senator from Alaska [Mr.

GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and other Senators. The Senate worked its will in connection with that unanimous-consent agreement, and decided to postpone action on the authorization bill until January 14.

Mr. President, I do not care how anyone tries to vocalize it or rationalize it—the fact is that the Appropriations Committee followed a course of action that amounts to getting around the will of the Senate in regard to postponing action on the authorization bill. The Appropriations Committee should not have done it. The Appropriations Committee should not pass this kind of indirect legislation upon an authorization bill. They are building up, if nothing else, legislative pressure for the passage of the bill on January 14. I can hear the argument that will be made, probably by the Senator from Arkansas, on January 14: "On today the Senate approved this indirect approval of the authorization bill." In my judgment, that is sloppy procedure, to be most kind. In my judgment, I think it is a violation of the jurisdiction of the Senate by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not call it sloppy. I believe it was to meet a contingency created by the Senator from Oregon. It is true that the Senate entered into a unanimous-consent agreement, but it did not thereby work its will. The Senate wished to vote on it. Because the Senator from Oregon, with his unusual capacity to delay the Senate, it was under the compulsion to agree to the unanimous-consent agreement or see a major part of the remaining legislation go down the drain. He used his right. He has that right. He has the right under the unusual rules of the Senate, of which I approve, of course; nevertheless the rules can be taken advantage of, in my opinion, and I believe the Senator from Oregon is a past master at it. He did take advantage of them. He did force this agreement, and I do not consider that to be the will of the Senate at all.

If he thought it was the will of the Senate, why did he not let the Senate come to a vote on it, and see what the will of the Senate was on that particular item?

He knew he would lose. That is why he let us understand that if we did not reach such an agreement there would be no vote on anything this week.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 1 minute. I am always saddened when I see the Senator from Arkansas abuse that brilliant mind of his. The Senator from Arkansas knows that every time the Senate accepts a unanimous-consent agreement it is working its will, and it agrees to the acceptance of the unanimous-consent agreement. He knows why the Senator from Oregon did not want to vote on it the other day. It was because the Senator from Arkansas was attempting some steamroller tactics to put the bill through the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas did not get his committee report to the floor of the Senate until the very afternoon he asked us to vote on the bill. The Senator from Arkansas got the bill through the committee on Friday afternoon. We did not get notice from the committee to file minority views on the bill. We came to the floor on Monday afternoon and found what the Senator from Arkansas, with his great ability, had done.

We stopped him in his tracks by insisting on either a unanimous-consent agreement or we would take the necessary time to enlighten the Senate as to what was involved in the bill.

It was then agreed that we would wait, until there could be a further study of the bill, until January 14. That is what happened. The Senate very wisely adopted the unanimous-consent agreement. I know I did not make the Senator from Arkansas happy by stopping his steamroller, but I stopped it cold last Monday afternoon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am trying to stop the Appropriations Committee from also adopting a procedure that I do not believe is in the best legislative interest of the Senate. That is why I have offered my amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to take much time.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The idea of a steamroller is ridiculous. The bill had been before the committee for months. It was introduced in June. It had been before the committee and was delayed at the request of various Senators. I forget now whether it was the Senator from Oregon who had a part in delaying it. I suspect he did. It had been under consideration for months, however.

There was no more of a steamroller then than there was during the 3 weeks of debate that the Senator from Oregon conducted on the foreign aid authorization bill itself. If there was a steamroller, it was not the Senator from Arkansas who was running that steamroller. I do not wish to go over it again, but the Senate has an opportunity now to pass upon the merits of the subject.

I hope the Senate will reject the Senator's amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to add to what the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Arkansas have said, that this is a procedure which is followed by the Appropriations Committee when at the tail end of a session an authorization is on the way through but has not gone through Congress. If it does not go through in January, so far as the bill under discussion is concerned, it all ends there.

However, I wish to point out to the Senate that in other instances we have done exactly this; for example, when the President has sent a message and when an authorization has not gone through. We have put such items like this in an appropriation bill under those conditions. It is not a good procedure, but it is a procedure which is followed at the tail end of a session. No one is hurt by it. If the Senator from Oregon kills the bill on January 14, then nothing will happen anyway. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Oregon will not be agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope we can vote on the amendment. I believe everything that can be said on it has been said.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will take only 1 more minute. I wish to say two things. First, so far as the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts is concerned, the President's message deals with budgeted items. We do not even have an authorization for this item. The second thing is I wish my friend from Arkansas to understand that I will not let the record stand with regard to his statement about a steamroller. The steamroller I am talking about is the steamroller of last Monday. There were not 10 Senators in the Chamber who could have passed an examination as to what the bill was all about.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is not unusual on many bills, I say to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. When the committee report came to the Senate, the Senator wanted an immediate vote. The Senator did not wish to wait even a day, so that the Senate could study the bill. If that is not a steamroller, I do not know what a steamroller is. All I asked for was some time in which the Senate could study the demerits of the bill. The bill is full of demerits. The Senate worked its will.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the

Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent on official business to attend the Presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 272 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Gruening
Hruska
Johnston
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
Miller
Morse
Mundt
Robertson
Russell
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—60

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—17

Beall
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Dominick
Engle
Goldwater
Hill
Jordan, N.C.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mechem
Neuberger
Pearson
Scott
Simpson
Tower
Walters

So Mr. Morse's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the Senate is proceeding under a time limitation, with one-half an hour available. The bill is quite well understood. If Senators will remain in the Chamber, it will not be necessary to use all the time which has been made available; then the vote can be taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if there are no further amendments——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL—AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate take up the items in disagreement on the legislative appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. First, Mr. President, I wish to clear up the parliamentary situation. Will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that there may be a brief parliamentary discussion with the majority leader, and that the time required for it not be charged to the time available under the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Rhode Island has pointed out, the Senate is proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into a while ago in the absence of a number of Senators who now are present. Under the agreement, the Mundt wheat amendment is to be brought up tomorrow. The agreement was that final action would not be taken tonight on the foreign aid appropriation bill. Other amendments will eventually be offered, and 15 minutes are available to each side. I was pleased to suggest to the majority leader that such a timesaving arrangement be entered into, and both of the leaders agreed.

I have just now told the majority leader that, in my judgment, further time will be saved if no attempt is made to press for the taking of votes tonight on other amendments. I believe that many more amendments would be offered tonight, as compared with the number offered tomorrow if proponents of amendments were permitted to have time to hold conferences and thus decide on the amendments to be offered. Then the Senate can work its will.

I suggest that after action on the amendments in disagreement to the legislative appropriation bill, the Senate either take a recess or adjourn until tomorrow morning, at 10 o'clock.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore]; the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader [Mr. Dirksen]; the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and other Senators who are interested in this particular matter. We would like—with the permission of the Senate—to call up very shortly the amendments in disagreement to the legislative appropriation bill, and to see what luck they have this time.

So far as further consideration of the foreign aid appropriation bill is concerned, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session tonight, it take a recess until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to state that there will be no further votes tonight on amendments to the foreign aid appropriation bill.

I ask that the unanimous consent agreement on the foreign aid appropriation bill be laid aside until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning, when the time limitations will again run.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust that Senators will not leave until the amendments in disagreement to the legislative appropriation bill are disposed of, because I apprehend—in view of all that has been said on the floor—that one of them will have to go back to the committee.

I see no necessity for a record vote; I am quite content to have a voice vote taken.

I understand that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] is prepared to ask that those amendments be called up.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I intend to ask that they be taken up. One of the amendments is still in disagreement on this side of the Capitol.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator from Montana to state that there will be no more yea-and-nay votes this evening; or did he state that there will be no more votes of any sort today on the foreign aid bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There could still be a yea-and-nay vote in connection with the amendments in disagreement to the legislative appropriation bill; I do not know. My remarks pertained only to the foreign aid appropriation bill.

Mr. MILLER. Very well.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL—MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives in regard to certain of the amendments adopted by the Senate to House bill 6868, the legislative branch appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6868, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
December 17, 1963.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30, 31, 35, 37, and 38 to the bill (H.R. 6868) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *$2,119,000*

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 104. No part of any amount appropriated in this act shall be available to finance, under authority of section 4167(a) of title 39, United States Code, the mailing and delivering of mail matter sent through the mails after October 2, 1962, with a simplified form of address under the franking privilege by any Member or Member-elect of the United States Senate to postal patrons, including those patrons on rural or star routes; nor shall any part of any amount appropriated in this act be so available with respect to the mailing and delivering of such mail matter so addressed by any Member or Member-elect of the House of Representatives beyond the district which such Member or Member-elect was elected to represent.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, since there are only two amendments still in disagreement—for the House has receded on the others—I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36.

This amendment relates to funds for the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The House approved an appropriation of $2,138,000. The Senate committee voted to decrease this amount by $39,000, to $2,099,000.

In the conference on the bill, some time ago, the conferees agreed on a compromise figure of $2,099,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This amendment does not deal with the so-called junk mail item, does it?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. It relates only to the Legislative Reference Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40. This relates to the mailing prerogatives of the House and the Senate—with respect to which the committee has worked long and hard in an effort to reach an agreement. But we have been unable to do so; and I believe that the two bodies find themselves hopelessly deadlocked, unless a compromise is reached.

The amendment which was brought before the Senate a week or so ago was not, I believe, considered on its merits. Instead, I believe it was considered on the basis of anger by the Senate in regard to what it believed to have been unjustified and untrue allegations against the Senate and its payroll, and other statements without substance or fact.

I do not believe that at that time we reached the heart of the issue or the contents of the amendment, in connection with the effort to settle this difference between the two Houses.

As regards apologies, we received a letter from the chairman of the House subcommittee on the legislative appropriation bill. Furthermore, when the matter was brought up yesterday in the House, a compromise and conciliatory effort was made. Regret was expressed by the House chairman for being inept and for making statements, which were not justified, which angered the Senate. They were, in his opinion, bandied about by the press and, as he says, were overplayed and distorted, and otherwise had the effect of making him unpopular with Members of this body.

The Senate, by a yea-and-nay vote of 88 to 2, voted to send the bill back to the House in protest. The House has responded to that vote by accepting the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Stated simply, the amendment provides that Senators would restrict themselves—as I think it is the present intention of the Senate—so that Senators would not use simplified address procedures. Mail could not be sent under a senatorial frank which would be addressed to "occupant" or "box holder."

Historically—for as long as I can remember—and until very recently, Members of both bodies could send mail addressed to "box holder" on a rural route under the frank without any name of the box holder being placed on the mail. We could send such mail to star routes or to fourth class post offices in instances in which city delivery is not available, and to the box holders in small post offices.

The amendment would take away—and I think quite properly so—the right of Senators to use the frank for the so-called occupant addressed mail, which some have called junk mail.

Under the original proposal of the House, to which we disagreed, an attempt was made to have the Senate recede from its position in favor of the House position on the right of Members of the House of Representatives to use a simplified address for rural routes and for city delivery as well.

As many Senators have pointed out, that proposal would have granted a rather unfair privilege to Members of the House. They would be able to circulate mail without the names and addresses of the recipients, but merely addressed to "box holder," and they could send such mail throughout their entire State. They would then have an advantage over a Senator in an election or in getting the sender's ideas to the people of the State in a very easy and simple way.

Since the amendment was sent back to the House with the resounding vote of 88 to 2, the House has responded with an amendment to the Senate amendment, which would leave the Senate's position on its practices unchanged. I believe that is how the Senate wishes it to be. The amendment provides that Members of the House shall be confined to using under the frank the simplified address system—that is, mail addressed to "box holder" or "occupant"—only within the Member's own district.

The amendment would confine the Member in almost all cases—except in the case of a Representative at Large—to a population of roughly about 500,000. An exception would pertain to some States which have an imbalance in their population representation.

That is the issue which is before the Senate.

I am satisfied that the House will not yield further on the subject. Traditionally, each House is the judge of its own rules. I believe the only thing we can do is to recede and to accept the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

Members of the House will limit their use of franked mail, and we shall go no further than the Senate chooses to go. We shall be the guardian of our morals; the House will be the guardian of its morals in the use of the frank.

If we wish to avoid the spectacle of being unable even to agree on appropriations for the legislative branch for the present fiscal year, which is nearly half gone, I urge that the Senate accept the compromise and send the bill to the White House for signature.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Oklahoma to be sure that I understand the situation. The Senate now has the privilege of addressing mail generally to rural areas, star routes, and fourth-class post offices. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. Under the provisions of the Williams amendment the Senate would not have the privilege of sending any mail under the frank except that which would be addressed to the owner's name and address.

Mr. MILLER. Yes, but under the House amendment, the Senate would have that right.

Mr. MONRONEY. It would still have the right. The right of Senators is changed only to the extent that we could not send mail to "box holder" or to "occupant" under a simplified addressing system under the Williams amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Under the amendment Members of the House of Representatives would not only be able to do that, but also they would, in addition, have the present privileges which are accorded Senators in relation to rural routes, star routes, and fourth-class post offices. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. The only change which the amendment would make would be to give Members of the House the right to send mail addressed only to "box holder" or to "occupant"; to people within their own congressional district. They would still be able to use the frank—as Senators could also—to send mail anywhere in the United States if it is addressed with the normal address form; for example, "Mr. Jones, 16 West 32d Street."

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa understands that point. But what can Members of the House now do with respect to rural box holders, rural star routes, and fourth-class post offices?

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand, under the present law Members of the House are allowed to send mail to rural routes and to fourth-class post office boxes—not city delivery—under the frank without such mail being addressed.

Mr. MILLER. Does it not come down to the fact that House Members within their own congressional district and Senators would be treated exactly the same under the proposal, except that within a congressional district the Senator could not send mail to "occupant" or to "box holder" in a city, but a Member of the House could?

Mr. MONRONEY. Within his own district.

Mr. MILLER. Within his own district.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is the only expansion which has taken place. The mail could be sent to "householder" or "occupant" in a fourth-class post office without the complete address.

Mr. MILLER. A Member of the House could do so.

Mr. MONRONEY. A member of the House could do so. A Senator would not be able to send any mail under the frank unless such mail were completely addressed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Would the House proposal be workable in a large metropolitan city within which are many congressional districts? Would the proposal place an undue burden upon the mail carrier who would cross from one congressional district to another?

Mr. MONRONEY. The amendment in the report would probably place on the Members of the House the major job of policing that problem in a large city, because at times even blocks are divided. It is quite difficult to determine where one congressional district ends and another begins. But I believe that the activity would be subject to policing if the mailing were done on any substantial scale. I believe the penalty for going across the line would be severe, but under the general laws as regards abuse of the use of the frank, I believe it would be possible to enforce the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will again reject the House amendment which would allow junk mailing privileges for Congressmen. As the Senator from Nebraska has pointed out, in New York City there are several Representatives. It is physically impossible for this proposal to be administered. One Representative could circularize the entire city of New York. How could the postman in the State which I represent in part or in any other State tell where the mail should properly be delivered?

There are many post offices in towns that are adjoined in Maryland and Delaware, and in Pennsylvania and Delaware. The address may be Delaware. The Representative could circularize box holders in that whole area. How would he know whether the mail would go to people in Maryland or across other State lines? In States in which only one Representative is elected, that Representative could circularize the entire State. The Senator from that State would enjoy no such privilege.

The only basis for the argument in favor of the proposal is to give Members of the House of Representatives an opportunity to circulate in their congressional districts tons of political propaganda in the 1964 election. Congress has always had the same rule for both the House and the Senate. I do not know of a single instance in which there has been a different rule. Why should the taxpayers be required to pay the postage on political propaganda of a Member of the House? Let them pay their own postage.

Two years ago the Senate by a vote—the House later concurred—abolished that privilege and limited both Houses to using the frank for the purpose of answering legitimate mail only. Now the House wants to reinstate this junk mail provision for their Members.

I believe the Senate amendment should be adopted and the conference report rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I concur in what my colleague, the Senator from Delaware, has said.

It has been mentioned in the newspapers that one of the reasons for the difficulties over the mailing controversy is that some Members of the Senate are concerned that Members of the House might be able to take unfair advantage in a possible future contest, particularly a primary election. This is not the reason why I feel as I do against the adoption of the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

Congress has been subjected to much criticism already, and much of it I believe is unjustified. We should not invite further criticism by agreeing to the House amendment.

Many people get the idea that if a House Member is allowed to do something, everyone in the Congress—all Members of the Senate and of the House alike—are doing the same.

I venture to say that if the junk mail privilege is extended to House Members, even within their own congressional districts, soon Senators will receive mail suggesting that Senators are doing the same. This will only add fuel to the fire which is already spreading around the country with respect to some of the "loose" operation in which I fear a few of our colleagues may have been engaged.

We should not be a party to permitting the junk mail privilege to anyone, either Senators or Members of the House. Both should be treated alike.

We should be thankful for the franking privilege Senators now enjoy, without running the risks of abuse.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall vote against the House amendment to the Senate amendment. I shall do so because I am convinced that at present the Congress is receiving lacerating condemnation. My mail indicates that clearly. The letters are of a character difficult to answer.

I agree with what was said a moment ago, that we now enjoy a privilege in the franking rights which is great. I do not believe we have any right to load the mail boxes of citizens against their will. That is being done with junk mail.

For my own protection and for the protection of the honor of Congress, I do not believe we should in any way in the Senate give approval to the flooding of the mail with propaganda.

It is argued that it is for the service and enrichment of the knowledge of the citizenry. That, in my opinion, is not the fact. It is used for political purposes and for political purposes alone.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma to agree to the House amendment——

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to make clear the parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma to concur in the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 40.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. A vote "nay" would be a vote to reject the House amendment?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** A vote "nay" would be a vote to reject the House amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters], and the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent on official business to attend the Presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. Carlson and Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 41, as follows:

[No. 273 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Church
Eastland
Edmondson
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NAYS—41

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Cannon
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Fong
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Nelson
Prouty
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smith
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—17

Beall
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Dominick
Engle
Goldwater
Hill
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mechem
Morse
Neuberger
Pearson
Scott
Simpson
Tower
Walters

So Mr. Monroney's motion was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. MILLER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] was agreed to.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is this a vote on the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Yes. The vote is on the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Chair.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senators from Oregon [Mr. Morse and Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters], and the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent on official business to attend the Presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. Carlson and Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 41, as follows:

[No. 274 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Church
Edmondson
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NAYS—41

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Fong
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Prouty
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smith
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—17

Beall
Carlson
Dominick
Eastland
Engle
Goldwater
Hill
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mechem
Morse
Neuberger
Pearson
Scott
Simpson
Tower
Walters

So the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma was adopted was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, when the vote was taken on the conference report itself, I was not recorded as voting. I was in the Chamber and announced my vote against the measure; but it was a little late and therefore was not recorded. I desire to have that statement appear in the Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** According to the clerk, the Senator from Ohio was recorded on the last vote.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then my remarks are out of order. Am I shown as

recorded on the vote on the conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recorded as having voted in the negative.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a comparative statement of the legislative appropriations for 1963 and the budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1964.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative statement of the appropriations for 1963 and the budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1964

Item	Appropriations, 1963 (to date) [1]	Budget estimates, 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
SENATE					
Vice President and Senators:					
Compensation of the Vice President and Senators	$2, 471, 140	$2, 471, 140		$2, 471, 140	$2, 471, 140
Mileage, President of Senate and Senators	58, 370	58, 370		58, 370	58, 370
Expense allowance, Vice President, majority and minority leaders	14, 000	14, 000		14, 000	14, 000
Total, Senators and Vice President	2, 543, 510	2, 543, 510		2, 543, 510	2, 543, 510
Salaries, officers and employees:					
Office of the Vice President	134, 070	136, 710		136, 710	136, 710
Chaplain	9, 250	9, 430		9, 430	9, 430
Office of the Secretary	755, 070	769, 320		897, 885	897, 885
Committee employees	2, 679, 240	2, 731, 965		2, 731, 965	2, 731, 965
Conference committee:					
Majority	81, 160	82, 740		82, 740	82, 740
Minority	81, 160	82, 740		82, 740	82, 740
Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators	13, 265, 260	[2] 13, 609, 650		13, 609, 650	13, 609, 650
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	2, 647, 310	2, 698, 585		2, 704, 615	2, 704, 615
Offices of secretaries to the majority and minority	132, 615	135, 195		135, 195	135, 195
Offices of the majority and minority whips	29, 750	30, 330		30, 330	30, 330
Official Reporters of Debates	226, 195	230, 810		231, 555	231, 555
Total salaries, officers and employees	20, 041, 080	20, 517, 475		20, 652, 815	20, 652, 815
Contingent expenses:					
Legislative reorganization	131, 875	134, 755			
Senate policy committees	343, 580	351, 170		351, 170	351, 170
Automobiles and maintenance	37. 300	37, 840		37, 840	37, 840
Furniture	31, 190	31, 190		31, 190	31, 190
Expenses of inquiries and investigations	3, 951, 010	4, 025, 760		4, 025, 760	4, 025, 760
Folding documents	36, 000	36, 700		36, 700	36. 700
Mail transportation (motor vehicles)	16. 560	16, 560		16. 560	16. 560
Miscellaneous items	2, 435, 205	[2] 2, 484, 860		2, 458, 860	2, 458, 860
Postage	55, 975	55, 975		63, 535	63, 535
Stationery	195, 000	195, 000		195, 000	195, 000
Communications	15, 150	15, 150		15, 150	15, 150
Total, contingent expenses	7, 248, 845	7, 384, 960		7, 231, 765	7, 231, 765
Other, Senate:					
Legislative counsel	242, 350	247, 260		247, 260	247, 260
Beneficiaries of deceased Senators	67, 500				
Total, other	309, 850	247, 260		247, 260	247, 260
Total, Senate	30, 143, 285	30, 693, 205		30, 675, 350	30, 675, 350
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
SALARIES, MILEAGE FOR THE MEMBERS, AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF THE SPEAKER					
Compensation of Members	10, 672, 000	10, 622, 500	$10, 622, 500	10, 622, 500	10, 622, 500
Mileage of Members and expense allowance of the Speaker	200, 000	200, 000	200, 000	200, 000	200, 000
Total	10, 872, 000	10, 822, 500	10, 822, 500	10, 822, 500	10, 822, 500
SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES					
Office of the Speaker	87, 650	94, 875	94, 875	94, 875	94, 875
Office of the Parliamentarian	67, 840	75, 380	75, 380	75, 380	75, 380
Office of the Chaplain	9, 250	9, 425	9, 425	9, 425	9, 425
Office of the Clerk	1, 210, 220	1, 260, 970	1, 220, 000	1, 220, 000	1, 220, 000
Committee employees (standing roll)	3, 062, 780	3, 157, 000	3, 125, 000	3, 125, 000	3, 125, 000
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	647, 270	661, 600	661, 600	661, 600	661, 600
Office of the Doorkeeper	1, 109, 225	1, 150, 410	1, 150, 410	1, 150, 410	1, 150, 410
Special and minority employees (several items)	316, 560	339, 515	339, 515	339, 515	339, 515
Office of the Postmaster	342, 300	359, 525	359, 525	359, 525	359, 525
Official Reporters of Debates	212, 980	217, 120	217, 120	217, 120	217, 120
Official Reporters to Committees	215, 160	219, 345	219, 345	219, 345	219, 345
Committee on Appropriations (investigations)	628, 260	660, 000	660, 000	660, 000	660, 000
Office of the Legislative Counsel	239, 785	[3] 252, 530	252, 530	252, 530	252, 530
Total, salaries, officers and employees	8, 149, 280	8, 457, 695	8, 384, 725	8, 384, 725	8, 384, 725
MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE					
Clerk hire	21, 348, 090	21, 800, 000	21, 300, 000	21, 300, 000	21, 300, 000
CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE					
Furniture	269, 620	282, 550	269, 620	269, 620	269, 620
Miscellaneous items	2, 688, 685	2, 825, 000	2, 800, 000	2, 800, 000	2, 800, 000
Reporting hearings	175, 000	175, 000	175, 000	175, 000	175, 000
Special and select committees	3, 058, 960	3, 325, 000	3, 300, 000	3, 300, 000	3, 300, 000
Office of the Coordinator of Information	119, 525	121, 855	121, 855	121, 855	121, 855
Telegraph and telephone	1, 500, 000	1, 670, 000	1, 670, 000	1, 670, 000	1, 670, 000
Stationery (revolving fund)	788, 400	784, 800	784, 800	784, 800	784, 800
Attending physician's office	16, 545	16, 545	16, 545	16, 545	16, 545
Postage stamps	183, 640	182, 840	182, 840	182, 840	182, 840
Folding documents	251, 300	256, 800	251, 300	251, 300	251, 300
Revision of laws	20, 485	20, 765	20, 765	20, 765	20, 765
Speaker's automobile	10, 400	10, 600	10, 600	10, 600	10, 600
Majority leader's automobile	10, 350	10, 500	10, 500	10, 500	10, 500
Minority leader's automobile	10, 350	10, 500	10, 500	10, 500	10, 500
Portrait of Speaker	2, 500				
Payments to widows and heirs of deceased Members	45, 000				
Total, contingent expenses	9, 150, 760	9, 692, 755	9, 624, 325	9, 624, 325	9, 624, 325
Total, House of Representatives	49, 520, 130	50, 772, 950	50, 131, 550	50, 131, 550	50, 131, 550

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for 1963 and the budget estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1964—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1963 (to date) [1]	Budget estimates, 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
JOINT ITEMS					
Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures	$28,250	$29,750	$29,750	$29,750	$29,750
CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE					
Joint Economic Committee	260,590	265,730	235,000	235,000	235,000
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy	305,445	311,000	311,000	311,000	311,000
Joint Committee on Printing	120,980	123,530	123,530	123,530	123,530
CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE					
Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation	337,690	344,440	344,440	344,440	344,440
Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Joint Committee on Defense Production	68,060	69,550	69,550	69,550	69,550
CAPITOL POLICE					
General expenses	36,700	36,700	36,700	36,700	36,700
Capitol Police Board	136,000	144,416	144,000	144,000	144,000
EDUCATION OF PAGES					
Expenses	72,945	77,025	77,025	77,025	77,025
PENALTY MAIL COSTS					
Expenses	3,986,000	[4] 4,867,374	4,867,374	4,867,374	4,867,374
STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS					
Preparation	8,000	8,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
Total, joint items	5,380,660	6,297,515	6,271,369	6,271,369	6,271,369
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
Salaries, Office of the Architect	363,000	496,000	460,000	442,500	442,500
Contingent expenses	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Capitol buildings	[5] 1,296,250	1,437,000	1,428,500	1,428,500	1,428,500
Extension of the Capitol (liquidation cash)	800,000	1,000,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Planning for restoration of Old Senate Chamber and Old Supreme Court Chamber in the Capitol				37,500	37,500
Capitol Grounds	435,000	496,000	476,000	476,000	476,000
Legislative garage	63,000	50,500	50,500	50,500	50,500
Senate office buildings	2,251,150	2,945,000		2,535,300	2,535,300
House office buildings	1,722,000	1,928,000	1,778,000	1,778,000	1,778,000
Acquisition of property, construction, and equipment, additional House office building (liquidation cash)	8,500,000	[3] 20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Capitol Power Plant (operation)	2,052,000	2,230,000	2,213,000	2,213,000	2,213,000
Library buildings and grounds:					
Structural and mechanical care	[6] 844,500	3,522,000	3,388,200	3,388,200	3,388,200
Furniture and furnishings	225,000	180,000	180,000	180,000	180,000
Total, Architect of the Capitol	18,601,900	34,343,500	30,744,200	33,279,500	33,279,500
BOTANIC GARDEN					
Salaries and expenses	[7] 452,000	483,000	462,000	454,500	454,500
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Salaries and expenses	[8] 10,074,380	10,405,000	[9] 9,726,000	9,726,000	9,726,000
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses	1,673,560	1,794,000	1,781,000	1,781,000	1,781,000
Legislative Reference Service, salaries and expenses	1,960,820	2,143,000	2,138,000	2,099,000	2,119,000
Distribution of catalog cards, salaries and expenses	2,754,370	[3] 3,077,000	[10] 3,042,000	3,042,000	3,042,000
Books for the general collections	570,000	670,000	650,000	670,000	670,000
Books for the law library	110,000	110,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
Books for the blind, salaries and expenses	1,893,910	1,902,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presidents, salaries and expenses	112,800	112,800	112,800	112,800	112,800
Preservation of American motion pictures	60,600	60,600	50,000	50,000	50,000
Collection and distribution of Library materials (special foreign currency program):					
Purchase of excess local currencies owned by U.S. Treasury	630,000	898,000	898,000	898,000	898,000
U.S. dollar amounts	49,900	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
Indexing and microfilming the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church records in Alaska	15,000				
Total, Library of Congress	19,905,340	21,252,400	20,487,800	20,468,800	20,488,800
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE					
Printing and binding	15,200,000	18,200,000	18,200,000	18,200,000	18,200,000
Office of Superintendent of Documents, salaries and expenses	4,759,530	5,417,880	5,242,000	5,242,000	5,242,000
Acquisition of site and construction of annex	6,450,000	3,758,000			
GPO revolving fund (additional capital)		[3] 11,000,000	8,500,000	[11] 3,450,000	[11] 3,550,000
Total, Government Printing Office	26,409,530	38,375,880	31,942,000	26,992,000	26,992,000
Grand total	[1] 150,412,845	182,218,450	140,038,919	168,273,069	168,293,069

---

[1] Including amounts in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.

[2] As amended in S. Doc. 25.

[3] As amended in H. Doc. 105.

[4] As amended in H. Doc. 118.

[5] And reappropriation, estimated at $337,000. (Language in 1964 bill would extend $78,000 of the unobligated balance to June 30, 1964.)

[6] And reappropriation, estimated at $272,200.

[7] And reappropriation, estimated at $62,000.

[8] And reappropriation, estimated at $67,000.

[9] Together with $230,000 by transfer from National Science Foundation.

[10] Together with $28,000 by transfer from National Science Foundation.

[11] Together with $6,450,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Acquisition of site and construction of annex."

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS—1964

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, has the Senate now resumed the consideration of the foreign aid appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. While the foreign aid appropriation bill is the pending business, announcement was made that the bill would be laid aside and that the Senate would not return to its consideration today and that there would be no votes on that bill until tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was not about to ask for a vote. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to page 18 of the foreign aid appropriation bill as follows:

> MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS
>
> For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items", $215,000: *Provided*, That effective January 1, 1964, the paragraph relating to official long-distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" in Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress (2 U.S.C. 46c), as amended,

is amended by striking out the words "one hundred and twenty" and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred and sixty" and by striking out the words "six hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight hundred".

POSTAGE STAMPS

For an additional amount for air mail and special delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate, $6,060: *Provided* That the maximum allowance per capita of $550 for air mail and special delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate is increased to $610 for the fiscal year 1964 and thereafter.

STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

For an additional amount for stationery, $60,000: *Provided,* That commencing with the fiscal year 1964 and thereafter the allowance for stationery for each Senator and the President of the Senate shall be at the rate of $2,400 per annum.

I make the point of order that these items constitute legislation on an appropriation bill and are, therefore, out of order in this particular bill.

In view of the fact that the Senate has just reinstated the right to distribute junk mail under the franking privilege, the least we can do is to save the amount of money provided in these other three items. I ask that the Chair rule on the point of order.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the point of order is untimely. A unanimous consent agreement was made to put the foreign aid appropriation bill over until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. If a point of order is to be made, it must be made at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator feels that I am out of order in making the point of order now I will withhold it and reserve the right to make the point of order tomorrow. According to the rule of the Senate the items to which I have referred constitute legislation on an appropriation bill, and a point of order can be made against either this amendment or against the bill itself.

I shall reserve my decision as to how I will raise the point of order until tomorrow. I had intended to make the point of order against only the amendment tonight, but tomorrow I may decide to expand it to the entire bill.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS ACT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1756.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bayh in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1756) to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That section 5 of the Alaska Public Works Act (63 Stat. 627, 628; 48 U.S.C. 486c) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof: "*Provided,* That notwithstanding the requirements of this sentence, or any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to collect, or as he may determine to be justified by the special financial condition of the applicant or other unusual circumstances, to compromise or release any claim or obligation assigned to or held by him in connection with any such agreement until such time as such claim or obligation may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may delegate to the head of any other department or agency of the United States any of his functions, powers and duties with respect to such collection, compromise, or release of claims or obligations as he may deem appropriate, and may authorize the redelegation of such functions, duties, and powers by the head of such department or agency."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I have cleared this measure with the chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. McNamara] and with the ranking minority member of the committee.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is debatable.

SALE OF WHEAT TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, much confusion and uncertainty seem to have arisen among Members of the Senate concerning the amendment added to the foreign aid bill by the House of Representatives the night before last on a motion to recommit the proposed legislation for the purpose of adding an amendment which would prohibit the Export-Import Bank from granting extensions of credit or guaranteeing credits to Soviet countries.

I have been trying to respond all day to questions from Senators as to what is involved. I shall say a few words to set the record straight, because this proposal will be voted on sometime tomorrow.

First, I ask unanimous consent that the exact language of the amendment as adopted by the House be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> On page 16, after line 24, insert the following paragraph:
>
> "None of the funds provided herein shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereinafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, because of cursory reading or careless reporting, some newspapers and wire services have referred to this proposal as an attempt to ban the shipments of wheat and corn. It bans the shipment of wheat and corn only insomuch as they are included in the destination of the end product.

I emphasize that the amendment is exactly the same as the amendment the Senate had before it on two different occasions: in the so-called Mundt amendment to the foreign aid authorization bill, and again when we took up a measure under a unanimous-consent agreement the day after the funeral of our late President.

This provision applies to the purchase of any product by a Commuist country, and that purchase need not be in the United States. It relates to the prevention of attempts by some Communist countries to obtain American credit to purchase products elsewhere. It would eliminate that factor as well as eliminate the extension of credit for the purchase of products in the United States.

In the third place, I should like to call attention to the legislative manner in which this proposal will come before the Senate tomorrow. It will come before us, I presume, because some member of the Committee on Appropriations—presumably the acting chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore]—will move to delete from the House bill this amendment which is now a part of the bill. The amendment will not be offered by the senior Senator from South Dakota, because I am in favor of what the House has done. The action of the House will stand unless it is deleted.

For the first time in the three instances we have had the proposal before us, Senators will have an opportunity to vote for it or against it on the basis of its own merits. Until now, one motion to lay on the table was defeated, and one motion to lay on the table was agreed to; but both were motions designed to defer until some other time a decision as to whether we desire to subject the taxpayers to a potential loss by guaranteeing the credit of the United States.

Tomorrow will be the first time Senators will have an opportunity to express by a yea-and-nay vote, their attitude on the specific and sharp question of whether they desire to have the public credit of the United States extended to the Communist countries and the Communist dictators. So that will be a different vote on an aspect different from any we have had before us heretofore.

Several Senators have asked me where they can find the record as to what transpired before. I point out that on November 14 the Senate rejected the motion to lay on the table; the vote was 40 yeas and 46 nays. And on November 26 the Senate voted—with 57 yeas and 35 nays—to lay the bill on the table.

I ask unanimous consent that these two yea-and-nay votes be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the votes were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Congressional Record, Nov. 14, 1963, p. 21894]

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 46, as follows (No. 237 Leg.):

Yeas—40: Aiken, Bartlett, Bible, Boggs, Brewster, Burdick, Byrd of West Virginia, Cannon, Carlson, Church, Clark, Eastland, Fulbright, Gore, Hart, Hayden, Hill, Humphrey, Inouye, Javits, Johnston, Kennedy, Mansfield, McCarthy, McGee, McNamara, Metcalf, Monroney, Moss, Muskie, Nelson, Pastore, Pell, Randolph, Saltonstall, Sparkman, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, Young of North Dakota, Young of Ohio.

Nays—46: Allott, Bayh, Beall, Bennett, Byrd of Virginia, Case, Cooper, Cotton, Dirksen, Dodd, Dominick, Douglas, Edmondson,

Ervin, Fong, Goldwater, Gruening, Hartke, Hickenlooper, Holland, Jordan of North Carolina, Jordan of Idaho, Keating, Kuchel, Lausche, Long of Missouri, McClellan, McIntyre, Mechem, Miller, Morse, Mundt, Pearson, Prouty, Proxmire, Ribicoff, Robertson, Russell, Scott, Simpson, Smith, Symington, Talmadge, Thurmond, Tower, Williams of Delaware.

Not voting—14: Anderson, Curtis, Ellender, Engle, Hruska, Jackson, Long of Louisiana, Magnuson, McGovern, Morton, Neuberger, Smathers, Stennis, Walters.

So the motion to table was rejected.

[Congressional Record, Nov. 26, 1963, p. 22766]

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 35, as follows (No. 256 Leg.):

Yeas—57: Aiken, Anderson, Bartlett, Bayh, Bible, Boggs, Brewster, Burdick, Byrd of West Virginia, Cannon, Carlson, Case, Church, Clark, Ellender, Fulbright, Gore, Gruening, Hart, Hartke, Hayden, Humphrey, Inouye, Javits, Johnston, Jordan of North Carolina, Keating, Kennedy, Kuchel, Long of Missouri, Long of Louisiana, Magnuson, Mansfield, McCarthy, McGee, McGovern, McIntyre, McNamara, Metcalf, Monroney, Moss, Muskie, Nelson, Neuberger, Pastore, Pell, Randolph, Ribicoff, Saltonstall, Sparkman, Symington, Talmadge, Walters, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, Young of North Dakota, and Young of Ohio.

Nays—35: Allott, Beall, Bennett, Byrd of Virginia, Cooper, Cotton, Curtis, Dirksen, Dominick, Edmondson, Ervin, Fong, Goldwater, Hickenlooper, Holland, Hruska, Jackson, Jordan of Idaho, Lausche, Mechem, Miller, Morton, Mundt, Pearson, Prouty, Proxmire, Robertson, Russell, Scott, Simpson, Smith, Stennis, Thurmond, Tower, and Williams of Delaware.

Not voting—8: Dodd, Douglas, Eastland, Engle, Hill, McClellan, Morse, and Smathers.

So Mr. Mansfield's motion to lay the bill (S. 2310) on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the vote taken on Monday in the House. It is to be found on page 24758 of the Congressional Record for December 16.

There being no objection, the vote was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Congressional Record, Dec. 16, 1963, p. 24757]

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Mr. Jensen moves to recommit the bill H.R. 9499 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with an amendment as follows: On page 16, after line 24, insert the following paragraph:

" 'None of the funds provided herein shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereinafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national.' "

The Speaker. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—years 218, nays 169, answered "present" 1, not voting 46, as follows:

(Roll No. 242)

Yeas—218: Abbitt, Abele, Abernethy, Adair, Addabbo, Alger, Anderson, Andrews of Alabama, Andrews of North Dakota, Arends, Ashbrook, Ashmore, Auchincloss, Ayres, Baker, Baldwin, Baring, Barry, Bates, Battin, Beermann, Bell, Bennett of Florida, Bennett of Michigan, Berry, Betts, Bolton, Frances P., Bolton, Oliver P., Bow, Brock, Bromwell, Broomfield, Brotzman, Brown of Ohio, Broyhill of North Carolina, Broyhill of Virginia, Bruce, Burleson, Burton, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Cahill, Carey, Casey, Chamberlain, Chenoweth, Clancy, Clausen, Don H., Clawson, Del, Cleveland, Collier, Colmer, Corbett, Cramer, Cunningham, Curtin, Curtis, Dague, Delaney, Derounian, Devine, Dole, Dorn, Dowdy, Downing, Dulski, Dwyer, Fallon, Feighan, Findley, Fino, Fisher, Ford, Foreman, Forrester, Fountain, Fulton of Pennsylvania, Fuqua, Gary, Gibbons, Glenn, Goodell, Goodling, Griffin, Gross, Grover, Gubser, Gurney, Hagen of California, Haley, Hall, Halleck, Halpern, Hardy, Harrison, Harsha, Harvey of Indiana, Harvey of Michigan, Hemphill, Herlong, Hoeven, Horan, Horton, Hosmer, Huddleston, Hull, Hutchinson, Ichord, Jarman, Jensen, Johansen, Johnson of Pennsylvania, Jonas, Jones of Missouri, Keith, Kilburn, Kilgore, King of New York, Knox, Kornegay, Kunkel, Kyl, Langen, Latta, Lennon, Lipscomb, Lloyd, Long of Louisiana, McClory, McCulloch, McDade, McIntire, McLoskey, McMillan, MacGregor, Marsh, Martin of California, Martin of Nebraska, Matthews, May, Meader, Michel, Minshall, Montoya, Moore, Morton, Mosher, Nelsen, Norblad, O'Brien of New York, O'Konski, Ostertag, Pelly, Pike, Pirnie, Poff, Pool, Quie, Quillen, Reid of Illinois, Reid of New York, Reifel, Rhodes of Arizona, Rich, Rivers of South Carolina, Roberts of Texas, Robison, Rogers of Florida, Rogers of Texas, Roudebush, Rumsfeld, St. George, Saylor, Schadeberg, Schenck, Schneebeli, Schweiker, Schwengel, Scott, Secrest, Selden, Senner, Shriver, Sibal, Sikes, Siler, Skubitz, Smith of California, Smith of Virginia, Snyder, Springer, Stafford, Stephens, Stinson, Taft, Talcott, Taylor, Teague of California, Teague of Texas, Thomson of Wisconsin, Tollefson, Tuck, Tuten, Utt, Waggonner, Wallhauser, Watson, Weaver, Westland, Whalley, Wharton, Whitener, Whitten, Widnall, Williams, Wilson of Indiana, Winstead, Wydler, Wyman.

Nays—169: Albert, Ashley, Aspinall, Barrett, Bass, Beckworth, Blatnik, Boggs, Boland, Bolling, Bonner, Brademas, Brooks, Brown of California, Buckley, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Cameron, Cannon, Celler, Chelf, Clark, Conte, Cooley, Corman, Daddario, Daniels, Davis of Georgia, Davis of Tennessee, Dawson, Dent, Denton, Diggs, Dingell, Donohue, Duncan, Edmondson, Edwards, Elliott, Everett, Farbstein, Fascell, Finnegan, Flood, Flynt, Fogarty, Fraser, Frelinghuysen, Friedel, Fulton of Tennessee, Gallagher, Garmatz, Gathings, Giaimo, Gilbert, Gill, Gonzalez, Grabowski, Gray, Green of Oregon, Hanna, Harding, Harris, Hawkins, Hays, Healey, Hechler, Holifield, Holland, Jennings, Joelson, Johnson of California, Johnson of Wisconsin, Jones of Alabama, Karsten, Karth, Kastenmeier, Kee, Kelly, King of California, Kirwan, Kluczynski, Lankford, Leggett, Lesinski, Libonati, Lindsay, Long of Maryland, McDowell, McFall, Macdonald, Madden, Mahon, Mailliard, Martin of Massachusetts, Mathias, Matsunaga, Miller of California, Mills, Minish, Monagan, Moorhead, Morgan, Morris, Morrison, Morse, Moss, Multer, Murphy of Illinois, Murray, Natcher, Nix, O'Hara of Illinois, O'Hara of Michigan, Olsen of Montana, Olson of Minnesota, O'Neill, Passman, Patman, Patten, Pepper, Perkins, Philbin, Poage, Powell, Price, Pucinski, Purcell, Randall, Reuss, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Rivers of Alaska, Roberts of Alabama, Rodino, Rogers of Colorado, Rooney of New York, Rosenthal, Rostenkowski, Roybal, Ryan of Michigan, Ryan of New York, St Germain, St. Onge, Sheppard, Shipley, Sickles, Slack, Smith of Iowa, Staebler, Steed, Stratton, Stubblefield, Thomas, Thompson of Louisiana, Thompson of New Jersey, Thornberry, Toll, Udall, Van Deerlin, Vanik, Vinson, Watts, Weltner, White, Wickersham, Willis, Wilson, Charles H., Wright, Young, Zablocki.

Answered "present"—1: Keogh.

Not voting—46: Avery, Becker, Belcher, Bray, Burke, Burkhalter, Cederberg, Cohelan, Derwinski, Ellsworth, Evins, Grant, Green of Pennsylvania, Griffiths, Hagan of Georgia, Hansen, Hébert, Henderson, Hoffman, Laird, Landrum, Miller of New York, Milliken, Murphy of New York, Nedzi, O'Brien of Illinois, Osmers, Pilcher, Pillion, Rains, Riehlman, Rooney of Pennsylvania, Roosevelt, Roush, Shelley, Short, Sisk, Staggers, Sullivan, Thompson of Texas, Trimble, Tupper, Ullman, Van Pelt, Wilson, Bob, Younger.

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I also point out—I shall not debate the bill now, because time for that is reserved for tomorrow, with 1 hour to each side—that other aspects of credit are now being sought by the Communist nations, for purposes which have nothing, even remotely, to do with agricultural products—purposes ranging all the way from alcohol for the vodka the Russian Government wishes to provide for the citizens of Moscow to a new plea for an amount of credit which might run into billions of dollars, because Khrushchev has said he is desirous of establishing a $46 billion chemical industry in Russia, part of which will be used to produce fertilizers to be placed on Russian fields, to expand the Russian production of agricultural products—so Khrushchev says—twofold, and it may be threefold. If that happened, it would mean that the U.S. taxpayers would be providing Russia with credit with which to obtain fertilizers with which to increase the Russian production of agricultural commodities which Russia then would be able to export. I point out that if we were to vote to extend that credit, we would be voting to help to drive a new knife into the backs of the American producers of agricultural commodities.

Furthermore, part of that aid could be used by Russia to obtain materials for warfare, because militarism is still a part of the Communist creed.

Khrushchev has said he is willing to purchase these chemicals and materials from U.S. firms; he says he is willing to provide the U.S. shopkeepers with a profit. But he says he wants to make those purchases on credit issued by the U.S. Government. So, Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will be dealing with that matter.

At this time I wish to attempt to straighten out the understanding of the legislative pattern. I believe the majority leader will not move, this time, that the motion be laid on the table.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They say the third time is the charm. On tomorrow, I will not move that the proposal be tabled.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well. Then, Mr. President, tomorrow we shall have a straightforward, up or down, adopt or reject, vote on the merits of the issue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have no choice.

Mr. MUNDT. So there will be no dodging; tomorrow, the issue will be this: Where do Senators stand—for or against the pledging of the honor and the credit of the taxpayers of the United States behind the Soviet Communist dictators who are trying to utilize the credit of the U.S. Government?

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS ACT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I renew my motion that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1756, to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alaska.

The motion was agreed to.

HEARINGS ON AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION QUOTA SYSTEM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, those of us looking to serious consideration of proposals for the ultimate reform of this country's immigration legislation were gratified by the announcement by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], that on January 13, 1964, hearings will be opened by the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee on two bills—Senate bill 1932, which reflects the recommendation by the late President Kennedy; and Senate bill 747, which was introduced by me prior to the immigration message of the late President Kennedy.

Two days of hearings—January 13 and January 14—will be conducted by the subcommittee. The purpose of the hearings will be to provide an opportunity for sponsors of pending immigration legislation to be heard. Later, there will be scheduled, I announce, hearings at which to hear from interested organizations and Government agencies—in addition, of course, to any persons or groups who may wish to oppose such proposed legislation.

I am delighted to know that this proposed legislation will get off to an early start in the next session. This will be the first time Congress has held hearings on our immigration policy since those on the Immigration Act of 1952. It is certainly time that we reconsidered our policy, in light of our new emphasis on the individual dignity of man.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a message sent by President Johnson to the American Committee for Italian Immigration, at its December 12 meeting in Chicago, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

December 12, 1963.

I am pleased to extend through Senator Douglas my best wishes to those attending the rally of the American Committee for Italian Migration. President Kennedy transmitted to the Congress legislation to revise and moderize our immigation laws. There is no consistency in an American policy that both recognizes equality among peoples and capriciously bars immigration from countries of southern Europe. Each person seeking admission to the United States should be judged on the basis of his personal qualities and skills and special consideration should be given to the reuniting of families.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I commend the Senator from Michigan for the initiative in proceeding with these hearings; they are very important. As he knows, many of us have been attempting to obtain action in this field for many years. The hearings have now been scheduled; and I express the hope that at the next session we shall be able to pass a bill in this area which will be meaningful. Certainly there is an urgent need for action by the Congress in this field.

The bill sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, which I and a number of other Senators have joined in sponsoring is a fine vehicle for proceeding with these deliberations. It offers an excellent opportunity for meaningful reform of our immigration procedures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on Sunday, I had the privilege of being the principal speaker at a very large mass meeting in Chicago, conducted by the committee on Italian immigration. It was attended by close to 5,000 persons. The sentiment in favor of Senate bill 1932 was strong; and resolutions— which later I shall ask to have printed in the Record—were adopted. I think there is no doubt that popular interest in support of this measure is rising very rapidly.

Mr. HART. And understanding is important.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is.

Mr. HART. To eliminate it from the scare charges.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY MEMORIAL CENTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 765, Senate Joint Resolution 136.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 136) to provide for the renaming of the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center, and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

Whereas the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy served with distinction as President of the United States, and as a Member of the Senate and House of Representatives; and

Whereas the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy dedicated his life to the advancement of the welfare of mankind; and

Whereas the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy was particularly devoted to the advancement of the performing arts within the United States; and

Whereas by his untimely death this Nation and the world has suffered a great loss; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Congress that it is only fitting and proper that a suitable monument be dedicated to the memory of this great leader; and

Whereas the living memorial to be named in his honor by this joint resolution shall be the national monument to his memory within the city of Washington and its environs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the National Cultural Center Act (Public Law 85–874; 72 Stat. 1698) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 1 by striking out "National Cultural Center Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "John F. Kennedy Center Act";

(2) By striking out "National Cultural Center" each place that it appears in such Act (including the title of such Act but excluding clauses (2) and (3) of subsection (b) of section 2 of such Act) and inserting in lieu thereof at each such place the following: "John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts";

(3) In section 4—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3),

(B) by striking out "Cultural Center." in paragraph (4) of section 4 of such Act and inserting in lieu thereof "John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts,", and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(5) provide within the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts a suitable memorial in honor of the late President."

(4) In subsection (c) of section 6 of such Act by inserting immediately after "Smithsonian Institution" the following: "and to Congress";

(5) By adding at the end of section 6 the following new subsection:

"(d) The Board shall transmit to Congress a detailed report of any memorial which it proposes to provide within the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts under authority of paragraph (5) of section 4 of this Act, and no such memorial shall be provided until the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution shall have approved such memorial."; and

(6) By adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Appropriations

"Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board for use in accordance with this Act, amounts which in the aggregate will equal gifts, bequests, and devises of money, securities, and other property, held by the Board under this Act, except that not to exceed $15,500,000 shall be appropriated pursuant to this section.

"Borrowing Authority

"Sec. 9. To finance necessary parking facilities for the Center, the Board may issue revenue bonds to the Secretary of the Treasury payable from revenues accruing to the Board. The total face value of all bonds so issued shall not be greater than $15,400,000. The interest payments on such bonds may be deferred with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury but any interest payments so deferred shall themselves bear interest after June 30, 1972. Deferred interest may not be charged against the debt limitation of $15,400,000. Such obligations shall have maturities agreed upon by the Board and the Secretary of the Treasury but not in excess of fifty years. Such obligations

may be redeemable at the option of the Board before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations, but the obligations thus redeemed shall not be refinanced by the Board. Each such obligation shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on current marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligations of the Board. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any obligations of the Board to be issued under this section and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Board's obligations under this section.

"GIFTS TO UNITED STATES

"SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States any gift to the United States which he finds has been contributed in honor of or in memory of the late President John F. Kennedy and to pay the money to such appropriation or other accounts, including the appropriation accounts established pursuant to appropriations authorized by this Act, as in his judgment will best effectuate the intent of the donor.

"NATIONAL MEMORIAL

"SEC. 11. The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, designated by this Act, shall be the national memorial to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy within the city of Washington and its environs."

SEC. 2. In addition to the amendments made by the first section of this Act, any designation or reference to the National Cultural Center in any other law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be held to designate or refer to such Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Public Works held joint hearings with the House Committee on Public Works on this measure.

The language which has been substituted for the original text of Senate Joint Resolution 136 was worked out in discussions with the House committee and is virtually identical to the measure reported favorably by that committee on Tuesday.

On behalf of the Senate committee and the 51 Senate sponsors of this joint resolution, I urge favorable consideration.

Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 136, as amended, would provide for the renaming of the National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

In addition, it would authorize a maximum Federal appropriation of $15.5 million to match dollar-for-dollar contributions collected by the board of trustees for construction of the Center superstructure.

Further, the amended joint resolution would provide borrowing authority not to exceed $15.4 million for the construction of parking facilities at the Center.

These are the major amendments made by the Senate Committee on Public Works in unanimously reporting the resolution to the Senate.

Mr. President, following the sudden and shocking death of President John F. Kennedy, there were many ideas proposed to memorialize our late leader.

It is noteworthy, I think, that a consensus of opinion quickly formed behind the proposal to name the new Cultural Center after the late President.

This was considered most appropriate due to the personal interest in the arts that President Kennedy demonstrated throughout his all-too-short tenure in our Nation's highest office.

This interest had focused in large measure on the proposed National Cultural Center, and he was instrumental in acquiring broad support for that project.

The fact that the Center was already well advanced seemed to make it a particularly appropriate answer to the many demands for a Kennedy memorial.

The proposed Center, as envisioned by this resolution, would be a lasting monument to the late President.

But it would be a living monument, one in almost constant use here in the Nation's Capital, where its benefits could be enjoyed by millions of residents and visitors.

And, certainly, it would contribute to the advancement of the arts so keenly desired by President Kennedy.

This proposal has the full endorsement of President Johnson and his administration.

In a letter addressed to me as chairman of the Senate committee, President Johnson wrote:

> It seems to me that a center for the performing arts on the beautiful site selected would be one of the most appropriate memorials that a grateful Nation could establish to honor a man who had such deep and abiding convictions about the importance of cultural activities in our national life.

President Johnson also stated:

> That the Federal Government should participate in this undertaking by providing funds to match the contributions which already have been made and will be made in the future by people throughout this Nation and the world is entirely fitting.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], for the way in which he has handled the proposed legislation. It has been expeditiously handled. I believe it is unprecedented. The joint meeting of the Committee on Public Works of the House and the committee of which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] is chairman has done an outstanding job in promoting the proposed legislation. I believe it is a wonderful step forward in the creation of this badly needed facility for our city. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Michigan for the way he has handled it. I believe it is now off the ground, and I am hopeful the Center will be built in our lifetime.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his remarks.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, shall it pass?

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 136) was passed.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the joint resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution providing for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes."

The preamble was agreed to.

HEARINGS ON AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION QUOTA SYSTEM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to identify myself with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] in the expectation of hearings on the immigration bill, of which I am also a cosponsor, and in which I am deeply interested, because I believe it is of major national importance.

I hail the advent of these hearings and shall participate in them. I congratulate the Senator from Michigan in working out the arrangements. It is a major public effort which I hope will come to fruition.

MAJOR LOOPHOLES AND TRUCKHOLES IN OUR TAX LAWS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, over the past few weeks I have made a number of short speeches, usually at the end of the day, on some of the major loopholes and truckholes in our tax laws.

I first gave examples of 20 taxpayers with incomes of $500,000 or more per year who paid no taxes at all. Five of them had annual incomes of over $5 million. I then gave six examples of individual oil operators with incomes in excess of $1 million a year who paid either no taxes or a very small proportion of their income in taxes.

On Friday of last week I gave examples from Fortune magazine of the large oil companies in the country and the estimated depletion allowances which they take per year.

Over the years I have also been collecting some facts and figures on the taxes paid, on the whole, by the smaller oil and gas producing companies. I have collected figures on some 28 companies of the amount they have paid in income taxes and the percentage these taxes were of their income before taxes. These figures run back to 1945, and therefore cover a span of 18 years.

We all know that since World War II corporate taxes have been in the neighborhood of 47 to 52 percent of net profits. However, the oil and gas companies have paid taxes at a much lower rate compared with the other corporations.

The companies for which I have collected records are, on the whole, smaller companies and entirely producing companies. It has been difficult in the past to distinguish the income the integrated companies receive from the production of oil and gas, from the income they also receive from refining, distribution, and other activities. But Fortune magazine overcame that difficulty last spring in their April issue and published their results a few days ago.

I am calling these 28 companies company A, company B, company C, and so forth. I want to make it clear in all probability that they have done nothing illegal, and since it is the principle that I want to talk about, I do not want to condemn them as companies. So, while this information is in the public domain and is readily available to anyone who wants to go to Moody's Manual, I have nonetheless on principle referred to them anonymously. I want to condemn the sin, not the sinner. These companies are merely taking what the law allows them to take, and so I do not want to go after them individually.

However, I do know the names of these companies and if anyone has any doubts about the authenticity of the figures, I will supply them with the code which identifies the company. I prefer, however, not to do so unless I am challenged on their authenticity by a fellow Senator, or by the public.

My purpose is, then, to illustrate the effects of the great many legal tax avoidance provisions of the code which result in the very low percentage of taxes which these companies actually pay.

HOW IT IS DONE

There are several provisions in the tax law which makes it possible for these companies to pay such a low percentage of their income in income taxes. The first is the notorious percentage depletion allowance of 27½ percent of gross income up to 50 percent of net income. This provision is in addition to ordinary depreciation and other legitimate expenses of a business which can properly be deducted, and it is in addition to the writeoffs for dry holes or losses which are, of course, proper deductions.

However, percentage depletion runs in perpetuity as long as the oil well is producing and the costs of the oil wells are often recovered 5, 10, 15, and even 20 or more times.

The second method by which oil and gas companies pay such low taxes is what is called the intangible drilling and development cost deduction. If an ordinary corporation builds a building or buys machinery, or makes an investment, the cost of the investment is generally depreciated over the life of the property—usually 20 years.

The labor costs, the power costs, the raw material costs, the bricks and mortar, and all the ingredients which go into producing an asset are capitalized and depreciated over time.

But in the case of the oil industry, from 70 to 90 percent of these costs, which in other industries could only be recovered over the life of the property, are written off or "expensed"—as it is put—in the first year.

The third method by which the oil and gas industry is able to pay such low income taxes is the 14-point Western Hemisphere deduction. Even after all these other deductions are taken and the taxable income is arrived at, if the property is located in Venezuela, or Canada, or Mexico, or some other Western Hemisphere country, instead of paying a tax of 52 percent on what remains, a tax of only 38 percent is applied.

This is not unique to the oil industry, but they are one of the biggest users of this special tax privilege.

A fourth method by which the oil companies pay such small taxes is the fact that payments of royalties abroad are allowed to be offset against the actual taxes owed at home by the corporation. In other words, payments to a Middle Eastern potentate—a sheik, a king, a ruler—in the form of royalties, and which most businesses making similar kinds of payments would merely be allowed to deduct as an ordinary expense, are called taxes and reduce dollar for dollar the amount of taxes which the company would otherwise owe.

There are, of course, other provisions in the tax laws which also help to bring these results which are not necessarily unique to the oil industry, such as the various capital gains provisions in the tax law, the loss carryover provision, and so forth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the tabulations of these 28 companies be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Income taxes paid by 28 oil and gas companies

COMPANY A

[Data through 1962, if available]

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$34,804,282	$1,294,000	$33,510,282	3.72
1961	28,824,114	250,000	28,574,114	.87
1960	27,768,929	200,000	27,568,929	.72
1959	24,122,835	100,000	24,022,835	.41
1958	23,270,135	785,000	22,485,135	3.37
1957	35,208,979	5,260,000	29,948,979	14.94
1956	29,523,395	3,024,000	26,499,395	10.24
1955	28,143,673	2,780,000	25,363,673	9.88
1954	21,029,684	1,252,000	19,777,648	5.95
1953	18,812,590	367,000	18,445,590	1.95
1952	16,550,361	654,000	15,896,361	3.95
1951	17,369,652	1,073,000	16,296,652	6.17
1950	18,467,607	3,068,000	15,399,607	16.61
1949	14,759,193	375,000	14,384,193	2.54
1948	27,367,252	4,725,000	22,642,252	17.27
1947	17,749,626	2,830,000	14,919,626	15.94
1946	10,130,975	1,275,000	8,855,975	12.59
1945	5,611,770	215,000	5,396,770	3.83

NOTE.—"Income taxes" also include State and/or foreign taxes.

Income taxes paid by 28 oil and gas companies—Continued

COMPANY B

[Liquidated Apr. 1, 1961]

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1960	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
1959	$7,799,592	$915,000	$6,884,592	11.73
1958	4,371,094	525,000	3,846,094	12.01
1957	5,392,505	150,000	5,242,505	2.78
1956	6,975,382	1,095,000	5,880,382	15.70
1955	5,975,382	485,000	4,965,220	9.90
1954	3,291,733	38,172	3,253,561	1.16
1953	5,594,074	1,552,500	4,441,574	27.75
1952	4,436,030	669,500	3,766,530	15.09
1951	5,561,770	714,880	4,846,890	12.85
1950	5,709,537	1,023,900	4,685,637	17.93
1949	3,259,928	163,040	3,096,888	5.00
1948	6,295,858	898,900	5,396,958	14.28
1947	4,011,073	1,023,126	2,987,947	25.51
1946	2,089,932	417,000	1,672,932	19.95
1945	2,321,605	205,908	2,115,697	8.87

[1] Not available.

NOTE.—"Income taxes" may also include State and/or foreign taxes.

COMPANY C

[Acquired by company B-Z, Dec. 22, 1961]

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1960	$5,548,693	$658,022	$4,890,671	11.86
1959	4,378,649	1,061	4,377,588	.02
1958	5,402,894	481,413	4,921,481	8.91
1957	5,561,652	640,635	4,921,017	11.52
1956	4,770,495	261,837	4,508,658	5.49
1955	4,826,687	417,388	4,409,299	8.65
1954	4,625,759	336,889	4,288,870	7.28
1953	4,391,404	179,114	4,212,290	4.08
1952	3,588,107	91,660	3,496,447	2.55
1951	3,934,107	399,397	3,534,710	10.15
1950	3,696,584	847,072	2,849,412	22.91
1949	3,373,448	679,553	2,693,895	20.14
1948	4,542,842	982,540	3,560,302	21.63
1947	2,284,109	529,781	1,754,328	23.19
1946	161,816	212	161,604	.13
1945	33,895	256	33,639	.76

NOTE.—"Income taxes" may also include State and/or oreign taxes.

COMPANY D

[Sold and liquidated]

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1960	($623,758)	0	($623,758)	--------
1959	(35,226)	[1] ($20,347)	(14,879)	--------
1958	156,130	0	156,130	0
1957	271,515	5,000	266,515	1.84
1956	472,556	35,000	437,556	7.41
1955	549,093	15,000	534,093	2.73
1954	309,405	------------	309,405	--------
1953	303,453	11,332	292,121	3.73
1952	159,084	25,686	133,398	16.15
1951	415,948	8,234	407,714	1.98
1950	277,514	1,500	276,014	.54
1949	177,187	1,000	176,187	.56
1948	526,061	35,000	491,061	6.65
1947	399,643	52,000	347,643	13.01
1946	139,923	1,000	138,923	.71
1945	140,101	1,500	138,601	1.07

[1] Credit.

NOTE.—"Income taxes" may also include State and/or foreign taxes.

Income taxes paid by 28 oil and gas companies—Continued

COMPANY E

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$12,040,753	$2,350,000	$9,690,753	19.52
1961	11,794,460	2,500,000	9,294,460	21.20
1960	11,156,510	2,000,000	9,156,510	17.93
1959	9,497,890	950,000	8,547,890	10.00
1958	8,108,706	800,000	7,308,706	9.87
1957	11,303,747	1,600,000	9,703,747	14.15
1956	11,379,241	1,900,000	9,479,241	16.69
1955	8,509,136	1,500,000	7,009,136	17.63
1954	5,320,750	----------	5,320,750	--------
1953	6,420,968	1,048,000	5,372,968	16.32
1952	5,601,723	1,400,000	4,201,723	24.50
1951	5,866,052	2,000,000	3,866,052	34.09
1950	4,951,476	1,500,000	3,451,476	30.29
1949	4,928,459	1,020,000	3,908,459	20.70
1948	5,766,543	960,000	4,806,543	16.65
1947	3,650,374	600,000	3,050,374	16.44
1946	3,248,813	200,000	3,048,813	6.16

NOTE.—"Income taxes" include Federal taxes only.

COMPANY F

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$69,483,631	$407,000	$69,076,631	0.59
1961	67,544,853	3,018,000	64,526,853	4.47
1960	70,832,501	9,600,000	61,232,501	13.55
1959	78,177,550	17,905,500	60,272,050	22.90
1958	54,865,371	7,400,000	47,465,371	13.49
1957	51,273,749	4,550,000	46,723,749	8.87
1956	67,517,000	15,700,000	51,817,000	23.25
1955	56,259,000	9,900,000	46,359,000	17.60
1954	50,383,000	8,700,000	41,683,000	17.27
1953	55,775,000	14,900,000	40,875,000	26.71
1952	52,488,000	14,400,000	38,088,000	27.43
1951	58,593,000	17,300,000	41,293,000	29.53
1950	57,407,000	15,000,000	42,407,000	26.13
1949	46,487,000	10,390,000	36,097,000	22.35
1948	74,080,000	19,863,000	54,217,000	26.81
1947	40,655,000	9,298,000	31,357,000	22.87
1946	22,599,000	3,585,000	19,014,000	15.86
1945	16,371,700	1,228,000	15,143,000	7.50

NOTE.—"Income taxes" include Federal taxes only.

COMPANY G

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$1,134,525	$313,524	$821,001	27.63
1961	1,408,071	624,112	783,959	44.32
1960	859,517	85,000	774,517	9.89
1959	865,330	105,000	760,330	12.13
1958	804,716	50,000	754,716	6.21
1957	1,167,546	115,000	1,052,546	9.85
1956	560,753	----------	560,753	--------
1955	832,765	----------	832,765	--------
1954	785,624	----------	785,624	--------
1953	730,699	----------	730,699	--------
1952	968,287	69,022	899,265	7.13
1951	935,134	137,220	797,914	14.67
1950	892,552	147,275	745,277	16.50
1949	969,991	204,860	765,131	21.12
1948	872,719	150,367	722,352	17.23
1947	654,922	160,452	494,470	24.45
1946	471,923	135,664	336,259	28.75
1945	461,448	180,808	280,640	39.18

NOTE.—"Income taxes" may also include State and/or foreign taxes.

Income taxes paid by 28 oil and gas companies—Continued

COMPANY H

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$1,902,482	0	$1,902,482	0
1961	1,784,566	[1] ($120,000)	1,904,566	--------
1960	2,021,545	55,000	1,966,545	2.72
1959	2,022,351	30,000	1,992,351	1.48
1958	1,760,794	0	1,760,794	0
1957	2,176,226	160,000	2,016,226	7.35
1956	2,647,058	93,000	2,554,058	3.51
1955	1,994,072	86,000	1,908,072	4.31
1954	2,276,415	238,329	2,038,086	10.47
1953	1,899,343	156,039	1,743,304	8.22
1952	1,998,758	370,291	1,628,467	18.53
1951	1,992,234	411,166	1,581,068	20.64
1950	1,270,271	72,843	1,197,428	5.73

[1] Credit.

NOTE.—"Income taxes" include Federal taxes only.

COMPANY I

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$6,633,096	$107,906	$6,525,190	1.63
1961	4,166,438	64,355	4,102,083	1.54
1960	2,260,728	65,000	2,195,728	2.88
1959	6,696,047	40,000	6,656,047	.60
1958 [1]	7,076,455	[2] (23,352)	7,099,807	--------
1957	9,079,022	[2] (5,860)	9,084,882	--------
1956	8,886,172	151,000	8,735,172	1.69
1955	8,106,746	429,075	7,677,671	5.29
1954	6,769,145	196,335	6,572,810	2.90
1953	5,414,063	26,156	5,387,807	.48
1952	5,067,243	410,539	4,656,704	8.10
1951	4,477,673	404	4,477,269	.01
1950	3,456,001	202,087	3,253,914	5.85
1949	2,949,585	72,628	2,876,957	2.46
1948	2,774,079	201,176	2,572,903	7.25
1947	3,172,001	504,487	2,667,514	15.90
1946	755,220	258,488	496,732	34.23
1945	102,860	65,966	368,946	64.13

[1] 12 months ended June 30.

[2] Credit.

NOTE.—In total analysis 1956 equals 1957 on this company, etc. "Income taxes" may also include State and/or Federal taxes.

COMPANY J

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$2,556,000	0	$2,556,000	0
1961	3,176,000	$25,000	3,151,000	.79
1960	1,816,000	[1] (400,000)	2,216,000	--------
1959	3,517,000	150,000	3,367,000	4.26
1958	2,950,700	90,000	2,860,700	3.05
1957	3,154,900	20,000	3,134,900	.63
1956	3,168,549	75,000	3,093,549	2.37
1955	3,656,274	150,000	3,506,274	4.10
1954	3,570,162	360,000	3,210,162	10.08
1953	3,363,964	500,000	2,863,964	14.86
1952	2,561,162	267,461	2,293,701	10.44
1951	3,971,370	965,230	3,006,140	24.30
1950	2,302,729	519,263	1,783,466	22.55
1949	1,551,586	104,000	1,447,586	6.70
1948	1,344,021	150,000	1,194,021	11.16
1947	1,230,364	50,000	730,364	4.06
1946	409,171	----------	409,171	--------
1945	328,260	----------	328,260	--------

[1] Credit.

NOTE.—"Income taxes" may also include State and/or Federal taxes.

Income taxes paid by 28 oil and gas companies—Continued

COMPANY K

[Assets sold in October 1961]

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1960	$12,062,758	$1,700,000	$10,362,758	14.09
1959	14,594,387	1,700,000	12,894,387	11.65
1958	14,145,331	2,300,000	11,845,331	16.26
1957	17,938,378	3,400,000	14,538,378	18.95
1956	16,316,268	2,500,000	13,816,268	15.32
1955	15,599,264	1,900,000	13,699,264	12.18
1954	11,541,464	1,278,154	10,263,310	10.01
1953	11,762,519	1,590,080	10,172,439	13.52
1952	9,218,224	1,875,000	7,343,224	20.34
1951	10,327,002	2,400,000	7,927,002	23.24
1950	8,723,484	2,000,000	6,723,484	22.93
1949	8,716,231	1,800,000	6,916,231	20.65
1948	17,245,547	4,000,000	13,245,547	23.19
1947	9,301,386	2,300,000	7,001,386	24.73
1946	5,321,560	1,010,000	4,311,560	18.98
1945	4,235,097	257,000	3,978,097	6.07

Note.—"Income taxes" include Federal taxes only.

COMPANY L

[Liquidated Apr. 11, 1957]

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1954	$7,762,785	$1,275,000	$6,487,785	16.42
1953	8,494,844	1,785,000	6,709,844	21.01
1952	7,844,057	1,500,000	6,344,057	19.12
1951	8,553,640	1,500,000	7,053,640	17.54
1950	8,086,702	1,983,000	6,103,702	24.52
1949	7,805,345	1,900,000	5,905,345	24.34
1948	7,512,733	1,726,006	5,786,727	22.97
1947	7,667,536	1,575,000	6,092,536	20.54
1946	5,146,094	1,100,000	4,046,094	21.38
1945	3,209,359	831,500	2,377,859	25.91
1944	3,519,208	1,068,760	2,450,448	30.37

COMPANY M

[Merged on Dec. 1, 1959; the following data are for parent company and include Company M]

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$848,903,000	$8,000,000	$840,903,000	0.94
1961	814,083,000	56,000,000	758,083,000	6.88
1960	735,573,000	47,000,000	688,573,000	6.39
1959	708,778,000	79,000,000	629,778,000	11.15
1958	573,475,000	11,000,000	562,475,000	1.92
1957	857,178,000	52,000,000	805,178,000	6.07
1956	925,534,919	117,000,000	808,534,919	12.64
1955	824,309,992	115,000,000	709,309,992	13.95
1954	680,793,158	96,000,000	584,793,158	14.10
1953	714,825,969	162,000,000	552,825,969	22.66
1952	653,981,109	134,000,000	519,981,109	20.49
1951	695,460,779	167,000,000	528,460,779	24.01
1950	501,223,223	93,000,000	408,223,223	18.55
1949	316,869,501	48,000,000	268,869,501	15.15
1948	452,604,976	87,000,000	365,604,976	19.22
1947	327,626,580	59,000,000	268,626,580	18.01
1946	201,609,931	24,000,000	177,609,931	11.90
1945	179,156,196	25,000,000	154,156,196	13.95

NOTE.—"Income taxes" include Federal taxes only.

Income taxes paid by 28 oil and gas companies—Continued

COMPANY M

[Before merger]

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1958	$512,543,223	$16,000,000	$136,543,223	10.49
1957	192,910,393	17,000,000	175,910,393	8.81
1956	212,961,000	34,000,000	178,961,000	15.97
1955	215,997,000	41,000,000	174,997,000	18.98
1954	174,803,000	28,500,000	146,303,000	16.30
1953	207,757,854	43,500,000	164,257,854	20.94
1952	175,792,000	30,500,000	145,292,000	14.68
1951	220,981,000	51,500,000	169,481,000	23.30
1950	161,360,000	32,000,000	129,360,000	19.83
1949	138,480,000	18,000,000	120,480,000	13.00
1948	240,069,000	54,000,000	186,069,000	22.49
1947	153,207,000	29,100,000	124,107,000	18.99
1946	79,332,000	7,500,000	71,832,000	9.45
1945	80,395,000	9,500,000	70,895,000	11.82

COMPANY N

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$19,507,764	$2,473,500	$17,034,264	12.68
1961	21,464,125	4,461,000	17,003,125	20.78
1960	10,600,457	3,313,000	7,287,457	31.25
1959	6,548,745	675,415	5,873,330	10.31
1958	5,378,973	0	5,378,973	0
1957	7,972,558	1,727,910	6,244,648	21.67
1956	5,378,994	699,000	4,679,994	13.00
1955	2,502,867	18,000	2,484,867	.72
1954	1,603,682	23,923	1,579,759	1.49
1953	3,077,447	4,724	3,072,723	.15
1952	2,334,532	99,844	2,234,688	4.28
1951	1,209,045	31,250	1,177,795	2.58
1950	282,202	49,750	232,452	17.63
1949	1,225,576	6,949	1,218,627	.57
1948	1,395,517	29,053	1,366,464	2.08
1947	359,903	15,000	344,903	4.17
1946	[2] 106,098	200	[2] 106,298	--------
1945	1,537,551	406,500	1,131,051	26.44

[1] 12 months ended June 30.
[2] Deficit.

NOTE.—In total analysis, 1956=1957 on this company, etc. "Income taxes" also include State and foreign taxes.

COMPANY O

[Merged July 31, 1959]

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1958	(1)	(1)	(1)	--------
1957	$1,573,165	------------	$1,573,165	--------
1956	1,034,094	(2)	1,034,094	--------
1955	1,006,718	(2)	1,006,718	--------
1954	1,690,567	$42,130	1,648,437	2.49
1953	1,873,226	50,000	1,823,226	2.67
1952	1,502,077	40,000	1,462,077	2.66
1951	2,714,277	30,000	2,684,227	1.11
1950	2,692,947	40,000	2,652,947	1.49
1949	3,382,140	42,323	3,382,140	1.25
1948	4,236,057	348,900	3,887,157	8.24
1947	1,517,480	48,919	1,468,561	3.22
1946 [3]	689,609	10,241	679,368	1.52
1945 [3]	664,526	4,103	660,423	.62
1954 [3]	2,205,837	42,130	2,163,707	1.91
1953 [3]	2,600,271	50,000	2,550,271	1.92
1952 [3]	2,202,835	40,000	2,162,835	1.81
1951 [3]	2,623,191	30,000	2,593,191	1.14
1950 [3]	3,744,852	40,000	3,704,852	1.01
1949 [3]	4,158,672	42,322	4,116,350	1.00
1948 [3]	4,353,435	348,900	4,004,535	8.01

[1] Not available.
[2] Not reported.
[3] Figures for 1954–48 restated as result of revision of estimates of recoverable oil and gas reserves.

NOTE.—Company O felt not liable for Federal income tax in this period.

Income taxes paid by 28 oil and gas companies—Continued

COMPANY P

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$6,137,672	$470,000	$5,667,672	7.66
1961	6,209,027	470,000	5,739,027	7.57
1960	6,449,358	610,000	5,839,358	9.46
1959	6,407,498	590,000	5,817,498	9.21
1958	6,235,363	470,000	5,765,363	7.54
1957	6,611,110	660,000	5,951,110	9.98
1956	6,277,997	478,000	5,799,997	7.61
1955	6,211,916	470,000	5,741,916	7.56
1954	6,209,385	470,000	5,739,385	7.57
1953	6,761,834	515,000	6,246,834	7.62
1952	7,023,582	540,000	6,483,582	7.69
1951	7,008,444	535,000	6,473,444	7.63
1950	6,616,103	415,000	6,201,103	6.27
1949	4,940,029	270,000	4,670,029	5.47
1948	5,679,055	333,000	5,346,055	5.86
1947	2,827,824	159,000	2,668,824	5.62
1946	2,532,718	151,000	2,381,718	5.96
1945	2,522,301	157,075	2,365,226	6.23

NOTE.—"Income taxes" include Federal taxes only.

COMPANY Q

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$24,216,327	$7,380,000	$16,836,327	30.48
1961	19,967,835	6,037,000	13,939,835	30.22
1960	15,026,655	4,205,000	10,821,655	27.98
1959	14,236,083	3,575,000	10,661,083	25.11
1958	16,144,274	3,271,000	12,873,274	20.26
1957	19,137,735	4,500,000	14,637,735	23.51
1956	10,590,947	2,703,000	7,887,947	25.52
1955	13,034,071	1,852,000	11,182,071	14.21
1954	14,484,813	1,967,000	12,517,813	13.58
1953	12,815,586	1,143,000	11,672,586	8.92
1952	9,570,934	602,000	8,968,934	6.29
1951	8,190,680	385,000	7,805,680	4.70
1950	6,263,638	400,000	5,863,638	6.39
1949	5,183,830	210,000	4,973,830	4.05
1948	7,713,057	407,623	7,305,434	5,28
1947	3,896,936	85,000	3,811,936	2.02
1946	1,614,888	65,000	1,549,888	4.02
1945	997,075	40,000	957,075	4.01

NOTE.—"Income taxes" also include State and/or foreign taxes.

COMPANY R

[In process of liquidation]

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1960	($2,845,711)	[1] ($400,000)	($2,445,711)	--------
1959	1,644,843	[1] (540,900)	2,185,743	--------
1958	3,620,312	[1] (968,000)	4,588,312	--------
1957	6,908,969	882,000	6,026,969	12.77
1956	10,595,588	2,640,000	7,955,588	24.92
1955	8,052,718	1,164,559	6,888,159	14.46
1954	8,395,561	1,636,500	6,759,061	19.49
1953	11,536,428	3,477,350	8,059,078	30.14
1952	13,532,095	3,884,000	9,648,095	28.70
1951	14,940,795	4,645,000	10,295,795	30.11
1950	10,850,226	2,351,801	8,498,425	21.68
1949	6,470,610	299,023	6,171,587	4.62
1948	8,229,656	1,635,000	6,594,656	19.87
1947	4,773,864	576,444	4,197,420	12.07
1946	2,475,239	370,000	2,105,239	14.95
1945	1,983,259	252,500	1,730,759	10.27

[1] Credit.

NOTE.—"Income taxes" include Federal taxes only.

Income taxes paid by 28 oil and gas companies—Continued

COMPANY S

[Assets sold to major company and 4 other companies in December 1961. In liquidation]

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1960	$6,379,492	$675,000	$5,704,492	10.58
1959	4,318,985	250,000	4,068,985	5.79
1958 [1]	3,337,324	[2] 236,642	3,100,682	7.09
1957 [1]	4,712,841	330,000	4,382,841	7.00
1957	4,712,841	330,000	4,382,841	7.02
1956	4,060,798	260,000	3,800,798	6.40
1955	4,284,521	220,000	4,064,521	5.13
1954	5,241,179	43,000	5,198,179	.82
1953	5,525,948	583,000	4,942,948	10.55
1952	5,618,762	1,425,000	4,193,762	25.36
1951	5,280,578	964,000	4,316,578	18.26
1950	2,944,322	191,000	2,753,322	6.49
1949	4,736,153	342,000	4,394,153	7.22
1948	4,213,001	266,000	3,947,001	6.31
1947	3,200,034	160,000	3,040,034	4.99
1946	1,809,404	30,000	1,779,404	1.66

[1] 12 months ended June 30.
[2] Includes credit of $171,642 prior years' tax adjustment.

NOTE.—In total analysis 1956=1957 for his company, etc. "Income taxes" may also include State and/or foreign taxes.

COMPANY T

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	($571,641)	0	($571,641)	--------
1961	(89,095)	0	(89,095)	--------
1960	425,933	0	425,933	0
1959	515,400	[1] ($86,814)	602,214	--------
1958	1,011,165	[1] (235,320)	1,246,485	--------
1957	701,822	0	701,822	0
1956	949,659	138,000	811,659	14.53
1955	1,385,335	185,000	1,200,335	13.35
1954	542,208	2,500	539,708	4.61
1953	408,107	------------	408,107	--------
1952	431,569	------------	431,569	--------
1951	273,473	------------	278,473	--------
1950	183,116	5,000	178,116	2.73
1949	[1] 6,000	------------	[1] 6,000	--------

[1] Credit.

NOTE.—"Income taxes" include Federal taxes only.

COMPANY U

[Acquired by major company in June 1958]

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1958	(1)	(1)	(1)	--------
1957	$11,719,324	$560,482	$11,158,842	4.78
1956	9,568,842	200,000	9,368,842	2.09
1955 [2]	9,340,810	900,000	8,440,810	9.64
1954	7,805,307	335,000	7,470,307	4.29
1953	7,140,132	600,000	6,540,132	8.40
1952	7,715,591	1,000,000	6,715,591	12.96
1951	10,239,600	2,900,000	7,396,000	28.32
1950	7,659,000	1,200,000	6,459,000	15.67
1949	6,656,347	875,000	5,781,347	13.15
1948	9,030,713	2,250,000	6,780,713	24.91
1947	7,191,002	1,250,000	5,941,002	17.38
1946	3,400,586	400,000	3,000,586	11.76

[1] Not available.
[2] Restated to conform with accounting practice effective Jan. 1, 1956—method of charging intangible development costs was changed. 1956 net income would have been $1,470,000 less without such change.

Income taxes paid by 28 oil and gas companies—Continued

COMPANY V

[In liquidation]

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1954	$4,173,767	----------	$4,173,767	--------
1953	3,951,367	$350,000	3,601,367	8.86
1952	4,414,623	660,000	3,754,623	14.95
1951	3,112,871	----------	3,112,871	--------
1950	1,904,836	526,000	1,378,836	27.61
1949	[1] 592,448	7,500	584,948	1.26
1948	461,640	2,400	459,240	.52
1947	416,506	4,100	512,406	.98
1946	328,052	11,282	316,770	3.44
1946 [2]	176,841	5,250	171,591	2.97
1945 [2]	298,539	6,127	287,412	2.0

[1] Before $653,408 loss on wells abandoned.

[2] 12 months ended Apr. 30. In 1946, the company changed to a calendar year basis, so 1946 taxes are shown both ways.

COMPANY W

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$23,311,467	$2,496,407	$20,815,060	10.71
1961	26,423,774	5,298,305	21,125,469	20.05
1960	21,478,712	[1] (123,194)	21,601,906	--------
1959	20,164,080	808,150	19,355,930	4.01
1958 [2]	16,726,337	[3] 175,000	16,551,337	1.05
1957 [2]	18,877,389	0	18,877,389	0
1957	18,877,389	----------	18,877,389	--------
1956	5,040,752	----------	[4] 5,040,752	--------
1956 [5]	([6])	----------	([6])	--------
1955	3,395,446	----------	3,395,446	--------
1954	10,260,388	[1] 100,000	10,360,388	([7])
1953	11,500,382	[1] 500,000	12,000,382	([7])
1952	12,100,165	200,000	11,900,165	1.65
1951	15,195,639	1,900,000	13,295,639	12.03
1950	7,128,542	200,000	6,928,542	2.81
1949	7,483,443	200,000	7,283,443	2.67
1948	17,917,474	3,000,000	14,917,474	16.74
1947	5,266,897	400,000	4,866,897	7.59
1946	1,844,156	----------	1,844,156	--------
1945	5,422,254	450,000	4,972,254	8.29

[1] Credit.

[2] 12 months ended Aug. 31.

[3] Foreign income taxes.

[4] Same for both consolidated and company only.

[5] Consolidated.

[6] Same.

[7] Credit taxes.

NOTE.—In total analysis, 1956=1957 on this company, etc. "Income taxes" also include State and/or foreign taxes.

COMPANY X

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$7,152,966	$844,864	$6,308,102	11.81
1961	7,696,827	1,626,142	6,070,685	21.13
1960	5,972,614	1,272,698	4,699,916	21.31
1959	5,194,877	1,006,024	4,188,853	19.37
1958	4,642,978	670,023	3,972,955	14.43
1957	7,670,654	840,709	6,829,945	10.96
1956	6,057,708	400,000	5,657,708	6.60
1955	6,720,029	400,000	6,320,029	5.95
1954	5,245,527	----------	5,245,527	--------
1953	4,470,659	240,000	4,230,659	5.37
1952	3,635,498	450,000	3,185,498	12.38
1951	3,702,765	550,000	3,152,765	14.85
1950	3,770,706	696,200	3,047,506	18.46
1949	4,022,266	640,907	3,381,359	15.93
1948	4,731,952	901,906	3,830,046	19.06
1947	2,940,750	597,621	2,343,129	20.32
1946	1,394,512	163,973	1,230,539	11.75
1945	666,557	----------	666,557	--------

NOTE.—"Income taxes" may also include State and/or foreign taxes.

Income taxes paid by 28 oil and gas companies—Continued

COMPANY Y

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$7,805,736	[1] ($105,074)	$7,910,810	--------
1961	7,272,890	[1] (534,557)	7,807,447	--------
1960	7,664,892	[1] (113,002)	7,777,894	--------
1959	7,196,561	0	7,196,561	0
1958	6,231,481	0	6,231,481	0
1957	7,802,218	570,000	7,232,218	7.31
1956	7,859,694	650,000	7,209,694	8.27
1955	8,449,374	500,000	7,949,374	5.92
1954	8,256,034	400,000	7,856,034	4.85
1953	8,874,068	1,275,000	7,599,068	14.37
1952	8,101,335	1,255,000	6,846,335	15.49
1951	8,009,124	1,185,000	6,824,124	14.79
1950	7,047,367	1,050,000	5,997,367	14.89
1949	7,048,753	710,000	6,338,753	10.07
1948	9,186,038	1,725,000	7,461,038	18.78
1947	4,883,907	760,000	4,123,907	15.56
1946	2,428,249	315,000	2,113,249	12.97
1945	1,934,850	175,000	1,759,850	9.04

[1] Credit.

NOTE.—"Income taxes" include Federal taxes only.

COMPANY Z

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$3,040,880	0	$3,040,880	0
1961	2,841,243	0	2,841,243	0
1960	1,040,237	0	1,040,237	0
1959	2,379,129	0	2,379,129	0
1958	2,065,816	0	2,065,816	0
1957	2,215,290	0	[1] 2,215,290	0
1956 [2]	746,447	----------	746,447	--------
1956 [3]	1,602,988	----------	1,602,988	--------
1955	1,262,177	----------	1,262,177	--------
1954	1,720,086	----------	1,720,086	--------
1953	1,508,988	----------	1,058,988	--------
1952	1,547,048	----------	1,547,048	--------
1951	703,747	----------	703,747	--------
1950	151,488	----------	151,488	--------
1949	154,707	----------	154,707	--------
1948	134,881	----------	134,881	--------

[1] Adjusted.

[2] 7 months ending Dec. 31.

[3] In totals analysis, May 31 ending years used.

NOTE.—Years end May 31 prior to 1957. "Income taxes" include Federal taxes only.

COMPANY A–Z

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$1,222,633	0	$1,222,633	0
1961	880,515	0	880,515	0
1960	839,556	0	839,556	0
1959	982,552	0	982,552	0
1958	909,982	0	909,982	0
1957	891,025	0	891,025	0
1956	783,082	----------	783,082	--------
1955	981,994	----------	981,994	--------
1954	647,516	----------	647,516	--------
1953	1,008,416	$80,000	928,416	7.93
1952	768,664	----------	768,664	--------
1951	1,143,004	283,000	860,004	24.76
1950	969,156	264,774	704,382	27.32
1949	394,227	----------	394,227	--------
1948	874,306	173,000	701,306	19.79
1947	655,289	73,000	582,289	11.14
1946	227,789	----------	227,789	--------
1945	322,232	----------	332,232	--------

NOTE.—"Income taxes" include Federal taxes only.

Income taxes paid by 28 oil and gas companies—Continued

COMPANY B–Z

Year	Net income (loss) before income taxes	Income taxes (credit)	Net income (loss) after income taxes	Percent of income taxes to income before taxes
1962	$46,266,000	0	$46,266,000	0
1961	46,094,000	0	46,094,000	0
1960	45,816,000	[1] ($750,000)	46,566,000	--------
1959	27,526,000	[1] (2,648,000)	30,174,000	--------
1958	29,750,374	[1] (4,074,902)	33,825,276	--------
1957	33,842,149	[1] (1,827,610)	35,669,759	--------
1956	52,638,000	5,481,000	47,157,000	10.41

[1] Credit.

NOTE.—"Income taxes" include Federal taxes only.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask the readers of the RECORD to notice the extraordinarily low percentage of taxes paid compared to net income earned for these companies, when compared with ordinary corporate organizations which pay taxes at rates of from 47 to 52 percent.

LIMITATION OF CONSENT GRANTED TO FINANCE COMMITTEE TO MEET DURING THE SENATE SESSIONS THURSDAY AND FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege granted to the Finance Committee to meet on Thursday and Friday mornings while the Senate is in session be limited to tomorrow morning and not include Friday morning, if the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE IN RESOURCES OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION — UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed this request with interested Senators as well as with the minority leader.

I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 760, S. 2214, be considered under the same unanimous-consent agreement as that already granted with respect to H.R. 7406, and that consideration of the bill follow consideration of H.R. 7406 on the same basis, as soon as possible thereafter.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Will that be considered ahead of Calendar No. 755?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. H.R. 7406 is scheduled for consideration on January 14 of next year. Calendar No. 758, H.R. 7406, which is to be considered on that day, has a 1-hour limitation on amendments and a 2-hour limitation on the bill.

Mr. KEATING. The present request has nothing to do with Calendar No. 755?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. KEATING. Which will be considered after the Senate finishes foreign aid?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It has nothing at all to do with it.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That following action on H.R. 7406, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 2214) to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

SHIPPING REGULATIONS WITH RESPECT TO CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the new shipping regulations announced with respect to Cuba are a step in the right direction. For too long we have taken the view that if one ship trades with Cuba, no other ship of the same owner or shipping line will be blacklisted by the United States. This regulation, though incomplete, is a definite step toward a broadening of the impact of our boycott of Cuba and may be very useful in cutting down the number of ships that still continue to ply Cuban waters.

Mr. President, the overall review of U.S. policy toward Cuba, including personnel changes, may also be helpful in reducing Castro's economic potential. So far, despite U.S. restrictions, Castro's Cuba has been a beehive of activity, training terrorists, supplying subversives, and working for revolution throughout Latin America.

Mr. President, today Latin America is under a state of siege nearly, if not quite as surely as if Red armies were landing on the beaches, but this siege is sophisticated, subtle, and indirect, employing all the techniques of the modern "cold warrior."

The range and extent of Communist subversive activities in Latin America is so great that the economic base on which the Alliance for Progress hopes to build is being undermined.

The Communist tactics of infiltration and subversion now being used against the Latin American Republics are, in many ways, far more difficult to discover, contain, and combat than outright aggression.

Since the 1920's the Communists have had an organized and well-defined program for takeover in Latin America. In the thirties and forties the southern portion of the Western Hemisphere was divided into three theaters of Communist operation.

Montevideo, Uruguay, was the command post for South America, Mexico City for Central America, and Havana, Cuba, for the Caribbean area. Of these three capitol cities, Havana has had the unique privilege of becoming headquarters for Communist energies in this hemisphere.

The responsibility for letting Castro come to power in Cuba must be shared by both major political parties in the United States. The forces of tyranny which suppressed the Cuban people were able to triumph partly because we ignored for too long the conditions on which communism feeds and festers. That part of the Cuban lesson has been well learned and the Alliance for Progress is a bold response.

But while we plan for the long range development of Latin America, our response to the present dangers must be equally bold or we may find that the base on which we hope to build is no longer there. Communists use many tactics to undermine the political, social, and economic base of a country. These include primarily, first, use of psychological techniques directed at the masses through the printed media, radio, television, and films. Second, recruitment and training of selected individuals to be activists in the Communist cause, with emphasis on teaching Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the techniques of sabotage, espionage, terrorism and guerrilla warfare, and finally, promotion of Communist front organizations and infiltration into nationalist groups originally dedicated to solving the problems of a developing country.

With the establishment of the Castro regime in Cuba, international communism was given a strategic base. From Cuba, all the pressures of subversion could be more effectively applied than they were before. A new and more sinister dimension has been added to Communist activity in this hemisphere.

Last year, for instance, CIA estimates that more than 1,500 Latin Americans were brought to Cuba for training and indoctrination. Even more have taken part in Cuban-sponsored programs this year. The class of 1962 graduated, among its prize pupils, a large group of Venezuelans who returned to Venezuela to organize the terrorist-armed forces of National Liberation.

They tried, unsuccessfully, to prevent the election of a succesor to Romulo Betancourt and to destroy the machinery of free government.

These terrorists have resorted to indiscriminate slaughter. In their attempts to terrorize and panic the populace they would snipe at innocent pedestrians, women and children included. On the night before the election this "liberation" front issued a proclamation warning the people that their lives would be in jeopardy if they dared to vote the next day. It is eloquent testimony to the courage and resolve of the Venezuelan people that more than 90 percent of the electorate cast their ballots despite these threats, and elected the second constitutional President of Venezuela.

The Cuban Government has established a regular educational system for subversives with courses for grade school through graduate studies. There are at least 10 of these "schools for scoundrels" in Cuba, with each center concentrating on a particular phase of Communist training. The La Cubana Fort in Havana is especially for young people. The San Lorenzo School in the Sierra Maestra, is for the training of guerrillas. Many of these schools are manned by Russian instructors, or instructors from other Communist countries.

Fidel Castro has always been interested in education. One of the first things he did as dictator of Cuba was to establish a fellowship program to bring young Latin Americans to Cuba in order to afford them the Communist background he was given as a young man. He has bound hundreds of young people together in a new alliance, an "Alliance for Violence."

There is even a "seminar program" for seasoned activists. This includes meetings and conferences which are designed to bring together Communist agents and sympathizers with varied interests, such as workers, students, artists, athletes, teachers, and so on. It is ironic that one of these conferences was held in November of 1962 on the occasion of Solidarity with Venezuela Week. It is typical of Communist "double think" that they should offer the hand of so-called friendship while they are stabbing a neighbor in the back.

The Communist programs for organizing the cadres of subversion are so extensive that they constitute an allout offensive effort, an underground war.

Our traditional concepts of aggressive action are misleading standards by which to judge and evaluate the threat of subversion from Cuba. There are no armies to be met on the battlefield, there are no ships to be sunk at sea, there are no planes to be shot out of the skies, but there are groups of well-trained well-coordinated, Cuban-based Communist agents spread in weblike fashion throughout South and Latin America and dedicated to the overthrow of constitutional government by the use of force, violence, terror and the perversion of constitutional government to serve their own evil ends.

There are several steps which can and should be taken to reduce the flow of manpower to and from Cuba. We must make it more difficult for agents to utilize Cuba as a staging ground for their activities and as the point of departure for the rest of Latin America. The United States has instituted a ban on travel by most U.S. citizens to Cuba, but this is not the practice of all Latin American countries. What is more, we have had difficulties enforcing our own ban.

Individuals easily get around it by going to a country in which travel to Cuba is permitted and leaving from there. I strongly recommend that we work for international agreements which would enforce travel bans beyond national borders. In other words, each government would observe certain limitations imposed upon travel by other governments.

Most important, however, there is urgent need for something like an Inter-American Subversion Control Board within the Organization of American States to provide a system for the exchange of information on known Communist agents and subversives who travel to Cuba.

INTER-AMERICAN SUBVERSION CONTROL BOARD

As another example of supranational intelligence coordination is the International Criminal Police Organization known as Interpol. This group was organized in 1923, disbanded during the Second World War, and reactivated in 1946. Its membership includes the police bureaus of some 60 member nations. It furnishes member governments with studies, reports, and interchange on the activities of various individuals and groups engaged in international criminal operations.

Interpol deals primarily with international crime such as counterfeiting, smuggling, and narcotics, rather than political sabotage and espionage. It serves as a clearinghouse for the exchange of information and requests of its participating countries.

The purpose of Interpol is to promote the closest possible cooperation between and among the criminal law enforcement agencies of member countries in order to prevent and suppress international crime. This unique organization fills an important gap which exists between the police forces of various nations.

The Interpol home office maintains files on some 120,000 international criminals, and broadcasts crime bulletins over a worldwide network of 21 radio stations. Interpol men themselves never arrest a criminal. Yet the coordinated police effort made possible through their existence has led to the capture of many an international criminal.

In a similar way an Inter-American Subversion Control Board could coordinate the efforts of the police bureaus of the hemisphere to prevent and suppress outside subversion.

There is precedent for the formation of a group such as this. In 1942 Western Hemisphere nations established the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense in order to counteract the efforts of subversive agents of the Axis powers. This committee served as a center to assist member governments in identifying the sources of Nazi propaganda, and subversive activities and helped to develop means of control. We recognized then that this Nation could not be strong anywhere else in the world if we were weak or insecure in this hemisphere. We should recognize a serious similar danger today.

Besides coordinating and pooling information of the various Latin American countries about Communist actions, it could direct the activities of our own security agents in a cooperative effort to arrest, resist, and prevent subversive activities throughout the hemisphere.

The Council of the Organization of American States has already established machinery to keep the council advised of "technical problems in the field." But there is no body specially designated to carry out the recommendations of this group or able to coordinate antisubversion activities. An Inter-American Subversive Control Board would go a long way toward meeting the problems we face in this area.

One of its major tasks could also be to counteract the massive effort being waged by the Communists through propaganda. Propaganda is an essential part of the Communist strategy. It sows seeds of doubt and confusion and exploits the desires of the people to find quick and easy answers to the problems of hunger, poverty, disease, and injustice. The Communist objective is to supplant objective reason with emotional hysteria, political stability with political decay, economic order with economic chaos.

To carry out this objective, the Communists use every medium available for the dissemination of information. Shortwave radio has been the principal device. Radio Havana was established on May 1, 1961, and now broadcasts a total time of 266½ hours per week. With the Soviet, European satellite and Chinese efforts included, total Communist broadcasting to Latin American countries comes to more than 400 hours per week.

A great deal of Communist propaganda also goes out through the printed media. Most of it is smuggled into South America via Cuba. Last October, for instance, a large crate, weighing 1,800 pounds was sent by the Cuban Government to its embassy in Chile labelled "samples of Cuban products and cultural and commercial material." When it was opened by Chilean authorities, the contents turned out to be Cuban propaganda addressed to various Chileans who a few months before visited Cuba. Chile sent a stern protest to Castro over this outrageous violation of the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of another country.

Major instruments for the spread of propaganda are the diplomatic and consular mission of the Cuban Government in particular and all Communist governments in general. They have been publicly unmasked on several occasions. The improper use of diplomatic missions is a serious subversive threat. There are only four countries which still maintain diplomatic relations with Cuba: Brazil, Chile, Uraguay, and Mexico, but the demonstrated ill will of these Cuban missions would give the four countries ample reason to reconsider their policy.

To prevent the abuse of diplomatic privilege by Communists, other nations could strictly limit the movement and circulation of Communist so-called diplomats and restrict them to the same advantages and courtesies offered to our representatives in their countries, which are precious few, to be sure.

Cuba has become the school and printing press for Communists in Latin America. It has also become the bank. It costs money to finance the farflung operations of the Communist Party. The Communists have elaborate means for obtaining funds. For instance, they collect proceeds from social events such as balls, festivals, bazaars, and the like; they demand compulsory contributions; they sell Communist publications; and, the most diabolical method of all, they sell contraband, especially narcotics.

If they can help it, Communists do not dig into the resources of Communist nations but rather they exploit weaknesses of their fellow men to finance the very activities which will keep others weak, poor, and enslaved.

Via Cuba, the Soviet Union can also supply funds directly when necessary. It is even harder to control transfer of funds than any normally clandestine activity. The American republics should coordinate and improve intelligence services to prevent the transfer of funds, which is at the root of subversive activity. An Inter-American Subversion Control Board could certainly play a large part in strengthening the security of the hemisphere and coordinating the isolated efforts of individual countries.

The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance certainly provides for such an action. Under this agreement, known as the Rio Treaty, a country guilty of aggressive intervention in the affairs of a member state can be subjected to far-ranging sanctions, including the use of force. The Organization of American States has already voted to investigate specific charges brought by Venezuela that Cuba smuggled arms to the terrorist Armed Forces of National Liberation. There is clear proof that a large shipment of arms valued at more than $350,000 found on a Venezuelan beach came from Cuba. And, incidentally, for the first time our own Government admits the evidence is conclusive, although, of course, Castro denies it.

We should back Venezuela with real determination, and press for whatever steps are necessary to prevent the continued flagrant violations of the sovereignty of our sister Republics.

This determination was publicly stated more than a year ago when a joint resolution was passed, declaring that:

> The United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere.

At the same time, while we devote every effort to controlling the present activities of Castro in Latin America, we must not forget that the best way to cure the symptoms is to get rid of the disease.

I have long supported economic sanctions against the Castro regime. But economic sanctions can only be effective if they are complete and wholehearted. As I pointed out in September, there is evidence of French commercial interests and activity in Cuba today, as well as British. Moreover, the latest shipping reports show that, on the average, through 1963, more than one ship per day arrived in Cuba registered under the flag of free-world nations. It is our policy and the policy of the free world to weaken the Communist dictatorship in Cuba by denying it access to the industrialized markets of the free world. This policy cannot succeed if our enemies are aided and abetted by our allies. It is increasingly important to tighten the boycott and isolation of Cuba and to discourage our allies, above all, from sales or activities that could strengthen Castro's position and prolong his rule in Cuba.

In Latin America, above all, we must not, by indifference or lack of action, discourage the native desire of Latin America for freedom. We must not by our hesitation allow their desire and capacity for freedom to be weakened. For if it does, our own freedom may die with it.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the recent announcement from the White House that Secretary of the Interior Udall would have responsibility on petroleum policy matters has awakened deep concern once again over the discriminatory policies of oil import restrictions that block modern economic growth and free competition on the east coast.

Restrictions on the importation of vitally needed residual oil are now causing serious hardship on the east coast. There are over 50 million residents in the Atlantic Coastal States. Directly or indirectly, they are being forced to pay higher rates for the energy that they consume because of import restrictions, as well as the impractical and unfair manner in which import allocations are made to the marketers.

I have the fullest sympathy with the problems of West Virginia. These problems have not been caused by residual fuel imports, however, but rather by automation which has reduced the demand for manpower in the production of coal from around 400,000 to the present level of under 170,000 coal miners. Domestic coal has lost some markets in the USA, but this is due to competitive inroads by diesel fuel oil in the case of the railroads and household heating oil in the case of the household consumer.

The solution of the problems of the coal mining industry lies in efforts to solve unemployment by vocational training, relocation of retrained personnel, diversification of industry by attracting new industry into the depressed areas of coal, and, finally, by an all-out program to expand uses of coal exports. The latter is particularly desirable since U.S. coal now can compete in any corner of the free world with foreign-produced coal and every ton of coal shipped out of this country helps our balance of payments.

At the same time, on the east coast, residual fuel oil imports are essential to keep the cost of living down. These imports also play a vital role in keeping our cost of production down to levels that enable us to manufacture goods that can meet competition throughout the world.

These imports also are of vital importance to our friendly ally and neighbor to the south, Venezuela. Venezuela has played a leading role, under the Alliance for Progress, in developing her economy and her social welfare programs. These could not have been accomplished without revenue earned through the sale of oil products to our country. Venezuela is one of our best customers. Many of the dollars earned by selling us residual fuel oil are spent in buying our manufactured goods and agricultural products.

Unjustified controls, as has been proven by every study made by the Federal Government on this subject create a shortage of supply in the New York-New England area. They also create imbalances in the marketplace. Two of the biggest utility companies in the world that play a major role in supplying power to the New York area are now being forced to convert to a more expensive fuel at sizable increases in capital expenditures. This is damaging to the economy of the whole region.

At a time when the Soviets are accelerating their trade programs, we cannot afford to sacrifice the interests of 50 million consumers of energy on the east coast. We cannot afford to sacrifice the interests of the Western Hemisphere by continuing a program of import controls that is forcing the diversion by Government decree from supply sources in the Western Hemisphere to areas that are far removed in other hemispheres.

Mr. President, it is time for the meaningful relaxation of controls urged by the Office of Emergency Planning. It is time to end an anachronism in our economy and a hindrance to industrial and employment growth on the east coast. It is time to restore competition to the fuel supply field and stop penalizing consumers and industries in the Northeast for the development of automation elsewhere.

For that reason, my colleague [Mr. JAVITS] and I addressed a letter to Secretary Udall asking very pointedly for his views on this problem.

THE SOVIET UNION AND ITS DEFENSE BUDGET

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have read with interest the announcement by the Soviet Union which states that it is reducing its defense budget by 4.4 percent next year and that it intends to devote more of its national resources to improving the lot of the civilian consumer through increased production of farm and consumer goods.

This statement of the Soviet Union, of course, leaves many questions yet unanswered. Do we know, for example, whether their concept of a defense budget is the same as ours? How much of their budget for science, for example, includes moneys which we would include in our Defense Department research and development budget?

These are questions which we hope will be answered, rather than reasons for discouragement. But the fact that they have announced a 4.4 percent decrease in their official defense budget is encouraging in itself. We may hope for a continued trend in this direction which in the future will improve the lives of ordinary men, women, and children throughout the world and decrease tensions and lessen the dangers of armed conflict.

We all know how hard President Johnson has been working to cut unnecessary expenditures from our defense budget. We will see the final result of his effort early next year.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Disarming Gesture," as well as an article from the New York Times entitled "Soviet Trims Arms Budget and Some Economic Goals," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

DISARMING GESTURE

The first question to ask about the cuts in military spending and armed forces announced by Mr. Khrushchev is whether there will be any cuts. Unfortunately, the document that might help answer this question is unreliable. This is the official budget, which has far less to do with finances than with the feelings Mr. Khrushchev wishes to project upon the Soviet people and the world beyond.

In respect to his people, Mr. Khrushchev apparently feels confident enough of the current scene to take them off the hook of tension where they have been set for the last few years. The detente is real, he says in effect. This does not mean that he has decided it is safe to disarm. It means he has been able to politically disarm his marshals and militants, who have a vested interest in international tension, and in defense spending.

As for the world beyond, excluding China, detente is the key. What better way to show that the Soviet Union is sincere than by a unilateral gesture toward disarmament, particularly if the gesture is empty or if it merely conceals a further shift from conventional forces to nuclear missiles. The gesture suits the general needs of the day in a world fearful of war and it suits the particular needs of the moment—to sprinkle diversion among NATO, meeting this week in Paris, and to sweeten the 17-nation disarmament conference, meeting next month in Geneva.

If military spending and manpower actually are cut, the Kremlin has plenty of good uses for the savings. The chemical industry is due for a massive boost, mainly to invigorate and stabilize agriculture. The consumer-goods sector and community services can easily sop up every spare kopeck. The experts think, however, that the consumer will get a very small advantage.

Disarmament would make this a safer world but disarmament is not achieved by a Soviet decision to trim fat off an overswollen military budget or to exchange infantry regiments for intercontinental rockets. President Johnson has said that American military spending will decline, too, but, rightly, no one trumpets that as disarmament. What Mr. Khrushchev has done, with a master politician's skill, is to seize a propitious international moment in order to affect—perhaps—some internal changes long overdue.

[From the New York Times]

SOVIET TRIMS ARMS BUDGET AND SOME ECONOMIC GOALS

(By Theodore Shabad)

Moscow, December 16.—The Soviet Government announced today that it planned to reduce its overt defense budget next year by 600 million rubles ($660 million).

The token reduction, which mainly affects the direct cost of maintaining the armed forces, would bring Soviet military expenditures down to the level reached in 1962 as a result of growing East-West tension in the Berlin dispute.

In presenting the budget to the opening session of the Supreme Soviet (Parliament), Finance Minister Vasily F. Garbuzov said the allocation funds were sufficient to "insure the security of the country and of the entire Socialist camp."

WAGE INCREASES DEFERRED

Mr. Garbuzov's report and a 2-year economic plan outlined to the Supreme Soviet by Pyotr F. Lomako, chairman of the State planning committee, gave some indication of how the government proposed to finance the early stages of its ambitious 7-year chemical development program.

An increase in the monthly minimum-wage level to 40 to 45 rubles ($44 to $50), originally planed for 1962, is being delayed until 1965.

The present minimum wage is 27 to 35 rubles ($30 to $39). Under the initial schedule of the current 7-year plan, a minimum of 50 to 60 rubles ($55 to $66) was to have been achieved by 1965.

However, the Government plans to increase the salaries of teachers and physicians, who represent the lowest paid professional people in Soviet society. They earn about 70 to 80 rubles ($77 to $88), substantially less than the average Soviet wage of about 100 rubles ($111) a month.

Although their wages are low by Western standards, Soviet citizens benefit from a range of free services, such as health care, and spend only nominal amounts on rent and transportation.

HOUSING PLAN CUT BACK

The housing program is being cut back by about 17 percent. The 2-year plan provides for the completion of housing for 15 million people compared with the 9 million planned alone for 1963. Actually, the housing program has regularly been underfulfilled in recent years; about 8 million people have been moving to new apartments each year.

Iron and steel production is to be expanded chiefly through plant modernization rather than new plant construction.

Stress to be placed on raising output through improved technology such as the use of natural gas and oxygen to speed the operation of ironmaking blast furnaces and the use of more productive techniques in smelting and casting of steel.

Mr. Lomako's figures also showed that the original 7-year plan, from 1959 to 1965, would be fulfilled in terms of the ruble value of industrial output but not in terms of the actual physical amounts of some major commodities such as natural gas, textiles, and leather shoes.

ARMS BUDGET HURT PLAN

The lag on meeting long-term goals suggested that the plan for the next 2 years had been redesigned not so much because of changes in economic policy emphasizing chemicals but because of shortcomings in fulfilling the initial program.

The increases in the defense budget, which ran at slightly more than 9 billion rubles ($9.9 billion) in the early part of the 7-year plan to the present rate of more than 13 billion rubles ($14.4 billion) a year was undoubtedly a factor contributing to the failure of the plan.

The military expenditures of 13.3 billion rubles ($14.6 billion) set for next year represents 14.6 percent of the total expenditures of 91.3 billion rubles ($100.4 billion).

The planned revenue of 91.8 billion rubles ($101 billion) is expected to provide a surplus of 500 million rubles ($555 million), one of the slimmest margins in recent Soviet budgets.

Although Mr. Garbuzov announced the planned total budget for 1965—exceeding next year's figures by about 9 billion rubles ($9.9 billion) in both revenue and expenditures—he did not disclose the planned military expenditures and allocations to the national economy for 1965.

It was evident that the appropriations would depend on the progress made this year by East-West negotiators toward a further relaxation of tension.

The Soviet Union's military posture is determined not only by its overt defense budget but also by economic allocations for aircraft and space projects, arms and munitions industries, and other unpublicized budget items.

The reduction in direct military expenditures was forecast by Premier Khrushchev in a speech Friday.

The new emphasis on the chemical industry is reflected in several ways in the plan and budget. The investment in the construction of chemical plants is to increase from 1.6 billion rubles ($1.8 billion) this year to 2.7 billion rubles ($3 billion) in 1965.

FERTILIZERS STRESSED

Two-fifths of these funds are to be allocated to a priority program of building fertilizer factories to spur agricultural yield and to make the Soviet Union once again self-sufficient in grain. A poor harvest this year compelled Moscow to purchase 10 million tons of wheat abroad.

The Soviet Union plans to develop a fertilizer-production capacity of 24 million tons in 1964 and 1965. This means it will try to build in 2 years the equivalent of two-thirds of the entire U.S. fertilizer industry, which has been under development for decades.

Mr. Garbuzov said in his report to the Supreme Soviet that chemical research would absorb 685 million rubles ($767 million) of a 2-year science budget of 10.6 billion rubles ($11.7 billion).

The plan also provides for increased investments in agriculture and in consumer-goods industries.

The overall planned rate of industrial growth, which declined from 8.9 percent in 1961 to 8 percent this year, is once again set higher in the next 2 years, at an average annual growth rate of 8.4 percent. Actual growth, which is calculated in rubles of industrial output, is normally slightly higher than the planned rate.

HEAVY INDUSTRY FAVORED

As usual, heavy industry is scheduled to expand at a more rapid rate than the consumer goods industries, although the gap between the two growth rates is being narrowed by three-tenths of 1 percent.

As a result of a major shipbuilding program over the next 2 years, including large oil tankers, the Soviet Union expects to carry 52 percent of its foreign trade in domestic bottoms by 1965. Last year, Soviet vessels handled 37 percent of imports and exports.

Crude oil, scheduled to increase from this year's output of 205 million tons to 240 million tons by 1965, is one of the few major industrial commodities meeting the original 7-year plan goals.

The Soviet Union is expected to increase oil exports to help finance growing purchases of chemical equipment and other industrial plants abroad.

APPOINTMENT OF THOMAS C. MANN AS ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the Record an excellent editorial that appeared in the Washington Post 2 days ago, entitled "Mann in Charge."

It relates to the appointment of Thomas C. Mann as the new Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. It is an excellent editorial which tells a great deal about Mr. Mann's background. It underscores once again for the American people the great experience and competence of this able public servant.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 16, 1963]

Mann in Charge

In his first major appointment, President Johnson has placed Thomas C. Mann in charge of Latin American policy. The President's letter to Mr. Mann makes clear that the new Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs will have broader powers than Edwin Martin, the outgoing hemisphere chief. Mr. Mann was explicitly given authority over "all policies and programs of the U.S. Government, economic, social and cultural, relating to Latin America." It is understood that President Johnson also intends to give Mr. Mann a new rank as Under Secretary of State.

Most of the obvious things have been noted about the appointment. A native of Texas, Mr. Mann is an old friend of the President. During the Eisenhower years, he was intimately involved in hemisphere policy, first as an Assistant Secretary of Economic Affairs and then in the same post to which he has now been renamed. Since 1961, he has been Ambassador to Mexico. He has long experience which will stand him in good stead.

Certainly Mr. Mann understands full well the President's cautioning remark that "there can be no illusion that the work will be easy." There is hardly a serene patch of blue on the hemisphere horizon—excepting, perhaps, Mexico. Venezuela is beset by terrorists; Brazil by hemorrhaging inflation; Chile by political uncertainty. Oil disputes simmer in Argentina and Peru. Bolivia is on the verge of open conflict between insurgent tin miners and the central government—a conflict that may be sharpened following the release of Americans held as hostage by the rebellious workers.

In the Caribbean, the United States finds its position threatened at the far left by Castro's Cuba and on the right by military usurpers who have overthrown constitutional regimes in Honduras and the Dominican Republic. The recognition granted to military juntas in these two countries was a pragmatic response to events which avoids, and does not resolve, the dilemma of squaring a prodemocratic policy with acquiescence in coups.

During his tour, Assistant Secretary Martin was caught in the net of contradictions arising from a major change in Washington's policy under the Alliance for Progress. Though this newspaper on occasion was critical of Mr. Martin, his competence won him respect, particularly after his able performance at the São Paulo economic conference. The reins will soon be in Mr. Mann's grip. In the past, he has shown firm convictions of how American policy should be managed. His skill and good sense will be tested as never before; he surely deserves prayerful best wishes as he undertakes a taxing new job.

DR. JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH GIVES PLAN FOR ATTACKING POCKETS OF POVERTY IN AMERICA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a significant address at a meeting of the National Policy Committee on Pockets of Poverty was delivered on Friday, December 13, by the distinguished Dr. John Kenneth Galbraith.

Because of the importance of the points made so well in this address entitled "Wealth and Poverty," I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEALTH AND POVERTY

(Address delivered by John Kenneth Galbraith to meeting of the National Policy Committee on Pockets of Poverty, Friday, December 13, 1963)

You are very kind to allow me to say these few words today. Because, a few years ago, I wrote a book which described our society as affluent I have ever since been accused of believing that there are no longer any poor people in the United States. This charge, to be sure, comes from those who have not read the book. But, as all authors will agree, this is always a distressingly large number. Those who have been more profligate of their energy do perhaps remember that one of my principal purposes was to urge that growing wealth will not, of itself, solve the problem of poverty. Instead, with increasing well-being, the poverty of those who are left behind becomes even more shameful—an anachronism from which we are able to avert our eyes only with ever-increasing determination.

The problem of poverty in the United States is the problem of people who for reasons of location, education, health, environment in youth or mental deficiency, or who because of racial discrimination are not able to participate effectively—or at all—in the economic life of the Nation. Being barred from participation they are denied the income that accrues to participants. So they live in privation.

Those who argue that a steady expansion in economic output is a necessary condition for the elimination of poverty have a valid case. People who are able to participate in the economy must have a chance for jobs. And there continues to be good reason for seeking a broad and equitable distribution of the revenues from production. Despite considerable propaganda to the contrary, the greatest need of the moment is not a decision to be tender to the well-to-do. Their situation is not so desperate as popularly represented. Also one makes an economy work not by rewarding the rich but by rewarding all who contribute to its success.

But on one elementary point there must be no doubt. If the head of a family is stranded deep on the Cumberland Plateau, or if he never went to school, or if he has no useful skill, or if his health is broken, or if he succumbed as a youngster to a slum environment, or if opportunity is denied to him because he is a Negro, then he will be poor and his family will be poor and that will be true no matter how opulent everyone else becomes.

Equally there must be no doubt that the means for rescuing this man, or his children—investment to conserve and develop resources, assistance in relocation of workers, assistance to new industries, vastly improved education, training and retraining, medical and mental care, youth employment, counselling, urban recreational facilities, housing, slum abatement, and the assurance of full civic equality—will require public effort and public funds. Poverty can be made to disappear. It won't be accomplished simply by stepping up the growth rate any more than it will be accomplished by incantation or ritualistic washing of the feet.

We have, of course, no hope of erasing this blot on our social life if we are affected by the thinking of that new and interesting cult which call themselves the modern conservatives. On this, I suppose, there will be general agreement. The modern conservative is, in fact, not especially modern. He is engaged, on the contrary, in one of man's oldest, best financed, most applauded and, on the whole, least successful exercises in moral philosophy. That is the search for a truly superior moral justification for selfishness. It is an exercise which always involves a certain number of internal contradictions and even some troublesome absurdities. The comfortable turn up urging the character building value of privation for the poor. The man who has struck it rich in minerals, oil, or other bounties of nature is found explaining the debilitating effect of unearned income from the state. The corporation executive who has proved himself a superlative success as an organization man weighs in on the deadening effect of bureaucracy. Federal aid to education is feared by those who live in suburbs that could easily forgo this danger, and by people whose children are in private schools. Socialized medicine is condemned by men emerging from Walter Reed. Social security is viewed with alarm by those who have the comfortable cushion of inherited income. Those who are immediately threatened by public efforts to meet their needs are almost always oblivious to their fate.

The first three or four times that I read "The Conscience of a Conservative" I confess that I was slightly attracted by the vision of a young, two-fisted man of my own age, up from the ranks, self-reliant, self-made, accepting the risk of illness without income, disdaining any organized provision for his old age, asking only that he might keep safe from the tax collector what he earned by the sweat of his own brow. I continue to think of this as the work of a detached scholar. But, in the purely literary way that one writer explores the psyche of another, I wonder if some personal anxieties are not eased by identification with a really good store.

I have no thought of reproach here. My own interest in the Harvard retirement plan slumped appallingly when my books began to appear on the bestseller lists and my wife, quite unexpectedly, became the beneficiary of the small remnants of a New England fortune founded, we believe, on the discovery of a better horse blanket. Should not, we also thought, such a tradition of enterprise be better rewarded in the present generation? For one fleeting moment Young Americans for Freedom had their chance.

But it is not conservatives but liberals that are the object of my interest today. It is to them, conservatives will be relieved to know, that I address my word of reproach.

The elimination of poverty at home and its mitigation abroad is a job for liberals. It will not be accomplished unless liberalism is a determined faith. That, alas, is what it is ceasing to be. It is coming to be supposed that there is something uncouth about argument, unwise about controversy and irresponsible about innovation. A high State Department official expressed regret the other day—I am sorry to say that he had India in mind—that ambassadors should involve an otherwise placid institution in controversy. Liberals, I fear, are responding to this mood.

I am not at all sure that either on foreign or domestic policy the liberal serves his highest function by acting as an early warning system for possible rightwing criticism. This role, and that of providing an elegant and sophisticated rationale for convenient or politically expedient action, are ones on which I hope to dwell one day at greater length. To those who feel that they best serve by endowing the scene with their presence, rather than by pursuing their convictions, let me simply say that I agree it is a good life. But it is also a bit like being one of the warriors in the Washington parks. The posture is heroic; the sword is being waved; but, alas, the movement is nil.

It is especially important that we not be defensive about the public tasks that lie ahead. Those who make it their profession to resist humane works have of late been turning in a virtuoso performance. I find myself less than happy about the number of people who have seized on tax reduction, a measure which was meant to stimulate the economy and increase public revenues, as an excuse for holding back on the needed tasks of government. And some now argue that expenditure limitation or reduction is necessary so that we may reduce taxes with safety. Prof. Raymond Saulnier, President Eisenhower's informed and conscientious economic adviser, has just concluded that the nondefense expenditures of the United States—he mentions as illustrative those for Rural Electrification Administration, the Agency for International Development, Export-Import Bank, Farmers' Home Administration, outlays for civil public works, research—must be cut by $2 billion if there is to be tax reduction and provision for the built-in or contractual increases in Federal outlays.

John F. Kennedy liked to describe himself as a prudent man. And he hated extravagance of any sort—extravagant speech, extravagant gesture, waste of money. Our new President is also a wisely prudent man. No one would ask for any other kind of leader. We want men who husband public resources—who make departments answer well for their needs. Our quarrel is with those who see in sound public service some danger to society. In fact, the public services are one of the two great forces working for economic equity and social stability.

We have long recognized that the progressive income tax is one such force. In the last quarter of the last century and the first quarter of this century the concentration of wealth proceeded at a rapid, and some would say an appalling, rate in the United States. There seemed to be good ground for the Marxist prediction that this concentration would, in the end, destroy the substance and bring the destruction of capitalism. The income tax was a major step in arresting the concentration trend and thus annulling Marx's prediction. Conservatives have many reasons to be grateful for the Taft family but there can be little doubt that its greatest single monument is the income tax amendment. I do not share the enthusiasm, now also at a high pitch in some places, for making the income tax less progressive.

But we need to bear in mind that the incidence of public services is also highly progressive. Like a well-designed income tax these also strongly favor the least fortunate.

Thus, the well-to-do family can escape to the country. It is the poor who need parks and whose children need swimming pools. Only the poor live in the slums and require the myriad of services that, we may hope, will one day mitigate urban congestion and public squalor. The well-to-do live in communities that have good schools; it is the schools of slum dwellers and wage and salary workers which would be principally improved by Federal aid to education. Colleges and universities are more accessible to the rich than to the poor. It is the masses and not the classes who use mass tranportation. The elderly couple of less than average income would be the major beneficiary of medicare. Social security, minimum wages enforcement, youth employment are all most important for the least well-to-do. It is poor children who play in dirty streets. It is their father who gets laid off when public works are suddenly cut back.

Even the protective functions of the State are most important for those in the lower income brackets. Poison serum and lethal drugs do, I judge, work democratically on rich and poor alike. But many of us here today could probably survive a certain amount of exploitation in our prescriptions, fraud in our food packaging, mendacity in our dental advertising or thimble rigging in our securities. We live in parts of cities where epidemics are less likely. The family that struggles to make ends meet, the widow with life insurance money around loose, the dwellers in urban tenements need the protection of an alert FTC, FDA, SEC, and Public Health Service.

Public services have, to use the economist's word, a strong redistributional effect. And this effect is strongly in favor of those with lower incomes. Those who clamor the loudest for public economy are those for whom public services do the least. It is evident that tax reduction that affects public services has a double effect in comforting the comfortable and afflicting the poor.

This is something which liberals should not forget. I venture to think there is an even stronger lesson for the man of good will and good income who, regardless of political disposition, counts himself a good and compassionate citizen. He should bear in mind, when he is tempted by a crusade against public expenditure, that the sacrifice is not his.

In recent times one has sensed a certain reluctance to base social policy on differences in income—or even to admit that they exist. As pornography has become ever more popular, mention of inequality has become obscene. Ours is a classless society; we must not set the poor against the rich, or possibly vice versa.

This is great nonsense. There are wide differences in ability to pay in our society. There are also wide differences in the benefit from public services. These are facts of life to be treated without rancor but with all candor. To pretend that public services are of equal benefit to people of all income, and hence that there is equality of sacrifice in curtailment, is to work a fraud on the poorest of our people.

My impression is that poverty will be eliminated primarily by energetic action along lines on which we are already working—civil rights, education, slum abatement, the rest. Even in the Communist countries miracles are currently selling somewhat at a discount. But I wonder if we might consider one possibility.

To the best of knowledge there is no place in the world where well-educated people are really poor. Why don't we select, beginning next year, the hundred lowest income counties (or in the case of urban slums more limited areas of equal population) and designate them as special educational districts. They would then be equipped (or reequipped) with a truly excellent and comprehensive school plant, including both primary and secondary schools, transportation, and the best in recreational facilities. The construction employment in this part of the task would not be unwelcome. Then, in the manner of the Peace Corps, but with ample pay, an elite body of young teachers would be assembled—ready to serve in the most remote areas, tough enough and well-trained enough to take on the worst slums, proud to go to Harlan County or to Harlem. In the year following we would proceed to the next most abysmal areas. It seems likely that the system should also include modest educational grants to families to feed and clothe children for school and to compensate for their earnings.

This is not Federal aid to education. It is an attack on poverty by what I would judge to be the most effective single step that could be taken. Can anyone argue that youngsters with these facilities and this training would share the dismal fate of their parents? As incomes rise the schools would be returned to the localities. Those who fear Federal control of education are amply protected. The effort would not affect them.

There are adequate precedents for such action. Some 10 years ago it was sadly evident that our highways were heading for trouble. In the richer States they were often fairly good. Elsewhere they were too few, too narrow, and too slow. One day soon the vehicles would be backing up into Detroit itself. Then we would have only an interlocked mass of metal full of sound but devoid of movement. The economic consequences would be far from agreeable. Foreseeing this crisis the Federal Government stepped in. Disdaining to be bound by the time-honored formulas for sharing costs with the States, it proceeded to contribute up to 90 percent of the cost of the new highways. General Motors did not object. Ford did not object. Mr. George Romney of American Motors did not object. The National Association of Manufacturers was acquiescent. Mr. Lucius Clay, the father of the scheme, was at no time stigmatized as a radical promoter of big government. Confident of the same approval, I would propose that we finance this frontal attack on the areas where education is worst, needed most, and has the most to offer in precisely the same way.

DR. TSANOFF OF RICE UNIVERSITY EULOGIZES THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at a stirring memorial service held Monday, November 25, at the Rice University Memorial Chapel in Houston, Tex., Dr. Radoslav A. Tsanoff delivered the tribute to President Kennedy.

Because so many persons who heard this glowing message of tribute have praised it, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record so it will be available for others to see, on a broader scale.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Eulogy of President John F. Kennedy

(By Dr. Radoslav A. Tsanoff, at the memorial service for President Kennedy held in the Rice University Memorial Chapel, on Monday, November 25, 1963)

We have come together for this memorial service with heavy hearts. Our Nation is plunged in grief for the tragic death of our President. To millions of us President Kennedy stood as the living symbol of America in her expanding leadership of the free world in these days of grave trouble and peril—America, the home of freedom and justice and welfare for all.

As we try to express to ourselves the ideals to which President Kennedy was dedicated, we remember his speeches to us expressing his aims, his vision of a greater and fairer and more humane America. We remember his Executive proposals to enact these principles into legislation. We remember his unflinching courage, when he stood on the very edge of atomic war in defense of our national safety and honor. Do we not also come upon one basic principle, central in his convictions as a citizen and as a statesman? It signifies and clarifies to us his entire policy. You will recall how he appealed to us, in his inaugural address, not to ask, What can our country do for us—but rather, What can we do for our country? This is so simple to say, but does it not go to the heart of the matter? Does it not distinguish two sorts of citizens, two contrasting attitudes toward public policies, two conceptions of national life altogether? I may regard my country as a source of profit and prestige to myself. I may support public measures which enrich and advance me and my class, my trade, my profession; I may resist whatever seems to be against my interests. Or I may identify myself with the larger national needs, ready to grow with my country, yes, but also willing to labor and to suffer, if needed, for my country, and in public measures to think first of America and only second of myself. Put this idea really to work in our daily lives, and it transforms us and will transform our entire American society. President Kennedy was asking us every one: Are we to be citizens who join in common good will to build a fairer social order, or are we to keep on saying: Let us alone to look after our own affairs?

This national calamity has unnerved us with its suddenness. In the very midst of our welcome to our Chief he was smitten down before our eyes. Only last Thursday President and Mrs. Kennedy visited Houston on their good-will trip to Texas. Hundreds of thousands lined our streets to welcome them to our city. Speaking at the coliseum to an enthusiastic audience, the President hailed the creative vision which has led America to higher and higher levels of greatness and honor, but he also pointed out the responsibilities which greatness and honor impose on us. In winged words he challenged us to become worthier of our heritage, to face our present problems so as to deserve the respect of our children and grandchildren. Only last week he stood here before us, mature in statesmanship yet young in his animation and glowing energies, granite firm in his resolute devotion to the public good, yet without any trace of malice, breathing good will for all. And the very next day after he had left us here, where thousands had stood to do him honor and wish him Godspeed, he was shot down by an assassin's bullet.

Joined with the whole Nation on this day of mourning, our Rice University community feel for Mrs. Kennedy and the entire bereaved family our deepest sympathy. As we watched on television the funeral service this morning, we all shared the unutterable sense of the wastefulness of violence which has robbed us of all the wisdom and nobility and devotion which President Kennedy signalized. We are everyone stricken to the heart.

Our minds and hearts go back to the memory of another black day, almost a hundred years ago, when our Nation lost another noble humanitarian leader, one with whose name the name of our own Chief will always be joined. We do not have the words, though we have the heartache, to express our grief as Walt Whitman expressed it in his song of mourning for Abraham Lincoln, "O Captain! My Captain!"

> "But O heart! heart! heart!
> O the bleeding drops of red!
> Where on the deck my Captain lies,
> Fallen cold and dead!"

Even as President Lincoln a century ago, so President Kennedy in our day strove with mind and heart and will against the forces of greed and racial prejudice and injustice and ignorance. Like Lincoln, so Kennedy struggled to achieve a spirt of national unity, to realize more fully the true destiny of America in the life of mankind. A whole century after Lincoln, this struggle has still to be waged. But we know more clearly now that it must be waged and that it must be won. History is a great judge; its verdict which has enshrined Abraham Lincoln will enshrine John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Like Lincoln, Kennedy also belongs to the ages. His life and his death are a challenge to us all. Can we, all of us in America, without regard to race or religion or political party or economic class—can we really as a nation come to our senses, grasp the full meaning of the words which we teach our children to repeat: "A government of the people, by the people, and for the people—with liberty and justice to all?" If in our heartbroken realization of this tragedy, that this black outrage has been perpetrated in our day, before our eyes, in our Texas, if we could now, in remorse and humility, rededicate ourselves more resolutely to the ideals toward which President Kennedy was always leading us, then neither his life nor his tragic death would have been in vain.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND LEGAL WRONGS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, recently in Montana weekly newspapers a three-column, page-length advertisement appeared entitled "Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs." This advertisement sponsored by the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom, 301 First Street NE., Washington, D.C., purported to be an analysis of the civil rights bill of 1963 and made such broad charges and obvious distortions relative to that pending legislation that I asked the Department of Justice for comments and analysis.

In response to that request I have received the following splendid critical comment on the advertisement by Mr. Burke Marshall, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division. I call Mr. Marshall's letter to the attention of my colleagues who may have had the same or a similar advertisement circulated in their State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Marshall be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., December 17, 1963.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This is in reply to your request for our comments on a newspaper advertisement sponsored by the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom which you enclosed in your letter to the Attorney General. The advertisement attacks the civil rights bill now pending in Congress.

The purported analysis of the pending bill, entitled "Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs," reveals a complete lack of understanding of the proposed legislation. The pending civil rights bill seeks simply to protect the right of American citizens to be free from racial and religious discrimination and to guarantee to them the full enjoyment of citizenship. As such, the bill is a constitutionally and morally justified exercise of the obligations and authority of the Federal Government.

The bill does not establish dictatorial Federal control, as the advertisement claims. If enacted, it would simply help in the realization of the promise of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States that all men are created equal and are entitled to the equal protection of the laws.

The extravagant statements made in the advertisement do not fairly represent either the contents of the bill or its purposes. These extreme statements are hardly calculated to assist in the solution of a problem which is of such immense importance to the United States and to the citizens most directly affected.

The following is an examination of what the various provisions of the bill would do, and also what the bill would not do. The latter is particularly important in view of the innuendoes, distortions, and exaggerations contained in the advertisement.

A. PROTECTION OF THE RIGHT TO VOTE

1. In many localities, local election officials have a habit of turning down Negroes on the ground that they are illiterate (even those who are teachers or college graduates) while at the same time registering white applicants who are unable to read or write.

2. The bill would rectify this situation by requiring that equal standards be used for all applicants. And the bill makes no changes in existing law, under which the courts—not the Justice Department—have the right to register persons who are eligible to vote when those persons have been illegally turned down by local officials.

3. The bill also would prevent long and unnecessary delays in voting suits by requiring that such suits be heard on an expedited basis, with a provision for prompt appeals.

4. The bill does not give the Department of Justice power to gain Federal control of the electoral machinery. It merely requires fair play for all eligible voters, regardless of race. That is as it should be.

B. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

1. The bill contains no provisions whatever governing the sale or rental of private homes.

2. The bill does not affect doctors, lawyers, or realtors.

3. The bill does not affect small rooming houses, with no more than five rooms for rent, which are actually used by the proprietor as his residence.

4. The bill does not affect places of business merely because they pay State or local license fees to operate their establishments.

5. The bill would prevent racial discrimination when it is supported by the State. Discrimination of that type has already been declared unconstitutional.

6. The bill would require that certain business establishments, whose operations affect interstate commerce and which hold themselves out as serving the public, provide these services to the public, without distinction as to race. These establishments include hotels and motels furnishing lodging to transients; restaurants and lunchrooms; motion picture houses, theaters; gasoline stations.

7. At least 30 States and many municipalities now have such legislation requiring fair treatment of all races in places of public accommodation. Federal legislation would extend this protection throughout the country. Under article I of the Constitution and under the 14th amendment the Congress has the clear constitutional authority to pass such legislation.

8. Many Southern States have long had laws on the books prohibiting businessmen from serving their customers on a nondiscriminatory basis. There is no record of protests that this constituted an unwarranted governmental interference with business.

C. NONDISCRIMINATION IN PROGRAMS ASSISTED BY FEDERAL FUNDS

1. The bill provides that, where Federal money is used to support any program or activity—money which is paid into the Treasury by Negro and white citizens alike—the program must be used for the benefit of both races, without discrimination. This is basic American justice and fairplay.

2. Sweeping statements in the advertisement intimating that the bill would affect persons who borrow money from or deposit money in a federally insured bank, farmers who have financial dealings with Federal agencies, and the like, are distortions designed to arouse resentment. The bill will not punish innocent beneficiaries of Federal aid for wrongs committed by others. The bill would not affect an individual farmer, for example, who borrows money through a Government agency. It would affect the distributor of those funds if the distributing agency refused to lend to Negroes but did lend to white persons.

3. The bill does not require the calling of any loans or blacklisting of individuals.

4. The bill will permit the appropriate Federal agency to refuse to give further Federal aid to those who are carrying out certain programs or activities with Federal assistance but who deny the benefits of those programs to individuals solely because of their race. Even this cutoff will not be made until all methods of persuasion and voluntary compliance have been completely exhausted.

5. The bill provides that the courts will be the ultimate judges of whether funds may be cut off. Ample opportunity is provided for judicial review of any Federal agency action which cuts off assistance on grounds of racial discrimination.

D. DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

1. Under the bill, the Federal Government will have no control whatever over hiring and firing of teachers or selection of textbooks.

2. It is not true that the bill would enable the Commissioner of Education to force the transfer of children from one school to another.

3. The charge that the bill would mean thought control of future generations is untrue and absurd.

4. The bill provides for technical assistance and financial grants to schools which are complying with the law of the land by beginning the desegregation of their classes if—and only if—the local authorities request such assistance. Local authorities would remain in complete control of their school systems.

5. It is a startling fact that today, nearly 10 years after the Supreme Court of the United States declared that compulsory segregation in public education violates the Constitution, almost two-thirds of the previously segregated school districts have still not afforded Negro children their constitutional rights. The bill would enable the Federal Government, under certain conditions, to bring suit in court for school desegregation in compliance with the Constitution. Thus, the bill would simply implement the law of the land and hasten the enjoyment by all our citizens of their constitutional rights.

E. FAIR EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY (EMPLOYERS, EMPLOYEES, AND UNIONS)

1. Nothing in the bill permits any individual to demand employment.

2. The bill contains no provision to require a quota system or racial or religious "balance" in employment.

3. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to control the internal affairs of employers or unions or to tell them whom to hire or fire.

4. The bill does prohibit racial discrimination by certain employers engaged in interstate commerce, and by labor organizations, and it continues existing prohibitions against racial discrimination in Federal employment and employment under Government contracts.

5. The statement that Federal administrative personnel would be prosecutor, judge jury, and executioner is completely inaccurate. The Commission would seek to obtain voluntary compliance. If unsuccessful, the charges of discrimination would be tried

before a Federal court, with full right of appeal.

6. Some 25 States now have laws to prohibit discrimination in employment. Federal law would extend this protection throughout the 50 States.

F. EFFECT ON EVERYONE

The legislation will be unwelcome only to those who wish to treat our Negro citizens as second-class human beings. Negroes serve in our Armed Forces, pay taxes which support our local, State and Federal Governments, and contribute to the economic welfare of the country by buying goods and services. They must no longer be subjected to hardship and humiliation because of their color.

The legislation will be welcome to all of us who believe in the American ideal of equal opportunity for all our citizens and who wish to maintain the respect not only of other nations but—what is most important—of ourselves.

Thank you for writing to the Attorney General about this matter.

Sincerely,

Burke Marshall,
Assistant Attorney General,
Civil Rights Division.

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on December 13, 1963, Mr. Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, delivered an important speech on U.S. policy toward Communist China. I think it is essential that we keep under constant consideration our policy toward this largest of all countries. It has been my growing belief that we cannot continue on the rather sterile course which we are now following with reference to mainland China. I hope that Mr. Hilsman's statement before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco is an indication of growing consideration of possible alternatives to our present China policy.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hilsman's address be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Policy Toward Communist China

I

(Address by the Honorable Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, at the Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, Calif., December 13, 1963)

I am honored to be invited to this distinguished forum. Here in San Francisco you stand at the gateway to the problems and promise of the Pacific. As one currently responsible for dealing with the problems and furthering the promise of this region, I feel a special obligation to you.

Asia is not on fire; but portions of it smoulder with each morning's headlines—a new South Vietnam Government struggling to defeat Communist terrorism, Indonesia in a period of confrontation with the new Malaysia, Cambodia seeking an altered power balance between East and West to preserve its neutrality and independence, and many lesser conflicts.

I could focus today on any one of these problems—and our time would be too little to do it justice. For the passions of nationalism—at its best and at its most vexing—are at floodtide in much of Asia. And out of the interaction of these passions and the threat of Communist aggression are emerging new national identities and new national purposes.

Of course, the paradox of nation building is that the ultimate guarantee of its success lies in the capacity of national leaders to transcend parochial nationalism and to understand the interdependence of all peoples. How to bring peaceful regional cooperation out of conflicting national revolutions—that is the key question.

In the Far East that question has a special significance. For the evolution of each Asian state is taking place today under the long shadows cast by China—by the China of history that was for so long the matrix of east Asian civilization, and by the mainland China of today, the torchbearer of a rigid totalitarian ideology that threatens all its neighbors.

For Americans, China presents a special problem in history. We first met Chinese civilization late in the decay of its imperial splendor. For a century we sent out to China our traders, our missionaries, our educators, our doctors, and our good will. In the turmoil that followed the Chinese revolution of 1911 we felt a special kinship with China's culture and people. In World War II we became the stanchest of allies.

Yet our involvement with China, while intense, was not wholly real; it was fed by illusions as well as good will. We knew little—and understood less—of imperial China's strength and unity. We had little understanding of the ferment and weakness created by the collapse of the confucian state. And we were little aware of the depth and fervor of Chinese nationalism in reaction to a sense of repeated humiliation at the hands of the West.

As a result, Americans were totally unprepared for the tragedy of the Chinese revolution: Its capture by Marxism-Leninism, and its transformation into a fiercely hostile force—hostile to the West, and menacing to its neighbors. Our reaction was anger and disbelief, a sense of personal betrayal.

Today, 14 years have passed since the establishment of the Communist government in Peiping. It is time to take stock—dispassionately—of the greatest and most difficult problem we face in our efforts to assist in the development of a peaceful Far East.

II

Let us begin by disposing of a myth: It is frequently charged that the U.S. Government is ignoring China and its 700 million people.

This is simply untrue. We do not ignore our ally, the Government of the Republic of China. We do not ignore the 12 million people in Taiwan. Nor, in fact, do we ignore the people on the mainland. We are very much aware of them, and we have a deep friendship for them. Nor, finally, do we ignore the Communist leadership which has established itself on the mainland. We meet with them from time to time, as at the periodic talks between our Ambassadors in Warsaw. We should like to be less ignorant of them and for them to be less ignorant of us. To this end, we have been striving for years to arrange an exchange of correspondents; but we have been put off with the assertion that, so long as the principle issue—which they define in terms of their absurd charge that we are occupying Taiwan—is unresolved, there can be no progress on secondary issues.

If we have not persuaded the Chinese Communists to allow an exchange of correspondents and to lower the wall of secrecy with which they surround themselves, we have nevertheless spent considerable effort in trying to understand what manner of men the Chinese Communists are, what are their ambitions, and what are the problems which stand in their way. We have tried to be objective, and to see to it that dislike of communism does not becloud our ability to see the facts.

III

What is the essence of our analysis? What sort of people are the Chinese Communists? What kind of power is at their disposal?

These are important questions. We shall be in danger if we let our policies be guided by emotionalism, or our thought processes by cliches. Our policies flow from the answers to these questions, and it is not enough that we prove ourselves properly anti-Communist by repeating anti-Communist phrases.

First and foremost, the Chinese Communist leaders have shown themselves to be dangerously overconfident and wedded to outdated theories, but pragmatic when their existence is threatened.

Take the example of the so-called great leap forward of 1958–60. You have undoubtedly heard that it was a catastrophe, and so it was The Chinese Communist leaders did not understand the laws of the economically possible, and they undertook to do what could not be done. The collapse was extraordinary. Agriculture has barely regained its 1957 level but there may be 70 million more mouths to feed. Industrial production fell by perhaps one-half between 1959 and 1962. The Chinese Communists first blamed the weather, then blamed the Russians. But, as their educated men must know, they have above all else to blame their own attempt to rewrite economics. I am still astounded at the arrogance of a leadership which believed that what all others have learned about economics was wrong, and that it had by some flash of illumination come upon the truth.

The failure of the great leap is not the only lesson which we may learn from this period of internal crisis. Though the economy collapsed, the regime did not. Nor was its authority effectively challenged. It retained firm command of the instruments of control.

Equally important, the leaders have learned, and publicly admit, that it will take generations before China becomes a modern industrial power. They have finally shown an ability to temper their grandiose slogans and frenetic schemes.

To be sure, communism has yet to prove that it can make agriculture work. The Communists have swallowed their Marxism and allowed the return of small private plots, but they have not abandoned collectivized agriculture. This dogmatic contrariness in a land which is still overwhelmingly agricultural may yet bring them even greater troubles. Moreover, recent failures have eroded the morale and discipline of the movement.

Nevertheless, the Communists did correct the most dangerous mistakes of the great leap forward. When their survival depended upon it, they showed flexibility in meeting the threat, and we have no reason to believe that there is a present likelihood that the Communist regime will be overthrown.

A second major fact about Communist China's leaders is their parochialism: They have seen extraordinarily little of the outside world, and their world view is further constricted by their ideology. Thirty to forty years ago, they took over certain Marxist economic assumptions and Lenin's technique for organizing a disciplined party. To these, Mao Tse-tung added certain tactical innovations. Such methods worked in their struggle for power, and they expect them to work in their struggle for modernization. I believe, however, that there are men at the second echelon who know that the great leap forward reflected a stubborn addiction to theories which do not work in a modern world. Yet I wonder whether the leadership has absorbed the same lessons.

These are the Marxist puritans: They see all the world as a conflict between unblemished good and unredeemable evil. Few people consider themselves wrong and evil, but there are very few people on earth who are so sublimely confident as are the Chinese Communist leaders that they are always right and good. They have arrogated to themselves the right to represent the revolution. Those who disagree are automatically wrong and evil. This attitude is displayed in their quarrel with the Russians.

Unfortunately, in this world there is no assurance that people are good because they think they are good, or that they are right because they think they are right. If the Chinese Communists are obsessed with their own goodness, rather than being consciously evil as they often appear to others, the threat which they pose to a peaceful world is not thereby diminished. Mao and his colleagues are simply unaware of some of the vital ideas which have moved civilization. For them, there is no problem of the relationship between man and society: The individual must yield. These men know nothing of the genuine purposes of democracy, or of constitutional government. These are men who say that "all progressive wars are just, and all wars that impede progress are unjust," and who then reserve the right to decide what is progress. These are men who comfortably clothe their own dictatorship in a cloak of doctrinal righteousness. Where such men triumph, some of civilization's most precious values are eclipsed. And they have proclaimed their determination to spread their system everywhere.

Is this permanent? Must we live indefinitely with such men?

Perhaps I am too optimistic; but there is some evidence of evolutionary forces at work in mainland China. As I have said, the present leaders have seen remarkably little of the outside world. They have conquered mainland China. They may believe that, with concepts unchanged, they can go on to conquer the world. These leaders, however, were deep in rural China when the rest of the world was debating Keynes and sharpening the tools of economic analysis. They may not yet have absorbed all the lessons of the great leap forward; but the more sophisticated second echelon of leadership undoubtedly knows that it was simple ignorance of the techniques of administering a complex economy which led to many of the mistakes of 1958. This economic example is particularly striking; it could be repeated throughout the sciences and humanities. The leaders may not know it, but the intellectuals know that the official explanation is not adequate as a description of reality. As these ideas seep upward or as the present leaders retire, this awareness may eventually profoundly erode the present simple view with which the leadership regards the world.

Furthermore, an economy becomes geometrically more complex as it modernizes, as the stages of production multiply, and as wants become more diverse. Rule by command becomes progressively less effective than encouraging the exercise of personal initiative in running such a society. The Chinese Communists have shown that they see the problem; but they have not shown themselves willing to sacrifice their doctrinal orthodoxy, as will be required if they are to deal with the problem.

In China today the old gods have been struck down, and Marx, Lenin, and Mao Tse-tung put in their place. We see no signs yet that a new credo is on the rise to replace this present pantheon. We may see a leadership professedly Marxist for some time, even if its values and priorities change. This process of change is not automatic, nor is it likely to happen very fast. Nevertheless, the present leaders have shown that they already fear it, in their efforts to resurrect revolutionary awareness. We do not know which way these changes will go, but—and here is my point—neither do the Chinese Communists.

What about the appeal of the Chinese Communists to the new nations of the world? They have scored some successes with extremists everywhere in identifying themselves as the radical end of the Communist movement.

Peiping has been alert to the worldwide opportunities for playing on nationalistic differences and prejudices and gaining toeholds within the so-called national liberation movements or among the dissatisfied and disgruntled. We may expect this process to continue. These successes, however, may be more apparent than real. As extremists approach power, they may become less radical and may weigh more heavily the questions as to who can offer them more support and more protection.

The Chinese Communists are true believers, arrogant in the assumption that other countries will wish to do things their way and will see the world as they see it; they cannot see themselves and their own beliefs as the product of a special time and place. But, if there is a tendency afoot in the world, it would seem to be in the opposite direction, as more countries look to their own national ideals and interests rather than to an unquestioning faith in Marxism-Leninism.

Thus, the Chinese Communists have set themselves up as a model for the less-developed nations. But, like the king in the fairy tale, they seem unaware that they have no clothes. Others see, though the Chinese Communists have not, that the failure of the "great leap forward" has shown the model to be gravely deficient.

IV

The tragedy of the closed and stagnant society on the mainland is dramatized by the robust survival of an alternative model for Chinese development: the record of the Government of the Republic of China on Taiwan.

Here the modernization of Chinese society has taken place outside the Communist straitjacket—and the results are extraordinarily impressive.

Of the Republic of China, I can only say: "Go see for yourself." While Communist China has suffered the disaster of the "great leap forward," Taiwan has enjoyed a sustained and remarkable economic growth. The model of Taiwan's development in the past 15 years is of increasing interest to the less developed nations everywhere. In time, the contrast with the mainland can hardly be lost upon those nations which have an opportunity to see it.

Stereotypes die hard, and Communist China by its sheer size exercises a fascination; but if the economic techniques used by the Republic of China over the next few years yield the great gains in economic and social welfare that we have reason to expect, the impact on other developing nations will be considerable. And we may see a diminution in the attractive power of industrialization carried out through the suffering which seems to be the inescapable companion of economic growth in Communist countries.

Not alone through economic accomplishment, the Republic of China has the opportunity to preserve and vitalize the humane traditions and values of Chinese civilization in the course of its modernization. These are a legacy which the Chinese Communists are attempting to eradicate on the mainland.

V

You have expected me to talk about American policy, and I have talked mostly about Communist China's prospects. I have had a reason for doing this. Policies based upon a misapprehension of reality may lead us far from the goals we seek. There has perhaps been more emotion about our China policy than about our policy toward any single country since World War II. Yet our Nation must look squarely at China, pursuing policies which will protect the interests of our country, of the free world, and of men of good will everywhere.

Our prime objective concerning Communist China is that it not subvert or commit aggression against its free world neighbors. It must not be allowed to accomplish for communism through force of arms that success which it has rarely achieved at the ballot box.

President Kennedy called our purposes in the Far East peaceful and defensive. And so they remain.

If the free world governments of Asia are responsive to the needs and wishes of their own peoples, and if they have developed the techniques and machinery for fulfilling the role of government in their countries, communism can endanger them only through the naked threat of military force. Most of the countries thus threatened are too small to stand alone against such a threat, and they need to use their resources for their people's welfare rather than for the creation of an elaborate war machine. We have undertaken in many cases to provide the protection against massive attack which will permit them to pursue their own destinies unafraid.

Our military assistance in the Far East has been given with the objective of permitting Asian nations to develop the forces to defend their own borders and to protect themselves against probing attacks and paramilitary challenges. This is a necessary and grave responsibility.

However, I think that our hearts lie in that assistance which we can give in another direction: in helping them to establish the economic and political conditions in which a free society can flourish. This is particularly agreeable to us, because these are the things which those countries would want to do, and which we would want to help them to do, whether or not communism existed.

Before I close, there is one other area in which questions have been raised about American policy, and in which a clarification of this Government's position is timely: I refer to the apparent differences in the policies which we are adopting toward the Soviet Union and toward Communist China. We maintain a policy of nonrecognition and trade embargo of Communist China—at a time when we are willing to broaden contact with the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union and Communist China do share the goal of communizing the world. But we see important differences in the thinking and tactics of the two. In the U.S.S.R., the Communists were developing a modern industrial society precisely when in China they were conducting a guerrilla war from rural bases. The Soviet leadership seems to have absorbed certain lessons from its more extended development—as to the values and priorities which one may safely pursue on a small planet, and as to the price of miscalculating the nature of the outside world.

We believe that the policies which have proved their worth with Moscow are equally valid for our long-term relations with Peiping. But we also believe that our approach should be adapted to the differences in behavior between the two, as they relate to our own national objectives.

First and foremost, we fully honor our close and friendly ties with the people of the Republic of China on Taiwan, and with their government. We conceive of this relationship not as an historical accident but as a matter of basic principle. So long as Peiping insists on the destruction of this relationship as the sine qua non for any basic improvement in relations between ourselves and Communist China, there can be no prospect for such an improvement.

Our differing policies toward the Soviet Union and Communist China derive, secondly, from their differing attitudes toward negotiations, as such, even in limited areas. Faced with the realities of the nuclear age, the Soviet Union appears to recognize that certain interests—notably survival—are shared by all mankind. Peiping, however, remains wedded to a fundamentalist form of communism which emphasizes violent revolution, even if it threatens the physical ruin of the civilized world. It refuses to admit that there are common interests which cross ideological lines.

Third, U.S. policy is influenced by Chinese communism's obsessive suspicion of the outside world, far exceeding even that of the Soviet Union. Whereas Moscow appears to have learned that free world readiness to negotiate limited common interests is not a sign of weakness, Peiping regards any conciliatory gesture as evidence of weakness and an opportunity for exploitation.

Perhaps the best evidence of this paranoid view of the world came from Peiping's Foreign Minister Ch'en I who declared, at the height of China's food crisis in 1962, that his government would never accept any aid from America because this would mean handing our vast market over to America. Given the near-subsistence level of the society and the limited purchasing power of the government, this view of American intentions could only be conjured up by men possessed of an unremitting distrust of all external peoples and a naive sense of their own economic prospects.

Fourth are the differing circumstances and opportunities on the peripheries of the Soviet Union and Communist China. The Soviet Union and European members of its bloc border on long-established, relatively stable states defended by powerful, locally based—as well as more distant—deterrent and defensive forces. Communist China's neighbors, on the other hand, include newly established states struggling to maintain their independence, with very limited defense forces. There is a wider range of opportunities for aggression and subversion available to Peiping, which renders it even more important that in dealing with Peiping we not permit that regime to underestimate free world firmness and determination.

Much speculation has turned around the question of possible commercial relations between private American firms and Communist China, especially in view of the declining trade between Communist China and its Soviet bloc partners. Peiping's own policies however, seem crystal clear on this point. Peiping apparently wants none of it. As one of its trade officials recently declared, "We have a very clear attitude. We won't trade with the United States because the U.S. Government is hostile to us." The Chinese Communists follow Mao's maxim that "politics and economics are inseparable." They made this clear in their unilateral rupture of contracts with Japanese firms in 1958 and their willingness to jeopardize major industrial projects as the price for carrying on their dispute with the Soviet Union in 1960.

In sum, while respecting the right of others to view the matter otherwise, we find important differences in the willingness and ability of the Soviet Union and Communist China, at the present stage of their respective development, to reach limited agreements which can bring some reduction of the terrible dangers and tensions of our present-day world. We believe that policies of strength and firmness, accompanied by a constant readiness to negotiate—policies long and effectively pursued with the Soviet Union—will best promote the changes which must take place on the China mainland before we can hope to achieve long-sought conditions of peace, security and progress in this half of the globe.

President Johnson said that:

"We will be unceasing in the search for peace; resourceful in our pursuit of areas of agreement even with those with whom we differ. We must be prepared at one and the same time for both the confrontation of power and the limitation of power—we must be ready to defend the national interest and to negotiate the common interest."

We are confronted in Communist China with a regime which presently finds no ground of common interest with those whose ideals it does not share, which has used hatred as an engine of national policy. The United States is the central figure in their demonology, and the target of a sustained fury of invective. After President Kennedy's assassination, while other nations—Communist and free—shared our grief, the Chinese Communist Daily Worker published a cartoon of a man sprawled on the ground, with the caption "Kennedy Bites the Dust." If this speaks for the Chinese Communist leadership, I am confident that it does not speak for most Chinese.

Americans—businessmen, missionaries, diplomats—have long felt a particularly close rapport with the Chinese. In World War II, American pilots downed in Communist areas came out with moving accounts of Chinese helpfulness and friendliness. The Communists had not destroyed those attitudes then. I doubt they have succeeded in destroying them now.

We do not know what changes may occur in the attitudes of future Chinese leaders. But if I may paraphrase a classic canon of our past, we pursue today towards Communist China a policy of the open door: we are determined to keep the door open to the possibility of change, and not to slam it shut against any developments which might advance our national good, serve the free world, and benefit the people of China. Patience is not unique to the Chinese. We too can maintain our positions without being provoked to unseemly action or despairing of what the future may hold. We will not sow the dragon's seed of hate which may bear bitter fruit in future generations of China's millions. But neither will be betray our interests and those of our allies to appease the ambitions of Communist China's leaders.

We hope that, confronted with firmness which will make foreign adventure unprofitable, and yet offered the prospect that the way back into the community of man is not closed to it, the Chinese Communist regime will eventually forsake its present venomous hatreds which spring from a rigid class view of society. We hope that they will rediscover the Chinese virtue of tolerance for a multitude of beliefs and faiths; and that they will accept again a world of diversity, in place of the gray monolith which seems to be communism's goal for human society.

On November 27 President Johnson said: "The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and respect one another. Let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right."

President Johnson was talking about America. But the words are valid for all mankind.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ENDORSES VOLUNTARY WHEAT CERTIFICATE PLAN

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am pleased with the announcement issued late yesterday by the Department of Agriculture that the National Advisory Committee on Feed Grains and Wheat has endorsed a voluntary wheat program, financed through a system of marketing certificates—a voluntary wheat certificate plan.

The announcement is gratifying to me, Mr. President, not only because I introduced such a program in Senate bill 1946 earlier this year, but because this endorsement means that the great bulk of wheat producer associations, farm organizations, and the administration can now unite behind one program for this vital food grain. It means that it is now possible to adopt a new program before spring wheat is planted and while there is still time for most winter wheat growers to get into compliance.

It means that we can prevent the $600 million decline in farm income foreseen in the recent Agricultural Outlook reports along with resulting economic hardships in the cities, towns, and farms of the wheat country.

It means that reduction of our surplus stocks of wheat can continue.

It means that there will not be a flood of wheat into the feed markets to disrupt the voluntary feed grain program which has been so successful.

I submit for the RECORD, Mr. President, the release as it was issued by the Department for the Advisory Committee, including a list of the outstanding producers, economists, and trade people who compose the Committee, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ASKS QUICK ENACTMENT OF WHEAT PROGRAM TO AID FARM INCOME

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Advisory Committee on Feed Grains and Wheat today recommended that Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman press for quick legislative enactment of a voluntary wheat program to avert a sizable drop in farm income.

This program would take the place of the mandatory wheat program rejected by farmers in a national referendum last spring, and would preserve the basic program features of present law on a voluntary basis. Without new legislation, the 1964 crop support price will be about $1.25 a bushel and returns from wheat would be about $600 million below 1963, according to USDA estimates.

The Committee also recommended that improvement in incomes of wheat and feed grain producers continue to be a goal of farm programs.

By a wide majority, the Committee favored financing the voluntary wheat program through a system of marketing certificates, rather than a system of compensatory payments. Under the certificate plan, returns to farmers, and cost of wheat foods to consumers would remain near recent levels.

The Committee met December 16 and 17 at USDA to advise Secretary Freeman on major legislative proposals and other matters in connection with feed grains and wheat.

Discussions of the Committee were generally within the three basic administration guidelines for farm legislation: To improve farm income, cut Government costs, and reduce Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

Committee members attending the meeting were Glen L. Bayne, Prosser, Wash.; Palmer Beebe, Dowagiac, Mich.; Keith Carlson, Edwall, Wash.; Clay L. Cochran, Alexandria, Va.; Ralph H. Cole, Lincoln, Nebr.; Hilliard Currin, Brownsville, Tenn.; William E. Dimond, Lovington, Ill.; Curtis L. Edwards, Panhandle, Tex.; Harold O. Edwards, Tekoe, Wash.; Joseph N. Gill, Hartford, Conn.; Walter W. Goeppinger, Boone, Iowa.

Ray Allen Goldberg, Chestnut Hill, Mass.; Joseph B. Gregg, Prairie Village, Kans.; Charles J. Hearst, Cedar Falls, Iowa; Fred W. Heinkel, Columbia, Mo.; Anson R. Horning, Larned, Kans.; Raymond E. Jackson, Headrick, Okla.; Woodrow W. King, Rock Falls, Ill.; Horace M. Layman, Decatur, Ala.; Z. A. McCasland, Clovis, N. Mex.; Thomas B. Mezger, Woodland, Calif.

John E. Mitchell, Flat Rock, Ind.; Orlando Odegard, Buxton, N. Dak.; Reagon Gray Peeler, Hereford, Tex.; Cushman S. Radebaugh, Orlando, Fla.; Lail W. Schmidt, Lamar, Colo.; Jack L. Smith, Condon, Oreg.; Don A. Stevens, Minneapolis, Minn.; Hassell Thigpen, Tarboro, N.C.; Thomas F. Toohey, St. Paul, Minn.; Gordon R. Twedt, Rudyard, Mont.; and Donald Wooten, Crosbyton, Tex.

SENATOR McGEE SPEAKS OUT FOR REA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, for many months we have seen a sustained attack on the Rural Electrification Administration and the principle of cooperative, consumer-owned electric companies. This attack threatens the continued success of a development which has transformed American agriculture and made it a part of the space age.

Mr. President, my good friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] recently spoke to the sixth annual meeting of the Midwest Electric Consumers Association, Inc., in Denver, Colo. In that speech the Senator from Wyoming, Senator McGee, not only presented an astute analysis of the problems facing REA systems, but gave a stirring challenge for those who believe in this idea to face the demands of the future and work for the proper and logical development of our tremendous resource potential in this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by the Honorable Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator From Wyoming, at the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Midwest Electric Consumers Association, Inc., Denver, Colo., December 9, 1963

CONSUMER-OWNED POWER AND THE RACE FOR TOMORROW

President Bonar, association officers, members, friends, today I speak to you at a time when the entire Nation is taking stock of itself. In the wake of the awful tragedy of President Kennedy's assassination, we have been forced to look inward to see whether our goals and our aspirations for ourselves and for our Nation measure up to the standards set over the years by the men who created and developed this great Nation. And many of us, far too many, have found something of shame and embarrassment in this self-evaluation. The values that once seemed so real, so meaningful, now seem to be tinsel and tissue paper. The goals we sought, now are sham and delusion. Those who once mouthed the oversimplifications and the vilifications of the fright peddlers and the bitter denunciations of the professional bigot now find a bitter aftertaste and the realization that they had abandoned not only the course of reason and good will, but had lost touch with the realities of life in the 20th century.

And now we have been abruptly brought face to face with hard reality—the reality that if you preach hate and discord, nonsense and ignorance, those whose souls are twisted by hate and nurtured by ignorance will take you literally. The end result is an action that even today, almost 3 weeks later, still defies belief and reason.

My point in probing into this national wound is to suggest that the reexamination of our national purpose it has engendered can be of great benefit to the cause of progress and national development. There are many who will not face the challenge to our future because they look only backward. They may now be willing to listen at least to a little of what we have to say.

In few areas of national concern is there more heat and less light than in the discussion of the relationship between consumer- and investor-owned power systems. Since this relationship and the growth and development of both systems are of vital concern to all of you here, I propose to speak at some length on this subject. First, however, I would like to talk about the whole picture of which electric power is a part.

NEW ECONOMIC DEMANDS

This picture is of the United States of America in the year 2000. The picture is of a nation in the midst of economic growth and development and providing a new and vastly improved way of life for its citizens and positive leadership for the world. Or the picture is of a nation beset by problems of shortage and supply, faltering here for lack of a mineral, lagging in development there because the population has outgrown the power supply. This is the choice of pictures, the two views of the future that we here today can see and that we here today in the 1960's will choose—by our actions or lack of them—for our children and grandchildren.

Let us consider some of the demands that will be made on our economy by the year 2000. And let me remind you that our experts have a distressing habit of shooting way under the mark when considering what our future needs will be. Nevertheless, the figures I have collected show that at the turn of the century we shall use each year nearly 200 million tons of steel and iron, an increase of 170 percent over 1960 production. The miracles of modern metallurgy are evidenced in the projected annual need for 151.5 thousand tons of molybdenum, an increase of 853 percent. Similarly, the demand for aluminum will increase 844 percent in the next 40 years.

Our petroleum consumption will jump from 3.2 billion to 10 billion barrels or 214 percent. Our municipalities in the West now use 3.7 billion gallons of water a day. By the year 2000 they will need more than 20 billion gallons.

In an area with which you are familiar, I will point out that in 1960 our Nation used a total of 845 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity. Your grandchildren in 2000 will be consuming 4,711 billion kilowatt-hours, and I hope that it will be there when they flip the switch.

VAST RESOURCES

These figures go on for a long time. But what they all say is that we are going to have unprecedented demands upon our national resources in the very near future. And it should be obvious that our national existence depends upon how well these demands are met.

The problem we face is serious, but it could be worse. For the resources that we need exist; the problem will be to provide for their proper utilization. The minerals and mineral fuels are in the ground, our farmers have demonstrated—too well for the moment—their capacity to grow more and more food with less and less labor. Thermal, hydroelectric, and nuclear electric power potential is all but unlimited.

Three years ago I had the Geological Survey prepare a report on the mineral resources that exist in my State so that we would have, collected for easy reference, some idea of our potential for growth. Now I am accustomed to dealing in superlatives when it comes to the State of Wyoming, but I must admit that I was truly amazed when that document was prepared. There are in Wyoming 9 metals in the earth, and 14 different substances classified as useful minerals and construction materials. Naturally, the report reflected our vast petroleum potential and our deposits of oil shale. In addition to all this, the report noted that 41 percent of the State is underlaid with coal.

Now while Wyoming is naturally a leader in many fields, it is not unique in this regard, and certainly the other States represented here today have similar potential. The problem is to convert this potential into production. This will involve new ideas and new effort. New ways to utilize mineral deposits not now workable must be developed. New techniques of mobilizing every drop of water and every acre of suitable land must be explored. Much of our present range and forest land is in a sad state of repair. Erosion, disease and insect damage, and improper utilization have combined to rob us of vast amounts of pasture and lumber. Rehabilitation programs must be initiated and carried out.

Billions of gallons of water now run unused into the sea, evaporate from reservoirs, are contaminated into uselessness or are wasted in other ways. Just this month the new nation of Algeria launched a full-scale tree-planting program to prevent the Sahara from squeezing it into the Mediterranean. The rise and fall of civilizations throughout the Mideast reflects the misuse of water and nature's system of water conservation. As a member of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, I have followed this problem closely. While I will not submit to you any more statistics, I will say that, if this waste is permitted to continue, things are going to be pretty dry around the country in a very few years.

ATTACK ON PROGRESS

For at some length now, I have gone on about the subject of natural resources, because I am convinced that we cannot stress the need for orderly and immediate development too strongly. We in this Nation need more and more people willing to take up the cause of resource development. Because for every person who is willing to face and to plan for the future, there is another person who clings to the status quo as if it were the magic key to survival. To many, planning on any large scale is heresy. These people would not dream of living without insurance, yet they resist effort to provide even more vital life insurance for their Nation's future. These are the people who in the 1930's decried the TVA as an unwarranted encroachment on the private domain and saw nothing but waste in the hydroelectric projects in the West. Yet, where would we be today if it had not been for the electric power produced by these projects and fed to our aluminum producers and to those strange operations taking place at Oak Ridge, Tenn. Literally hundreds of small private enterprise businesses, moreover, sprang up in their wake.

This brings me back to the subject which has brought all of you here—electricity. I have been speaking of those people whose look at the world is distorted by preconceptions and prejudices of an old order that believed the many existed to support the few and that any interference with the right to take as much as economic or political power would permit was thwarting divine providence. These people have many targets—

labor unions, urban renewal, the income tax, the United Nations, farm programs, social security, and the Rural Electrification Administration.

The size and persistence of this attack was made very plain to me just recently in Washington. Into my office came the December issue of a very popular magazine that usually prints condensed articles that have appeared in other magazines. It has one of the highest circulations in America. In this issue is an article, not reprinted from anywhere else, entitled "The REA—A Case Study of Bureaucracy Run Wild." If any of you aspire to the propagandist's trade, be sure to read this article. It is a masterpiece—a masterpiece of distortion, omission, half-truth, and innuendo.

ONLY HALF THE STORY

You probably can guess what this article said if you haven't yet read it. It claimed that the REA was in unfair competition with private-power companies who found their great willingness to provide electricity to everybody at extremely low prices thwarted by a monstrous bureaucracy. Not only are REA's getting cheap loans from the Government, they are building generating plants that duplicate existing private facilities and developing in urban areas with "needless" loans, according to this article. I will not go into further detail; I'm sure most of these charges have been heard by you before—and you will probably be hearing them again since this magazine very generously sells reprints of articles such as this in wholesale lots.

It might be interesting to ask the authors of this article where the private-power companies were 30 years ago when less than 10 percent of our farms were electrified. And if they now insist that REA loans are unfair because the government pays more than 2 percent for its borrowed money, why they did not seek a lowering of the REA loan rate years ago when the Treasury was paying less than 2 percent for its money. Does the fact that the average cooperative-power company has 3.3 customers per mile of line while the average private-power company has 32 per mile have any bearing? I think it does, but the authors of this article do not. Nor do they mention the fact that individual cooperative-power organizations invest $4 of their own money for each $1 in government loans, or that last year the repayment of these loans passed the $1 billion mark. And I am wondering if the private companies are prepared to accept the requirement that holds for the cooperative organizations that they furnish power to almost everybody in their distribution area who wants it and not just to those who fit into their geographic distribution.

It would be interesting to refute this article point by point, but this is a defensive action; and we must offer the positive side of the argument if we are to be successful.

FARM WIFE GAINS

If ever there has been a revolution in an industry, it has been in the agricultural industry. And the impetus for that revolution is in the electric power provided by the REA. Many of you here remember full well when a farmer's life was a life of perpetual drudgery, the repetitious performance of chores and a life with little recreation in virtual isolation from the rest of the world. Today these chores are done automatically by electric milkers, feed grinders, and the like. The farm house is warm and filled with light, the plumbing is inside, it is no longer a major project to take a bath. And the world, brought near by the automobile, is present—perhaps a little too loudly—in the living room through television and radio. The farmer's life is still no vacation, but he is now part of the modern world with the worst of the drudgery and uncomfort removed.

Some of the greatest benefits of rural electrification have been gained by the farm wife. No longer is she numbed by continual manual labor and a spirit of deadening drudgery. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, has told me of a friend who is a Methodist minister in southern Illinois who attributes to REA a lessening in the divorce rate among farm couples. The husband and wife are no longer so tired and worn at the day's end, he said, and thus less prone to argue and fight with each other.

The world has changed since the original powerlines worked their way out into the country. Areas once completely rural are now suburbs. Little industries, with more than little power demands, are locating away from the crowded cities in towns and hamlets. The cooperative-power companies, who brought the initial power to this area, are ready, willing, and able to meet the new power demands of the space age. But now—now that the power needs are up, it is determined by those who by some mysterious mandate set right from wrong that cooperative power must now leave these areas—the areas that once nobody else would take—so that private power can take over and make their rightful profit. It is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain a good humor in the face of this argument. Yet, lest I be misunderstood, the question in power generation is not either or; private versus co-op. Rather the need—and desperately so—is for both. We can ill afford the reckless activities of one to destroy the other. Our future cries out against such shortsightedness.

In spite of this, not a year passes in the Senate—particulary in the Appropriations Committee—when there isn't a quiet, or unadvertised, or sly move made to erode the position of the electric co-ops. It is this persistent attempt to put them out of business that should point up the need for urgent and alert awareness of the political implications which currently threaten the REA's around the country. For altogether too long members, and presumably believers, of and in REA co-ops have taken their existence for granted. They have assumed that their role was so clearly defined by history that it could never be challenged. But it is being challenged—and in a way that may injure, or even wipe out, the great gains of REA co-ops.

TOP PRIORITY

Therefore, it is incumbent upon every person interested in the broad principle of the REA to stop taking this development for granted and start fighting for its preservation. This means more than just talk. It means action. A one-word synonym for action is "votes." Every electric cooperative member ought to place the preservation of the co-ops at the top of his priority list of election-year issues before it is too late.

All of this is said even at the very moment that the cooperative movement is doing its finest job in keeping up with the space age. Nor in no sense is it threatening to put private power out of business. It will surprise many to find that the ogre of cooperative power sells to less than 20 percent of the Nation's power consumers. Despite this disparity in size, the REA's across the land have kept up with the vast increases in power demand. Once electricity is available, its uses multiply with great rapidity. The Main Street merchants who have sold more than $1 billion in appliances, wiring and equipment should not forget this fact. An REA generation plant using atomic energy has recently opened for business in Elk River, Minn. New techniques for generation are being tested in many places.

In this regard, I would like to mention a new development that possesses the potential for a vast new electric-generating potential in the West. You will get the technical details here tomorrow morning, but I would like now to consider the overall meaning of this development. I refer to the development of practical air-cooled, thermal generating plants. As you know, a lot more of the West has coal than has water. Many sites that were ideal by all other considerations were ruled out for generating plants because they lacked the necessary water. Now it is possible—or will be shortly—to generate this power from coal without the water. This is a breakthrough of tremendous importance to the West. And it is significant all the more because it can be coupled with the new long-distance, high-voltage transmission techniques so the power can be sent to where it can be used.

SPEED DEVELOPMENT

Thus, we can take advantage of the fact that power demand peaks at different times in different areas and send our power the extra hundreds of miles to other time zones and other climates where it can be efficiently used. I need not tell you what the passing of the steam locomotive has done to the coal industry in Wyoming and other Western States any more than I need tell you what the realization of this new technique could do for the coal industry and, therefore, to the whole Western economy.

I would propose that the work on this process be accelerated with as much speed as is possible and would tell you of my intention to institute whatever action is necessary in the U.S. Senate to make sure the facilities of the Government are being put to maximum use in this development.

We have talked about many things here today, but there is a constant thread that has run through all these remarks and that is the knowledge that for every plan we propose to meet the challenge of the future, for every attempt to consolidate and strengthen the gains of the past, there are those who say no. They give impressive arguments and insist that theirs is the only truly American way. And too often they monopolize the idea channels of our society.

CHALLENGE FOR FUTURE

At the beginning I said that we have been cruelly shocked into a period of reexamination of our national purpose. And this, then, is the time for those who would face the realities of life and the realities of the future to press forward with word and deed. When you hear the propaganda assaults on cooperative power or on resource development, do not turn away to avoid unpleasantness and controversy. You must defend these ideas on the firing line of Main Street, in the social clubs, and the barber shops. Americans have traditionally been able to make the wisest choice when they have all the information at hand. And providing that information is your job.

I looked for some time for a significant quotation with which I might end these remarks—one that would convey to you the challenge of the future and the responsibility to meet that challenge. And I believe that I have found what I was searching for. The statement I shall read to you was made last year in Pierre, S. Dak. by John Fitzgerald Kennedy:

"The role of the REA is not finished, as some would believe. We are rapidly approaching the time when this Nation will boast a 300 million population, a $2 trillion national income, and a grave responsibility as the breadbasket and food market for a world whose population will have doubled. That is the prospect for the end of this century—and the key to this century is power—power on the farm as well as the factory—power in the country as well as the city. As the need for power on the farm and the countryside continues to increase, electricity rates must remain low—more generating capacity must develop—and soon the vast resources of nuclear energy must be tapped.

This is not a choice between spending and saving—for REA is a form of saving: saving hours and lives on the farm—saving farms for our Nation's needs—and saving and returning to our Nation's government every dollar loaned, with interest. Our electric power needs will double during this decade—our economic, military and international posture will require a continuing ability to find new sources of energy. Surely a continent so rich in minerals, and a society so replete with scientists and technicians can meet this challenge by making the best possible use of all our energy resources and all who are engaged in transmitting it."

CRITICISM OF 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the recent rash of articles, editorials and news stories critical of the 88th Congress might well leave the impression that this criticism reflects general public opinion.

From their daily mail, Senators, of course, know this is not the case. They know that the function of the Congress is not merely to produce laws indiscriminately. They realize that our role is not unlike that of the loan officer in a bank who reviews loan applications, granting the good ones and rejecting the bad ones. So it is with legislation. Our purpose, indeed our duty, is to review bills to act advisedly by enacting the good ones and rejecting the bad ones.

I wish to share with the Senate a letter I have just received from a most perceptive citizen of McCook, Nebr., Mr. Wade Stevens, who has practiced law there for more than 40 years.

He has sent me a copy of a letter addressed to the Saturday Evening Post and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McCOOK, NEBR., *December 12, 1963*.

The SATURDAY EVENING POST,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: Your editorial "The Waterlogged Congress" and the article by Stewart Alsop, "The Failure of Congress," both in the December 7 issue, should not go unchallenged. You state that "as presently constituted, Congress is not truly representative of the people."

The fact that the "four major objectives" have not been enacted is most likely due to the fact that Congress does represent the people and that each Member knows something about what his constituents are thinking. It is possible that the people do not want a tax cut without reduced spending; that they do not want a civil rights bill which destroys important rights; that they know that an aid-to-education bill is not necessary or desirable; and that medicare is too socialistic for the American stomach.

There was a time when the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government were supposed to have their separate functions. Your thinking appears to be that the legislative was made for the executive and that unless the Congress performs all of the whims of the administration it becomes a failure and no longer represents the people.

Very truly yours,

WADE STEVENS.

AN INTERNATIONAL EPIDEMIOLOGICAL YEAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in all the field of international cooperation, there is perhaps greater agreement on one phase than on any other—the need to cooperate on world health.

It is almost universally recognized that in this "jet age," the citizen of every country is every other man's neighbor. He is, thanks to modern flight, no more than a few hours away, meaning just a few hours away from conditions of health or of disease, communicable or otherwise.

For a number of years, there have been proposals for launching an all-out effort for a breakthrough for health in geographic areas which have been riddled with pestilence from time immemorial.

One of the inspirations for such an effort was the success of international teamwork in the famous International Geophysical Year.

SENATE RESOLUTION FOR IHY

Twice I have offered, and twice the Senate has unanimously approved, a resolution for an international public health and medical research year, known popularly as IHY.

This concept was likewise unanimously approved by the United Nations General Assembly.

But when IHY was turned over to the World Health Organization, that great body found, unfortunately, that its finances were so desperately limited that it had no alternative but to defer action indefinitely on such a year.

The fact is that few other industrialized nations have been willing to help shoulder the increased costs for such an intensive new program. And the developing nations are, of course, so hard-pressed financially that they can fulfill even their limited existing health programs only with difficulty.

A way has been sought, therefore, for a more modest, lower cost, yet meaningful world health surge.

PROPOSAL FOR IEY

In Sunday's New York Herald Tribune, the distinguished science editor, Mr. Earl Ubell, has made an important proposal for one type of concentrated international counteroffensive against disease.

He proposes what he terms "IEY"—an International Epidemiological Year. It would be a year in which the combined scientific resources of the world would be mobilized to study the geographic distribution of disease.

Once science would come to know better where disease exists, in what numbers and severity, it could proceed to pinpoint the groups who are actually stricken by disease—that is, what race, religion, sex, age group, cultural group. By adding to these clues such key facts as that group's eating habits, circumstances of work, natural environment, and so forth, science could unlock answers to current mysteries of disease.

This type of detection is known to science as the discipline of epidemiology. It is not a new discipline; history is full of its successes. But it is a discipline which has hardly been tapped to a fraction of its potential.

As in the case of other scientific efforts, its use is not without some controversy. Sometimes, for example, scientists question a conclusion which correlates one set of facts of incidence of disease with another; thus, they contend, the correlation may be a matter of coincidence, not of cause and effect.

Be that as it may, the science of location of where disease strikes, whom it strikes, how it strikes, is an established, long-proven, valuable science.

Mr. Ubell's suggestion is entitled to the most earnest consideration by the World Health Organization and the international scientific community.

MANY VALUABLE ASSETS TO IEY

The suggestion has many virtues: First, it would involve genuine cooperation on a two-way basis by both the "haves" and the "have-not" nations, second, it could be mutually beneficial—it could track down clues to such diseases as cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and so forth, which are the foremost health concerns in the Western World, and the communicable diseases which are the principal killers in the emerging nations; third, it would build on present foundations; it would not be so completely new as to lack effective roots. Many oversea epidemiological studies have been made in recent years under both international and national auspices—by WHO, by our own National Institutes of Health, by private American foundations, by some foreign sources; fourth, it would seek the possible. It would not set goals so impossibly high as to be unrealistic and frustrating. For example, indigenous epidemiologists who are in short supply in many deprived countries could be trained to perform helpful duties without too much cost and without taking too long a time; fifth, IEY would lay a basis for continuous action, long after it had nominally ended. Of course, no mere 12- or 18-month effort can alone provide a permanent answer.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE'S WORK

And so, I commend this proposal. This commendation is based, I might add, not on a one-shot examination, but on the basis of years of prior study from a policy standpoint.

In 1959, a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, made a study on the importance of epidemiology.

We published the study as the sixth print in our "international health" series. The print was circulated throughout the world and was widely commended.

As Mr. Ubell correctly states, however, our study's suggestions were, unfortunately, not "picked up" by others in dynamic action.

The time is overdue for such action. Let us first survey what epidemiological studies are now underway, under whose auspices, where and how; and second, what important studies are "on the shelf"—have been sidetracked for lack of men and money.

Then, let a conference of the world's greatest epidemiologists be convened.

Let it lay plans for coordination of the present largely haphazard studies.

Let it set up a proposed program, a system of priorities and a blueprint for task forces to work on tracking down clues on major categories of disease.

And then, let there be an International Epidemiological Year. Let the United

States take the initiative, as it so often has, to its great credit and to mankind's benefit.

We have the resources. We have the largest numbers of highly skilled manpower—at NIH, in the Department of Defense, at the famed Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service in Atlanta, and in State and city health departments across the land. We have the will. And we will be serving ourselves, as well as others.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Ubell's article be printed at this point in the Record:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Dec. 15, 1963]

Counting Out Disease: One, Two, Three—A Million

(By Earl Ubell, science editor)

What is the Bantu to you, or you to the
Bantu,
That you should count of them?
—With apologies to William Shakespeare.

It started with a pump handle in London and may well end with conquest of cancer and most of the ills of mankind. It is epidemiology, the science of counting noses, of determining who is sick and who is well and of isolating the disease generators—be they germs, contaminated water, cigarette smoke, or diet.

Dr. John Snow removed the pump handle from the London well in 1854 after he counted the cholera cases and spotted them on a map. By the way the cases clustered around the neighborhood of the pump, he indicted the water as a cholera carrier long before science suspected a cholera germ.

Just last week the Snow technique reached its zenith with another installment of the American Cancer Society's mammoth study of a million persons. The clusters of numbers tied cigarette smoking to lung cancer, heart attack, breathing troubles, and cancer in general. The society's scientists did it with computers, questions, and head counting.

Yet the lesson of the cancer society's achievement goes far beyond cigarettes: It exhorts the nations of the world to get together and apply John Snow's method to every ailment from pinworms to cancer, to every people in every land. At this moment in history, opportunity, technology, and manpower are prepared as never before.

And the nations already have a model for this sort of scientific cooperation in the fantastically successful International Geophysical Year, a period of 18 months that started in 1958 and in which more than 60 countries banded together and spent hundreds of millions of dollars to plumb the mysteries of earth, sky, and sun.

Why not, then, an International Epidemiological Year?

Out of such a scientific enterprise (at a far cheaper price than IGY), could come untold medical riches. With much poorer instruments the head-counters in the past brought about control of smallpox, childbirth fever, typhus, malaria, yellow fever, beriberi, pellagra, scurvy. Nobody pooh-poohed their efforts as "just statistics."

Though there is much statistical work left to be done on infectious diseases, epidemiology has moved into the field of chronic ills—heart ailments, cancer, mental disease and the afflictions of age. Even now, epidemiology has already thrown up clues to those terrible disorders.

The Bantu in South Africa, who live on a diet low in animal fat, have arteries free of cholesterol—a hint concerning the origin of the disease in New York. In Central Africa, a strange cancer-like disease of the jaw seems to be the first example of a cancer caused by a virus. And a crude survey of people all over the world indicates that schizophrenia may be inherited as is eye color, hair curliness and skin shade.

But more than indicating to medical science the directions to follow in the laboratory, epidemiological research frequently points directly to ways of preventing the ailment: you remove the pump handle to stop cholera, you introduce fresh vegetables and meat into a pellagra region, you vaccinate against smallpox. You need not know the "real cause" of the disease, only the epidemiologically indicated cause.

An International Epidemiological Year (IEY) could provide a channel for the worldwide distribution of this powerful scientific tool. And IEY could give Western scientists fresh access to those natural situations (like the Bantu) that illuminate Western afflictions. An IEY could give underdeveloped countries the first real measure of the extent and kind of disease that ravages their populations.

An IEY could start out modestly with a conference of the world's leading epidemiologists, just as the IGY started out with a conference of geophysicists. Then later, the nations of the world could put the power of their money and sovereignty behind the exploration of the world of disease.

The next step could move on to simple epidemiological problems. For example, in some parts of the world the fall of a man is hardly marked more accurately (or even at all) than the fall of a sparrow. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that only a third of the world's deaths are registered, to say nothing of the listing the cause of death.

In the next stage, multination disease surveys carried out simultaneously under standardized conditions could reveal the source and prevention of such diseases as cancer, arthritis, and other chronic ills.

In 1959 the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations under Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, provided a kind of outline for an IEY with a committee report on "Patterns of Incidence of Certain Disease Throughout the World—Opportunities for Research Through Epidemiology." But nobody took up the challenge.

Instead a proposal came forward for an International Medical Year in which it was suggested that scientists from different lands work in this country and vice versa, a process that goes on naturally anyway. Usually such exchanges mean that the medical "haves" hand down their medical wisdom to the "have-nots."

An IEY, however, provides a means for real international medical cooperation. It is not the rich countries giving to the poor, but each nation providing, through the happenstance of natural disease conditions, the data to control disease worldwide.

In an IEY, the South African Bantu contributes as much to the health of the man walking the streets of New York as an Atlanta polio expert does to the Indian of the jungles of Guatemala.

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLES SIRAGUSA, A COURAGEOUS PUBLIC OFFICIAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most important, continuing efforts in the Nation today is the suppression of the illegal use of narcotic drugs.

A recent dinner, cohosted by Mr. Harry J. Anslinger, former Federal Commissioner of Narcotics, and Mr. Sam Pryor, of Pan American World Airways, honored Mr. Charles Siragusa, who is leaving the post of Deputy Commissioner of Narcotics to take the position of executive director of the Illinois Crime Investigation Commission.

Mr. Anslinger was kind enough to write a report on this dinner and the effective work of these men. His communication includes the texts of letters from President Johnson, Attorney General Kennedy, and Treasury Secretary Dillon. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Anslinger's letter be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Humphrey: We were profoundly disappointed that you were unable to attend the dinner for Mr. Charles Siragusa, Deputy Commissioner of Narcotics, who has recently been appointed executive director of the Illinois Crime Investigating Commission. We know that the urgency of events dictated your absence. Knowing your intense interest in the narcotics problem, particularly as you are widely recognized in the pharmacy profession, in accordance with your request, I will give you a brief résumé of the farewell dinner which was held at the Hotel Stater Hilton on the evening of December 11, 1963.

Mr. Sam Pryor was my cohost at this dinner. Mr. Pryor is a dedicated public-spirited citizen. He has wide-and-varied interests in the business world. I wish, along with many others, that there were businessmen in this country who have such a vital interest in law enforcement. He has been extremely helpful to the Bureau, not only in the United States but in other parts of the world in suppressing the abuse of narcotic drugs. In Connecticut, he is a stanch supporter of law enforcement agencies. Some few years ago, at my suggestion, Mr. Pryor enrolled in the Federal Bureau of Narcotics Training School, and graduated from that school with honors.

Mr. Pryor, in paying his respects to the outstanding career of Mr. Siragusa and regretting his departure from the Federal service, said that the foundation of freedom in all countries and communities was good law enforcement.

Senator Thomas J. Dodd, chairman of the Senate Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, related that in that afternoon the Senate had just paid tribute to the late President John F. Kennedy and he explained how this all-serious of tragic events had close relationship with good law enforcement. Senator Dodd is highly respected by all law enforcement agencies, being an alumnus of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In introducing the guest of honor, I pointed out that in 25 years of reading the reports of Charles Siragusa and his accomplishments in breaking up international narcotic gangs, international counterfeit rings, and his many other activities for the Armed Services Investigating Agencies, his stopping the diversion of highly strategic materials to Iron Curtain countries; also, showed his many extracurricular investigative activities which he had been requested to undertake on behalf of foreign governments. I stated, also, that he had many awards, had been Italian-American Man of the Year, and received one of the highest decorations by the Government of Italy; these medals having been deposited in the Department of State.

His top superior in the Treasury, the Honorable James A. Reed, Assistant Secretary, spoke of his close association with Mr. Siragusa in law enforcement work, particularly in his travels in many countries, much of which time was devoted to narcotic enforcement. Mr. Reed has been a stanch supporter of the Bureau, especially in relation to the 1961 Narcotic Convention, which we hope will not become operative, as it would destroy many of the controls and safeguards of previous nine treaties and protocols.

Mr. Reed's predecessor, the Honorable A. Gilmore Flues, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, told of his many relationships with Charles Siragusa in the field of international narcotic law enforcement. He related how he traveled throughout the world and in talking with foreign officials of many governments at high level, their first remark was, "How is Charlie?"

New York State Supreme Court Justice Victor L. Anfuso paid his respects to Mr. Siragusa and was particularly proud that a man of Italian extraction had been able to perform such diligent and extremely valuable service to his country and that Mr. Siragusa was preeminently qualified to take on the directorship of the Illinois Crime Investigating Commission which will be a pioneer in the field of law enforcement and the first State commission of this kind to be established in the United States.

Mr. John J. Bellizzi, chief of the New York State Division of Narcotics and one of the Directors of the International Narcotic Enforcement Officers' Association, presented a desk set with appropriate insignia to Mr. Siragusa in his new position.

Charles Siragusa, in responding to the numerous accolades bestowed on him, replied with earnest appreciation for the many remarks and honors.

The Treasury Department presented Mr. Siragusa with a Gallatin Award and also the following citation:

"In recognition of an outstanding record of achievement.

"In your dedicated efforts in the struggle against the illicit narcotic drug traffic and organized crime, you have demonstrated outstanding ability, inspiring leadership, and extraordinary personal courage.

"Your noteworthy achievements have made a lasting contribution to the Treasury Department and to the Nation.

"DOUGLAS DILLON."

The Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General, sent the following letter which was read by the Honorable Herbert J. Miller, Assistant Attorney General:

"The Chicago Crime Commission is to be congratulated on its acumen in selecting as its deputy director a man such as yourself.

"Your many years of service with the Bureau of Narcotics are characterized by devotion to duty, initiative, imagination and leadership. I have no doubt that the successful and impressive record of accomplishment which the Bureau has amassed in the past several years is due in large measure to your efforts on its behalf. You have reason to take great pride in your service to the Bureau and to the Nation.

"On behalf of myself and those others in the Department of Justice who have been privileged to know you and to work with you I extend to you best wishes for the future.

Sincerely,

"BOB,
"Attorney General."

The most important event of the evening was the following letter to Mr. Siragusa which was sent by the President, Lyndon B. Johnson, and read by Senator THOMAS J. DODD:

"Our country is indeed fortunate to have had you one of the leaders in the struggle against the illicit narcotic traffic and organized crime.

"During your long, professional career, your worldwide successes have established you as an outstanding law enforcement official fully qualified to accept the most challenging assignments.

"While I regret your leaving the Federal service, I wish you every success and congratulate the State of Illinois on their good judgment in drawing upon your selfless dedication and inspiring leadership.

"Sincerely,

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON."

Sincerely and respectfully,
HARRY J. ANSLINGER,
Federal Commissioner of Narcotics (Retired).

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE NEGRO REVOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the RECORD an article in the December 1963 issue of the New York University Alumni News entitled "Negro Revolution: Its Economic Impact" by Jules Backman, research professor of economics New York University. Professor Backman gives the background in this article for seven results which he believes the current civil rights revolution could bring about. When economic discrimination against Negro citizens ends, he believes we will see: first, a 50 percent increase in the average income of Negroes; second, greater productivity of a better-trained labor force; third, a reduction in school drop-outs; fourth, the creation of a million or more jobs; fifth, a vast reduction in unemployment; sixth, a reduction in community costs for welfare programs—offset in part by the higher cost of educational programs—and seventh, a higher rate of economic growth. Professor Backman's judgment reenforces earlier opinion rendered by other authorities such as the eminent Swedish economist, Gunnar Myrdal, who was recently the guest of Senator Clark's Subcommittee on Manpower here at the Senate; of our own Secretaries of Commerce and the Treasury who have pointed to the economic drag which racial discrimination imposes on our economy; and a recent study entitled, "The Businessman and the Negro," appearing in the September 1963 issue of Fortune magazine written by Charles E. Silberman. When the Senate considers the equal employment opportunity provisions of the civil rights bill in the coming months, I hope the Members will keep this authoritative testimony in mind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGRO REVOLUTION: ITS ECONOMIC IMPACT

(By Jules Backman)

Less unemployment and greater economic growth—these are two significant economic benefits which will accompany the attainment of equality by the Negro. The Negro is entitled to equality for ethical, religious, moral, and social reasons. There are also compelling economic grounds. Too little attention has been directed to the benefits that could accrue to our economy if the condition of the Negro were improved. Although the economic ramifications are less important than the other considerations, they do represent an important plus for permitting the Negro to achieve his aspirations. When he does, our economy will gain from:

A 50 percent increase in the average income of Negroes.

The greater productivity of a better-trained labor force.

A reduction in school dropouts.

The creation of a million or more jobs.

A vast reduction in unemployment.

A reduction in community costs for welfare programs (offset in part by the higher cost of educational programs).

A higher rate of economic growth.

Negroes accounted for 18.9 million or about one-tenth of our total population in 1960. This significant segment of our citizenry has participated less than proportionately in income, jobs and educational opportunities. The average income level of Negroes is about three-quarters as high as that of whites except in the South, where it is only three-eighths as great.

Their poorer income status reflects mainly two factors: (1) discrimination in hiring policies, and (2) lesser educational opportunities. Negroes usually have had several years less schooling than whites and the quality of their education, particularly in the South, has been inferior; only about one Negro in five holds a high school diploma, a ratio about half as large as that for whites.

INSUPERABLE BARRIER

This lack of education creates an almost insuperable barrier for many jobs for which the high school diploma has become a minimum requirement. It stands in the way of getting better-paying jobs. The resulting low income of poorly educated Negro parents makes it difficult for them to support their children until they finish high school. A vicious circle has been created, with the financial difficulties of the parents limiting the educational opportunities of the children. Moreover, discrimination against them in better-paying jobs has impaired the incentive of many to seek greater education.

Several national programs deal with this problem in a small way. For example, the 1962 Manpower Development and Training Act provides for the retraining of unemployed and underemployed individuals in occupations that seem likely to provide opportunities for future employment. However, by the end of July 1963, only about 50,00 persons had been covered by this program.

The Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 provides for retraining of workers in economically distressed areas. As of July 1963, the total number of workers affected was merely 25,000. Since these two programs cover all workers, the number of Negroes involved obviously is very small.

The Secretary of Labor has ordered that apprenticeship programs financed by the Federal Government would not be certified if they involve discrimination. This can open up job opportunities for some younger Negroes.

There are also Federal and State fair employment laws. One illustration is the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. Its activities are related to firms which hold government contracts of at least $10,000. It can require these companies to hire and to promote without discrimination as to race. In addition, it may deny government contracts to firms that do not agree to abide by the rules. While some jobs have been opened up by this program, the total appears to be quite small.

The Federal Government has attempted to prevent racial job discrimination on Federal construction projects and in connection with defense contracts. Although such contracts must contain antidiscrimination clauses, the emphasis has been on voluntary compliance.

Local community pressures also have developed to expand job opportunities for Negroes in various crafts, particularly in the building trades. A little progress is being made in this area in a few cities. To some extent the hiring of Negroes in the building trades may be at the expense of job opportunities for whites. However, the expansion of apprenticeship programs to include Negroes does not cause any employed white person to lose his job. It does mean that whites who might have been apprenticed must seek jobs elsewhere.

The programs adopted to date have made only a minor contribution to the solution of the problem. Although any steps represent some progress, these are small, hesitant measures rather than major solutions.

In addition, some token measures have been taken in the South. But this cancer will not be cured by the admission of one, two, or a handful of Negroes into the public schools and colleges. The integration in education that has developed in many southern communities is a farce. The universities and colleges in the South should be the citadels of freedom; instead they are the bastions to be stormed. They should be providing the leadership for the effectuation of the Supreme Court's decisions; instead they are passive, if not resistant, to change. Their leaders should be bold; instead they are pusillanimous.

The elimination of the barriers to job opportunities for Negroes and other groups against whom discrimination is effectively practiced is a vital first step which can bring some immediate improvement. Improved educational opportunities is the road to longer term gains.

IMPACT ON GROWTH

There is considerable concern over the lag in economic growth in the United States. Improvement in the status of the Negro should help in part to overcome this lag. Economic growth is influenced by the training, skill, and education of the population and by its most efficient use in production.

The more educated the labor force, the more productive it will be. Improvement in technology, so vital to economic growth, depends on education. Efforts have been made to measure the role of education in economic growth. Although no precise answer can be given, it has been estimated that close to one-fourth of the rise in gross national product and more than two-fifths of the gain in output per worker over the past three decades has resulted from greater education.

For these reasons economists include education as a vital contributing force to productivity. Productivity in turn is a key element in national economic growth. Improved educational opportunities will make possible greater skill and efficiency for the Negro and in turn will favorably affect national productivity.

The Bureau of the Census estimates that personal income of the Negro community totaled $21 billion in 1962, or about 4.8 percent of the national total. This proportion of personal income is considerably smaller than the 10.5 percent of the population accounted for by Negroes.

The Council of Economic Advisers has estimated that if discrimination were removed in education and employment, $13 to $17 billion could be added to gross national product. This would be an increase of 2.9 to 3.2 percent in the current total value of goods and services produced in this country. In part, this gain would reflect the more effective utilization of existing skills, including a reduction in unemployment for nonwhites.

VAST INCREASE

Dr. Andrew Brimmer, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs of the U.S. Department of Commerce, has estimated that an increase of this magnitude in gross national product would increase the personal income of Negroes $9 to $13 billion. In other words, the elimination of discrimination in education and in jobs would add some 50 percent to the total income received by Negroes.

Increases of this magnitude in gross national product and in consumer incomes could create a million or more jobs for Negroes and whites or could convert a substantial amount of part-time employment into full-time jobs. Such an increase would be large enough to solve most of our unemployment problem.

It must be emphasized that these estimates are extremely crude. There is no way to determine with any precision the full benefits to be derived if the opportunities available to the Negro were improved and his energies released under the stimulus of a more favorable environment. But that the economy would be benefited is unchallengeable.

Deficiencies in education cannot be made up overnight. A high school education is not realized by the stroke of a pen or by an expression of good intentions. The training of college men and women requires even longer periods of time. Moreover, these developments cannot be dissociated from the economic circumstances of the family, since this is often the source of pressure to discontinue education.

Greatest immediate progress can be made by eliminating discrimination in jobs. However, even that measure cannot solve the problem completely because of the relatively small number of highly educated and highly skilled Negroes available.

It will take many years to correct the inadequacies and injustices of the past. Thus, the opening up of opportunities for improved education and jobs will not be reflected in an immediate burgeoning of economic growth. Over the years, however, it can make an important contribution.

Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz has emphasized how the plight of the Negro hurts local business in the affected areas. Wirtz has said that "business in trade and services is reported to have improved among numerous firms and in cities where desegregation has occurred."

In recent years, the South has been experiencing an industrial boom. To continue this boom will require a large pool of skilled workers, which probably can be provided to a significant extent by Negroes, who are a large part of the labor supply. A failure to provide the education and training required by this group could in time abort the expansion, thus inflicting an economic penalty on the South and on the entire Nation.

Unemployment has been a persistent problem in recent years. Of 4 million unemployed in 1962, about 800,000 were nonwhites, mainly Negroes. Their unemployment rate was 11 percent as compared with 4.9 percent for whites.

But these figures do not show fully the unfavorable position of nonwhites. About one-quarter of the jobs for nonwhites were part time as compared with one-seventh for whites. Chronic unemployment—defined as 15 weeks or more—has accounted for a larger proportion of the total for nonwhites. In addition, the Negro usually is among the first to be laid off in periods of declining business activity and the last to be hired during periods of recovery, usualy because he has low seniority or is performing unskilled work. In the latter connection, the Negro is particularly vulnerable to automation that tends to wipe out unskilled or semiskilled jobs. Studies of plants show that the lack of education of the men replaced by machines has played a key role in limiting the ability to retain them for other jobs.

DROPOUTS REDUCED

Many of the unemployed are those who fail to complete high school. Negroes account for a large proportion of this group. They have little incentive to continue their education when they see their well-educated brothers and sisters compelled to accept jobs far below their skills. Improvements in job opportunities would be accompanied by a greater willingness to stay in school. Dropouts would be reduced.

It must be remembered that even under favorable economic circumstances we would have almost 3 million unemployed, the 4-percent rate to which President Kennedy frequently made reference. These people are unemployed for such reasons as illness, seasonal work (e.g., apparel, construction) and mobility of labor. Others are simply unemployable. Thus a reduction of somewhat more than a million in unemployment is required to reduce that total to tolerable levels.

If nonwhites had the same unemployment rate as whites—namely 4 percent—the number of unemployed would have been 400,000 less in 1962. Such a reduction would eliminate a substantial proportion—some 40 percent—of the excess unemployment and would make a major contribution to solving the unemployment problem.

Lack of education and training makes it virtually impossible for the Negro to get off the merry-go-round on which he finds himself. The key, therefore, is improved education and training for better jobs. Better jobs would not be assured, however, so long as widespread discrimination is practiced. In this respect, a modernization of the rules of some labor unions also would be helpful. But without improved education opportunities, the elimination of discrimination alone would only solve the problem in part.

Would the creation of these jobs displace an equal number held by white? In some instances, such a displacement undoubtedly would occur. However, many available jobs are not filled because of a shortage of trained personnel. Improved training or upgrading of already trained Negroes by the elimination of discrimination could meet this need in part. The increase in income generated by this employment then would generate expanded demand. In turn this would increase the total number of employment opportunities for both whites and Negroes. To the extent that trained Negroes are upgraded, their present jobs will be available to other Negroes or whites. Moreover, some jobs will be created, largely for whites, to handle the expansion in the schools and in training programs.

EDUCATION TAKES TIME

Our economy does not have a fixed number of jobs. Over the years, the total has increased markedly. Despite the lag in economic growth and the alleged adverse effects of automation there was a net increase of 3.5 million jobs between 1957 and 1963. This trend should continue in the years ahead. If Negroes obtain a larger proportion of the new jobs than in the past, the disparity in employment rates would be reduced or eliminated.

Finally, it takes time to educate and to train or to reeducate and to retrain. As a result, it would take many years to effect the changes required. Thus, the impingement upon the job opportunities of others by granting greater equality of opportunity to Negroes should be relatively unimportant in any period.

A decrease in the number of Negroes unemployed also would yield important benefits in terms of improved health and lower cost of welfare programs. The reduction in these costs would be offset in part by the increased cost of education. At the same time, the tax base would be broadened and higher revenues would be obtained by all levels of government. But even more important would be the yield in terms of better citizens with better health and increased human dignity.

ADVERSE EFFECTS

With economic change, improvement in the status of one group may hurt some persons who are not in the group—in fact, it usually does. Thus, as Negroes move up the economic ladder, the supply of unskilled labor will be reduced and some businesses will be unable to hire workers at the low wages they have been paying. They may suffer a cut in profits, as a result, and in some cases may even be forced out of business. Some whites will experience increased competition for jobs, as was noted earlier. While such adverse effects must be recognized, they cannot be made the excuse for a continuation of the intolerable situation that prevails.

An analogy may be drawn with child labor. On moral, economic, and social grounds, child labor was undesirable. Its elimination undoubtedly hurt many of the firms that took advantage of the situation and even inconvenienced some families that had depended upon the meager income brought home by their children. Nevertheless, there is now general agreement that the case for eliminating child labor was overwhelming and that the benefits derived by society from better-educated citizens with better health have far outweighed the losses to some marginal concerns that were able to thrive on the backs of children.

The same will be true for greater education and job opportunities for the Negro.

Rank injustice for any minority group is not in the democratic tradition. When that group includes more than one-tenth of the population, significant adverse economic effects are unavoidable. We have made haste much too slowly in this area.

We are wasting an extremely valuable human resource when we fail to open up all jobs to properly trained persons and when we fail to provide good educational opportunities for the Negro. One result is a drag on the rate of economic progress. Another is excessive unemployment.

Unfortunately, the mistakes of the past will take time to correct. They cannot be overcome by token measures. We require a prompt, massive attack on the problem, especially by opening the doors wide to educational opportunities and by eliminating the barriers to job opportunities. The elimination of job discrimination will provide some immediate relief and will provide the incentive for Negroes to undertake more extensive education. Improved educational opportunity is the important longrun solution because without it the Negro will not be qualified for the better jobs.

The case for equality of education and of job opportunities for the Negro is powerful on ethical, religious, social, moral, and economic grounds.

WE THE PEOPLE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, just recently there has appeared a new book giving the story of the U.S. Capitol. It is entitled "We the People," and is a publication of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society.

In 143 pages, complete with index, it is a superb guide to the Capitol, matching the fine job done for the White House under the stimulus of Mrs. John F. Kennedy, the wife of our late President.

Such a book on the Capitol has long been needed. Hundreds of thousands of people from all 50 States of the Union and from all over the world visit Washington every year. From schoolchildren to adults, they are well guided and given sound historical talks at the same time. Yet it would take many visits to remember and absorb all one wishes to. It would take a number of trips to fix in one's mind all of the color and a feeling for all of the rich historical art that is here. A book like "We the People" helps immensely in the recall of the visit. It permits a kind of continuous revisitation.

Persons who have come here many times have already expressed unbounded appreciation for the job which has been done with this book. The writing is excellent, the color plates of the very best, and the paper of a quality befitting the durability of the Capitol. As a matter of fact, I dare say that even some of us who have been around here some time will learn things from this book that we did not know.

Washington, D.C., in general, and the Capitol Building in particular, constitutes the largest single classroom in American history to be found anywhere, and handles the largest amount of students. This book will be an invaluable assistance to those who would learn in that classroom.

Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL is to be congratulated for his work as president of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society in bringing out this book. It was through the persistent and diligent work of Congressman SCHWENGEL that this splendid publication advanced from a dream to a reality. I have considered it a privilege and a honor to have shared in this endeavor. The National Geographic Society was indispensable, and deserves full appreciation.

I wish to commend this book to the attention of my colleagues and to suggest further that in newsletters and offices, they can promote the sale of this book with both pride and pleasure.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN IN MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I remember that when the budget for the District of Columbia was being discussed in the Senate there were many conflicting statements about the efficacy of welfare aid to dependent children. Most of the argument came over the addition of one extra category of children to the three groups now getting welfare funds. Children in the District and in many of the States now get relief funds if their parents are either dead, not present in the home, or physically incapacitated. The program which was requested for the District was ADCUP. Under that program children whose parents were employable, seeking work, but unable to find work enough to support their families, would come under the ADC program.

During the discussion the assertion was often made that ADC itself was not a good program and led to cheating, chicanery, and unending expense. Undoubtedly there is an element of truth in these claims. But is not due to the requirements of the program. Many States have successfully operated an ADC program and have found little difficulty in keeping their records, the feelings of the recipients, and their budgets, in balance.

In my fine State of Minnesota, the experience has been a fruitful and satisfactory one. A recent series of articles carried in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune have dealt with the ADC program in Minnesota. These articles exemplify the excellent results that can be obtained from ADC if it is properly administered and generous enough to reduce the incentive to cheat.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Caseworkers Find Little Cheating by Minnesota Welfare Recipients" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune, Dec. 11, 1963]

CASEWORKERS FIND LITTLE CHEATING BY MINNESOTA WELFARE RECIPIENTS

(By Sam Newlund)

Welfare is like income tax. They're both so complex that the line between honesty and cheating is sometimes blurred—or invisible.

Pinpointing the number of cheating welfare recipients is like specifying how many taxpayers are certain beyond doubt that they've paid the precise amount owed.

But for what it's worth, conversations with dozens of Minnesota caseworkers brought a universal response: Only a small percentage of their clients deliberately cheat.

Last summer, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) conducted for Congress a nationwide review of aid to dependent children (ADC) caseloads. This involved record checking and personal contacts with samples of cases.

Minnesota fared well in the statistics. The reviewers found 3.5 percent of the State's sample families had one or more persons who were not eligible for assistance but getting it anyway.

There were 14 States with a better record than this.

In 2 out of 100 Minnesota cases, the entire family was ineligible.

Of the 445 cases in the State sample, there was only 1 family which the reviewer was willing to say was deliberately perpetrating a fraud, according to the State welfare department. Of course, this didn't rule out the possibility of deliberate fraud in other cases.

Also, 18 percent of the State families were getting more than they should have (although they were eligible for a lesser amount), and 13 percent were getting less than they were entitled to.

Later, a team of ex-FBI agents investigated ADC and relief clients in St. Louis County and reported: "No fraud."

These findings, of course, don't square with the belief that welfare is a huge boondoggle in which hordes of unscrupulous drifters are bilking the taxpayers.

This is not to say that welfare recipients don't cheat. Some do.

Some ADC mothers spend much of their aid money on liquor, then lie to their caseworkers about it. Some get financial help from their paramours, then deny it.

Some recipients get jobs on the side and continue to draw full benefits. Some rural people get rides to town to plead for an emergency order, then split the "loot" with a friend who provided the transportation.

But persons who deal directly with these people point out:

The only available evidence indicates that flagrant, deliberate cheating is done by a minority of their clients.

Welfare recipients cannot be expected to be any more moral than the population as a whole. If they are less moral, proportionately, it is probably because they are stuck with proportionately greater social, economic, educational, and intellectual poverty—not because they are on welfare.

The line between cheating and honesty may be fuzzy.

This fuzziness can be illustrated in the case of a middle-aged ADC mother. She has one daughter, and is on ADC because the divorced father is a drunkard of low ability who can't support himself, let alone his offspring.

"Why did you throw him out?" a caseworker asked the mother.

"Drinking, cruelty," she said. "He beat me up. He's so belligerent. He isn't educated to the degree that he could carry on an intelligent conversation. But he thinks he knows it all. I swear—he would argue with his daughter and you'd think he was the same age as she was."

The mother brought up babysitting. She wanted to know if she could earn a little this way without losing some of her ADC money. (Regulations say no. Even small bits of income are to be reported to the caseworker so that adjustments in the grant can be made.)

"I'll be frank with you," replied the caseworker. "I'm not going to say much, although according to the book I should take note of any resources."

"How do all these others get by with it?" the woman demanded. She mentioned other ADC mothers who make sizable amounts without penalty.

"I know it goes on," the caseworker said. "But sooner or later somebody blows the whistle. I've got 85 mothers on my caseload, and I'll bet 70 of them do a little babysitting once in a while."

Anyway, he wasn't going to quibble about a few dollars now and then as long as it wasn't steady income.

Such realities are recognized by Morris Hursh, State welfare commissioner.

"If a guy mows a lawn and makes a couple of dollars or sweeps out the church and makes $2, nobody is going to take it away from him," Hursh says.

But if one of the reviewers in last summer's ADC study had come across such situations, he presumbly would have reported an overpayment.

In fact, the overpayments found in the 18 percent of the State included some amounts no greater than $1 a month. The biggest was $139.

Overpayments and payments to ineligible persons may be due to fraud. They may also be due to errors in arithmetic (in 1 county 3 of the 14 overpayments were for this reason). They may be due to misunderstanding on the client's part, or to a caseworker's failure to keep current with changing situations.

Suppose an ADC child turns 18, but the caseworker doesn't visit the home until 6 months later and the mother fails to report the child's birthday. For 6 months the family would get, for example, $25 a month more than it had coming, since ADC is supposed to stop at 18.

Suppose a woman turns 35. Unless the caseworker catches it, there will be an overpayment because the food allowance drops slightly at age 35.

Sometimes the same mistakes that cause a family to get too much can cause it to get too little. Children, for example, are due for bigger food allowances as they grow older.

What is done, then, to minimize fraud and honest mistakes?

Control measures are limited by shortages of caseworkers. Some clients might not see a caseworker more than once a year or so. The money just keeps coming.

But now, for ADC only, Federal requirements call for an eligibility review at least once every 6 months.

And in January the State welfare department will launch an intensified and continuing statewide eligibility check.

The Minneapolis Relief Division, which handles only general relief, maintains a special investigation section. In the year ending last June, the section took action in 64 "fraud" cases involving some $19,000. (Its case load is more than 2,000.)

All told, the division collected less than $1 of each $5 it had coming, according to Robert A. Hughes, head of the investigation section.

"Those people are so down and out that they couldn't make restitution if they wanted to," Hughes said.

Advocates of welfare crackdowns sometimes suggest "stakeouts" to spy on suspected cheaters and abusers of welfare. But social workers generally object on grounds of invasion of privacy.

Edward Fields, member of the Anoka County Welfare Board, says stakeouts would be "a good idea" whenever the board gets reports that a mother is entertaining a man overnight or is spending her money in taverns.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON INSPIRES CONFIDENCE BY FIRM HANDLING OF DUTIES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Houston Post in an editorial Monday, December 16, entitled "Johnson Inspires Confidence by Firm Handling of Duties," praised President Johnson for having reassured the country by the firmness and self-confidence which he has demonstrated in stepping up to the Presidency. I have been impressed equally with the Houston Post. President Johnson has moved with firmness, sureness, and with great ability.

Because this editorial expresses so well what appears to be the opinion of the Nation as a whole, still stunned and saddened by the loss of the late beloved President Kennedy, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post,
Dec. 16, 1963]

JOHNSON INSPIRES CONFIDENCE BY FIRM HANDLING OF DUTIES

Despite all the jokes made about his frequent use and pronunciation of the word, one of the attributes of the late President Kennedy which most Americans admired was the spirit of youthful vigor that he and his family brought into the White House and infused to a considerable extent into the entire executive branch of the Federal Government.

It has been said that the country was in need of the sense of buoyancy and optimistic hopefulness as to the future that he imparted by reason of his personality and his handling of the presidential office.

During the days that have followed his death and the accession of President Lyndon B. Johnson to the office, the country has been greatly impressed and reassured by the firmness and self-confidence with which the new President has taken over the vast responsibilities and heavy workload of the Presidency. They have been no less impressed by the vigor with which he moved in taking command. He has inspired nationwide confidence by demonstrating his competence to deal with the many difficult problems which he inherited.

In fact, some people, recalling the heart attack that he had several years ago and from which he has recovered, has begun to suggest somewhat cautiously that he may be driving himself too hard. This feeling is at least partly responsible for the growing interest that is being manifested in the matter of the presidential succession, what might happen if the new President should die or become disabled.

The country now, of course, has no Vice President, and the next man in line to become President is the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who is 71.

The pace at which the new President has been moving since taking over the office certainly came as no surprise to anyone who has known him personally. He has never been known as a contemplative man. On the contrary, his problem in recent years has been one of restraining himself as to his physical activities.

The relative quiet of the Vice Presidential office at least gave him an interlude in which his official responsibilities permitted some relaxation. But this interlude was ended abruptly by the assassin's bullet in Dallas.

It is possible that when President Johnson has become settled in the job and in the White House, he will find it unnecessary to maintain the somewhat hectic pace that he has kept during recent weeks. He may chafe under enforced inactivity, but as President he has a responsibility to the Nation as well as to himself to protect his physical health.

At the insistence of the White House doctors, he has made one concession. He has been spending 20 to 30 minutes a day in the White House pool, but even there, host columnist Joseph Alsop has reported, he continues to be concerned with the official duties of his office. Staff members are summoned to the pool for informal discussions.

But Alsop also reported that the President has been allowing himself at least a few quiet hours. Always an early riser, he has been starting his day at 6:20 a.m., but he devotes his first 2 hours to reading, first the day's newspapers and then the docket for the day, including the memorandums he has written to himself about things he must do. He gets another hour or so of quiet before bedtime.

Thus Alsop observed, the President's schedule allows him considerably more time for study and reflection than might be guessed from his public activities. This is all to the good, and it is to be hoped that he continues the practice. By doing so, he will help to make all of the concern about the line of presidential succession largely academic.

TURNING POINT IN FISCAL POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from the National City Bank Letter of December 1963 printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURNING POINT IN FISCAL POLICY

President Johnson has inherited a fiscal situation clouded by continuing uncertainties over the proposed tax cut and an unprecedented slowdown in the passage of spending legislation by Congress. While getting ready to put the finishing touches on the fiscal 1965 budget for presentation to Congress next January, the administration, under the late President Kennedy, had been in the unusual position of running Government operations almost halfway through the 1964 fiscal year with 8 out of 12 appropriation bills still pending in Congress. The impasse in fiscal decisions had already been causing considerable headshaking among businessmen and economists seeking to forecast the shape of the business curve for the year ahead.

The key questions still remain: Will there be a tax cut and if so, when and how big? How much money will the Government spend in the years ahead and how much tax revenue will it give up? How large will be the deficit resulting from the tax cut and spending decisions for fiscal 1964 and 1965?

Answers to these questions have been delayed as both tax cut and spending decisions have become enmeshed in the legislative bargaining process. It is no secret that the delays are at least partly traceable to the strong sentiment in Congress for lower spending and smaller deficits than the administration had envisioned. While congressional actions have also been slowed by consideration of other issues—including civil rights, the test ban treaty and the rail strike threat—deliberations have been prolonged, as in the foreign aid debate, by a heightened desire to limit Federal spending and eliminate waste. All this is leading to one of the longest congressional sessions in history.

SOLID IMPROVEMENT IN BUDGETARY OUTLOOK

But despite the appearance of confusion and the impossibility of making precise estimates pending congressional decisions, the fact is that the actual fiscal situation has improved a good deal since last January when the late President Kennedy's tax and budget proposals were first unveiled. Requests for authorizations and new appropriations are being examined with a critical eye by committees of both Houses and several bills have undergone further trimming on the floor. Spending is not only being cut for the current fiscal year but authorizations for future expenditures are being held considerably below original requests. As a result of these decisions, as well as economies effected by the administration, Budget Bureau Director Kermit Gordon a month ago estimated that expenditures this fiscal year would be held to $97.8 billion—$1 billion below the $98.8 billion estimated in January.

Meanwhile, both individual incomes and corporate profits have risen more than expected, yielding $1 billion in additional taxes. The 6-month postponement to January 1, 1964 in the anticipated effective date of the tax cut will mean about $900 million more in revenues. Thus, Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon now figures revenues for the year ending next June 30 at $88.8 billion—$1.9 billion more than projected last January.

Original estimates and actual results for fiscal years 1955–64, administrative budget basis

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Expenditures		Receipts		Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	
	Original estimate	Actual result	Original estimate	Actual result	Original estimate	Actual result
1955	65.6	64.4	62.7	60.2	−2.9	−4.2
1956	62.4	66.2	60.0	67.9	−2.4	+1.6
1957	65.9	69.0	66.3	70.6	+ .4	+1.6
1958	71.8	71.4	73.6	68.6	+1.8	−2.8
1959	73.9	80.3	74.4	67.9	+ .5	−12.4
1960	77.0	76.5	77.1	77.8	+ .1	+1.2
1961	79.8	81.5	84.0	77.7	+4.2	−3.9
1962	80.9	87.8	82.3	81.4	+1.5	−6.4
1963	92.5	92.6	93.0	86.4	+ .5	−6.2
1964	98.8	[1] 97.8	86.9	[1] 88.8	−11.9	[1] −9.0

[1] Latest estimate of the Bureau of the Budget, assuming that the House-approved tax-cut bill becomes effective Jan. 1, 1964.

The improvement in revenues, combined with the lowered spending estimates, has reduced the projected deficit for the current fiscal year by $2.9 billion. Assuming that the House bill calling for a two-stage $11 billion tax cut becomes effective January 1, 1964, Secretary Dillon now places the deficit at $9 billion, compared with the $11.9 billion figure of last January.

Thus, the prolonged deliberations and heated debates over fiscal legislation have not been in vain. The more that spending bills have been slashed, the more likely it has become that we can reduce tax rates without running undue risks of inflation. In terms of fiscal fundamentals, the developing decisions are giving substance to a new policy based on closely controlling Government spending while providing tax relief to improve incentives and spur the private economy.

ECONOMY PLEDGE BEING FULFILLED

It may be recalled that the administration's fiscal proposals last January, which coupled a big tax cut with a $4.5 billion rise in expenditures and an $8.6 billion boost in new obligational authority, where sharply challenged from both sides of the aisle. Chairman CLARENCE CANNON of the House Appropriations Committee—which originates all money bills in Congress—vowed to do his best to trim the budget: "We will look for and find places to cut it substantially without impairing national security."

With sentiment for economy gaining strength in both Houses as the session has progressed, Representative CANNON has been true to his word. The complexities of the Government spending mechanism make precise estimates difficult, but Representative CANNON recently expressed the opinion that Congress would chop "something like $5.4 billion" from the administration requests for appropriations, holding them about $2.9 billion below what was granted last year.

Cutting appropriations, however, is not the same thing as cutting current expenditures. It takes a long time after the spigot is turned off before the money stops flowing. Some $42.4 billion of this year's budget expenditures were authorized by Congress in years past. Another $11.8 billion recur automatically under permanent law, the most important item in this category being interest on the public debt. (With money rates rising this year, Budget Director Gordon has estimated that interest costs have risen by $500 million since the January projection of $10.1 billion.) Thus, only some $44.7 billion out of the $98.8 billion in expenditures originally requested were subject to action by Congress in this session.

Spending is also being held down by the unprecedented delay in voting new appropriations. In the interim since July 1, many agencies—including the Defense Department until mid-October—have operated under "continuing resolutions." This means that agencies must restrict their spending roughly to the same rate as in fiscal 1963 or to that provided in pending appropriation bills, whichever is lower.

With almost half the year gone, many agencies that were slated to raise their spending this year have been forced to hold their expenditures below original budget estimates. While this creates practical difficulties for Government agencies, it shows the intimate relationship between taxes and spending that exists in the minds of Congressmen.

REDUCTIONS IN SPENDING AUTHORIZATIONS

Seasoned observers, however, are not so much impressed with the reduction in fiscal 1964 expenditures as with the sharp paring of requests for new obligational authority. Though the phrase sounds like a prime example of bureaucratic gobbledygook, new obligational authority—which may be viewed as charge accounts for Government agencies—constitutes the key to all future spending. As shown in the accompanying explanation below, which explains budget terminology, the Government cannot enter into contracts or spend money unless authorized by Congress.

Appropriations being the most important kind of obligational authority, the $5 to $6 billion that Congress is cutting from the administration's appropriations requests is highly significant in showing the spending trend. Originally, the Kennedy administration had requested $107.9 billion in new obligational authority, but later cut this by $620 million. With these changes, as well as the $500 million rise in interest costs, the congressional reductions would leave the new authorizations some $6.1 billion below the amount requested last January.

In the four appropriation bills which had won final approval by late November, initial requests amounting to $61.9 billion had been slashed by $2.2 billion. The largest of these requests—$49 billion for national defense—was trimmed back by $1.8 billion. The National Institutes of Health—which for years have been voted more money than they asked for—for once were given less than the $980 million originally requested.

An additional $3 billion has been cut from seven other appropriation bills by the House of Representatives. At the end of November, the only regular appropriation bill still to be acted on by the House was foreign aid. But even here, sharp cuts in the foreign aid authorization bill by both Houses had set an upper limit of about $3.6 billion—some $1.3 billion less than what the administration had originally requested Among other actions, both Houses chopped $600 million out of the $5.7 billion requested for the space program, reflecting less urgency felt for the moon race. Even the $4.6 billion public works bill—known as the "rivers and harbors" bill—was pared by $286 million in the House.

Progress to date, of course, could be substantially nullified if large supplementary appropriations are voted later on. Legislators must continue to exercise restraint in order that the balanced fiscal formula thus taking shape is not upset.

CONDITIONS RIPE FOR A TAX CUT

It now seems that the fiscal conditions for a sound tax reduction are on the way to being met. Not only are current expenditures being held down, but new authorizations for future spending are being tightly controlled. The rising trend in obligational authority has been moderated. For his part, President Johnson has ordered an economy drive in Government agencies and among defense contractors.

It should be recognized, however, that economy sentiment has prevailed in Congress largely because of the widespread desire to cut taxes in a responsible manner. Failure to act on taxes would not only mean that many legislators would no longer feel constrained in their spending decisions but it would give the spending forces the upper hand in the event of any pause or dip in business. In that event, the prospective deficits are certain to be much larger than any now envisioned with a tax cut.

Now that so much has been accomplished to minimize interim deficits and keep the lid on inflationary forces, it would be fitting for Congress to get on with the job of reducing taxes. Nothing else could so effectively remove the uncertainties hanging over the business situation than for Congress to cooperate with the new President in bringing long-awaited tax relief to the American people.

Congressional actions on spending authority, 1955–64

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	New obligational authority			Total obligational authority year-end balances
	Administration requests [1]	Actual authorization	Change from previous year	
1955	$56.3	$57.1	−$5.7	$79.6
1956	58.6	63.2	+6.1	73.0
1957	66.3	70.2	+7.0	68.9
1958	73.3	76.3	+6.1	72.1
1959	72.5	81.4	+5.1	71.8
1960	76.8	79.6	−1.8	72.4
1961	79.4	86.7	+7.1	76.5
1962	80.9	92.9	+6.2	79.3
1963	99.3	101.5	+8.6	[2] 87.2
1964	107.9	[3] 101.8	+ .3	(4)

[1] Requested in January budgets.

[2] Current estimate.

[3] Estimated on the basis of congressional actions to date on 11 appropriation bills and on the foreign aid authorization bill, and allowing for $500,000,000 increase in estimated costs of the public debt.

[4] Not available.

THE BUDGET PROCESS

New obligational authority: Since no Federal funds can be spent without specific authority from the Congress, the budget presents the Presidents' recommendations as to the amounts of budget authorization (new obligational authority) necessary to carry out the planned programs. The Congress then considers and acts on these requests for new obligational authority.

New obligational authority is composed of three kinds of authorizations which allow Federal agencies to incur obligations requiring the payment of money.

Appropriations are the most common form of new obligational authority; they authorize the agencies not only to order goods and services but also to draw funds from the Treasury and make expenditures to pay for the goods and services when delivered.

Contract authorizations are occasionally given to agencies which allow them to contract for the delivery of goods and services but not to make expenditures to pay for them.

Authorizations to expend from debt receipts permit agencies to borrow money (usually through the Treasury), to contract for its use and to pay the amounts authorized.

Relationship between new obligational authority and expenditures: Not all of the obligational authority enacted for a fiscal year is spent in the same year. Appropriations to pay salaries or pensions are usually spent almost entirely in the year for which they are enacted. On the other hand, the bulk of appropriations to buy ballistic missiles or to construct an airfield are likely to be spent 2 or 3 or more years after enactment. * * * Therefore, when the Congress reduces or increases the amount of new obligational authority requested by the President for a given year, it does not necessarily change the budget expenditures in that year by the amount of the increase or decrease.—Excerpted from "The Budget in Brief, 1964 Fiscal Year," Bureau of the Budget.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, an article by John Herling in the Washington Daily News of December 17, 1963, calls attention to an important statement on the unemployment problem in this country by Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman of the board, International Business Machines Corp.

I believe the article, together with the full text of the statement made on November 12, will interest my colleagues here in the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the article and the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Dec. 17, 1963]

THE UNEMPLOYMENT ALARM

(By John Herling)

When Studebaker announced the shutdown of its auto plant a shudder ran through the labor force of the United States. In South Bend, Ind., 6,000 workers lost their jobs at a single blow, but the repercussions of this latest evidence of employment insecurity caused fear and trembling in hundreds of thousands of homes this Christmas season.

This latest traumatic experience adds pressure and testimony for action in the fight against unemployment. Urgency here affects us all. Unemployment—witness Studebaker—involves the skilled and the unskilled, the traditional occupations as well as the new ones in the age of automation and rapid technological advance.

Perhaps the most articulate and significant statement on the subject was made recently on Capitol Hill by Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president of International Business Machines—"Mr. Automation" himself. He states the problems involved in unemployment, and he does not step away from solutions, those he might offer and others which might be advanced. He does not shudder in revulsion even at the idea of a shorter workweek. He recognizes the essential social obligation of the Nation—and the leaders of the Nation—to meet the problem.

What is the alternative? The alternative, says Mr. Watson bluntly, is the possible destruction of our system. Which hardly is an alternative.

In short, Mr. Watson is sounding an alarm. He warns that in dealing with the complexities of unemployment, we may have to try treatments we have never tried before. This does not faze him one bit.

"Had we concluded after World War II that the way to help save Europe was to let events run their course, we might today be alone in a Communist world," Mr. Watson reminds us. "Instead we responded to a new situation with a new measure. Some said the Marshall plan would not work. But as a nation, we had the good sense to know it was more dangerous to tolerate the sickness than to try some new and unusual form of treatment. This is like Americans—when ordinary measures fall short, we invent new measures, new programs, and new approaches."

One cannot recall an industrialist making such a call to national action in peacetime as does Mr. Watson in these words:

"Let's stop deferring adjustments we shall have to make in the hope that the need for them will disappear. The longer we put them off, the more they accumulate and the tougher they are to deal with.

"Let's stop pretending that this business of adjustment can be left solely to the individual or the normal course of events. Hardship is inevitable in the process of change. We must learn to share it as we now share the benefits.

"Let's stop thinking that we may be able to solve these problems with one grand solution that will take care of them forever. They are going to be with us forever in one form or another as technological change takes place, and what we must do is step up to each of them. The time has come to find workable solutions. If we do this, it will solidify us as a people and help insure our leadership in the world. If we fail, we may alienate millions of citizens permanently and possibly destroy our system while trying to defend some of its ideological details.

"It has often been observed that America can not hope to survive as an island of plenty in a sea of international poverty. It must be even more true that a majority of Americans cannot survive in unworried affluence while a minority are doomed to lives of idleness and poverty."

STATEMENT OF THOMAS J. WATSON, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND MANPOWER OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, NOVEMBER 12, 1963

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I share your concern over the problems of unemployment and displacement. As you know my company makes machines which are laborsaving devices. Unquestionably they do displace people. Fortunately, however, white-collar employment has been increasing steadily and there has not been a great deal of hardship as a result of office automation. I am heartened by this, but I am disheartened by the Nation's apparent inability to cope with the overall problem of unemployment.

In our failure to solve this problem easily, I fear we may turn in frustration to attack technological change as if it were a disease or pestilence, when we should be accepting it as a boon. We cannot overlook the fact that technology has been a major force in man's progress. Constant technological change has been the key to lightening the burden of man's labor, increasing the prospect of leisure and raising individual living standards by improving and lowering the cost of goods. This process, therefore, is intertwined with the total process of civilization.

We simply cannot turn back the clock and try to slow the advance of technology. To do so would be to commit economic suicide. The problem of unemployment is solvable. To solve it, we must be willing to face up to the facts, and to act decisively.

Unfortunately, one sometimes gets the impression that more time is spent on the old arguments over the causes of unemployment than is spent in looking for appropriate solutions. I am also impatient over the tendency to debate the precise accuracy of our employment statistics. In one sense it is relatively unimportant whether we have 5-percent unemployed, or 4, or 6. The important fact is that whichever of these percentages you choose, it translates into millions of idle workers.

The question, in my mind, is no longer whether we as a nation should take more aggressive action. Rather, it is what should we do, and as a framework I would like to refer back to the report to the President from the Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy. Its title is "The Benefits and Problems Incident to Automation and Other Technological Advances." The Committee, of which I am an industry member, presented its report on January 11, 1962. The report offered three central propositions:

First, automation and technological progress are essential to the welfare, the strength and the defense of the Nation.

Second, we must achieve technological progress without allowing it to impair our system of human values or make second-class citizens of any of our people.

Third, to avoid burdening individuals with the human cost of technological change, we must combine private and Government action in programs that are consistent with the principles of a free society.

You have already heard enough testimony to know that nearly everyone agrees in principle with these propositions. But when we get to the point of how to apply them in programs, there is disagreement.

Some believe that the Nation's principal problem is aggregate demand. If we only stimulate the economy, the general problem will be solved.

Some believe that the difficulty is structural unemployment. They point to the fact that our labor force has gotten out of balance—that we have too few skills of the kind that new technology demands, that certain areas of the country have seen much of their labor force made obsolete and unneeded.

Still others hold a different view. They feel that shorter work hours are essential to full employment.

Unemployment is a sufficiently severe problem so that all of these views merit our consideration. My own primary concern lies with the structural problems of the hard core unemployed and the chronically depressed areas.

I also believe we should act now to try to stimulate our entire economy. I do not know what the ideal growth rate for America should be. Lincoln said that a man's legs should be long enough to reach the ground.

By the same token, our rate of economic growth must be high enough to create a reasonable number of jobs.

The Congress has before it a tax program designed to stimulate economic growth. I am not sure as to its immediate effect on the unemployment problem. But I do believe it is a necessary condition for the stimulation of long-term growth in our economy.

As to my primary concern—the hard core unemployed and the chronically depressed areas—I believe we've taken some important steps forward. But I am not certain we fully recognize how deep seated the problems are.

One example can be seen in agriculture. As technology moved in with better machinery, better seed, and improved methods, fewer farmers produced more food than we needed. Families were forced off their farms.

Many of these people acquired new skills, found new jobs and adjusted to urban life. But others have become the unskilled marginal industrial workers who have suffered unemployment at every downturn in the economy.

Another example is the coal mining industry. Change came to it in a different way. Other fuels began absorbing some of coal's traditional markets. To remain competitive, the coal industry introduced more productive equipment in the mines. Once again, human problems were created. We tried to tell ourselves that the necessary adjustments could be made by the people themselves. It hasn't worked out that way. As the New York Times recently observed in an editorial, displaced people "do not have the good grace to disappear when they are no longer needed."

As a consequence of these changes, we are struggling with a situation which defies simple solutions.

The two programs designed to help relieve structural unemployment, passed last year by Congress, were, I believe, a good beginning. Specifically, I refer to the manpower retraining program and the area redevelopment program. As you know, these are pioneering efforts that have not yet had an opportunity to prove themselves. They should be continued and strengthened.

I know that these bills have had the support of the majority of the members of this committee and I commend the individual members who have contributed to their development.

These measures should be helpful in starting to solve the twin problems of the hard core unemployed and those of the chronically depressed areas. Whether families or areas are involved, however, poverty can become self-perpetuating. It has already done so to such an extent that more corrective measures will unquestionably be needed, and we should not limit them to traditional approaches.

Some very unusual measures have already proved successful in other places. Puerto Rico is an example.

In the 1930's, Puerto Rico had a one-crop economy, sugar, a largely unskilled labor force and almost no industry. The island was impoverished and apathetic beyond anything we have ever known in the United States. Conventional methods were obviously not going to be enough. In the early 1940's, the Puerto Ricans initiated basic economic reforms. These were followed by a full program of incentives to private industry in the 1950's.

They offered tax incentives to industries that would move to Puerto Rico. They waived their profit tax for a period ranging from 10 up to 17 years. Businesses moving into the more depressed areas received the longer exemptions.

They offered buildings, ready for occupancy, that could be purchased or leased on favorable terms.

When training was involved they allowed businesses to offset these costs against the occupancy charges for the buildings, or gave cash reimbursements.

When special training had to be done in the United States, they paid salaries to the trainees and paid the transportation costs.

They paid industries' costs for transporting machinery and equipment to Puerto Rico.

We all know that Operation Bootstrap has paid off for Puerto Rico. When the Economic Development Commission started in 1950, the island had only 83 industrial establishments. They now have almost 900 plants and an industrial payroll of 100,000. They estimate another 100,000 jobs were indirectly created. Puerto Rico still has employment problems, but without Operation Bootstrap these problems would be much worse.

In France the Government has for many years made it consistently easier for industry to move into areas of unemployment and equally difficult—if not impossible—to build new plants in areas with full employment.

In Great Britain, my own company paid a rental of 20 cents per square foot for the first 7 years in a plant that the British Government built for us in Scotland. And last year, in what has been described as the greatest organized redeployment of manpower in British industrial history, nearly 3,000 coal miners and their families successfully moved from poor coalfields to better areas.

Some of these solutions may seem radical to us, but the problem we face in some of the depressed areas of our country is so severe, and has gone unsolved for so long, that new approaches are clearly needed. The problem is not going to disappear by itself.

There is another side to the unemployment problem. It is less obvious, less dramatic and, in a way, more complex. This is the almost continuous displacement that takes place as market demands change, styles change, and technical improvements are made. It affects total industries and whole occupational groups.

Something as innocent as a style change can leave thousands of people jobless. In my home State of Connecticut, we had a severe problem in Danbury for several years. Men, for reasons nobody can explain, began going hatless and this was one of the major reasons the hatters of Danbury lost their jobs.

We're acutely aware of technology's impact when fewer men produce more of the same product. The auto industry seems to be an example of that.

But, just as often, a combination of changes affects employment in an industry. In railroads, for instance, the effect of the change from steam to diesel locomotives was compounded by the switch of passengers from railroads to other means of transportation and the diversion of freight from trains to trucks and pipelines.

Still another example of this process is the wholesale movement of an industry from one region to another. New England has seen this. From the early 1800's, it was the center of textile manufacturing. Yet, in only 20 years, a substantial part of that huge industry uprooted itself and moved to the South.

The impact of these changes normally occurs in two stages. The first is the direct and obvious one. People, skilled and unskilled, lose their jobs and a period of churning in the job market begins.

The second stage is the bumping down as the skilled worker displaces the semiskilled, and the semiskilled displaces the unskilled.

Most of the unemployed people we see today are victims of this bumping down process. They are the undereducated, the unskilled, the older workers, and teenagers. Too often, they are members of minority groups.

Consider the youngsters in the 14- to 19-year-old bracket. Today, in that age group, unemployment reaches about 13 percent. For those in their early 20's it averages 9 percent. These young people are vulnerable because of inexperience, because they lack seniority and, overshadowing everything else, because they have not acquired either the educational background or the skills needed in today's labor market. Many of them are school dropouts.

Therefore, we must find new ways both to detect youngsters who might leave school and to prevent their doing so. Our first effort should be to keep them in regular school programs and help them through better teaching methods and a greater understanding of their problems. In cases where this fails, we should provide them with vocational education opportunities so that they may have the chance to acquire the basic skills necessary to earn a living.

And finally, we should also have the special camps which would be provided by the Youth Conservation Corps. I believe that this bill, already passed by the Senate, is a good one, and hope that it is approved by the House. If this experiment succeeds, then the camps should be continued so long as the problem exists. We simply cannot forget those who find it difficult to remain in schools, just because they represent a difficult challenge.

The unemployed older worker usually faces a slightly different problem. His skill and training have become obsolete. Often retraining will put such workers back into the labor force. But in some instances, it is hard, if not impossible, to find a place for these people.

The statistics on the older unemployed group are discouraging. Last year, 3 out of 10 unemployed men had been looking for work for more than 15 weeks. But among those unemployed men who were between 45 and 64 years of age, the number jumped to 4 out of 10, and over 64 it was 5 out of 10 who had been out of work for more than 15 weeks.

An increasing number of older men have been leaving the labor force in recent years. The trend seems to be accelerating. This is partly due to liberalized retirement provisions of the Social Security Act. It is estimated that when the age limit was reduced to 62, 100,000 men voluntarily retired at reduced benefits.

I believe that many more would retire if the benefits were liberalized even further. Moreover, I feel that the amount should be reconsidered to determine if it is adequate.

There are other approaches which can be helpful. Too often we tend to think of relocation allowances as applying only to depressed areas. They can also be useful to the hard core unemployed scattered throughout our country. In some areas of the country an unemployed worker not only has a limited opportunity for jobs, he may also not have the opportunity to get training. If a worker is trainable, and is willing to move, then I believe we must see to it that he can move to an area where there is a reasonable chance to find work.

Finally, if the unemployment problem does not respond to other corrective actions, it may become necessary to look at the total man-hours worked per year. Already we see a trend toward longer vacations, sabbaticals and more favorable industry benefits to encourage early retirement.

In addition, we must be willing to consider shortening the workweek. Please understand me. I am not advocating that this be done now.

A shorter workweek, undertaken suddenly, could do a great deal more harm than good, and so we must proceed slowly and with caution. If we were to cut the workweek now, without cutting take-home pay and without raising productivity, we would add new labor costs to American products. On the other hand, I am sure working hours will eventually be reduced. In 1850, the average workweek in nonagricultural industries was nearly 66 hours; by 1900, 56 hours; by 1950, nearly 39 hours. And there it has hovered for a decade, declining less than 1 hour, despite the fact that it had dropped nearly 3 hours on the average, in each preceding decade for more than 100 years.

Unemployment is a complex and difficult problem. If any of us were faced with a personal problem of such serious proportions, I suspect we would all approach it in about the same way. First, we would try to define our problem. Then we would devise the solution we thought most likely to succeed, and try it for a reasonable period of time. If it did not work, we would turn to another solution and try that. We would keep repeating this process until we found an answer that worked. That is the kind of approach I think we must take.

We may have to try treatments we have never tried before. Had we concluded after World War II that the way to help save Europe was to let events run their course, we might today be alone in a Communist world. Instead, we responded to a new situation with a new measure. Some people said the Marshall plan would not work. But as a nation we had the good sense to know that it was more dangerous to tolerate the sickness than to try some new and unusual form of treatment.

This is like Americans—when ordinary methods fall short, we invent new measures, new programs and new approaches.

If present measures do not give us the results we need in depressed areas, then we should look at other approaches. Perhaps we cannot borrow directly from Puerto Rico or Europe, but we can consider temporary incentives of our own such as:

State and local tax concessions to attract new businesses to depressed areas. Where necessary, Federal assistance to replace revenue losses resulting from such tax concessions. A special program of accelerated depreciation allowable under Federal income taxes on new plant and equipment investments in depressed areas. And ultimately, direct Government subsidies for development and renewal programs in depressed areas.

If present measures do not solve the serious hard core unemployment problems which exist throughout the country, then, as I mentioned earlier, we should consider such other measures as: Relocation allowances for individuals; earlier social security retirement benefits; strengthened educational programs for the potential school dropout; and possibly, a shorter workweek.

In a sense, our success may stem as much from what we stop doing, as what we do.

Let's stop deferring adjustments we shall have to make in the hope that the need for them will disappear. The longer we put them off, the more they accumulate and the tougher they are to deal with.

Let's stop pretending that this business of adjustment can be left solely to the individual or the normal course of events. Hardship is inevitable in the process of change. We must learn to share it as we now share the benefits.

Let's stop thinking that we may be able to solve these problems with one grand solution that will take care of them forever. They are going to be with us forever in one form or another as technological change takes place, and what we must do is step up to each of them, find an answer and move on to another.

And let's conclude the debate as to whether we have a problem. We have. The time has come to find workable solutions.

If we do this, it will solidify us as a people and help insure our leadership in the world. If we fail, we may permanently alienate millions of citizens and possibly destroy our system while trying to defend some of its ideological details.

It has often been observed that America cannot hope to survive as an island of plenty in a sea of international poverty. It must be even more true that a majority of Americans cannot survive in unworried affluence while a minority are doomed to lives of idleness and poverty.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, there have been many fine tributes paid to our late President, John F. Kennedy. One of these, which I found particularly appropriate, was written by John Herling, Washington correspondent and editor of John Herling's Labor Letter.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Herling's tribute be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE MOST TRAGIC NEWS OF OUR LIFETIME

We have all lost our President, and many of us a personal friend. Jack Kennedy lived life with zest and intelligence. He gave to all of us a renewed sense of the challenge, the laughter, and the danger of life. He brought into public career the importance of private dedication. His gaiety was always tinged with the imminence of uncertainty. He was serious without pompous solemnity. He was natural in demeanor but his demeanor was one of easy dignity. He was often fierce in private anger and scorching in his estimate of those whom he thought proved unworthy of trust or who tried to nail him or his friends to a double cross.

He was a wealthy young man; in his own lifetime he witnessed the transition of his family from middle income to great fortune. But an overriding fact about John Kennedy is that the aura of suffering hovered over him constantly. In his youth he was not too robust, and was rather introspective. During the war his great deed of daring for which he is remembered was a rescue operation of his comrades. He came out of the war with a smashed back which nearly cost him his life on the operating table 10 years later. Its dull ache plagued him all his remaining days. But it was not only personal suffering that he endured, he had a sense of folk suffering. He never forgot, and indeed many refused to let him forget, that he came out of a minority group. His father once said, "When will people stop calling us Irish-American and just call us American?"

The paternal anger was understandable. He was fighting for his children's rights. But the son turned his origin into a status symbol. His psychological insight made him understand the frustration and the yearning and the aspiration of all men of all groups who were hit by prejudice and who day after day were shot down by the glaring eye of the bigot. He understood full well that deprived men and women do not, indeed, cannot act always from the highest motives. But as a practical politician, he sought to convert dross into a new creative element.

His relations with the trade union movement were easy and spontaneous, and were based on a fundamental respect for the people in it, and for the historical and humanitarian posture of the American trade union development. He frequently felt that organized labor did not take sufficient advantage of its strength and position, while he never hesitated to indicate where he thought that important opportunities were lost either through carelessness, or lack of sensitivity. Just as he himself had a great sense of history, so he constantly sensed the significant place in history of the American labor movement.

He was a great reader. He was avaricious for learning. He admired men of ideas who acted to make them real. He was constantly exploring the geography of his own mind, and of the minds of others. When people like myself wrote a column, or a letter, we flattered ourselves that we were being read by the usual people, plus one. He sometimes would talk to newspapermen about something they wrote, and would give them as much time as he might an ambassador, or indeed, a head of state. Like a good newspaperman, which he once was, he sought to comfort the afflicted, and he never hesitated to afflict the comfortable, if he thought they deserved it.

We all died a little—oh, more than a little—when John Fitzgerald Kennedy was killed in Dallas. He had added to our self-respect, he had made us stretch our mind and our spirit even as he stretched his. We were fortunate as a people to have lived with Jack Kennedy and that Jack Kennedy grew into our lives. He might have perished in the Pacific war, he might have died on the operating table, but instead he lived on to be President—and he died when and as he did. We who used to ask him questions now will have to ask them of his successor. But for a long time, there will be an ache in the asking, and in that room, we shall hear the echo of that brilliant, gallant, and thoughtful man who today looks toward us from Arlington, and we to him.

J.F.K.'S LEGACY TO LABOR

Just a year ago in the same East Room of the White House where John Kennedy lay dead, the young President strode in with a confident, half-smiling, half-appraising look on his face to talk to 600 invited labor leaders. He looked out at them and then grinned widely. The faces before him were familiar. He knew personally more trade union men of national and local importance than any President before him. While President Franklin Roosevelt surely understood the nature and purpose of the labor movement, he was never really acquainted with many local leaders outside his own State. But J.F.K. knew them.

They warmed to him and he to them.

On that November day in 1962, the purpose of the meeting was to talk about civil rights and about organized labor's responsibility in the field. Mr. Kennedy said:

"I want to express my warm welcome to you in this historic room, and to express my great appreciation to you for your effort in joining together to commit ourselves once again to the goal of equal opportunities for all.

"This," he said, "is a cause you understand very well. The labor movement, after all, was originated by those who were being denied their equal opportunity. Whether it was because they were working 12 hours a day, 6 or 7 days a week, whether it was because they were immigrants, whether it was because of one reason or another, the labor movement began as a union of those who were the least privileged in our society.

"So it seems to me very natural that those who took into their ranks and, indeed, built their ranks upon immigrants, upon women who were exploited, upon men who worked too long, upon young people who were put to work under adverse conditions, old people who were dismissed when they were too old to sustain the burdens of long employment—that the labor movement could be, as it has been for the last 30 years, the natural center and core of the effort to provide better opportunity for all of our fellow citizens. Whatever their racial descent, whatever their religion, whatever their color, whatever region of the country they come from, this is a cause to which labor has been associated for many years."

He turned to Lyndon Johnson, and said: "I want to commend the Vice President for his long efforts with all of the people of our country in making this cause more successful; the labor movement itself, and the Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz. This is something you know all about. This is something you are doing. This is something we can all do better on."

Then with great emphasis he said: "The work of the labor movement isn't done. When the work of the labor movement is done, then all of you might just as well go home and stay in bed. The work of the labor movement goes on. It is wholly unfinished.

"There are too many areas of our country where there isn't equal opportunity, where people aren't adequately paid, where they work too long, where their rights are not guaranteed, and as long as that is true, there is need for the American labor movement.

"So I ask you to join in an old cause and a new one—and that is to make sure that in the ranks of labor, labor itself practices what it preaches. This is true of labor; it must be true of all of us."

THOUGHTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S DEATH

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I was moved in reading the letter written on the morning of the day when tragedy befell us, and the world, in the death of President Kennedy by a young man from Alaska who is studying in Germany.

Richard Gillam, honor student and Stanford University junior, is one of 60 Stanford students studying abroad for 6 months. The letter written in Stuttgart, Germany, was directed to his father, Byron Gillam, in Anchorage. Its text is worthy of a wide audience and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am writing this letter on the morning of President Kennedy's death. I am writing because I wish to express my feelings to someone a bit closer to the situation than I. I am writing because I think a breathless moment in our history has been reached. I am writing because today—and perhaps only last night for a few terrible moments, or seconds—the world must suddenly view itself as it is. And I am writing because a great and good man has been destroyed.

He was a man who more than anyone of our century embodied the hopes and aspirations of mankind—he was the only figure in modern world history that would have spontaneously inflamed over 60,000 West Berliners—in a city directed microscopically by the hate of the world—to express their grief in a milling, unbelieving demonstration on the very spot where this man, only a few months before had said, "I am a Berliner."

And my father, Berlin is the world today—2 million flickering candles in an otherwise dark city have marked the ascension of this world's—and I mean Berlin's—Christ on earth.

It is trite, and so very true to say that he was an idea, a very needed idea in a world which it appears must ever again be snatched from the jaws of a ravaging entity that feeds on darkness and spews billowing mushroom-shaped clouds of destruction.

It is unconceivable that this event should have occurred, but it has—and the eternal inevitable and unanswerable question is why, why, why—?

And it matters not from which fountain of evil the assassin stemmed—as Mr. Cronkite (news analyst Walter Cronkite) so eloquently expressed—they have all participated and have all pulled the trigger.

In the early 1930's, the madman of all history came to power because he burned the Reichstag and blamed the Communists; the magnitude of evil then unleashed may never be comprehended but let us now at least realize that we are all morally accountable for yesterday's monstrosity because if we don't realize this fact we are only compounding the now manifest unrights in the history of man.

America will survive the crisis because it is a strong country. But we can survive either under the reactionary and stunting philosophy of isolationist self-centeredness and pragmatic, hatemongering opportunism or under a philosophy which I can only describe as one of hope, love, and intense world concern.

The man to carry on this philosophy I cannot name, but I hope to God, America, that you wake up, because you can either destroy or recreate yourself within the span of these coming precarious months.

The people of Europe realize this and are waiting. Last night the air was pervasive with confusion and fear. Crowds milling around the few still open newsstands could not and did not want to believe what they heard. People parked about American embassies throughout this continent prayed that the reality which they already knew was true was not true.

It seemed that a vital, elemental stay of reality had suddenly been smashed way, and a humanity in free fall clutched at all straws offering promise of support—yet last night there were no straws.

Viewed soberly in the light of a new morning, we begin to pull ourselves together. We begin to hope again. We find new references, a severely tried political system shows signs of pulling itself together also, and the world waits.

We may well be at a great crossroads in the path of human existence—we face the complexity of infinity in choosing our course—may we have the courage and wisdom, to find the right. And may we never forget the "why" of this great and terrible lesson we have been given.

IN MEMORY OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, since the death of President Kennedy, many eloquent words have been written and spoken by our finest citizens.

No writer has come closer to expressing my own feelings about the President, his life, and his death than Mr. William Attwood, who writes in memory of the President in the December 31 issue of Look magazine.

Bill Attwood, who served as Ambassador to Guinea during the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration, now represents the United States on a special assignment to the United Nations.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Attwood's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN MEMORY OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By William Attwood)

I never knew Jack Kennedy very well. I was not what they called a New Frontier insider or even an old friend. Over the past 4 years, I don't think I talked with him more than 20 times. So do not read on if you are expecting one of those intimate portraits.

I knew him as a boss—and he was a darn good one. You knew where he stood and what he wanted. You could always get to him when you had to, and when you did, you knew that he was interested in what you were doing and in what you had to say. I've just been looking at a note he sent me a few weeks before he was killed. He simply wanted to let me know he'd read an article I'd done for Look, and had liked it. And at the end he wrote, "Many thanks."

Many thanks. Well, I think perhaps it's my turn now to thank Jack Kennedy. Not for any personal favors—I don't mean that. He did make me Ambassador to Guinea, and I spent a couple of hard and satisfying years there, but I'm not thanking him for that. What I'm grateful for is something not as tangible: It's for having made me and my generation—some of us, anyway—feel alive, exhilarated and prouder to be Americans than we've ever been before.

This is no small thing. It takes a lot to give you this kind of feeling when you're past 40 and have, as they say, been around.

The funny thing is that Jack Kennedy seldom acted as if he were trying to inspire or stir up the people who worked for him. Maybe that's why he succeeded. Maybe we reacted to him and to his style of doing things because he was always cool, always restrained, always himself, and never, in the slang of our generation, corny.

I remember flying into El Paso on his plane during the 1960 campaign. It was night and we were late, and a crowd of 7,000 people had been waiting at the airport for hours. They wanted to yell and cheer, and they wanted him to wave his arms and smile and say something about the Texas sky and stars. But he just strode out of the plane and jabbed his forefinger at them and talked about getting America moving again. And then he turned and climbed into a car and drove away.

A few days later, when I saw him on the plane, I told him the crowd had felt let down and suggested that the next time he should at least wave his arms the way other politicians did and give people a chance to get the cheers out of their throats. Kennedy shook his head and borrowed my notebook and pencil (he was saving his voice for the day's speeches) and wrote, "I always swore one thing I'd never do is—" And he drew a picture of a man with his arms in the air.

Jack Kennedy could never pretend to be somebody he wasn't. He couldn't even put on funny hats or Indian feathers like other candidates. He had his own personal, downbeat style, and all who met him got used to it, and the country got used to it, too.

It was a style that had class—in the very best sense of that word. In Boston, where he started the long political journey that ended in Dallas, they loved him for it. Outside an Irish tavern on East Broadway in Boston, after President Kennedy died, a court clerk named Patrick Hines was trying to talk away his tears:

"Oh, I remember when he used to come marching down this street in a parade, and boy, he had that walk, and no hat, and—'My name is Jack Kennedy, I'm a candidate for Congress,' and girls used to flock around him—young, young, personality second to none—God, we'll miss him."

Outside of Boston, I don't suppose many Americans had yet learned to love him the way they loved F.D.R. or Ike (I'm sure he was embarrassed by the affection of those who did)—but even his political opponents liked and respected him, and that's what he really wanted.

Jack Kennedy was cool, but not cold. He sought the Presidency, he used to say, "because I want to get things done," and he was anything but cool and detached about these things, these measures that he believed would make America stronger and the world safer.

Civil rights was one of the things he cared about, and I'd like to be able to thank him now for these words he spoke last June:

"If an American, because his skin is dark, cannot eat lunch in a restaurant open to the public; if he cannot send his children to the best public school available; if he cannot vote for the public officials who represent him; if, in short, he cannot enjoy the full and free life which all of us want, then who among us would be content to have the color of his skin changed and stand in his place? Who among us would then be content with the counsels of patience and delay?"

The day before, he had been speaking of the search for peace in a world divided between rival political systems:

"Let us not be blind to our differences, but let us also direct our attention to our common interests and the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal."

This was the speech, they say, that induced Khrushchev to sign the test ban treaty. So here's something else to thank Jack Kennedy for.

He was tough, too, and God knows we needed a tough President as we entered the sixties. I first glimpsed his toughness a few weeks before he was nominated. We were having dinner in Washington. I had been doing some work for Adlai Stevenson, and Kennedy wanted to know why Stevenson was holding back, instead of supporting him for the nomination. I told him that some of Stevenson's friends thought the convention might deadlock, and they wanted him to be available, just in case. Also, people were talking about a Stevenson-and-Kennedy ticket.

Kennedy dismissed this possibility. He had the first-ballot votes all but sewed up, and if by some chance he couldn't make it, he would never settle for anything else. He was running for the Presidency, period.

I started to say something about how some people thought he wouldn't refuse the second spot if it came to that, but he cut me off in midsentence. His eyes were cold and his voice—as flat as a slap—ended the conversation, "Yes, well, you can tell them they're wrong."

I have a feeling that the Soviet Ambassador saw that look and heard that voice during the Cuban crisis last year, just before the Russian ships turned around in mid-Atlantic.

The whole world can be thankful for that.

Jack Kennedy understood this revolutionary era we live in. We knew he did on that cold, sparkling afternoon in January when he stood on the steps of the Capitol and flung out the words that still stir me as much as any words I have heard:

"Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans, born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage, and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world."

Around the world. He was respected around the world because he was trusted—and because of him, those of us privileged to represent our country in the world were trusted, too. It was a wonderful time to be an American abroad. How often I can remember being able to say, with pride, in Africa, "I know this is what President Kennedy believes—this is what we Americans stand for." I remember the foreign minister who told me: "Let me know what we can do to help your President. We need him as much as you." And I remember, at the United Nations in New York, the day he died, all the African hands gripping mine, the eyes full of tears.

He talked the language of the young leaders of this turbulent new world because, in his midforties, he was one of them. I saw some of these leaders at the White House and talked to them later. They thought of him as a friend. He knew their problems and made them understand ours. It was because of President Kennedy, because they had talked to him and knew what he was trying to do, that the leaders of black Africa have been so understanding of the torment and the violence of our own struggle for freedom and equality here at home.

Out in the world, Jack Kennedy's memory will also live on, for years to come, wherever the Peace Corps is, for that was his idea and, I suspect, one of the most enduring legacies of his administration. For the Peace Corps volunteers, I'm sure, as for most of us who were serving overseas when he was President, it was good to know he was back there in the White House, cheering us on, in his own way, by making the decision and fighting for the legislation that would help us in our work.

Like Harry Truman, he could make up his mind, and he didn't pass the buck. He made you want to try harder because you knew he was trying all the time. Those of us who worked for him usually felt we were hitting on all cylinders, and glad to be. He often spoke of the ancient Greeks' definition of happiness—"the exercise of vital powers along lines of excellence in a life affording them scope"—and some of us were able, under his leadership, to appreciate that definition for the first time. And I'm grateful for that.

Jack Kennedy was so much a part of everything we did in Washington that the day after his death, waiting at the State Department before going over to the White House, I still found it hard to believe, impossible, really, that the President would not be there to greet us in his office. He had been dead, after all, less than 24 hours. It wasn't until I walked into the darkened East Room and saw the flag-draped casket that I fully realized that we had lost him—and what an unexpectedly personal loss it was for someone like me, who had known him so fleetingly.

The Kennedy administration was an exciting time to be alive, and a good time to be busy. I think the Johnson administration will be, too, for the new President has the experience and the drive, and the Nation now has the momentum. But my thoughts are still turned to the years just past, rather than to the years just ahead. All I know, as I end this memoir, is that I shall always be proud to have been involved with the history of this time—the New Frontier period, as the historians will surely call it—and that my children—the two old enough to have worn Kennedy campaign buttons and the one soon to be born—will also remember and be proud of what their father was doing in the early 1960's.

So I have that to thank Jack Kennedy for, too.

And now, with Christmas almost upon us, I find myself thinking of last Christmas and the present I brought back to my 11-year-old daughter from the White House. It was a note from the President in answer to a letter she had written him. She had it framed, and it has been on her bedside table ever since. The note is signed, "Your friend, John F. Kennedy."

She never met the President, but she always thought of him as her friend, and she was crying that terrible weekend because her friend was dead.

This Christmas, I think a lot of Americans, like my daughter, feel they have lost a friend. They have.

LYNDON JOHNSON: TRAINED FOR POWER

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most perceptive political writers of today is Mr. Fletcher Knebel, coauthor of the best-selling volume "Seven Days in May."

Mr. Knebel has given us an appraisal of our new President, Lyndon Johnson, that is in his pattern of excellent writing and interpretation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the December 31 Look magazine be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LYNDON JOHNSON: TRAINED FOR POWER

(By Fletcher Knebel)

In the numbing hours after John F. Kennedy's life fled away in the bloodstained lap of his wife, many Americans wondered fearfully about their new President. Few of them really knew him, and in some northern areas, many could not even identify him. A television show last autumn interviewed 137 persons at random in New York, New Jersey, and Kansas. Forty-four of these could not identify Lyndon Johnson. To understand Lyndon Johnson, you must understand Texas.

Texas has power, sweep, grandeur, brashness, ebullience, a raw simplicity, egotism, patriotism, crudeness, flamboyance. So has Lyndon Johnson, a Texas man. Texas can overwhelm—in hospitality, in pride, in self-analysis, in earthly humor, in work, in aggressiveness. So can Lyndon Johnson. Texas can live extravagantly and lavish itself upon others. So can Lyndon Johnson. Like Texas, Johnson is rugged, virile, self-made. His handsome, mobile face reveals, as candidly as a mirror, the strong emotions that course through him. Lyndon Johnson, like his native State, is outsize.

Political leaders of both parties know that. They know Johnson as a man to whom power clings as naturally as does moss to a live oak. "Power is where power goes," said Johnson when friends counseled him at the Democratic National Convention against accepting the vice-presidential nomination tendered by Kennedy. Throughout the three decades of his political life, Johnson was never far from the seats of power. He was a young friend of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. "He was like a daddy to me," Johnson often remarks. He was an intimate of the late House Speaker Sam Rayburn. As majority leader of the Senate, Johnson ran that intricately fragmented body as it had never been run before. He served President Kennedy loyally through the last 3 years. Johnson was not born to power, but he schooled himself for it, and he found its lure irresistible.

He assumed the office of President naturally, simply, without fright, without histronics. UPI correspondent Merriman Smith, in a brilliant eyewitness story of Johnson's oath-taking ceremony, told how Johnson was sworn into office in Air Force 1, the Presidential jet transport parked at Love Field, Dallas. Johnson kissed his wife, Lady Bird, and then placed an arm about Mrs. Kennedy, kissing her gently on the cheek. Many of those in the group of 27 persons pressed forward to shake the new President's hand, but Johnson backed away and said, "Now, let's get airborne."

Johnson was firmly in command, only 99 minutes after the last breath left John Kennedy's body. Many of the tears shed that black Friday, November 22, 1963, were shed by Americans who thanked God for a constitutional system that permitted such a smooth and rapid transfer of national leadership. And some people wept in relief that Johnson was a man trained and molded for such an hour. Later might come the stormy political battles over issues and Johnson's conduct of the Presidency. At the moment, the only question was one of leadership. And Johnson was a leader, proud, dignified, composed. The petite Lady Bird had unknowingly forecast this hour in an interview 2 years before. "Lyndon," she said, "is a good man to have around in a tough situation."

Johnson's attitude toward the Presidency has always been a mixture of reverence, personal ambition, and a naked confidence in his own ability to handle the job. In the spring of 1959, Johnson lay in a hammock beside the swimming pool of his Texas ranch. The Senate majority reader was discussing the coming presidential race with a Look writer. Johnson gazed out over his land, which lay serene and benign in the warm sunlight. "Would anybody give up all this to run for President of the United States?" he asked suddenly. Without waiting for a reply, he said with a touch of sadness in his voice, "Yes, I guess he would."

A man is known by his moments of trial. Because of his long exposure to national politics, as a New Deal Congressman, as a middle-of-the-road Senate leader, and as a New Frontier Vice President, hundreds of Washingtonians carry mental vignettes of Lyndon Johnson in times of crisis. Here are several that hint at the personality core of this strangely complex man.

On the night of Tuesday, October 23, 1962, Johnson was the watch officer for the informal executive committee set up during the Cuban missile crisis. The White House had announced that a naval blockade of Cuba would begin at 10 a.m. the next day. The question was war or peace. Would Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev turn his arms-laden ships around or order them to fight their way to Cuba?

Flanked by intelligence officers and aids, Johnson maintained an all-night vigil in the Washington mansion he had recently purchased from Perle Mesta. As surveillance reports flowed in from the Atlantic, there was no hint that Khrushchev would flinch. Johnson began to talk about the decision to confront Russia, about America, about the Constitution. It was a rambling discourse, yet one filled with determination and quiet courage. Once, he said they must face the fact that nuclear war might erupt, that the city of Washington might not exist in a few days. A Johnson aid will never forget driving home through deadened Washington streets shortly before dawn Wednesday, musing on Johnson's ability to face the ultimate danger without a crack in his composure.

Another vignette shows Johnson in one of his turbulent moods, when he batters out policy in bruising engagements with other officials. He was touring Asia on a good will mission for President Kennedy, and among his party was Carl Rowan, a Negro State Department official and now Ambassador to Finland. Rowan and Vice President Johnson had squabbled over a proposed statement involving Prime Minister Nehru, of India. Rowan insisted that one paragraph of the statement should be deleted. Johnson refused. They argued heatedly, and curses were heard. Johnson was not accustomed to "no" men around him. The set-to ended on an abrasive note.

But the next day, the paragraph was deleted,. and Johnson apologized to Rowan. "You were right," he said. "It never hurts to get your head knocked in and keep coming back for more." Now, Johnson and Rowan are friends, tied by mutual respect. The incident also throws light on Texan Johnson's racial attitudes. A close friend and assistant once observed, "There isn't an ounce of discrimination in Lyndon's makeup. He can bawl out anybody, regardless of race, creed, or color."

A third vignette is shared by a score of people, but none of them remembers it in quite the same way. It shows Johnson at the 1960 Democratic Convention at Los Angeles, the day after Kennedy defeated him for the Presidential nomination. The nominee offered the Vice Presidential nomination to Johnson, and Johnson, surprisingly, accepted. Then ensued 4 hours of tumult in Johnson's suite at the Biltmore Hotel. Robert F. Kennedy, campaign manager for his brother, appeared three times among the crowd of aids and friends milling about in the clutter and debris of Johnson headquarters. Each time the younger Kennedy appeared, he brought tales of woe and devastation in party ranks. Labor was in revolt, he said. The liberals wouldn't take Johnson.

On Bob Kennedy's first visit, he warned Johnson that rebellion had erupted in the Michigan delegation. Auto Workers President Walter Reuther had turned thumbs down on Johnson. "They're always revolting," rasped Johnson. "We're going ahead and to hell with it." Bob mentioned the possibility of the party's national chairmanship for Johnson instead. Craggy Sam Rayburn rejected the idea with a four-letter expletive.

On Bob's second visit, Johnson brushed him off to Rayburn and John Connally, Jr., later the Texas Governor who was seriously wounded in the Kennedy assassination. Rayburn listened to Bob's story of spreading revolt. "My man's not runnin' for nothin'," said Rayburn, "and he's not withdrawin' from nothin'. Besides, that's up to the candidate. He asked him to run."

On the third trip, Bob was braced by Connally. "If it's your purpose to get Lyndon to withdraw," said Connally, "you're wasting your time. He isn't going to do it. That's final."

When Philip L. Graham, the late publisher of the Washington Post and a friend of both Kennedy and Johnson, entered the Johnson suite about 3:30 p.m., he found a scene of desolation, as he recalled later. Johnson lay on his bed, muttering "doublecross." Lady Bird was on the verge of tears. Rayburn was apoplectic. Bob Kennedy, restless and agitated, was conferring with Johnson aids. Connally wore a look of fury. There had been no recent direct communication with Jack Kennedy. Graham called him. Kennedy, quietly unconcerned, asked what all the excitement was about, then said: "We may lose Alex Rose and the Liberal Party in New York, but we're going ahead with it." He read his proposed public announcement of Johnson's selection, said he was going on TV in a few minutes and advised Johnson to get ready to do likewise. Johnson bounded out of bed, grinning and ready for battle. Nobody knew it then, but in this caldron of convention politics, two Presidents of the United States had been forged.

Johnson is a large man. He stands 6-foot-3 and weighs about 190 pounds. He used to weigh over 200, but a postelection diet stripped off 29 pounds. He has regained weight since. He suffered what he called a "massive" heart attack in 1955, but he shows no lingering cardiac disturbance and appears fit and healthy for his 55 years. Once a hearty drinker and heavy smoker, he neither smokes nor drinks whisky. Occasionally, he sips a little wine at dinner.

He formerly worked 18-hour days, his torrent of energy impelling 3 a.m. phone calls to fellow Senators. Since the heart attack, he has learned to pace himself, but he still drives himself in powerful bursts in times of stress.

There is corn in Johnson's makeup. On his campaign train through the South in 1960, his accent got richer, his anecdotes grew more pungent. He can wear ten-gallon hats and cowboy boots. In Washington, his $200 suits contrasted with flashy ties and colored shirts. President Kennedy once alluded affectionately to "Lyndon's riverboat gambler" style, so alien to his own taut restraint. Often Johnson's ghost-written prose on such subjects as space and weaponry bristled with gaudy verbs. And then at times, he would rue his cattle-and-tumbleweed manner. "When you going to help me wipe this tobacco stain off my jaw?" he once asked publisher Graham.

Although his admirers have included such impeccable intellectual types as former Secretary of State Dean Acheson and retired Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, Johnson never thrived on academic cultural fare. He was graduated from Southwest Texas State Teachers College and attended Georgetown Law School, but he reads few books, cares little for such pursuits as art, literature and drama. His great store of practical knowledge about government and its problems comes largely from experience and briefings by experts.

In politics, his love and his life, his philosophy is a simple one: "Let's keep our eyes on the stars—and do the possible." He leads by arrangement, by persuasion, by compromise. "Lyndon," says a Senate admirer, "is not a crusader. He never cries, 'Follow me to the barricades.' Rather, he leans against an issue and then fixes the gate so the troops can pour through."

In Senate days, Johnson was literally a physical leader. The "treatment" for wavering Democrats included the laying on of hands, a finger jabbed in the ribs, a lapel grasped, an arm clutched or a pair of shoulders embraced. Leader Johnson coaxed, implored, wheedled, only rarely threatened. But always in the background was the shadow of power, his power to grant or withhold a multitude of favors.

In January 1960 some Democratic Senators chafed under his leadership and demanded less dictatorship and more democracy in party councils. The move died aborning, by a vote of 51 to 12. The extraordinary fact about this vote was not the dozen Senators who opposed him. It was that after 7 years of ironhanded rule, Johnson could still muster the allegiance of 51 Democrats in a legislative body renowned for its individual caprices and restiveness under party discipline.

Vanity has led Johnson into numerous bouts with the press. He warned photographers not to picture him wearing his glasses. Criticism pains him. Like some labor leaders, he desires total approbation in character sketches about him. Eighty-percent approval won't do, and, accordingly, President Johnson will not like this article. He spent most of one busy Senate day taxing one reporter for the source of a story that Johnson had been stranded in a Capitol elevator for a few minutes one night. Yet, once a culprit's offense has faded into memory, Johnson can lavish warmth and hospitality on a newspaperman. The truth appears to be that Johnson wants to be loved, a not uncommon human emotion.

There is no question that Johnson would have steered a somewhat more conservative course in the last 3 years than did Kennedy, particularly in fiscal policy. At White House conferences in the summer of 1961, when a boost in defense spending was proposed, Johnson argued that a 2-percent hike in taxes should accompany the increase. He lost his case. Kennedy wanted no new taxes. Also, Johnson would not have made some of the liberal appointments that Kennedy did. He has been known to call some of these men 'red-hots' and 'far-out boys.' Yet the differences between Kennedy and Johnson should not be exaggerated. On broad-gage foreign and domestic matters, they would have sailed a roughly similar course.

Johnson was born near Stonewall, Tex. His father had been wealthy and served in the Texas legislature, but a depression wiped him out before Lyndon's birth. Johnson grew up as a poor boy. After high school, he bummed his way to California, working at odd jobs, including elevator operator. He worked his way through college and taught high school before going to Washington as secretary to Representative Richard M. Kleberg, of the King Ranch family. In 1937, he won his own seat in Congress and has been in Washington ever since.

In 1948, he defeated Gov. Coke Stevenson in the Democratic primary for Senator by 87 votes out of a total of almost a million. Charges of fraud provoked a lengthy court battle that Johnson finally won. His towering majority among Mexican voters in boss-controlled Jim Wells County inspired a story that still circulates:

Manuel: "Pedro, why are you crying?" Pedro: "It is because of my poor dead father." Manuel: "But, Pedro, your father died 10 years ago." Pedro: "That's just it. Yesterday, my father came back to vote for Lyndon Johnson, but he no come see me."

As an employer, Johnson is a driver. His staff works as hard as any in Washington. He once dictated 131 letters to one girl in a single 12-hour stretch. He can be curt and explosive with subordinates, then turn about and overpower them with gestures of affection and generosity. He has a keen eye for talent, and the Kennedy administration was sprinkled with Johnson men of high ability. There is no halfway house for Johnson staffers. Either they dislike him and quit, or they work long hours for him in the grip of a fierce loyalty.

Johnson's family is wholesome America. He has two daughters, Lynda Bird, 19, a student at the University of Texas, and Lucy Baines, 16, a student at the National Cathedral School for Girls, in Washington. They are pretty, merry girls, atwitter with activity. Said Lynda Bird, when Queen of the President's Cup Regatta: "My life is one constant struggle for survival."

The Nation's new First Lady, christened Claudia Alta, is a successful businesswoman who inherited $67,000 and ran it into a small fortune through TV, radio, and real-estate enterprises. A sparkling woman of 51, she is only 5 feet, 4 inches, and weighs but 118 pounds, thanks to a diet that brought her down from 132. She once cared little for clothes, but Johnson demanded more style, and she launched into the cosmetics-and-wardrobe fray like a true competitor. She is gay, practical and completely natural. For the Johnsons, the love affair of 1934 has never eroded. They are proud of each other, and they show it.

Johnson's last 3 years have been trying ones for a man with his flair for action and leadership. He had to follow Kennedy, who had been Johnson's follower in the Senate. The reversal of roles found Johnson, for the first time in his life, playing everything in low key. But he was 100 percent loyal. Never once did he backbite, in public or private. Never once did he vent displeasure or express annoyance.

"I'm trying to be the kind of Vice President," he said, "that I would want if I were President. If there's only one man left the President can trust, I want that man to be me."

Now, President Johnson will demand that same kind of loyalty as he seeks to govern the Nation and steer toward his own nomination for President next summer.

The making of President Lyndon B. Johnson occurred in his Biltmore suite at the Democratic Convention of 1960. Now, the principal actors in that tense scene have been seized by the fates as though they were characters in a Greek tragedy. President Kennedy lies buried, slain by an assassin's bullets. John Connally, Jr., was grazed by death in the same ambush. Robert Kennedy, no longer the sole trusted confidant of a President, is a sorrowing brother. Publisher Graham is in his grave, a suicide after a mental breakdown. Sam Rayburn is dead of cancer. Lyndon Johnson, unwanted by Robert Kennedy and others in the party, stands at the pinnacle of power. Perhaps, in some mysterious way, the Presidency was Lyndon Johnson's destiny.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in recent weeks there has been considerable interest in the related questions of presidential succession and disability. Although there is substantial disagreement as to what specifically should be done to meet these problems, most observers agree that action is needed.

The Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, will hold hearings on these various proposals early next year. In the meantime, however, I would like to introduce for the benefit of my colleagues some of the many articles and editorials on the subject which have appeared in recent weeks. Yesterday, I introduced a series of articles dealing with the problem of Presidential disability—a problem which is the subject of sections 3, 4, and 5 of my amendment. Today, I would like to introduce a series of articles dealing with the line of succession.

Mr. President, I resent the attempts of some columnists to use articles on the question of succession to cast aspersions on the distinguished and well-qualified Speaker of the House or the President pro tempore of the Senate. They are both able and well-qualified public servants. But I think that the present law of succession is wrong and should be changed, and I would urge this change—as put forth in section 6 of my amendment—regardless of who was holding the offices of Speaker and President pro tempore.

My reasons for advocating such a change are contained in the following articles by Chalmers Roberts, Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., Congressional Quarterly, and Lindsay Rogers, and in editorials from the Washington Post and the Christian Science Monitor. I ask unanimous consent that they be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

EVENTS MULTIPLY IMPORTANCE OF ISSUE—SUCCESSION THROUGH CABINET LINE URGED

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

In the current discussion of the presidential succession, now that the United States once again has no Vice President, any proposal must be measured against some fundamentals in the American system of Government. For example:

Continuity of the American Government is primary. As President Johnson put it, "continuity without confusion" must be "the key to our system." Communist regimes have succession crises; there must be none in the American system.

Since a President and his Vice President are elected from the same political party and since they have been elected as the leaders of a specific party, the succession beyond them should be within the same party.

Since continuity of policy, at least in general terms, ranks in importance with continuity of government and continuity of party control, the Cabinet is the logical line of succession after the Vice President.

Cabinet members all have to pass Senate scrutiny for confirmation. The senior member is the Secretary of State, and foreign affairs is and doubtless will remain the most critical area of knowledge for a successor to the Presidency. Next in line are the Secretaries of the Treasury and Defense, both of whom deal in international problems.

Furthermore, the top Cabinet members have been intimately concerned with administration policy and world affairs, far more so than any Member of Congress.

For 61 years prior to 1947, the succession law (an act of Congress) put the Cabinet next in line after the Vice President, in order of the establishment of the various departments the Cabinet members head.

In 1947, a Republican-controlled Congress did what a Democratic-controlled Congress 2 years earlier had refused to do at the urging of Democratic President Harry S. Truman—change the succession to put the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate ahead of the Cabinet members.

Mr. Truman favored the idea of elected officials, rather than appointive Cabinet members, being in line behind the Vice President. Had he died in office, Republican Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., or later Democratic Speaker Sam Rayburn would have succeeded. In MARTIN's case, party political power would have shifted.

Age is another important factor. The current Speaker, Democrat JOHN W. MCCORMACK, will be 72 on December 21. By contrast, Secretary of State Dean Rusk is 54.

Of the 11 men who have reached the speakership, essentially but not entirely a matter of seniority and longevity, in the 20th century, the oldest was 72 and the youngest 56. One other was 70 and another 58; the remaining seven were in their sixties. However, many served a long time; Rayburn was 77 when he died and 6 of the 11 were in the seventies as Speaker.

By contrast, of the last 11 Secretaries of State (Charles Evans Hughes to Rusk), one was in his forties on taking office, three in their fifties, and seven in their sixties.

On leaving office, only 2 of the 11 were in their seventies; Cordell Hull, the oldest, was 73. Roughly speaking, the median age of Secretaries of State as possible successors to the Presidency has been about 10 years less than that of Speakers.

All of this discussion has to do with the simplest part of the presidential succession issue. The more difficult problem relates to presidential disability, a problem that has never been satisfactorily resolved.

One has only to imagine what might have happened had the bullets that killed President Kennedy left him alive but partially paralyzed, able only to carry on in a limited way.

The compacts between Presidents and Vice Presidents agreed upon by Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Nixon and then Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Johnson provide at least a partial solution to this disability problem. But it will be more difficult to implement such a compact between a President and the Speaker.

The compact announced yesterday between President Johnson and Speaker McCormack may seem to offer a temporary solution in the current situation, but it also raises new problems.

If the Speaker became Acting President because of a presidential disability, he would have to resign both his speakership and his House seat. If the President then recovered, the Speaker apparently would be out of a job, indeed out of two jobs.

But if the President should die while the Speaker were only Acting President, then not he but the new Speaker, meanwhile elected to succeed him, would be the new President. Or so it would seem on first analysis.

With such problems as these now arising, the only sensible procedure is for Congress promptly to restore the Cabinet line of succession. Then it should set up a blue ribbon committee to write a new law on disability, a problem on which it will take much longer to reach a consensus.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 8, 1963]

Would Cancel Act of 1947—Constitutional Scholar Proposes Restoring Succession to Cabinet

(Editor's Note.—The problem of Presidential succession once again is a matter of major national concern. This article was written at the request of the Washington Post by one of the country's foremost authors and constitutional scholars.)

(By Lucius Wilmerding, Jr.)

The Constitution gives Congress the power to provide by law for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President, "declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected."

It has always been understood that the word "officer" means "officer of the United States"; and, indeed, the resolve adopted by the Federal Convention and referred to the Committee on Style for inclusion in the draft of the Constitution expressly restrains the temporary appointment to officers of the United States. As the Committee on Style had no authority to change the substance of any resolve, the omission of the words "of the United States" must be regarded as accidental. We know from Madison's notes of September 7, 1787, that some members wished Congress to be at liberty to appoint others than such, but we know also that they were overruled.

The debate in the first Congress—January 10 and 11, 1791—on a bill declaring what officer, in case of vacancy in the offices of President and Vice President, shall act as President, confirms this construction of the Constitution.

VARIOUS OFFICERS PROPOSED

William Smith, of South Carolina, observed that, by the Constitution, the vacancy is to be filled with an officer of the United States. This narrows the discussion very much. No one disputed this statement. The only disagreement was on the officer to be designated. Various members proposed the respective offices of Chief Justice, Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, and President pro tempore of the Senate, but no agreement was reached and the bill failed.

In the next Congress the discussion was resumed and on March 1, 1792, an act passed designating the President pro tempore to act as President in the event of a double vacancy in the Executive Office. It had been argued in both Houses that an officer of the Senate or House of Representatives was not an officer of the United States, and so was constitutionally ineligible to act as President, but the contention could not be sustained.

ACT OF 1792 REPEALED

The act of 1792 was repealed in 1886 and the Secretary of State substituted for the President pro tempore of the Senate. In 1947 this act was in turn repealed and the Speaker of the House designated for the temporary appointment, but a novel provision was introduced. The Speaker must resign his office and his seat in Congress before beginning to act as President.

How does the act of 1947 square with the Constitution? No one can now challenge the proposition that the Speaker of the House is for the purposes of filling a vacancy in the Presidency an officer of the United States—the legislative construction of the Constitution made in 1792 has determined the question. But what office of the United States is held by a resigned Speaker? The language and intent of the Constitution seems sufficiently clear. The person designated is not to be President but to act as President until the disability of the elected President or Vice President is removed or until a new President is elected. At the same time he must be an officer of the United States. Under the Constitution, a Speaker who resigned his office before beginning to act as President would disqualify himself for the temporary appointment; if he resigned afterward he would create a new vacancy.

MADISON'S OBJECTION

The possibility of putting a resigned officer into the presidential chair even for a day was not contemplated by the first Congress. One of the objections offered by Madison to designating the President pro tempore of the Senate was that he would "still hold his office—thus he will hold two offices at once."

To cast doubt upon the constitutionality of the act of 1947 is to confuse a problem already difficult enough. But that the doubt exists can scarcely be denied. In the present situation there is an urgent necessity that it be resolved.

To review the last and bring it into conformity with the Constitution and the exigencies of the moment must be a work of time—and there is no time. But there are two ways in which the present danger might be avoided. If the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate (who becomes Acting President if there is no Speaker or the Speaker fails to qualify) were jointly to declare that neither would resign his office, the succession would pass under the act of 1947 to the Secretary of State.

An alternative and perhaps a better mode would be for Congress, by a legislative construction of the Constitution, to declare the act of 1947 null and void from the beginning. In that case the act of 1886 would be restored to the statute books, and the Secretary of State would become once again the officer designated to act as President until the disability be removed or another President be elected.

INTERMEDIATE ELECTION

The act of July 29, 1789, declaring that the power of removal is vested by the Constitution in the President alone is a precedent for such a legislative construction, as is the act of 1879 above mentioned.

This second solution would have the further great advantage of striking from the statute books that part of the act of 1947 that requires the Acting President, except in cases of inability, to serve for the remainder of the President's term. It would then be possible for Congress to provide by law for the election of a new President and Vice President at an early period as it did in the act of 1792. The desirability of an intermediate election is obvious in the event of a double vacancy occurring near the beginning of a term. A midterm election would not disturb the synchronism of the Constitution, for at that time, as at the regular period, the whole of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate are chosen.

These are drastic solutions to a problem that requires long and careful consideration, but they would meet the immediate difficulty and buy time for such consideration.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 12, 1963]

(The Congressional Quarterly)

U.S. Law of Succession Has Pitfalls

The moment Lyndon B. Johnson became President, the United States no longer had a Vice President. Under a 1947 law, Speaker of the House John W. McCormack, a veteran Boston Democratic Representative, moved next in line to the Presidency.

McCormack's position a heartbeat away from the Presidency has aroused widespread concern on two counts:

First, McCormack has never been considered a man of Presidential stature. For many years he proved effective as majority leader under the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, Democrat, of Texas, but since his election in 1962 to succeed Rayburn largely on the basis of seniority, he has failed to match Rayburn's legislative successes.

Moreover, McCormack will be 72 years of age December 21. No President has ever achieved that age in office.

President Eisenhower was 70 years, 3 months, and 6 days old when he left office in 1961. Serious doubt exists as to McCormack's physical ability to withstand the pressures of the Presidency.

PROBLEM OF DISABILITY

Secondly, concern has been expressed about what might happen in the event of a temporary Presidential disability.

President Eisenhower and Vice President Richard M. Nixon, and later President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson, made written agreements providing that the Vice President would become acting President if the President were temporarily disabled.

If the President were unable to communicate, the Vice President would confer with the Cabinet before assuming the powers of the office. He would relinquish Presidential powers as soon as the President declared himself able again.

On December 5, the White House announced that President Johnson and Speaker McCormack had agreed verbally to follow the example of the Eisenhower-Nixon and Kennedy-Johnson agreements. But Press Secretary Pierre Salinger acknowledged a serious difficulty not covered by the new verbal agreement.

Under the automatic Presidential succession law of 1947, which puts the House Speaker next in line, it is specifically stipulated that the Speaker shall only "act as President * * * upon his resignation as Speaker and as Representative in Congress."

CONSTITUTION PROVISION

Not even an act of Congress could change the effect of that language, because the Constitution also provides that "No person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office."

Thus McCormack would be required to resign as Speaker and as a Member of Congress to assume the duties of the Presidency, even if it were just for a few hours or days in the event of a temporary presidential disability.

The possibility raises a series of questions: Would McCormack be willing to resign from Congress to be acting President, knowing it might be only for hours or a few days; if he were to refuse or hesitate, might the country not find itself without a President for a period of time; and how could the country react to a threatened nuclear attack or other international emergency under such conditions?

SHORT-TERM SOLUTIONS

Two short-term solutions to the problem appear possible.

One, advanced by two western Massachusetts newspapers during the week of December 2, would be for McCORMACK "to recognize the incongruity of his present situation by stepping down as Speaker of the House so that a younger man can be elevated to the post which is now, in effect, the Vice Presidency."

Another possible solution would be for both McCORMACK and Senate President pro tempore CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, 86, the man who would be in line for the Presidency if no Speaker qualified, to execute written documents declining to accept the duties of the Presidency. In that event, the Secretary of State, and after him the other Cabinet officers, would be in line for the Presidency, as they were previous to passage of the 1947 succession law.

AMENDMENT NEEDED

Most proposed long-term solutions, however, would require a constitutional amendment.

One simpler solution would be for Congress to revoke the 1947 succession law and once more make Cabinet officers next in line, as they were from 1886 to 1947.

The system was changed in 1947, partly because President Harry S. Truman said he did not think he should have the power to appoint, in effect, his own successor through Cabinet designations. Observers have recently pointed out, however, that presidential candidates almost always designate their vice presidential running mates—another form of naming their potential successor.

Because of their positions, Cabinet officers can be kept fully informed on all executive branch activities. The separation of powers between executive and legislative branches creates some problems on fully briefing congressional officers.

Moreover, Cabinet officers—especially the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Defense, the first three in line of succession—are likely to have a fuller grasp of key international developments than any congressional officer.

[From the Reporter, Dec. 19, 1963]

THE LINE OF SUCCESSION

(By Lindsay Rogers)

Eight of the 36 Presidents of the United States were elected as Vice Presidents and moved to the highest office when Presidents died. Shock and sadness there have been, but the transitions have been orderly and the country has always rallied behind the new Chief Executive. We have been able to say to ourselves, as James A. Garfield (who was himself to be our second assassinated President) said on the morning of Lincoln's death, "God reigns, and the Government at Washington still lives."

Happily, no President has died while the Vice Presidency was vacant. Happily all Presidents who moved up from the Vice Presidency finished the terms for which they had been elected. Thus the constitutional mandate has so far sufficed to determine the Presidential succession and we have never had to follow congressional wisdom—or lack of it—as expressed in Presidential succession acts. There have been situations in the past when, had we been compelled to follow the act, it would have been difficult for the "Government at Washington" to continue to live. I suggest that the present situation is one we should examine, and to do this adequately a little study of history is necessary.

The framers of the Constitution sought to guard against any Presidential interregnum by providing that "In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President." They then empowered the Congress to provide by law "for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly until the disability be removed or a President shall be elected." The Second Congress passed a Presidential Succession Act dated March 1, 1792, with scant discussion of the possible constitutional objections or of the practical difficulties of its application.

The act provided that the President of the Senate pro tempore and the Speaker of the House of Representatives should follow the Vice President in succession to the Presidency. But were the President of the Senate pro tempore and the Speaker officers of the United States within the meaning of the constitutional provision? Moreover—Madison was one of those who pointed this out—there was no requirement that, if one of these officials went to the White House, he give up his original duties and avoid a conflict between his executive and legislative functions. Again, the President of the Senate pro tempore did not hold over; the office was frequently vacant and so was the speakership. The great men in the Congress had overlooked the fact that a new Congress elected in November normally would not assemble for 13 months, leaving the House without a Speaker from March 3, when the "lame duck" session ended, until December. These defects have been largely cured by a change of senatorial practice allowing the President pro tempore to hold over and by the 20th amendment in 1933 abolishing the "lame duck" sessions of Congress. But there was another defect that was unanticipated. As the hopes of the framers of the Constitution were frustrated and powerful political parties emerged, it became possible that a President pro tempore or a Speaker would not be of the same political party as that of the President and Vice President. Is it democracy for the voters to win an election by a majority and then suffer defeat by an act of God?

THE CONTINUING PROBLEM

Over the years little attention was paid to these problems. Indeed, it is difficult to think of a really important matter with which Congress has dealt so nonchalantly. In 1820 the Senate Judiciary Committee reported unanimously that it was inexpedient to attempt to legislate further. In 1856 the Judiciary Committee opined that the act was constitutional, and went on to propose that if no President pro tempore or Speaker was available, the succession should go to the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court (providing he had not presided at an impeachment) and then to the Associate Justices in order of seniority. The Senate took no action on this silly report and then for 25 years there was no further interest in the matter.

On September 19, 1881, President James A. Garfield died and Chester A. Arthur succeeded him. If anything had then happened to President Arthur, the act of 1792 would have been worthless; there was no President pro tempore until October 10, and no Speaker until December 5. A comparable situation existed after Grover Cleveland's Vice President, Thomas A. Hendricks, died on November 25, 1885.

Congress was finally aroused from its lethargy and passed a new statute. The act of January 19, 1886, provided that, after the Vice President, succession to the Presidency should vest in the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and other members of the Cabinet. The act also declared that when the powers and duties of the office of President devolved upon any such person, Congress, if not in session, should be summoned by that person within 20 days. For 60 years this order of presidential succession was considered satisfactory and no serious effort was made to change it.

A principal reason for the silence was that, by and large, our Secretaries of State have been men of considerable stature. On more than one occasion since the days of Monroe and John Quincy Adams, the Secretary of State has been manifestly abler than the occupant of the Executive Mansion. Rarely, if ever, has he been less able than the Speaker. But when Franklin Roosevelt died and Harry S. Truman became President, the Secretary of State was Edward R. Stettinius, youthful, amiable, and able but not a man who in the Presidency would have drawn the confidence of the country. Immediately some public figures, notably James A. Farley, attacked the "undemocratic" power of the act of 1886 had given a Vice President who had become President: Mr. Truman could appoint a new Secretary of State and in effect name his own successor. It is not hard to think of occasions on which such a power could be used to great advantage.

On June 19, 1945, President Truman sent Congress a message urging a new Presidential Succession Act. He argued that the man next in succession after the Vice President should be someone who had been elected to some office, and he suggested "that the Speaker is the official in the Federal Government, whose selection, next to that of the President and Vice President, can be most accurately said to stem from the people themselves." Mr. Truman's reasoning was faulty; in order to acquire the seniority that is necessary to be elected, the Speaker must come from a safe district. Mr. Truman proposed that the President pro tempore of the Senate should be next in line of succession and be followed by the Cabinet officers. This was in part the act of 1792 in reverse.

Soon, however, Stettinius was out and James F. Byrnes became Secretary of State. He had been a Member of Congress, a Senator, a Justice of the Supreme Court, and head of the Office of War Mobilization, in which capacity he had been described as Franklin Roosevelt's "Assistant President." Interest in Mr. Truman's proposal sharply declined, but not before there had been a number of crackpot suggestions.

One such was that the electoral college be resummoned to elect a President and Vice President to serve out the remainder of the unexpired term. Another proposal was that the successor to the Vice President be chosen by the House of Representatives from a list of three Senators nominated by the Senate. One Congressman thought that the electorate should choose not only a first but a second and third Vice President of the United States. But the craziest idea of all was that the ranking officers of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force (why the discrimination against the Marines?) should choose a civilian who would be an interim President who should act until "the State Governors, at a meeting called by him, shall select from their number by majority vote a President and a Vice President" to serve out the unexpired term.

With Mr. Byrnes as Secretary of State, Congress and the country had lost interest. But when, in 1946, the country returned a Republican Congress and Mr. Truman was challenged to stand by his proposal, he said that he was prepared to do so; that if he were to die or become incapacitated, he thought his successor could be a Republican. Joseph W. Martin was then the Speaker of the House and Arthur H. Vandenberg was President pro tempore of the Senate. These were men of stature; Sam Rayburn, who had been and who again would be the Speaker of the House, was of even greater stature. Congress and President Truman paid attention to personalities rather than to principle. Was the House to vote no confidence in

Joseph Martin or the Senate in Arthur Vandenberg? In his work on the Presidency, Prof. Edward S. Corwin says that Mr. Truman acted "sportingly." The adverb may be appropriate but Professor Corwin could also have written "unintelligently." This judgment is not challenged by the fact that the new statute made two minor improvements. It provided for a vacancy by reason of "failure to qualify" and it declared that whoever succeeds to "act as President" must resign the post by virtue of which he succeeded, and if it is the Speaker he must also resign "as Representative in Congress."

THE CASE FOR FLEXIBILITY

Under the Presidential Succession Act of July 18, 1947, what are the possibilities we now face? The Speaker of the House, elected in August, 1961, is John W. McCormack, who has represented a safe Massachusetts district since 1928. His biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory does not disclose his age but on December 21 he will be 72. Until his election as Speaker he was hardly known outside his district or outside the House of Representatives. Since he has been Speaker he has failed to impress the country and is relatively unknown in Europe.

The President pro tempore of the Senate is CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, who is 86. He is able to preside over the Senate, but only for very short periods; if President Johnson's magnificent address before Congress had lasted a few minutes longer, his colleagues (and many television viewers) would not have been surprised if the Senator had dozed. It should be noted that it is possible that HAYDEN would not follow McCORMACK, because the House, as soon as McCORMACK became President, would immediately elect a new Speaker, who would then automatically become next in line for succession.

Meanwhile, until Congress acts, the situation is alarming. When matters are of the highest importance, reticence is out of place, and frankness is essential. It is not inconceivable, then, that Speaker McCORMACK and Senator HAYDEN might guarantee themselves glowing mention in the history books by urging their fellow Representatives and Senators to undertake an immediate reexamination of the Presidential Succession Act, and by telling them not to delay because of reluctance to express a lack of confidence in two well-liked colleagues. I therefore call attention to some language in the act of March 1, 1792, which is still the law of the land:

"Resignation or refusal of office. The only evidence of a refusal to accept, or of a resignation of the office of President or Vice President, shall be an instrument in writing, declaring the same and subscribed by the person refusing to accept, or resigning, as the case may be, and delivered into the office of the Secretary of State." Our Second Congress—it included some of the Founding Fathers—did not think it out of the question that there might be occasions when selfless patriots could best serve their country by refusing to accept or resigning.

It is inconceivable that Congress be complacent about the present order of succession. Much time will elapse before adequate legislation can be drawn up to revise the present muddle. Meanwhile, if Speaker McCORMACK and Senator HAYDEN are willing, might it not be a good temporary measure to return to the succession ordered in the act of 1886—the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, etc.—which for 60 years was never seriously challenged? This, surely, would be a better choice than that offered by the present Presidential succession law.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 10, 1963]

DEFECTIVE SUCCESSION LAW

The growing demand for a change in the law of Presidential succession has been buttressed by the disclosure of a grave weakness in the present statute. After digging into the historical background, Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., an eminent authority in this field, has concluded that the present succession law is unconstitutional.

The gist of Mr. Wilmerding's argument is this: The Constitution does not give Congress a clear slate on which to legislate in this sphere. Rather, it provides that in case of "removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President," Congress may declare by law "what officer shall then act as President." But in designating the Speaker of the House for this role in 1947, Congress provided that the Speaker would have to resign from Congress before he could perform any of the Presidential duties.

Upon his resignation the Speaker would obviously no longer be an officer of the United States. Consequently, says Mr. Wilmerding, he would not meet the requirement laid down by the Constitution—that the person functioning temporarily as President hold such an "office."

It is readily apparent why Congress wrote into the law a requirement that the Speaker resign before exercising the Presidential power. Article I, section 6 of the Constitution provides that "no person holding any office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House (of Congress) during his continuance in office." Certainly this must mean that no person can be Acting President and a Member of Congress at the same time.

In other words, it appears that Members of Congress cannot be constitutionally placed in the line of Presidential succession whether or not they are required to resign.

This is a matter of the utmost gravity. It seems to leave succession to the Presidency, when there is no Vice President, hanging by a precarious and uncertain thread. And confusion over who would exercise the Presidential powers in case of emergency is one of the gravest dangers to our national security as well as to the stability of our political system.

Repeal of the 1947 Succession Act thus appears to be one of the most important tasks confronting Congress. Even without weighing the constitutional defect in the law, Speaker McCORMACK has indicated that he will raise no obstacle to its reconsideration, although he prefers the present arrangement. Congress might well consider this an invitation from the Speaker to restudy the problem. Fortunately, it can wipe out the present uncertainty and restore the Secretary of State to the head of the succession line by a simple concurrent resolution that would erase the act of 1947.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 6, 1963]

AFTER THE VICE PRESIDENT

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, has proposed that the Constitution be amended to provide for the election of two Vice Presidents to strengthen the line of succession to the Presidency.

It is not an idea that is apt to catch on, because the Vice Presidency is an awkward office to begin with, and multiplying it has little appeal.

But the need to strengthen the line of succession is a real one, and the Nation should be giving serious consideration to it. Now that Mr. Johnson has moved up to the Chief Executive's post there is no Vice President. The next in line are Speaker of the House JOHN W. McCORMACK and Senator CARL HAYDEN, the President pro tem of the Senate, both of whom are too old to undertake the arduous duties of the Presidency. (The Speaker, who is the younger of the two, is already older than our oldest President was when he finished his term of office.)

The Speaker and the Senator could, of course, disqualify themselves by resigning and let the two Houses elect younger men. But that would be a cruel choice to impose on them and a disservice to Congress.

Moreover, there is a serious question as to the constitutionality of the 1948 Succession Act, which restored the Speaker and the President pro tem to the line of succession after a lapse of 62 years. The Constitution authorizes Congress to say what "officer" shall be in line to succeed after the Vice President. Are Members of the Congress "officers" within the meaning of the basic law?

Madison, who had more to do with writing the Constitution than anyone else, thought not and violently objected when the Speaker was included in the first Succession Act. He also called it a violation of the principle of separation of powers and of the convention's intent that the President should be a "continental character" without ties to a local constituency.

What then are the alternatives?

Unless we are prepared to hold special elections, which would disrupt what the Founding Fathers called the "synchrony" of Presidential and congressional terms, we must probably turn to the Cabinet, as we did from 1886 to 1948. Cabinet members are certainly officers of the Government, and they also have a "continental character," having more national distinction on the average than our Vice Presidents.

The flaw here is that Cabinet officers are not popularly elected. The 1948 law was enacted largely because President Truman felt it was undemocratic for him to appoint his own successor (his Secretary of State then being first in line of succession). But Cabinet officers do have to be confirmed by the Senate, and in this sense they are as much elected as the House Speaker or Senate President.

The difficulty could be gotten round if a new Succession Act, while placing the Cabinet members back in the direct line again, should also provide that upon the death of the President all Cabinet members should resign and resume their places only if reappointed and reconfirmed by the Senate.

Congress has a positive obligation to review the 1948 Succession Act now and make some new provision for the transfer of Presidential power. What happened at Dallas should remind them that the task is urgent.

THE DEATH OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the best editorials I have seen concerning the death of the late President John F. Kennedy was printed in the Tazewell County (Ill.) Reporter for Thursday, November 28, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial appear in the RECORD so that others may read it as well.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY? WHY?

Why? Why?

This mournful dirge will ring down the long corridors of eternity and still go begging for an exact answer.

Why? Why?

In that split second before the light was forever extinguished, this inscrutible question may have entered that magnificent tomb which was the brain of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Why by the stealth borne of cowardice did the assassin squeeze the trigger which launched the fatal bullet on its dreadful path? Why when confronted with insurmountable evidence of his guilt did he choose to deprive the country of the important but twisted logic behind the deed?

Little does it matter now that he paid the extreme penalty at the hands of another assassin. The question of his guilt and the certainty of his ultimate punishment by the society he betrayed were already sealed.

But lost forever is the imparting from his own lips the vital information of what factors are at work in our society which drive men to such lengths. For, though we seemingly stand on the heights and gaze down into the chasm of his iniquity, perhaps we too have the blood of the President upon our hands.

Though we kept the prayerful watch and draped the colors at half-mast, what will the morrow bring? Will we look the black man in the face and recoil? Will we say to the Jew, "You killed Christ"? Will we tell our neighbors around the world, "Get along as best you can, for the burden is too heavy for us"?

Will our legislators continue to belabor those hallowed halls with minuscule and divisive interpretations of how best to chart the course of a great nation on a perilous voyage? Or, will statesmen rise and grasp the torch so recently fallen on the blood-stained street at Dallas?

A just God grant they may. Then, truly, meaning will be given the fervent hope of John Fitzgerald Kennedy: "Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans."

And, what of the man himself? Is it finished with the placing of his mortal remains beneath the sod on a windswept slope in Arlington National Cemetery? There he will keep the vigil with thousands of others who died in the service of our country.

Those who note the flight and fall of the lofty eagle will, in mind's eye, visit this spot again and again. And, with the passage of time, the breadth and height and scope of the martyred man will emerge to be savored and reflected upon by those unashamedly in love with America.

For, despite the circumstances of wealth and position, he was a man who held out the hand of greatness to a nation too hesitant to grasp it and, at times, reluctant to make the sacrifices attendant upon it. By catchword and cleverly implanted doubt, we were often cautioned to suspect his motives.

It is ironic that perhaps the most moving summation of his life and creed are from another country. The Vancouver, B.C., Province said:

"He chose the glory road, the road chosen by those who have the look of eagles, the high and dangerous road that winds beside chasms and precipices that daunt lesser men."

Not in our time have we seen such an outpouring of grief at the passing of one man. The death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who led us in the dark days of the depression and the difficult times of war, is the closest analogy. Though shocking and sad, his passing was from natural causes due to infirmities generally known.

But, here we have a man senselessly cut down in the vigor of manhood with great triumphs ahead; a man who leaves behind a grieving young widow and two children with the pap of infancy scarcely gone from their lips. He brought all the forces of a giant intellect to bear upon the awesome task he undertook with complete dedication to the ideal that he was President of all the people.

And how stands the Nation? We can all thank on bended knee the foresight of the founders of our great Republic who provided for the orderly transition of Executive authority. The mantle of leadership flows naturally from shoulder to shoulder, decade upon decade, without strife or civil insurrection and the Nation endures.

Just as the memory of those great forefathers endure and the intent of their handiwork becomes clearer with the ages, so will this Nation endure the winds of change and momentary calamities which buffet her. While we have seen, and will see, differing interpretations on the founding precepts handed us, we need have no fear so long as the core of their meaning is preserved.

With the course of our national purpose pointed aright and the minds of our leaders attuned to the hopes and aspirations of our people, we may take renewed dedication in those immortal words: "Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

In epilogue, we have one more sacred obligation before us this day. We must not slight nor tranish the glory of that other martyr who died with the President that fateful November day.

J. D. Tippitt, who died by the same hand which slew the President, has earned a niche in the memory of his countrymen. He was killed while carrying out the highest tradition of our Nation's law enforcement agencies. He was the instrument serving as intermediary between the actual and the philosophical in a concept that this is a Nation of men and laws.

As thousands of military graves throughout the world testify, there can be no nobler death than that imposed by faithful performance of oaths taken. Officer Tippitt epitomizes to the highest his fallen Commander's admonition:

"Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country."

So mote it be.

KREBIOZEN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on December 5, 1963, I made a lengthy speech in the Senate in which I published the report prepared for me by a team of medical doctors, physicists, and chemists showing that when the Food and Drug Administration claimed that the anticancer drug Krebiozen was the common amino acid called creatine that they were mistaken. There was an abundance of proof provided in that report.

I now ask unanimous consent that a number of editorials and articles from newspapers around the country commenting on this matter be printed in the Record at this time.

These include articles by Dr. George Crane, the noted medical writer; Mr. Jack Mabley, of Chicago's American; Mr. James A. Wechsler, of the New York Post; Mr. Roger Ebert, of the Champaign-Urbana (Ill.) News Gazette; Mr. Robert Gruenberg, of Chicago's American; editorial from the Denver Post, and an article by Mr. Oliver Starr, Jr., which appeared in the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Facts About the Krebiozen Cancer Controversy

(By Dr. George W. Crane, Ph. D., M.D., research scientist for 5 years for the National Research Council of America and the Carnegie Institution of Washington, D.C.)

Senator Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, called me to Washington, D.C., on November 13 to view the startling exposé of the falsification by the Food and Drug Administration concerning Krebiozen.

The FDA had released on September 7 a glib report that Krebiozen is "nothing but creatine."

Astute Senator Douglas (himself a famous Ph. D. scientist in former years at the University of Chicago) was dubious.

So he called to Washington several American scientists, for the FDA had arrogantly asserted that its analyses of Krebiozen were "scientifically unimpeachable."

Dr. Scott Anderson, an expert in spectrographic analysis at the home city of the University of Illinois, went over the FDA's spectrographs of creatine and Krebiozen before our very eyes in the office of Senator Douglas.

Dr. Scott pointed out 29 differences in those two spectrographs, though the "unimpeachable" FDA had called them "identical."

Then Howard S. Clark, head of the Clark Microanalytical Laboratory (Urbana, Ill.), who had received aid from Prof. Roy Whistler, specialist in carbohydrate and polysaccharide chemistry at Purdue University, completely demolished the "unimpeachable" report of the FDA, as follows:

Krebiozen, light brown or tan color; creatine, white.

Krebiozen, galacturonic acid; creatine, none.

Krebiozen, glucosamine; creatine, none.
Krebiozen, galactose; creatine, none.
Krebiozen, glucose; creatine, none.
Krebiozen, arabinose; creatine, none.
Krebiozen, xylose; creatine, none.
Krebiozen, palmitic acid; creatine, none.
Krebiozen, oleic acid; creatine, none.
Krebiozen, palmitoleic acid; creatine, none.
Krebiozen, myristic acid; creatine, none.
Krebiozen, stearic acid; creatine, none.
Krebiozen, C–15; creatine, none.
Krebiozen, C–17; creatine, none.
Krebiozen, lauric acid; creatine, none.
Krebiozen, shorter chain acids; creatine, none.

Please observe that the FDA's claim that creatine and Krebiozen are the same substance, are thus disproved both by those 29 differences in their spectrographs, plus the many chemical differences above.

Senator Douglas issued a scholarly report in which he thus described the confusion of the Food and Drug Administration as "bureaucratic schizophrenia."

Since the head of the FDA holds neither a Ph. D. in chemistry nor an M.D., he rushes in where scientists fear to tread, as was true a few years ago when he scared America re the cranberry farce; then weakly crawfished later by admitting we could have eaten a carload of cranberries with no significant medical ill effects.

More recently, he ignored the standard medical methods for evaluating cancer drugs by refusing to consider any of Dr. Ivy's 504 cases that showed arrest of tumor or 50 percent reduction.

Likewise, he discarded all cases that reported freedom from pain after use of Krebiozen, saying this was a subjective report.

But how does he think we medics test any pain-killing drug, except to use the patient's own subjective report?

We use subjective reports for all other pain-killing drugs.

The FDA's falsification of scientific facts was also duplicated back in 1951 in the famous "100 cases" that the AMA has kept parroting ever since.

Yet, of those 100 cases treated by Krebiozen, two were admitted to have benefited, but were blithely ascribed to "chance."

The other 98 were called "dead or dying" when the report appeared in our weekly issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association.

But 72 of those 98 were moribund when selected, for they didn't live long enough to obtain but four shots of Krebiozen.

And of the remaining 26 "dead or dying," Dr. Ivy has signed statements years later from over 20 that they were still alive and apparently healthy, with nothing but Krebiozen shots to explain their good health.

On September 13 of this year (12 years later) I personally saw four of these "dead or dying" demonstrated by Dr. Ivy at the Hilton Hotel in Chicago. They were in good health and back on their jobs.

So Dr. Ivy has reproved the AMA for deliberately picking 72 cases not permissible for use in any normal experimental procedure, plus their use of over 20 "falsified" cases as per his affidavits.

Yet American physicians have been parroting for 12 years the "totally worthless" report of the AMA concerning that 1951 experiment re Krebiozen.

So why should the AMA and the FDA be so hostile to Dr. Ivy's demand that a fair clinical test be conducted?

What is the underlying terror that causes the FDA to falsify spectrographs and chemical reports to try to stop Krebiozen?

With 250,000 people dying this year of cancer, why shouldn't Krebiozen (used by 3,000 physicians on 5,000 patients) be given an unbiased test on cancer patients?

[From Chicago's American, Nov. 15, 1963]

MABLEY'S REPORT: DOUGLAS HITS KREBIOZEN FOES

(By Jack Mabley)

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS has made a devastating attack against the enemies of Krebiozen.

A document prepared by his staff accuses the Government's Food and Drug Administration of issuing "information and conclusions which are demonstrably false."

The major significance of DOUGLAS' action is this:

Unless the FDA can disprove charges, a congressional investigation of the agency would seem almost mandatory.

There is more reason than ever to press for a fair test for Krebiozen, the drug developed by Dr. Steven Durovic, and backed by Dr. Andrew Ivy.

All that Dr. Ivy ever has asked is a test of the drug which he believes is effective in combating some forms of cancer. This column has joined in urging such a test. Senator DOUGLAS has urged the test, and said in releasing his staff's report that this still is his major objective.

The document is a searing indictment of the FDA and the National Cancer Institute.

The report is signed by Howard E. Shuman, DOUGLAS' administrative assistant, and Miles H. Robinson, M.D.

It deals mainly with two Government findings. On September 7 the FDA called a press conference and announced without qualification that Krebiozen is a common substance known as creatine, and is useless in combating cancer.

DOUGLAS' staff offers greatly detailed evidence that Krebiozen is not creatine. It is extremely persuasive to a layman, which I am. But more important, it can easily be resolved by disinterested scientists, if such can be found.

Second, DOUGLAS' staff disputes the findings of a committee gathered by the National Cancer Institute which "analyzed" 504 cancer cases treated with Krebiozen, and again announced the drug was useless.

One of the minor points made by Senator DOUGLAS is that the NCI report was made weeks after the FDA announced that Krebiozen really was creatine. So the men making the analysis of the cases were put in the position that if they did acknowledge benefit by the drug, in effect they were saying creatine was an effective against cancer. Obviously they could not do this.

Dr. Ivy continues to be mystified at the fantastic lengths to which the forces in control of organized medicine will go to avoid a test for Krebiozen.

A test would cost around $50,000 and settle the matter once and for all. Dr. Ivy estimates the FDA has spent $1,250,000 in the massive effort to gather evidence to discredit the drug and avoid a test.

I share his bafflement. Even the worst detractors of Krebiozen admit it is not toxic, and nothing could be lost by treating terminal cancer patients with the drug in a test.

Senator DOUGLAS' staff points out that in evaluating the Krebiozen cases, the secret committee refused to see Dr. Ivy. They refused to see a single patient or a single doctor who had used the drug.

This column has been outspoken in its urging that Krebiozen be given a test. Never have we said it is a cancer cure. But repeatedly we have said the evidence that it is effective against some forms of cancer is impressive, and if there is only 1 chance in 100 that it is effective, it is unthinkable that it not be tested.

After seeing Senator DOUGLAS' documents, I revise my estimate. The chances are far greater than 1 in 100.

There has been talk by Dr. Ivy's and Dr. Durovic's enemies that they be tried for fraud in Federal court. Dr. Ivy would be overjoyed at such a chance to answer the charges, and place his case before an impartial jury, and finally come face to face with the men who will not give him a hearing.

The Denver Post has joined the tiny group of journalistic voices calling for a clinical test of the drug. In an editorial October 23 the Post quoted Alexander Fleming, discoverer of penicillin:

"Penicillin sat on the shelf for 12 years while I was called a quack. I can only think of the thousands who died needlessly because my peers would not use my discovery."

The editorial pleads that man should never make such a tragic mistake again.

[From the New York Post, Sept. 25, 1963]

ON KREBIOZEN

(By James A. Wechsler)

The Krebiozen battle isn't over. In fact the most dramatic episodes in this long, elusive controversy may be approaching. Before it ends, President Kennedy himself may have to enter the dispute.

About a fortnight ago, when the Food and Drug Administration issued a derogatory report suggesting that Krebiozen was a fraud, the announcement was greeted as the last word.

But it wasn't. For one thing, too many people who believe their death sentences were commuted by Krebiozen after all orthodox procedures had failed are unlikely to be shaken by any Government analysis of the content of the drug. Even if it were shown to be branch water, they would contend that what this country, and especially its cancer victims, need is more of the stuff.

In countless letters I have received from such people and their relatives during the last decade, that point has been repeatedly made.

The FDA's assertion that Krebiozen was nothing more than the common body substance creatine was presumably designed to proclaim that all the imagined beneficiaries of Krebiozen had been deluded. The implication was that they were cases of "remission" who squandered their money on Krebiozen.

The disclosure sounded devastating. But, as Barbara Yuncker, who has diligently and objectively covered this controversy for many years, reported in the Post yesterday, serious questions have been raised about the validity of the FDA verdict. Dr. Miles Robinson, a respected medical maverick, has submitted a critical study of the FDA report to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, a longtime leader in the fight for a fair evaluation of Krebiozen. There is reason to believe that his study will receive attention on the highest Government levels.

Beyond that remains the still-awaited report of the National Cancer Institute on the case histories of 504 patients who have been treated by Krebiozen. It has been rumored that this report will also be adverse to the Krebiozen sponsors. What is far from clear is whether the nature of its findings will satisfy Senator DOUGLAS, Dr. Robinson and others who have been frankly critical of the approach of the medical establishment to Krebiozen.

I write about this matter reluctantly because I lack any scientific credentials. What brings me to the subject is my uneasiness about the frenzy with which the anti-Krebiozen crusade has been pursued and the tones of satisfaction in which negative judgment is being pronounced. If Krebiozen is a delusion, the news should be treated as a large human disaster.

Instead one has detected a certain cold jubilation among the pillars of the AMA and some of their Government brethren, as if the discrediting of the Krebiozen advocates were a great day for mankind, a vindication of medical stodginess and a rebuke to any infidels who defy the ukases of the AMA house.

The lines are not simply drawn. Consumer Reports, the respected organ of Consumers Union, has published a lengthy critique of the conduct of Dr. Steven Durovic during his long battle, blaming him for the curtain of secrecy which so long prevented independent analysis of his product. Yet even CU's study, as Miss Yuncker has shown in a thoughtful comment she has transmitted to the magazine, was inaccurate and incomplete on certain key points. And she writes not as a Durovic partisan, because she believes he is justly subject to much criticism for, at the very least, eccentric behavior, but as a reporter who has tried to get to the bottom of this story—and found herself increasingly distrustful of both Dr. Durovic and his critics.

The plain truth is that too many people have acquired a vested interest in vindicating past positions. As far back as 1951, the AMA hastily and prematurely condemned Kreboizen; how would the AMA's elders look if that verdict were now exploded? By the same token it can be said that Dr. Andrew Ivy, a man of large distinction who early became Durovic's advocate, has a big stake in vindicating the drug.

Obviously I do not believe that even the dreariest AMA dignitary would deliberately suppress a cancer cure; after all, he might need the stuff himself one day. But neither do I believe that Dr. Ivy would consciously remain the merchant of fraud.

In medicine, as in politics, however, men seem capable of losing their detachment, and seek to justify old judgments rather than dedicate themselves to truth. There are impurities in the purest of science.

What is disconcerting is the apparent tendency of some FDA officials to display the same partisan spirit.

Whether the impending National Cancer Institute report will be subject to fimiliar criticism remains to be seen. If it is, there will surely be ground for appointment of a Presidential Board of Inquiry.

Dr. Durovic may be a dismal character, but, for all I know, Galileo may have been a hopeless neurotic. Many of the biggest breakthroughs have been accomplished by odd fellows who could not accept the obvious evidence that the world was flat. The only question that matters is whether Krebiozen has worked, whatever its substance. On that point we are entitled to a judgment that no responsible medico or scientist can seriously challenge.

[From the News-Gazette, Champaign-Urbana, Ill., Dec. 8, 1963]

BIZARRE KREBIOZEN CONTROVERSY IS STILL VERY MUCH ALIVE AND BITTER

(By Roger Ebert)

Early on the morning of September 3, Chicago police found a woman hiding in a linen closet on the seventh floor of a Loop office building.

In her purse were tools she had used to break into one of the offices, and 12 tiny vials of a drug she had stolen.

The drug was Krebiozen.

The women, a 35-year-old cancer victim turned to crime for the first time in her life to obtain the drug. She told police her doctors had prescribed Krebiozen, but later discontinued the treatment because of controversy over its value.

Without the drug, she said, pain was so great that she lost her job as a clerk. In desperation, she decided to steal Krebiozen.

The women was charged with disorderly conduct after Dr. Steven Durovic, the discoverer of Krebiozen, did not press charges. Her arrest made still another entry in the bizarre record of a drug which has been described as the medical find—or fraud—of the century.

Nearly 13 years have passed since Durovic, a Yugoslavian scientist, walked into the offices of Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, of the University of Illinois, and announced that he had found a drug effective against cancer.

During those years, more than 3,000 doctors have given Krebiozen to more than 4,000 cancer patients. Yet, Krebiozen has never been the subject of a standard series of tests by a Federal agency. Volumes of testimony and a shelf of books have been written to solve the Krebiozen controversy. Yet it remains alive and bitter.

In recent years, the chief public supporter of Krebiozen's claims to an impartial Government investigation has been Senator Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois. On July 18, Douglas led a group of 16 Senators in introducing a Senate resolution which directed the National Cancer Institute to undertake such a test.

But on September 7, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration dropped a scientific bombshell that seemed to make such a test unnecessary.

In a Washington press conference, the FDA said its investigators had examined a sample of Krebiozen and identified it as creatine, an inexpensive chemical with no power against cancer.

As part of its unmasking process, the FDA supplied Life magazine with spectrographic "fingerprints" which traced the chemical compositions of creatine and Krebiozen on a chart. The two appeared to be nearly the same, with small irregularities which the FDA said were caused by impurities in the sample.

In a swift series of moves after this presentation, the Krebiozen Foundation was barred from sending the drug across Illinois State lines, and Federal officials announced plans to bring criminal charges against Durovic and Ivy.

On October 17, the National Cancer Institute denied the request by Douglas and 15 other Senators that Krebiozen be given a test. The Institute denounced Krebiozen as a fraud, and said it had examined 504 typical cases of treatment with Krebiozen without becoming convinced that an investigation was necessary.

On October 25 and 26, the FDA and the American Medical Association held joint press conferences at which Krebiozen was branded as a hoax and an illustration of quackery.

The day after the FDA's first report, Dr. Ivy had charged in Chicago that Krebiozen had been made the victim of a smear to avoid the performance of a clinical test. Ivy said Krebiozen and creatine were not the same substance, and cited differences in melting points and solubility in mineral oil.

But the forces supporting Krebiozen were in a state of confusion and dismay. Senator Douglas admitted:

"When the Food and Drug Administration and the Cancer Institute published their denunciations of Krebiozen, I was, I admit, somewhat shaken. Could it be that Krebiozen was a hoax after all and completely unworthy of a test?"

Douglas decided to seek an independent scientific and medical analysis of the same data which had led the FDA to believe that Krebiozen and creatine were the same. He asked Dr. Miles Robinson of Potomac, Md., to act as chairman of a committee to appraise the Government findings. Robinson, formerly an educator in the Vanderbilt and Pennsylvania medical schools, is now in private practice and agreed to act without pay. Douglas assigned his administrative assistant, Howard E. Shuman, to work with Dr. Robinson in the investigation. Shuman is a graduate of the University of Illinois, holds advanced degrees from the University of Michigan and Oxford University, England, and was an asistant professor of economics at the University of Illinois before joining Douglas' staff in 1955.

Robinson and Shuman discovered that two Champaign-Urbana scientists had been conducting tests of Krebiozen for several years. They are Dr. Scott Anderson, director of the Anderson Physical Laboratory; and Howard Clark, director of the Clark Microanalytical Laboratory.

Working on the basis of findings by Anderson and Clark, the Robinson-Shuman team compiled evidence which, Douglas says, "shows that the Food and Drug Administration has been grievously biased and that the claimed identity between Krebiozen and creatine is definitely mistaken."

The charge by Douglas is contained in an inch-thick sheaf of reports, charts, and other findings which he placed in the Congressional Record on Thursday.

The Douglas report, heavy technical reading for a layman, presents charges against the FDA which, if true, would reopen the Krebiozen case soon after Federal officials thought it had been closed for once and all.

In the report, Dr. Anderson cites a series of studies of Krebiozen's infrared spectra which were made in his laboratory over the past 10 years, using about two dozen samples of the drug. He compares his studies with those of the Government scientists and concludes:

"It would appear that most samples consist of at least two components—creatine plus some substance (or substances, since relative concentrations seem to vary)."

Dr. Anderson also writes: "An inspection of the 'Life' photograph of the two spectra (Krebiozen and creatine) reveals that it was made by laying the two spectra juxtaposed on a viewing table illuminated from below. The two spectra are displaced vertically relative to one another."

Reproductions of the two spectra, according to Douglas' report, indicate that when Krebiozen and creatine charts are laid squarely on top of one another, significant differences become obvious and it grows apparent that the spectra are not identical, as the FDA claimed.

Douglas charges:

"To get the effect (in the Life photograph of the spectra) the Food and Drug Administration did not squarely overlay one graph on the other * * * but deliberately dropped down the creatine graph about 7½ percentage points below the Krebiozen graph so that at the particular area of most obvious difference * * * the creatine and Krebiozen lines would coincide and this difference would be obliterated."

The report also cites chemical analysis by Clark which indicated significant differences in the two compounds. Reviewing these, Douglas sums up by asserting:

"The so-called identical fingerprints are not identical but there are significant differences throughout at least half of the spectrum.

"Chemical analysis (by Dr. Clark) demonstrates that Krebiozen is not creatine.

"The difference in color demonstrates that Krebiozen is not creatine. Creatine is pure white or colorless to the naked eye. It does not fluoresce under ultraviolet light. But Krebiozen is light tan to the naked eye and fluoresces under ultraviolet light.

"Krebiozen contains at least six sugars and nine acids not in creatine."

Repeating that he does not claim that Krebiozen is a cancer cure, Douglas says the report compiled for him provides evidence to make a Government investigation of Krebiozen necessary.

Specifically, he calls for an inquiry by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations into the "nature and accuracy" of the FDA and Cancer Institute statements. He asks that independent scientific investigation of Krebiozen be made to determine whether it is identical to creatine, as the FDA claims. And he calls for an impartial medical test of Krebiozen.

The Douglas report has been discounted by some opponents of Krebiozen on the grounds that the Senator, long identified with the mystery drug, was simply unwilling to accept the FDA findings.

But publication of the studies, coupled with evidence that the FDA photograph in "Life" apparently was inaccurate, may lead others to the conclusion that Krebiozen, even if worthless as a cancer cure, was not properly identified as creatine.

If this is the case, the 13-year-old search for the key to Krebiozen's puzzle will begin again. The Anderson and Clark findings, and the Douglas report, appear to reopen a question that the FDA felt was closed. The next move appears to be up to the Food and Drug Administration.

[From Chicago's American, Nov. 15, 1963]

DOUGLAS EXPERTS RIP FDA FINDINGS—KREBIOZEN REPORT CALLED FALSE—UNITED STATES DISTORTED ITS OWN FACTS, SENATOR TOLD

(By Robert Gruenberg)

Washington.—New information casting doubt on the widely publicized Government condemnation of Krebiozen has been submitted to Senator Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois.

It could—if verified and given serious study by the Food and Drug Administration—open up the entire question to review once more.

The FDA has stamped Krebiozen, a controversial cancer drug, as worthless. Last week the agency started formal steps leading to criminal prosecution of its sponsors, Dr. Andrew C. Ivy and Dr. Steven Durovic.

EXPERTS MAKE STUDY

A 49-page study, prepared by Douglas' staff and a small group of medical and technical experts, said that the FDA's finding that Krebiozen actually is creatine, a common body substance, is "demonstrably false."

They reached their conclusion "not only on the basis of new or additional evidence, but on the basis of the evidence produced by the FDA itself," they said.

The study strongly indicates that the FDA distorted the facts of its own investigators in condemning Krebiozen, that some of its scientists "misstated the facts," while in some cases they "ignored the clues which were present in their work" and would have influenced the FDA's ultimate ruling on Krebiozen.

IGNORED THE CLUES

"The administrative bureaucrats ignored the clues entirely," the report states at one point. It adds:

"They caused to be issued to the public under the authority of their department and the Government of the United States information and conclusions which are demonstrably false and for which they must bear the public responsibility."

Douglas, reviewing the study, emphasized that he did not advocate Krebiozen as a cancer cure or even as a cancer-fighting agent.

CALLS FOR FAIR TEST

He is, he said, interested in seeing that Krebiozen is given a fair test. He has maintained this position during the entire controversy, he says.

However, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, backed by the FDA and the National Cancer Institute, refuses to test Krebiozen, relying on their identification of it as creatine.

Creatine is a relatively common body substance which is plentifully available from meat in the ordinary diet, says HEW.

LIST POINTS IN DISPUTE

However, the staff members report submitted to Douglas disputes this conclusion that creatine is Krebiozen, and makes these points in support:

1. The two "fingerprint" identifications—FDA spectrographs showing creatine and Krebiozen to be identical—actually showed "significant differences" and were not identical "fingerprints" at all.

2. Chemical analysis—including a 1962 analysis made by the FDA—showed Krebiozen and creatine to be different.

3. Difference in color showed that Krebiozen, which has a yellow-brown appearance, is different from creatine and creatine-related substances, such as creatine-hydrate and creatinine. The latter two, like creatine, are "pure white or colorless," the report stated.

4. There are "at least six sugars and nine acids" in Krebiozen which are not found in creatine. "This has been verified many times and by independent analyses," the report stated.

5. Many indications that Krebiozen might not be creatine were "totally ignored" by the FDA scientists.

HARSH STANDARDS ALLEGED

The report charged that the FDA set up harsher standards to judge Krebiozen than the agency applies to other drugs.

"They were standards which * * * had seldom been applied to any of the 24,000 or so other substances tested routinely, or the 100 or so substances tested on humans per year," it stated.

The report was given Douglas by his chief aid, Howard Shuman, and Dr. Miles H. Robinson, Potomac, Md. Robinson is a pharmacologist, a former University of Pennsylvania instructor, and a close observer of the Krebiozen battle.

PHYSICIST'S TEST RESULTS

Evidence on the spectrograph results was submitted by Dr. Scott Anderson, of Urbana, Ill., physicist and former professor at Carleton College and Carnegie Tech, and Howard Clark of Urbana, a microanalytic chemist.

Both men freely acknowledged in interviews with reporters that they had performed research work for Dr. Ivy and Dr. Durovic, although, they said, on a small scale.

DON'T CLAIM A CURE

They have been unknown to the public in the Krebiozen controversy until now. Dr. Anderson said he decided to get into it, as did Dr. Clark, because he did not feel that Krebiozen founders and backers were receiving fair treatment.

Both men, as did Dr. Robinson, insisted, however, that they are not advocating Krebiozen as a "cancer cure." Like Douglas, they said they seek only a clinical test of its value.

The study was undertaken at the request of Douglas. He has had a leading role in marshaling other Senators to press for a Government test of Krebiozen and has been concerned since the FDA condemnation of the drug on September 7 and October 16.

Douglas asked Shuman to analyze the FDA reports adding only one directive: Find out the truth, even if it goes against Durovic and Ivy. The latter has been a friend of Douglas for 40 years.

DETAILS OF EVIDENCE

In the tables, charts, and explanatory material, the study elaborated on the following points:

1. The spectographic "fingerprints."

Differences were first noted by Anderson and Clark upon publication of the spectrographs in a national magazine October 4. Subsequently, reproductions of the spectrographs used by the FDA in the identification of creatine and Krebiozen were used by the Urbana scientists in their study.

These showed, they said, that the peaks and the valleys of the spectrum line varied between the two spectrographs in 8 to 10 areas which could be spotted visually. There were also 29 points of difference which were plotted by mechanical means, they said.

DIFFERENCES ARE GREAT

"These differences are not technical and are much greater than would be due merely to tolerances or reasonable margins of error," the report stated.

The differences appeared to be small to reporters, who were shown reproductions of the spectrograph by Anderson and Clark.

But, they emphasized, "differences of this magnitude are of the utmost significance chemically, scientifically, and especially biologically.

The report also cited scientific authorities to deny the FDA "fingerprint" explanation that no two compounds have the same print. "Spectrographic 'fingerprints' by no means meet this standard," it said.

MANY CHEMICAL STUDIES

2. The chemical analysis.

Clark said he performed "repeated chemical studies on Krebiozen over a 10-year period," and with Anderson conducted other studies.

These have showed that Krebiozen is not creatine, they stated.

Key points in their findings were backed by an independent study, they added, conducted by the Shuman Chemical Laboratories, Inc., of Battle Ground, Ind.

"This laboratory worked closely with Prof. Roy Whistler of Purdue University, a specialist in carbohydrates and polysaccharides," the report stated.

KREBIOZEN BROWN OR TAN

3. Color differences.

While creatine is pure white, or colorless, Krebiozen has a light brown or tan, the report pointed out.

FDA scientists themselves said the study described the Krebiozen colors as beige, beige with an orange tint, light tan, brownish white with a shade of pink, and pale buff.

4. Sugars and acids.

Clark said that he and the Shuman laboratory had "verified many times" the six sugars and nine acids which are in Krebiozen but fail to show in creatine.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Oct. 23, 1963]

TESTS NEEDED TO END KREBIOZEN FIGHT

A committee of 24 physicians assembled by the National Cancer Institute, after reviewing 504 case histories of Krebiozen-treated patients, has concluded that a clinical test of the drug is not justified.

But the committee's conclusion that the drug is worthless in the treatment of cancer will not end the amazing Krebiozen dispute.

For more than 12 years, opponents and backers of Krebiozen have engaged in a bitter tug-of-war. Scientifically, neither side has gained an inch.

Opponents of the drug have charged quackery and fraud. Backers have charged conspiracy and persecution.

Opponents have shown "conclusively" first that Krebiozen doesn't exist, then that it exists but it is merely mineral oil, and now that it is really creatine, a common amino acid derivative found in large quantities in the human body and ineffective against cancer.

Backers have shown "conclusively" that Krebiozen causes regression of certain types of tumors and eases pain in many cases of terminal cancer.

In truth, neither side has shown a thing.

Dr. Stevan Durovic, discover of Krebiozen, and Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, chief scientific sponsor of the drug, are not likely to let up now. Neither are the dozens of doctors who say they have used it, and that it works.

And neither, judging from the intensity of feeling shown to date, are the 400 cancer victims in the United States who believe they need Krebiozen to stay alive—or the relatives of many cancer victims who have been given the drug in the late stages of the disease.

The American Medical Association, on the other hand, will surely continue opposing the efforts of the drug's backers. Along with the influential AMA will be most of the medical profession.

But who is right? Ordinarily, we would be inclined to accept the edict of the AMA without question on a medical issue. And yet, it seems to us that enough evidence has been presented in the past 12 years at least to justify a clinical test of Krebiozen.

The physicians who back the drug are not quacks. They are scientists who believe the drug Krebiozen is effective in the treatment of cancer and warrants further investigation. They have never made fantastic claims.

Perhaps they are wrong. But if there is just once chance in a million that Krebiozen is the beginning to a solution to the dreadful cancer problem, it should be given the fairest and fullest possible test.

Even if the tests showed that use of the drug results only in relief of pain without the toxic effects of narcotics, the finding would be worthwhile.

Even though the AMA leaders are opposed to a National Cancer Institute test for Krebiozen, we have been told by individual physicians and researchers that at least the scientific theory behind the drug is sound and that they think it should be tested.

The Food and Drug Administration banned interstate shipment of Krebiozen on July 12. Thereafter, many patients who had been using it moved to Illinois where it is manufactured.

Emphatically, we wish to make the point that we do not, and cannot, pass judgment on the effectiveness of the drug. We do, however, suggest that the reading and interviewing we have done indicate that there is enough here to warrant Krebiozen being given a fair clinical test.

We cannot laugh off the conviction of hundreds of cancer victims who believe it is sustaining them.

And a reading of history indicates that it is foolish to cast aside any drug that shows even an inkling of promise against a disease that strikes one in every four Americans.

Alexander Fleming, discoverer of penicillin, once said: "Penicillin sat on the shelf for 12 years while I was called a quack. I can only think of the thousands who died needlessly because my peers would not use my discovery."

Man should never make such a tragic mistake again.

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, Nov. 13, 1963]

STARR GAZING

(By Oliver Starr, Jr.)

Krebiozen is far from dead. The recent condemning of it by the Food and Drug Administration after an adverse report by 24 physicians assembled by the National Cancer Institute to review case histories of 504 Krebiozen-treated patients was supposed to have killed it.

But instead of dying, Krebiozen has picked up powerful new voices across the country asking that its backers, led by Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, of Chicago, be granted the clinical test they have been seeking for 13 years.

In just the past week two Indiana Representatives, RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, Republican, of Noblesville, and WILLIAM G. BRAY, Republican, of Martinsville, have joined 41 other U.S. Representatives and Senators in sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 101 originally introduced by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

Senate Joint Resolution 101 asks that the National Institutes of Health be directed to undertake a "fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen" and that $250,000 be appropriated for the test.

Why didn't the FDA report end the controversy?

As the Denver Post pointed out editorially after the FDA report, neither Dr. Ivy and the dozens of doctors who have used it and say that it works, nor the more than 400 cancer victims in the United States who say they need Krebiozen to stay alive are likely to let up now. Without the controlled clinical test, neither side in the controversy can actually have any scientific validity to their claims. Their "evidence" is all subjective—not objective.

Nationally syndicated health columnist Dr. George W. Crane has come out strongly since the FDA report in support of Dr. Ivy, challenging the validity of a spectrographic test made by FDA in which it asserted that Krebiozen was creatine. He maintains that it couldn't be creatine because that substance does not dissolve in mineral oil, the solvent in which Krebiozen is used. He charged the FDA with distortion of data and intimidation in the case.

Krebiozen also touched off a David and Goliath battle between the American Medical Association and the National Health Federation as both met in Washington, D.C. The NHF passed a resolution asserting that it would not consider the Krebiozen controversy settled until it was resolved through a clinical test. It also promised to exert its influence until a clinical test was approved.

Dr. Edward Annis, president of the AMA, aiming a broadside at the NHF and Dr. Ivy called Krebiozen "one of the greatest frauds of the 20th century." This brought a prompt reply from Dr. Ivy, denying that it is a fraud and challenging Annis to a public debate on the drug. Annis declined. Dr. Ivy says that Annis previously had agreed to an August 26 debate in Miami but did not show up at the appointed time.

In Illinois, a Krebiozen study committee set up at the request of the Illinois Medical Society recently recommended that "appropriate steps be taken immediately" to stop the distribution of Krebiozen in Illinois, basing its finding mainly on the same report made by the 24 cancer experts brought together by the National Cancer Institute.

Illinois Attorney General William G. Clark, however, has refused to ban the sale of Krebiozen in the State until he receives the names and addresses of medical experts who were called upon in the study, and their qualifications as experts. He also said he must have the names, addresses and qualifications of other medical experts "who are willing to testify that Krebiozen is not an effective anticancer agent."

Reached at his Chicago office at Roosevelt University, Dr. Ivy said that the cutting off of interstate shipment of Krebiozen to patients who had been receiving it already has resulted in seven deaths to persons in which cancer symptoms had been kept under control until the drug was cut off.

He charged that FDA inspectors have harassed a Long Beach, Calif., mother who had been giving her young son Krebiozen until she wrote to Dr. Ivy that "they've made me feel like a criminal because I'm trying to keep my boy alive." Dr. Ivy said that he is still just as resolved as he was when the Krebiozen controversy began to press for a clinical test for the drug. He said, however, that the FDA had been using unfair tactics to attack him, as well as Krebiozen.

PUBLIC LAW 88-204 THE ACADEMIC FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received copies of informational materials relating to the Higher Education Construction Act, now Public Law 88-204, which I feel will be of great assistance to Senators in answering the many questions which the enactment of this landmark legislation will bring to their offices. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that copies of correspondence addressed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Governors of the States, and addressed by the Commissioner of Education to the chief State school officers of the States, together with supporting enclosures and statistical data be printed at this point in my remarks. I commend the office on moving so promptly in this important area, to acquaint the States with the procedures under the act necessary to begin without delay the operation of the program.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., December 16, 1963.

DEAR GOVERNOR ———: President Johnson, when he signed the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, stressed the urgent need to help our colleges and universities to nearly double their physical capacity in this decade. He also asked me to communicate with you about the principal steps required by you and the Office of Education to get the new program underway as soon as funds are available. A copy of the President's statement on this significant national commitment to increase academic facilities is enclosed.

Presidents of institutions of higher education and the chief State school officer in your State will receive similar information from the Commissioner of Education.

Title I of the act authorizes grants to pay part of the cost of construction of certain types of academic facilities for publicly controlled and privately controlled institutions of higher education. Twenty-two percent of the funds under title I are reserved for the construction of facilities in public community colleges and public technical institutes. Title II authorizes grants to pay part of the cost of the construction of facilities for graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers. Title III authorizes loans for the construction of academic facilities.

The law authorizes $230 million for title I for the year ending June 30, 1964, and for the 2 succeeding years. The attached table shows the State breakdown of this authorization.

An important purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention section 105(a) of the act which concerns the designation or establishment of a "State commission." This section provides that a State desiring to participate in the grant program under title I shall designate an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and technical institutes) in the State, or, if no such State agency exists, shall establish such a State agency, and submit to the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Francis Keppel, through such agency, a State plan. States intending to participate in the program under title I should notify the Commissioner of Education as to the State agency which has been designated or established as the "State commission." Such notification should also be accompanied by (1) your certification that the members of such commission are, in accordance with section 105 (a), broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and technical institutes) in the State, and (2) a certification, including citation of State law, by the appropriate State legal officer, that such "State commission" is authorized under State law to formulate, submit and administer a State plan under title I.

In addition, under section 105(b) the Office of Education is authorized, subject to the availability of funds, to expend such amounts (not to exceed a total of $3 million for all States during each of the first 2 fiscal years) as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of State plans approved under title I of the act, including expenses which were necessary for the preparation of such plans.

I can assure you that the Commissioner of Education will welcome your observations and suggestions about the administration of this program.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
Secretary.

Identical letters sent to the Governors of the 50 States, District of Columbia, Virgin Islands, Guam, Puerto Rico, and American Somoa.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., December 16, 1963.

Identical letter sent to all chief State school officers.

DEAR ———: President Johnson, when he signed the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, stressed the urgent need to help higher education to nearly double its physical capacity in this decade. He also asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through me to communicate with you about the principal steps required by the States and the Office of Education to get the new program underway as soon as funds are available. A copy of the President's statement on this significant national commitment to increase academic facilities is enclosed.

The Governor of your State has been advised by the Secretary of this action and asked to designate or establish a State commission as provided for in section 105 of the act.

Title I authorizes grants to pay part of the cost of construction of certain types of academic facilities for publicly controlled and privately controlled institutions of higher education. Twenty-two percent of the funds under title I are reserved for the construction of facilities in public community colleges and public technical institutes. Title II authorizes grants to pay part of the costs of the construction of facilities for graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers. Title III authorizes loans for the construction of academic facilities.

The law authorizes $230 million for title I for the year ending June 30, 1964, and for the two succeeding years. The enclosed table shows the State breakdown of this authorization.

An important purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention sections 105, 106, 107, and 108, which set forth the act's provisions for the State commissions and plans, eligibility for grants, assignment of priorities, institutional application, and conditions for approval of projects.

Your observations and suggestions about the administration of the program will be most welcome.

Sincerely yours,

————— —————,
U.S. Commissioner of Education.

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., December 16, 1963.

Memorandum to college and university presidents.

From Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education.

President Johnson, when he signed the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, stressed the urgent need to help higher education to nearly double its physical capacity in this decade. He also asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through me to communicate with you about the principal steps required by you and the Office of Education to get the new program underway as soon as funds are available. A copy of the Presidents' statement on this significant national commitment to increase academic facilities is enclosed.

The Governor of your State has been advised by the Secretary of this action and asked to designate or establish a State Commission as provided for in section 105 of the act.

Title I authorizes grants to pay part of the cost of construction of certain types of academic facilities for publicly controlled and privately controlled institutions of higher education. Twenty-two percent of the funds are reserved for the construction of facilities in public community colleges and public technical institutes. Title II authorizes grants to pay part of the costs of the construction of facilities for graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers. Title III authorizes loans for the construction of academic facilities.

The law authorizes $230 million for title I for the year ending June 30, 1964, and for the 2 succeeding years. The enclosed table shows the State breakdown of this authorization.

An important purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention sections 105, 106, 107 and 108, which set forth the act's provisions for the State commissions and plans, eligibility for grants, assignment of priorities, institutional application, and conditions for approval of projects.

Your observations and suggestions about the program will be most welcome.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING H.R. 6143, THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963, IN THE CABINET ROOM

I am proud and happy to approve at this time the Morse-Green bill, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and to especially compliment Chairman POWELL, Congresswoman GREEN, and their colleagues in the House, Senator MORSE and his colleagues in the Senate, and everyone else who worked so hard for the passage of this very important legislation.

A great former President of the Republic of my State said "The educated man is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that freemen recognize and the only ruler that freemen desire." So this new law is the most significant education bill passed by the Congress in the history of the Republic. In fact, this session of the Congress will go down in history as the education Congress of 1963, and every person here this morning who has been invited to come to the White House at the request of the President can be very proud, and their children can be very proud, of the part they played in the enactment of this legislation.

Working together, the Congress and the executive branch have made possible the enactment of a series of legislative landmarks in the field of education. Under these various measures:

1. We will help to provide college classrooms for several hundred thousand more students who will nearly double college enrollment in this decade.

2. We will help to build 25 to 30 new public community colleges every year.

3. We will help to construct the technical institutes that are needed to close the gap in this crucial area of trained manpower.

4. We will help to build graduate schools and facilities in at least 10 to 20 major academic centers.

5. We will help to improve the quality of library facilities in our own universities and colleges.

6. We will increase the number of medical school graduates and we will relieve the growing shortages of physicians and dentists and other needed professional health personnel.

7. We will enable some 70,000 to 90,000 additional students to attend college each year under an expanded loan program.

8. We will modernize and expand our Federal-State programs for vocational education in order to train for the changing world of work the 8 out of 10 young people who will never obtain a college education.

9. We will reduce the shortage of qualified personnel for the training and teaching of mentally retarded and other handicapped children.

10. We will expand our manpower development and training program to meet the growing problem of untrained, unemployed school dropouts.

11. We will expand programs for teaching science and mathematics and foreign languages, while extending the other valuable provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

12. We will continue the program of Federal financial assistance for the construction and the maintenance and the operation of schools that are crowded by the presence of children of Federal personnel.

13. And finally, we will, under legislation to be passed shortly, provide public libraries for the residents of cities and counties all over this great country who now have only antiquated library facilities and some have no libraries at all.

This legislation is dramatic, and it is concrete evidence of a renewed and continuing national commitment to education as the key to our Nation's social and technological and economic and moral progress. It will help meet the demands of our economy for more skilled personnel; it will enable many more of our young people to cope with the explosion of new knowledge and to contribute effectively in a world of intellectual, political, and economic complexity.

But these new measures will still not do the whole job of extending educational opportunities to all who want and can benefit by them, nor in meeting our growing national needs. I, therefore, strongly urge the Congress to take early, positive action on the unfinished portion of the National Education Improvement Act, particularly those programs which will assist elementary and secondary schools. In addition, I urge prompt action on proposed programs for combating adult illiteracy, for expanding adult education, for improving the quality of education at all levels.

President Kennedy fought hard for this legislation. No topic was closer to his heart. No bill was the object of more of his attention. Both his life and his death showed the importance and the value of sound education. The enactment of this measure is not only a monument to him, it is a monument to every person who participated in passing it, and most of you are in this room today.

It clearly signals this Nation's determination to give all of our youth the education they deserve, and as long as we have a government, that government is going to take its stand to battle the ancient enemies of mankind, illiteracy, and poverty and disease, and in that battle, each of you are soldiers who wear the badge of honor.

PRINCIPAL STEPS IN INITIATING THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

1. Designation or establishment of the State commission by the Governor (title I).

2. Establishment by the Office of Education of the Advisory Committee on Graduate Education (title II).

3. Publication by the Office of Education of initial regulations.

4. Submission of State plan and approval of plan by the Office of Education.

5. Submission by the higher education institutions of part I of applications (preliminary application for purposes of eligibility determination and tentative approval).

6. Recommendation of projects by the State commission and the Advisory Committee on Graduate Education to the Office of Education.

7. Tentative approval of applications (part I) and reservation of funds for grants or loans by the Office of Education.

8. Submission by higher education institutions of part II of applications (complete application with proposed construction plans), and processing of these for approval.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

Distribution of legislative authorizations for grants by States for construction of undergraduate academic facilities (title I), fiscal year 1964

State	Total	For public community college and public technical institutes [1]	For undergraduate institutions other than public community colleges and public technical institutes [2]
United States and outlying parts	$230,000,000	$50,600,000	$179,400,000
50 States and District of Columbia	227,781,567	49,964,140	177,817,427
Alabama	3,799,198	1,155,837	2,643,361
Alaska	169,796	34,250	135,546
Arizona	2,039,680	437,366	1,602,314
Arkansas	2,255,144	675,054	1,580,090
California	23,526,503	3,726,316	19,800,187
Colorado	2,571,544	487,685	2,083,859
Connecticut	2,902,416	505,248	2,397,168
Delaware	500,816	83,281	417,535
Florida	5,635,182	1,350,056	4,285,126
Georgia	4,509,395	1,231,290	3,278,105
Hawaii	899,468	234,752	664,716
Idaho	984,840	274,101	710,739
Illinois	11,297,614	2,090,262	9,207,352
Indiana	5,975,860	1,329,095	4,646,765
Iowa	3,831,406	931,592	2,899,814
Kansas	3,079,469	753,906	2,325,563
Kentucky	3,513,723	919,798	2,593,925
Louisiana	4,175,243	1,097,948	3,077,295
Maine	1,171,567	329,261	842,306
Maryland	3,624,130	752,669	2,871,461
Massachusetts	7,210,128	1,296,905	5,913,223
Michigan	10,234,803	2,266,764	7,968,039
Minnesota	5,014,430	1,170,876	3,843,554
Mississippi	2,727,345	742,420	1,984,925
Missouri	5,321,233	1,201,727	4,119,506
Montana	961,224	235,679	725,545
Nebraska	$1,944,680	$452,199	$1,492,481
Nevada	307,199	53,460	253,739
New Hampshire	808,359	180,313	628,046
New Jersey	6,048,385	1,321,112	4,727,273
New Mexico	1,248,015	295,578	952,437
New York	19,470,568	3,336,848	16,133,720
North Carolina	5,985,548	1,624,672	4,360,876
North Dakota	1,002,227	275,852	726,375
Ohio	11,604,625	2,565,844	9,038,781
Oklahoma	3,424,468	821,735	2,602,733
Oregon	2,723,857	579,361	2,144,496
Pennsylvania	13,590,426	3,239,816	10,350,610
Rhode Island	1,083,955	222,134	861,821
South Carolina	2,830,114	859,487	1,970,627
South Dakota	968,409	253,087	715,322
Tennessee	4,523,952	1,216,405	3,307,547
Texas	11,654,882	2,702,739	8,952,143
Utah	1,826,626	353,828	1,472,798
Vermont	618,569	141,789	476,780
Virginia	4,359,966	1,102,635	3,257,331
Washington	4,214,652	872,466	3,342,186
West Virginia	2,340,941	649,714	1,691,227
Wisconsin	5,502,074	1,336,254	4,165,820
Wyoming	448,283	101,410	346,873
District of Columbia	1,318,630	91,264	1,227,366
American Samoa	14,171	3,657	10,514
Guam	67,945	19,520	48,425
Puerto Rico	2,114,530	604,082	1,510,448
Virgin Islands	21,787	8,601	13,186

---

[1] Distributed according to the State products of (1) 1962-63 high school graduates and (2) allotment ratios with limits of 0.3333 and 0.6667.

[2] One-half is distributed according to fall 1962 enrollment in grades 9-12, and one-half is distributed according to fall 1963 enrollment in institutions of higher education.

NOTE.—Data on enrollments and high school graduates are partially estimated.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

PURPOSE

To assist the Nation's institutions of higher education to construct needed classrooms, laboratories, and libraries in order to accommodate mounting student enrollments and to meet demands for skilled technicians and for advanced graduate education.

TITLE I

1. This title establishes a 5-year program of grants to institutions of higher education for the construction of academic facilities. The appropriation authorization for each of the first 3 fiscal years, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, is specified in the statute as $230 million.

2. The appropriation for any fiscal year is divided into two parts for allotment among the States (including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa):

(a) Twenty-two percent of the appropriation is allotted on the basis of a State's relative per capita income and number of high school graduates. A State's allotment from this fund can be used only for public community colleges and public technical institutes.

(b) The remaining 78 percent of the appropriation is allotted as follows: One-half on the basis of the realtive number of students enrolled in grades 9 through 12 in the State and one-half on the basis of the relative number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in such State. The allotment from this fund is available for grants to institutions of higher education, public and private, in the State (other than public community colleges and public technical institutes).

3. Institutions of higher education other than public community colleges and public technical institutes are eligible for construction grants only if the construction is limited to structures (or portions thereof) especially designed for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences, mathematics, or modern foreign languages, engineering or for use as a library; and all institutions of higher education (including public community colleges and public technical institutes) are eligible for a grant for construction only if the particular construction will, either alone, or together with other construction to be undertaken within reasonable time, result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institutions' student enrollment capacity or, in the case of a new institution of higher education, result in creating urgently needed enrollment capacity.

4. A State desiring to participate in the grant program under this title must designate, as the State commission, an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and technical institutes) in that State, or if no such State agency exists, establish such a State agency, and submit to the Office of Education through such commission a State plan for participation under title I. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to expend from funds available therefor, not to exceed a total of $3 million for all States, during each of the first 2 fiscal years of the program under this title, such amounts as may be necessary for proper and efficient administration of State plans approved under this title, including expenses which were necessary for the preparation of such plans.

5. Among the provisions required in a State plan, as enumerated in section 105(a), is the setting forth of objective standards and methods, consistent with basic criteria prescribed by the Commissioner of Education, for determining (a) relative priorities of eligible projects for the construction of academic facilities submitted by institutions of higher education in the State, and (b) the Federal share of the cost of each such project (other than a project for a public community college or public technical institute).

6. While the Federal share of a project for an institution of higher education, other than a public community college or a public technical institute, may vary up to a maximum of one-third of the cost, the Federal share of a project for a public community college or a public technical institute is fixed by law at 40 percent.

TITLE II

1. This title establishes a 5-year program of construction grants (covering up to 33⅓ percent of the costs) to assist public and private institutions of higher education to improve existing graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers and to assist in the establishment of graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers of excellence. Appropriation authorizations for the first 3 years are specified in the statute, i.e., $25 million for fiscal year 1964 and $60 million for each of the next 2 succeeding fiscal years.

2. In approving applications, the Commissioner is required to consider the extent to which a particular project will contribute to achieving the objective of this title—which is to increase the supply of highly qualified personnel urgently needed by the community, industry, government research and teaching—and also the extent to which the grant will aid in attaining a wider geographical distribution of graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers.

3. This title also establishes in the Office of Education an advisory committee on graduate education to advise the Commissioner on the administration of the program, including the action to be taken on applications for grants under this title.

TITLE III

1. This title authorizes a 5-year program of loans for the construction of academic facilities at institutions of higher education. The appropriation authorized for each of the

first 3 fiscal years commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, is specified in the act as $120 million.

2. The loans will bear an interest rate determined by the Commissioner which cannot be less than one-quarter of 1 percent above the average annual interest rate on all Federal obligations. Currently this rate is 3⅝ percent. The maximum period for repayment of a loan is 50 years.

3. An institution applying for a loan will have to show that not less than one-fourth of the development cost of the project will be financed from non-Federal sources and that it cannot borrow from other sources on equally favorable terms.

EXCLUSIONS

The following are not considered academic facilities for which grants or loans for construction may be made under the act:

1. Any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is charged to the public.

2. Any gymnasium or other facility specially designed for athletic or recreational activities, other than a course in physical education.

3. Any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship.

4. Any facility used or to be used primarily for any part of the program of a school or department of divinity.

5. Any facility used or to be used by a school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, or public health.

December 13, 1963.

TRIBUTE TO LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL AND GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in reviewing the educational legislation which has been brought to the floor of the Senate in this first session of the 88th Congress, I have once more been struck by the debt that we as Senators owe to certain of the professional service organizations of the Senate, without which our operations as legislators would be severely handicapped. I refer in particular at this time to the unstinting cooperation we have received from the Office of Legislative Counsel of the U.S. Congress. Mr. Peter W. LeRoux, assistant counsel, worked with my subcommittee at each stage of the legislative process. His professional skill and advice at the drafting stage, in committee and in conference were invaluable to me and to my colleagues.

Legislation in the field of education, involving as it does much material of a statistical nature, particularly when the legislation incorporates equalization formulas, places heavy demands upon the Government Printing Office and their skilled craftsmen. I thank them and I thank the Senate Official Reporters, who with Mr. Placidino Zagami, their chief clerk, have as usual performed miracles of syntactical skill.

SIGNING OF PUBLIC LAW 88-210, THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, by his signature this morning, President Johnson completed the legislative process on H.R. 4955, the vocational education bill. By this act the President has formally reaffirmed our national commitment to education as the best technique to achieve for all Americans the realization of our goals.

On an occasion such as this, in my view, it is most appropriate to bring to the attention of Senators a speech delivered by the Honorable Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, December 9, 1963, at the annual convention of the American Vocational Association in Atlantic City. The speech is entitled: "Vocational Education: A Promise for Tomorrow." In it the Commissioner stressed many points of importance which are contained in H.R. 4955, now Public Law 88-210, which make his address worthy of careful study. At this time I shall note but two which, in my judgment, deserve emphasis over and over again.

The first point is marked by a note of optimistic affirmation as he discussed automation and the challenge this phenomenon presents to our society. I quote:

> Automation, the specter that haunts the ranks of the unskilled and semiskilled, can be turned into a blessing. I refuse to be intimidated by the forecast that, through automation, this country is faced with a permanent high level of unemployment. I am convinced that automation is just the means we need to make us find more efficient use for the human mind as we are freed from the need of harnessing human brawn.
>
> Today, we are finding that job opportunities are declining for all but the highly skilled and the knowledgeable. But what does this forecast mean? I say it summons a breakthrough in education, that it calls on education to reveal and develop the hidden potential of the human intelligence and the human spirit. I will not accept the premise that there are unteachables in our society. I firmly believe that every human being possesses a potential contribution to mankind—if we have the skill to release this contribution.

I share the faith that the Commissioner has so well stated that:

> Every human being possesses a potential contribution to mankind—if we have the skill to release his contribution.

This is our job as legislators, to clothe with statutory language the ideals of our generation and the timeless truths of our moral heritage from Athens, Jerusalem, and Rome. This we have tried to do in H.R. 4955.

The second point upon which I commend the Commissioner is his concluding brief statement in which he sets forth the "Declaration of Principles" of the Office of Education in its operation and administration of educational legislation.

Commissioner Keppel says:

> May I conclude with a brief statement of the position of the Office of Education? I would offer it in the form of a declaration of principles:
>
> First, training for work should be a fundamental aspect of education.
>
> Second, the means and goals of education should reflect the economic and social conditions of the present and the likely trends of the future.
>
> Third, vocational education should stretch its dimensions to reach those for whom a minimum education is the only hope for dignity and economic freedom, and those who enjoy technical talents.
>
> Finally, vocational education should inculcate the appreciation of ideas as well as the performance of techniques. For vocational education should not be regarded as a substitute for a sound academic background but as an integrated part of a grand educational phase.
>
> With these principles, I submit, vocational education will truly join the mainstream of all education in this latter half of the 20th century.

Again, I concur and commend the Commissioner for his lucid statement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Vocational Education: A Promise for Tomorrow

(Speech by Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, delivered at the American Vocational Association convention, Atlantic City, N.J., December 9, 1963)

It is a pleasure to be with you today, to speak before the American Vocational Association. I come here seeking our common cause. Your purpose is to foster the development and improvement of vocational education; mine, to foster the improvement of education generally. These purposes are and should be one and the same.

In this 7th decade of the 20th century, we have come to a time of unique change, vast social and economic and technological change, which is reshaping our country and our future. In such a time of change, men look to education to find their bearings, to gage their direction and their course.

But if education is to serve, it must be responsive and sound—from elementary to vocational education, from high school to college. It provided training for boys and men for jobs in the mechanized factories that were changing the profiles of our cities—and for work on farms that were becoming mechanized. To public schooling, the Smith-Hughes Act added a new dimension of economic reality.

Thus, in 1917, came the beginning of a vision. But in the years that followed, despite some new legislation, vocational education seemed to mark time and the vision was blurred and dimmed. Meanwhile, our society was undergoing enormous shifts through the population boom and rapid developments in science and technology.

The vocational school still stands in the big cities of our country—where so many of our people are converging—but it often stands as a monument to another time. Even the school buildings that house vocational students are for the most part remnants of the red brick period. In the rural communities of the Nation, the unrealities of vocational programs are even more obvious.

Both the big cities and the small towns in too many localities, are failing to relate education to the changing job market. The States, in turn, may have helped to perpetuate these unrealities by continuing antiquated standards of teacher certification; by neglecting new research; and by isolating vocational education from the mainstream of education planning. These criticisms do not apply universally, of course. But the shortcomings in many localities have brought down criticism on the whole sweep of vocational education.

This uncoveted attention comes at a time of awakening to its intrinsic importance. Now, as in 1917, vocational education is again in style. Everyone wants to improve it.

Now, thankfully, we are moving into a new period of opportunity for vocational education. In his education message to Congress in 1961, President Kennedy called for a review of existing Federal vocational education legislation with a view toward modernization and expansion. Subsequently, he requested the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to appoint a national Panel of Consultants to make a review. This 25-member Panel submitted its report to the President a year ago. From its findings and recommendations have come proposals for legislation that would put vocational education in new and proper perspective, befitting its importance to the Nation.

The basic proposals first appeared in the administration's program for school aid, submitted early this year. They are now embodied in H.R. 4955, an act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

You are well acquainted with these basic provisions—greatly increased Federal funds; leeway to the States to permit development of occupational training responsive to their economic needs; construction money for area schools; an authorization to the Commissioner of Education to make grants for basic research and developmental demonstration projects.

Additional proposals, appearing in the Senate version of the act, call for a special appropriation for demonstration work-study programs and for experimental residential schools. These two provisions derive from President Kennedy's civil rights message of last June 19. They reflect a profound concern for the special needs of youth who are socially, economically and academically deprived.

One important aspect of the administration's proposals for aiding vocational education would establish a national advisory committee to be drawn from education and also from business, labor, industry and welfare. New State plans would become part of the modus operandi of the new legislation.

This section dealing with State planning strikes me as the keystone of the proposals. Specific guidelines for development of State plans, under the new legislation, would be drawn up with the guidance of the national advisory committee. These plans would neither become straitjackets against those who would seek changes to meet economic and technological developments, nor would they become refuges for those who would oppose change. Instead, they would be dynamic guides to the progress and change in vocational education and training required to keep pace with the changing occupations of this century.

The legislation presents us with certain overriding issues, focal points for our working together in search of new solutions. I would like to turn to four points which should be reflected and underscored in the planning of the States: (1) employment of a State board of advisory committee in State planning; (2) consideration of manpower needs and job opportunities; (3) consideration of vocational educational needs throughout the State; and (4) research and development.

Now let us examine these specific points.

First, proposed legislation provides for a State board of education, or of vocational education, either to include persons representative of management and labor and persons representative of college-level vocational training institutions, or for the State to provide an advisory committee which includes such persons.

To tune our education goals to the fluctuating wave lengths of regional and national economic conditions requires an adjustment to the whole band of community services. Economists, sociologists, labor leaders and educators themselves have, by default, helped to perpetuate educational defects. Each group has frequently deplored the shortcomings as seen from its corner. It has not often acknowledged that solutions lie only in the combined efforts of all.

In our vocational education planning, we would wisely recruit and use personnel whose basic training has been in economics and sociology, in engineering and welfare, in business and in public health. These persons need not necessarily come with formal experience in vocational education. We are now planning just this kind of recruiting at the Office of Education.

Second, the proposed legislation requires the inclusion in the State plan of a statement that due consideration be given to the results of periodic and projected manpower needs and job opportunities.

This is most important to appropriate planning. Clearly, we must devise methods to assure that our vocational programs will not soon go out of date, that they will respond to the impact of developing technology on the labor market. At best, the data we now have is sketchy. Here, there is room for significant research and for closer cooperation between education services and employment services, between labor unions, business and industry.

To achieve such coordination will require active advisory committees, both local and State. I know that advisory committees already exist. But I also know that many exist in little more than name. They do not regularly appraise, coach, inform or advise. We could use these bodies more effectively in vocational education than they are now being used.

Third, the proposed legislation requires that State plans must reflect consideration of the vocational education needs of all groups in all communities in the State.

Walter Arnold, Assistant Commissioner of Vocational and Technical Education at the Office of Education, sees the broadest of horizons for the reach of vocational education. Vocational education, he says, and here I quote: "Has implications for almost everybody. It must reach into all high schools * * * must extend into the lives of the working people who have long since left school; (it must) offer the variety and quality of training that will insure us against future generations of unemployables and * * * insure today's workers against the specter of unemployment caused by job obsolescence."

It is this view that I would commend to the States. What faces us is not merely interrelating vocational education to the total scheme of education. We must also relate the total scheme of education to the economic and social realities of our time. Toward this direction, we have begun to make efforts.

Last summer, the Nation launched a crash program to recapture dropouts, to bring young Americans back to the mainstream of schooling. It is already marked by success. Some 5,000 followup letters were sent by President Kennedy to school administrators and teachers throughout the country. Among the replies were many which pointed specifically to vocational education as a key to the school's ability to hold its students. Let me read to you a brief excerpt from a reply from Berkeley Heights, N.J.:

"Students who are sincerely committed to a definite vocational or educational objective generally do not drop out of school. This commitment must be a valid one * * * the result of considered action based upon pupil desire and capability, parental involvement, and the recommendations of qualified guidance personnel."

A crash program, an emergency measure, of course, is not a pattern for permanent success. In vocational education over the long haul, we must seek a stability that will preclude the need for crash programs. And here, indeed, we have a long way to go.

There are cities in this country that are turning out young people trained for vocations which are already becoming extinct in the economic setting of their regions. There are school systems where the unemployment rate for Negro youths runs as high as 80 percent—partly because they are not trained for the kinds of jobs available, and partly because they are not trained very well in anything, beginning with the basic tool of reading.

In a nation abounding in natural resources and increasing its economic resources every year, there should be no tolerance of poverty caused by ignorance. Nor should we tolerate oppression felt by people who are excluded from our national well-being because their educational level limits them to a passive, second-class citizenship.

Automation—the specter that haunts the ranks of the unskilled and semiskilled—can be turned into a blessing. I refuse to be intimidated by the forecast that, through automation, this country is faced with a permanent high level of unemployment. I am convinced that automation is just the means we need to make us find more efficient use for the human mind as we are freed from the need of harnessing human brawn.

Today, we are finding that job opportunities are declining for all but the highly skilled and the knowledgeable. But what does this forecast mean? I say it summons a breakthrough in education, that it calls on education to reveal and develop the hidden potential of the human intelligence and the human spirit. I will not accept the premise that there are unteachables in our society. I firmly believe that every human being possesses a potential contribution to mankind—if we have the skill to release this contribution.

But do we have this skill? Can we train students for the world's needs as they exist? Or are we still training young Americans only for a world that is vanishing? What are the facts?

We have produced more than 30,000 highly skilled new technicians in 5 years of technical education under the National Defense Education Act. But estimates tell us that the country's industries and scientific endeavors can absorb up to 10 times that number. Indeed, 1 observer has come up with an estimated need for close to 200,000 new technicians every year.

We have increased the number of public institutions offering technical education to 650 or so. But the range of offerings in many of these schools is severely limited. While Federal funds are available for training in the industrial and engineering technologies, few States, on their own initiative, have reached into the wide-open fields of biological technologies.

Last year, we expended about $14 billion in public funds—Federal, State, and local—on public education. But only $256 million went into the federally aided programs of vocational education.

Today, the outlook for the untrained person is most unpromising. For example, jobs that require no skill are occupied by only about 5 percent of our industrial workers, and the number of unskilled and semiskilled production workers in manufacturing has declined by 772,000 in the past 5 years.

On the other hand, for the person who possesses specialized skills and the background knowledge to go with them, the outlook is excellent. Jobs for professional and technical workers will rise about 40 percent in the 1970's, and jobs for sales workers, managers, and proprietors will rise about 20 percent, according to official estimates. Moreover, in the field of health occupations, at all levels, the demand for trained workers greatly exceeds the supply. And the gap will not be closed very soon.

Thus the shaping of vocational education programs to meet anticipated developments in these employment areas becomes a matter for each and every community to explore for itself as well as for each State to explore in relation to its place in the national scheme of things.

Fourth, the proposed legislation leads to the necessity of understanding precisely the vocational needs of our society and how we can meet them. It calls for cooperative arrangements with the State public employment offices to supply occupational information for vocational education agencies in counseling students and in determining the occupations for which they are trained.

These requirements obviously call for a major effort in research and development, in which all the specialized fields of social and economic learning can contribute. Realistically conceived and executed, research in depth should become an integral part of education planning.

We are faced by difficult questions. What kinds of training programs are proving most effective in industry? What qualifications should we seek in vocational teachers? How effective are the teaching aids we now employ? How can we develop curriculums better suited to individual needs? How shall we train today for tomorrow's employment?

To such questions as these, research can provide answers. From research we can shape meaningful precepts for new vocational programs.

Sometimes we can learn fast by trial and error. For this reason, pilot projects deserve a bigger place in public education than they are now receiving. We are already learning much from the special projects of the Manpower Development and Training Act. At times the failure of a project as an education venture makes for success in pointing up fallacies in old methods applied to new situations.

Therefore, the provision for research grants and demonstration project grants, awarded by the Commissioner of Education, may prime the pump of State activity in research and development in vocational education. But beyond this, I hope that the States can join forces to create regional research centers to coordinate important work which is now performed too often in isolation. These research centers would provide the means by which economic, social, and educational problems common to an entire region could be treated in a coordinated fashion.

I repeat that these points are specifically outlined in the proposed legislation, H.R. 4955. At the same time they give us guidelines for new directions, regardless of the fate of the legislation. From them, we can formulate a new series of guides for vocational education, guides to lead this Nation toward a new era in our total educational accomplishment.

May I conclude with a brief statement of the position of the Office of Education? I would offer it in the form of a declaration of principles:

First, training for work should be a fundamental aspect of education.

Second, the means and goals of education should reflect the economic and social conditions of the present and the likely trends of the future.

Third, vocational education should stretch its dimensions to reach those for whom a minimum education is the only hope for dignity and economic freedom, and those who enjoy technical talents.

Finally, vocational education should inculcate the appreciation of ideas as well as the performance of techniques. For vocational education should not be regarded as a substitute for a sound academic background but as an integrated part of a grand educational plan.

With these principles, I submit, vocational education will truly join the mainstream of all education in this latter half of the 20th century.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Secretary Celebrezze, Assistant Secretary for Legislation Cohen, and Commissioner Keppel all deserve and should receive our thanks and gratitude for the splendid record in educational legislation they have made possible in this 1st session of the 88th Congress. As chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to express to each of them formally my congratulations as I did in person, informally, this morning.

NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER AS A MEMORIAL TO THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, both the House Public Works Committee and the Senate Public Works Committee have now reported favorably a bill to name the National Cultural Center, the John F. Kennedy Memorial Center for the Performing Arts. It is my hope that the Congress will pass such a bill before it adjourns. Perhaps the first, or at least one of the first, to make a recommendation for this course was Kenneth A. Finch. He wrote to every Member of Congress, and to many others. I ask unanimous consent that two letters written by Mr. Finch be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 26, 1963.

To the U.S. Congress Assembled and to the Governors of the 50 States.

GENTLEMEN: The attached letter to the editor, entitled "In memoriam—Let There Be Music," was written at dawn on November 23, 1963, upon my return from an all-night vigil before the White House, waiting for the President to come home for the last time.

In originally submitting my letter to the editors and music-drama critics of all newspapers in the Nation's Capital, I urge them to either print my proposal or adopt the idea contained therein in their own words. To date, to the best of my knowledge, my letter has never been set in print anywhere, but the idea has been adopted in part in Washington editorial comment. What is of equal importance, I have been assured by several Members of Congress, to whom I have already written and spoken, that they will introduce legislation to effect this proposal. However, the problems involved in introducing such legislation and enacting the same are, as we know, poles apart.

Therefore, let me urge you, individually, to act on this proposal and to bring the attached letter to the editor, or the seeds of the ideas contained therein, to the attention of your constituents, the American people—that support for the proposed legislation may spring forth from the grassroots of this Nation, that the American people may join together with hands and hearts in building this living memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, thereby insuring the fulfillment of one of his most cherished dreams of his country and his people.

Sincerely,

KENNETH ANDERSON FINCH.

NOVEMBER 23, 1963.

IN MEMORIAM—LET THERE BE MUSIC

(A letter to the Nation)

At 0425 hours this 23d day of November in this year of our Lord, 1963, John Fitzgerald Kennedy came home for the last time. His widow, clothed in her bloodstained gown, grasping those 50 stars on a field of blue that now were his last mantle, smiled a Mona Lisa smile through her veil of tears at the sight of a throng, a thousand strong, who had shared her all-night vigil at his side. The Nation had not slept—we dare not sleep.

Two years, ten months, two days—eternity. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, now belongs to the ages. It is not our right to judge him; history will see to this; but it is our duty to remember him—this smiling, vigorous, imaginative man, our Nation's youngest President, war hero, man of letters, patron of the arts, scholar, statesman, untiring advocate of peace, unflinching champion of freedom and equality for all men.

Let us not mourn him in somber tones—in cold marble or stone—for this was not the measure of this vital young man. Rather let us dedicate ourselves to a living memorial that will forever bespeak itself of him. Among his most treasured unfulfilled dreams was the hope that one day this American democracy and his people would reach the same cultural heights realized by the ancient Athenians in the golden age of Greece.

In dedicating the Robert Frost Memorial Library at Amherst College on October 26, 1963, the President expressed his dream in these words: "I look forward to an America which will reward achievement in the arts as we reward achievement in business or statecraft. I look forward to an America which will raise the standards of artistic accomplishment and which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all our citizens. And I look forward to an America which commands respect throughout the world not only for its strength but for its civilization as well."

Like no other occupant before them the late President and his First Lady threw open wide the doors of their home, the White House, lit the east wing where now he rests and filled it with the joyous sounds of music and song, drama and dance. The performing arts in this Nation's Capital have never known greater friends; and tonight concert halls and theaters across the Nation are darkened because of the passing of him. Let us not curse this darkness—rather let us together light a candle in memory of him.

Let us tear from our hearts the smallness, the bigotry, the hatred that has taken him from our midst all too soon by building a living tribute to him in the shadow of the Lincoln Memorial. Let men and women across the Nation, whatever their race, religion, or political belief, join as one in petitioning the Congress through their individual Senators and Representatives, urging that legislation be passed designating the proposed National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Center for the Performing Arts.

Finally, upon the enactment of this legislation by the Congress, and with the permission of his bereaved widow, let us, his countrymen—or rather, let people the world over join together in contributing the stones of this living memorial—whether by dime or drachma, shilling or franc, lire, yen, peso, kroner, kopec, or mark. Let us endow this living memorial to insure that the music that goes forth therefrom to this land and to the four corners of the earth will truly reflect the spirit of this man—consumed by his dream of peace for the world, freedom and equality for all mankind. Let us begin anew with this living tribute—for music is truly the only universal language of man. Let us begin today—the end of this, our longest day.

KENNETH ANDERSON FINCH,
Captain, USAFR.

MASS TRANSIT: EFFICIENT, ECONOMICAL, NECESSARY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the recent House defeat of the

District of Columbia transit proposal for very unfortunate reasons only serves to dramatize again one of our greatest national needs—a balanced transportation system.

It should serve to show that unbending conflict among varying groups cannot solve the problem of increasing congestion which confronts all our cities, and is even beginning to plague the smaller towns. But cooperation can, and will, if we are determined to make it possible for both transit and automobile to do the job they are best suited to do. To this end, I sponsored the administration's mass transportation bill, which passed the Senate last spring.

The autumn issue of Nation's Cities, a new and most valuable magazine of the American Municipal Association, contains an excellent discussion of the mass transportation bill, and its potential for bringing balance and cooperation into the congested urban transportation scene. I request unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mass Transit: Slowed Down But Not Derailed

(By Donald W. Lief)

Once bright, the chances of final congressional approval of a mass transportation bill have been clouded by a remarkable set of circumstances. With the support and headway already achieved in Congress, this is surprising. Consider the positive side: Passage by the Senate before Easter, substantial approval by the House Banking and Currency Committee, and a growing national agreement that healthy mass transit facilities are a vital part of tomorrow's balanced transportation systems.

But events during the 88th Congress have indicated to the House leadership that, should the measure be brought to a vote, the outcome would be far from certain. There are strong reasons for the leadership's hesitation: The rebuff suffered by the administration on the Area Redevelopment Act showed that it could not count on a working majority for its priority bills. Civil rights then came to the fore and sharpened sectional differences. The passage of the tax cut bill gave impetus to the economy mood against grant programs.

On top of these came the White House decision to endorse a $790 million rapid transit system for the Washington, D.C., area. The decision, which followed a plan developed by the National Capital Transportation Agency, included a freeze on construction of several key segments of Washington's freeway systems.

The decision unleashed a storm of controversy. In public and in private, highway, and automotive industry spokesmen grew vocal about lowering the priority of these urban sections of the Interstate System. And, in congressional hearings which examined the NCTA project, hostile witnesses began to tee off on the national mass transit bill as well as the local project. Their reaction was matched by transit partisans who had no sympathy for urban freeways.

Despite the decline in its appeal, the mass transit bill may yet prevail. Officials in the highway and transit industries are approaching philosophic agreement on the implications of balanced transportation. Planners and highway engineers are beginning to work more closely as they move into the field of comprehensive transportation planning required by the 1962 Highway Aid Act.

Responsible persons and organizations see balanced transportation as an essential goal—with mass transit's role not limited to commuter rail systems in the great metropolis but including the smaller community's bus systems.

Typical of the attitude of the transit industry is the comment of George W. Anderson, executive vice president of the American Transit Association, who told the Automobile Manufacturers Association, "Future emphasis should probably be placed not so much on the mutually exclusive uses of these two media [transit and autos] as upon their complementary uses in a balanced system of urban transport which capitalizes on the capacity characteristics of each and the relation of these characteristics to the travel patterns of the metropolitan area."

Within the great metropolitan areas, private automobiles alone cannot meet the transportation needs of the future. Since 1959, the American Municipal Association's policy has pointed out, "Not only would the cost be prohibitive, the amount of land required for highways and parking facilities would take so much of the usable space in any urban area as to defeat its own purpose."

The problems of rush hour congestion and parking are increasingly familiar to cities of moderate size where the toll of private bus lines has been significant since the end of World War II. These medium and smaller cities also require fluidity of movement for survival. But the Nation's transit bus fleet declined more than 20 percent between 1954 and 1960.

To restore health to a generally sick transit industry is a major undertaking, but the alternative of a dead transit industry is much worse. Transit and commuter railroads have left the category of private convenience; they are clearly necessities.

Communities throughout the country have come to realize this: Voters in the San Francisco Bay area last year voted to tax themselves a total of $792 million to build an ultramodern high-speed rapid transit system linking San Francisco with Oakland, Berkeley, and other East Bay cities. Reynolds Metal Corp. reports that some three dozen metropolitan centers are actively planning new or revitalized mass transit facilities. Atlanta, St. Louis, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia are key examples.

Since mass transit—like commuting by automobile—often provides transportation across city, county, and even State lines, this is a problem which cannot be termed local. Cooperation is needed—at all levels of government and by private as well as public carriers.

Despite the opposition of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, local chambers of commerce in Boston, Philadelphia, and other cities have strongly endorsed the necessity for national action on this national problem.

Just what would the pending mass transit bill try to do? Would it be a massive Federal spending program?

The bill would aid mass transportation by helping private and public companies modernize their facilities and equipment. It would also support badly needed research in the technology of mass transportation. Like recent housing and highway legislation, the bill would also encourage areawide planning to result in desirable urban development.

Under the bill's terms, grants or loans could be made to assist States, local governments and other public agencies. Funds could be spent on land (not public highways), buses and other rolling stock, tracks, and terminals. Money could not be used to subsidize any operating deficit of the system.

No grant or loan, according to the bill, could be made unless the facilities and equipment of the project were to be part of a unified, coordinated urban transportation system. This system would have to be developed with the objective of sound, economic and desirable growth of the area.

In short, the criteria for assistance under this bill strongly resemble the terms of the 1962 Federal Highway Aid Act which make comprehensive, continuous transportation planning a "must" for metropolitan areas by July 1, 1965, if they seek additional Federal help with highway projects.

Further evidence of the growing agreement between highway and transit viewpoints in the Federal Government is the recent requirement by the Bureau of Public Roads that this transportation planning must give strong consideration to mass transit facilities.

When the planning process, with the impetus of the Highway Act, gets underway in more than 200 urbanized areas, extreme arguments of "highways versus transit" will be muted as conclusions emerge from massive collections of evidence. Then the transportation plan's alternatives can be debated sensibly.

In the meantime, however, action must be taken. The authorization of $600 million contained in the mass transit bill is important; the funds are direly needed by communities which are witnessing a daily deterioration in their transportation picture. But—equally important—the bill's passage would acknowledge that the economic health of our urban areas is of national concern, and that the Federal Government's policies on transportation are one large step closer to being consistent, balanced, and farsighted.

SUCCESS OF MIGRANT HEALTH ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in 1962 the Congress passed a major piece of legislation designed to bring direct help to America's forgotten man, the migratory worker. The Migrant Health Act of 1962 was the first piece of migratory labor legislation to be enacted in more than 30 years.

I know that the many supporters of this program will be happy to learn of the successes it has attained. Migrant health projects were in operation in more than 22 States during the past summer. The Public Health Service has prepared a brief summary of the operations of the program and I ask unanimous consent that this report be included in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The State of California has been a leader in efforts to improve health conditions among migrant workers and their families. Two articles in the Medical Tribune describe the outstanding work being done by the California Farmworkers Health Service with the help of money granted under the Migrant Health Act. The articles also pay a well deserved tribute to the selfless work of Dr. Bruce Jessup, the former head of the Farmworkers Health Service. The passage of the Migrant Health Act was greatly helped by Dr. Jessup's ceaseless efforts in its behalf. He is now using his great talents to help the Iranian Government improve health care for the poor peasants of that country.

These articles describing the work of Dr. Jessup, his able successor, Dr. Paul O'Rourke and Dr. Malcolm Merrill, the State health director will be of great interest to all concerned with the many problems facing migratory farmworkers. I ask unanimous consent that the two articles from the Medical Tribune be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Migrant Health Act is only a beginning; much remains to be done to better the living and working conditions of the migrant. But the success of this program shows that we can, and must, bring practical help to these long neglected and oppressed Americans. If we cannot develop an adequate solution to the problem of migratory farmworkers we will be faced, not only with a continuing economic burden, but a permanent shame to our prosperous society.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Migrant Health Act—Progress Report

To: Regional and other officials.
From: Robert J. Anderson, Assistant Surgeon General, Chief, Bureau of State Services.
Subject: Executive memorandum No. 12 of 1963.

The Nation's million agricultural migrants traditionally have fallen between the cracks of community health services, whether those services have been provided under public or voluntary auspices. Recent national awakening to the agricultural migrants' health needs and problems in obtaining care led the Congress to pass the Migrant Health Act of September 1962 (EM, Oct. 19, 1962). This law (Public Law 87-692) helps to reduce the unfavorable position of migrants in gaining access to community health services. It is based on the premise that, given an extra boost of financial and technical aid, States and communities can muster resources that will provide realistic access to medical care and preventive health services, for these temporary residents.

The Congress authorized a 3-year period to test this approach to the health problems of the migratory farmworkers; and placed in the State and in the community, at the point of delivery of services, the major responsibility for planning and conducting these services. The role of the Public Health Service is to assist the States and communities. Briefly the law provides for:

Grants through the Public Health Service to pay part of the cost of family health service clinics or other types of projects, to improve migrants' health services or conditions.

Expanded effort of the Public Health Service, in programs to improve health services for or otherwise improve the health conditions of, domestic agricultural migrant workers and their families.

The broad objectives at the national level are to encourage migrants to assume responsibility for meeting their health needs; and to promote the kind of community environment in which such effort on their part is realistic. In meeting these objectives, the Public Health Service places priority on the development of service projects in the major home base and work areas; and on linking more closely the health services which are provided in various localities along each migratory stream.

Progress under this law will be measured by the services provided and their effect on the health status of migrants; by the knowledge gained and responsibility developed by both migrants and communities.

Action under this new law was begun as soon as the President signed the bill. Before funds were appropriated last May, 58 applications for migrant health grants had been received by the PHS, from public and voluntary nonprofit organizations scattered over the country.

Applications have varied. Some have proposed temporary seasonal clinics to provide medical care to all family members, scheduled and located within easy reach of the families. Some applications have combined family clinic services with nursing and sanitation services. Some have been single-purpose proposals, focusing on nursing or other single-type service. Nearly all of the applications have had health education built into them: To identify and overcome barriers to communication; to involve migrants in identifying and solving their health problems; and to help migrants develop better health habits that can be practiced under their living and working conditions. Some applications proposed State-level units to offer leadership, assistance in providing services, and coordinating efforts within the State, and other aids to project development.

A national project review committee has been established by the Public Health Service. Members include a private medical practitioner, public health workers, a grower, and others concerned with problems of the migrants and of their temporary communities. Dr. J. Robert Lindsay, Chief, Migrant Health Branch, points out that committee members reviewing applications are concerned over what, specifically, will this project contribute to the improvement of migrants' health services and conditions? Will services be suitable to migrants' working and living conditions, as well as to their experience, concerns, and understanding? Will the project help improve migrants' health knowledge and behavior? Will it serve an area important in number of workers and family members? Will substantial contributions be made by the applicant, or by other individuals, or public or voluntary groups (services, knowledge, facilities, equipment, or funds)? Does the project give promise of becoming part of ongoing community health planning and services, supported from local and State sources? How does it propose to relate its services to those provided to the same people in other localities? Does the selection and orientation of project staff take into consideration attitudes, interest, experience, and familiarity with migrants, as well as professional competence? Is proposed staff supervision adequate? Will the project make a contribution of value beyond its geographic boundaries, in providing other localities with new information, techniques, training opportunities, demonstration of services, etc?

Is it evident in the application that project planning has specifically determined: Who will do what? For whom? Where? When? How? Why? At what cost and to whom? How to measure and evaluate the effectiveness of services.

Funds to carry out the Migrant Health Act of 1962 became available late last May. By mid-July, 35 applications had been approved for funding, and grants totaling $1.3 million were awarded. Additional contributions from other than PHS Migrant Health grant sources, as shown by the applications for these funded projects, approximated 40 percent of the total costs.

A majority of the projects got underway quickly. New night clinics were opened. New nurses and sanitarians were employed. New efforts were started to tie the services of one project area to those of others in the same migratory stream. New or expanded health services reached migrant workers in one or more communities of 21 States during this 1963 crop season.

Many conditions requiring health care—which otherwise would have continued without attention—were found, and treated: whooping cough, skin infections, diabetes, and numerous pregnancy cases needing prenatal care. Camp facilities were found to require immediate improvements, and corrective action followed—in garbage and refuse disposal, toilet and shower facilities, insect and rodent control.

That some projects would strike snags was expected. Action was urgent as migrants were already arriving. Project staff in a few locations had little time for the careful groundwork so necessary to assure the best communication and working relations with church groups, local physicians, growers, other individuals and groups. In some communities physicians, dentists, nurses, and sanitarians to fill key positions were hard to find, and obtaining needed facilities, equipment, and supplies caused some delays. Only two projects however, have not been able to get underway thus far, for lack of a key staff member.

Project efforts in many localities have developed a fine community enthusiasm; a greater community understanding and acceptance of migrants; stronger public-voluntary group cooperation; and effective working relationships between State and local health department staffs, for migrant health.

Some applicants have been disappointed that hospital bills cannot be paid from Migrant Health grant funds. A few applicants have incorporated provisions for in-hospital care to be paid from other than PHS Migrant Health funds; using the migrant health grant funds to support general medical care (including preventive health services). Some of these projects, therefore, will provide information on the actual costs of hospital care for migrants. The migrant health program of the PHS is also working with the American Hospital Association to develop and promote a system for further collection of this type of data.

Many groups have looked to the PHS for health education materials adapted to migrants. To relieve the dearth of such materials, the Service has contracted for the preparation of three short health education films. The Service has also contracted for the development of a guide for persons preparing and using materials with east coast migrants.

The knotty problems of relating the services of projects widely separated along migrant streams is another that is being tackled. The PHS cooperatively with interested States and regions will try out several methods during fiscal year 1964. To serve the Central States stream, the nucleus of an interregional consultant team has been established to promote and help develop better communications and coordination of effort. With the east coast regions and States, the proposed approach will utilize central office staff. Conferences involving project staff along major streams are also being considered.

Planning for migrant workers and families is difficult. Nevertheless, fewer communities are now overlooking them when they deploy their resources to meet community health needs. The million migrant agricultural workers, who for so long have fallen between the cracks, are being reckoned with and helped to close the gap in their access to community health care. Although each project can meet only part of the problem, a nationwide solution becomes a possibility as project sponsors along all the migrant streams begin to plan and work together.

[From Medical Tribune, October 4, 1963]

Medical Plight of Coast Migrants—I: Health Prospects of 250,000 Brightened by Federal Grant

Berkeley, Calif.—Perhaps no other single large group of Americans has suffered such medical neglect over the years as California's migratory agricultural workers. While farm mechanization has gradually cut back their number, it is estimated that some 250,000 workers and their dependents (usually all but the youngest children work) still follow the crops from Imperial County north through the great San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys, leading an economically and medically marginal life. (This figure does not include about 74,000 braceros, Mexican nationals who are imported under treaty agreement at crop seasonal peaks.)

Suddenly the future of the migrant seems brighter—thanks to a $1 million 2-year Federal grant to the California Department of Public Health, to be used, without the necessity of matching funds or other strings, to ease the medical plight of the migrants.

The grant—based on a bill sponsored by New Jersey Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS—came in response to the dedicated but ill-financed efforts of a group of young physicians within the department and to the prodding of one of them, Dr. Malcolm H. Merrill, the fighting chief of the department.

Leader of the group was Dr. Bruce Jessup, who gave up a lucrative pediatrics practice with the Palo Alto Medical Clinic to take on the task of trying to improve health conditions in migrant labor camps after observing in person the horrifying situation there, particularly among the children.

Dr. Jessup is now doing a similar sort of job for the Iranian Government for that country's poorer peasants, and his place in the California Department of Public Health has been taken by Dr. Paul O'Rourke, another young, crusading physician, whose title is chief of the Farm Workers Health Service.

When Dr. Jessup first took on the job three years ago, he found that the proud—and generally correct—boast of American medicine that no man need go without adequate medical care simply failed to cover these forgotten people.

For one thing, they are largely made up of members of minority groups that often suffer prejudice and discrimination in this country. Half are of Mexican extraction and speak only Spanish, and 20 percent are Negro. Twenty percent are of Anglo-Saxon origin but are the remnants of the Okies and Arkies of Grapes of Wrath memory. The rest are Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos and alcoholic transients.

For another thing, most of the workers move too fast from crop to crop for any local effort to alleviate their health conditions to be meaningful. California's 58 counties have widely differing rules, but in general no one has a right to county medical services—except in life-threatening situations—short of 6 months of residence.

And, finally, most of the migrants are too ignorant or frightened to seek what little medical care is available to them.

SOME DISHEARTENING FACTS

An early Jessup survey turned up some disheartening facts. Among them:

Most migrant camps were filthy and without sanitary facilities—despite the fact that in many cases they bordered on thriving, clean, country communities.

Three-quarters of all the mothers came to term with no prenatal care whatsoever; in the remainder it was cursory at best.

Two-thirds had no family doctor and had, indeed, rarely even seen a physician.

Ninety percent had no health insurance.

Two-thirds of the children under 3 had no immunizations of any sort.

Three-quarters of those under 18 years had received no polio shots.

In a single camp in Merced County in 1960 there were 30 hospitalizations for infant diarrhea—with an unrecorded number of deaths—and in other camps the condition was very nearly endemic.

Among all the workers and their families, accident rates were alarmingly high, owing in great part to overused farm machinery. Pesticide poisoning always has been a severe problem.

While no exact statistics are available, Dr. Jessup noted sky-high incidences of skin infections, respiratory infections, and uncorrected birth defects. The TB rate was at least three times the State average.

[From the Medical Tribune, Oct. 7, 1963]

THREE MD'S AND PILOT PROJECTS OFFER HEALTH HOPE TO COAST MIGRANTS

BERKELEY, CALIF.—Thanks to the crusading efforts of three physicians and to a Federal grant of $1 million, California's migrant crop workers may soon shed their unhappy reputation as the sickest, least medically cared-for group in the country.

That description—which no one seems to have successfully challenged—comes from one of the three physicians, Dr. Paul O'Rourke, chief of the Farm Workers Health Service of the California Department of Public Health. The others are Dr. O'Rourke's boss, Dr. Malcolm H. Merrill, State health director, and Dr. Bruce Jessup, Dr. O'Rourke's predecessor and now a medical consultant to the Iranian Government.

Most Californians have reacted to their essential seasonal crop workers with feelings that ranged from outright enmity to uneasy conscience pangs. Generally, they have looked the other way, hoping the problem would go away.

With rare exceptions the owners of the big, corporation-like farms that employ most of the migrants have disclaimed any responsibility for them, beyond helping to "save" them from labor unions.

The travels of the migratory workers have made them ineligible for health or welfare aid from the counties, which almost uniformly require 6 months of continuous residence.

When Dr. Jessup surveyed their health status 3 years ago, he found conditions grim. They still are mostly unchanged today, but in such selected counties as Butte, Merced, and Kern, pilot clinics and demonstration projects, set up under the direction of Dr. Jessup and continued by Dr. O'Rourke, have begun to alleviate many of the worst problems. For example, in one camp hospitalizations from infant diarrhea dropped from 30 in 1960 to 1 last year.

The first problems tackled were lack of education and a basic lack of communication due to the migrants' suspicion of authority and a language barrier (at least half are of Mexican origin, with most of them speaking only Spanish).

Dr. Jessup selected from the camps teams of likely young bilingual Mexican men and women, who were put through a brief and intensive health education course by the State health department and then sent back into the camps. They served not only to educate and care for their fellows but also to help break down the suspicion of outsiders.

OTHER ASPECTS DESCRIBED

Other aspects of the demonstration projects were motorized clinics and night clinics—because the workers fear above almost all else the thought of losing even an hour's work. Special prenatal care programs were set up, as well as sanitation units and visiting nurse services, using Spanish-speaking personnel wherever possible.

As Dr. O'Rourke noted, many of these activities departed from the traditional preventive medicine role of public health services. This fact brought outright opposition, or, at best, only grudging support, from the county medical societies. The only solution offered by most societies was a demand that if the State money must be spent on the migrants, it be used to buy them health insurance.

The projects, nevertheless, never lacked for active participation by individual physicians, scores of whom spent night after night at migrant clinics.

It was the success of these demonstration programs that brought the $1 million Federal grant, to be spent over 2 years. The funds will be used to spread and augment the projects already inaugurated and to add such other efforts as sanitation teams, a bilingual statewide directory of health services, and special prenatal care clinics.

Dr. Merrill has expressed the hope that the Federal grant will serve as "seed" money to stimulate State and county spending. On the other hand, it seems more likely to less optimistic observers that the funds will serve as another excuse for the counties to duck the issue. These observers deem it probable that the health problems of the migrants will become a more or less permanent responsibility—by default—of the Federal Government.

RECESS TO 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, December 19, 1963, at 9 o'clock a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Trust Territories Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, our own Congressman MICHAEL KIRWAN, dominant, earnest, and practical in his every action, has again shown us why we respect his fine judgment and secure sense of direction. Early in 1961, he visited the trust territories islands, that are managed by the Department of the Interior, under a trustee agreement with the United Nations (formerly administered by the Japanese, since World War I, after the defeat of Germany, who had purchased the scattered islands from Spain).

What he saw there was enough to turn a puritanical heart to stone. Upon his return he went to work, in his own inimitable way, to remedy the sad conditions under which these underprivileged people were living.

Although a study was made by the United Nations, 3 years ago, not one of the other countries of the 14 comprising this group, evinced any interest in joining the United States in its contributory benevolence to solve or alleviate the problems of these 85,000 souls.

At the time of his visit, $3 million was appropriated to meet our obligation.

Through argumentative persistence and factual presentation of actual depressive conditions—the Insular Affairs Committee made it possible for the Appropriations Committee to appropriate $6.5 million.

For 10 years the Interior Affairs Committee had asked for this sum. A large portion of this money was spent on the expenses in maintaining and manning headquarters district offices, transportation and communication systems. So that, as those costs rose, the $6.5 million bought fewer services, the population increased from 47,000 to 85,000 since 1947—thus adding more problems.

Thus, the few funds left that were made available were not sufficient to carry out our promises to further their educational, economic, social, and political progress. This seeming neglect of Micronesia and its people, has brought criticism (deservedly) upon the United States. But, again, the Insular Affairs Committee raised the budget to $15 million for this year and 1964.

A substantial portion of this sum is being expended on educational programs—to build and equip schools—as reflected in the recent letter received by Michael Kirwan, from his intimate friend, Rev. William J. Walter, S.J.

President Johnson, upon signing the bill, said, that education is the key to all further progress in the political, economic and social fields. American teachers are now being recruited to teach English, which authorities hope will become the common language of all the islanders.

Congressman Kirwan stated that every dollar is needed, and more, to accelerate all the programs so that these wards of the United States will develop a way of life inimical to the inroads of communistic doctrines—in the near future years he predicts that $30 million will be needed to realize our determination to mold a grateful people into a government stronghold for democracy.

If the people of the territory decide, in the future, by vote, to select the United States as its protectorate instead of becoming nationally independent, the United States will hold a chain of islands of supreme strategic importance to our security and that of the free world.

Thus, a leader of the Congress, traveling to distant lands to study actual conditions and to note the developing results realized through expenditures of moneys for specific purposes, in accordance with the intention of the Congress, made possible a reevaluation of a projected program, and stimulated stronger support to realize our honest aims in benefiting these unfortunates who were witnesses to the murderous assaults of our troops against the enemy, which cost us many American lives.

The question of whether the $15 million is enough and should other programs be accelerated, were questions asked by former President John F. Kennedy and the State Department, which is embarrassed in that it is suspected that the future debates of the United Nations will be critical of the U.S. administration of the islands. President Kennedy appointed a seven-man mission, headed by Anthony M. Solomon, a State Department official, to survey the islands. These findings and recommendations have not yet been made public but it is rumored that the report will recommend the major acceleration of all programs.

In his closing remarks, Congressman Kirwan true to the simplicity of his deep-felt appreciation for the confidence reposed in him by his colleagues on the committee, in following his advice and the honesty of his representations in this important matter, said, "I am thankful to the members of the Insular Affairs Committee who made it possible for the Appropriations Committee to give the needed money to the trust territories (islands)."

Congressman Kirwan received this letter—in itself it tells the whole story—Reverend Walter, a man of God, blessed him for his fine work—and we are proud that we know and associate with such a distinguished servant of the Republic:

Yap, Caroline Islands,
U.S. Trust Territory, Pacific,
December 11, 1963.

Hon. Michael J. Kirwan,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kirwan: Early in 1961 you flew to the trust territory and made a brief stop at Ulithi Atoll. Ulithi had been devastated by a typhoon a few months previous to your visit. It was a sad sight. At a meeting of the chiefs you expressed your sympathy and they gave you a few souvenirs as a present. I was at Ulithi at the time but could not get to the island where you landed in time to meet you.

Things are beginning to happen at Ulithi. Last summer the Government delivered the materials for school buildings. There are to be four grade schools and a junior high school. The natives were expected to donate their work and Mr. James Boykin came to supervise it. I helped a little in an unofficial capacity.

The people were so eager to have their junior high school up for September that they worked overtime to do the job quickly. School opened on time with 125 students from Ulithi and the outer islands. Another American arrived to help Mr. Boykin.

Both he and Mrs. Stahl are completely dedicated people. They do not mind the isolation and lack of civilized living. They are enthused with their work and put in many extra hours trying to help the people. At last we have made a beginning in education and the future looks brighter. Eventually we will have an American teacher at each of the grade schools.

The people of Ulithi Atoll have asked me to send you their thanks and I also hereby include mine. They deeply appreciate your visit and the encouraging words you spoke at that time.

May God bless you for helping to bring about a change. For 15 years I had been living in the atolls and for 15 years I had been ashamed of my country. We had the islands in trust and we were not fulfilling the responsiblity we had assumed. I was becoming a bit discouraged with our system of government—it seemed to be a big bureaucracy without a heart. Having met and talked with the present high commission has changed all that. May you be the first to receive the Christ Child's blessing on Christmas Day.

Sincerely yours,
Rev. William J. Walter, S.J.

American-Built Racing Automobiles Could and Should Lead the World—Only One U.S. Manufacturer Realizes This Fact of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during the past year automobile racing has made a strong bid to become America's leading spectator sport. Reported attendance at various competitive events has grown about 20 percent during each of the last 3 years and this year could reach an estimated 50 million.

Historically, the many improvements in automobiles resulting from racing are well known. The rearview mirror, low-pressure tires and four-wheel brakes—to name but a few examples—were first developed and tested to meet the demands of racing.

Today, although cars are much more sophisticated and the methods of testing cars are highly scientific, manufacturers still learn a great deal of benefit to the car-buying public from competitive events, that they can learn in no other way. That is because the stresses placed on a car by a driver competing in a race cannot be duplicated on any test track.

One leading manufacturer, for example, has torn down from competitive vehicles more than 100 engines, 50 transmissions, and 40 rear axles during the past year. As a result of careful study and followup work, this company has incorporated into its products a number of changes which provide the general public with cars of greater durability and safety.

Engines are more reliable and better able to withstand the strain of continuous freeway driving. Transmissions are more durable and able to withstand the abuse of unskillful shifting. Rear axles are prepared to absorb the sudden shock caused by a foot slipping off of the clutch, or the added strain of hauling a trailer.

With increased durability and reliability in these new cars has come improved performance.

I mentioned that racing may become America's No. 1 spectator sport. I would like to tell you what this has meant to one locality in my home State of South Carolina.

Darlington, a community of 6,000 persons, is located in the rural north-central part of South Carolina.

Darlington is steeped in the ways and customs of the Old South. Its principal crops are tobacco, cotton, and sweet potatoes. Until the Darlington Raceway was built, its industry consisted of a 100-year-old cotton mill and a small Dixie cup assembly plant.

Construction of Darlington Raceway was financed with $50,000 supplied by manufacturers and suppliers who received common stock in lieu of cash repayments.

The raceway opened on Labor Day, 1950, with a 500-mile stock car automobile race.

The American Automobile Association, then the ruling body of auto racing, refused to sanction the event on grounds the race would be a farce. The AAA contended no American-manufactured stock automobile could run 500 miles at full speed.

Today no one can correctly tell how many people attended that first race. Thousands jammed the infield.

For tax purposes, the management and tax officers agreed that between 25,000 and 26,000 had paid to see the race.

In 1955, the first 50,000 attendance was registered.

Double-deck boxes and a deluxe paddock stand now have increased seating to almost 40,000, exclusive of infield capacity.

The gross income reported for 1963 was $592,766.08. State and Federal admission taxes totaled $92,604.57. Still to be paid are corporation, income, county, and State taxes, comprising an estimated 52 percent of total income. Today, Darlington Raceway is the largest single-day taxpayer in South Carolina.

The impact of Darlington Raceway on the economy of the State of South Carolina is illustrated by the fact that banks in a three-county area around Darlington reported a $2,500,000 advance over normal deposits 30 days after a Southern 500. Studies indicate that the money was spent for many things other than the race. It went for food, lodging, parking, fuel, and souvenirs. Further, most of the money literally was spent three and four times before it got to the bank.

As an example of how auto racing helps the little man, one farmer near Darlington parks 4,000 cars each race. His wife and sons do the parking and they charge $1.50 per car. This brings them $6,000—more than they ever earned in a full year on the same land raising cotton.

The Darlington Raceway more than once has bolstered the economy of the community in time of crisis. For instance, in 1958 the local cotton mill—which employed most of Darlington's working citizens—closed its doors. Darlington was declared a Federal disaster area, but the soup lines never materialized. Fresh money from the Southern 500 saved the town until new industry could be secured.

Said the vice president of the Darlington County Bank:

> Thank God for the Southern 500.

To woo new industry, Darlington officials invited executives of the Pyramid Electric Co. to a Southern 500; the company decided to locate in Darlington because "we're interested in an area that shows so much community spirit and cooperation." Pyramid bought the old cotton plant, remodeled it and today employs more people than ever worked at the old mill.

Dixie Cup, too, enlarged its Darlington facilities and 2 years ago established a permanent Dixie Cup trophy for the Southern 500 winner.

Nearly everyone in both Darlington and nearby Florence, S.C., has a part in Southern 500 proceedings. The track itself employs upwards of 600 persons for 1 day to 1 week. Wages range from $1.50 to $3 an hour.

The permanent raceway work force includes a general manager, an assistant general manager, two executive secretaries, two male clerks, a publicist, a grounds superintendent and a labor crew of six. Eleven directors also are on salary and each heads a department.

The impact of the Southern 500 on the people of Darlington has been equally spectacular.

Schools and churches found that they could raise funds for their projects by making and selling box lunches and operating open-air cafeterias. Surrounding towns also felt the bonanza, with race-time housing in demand for a hundred miles in every direction. One seaside resort—Myrtle Beach some 75 miles away—once closed its season on Labor Day but now remains open to a sellout crowd of racing fans.

The establishment of a youth activity fund by the Darlington Police Department did much to win support of those people who did not share in the excitement and profit of the racing program.

The youth activity fund was established by the police department in an attempt to curb juvenile delinquency in Darlington County. The Raceway underwrote the activity by establishing the first Miss Southern 500 beauty pageant on Saturday prior to the Monday Southern 500. All pageant proceeds go to the youth fund. The pageant, now 11 years old, has drawn 20,000 spectators plus stars of stage and screen. A Lake Darpo (Darlington police department) project has been established complete with buildings, fishing, swimming, boating, hiking, camping and other facilities for underprivileged children. The Youth Activity Fund also has provided school buses, equipment for athletes and schoolboy patrols, and an annual trip for school patrol boys to such places of interest as Washington, D.C., Cape Kennedy, Daytona Beach and Silver Springs. Recently the chief juvenile officer of the South Carolina State Police, asked to speak in Darlington, replied:

> Why? You don't need me. Darlington County has the lowest rate of juvenile delinquency in the State.

Another highly worthwhile development is "Southern Festival Week," which starts on Wednesday—the first day of time trials for the Southern 500—and continues until the morning of the race.

Originated in 1953, the Southern Festival includes parties, costume balls, and a gigantic parade in downtown Darlington on Saturday morning. The parade is one of the most unusual in the world; in addition to the usual clowns and bands, it features floats depicting such local activities as an actual tobacco auction.

Managed by the junior chamber of commerce and underwritten by the city council, the race-weekend program provides a bonanza for Darlington merchants and entertainment for entire families. Many out-of-State families now plan their vacations around the Southern Festival. For the men there are the racing and time trials; for the women, parties and the pageant; for the children, primarily the parade. State police estimate that 125,000 persons take part in the week-long activity—not counting the race.

Darlington Raceway and the Southern 500 also serve the interests of highway safety in many ways. The asphalt surface of the race course is used for surface experiments, and a spring-type steel guard railing pioneered at Darlington and proved in 14 years of racing, today is used on highways throughout the country.

Speaking of highways, I read with great interest the article, "The Case for Fast Drivers," appearing in the September issue of Harper's magazine. The article said:

> Over 85 percent of all U.S. traffic accidents are caused by factors other than high speed. More than half of the fatal auto accidents in the United States happen at speeds below 40 miles per hour. If no one in the country drove over 50 miles per hour last year, 60 percent of all fatalities would still have occurred.
>
> The greater a car's horsepower, the less likely it is to become involved in an accident. Statistics prove that there is a direct relationship at every level between higher horsepower and fewer accidents.

Seat belts, harnesses, safety door latches and reinforced hubs, plus an indoctrination test for new drivers, have helped produce a record of safety at Darlington that has brought praise from the State highway police. Since the start of the Southern 500, competitive drivers have registered 307,396 miles of high-speed racing with a single fatality and but one accident in which a driver was hurt seriously enough to stay overnight in a hospital. Few highways can boast as good a record.

Since Darlington opened in 1950, new and larger auto raceways have been developed elsewhere in the South, including Daytona Beach, Charlotte, and Atlanta. Darlington's management, welcoming these additions on the theory that each new speedway would create new fans, set up a program of aid and assistance.

In summary, I repeat that well-run competitive performance events not only provide an effective means of developing better, safer, and more durable cars, but help strengthen the economy, morale and social structure of the communities and areas they serve.

Mr. Speaker, I get very tired of seeing some well-known foreign made automobiles in many of the world's well-known races move in ahead of American entries because of an alleged agreement among the Big Three manufacturers of this country not to give official blessing to racing car construction.

Our manufacturers have the greatest know-how, ample financing and every reason to develop the best racer on earth. It is not sinful for the fastest automobile in the world to bear the label "Made in the United States of America."

Mr. Speaker, I enclose an article from Harper's magazine of September 1963, entitled, "The Case for Fast Drivers," by Robert L. Schwartz:

THE CASE FOR FAST DRIVERS

(By Robert L. Schwartz)

(Robert L. Schwartz has written for most major American magazines. As an entrepreneur he built and operated the Japanese-designed Motel on the Mountain at Suffern, N.Y.; as a motorist, he has a license free of speeding arrests)

Contrary to common belief, they are not the worst menace on the road * * * low speed limits don't really reduce accidents * * * and safe-driving campaigns may actually make our highways more dangerous.

More than a clutch of my fellow Americans seem seized with the notion that we live at the mercy of maniacal speed demons who are making death traps of our highway system.

The myth about the "dangerous high-speed driver" is almost a perfect example of a mass search for a scapegoat: there must be someone at fault in the complicated, depressing highway-accident situation—sure enough it's the high-speed driver. A substantial sets of facts supports the myth. The facts, all completely wrong, usually go like this: (1) Auto deaths are increasing at a tremendous rate; (2) the resulting highway carnage is practically a national disgrace; (3) the chief cause is high-speed driving; (4) the horsepower race—the reckless insistence of automobile manufacturers on building cars with more and more powerful engines—is a major supporting cause; (5) a hard core of fast drivers is particularly dangerous; (6) constant safety campaigns to increase public awareness of danger are important; (7) the real solution, however, is lower speed limits.

These truths are all false. The actual facts are these.

Auto deaths are not increasing. In absolute terms, the annual death toll has not only risen but fallen several times during the past three decades. Its highs were 39,969 in 1941 and 40,900 in 1962; its low, 23,823 in 1943. And in relative terms, the toll has decreased markedly. Although more Americans drive more every year, the rate of deaths per mile driven has been cut by better than two-thirds over the past 30 years—from a high of 16.7 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles in 1934 to a current 5.3 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles. Traffic deaths once accounted for 3 percent of all U.S. fatalities; they are now less than 2 percent.

The annual death toll from highway accidents in the United States is lower than the death toll from pneumonia. This is not carnage.

Over 85 percent of all U.S. traffic accidents are caused by factors others than high speed. More than half of the fatal auto accidents in the United States happen at speeds below 40 miles per hour. If no one in the country drove over 50 miles per hour last year, 60 percent of all fatalities would still have occurred.

The greater a car's horsepower, the less likely it is to become involved in an accident. Statistics prove that there is a direct relationship at every level between higher horsepower and fewer accidents.

There are practically no high-speed drivers as a constant group; a man's own driving speeds vary more from hour to hour or from day to day than they do from those of other motorists. A man killed at 40 miles per hour today on a rural highway was going 65 miles per hour yesterday—and he was safer then by 300 percent.

Safety campaigns are more than a bore. They're a menace. By scaring the timid and by emotionalizing danger, they only add another disturbing ingredient to the highway problem.

Finally, and perhaps most surprising, there is evidence that lowering speed limits tends to induce accidents, while raising the limits prevents them.

These disclosures make a mockery of most of the Nation's speed laws, speed limits, and speed enforcement, under which some 3 million Americans were arrested for speeding last year. Local traffic cops, safety officials, and police-court judges may, indeed, be causing more automobile fatalities than they prevent.

Most of this information comes from a survey submitted to Congress in February 1959 by the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce. Called "The Federal Role in Highway Safety," it reports on a massive study of rural driving authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956—the same law that provided for the huge Interstate Highway System now under construction. The survey, the most comprehensive of its kind ever made, covered 600 miles of highway in 11 States and included roadside interviews with no fewer than 290,000 drivers. It amassed statistics on 3.7 billion miles of travel and on accidents involving 10,000 vehicles. It took 3 years to complete, and when it was finished there was so much data that conclusions had to be obtained by feeding the figures into a high-speed computer.

Its findings have subsequently been supported by independent studies conducted by several States—a few of which have quietly changed their speed laws as a result.[1] Nevertheless the report has been widely overlooked by traffic officials and entirely ignored by the public at large, possibly because the most dramatic conclusions were buried deep in an otherwise unremarkable Government pamphlet.

Statistically the study is beyond reproach. Indeed, it is the only study to have measured the percentages of motorists traveling at different speeds, so that it is possible to reach conclusions like this one: A motorist driving at 65 miles per hour on a main rural highway will go almost three times as far before a fatality (22 million miles) as a man going 35 miles per hour (8 million miles). In other words, more people aren't killed at 35 miles per hour because more are driving at 35 miles per hour; more are killed because 35 is a less safe speed on a main rural highway than 65, mile by mile.

The logic to this seeming paradox is simple: a sustained high-speed traffic flow is far safer than a shifting current of fast- and slow-moving vehicles. It is best to set and maintain a speed limit which acknowledges the desire of most motorists to get where they're going within an increasingly shorter time.

LET FAST DRIVERS RULE

What would happen if the speed limits on all U.S. main rural highways were lowered to 40 m.p.h.? By hypothetically projecting the available data, we come up with a national death toll from auto accidents of 90,000—well over double the present figure. Grim support for such an estimate comes from the Pennsylvania Turnpike statistics: when a 1942 Presidential directive reduced turnpike speeds from 70 to 35, in order to save wartime gas and tires, the turnpike death toll shot up to its highest accident and fatality level—before or since.

Raising rural speed limits to 70, on the other hand, would probably cut the national death toll by as much as 5,000. In the New York City area today, the high-speed Garden State Parkway (60 m.p.h., casually enforced) has less than half as many fatalities, mile for mile, as the less crowded, nearby Palisades Interstate Parkway (45 m.p.h., rigidly enforced).

Tickets, under our present system, usually go to the safest drivers. As State surveys have repeatedly shown, the fast drivers are the ones who tend to go at safe speeds, regardless of the rules. Sensibly, many States have taken this lesson to heart and begun to let the drivers themselves determine speed limits. Assuming that, though most motorists ignore unreasonable curbs, they still have a strong, sane interest in their own survival, officials of these States set the maximum speed being used by 85 percent of motorists as the limit. Most drivers respond to such adult treatment by slightly lowering their previous speed.

Where Illinois officials did a statewide test of this theory in 45 low-speed-limit areas, the obedience rate rose by 119 percent, the average speed declined from 42.6 to 42.4 m.p.h., and accidents declined 36 percent from 62 a year to 40.

Results in Utah were much the same. On a two-lane highway west of Salt Lake City, the 85 percentile figure indicated a proper limit of 60, not the posted 40, which was being ignored by 95 percent of motorists. Despite a huge public outcry because school buses were loaded in one section of the area and because the accident rate was already high, the authorities pressed ahead. What happened? Though speed limits had been raised 20 m.p.h., the average speed through the area was reduced, legal limits were observed by 95 percent of motorists instead of 5 percent, and accidents declined in 1 year from 10 to 3 on this highway.

Similarly, when the Nebraska Highway Department raised the speed limits on Highway U.S. 30 as it went through 28 Nebraska villages and towns, the accident rate fell 34 percent.

In Oregon and in Virginia, merely the observance of speed limits was tested. The finding: in every one of nearly 1,000 cases where speed limits were raised, traffic speeds declined.

These findings fly in the face of all previous logic about speed, speed limits, and accidents. Perhaps it will pay to look at the earlier logic in action. Which brings us to Safe Driving Day. This long-planned, widely heralded effort occurred on December 1, 1955. Sponsored by a Presidential committee with over 200 cooperating national organizations, it was the Nation's most massive attempt at an emotional approach to traffic safety. Unfortunately, the death toll climbed 10 percent on Safe Driving Day. Since a prior dry run also increased the traffic toll, and the final performance confirmed it, the plan has been abandoned.

Another emotional effort for safety was a 1960 1-hour CBS television documentary called "The Great Holiday Massacre," narrated by Edward R. Murrow. Though thoughtfully done, the show featured screaming sirens, injured children, sheet-covered victims, and other emotion-loaded scenes. A subsequent audience poll by the National Safety Council found that the number of people who felt personally invoved in the auto-accident probem had declined by 50 percent; most viewers could not personally identify with the gore, and instead transferred their feelings of involvement to certain bad drivers featured on the show.

Emotional approaches to traffic safety, accompanied by our fixation with speed, have done still more serious damage by drying up any interest, and any funds, for a truly scientific study of auto accidents. As a result, practically nothing is known about them. Postaccident investigation is almost nonexistent. The police do little more than see that victims are sent to morgue or hospital and wreckage is cleared from the highway. Detailed mechanical, engineering, medical, and phychological studies are not attempted. The simplest report for a policeman to make is "Driving too fast," and, being human, he usually makes it.

---

[1] Among the more enlightened traffic experts and highway officials who have urged changes as a result of the study, often after confirming State studies of their own: Wilbur S. Smith, Connecticut; J. Edward Johnston, Utah; J. C. Womack, California; J. E. P. Darrell, Minnesota; Martin E. Bruening, Wisconsin; J. P. Mills, Jr., Virginia; Burton W. Marsh, AAA; John E. Baerwald, University of Illinois; Harold L. Michael, Purdue.

In court, most motorists charged with speeding are understandably readier to plead guilty and leave than to plead not guilty and extend the proceedings. Thus the traffic court doesn't act as a corrective or a teaching influence either. What it does do is bring in money. Since contemporary folklore regards the arrest of speeders as almost noble, and since it is clearly profitable, there is a subtle pressure to keep low speed limits for their income potential—which is enormous. In 1951, for example, 47,000 summonses issued to speeders on the New York City parkway system brought in almost half a million dollars in fines.

IS LIFE WORTH $5?

The saddest and heaviest loss caused by the traffic myths is in research. Quite possibly, more money has been spent on scientific study of any one major air crash than has been spent on the serious study of all of several million typical auto accidents. An average of $100,000 per victim goes into air crash research. An average of less than $5 per victim goes for auto fatalities. The difference in quality of the research is even greater than the difference in dollars.

Private and Government studies continually lead to changes in airline procedures, techniques, and equipment (the Boeing 707 and the Douglas DC-8 have each had over 250 design modifications for increased safety—and more will come). But a typical auto safety effort usually leads absolutely nowhere. In 1960, for instance, the coveted Alfred P. Sloan Radio and TV Award for distinguished public service in highway safety was given to radio station WCCC in Hartford, Conn. What did the station do? It gave schoolteachers 3,000 apples, each with a cellophane wrapper plugging safety—and also plugging radio station WCCC.

The incredible truth of the matter is that there is not one single study of the causes of the typical automobile accident, despite the millions of dollars spent for promoting highway safety. (Useful work done at Cornell, Minnesota, and the University of California, Los Angeles, is excluded since it deals with impact, seat belts, and other factors affecting survival after an accident. It does not attempt to study the cause of the accident. Hardly anybody does.)

The only serious study worthy of respect is one now underway at the Harvard Medical School, under a grant from the U.S. Public Health Service, and this study, as massive, complex, and thoughtful as it is, deals only with a fraction of highway accidents: those which are fatal. One of the earliest things learned by the Harvard group was that the fatal accident is a wholly different breed of animal from the nonfatal accident. Thus the typical or nonfatal accident is still unstudied and uncharted.

Researchers at Harvard investigate fatal auto accidents in the same painstaking detail as is used after air crashes. A team of scientists from many fields pores over the accident site, examining and recording everything. A mechanical and engineering group studies the wrecked cars, the highway, the collision course. An automotive engineer looks for possible auto malfunctioning prior to the crash. Another group of scientists studies the victims involved. This group includes a pathologist, chemist, technician, sociologist, internist, psychiatrist, ophthalmologist, optometrist, statistician, clergyman, and attorney. They examine survivors, witnesses, and others knowing the past history of the principals in the accident. In most cases, they do an autopsy on dead drivers to study (a) possible death or physical impairment prior to accident, (b) influence of alcohol, medication, or drugs, if any, and (c) actual cause of death.

Granted funds to study accidents in depth over a 5-year period, the group has examined over 200 fatal accidents so far. No overall results are yet available, but the fractional returns are interesting and enlightening.

DEADLY SIMPLE SLIPUPS

Among the first things that become clear about fatal accidents was that generally accepted "causes" won't stand up. For instance, the three most widely believed accident causes are speed, traffic violations, and lack of courtesy. These turned out to be without significance.

What does produce accidents? The answer is very simple—and very complex. Fatal accidents are caused by small things, simple, everyday human or mechanical or highway failures. But they always team up. A list of the causes of any hundred fatal accidents would run over 200 items.

Let us take one of the fatal accidents studied by the Harvard group. On the police records, the cause was "speeding," and there was a belief that intoxicants were a factor. The case was thus ended for police purposes.

There were actually four causes of the fatalities. Here, with names and locale changed, is what happened:

At 2 p.m. of a clear October afternoon, Miss Jane Smith and Miss Mabel Jones were returning to Boston from a trip to Gloucester. As they came over the crest of a hill on Route 128, they were in the left (high-speed) lane but were actually within the speed limit (50 m.p.h.). At this moment (cause No. 1) the right front tire of Miss Smith's car lost all its air. This was not a blowout; this was a maintenance failure. Some weeks earlier, Miss Smith's practically new tubeless tire had been cut by a rock and had gone slowly flat. The gas station man fixed it by pouring some rubber-like glop over the inside of the scar. But the cut sawed back and forth on itself, and finally sawed through the repair compound. (The tire should have been thrown away. Did Miss Smith insist on repair instead of replacement? Did the garageman recommend repair as adequate? Or did he tell her he'd replace her tire when he'd only fixed it? No one knows.)

At this point, Miss Smith was not in real trouble. At her speed and with the low density of traffic around her, she should have had no difficulty taking her car slowly off the road and gently braking to a stop. But Miss Smith (cause No. 2) had inadequate driving skills for this situation. She promptly turned a minor problem into a major crisis. She vigorously grabbed the wheel to straighten the wobbly course of her car, and she slammed on the brakes. A straight-line panic stop with a flat tire is virtually impossible. Miss Smith's car swerved way to the right and went up on the wide, grassy berm alongside the road. Happy day. Miss Smith was now safely out of traffic, pointed in the right direction, and had one-half mile of grass paralleling the road in which to roll gently to a stop with moderate periodic braking. But Miss Smith didn't know about stopping gently with a blowout. She kept her brakes on hard. And now she was on grass. Her car swung back left and headed across her side of the highway toward the dividing grassy mall in the center.

At this point, no one still need have died. But cause No. 3 was looming ahead. The mall was too narrow and had no guardrail to separate opposing traffic. If (cause No. 3) inadequate highway environment had not been a factor, Miss Smith might have bounced along a retaining barrier and come to a noisy, fender-bending halt, hurt but still alive. (Divider barriers on roads with center malls drastically reduce fatalities by preventing head-on collisions.)

But by now, (1) bad maintenance (2) inadequate driving skills, and (3) inadequate highway environment had already gone a long way toward causing a fatal accident. At this point, one and possibly two persons were apparently doomed to death, but cause No. 4 was still to take an additional life.

Miss Smith went across the mall and into the path of a car being driven by David Brown, returning from the beach with his family of four. Brown was in the fast lane and was going approximately 50 m.p.h. Miss Smith, her speed now down to, say, 40, smashed at an angle right into the middle of the front bumper of Brown's car.

A head-on collision is always serious because of the combined speeds of the two cars, in this case, approximately 90 m.p.h. What happened was predictable—though little understood and quite startling. Both cars hit each other four times. In an action much like the bouncing ping-g-g-g when a hammer strikes an anvil, the two cars impacted again and again and again, with such force that one bolt of the Smith car made four distinct, close-together dents in the bumper of the other car. (Passengers are also subject to this injury-producing series of impacts.) In the instant that this was happening, the rears of both cars rose high in the air. An impacting car, whether it hits a tree, a wall, or another car, always goes down in the front and way up in the rear. This action flipped Miss Smith and Miss Jones right through the windshield of their car and sent Miss Jones completely over the Browns' car and into the windshield of a third car, trailing behind Brown. This windshield did not break, but splintered, and the driver, braking hard but without success, smashed under the raised rear end of the Browns' car, still off the ground from impact. So quickly did all this occur that Miss Jones was dead against the windshield of the third car before Brown's car had even settled to the ground.

When the noise and dust had settled, Miss Smith and Miss Jones were dead, Brown, the driver of the second car, was mortally injured (he would die 29 days later while apparently recovering), and all six other passengers were injured.

One safety device almost saved Brown; another saved the driver of the third car. Brown would have died instantly but for the deep-dish steering wheel (a product of Cornell research) which cushioned his impact against the steering column. The driver of the third car would have been killed by the arrival of Miss Jones through his windshield if it had not been safety glass of high-strength modern construction. As it was, no one—neither police nor survivors—would believe that Miss Jones had actually hit that windshield until the Harvard researchers showed lab tests proving the hair on it was hers. The police also (a) would not believe Miss Smith wasn't speeding, (b) would not accept the wobbly brake marks as indicating she had had a flat tire prior to impact, (c) were indifferent to the cut-and-repaired tire as additional evidence, and (d) preferred to ignore an autopsy report showing no alcohol in Miss Smith's blood. Instead, they accepted the "direct evidence" of their observation that Miss Smith was found with beer cans all around her. No one was interested in the Harvard lab report showing that Miss Smith's body finally came to rest among some half-rusted beer cans that had been on the mall for at least 1 month.

Miss Jones and Mr. Brown would be alive today if there had not been (cause No. 4) lack of restraining devices. If all persons involved had been wearing seat belts, two of three deaths would have been prevented and more than half the injuries. This confirmed a typical Harvard finding: the group has never investigated a multiple-death accident without finding that at least half the deaths could have been prevented with seat belts. Yet only a small minority of Americans wear them.

KEEP IT MOVING

Thus, like most of the accidents studied at Harvard, this one had not one cause, but many. None of them was high speed. It rarely is—and Americans are going to have to dismiss the comfortable, but inadequate, myth that speeders and reckless madmen are the principal cause of accidents.

Indeed, the high-speed myth, though still given credence by local police and magistrates (for whom it is a significant source of power and income) is given little importance by sophisticated thinkers about the problem.

Listen to Howard Pyle, president, National Safety Council: "Speed by itself decidedly has been overemphasized as a major cause of traffic deaths."

And to Russell E. Singer, executive vice president of the AAA: "Purely routine speed-checking is futile and wasteful of enforcement officers' time. It clogs the courts on matters that have a minimum relation to real traffic safety."

And to J. E. Johnston, traffic safety engineer (addressing the Institute of Traffic Engineers): "Publicity * * * for the past 30 years has all been aimed at speed as being the major cause of accidents, when nothing could be further from the truth."

Or to John D. Williams, head of the mathematics division of the Rand Corp. (the Air Force "think factory" where both civilian and military problems are pondered by civilian eggheads): "The physical and social structure of the country would be almost frozen in its present attitude were we to freeze the speed of the automobile. Speed is one of the really crucial factors in our society. I cannot help but believe that we would manage better if we were conscious of the need for more speed, rather than believing the exact contrary. Our laws tend to be aimed at the limitation of speed rather than at the promotion of traffic flow. If one recognizes that the central problem is to promote the smooth and rapid flow of lots of traffic, one is likely to devise measures that will in fact operate in this direction—and it will probably have reasonable safety.

"The motto of everyone concerned with traffic should be 'Keep It Moving.' The odds are that no matter what one does to that end, something good will come of it. The odds are that whatever one does that is contrary to the motto will have a detrimental effect."

America produces jet aircraft, space missiles, and over 60 percent of the world's automobiles. It is about time we produced—dispassionately and scientifically—some useful information about vehicular traffic accidents. Outmoded myths about speed can lead us nowhere.

Communist Expansion Since 1917

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the Library of Congress has assisted me in preparing a chart showing Communist expansion since 1917 in various countries of the world. The chart is concise and sets forth some startling figures which I believe will be of interest and value to all of my colleagues. I earnestly urge that everyone take just a few minutes to review the following information.

The chart follows:

Communist expansion since 1917

Date [1]	Country	At time of communization [2]		Mid-1963 [5]		Area in square miles (1963) [6]
		Population [3]	Percent of world total [4]	Population	Percent of world total	
Nov. 7, 1917	U.S.S.R.	[7] 182,182,000	10.1	224,700,000	7.1	8,603,000
Nov. 26, 1924	Mongolia	647,000	.03	1,000,000	.03	614,000
Aug. 3, 1940	Lithuania	[8] 2,879,000	.12	(9)	(9)	(9)
Aug. 5, 1940	Latvia	[10] 1,950,000	.10	(9)	(9)	(9)
Aug. 6, 1940	Estonia	[11] 1,126,000	.05	(9)	(9)	(9)
Nov. 29, 1945	Yugoslavia	15,600,000	.64	19,000,000	.60	99,000
Jan. 10, 1946	Albania	1,125,000	.04	1,800,000	.06	11,000
Sept. 15, 1946	Bulgaria	6,993,000	.30	8,100,000	.25	43,000
Dec. 30, 1947	Rumania	16,530,000	.70	18,900,000	.60	92,000
June 9, 1948	Czechoslovakia	12,339,000	.50	14,000,000	.44	49,000
Sept. 12, 1948	Korea (Democratic People's Republic).	9,291,000	.37	8,900,000	.30	48,000
Aug. 20, 1949	Hungary	9,247,000	.36	10,100,000	.31	36,000
Sept. 21, 1949	China (People's Republic)	463,493,000	18.47	730,800,000	23.00	3,897,000
Oct. 7, 1949	Germany (Democratic Republic)	17,688,000	.70	17,200,000	.54	42,000
Apr. 19, 1950	Poland	24,977,000	1.00	30,800,000	1.00	120,000
Dec. 29, 1954	Vietnam (Democratic Republic)	16,632,000	.60	17,000,000	.53	63,000
Dec. 2, 1961	Cuba	6,933,000	.22	7,200,000	.23	44,000
Total				1,109,500,000	34.99	[12] 13,761,000

---

[1] Date given is that on which the country declared itself a People's Republic, was incorporated into the U.S.S.R (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania) or, as in the case of Cuba, when Castro announced he would lead Cuba "to a people's democracy." East Germany excludes Berlin in all columns.

[2] Because it is extremely difficult to obtain reliable demographic data for the years prior to 1955, most of the population statistics has been synthesized from the following sources: "Statesman's Yearbook," 1917, 1940, 1941; "U.N. Demographic Yearbook," 1955, 7th issue, table 3, pp. 117-127; "U.N. Demographic Yearbook," 1962, 14th issue, "World Summary," p. 124.

[3] In most cases the population given is quite close to the date of communization. In certain cases, however, the data available was several years distant from the date of communization.

[4] The availability of world total population upon which the percentages must be based is even more difficult to obtain. The following world figures taken from U.N. sources were used: 1920, 1,811,000,000; 1930, 2,015,000,000; 1940, 2,249,000,000; 1945, 2,423,000,000; 1950, 2,509,000,000; 1955, 2,750,000,000; 1960, 3,008,000,000; 1961, 3,069,000,000.

[5] "World Population, 1963," Population Bulletin, vol. XIX, No. 6, October 1963. (Percentage for 1963 based on world total of 3,180,000,000 persons.)

[6] Total world area, excluding Antarctica: 52,409,000 square miles. Communist nations constitute 26.25 percent of this figure.

[7] 1915.

[8] 1939.

[9] Presently included in all U.S.S.R. statistics.

[10] 1935.

[11] 1934.

[12] 26.25 percent.

The Democrats' Free Trade Policies Have Finally Brought the Income of a Great Segment of Our Farmers to a Point of No Return

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, our constant tariff reductions on meats, especially on beef, have finally driven the price of cattle down to the lowest level during the past 6 years to a point of no return.

While we adhere strictly to our reciprocal trade treaties with all nations, we permit many nations to place strict embargoes against our exports to them, without placing like limits on their destructive imports to us, not only on meat imports but also on hundreds of other commodities—which has driven many American industries to the wall and is now doing the same thing to our meat-producing farmers.

To ad insult to injury, as far back as 1951, Mike DiSalle, President Truman's dictator of price controls, arbitrarily rolled back the price of cattle 10 percent, and from that day to this Midwest farm income has been on the toboggan. Look at the records.

Republican members of the House Agriculture Committee, headed by Congressman CHARLES HOEVEN, of Iowa, have introduced bills to raise tariffs on meat imports, and to limit such imports, but such bills have never seen the light of day out of committee by the refusal of the Democrat-controlled House Agriculture Committee to report such bills to the floor of the House for a vote.

The last of such bills was introduced on November 18 last, by Congressman ROBERT DOLE, of Kansas, a member of the House Agriculture Committee, who on December 14 made a lengthy statement to the House of Representatives in which he explained the problem of our beef producers. In his statement Mr. DOLE did, however, point out that the administration does protect certain of our industries. He said that just last week our Government raised the tariff on brandy from $1.25 to $5 per gallon. I am sure that will be great news to our cattlemen.

Now, in the hope that President Johnson, whose home is in the great cattle-producing State of Texas, and himself a cattleman, will help see to it that our U.S. meat producers' interests are protected, we sent him the following letter on December 14 last past:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1963.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned, strongly urge you to chart an immediate program to alleviate the desperate situation now faced by American livestock producers as a result of (1) rapidly increasing imports from foreign sources, particularly of beef, veal, lamb and lamb products; (2) failure of the United States to change to an ad valorem basis; and (3) the fact that the United States is among the most liberal in the world in its agricultural import policies. The United States and Canada are the only two major countries which provide no nontariff protection for domestic producers of livestock.

To stress the importance and the urgency of taking prompt, corrective action, we need only point out to you, Mr. President, that almost one-third of all cash receipts from farming come from the sale of meat animals. Naturally, when you consider that the price of beef dropped from $30 per hundredweight to $22 per hundredweight in the period of a few months, it is evident that the problem of the domestic livestock producer has approached serious proportions, particularly in view of the fact that 1962 red meat imports increased 39 percent over 1961.

The 1964 Outlook Issue, Demand and Price Situation, published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture on November 18, 1963, stated as follows: "Red meat consumption will reach 170 pounds per person in 1963, 6 pounds more than in 1962. U.S. base consumption this year will set a record high of about 95 pounds per person, up from 89 pounds per person last year." It seems completely incongruous that this strengthened demand for meat products is being accomplished in the face of the decline of the American livestock industry. We think that when you stop to consider that more than 1 pound out of 10 pounds of meat going on American tables today is being produced abroad, that the reason for the depressed condition of the livestock industry is clear.

Fresh beef imports increased from 414 million pounds in 1960 to 863 million pounds in 1962. Livestock cattle imports increased from 645,000 head in 1960 to 1,230,000 head in 1962.

Mr. President, we feel that when these facts are associated with the fact that Choice fed cattle are bringing approximately 25 percent less than they did a year ago in the livestock markets of the Middle West, that there is a clear connection.

We would be most happy for an opportunity to sit down with you and present still further facts and figures to completely document the case which we seek to make for immediate executive action. We do not seek to halt all livestock imports, but we do feel that it is imperative that quotas on either a voluntary or involuntary basis be established at once until conditions in the industry can be stabilized and the present ruinous trend of downward prices can be halted. We, of the Congress, then pledge ourselves to work for those legislative solutions that properly lie within the domain of this branch of Government.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN B. ANDERSON, Illinois; BOB DOLE, Kansas; WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, Wyoming; WILLIAM G. BRAY, Indiana; H. R. GROSS, Iowa; AUGUST JOHANSEN, Michigan; ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY, Illinois; CARLETON J. KING, New York; VERNON W. THOMSON, Wisconsin; DAVE MARTIN, Nebraska; CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa; GARNER E. SHRIVER, Kansas; JOHN J. RHODES, Arizona; MARK ANDREWS, North Dakota; RALPH F. BEERMANN, Nebraska; DURWARD G. HALL, Missouri; E. Y. BERRY, South Dakota; CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, Maine; JOHN W. KYL, Iowa; E. ROSS ADAIR, Indiana; CHARLES A. MOSHER, Ohio; FRANK T. BOW, Ohio; DON L. SHORT, North Dakota; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa; DONALD G. BROTZMAN, Colorado.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1963

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 18, 1963)

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore, Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

Rev. Frank H. VanDyck, Jr., D.D., pastor, Trinity Methodist Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who madest heaven and earth and sea and all that is in them, we thank Thee that Thou hast created us for days like these. Dwell here a moment now, that we may dwell with Thee.

Keep us from the fears that breed arrogance, and from the type of insecurity that nurtures greed. May we not be satisfied with getting by, nor given to a complacency which presses no demands upon us. Let not our desire to be approved by men precede our will to be approved by Thee.

At this season of the year, when Christmas comes, we rejoice in the revelation of Thyself brought by the Child of Bethlehem. Let not our hearts be busy inns that have no room to receive Him. Give us grace to present to the King the gold of obedience, the incense of lowliness, and the myrrh of healing friendship.

In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. PASTORE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, December 18, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 189. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif., to the county of Kern, State of California;

H.R. 393. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.;

H.R. 1182. An act for the relief of Willy Sapuschnin;

H.R. 1355. An act for the relief of Stanislawa Ouellette;

H.R. 1384. An act for the relief of Areti Siozos Paidas;

H.R. 1392. An act for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.;

H.R. 1403. An act for the relief of Capital Transit Lines, Inc., of Salem, Oreg.;

H.R. 1451. An act for the relief of Frank Mramor;

H.R. 1520. An act for the relief of Jozefa Trzcinska Biskup and Ivanka Stalcer Vlahovic;

H.R. 1521. An act for the relief of Lovorko Lucic;

H.R. 1713. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1886. An act for the relief of Valeriano T. Ebreo;

H.R. 2818. An act for the relief of Elmer J. and Richard R. Payne;

H.R. 4085. An act for the relief of Tibor Horcsik;

H.R. 4284. An act for the relief of Chrysanthos Kyriakou;

H.R. 4682. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred T. Winfield;

H.R. 4732. An act to change the name of the U.S. Olympic Association to the U.S. Olympic Committee;

H.R. 5302. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the Newton area, California, to Clarence J. Wilder;

H.R. 5500. An act for the relief of Lt. John P. Mann;

H.R. 5584. An act for the relief of Capt. Ransom C. Aplin;

H.R. 5858. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America Local Union No. 746 pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 5941. An act for the relief of Julian A. Erskine;

H.R. 5982. An act for the relief of Pasquale Fiorica;

H.R. 6182. An act for the relief of Bryce A. Smith;

H.R. 6313. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Kuryj;

H.R. 6320. An act for the relief of Walter L. Mathews and others;

H.R. 6591. An act for the relief of Constantine Theothoropoulos;

H.R. 6876. An act for the relief of Capt. Wilfrid E. Gelinas, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 7248. An act to change the designated use of certain real property conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., under the terms of Public Law 86–194;

H.R. 7499. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey 0.25 acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif.;

H.R. 7508. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish jurisdiction and venue for appeals from orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission in judicial reference cases;

H.R. 7533. An act for the relief of Demetrios Dousopoulos;

H.R. 7788. An act for the relief of Jack B. Fisher;

H.R. 7967. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii;

H.R. 8085. An act for the relief of Roy W. Ficken;

H.R. 8171. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands, including farm units and improvements thereon, in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, and to continue to deliver water for 3 years to lands of said division, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8323. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. David A. Staver, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 8344. An act to amend the Railway Labor Act to provide that the terms of office of members of the National Mediation Board shall expire on July 1;

H.R. 8392. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Laborers' Pension Fund of Hudson County, N.J., as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 8459. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to allow Federal credit unions greater flexibility in their organization and operations;

H.R. 8465. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to organize and microfilm the papers of Presidents of the United States in the collections of the Library of Congress";

H.R. 8673. An act to amend title V of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the validity of an instrument the recording of which is provided for by such act shall be governed by the laws of the place in which such instrument is delivered, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8828. An act for the relief of John T. Cox;

H.R. 8849. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Nicholas A. Stathis, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 8930. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

H.R. 8931. An act for the relief of Maj. Victor R. Robinson, Jr., U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 8999. An act to provide for the settlement of claims of certain inhabitants of the United States living in the area inundated by the sudden floods of the Rio Grande as a result of the construction of the Falcon Dam, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9036. An act to amend the act of October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 634; 40 U.S.C. 193 (n)-(w)), as amended, relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus;

H.R. 9234. An act to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc.; and

H.R. 9334. An act to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 212. An act for the relief of Yoo Sei Chun;

S. 697. An act for the relief of Misako Moriya;

S. 966. An act for the relief of Yukio Iseri;

S. 1097. An act for the relief of Despina J. Sanios;

S. 1129. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Bollers and Earlene Bollers;

S. 1172. An act to amend Public Law 86-518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86-518;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of the Arizona Milling Co. of Phoenix, Ariz.;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Dr. Demetrios Flessas and Dr. Eugenia Flessas;

S. 1516. An act for the relief of Ana Murgelj;

S. 1570. An act for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock;

S. 1698. An act to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds;

S. 1756. An act to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under this act;

S. 1767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the State of Delaware, and for other purposes;

S. 2228. An act to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks;

S. 2275. An act to revise the procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act, Public Law 86-3, for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

S. 2364. An act to provide that the Commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress;

H.R. 1289. An act for the relief of Maria Mereghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina);

H.R. 2513. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2985. An act to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to venue generally;

H.R. 4062. An act to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcom Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande; and

H.R. 7044. An act to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 189. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif., to the county of Kern, State of California;

H.R. 393. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.;

H.R. 7248. An act to change the designated use of certain real property conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., under the terms of Public Law 86-194; and

H.R. 7499. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey 0.25 acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1182. An act for the relief of Willy Sapuschnin;

H.R. 1355. An act for the relief of Stanislawa Ouellette;

H.R. 1384. An act for the relief of Areti Siozos Paidas;

H.R. 1392. An act for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.;

H.R. 1403. An act for the relief of Capital Transit Lines, Inc., of Salem, Oreg.;

H.R. 1451. An act for the relief of Frank Mramor;

H.R. 1520. An act for the relief of Jozefa Trzcinska Biskup and Ivanka Stalcer Vlahovic;

H.R. 1521. An act for the relief of Lovorko Lucic;

H.R. 1886. An act for the relief of Valeriano T. Ebreo;

H.R. 2818. An act for the relief of Elmer J. and Richard R. Payne;

H.R. 4085. An act for the relief of Tibor Horcsik;

H.R. 4284. An act for the relief of Chrysanthos Kyriakou;

H.R. 4682. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred T. Winfield;

H.R. 4732. An act to change the name of the U.S. Olympic Association to the U.S. Olympic Committee;

H.R. 5500. An act for the relief of Lt. John P. Mann;

H.R. 5584. An act for the relief of Capt. Ransom C. Aplin;

H.R. 5858. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America Local Union No. 746 pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 5941. An act for the relief of Julian A. Erskine;

H.R. 5982. An act for the relief of Pasquale Fiorica;

H.R. 6182. An act for the relief of Bryce A. Smith;

H.R. 6313. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Kuryj;

H.R. 6320. An act for the relief of Walter L. Mathews and others;

H.R. 6591. An act for the relief of Constantine Theothoropoulos;

H.R. 6876. An act for the relief of Capt. Wilfrid E. Gelinas, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 7508. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish jurisdiction and venue for appeals from orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission in judicial reference cases;

H.R. 7533. An act for the relief of Demetrios Dousopoulos;

H.R. 7788. An act for the relief of Jack B. Fisher;

H.R. 7967. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii;

H.R. 8085. An act for the relief of Roy W. Ficken;

H.R. 8323. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. David A. Staver, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 8392. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Laborers' Pension Fund of Hudson County, N.J., as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 8828. An act for the relief of John T. Cox;

H.R. 8849. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Nicholas A. Stathis, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 8930. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

H.R. 8931. An act for the relief of Maj. Victor R. Robinson, Jr., U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 8999. An act to provide for the settlement of claims of certain inhabitants of the United States living in the area inundated by the sudden floods of the Rio Grande as a result of the construction of the Falcon Dam, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9234. An act to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1713. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5302. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the Newton area, California, to Clarence J. Wilder; and

H.R. 8171. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands, including farm units and improvements thereon, in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, and to continue to deliver water for 3 years to lands of said division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 8344. An act to amend the Railway Labor Act to provide that the terms of office of members of the National Mediation Board shall expire on July 1; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 8459. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to allow Federal credit unions greater flexibility in their organization and operations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8465. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to organize and microfilm the papers of Presidents of the United States in the collections of the Library of Congress."; and

H.R. 9036. An act to amend the act of October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 634; 40 U.S.C. 193 (n)-(w)), as amended, relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Smithsonian Institution and its constituent bureaus; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

H.R. 8673. An act to amend title V of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the validity of an instrument the recording of which is provided for by such act shall be governed by the laws of the place in which such instrument is delivered, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9334. An act to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers; to the Committee on Commerce.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 9499, the Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act of 1964, upon which there is limitation of debate and controlled time.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk.

I ask unanimous consent that before the amendment is read, I may yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR DIRKSEN, THE MINORITY LEADER

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the acting minority leader very much for yielding to me.

Mr. President, in this closing week of the 1st session of the 88th Congress, I wish to pay my respects to the very distinguished minority leader, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, for whom Members of the Senate have profound admiration and deep affection.

Republicans are most fortunate to have him as their leader in the Senate, not only because of his great wisdom, but also because of his truly amazing patience and kindness to everyone—and at times under the most trying of circumstances.

The American people are, indeed, fortunate to have EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN as the Senate minority leader, because time and again he has shown that he has no hesitancy to support the position of a Democratic President if he is convinced that position is right—that he has the political courage to go against the position of a majority of his own political party in doing so. He is proud to be a Republican; but he takes greater pride in being an American first, for he puts his country ahead of his political party.

He has an amazing ability to take the brickbats in stride and never to let them divert him from the course of principle to which he has dedicated himself. He has an admirable sensitivity to principle, but an equally admirable disdain for the pettiness of detractors that every public official has.

I salute EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN for the great American that he is.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the distinguished Senator from Maine yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to endorse every word the distinguished senior Senator from Maine has just stated about the distinguished minority leader.

Speaking as the majority leader, I could not have a better or more understanding or more tolerant partner than the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

I am delighted that on this occasion the senior Senator from Maine has seen fit to give due credit to this outstanding American, because on more than one occasion he has placed country ahead of party.

He has been the recipient of brickbats which were unjustified.

I look upon him as a great Senator and a great American, and I join wholeheartedly with the senior Senator from Maine in the comments she has made.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the majority leader.

Certainly the Senate and the American people are very fortunate in having the team composed of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to lead them in the right direction.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak before my amendment is read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized to speak in the time available on the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Maine has, this morning, voiced sentiments which will be echoed and reechoed by every Member of the Senate.

EVERETT DIRKSEN is a great American. It will be recalled that on many occasions, EVERETT DIRKSEN has stood on this floor and spoken with great vigor and eloquence as a great American, not as a partisan, in the interest of what he believed would best serve the people of the United States and the cause of freedom and liberty among the peoples of the world.

Furthermore, as a partisan he has given those of us on this side of the aisle distinguished and unique leadership.

I would be recreant in the performance of my duty if I did not rise to say that all Senators—both on the Republican side and on the other side of the aisle—concur, without exception, in the excellent and appropriate comments made this morning by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I wish to join in complimenting the distinguished senior Senator from Maine for her very appropriate tribute to the distinguished minority leader.

She said—and her statement was most significant—that EVERETT DIRKSEN is—before he is a Republican—a great American. Before, afterward, and always, he is a great American.

I remember that only a short time ago, when the Senate was debating the bond issue to sustain the United Nations in connection with the Congo situation, Senator DIRKSEN delivered an address in support of that measure. At that time, I said that I thought the speech he had delivered was one of the most brilliant speeches ever to be made on the floor of the Senate within my memory, and I have now been here for 13 years. I repeat my praise this morning. As a great American, Senator DIRKSEN pointed out the virtues of this great international organization. At that time he said—and his statement remains indelibly in my mind:

> God forbid that the United Nations ever be broken apart. If it ever is, how could it ever be put back together again?

Mr. President, I join in the statement of the distinguished Senator from Maine that before EVERETT DIRKSEN is a Republican, he is a great American.

He is a patriot before he is a partisan—he serves his country before and above any petty, any party, any personal concern.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment I have submitted be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from California will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, in line 10, it is proposed to strike out lines 10 through 18, as follows:

> SEC. 118. None of the funds made available by this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used for the financing, in whole or in part, of any project in any foreign country where

persons other than nationals of such country or citizens of the United States will be employed to perform any work in connection with such project, except when such nationals or citizens of the United States are not available and qualified to perform such work.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 118. None of the funds made available by this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used for the financing, in whole or in part, of any construction contract in any foreign country where persons other than nationals of such country or citizens of the United States will be employed to perform any work in connection with such contract, except when such nationals or citizens of the United States are not available and qualified to perform such work, or when the President finds that application of this provision would be contrary to the national interest.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield himself time?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes, Mr. President; I yield myself 4 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the proposed amendment is self-explanatory. It would be substituted for language which was offered in the committee and was adopted without objection.

The amendment is designed to assure increased use of American and local or indigenous labor of all types, skilled, unskilled, or professional, in carrying out construction projects financed with U.S. foreign aid funds. Where the United States is involved in financing a particular construction contract, this amendment is designed to promote and to encourage the hiring of U.S. citizens or nationals of the local country in carrying out the contract.

The amendment applies only to contracts financed by the United States. It will not interfere with contracts under multilateral arrangements under either economic or military programs when contributions by other countries are involved. The infrastructure of NATO is one such example. Nor will the amendment impair private U.S. borrowing in the use of our own funds. The language provides for a Presidential waiver in case the decision by the executive branch concerns itself with an exceptional situation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. An amendment was accepted which more or less touches the same subject. The proposed amendment is a modification which I believe would strengthen that amendment. The committee is willing to accept it and take it to conference.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out section 113, which appears on page 10, lines 9 to 13, as follows:

SEC. 113. Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act not more than $6,000,000 may be used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, in carrying out section 241 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

At this point, Mr. KEATING introduced Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 140) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to create the offices of Executive Vice President and Legislative Vice President.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING relating to the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading, following the vote on the pending bill.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wonder if the leadership could advise us as to whether the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has been notified that we are awaiting for him to present his amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would like to present his amendment after consideration of the money amendments is concluded.

Mr. MORSE. When the money amendments are disposed of?

Mr. PASTORE. If there are any such amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Very well. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "$380,000,000" and insert "$300,000,000."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield himself time?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment would cut the new funds for supporting assistance from $380 million, the full amount authorized, to $300 million, allowed by the House.

It must be remembered that both the House bill and the Senate committee version would permit the expenditure of $6 million of supporting assistance which was left over from last year. Hence, the committee bill really carries $386 million for this category of giveaway grant aid, whereas my amendment would allow $300 million.

The amendment deals with the problem of grant aid. It is in the field of grant aid that there were hundreds of millions of dollars wasted over the year. Many millions of dollars are now being wasted in this field. The Comptroller General of the United States, in report after report to the Congress, has warned the Congress that there is great inefficiency and waste in the field of grant aid.

In this field the Foreign Relations Committee has done absolutely nothing by way of a followthrough and a followup to try to bring an end to waste. It has passed the buck back to AID.

Mr. President, this cannot be denied. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is a member of the committee. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is a member of the committee. Both Senators are now in the Chamber. The Committee on Foreign Relations has had before us the Secretary of State; Mr. Bell, the AID Administrator; and the officials who have been administering this program. The Foreign Relations Committee has been highly critical of the waste and inefficiency in the grant-aid program, yet we end by passing the buck back to the administrators. We slap them on the wrists and we ask them, "Won't you please do something about it?"

Mr. President, they will not do anything about it until we cut the aid. They have no intention of doing anything about it. The Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Missouri know that when we had Mr. Rusk and Mr. Bell before us this year we pointed out report after report which showed the shocking waste in regard to the administrative practices of AID and the overmanning of AID.

Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have said—and the record will speak for itself—that they have been in various AID centers around the world, and they were of the opinion that there were about twice as many personnel as were needed, and that the waste in connection with personnel was leaving a bad impression.

This is the time to cut. If we leave them $300 million, and take into account what is in the pipeline, it will be more than sufficient.

I talked at breakfast this morning with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I wish he were now in the Chamber. Were he present, he would agree as to the truth of the report I now make. The Senator pointed out that in this bill what we are really doing is reappropriating some $200 million which has already gone back to the Treasury. Therefore, we are asked not only to add to the authorization as presented, but also to add another $200 million, says the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], who is a member of the Appropriations Committee. The Senator said at breakfast this morning:

> This bill is not what it appears to be. There is more to it than can be seen on the surface.

I suggest, by this amendment, that this one grant-aid program be cut back to $300 million. I suggest that it be made perfectly clear, by so doing, that we want some savings brought about in the program.

This is the kind of recommendation that the President of the United States ought to be making to the Congress and to the people, rather than the recommendations contained in what I consider to be his most unfortunate letter, which was read to the Senate yesterday. I happen to know that the President himself believes that the inefficiencies in the foreign aid program ought to be corrected.

I say to my President, "Now is the time for you to insist, before you ask for more money. Now is the time for you to say to Mr. Rusk and to Mr. Bell, 'Give me a report on the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States in regard to the wastes in the foreign aid program, and tell me what you are doing to correct this inefficiency and to save some money.' "

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time yielded to the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MORSE. The President should say, "Now is the time for you to correct this inefficiency and waste; and when you get the program cleaned up administratively, saving the great sums of money that the Comptroller General indictates could be saved, we can consider what the total amount of money should be for the next authorization program."

We must remember, Mr. President, that there are not many months left in this fiscal year. In a few more months the AID administrators will be before us with a new authorization bill. From the time standpoint, in my opinion, we cannot justify the huge amount of money that the Appropriations Committee is asking the Senate to provide.

With only a few months left, we ought to cut it back now, and let the AID program, through the Department of State and through Mr. Bell, clean up its own house, and come to us next year and ask for the amount of money that can be justified on the facts. All I seek to do by my amendment is to return to the House figure of $300 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amendment is directed at the supporting assistance funds. The Senator contemplates reducing the allocation as recommended by the committee from $380 million to $300 million.

Mr. MORSE. Which is the House figure; but AID will end with $306 million, as I have already stated, because $6 million remains unspent from last year, and that is added to the amount provided by the bill. So the amount will be $306 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is not this the sum that is used as a substitute by the recipient countries for the moneys which they spend in maintaining their military forces—that is, the Taiwanians——

Mr. MORSE. Which are bloated, puffed, and wasteful. The Senator mentioned Taiwan. There are more generals in the Taiwanian Army than in the entire U.S. Army. The program is wasteful.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is argued that this money should be granted because of that expenditure by the foreign governments.

Mr. MORSE. That is the excuse that has been given to us for a long time to justify waste in South Korea. The waste in the Military Establishment is shocking. Does the Senator believe it is very effective in defending freedom in the Pacific? Freedom is going to be defended, not by the Taiwanian Armies, and not by the South Korean Armies, but by the American 7th Fleet, the American Air Force, and the thousands of American boys scattered throughout the Pacific. Does the Senator know what the reports of the battle efficiency of the Taiwanian Army and the South Korean Army are? Most of the indigenous armies could not lick 10 Boy Scouts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. How much more time have I?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eight minutes. The Senator has used 7 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When the subject was discussed in connection with the authorization bill, I pointed out that to keep a military man in Taiwan costs $200 a year. In South Vietnam the cost was about $700. In Korea it was about $200. In this country it costs about $5,000 to keep a soldier——

Mr. MORSE. The fallacy in the Senator's argument, may I say most respectfully, is that he makes the assumption that the Taiwanian soldiers and the South Korean soldiers are very good.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is where we differ. I have received reports; and I have a recent report, that the military men in Korea or Taiwan measure up to the standard of practically any military men in any country.

Mr. MORSE. That is not true on the basis of the Pentagon's own reports. Their battle efficiency runs from 20 to 30 percent. Does the Senator call that efficient? A 20- or 30-percent battle efficiency is no good for defense.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I regret that I cannot agree.

Mr. MORSE. That is in the Pentagon reports.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In my judgment, to cut here would be to cut in a place where it is most unjustified. We had better avail ourselves of the advantage of having countries around the world maintaining men in their military establishments. They may not measure up to our standards, but to the extent that we reduce the number of those military men, we must call our own into service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 1 minute.

This is not true. This is the heart of the argument. The Senator from Ohio is not correct in the conclusion he reaches. He sincerely believes it, but he is in error. The Taiwanian Army, the South Korean Army—the so-called indigenous armies—are of little value in defending our interests in the Pacific. Our interests in the Pacific are defended by the 7th Fleet, the American air armada, and the American boys scattered throughout the Pacific.

We are using American taxpayers' dollars to support military establishments that are bloated and inefficient and wasteful in those countries—military establishments their own economies cannot possibly support even in peacetime. We should insist that they spend their money for economic rehabilitation and development of their own civilian economies, and that the waste of taxpayers' money in those countries be stopped.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 1 minute. We ought to insist that they reduce the size of their military establishments to a size a little nearer to what their economies will support. A further reason is the undeniable fact that they would be of no help to us in case of a war with Red Russia or Red China. We will not fight another conventional war in the Pacific; we will be fighting a nuclear war if we get into war. I would rather see those countries build dams and irrigation systems and their civilian economies; I would rather export to them bread, and not bullets.

This is a place where we can cut foreign aid and strengthen it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I allow myself 5 minutes. The argument just made goes to prove how silly we can be. Insofar as this item is concerned, the revised budget figure was $435 million. In the authorization bill the Senate cut it to $380 million. That action was concurred in by the House.

The Senator is arguing that, for some reason, the $300 million figure the House has decreed in the appropriation bill is a sacrosanct figure.

I point out that 75 percent of this money goes to four countries—Vietnam, Korea, the Congo, and Jordan.

Let me say to my friend from Oregon that the reason why we must give this kind of assistance is that if they do not maintain their own soldiers, the mothers of America will have to send American boys there.

I quite agree that if there is any waste, it must be eliminated; but, in Heaven's name, let us stop throwing out the baby with the bath water. If this program is wasteful, the $300 million decreed by the House is wasteful. Because the House has fixed a figure of $300 million and the Senate committee has fixed a figure of $380 million—and that matter was debated in connection with the authorization bill—that does not make the House right and the Senate wrong.

We have admonished and impressed upon this administration that it must be frugal and efficient, and that waste must be eliminated. The $380 million figure represents the elimination of the fat and the preservation of the muscle.

I think it would be a crying shame; I think it would be crippling and chaotic, if the figure were reduced to $300 million.

I hope the Senate will go along with the committee, which made a thorough investigation of the subject.

I hope that all the cliches, all the generalities, all the platitudes will not delude the Senate into thinking that the committee which was charged with this responsibility does not know what it is doing.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Standing here on the floor of the Senate and talking about cliches and platitudes and something being silly, and "throwing out the baby with the water" is a long way from presenting evidence in support of the generalities.

I have said for some years in the Foreign Relations Committee—and it has not been denied—that there is a great deal of waste in this category; but the Foreign Relations Committee, instead of doing something about it, after it had the evidence of the waste, merely told Mr. Rusk, Mr. Bell, and the Pentagon officials that they should do better, and do something about the waste in the program.

I say to the Senator from Rhode Island that it is admitted there is waste to the extent of many millions of dollars. What the Senator from Rhode Island is doing is exactly what the Foreign Relations Committee is doing—passing the buck for another year.

My proposal is to reduce the item by $80 million, and leave it at $300 million, the figure fixed by the House.

Of course, there is waste in the $300 million. However, we are in the position of saying what it is possible to save the American taxpayers, at the moment. The House is willing to go along with $300 million. The Senate ought at least to save the $80 million and go along with the House. As a result of this debate, I am sure the State Department, the Defense authorities, and those in the Pentagon will take a long, hard look before they come forth with their next authorization bill, and will eliminate a great deal of waste. The Senator spoke about the countries to which we are giving support. I say again that we are giving too much to South Korea, to South Vietnam, to Turkey, and to Jordan. That much money is not needed in order to maintain their armies. The amount ought to be cut back for them, as well as for the others who are receiving the other 25 percent of supporting assistance.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 1 more minute.

Some of those in their armies ought to be put to work in other kinds of programs, as we do in this country, in the development of natural resources.

We cannot justify taxing the American taxpayer to pay practically 100 percent of the cost of the Taiwanian military establishment. It is bloated. It is too big. We have gone into that subject in the Foreign Relations Committee. All the Senator from Oregon is asking is a saving of $80 million, to bring the figure down to the House figure.

I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time. I should like to have a yea-and-nay vote. First I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that enough Senators may be brought into the Chamber to second a request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield briefly on my time?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. I am perfectly willing to have a yea-and-nay vote, and to have the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum, without the time being charged to either side. The Senator from Ohio would like to speak briefly on the amendment. I would like to have him speak after the quorum call. If that is agreeable, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be not taken from the time on either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon and I are in disagreement concerning the significance of our allies around the world maintaining military forces. He contends that they are of no aid to our country. My view is that they are. The Department of Defense feels as I do; and so does the Department of State.

On November 13, when this subject was discussed in the Senate, I placed in the RECORD a tabulation of the cost of maintaining military personnel in our country, as compared with maintaining military men in the countries of our allies. The RECORD shows that for the United States to maintain one military man—that is, without equipment and all the other costs that are involved in keeping him equipped—in 1961 the cost was $4,015; in 1962, it was $3,948.

I shall give the 1962 figures, the last ones available.

In Belgium, it is $1,571; Denmark, $2,107; France, $1,906; Germany, $1,689; Italy, $878; Luxembourg, $1,486; The Netherlands, $771; Norway, $1,965; Portugal, $837. I shall not read the entire tabulation, but shall come down to the cost of maintaining military men in South Korea, Vietnam, and Taiwan.

I am sure that the greatest strength that we have in this field, provided by foreign countries, is available in Taiwan, Korea, and probably Turkey and Pakistan. The cost of maintaining a military man in Korea is $247; in Vietnam, $651; in Pakistan, $438.

I cite these figures to show the significance of allowing the amount of $380 million to stand. I have an idea of the number of military men available in South Korea, Taiwan, South Vietnam, Turkey, and Pakistan, but I cannot mention the numbers; they are classified. But if it were necessary for the United States to substitute our own boys for the military men provided by foreign countries, the cost would be, in my judgment, 20 times more than the cost of this program.

If cuts are to be made, they ought to be made in other fields, but not in this area. So far as my studies are concerned, if we eliminate this assistance program, and eliminate the military units of Taiwan, South Korea, South Vietnam, Turkey, Pakistan, and other countries, it will be necessary to enact a law to draft more American boys. It will be necessary to bring them into the military service by the millions. To do that would cost $4,000 a man instead of the $200 a man that it now costs to provide a military man in Taiwan and perhaps somewhat more in South Korea and South Vietnam.

In my judgment, this is not the place to make the cut. I urge Senators to vote against the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I associate myself with everything the distinguished Senator from Ohio has said. It would be tragic to cut the program at this point. I hope the Senate will vote to reject the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have included in the RECORD, by unanimous consent, a tabulation showing the comparative costs of maintaining military men in the various nations around the world? An examination of the record will show that it would be absolute folly to substitute our men for the men of the foreign nations who are willing to serve.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL PER CAPITA MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS

Cost estimates for countries receiving military assistance shown below are confined to pay, allowances, subsistence and individual clothing. They do not include operation and maintenance expenditures, as no meaningful comparisons could be made due to differing weapons systems and technologies.

For comparative purposes, figures are included for 1961. Principal reasons for changes, where available, are indicated. Changes are primarily due to either new exchange rates, increased pay and allowances, or the proportion of personel in the lower pay grades.

Cost to maintain a soldier

	1961	1962	Net change 1962 versus 1961	Remarks
United States	$4,014	$3,948	−$66	
Belgium	1,571	1,571		
Denmark	1,650	2,107	+457	Increase due mainly to higher pay and bonuses.
France	1,788	1,966	+178	Increase due to higher pay and allowances.
Germany	1,689	1,689		
Italy	960	878	−82	
Luxembourg	1,486	1,486		
Netherlands	832	771	−61	
Norway	1,706	1,985	+279	Increases in all services.
Portugal	435	837	+402	Increase due to higher pay and allowances.
Spain	466	522	+56	Do.
United Kingdom	2,332	2,495	+163	Increase due to higher pay and reduced numbers in lower grades.
Ethiopia	375	483	+108	Increase due to increase in number of students attending schools CONUS and promotions in higher ranks.
Greece	385	389	+4	
Iran	501	564	+63	Increase due to greater number of junior officers and increase in Government retirement contribution.
Libya		670		
Pakistan	437	438	+1	
Turkey	404	427	+23	Increase due to higher pay and allowances.
Korea	219	247	+28	Different exchange rate and small pay increases for noncommissioned officers.
Cambodia	829	842	+13	Increase due to promotions, longevity, and a slight strength increase.
Thailand	406	417	+9	
Vietnam	1,049	651	−398	Decrease due to more realistic exchange rate.
Republic of China	174	177	+3	
Philippines	742	527	+215	Decrease due to decontrol of peso.
Japan	818	850	+32	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield me 1 minute?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I commend the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Rhode Island for what they have just said. This is the last item we ought to consider eliminating in this field. If this part of the program were eliminated, our position would be very much impaired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand I have 1 minute remaining.

Who is talking about doing away with the programs? We are talking about reducing the cost from $380 million to $300 million. We would not be doing away with the program.

We are maintaining 600,000 Korean soldiers at the expense of American taxpayers. Not more than half that number are needed.

In Taiwan there is a sharp conflict within the Taiwanian Army, because native Formosans are used, for the most part, as foot soldiers, while the generals and other officers are Chinese. That produces inefficiency and tensions within the army. The Taiwanian Army would trample itself to death running back from the mainland of China if they faced enemy guns. That is what would happen to the Taiwanian Army.

We are talking about a saving. It would not be necessary to draft one American if those two armies were reduced by 50 percent, because such large armies are not needed there for the defense of freedom in the Pacific. We are already doing that now with the 7th Fleet, our Air Force, the 50,000 American boys in Korea, and the 100,000 American boys in Japan and Okinawa. They are the real defenders of American interests in the Pacific.

What the Senator from Ohio is asking for is pure waste. I am offering Senators an opportunity to save $80 million and have a better program.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield the distinguished Senator from Ohio 1 minute on the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Red China, with 700 million people, has not dared to strike at Taiwan. The reason why that has not happened is quite interesting. It has not happened, of course, because of our 7th Fleet.

Mr. MORSE. You bet.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But it has also not happened because there are 600,000 Taiwanese under arms. If the Taiwanian Army were to be reduced, I could not agree that we would not finally have to find soldiers elsewhere.

The Department of Defense says that this program should be maintained.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado on the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I support all that the distinguished Senator from Ohio and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island have said. If we are to go through the bill and take the figures the House placed in it, the Senate Committee on Appropriations has spent weeks fruitlessly. The point is that those military personnel are needed. I do not care how often it is said that they are not needed in Taiwan, South Korea, South Vietnam, and the other places that were mentioned. They are needed. The only alternative to stabilizing that particular corner of the world is to place American troops there. A great number of American lives may be saved for $80 million. That is what Senators will be voting for when they vote to retain the Senate figure. This is one item that we should not consider cutting further.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. A vote to sustain the committee is a vote in the negative—a nay vote?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. [HARTKE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS], and the Senator from Tennessee Mr. GORE would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business to attend the Presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 55, as follows:

[No. 275 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Anderson
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Cotton
Curtis
Ellender
Ervin
Goldwater
Gruening
Hruska
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La.
McClellan
Miller
Morse
Mundt
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—55

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Clark
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Fong
Fulbright
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—17

Carlson
Cooper
Dominick
Eastland
Engle
Gore
Hartke
Hill
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McNamara
Pearson
Pell
Scott
Simpson
Tower
Walters

So Mr. Morse's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The amendment will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 2, line 15, it is proposed to strike out the numeral and to insert in lieu thereof "$350 million."

The language on page 2, lines 14 and 15 of the bill, is as follows:

> Supporting assistance: For expenses authorized by section 402, $380,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, my amendment would cut $30 million from the amount in the bill for supporting assistance. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], but with all due respects, that same statement has been repeated time after time in this Chamber and by the witnesses from the executive branch who have paraded before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

But the fact remains that if we continue to give assistance to the people of Korea, Taiwan, South Vietnam, Europe, and other parts of the world, there is no doubt in my mind that our military authorities and our President will be unable to get our allies to assist us in sharing the burden. We have been in South Korea for more than 14 years. The South Korean economy depends entirely upon the United States. In addition, we have 2 divisions in Korea, and we are also maintaining the 18 Korean divisions.

In order to give the operation an appearance of United Nations action, there are present about 500 soldiers consisting of a Turkish brigade, a few men from Ethiopia, a few from England, and a few from Canada. But to add insult to injury, there is in the bill a provision for money to pay the logistics for these soldiers that I have mentioned, except the few from England and Canada.

If the amount that the distinguished Senator from Ohio mentioned were the only sum given to South Korea, I would say good and well, but we have already furnished to that area of the world over $5.5 billion. It is time for us to take note of that fact, and try to get our allies to assist us in the area. This money is not directly for supporting assistance as it is dubbed in the bill. It is just another form of economic assistance. Aside from the amount under discussion, we are furnishing millions of dollars to South Korea to enable the country to purchase all of its military hardware. We do not receive one iota of assistance from any of our allies. And remember, we have two divisions there.

I refer to the case of Taiwan. On that little island that one can almost jump across we have spent $4½ billion. We have been maintaining the economy of free China ever since it was taken over from the Japanese.

As the distinguished Senator from Oregon stated, a large force was established there in the beginning. Chiang Kai-shek wanted some day to attack the mainland. He wished to retain Quemoy and the other islands as stepping stones toward the accomplishment of this objective. The record shows that these islands were to be retained for about 2 years in order to afford Chiang Kai-shek the opportunity, if ever presented, to return to the mainland.

Mr. President, if Taiwan is valuable to the free world, why are we there alone? We heard the same cry last year we are hearing now as to the necessity for these so-called supporting assistance funds, but the administrators could not obligate all the money provided. There was more than $6 million that could not be spent.

Senators know how this supporting assistance was distributed last year. I showed this information to the Senate when the authorization bill was being considered. It was stated, when the program was presented and justified to us, that $125 million was badly needed in Korea. What did the administrators do? They ended by giving $90 million to Korea.

It was stated that $140 million was needed for South Vietnam. But they cut that figure back to $120 million. What did they do with the money? A large part of it was diverted to Indonesia. Indonesia was to receive only $2½ million, but our administrators raised the amount to $21.9 million.

When the supporting assistance fund was presented to the Senate last year, a hue and cry was raised: "If we cut it back it will hurt Korea, it will hurt southeast Asia."

So long as Congress provides all the money requested in order to maintain the status quo, we cannot expect our rich allies to come to our aid. So long as we spend all the money asked for they will say, "Let Uncle Sam do it." That is the attitude they have assumed. There are billions of dollars now in the pipeline, and now we are adding more millions to continue it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator referred to the pipeline. By the "pipeline" does the Senator mean money which has been appropriated and allocated but not actually spent?

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The time yielded by the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 more minutes.

How much time have I remaining?

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROBERTSON. By "pipeline" does the Senator mean money which has been appropriated and allocated but not actually spent?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Money available for use.

Mr. ROBERTSON. For use?

Mr. ELLENDER. The money in the pipeline can be reallocated if the administrators decide to do so. They can deobligate and reobligate these funds. In fact, authority is granted in this bill to permit them to do exactly that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that the total in the pipeline exceeds $7 billion?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is an overall figure, for supporting assistance the pipeline is $365 million.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I mean for military, economic, and all other aid.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. I have the precise figures before me now and they show that the pipeline totals $6,916,993,490.

Mr. PASTORE. In this category?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; overall.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course not.

Mr. ELLENDER. Overall.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The reports in the press are that the bill is a $3.3 billion bill. Is it not true that the bill would authorize the reappropriation of $209 million which was appropriated last year for actual use, and which went back into the Treasury?

Mr. ELLENDER. Two hundred and nine million dollars.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If we add that amount, it is a bill involving $3.5 billion-plus.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If we add that to the $7 billion, would it not make it the largest amount we have ever had for foreign aid in the pipeline and in the appropriation?

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not say that, because at one time the pipeline was much greater, and at various times Congress has appropriated greater amounts than the $3.5 billion. However, in some years we have appropriated less than this amount.

The fact remains that there is now in the pipeline for this item alone over $365 million.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. ELLENDER. In one moment.

Of the total amount requested for supporting assistance, the report from the House shows that only $246 million is to be used for the support of a common defense. The remainder of the money is for economic grant assistance to countries not on the periphery of the Communist countries.

The program is unending, and it is time for us to begin to cut corners. It is the only way we can induce our allies perhaps to assist us. If we supply all the money and military equipment, how can we expect our allies to say, "We will help you"? They will lean on the shoulder of Uncle Sam as long as we permit them to do so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes of my time to the Senator from Louisiana.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. On the amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In view of the fact that the bulk of this assistance will go to nations in the steaming jungles of southeast Asia and Africa, is it true that if we take the percentage fixed from July 1 to December and use the same ratio of aid as was used last year, the Congress will give the administration $40 million over and above what was spent, on that basis?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. It will be over $44 million, as I pointed out to the committee. I submitted a proposal to the committee to stay with the total amount provided by the House but it was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

The most significant fact that has occurred in the debate on this issue is that on the vote on my amendment, which sought to cut $80 million, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, voted for the amendment. He is also a member of the Appropriations Committee. In my judgment, the vote of the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee is a devastating answer to every argument that has been made today asserting that the defense of the United States calls for maintaining this wasteful expenditure.

We can take judicial notice that the Senator from Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, is not voting to jeopardize the defense position of this Nation. His position knocked into a cocked hat the argument that we must do that in order to protect this country. That amendment would have saved the taxpayers $30 million.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I voted for the previous amendment and I shall support this amendment. I am confident that the $300 million approved by the House was not arrived at without careful consideration of our requirements. I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the House report on supporting assistance contained on pages 17 and 18 of the report be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MILLER. I believe that the Senate Appropriations Committee has not given sufficient consideration to the amount of money in the pipeline for supporting assistance, which was $365,521,000 as of June 30, 1963. No mention of this is contained in the committee's report. When added to this pipeline fund, the $300 million approved by the House would furnish over $600 million for supporting assistance. I happen to believe in the principle of supporting assistance. It is merely a question of judgment over how much should be furnished for it, and I believe that considering the pipeline amount, the $380 million figure approved by Senate Appropriations Committee is too high. The amendment now pending which would reduce this amount to $350 million could hardly be said to "cripple" our supporting assistance program—particularly when considered in light of the amount in the pipeline.

Exhibit 1

SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

1964 estimate	$435,000,000
1964 authorization	380,000,000
Recommended for 1964	300,000,000

Supporting assistance, according to data contained in the summary presentation, is that part of the economic aid program which is directed primarily toward meeting immediate political and security objectives.

The budget proposed a program funded by this appropriation for 18 countries and the CENTO organization for the following purposes:

(a) Support for common defense (Korea, Thailand, Turkey, Vietnam and CENTO)	$256,000,000
(b) Maintenance of economic stability (6 countries)	114,000,000
(c) An alternative to bloc aid (5 countries)	51,000,000
(d) Access to the U.S. military bases (Libya, Trinidad and ———)	24,000,000
Total	445,000,000

In addition to this supporting assistance program, the budget proposed other economic and military assistance programs which amount to a minimum of $954,398,000 for the same 18 countries and CENTO.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $300 million for the supporting assistance program for fiscal year 1964. This is $80 million below the amount authorized for the current fiscal year.

In connection with the supporting assistance estimate which is to provide access to military bases in Libya, Trinidad, and ——, the committee is of the opinion that this portion of the estimate in future years should be budgeted under the Department of Defense appropriation estimates.

A practice that is causing concern to the committee is the extending of supporting assistance grant aid to countries that are more or less in a financial straitjacket trying to pay off their debts to bloc countries. The following testimony from page 729 and 730 of part 3 of the printed hearings is pertinent:

"Mr. Montoya. I want to expedite this because I have to go and vote, but you do mention that Guinea is more or less in a straitjacket because of the previous loans Russia has extended to that country?

"Mr. Hutchinson. They do have heavy debt-servicing burdens.

"Mr. Montoya. Then are we supposed to use our dollars to extricate Guinea from that situation?

"Mr. Hutchinson. We hope to provide them some ability to get them somewhat extricated.

"Mr. Montoya. Is this not a new concept?

"Mr. Hutchinson. This is a concept that is most appropriate, it seems to me.

* * * * *

"Mr. Montoya. They are using their revenues for repayment of the Russian debt and we are giving them supporting assistance?

"Mr. Hutchinson. In their requirements for imports, in small amounts, with the full expectation that this is a short-term arrangement."

An example of the types of projects financed by this appropriation is the Khmer-American Friendship Highway in Cambodia. According to the testimony the original estimate of cost of this project was $15 million. A contract for construction was awarded on May 5, 1955, at a cost of $18 million. By the time the highway was completed in June 1959, the cost had risen to approximately $30.9 million. Immediately after completion of construction portions of the highway began to deteriorate, and since that date the United States has obligated a total of $13.4 million for repairs with an additional cost of approximately $1.2 million in fiscal year 1964 and future years. Thus, the total cost of this project is now estimated to be $45.5 million, an increase of over 300 percent in the original estimate.

Another practice of the AID agency that causes the committee some concern is the practice of committing millions of dollars to

> a Government or a project. While the committee recognizes the value to the United States of honoring its commitments, it questions whether these commitments should hold firm despite a change in government—legally or illegally, or a lack of desire on the part of the recipient government to cooperate in the successful liquidation of the commitment. For example, the President in 1959 committed the U.S. Government to finance the Rangoon-Mandalay Highway project in Burma at a cost of $28 million. Since that date expenditures have been as follows:

Fiscal year:	*Expenditure*
1960	$541,000
1961	127,000
1962	212,000

> In fiscal year 1963 AID obligated approximately $9,100,000 for the project and the estimate for 1964 is $19 million on the assumption that AID can reach agreement on engineering questions on a particular segment of the highway. Obviously, the 1964 estimate is still not firm. Anticipated expenditures in fiscal year 1964 are approximately $1,800,000.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] on the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the argument made by the Senator from Oregon is that proof that the amendment should have been adopted is the fact that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], on the last amendment, voted against the committee. I find difficulty in trying to reconcile the logic of the Senator from Oregon in using the Senator from Georgia as the final authority on how this issue should be decided. Other issues will be coming before this body in the next 2 months as to which I am sure the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Georgia will be in disagreement. I wonder what the view of the Senator will be then as to the extent to which that advice should be followed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No——

Mr. MORSE. Ten seconds?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. On this particular issue no Senator is as competent and qualified to testify in regard to the armed services needs of this Republic as is the Senator from Georgia. On this issue I salute him. Of course, I will disagree with him in other areas in which I do not think he is a particularly competent witness.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the time I have been a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have listened to the Chiefs of Staff testify on the foreign aid program. Each time it has been stated that the Far East is our first line of defense. If the situation is weakened there, the battle line is brought closer to the shores of the United States.

In the hearing on the bill I discussed the subject of support assistance. I heard the argument made by the Senator from Oregon, and I then put to Secretary McNamara certain questions. They were put to him in writing. Those questions dealt with Vietnam, Thailand, the Republic of China, Korea, Greece, Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan. I asked the Secretary of Defense, "If it is not classified information, will you tell the committee how many troops are maintained by those eight countries?" The answer was that the total number of troops maintained by the eight nations mentioned is 2,793,828.

It may be argued by the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Oregon that 2,800,000 troops in that area, friendly to our cause, mean nothing. I am unwilling to accept that argument.

I feel a bit of comfort in the knowledge that in those countries there are practically 2,800,000 men in uniform. Would we feel better if they were not there?

To me, this is the most economical part of the foreign aid bill.

The administration asked for $4,734 million—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield the Senator from Ohio 2 more minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The administration asked for $4,734 million. The House granted $3,010 million. Our committee recommended $3,005 million. If what has happened in the past happens again in conference, the administration will be given $3,250 million—$1,500 million less than has been asked.

I have not subscribed to the foreign aid program in full, but I respectfully submit that a cut of $1,500 million is substantial.

In my judgment, the amendment ought to be defeated. If cuts are to be made, let us make them in other areas, but not in this one, which is an economic area important to our country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as I have said before in the debate, supporting assistance, in my opinion, is one of the most important parts of the bill. Supporting assistance is divided into four categories: Support for common defense, maintenance of economic stability, alternative to excessive dependence on bloc aid, and access to U.S. military bases.

Of these four items, at least 60 percent is for the support of common defense. About 18 percent is the supporting assistance we give to Far Eastern countries. That is 18 percent of the entire AID budget.

We know that today the Far East is one of the most troublesome places that we must consider. Korea and South Vietnam are in the news constantly, particularly South Vietnam. As I have said, supporting assistance is of the utmost value in this bill. I would rather see some of the other items cut, if we must cut them, but not this item.

Mr. Frank K. Sloan, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense testified:

> In conclusion, I want to stress that in the Far East we find ourselves confronting aggressive Communist power—political, economic, psychological, and military. The United States and its allies are engaged in a war against this power. In Vietnam, the war is a shooting one, while in Korea we have a state of uneasy suspended war. Open hostilities could spread to other areas. Laos is a likely possibility. The United States can neither afford to lose in southeast Asia nor to invite aggression in the northern arc of the area. Vital and direct U.S. interests are at stake.

We know that much of this assistance goes into the so-called hamlet program, which may or may not be of value, but which we believe is of great value in the South Vietnam situation. Therefore, as I have said, this support assistance goes to support common defense, the maintenance of economic stability, is the alternative to excessive dependence on bloc aid, and gives access to U.S. military bases.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, for whom I have great respect, but with whom we agree to disagree, will be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have listened to the discussion with great interest. As I understand the arguments of some of the proponents of the bill, it is still necessary for this country to, in effect, bank freedom, all over the world, regardless of what anyone else does on this matter in other countries. As example, 10 years ago we had 250,000 troops in Germany. The Germans did not have any troops in uniform. Today the Germans have 400,000 troops in their army; and we still have 250,000 troops in Germany.

This Nation is banking freedom, in Europe, in the Middle East, in southeast Asia, and in the Far East.

The question would seem to be, How long can we continue to put so much of our resources into so much of this often unilateral banking, regardless of what so many of the other countries do to defend themselves?

More than 2 years ago, in South Vietnam, when I was with the general who is now Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I presented that the way we were handling that matter out there would never work out in the long run.

I believe that our position in Cambodia is serious. Obviously we are having very difficult troubles in South Vietnam. So far as Taiwan is concerned, I was impressed with the analysis made by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

Those of us who are coming to realize the significance of having a net of $4 billion in gold to support some $25 to $28 billion of current liabilities callable in gold, held by foreign countries, half in the Common Market, are wondering how long we can afford, regardless of what other countries do, to so bank freedom all over the world. No country in world history has that amount of treasure to put out this way indefinitely.

I will support the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, believing the treasure—the gold reserves—of the United States cannot continue to go out of the country, while country after country continues to build up its gold reserves, in effect, at the expense of this country. We have reached the point where we should take a new, hard look at this entire situation. Economic control of our country, in the opinion of many experts, is moving away from the shores of our country.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I do not believe any Senator feels we should not take a good, new, hard look at the foreign aid program. No one is more in favor of that than the senior Senator from Rhode Island. After 3 weeks of debate in the Senate on the authorization bill, the Appropriations Committee analyzed and scrutinized the pending bill. It voted to report a bill of $3.5 billion. I do not care what is said on the floor; $3.5 billion is less than we spent last year for foreign aid. This year we are appropriating less than was spent during the previous fiscal year. The bill has been scrutinized by the Appropriations Committee in all its aspects. No member of the committee wants to give money away, any more than does the Senator from Louisiana or the Senator from Oregon. All of us love America. I caution and admonish Senators to hearken to what the President said in a letter to the chairman of the committee as late as December 17, 1963. This is what he said:

> I recommend to the committee, in the strongest terms, favorable consideration of the maximum appropriation authorized under the enabling legislation. A candid look at the situation in Asia, Africa, and Latin America reveals no diminution in the continuing intensive thrust of Communist penetration and subversion. The interests of the United States are deeply engaged in the effort to establish freedom and progress in those areas. In my judgment—

This is the judgment of the man who is charged by the Constitution with the responsibility of conducting the foreign policy of this Nation—

> in my judgment, as in the judgment of Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman before me, the future welfare and security of the American people require us to support the struggle of the peoples in the developing countries to achieve and maintain their freedom.

What are we doing today? What is the argument that is being made? It is that we do not need this money in Korea; we do not need it in Vietnam; we do not need it in the Congo; we do not need it in Jordan.

The only reason why we are giving economic assistance to those countries is that if we do not do it, they will fall apart and will be unable to provide their soldiers. Every dollar we cut out of this category might mean that some mother's boy in America will have to shoulder a musket, somewhere, sometime, to protect our very security.

This is the cheapest way to provide for our defense. I realize that it is more palatable to cut out $30 million than it is to cut out $80 million. Perhaps certain Senators will feel that in their conscience they can go along with a $30 million cut rather than with an $80 million cut. To me it represents yesterdays' hamburger, only a little bit warm over. The amount that was authorized in the authorization bill was $380 million. No Senator can justify in detail every nickel of it, nickel by nickel I agree. However, the President of the United States, a man who has come into this very sensitive authority and responsibility at a very critical time, has said for the record: "I need this."

I want to give to Lyndon Johnson everything he needs to be a great President. If there is any doubt in my mind, or in anybody's mind, in the name of good reason, for the sake of this country, give the benefits of that doubt to the President of the United States. I hope the Senate will reject this amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute on the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. When the President wrote that letter, he got into the saddle backward and started riding backward, riding away from his previous announcement of economy. He cannot reconcile this request for the maximum, which involves a large amount of waste in foreign aid, with his previous statement about economy. It cannot be reconciled, either, with what is known as the President's position in regard to foreign aid, for the President knows there is waste in foreign aid and he is said to be taking steps to try to eliminate waste. His letter cannot be reconciled with the steps he is taking within his own administration to eliminate waste. We ought to eliminate $30 million of it.

In reply to the Senator from Ohio: If those countries are not able to support their armies in peacetime, how many billions of dollars would we have to give them, if we got into a war, to support their armies in time of war? Let us face the issue: If we got into a war, we would not use the Chinese Army; we would not use the South Korean Army. They would be worthless. They would have to be fed, clothed, and supplied by the United States just as if they were our own. But we would not do that. We would use American military might to defend America. Let us stop wasting money in time of peace. If those countries cannot support their armies in time of peace, what would they do in time of war?

Mr. PASTORE. I wish to reply to what the Senator from Oregon has just said, because the President's letter does not at all indicate what the Senator has said. I read from paragraph 3 of the President's letter:

> In the conviction, therefore, that the future of our own country is at stake, I strongly urge that the committee provide funds needed for a continuation of the strong U.S. economic and military assistance effort.

I emphasize this statement in the President's letter. This is the President speaking, not Senator PASTORE:

> I am conscious of the necessity for improving the efficiency of our aid program—of requiring more self-help from aid recipients, of trimming excess staff and of taking other measures needed to accomplish the results we seek at minimum cost.

Mr. MORSE. That is where the President rides off backward.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator from Oregon speaking on his time or on my time?

Mr. MORSE. On the time of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Let the Senator from Oregon speak on his own time. I continue to read from the President's letter:

> I assure you that we have already undertaken and will intensify our efforts to make this program effective and efficient.

I say to my friend from Oregon: "Please do not throw out the baby with the bath water."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business to attend the Presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is absent because of illness in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 276 Leg.]

YEAS—34

Anderson
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Cotton
Curtis
Ellender
Ervin
Goldwater
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Morse
Mundt
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—53

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Fong
Fulbright
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—13

Carlson
Dominick
Eastland
Engle
Gore
Hill
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Pearson
Scott
Simpson
Tower
Walters

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 4, before the words "to remain available", it is proposed to strike out "$800,000,000", and to insert in lieu thereof "$600,000,000".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Louisiana yield himself?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to provide the amount voted by the House—$600 million—for the Development Loan Fund.

As will be noted from the report, the Senate Appropriations Committee voted to add $200 million to this item. I seek to have the bill reduced to provide the House figure, $600 million, which I believe is ample for the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. President, we have now been engaged in programs of foreign aid for almost 15 years; and the amount we have spent since the Marshall plan—which would include the proposed amounts being appropriated by this bill—comes to $109 billion. This is in excess of one-third of our present debt.

Mr. President, the money we have spent during this period has been made available to the various areas of the world as follows:

To Latin America, $8.960 billion.

To the Near East and south Asia, $22.277 billion.

To the Far East, $24.509 billion.

To Africa—where we are just starting—$2.786 billion.

To Europe, $45.585 billion.

Administrative expenses have been $932 million.

Nonregional programs, which are scattered throughout the world, $3.834 billion.

Undistributed programs, $160 million.

I cite these figures to indicate the vast sums that have been appropriated over the years to assist our friends across the seas. Of course, most of this huge total was spent to assist Western Europe, so that it could restore its economy after having been devastated by a cruel war.

Mr. President, when I voted for the Marshall plan, I thought it was incumbent upon us to give assistance to war-torn countries of Europe in the hope that we could rehabilitate their economies. In time, it was expected that Europe would assist us in carrying the load in other parts of the world.

Now times have changed, but in this bill for the benefit of our far more prosperous allies in Western Europe, there is in excess of $200 million. This sum is present, supposedly, to fulfill certain promises we made in the past.

It is a peculiar situation. When we call upon our allies to do certain things, they do not mind violating their promises. But if we make promises, we must toe the mark.

As I have pointed out on many previous occasions, there is almost no one in South Korea today except 2 divisions of American boys and 18 divisions of Republic of Korea troops that we are supporting without assistance coming from any source. The same situation is found in Taiwan and in southeast Asia. It seems that we cannot get assistance from any of our allies. I do not blame them simply because Congress has voted year after year huge sums of money which makes it completely unnecessary for our so-called allies to "pony up."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I congratulate the Senator for discussing the Development Loan Fund, because, unbeknown to most of our constituents at home, what is known as the Development Loan Fund has become merely a disguised grant fund at three-quarters of 1 percent interest—deferred interest if the borrowers do not start to repay at once. There is no stipulation for amortizing the loan, which I submit is virtually a grant.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Because our constituents do not like to see their money given away, they are told it is a loan. When the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and I succeeded in putting the Foreign Relations Committee in a mood of sober consideration to increase the loan rate to 2 percent—which is still less than we charge our own veterans in America, and 2 percent is the prevailing REA rate—the State Department officials came down in hordes and worked on members of the Foreign Relations Committee so that they changed their opinions, and on subsequent rollcall votes in the committee, gradually the rate was reduced to practically 1 percent.

The proposal is a giveaway under the guise of a loan. If we wish to give those countries a grant, let it be called a grant. Let us be honest with the taxpayers. Let us not tell them it is a loan when it is actually a grant, because three-quarters of 1 percent is demonstrably less than the service charge for servicing the loan.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from South Dakota has anticipated me. I expected to show the type of assistance our friends in Western Europe is making available to the underdeveloped countries of the world.

Mr. MUNDT. And where they are charging the prevailing high rate of interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. We are deceiving the people by not telling them what a loan is.

Mr. ELLENDER. One thing the Senator from South Dakota must not overlook is the fact that not only are the loans made on a commercial basis by our allies, but also, they will not make such loans unless they are directly interested in the particular countries in which the loans are made. That is the situation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island, provided the time is charged to him.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a positive fact that this money is not loaned to the recipient countries so that they can reloan it for usurious interest? More than 95 percent of the money that is loaned is for merchandise and commodities bought in the United States of America and made by American labor. Then the borrowing country must pay it back. The idea of usurious interest is a fallacy and a misstatement of fact. It simply is not the case. This money is loaned on commodities and merchandise made in the United States and sent to the recipient countries, and they must pay it back. If the merchandise purchased is not made by American labor, I should like to have someone correct me.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish it were possible for our own people to obtain the merchandise to which the Senator from Rhode Island refers, and have 40 years to pay back the loan at three-quarters of 1 percent interest.

Mr. PASTORE. I will get to that point.

Mr. ELLENDER. Another point that my good friend has overlooked is the fact that the money is loaned, it is true, but it is unable to find its way to the Treasury. The repayments, if they are ever made, will become a part of a revolving fund. It can be reloaned as it is collected.

All of us know that this money is supposed to be used for underdeveloped countries. That is the story told to us. Yet what do we find?

In 1963 two loans totaling $45 million were made to Israel. Were they made on commercial terms? Were they made at a rate of interest that we must pay? No. They were made at a rate of interest of three-quarters of a percent, 10 years of grace, and with 40 years to repay.

Let me present some facts on the economic situation in Israel. Israel is not an underdeveloped country, by any means. The Israelis have achieved a rapid rate of economic growth. Their gross national product has risen 10 percent per annum over the past several years, and it is anticipated that this growth rate will be maintained. The per capita output in Israel already exceeds the level attained by some European countries, and is comparable to that of many industrialized countries. The per capita gross national product has risen from $734 in 1959 to $853 in 1962. On top of this the Israeli gold has increased from $87 million in 1957 to $498 million in 1962—a period in which we were making them low interest loans.

Despite this, we are still loaning borrowed dollars to Israel, repayable over a period of 40 years, at three-quarters of a percent interest.

The administrator who did that last year should be kicked out of office, in my opinion, because the purpose of these loans is supposedly to assist underdeveloped countries. These funds are not to be used as handouts to the developed nations.

Israel's present level of gross investment approximates 25 percent of gross national product, which rate I believe is exceeded only by Japan's.

I cite this one instance to indicate that the money, when available, will be used for one purpose or another. Our administrators will find some way to spend it. The issue is that simple.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was promised all the time I needed on this amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I shall be happy to allot time to the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have 30 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Thirty minutes more?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. How much time have we on the bill? Could we negotiate an arrangement of 15 minutes and 15 minutes?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on this parliamentary matter?

As Senators know, the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into when the Senator from Louisiana was out of the Chamber. I am the culprit, if anyone wishes to put it that way. I forgot the request of the Senator from Louisiana.

I discussed the situation with the majority leader. He said that when the appropriate time arrived he would be willing to seek unanimous consent to grant the Senator necessary time. I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement may be modified in this one particular, to grant 30 more minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that the request would give the Senator from Louisiana 30 minutes rather than 15 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. PASTORE. No. It would add 30 minutes to his 15 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. It involves an additional 30 minutes.

I say to the Senator from California that yesterday I was trying to cooperate in reaching a unanimous-consent agreement. I forgot the promise to the Senator from Louisiana of some time that was not covered by the agreement.

We have talked this problem over with the majority leader. He is not now present, but he said he would ask for additional time. I know I speak for the majority leader when I ask that the Senator from Louisiana be granted extended time.

Mr. KUCHEL. So the Senator from Louisiana would have a total of 45 minutes on the amendment, and 15 minutes would be available to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have no objection.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to help the Senator from Rhode Island, with respect to time on the bill, if he needs more time.

Mr. PASTORE. No. We shall not need more than 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I thank all Senators. As the Senator from Oregon said, I was not present when the agreement was made. I specifically asked the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] to notify me of any action taken on the bill. It was done in my absence.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is absolutely correct in his statement. That request was made. I did not believe it applied to this particular unanimous consent agreement. I want the RECORD to show that the Senator is being fair. The Senator is entitled to the half hour. No Senator is objecting. I believe he should proceed.

Mr. MORSE. It is not the fault of the Senator from Rhode Island; it is my fault.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not saying that it is anybody's fault, in particular.

Mr. President, I made an effort before the Committee on Appropriations to have a bill approved which matched the House figures. I sincerely believe that the House figures are sufficient, particularly in view of the fact of our balance-of-payments problem. I was among the first to bring this problem to the attention of the Congress in 1959. Since I brought this matter up, our Nation has lost an additional $5 billion of gold, and the outflow continues.

Since 1950 our deficit in balance of payments has aggregated $24.3 billion, and if this program continues, we can look forward to a worsening of our balance-of-payments position. At the present time our gold stock, in excess of reserve requirements, is $3.5 billion which foreign creditors hold potential claims against this gold of $25 billion.

As I previously pointed out there is $7 billion in the pipeline for this program. If the bill is passed in its present form, the administrators will have more than $10 billion at their disposal to obligate and to spend.

Let us not forget that the amount of money in the pipeline today can be shuffled around in many instances and given to areas which might need it the most. Of course, the pipeline amount includes not only economic assistance, but military assistance as well.

As I pointed out before the Committee on Appropriations, $284.9 million in economic assistance was obligated by AID in the first 5 months of this fiscal year. The amount of money which was obligated for military assistance during the first 5 months of this fiscal year was $304 million. If we add to those two figures the amount of economic as well as military assistance which was made available in the last 7 months of the previous fiscal year, we arrive at a figure of $2,965 million, which is $44.8 million less than the amount provided in the House bill. Thus, if the House bill were adopted, AID would have $44.8 million more than it had in fiscal year 1963.

I was voted down in the committee. I now seek to have action taken with respect to what is, in my opinion, the softest portion of the program, the development loan program.

Let me begin by pointing out that the United States is a heavy contributor to many banks which make loans throughout the world. The first was organized in 1945, under the Bretton Woods Agreement, and is known as the World Bank, or the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. This Bank has a callable capital of $16 billion and our subscription thereto is $5.7 billion.

When it was created it was thought that this bank would be able to assist in the rehabilitation of our friends all over the world. But we have been in the AID business on a bilateral basis to the extent of $109 billion, as I previously pointed out and the operations of the World Bank have steadily expanded.

In 1961 another fund was provided, known as the "soft window" for the World Bank. It is known as the International Development Association, commonly known as IDA.

In the bill the Senate is now considering there is provided $61 million for our fourth installment on a subscription to IDA which amounts in the aggregate to $320.3 billion.

Next year we are going to provide the fifth and final installment on this particular stock subscription. Our total participation in these initial contributions to IDA will be in excess of 33 percent.

There is also before the Senate, S. 2214, a bill, which will doubtless come up next year, wherein the capital in the International Development Association will be increased by $750 million. Our contribution to this new IDA venture will be $312 million, payable in three installments, which will approximate 42 percent of the total amount of $750 million.

Is that all? No; there are other so-called loan spigots. For another, there is the old Development Loan Fund, an institution created by us to make soft loans to underdeveloped countries, repayable in soft currencies. We have invested in this fund $1.896 billion.

We did not have enough loan spigots, so we established another institution in 1961, the New Development Loan Fund the item we are now considering, which was supposed to take the place of the so-called giveaway programs. "Instead of grants," we said, "Let us make loans which are repayable in dollars." As my distinguished friend from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] pointed out, they are not loans—they are grants, to all intents and purposes.

Our Government must pay from 2¾ percent to as much as 4 percent on the money it borrows; and it lends that money, without security at the rate of three-quarters of 1 percent, with 10 years' grace and with 40 years to pay.

As was pointed out, an amendment was adopted in the foreign aid authorization bill, which I believe was sponsored by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], providing that not less than 2 percent was to be charged, with a grace period of 5 years. That was changed by the conferees. The 2-percent rate remains, but, it is not to be utilized until 10 years after the loan is made. In the first 10 years, the rate is to be three-quarters of 1 percent.

What irks me is that we are making every effort we can to aid the entire free world, and we are doing it virtually alone. We are told by our administrators, by those who parade before us each year from Secretary McNamara on down, that things are going to be different; that, we are going to induce our friends to assist in this effort, and that they will put up enough money to relieve us of much of this burden.

Let me point out that Germany, France, Great Britain, and other countries do not make loans as we do. They make hard commercial loans. They make loans repayable in 3 years, 5 years, 10 years, and sometimes they will extend credit for 15- or 20-year periods.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. On the Senator's own time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself whatever time I take in asking questions.

Mr. ELLENDER. I dislike getting technical, but I must preserve the limited time I have available.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has talked about other countries making only commercial loans and has stated that in IDA we put up 42 percent. The same countries he is speaking of put up 50 percent; so they are participating in it. The $750 million that the Senator mentioned is to be applied over a 3-year period, $250 million a year, of which we shall put up 42 percent. It strikes me as a good bargain as compared with what we have done in the past.

I do not know whether the Senator from Louisiana supported the Marshall plan.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did, cheerfully.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then the Senator supported programs for outright grants.

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, yes. More than 50 percent of the grants were outright grants to industrialized countries. If any mistake was made in that program, it was that those should have been loans provided under development loan funds.

The loans under discussion are repayable in dollars. It is true that the interest rate is low, but they are still loans. The major part of the Marshall plan was in outright grants. Part of it was in loans. Those loans are being repaid today, to the extent of nearly $300 million a year. I do not follow the Senator's argument. This is a sound, businesslike transaction, providing for participation to the extent of 58 percent by the same countries he is now saying make commercial loans.

Mr. ELLENDER. If we were to end there, the Senator would not hear me arguing this point; but, as I pointed out, we are making available large amounts of other money—good old borrowed dollars—in addition to the sums we contribute to the international banks. I am arguing that $800 million is not needed for the Development Loan Fund, if we are going to make an additional $312 million available to the International Development Association.

It is true that contributions are made by other countries to IDA, and that is a good thing. But apparently IDA must be augmented. We must get in on our own; we must add our own aid programs. I believe the Senator from Arkansas, led the fight in the Senate to provide a 5-year authorization of $1.500 billion for each year, for the loans we are discussing here.

I felt that the creation of the World Bank would be sufficient to provide for the loans to which the Senator from Arkansas has referred.

Yes; I voted for the Marshall plan. However, as I understood the Marshall plan, at that time, it was to be on a loan basis, rather than on a grant basis.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no. The Senator knows very well that that is not so.

Mr. ELLENDER. As recommended by General Marshall it was supposed to be on a loan basis, but the Congress adulterated the original proposal and made it primarily a grant program. As I have said on many occasions, the original Marshall plan was put on the statute books in order to rehabilitate Europe. I can well remember when Mr. Hoffman, the first Administrator, testified before our committee. I and other Senators asked him, "Mr. Hoffman, how long do you expect this plan to run?"

He said, "Five years, at the most."

We asked him, "How much do you expect to spend?"

He said, "$17 billion."

We drifted into other areas. Instead of spending the $17 billion he said would be required for Western Europe, we have spent $45 billion. There is no end to the program. That is what I am complaining about.

All these programs are supplemented by us. If we could rely on the World Bank and IDA I would not be complaining.

What we have been doing is not only contributing the largest share to all these institutions, but we have also been providing separate and distinct funds of our own, in order to help the world. That is what I am complaining about.

It is true that we are receiving some assistance from our friends in the creation of these international banks. However, that is but a pittance compared with what we are supplying on a unilateral basis.

Where will all this money be used? Where will it be spent? As I pointed out, $45 million was given to Israel. When I say given, I mean just that. It may be paid back 40 years hence, but at three-quarters of 1 percent interest, it amounts to a gift.

Greece also received some of this easy money last year. Seven or eight years ago our program in Greece was supposed to come to an end, but the politicians over there were very vociferous, and were able to induce our AID directors to go back and resurvey the situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 10 seconds?

Mr. ELLENDER. The countries in the Near East which will receive more and more of our loans, are already debt ridden. We have already loaned them almost $3.5 billion, aside from what the international banks have made available. Now we are asked to provide $800 million, to further add to our burdens, in order to increase the amount they owe us. When a loan is authorized, our Administrator is supposed to have made the decision that this money will be paid back. It is not supposed to be a gift. However, I daresay that many recipients of our loans are so debt ridden that they cannot possibly pay back any amount we loan to them in the future.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 10 seconds?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish the Record to show that I completely agree with every observation of the Senator from Louisiana. I would reinforce his argument by calling the President's attention to an authoritative research study which has been published, which shows that 1 out of 10 Americans is living at a poverty level. I say to the President, "Let us have a letter from you as to what you propose to do about the 1 out of 10 in this country who are living on a poverty level, while you recommend in another letter that we continue to waste billions of American taxpayer money on foreign aid."

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I beg the Senate to cut back this $800 million and allow only

$600 million, the House figure. I am sure that would be ample.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator have available the figures as to the amount in the pipeline for development loans after June 30?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is $1,485,356,648; that is the amount in the pipeline.

Mr. MILLER. By adding the $600 million, which is the House figure, there would be available about $2 billion for this purpose. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The more money we make available to the administrators, the more they are going to spend. I would not so much object to the amount of the loans reported, if only the Foreign Relations Committee had retained in the bill the restriction that we proposed, that no money should be loaned on any project unless it is first studied by the Corps of Engineers. If we are to build a dam in Ohio, on the Ohio River, or in the State of Kansas or in the State of Iowa, it requires from 5 to 7 years to bring the project to the point where we can appropriate money with which to construct it. What are we asked to do in this case? If a road is to be built, the technicians fly over the area and say, "We think we can build a road for $2½ million."

I have seen instances in which, before a project was completed, the cost rose to five times the original estimate. If we should curtail this amount to $600 million, the money would be, I hope, more carefully distributed. The projects might be determined on a more selective basis. An appropriation of $600 million would be ample to do the job, particularly since there is in the pipeline for this purpose $1.48 billion. Think of how the figures are blown up. For fiscal year 1963 it was said that from $200 to $270 million would be needed for lending to the newly emerging countries in Africa. Do Senators know how much was actually used? $98 million. I daresay that many of the projects in this year's budget will not pan out. I visited some of them, and the only one that looked promising was the Volta River project, in Ghana. In that case, the Ghanaian Government paid half the cost, and the interest rate that we receive is above the amount we pay. Of course, that project was begun before this current program was started. I have hopes for Ghana, because they are a people who have invested their own money. They will try to save that money.

But many countries do not have the money, so they go to Uncle Sam, who shells it out of his pockets for their projects. Little care is given to the feasibility of the projects, as would be the case if those countries contributed their own money.

There is no doubt in my mind that with the money now in the pipeline and the $600 million I am suggesting be placed in the bill, the total amount will be ample.

Consider Morocco. There we provided last year a huge, inflated amount of money. Morocco had applied for $15 million; but later they said, "We do not need that much. We cannot meet your terms." They expected us to put up the money; but when we talked terms, there were no takers. The same is true of many other countries.

In the case of Liberia, with all the money we have made available there, instead of Liberia using the receipts collected from the rubber company and from iron ore, do Senators know what is being done with the money? For one thing, a palace is being built for the president that will cost from $10 to $12 million. Yet immediately across from where the palace is being constructed are some of the worst sewers in the world. There are none filthier. Also, a huge ornate judiciary building is being built there.

As I told President Tubman, things that are necessary ought to be built first. Yet while the resources of Liberia are being used to construct a palace and other unnecessary buildings, we are being called upon to make loans to enable them to develop a potable water supply and to provide more electricity. These are facilities that could have been provided out of the taxes, Liberia has collected, because the tax receipts in Liberia have increased considerably in the last 4 or 5 years.

Mr. President, the vast bulk of the funds made available to the Development Loan Fund will be spent in the Near East and south Asia. We have already made considerable loans in this area of the world. In fact, we have given until it hurts. We have already loaned to Pakistan, aside from grants, aside from the free gifts, $715,188,823. Now we are being called upon to increase that amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Louisiana another minute on the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD page 439 of the hearings, which shows the amount owed to us by the countries of the Near East and south Asia.

I say again that if my amendment should be adopted, there will still be sufficient money available, considering what still remains in the pipeline. I urge that Senators vote for my amendment.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Status of borrowings and repayments, NESA countries (MSP, DLF, and AID loans) as of June 30, 1963

Country	Value authorized	Repayment		Delinquencies		Remarks
		Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	
Afghanistan	$14,808,933.19	$180,414.19	$925,244.93	$110,140.75	$5,116.70	Delinquency results from error in billing to borrower. Being cleared up.
Ceylon	5,761,517.54	505,299.30	504,451.00			None.
Cyprus	2,275,000.00	0	0			Do.
Greece	119,600,000.00	2,399,338.50	6,962,045.57			Do.
Iran	219,910,193.55	12,538,993.05	17,263,929.01			Do.
Israel	185,993,720.16	4,150,984.02	9,245,118.11			Do.
India	1,691,254,976.93	41,779,689.05	72,604,156.01			Do.
Jordan	2,700,000.00	188,871.00	193,448.69			Do.
Lebanon	5,400,000.00	151,179.94	186,475.85			Do.
Nepal	400,000.00	0	0			Do.
Pakistan	715,188,823.89	17,630,969.87	22,412,685.15			Do.
Syria	18,399,907.00	29,425.19	111,529.52			Do.
Turkey	406,900,660.26	3,441,552.45	10,217,228.73			Do.
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	106,700,000.00	77,034.28	1,865,848.10			Do.
Grand total	3,495,293,822.52	83,073,750.84	142,492,160.76	110,140.75	5,116.70	

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. First, the revised estimate made by the President with reference to the authorization for this item was $1,060 million. The Senate passed a $950 million authorization. The House passed a $900 million authorization. In conference, the conferees resolved the amount at $925 million. The amount that is now proposed to be appropriated is $800 million, which is $125 million below the authorization and is $100 million below the House figure on the authorization bill.

The arguments made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana are to the effect that the entire program should be eliminated. I would not be surprised if the Senator from Louisiana voted against the foreign aid program after the bill had been read the third time. But long ago, beginning in 1957, it was thought by Congress that we should move from direct economic grants to loans. Congress decided that. We decided to change from making grants to making loans. We started by providing for repayment with soft money. Then in 1961 Congress amended the law so as to provide that if we loaned hard money—American dollars—we want it to be repaid in American dollars. That is the law today.

I should like to read to Senators an excerpt from one of the most eloquent speeches made in a long time:

> Now, on the world scale, the time has come, as it came to America 30 years ago for a new era of hope—hope and progress for that

> one-third of mankind that is still beset by hunger and poverty and disease.
>
> In my travels on behalf of my country and President Kennedy, I have seen too much of misery and despair in Africa, in Asia, in Latin America. I have seen too often the ravages of hunger and tapeworm and tuberculosis, and the scabs and the scars on too many children who have too little health and no hope.
>
> I think that you and I and our countries and this organization can—and must—do something about these conditions.
>
> I am not speaking here of a new way of life to be imposed by any single nation. I am speaking of a higher standard of living, to be inspired by these United Nations.
>
> It will not be achieved through some hopeful resolution in this Assembly, but through a peaceful revolution in the world—through a recommitment of all of our members, rich and poor, and strong and weak, whatever their location or their ideology, to the basic principles of human welfare and of human dignity.
>
> In this effort the United States will do its full share.

Mr. President, those words were uttered by the President of the United States, last Tuesday, at noon, at the United Nations.

Yet the argument made here by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is in complete opposition to that position taken by the President of the United States.

All we are saying is that we wish to lend this money, not to give it away. We propose that the money be loaned, with interest payments of not less than three-quarters of 1 percent for a 10-year period and 2 percent thereafter. Is not that better than giving it away? Congress decided on that course.

If Senators wish to have the program crippled, let them support this amendment.

On the other hand, if we wish to give help to the underprivileged of the world and if we wish to heed the clarion call of last Tuesday so clearly sounded by the President of the United States, how can we, in good conscience, vote to strike out this amount of money?

We shall not be giving away the money to the rich. It is too bad that when we began the Marshall plan, we did not then have the Development Loan Fund, because, in that event, today France, and the other rich countries of Western Europe, would be paying back the money.

Mr. President, this amendment would result in sticking a knife into the heart of the best program we have—the development loan program.

This $800 million is not to be spent abroad in any fashion these countries would like. We decide on the program, and the money is spent in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from Rhode Island has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. PASTORE. As I was about to say, Mr. President, this money will be spent in the United States, where it will create jobs for American workers; and the repayments must be made in American dollars. That is what this program amounts to.

Yet the Senator from Louisiana proposes that we revert to the amount voted by the House of Representatives. Mr. President, I am becoming a little weary of proposals to revert to the amounts voted by the House of Representatives. If that is to be done, why does not the Senate adopt a resolution doing away with the U.S. Senate? If Senators want the judgment of the House to be controlling and if Senators want to rubber stamp what the House votes, then what are we doing here? If we amount to no more than that, I think we should turn back our own salaries and should do away with the Senate Appropriations Committee—even though it worked very hard on the hearings on the bill. However, if Senators think that time was spent for naught and those efforts were futile, and if Senators think the members of the Appropriations Committee are wastrels, because of the report they have made on the bill, why not do away with the committee system and stop this "nonsense"? if "nonsense" it is.

Those who say, "Let us revert to the amount voted by the House" may prefer to have a unicameral Congress; in that case, the people of the United States would really save some money.

Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be resoundingly rejected, because, in my humble opinion, it would do irreparable harm to this entire program.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Appropriations Committee does not pass proposed legislation; it merely recommends it. The Senate is the body which passes the bills. The committees cannot be substituted for the legislative process of the Senate.

I believe it would be helpful to make the rollcall votes in the committee parts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in connection with the various portions of this bill, because from reading the committee report we obtain no idea of just where the committee members stood. I have been advised by members of the committee that they were greatly divided on item after item—whereas, Mr. President, from listening to the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island, one would think the committee was unanimous in adopting the report.

Mr. President, for years it has been argued that 80 percent of this money is spent in the United States. In that case, is the argument being made for a make-work program in the United States—because let us not forget that more than one-third of this money is for military equipment which is shipped abroad, and much of it is given away abroad. If a make-work program is wanted, then let us build up a program that will expand the American economy and will create productive wealth for the American economy and will provide an increasing number of jobs for the people of the United States.

Furthermore, much of this program is a giveaway program, which is not the way to build up the American economy. This amendment will not cripple the program, for by means of the amendment the bill will still provide $600 million for this fund.

Have we reached the point where we have to take the recommendations of the Senate Appropriations Committee as if they were sacrosanct and as if any modification which we might make in them would result in crippling the President's program?

I have great respect for the President and for his program; but, in my judgment, and I say this respectfully, in this instance the President is in his Texas saddle, galloping backward. He should first eliminate the millions of dollars of waste in this program, and then he will get support for a sound foreign aid program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I understand that I have 6 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to support the committee's position in favor of an appropriation of $600 million for the Development Loan Fund.

We should remember that the original administration request was for $1,060 million. This $800 million item is $260 million less than the original budget estimate, and $200 million more than the amount voted by the House.

To state the situation very briefly, the amount of grant aid is being decreased, and the amount of loan aid is being increased—which is what we want. I understand that loan aid is now being made available at 2 percent interest after 10 years, and three-quarters of 1 percent for the first 10 years; and 100 percent of the development loan money is spent in the United States.

Second, there have been no delinquencies in the interest repayments under the development loan program, which began 2 years ago.

Third, the obligation to repay the loans stimulates these countries' self-help efforts.

Furthermore, international consortium commitments have been made; and if too much of a reduction is made in the U.S. program, all these loans by other countries will be cut down. Essentially these loans are in India, Pakistan and Turkey. I believe that in these three countries alone $600 million of loan funds will be committed in 1964. For these reasons, Mr. President, I believe that the position of the committee should be supported and the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana should be rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 10 seconds to the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] for an insertion in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 10 seconds.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I intend to support the pending amendment.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has shown that as of June 30 last there was over $1.4 billion in the development loan pipeline of previously appropriated and obligated funds; and that even with the adoption of this amendment there would be some $2 billion in our current development loan program.

I have carefully examined the report of the House Appropriations Committee on this item. It has been carefully prepared. I regret that the Senate Appropriations Committee, in its statement on development loans, has not—with one exception—met the points made in the House report, and its explanation for increasing the House figure by $200 million is nonexistent.

The Senate committee was responsive to one point made by the House. This had to do with not the amount of the appropriation but with respect to a policy in governing the presentation of budget requests for development loans by the Agency for International Development. The House believes that Congress should be given an opportunity to evaluate the proposed loans—that these should be "justified on a country-by-country basis with definite loan applications to back up the estimate for each country."

The Senate Appropriations Committee does not believe it is practical, for detailed justification, for each individual proposed development loan to be submitted in advance in connection with future budgets. I am not persuaded to the Senate committee's viewpoint—at least with respect to large loans. The House committee's viewpoint is, in my opinion, much more in line with the guidelines advocated by the Clay committee. Moreover, at a time when our Government is suffering from deep, billion dollar deficits as a result of the failure of a majority of the Members of Congress to exercise prudence and restraint in appropriations, I find the willingness of the House to devote more time and effort to the scrutiny of our development loan program a refreshing attitude.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the portion of the House committee's report on development loans, appearing on pages 26 through 35.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOPMENT LOANS

1964 estimate	$1,060,000,000
1964 authorization	925,000,000
Recommended for 1964	600,000,000

The Budget proposed a development lending program, exclusive of the Latin American area of $1,160,230,000. This proposed program is composed of the following elements:

New obligational authority	$1,060,000,000
Carry-over of prior year appropriations	71,398,000
Deobligations during the fiscal year	25,832,000
Loan receipts	3,000,000
Total	1,160,230,000

Included in the appropriation estimate of $1,060 million in new obligational authority was an unprogramed amount of $52 million of which $32 million was in the Latin American area and $20 million was in the Near East and South Asia area. The Assistant Administrator for the Near East and South Asia area characterized this portion of the estimate for his area as a "contingency fund."

The committee recommends an appropriation of $600 million for development loans in fiscal year 1964.

Since fiscal year 1958 when the development loan program was initiated, the Congress has made available the following appropriations:

Fiscal year	Estimate	Appropriation
1958	$500,000,000	$300,000,000
1959	850,000,000	550,000,000
1960	700,000,000	550,000,000
1961	850,000,000	600,000,000
1962	1,200,000,000	1,112,500,000
1963	1,250,000,000	975,000,000
Total	5,350,000,000	4,087,500,000

The original Development Loan Fund was in operation from fiscal year 1958 through November 3, 1961, and made dollar loans which were repayable in dollars and/or local currency. During its existence the Development Loan Fund made 217 loans and commitments and 3 guarantees amounting to $2,008,500,000. As of June 30, 1963, loan repayments and interest collected totaled $170,696,330. All of the repayments, dollars and local currency, are credited to the U.S. Treasury and are not available for further lending.

The new AID development lending program initiated on November 3, 1961, has had total appropriations of $2,087,500,000. As of June 30, 1963, it had made 126 loans totaling $2,033,700,000. To date no principal repayments have been made. Interest and credit fees collected to date under the new development lending program total $2,018,746. Such payments are deposited into a revolving fund and continue available for further lending.

All development loans are now repayable in dollars, and most of the loans are very long term (30 to 40 years), carry a three-quarters of 1 percent credit fee in lieu of interest and provide a grace period of up to 10 years prior to commencement of repayment. The recently enacted authorization bill, however, now provides for a service charge of three-quarters of 1 percent per annum for the first 10 years and an interest rate of at least 2 percent per annum thereafter to maturity on all loans made after approval of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963.

While the Agency appears to be making some effort to harden the terms of the loans, the number of countries in which the policy is in effect is minimal. In addition, the committee has noted from the testimony and data supplied that while the United States is extending what amounts to a subsidized loan—as Administrator Bell stated: each loan is "perhaps two-thirds grant and one-third loan"—other free world and bloc countries are extending their development loans on much harder terms. For example, the following table indicates the terms of loans extended to India by other countries during fiscal years 1962 and 1963:

Loans to India from countries other than the United States

Country—Free world	Loan value	Date authorized	Interest rate	Grace period	Maximum maturity
UNITES STATES FISCAL YEAR 1962					
West Germany:	*Millions*		*Percent*	*Years*	*Years*
Balance of payments	$42.50	Sept. 14, 1961	3	7	20
Rourkela refinancing [1]	21.30	May 4, 1962	5½	4	13
Commodity aid	25.00	June 29, 1962	3	7	20
United Kingdom:					
Capital goods	14.00	Nov. 10, 1961	(2)	6½	25
Do	28.00	May 23, 1962	(2)	7	25
Durgapur expansion	61.60	do	(2)	7	25
Japan: General loan	80.00	Aug. 18, 1961	6	5	15
France: 3d plan loan, I	30.00	Feb. 5, 1962	5	--------	10
Italy: Petroleum projects [3]	45.00	Aug. 29, 1961	6	--------	12
Canada: 3d plan projects	[4] 10.60	Sept. 22, 1961 Jan. 19, 1962	6	1-5	15-20
UNITED STATES FISCAL YEAR 1963					
West Germany:	*Millions*		*Percent*	*Years*	*Years*
Maintenance support	$18.75	Dec. 12, 1962	3	7	20
Rourkela rehabilitation	14.00	do	3	7	20
Projects	26.75	do	[5] 6¼	5	15
Do	20.50	do	3	7	20
Development banks	12.50	do	5½	5	20
Rourkela expansion	100.00	Apr. 25, 1963	5¾	5	20
Rourkela refinancing [1]	15.35	do	5¾	4	13
United Kingdom:					
Capital goods	14.00	Sept. 4, 1962	(2)	7	25
Do	36.40	do	(2)	7	25
Steel, etc	9.80	Apr. 9, 1963	(2)	7	25
Japan: Textile machinery	10.00	July 20, 1962	6	--------	10
France:					
3d plan loan, II	20.00	Nov. 19, 1962	5	--------	10
Industrial Finance Corp	10.00	do	6	--------	13
Italy: Madras Aluminum [3]	8.80	Nov. 7, 1962	6	5	12
Austria: Capital goods	5.00	Nov. 23, 1962	6	2	12
Canada: 3d plan projects	[4] 14.40	Oct. 15, 1962	6	1-5	15-20
Belgium: Capital goods	10.00	(6)	(6)	--------	10-12
Switzerland: Capital goods	11.40	July 13, 1962	(7)	(7)	10

---

[1] Original loan for Rourkela steel mill of about $157 million made in 1958 was for 3 years. This is being refinanced for longer periods as portions of the credit come due. Original credit loans and refinancings should not be added together, since they represent essentially the same credit.

[2] Treasury rate plus ¼ percent.

[3] Part of a general agreement signed Aug. 29, 1961, for extension of credits up to $96,000,000. Latter figure represents a commitment but not an actual loan.

[4] Canadian loans given in Canadian dollars, which are worth a little less than U.S. dollars. The total for the 2 years (Canada, $25,000,000 or about United States, $23,100,000) is believed correct, but the division between U.S. fiscal year 1962 and U.S. fiscal year 1963 is estimated. Canada has also given India substantial grant aid ($36,000,000 for 2 years, April 1961 to March 1963) as part of its consortium commitment.

[5] Rate charged by bank consortium which advanced the funds. It is expected that the German Government will subsidize the interest payments, reducing the rate to about 5¾ percent.

[6] Not available.

[7] Discount rate plus 3¾ percent.

In comparison with the terms of the loans as indicated above the United States extended eight loans to India during fiscal year 1963 with a total value of $396,100,000, carrying a maturity date of 40 years, a 10-year grace period, and only three-fourths of 1 percent service charge.

U.S. development loan assistance to Pakistan is no different than such assistance to India. Other nations get good solid banking loans, and the United States seems to get what's left, as indicated in the table below which includes the consortium pledges and loan terms for the second and third years of Pakistan's second 5-year development plan:

Consortium pledges and loan terms for 2d and 3d years (fiscal years 1962 and 1963) of Pakistan's 2d 5-year plan

Consortium member	Total pledge (million dollar equivalents)	Interest rate (percent)	Grace period (years)	Duration (years)
United States	500			
AID grants	(23)			
AID loans	(427)	¾	10	40
Eximbank loans	(50)	5¾	1–2	7–18
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	70	5½–5¾	2½–5	10–25
International Development Agency	130	¾	10	50
United Kingdom	48	[1] 5½–6¾	5–7	25
Canada	38			
Grants	(23)			
Loans	(15)	6	5	15–20
Germany	80			
Loans	(60)	3–5½	5–7	20
Loans	(20)	6½		10
France	25	6		[2] 12–15
Japan	45	6	5	15
Total	945			

[1] Interest rate is the British Treasury rate plus ¼ of 1 percent. Hence there is a fluctuating interest rate as Treasury rate fluctuates.

[2] 10 years from time of delivery of equipment or completion of project.

During the hearings, Administrator Bell testified he was sure the United States could get harder terms on our loans, but that our position was that the terms of repayment should be related to the balance-of-payments prospects of the borrowing country. This principle has been accepted by the members of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD, including Germany, England, and Japan, but the Committee can see very little evidence of softening of lenders' terms as indicated in the table below which is the recent consortium pledges to India for fiscal year 1964:

"INDIA CONSORTIUM AGREEMENT

"The consortium of countries and institutions interested in development assistance to India concluded on August 7, 1963, a series of sessions devoted to considering India's needs for the third year (April 1963–March 1964) of her third 5-year plan. The pledges announced for the third year of the plan are as follows:

"Aid pledged by consortium for Indian fiscal year 1963–64

Donor	Amount (million dollar equivalents)	Maturity (years)	Grace period (years)	Interest rates (percent)
Austria	7.00	12	2	6
Belgium	10.00	10–12		(¹)
Canada	12.50	15.20	(¹)	(²)
	18.00	(³)		
France	30.50			
	20.00	10		5¼
Germany	15.35	13	4	5¾
	27.50	25	7	3
	22.50	20	5	5½
	5.15	20	12	5½
	29.00	10		5½
	99.50			
Italy	45.00	10		(²)
Japan	65.00	15	5	5¾
Netherlands	7.22	25	7	(¹)
	3.88	10		(¹)
United Kingdom	84.00	25	7	[4] 3½
IBRD	105.00	12–25	3–5	[5] 5½
IDA	140.00	50	10	¾
United States of America:				
AID	385.00	40	10	¾
Eximbank	50.00	10–15	3	5¾
	435.00			
Total	1,052.10			"

[1] Not available.

[2] To be based on Government's borrowing cost or market rate plus an administrative charge or commission.

[3] Grants.

[4] Interest payments to be waived during 7-year grace period. Subsequent payments to be related to United Kingdom Government's borrowing rate. It is expected that the interest charge over the life of the loan will work out to less than 3½ percent.

[5] IBRD charges current market rate at time loan is made. This has recently been 5½ percent.

In addition to the $4.087 billion which the United States has already appropriated since fiscal year 1958 for development loans on a bilateral basis, the United States has agreed to participate in two other multilateral development lending institutions and the Congress has provided appropriations as follows:

Inter-American Development Bank

Fiscal year	Estimates	Appropriations
1960	$280,000,000	$280,000,000
1962	110,000,000	110,000,000
1963	60,000,000	60,000,000
Total	450,000,000	450,000,000

Included in another section of the bill is a recommended appropriation of $50 million for the Special Operations Fund of the Bank. This appropriation was recently authorized by Public Law 88- ———, approved ———. In addition, the board of governors recently recommended that each member country of the Bank take the legislative and administrative actions necessary to make the proposed increase in capital stock of $1 billion as soon as possible. The U.S. share of this proposed increased capitalization of the Bank is $412 million. This increased U.S. contribution is also authorized by Public Law 88- ———.

Another recently established development lending institution is the International Development Association, an affiliate of the World Bank, which was created to provide development financing on more flexible terms than the World Bank. At present IDA makes loans, repayable in dollars, with a maturity date of 50 years, a 10-year grace period, and a service charge of three-fourths of 1 percent. The Congress has provided the following appropriations to date toward fulfilling our total subscription which represents approximately 32 percent of the presently authorized capitalization:

International Development Association

Fiscal year	Estimates	Appropriations
1961	$73,666,700	$73,666,700
1962	61,656,000	61,656,000
1963	61,656,000	61,656,000
Total	196,978,700	196,978,700

Also included in another section of the bill is $61,656,000 as the fiscal year 1964 appropriation to the association, with an additional appropriation of identical amount required in fiscal year 1965. In addition, legislation has been recently introduced (S. 2214) which would authorize an additional appropriation of $312 million to the IDA over a 3-year period beginning in fiscal 1966.

While the committee recognizes the need for a source of funds for development purposes, it questions the wisdom of an apparent trend toward a number of institutions, with the United States as the largest contributor, providing such assistance on soft terms. The World Bank, which was created in 1945, was the original institution in this field. Since its establishment it has made sound bank loans for developmental purposes. However, at the recent international monetary conference held in Washington it was suggested that the World Bank revise its present policy of hard-term loans to one of softer terms. Both of the banks discussed above—the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank's affiliate, the International Development Association—now make developmental loans on soft terms.

One objection to loans with soft terms is that with grace periods and maturity dates so far in the future, the banks' resources are soon exhausted and then there is a requirement for additional capitalization. The committee has already noted above the propositions for increased capitalization for both the Inter-American Development Bank and the International Development Association.

In its review of the material presented in support of the foreign assistance estimate, the committee noted in the summary presentation document the following statement:

"In the year and a half since the passage of the Foreign Assistance Act, development loans have become the major instrument of U.S. economic assistance.

"Nearly 60 percent of the total economic assistance program funds requested by AID for fiscal year 1964 is earmarked for lending. This share compares with about 54 percent estimated for fiscal year 1963 and about 30 percent in 1961, the last year of the Development Loan Fund."

In view of the substantial percentage of the 1964 estimate for economic assistance that is requested for development loans, the committee is quite concerned, as it has been in prior years, as to the lack of detailed information presented to the Congress in justification of the estimate of funds required for the program. The committee commented rather extensively last year in its report on this appropriation item with reference to the fact that projects are selected by the Agency and funded only after Congress makes funds available for development loans.

This year Assistant Administrator Hutchinson stated on page 1105 of part 3 of the printed hearings that the development loan program estimate was far more illustrative than any other part of the AID program. The committee questions whether that is possible, but it is willing to take Mr. Hutchinson's word.

Again, on page 1179 of part 4 of the printed hearings, the following colloquy occurred:

"Mr. Talbot. The answer on the money is, We do not know whether funds appropriated for development loans might be used for one loan or for another yet. Each loan application comes and is examined and a decision is made in the course of a year, so in our proposals for development loan funds, we are not at this time able to specify which particular development loan application will be accepted.

"Mr. Passman. You are saying this is an illustrative program. Even though you should justify funds for this project, you could always transfer them over to another project, and if you did not request funds for the steel mill project, you could take it out of some other part of the total; is that correct?

"Mr. Gaud. The amounts we are asking for development are not committed to any project.

"Mr. Passman. That is what I say. It is an illustrative program. Even though you may have no specific plans for the steel mill, at some subsequent date, after you receive the funds, you may decide it is more advantageous to build the steel mill than carry out some other project?

"Mr. Gaud. No. We are not asking money for specific projects."

The committee is of the opinion that future estimates for development loans should be justified on a country basis with definite loan applications on hand to back up the estimate for each country. In support of its position that such a presentation is possible, the committee points to the Latin America area, where on June 30 AID Washington had specific loan applications on hand in the amount of $285,552,000, in addition to $110 million in potential loans which were under negotiation on that date as indicated in the table below:

LOAN APPLICATIONS ON HAND AS OF JUNE 30, 1963

The following list of loan applications on hand as of June 30, 1963, totals $395.5 million:

Country and purpose	*Amount (thousands)*
Argentina:	
Irrigation network	$2,500
Modernization of river transport	1,770
School construction	6,558
Deciduous fruit production	698
Bolivia:	
Establishment, expansion and modernization of private industries	2,400
Drilling, exploitation and processing of crude oil	3,000
Construction of a tourist hotel	1,000
Supervised agricultural credit	3,700
Brazil:	
Electric power expansion	11,000
Cast iron pipe production	1,348
Brine industrial program	2,580
Chavantes hydroelectric power	10,000
Funil hydroelectric	2,000
Fortaleza power	2,400
Northeast Development Banks	20,000
Chile:	
Communications facilities	15,400
Development of timber property	3,000
Supervised agricultural credit	1,500
Fishing and canning plant	600
Feasibility studies	3,000
Housing	5,000
Colombia:	
Savings and loan associations	5,000
Health and medical facilities	7,000
Development bank	5,000
Supervised credit to small and medium industry	2,500
Capital for agricultural and small industrial loans	$2,000
Expansion of manufacturing facilities	5,000
Medellin sewerage	4,100
Baranquilla airport	6,800
Costa Rica:	
Metropolitan emergency water supply	1,400
Development bank	4,100
Ecuador: IBRD road program	13,500
Guatemala: Salama-Coban highway	6,000
Mexico:	
Housing institution	20,000
School construction	2,000
Agricultural school construction	2,000
Nicaragua: Electric power supply	370
Panama:	
Abattoir construction	300
Development bank	4,500
Peru:	
Expansion program of university	7,628
National highway development program	40,000
Aided self-help secondary roads	2,200
Construction of Pativilca hydroelectric plant	2,500
Hydroelectric power project Canon del Plato	2,200
Uruguay: Construction of primary classrooms	5,000
Central America:	
Housing	10,000
Fund for Central American integration	25,000
Program loans under negotiation between United States and recipient countries which cannot be identified by individual country in unclassified form until negotiations are completed	110,000
Total loan application, on hand June 30, 1963, in AID Washington headquarters	395,552

Inasmuch as the specific loan applications, exclusive of the loan applications in negotiation, are approximately 52 percent of the fiscal year 1964 estimate for development loans in Latin America, and if the additional $110 million of loans in negotiation are included, the percentage rises to approximately 70 percent, the committee is of the opinion that the Agency could and should have a separate project sheet for each loan by country which would supply all pertinent data on each proposed loan. With such information on hand, the committee would have a more businesslike basis upon which to recommend funds for this type of program. As it is now, the committee and the Congress are asked to appropriate funds in the dark, and can only hope that the Agency will approve during the year only those applications that are sound, worthwhile investments.

In addition, the estimates would not contain items such as the $20 million estimate for development loans for Israel which, according to the justifications, "rests increasingly on political comparisons rather than on an economic evaluation."

Such a presentation would also give the Congress itself an opportunity to approve or disapprove loan applications for specific projects such as the Bokaro steel mill project in India. As the program is presented to the Congress now, the only way the Congress can express its disapproval of a development loan project is through a specific prohibition in the authorization act. The committee is of the opinion that the Congress should have a strong voice in the decision as to how the U.S. taxpayers' money is to be spent overseas. As it is now, the Executive has the sole authority for this decision.

In connection with the Bokaro steel mill project in India on which the House has expressed its opinion, the committee was quite concerned to read that our Ambassador to India, Chester Bowles, made the following statement in a press conference in Calcutta on September 25 subsequent to House action on the authorization bill:

"Ambassador Bowles. The next point that is important to remember, that this does not in any way change the amount of American aid money going to India. We had been planning to spend $500 million on Bokaro. We will now have $500 million we didn't have before to spend on something else. This now releases the same sum of money for other projects, assuming we continue to get the budgets we have had for aid to India. It is not a loss of income or aid money or grants or loans to India—it simply switches from one set of projects to another. For instance, there are projects which India is financing herself with her own foreign exchange, that you earn from the sale of jute, iron ore, and other products. We can take over some of those, releasing your own funds for Bokaro."

Such an attitude on the part of the U.S. Ambassador to India is hard to understand and, in the opinion of the committee, puts any project in India which the United States may finance in the future in a very questionable light. Based on its hearings on the Bokaro steel mill project, the committee is of the further opinion that there is no justification for the allocation of any funds contained in this bill for the oversea construction of steel mills.

The committee will expect, in connection with the fiscal year 1965 and future budgets, detailed justifications (or project sheets) on each individual loan proposed for each country in the development loan estimate.

The committee has noted the strong recommendation of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the executive branch take advantage of the authority of section 205 of the Foreign Assistance Act whereby up to 10 percent of development loan funds may be lent to the International Development Association for further relending. This Committee strongly opposes the use of section 205 by the executive branch on two counts. One, the United States has to date appropriated $196,978,700 to the association and included in another section of the bill is the recommended appropriation of $61,656,000 as the fiscal year 1964 payment, with an additional $61,656,000 due in fiscal year 1965. In addition, legislation has been introduced recently authorizing an additional U.S. contribution of $312 million to the association, with the first payment due in fiscal year 1966. Two, the committee is recommending in this bill the appropriation of $600 million for development loans on a bilateral basis with the understanding that, to quote Secretary Rusk, it "furthers our own national interest" which may or may not be shared by an international organization.

The committee is of the further opinion that appropriations to the International Development Association should first be authorized and then approved on the merits of the proposition, rather than on a "back door" basis as recommended by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Therefore, the committee has included in the bill a limitation providing that none of the funds contained in the bill may be used to carry out the provisions of section 205 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time is left to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The Senator from Rhode Island has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have heard much discussion during this debate on the request and recommendation of the President. Of course, we all respect that recommendation. However, I am going to talk about the pending amendment from a different point of view. I am going to talk about our standing by the Senate and standing by the Congress, because only a few days ago we passed an authorization bill in the amount of $3,600 million. Of the figure now in issue the authorization bill approved more than the amount that is included in the Senate committee bill. It included $925 million and the Appropriations Committee cut it down to $800 million, as I remember the figures, and we are asked to further cut that amount to $600 million.

It seems to me that we must regard our own position, already solemnly expressed, as worthy of some consideration at this time. We fought 3 weeks on the authorization matter in this Chamber and the other body fought long periods of time. Then in conference the matter was tied up for a long time and we came out with a conference measure, which was approved by a heavy vote in the Senate by the very ones who are now asked to pass upon this amount, which is a somewhat smaller amount than that which we approved in the conference report. Before that authorization bill ever got to the White House we were asked to cut the entire measure some $600 million and were asked to cut the particular amount for development loans from $925 million to $600 million.

I do not believe that is the way to make the people of this country have confidence in the Senate and in the integrity of the Senate, particularly in the integrity of the final expression of the full Congress when a conference report, after all of the long debate, has been approved by Congress.

So, as far as I am concerned, I hope we will keep this particular bill—this appropriation bill—as near the conference report on the authorization measure as it is possible to do so, realizing perfectly well that the other body has seen fit to heavily reduce a large part of the authorization measure and that the real battle will be in conference.

If we proceed to cut down amounts so as to make our bill like the House bill, we shall indeed not only be ignoring the wishes of the President but we also shall violate the deliberate expression of the Senate and the expression of the Congress.

Mr. President, I do not believe that is the way to create confidence on the part of the public generally in the expressions of Congress. We enacted an authorization bill, worked out over a period of weeks, and before there is time to have that measure approved by the President, we—the same Senators and the same Representatives who gave our approval by a large majority to the authorization bill—come along and say we did not mean what we said. On the contrary, we are now asked to say that we meant something entirely different, and that we wish to cut down very heavily on the figures which we agreed to in the authorization bill.

I have a great deal of respect and confidence in the distinguished author of the pending amendment. I stuck by him in most of his fight on the authorization bill. The record will show except as to one vote on a $25 million cut—which, by the way, was proposed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon—I voted for every cut which we made during the authorization debate.

I voted for the conference report which was $100 million, roughly, less than the bill which we passed in the Senate. I believe when we have once set our hands to the plow and approved a conference report and an authorization bill, it ill becomes men of maturity and men of sound judgment to turn around and try to cut back $600 million of what we have worked out after long pain and great give and take and sincere effort.

I shall not be a party to approaching the matter in this way and I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, may I inquire whether there is any time remaining?

If there is any time left, I will yield it back. We are now ready to vote. I believe we have said everything that can be said on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present, and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Tennesee [Mr. Walters], and the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Kansas [Mr. Carlson and Mr. Pearson], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. Allott and Mr. Dominick], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent on official business to attend the Presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent because of illness in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 277 Leg.]

YEAS—30

Beall
Bennett
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Cotton
Curtis
Ellender
Ervin
Gruening
Hruska
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long, La.
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Morse
Mundt
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—54

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Smathers
Sparkman
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—16

Allott
Carlson
Dominick
Eastland
Engle
Gore
Hart
Hill
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McGee
Pearson
Scott
Simpson
Tower
Walters

So Mr. Ellender's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I offer a pro forma amendment, to strike title 1 from the bill. I do this only to get some time. I shall not take more than a few minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Kentucky if he is willing to yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], who has an item that can be handled very promptly, and which has been cleared on both sides of the aisle. If it takes more than 1 minute, it will be withdrawn.

Mr. MORTON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DETENTION OF ESCAPED JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, Senate bill 1319, having to do with the detention of escaped juvenile delinquents, was passed by the House with two amendments—improving amendments, I may say. I have cleared this matter with the majority and minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1319) to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents, which were, on page 1, lines 9 and 10 after "representative," insert "or from any institution in which he is confined by direction of the Attorney General, or from any custody under or by virtue of any process issued under the laws of the United States by any court, judge, or commissioner, or from the custody of an officer or employee of the United States pursuant to lawful arrests,", and on page 2 line 20, after "representative," insert "or of any person arrested upon a warrant or other process issued under any law of the United States or from any institution in which he is confined by direction of the Attorney General,".

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his graciousness and courtesy.

THE COFFEE AND TAX BILLS BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post there is an editorial under the head of "Coffeemanship."

The editorial starts as follows:

> A minor tempest in a coffee cup threatens to delay approval of a noncontroversial piece of legislation needed to confirm this country's adherence to the International Coffee Treaty.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be placed in the Record at this point in full, because I shall not read it in its entirety.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> [From the Washington Post, Dec. 19, 1963]
>
> ### Coffeemanship
>
> A minor tempest in a coffee cup threatens to delay approval of a noncontroversial piece of legislation needed to confirm this country's adherence to the International Coffee Treaty. Last week, we urged the Senate Finance Committee to approve the short implementing legislation already passed by the House. The deadline for approval is the end of this month, and it was our feeling that a housekeeping detail could be cleared up without delaying consideration of the tax cut bill now before the Finance Committee.
>
> Chairman Harry F. Byrd promptly sent us a letter pointing out that the administration itself had first requested and then canceled its request for hearings on the coffee legislation. What happened was a case study in deft one-upmanship on Mr. Byrd's part—a ploy that succeeded because the administration unwisely fell into the chairman's trap.
>
> Earlier this month, Senator Byrd requested the State Department's views on the legislation. Frederick G. Dutton, the Department's legislative chief, signed a routine letter in which he strongly recommended "early favorable action on the bill." So Mr. Byrd scheduled hearings and it became obvious that the chairman would be able to use this pretext for further delaying action on the tax bill.
>
> The next day, on December 12, the administration became aware of Mr. Byrd's intent and Mr. Dutton fired off a second letter urging hearings "only after completion of the tax bill." Because the administration made too sweeping an endorsement of prompt action it wound up by making too sweeping a reversal. The administration should have said that it wished prompt approval of the coffee bill but not at the price of prolonged hearings.
>
> In the meantime, coffee producing countries are caught in the middle and the good faith of this country is jeopardized by one-upmanship. Surely the committee could dispose of the short bill in an hour or so. Mr. Byrd has won his gambit. Now it would be sportsmanship, and statesmanlike, to send the bill through his committee.

Mr. MORTON. The editorial continues:

> Chairman Harry F. Byrd promptly sent us a letter pointing out that the administration itself had first requested and then canceled its request for hearings on the coffee legislation. What happened was a case study in deft one-upmanship on Mr. Byrd's part—a ploy that succeeded because the administration unwisely fell into the chairman's trap.

Mr. President, the first thing I want to say is that Harry Flood Byrd never laid a trap for anybody.

Another thing is that when the editorial writers talk about the coffee bill as being a noncontroversial, minor piece of legislation, they do not know what they are talking about. When the price of coffee goes up 1 cent, it costs the housewives of America $35 million; and it has gone up 6 cents in the last few months. So I do not think it is a noncontroversial piece of legislation.

Let us get the history and the record straight with respect to what happened in connection with coffee legislation. The Finance Committee agreed with its chairman that it would set aside the tax bill for 1 day, and have hearings for one morning, and meet in executive session that afternoon, to dispose of this matter one way or the other.

A letter was sent to the Finance Committee on December 11, signed by Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State. I am in no way criticizing Assistant Secretary Dutton. I once had the job he now has. It is a tough job. I believe he is taking the brunt of this controversy as a good soldier, and I compliment him for it.

But this letter was delivered on December 11, and after it was delivered to the committee, after it was sent here by the State Department, which requested hearings, Mr. Dutton himself called and stated that the White House wanted him to withdraw the letter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter, marked "No. 1," be printed in full in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> December 11, 1963.
>
> The Honorable Harry F. Byrd,
> *Chairman, Committee on Finance,*
> *U.S. Senate.*
>
> Dear Mr. Chairman: I am writing in reply to your request for the Department's views on H.R. 8864, a bill now pending before the Senate Finance Committee.
>
> Following advice and consent by the Senate to the ratification of the International Coffee Agreement, Secretary Rusk transmitted to the Congress on June 1 legislation to carry out the obligations of the United States under that agreement. This legislation was passed by the House with amendments that are entirely acceptable to the Department.
>
> The Department strongly recommends early favorable action on the bill, not only for the reasons outlined in the Secretary's letter of transmittal, but also because the International Coffee Agreement, which is only provisionally in force, will expire if ratification is not completed by December 31 of this year. Early action on the bill, that is, before the end of the current calendar year, is, therefore, a matter of urgency.
>
> The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report and that enactment of H.R. 8864 would be fully in accord with the program of the President.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Frederick G. Dutton,
> *Assistant Secretary.*

Mr. MORTON. Then came another letter, on December 11, which is designated as "No. 2," and which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> December 11, 1963.
>
> Hon. Harry F. Byrd,
> *Chairman, Committee on Finance,*
> *U.S. Senate.*
>
> Dear Mr. Chairman: I am writing in reply to your request for the Department's views on H.R. 8864, a bill now pending before the Senate Finance Committee.
>
> Following advice and consent by the Senate to the ratification of the International Coffee Agreement, Secretary Rusk transmitted to the Congress on June 1 legislation to carry out the obligations of the United States under that agreement. This legislation was passed by the House with amendments that are entirely acceptable to the Department.
>
> The Department strongly recommends early favorable action on the bill for the reasons outlined in the Secretary's letter of transmittal.
>
> The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report and that enactment of H.R. 8864 would be fully in accord with the program of the President.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Frederick G. Dutton,
> *Assistant Secretary.*

Mr. MORTON. That letter indicates that they want the coffee hearings after the tax bill, but implies that the tax bill would be passed before the Christmas recess, which we all know is impossible.

After that letter, another letter, No. 3, came, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

December 12, 1963.

Hon. Harry Flood Byrd,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am writing to confirm my telephone call today to Mrs. Elizabeth Springer, chief clerk of the Senate Finance Committee, requesting that hearings on H.R. 8864 be scheduled after completion of the committee's consideration of the tax reduction legislation now before it. This is consistent with the Department's letter of December 11, sent in response to the committee's request of November 18 for comments on H.R. 8864, and asking that early favorable action be taken on this bill. Hearings on the measure are sought, however, only after completion of the tax bill now before the committee.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report, and the request reflects the position of the executive branch on this matter.

Sincerely yours,
Frederick G. Dutton.

Mr. MORTON. In this letter it is stated that hearings are still wanted on the coffee bill; that they want action expedited on it, but after the tax bill.

Finally, at the insistence of the staff of the committee, a clarifying letter, No. 4, dated December 18, was submitted, in which it is stated that they want the hearings on the coffee bill in January, after the committee disposes of the tax bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Assistant Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C., December 12, 1963.

Hon. Harry Flood Byrd,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am writing to confirm my telephone call today to Mrs. Elizabeth Springer, chief clerk of the Senate Finance Committee, requesting that hearings on H.R. 8864 be scheduled after completion of the committee's consideration of the tax reduction legislation now before it. I understand that committee action on the tax cut bill will not be completed until after the first of the new year and consequently ask that hearings on H.R. 8864 be scheduled in January if at all possible.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report, and the request reflects the position of the administration on this matter.

Sincerely yours,
Frederick G. Dutton.

Mr. MORTON. During an executive session of the committee in considering this matter, in examining the various letters, the committee authorized the chairman to call the President of the United States, which he did, to find out what we were supposed to do; what he wanted us to do. We were willing to do what he wanted. The President told chairman Byrd, "Leave this coffee legislation until you get through with the tax bill."

That is the procedure this committee has followed.

While I am on the subject, let me say that the chairman of the Finance Committee has taken much abuse, not only in the Washington Post, but elsewhere, in being charged with dilatory tactics in connection with the tax measure. He is doing more to expedite action on the bill than is any other member of the committee. He is urging us to get on with our work, to get on with the amendments, and to get moving. I was not very diligent in attending the public hearings as a member of the Finance Committee. I had a member of my staff digest them, and I had a summary of what was said every morning; but the chairman was always present.

The committee meets at 10 o'clock. In marking up the bill and passing on amendments, a quorum must be present. A quorum is not needed at the hearings. The chairman is present at 10 o'clock in the morning, and so is the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams]. It is no secret that they are opposed to the bill, but they are at the committee meetings at 10 o'clock. I may get there at 5 or 10 minutes after 10, since we have had executive hearings on the bill. I point out that the proponents of the bill, those who champion the bill, are not found in the committee until 10 minutes after 11 or 12 o'clock. The day before yesterday we could not obtain a quorum until 10 minutes of 11. Five of us were there waiting 50 minutes—not those who are champions of the bill, but those who, for the most part, oppose it. It is no secret that I am for the bill.

I want to make it abundantly clear on the floor of the Senate that the editorial in the Washington Post is in no sense justified. Anyone who says Harry Byrd laid a trap does not know what he is talking about. He has done no such thing. I am sure any member of the committee will support me in my statement that he is doing as much as anyone else to expedite action on that measure, even though he is opposed to it. This criticism of him is grossly unfair and a reflection on one of the great men in the U.S. Senate, and the fairest chairman I have served under in any committee in either the Senate or the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Kentucky in paying his respects to the chairman of the Committee on Finance. No one could be fairer in expediting legislation, whether he is for it or against it, than the chairman of our committee. Certainly he has been more diligent in attending to his duties than any other member of the committee.

So far as the coffee agreement is concerned the Senator from Kentucky is 100 percent correct. Sometime ago the committee scheduled hearings, and the State Department had told us that they were ready for the hearings. They were given full assurance by the committee, even by those who may be opposed to the coffee agreement, that we could confine the hearings to one meeting and that we could hold an executive session and act on it on the same day. We assured them there would be no delay.

The State Department, as the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, first stated that it was urgent that action be taken by Congress by the 31st of December, under threat of dire circumstances developing if we did not do so.

Within 36 hours, as the records will show, they did a complete changeover and ended by asking us to delay the hearings until the beginning of next year. The Senator is 100 percent correct. The State Department must assume the full responsibility for the change. Perhaps there was a good reason for the change; however, they should accept the responsibility for it and not charge the chairman with the responsibility when he was willing to expedite consideration of the matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with what the Senator says about the editorial. It is wholly unjustified. It is my view that the administration made a mistake and that the editorial writer did not understand the real situation. The administration was clearly in error.

An agreement had been entered into at the time the coffee agreement was made that the State Department would not proceed to deposit the instrument of ratification until the implementing legislation had been passed. Then it became evident that the session would continue for a long time and that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to pass on the legislation before the end of this year. It was recalled that certain other Members would have to deposit the instrument of ratification or the whole agreement would collapse. Clearly a mistake was made in the administration.

Subsequent to that time, Mr. Dutton, of the State Department, inquired about submitting a letter to the chairman of the committee which would enable them to live up to their promise about the legislation and at the same time enable them to deposit the instrument of ratification. They pledged their word they would not do anything or take any action which would be prejudicial to freedom of action in Congress on the implementing legislation. They wanted to have approval on the filing of the instrument of ratification only. I showed the letter to the chairman the other day. If my memory serves me correctly, he did not have any objection to that procedure.

So far as the editorial is concerned, I believe it was based originally on a mistake made by the administration. The editorial is wholly unjustified, as the Senator has said.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I am not debating the merits or demerits of the coffee agreement. I know that from a practical standpoint it is meaningless unless we go along, because we consume about half of the world's coffee. I am not criticizing the administration for this mistake. This kind of mistake has happened in the past. However, I was constrained to rise because I did not like the attack that was being made on the chairman of our committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. The editorial is completely unjustified.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to confirm the statement made by the Senator from Kentucky regarding the coffee situation. We were urged by the administration to deal promptly with the implementing legislation, and we set aside last Monday as the day to act. Then a bewildering succession of letters followed. They were almost impossible to keep up with. Finally we were begged not to hold the session. The chairman was put under heavy pressure not to hold the session. It is unfair to blame him for what happened.

Now there is a very interesting future problem. The Senator from Arkansas has implied that the State Department has deposited the treaty. I thought it was not to be deposited until the Senate had approved the implementing legislation. The Senate has not approved it, but I infer that the treaty has either been deposited or will be shortly. The Senator from Alaska and I together with other Senators, voted against the treaty. I voted against it because, though I am sympathetic toward the position of the Latin American countries, I am afraid we shall be asked to support all the commodities of Africa and Latin America—the prices of which have fluctuated in the world market and in the main decreased. We may be called upon to hold up the world commodity price not only of coffee, but also cocoa, and the operation may range to other commodities. I am afraid it will cost our consumers in the United States hundreds of millions of dollars.

It may be that this is the policy which we should follow. I am very dubious about it. I cannot conscientiously vote for the treaty.

Now the treaty has been deposited as I infer from the Senator from Arkansas or shortly will be although an agreement had previously been reached that it would not be deposited until after the implementing legislation had been approved.

When the implementing legislation comes up, it will, of course, be said that it would be very ungracious on our part to withdraw a treaty which had already been deposited. Moral pressure will be put upon the Senate to approve the implementing legislation. In short, if there has been a ploy, it has been a ploy by the State Department to force the Senate into a position in which it will be compelled to ratify a measure to which some of us may have objection. I hope this is not a ploy on the part of the State Department and I would welcome a pledge of good faith on their part that they will not deposit the treaty unless and until the Senate has approved the implementing legislation. That was the original pledge. It was the understanding when orders were reversed and we were asked to delay instead of to expedite the implementing legislation. If it is not carried out someone will be guilty of a flimflam. It will not be the Senator from Virginia. It will not be the Senator from Illinois. I may be old fashioned and unable to play the Washington game. But I have always thought pledges should be carried out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe that the State Department was at fault. There are some new people at the White House. I honestly believe that they were not aware of what they were undertaking to do with regard to depositing the instrument of ratification. I do not believe they understood it. I believe this from my conference with Mr. Dutton; namely, that they were crossed up by the request not to suspend the hearings that had been planned. That is my belief of what happened.

The coffee agreement is not a part of the support program. All it imposes upon us is a reporting duty, to report the origin of the coffee. There is nothing in the authorization which would cause us to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in support of anyone's prices. We agreed to cooperate with countries which are producers of coffee, in reporting the origin of the coffee which comes into this country. What they are trying to do is stop the very serious overproduction with which they are plagued. We very properly are sympathetic with that aim. I do not believe it will result in a great support program.

I understand the Senator from Illinois has in mind a support program similar to the support program on wheat and other commodities. That is not involved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. For years that is what was done for sugar, and the Senator from Arkansas and I were the only two Members of the Senate who voted against it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. We do not make any commitments in the coffee agreement to support any prices under it. There is no authority to do so.

All we would really do in the implementing legislation would be to provide the mechanics for reporting to the producers what the origin of the coffee is. The allocation of it is in no way dependent upon a price that we commit ourselves to pay. I do not wish to leave the impression that we are undertaking a support program, because I do not believe that is so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope that is correct. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas speaks correctly. We do not have implementing legislation before us, and we do not know what would be its contents. We know that the producing countries are most desirous of having the support of the United States in maintaining and increasing the price of coffee. I think this is a proper question to raise.

We also know that behind the coffee agreement is a cocoa agreement, which, as I understand, is a price-fixing and output-restricting agreement. As I say, it may be that we should adopt these measures; but they are grave matters of public policy, and huge sums of money are involved. I think it is appropriate that we look into these questions. The State Department, or whoever was in charge of this matter, said we made some extraordinary "boners" in this connection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. For example, incompetence. While I differ with my chairman (Mr. Byrd of Virginia) on most matters of tax policy, and shall probably continue to differ with him, I think that in this respect he is completely faultless. The blame lies somewhere else.

I conclude by saying that I believe the Washington Post is a great newspaper.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield, so that I may address a question to him?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations know whether the increase of 6 cents a pound, to which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] has referred, is a result of the negotiations? Has it any relation to the treaty?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The treaty is not yet in effect. I do not know how to explain the increases in the stock market or the increase in the price of sugar from 3 cents a pound to 10 cents a pound. The price of coffee responds to influences that I do not understand; but it could not be as a result of the agreement, because it is not yet in effect.

Mr. GRUENING. Could it be psychological?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It could be; I do not know. However, there is now a vast oversupply of coffee. A huge supply is in storage. Speculation takes place in other products, such as salad oil, about which we have been reading. I do not know what is the factor. I do not see how it could be said that it is a result of the agreement, because the agreement has not yet gone into effect. It does not impose any duty on us to support any price. We would cooperate with other countries in reporting where the coffee came from and enabling them to try to establish some kind of equitable limitation among themselves, because utter chaos exists in many countries which produce coffee.

Rather than to say the agreement would have the effect of supporting prices, most likely it would have the element of bringing stability into the market, so that the price would not gyrate in such violent fashion from year to year, and thus disturb the economy of the countries which produce coffee.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas to enable him to make an insertion in the Record.

TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY BY SAM FAUBUS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Sam Faubus, one of my esteemed constituents and a good friend, recently wrote one of the most succinct and eloquent tributes to President Kennedy that I have seen. This tribute to our late

President appeared in the Madison County Record, which is published in Huntsville, Ark. The Madison County Record is owned by the Governor of Arkansas, who is the son of Mr. Sam Faubus.

Sam Faubus was introduced to President Kennedy when the President dedicated the Greers Ferry Dam in Arkansas this fall.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter by Mr. Faubus be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMBS, ARK.

DEAR EDITOR: I am stunned and bewildered. I don't seem to be able to realize that the bright-eyed, dark sandy-haired young man that greeted me with a smile and a warm handshake and told me he had received a nice letter from my daughter, Bonnie, in California, only a few days ago, now lies murdered by the hand of an assassin.

When history has rendered its verdict it will place the name of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as one among the greatest Presidents this country has had since the time of Abraham Lincoln. He has done more for peace and freedom in the 3 short years he has been President than any man in our Nation's history.

Children will read about John Fitzgerald Kennedy in their history books for generations to come, and men believing in liberty, justice, and freedom will revere his name throughout the entire world.

SAM FAUBUS.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

MEMORANDUM DIRECTED TO HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BY PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum directed to heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government by President Lyndon B. Johnson, who asks that a personal message from him be conveyed to all Federal employees.

In response to the unspoken question spontaneously asked by the men and women of the Federal service, "What can I do to help?", President Johnson replies: "Give your best to your job and your country." We can never forget that it was our late President John F. Kennedy, who enjoined us all to seek our country's needs.

As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and as a friend of the Federal employee, I welcome this message from President Johnson and I am sure that his words will be heeded by the loyal and devoted corps of Federal employees everywhere who have always responded to every challenge with devotion and pride in their work.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., December 13, 1963.

MEMORANDUM TO HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

I ask that you convey this personal message to all of your employees:

In these first days, men and women of all ranks within the government have asked me, "What can I do to help?" Many more of you, deeply committed to the Federal service, are undoubtedly asking yourselves the same question. It is impossible for me to make a direct and personal response to all of you, much as I would like to do so. Yet there is an answer which I would like to express to every employee in every agency at every location in the Federal Government. It is simply this: "Give your best to your job and your country."

As your Chief Executive, I will do my utmost to maintain the high quality and character of the career service in the Government and to advance its usefulness through improvement. I will look to those who direct the day-to-day activities of this great work force and to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission for continuing reports and recommendations to assist me in this purpose.

We have a great resource of abilities and talents among the people serving our Federal Government. We have career systems to assure continuity of people and programs. We are organized for the job, and the work is before us. President Kennedy did not shrink from his responsibilities, but welcomed them, and he would not have us shrink from carrying forward the great work he began so well. I say to you as I said to the Congress: "Let us continue."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 17, it is proposed to strike out $1 billion and insert in lieu thereof $977,700,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to reduce the amount of the military assistance fund to $1 billion, which is the amount provided in the authorization bill. Arguments have been advanced here this afternoon that we should try to keep this bill as close as possible to the authorization bill. This is what I seek to do with this amendment. In fact, if this amendment is adopted there will be appropriated for military assistance the precise amount which was authorized by Congress a few weeks ago.

The bill as adopted by the House and the Senate Appropriations Committee provides a total of $1,022,300,000, or $22,300,000 more than was authorized.

I hope the Senate will agree to reduce the amount for military assistance to $1 billion, the amount authorized. I urge the Senate to adopt my amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the point made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has much merit. The authorization for military assistance was $1 billion. It is all unobligated money. It had not been spent. There was a surplus of $22.3 million that the House reappropriated. The purpose of the amendment is, more or less, to delete that amount from the military assistance fund.

I have discussed the amendment with the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations and am perfectly willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was adopted be reconsidered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to strike title 6, on page 21, lines 1 through 20.

This is a pro forma amendment. I shall speak on another subject and yield myself 10 minutes.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—ANOTHER CHANCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to speak today briefly on the Alliance for Progress in response to the major move just made by the President in an effort to unify authority within our Government over Latin American affairs. He has appointed both as his White House aid for Latin American policy matters and as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Ambassador Thomas C. Mann. Thus the President is seeking to be sure that we speak with one voice concerning Latin American policy.

In my opinion, the Alliance for Progress is at the crossroads. It is an extremely vital program to our freedom and security; hence, as Mr. Mann—whom I know and admire as a personal friend, and who is a real leader in the field of Latin American policy—is about to take over direction of our Latin American policy, I felt that such views as I had upon this grave subject should be made known before the Senate recessed for the Christmas holidays.

I speak today, not as a critic, but as one whose thoughts might help to chart a new policy—a policy of realism—for an alliance for success. The hour is late and there is much trouble in Latin America and more may be impending.

Mr. President, my qualifications for making this analysis are, I believe, fair. Not only have I interested myself deeply in Latin America during the 15 years I have served in the Congress, including 8 years of service on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, but I am also, in cooperation with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], currently engaged in a major effort designed to bring a massive influx of capital and technical assistance from the United States, Western Europe, and Japan to Latin America.

Mr. President, the future of the Alliance for Progress and the economic prospects for the peoples of the other American states are in the balance. I believe that we must take at least five steps to reconstitute the Alliance for Progress. We must attempt to convert it from a program struggling to keep afloat into an effort founded on self-help and mutual cooperation which is capable of using the winds of social and economic revolution to arrive at a safe harbor of peace.

These five steps are:

First. The United States should join the countries of the hemisphere in a supreme effort to transform the Alliance into an effective political movement, and to galvanize Latin American public opinion into action behind it.

Second. The United States should concentrate the resources it makes available to Latin America under the Alliance in the countries with the greatest economic and political potential.

Third. The United States should be ready to use its forces, consistent with the Inter-American Treaty for Reciprocal Assistance, if called upon by duly elected governments in self-defense against Communist subversion or terror, and lend its full support to collective action by the nations of the hemisphere.

Fourth. It is essential that the United States revise its trade policies toward Latin America and put its full support behind the formation of a Hemispheric Common Market.

Fifth. The United States should devise new incentives for private capital as an inducement to bring new enterprise and new capital into Latin America.

For the "winds of revolution" in Latin America—about which much is said, and little understood these days—have been blowing and gaining force since the first wars of independence from European powers were waged and won in the 19th century. Originally inspired by our own Revolution and the ideas of Bolivar, San Martin, Artigas, Hidalgo, and other Latin American patriots, this upheaval has taken on an urgency calling for a major effort on our part to supply it with new inspiration.

The basic causes of this upheaval are not difficult to discern; centuries-old poverty of unbelievable proportions; short life spans for the people; failures of social justice and the absence of meaningful land reform, of human dignity, and an erosion of faith among the people in the ability of the democratic process to bring about substantial and rapid enough improvement in the economic welfare of the masses. The growing agitation is fed by worsening terms of trade and economic and social conditions and is creating almost intolerable tensions in the body politic of Latin America and in the relationship among the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

The situation confronting the hemisphere is of overpowering dimensions. In the last decade, the population of Latin America rose from 163 million to 206 million, an annual increase of more than 4 million or 3 percent annually—one of the highest birth rates in the world—while gross national product rose from $38 billion to only $55 billion. Per capita gross national product rose from $230 in 1953 to $265 in 1961, and since that year, per capita gross national product has fallen. Prices received from Latin America's exports have steadily declined since 1954, from an index value of 120—1958=100—to 93; and the terms of trade have gone against Latin America—a given volume of Latin American exports now buys only 89 percent as much from the industrial regions of North America and Europe as it did in 1957.

While U.S. economic assistance increased from $450 million in 1960 to $1.4 billion in 1962, the flow of new capital from the United States has almost dried up. The majority of the adult population in Latin America remains illiterate. Brazil is faced with political instability and rampant inflation; the Dominican Republic, Honduras, and Ecuador are undergoing trials for democracy, a legacy of past military takeovers; Paraguay and Haiti show little promise of release from military dictatorship; Peru, Bolivia, and Argentina are facing grave social and political pressures; meanwhile the Communists are hard at work to foment, for their purposes, popular movements based on legitimate discontents.

Our response to these challenges was the Act of Bogotá signed under the Eisenhower administration and the Alliance for Progress, a joint program of action established at Punta del Este by representatives of the 20 member nations of the OAS on August 17, 1961. The Alliance for Progress is "to enlist the full energies of the peoples and governments of the Latin American Republics in a great cooperative effort to accelerate the economic and social development of the participating countries of Latin America, so that they may achieve maximum levels of well-being, with equal opportunity for all, in democratic societies adapted to their own needs and desires." These goals include a minimum average per capita income growth of 2½ percent per year, more equitable distribution of national income, elimination of illiteracy by 1970, an increase in life expectancy of at least 5 years, enactment of comprehensive land and tax reforms, and encouragement of private enterprise.

To carry out this program it was estimated that $100 billion would have to be invested in Latin America during the first decade. The bulk of this—some 80 percent—is to be financed locally from public and private funds. The United States agreed to underwrite over 10 percent of the $20 billion to be supplied from sources outside Latin America; with private U.S. investors hopefully expected to furnish $300 million a year or $3 billion over a 10-year period.

The Alliance is now 2 years old. With such a short perspective, it is difficult to assess its achievements and shortcomings. Under the Alliance, the Latin American nations are learning to work together for the first time and to combine for self-help and mutual cooperation in taking responsibility for the fulfillment of the Alliance. The Alliance is also serving a vital function by making reforms respectable—a whole generation of young technicians eager to modernize their societies have been reinforced by the new and sympathetic endorsement of their goals on the part of the United States. The Alliance has made such painful measures as land and fiscal reform respectable. It has instilled a new sense of direction, a new point of reference from which to attack the vast and unresolved problems Latin American States have heretofore faced with less chance of success. On the other hand, despite the Alliance, one could point to the decline in new private capital flowing into the area, a decline in U.S. aid commitments and in actual outlays; and the need, now probably to be realized under Ambassador Mann, for streamlining the policymaking structure within the U.S. Government dealing with the Alliance.

But the underlying problem of the Alliance is in the political arena. The problem is well defined by Tad Szulc, a New York Times foreign correspondent in Latin America for the past 10 years, in his new book, "The Winds of Revolution":

> There still seems to be little realization in the politically mature West that the Latin American social revolution inherently has a political content, and that it cannot be treated solely as a statistical problem of increasing production, distributing wealth more equitably, and providing educational and health services. Though these material needs must, of course, be filled, there also is an abysmal political void in Latin America that will invite other ideologies if democracy cannot make its influence felt. And it may be more urgent today to fill this vacuum than to offer another billion dollars or even to raise the annual per capita income by 2.5 percent, as the Alliance for Progress unrealistically prescribes. For there is in Latin America a profound feeling of unrest, unfulfillment, and frustration among intellectuals, students, politicians, and the middle class. There is a hunger for a new orientation that sends Latin Americans in increasing numbers to the meccas of Havana, Peiping, and Moscow—in that order—and makes so many of them challenge the meaning of Western representative democracy and raise the question, "Why should we follow the United States?"
>
> More than 2 years after President Kennedy proposed the Alliance for Progress, this country has not yet provided an answer to this question in political terms fully satisfying to the Latin Americans. Although the Alliance is slowly beginning to be considered in terms of a political concept instead of merely an aid and self-help proposition, it has not yet been able to generate the political excitement and mystique that is vital for the success of the democratic social revolution President Kennedy has invoked.

The forthcoming decade is going to test our capability to understand the dynamics of social revolution and our ability to give its direction and fulfillment. In Latin America today, we are engaged in a broad political contest with the forces of communism and radicalism. If we fail to understand this, no amount of economic aid is going to help.

Yet this ferment should not be alien to us. It is not unlike the other struggles we have had in our history.

As a necessary first step, the United States should join the countries of the hemisphere in developing a political mystique which exceeds the narrow boundaries of nationalism in order to transform the lofty objectives of the Alliance into a program of social and political action which is meaningful to the masses of Latin America, and to weld the scattered forces of democracy—the liberal political parties, the new generation of young intellectual, professional, and industrial leaders, the democratic labor movement, the churches—into a united dynamic force.

Resolution E adopted at Punta del Este in 1961 offers an excellent means to this end. Entitled "Public Opinion and the Alliance for Progress," the resolution recognized that "in order to reach the Alliance's objectives it is essential that public opinion be fully informed of the causes that have brought about this movement, of the goals it seeks, and of its successive achievements." To implement it, the resolution calls for six concrete steps:

First. The convocation of a special meeting on information media to develop a plan of action.

Second. The Department of Public Information of the OAS to give preferential attention to the dissemination of information on the efforts to be undertaken and to take other specific steps.

Third. Information media of all types to direct their efforts to increase the awareness of Latin American countries to each others problems.

Fourth. The establishment of educational centers to disseminate knowledge of the social and economic development inspired by the Alliance.

Fifth. Members of the OAS to promote holding of conferences, seminars, and roundtables to report and discuss the main economic and social problems of the hemisphere and their possible solution within the Alliance.

Sixth. To call on public opinion, trade unions, labor, and student organizations to become aware of the social implications of the Alliance and to take an active part in the dissemination of information on its objectives.

The implementation of these steps is an essential first step to galvanize Latin American public opinion into action, to the evolution of the Alliance into a political movement, and to make the Alliance democracy's answer to radicalism.

During March 1962, meetings were held by a newly created OAS Technical Advisory Committee on Public Information to search for means to implement Resolution E. The key recommendations made by the Committee calls for the establishment of national committees in the member states of the OAS.

The principal function of these committees is to promote and encourage the efforts and initiative of various groups, representatives of all the social sectors of the peoples of the Americas, to give effective impulse to the development of the Alliance for Progress program—an impulse which is woefully lacking at the present and without which the Alliance will surely fail. On May 2, 1962, the Council of the OAS, in approving this recommendation, called on governments to facilitate the formation of such national committees whether of an official, semiofficial, or private nature.

As of today, no such committee for the Alliance for Progress has been created in the United States, while 16 of the 19 Latin American countries—all except Bolivia, Haiti, and Paraguay—have formed such committees. It should become an objective of the highest priority to our Government, to our free press, to our private foundations, to our civic organizations and to our public-spirited citizens to organize a U.S. Committee for the Alliance for Progress in an effort to increase the awareness of our own people of the enormous importance and implications of the Alliance to the future of the hemisphere.

So I direct the attention of Ambassador Mann to this problem as the first item of high priority in connection with the task of saving the Alliance.

Second, U.S. economic aid funds under the Alliance should be concentrated in selected Latin American countries with the greatest economic and political potential.

The Alliance has available to it limited resources. These limited resources spread over 19 countries would find it hard to make a major impact in any of them. Instead, the limited external resources committed to Latin America by the United States should be directed in large measure to countries where opportunities exist for rapid economic expansion, countries where there is some hope for success in the near term, countries with strategic significance to the success of the Alliance and to the security of the hemisphere. We should make a major effort to achieve a breakthrough in such countries and should we succeed, these Latin American countries in turn could become centers of strength for their fellow countries.

Let us concentrate our capital resources committed under the Alliance in these countries. To the others let us extend our full cooperation in the field of technical assistance, education, health, transportation, and so forth, and enlist the support of the Inter-American Development Bank, the Development Assistance Fund of the OAS—established at the São Paulo Conference in mid-November 1963—and make every effort to make them the beneficiary of the full range of progress now being made through the Inter-American Economic and Social Council.

Third, the United States should be ready to use its forces consistent with the Inter-American Treaty for Reciprocal Assistance if called upon by duly elected governments in self-defense against subversion and terror—including aggression from Cuba or other similar efforts from outside the hemisphere—and lend its full support to collective action by the nations of the hemisphere. The Inter-American Treaty for Reciprocal Assistance signed at Rio de Janeiro in 1947 makes any collective action—including the recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions, the breaking of diplomatic and consular relations, partial or complete interruption of economic relations, or communications—mandatory, if two-thirds of the 20 member countries so decide, except that no member is required to use its armed forces without its consent.

The organized terror campaign waged against the government of President Betancourt incident to the recent Venezuelan elections provides a primary example of a situation Latin American countries should be in a position to defend themselves against. President Betancourt has accused the Cuban Government of having interferred in the internal affairs of Venezuela and has proposed that the OAS adopt stern collective measures against Cuba if evidence of clandestine Cuban shipments of arms to Venezuela is confirmed.

I believe we should support President Betancourt to the hilt. This may be the first example of what can be done in the Americas to correct an intolerable situation. There is ample authority under the Rio Treaty for taking such action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 4 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. If the President of the United States feels that he needs a congressional resolution to enable him to do that, I am sure there are a dozen Senators in the Chamber, including myself, who would gladly sponsor such a resolution. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and other Senators would be ready to give him the added power needed to protect freedom and democratic institutions in any country that seeks our protection, especially when we can act collectively with other American States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish the record to show that I join the Senator from New York in the proposals he is making.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should also like to state for the record that I join the Senator from New York in the proposals that he is making.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful also to the Senator from Minnesota.

Fourth, a revision of current U.S. trade policies toward Latin America will be necessary to make the Alliance successful. We are firmly committed to help the economic and social development of Latin America through the Alliance. Much of our economic assistance will be nullified unless we can assist Latin America to broaden its markets in the United States and Western Europe. Important U.S. restrictions continue to be maintained on Temperate Zone and tropical products exported by Latin America, including restrictions on imports of beef, under the Imported Meat Act of 1930;

import quotas maintained on cotton and cotton textiles under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; quotas on lead and zinc set by a Presidential proclamation under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951; and quotas restrictions on imports of crude oil, unfinished petroleum oils, and some finished petroleum products set under the national security provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

Latin America is watching us to see whether we practice what we preach. I know that problems caused by import competition are grave for many industries in this country, but how much greater will they be if Brazil or some other great segment of Latin America "goes down the drain" precisely because we have not been ready to adjust our trade policies to the realities facing us in the hemisphere. I have said before, and I repeat again, that the whole of the economic assistance we give to any Latin American country can be negated in an afternoon by even a modest fall in the price of the main commodity sold by that country. The inability of Latin American countries to sell their products in our market is equally damaging to them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am pleased that the Senator has spoken so forthrightly on this matter, for the reason that I supported the coffee agreement. I do not believe the coffee agreement has satisfied all the needs of the coffee-producing countries, but it is better for those countries to earn their way receiving a fair price for a commodity than to depend on charity or even large and soft term loans.

The dropping of commodity prices in Latin American countries in the last 10 years has been disastrous to them. No amount of foreign aid will make that up. That is why I believe that while the consumer may be required to pay a little more for his coffee, the commodity price should be a fair price. We can always use the argument about the consumer. If we have labor working for 25 cents an hour, we can build a cheaper house or we can sell an automobile cheaper; but, after all, workers are also consumers; 25-cent-an-hour workers or $1-an-hour workers are not good consumers. So, a fair price for the producer's commodity is an important matter. That is one of the reasons why we need to trade and improve trade patterns, as the Senator has emphasized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield me 5 minutes from the opposition time that I may conclude my remarks?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, let me say in support of what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has said about the consumer, that volatile changes in the price of coffee result in unexpected shortages as well as in the oversupply of commodities, which not only damage the producing country but—in case of shortages—the consumer in the form of higher prices. In times of overproduction, commodity prices fall, but so does the producer's income and his ability to buy our goods. That is the price of instability in raw commodity prices.

We should consider, in light of the serious situation that now exists in many parts of Latin America, whether restrictive trade policies remain justifiable. During the forthcoming trade talks under GATT we should do all we can under authority given in the Trade Expansion Act to obtain continued entry for Latin America's products to the European Economic Community countries, and to assist with two basic problems facing Latin America with the EEC: preferential import treatment for tropical products from the associated African States which are in direct competition with Latin American exports; and temperate zone agricultural products—major exports from Argentina and Uruguay to Western Europe.

The cuts made in the House of Representatives in the aid appropriations for the Alliance for Progress has dealt a crippling blow to the image of the United States in Latin America. Should these cuts be sustained in the Senate, the only thing that could effectively balance this blow would be for the President to make an immediate review of our present trade policy toward Latin America and propose a unilateral reduction in our trade barriers in compensation.

Another aspect of the trade problem in Latin America is the movement toward economic integration. The Central American Common Market and the Latin American Free Trade Area are ample evidence that the idea of continentwide economic integration has become a reality—an effort that is essential both to create mass markets and to obtain greater cohesion needed for economic development, and to increase Latin America's negotiating power with industrial countries so that it may obtain better terms of trade for its exports. The creation of a hemispheric common market would be a logical next step to take for Latin America at this time.

There are no doubt a great many problems involved in the economic integration of an entire underdeveloped region. Nevertheless, the idea has attracted serious support from men of such stature as Paul Prebisch, former Executive Secretary, Economic Commission for Latin America, Felipe Herrera, President of the Inter-American Development Bank, William F. Clayton, former Undersecretary of State under Cordell Hull, and others.

The establishment at the recent São Paulo Conference of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—ICAP—as a focal point of the Alliance—and the creation of the Special Committee on Latin American Coordination—SCLAC—to coordinate the position of the Latin American countries at the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development in March 1964—are developments of great importance to further the economic unity of Latin America. The Subcommittee on Inter-American Relationships of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am a member, during its hearings in January 1964, will take a close look at what further steps may be taken to step up Latin American economic integration so that Congress and the public may be in a better position to give this effort constructive support.

A fifth and essential step is the provision of greater incentives to U.S. capital to reenter Latin America. One of the key assumptions made at the Punta del Este Conference in 1961, as heretofore noted, was that as an integral part of the assistance to be provided by the United States there would be a flow of $300 million in new private capital to Latin America. While there was a net inflow of $173 million in new capital from the United States in 1961, it dropped to zero in 1962 and 1963.

Our direct investments in Latin America remain close to $8.5 billion, a very substantial sum—with Brazil and Venezuela accounting for about half of this investment. Plant and equipment expenditures there have also remained sizable—$750 million in 1960, $795 million in 1961 and $840 million in 1962—indicating a determination by U.S. firms to weather the present storm and their faith in the future of the area.

American firms with long experience in Latin America are playing a creative and socially constructive role; companies such as Creole Petroleum, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Willys Overland, Kaiser Industries, Deltec Corp., International Basic Economy Corp., the Chase Manhattan Bank, and the Whirlpool Corp. have contributed much to increasing total production exports and tax revenue in Latin America.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I have been working hard for the past year on a major effort designed to demonstrate to businessmen and governments in Latin America, the United States and Western Europe the capacity of private enterprise to be imaginative, to understand the present social ferment in Latin America and to play a constructive role in the fulfillment of Latin American aspirations. The Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America—ADELA—has completed its organizational phase and will be formally launched at a high level conference in Paris on January 10, 1964, as a $40 million investment company, to provide concrete evidence that through well-conceived joint ventures, United States, European, and Japanese business in association with Latin American capital can make significant contributions to economic development while making a fair profit.

Nevertheless, to make the Alliance succeed, a large number of new firms and new capital must be attracted to Latin America. To accomplish this, effective incentives must be devised by our Government, including a tax credit for new investments—a proposal for a 30-percent tax credit may be recommended to the Congress early next session by the Treasury; a substantial tax incentive to exporters; a broadened investment program organized along the lines of the highly successful Foreign Credit Insurance Association program—with private insurance firms administering the investment guarantee program backed by the AID; and a multinational investment treaty or code to protect private investment against expropriation without compensation or other types of discrimination.

An added factor will be the newly created high-level Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, which was adopted as part of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. This Committee, in my opinion, will become a major source of new ideas on how private enterprise can cooperate with our Government in increasing the flow of new capital to the less developed countries we aid and making our foreign assistance program a more effective instrument of U.S. foreign policy.

And finally, it is essential that the Alliance for Progress should become a truly inter-American effort. I was therefore very gratified that an Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress was created at the November meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at São Paulo. Unless the Alliance is transformed into a program in which all of the countries of the hemisphere take an equal part, it cannot succeed. It is of equal importance that the organization of our own Government for the implementation of our own Latin American policies and programs undergo a full review including existing lines of authority and responsibility. With political direction in the State Department, economic coordination under AID and with the operation of the varied program dispersed among more than half a dozen agencies, the result has been a decline in the effectiveness of the implementation of vital aspects of the Alliance.

The question that we must answer in the next few years is whether the United States is capable of understanding and dealing with the revolutionary situation in Latin America and of leading this upheaval into democratic channels, and giving the democratic approach ideological appeal. I believe we have the ideas, the power, and the resources to see through the storm to the clearer days ahead. The appointment of Ambassador Mann to be in charge of our Latin American policy is already a good augury of the intentions of this administration. Also, the recommendations I have made here will, I hope, have early consideration.

The following quotation from Szulc's "The Winds of Revolution" gives a good measure of the challenge and the prize confronting us:

> Relations with a Latin America must be judged in the historical perspective of a great revolution with which, in the real meaning of history, the United States and the West must come to terms.
>
> If this occurs, then communism may have to face the devastating truth that, after all, Marx and Lenin were not so infallible in predicting a Socialist future for Latin America and the rest of the underdeveloped world.

Mr. President, the appointment of Ambassador Mann to be in charge of our Latin American program is critically important. We must have a highly efficient and single centered administration of the Alliance for Progress.

I have the greatest of friendship for and confidence in Ambassador Mann, and I shall give him all the backing he needs. I make these recommendations to him for his immediate consideration. If the Alliance is not to fail, and if we are not to see great sections of Latin America, where we stand in imminent danger, slip into the grip of communism and confound our policy all over the world, these recommendations should be considered with the utmost seriousness and should be put into effect at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I congratulate the Senator from New York for a thorough and sound presentation concerning the Alliance for Progress. I agree with the Senator that this is a program of major importance. Distinct from other parts of the world where we indulge in foreign aid, and where our task should be shared by other old world nations, this is an area of primary responsibility in the United States.

I share fully the Senator's comment that we should be selective. I have believed that for years. I have tried to present that view to the AID administrators, who to date have never accepted it. They seem to feel they must give indiscriminately to everybody. The result has been disastrous, because governments which have not tried to put their houses in order and have not tried to make the reforms essential to progress have found because of our attitude there was no need to do so.

Their poor example then reflects itself to other countries in which efforts are being made to put houses in order and to cooperate. The governments of those countries then say, in effect, "There is no need for our doing this, because you are not enforcing it everywhere."

If half of the 19 countries of Latin America are ready, politically and economically, to receive our financial aid and use it wisely, those are the places where we should make our maximum effort, meanwhile working with other countries to try to get them ready.

The "scattershot" arrangement is largely responsible for whatever failures have occurred. The responsibility is just as much ours in Washington as it is anyone else's.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful for the remarks of my colleague, the Senator from Alaska.

I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I must leave the Chamber shortly, but I wished to let the Senator from New York know that I believe his speech to be a major contribution at this particular time to the Alliance for Progress program. I am hopeful that Ambassador Mann, who has been selected by the President for a new responsibility and an important assignment as Special Assistant to the President and as the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, will read the Senator's speech carefully. I say this because I believe the Senator from New York has made some very constructive suggestions which will stand Ambassador Mann well in his efforts and in his program of reorganization.

I wish to associate myself with the text and the substance of the Senator's speech. I believe it is one of the truly great speeches made on this whole subject matter. The Senator is to be commended.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to my colleague for his high praise. He knows I love him dearly. His remarks mean a great deal to me, as do those from the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I express my thanks to my colleagues for their forbearance and cooperation in giving me this time. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment, and yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, between lines 18 and 19, it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

> SEC. 119. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the total amount appropriated pursuant to this title (excluding reappropriations of prior appropriations) shall not exceed $3,000,000,000. The President is authorized and directed within thirty days after the enactment of this Act to determine and to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget which of the appropriation items shall be reduced, and the amount that each shall be reduced, in order to effectuate the reduction made by this section. Each appropriation item specified by the President in his certification is hereby reduced by the amount of reduction specified by him with respect to such item in such certification; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make the necessary entries on the books of the Treasury to reflect such reductions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the language just read subject to a point of order? It is not that I intend to make a point of order, but I merely inquire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is legislative in character, and would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. PASTORE. It would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Do I correctly understand that the purpose of the amendment is to cut the amount to $3 billion, plus the $209 million?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. That would be a total of $3.209 billion.

The amendment has another great advantage. I am satisfied that the President of the United States know that there is a need for reform in the foreign aid program. I am satisfied that the President knows that there are places where great savings can be made.

The amendment would grant great latitude to the President to bring about savings. There are really only 6 months left in the present fiscal year.

The amendment provides:

> The President is authorized and directed within 30 days after the enactment of this act to determine and to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget which of the appropriation items shall be reduced, and the amount that each shall be reduced, in order to effectuate the reduction made by this section.

The President could get together with the Secretary of State, with the Secretary of Defense, and with the Director of AID to decide how best to distribute the money to bring about the savings and reforms which I believe ought to be brought about.

The Senator from Rhode Island is quite correct. The language would be subject to a point of order, since its content is not covered, really, by either authorization bill. The amendment could be objected to on that ground.

I offer the amendment in this way, rather than segment by segment, which I shall do, if necessary.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I repeat that I am unalterably opposed to the reduction to $3 billion. Should the Senate choose to do that—and I hope it will not—but I have no objection to the language as such; therefore, I shall not raise a point of order. However, I want it clearly understood that I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is not much that needs to be said in support of my amendment. It speaks for itself. The amount involved is $3,209 million, because although the amendment would limit the new money to $3 billion, $209 million of unexpended funds would be reappropriated under the proposed legislation.

I believe that is a sufficient amount. It would allow a reasonable bracket for compromise with the House.

I believe the amount proposed by the Senate committee is too large. It would lead to serious trouble in the conference, because I do not believe the House conferees would split the melon as between the $2.8 billion plus the unexpended funds and the Senate committee figure of $3.5 billion plus the unexpended funds.

I believe the Senate committee figure is unrealistic to take to conference. I believe I am offering a workable bracket for negotiations in conference, which would make it possible to dispose of this item quickly in the conference. I have reason to believe that if the Senate figure is left at its present size, the conference will not dispose of this matter quickly.

Second, this gives to the President an opportunity to keep faith with his own announcements to the American people that he seeks economy and efficiency in Government.

He has been asking the various departments, as far as our domestic budgets are concerned, to proceed to reevaluate them from the standpoint of economic savings. I am giving him the opportunity, as chief of our foreign policy, to do it in connection with the foreign aid bill.

This, I think, is a fair, reasonable compromise. It does not end with $3 billion. It ends, so far as new money is concerned, with $3 billion plus $209 million of unexpended funds, making a total of $3.209 billion.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the objective of the amendment is to reduce the amount reported by the committee, a figure of $3.3 billion, has been fortified by the various votes had—not only last night, but this morning and the early part of the afternoon. This proposal would more or less restore the House figure.

The Senate has already more or less firmly indicated its will on the matter, but the Senator from Oregon has a perfect right to propose the amendment. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Oregon knows I have supported some of his amendments, but it seems to me the one objectionable feature of the amendment is that the Senator is, in effect, proposing to delegate to the executive branch a function which belongs in the legislative branch of the Government. I am most reluctant to see Congress delegate any of its responsibilities to the executive branch. I think we have done too much of it.

While the intention of the amendment may be meritorious, this is one objectionable feature which I could not accept. So I regret that I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Engle]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Kansas [Mr. Carlson and Mr. Pearson], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. Allott and Mr. Dominick], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent on official business to attend the Presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent because of illness in his family.

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 55, as follows:

[No. 278 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Anderson
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Cotton
Curtis
Ellender
Ervin
Goldwater
Gruening
Hruska
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La.
Mechem
Morse
Mundt
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—55

Aiken
Bartlett
Bayh
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Fong
Fulbright
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—14

Allott
Carlson
Dominick
Eastland
Engle
Gore
Hill
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Pearson
Scott
Simpson
Tower
Walters

So Mr. Morse's amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of Senators, I should like to say at this juncture that there is one more amendment to be offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. Then a point of order will be raised by the distinguished Senator from Delaware. Following that, the so-called wheat amendment, to be offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] will be considered. I believe that will more or less wind up our discussion. If Senators will remain in the Chamber, we shall be able to dispose of the bill expeditiously.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 9, it is proposed to strike out the numeral and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "$50,000,000."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not take my full 15 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator will yield, I shall be glad to take his amendment to conference.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to read only two sentences in explanation of the bill, so that it will be in the RECORD.

Mr. PASTORE. As I understand, the House figure was $50 million. I will accept the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this amendment reduces funds for administrative expenses of AID to the figure provided by the House, $50 million. However, the $50 million is only in new money; there is $2 million more in unexpended balances that is reappropriated elsewhere in the bill.

As a result, when the committee report says it is only providing what is authorized in the authorizing legislation, it is omitting mention of the additional $2 million that is reappropriated.

When the Senate passed the authorizing legislation, it allowed $52 million for this purpose, and that is what would be available if my amendment is adopted. Otherwise, $56 million will be available.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I consider this to be a reasonable amendment. I shall be very happy if the Senate agrees with me that it should be accepted.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island very much.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays on the amendment be rescinded.

Mr. MORSE. I join in that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning on page 19, line 11, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 10 on page 20, as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

Miscellaneous Items

For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items", $925,000.

Reporting Hearings

For an additional amount for "Reporting hearings", $48,000.

Special and Select Committees

For an additional amount for "Special and select committees", $665,500.

Telegraph and Telephone

For an additional amount for "Telegraph and telephone", $515,000.

Stationery (Revolving Fund)

For an additional amount for "Stationery (revolving fund)", to remain available until expended: first session of the Eighty-eighth Congress, $261,600; second session of the Eighty-eighth Congress, $261,600.

Postage Stamps

For an additional amount for "Postage stamps", to remain available until expended: first session of the Eighty-eighth Congress, $45,710; second session of the Eighty-eighth Congress, $45,710.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to strike from the bill that portion of the suggested appropriation which has nothing whatever to do with the foreign aid program. The Senate is supposed to be acting today on a foreign aid program. Yet we find in the bill many items for increasing allowances for Members of both the House and the Senate.

This amendment deals only with the contingent expenses as approved for the House. The contingent expenses which have been approved by the Senate are subject to a point of order in that they are legislation, and the point of order will definitely be made following the action on this particular amendment. That would then put the bill in a position so that if this amendment should be agreed to, and the point of order sustained—and I have been advised that the language constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill—we would have deleted from the bill all references to increased allowances for Members of Congress. Those items if found to be necessary can be included in a supplemental appropriation bill.

I see no reason why, under the guise of enacting a foreign aid appropriation, we shoud increase allowances for various Members of Congress.

For example, unless the amendment is adopted we shall be approving $261,600 or an additional stationery allowance of $600 each, for Members of the House and the Senate for the first session of the 88th Congress. We are all hopeful that this session will end either tomorrow night or, at the latest, Saturday night. Why does the House need $261,600 additional stationery allowance for the remaining 2 days of this session of Congress?

By the same token, I shall make a point of order to strike a similar provision as it applies to the Senate.

The second session of the 88th Congress will begin next month. The bill would provide an additional $261,600, or $600 extra, for each Member next year. If it is needed next year why not wait until next year and then deal with it in a regular appropriation bill? But let us not try to get it now under the guise of an appropriation for foreign aid. Actually, this is nothing more than a Christmas bonus for Members of Congress.

The bill provides for an additional amount of $45,710 for postage stamps for Members of Congress during the remainder of the 1st session of the 88th Congress. Why is it necessary to provide $45,710 to buy postage stamps for the remaining 2 days of this session of Congress? We are almost at the end of the session. One cannot retroactively put a postage stamp on a letter. So what is proposed is to provide additional postage for letters that will be sent out in the next 2 days. There can be no possible justification for that item.

If these items are needed in the next session of Congress, let them be presented in a routine manner and be included in the normal appropriation bills.

My amendment would strike out all such items and also strike out the $925,000 of "miscellaneous items," as to which apparently neither House has as yet decided how it will be spent.

Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall not delay the Senate longer. I hope this amendment will be adopted. Following the action on the amendment, I shall make a point of order with respect to the additional contingency expenses provided for the Senate. That would then restore the bill to a foreign aid appropriation bill, as it is designated in the title and as it should be.

I repeat—there can be no justification for including these additional allowances for Members of Congress in a foreign aid program.

How can a $261,600 additional stationery allowance, a $45,710 additional postage stamp allowance, and an allowance of $925,000 for "miscellaneous" items be used in the last 1 or 2 days of this session of Congress? These items, totaling $3,239,780 extra benefits for Congress should be stricken. I hope the amendment will be approved.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it is a pity that the proposer of this amendment, the distinguished Senator from Delaware, does not happen to be in charge of the bill. If he were, he would realize and appreciate the awkward position in which the Senator from Rhode Island finds himself because of the amendment.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations had nothing to do with these items. They were included in the bill by the House.

It is true that certain items are those ordinarily included in the legislative appropriation bill; but the House in its wisdom saw fit to include them in this particular bill. If Senators wish to repudiate the House at this juncture, it is their responsibility; I will have nothing else to say, other than that I believe it would be very embarrassing, our job would become more tedious, and the chances are that if the amendment is sustained the fate of the bill would more likely accommodate those who are opposed to our measure.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I hesitate to speak about this matter, but I shall not detain the Senate long. There is much more to this story than so far appears. Senators are in what seems to be the following absurd position: Telegraph allowances for every Senator are regulated by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I believe the telegraph allowances to be entirely adequate; at least, I returned $2,000 from my telegraph allowance last year.

The telephone allowances are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. In my judgment, telephone allowances are entirely inadequate. For example, last year, as a Senator from a large State, I paid out of my own pocket more than $2,000 for excess telephone calls. To be sure, I could deduct that amount as a business expense on my income tax; but that means, without revealing any confidences as to what bracket I am in, that a very substantial amount of that telephone payment still comes out of my pocket. Perhaps some will say, "He can afford it." That is all right. But perhaps others cannot.

It seems to me it is really an absurdity to have this administrative gobbledygook monstrosity, under which telephone expenses are regulated by the Committee on Appropriations and telegraph expenses by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I do not even know what committee has jurisdiction of the stationery allowances. Nevertheless, we cannot get the members of the staffs of those committees or the Senators themselves sufficiently interested in the plight of a Senator from a large State who must keep in constant touch with his constituents, especially if his State happens to be a doubtful State. Year after year, he pays this money out of his own pocket.

I pay public tribute to Senators from the smaller States who, year after year, as a result of my own staff importuning them, have been willing to give me support by making available some of their stationery allowance. I could not get along on my stationery allowance, but Senators from small States, who do not need all of theirs, make some of it available to me.

But last Sunday, mirabile dictu, the items to provide additional sums appeared in the bill, so perhaps this will clear up the situation and I will not have to pay any more money for my telephone calls or on my stationery account.

This is a situation that confronts every Member of this body who represents a large State. I do not know about the situation with respect to Senators who come from some of the other States.

I understand the position of the Senator from Delaware. I can well understand the embarrassing position in which the Senator from Rhode Island finds himself. But I hope this provision will not be eliminated from the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Oklahoma 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we would be embarking on a program that would wreak havoc on the already rather strained relations between the two bodies. They are held together by goodwill and by tradition extending over more than 175 years, in which the Members of each House have independently assumed the responsibility of being moral, ethical, and conscientious public servants.

When the other body appropriates funds for its own operation, knowing that its Members must run for office every 2 years, and each of them represents a rather small electorate, of some 500,000 people, it is they who must be held to blame or to be held blameless for the money they spend.

This would strike at other items in addition to the two items the distinguished Senator from Delaware has mentioned—the stationery fund and the postage stamp item. It affects the holding of hearings in the House of Representatives and $48,000 in that connection; also the additional amount of $65,500 for special and select committees—evidently for staff salaries; also the additional fund of $515,000 for telephone and telegraph, as well as the other items the Senator from Delaware has mentioned.

I do not see how we can expect to audit these accounts without expecting the House to take whatever discretionary attitude it might choose to take in regard to cutting down the funds for the Senate's Special and Select Committees and other items which the Senate has always felt justified in voting for itself.

In fact, when the legislative appropriation bill is dealt with, the House—recognizing the comity which traditionally exists between the two bodies—does not make the slightest change in the items for the Senate.

So, although we can embark on this proposal to eliminate these funds from the bill, if that were to be done, such action would rise to haunt us again and again.

Instead of having the Senate seek to hold the Members of the other body accountable for their expenditures for stationery and postage, the 435 Members of the other body can be held accountable by their constituents, at the forthcoming election. That is the preferable course, rather than for the Senate to attempt to decide what the other body shall spend. I am sure the Senate does not wish to do that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, we have already considered the "junk mail" item and the other items; and I believe it best for now to vote down the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, and thus permit the conferees to have an opportunity to prepare their report.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Suppose the amendment is rejected, and suppose a point of order then is made—as the Senator from Delaware has indicated he will—with respect to the items on pages 17 and 18. In that event, will the House have its stationery and postage funds, but the Senate will not?

Mr. PASTORE. No, because of this reasoning and this has been my position. Our amendment is to the House amendment, and therefore, is not subject to a point of order.

So far as the postage item is concerned, I shall move to delete it from the bill, because we acted on it yesterday in connection with the legislative appropriation bill. So it is not necessary for it to be included in this bill, for then there would be a duplication.

I repeat that my position is that our amendment is to the House amendment, and therefore is very much in order and is germane.

Mr. MILLER. Did the Senator from Rhode Island say he is proposing to delete the postage stamp item on page 18?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. What about the item for the House, on page 20?

Mr. PASTORE. That item has never been voted on, for I do not think it was in the legislative appropriation bill conference report. I am told it was not in it.

The only reason why I shall move the deletion of the item for the Senate's postage account is that we have already voted for it, and there is no need to do so again.

Mr. MILLER. Then is it necessary to include the item on page 20?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, because the House has not yet acted on that item. But, in regard to the Senate item, this would be the second bite at the cherry.

I repeat that the House item has not yet been decided on, but the Senate item for postage has been decided on, and there is no need to do so again.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time remains available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 10 minutes remaining under his control.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall not need all that time.

Let me remind the Senate that yesterday we took final action on the legislative appropriation bill. The appropriation items pertaining to the legislative branch had been passed on by the Appropriations Committees of the two bodies and by both the House and the Senate, and in our opinion yesterday that appropriation provided ample funds to enable the Members of Congress to operate their offices.

The $3,239,780 proposed here today would be an additional allowance, over and above the appropriation item on which the Senate voted yesterday. Why is the additional $261,600 stationery allowance needed for the remaining 2 days of the session? At the most, there remain only Friday and Saturday.

I propose to strike this item from the bill, following which a point of order would strike out all reference to such increases for the Senate.

I respect the need for comity between the two Houses. However, we must also respect the need for comity between the Congress and the taxpayers. I doubt very much that they would approve of such a Christmas bonus for Congress. This item has no proper place in the foreign aid appropriation bill. Should it remain in the bill, then let us not attempt to kid the American people into believing that we are dealing only with a foreign aid appropriation bill.

I am opposed to a Christmas bonus for the Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of the time if the Senator from Rhode Island will do likewise.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under control.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, my parliamentary inquiry is as follows: I believe we should have a ruling from the Chair in regard to the point raised by the Senator from Rhode Island—namely, that the Senate committee's language at the bottom of page 17 and on page 18 constitutes an amendment to the text voted by the House, and is in order.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit that statement by the Senator from Iowa is not timely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that a point of order has not been raised by the Senator from Iowa, and that the matter to which he has referred is not before the Senate, and that the Chair cannot rule upon it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Kansas [Mr. Carlson and Mr. Pearson], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. Allott and Mr. Dominick], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent on official business to attend the Presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent because of illness in his family.

If present and voting, the Senators from Kansas [Mr. Carlson and Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 62, as follows:

[No. 279 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Aiken
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Ellender
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Mechem
Miller
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Prouty
Smith
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—62

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—15

Allott
Carlson
Dominick
Eastland
Engle
Gore
Hill
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McGovern
Pearson
Scott
Simpson
Tower
Walters

So the amendment of Mr. Williams of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order. This is very important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, rule XVI of Senate Rules, paragraph 2, provides:

> 2. The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any restriction on the expenditure of the funds appropriated which proposes a limitation not authorized by law if such restriction is to take effect or cease to be effective upon the happening of a contingency, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation or any such restriction, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

In that connection, I make the point of order that the language appearing in the appropriation bill, on page 18, beginning with line 1 and extending through line 24—all three of the items—constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

Earlier the Senator from Rhode Island mentioned the fact that in his opinion—and I respect his opinion—this language is merely an amendment to the House language. I call particular attention to lines 4 through 7 on this page. Senators will find that this language does not amend any House language but under the terms of the bill, would amend Public Law 479 of the 79th Congress, as amended.

This language would be an amendment of the law, not an amendment of any language in the House bill. I find no language similar to that in the House bill.

I make the point of order that the language constitutes legislation, and therefore should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware make a point of order?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I make the point of order.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe the point of order is not well taken. The bill came to the Senate with "Title IV, Legislative Branch." enumerating certain items under the legislative category. All we did was to amend the bill by adding other legislative matters to it, matters which are germane and which are pertinent.

I submit that the language is in perfect order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know about the allocation of time. I should like to have 4 or 5 minutes on this question, if there is an allocation of time.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield whatever time the Senator desires from the time on the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this happens to be a matter with respect to which I have had considerable experience.

Rule XVI is one of the most important rules of the Senate. It was enacted in an effort to protect the jurisdiction of the legislative committees of the Senate. However, it does not extend to denying the Senate the right to amend legislative language which comes to the Senate in a bill from the House of Representatives.

Legislative provisions in an appropriation bill which come to the Senate from the House of Representatives are not subject to a point of order. They are a part of the bill. If the House legislates in any degree in an appropriation bill, the Senate is entitled to amend the House language, so long as the amendment is germane.

I point out that this is very clearly stated on page 73 of Senate Procedure. It is stated in succinct language. It happens to be in language I used when the same question arose in 1943:

> If the House of Representatives opens the door by incorporating legislation in a general appropriation bill, the Senate has an inherent right to amend such proposed legislation, and to perfect that language, notwithstanding its rules.

The "rules" in this connection can only apply to rule XVI of the Senate.

Mr. President, this question had arisen before the Senate previously, but the first time I was involved in it was in 1943, during consideration of an agricultural appropriation bill. The House had inserted a very small legislative provision. It could have been nothing more than is contained in this bill. The words "to remain available until expended" have been held to be legislation. They have been so held by Cannon's Procedure of the House of Representatives.

The Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture Department Appropriations broadened the scope of the language. When the matter came to the Senate, the late Senator from Missouri, Mr. Clark, made a point of order against the language.

I took the position then, which was sustained by the Senate on an appeal, that when the House opened the door to legislation, the Senate had a right to perfect that legislation or to amend it so long as the amendment was germane.

A similar question arose in 1949, and it was debated at some length in the Senate.

Mr. President, so that I shall not have to repeat all of the argument at this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the argument I made in 1949, when my position was sustained by the Senate.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I speak with some trepidation after the arguments made by the distinguished Senator from Texas, Mr. Connally, and the distinguished junior Senator from Florida. I would not speak on this occasion were it not for the precedents involved in this matter and my familiarity with them.

This is no new question in the Senate, Mr. President. It has been before this body on numerous other occasions. I happen to recall that in 1943 there was pending before the Senate the agricultural appropriation bill. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, I was entrusted with the responsibility of handling that bill on the floor. I have just glanced briefly through the record of the debate which then took place and of the points of order which were made at that time, and the parallel between the two cases is very striking. The Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, has not changed his mind. He made exactly the same argument in 1943 that he has made upon the floor of the Senate today with respect to legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Senate on that occasion sustained the ruling of the Chair by a vote of 54 to 23, after discussion of the rules which covered 1 whole day's time.

Mr. President, with all due deference to those who have spoken on subdivision 4 of rule XVI, it very clearly covers two separate and distinct situations. The first sentence of the rule, which the Senator from Texas emphasized so eloquently, and with such force, provides that, "no amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill." That language is tied in with the argument that was made by the Senator from Illinois about the two-thirds rule. If a general appropriation bill comes before this body with no legislation in it, any amendment offered that contains any legislation falls under the inhibitions of the first sentence of subdivision 4 of rule XVI. It is subject to a point of order. The Chair would sustain it.

The only way the Senate can possibly consider it is on a motion to suspend the rule, which requires a two-thirds vote, that is, if legislative matters are offered de novo in the Senate of the United States. But if legislation be found in the bill which comes to the Senate from the House of Representatives, the first line of the rule, relating to general legislation and making it subject to a ruling of the Chair which would strike it down, and therefore require the operation of the two-thirds rule, does not apply. If there is legislation in the bill as it comes from the House, then the sole question that confronts the Senate of the United States when an effort is made to amend the House provision is, first: "Has the House legislated in this bill?" Second: "Is the amendment which is offered in the Senate germane to the House legislative provision?"

Mr. President, no one would contend that the House has not legislated in this bill, not merely in small degree; but the House of Representatives sent this bill to the Senate shot through and through with legislative provisions. As a matter of fact, the greater part of the bill is purely legislative. It comes to us in that condition.

Now what are the Senate's rights in the matter? Can we not even offer any legislative amendment to the bill?

* * * * *

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, Mr. President, the question of germaneness is something which every Senator must pass upon for himself, subject to the dictates of his own wisdom and his own conscience.

In my judgment, this amendment is germane because there are in the bill as passed by the House two legislative provisions which directly affect and control the expenditure of this part of the appropriation. The Senate provision likewise would influence and control the expenditure of this part.

If I may continue for a few moments, let me say there are some Members of the Senate who still recall the services of the former distinguished Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin. In my judgment, a finer parliamentarian than the distinguished Senator La Follette never served in this body.

When this identical issue was previously before the Senate, as appears on page 5546 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 9, 1943, Senator La Follette discussed this matter at some length. After urging the Senators to dissociate themselves from the mere merits of the amendment involved, and to make their decision on the appeal from the decision of the Chair on the parliamentary situation which was presented to the Senate, he said:

"The issue at stake is the question of whether or not the Senate shall maintain its unbroken precedents holding that it has the right to explore any field of general legislation which the House of Representatives may have entered. That, Mr. President, is a vital question; it is a question of great, extreme importance as affecting the power of the Senate."

Senator La Follette argued the matter at some length, saying that where the House of Representatives had legislated the Senate had the power to invade that field. He did not say the Senate had to work the exact row that was hoed by the House of Representatives, but he said the Senate had the power to invade the entire field.

Mr. President, the House of Representatives has dealt with two matters which vitally affect the expenditure of these funds; and I insist that under the rules the Senate has a right to deal with the expenditure of the funds, and that the decision of the Senate in declaring the amendment to be germane should be adhered to.

Of course, Mr. President, the question of the decision as to the germaneness of this amendment to legislation already in the bill places the distinguished President of the Senate in a position where the only ruling he could possibly make, as he has properly done, was to the effect that the question of whether it is legislation has now nothing to do with it.

The question was never raised, or was never seriously argued, that the House did not legislate in the bill. That is generally conceded. That led to one issue in regard to the amendment, as to whether it was germane. I may say to the distinguished Vice President, it so happens that in 1943 almost the same issue arose as to whether the proponents of an amendment could insist that it was germane to a provision of the House bill, and the parliamentary rulings and the discussion of the subject cover some 40 or 50 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We should, Mr. President, as was said by the Senator from Wisconsin on that occasion, forget our personal prejudices and vote in conformity with the precedents of the Senate, and vote to sustain the right of the Senate as a coequal body in our scheme of government to deal with these matters to the same degree the House has dealt with them.

Mr. RUSSELL. The question arose again in 1951. The Senate made the same decision. Any other decision would put the Senate in an absolutely untenable position.

It does not require any knowledge of parliamentary law or of any other kind of law to know that if the Senate is a coequal body, if the House includes provisions in a bill in a manner which affects the people of this country or either of these bodies, the Senate cannot be denied an equal right. Yet we restrict ourselves to a very narrow limitation. Under Rule XVI Senators cannot offer legislation on an appropriation bill if there is no legislation in the bill.

If this bill had not come to us with legislation included in it by the House, these amendments would not be in order, but since the House did include such provisions in the bill, the Senate amendments are in order.

How ridiculous can we make ourselves? If the Senator from Delaware were correct and had directed his point of order against all of the provisions of the bill which are directly involved in the parliamentary question before the Senate—although he was human enough not to do so—this would be the situation—the House had included in the bill legislation providing for payments to three widows of Representatives in Congress who have departed this earth while this Congress was in session. Yet the Senator from Delaware would hold that the Senate is denied the right to provide for the widow of the late lamented Senator Kefauver of Tennessee in this same bill.

In effect, the Senate would be holding that, parliamentarily, the Senate does not have such a right, if it sustains the point of order made by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President, I only wish to say that this question has been before the Senate time and again. The point of order would be good if there were no legislation in the bill. When the bill comes to the Senate with legislation the Senate, as a coequal body, has a right to treat the same question of legislation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes yielded to the Senator from Georgia have expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I point out, to confirm what the Senator from Georgia has said, that the House put in contingent expenses of the House. The committee added contingent expenses of the Senate. The Senator from Delaware called attention to the fact that Public Law 479, as amended, was involved.

The question is one of germaneness. I invite attention to the fact that the contingent expenses of the House are in the bill. What the committee added are the contingent expenses of the Senate, and certainly those are germane.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course they are germane. If the House is to provide itself additional stationery funds it cannot be said it is not germane for the Senate to provide stationery funds for the Senate.

It may be that Senators would like to vote against the amendment. Senators have that right.

Certainly, from a parliamentary standpoint, when the House of Representatives sends legislation to the Senate, our rules do not deny the Senate the right, so long as the amendment is germane, to deal with legislation in that field.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia raise the question of germaneness?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am glad to do that. I submit that this language is germane to the legislative provision of the House, and I believe it could not be construed any other way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question having been raised, the Chair reads from page 72 of Senate Procedure:

> Under rule XVI, the germaneness of amendments is required in the case of general appropriation bills, and all questions of germaneness or relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate.

The question then arises on whether or not the amendment is germane, and I submit the question to the Senate for decision.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on whether or not the amendment is germane. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. Senators are about to vote on the question of germaneness. A "yea" vote means that a Senator thinks the amendment is germane. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters], and the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Colorado [Mr. Allott and Mr. Dominick], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. Carlson and Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent on official business to attend the Presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent because of illness in his family.

If present and voting, the Senators from Colorado [Mr. Allott and Mr. Dominick], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. Carlson and Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 5, as follows:

[No. 280 Leg.]

YEAS—78

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—5

Aiken
Cooper
Curtis
Mechem
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—17

Allott
Carlson
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Gore
Hill
Jordan, N.C.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Morton
Pearson
Scott
Simpson
Tower
Walters

So Mr. Russell's point that the amendment was germane was sustained.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the point of germaneness was sustained.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, for the reasons I have already stated to the Senate, that the postage item in the Senate part of the legislative title of the pending bill is now redundant, because we acted on it yesterday, I offer an amendment to delete from the bill the language beginning on page 18, line 12, down to and including line 18.

The amendment is to strike out the following language:

Postage stamps

For an additional amount for air mail and special delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate, $6,060: *Provided,* That the maximum allowance per capita of $550 for air mail and special delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate is increased to $610 for the fiscal year 1964 and thereafter.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am glad the Senator offered his amendment, because otherwise I would be in a very embarrassing position. I did not approve of increasing our own allowances. The first vote was on the issue: Shall the House have the exclusive right to fix its allowances for office expenses? I voted that it did.

The next issue was on the question of germaneness. As clearly pointed out by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the House had legislated on its office expenses, and we could do the same, and expand it. The House had provided benefits for three widows. Certainly that was germane. If that action was germane, the Senate had the right to do the same thing for widows in the Senate. That also would be germane. Therefore, I voted that it was germane.

However, Mr. President, I did not want to go on record as voting to increase my own allowances.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the past two votes have been partly influenced by the parliamentary situation. I understand the reasoning of Senators on the question of germaneness. However, in order that there may be a clear-cut vote on the issue of whether we wish to add $3,239,000 in benefits to Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate, I offer another amendment and ask for a vote on them.

I will yield back the remainder of my time after stating that the amendment would merely strike from the bill all additional allowances for offices of Members of the Senate and additional allowances for offices of Members of the House.

The amendment puts all of us in the same category. This will be a straight vote on whether we want to appropriate under a foreign aid appropriation an additional $3,239,000 for our own allowances and for allowances in the House. This has nothing to do with the allowances for widows of either Members of the House or the Senate; nor did any of the preceding votes have anything to do with their payments.

This amendment should be approved, first, on its own merits. There can be no justification for granting Members of Congress these additional allowances.

Second, this is a foreign aid appropriation act. By what line of reasonableness can Members of Congress qualify for foreign aid—even though some do spend considerable time out of the country.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendments will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. Beginning on page 17, line 23, it is proposed to strike out all the language down to and including line 24 on page 18; also, it is proposed to strike out all the language beginning on page 19, line 11, down to and including line 15 on page 20; as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Miscellaneous items

For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items", fiscal year 1963, $190,000.

Miscellaneous items

For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items", $215,000: *Provided,* That effective January 1, 1964, the paragraph relating to official long-distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" in Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress (2 U.S.C. 46c), as amended, is amended by striking out the words "one hundred and twenty" and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred and sixty" and by striking out the words "six hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight hundred".

Postage stamps

For an additional amount for air mail and special delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate, $6,060: *Provided,* That the maximum allowance per capita of $550 for air mail and special delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate is increased to $610 for the fiscal year 1964 and thereafter.

Stationery (revolving fund)

For an additional amount for stationery, $60,600: *Provided,* That commencing with the fiscal year 1964 and thereafter the allowance for stationery for each Senator and the President of the Senate shall be at the rate of $2,400 per annum.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

Miscellaneous items

For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items", $925,000.

Reporting hearings

For an additional amount for "Reporting hearings", $48,000.

Special and select committees

For an additional amount for "Special and select committees", $665,500.

Telegraph and telephone

For an additional amount for "Telegraph and telephone", $515,000.

Stationery (revolving fund)

For an additional amount for "Stationery (revolving fund)", to remain available until expended: first session of the Eighty-eighth Congress, $261,600; second session of the Eighty-eighth Congress, $261,600.

Postage stamps

For an additional amount for "Postage stamps", to remain available until expended: first session of the Eighty-eighth Congress, $45,710; second session of the Eighty-eighth Congress, $45,710.

JOINT ITEMS

Education of pages

For an additional amount for "Education of pages", $2,655, which amount shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation of the District of Columbia.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does the Senator wish to have his amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays. I urge the Senate to defeat the amendments. There is nothing further to be said.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Walters], and the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Colorado [Mr. Allott and Mr. Dominick], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. Carlson and Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent on official business to attend the presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent because of illness in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 281 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Case
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Douglas
Ellender
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Long, La.
McClellan
Mechem
Miller

Mundt
Neuberger
Proxmire
Robertson
Smith
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—58

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Dodd
Edmondson
Ervin
Fong
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Kuchel
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—17

Allott
Carlson
Eastland
Dominick
Engle
Gore
Hayden
Hill
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Morton
Pearson
Scott
Simpson
Tower
Walters

So the amendments of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware were rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, it is proposed to strike out lines 10 through 18, as follows:

SEC. 116. None of the funds made available by this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used for the financing, in whole or in part, of any project in any foreign country where persons other than nationals of such country or citizens of the United States will be employed to perform any work in connection with such project, except when such nationals or citizens of the United States are not available and qualified to perform such work.

THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the previous four statements I have presented to the Senate on the balance-of-payments deficits of the United States, the following factual conclusions emerge:

First. The principal causes of our balance-of-payments deficits, current and cumulative, have been: (a) U.S. Government expenditures abroad, for military and economic aid; (b) a fundamental structural change in our international commodity trade pattern.

The United States has become more and more dependent on imports of basic raw materials. The U.S. proportion of world trade has been declining. It has been difficult, therefore, to earn sufficient surplus of exports over imports, to pay for our Government expenditures abroad; (c) there is a growing deficit on tourist account.

Second. An analysis of proposed remedies showed: (a) Increasing interest rates, so as to stem the flow of capital and hold down, or reduce, the price of commodities in the United States in order to become competitive in world markets, is probably unacceptable, on both economic and political grounds; therefore, not likely to succeed; (b) any prospects of solving the balance-of-payments deficits by means of a successful export promotion drive are not promising, because the Iron Curtain countries, and the underdeveloped countries, do not show opportunities for net export sales for cash. In addition, the balance-of-payments surplus countries of Western Europe, nations which can afford to buy from us, nevertheless are not inclined to liberalize their policies through specific consideration of our increasingly serious balance-of-payments problem; (c) devaluation of the dollar, or flexible exchange rates, are neither useful nor practical.

Because of growing recognition by international bankers and economists that the balance-of-payments deficits of the United States may not be easily resolved without unhappy consequence to the economies of other countries, we have been forced to the only other alternative; namely, that of continual borrowing from other countries and international institutions, in order, in turn, to continue with our program of excessive foreign expenditures. This is now being done through the sale of our so-called Roosa bonds to other governments and foreign central banks.

These latter bonds are U.S. Treasury obligations, denominated in the currency of the lending country; namely, Swiss francs, German marks, Italian lira.

Already some $650 million of said bonds have been used to borrow from foreign countries; also there has been some $600 million of additional borrowings from the International Monetary Fund.

And the pileup of current liabilities. liabilities of the United States to pay in gold are, of course, still additional borrowings, in this case callable on demand.

It is a fact that this easy way out—continuing our deficit expenditures abroad on borrowed money—is the basis of recommendations made by the Brookings Institution, along with certain other economists and bankers, to create an international credit issuing bank in the name of increasing liquidity; a bank from which we and others could borrow, and into which surplus countries could deposit their earnings.

This alternative can only lead the United States deeper and deeper into debt, either to other countries, or to international institutions; and that in turn can only lead to the loss of our freedom of action.

Admittedly, therefore, there has been created a dilemma for U.S. policymakers, because all available choices would appear to have unpleasant consequences for someone.

Perhaps it is fair to say also that we have hesitated to make the necessary hard decisions.

In any case the problems incident to putting our financial house in order—bringing in line expenditures abroad with receipts from abroad—are becoming steadily more complicated.

Now what would be the least harmful way of achieving this latter result?

First and foremost, of course, would be the willingness of our European allies to buy more goods from us. This they could do in coal, in various agricultural products such as poultry and grain; and also in such hardline end items as automobiles, aeroplanes, electrical appliances, and so forth.

Such action would require these nations to retreat from their increasingly nationalistic and protectionist policies of autarchy; this could do through lower tariffs, quota eliminations, and the wiping out of internal discriminatory taxes and regulations.

Our friends and allies could also contribute to the solution of our balance-of-payments problem by sharing more equitably the cost of defending the free world, sharing with us the tremendous expenditures we continue to make, in both foreign aid and offshore military outlay.

Unfortunately, however, there has been little inclination to give adequate response to our repeated urgings in this direction; and although these now prosperous nations count on our troops remaining in Europe, they are not willing, either to pay their fair share of the costs incident to such troops, or to make the equivalent money and manpower contributions they nevertheless consider necessary for the defense of their own homelands.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield briefly to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Missouri knows that once before I spoke very highly of the Senator's series of speeches on the balance-of-payments problem.

I have read the advance copy of the speech he is making at this time, and I congratulate him on it.

I believe his five speeches should be printed in a booklet, because, in my judgment, they are very meritorious and should receive wide dissemination.

The point the Senator from Missouri is making is unanswerable. Instead of six divisions being kept in Germany, five of them should be brought home. Their presence abroad has a direct relationship to the balance-of-payments situation. I cannot understand why we should continue to pour our money into our infrastructure program in Europe and still expect to improve our balance-of-payments situation.

Certainly we shall not receive cooperation from these countries so long as our country continues to pour out this money.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the comments of the able Senator from Oregon. No one appreciates the grave and growing aspects of this problem more than he.

These nations want the United States to continue with its aid program, including loans made with an interest rate of three-fourths of 1 percent. But we find them making business loans to underdeveloped countries at rates of 5 percent or 6 percent.

Let us bear in mind also that no nation except the United States assumes any real responsibility for defense against the country which would appear to constitute the greatest of all threats to freedom—Communist China.

In addition, although most of these countries have passed over to the United States most of the financial responsibilities necessary to defend their former colonial system, they are continuing their favorable commercial relationships with those areas, at the expense of the United States.

Unless our friends and allies are willing to recognize the points presented above, therefore, we should consider the following alternatives.

Let me say at this point that I am not one of those inclined to criticize the heads of the governments of other countries for protecting the best interests of their nations. It is the function of sovereignty to be concerned with the safety, security, and welfare of its own people.

On the other hand, and especially in that the economy of the United States is the single most important free world requisite for adequate deterrence against further Communist aggression, no one should criticize us if we, too, follow a course which protects our own economy.

Only by such action can we be in a position to bargain effectively and to reach an understanding with our allies, on the basic question of how to best maintain the strength necessary for the security and prosperity of the free world. We must control and limit further erosion of U.S. economic power through the accumulation of external deficits and debts; and unless we can have support from our friends in our effort to obtain that control, it will be necessary to mobilize our total bargaining resources—in which case I would make the following specific recommendations.

These recommendations may appear strong; but we have already exhausted much time in fruitless persuasion, as our gold holdings "continue to dwindle":

First. The U.S. Government should invoke article XII of the GATT Agreements entitled "Restrictions to Safeguard the Balance of Payments," which says:

> Any contracting party, in order to safeguard its external financial position and its balance of payments, may restrict the quantity or value of merchandise permitted to be imported, subject to the provisions of the following paragraphs of this article.
>
> (a) Import restrictions instituted, maintained, or intensified by a contracting party under this article shall not exceed those necessary: (i) to forestall the imminent threat of, or to stop, a serious decline in its monetary reserves; or (ii) in the case of a contracting party with very low monetary reserves, to achieve a reasonable rate of increase in its reserves.

As this problem of continuing unfavorable balance of payments becomes ever more serious, unless our negotiators can be more persuasive, should we not follow the many actions of our friends and allies and invoke this article XII of the GATT Agreements?

Such action would give notice that unless more constructive means could be found to solve the deficit problem of this country, the United States in turn would be forced to undertake its own import restrictions.

In this connection I have asked the State Department to give me a list of all the occasions upon which these countries have utilized article 12 of the GATT Agreement. However, for some reason, so far they have been unwilling, or unable, to do so. But I do know the article has been utilized many times in recent years.

The advantage of invoking this article, as against any other unilateral action, is that other nations would not have the right to retaliate, particularly in view of the historical fact that in the past many countries have used this article, against U.S. imports, on balance-of-payments grounds; and we have been agreeable to such action.

Second. The United States should immediately invoke the GATT rights we have retained in the field of agriculture, in annex B and annex C of the agreements dated March 7, 1962, under the Dillon round of negotiations.

In January 1962, the Common Market countries agreed to establish variable levies at port of entry on a number of agricultural products. This action equalized the international price, and the internal support price of imported agricultural products; and, with the added $1 a ton surcharge, gave preference to internal Common Market sources.

Recently the Common Market Commission also recommended to the Counsel of Ministers a scheme of internal support prices which, in effect, increased considerably the prices on all grain products, thereby encouraging the internal production of grains; with the variable levy increased accordingly; and although we understand this has been deferred, it shows the developing line of thought in Europe.

As a result of the above programs, the United States now stands to lose hundreds of millions of dollars of agriculture sales it has been making in Europe; and this of course can only further aggravate our balance-of-payments deficits.

The United States encouraged the development of the Common Market to the point where, under the previously mentioned round of negotiations, this Nation agreed to withhold agricultural products from such negotiations; and actually deferred any decisions until the adoption of the common agricultural policy of the Common Market. In other words, in our effort to be fair and constructive, we stood aside while the Common Market conceived and carried out its restrictive policies.

But there is no use crying over spilled milk; and fortunately annex B to the agreements of March 7, 1962, states that the "parties signatory to this agreement in no way limit their rights under GATT or on any other basis."

Specifically on wheat, annex C states that "negotiations shall commence as soon as the European Economic Council of Ministers had decided to introduce the common policy for wheat, and not later than June 30, 1963." Then it continues:

> The Community undertakes to enter into negotiation on the subject of the consequences on imports from third countries of the common agricultural policy to be applied. It does not exclude negotiation on the maximum level of the levy or levies. This negotiation shall take into account the importance of international trade in wheat, and shall be such as to provide for the evolution of this trade with the Community under fair and reasonable conditions.

Mr. President, I do not believe the combination of variable levies along with the recommended support prices, is either fair or reasonable; and in view of the predictable results of the combination—the Mansholt price support program and the variable levies—should we not assert our rights under these specific agreements, entered into March 7, 1962, and under the GATT Agreements, and exert every possible influence to prevent the execution of this Common Market agricultural policy, a policy that can only do great harm to U.S. agriculture and U.S. exports?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very glad to yield to the able Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I commend the Senator from Missouri for his excellent speech.

The United States is getting the short end of the trade with the Common Market countries, because of some of their trade agreements. This is particularly true in regard to poultry. Wheat is another example. We are being closed out of their markets; and when we do sell wheat to the West German Government for example, it then sells it to the German people, and makes a substantial profit through selling it on the basis of their higher support price.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from North Dakota, who is a true expert in the field of agriculture, and a devoted friend of the American farmers.

Mr. President, should we not be prepared to postpone negotiations under the Trade Expansion Act, until a satisfactory agreement is reached on the Common Market agricultural price supports and variable levies?

How can a temporary market access agreement, which merely holds our export opportunities at a past historical level for a short period, be considered adequate?

If the theory of Atlantic Community interdependence is going to be applied to military defense and industrial production, why should it not also apply to agriculture?

I believe the long-range objectives of the Common Market should be lower support prices and lower levies on imports.

This would give American agriculture exports a chance to continue to supply the growing population of Western Europe with lower cost food products.

That course should be to the advantage of Western Europe. It would help raise its standard of living, and increase the gross national product by diminishing the less productive employment of labor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 20 seconds?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. It is the duty of the State Department to exercise its rights under GATT and to retaliate. However, it has been more than a year since Secretary Rusk and Mr. Herter have had clear notification. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] knows whereof I speak in regard to what is happening to fruit exports to Europe. France and other countries have discriminated against American fruits. For more than a year we have requested that our rights under GATT be applied, and we continue to get the "runaround" from both Mr. Rusk and Mr. Herter. It is about time that the American people started giving them the "runaround."

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able friend. All I can say, in reply to the Senator from Oregon, is that the more one gets into this question, the more apprehensive one becomes with respect to the economic position of the United States and its relationship to the free world.

Until such a program is agreed on, I believe, we should be prepared to delay negotiations under the Trade Expansion Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Missouri is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Again, how can these negotiations be of any real benefit to the United States unless the principle of interdependence applied to defense is also applied to agriculture, to industry?

My third point is that the United States should undertake, immediately, to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 so as to bring it more in line with present reality.

This act was passed with certain assumptions. It was assumed, for example, that England would be a part of the Common Market by the time negotiations started under the act.

Section 211 of the act authorized negotiations with the Common Market to lower tariffs down to zero on commodities in which the Common Market and the United States accounted for 80 percent of world trade. Without British participation, however, this provision is almost null and void; and actually ties our hands in arriving at favorable agreements with countries outside the Common Market.

I recommend, therefore, that section 211 of the Trade Expansion Act be amended to include the authority to negotiate separately with Great Britain, the Outer Seven—EFTA—countries, and the British Commonwealth of Nations. In this way we would acquire real and practical bargaining leverage with the Common Market countries.

This leverage, however, cannot be obtained if the principle of most-favored-nation treatment is retained in the Trade Expansion Act, because any concessions made to any country would automatically be extended to the Common Market, thereby automatically giving them a free ride.

The principle effectively ties our hands and prevents us from improving our bargaining position with the continental European countries.

Elimination of the most-favored-nation clause should not be considered a retrogressive move. This Nation should always be ready to negotiate, with any county, or groups of countries, the premise being that any agreement should be on the concept of a two-way street.

These proposed amendments to the Trade Expansion Act would put the United States in a position to develop a trade fair both to its friends and allies; and also to itself; a bloc which would extend from the Scandinavian countries to Japan, and from Capetown to Melbourne; a bloc which would immeasurably improve our seriously weakened bargaining position in Europe.

My fourth point is that the United States should present why we can no longer afford to keep our present tremendous military force in Europe, a position deeply involved with the current problem of a continuing and growing unfavorable balance of payments. Only recently, former President Eisenhower stated that six divisions in Europe was not sound; and I believe he was right. I made the same observation on October 4, in an article written for the Kansas City Star.

European governments withhold manpower from NATO defense planning on the ground they cannot afford to carry out their agreements in entirety. Surely then they should be sympathetic to our own increasingly serious problem—the continuing loss of our gold.

It is clear that any ultimate defense of Europe now depends on nuclear firepower. Why then should we continue in Europe the same large ground force defense structure established many years ago; and which is being continued at a cost of billions of dollars to the United States?

If these nations disagree with this reasoning, as their gold reserves build up and their prosperity becomes unprecedented, should they not pay the bill?

Should we not also discuss with these, our friends and allies, the long-range interest of the Atlantic Community in the Far East? Banking freedom in that part of the world is also costing the United States billions of dollars a year.

Should we not find out if these prosperous European countries believe it important to try to continue to contain the imperialistic ambitions of Red China?

Is it fair for these friends and allies to pursue their commercial interests to the point where they are selling billions of dollars of products to the Communist Chinese for gold, while we not only refuse to allow our banks and industries the right to deal with the Chinese Communists, but actually continue to send out our own youth to die in effort to contain the allies of Red China?

Finally, Mr. President, in next year's foreign aid bill, the United States should give serious consideration to converting the foreign aid program to a lend-lease program—materials, instead of money—based upon the availability of goods that we are in a position to produce and finance.

At present, whereas our balance-of-payments problem grows more serious, we nevertheless continue to add to the problem by continuing to give foreign aid to other countries, which countries use that aid to make up their own balance-of-payments deficits.

The allocation of aid responsibility among all developed countries could be arranged, based on ability to produce and willingness to finance, by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Mr. President, this is the last of five addresses I have made on the floor with respect to this problem of balance of payments.

If it becomes clear that, unless there is change, the United States will apply these recommended policies, other countries will become more impressed with the importance of a more just and logical division of the costs of freedom.

Recently, in Frankfurt, the Secretary of State forthrightly urged an equivalent sharing of defense expenses. Based on the record, however, I do not believe we are going to bring our allies to a realization of the importance of this sharing, unless they become convinced we are ready to undertake a firm program.

Surely our friends and allies realize that they are free, and independent, and able to operate profitably their economies without Communist threats, only because of the nuclear shield, and the military guarantees that have been given them by the United States, ever since the end of World War II.

These countries should also realize that the ability of the United States to continue to furnish those guarantees depends on its prosperity and stability. They know that our physical strength, which over the years and in the interest of freedom we have willingly shared with them, can only come from our economic strength.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I, too, have followed the excellent addresses of the Senator from Missouri on the subject of our balance-of-payments problem. They have been brilliant. We have held a series of hearings before the Joint Economic Committee on the same subject. The Senator has shown a deep understanding of this complex problem and has contributed to my own understanding of and enlightenment in this field.

The Senator is correct when he points out that there is no painless solution to the problem. I believe the Senator would agree that while the recommendations he makes are intelligent and meritorious, in each case they represent a difficulty involving ourselves and our allies that will not be easy to put into effect. But something of the kind proposed is absolutely essential. Some people have the feeling that the problem is nearing solution because announcement of the interest-equalization tax has stemmed the flow of capital abroad. Results of the statistics of the past 2 or 3 months show that in that period we have not lost much gold and that our balance-of-payments situation is improving. Those statistics, however, should be viewed in the perspective of what is causing this temporary correction. The basic problem is one which gives evidence of becoming permanent unless we take action against it.

The Senator from Missouri is correct in saying that we are going deeper into debt and losing our freedom of action. We are getting into a position in which we may be forced to act, and act precipitately, and perhaps against the interests of the free world, unless we put into effect such recommendations as the series of carefully worked-out proposals which the Senator from Missouri recommends.

The Senator from Missouri has made an excellent and persuasive presentation. I hope it receives the kind of national attention and consideration it so richly deserves.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the remarks of the senior Senator from Wisconsin. After serving with him many years, it is my conviction that no Member of this body has more grasp of the fiscal and monetary policies of the United States, and the problems involved therein than does the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my able friend from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I believe the whole country—and certainly the Senate—should be grateful to my colleague, the Senator from Missouri, for his presentations; so intelligent, so thoughtful, so provocative, and so original. I compliment the Senator. I know that if millions of people could speak on the floor of this Chamber they would speak as I do.

I wish to make two points with my colleague, the Senator from Missouri. Like our beloved friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, the Senator knows that I also have addressed myself to these problems.

The first point is, Why are we agitated about the balance of payments? It is not that the United States does not have great resources, great productive power, or is not solvent. We are exercised because it is a "fever chart." The appraisal of the world is that we are not doing as well as we need to do to carry the load. Either we must disengage from some of the load or we must do much better, as in export trade and other matters which produce dollars.

The Senator mentioned tourism, which costs us $1.5 billion a year.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes, I mentioned tourism.

Mr. JAVITS. That is the first point. That is what the American people must realize.

We are not belaboring the subject because of the $3 billion a year involved. We are belaboring it because of the trend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 more minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, have I time available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has 15 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield all my time to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my friend the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his typically gracious courtesy. and take this opportunity to congratulate him on the way he is handling this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. We are discussing the fact that the stability of the dollar is the base upon which world finance depends. Our own operations show that we are carrying too big a load. Either we must disengage ourselves from some of that load, with our allies, or we must find ways of financing it better than we have in the past.

Incidentally, like the Senator from Missouri, I am devoted to the foreign aid program and other programs, so I believe the answer is that we must find some way for greater burden sharing, and we must make efforts to deal with the problems of the general type the Senator has described, with which other Senators have also dealt.

There is another point which is quite important to the two Senators who have spoken and to the majority. Some of the most original and provocative ideas in this Government are voiced on the Senate floor. Senators are pretty important people. At least, the people of the country so believe. They send Senators back, in votes by the millions, for long terms.

When a suggestion comes from the Senate floor it seems to me that it falls like a stone in the sea. That is the end of it. No executive department takes any interest in it, unless beaten over the head with an amendment or some hearing and compelled to pay attention to it. Then they suddenly discover that ideas are presented.

When the President makes a suggestion or when the Secretary of some Department makes a suggestion, we comment on it. We are interested. We see what can be done. We introduce bills, and so on.

I hope very much that Senators who have addressed themselves to this subject will use their influence with the executive departments, so that when ideas are proposed they will be given serious and thoughtful study and consideration, and we will get a reaction, to find out whether they are right or wrong and whether anything can be done in governmental policy.

That is the least tribute that can be paid to such thoughtful, painstaking, detailed work and original thinking as evidenced by the presentation of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the comments of the distinguished Senator from New York. He, too, is an expert in this field. One of his talks last summer stimulated me to look deeper into this entire problem. I also agree more attention should be paid to the problem.

Not long ago the gold reserves of the great country of France were less than a half billion dollars. Recently they were more than $3.7 billion.

Not long ago the gold reserves of the great country of the Netherlands were around $300 million. Recently they were $1¾ billion.

Not long ago there were little or no gold reserves in West Germany. Now their gold reserves are tremendous.

We have done our best, during all of this time, first to help these fine friendly countries get back on their feet, and we have had something to do with giving them the greatest prosperity they have ever known. At the same time, our own gold reserves have dropped from over $24 billion to less than $16 billion.

In addition, we have callable liabilities in foreign countries of from $25 to $28 billion, depending upon how one figures certain international commitments. Inasmuch as these current liabilities we have incurred are callable in gold, and inasmuch as we must keep $12 billion of our $15.8 billion of gold available as guarantee against our currency, actually we have available less than $4 billion in gold to put up in case we should be called upon to redeem in gold these $25 to $28 billion.

The more one goes into these figures the more apprehensive one becomes.

Regardless of the physical strength and productive capacity and capability of this country, it seems to me that economic freedom is beginning to move away from our shores.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my able friend the Senator from Alaska, who has made constructive observations about this problem in the past.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to join my colleagues in congratulating the senior Senator from Missouri for his thoughtful speech. The Senator has made a great contribution.

I should like to add one thought, which I believe is pertinent in respect to our diminishing gold supply.

For several years those of us who serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have sought to find some legislative approach to stop the drain. Our gold-mining industry is practically extinct now, and is becoming extinct due to the fact that during the war an order was given abolishing all gold mining. This was not done by our gold-mining allies. It was not done by Canada. It was not done by Australia. It was not done by South Africa.

Every proposal which we make meets with an objection from the Treasury

Department that anything we do in behalf of the gold-mining industry somehow will cause panic. None of us who serve on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, who have heard these remarks repeatedly, can see any justification for them. We have sought again and again to induce the Treasury Department, since it does not agree with the proposals made by the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], by the chairman of the committee, and by other Senators, to come forth with some alternatives. The Department does not produce any.

That is a very shocking situation. In the other countries of the world where gold is found, it is being mined and cultivated. We are allowing our industry to perish, and are making no attempt to preserve it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for his able and informed contribution to this discussion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my friend the distinguished Senator from Alabama and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I have said to the Senator from Missouri privately, I believe he has given us a series of thought-provoking speeches. I have expressed the hope that the Senator would have them printed in a single brochure which might be made available.

There was one thing in the Senator's speech today which somewhat confused me. I should like to ask a question about it. I refer to the first point the Senator made with reference to the increase in short-term interest rates, I believe.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And our effort to discourage American money from going abroad for the building of plants and so forth.

I wondered what effect that would have. The Senator says it is not effective. I read in yesterday's press a column by a very distinguished and fine economist, Mr. J. A. Livingston. If I remember correctly, Mr. Livingston said that he had been one of the "doubting Thomases" who did not believe it would work, but, he pointed out, it was working and was having a decided effect on our outflow of capital.

It seems to me that is in conflict with what the Senator from Missouri said, and I wonder what his comment would be.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did not read the Livingston column. Private investment abroad has returned much capital in the way of dividends. It has cost us jobs here. The able Senator is, I believe, talking about short-term improvement in the last quarter, less gold leaving this country. Whereas slightly more than 6 months ago, gold was going out at an average of some $5 billion a year, that was cut to a little over $1 billion a year for the last quarter. An increase in interest rates had something to do with it. The Senator from Wisconsin brought out other reasons.

If we followed any extended policy, however, of increasing our interest rates, we would slow down the rate of growth of our economy, and our gross national product would be affected, and unemployment would increase. Such action does not appear to be the ultimate solution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with the Senator, except for this: My recollection is that Secretary Dillon tried to draw this distinction very clearly when the policy was announced—that is, the policy of seeking an increase in short-term interest rates, but not in long-term interest rates. In other words, the long-term interest rates would primarily affect our economy, and the short-term interest rates would affect the tendency to invest abroad.

Mr. SYMINGTON. At times based on certain actions, the rate of outflow of gold considerably improves; but later the flow increases. I am reminded of a person saying, "good news today. The cancer has improved. It is better." Next week it becomes worse, however, then better, then worse again. Everyone knows that if such a situation continues, eventually there will be extinction of human or economic life. I do not see how we can afford not to do some things fundamental in recognition of this balance-of-payments problem.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am in complete agreement with the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Before relinquishing the floor, I want nothing to be construed as being critical of our friends and allies. I have nothing but admiration, respect, and deep affection for them. But I would hope that we would start looking at our problems in our country, the way it is clear they are looking at their problems in their countries.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on the point raised by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Alabama was talking about the interest-equalization tax, which would be a tax on the interest paid by foreigners borrowing from this country. It would not affect the interest rate in this country, as I understand.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. While I am wholeheartedly for it, and I think the Livingston column is right, that it has worked well, nevertheless, economists who have testified before the Joint Economic Committee have taken the position that the proposal has already had its full effect, even though such a law has not been enacted, because the effect of the proposal has been discounted—perhaps overly discounted—in the past few months. This is why improvement has been sudden, but probably temporary. The export of capital is only a part of our adverse balance-of-payments problem.

The respite of the past few months will be tomorrow, our adverse balance, permanent unless we do something to correct it in some such constructive way as the Senator from Missouri recommends.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I agree. I said I tried to get at the one point.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, has the pending amendment been withdrawn?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator withdraws the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an article very pertinent to the issue before us appears in this afternoon's Washington Star. It is the last of an excellent series by George Sherman, and is headed "Brazil Gripped by Chaos." The jump head on an inside page is "Living Cost in Brazil Up 100 Percent in Year."

The article points out that the Brazilian Government has failed to undertake steps which she promised to take to curb inflation. I quote from the article:

> The United States is caught between not being able to turn its back on the major country of the south, and not being able to work with its government.
>
> As a result the U.S. aid program is virtually at a standstill.

In a later paragraph it says that this program, which is at a standstill, amounted to $100 million last year. If that is a standstill, what would the program cost and amount to if it was really going?

Here is another example of some of the waste and folly which has plagued the program as a result of these governments not carrying out the promises they made and our continuing to give aid nonetheless.

Of course, these loans will not be paid, even though there is a moratorium of 10 years and they are to be paid at an interest rate of three-quarters of 1 percent. The people making those loans in the administration will not be there when the time comes. Our practice has never been to say that the loans are not being paid. When they come due they are merely "refunded." It is a piece of hypocrisy and concealment which at some distant day will plague us.

This article is pertinent to the efforts of the Senator from Oregon and some of the rest of us to bring sanity and sense to the program, which needs them and should have them if it is to succeed.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I have referred printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRECARIOUS PARTNERS—BRAZIL GRIPPED BY CHAOS

(By George Sherman)

Brazil, the Goliath of Latin America, is a country wrapped in dangerous uncertainty.

Even Brazilians are beginning to admit that their aspirations to lead the southern continent are being lost in a quagmire of economic and political chaos.

In the tropical splendor of Rio de Janeiro, or along the busy streets of industrial São Paulo, the visitor easily misses the signs of nagging uncertainty.

The beaches of Copacabana are as full as always this summer season, the lavish hotels are packed and the new superhighways along the bay to the central city are jammed with racing automobiles.

In central São Paulo to the south, new skyscrapers are competing with their elders.

But the uncertainty is nonetheless there. It comes out in the frenetic shopping spree of a nation which lives on credit because it no longer sees either the need or possibility to save. It comes out in a growing rash of strikes reflecting the growing restlessness of workers over their deteriorating lot.

President Goulart himself admits that the cost of living this year has risen 100 percent. "The inflation threatens to devour us," he said in a recent interview printed in a Brazilian magazine. He forecast a treasury deficit for the year of 350 billion cruzeiros (almost $600 million).

No one seems quite sure how the Government can finance the annual "13th month" bonus equal to 1 month's full wages paid workers every December—except to print still more currency. For his part, the President is now backing a demand that the unions negotiate wage boosts every 6 months to keep up with inflation, instead of at the current yearly intervals.

Inflation is no new phenomenon. It has been virtually unchecked for years. But its impact on vital economic expansion is only now understood.

Thanks to fiscal irresponsibility and a series of official discouragements, private foreign investment has dropped to almost nothing. In 1961, such investment was running at $100 million a year. In 1962 it was already down to $22 million. The economic growth rate of 7.5 percent in 1961—the highest in Latin America—today has fallen to the point where it lags behind a terrifying population explosion.

But despite these statistics, most observers believe the basic problem in Brazil is political rather than economic. The country has rapidly developed its natural resources, human know-how, and modern industrial base to launch into the 20th century.

But political leaders still live in another age. They attack national problems with all the primitive passion of feudal barons protecting their fiefdoms.

President Goulart is considered a prime example. Students of politics have long since given up trying to discover what ideology or consistent philosophy of action guides him. He is now attacked on all sides—right and left—as a crass opportunist.

CABINET NEVER SURE

He manipulates power from the cloistered precincts of the presidential palace in the new capital of faraway Brasília. And even his Cabinet ministers—who are regularly changed over 6-month intervals—are never quite sure what he will do next.

It is generally believed, for instance, that Mr. Goulart urged extremist union leaders in São Paulo to strike last month so as to embarrass and weaken Gov. Ademarde Barros, a bitter opponent of the President.

But the Governor held firm and the commander of the powerful 2d Army in São Paulo backed him up. Strike leaders were arrested, and the right of workers to cross picket lines was protected.

When it became obvious the strike would fail, Mr. Goulart counseled moderation on the unions and took credit for averting disaster.

He also quickly transferred the commander of the 2d Army and still further divided a military already deeply divided over the Goulart brand of politics.

CHAIN REACTION OF SUSPICION

Continued uncertainty has unleashed a chain reaction of suspicion. Mr. Goulart blames the inflation and turmoil on the unwillingness of the conservative majority in Congress to pass the agrarian, tax, banking, and administrative reform laws which he requests.

There is just enough truth in the accusation to appeal to the half-literate masses who rarely look beyond their own crippling misery.

The leaders of Congress have their own appealing answer. They claim that they will not pass drastic legislation completely changing the face of the country when they suspect that the chief executive will use the new power for his own ends.

So fearful is Congress of a Goulart attempt to overthrow the whole constitutional system that the leadership refused to recess this year for its long Christmas holiday.

The result is stalemate. The economic situation deteriorates and there is increased talk about revolutions, coups, and countercoups.

Perhaps the most debated question is whether Brazil can stagger through to the national elections in October 1965.

The debate is heightened by persistent reports that Mr. Goulart is on the verge of shifting his Cabinet to the "nationalist left."

Despite presidential denials, the fear is that such a shift will bring into the Government Leonel Brizola, federal deputy, brother-in-law of the President, and the most outspoken advocate of ending "imperialist domination" of an "independent" Brazil.

REASONS FOR STRENGTH

The personal influence of Mr. Brizola with the President, plus a limited infiltration of Communists or their admirers into parts of the Government, accounts for the strength of leftist nationalism.

As an organized movement, it commands little popular support. And the Communists, who hide behind extreme nationalist slogans, are themselves badly split over whether to follow violent or nonviolent tactics.

On the other side stands Gov. Carlos Lacerda of Guanabara Stata, where Rio is located. He is a determined foe of the Communists and the most outspoken enemy of the President. He attacks Mr. Goulart for everything from corruption to sheltering Communists in his Government. He has also increasingly emerged as a leading candidate for the Presidency in 1965.

U.S. diplomats in Brazil walk a nervous tightrope. They visibly despair of finding any solution.

The United States is caught between not being able to turn its back on the major country of the south, and not being able to work with its government.

As a result the U.S. aid program is virtually at a standstill.

LOAN PAYMENTS NOT MADE

Due to the Goulart failure to carry out an austerity program promised last March, payments on a $100 million loan for currency stabilization have not been made.

The United States has continued food-for-peace programs and loans for essential long-range development projects. These amounted to $100 million for the fiscal year ending last July 1.

These new roads, schools, irrigation and sewage systems, and training programs represent the loan foothold of the Alliance for Progress in Brazil today. They are more hollow symbols of what could be than of what is.

For, it is now quite clear, the Alliance for Progress never will become a living reality in Brazil until a political leadership emerges willing to make it so.

THE TAX BILL AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa may proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, ever since this administration gave No. 1 priority to its ill-advised tax cut bill in the House, evidenced by action in the House passage of the tax cut bill long before a civil rights bill was even reported out by the House Judiciary Committee, I have been warning that statements by administration spokesmen that civil rights would be given No. 1 priority are meaningless. It is not words but action that really count, and House action on the tax cut bill first was a warning.

The American people have not yet become acquainted with the full implications of the situation. In today's Washington Post there appears an excellent, timely, and discerning article by the columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, entitled "Johnson's Timetable." The authors, who are well informed about the legislative process and the techniques which can be used on Capitol Hill and in the White House, present an interesting explanation of the reason why House Democratic leaders refused to sign the discharge petition with respect to the Judiciary Committee's civil rights bill, which is now pending in the House Rules Committee, awaiting a rule to permit House debate on the bill. They suggest that the administration does not want prompt action on the civil rights bill; that it does not want the House to act on civil rights before the Senate takes up the tax cut bill, because if this were to happen, the Senate would be forced to take up the House-passed civil rights bill, and this would delay, if not prevent, ultimate passage of the tax cut bill. I say that the Senate "would be forced to take up" the civil rights bill, because its failure to do so would constitute irrefutable proof that civil rights legislation is not of No. 1 priority.

If the Senate takes up the tax cut bill first, there can well be a filibuster, or at least very extended debate, as to it, because there are a good many Senators, including myself, who are opposed to a tax cut without a cutback in spending to make room for it. We do not want to see the American people teased with the illusion that they can have something for nothing—that they can have a meaningful tax cut without a cutback in spending to make room for it. And we do not want to see millions of low-income people, who would gain little or nothing from a tax cut, hurt by the inflation which a tax cut, unaccompanied by a cut in spending to make room for it, would thrust upon them.

If there is extended debate on the tax cut bill, while the House finally takes up and passes a civil rights bill, it could well be that the Senate would not take up the civil rights bill until so late that extended debate on it would permit time to run out in this coming session of Congress without action on civil rights legislation by the Senate; or, if the Senate finally acted, without action by the conference committee which would attempt to settle differences between the House and Senate.

Mr. President, I believe that most of the Members of Congress wish to see meaningful civil rights legislation passed by this Congress. We may differ over some of the details, but I believe that we can get together on a reasonable bill. But, if this is to be certain of happening, the administration is simply going to have to direct that the tax cut bill take the back seat. If prolonged debate on civil rights legislation results in failure of the tax cut bill, that is a consequence the administration should be willing to accept. And, as far as many of us in Congress are concerned, this is a consequence we will be more than happy to see—as long as the administration adheres to a program of a tax cut without a cutback in spending to make room for it—a program, I might say, clearly enunciated by the President's Council of Economic Advisers and the Secretary of the Treasury.

QUOTATIONS FOR MAY FUTURES IN SOYBEANS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, at the close of yesterday's trading in the commodity market, Chicago quotations for May futures in soybeans were $2.80⅞ per bushel. The opening quotation was $2.79½.

Today's issue of the Wall Street Journal, at page 18, reports that traders expected the Government report, which was issued after the close of trading yesterday, to show a drop in production estimates from a month ago; that dealers had expected a fall of only about 2 million bushels in the estimate.

In fact, the report, issued yesterday, following the close of trading, by the Crop Reporting Board of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, shows a drop of 16,717,000 bushels to an estimated production total of 701 million bushels.

The impact of this report on today's market was that trading in May futures in soybeans opened at $2.89¼ and closed at the same figure. Trading was reported as constant at these prices—the maximum limit over the previous day's close. A great deal of money has been made by speculators today. And if anyone had any "inside" information regarding the report that was issued following the close of trading yesterday by the Crop Reporting Board, a great deal of money could have been made illegally.

What prompts my concern is what appears to be an inexcusably inaccurate job of forecasting 1963 soybean production on the part of the Department of Agriculture, the results of which may well have cost our farmers who produce soybeans hundreds of thousands of dollars.

On November 15, May futures in soybeans closed at $2.99. Since that time, until today, a large volume of trading has been as much as 23½ cents lower. It is most unlikely that there would have been such a drop in the market if the estimates of the USDA had not been off so far.

On September 10, the Crop Reporting Board's publication, Crop Production, estimated soybean production, as of September 1, at 728 million bushels. On October 10, the Board estimated production as of October 1 at 727 million bushels. This estimate appeared in sharp contrast to reports of drought conditions in some parts of the country, and particularly to an article appearing in the October 29 issue of the Wall Street Journal which, among other things, pointed out that the associate dean of agriculture of Iowa State University had estimated 1963 soybean production at only 688 million bushels. I ask unanimous consent that extracts from the Journal article be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Buying in the soybean market followed a statement by the American Soybean Association that drought this year was more widespread and that the effects on 1963 soybean production could be greater than had been anticipated earlier.
>
> The association said reports from Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio noted soybean yields below a year ago. The association added that farmers are holding back more of their production from the marketplace than they have for some time.
>
> The associate dean of agriculture at Iowa State University, Louis M. Thompson, said 1963 soybean production would probably be 688 million bushels. The Government as of October 1 estimated the crop at 727 million bushels.
>
> After the close of trading the Government announced 5,055,857 bushels of soybeans were inspected for export in the week ended October 25. This was up from 4,805,936 a week ago and from 4,367,926 a year earlier. The total for the season, which started October 1, is 13,339,609 bushels, down from 16,325,689 bushels a year earlier.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on November 12, the Crop Reporting Board of the USDA estimated production for 1963 at 718 million bushels, as of November 1—a drop of 9 million bushels from its estimate of the previous month. And now, 1 month later, it has dropped its estimate by 16,717,000 bushels.

Perhaps the most alarming part of these last two estimates is that the unusually dry weather this past fall permitted a generally early harvest, so that most of the 1963 production was harvested before November 1. Under such circumstances, a difference in estimates between October 1 and December 1 of 26 million bushels appears to be inexcusable.

I am requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to look into this situation immediately and to furnish me with an explanation of why this occurred. And I am also directing a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee suggesting that this matter be investigated by his committee—not only with a view to determining how such inaccurate estimates can be prevented from happening again but also with a view to determining whether there has been any unethical or illegal activity connecting personnel of the USDA and members of the grain trade who have been making profits following release of USDA production estimates.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. What is the status of the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One committee amendment has not been agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Is that the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been laid aside. Is the Senator ready to call it up?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment, which was laid aside, relating to the language at page 17 of the bill, be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out the language on page 17 from line 9 to line 16, inclusive, as follows:

> None of the funds provided herein shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand that the time limitation on the amendment is 2 hours, with 1 hour allowed to each side. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield time?

Mr. PASTORE. I thought the Senator from South Dakota would proceed first.

Mr. MUNDT. Assuming there are any arguments in favor of the Senator's position, should not the Senator from Rhode Island proceed first?

Mr. PASTORE. The argument in favor of my position is the one which the Senate heard several weeks ago.

The amendment was suggested by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. It then was agreed to refer it to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which reported it unfavorably, but with minority views.

The proposal was debated exhaustively on the floor of the Senate, and the Senate rejected it.

This is more or less the same amendment that has been inserted in the foreign aid bill by the House. Because of the action taken by the Senate, as I have already said, the Committee on Appropriations rejected this particular language in the bill as it came from the House.

If the Senate is to remain consistent with its position already taken, that nothing has happened in the intervening time that would cause Senators to change their minds, I suggest that the language should be deleted. That is the gist of the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Good causes, like old soldiers, never die. What has been said by the distinguished acting chairman of the committee is correct up to a certain point. But he failed to state that while the Senate has voted twice in connection with the contents of the issue before the Senate, on one occasion it voted not to lay the measure on the table, which was tantamount to voting for its approval; and on another occasion it voted to lay it on the table, which was tantamount to deferring a decision on the issue.

I am not sure what the attitude of the Senate is on the merits of the proposal itself.

On yea and nay vote today, there will be no motion to lay on the table; the Senate will have before it, clearly, squarely, and firmly, the issue of whether it wishes to initiate a policy of placing the credit of the American Government and of our taxpayers' money behind the bad credit of Communist dictators for the purchase of supplies, here or abroad. That is the essence of the issue.

I placed in the Record yesterday, for easy reference, at pages 25030 and 25031, the three yea and nay votes which have been taken on this issue, one in the House of Representatives and two in the Senate. In the main, we can fairly well predict how Senators will vote; but there is a "swing shift" of 12 or 15 Senators who have been, at times, on one side, and, at different times, on different sides of this important issue. I wish to direct my remarks primarily to the "swing shift," to try to get them on the right side now, for we are dealing with the basic issue at hand.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Were the page numbers to which the Senator just referred pages in the Congressional Record?

Mr. MUNDT. The Congressional Record of yesterday, December 18, pages 25030 and 25031.

There is before the Senate this time a clear-cut issue. It should have been before the Senate all the time because, in my opinion, this will be a far-reaching public decision, in many ways more significant to the future of America than our vote on the test ban treaty, which was adopted after many days of debate, and which I supported affirmatively, but as to which there was a considerable amount of dissension and discussion.

In this instance, we are called upon to change a policy that the Export-Import Bank has followed since its inception. Never since 1933 and until the recent decision by its Board of Directors, has the Export-Import Bank extended credit to a Communist country or guaranteed credit that the Communists have achieved.

For 16, 17, or 18 years we have followed the congressional and administrative policy of restricting trade with the Red Communist bloc as a part of our cold war technique and our basic American bipartisan foreign policy and as a supplement of the foreign aid processes and programs which we have been debating for the past few days.

When it was announced on October 9 that American firms had received export licenses to trade with Communist countries, and that some of those licenses had been issued to commercial traders for the export of commodities to the Soviet Union and Soviet bloc countries, it was then stipulated that the trade would be for cash, for gold, for cash on the barrelhead, or on normal commercial terms. I submit that it is straining the words "normal commercial terms" to do something which has never before been done; that is, to extend to the Export-Import Bank credit and credit guarantees to the Communist bloc countries. It is unusual. It is unwise. Obviously, it is not in conformity with "normal commercial terms," because a proposed action, which has never been taken before, certainly cannot be considered a normal action.

Mr. PASTORE. But neither have we sold wheat to the Soviet Union before.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Naturally, if we are to do one thing we have never done before, as contingent upon something else, why is the Senator so excited or disturbed about the latter part?

Mr. MUNDT. I will explain why I am disturbed about it. Whether I am disturbed or not, it would not be a normal transaction. It has never been done before.

I believe the American people generally do not understand the situation. They have received a wrong impression. Editorials by the dozens have appeared all over the country, either for or against the transaction, on the basis that it was to be cash on the barrelhead. Senator after Senator stated on the floor or wrote to his constituents that he approved or disapproved a policy, which involved the sales of grain for cash or for gold.

So now the issue is squarely before the Senate, and the coming vote will decide exactly the Senate's attitude in this area.

In the second place, the votes which were taken in the Senate were not votes taken on the merits of the bill. Senators have expressed in public and in correspondence the fact that they were voting because of the timing of the situation. They were voting because they did not believe the question should be considered in that bill, or place, in that way or at that time. They said they were deferring action on the proposal by voting to lay it on the table.

But now the moment of truth has arrived. The House has written the provision into the bill. Now we are to decide by our votes the only question: Do we approve or disapprove changing a policy we have followed for from 15 to 18 years; of changing the policy of the Export-Import Bank, which has existed since its inception in 1933?

Do we want to compel our constituents, the taxpayers, to underwrite with their money the good faith, good intentions, and good credit of the Communist dictators? A vote "Yea" would say, "All right, Mr. Taxpayer, you are stuck. If the Communists violate the terms, you will pay for it." A vote "Nay" would continue a foreign trade aid policy which has served this country well for almost two decades.

Furthermore, this is not a proposal which involves the question whether we should trade wheat, corn, cotton, or tobacco. The amendment as approved by the House deals with all products and for all countries. It involves the question whether we want to do business with Communist dictators, helping them to import the things they need to shore up the staggering economy in the Communist countries by means of the credit extended by the American taxpayers?

It involves, in addition to grain, other items which the Soviet Union has been seeking from this country. They have been seeking to purchase alcohol, because they have a shortage of alcohol in their vodka operations. It involves whether we want to extend the credit of the fine, churchgoing people of this country and compel them to pay, from their funds, the losses sustained in providing booze for the Communists—because that also is what is involved.

There is something worse. The Communists have now said they want to produce some $46 billion worth of fertilizer, fertilizer machinery, and fertilizer equipment.

They have said they intend to purchase 50 complete fertilizer plants from the United States; that they would like to spend at least $2,500 million to buy the fertilizer plants—and they want it not only on credit, but on 10-year credit.

If we continue to appease the demands of the Communists as fast in the next 3 months as we have in the past 3 months, we shall be giving them the 10-year credit and also giving them green trading stamps as a bonus or as interest on the easy credit, because we have slipped away from the high position of cash on the barrelhead to a position where we have yielded, first, to giving them a lower interest rate than they can get in Canada.

Second, we have yielded on the basis of no longer requiring cash on the barrelhead. Instead, the proposal now is for 75 or 80 percent to be extended by credit for at least 3 years.

Third, we have yielded to the extent of giving them preferential shipping rates. They have been given a most-favored-nation status.

So we have appeased them at every stage of the negotiations, in our scramble to attempt to sell some of our merchandise to the Communists, so they can strengthen their muscles and increase their stature and become stronger in their attempts to imperil the free world. In fact, we have appeased them to such an extent that next year and the year following, ad infinitum and ad nauseam, the State Department will be able to say to us, "Appropriate $3 or $4 billion more of U.S. aid to shore up the economy of the free world since our sales on credit to Red Russia have enabled the Russians to imperil the economies of the free world countries"—and to do all this by means of aid from the United States extended on credit guaranteed by American taxpayers.

No wonder the House of Representatives voted to make sharp cuts in the foreign aid bill, and no wonder so many cutbacks on foreign aid were voted by the Senate. Our policies have become completely self-defeating.

I submit that it is idiotic to attempt to put us in the business of financing both sides of the cold war at the same time, all with American funds. But, in essence, what is the difference between our approach of cold war foreign aid to the Communist countries, if we permit this arrangement to continue, and our aid to the free countries? The only difference is in the interest rates we charge. We propose to guarantee the repayment of the Russian credits, and to let them have our funds with which to buy supplies in the United States: we merely would charge them a few percentage points more interest than the interest rate we charge for the aid we give the countries which are friendly to us. That becomes the only difference.

Mr. President, at this rate, how long do Senators believe it will take to bankrupt the United States or to destroy whatever efficacy there is in our mutual aid program, if we continue to support both sides at the same time—which is exactly what we have been contemplating in the last few weeks, insofar as the extension of credit to Communist countries is concerned. If we adopt this proposal now, we shall be extending hundreds of millions of dollars of credit—perhaps ultimately billions—to the Communist countries; and if the added credit extended to the Communists does not pay out, the bill will be paid by the U.S. taxpayers. Furthermore, Mr. President, the record shows that the Communists do not pay very well.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not mean any impertinence by the question I shall ask; but I wonder whether the Senator from South Dakota would be inclined to favor the sale of any of our wheat to the Russians. I assure him that I am not trying to "box him in."

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; I would be inclined to favor the sale of our wheat to Russia, by means of cash on the barrelhead at time of delivery provided we did some hard-headed American trading, for once, and did not always trade a horse for a rabbit. If we could obtain a quid pro quo in regard to the Berlin Wall and in regard to Vietnam or Korea, we would be in a position to obtain some victories for the free world.

Mr. PASTORE. But that was not my question.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Rhode Island asked whether I would be willing to have any of our wheat at all sold to Russia; and I answered the Senator's question.

Mr. PASTORE. No; I asked whether the Senator from South Dakota would be willing to have any of our wheat sold to Russia for straight cash; and the Senator from South Dakota has answered by saying that he would be willing to have that done, provided we obtain some concessions, in addition to the cash. Is not that a correct statement of his reply?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that the Senator from South Dakota has always been a great protagonist of the USIA information program.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Will not the Senator from South Dakota admit, with me, that "poor Mr. Khrushchev"—and I use the word "poor," in that connection, with all the appropriate contempt anyone can imagine——

Mr. MUNDT. Except that I would say "poor credit-risk Mr. Khrushchev."

Mr. PASTORE. After all, all of us love America as much as anyone else does, and all of us hate communism as much as anyone else does. I do not think the Senator from South Dakota believes that he hates communism any more than the Senator from Arkansas or I do. All of us hate communism.

But it is a fact that Khrushchev has held nothing but contempt for our capitalistic system; he has said again and again, "Your system will not work. Your system cannot work. The only solution for humanity is communism."

We have spent many millions of dollars for propaganda purposes; and now we find that Khrushchev is forced to acknowledge to the entire world that the only way he can feed his hungry people is by obtaining food from capitalism. Think of that, Mr. President, if that sort of propaganda is not worth several billion dollars, I do not know how else to describe it. Khrushchev now finds that he is forced to ask capitalism for food for his hungry people, even though again and again he has said, "I will drive capitalism into the sea." But today he recognizes that the only way he can fill the stomachs of the hungry people of Russia is to obtain food from the capitalistic system which he said could not work. Mr. President, we would never be able to buy such successful propaganda—not even for $100 million or $1 billion.

So I say this is the biggest boon to the free world in the cold war, in terms of propaganda, that we have witnessed in the past score of years. Khrushchev has insisted that our system could not work; but now he finds that he cannot feed his people unless he obtains food from us. I say, "Poor Mr. Khrushchev."

Mr. MUNDT. I say, "Poor credit-risk Mr. Khrushchev"—and I shall proceed to prove it.

Khrushchev has taken the same attitude ever since we showed we were willing to play Mr. Sucker. He started, at the beginning of the lend-lease program and the pipeline operations——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, if the other side will yield some of its time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am willing to have the time yielded to the Senator from Montana charged to the time under my control.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In the negotiations with Canada, the Russians paid 25 percent down, and paid the rest in 15 months; and in one case they paid 80 percent down, in order to avoid paying more interest.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, because the Canadian Government was smart enough to charge such a high interest rate that the Russians preferred to pay cash.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not yield now. The Senator from Vermont will be able to have time yielded to him from the time available to those on his side.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont such time as he may use.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well. Will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Vermont the amount of time the Senator from Rhode Island took, in the last few minutes, from the time available to me?

Mr. PASTORE. Absolutely.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well; then it is a "deal."

Mr. PASTORE. Certainly.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask how many countries have fully met their lend-lease obligations to the United States. We know that Finland has done so; but how many other countries are completely free of obligation to the United States because of debts incurred during the war?

Mr. MUNDT. That is one reason why I tried to induce the Senator from Vermont to go along with me, in the Foreign Relations Committee, in my effort to have a higher interest rate charged and to make an arrangement for amortization payments, so we could get back some of that money.

Mr. AIKEN. But I do not think the way to do that is to tell our wheatgrowers that they must stop raising wheat. Yet that is what will have to be done if we have to sell our wheat on a restricted market. Western Europe is trying to put us out of its market, and the Public Law 480 operations are becoming a little shaky. Under these circumstances, soon we shall not be able to even give away our wheat.

Therefore, either we shall have to permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell the wheat as best it can, and it will have to repeal the regulations—Congress will not have to do it—which were inaugurated a few years ago; it will either be necessary to remove those administrative regulations, or else we shall have to establish the strongest kind of controls over the production of wheat in the United States, if it no longer will be possible to sell our wheat in Western Europe and if we will not allow it to be sold to Eastern Europe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield half a minute of his time to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for one-half a minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What have we been doing under Public Law 480, during the past several years, in Poland and Yugoslavia?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. President, I assume that the time I am using will be charged to the time under the control of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, Mr. President; this time can be charged to the time available to Senators on this side.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe we can keep communism and socialism out of the United States altogether, but the U.S. Commodity Credit Corporation is in the business of selling grain to any country. We can take it away from private traders. They do not like it, but we can take it away. We can say to the Commodity Credit Corporation that it must sell direct, if it is sold, or else they must do something else with it, or else we will most likely tell the U.S. wheatgrower that he must let the other countries of the world take over the world market and not plant.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Not at the moment. I do not wish to become diverted into a discussion of the farm program, which is altogether unrelated to the question.

Mr. AIKEN. We cannot separate this problem from the farm problem.

Mr. MUNDT. I could make my point if there were not a single grower of wheat involved. I am primarily interested in the pattern that is emerging. We have already received requests for alcohol, for fertilizer, and for a chemical plant. Borrowing American money and guaranteeing Communist credit to purchase fertilizer and chemical plants, which can be used not only for agriculture but also for warfare, I believe makes this a program of international idiocy, underscored and italicized.

I am pleading for some consistency in our foreign aid programs. Either we are to have foreign aid programs and engage in a cold war, or we are not. But if we are to have foreign aid programs, to the extent of $100 billion now expended for 107 countries, to fight a cold war which has succeeded to the point where the Russian economy is beginning to stagger, are we to call an armistice or a moratorium and say "You are getting in bad shape with this unworkable Communist bureaucracy of yours. If you need something we will give you the money and the credit; we will sell you what you need; we will make you strong again to continue your Communist aggressions" ad infinitum? It does not make sense.

We should decide for ourselves: Are we serious about trying to pinch the economy of the Communists, or are we not?

Concerning the credit risk of Soviet Russia, I should like to quote from an article written by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, distributed by the Hall Syndicate in New York City, about the Canadian experience:

> WASHINGTON, November 11.—Canada's immense wheat sales to Red China are turning sour. While deliveries of the grain, which the Canadians peddled with zealous eagerness, are continuing on schedule, payment is not. Peiping's installments are steadily lagging. Authoritative U.S. sources estimate the Communists are more than $100 million in arrears.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET RUSSIA CREDIT RISK

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON, November 11.—Canada's immense wheat sales to Red China are turning sour. While deliveries of the grain, which the Canadians peddled with zealous eagerness, are continuing on schedule, payment is not. Peiping's installments are steadily lagging.

Authorative U.S. sources estimate the Communists are more than $100 million in arrears.

Ottawa is giving no public hint of this disturbing situation. And naturally, Peiping is saying nothing either.

But Canada is sounding out United States, British and World Bank officials on bailing out Red China by lending enough money to meet its overdue installments on the $650 million wheat debt.

In these hush-hush feelers, the Canadians apparently are thinking in terms of a loan of several hundred million dollars to the Communists.

So far, these backstage overtures have gotten no encouragement.

What the next move will be remains to be seen. This matter has become known to congressional leaders, and they are watching it closely. Any attempt to provide Peiping with funds to pay for the wheat it bought from Canada, over U.S. protests, would precipitate a furious uproar.

The Kennedy administration, already deeply embroiled in congressional tribulations, is not likely to risk such a certain violent explosion.

For Red China, its financial difficulties come at a highly inopportune time.

Faced with the absolute need to continue importing large quantities of grain for at least another 5 years, the Communist rulers already are shopping around for new supplies.

Argentina and Australia are being broached for deliveries in 1965.

But the specter of the steadily mounting lagging payments to Canada is casting a pall on China's chances of doing business with those countries. They are hinting at cash-on-the-barrelhead terms.

Canada sold its grain for a 25-percent downpayment and the balance in installments over 18 months after delivery.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to yield to my good friend.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the transaction being proposed is not with Communist China but with the Soviet Union, whose credit, I understand, is good.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not know where the Senator gets his understanding of the validity of Communist credit, because they have not even settled the debts which they incurred in the pipeline of lend-lease.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has raised that question. What the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has raised is the question of credits to Communist China.

Mr. MUNDT. I am talking about Communist Russia's failure to pay its lend-lease claims. I agree with the Senator from Vermont that there is some legitimacy in their disagreement on that, but not on the pipeline claims or the debts extending beyond that.

We offered to cut $11 billion of Red Russia's bad debts down to $800 million. They refused to settle. They countered with an offer of $200 or $300 million, with the provision that they could purchase materials which they needed from the United States on credit. Now it is proposed to give them the credit. We will not even get our $200 to $300 million payment on the bad debts which have accumulated in the past.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Not at this moment.

Small wonder, Mr. President, that the Wall Street Journal, which knows something about international finance, and serves the financial community of the country, points out in an editorial entitled "How One Thing Leads to Another," how we have adopted an American foreign policy based on slippage and expediency. We make a brief announcement that the Communists will not buy this—and we retreat; they will not buy that—and we retreat; and we continue to retreat. I submit this can go on into the billions of dollars. If we establish for one segment of the economy its right to sell on credit guaranteed by the U.S. taxpayers, we must establish it for all.

Mr. President, because it is pertinent to the debate, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial from the Wall Street Journal printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

HOW ONE THING LEADS TO ANOTHER

When the Russian wheat deal was first proposed last October, the late President Kennedy, in clear and specific language, laid down some excellent terms. He carefully explained what the deal would be—and would not be.

This would be a private, commercial transaction, the Government's role being llimted to granting the necessary permission, he said.

The sale would be for gold or American dollars, either cash on delivery or "normal commercial terms." Basically, in his words, "the Soviet Union would be treated like any other cash customer * * * who is willing and able to strike a bargain with private American merchants."

In presenting this arrangement, Mr. Kennedy emphasized that one feature of it was that the wheat sold to the Soviet Union would be carried in American ships.

Thus while even then the wheat sale was not without its critics, it was generally accepted by the public on the basis of this straightforward arrangement. On such terms the Russians could buy wheat on the world market anyway, and it seemed as though we would get a fair "quid" for the Russian "quo."

Now, it seems things aren't quite what they seemed.

One of the first things that happened, once the Soviet buyers got the U.S. Government's approval to the principle of a sale, was that they balked at having the wheat shipped to them in American ships. Mr. Khrushchev, figuratively at least, banged the bargaining table, and the U.S. Government relaxed this part of the arrangement.

After that it developed that the Soviet Union didn't want to pay cash after all, either in gold or U.S. dollars. Nor were the Communists willing to deal on "normal commercial terms," meaning such short-term credit as they might get from either the private sellers or private banks. A few efforts at obtaining such credit on their terms, here and in Europe, were unproductive. Whereupon the Soviets said to us: No credit, no deal.

So next the proposition was that the U.S. Government, through the Export-Import Bank, itself finance the Russian wheat purchase by guaranteeing a loan for 75 percent of the purchase price.

The first reactions to this, not unreasonably, were objections in Congress. A bill was introduced to prohibit this U.S. financing of Russian trade. And although Treasury Secretary Dillon argued that we must underwrite the sale or there would be no sale, the Senate Banking Committee appeared unpersuaded that the deal was worth that price. Appeared unpersuaded, that is, until the assassination of President Kennedy.

Then, in the aftermath of that tragic event, the Senate committee quietly decided to put aside its objection to financing the Russian wheat sale. The explanation given was that this was intended as a tribute to the man who had so carefully spelled out the original terms, and somehow as a gesture of confidence to the new President.

This action had hardly been taken, yielding one more point to the Soviet bargainers when there developed an argument over the shipping rates for transporting the wheat to Russia. The Russians decided they were too high, implying that if something can't be done to get cheaper shipping rates—a special U.S. subsidy, perhaps?—maybe they would have to get their wheat somewhere else.

What interests us here is not so much the wrangle over the Soviet Union's credit standing, although Senator MUNDT had a point about the unpaid Soviet debts due us from World War II. Nor so much even the fact that a Soviet wheat loan would be a major change in the Export-Import Bank policy, which has so far never extended credit or credit insurance to a Communist bloc country.

Rather, the intriguing thing here is the progressive change in the wheat deal and the attitude of U.S. officials to the changing Soviet demands. We have witnessed a typical Communist maneuver. First a proposition that has the sound of reasonableness. Then, a bargain seemingly struck, demands for a "little change." Finally, this being agreed to, a new set of demands. The same sort of thing has happened a thousand times over in different kinds of bargaining with the Communists.

Unfortunately, the American reaction is also all too typical. Congratulations at a well-struck bargain; next a little yielding in the hopes of saving the bargain. Finally, "getting a deal" seems to become to us as important as the terms of the bargain. And before you know it, the Russians have what they were after in the first place.

Whatever else may be said about the present proposals, they are a far cry from the thoughtful terms laid down by President Kennedy last October. It is really astounding, when you think of it, how one little thing leads to another.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Russians have gold. They do not have the wheat that they need. They do not lack it to feed themselves; they do not have the wheat they need to fill the commitments to Western European countries, to Cuba, to China, and to their satellites. Why do they not pay gold and get their wheat and become the "big brother" among the Communist bloc countries?

It is my considered judgment that Communist Russia is more interested in establishing a line of credit in this country than in purchasing wheat, or even alcohol for their vodka for the "happy hours" they hold in Moscow, or perhaps even more for fertilizer. They wish to establish a line of credit and then, after having established it, to give us the old double heave-ho. They would renege as they have reneged before. This is obviously to their interest, because they recognize that their economy has faltered, and is faltering even more as it goes along.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the New York Times and an article published in the U.S. News & World Report which spell out precisely the 10-year credit terms that the Communists would like to get for the purpose of fertilizer plants, alcohol, machine tools, and other products in this country, quoted, in the words of "poor credit risk" Nikita Khrushchev himself.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 10, 1963]

KHRUSHCHEV PLANS VAST INVESTMENT TO SPUR FARMING—SAYS $46 BILLION EXPANSION OF FERTILIZER OUTPUT WILL DOUBLE GRAIN HARVEST—WESTERN CREDIT ASKED—PREMIER TELLS PARTY CHIEFS SOVIET IS READY TO PLACE LARGE ORDERS ABROAD

(By Theodore Shabad)

MOSCOW, December 9.—Premier Khrushchev announced today a 7-year program of expansion of the chemical industry designed to double farm production by 1970.

The Soviet leader said Moscow was opening a substantial market for chemical equipment. It is ready to place orders in the West in addition to $1 billion worth of goods to be delivered by Soviet-bloc countries, he added.

Mr. Khrushchev warned Western suppliers against attaching "political conditions" to any sales on the supposition that the Soviet Union was in an unfavorable bargaining position as a result of this year's wheat crop failure.

He said the Soviet goal of 70 to 80 million tons of fertilizer by 1970, half of which is to be used for grains crops, would make it possible to double the production of grain and livestock fodder compared with this year's level.

INVESTMENT ESTIMATED

The Government investment required for the 7-year chemical plan was put by Mr. Khrushchev at 42 billion rubles ($46 billion), including 25 billion rubles for chemical plants and 8 billion for the development of additional raw materials and electric-power requirements.

The total Government investment in economic development is now running at a rate close to 40 billion rubles a year.

In what seemed to be an attempt to justify Moscow's large grain purchases against apparent criticism within the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev disclosed that in 1947 people in the Soviet Union died of hunger because of Stalin's policy of exporting grain even in poor crop years.

The Premier's speech, 4½ hours long, opened a week-long meeting of the Communist party's central committee. More than 5,000 guests were present in the modern Palace of Congresses in the Kremlin.

The text of the speech covered 5 of 6 pages of Izvestia, the Soviet Government newspaper, and of a special evening edition of Pravda, the Communist Party newspaper.

Except for the prospects of buying chemical equipment abroad, Mr. Khrushchev did not touch on foreign policy matters in what was his first major address since the death of President Kennedy. Observers suggested he might discuss international problems later this week in summing up the party discussions.

The Premier charged that "the most reactionary and embittered enemies of socialism like Adenauer and others" were seeking to exploit the Soviet Union's agricultural difficulties.

Former Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of West Germany suggested in an interview that the West should extract political concessions from Moscow before agreeing to large-scale sales of grain and chemical equipment.

Mr. Khrushchev also alluded to the breakdown of Soviet-United States wheat negotiations over high shipping rates. He said.

"Bitterly disappointed will be those who expect to make fabulous profits, using a seemingly advantageous situation, who expect the Soviet Union will be compelled to accept any agreement because it supposedly has no other way out."

Warning that Soviet chemical equipment orders would go only to those who "are willing to earn an honest living," he made such purchases conditional on the granting of credits, which he described as accepted practice in commercial relations.

In disclosing criticism in the Soviet Union of Moscow's purchase of 10 million tons of wheat abroad, Mr. Khrushchev said:

"It seems there are people who wonder why we are now buying wheat whereas previously, with smaller crops, we always sold wheat.

"What can one say to such people? If grain were to be distributed to the population according to the method used by Stalin and (Vyacheslav M.) Molotov, then we could have sold grain abroad this year too. They sold grain while in some areas people had bloated stomachs, or even died from lack of food. Yes, comrades, it is a fact that in 1947 in some regions, for example the Kursk area, people died of hunger. And grain was exported all the same."

PROFITS IN UNITED STATES CITED

Mr. Khrushchev explained his chemical expansion program entirely on economic grounds, with frequent references to U.S. experience.

He said profits of U.S. chemical companies, especially in the petrochemical field were up to 80 percent higher than the average profits of all manufacturing concerns.

The Premier ascribed high U.S. agricultural output not to "any special American wisdom" but to the fact that the United States was using 4 times as much chemical fertilizer per acre as the Soviet Union.

The Soviet leader warned that the rate of growth of some industries would have to be slowed in view of the radical shift of investment capital to chemicals, but he did not identify the sectors.

Although a rapid increase of fertilizer production was presented by Mr. Khrushchev as the principal immediate goal of the chemical program, he also stressed the use of chemical fibers, plastics, and other synthetics in consumer goods, industry, and construction.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 23, 1963]

Business sources in Geneva say Russia will try to buy at least $3.5 billion worth of equipment, including 50 complete chemical plants, from the West. But they also say Russian officials want 10-year credits.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate, which now has the responsibility of meeting the issue head on, will vote to relieve its constituencies and taxpayers of the potential liability of underwriting the promissory notes of the Communist dictators, especially Communist Russia.

Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Chair as to how much time I have consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has spoken for 24 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

It is interesting how this transaction is being handled economically. The international grain companies, which stand to make a profit by selling the wheat, leaped at the opportunity to send representatives to Ottawa where the Canadians were already dealing with Russia, and said, "Let us get in on this bonanza." When the transaction was accepted, and they found out it was not on cash they reneged. They said, "We do not want to advance credit to the Communists." So they went to the international bankers who extend credit all over the world. The Chase Manhattan Bank is a big bank in New York. I do not single them out as any one particular bank, but they are international bankers.

The grain company representatives said, "Will you give us the credit?" The bank said, "On what security?" The representatives said, "On security of wheat shipped to Russia; will you extend credit to Russia?"

They said, "No."

The representatives came to Washington and testified before the Banking and Currency Committee. They liked the idea of the interest rate that the bank would get—higher by far than they could get on a commercial loan in their own area—but they said, "We will not extend them credit without an American guarantee, because Communist credit is bad."

What I am requesting Senators to do is to be as concerned and as considerate about the financial interests of their own constituents as was every officer from a big city international bank who testified before the Banking and Currency Committee and manifested concern and consideration for the security and safety of their stockholders and depositors.

They said, "No." So they said to the United States, "You guarantee the credit."

This is a curious economic situation. Those who are to make a profit by selling the grain are to get all the profit and assume no risk. Those who are to receive the inflated interest payments will make a profit and assume no risks. The American taxpayer is to assume all the risk but is to get none of the profit.

Do Senators realize what they are asked to do, Mr. President? They are asked to give the banks of New York City what is equivalent to a 5-percent Government bond, and to ask the taxpayers back home to buy bonds paying them only 3¾ percent interest to guarantee the return to the big banks of their 5 percent, less a small percentage covering the insurance premium.

I believe this proposal needs a little further study and consideration. The folks back home are asked to buy Government bonds, and they do buy Government bonds as they should, and they are given only 3¾ percent interest. They have a right to know why their money is to be used to insure and guarantee that the Communists are going to pay 5 percent interest to New York bankers, under terms as secure as those on Government bonds, because it is under the same guarantee. What is the purpose of it?

Wheat is running out of our ears in the Commodity Credit Corporation bins of America. This is to be a government-to-government transaction, anyway. Why is it necessary to "cut in" two business segmets for profit without risk, merely to transport the wheat to Russia

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. At least, if we were to sell the wheat direct from the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Russians all we could lose would be the wheat. By this procedure, if the Communists do not make good on the loans, we could lose not only the wheat but also the guaranteed interest rate plus the guarantee of principal.

I do not think any "get-rich-quick Wallingford" could think up a system to put the taxpayer in a worse position, as a part of what is supposed to be the foreign policy pattern developed in America.

This is not a proper and workable foreign policy pattern. As I quoted from the Wall Street Journal, it is a matter of slippage. I believe this proposal deserves to be considered fully. I believe the Senate should accept the House provision. I believe the House acted wisely when, by a yea-and-nay vote it put the language in the bill.

All this proposal would mean is that there would be no further transaction of the kind mentioned until we established an American foriegn policy which does not try to look in three directions at the same time, until we find out what we are doing.

Are we really to continue to try to finance both sides of the cold war at the same time, with the only difference being the interest rates that we charge the Communists, who are against us, a little higher interest rate than we charge the friendly countries which are for us? That is the only difference. There is no other difference between what is proposed to be done through the Export-Import Bank and what is proposed to be done through the AID Administration. In both instances American money is to be made available to buy American supplies to help local economies.

Obviously a careful analysis of the proposal will demonstrate that that kind of program will not work.

We can hold the line until some time in February, March, or even May—whenever the new administration decides it wants to propose a consistent pattern of foreign policy, a trade aid program that makes sense. Then we can act upon it.

I submit that Senators should vote "no" on the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island. By doing so we shall serve the public and world peace exceedingly well.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota and Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, while this is called a wheat amendment, it would affect practically all segments of our economy.

Our allies have been doing about $7 billion a year worth of business with the Communist bloc countries. The Studebaker Corp. is a good example. That corporation has discontinued its automobile production in the United States entirely and moved to Canada. Why? Because from Canada it can sell its products to Russia and the Communist-bloc countries.

A one-nation blockade as is the case presently is not apt to succeed and we may go broke in the process. At least, we may cripple ourselves badly. I make reference to the poor balance-of-payments situation we face at the present time.

Wheat growing is one of our major industries. This year Canada had the biggest crop in history, on its second greatest acreage. Last year the United States had the smallest acreage planted to wheat since 1904. We are faced with the liquidation of our wheat industry, which has been a major industry. In the meantime, we are accomplishing nothing.

I doubt very much that we have anything to gain by withholding wheat from Russia or the Communist-bloc countries. Argentina has a big crop coming on. So does Australia. The Argentine crop will be one of the biggest in history. Canada has a great deal of wheat unsold which can be sold and delivered next spring. That can be made available as soon as spring comes, when shipping facilities will be more adequate. Russia and bloc countries can get the wheat in time.

In the meantime, the members of the Communist Party in Russia will not be starving. The poor people are those who will starve; those who would like to be on our side.

Hungary is a good example. The people of Hungary not long ago tried to overthrow the yoke of communism. Those people will go hungry, if there is a shortage of wheat. They are our friends and would never understand why we would not make our wheat available to them.

Much has been said about the drought and the bad crop situation in Russia. It is true that Russia has had its poorest crop in history. Part of that is due to their poor system, and a large part of it is due to drought. Many people believe the Russians will never be able to again produce enough wheat to feed its people.

I remember what happened during the drought years and the dust years of the 1930's here in the United States. Many so-called experts of agriculture at that time were saying that the land would never produce again. One of the first news stories I ever had was when an out-of-State expert came to me and said, "What will you do now, with no topsoil, all of it blown away?" I said, "When the rains return the land will produce again."

That land is now producing twice as much as it produced previous to the drought years.

Any nation like Russia, which put the first man into space, can find a way of producing fertilizer. Land now more or less has become a receptical for water and fertilizer. If rainfall is ample and they can pour on fertilizer, the land will produce. This is the program Russia is embarking upon. The Russians will wish to become self-sufficient in the future as to food and fiber. We would be far better off if the Russians had to depend upon us for part of their food supply. Then they could not be quite as independent as they are now.

Much has been said about the credit involved. I believe that is a major consideration in the proposal. All of our allies provide loan insurance to their local business interests which trade with the Communist bloc countries.

If this proposal were adopted, the United States would be the only nation that did not provide this kind of credit insurance.

This would do nothing to stop Public Law 480 sales to Russia or to Communist bloc countries. We sold 450 million bushels of our food commodities to Poland under Public Law 480, and received their local currencies in exchange. Currency that had little value to us.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe the Senator misspoke. We cannot, under Public Law 480, make sales to Russia. Those sales must be made to friendly people. We do make sales to Yugoslavia and Poland.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The Senator is correct. We can and do make sales to the Communist bloc countries.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. This proposal would do nothing to stop the sale of grain to Poland or to other Communist bloc countries.

During the past 10 years, starting with the Eisenhower administration, we have given to Yugoslavia, in grants and loans and Public Law 480 sales, $2.4 billion. There is nothing in the proposal whatever to stop that kind of give away proprograms. All of that could go on as before.

All that we would accomplish would be to stop the insurance on the sales to Russia and bloc countries and virtually stop all sales. If our Government were handling it, like the other governments do, credit insurance probably would not be necessary. I do not know of any grain dealer in this country who is big enough to handle this kind of transaction alone. If we are to have the sales, we must have this type of insurance. It is absolutely necessary.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. While we cannot sell under Public Law 480 to Russia and other countries of Eastern Europe, so far as I know there is no law against the Commodity Credit Corporation selling grain in its possession to the countries of Eastern Europe.

It seems to me that we would force our private grain trade out of the business of selling to those countries and force the trade into the hands of the Government, and we would be doing perhaps the very thing we want to do least.

I point out also that we are aware of the strongly rising sentiment against foreign aid in this country. It is very much evidenced by the bill now before the Senate. It has been cut at least $1¾ billion from the original request.

I think I am correct in saying that the taxpayers of the country would be no more happy with a $500 million a year payment to producers for raising wheat that we could not sell and did not need than they would be with spending $500 million for the assistance of some country we did not like too well, or a country we liked, for that matter.

I do not think the taxpayers are going to be any happier with a huge farm subsidy than they are with the foreign aid bill.

So we would either have to pay a subsidy to the growers to keep their heads above water or restrict their growing and cut their acreage down to the bone. We may have to do that, because Western Europe would like to get our wheat market. Western Europe can produce all it wants, and also Eastern Europe can, once importation of wheat from the United States can be restricted.

The Canadians and the Australians have gone out for the business. Australia is making 3-year contracts with the Communist countries. I always thought the Canadians and the Australians were good traders. They always have been with us.

So they are trying to get the business. France and Western Europe could produce all the wheat they needed, provided imports from this country could be restricted and they could get a higher price.

What do we want to do? Do we want to add a billion dollars to farm subsidies and storage costs, shall we permit the sale of the wheat on the world market by the private trade, or do we want the Government to sell the wheat and take the private traders out of business? It is well known that in Canada the Government handles the entire wheat crop. In Poland I am told the Government handles only 20 percent.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, a few years ago everyone in the grain-producing areas wanted to get rid of the surplus. This was true here in Washington. But in recent years there has been a strange development. I do not charge the proponents of this proposal with any such thinking, but it is strange that in the grain-producing areas storage has become a big business. The Government pays $400 million a year in storage charges. It has become a profitable business. The great majority of the people in my State want to get rid of this costly storage and there are some in some areas who would like to continue the big stockpile of grain so they could continue to receive lucrative storage payments. In some cases this is a bigger business than the growing of grain itself.

In closing my remarks, let me say that for many years we have been giving money to countries all over the world. We have been lending to them, we have been giving them huge grants of money. We have been selling wheat to them for foreign currencies which have little value. Here we have an opportunity to sell a commodity of which we have a great surplus and derive some good from it and get some dollars in return. I think it is worth trying.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, would the Senator say——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 1 minute to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator say there is as much profit in storing and handling a bushel of surplus wheat for 5 years, which will not be sold, than the farmer gets for raising it? Of course the storage of surplus commodities has become big business.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota agreed to yield me 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, twice within the past 5 weeks the Senate has considered the question of whether the Export-Import Bank should insure credit sales of agricultural commodities to Communist countries. On motions to table amendments which would have prohibited the Export-Import Bank from insuring such sales, the Senate voted in the negative on November 14 and in the affirmative on November 26.

The Senate should welcome this last chance to reconsider the matter on a direct vote.

Let me say at the outset that I oppose the sale of wheat or other commodities to the Soviet Union. Food is a weapon in the cold war just as much as bullets or bombs. The acquisition of food by the Soviet Union from the United States will relieve the pressures on the Soviet Government and may even make it possible for the Soviets to continue diversion of their own resources from agricultural and food-producing segments of the economy to military preparedness.

Less than 2 weeks ago, we marked the 22d anniversary of that day of infamy when Pearl Harbor was attacked by the Japanese. It was on that day of December 7, 1941, that the United States began to collect its returns from its sales of scrap metals, which were surplus to our needs, to the Japanese in the days prior to World War II. There were few people in the United States in the late 1930's who saw any danger whatsoever in selling scrap metals to the Japanese. These scrap metals were something we had and did not know what to do with. We needed the money and Japan wanted to buy.

I am aware, of course, that the Communist bloc nations can possibly buy wheat and other commodities to meet their minimum needs from other nations in the free world, although I am not convinced that all of the amounts of grain needed by them can be acquired elsewhere. There is a matter of principle involved, however, and two wrongs do not make a right. The United States has assumed the role of leadership in the free world. We profess to stand foursquare against Communist aggression. If we succumb to the temptation to seek profits from the Soviets, despite their announced goal of world domination, many people across the face of the earth will interpret this sale as proof of the fact that the United States is motivated primarily by the quest for the almighty dollar.

The issue before the Senate, however, does not reach so far as to prohibit the sale of agricultural commodities to Communist nations. It is of a much more limited scope. This amendment would merely prohibit an agency of the U.S. Government, financed with the American tax dollars, from insuring payment on credit sales of surplus agricultural commodities to Communist nations.

The Export-Import Bank is an agency of the United States. It is a creature of Congress. It is not private in any sense, nor is it an international entity. Its basic financing comes from funds taken out of the Treasury of the United States, despite the fact that it does charge fees for insuring loans and interest on loans which it makes. It is proposed that the Export-Import Bank, for a small fee, guarantee or insure private lending institutions against the risk that Communist nations including the U.S.S.R., may not pay the debts which would be incurred by the credit sale of surplus wheat or other commodities to such countries.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the American public would willingly underwrite this risk. This is not a loan to some free world brother-in-law based on sentiment, rather than on the credit reliability of the borrower. We are dealing with nations, the governments of which are sworn to bury us and our freedom. At the very least, the would-be purchasers and borrowers should be treated at arm's length on a purely business basis. And on a purely business basis, Russia, for one, rates as an unacceptable credit risk.

When it comes to making loans to Russia, the United States is more than a two-time loser. On World War I loans extended to Russia, that nation is in default in an amount now exceeding $621 million. This is by no means the only bad debt we are carrying on the books from the Soviet Union. In addition to the unliquidated amounts owed by Russia to the United States for lend-lease shipments to Russia during World War II, which amounted to approximately $11 billion, the U.S.S.R. still owes in excess of $205 million for goods received after World War II for which the Soviet Union agreed to pay. I cannot believe that the American public is willing to insure further credit to any nation which has an unbroken record of default on its financial obligations, and a nation which has used its resources in attempting to subvert our Government rather than paying its honest debts to our Nation.

If the U.S. Government is determined to sell wheat and other agricultural commodities to the Communist nations, then at the very least, those sales should be for cash or financed by the Soviets themselves. They have large quantities of gold which can be converted into dollars with which to purchase such grain as they need.

The Government of the United States is noted for its generosity with funds taken from the taxpayer. It is time for the Congress to recall that it has a responsibility to be just before it is generous, and the responsibility to be just extends first to the taxpayer. It would not be just to require the American taxpayer to accept the risk that its sworn enemy, who is already repeatedly in default on its financial obligations to the U.S. taxpayer, will in this instance pay for credit sales of grain or other commodities.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will concur with the wise action of the House of Representatives in prohibiting the Export-Import Bank from insuring payment on credit sales of agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union and other Communist nations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am now happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. First I wish to commend the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] on making a good point, namely, that 25 years ago we were guilty of selling scrap iron to Japan and to our allies at the same time, and on his expressing the hope that America has learned more in the last 25 years, and has developed a foreign policy which has not merely shifted from selling scrap iron to both sides in the war at that time to shipping our precious metal, gold, or the equivalent thereof, our credit, to both sides in the cold war at the same time.

It is a very dismal lesson in education if we have learned nothing else in a quarter of a century.

I now yield 12 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senate has on two previous occasions debated the issue now before us, but on each of them the votes taken were not directly on the merits of the proposal but rather on motions to table.

The first occasion was during debate on the foreign aid authorization bill, when Members of this body, as well as Americans generally, were shocked to learn that under the terms of the transaction the taxpayers of this country would be called upon to insure the credit of the Soviet Union. This was to be accomplished by a guarantee from the Export-Import Bank that the Communists would meet their payments of principal and interest for the purchase of wheat. Such a guarantee would have made a government-to-government transaction out of a sale which was originally described as one in which private traders would be involved, in which credit would be granted by private banks, and in which those private traders would take the risk with the private banks.

This amazing transformation so jarred the Senate that the leadership's effort to table the Mundt amendment was defeated. The Senator from South Dakota subsequently was prevailed upon to withdraw his amendment in order that it could be reported to the Senate by its Banking and Currency Committee. When the bill was reported, there was no vote on its merits, but rather upon another motion to table which prevailed on this second occasion.

There can be little doubt, Mr. President, that the outcome of that second vote was profoundly affected by the sudden and tragic death of President Kennedy. The vote came just 4 days after his assassination, and within 24 hours of his burial. The Nation and its lawmakers were numb with grief. The merits of this measure seemed to be lost in this emotion. Many of the votes which were cast on that day were unquestionably motivated by a sincere and heartfelt desire to evidence the confidence of the people of this Nation in their new President.

The passage of time has not dimmed the memory of the tragedy which befell this Nation on November 22. But together with other circumstances, it has given us the opportunity to reconsider our previous votes. It is well that we have this further and calmer opportunity to consider this measure, this time directly on its merits.

On this third occasion, the language of the Mundt amendment is a part of the foreign aid appropriation bill as passed by the House. Its purpose is to prevent the Export-Import Bank from guaranteeing the payment of any obligation incurred by any Communist country in connection with the purchase of any product, or in any other way from participating in the extension of credit to such Communist country in connection with such purchase. This debate comes on the proposed amendment to strike that langauge from the bill. For the first time we are to vote directly on the merits of the proposal.

Mr. President, the amendment to strike should be defeated. The language should be retained.

First of all, for the Export-Import Bank to guarantee any credit extended to a Communist country would be an entirely new venture in its credit insurance program. It has never insured a credit risk for any Communist country or directly extended credit to one, except in the case of Yugoslavia, which both Congress and the Executive have treated in a special category. To allow the Bank at this time to guarantee Soviet Russia's credit would be to establish a new national policy of far-reaching implications.

We should remember that the Eximbank is a Government-chartered institution, the capital fund and operating expenses of which are furnished by tax funds. It is being asked to guarantee payment of Communist countries' obligations because commercial bankers or exporters are not willing to assume the credit risk involved. Those bankers and exporters will not extend their own credit because they regard such transactions as bad risks and the Communists as insecure and unsatisfactory debtors. In this they are fully justified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understood the Senator to say that the exporters considered this a poor credit risk. Am I not correct in saying that because of the Johnson Act the exporters must get the Export-Import Bank behind the transaction; otherwise they cannot make it legally?

Mr. HRUSKA. I did not understand that to be the fact. Perhaps the Senator from Massachusetts has information with which I am not familiar.

Mr. MUNDT. The Attorney General, a native of the great State of Massachusetts, has ruled and declared that that point is not involved.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Attorney General has ruled that this is an extension of credit in normal commercial transactions and therefore not subject to the Johnson Act.

The Soviet Union has demonstrated time and time again that it is not a good credit risk. Its perfidy is not confined to treaties and agreements. In this respect the Soviet Union is at least consistent because it has reneged on almost every loan made to it by the United States during the 20th century.

A recital of these broken pledges could begin with the unpaid obligations stemming from loans made to Russia by the United States during World War I. The outstanding principal on these loans as of June 30 of this year was $192,601,297.37. Interest due and unpaid as of that date was $428,819,108.19. The total amount in default is $621,420,405.56.

The Kremlin today refuses to acknowledge any responsibility for these obligations on the grounds that they were incurred by the czarist government of Russia. Nevertheless, they are obligations owed by the people of the Soviet Union to the people of this country.

Likewise, there is no excuse for Soviet Russia not paying the balance of some $205 million still owing by her under agreement to accept and pay for the pipeline lend lease which had been ordered for them and was scheduled to be delivered at the end of the war.

That debt does not take into consideration the approximately $11 billion shipped to the Soviet Union during World War II under the main body of lend lease. This amount is also outstanding. The last offer to settle this indebtedness was for approximately $300 million. This was made in 1960. No offer has been made since that time. It is ironically significant that this offer is so close to the amount of money involved in the wheat trransaction which has brought this entire matter to national attention.

Now then, Mr. President, the Export-Import Bank Act—12 U.S.C. 635(b)—requires the Bank, among other things, to satisfy itself that the obligor, whether private or government, offers "reasonable assurance of repayment."

In testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the President of the Bank declared that its Board of Directors gave adequate consideration to the credit risk involved and found that "reasonable assurance of repayment" existed as required by law in the case of the proposed wheat sale. However, he also testified that the credit would not be forthcoming without his Bank's guarantee. That is, the Bank created and functioning with the taxpayers' funds would undertake a risk that would not be approved by private banks or exporters.

This is borne out by the testimony of three eminent American bankers, who also testified before the committee.

Mr. Alfred W. Barth, executive vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank testified that the terms of the wheat transaction involve credit factors which commercial banks should not assume.

Mr. August Maffry, senior vice president, international division, Irving Trust Co., New York, N.Y., testified as follows:

> Senator DOMINICK. If the Export-Import Bank was not going to guarantee this, what interest rate would you require?
>
> Mr. MAFFRY. We wouldn't go into it at all except on sight terms.
>
> Senator DOMINICK. Cash only?
>
> Mr. MAFFRY. Cash only.
>
> Senator DOMINICK. Why is that? The risk is too much?
>
> Mr. MAFFRY. Yes, sir; not the credit risk, the political risk.
>
> Senator DOMINICK. Political risk. What do you mean by the political risk?
>
> Mr. MAFFRY. The risk that relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. might deteriorate sharply over the period the credit extended, which would lead to, let us say, a break in relations and a repudiation of any obligations undertaken toward U.S. banks or others.

Mr. John L. O'Halloran, senior vice president, international division, Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., made the following statement during the hearings:

> I repeat that it is utterly inconceivable to me to recommend in any way the extension of private credit in the amount or tenor contemplated by this particular grain sale to Russia. I add, in the case of the obligation of a Russian entity, the very definite political risks, in my opinion, that were mentioned by one of the previous witnesses, that to me, too, is an important element in our rejection of a financial operation involving the magnitude of money, materials, and of the tenor involved.

While these men were testifying on behalf of the Export-Import guarantee, they actually admitted that they could not expect their shareholders and depositors to assume the risks of such a credit transaction with the Soviet Union despite the fact that the Nation was told when the first official Presidential announcement was made on October 9 that this risk would be assumed by "the grain dealers with private banks."

Frankly if this transaction is not sound enough for the shareholders and depositors of their banks, then why should it be any more sound for the people of this Nation?

It should be clear that the interests of the American taxpayers will not be protected unless the language of the Mundt amendment is retained in the bill.

Unless it is retained, this new policy of extending guarantee of credit to Communist countries, which the Bank favors doing, will be a precedent for future allocations of such guarantees or even direct credit extension to strengthen and rescue the sagging economy of Communist countries.

As the Senator from South Dakota pointed out yesterday, there is a great deal more involved here than the question of whether we shall sell some wheat to Russia. What is involved is a basic and fundamental revision of our policy of trading with the enemy.

The Senator from South Dakota has already pointed out that it would lead not only into other agricultural programs, but into sale of commercial fertilizer and other products. He makes a very telling point when he says that if there is as great deterioration in foreign policy in the next 3 months as there has been in the past 3 months, we can look forward to a modification or repeal of the Johnson Act, which makes it illegal to extend on ordinary commercial terms any credit to any Communist country which has defaulted in the payment of its debts to this country.

Premier Khrushchev has already announced ambitious plans to develop the Russian fertilizer industry in order to bolster his sagging agricultural economy. Is it our purpose to provide, through tax-supported guarantees of credit, the means whereby Soviet agriculture can be supported, its exports widened to compete with our own agricultural exports?

It is a curious thing that the point even needs discussion, because either we have been right in our long-standing and ardent efforts to curb communism by military, economic, and political means, or we have been wrong. If we have been right, we cannot possibly contemplate a reversal of that policy as it pertains to the matter now under discussion.

The opponents of the Mundt amendment cannot have it both ways. They cannot come here, as they have done in the past 2 days, and as they did a week or 2 weeks ago, and cite the Communist threat as the reason for billions for defense and foreign aid, and then come back a few days later and say, "Oh, but we want to get along with the Communists. Let us give in just a little."

The editorial that was cited by the Senator from South Dakota about one thing leading to another is a striking illustration of what can happen when we give way a little.

Mr. President, this Nation, together with our allies in the free world, is locked in a titanic struggle with forces of international communism led by the Soviet Union and its bloc of satellites. We should bear clearly in mind the arguments of the past 17 years on behalf of this foreign aid program under which we have spent so many billions of our country's resources. Its huge spending has been justified as an investment in freedom from Communist tyranny, as an assurance against its spread, and as an expenditure in pursuit of world peace and security.

The late President, transmitting the foreign aid bill to the Congress last spring, said of our assistance program:

> Their aim has been not to gain territories for the United States or support in the United States, but to preserve freedom and hope and to prevent tyranny and subversion in dozens of key nations all over the world.

In the course of that April 2 message, President Kennedy recalled the Marshall plan as having made it "possible for the nations of Western Europe, including the United Kingdom, to recover from the devastation of the world's most destructive war, to rebuild military strength, to withstand the expansionist thrust of Stalinist Russia."

Of an earlier episode, the message stated:

> History records that our aid programs to Turkey and Greece were the crucial element that enabled Turkey to stand up against heavy-handed Soviet pressures, Greece to put down Communist aggression, and both to recreate stable societies and to move forward in the direction of economic and social growth.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was curious about a point the Senator is making to cite reasons for foreign aid. Does it strike the Senator as being curious that practically every Senator who is eager to support the position of the Senator from South Dakota has always opposed foreign aid; therefore, they must not think that the threat of communism is a serious one. They have usually opposed foreign aid.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I would be willing to make the Senator a little pre-Christmas wager; namely, that I have supported foreign aid three times more often than I have opposed it on rollcall votes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator mean originally or after the amounts had been reduced by amendments?

Mr. MUNDT. Sometimes I have voted for real economy, which is a practice I heartily recommend to the Senator from Arkansas. But I have voted for foreign aid in the final action.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is one thing to vote for an amendment, and then to scuttle the bill on its final passage. But the Senator has cited a point for foreign aid. It is my impression that the Senator from Nebraska has opposed foreign aid.

Mr. HRUSKA. I have always opposed it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Therefore, the Senator has never accepted the argument that there is no real danger from the Communists.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is not the point. Every bill for foreign aid is not necessarily a good bill, any more than every bill for farm aid is necessarily a good farm bill.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] stood in the Chamber for 2 weeks in opposition to some parts of the foreign aid bill. He is not opposed to foreign aid, but he is against the way it is administered. He is opposed to the extravagance and mismanagement involved in it. What he seeks to do is to resolve it to the point where the program will be manageable and more selective, and where it will be really effective. That has been the position of the Senator from Nebraska, and it will continue to be his position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the Senator from Rhode Island yield the Senator from Nebraska 3 minutes?

Mr. PASTORE. Will I yield him 3 minutes?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Why does not the Senator from South Dakota yield from his time?

Mr. MUNDT. I would have to get time from the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Very well; I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this situation was brought up to date because, in his message on April 2, President Kennedy said:

> History records that our military and economic assistance to nations on the frontiers of the Communist world * * * has enabled threatened peoples to stay free and independent when they otherwise would have either been overrun by aggressive Communist power or fallen victim of utter chaos, poverty, and despair.
>
> * * * * *
>
> History will record that today our technical assistance and development loans are giving hope where hope was lacking, sparking action where life was static, and stimulating progress around the earth—simultaneously supporting the military security of the free world, helping to erect barriers against the growth of communism where those barriers count the most.

Then he brought into focus the battle and the threat of the present hour as it has been the battle and the threat for many years:

> Freedom—all freedom—is threatened by the subtle, varied, and unceasing Communist efforts at subversion in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. And the prospect for freedom is also endangered or eroded in countries which see no hope—no hope for a better life based on economic progress, education, social justice, and the development of stable institutions. These are the frontiers of freedom which our military and economic aid programs seek to advance; and in so doing they serve our deepest national interest.

The power and the thrust of these declarations lie in the fact that there is here and now the continued threat, activity, and menace of "subtle, varied, and unceasing Communist efforts."

Only yesterday, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] read a letter from President Johnson which again pointed up the immediacy and persistence of the threat of Communist penetration and subversion as reason for favorable action on the bill. It is this threat which for years has formed the basis for America's foreign aid program. It still does.

When the Senator from Rhode Island read the letter of President Johnson, he read:

> A candid look at the situation in Asia, Africa, and Latin America reveals no diminution in the continuing intensive thrust of Communist penetration and subversion. The interests of the United States are deeply engaged in the effort to establish freedom and progress in those areas.

Mr. President, that is today, and has been for some years, the policy of the United States. It is held aloft, like a beacon of liberty, to the captive nations which have fallen under the curse of communism, to the neutral or uncommitted nations which are threatened by the Red onslaught, and to our allies in the free world who have joined us in this contest against communism.

Those efforts and that Communist dream and determination to dominate the world and hold it in bondage under its own system are now encountering difficulties. The Communist system just is not working, Mr. President. It is bogging down under the weight of its own false premises about human nature and conduct. Certainly in denying its citizens the incentives and the freedoms upon which true and enduring strength is based, it has encountered and generated internal struggles which are slowing down its program of "heavy handed pressures" and "expansionist thrust" and the "subtle, varied and unceasing" efforts to which President Kennedy's message referred.

The new action contemplated by the Export-Import Bank seeks to extend the helping hand of the institution which is endowed by the substance of the U.S. taxpayer to rescue, shore up, and restore the strength and power to the arch enemy of this Nation and of the entire free world.

We should not allow this to happen. We should bear in mind, not only those unceasing Communist efforts and the fact that much of our multibillion-dollar foreign aid program was made necessary by reason thereof—but also that it is the Soviet Union and its satellites which make it necessary for the United States to maintain a defense posture at a cost of over $1 billion per week for every week of the year for this year, past years, and perhaps even more in future years.

On the one hand this Republic expends on the order of $50 billions each year to be ready at all times to deal effectively with the military might of the Soviet Union; we spend additional millions each year in foreign aid to combat communism's unceasing efforts to expand into territories not yet under its domination. Now there are indications of a tender solicitude for the internal economic difficulties Russia and her satellites are suffering. We are asking the taxpayers of this Nation, not only to pay for national defense and mutual security but also to extend foreign aid of a kind to the nation which makes that military expenditure and mutual security among our allies imperative. We are being asked to expose our Government-chartered Export-Import Bank to financial risks which no other bank will undertake. We are being asked to help Russia overcome her own inadequacies, mismanagement, and faulty system thus enabling her to survive and gather strength with which she may continue her grand design to dominate the world.

We are engaged in a tremendous and expensive effort to prevent the subversion and aggression of the Soviets. It is senseless to give aid to the powers which are keeping under captivity the exploited nations of Eastern Europe and are seeking to expand their domain.

We should not help them put new and fresh resources into the struggle against us and against the rest of the free world.

Unless we retain in this bill the language of the Mundt amendment, we shall be cruelly deluding the American people. More bluntly, we shall be double-crossing them by spending their dollars to finance both sides of the cold war.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, my plea today would be that, if possible, we at least defer the guarantee of the proposed loans until a more definite, more inclusive trade policy could be developed. I do not believe that many Senators are satisfied with the situation which confronts us. In the bill before the Senate, it is proposed to appropriate more than $1 billion for foreign military aid, in addition to the $50 billion we have appropriated for our own military program. We have six divisions in Western Europe. We have approximately 16,000 military men in Vietnam. We have many men in the military forces in Korea, and others scattered all over the world. Why? To guarantee, or try to guarantee, against Communist aggression.

At the same time, under conditions in which Communist aggression is rendered less probable, at least, because of adverse economic conditions in Soviet Russia, we undertake, at the same time we appropriate money, to strike from the bill a provision which would prohibit the underwriting of a sale of wheat to Russia. In other words, on the one hand, we are appropriating money to try to stop aggression; at the same time, with the other hand, if we pass the bill as it is now written, we will be making aggression more probable. I cannot see how we can go up hill and down hill at the same time, which is in opposite directions at the same time. I do not believe there are many Members of this fine body who are convinced of the logic, soundness, and commonsense of the position that the proponent of the bill asks us to take. The House amendment prohibiting the underwriting of the loan to Russia should stay in the bill.

I say it does not make sense to do otherwise.

I believe that the best point yet made is that we should not close the door on the possibilities of trade—and, of course, my part of the country is also interested in trade—but that at least, until some consideration is given by our allies and until there is a worldwide review of this problem and the possibilities in connection with it, we should not proceed through the back door to establish a precedent which will not be an overall policy, but will plague us in the future and will defeat the entire purpose of the foreign aid military program and the rest of the foreign aid program.

I thank the Senator for yielding this time to me.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I wish more Senators had been present to hear his remarks. I labor under the uneasy feeling that more of our colleagues listen to telephone calls from the other end of the avenue, rather than to some of their colleagues.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on this point will the Senator from South Dakota yield 30 seconds to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator from South Dakota that no such telephone calls have been made, or need to be made, because the President of the United States trusts the good judgment of the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. That is fine; and I hope that trust in our good judgment will be vindicated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It will be.

Mr. MUNDT. If so, we shall show him that we favor a sensible foreign policy, instead of one which would be self-defeating.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield briefly to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I point out that all will not be lost if this amendment fails. Some would seem to take the position that if the amendment fails, there will be no possibility of making such sales to the Soviet Union. However, I suggest that in that event the sales could be made for cash.

Recently it was reported in the newspapers that a spokesman for the Soviet trade delegation said that defeat of this measure would mean nothing particularly to them, and stated that they prefer to buy for gold, anyway, and do not wish to pay interest to American bankers.

So let us not be so naive as to believe that if the proposed credit is not made available, the Soviets will not be willing to buy the wheat for gold.

Some have asked how good the credit of the Soviets is. The answer is that it is just as good as they want it to be. If they do not want it to be any good, it will not be worth a tinker's dam.

I suggest that the experience of the United Nations is a clear demonstration of the fact that the credit of the Soviet Union is worthless. The Soviet Union is the biggest "deadbeat" in all the world, today. It owes the United Nations more than one-half of the $104 million in delinquencies before the U.N. If the Soviet Union would practice fiscal integrity in dealing with the United Nations, I might be a little more impressed by the statements about how good the credit of the Soviet Union is. But until then, I shall not be impressed by arguments to the effect that the Soviet Union has a good credit standing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that appropriately designated portions of an article from the Evening Star of Saturday, November 30, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEADLOCK SEEN ON U.S. WHEAT SALE TO RUSSIA

Negotiations for the sale of $250 million worth of wheat to the Soviets appear to be deadlocked.

State Department officials said yesterday they knew of no indication that talks have broken off between the Soviets and American grain dealers, but Sergei A. Borisov, head of the Soviet governmental wheat group, left the United States last Wednesday without giving any sign when he would return.

* * * * *

Senate defeat earlier this week of a bill by Senator Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota, to prohibit the Export-Import Bank from guaranteeing commercial credit to finance the wheat deal left the Soviets unimpressed, diplomatic informants declared. They said Moscow was prepared to pay for the wheat in gold or hard currency anyway.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield briefly to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this question has been debated before.

I am opposed to the position taken by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt]. I am opposed to it for the fundamental reason—which I think should be repeated again and again—that if we were to do what the Senator from South Dakota proposes, we would be confusing the position of the United States in the eyes of the rest of the world. In other words, we would be indicating that after a national position has been taken by our country, the President and the Congress would be pulling in opposite directions.

We have indicated that we have made a policy decision for a one-shot wheat deal. After doing that, if we now forbid the Export-Import Bank to participate in it, we shall present to the rest of the world a most confusing picture.

Instead, once we have made the policy decision in regard to making this trade arrangement, we should permit the necessary things to be done, including the issuance of export licenses. Certainly no grain dealer or bank in the United States would back this deal if the U.S. Government were not behind it. So how ridiculous it would be to take the position, at this time, "But we will not permit the operations of the Export-Import Bank to be used."

Mr. President, it is clear that if this policy decision is to be implemented and made effective, the credit of the United States must be used; and the credit of the United States is just as much a resource of the people of the United States as any other resource they have. So it is obvious that this transaction must be handled in the same way any ordinary business transaction is handled.

Therefore, I cannot favor a proposal to make our Government appear ridiculous in the eyes of the rest of the world—by insisting that our Government say, "Yes, we will participate in this transaction, but we will not permit the Export-Import Bank to have any connection with it."

Instead of that, our Government should demonstrate to the rest of the world that the United States is a great power. Therefore, if this transaction is to be engaged in, all necessary transactions in that connection should be authorized and permitted. That will not mean that we shall be saying we favor the Soviet Union. However, once we have decided to make this deal, we should proceed in connection with it in a way in conformity with the procedure of a dignified and important nation which has reached this national policy decision and conclusion.

Therefore, I hope the Senate will approve what the committee has done.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas for yielding to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield briefly to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield up to 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the point the Senator from New York has made.

I believe two considerations are involved in connection with the so-called Mundt amendment.

The first is the question of policy—whether we wish to help get rid of our surplus wheat and help stimulate wheat sales, so that the amount of wheat held by the Commodity Credit Corporation can be reduced, and so that the production of wheat can return to a more commercial basis, without subsidies.

We know that Canada and Australia are selling wheat to Russia. Therefore, the question before the Senate is whether the United States will participate in these sales or will be willing to have them confined to other countries.

As a representative of a consumer State, I wish to see this transaction carried out properly. From the banking point of view, it is clear that the Export-Import Bank must participate in the transaction.

Mr. Linder, the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, informed the committee that he checked with a number of large banks of the country, and found that no bank would take this credit risk without having the guarantee of the Export-Import Bank behind it.

Then we considered how the Export-Import Bank handled its transactions. In that connection, I refer now to page 12 of the committee hearings. I understand there are two types of credit which are guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank. The first is the so-called insurance arrangement; and in that connection the Export-Import Bank has organized the Foreign Credit Insurance Association, comprising 75 of the most important insurance companies in the country, other than life insurance companies. That organization will take certain risks; and the Export-Import Bank underwrites all the policy risks. These insurance companies will take 50 percent of the credit risk, and the Export-Import Bank will take 100 percent of the political risk, which, as Mr. Linder pointed out, comprises war, insurrection, civil disturbances, and inconvertibility.

The other procedure of the banks is the underwriting of the loans. That is the commercial transaction which is referred to in the present instance, and which the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has discussed.

As I understand, there would be allowed 18-month credit, with 25 percent down, and the balance to be paid in 18 months at 5 percent interest. The Export-Import Bank would receive its cut out of the five-eighths of 1 percent of the last 5 percent. In that way the Export-Import Bank would make a certain amount of money and take that risk, if there is a risk in the granting of 18-months' credit with 25 percent down. We were told that in commercial transactions the Soviets and the Communist countries had been excellent in their payments. That statement does not include the Second World War loans and other loans of that character, but it does include the commercial transactions, of which the one about which we are speaking would be one.

The Export-Import Bank, through Mr. Linder, its President, has told us that the losses of the Bank have been infinitesimal, or using his word, "minimal," over its history. On guarantees of insurance risks they have lost only between $1 million and $8 million over all their history. In the guarantees I believe they have lost even less than that. So from the point of the Export-Import Bank, the Bank that is financed by our taxpayers, the risk in the transaction would be infinitesimal. From the point of view of policy, in getting rid of our surplus wheat, knowing that other countries are doing the same thing, we would make it possible for us to carry forward with the same sort of loans and the same sort of sales that other countries are making.

As a question of policy, it seems to me that the proposed course is the wise one to take. From the point of view of the Government, through the Export-Import Bank, the risk would be very small, while the policy of getting rid of our surplus wheat is worthwhile. For that reason I shall support the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], in his endeavor to eliminate the language that was sent to the Senate by the House and deleted by the committee.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair recognize the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] for a formal function, and that the time necessary for its performance be not charged to either side.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE CABINET OF THE GOVERNMENT OF KENYA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, today there are present in the Senate Chamber four distinguished members of the cabinet of the Government of Kenya. As Senators know, Kenya achieved its independence from Britain a week ago today and, earlier this week, became the 113th member of the United Nations.

Kenya, a dynamic new nation, is the 34th nation to emerge in Africa. Our guests are with us while on a visit to the United States. We are glad to have them here. I am sure that they will find a will on the part of the people of our country to see this new independent nation live, thrive, and grow among the family of nations of the world.

It is now my distinct pleasure to present to the Senate the Honorable Oginga Odinga, Minister of Home Affairs; the Honorable Joseph Murumbi, Minister of State at the Prime Minister's Office; the Honorable Charles Njonjo, Attorney General; and the Honorable Njoroge Mungai, Minister of Health and Housing.

The gentlemen are members of the Cabinet of Kenya; they are present in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The Chair welcomes our distinguished visitors to the Senate, and hopes that their visit will prove interesting and rewarding.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, in order to provide Senators an opportunity to greet our distinguished visitors, and that the time necessary for the recess be not charged to either side of the debate on the pending business.

There being no objection, at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m. the Senate reassembled on being called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INOUYE in the chair.)

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

It is very difficult to find anything new to say about the issue, since it has been argued at great length on two occasions, and has been the subject of an exhaustive study by the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Senate voted on the question once. As we know, the vote was 57 to 35 against the inclusion of the provision in the bill.

I do not know that there is anything new to be said on the subject. I can only say that I believe it is a good business deal. The Russians have a commodity that we need. We have a commodity that they need. That is the basic consideration. The transaction would result in benefits to our railroads that would haul the wheat and our ships that would transport it, and would give employment in many different parts of our economy.

The argument has been made that the Russians have been in default. For one reason or another, many countries have been in default on various war debts of one kind or another. The other day I mentioned that the French, who were our good and strong allies, are in default to the extent of about $4 billion on their First World War debt. Those are utterly irrelevant considerations to the question at hand.

One point that has not been emphasized that I believe we might at least consider is that there are great political implications involved in the measure. First, the President of the United States under our constitutional system is given the primary responsibility for the conduct of our foreign policy. Both President Kennedy and President Johnson have urged the Senate not to adopt the so-called Mundt amendment as it was first presented, that is, to delete the amendment that was inserted in the bill by the House.

That is the first consideration. The Secretary of State, as an agent of the President, is very strongly of this view.

It seems to me that a basic assumption on the part of those who are so strongly opposed to the utilization of the Export-Import Bank is that the cold war as it has existed during the past 15 or 16 years is an unalterable relationship and that it should continue. Sometimes I am almost disposed to believe they would be disappointed if it did not continue.

Really, there are political possibilities of opening up some trade wtih the Communist bloc. I cannot guarantee that this would result in any relaxation of the cold war or in any improvement in our political relations. Nevertheless, there have been changes already within the Communist bloc, not only with respect to Russia. In fact, the changes perhaps have been less with respect to Russia, although I believe the test ban treaty was a significant step forward.

The satellite countries or affiliated countries have also been involved, such as Poland, and Yugoslavia, which is a Communist country but not a member of Comecon nor a satellite country.

I believe that the possibility of change for the better in our relations with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries is the overriding consideration. I do not look solely at the dollars, as someone who supports the position of the Senator from South Dakota might. I believe that is an important consideration. I believe it is probably less important than the political potential of resuming some degree of trade with these countries. When I say "countries" I refer to all the Eastern European countries as well as the Soviet Union.

I believe this has already been stated forcefully by the Senator from Rhode Island. The fact that Russia must come to this country or to any other country and ask for wheat—it has already gone to Canada and concluded an agreement—is in itself one of the most significant developments of the past 15 years, demonstrating clearly the inadequacy of their system, especially as applied to agriculture. I cannot believe this will be lost upon the people of the Communist world or the people of the free world.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for yielding.

Is it not a fact that the terms which are being suggested, through the Export-Import Bank, are the commercial terms ordinarily and customarily used in the grain trade on a worldwide basis?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. Also, the other countries which have been selling to the Soviet Union have utilized a similar method of insurance by a Government agency.

Mr. MONRONEY. This is a universal practice. If one wishes to enter into world trade one must abide by world trade rules and sell at world trade prices and on world trade terms.

There is a point I should like to make, which I believe needs to be emphasized. If we sell to all the other countries of the world, and take from many of them local currency which has no convertible value, and extend to many others credit when credit is known to be weak, if we should demand cash for one deal in trading with a world power, although we may violently disagree with its political system, would we not be discriminating—at least, would they not feel we were discriminating—against them by demanding terms and conditions of sale we do not demand from any other country?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. Such a country would be insulted if it were offered terms different from those offered other countries.

In the case of Poland, which is a Communist country, a member of Comecon, we have been selling wheat under Public Law 480, which is, in effect and for all practical purposes, a grant.

Mr. MONRONEY. For nonconvertible currency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For nonconvertible local currency.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There was no great outcry about that. There is no good reason why this particular aspect of the trade, that is, the insurance, should be rejected.

Even though the insurance is provided, because there has been a demand for certain additional concessions with respect to shipping, which entails a higher price, that in itself may prevent the deal from going through. There is no assurance that the wheat will be sold, even though the Export-Import Bank is given the right suggested.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that, if the Export-Import Bank guarantees the money which will be furnished by the American banks, this money will then in turn go into the Commodity Credit Corporation for the wheat?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. We would be guaranteeing the funds which we would be receiving for the wheat sale and in the process removing the wheat from storage, reducing thereby an expense that might go on for the next 10 years if we do not find some market for the wheat.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct.

I heard on the radio the other day, and saw on television, some interviews of some farmers from the State of Oklahoma. Everyone who was asked about this wheat deal said he was in favor of it.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are realistic in regard to trade.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the Senator is correct. There is no question about that.

There is a good reason why a Government organization should be brought into these large international transactions, because if any difficulty should arise the Government would be in a better position, through its diplomatic representatives, to make whatever representations were necessary.

We are not the only country doing this. As has been said, all other major trading nations utilize this device.

Mr. MONRONEY. Remarks have been made, as this question has been discussed in the past, to the effect that wheat is a strategic item. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations if he has any doubt in his mind, whether the Russians buy the wheat from us or do not buy the wheat from us, about the army of Russia being fed. The civilians may go hungry, but the army will have whatever wheat it needs, at whatever cost to the civilian population of Russia.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no doubt about that at all. I believe even the difficulty with the Russian people will be of a temporary nature. They will have less than they would like to have, but it will not be too serious.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield me 3 more minutes?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 3 more minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The observation should be made that the language does not apply solely to grain.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It applies to all products.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We ought to make it crystal clear that we are not talking solely about wheat deals.

Secondly, today we heard the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] discuss the dangers facing this Nation because of the loss of gold, the deficit in the balance of payments.

I wonder if my colleague realizes that one of the reasons why there has been a flight of capital from the United States—and there has been some—is that American business firms and American merchant enterprises have established offices, factories and warehouses in Europe in order to do business with Eastern European countries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Thereby getting the guarantees of the British, French, Germans, and Dutch upon their sales.

On the one hand we hear impatient speeches about our balance-of-payments situation, while on the other hand an amendment is offered to us which would further drive out of this country the capital needed to establish plants, in order to do business in the Eastern part of Europe.

I point out also to the Senator that we are not talking about only Russia. The Senator made this point, as other Senators have. We are talking about a trade policy which may affect the whole area of the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Each one of these Eastern European states is a separate nation. As has been indicated to us time and time again in recent months, those nations are beginnning to show more independence. They are beginning to show a desire to pull away somewhat from the Russians. It seems to me we ought to have a foreign policy which expresses that particular situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the cold war is a major fact of life in the age in which we live. We do have to deal with the clashing interests of the Soviet Union and of the United States. We will do so far more effectively if we deal with these clashing interests in terms of our own national interest, which is the security of the United States and the free world, and not in terms of a struggle to the death between crusading ideologies.

The logic of the bill proposed by the Senator from South Dakota is that sooner or later either our type of society or the Soviet Union's type of society must be destroyed—either through warfare, subversion, or internal collapse. This logic allows no room for the possibility of change through a long process of evolution. Yet it is precisely this posibility which I see as the hope, perhaps the only hope, of avoiding the irreparable catastrophe of thermonuclear war.

There have been evolutionary changes in the Soviet Union in recent years. We are uncertain as to their exact extent and significance, but we know that they have occurred and that they continue. Changes are also occurring in the Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe, and we are all familiar with the ideological split between the Soviet Union and Communist China. It seems to me clearly in the interests of the United States to encourage these changes. We need to be pragmatic rather than dogmatic. From our point of view, Khrushchev is a lesser evil than Stalin; Tito is less objectionable than Mao Tse-tung.

If we adopt the policy embodied in the bill, we will be moving against the trend in every other important free world country. Our NATO allies are conducting a growing trade in peaceful goods with the Soviet bloc. This is not necessarily a reason for us to do likewise, but it is entitled to considerable weight. Trade between Europe and the Soviet bloc has tripled over the past decade. It is clear that our virtual embargo on nonstrategic trade with Communist countries has become self-defeating. It does not deny the Communist countries the goods which they wish to buy, but only assures that they will buy them from sources other than the United States. Our insistence on an unrealistic boycott has made it impossible for us to coordinate the trade policies of the Western nations and has thus enabled the Soviet Union to use bilateral trade as a political weapon to divide the free nations and advance its own ambitions.

The issue involved in this bill is whether we are to regard the Soviet Union as an implacable enemy for all time and for all purposes, or whether we are to regard it as a powerful and dangerous antagonist whom we can and should influence in various ways with a view toward inducing it to abandon its aggressive designs. If our objective is the former, that is, a policy of permanent and relentless hostility, then the bill offered by the Senator from South Dakota is appropriate. If, on the other hand, our objective is to try through patient and persistent effort to create a safer and more peaceful world, then it is incumbent upon us to seek practical means of reducing the areas of conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union. Trade is one of many ways in which we can reduce animosities and inject an element of normalcy in our relations with the Communist nations. The proposal before the Senate would preclude the possibility of any substantial trade.

One of the most significant aspects of this entire situation is that the Russians, after nearly half a century of tinkering with agriculture, are now forced to admit that their system has failed. What more dramatic testimonial to failure of their system could we want than to have them come to us to buy a basic consumer commodity like wheat. I do not think that this admission has escaped the attention of many citizens of Russia and Eastern European countries. When an item as basic as bread is involved, the significance of the current negotiations with the Soviet traders cannot be ignored by the nations on the sidelines.

On the other hand, if we pass this bill and the deal falls through—as it likely will—we will have handed the Russians a tailormade propaganda weapon. From the founding of the Nation we have been world traders. The term "Yankee Trader" is known throughout the world. To lay down conditions which bring about the rejection of a deal as advantageous to us as this can only furnish proof to the Russian people that we are not really willing to engage in peaceful competition and let economics determine which system is the superior one. At the same time we will lend great weight to the Russian argument that the satellites must maintain strong, unbending ties to the Soviet Union and that the West has no concern for their problems. It will be difficult to refute such an argument if the Congress makes it impossible for the wheat deal to be concluded.

Above all, I urge Senators to remember that the Export-Import Bank's sole reason for existence is to promote our foreign trade. Its purpose is not to aid foreign concerns or governments but American exporters—and the American economy. When the Bank agreed to guarantee short-term credits for purchase of this wheat it was assisting our wheat farmers and wheat exporters—not the Russian Government. All the Bank plans to do is provide nothing more than the same assistance available in the normal course of our export trade.

The proposed wheat deal is another step toward normalizing United States-Russian relations and is an appropriate development to follow the test ban treaty. Adoption of this proposal, which will almost assuredly result in canceling the wheat sale, will be a step backward from ratification of that treaty. I hope that the Senate has not had such a change of heart in only 2 months' time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for the fact that, with his customary candor and consistency, he stands as the first speaker on that side of the argument who has made it clear, as I have tried to make it clear time and time again, that this is not a wheat amendment. It is not a wheat provision in any way, shape, or form. It deals with every exportable product. It is a question of foreign trade policy. One could just as well call it a "booze" amendment, or a "fertilizer" amendment, or an "alcohol" amendment, or a "machine tool" amendment. It covers all products. I do not know what one must do to make that point clear and to have it reported accurately around the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD again the exact language of the proposal adopted by the House, so that all editors may read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> None of the funds provided herein shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national.
>
> Amendment to restrict American public credit to Communist countries as adopted by the House of Representatives—it is the language contained in the so-called Mundt bill.

Mr. MUNDT. We cannot get that fact reported by the columnists, Mr. President and by many Capitol Hill reporters. They talk about a "wheat amendment." In the spirit of Christmas, I offer my friends in the press gallery, which is well filled at this hour, a beautiful Black Hills spruce Christmas tree, with candles studded with solid gold nuggets from the gold mines of South Dakota—the world's best—if they can find the word "wheat" in the amendment or in S. 2310, the so-called Mundt bill. If they cannot, let them not call it a "wheat amendment." Call it a "booze" amendment. Call it a "Red trade" amendment. Call it——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Or a "spruce" amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. They may call it anything they want to give it an accurate rather than a distorted definition. I stand ready to deliver a Christmas tree with gold studded candles on it if anyone can find the word "wheat" in this proposal. If it is not there, why not label it correctly, instead of involving the wheat farmers? This is not a matter of farmers and wheat sales, it is a matter of foreign policy.

Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is now suggested that we change the policy that has been in existence for about 15 years. I assume that, if there were a change in international relations, and especially with Red Russia, we might be justified in changing our policy. I cannot dismiss from my mind that in the 1940's those men who were in charge of our Government and the Congress when they declared that we shall not sell to Communist countries our merchandise and our grains and other commodities at subsidized prices, knew what they were doing.

As I stated a moment ago, we contemplate changing a policy. The change would be justified only if there had been a genuine change in the attitude of Red Russia. I respectfully submit that no such change has occurred.

Mr. George Kennan has been in our Foreign Service. He is constantly being quoted as the authority of what our course should be in our international relations. Some time ago he made a statement. He wanted to describe the thinking of Russia, so he devised this statement, putting it into the mind of and upon the tongue of a Communist Russian. This is what he said, speaking as a Russian would speak:

> We despise you—

That is, despise the United States—

> We consider that you should be swept from the earth as governments, and physically destroyed as individuals. We reserve the right in our private, if not in our official, capacities to do what we can to bring this about; to revile you publicly, to do everything within our power to detach your own people from their loyalty to you and their confidence in you, to subvert your Armed Forces and to work for your downfall in favor of the Communist dictatorship. But since we are not strong enough to destroy you today, since an interval must unfortunately elapse before we can give you the coup de grace * * * we want you during this interval to trade with us. An outrageous demand? Perhaps. But you will accept it, nevertheless. You will accept it because you are not free agents; because you are slaves to your own capitalist appetites, because when profit is involved, you have no pride, no principles, no honor. In the blindness that characterizes declining and perishing classes, you will compete with one another for our favor.

Those words are true. They are true when applied to the Senate today. The gold has been dangled before our eyes. We are moved by it. We are going to change our policy.

Let us now take a look at what the situation was when the Russians originally proposed to make the purchase. The statement was made, "We will pay in gold or cash." When that statement was published throughout the land, it was generally accepted as sound. But then came the change, and they said, "We will not pay you in gold or cash. We want to buy on credit, and we want the taxpayers of the United States to guarantee that we will pay the bill."

That is quite a substantial change from the original proposal, and what we contemplated doing.

But if Kennan went too far, may I quote for the moment Khrushchev? Khrushchev said not long ago:

> When the gold of the Russian and of the Communist nations is dangled before the eyes of the capitalist United States, they will abandon all principle.

I wonder if, back in Moscow, Khrushchev is not, in solitude, listening to and watching what we are doing. Is he ready to speak out and say, "The prognostication which I made turns out to be true?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 3 more minutes?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I inquire as to the status of the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. May I inquire about the status of the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has no time.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield the Senator from Ohio 3 minutes on the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, we have friends throughout the world, and we have enemies who are seeking to destroy us.

I wonder what impact this will have on our friends. Will they have awakened in their minds a doubt about the need to be loyal to the cause of the free people of the world, or will they say to themselves, "What difference does it make if we stand shoulder to shoulder with the United States or if we threaten to destroy them?"

If they ask that question, the answer will have to be: "It makes no difference; they will help us even though we oppose them."

I do not want to become a party to that type of debased and mean moral approach to my responsibilities as a citizen of the United States.

We have a gold problem, but it is rather strange that only at this late date have we begun to discuss it on the floor of the Senate. It has been with us for 5 years. Now, instead of trying to solve it in an honorable way, we are about to adopt the abject policy of grabbing for gold, and in that way confirming the declarations of Kennan and of Khrushchev and other Communists in the world. I cannot vote to support that type of conduct.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Ohio has spoken feelingly about the attitude of our friends toward us for doing this. I wonder whether the Senator knows how our friends will square this course—assuming that we take the suggested course—with our course in forbidding the importation of food into Cuba, a short distance from our own country, and in stopping any ships of friendly nations that take food to Cuba from coming to our ports. I wonder how the Senator thinks they will square that part of our foreign policy with this proposed part of it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad the Senator asked that question. I ask Senators, "If you sell to Russia, why not sell to Cuba? What morality justifies a sale to Red Russia and not to China and not to Cuba?"

I assume that as Senators we possess some sense of the rational. We cannot differentiate between the propositions. If today we sell to Red Russia, when more gold is needed, are we going to sell to Cuba, and are we going to sell to Red China?

I believe the question answers itself.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it will take me only 2 minutes to state my reasons for supporting the Mundt proposal. I do not care how we slice this subsidy melon, the taste is the same, and all the language that has been used cannot conceal the fact that we are dealing with a subsidy that is not in the public interest. We are dealing with a subsidy of American taxpayers' money which belongs to them, and that money is in the Export-Import Bank.

When we are through shaking this proposal down, that is what we have.

A group of grain brokers and dealers own the wheat, and they want to sell it to Russia. They have made certain arrangements with banks to be of some help to them in order to sell the grain to Russia. They cannot consummate the

deal unless they can get a taxpayer subsidy through the Export-Import Bank. The Export-Import Bank is going to pick up the check in case Russia does not pay.

I believe this to be bad public policy. This is not contrary to the statement of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], about an ordinary commercial transaction. Are we to establish a dangerous precedent of using American taxpayer money in the Export-Import Bank to subsidize private interests which will sell the grain to Russia, and if Russia does not make good have the American taxpayer pick up the check through the Export-Import Bank? That is what it all shakes down to. That is not good public policy.

The American grain dealers and American banks are not entitled to that kind of subsidy. If we want to make this a direct transaction, why is it not proposed that the American Government deal directly with Russia and itself sell the grain directly to Russia? Of course that would not let some people make a shakedown profit without the risk of a loss.

We should support the Mundt proposal, and prevent this kind of precedent from being established.

I do not trust Russia. We have no way of knowing that she is not going to find various reasons for claiming she does not have to pay. How do we know she will not claim that the grain is dirty or wormy, or that the quality is not up to standard, and therefore will not pay?

If that happens, we shall have a long battle. In the meantime our taxpayers will be taken for another ride under the foreign aid program. In my judgment, they are already being cheated out of hundreds of millions of dollars. I do not think we ought to add to their loss.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall deal hardly at all with the merits of the Mundt proposal, because in my opinion the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Arkansas have so completely and utterly demolished the arguments of the proponents that to add to their arguments would be mere redundancy.

It is difficult for me, in trying to be openminded, to understand how intelligent, mature men can support this kind of proposal. In my judgment not one valid argument in support of the Mundt proposal has been advanced in the Senate in the two long sessions during which it has been under discussion.

I turn to another point. There are those who believe it is popular in this country to shake one's fist at Russia and to raise a so-called moral issue and to beat his breast and wrap the American flag around him and say, "We are departing from American traditions and morals if we permit the wheat to be sold to Russia."

That is not true. Here is incontrovertible evidence. I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Wheat Sale and the Public," written by Elmo Roper, the well-known polling expert, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHEAT SALE AND THE PUBLIC

(By Elmo Roper)

Seldom has the path to peaceful coexistence been paved with rubles. Rarely has the United States been offered, all at once, the chance to advance the cold war thaw, feed the hungry, get rid of a burdensome surplus, improve its balance of international payments, and make a profit besides. This is the opportunity implicit in the President's recent decision to permit the sale of American surplus wheat to Russia. It is generally agreed that the consummation of the wheat deal would benefit U.S. farmers, grain traders, and shippers, as well as reduce this country's embarrassment of surplus wheat riches to something close to a normal reserve. If the Russians pay in gold, and even if they don't, the impact on the U.S. balance of payments is bound to be beneficial. And if it has any political impact at all, it must inevitably be in the direction of reducing United States-Soviet tensions. Yet the wheat sale has been called highly controversial and a political liability. Is it?

To find out, Saturday Review commissioned Elmo Roper and Associates to do a succinct, to-the-point survey of a cross-section of Americans just 10 days after the sale was authorized. Had Americans heard about the wheat deal? Did they approve or disapprove of it? The answers to the first question show a remarkably high degree of awareness of the wheat-to-Russia decision, as compared with other issues on which the public has been polled in the past. This was the question:

"Have you read or heard about President Kennedy's decision to permit the sale of surplus American wheat to Russia? Yes, 85 percent; no, 15 percent.

More men than women (91 percent) * * * had heard about the President's decision. Not surprisingly, awareness was highest in the Middle West:

Awareness of the President's decision in major regions

	Percent
Middle West	92
Far West	89
Northeast	88
South	75

Those who had not heard about the wheat decision were then told about it, and everyone was then asked:

"How do you feel about this—do you approve or disapprove of President Kennedy's decision to sell surplus wheat to Russia?"

	Percent
Approve	47
Disapprove	27
Don't know	26

The weight of decided opinion, then, clearly shows the most people think the President did the right thing. This is true in all areas of the country, although the vote was rather close in the South:

Attitudes toward the President's decision in major regions

NORTHEAST	*Percent*
Approve	55
Disapprove	20
Don't know	25
MIDWEST	
Approve	48
Disapprove	27
Don't know	25
FAR WEST	
Approve	48
Disapprove	29
Don't know	23
SOUTH	
Approve	38
Disapprove	32
Don't know	30

In view of the way the wheat deal is stacked, it is not surprising to find this much approval for it. Any number of motives—or combination of motives—might have pushed people toward approval. Humanitarians would not want to deny food to the hungry; worriers about American food surpluses would be glad to see a burden removed; fiscal conservatives, among others, would heave a sigh of relief about incoming payments from abroad; those in fields directly benefiting would be glad to see business turned their way; and, last but hardly least, those hopeful of world peace and tranquillity would be happy to see the harsh accents of military threats replaced with the gentler language of commerce.

It is the opposition—and, even more, the indecision—that warrants comment. Perhaps, for some, the whole thing simply came too fast, and they hadn't had time to think out the issues involved in this new form of economic coexistence. But if there are so many reasons for approving of the wheat sale, it is hard to discover more than two major reasons for withholding that approval. The first, that the sale benefits the Russian economy and thus strengthens the Soviet Government, can be disposed of easily. For the simple fact is that if we had turned the Russians down, they would have gone elsewhere for the wheat. The effect on the Russian political and economic structure would be the same, whether the wheat came from the United States or from other sources. However sincerely held, this view is simply mistaken. The other reason can only be a deep, firmly held conviction that it is evil to sell to the enemy. Although no actual evil effects could be proved, and although, as in all trading situations, we would gain as much as the other side, there are undoubtedly many people to whom the idea of trading with the Russians is morally repulsive—or at least disturbing enough to suspend their judgment between pro and con.

The belief that selling to the Russians is inherently wrong is closely akin to the belief that trying to get along with the Russians is inherently wrong, and that efforts to reduce world tensions are evidence of weak-willed liberalism if not national betrayal. This is primitive moral thinking suitable to a black-and-white world. But the real world is inescapably gray; we have to get along with our enemies—or destroy them. Exploring the path to peaceful coexistence requires not selling out or giving in, but a patient search for ways to reduce the areas of tension and hostility and enlarge the areas of agreement and accommodation between East and West. The alternative is an ultimate military confrontation in which the loser would inevitably be the human race.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the article shows incontrovertibly that, with the exception of the South, practically 90 percent of the American people were aware of President Kennedy's decision to permit the wheat to be sold to Russia. In the South, 75 percent of the people were aware of it.

Forty-seven percent of all the people approved it; 27 percent disapproved it; and 26 percent stated they did not know.

The attitude of approval is in the plurality in all areas of the country, including the South.

I also ask unanimous consent that the Harris survey, printed in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Monday, December 16, may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HARRIS SURVEY

(By Louis Harris)

In negotiating with the Russians, President Johnson will be limited by American public opinion as well as by considerations of national security.

In a survey of a carefully selected cross section of this country, the people indicate in sharp and unmistakable terms just what the limits of public opinion are as to U.S. dealings with the Russians.

The American public favors widespread cultural exchanges with the Russians, is willing to sell food and consumer goods, is clearly opposed to joint scientific projects and overwhelmingly rejects any deals which would remotely enhance Soviet military capabilities.

First, people were asked how they felt about the exchange of musicians and artists and also about exchanging students:

Cultural exchange with Russia

	Nation total (percent)
Exchange of artists and musicians:	
Favor	71
Oppose	21
Not sure	8
Exchange of students:	
Favor	69
Oppose	24
Not sure	7

Such cultural exchanges, of course, have been going on for some time. Van Cliburn, the American pianist, grew to world fame by winning a music contest in Russia, while the Bolshoi Ballet has been a huge success in performances in this country. It is apparent that the American people would like to see a wider exchange of cultural missions and students of many kinds.

Next, the cross section was asked about selling wheat and other food to Russia and also about selling U.S. automobiles to the Soviets:

Food and autos

	Nation total (percent)
Selling wheat and other food:	
Favor	54
Oppose	36
Not sure	10
Selling U.S. autos:	
Favor	51
Oppose	39
Not sure	10

A proposed deal on wheat, of course, was being negotiated with Russia before President Kennedy's death. It is evident the American people favored this idea and also would be willing to extend the sale to a broad range of food products—although not in such overwhelming numbers as on the cultural question.

To some degree Americans are motivated by a humanitarian desire to see other peoples fed, regardless of their politics. But there is also a strong strain of practical business advantages to the United States in these answers. This is especially true in the case of selling American automobiles to Russia.

In another series of questions, people were asked about exchanging engineers and scientists with Russia and joining with the Soviets to place a man on the moon:

Soviet cooperation

	Nation total (percent)
Sending man to the moon jointly:	
Favor	35
Oppose	54
Not sure	11
Exchanging scientists and engineers:	
Favor	34
Oppose	54
Not sure	12

It is at the point of sharing jointly in scientific information or cooperative ventures into space that the American people firmly draw the line. Implicit, of course, is the fear that such action would be aiding and abetting Russian military power.

This deep concern over not helping Russia in any way that could lead to military assistance emerged most sharply of all when people were asked how they felt about selling the Russians such items as machine tools and computers or letting them have U.S. jet planes for commercial use:

Strategic equipment

	Nation total (percent)
Selling machine tools and computers:	
Favor	22
Oppose	67
Not sure	11
Selling jet planes for commercial use:	
Favor	16
Oppose	76
Not sure	8

In the direct area of selling Russians equipment that might have a military application, the American people are adamant and nearly unanimous in opposition.

The idea of taking cautious first steps toward peace has recently taken hold in this country, but the lesson of dealing from strength at all times with the Russians is indelibly stamped on American public opinion.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the article is written by Louis Harris, a political pollster who has done some accurate work for me in the past, as well as for many other Members of the Senate. He shows that with respect to the sale of food to Russia, 54 percent of the American people approve, 36 percent disapprove; and 10 percent are not sure.

The other parts of the Harris report are interesting, because they indicate a large majority supporting cultural exchanges with Russia, a majority opposing a joint trip to the moon, and an even larger majority opposing the sale of strategic equipment to Russia.

On the wheat sale the preponderance is clear. Fifty-four percent approve. I have no doubt that even those who would like to demagog this issue will get little comfort from the people of the Nation.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before the Senator yields back the remainder of his time, will he yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Did the poll show that the people voted on the question of whether or not the Export-Import Bank should guarantee the sale?

Mr. CLARK. It did not. In my opinion that is a totally irrelevant and immaterial issue. It has nothing whatever to do with this issue. The Senator knows full well that the Export-Import amendment is put into the bill to kill it, and for no other purpose.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator's speech is irrelevant to the issue, and a complete nonsequitur.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, for the enlightenment of the Senate, I understand that the next speaker will be the Senator from South Dakota, who will address himself to the amendment for a short time; then we shall expect to hear from the distinguished majority leader. Then I shall be ready to yield back whatever time remains to me, in the hope that we might vote on the amendment by 5 minutes past 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from South Dakota yield to himself?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield myself 5 minutes. Unless there are other Senators pressing for time on this side of the question after I conclude I shall be glad to yield back the remainder of my time.

If I were speaking like Alice in Wonderland, I would say that the debate becomes "astonishinger and astonishinger." We now hear from the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that we have been tying in the Export-Import Bank in order to kill the bill.

We are trying to keep the Export-Import Bank out. We are not opposing private transactions. We are merely trying to shift off the backs of American taxpayers' liability for making good the credit if the Soviet Union should default in its obligations.

I wish to address my remarks tonight to the group of Senators who have been, at one time or other, on both sides of this issue. I should like you members of the "swing shift" to listen to some of the testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency, which held careful hearings and took the testimony of many outstanding witnesses. One such piece of testimony is the testimony of Dr. G. Warren Nutter, chairman of the James Wilson Department of Economics, of the University of Virginia. He said:

> Granting special concessions to the Communist countries would indeed be sadly ironic. We have given foreign aid to various countries in order to inhibit the spread of communism. This foreign aid has helped to bring about a deficit in our current international balance of payments. We would then propose to correct that deficit by giving aid to Communist countries.

I think anyone could catch on to the irony of that.

The next statement was made by Dr. Gerald L. Steibel, of the Research Institute of America, New York, N.Y., and appears on page 72 of the hearings on S. 2310, with respect to participation by the Export-Import Bank. Dr. Steibel, by the way, was alluded to in committee by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who opposes what we are trying to do. But he had the fine, charitable impulse to say that Dr. Steibel "is a member of a very distinguished organization in New York headed by Leo Cherne and Carl Hubbard. I know them both very well, Mr. Chairman, and I am very glad to introduce the witness to the committee."

So we have in Dr. Steibel a high authority, respected by both sides of the argument. Let me quote a paragraph or two from the testimony of Dr. Steibel:

> When we grant credits—and the fact that the Export-Import Bank merely insures someone else's credit is not significant—we are announcing our faith in the debtor. In ordinary commercial transactions, this faith generally extends only to the prospect for repayment; in this transaction it inevitably goes much further: We are saying that we are expressing faith in their system, because we are doing more than selling them commodities; we are aiding them to ride out some very fundamental internal troubles.

That is a point which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and I tried to make earlier in the debate, but which no Senator on the other side of the question has yet answered: "Why should we be bailing out the Communists just when their devilish, unworkable system is beginning to crack up in the cold war? Why should we be helping them at all?" No one has yet answered that question. I will let Dr. Steibel make the point:

> I realize that this is not necessarily the purpose of the administration. Nevertheless, that is its effect. It will be so read by other nations, and it is so being read by them now.

It is, indeed, since we know that the business of extending credit to Soviet Russia and the extension of trade by our allies to Red Russia has increased tremendously and will increase further if we insist on encouraging it in the form of Americans seeking the business in the form of American guarantees.

Dr. Steibel continues:

> A business deal with the Communists for cash is, in my opinion, bad enough. Nevertheless it does maintain at least some reserve on the part of this country. It informs the Communists that we are dealing with them, to be sure, but that we are doing so gingerly, that we do not trust them.
>
> A cash deal also is a warning that we are not committing ourselves to a next time. It gives them at least some incentive to behave better in all the ways in which we would like them to behave better. And it gives us the option of stopping the flow of goods quickly when that becomes necessary.
>
> But when we underwrite credit we are going far beyond that. For one thing, we are opening ourselves to the possibility that we may be asked to take Communist goods as repayment for the credit. It would be entirely within the Communist character to say to us after the 18 months are up, "Sorry, we don't have the cash, but we'll be glad to give you oil, or chrome, or something else that will cut the heart out of your own allies' markets."
>
> And what would that do to the balance-of-payments argument for the wheat deal? We would deserve that fate if it turned out to be ours.

That is about all I have to say, Mr. President except to correct a few inadvertent errors which have crept into the debate, and which should be corrected for the RECORD.

For example, when the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] summed up that there is no difference between permitting the Export-Import Bank to get into these transactions and permitting private trade to conduct them, I point out that there is all the difference in the world between public credit and private credit. It is the difference between the old American adage that he who makes a profit takes the risk, and the new kind of concept that he who makes the profit takes no risk at all. To me, that is the big difference. Private operators make a guaranteed profit—the general taxpayers assume the entire risk. Clearly this comes under the heading of "nice work—if you can get it."

I should like also to correct the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who said that the sole reason for voting to strike out the provision is that the Export-Import Bank has had no loss; therefore, the credit of the Communists must be good. The one thing wrong with that argument is that the Export-Import Bank has never in its history lent a dime to the Communists. So there is no relevancy to that argument. There is no connection between the statement that the record of the Export-Import Bank attributes good credit to the Communists, and the statement that a full moon means a low price for cheese.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] pointed out, inadvertently, I assume, that the money would go from the Export-Import Bank to a commercial bank, and then be paid by a commercial bank to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Not so. The money goes to a commercial bank, and is given or loaned to the grain dealers of America, who will buy the wheat anywhere they can buy it and can make the biggest profit. If they have some of their own wheat to sell, they can make a big profit. The Bank loans the money to the Communists; they pay it to the exporters. John Q. Taxpayer takes all the risk.

Two other points: I hope this issue will be decided, as it should be, tonight, and that we may be confronted early next year with a Presidential message with respect to some kind of program of trade and aid which will be consistent and positive in nature. I renew my recommendation that America should call a free world trade aid conference for that purpose. I have received several telephone calls from Members of the House of Representatives today, pointing out that if the Senate eliminates the House action on a yea-and-nay vote, the House will insist that the bill be delayed until January. It will not back down. House Members have made up their minds and those voting "aye" the other day are unlikely to vote "nay" tomorrow.

To those who are insistent upon early action on a foreign aid bill, I point out the difficulties that will be confronted in conference if the Senate eliminates the House provision against extending public credit to our enemies.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator believe that he can frighten a majority of the Members of this body because two or three Members of the other body have called him to express their opinion?

Mr. MUNDT. The number of calls which the Senator has stated is entirely wrong. But I am not easily frightened, and I do not believe the Senator from Rhode Island is.

Mr. PASTORE. I am never frightened.

Mr. MUNDT. I am pointing out as a matter of practical reality that we are meeting on the day before it is expected that Congress will adjourn for this session. This is something that might be considered now before we find it out when we go to conference.

When a majority of 48 makes up its mind on a yea-and-nay vote in the House, the House does not often change its mind.

Finally, I hope that this issue if it comes back again—and in some way or other it is certain to come back again, regardless of our action—we will recognize that we are talking about a policy of putting the good faith and the money of American citizens behind the credit of Communist countries, for purchase of any supplies whatsoever, wherever they decide to purchase them, in the United States of America or elsewhere.

This is not a wheat proposal or a farm commodity proposal or a grain proposal, any more than it is a proposal in regard to any other product the Soviets have indicated they want to buy—and we know they want to buy alcohol, chemical supplies, fertilizer, fertilizer factories, machine tools, trucks and who can speculate what else.

So the question is what policy we want to establish vis-a-vis our adversary in the cold war, whose devastating attacks make it necessary for us to pass, today, a bill providing appropriations of more than $3 billion.

Do we want to make it possible, by granting our credit, for our adversary to launch an expanded attack at our expense? I think not. Therefore, I urge the rejection of the committee amendment.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, what time remains available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the amendment, the Senator from Rhode Island has 20 minutes remaining; and the Senator from South Dakota has no time remaining.

On the bill, the Senator from South Dakota has 3 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Rhode Island has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the only remaining speaker on our side is the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD]. He will be entitled to use whatever portion of the remaining 20 minutes he wishes to use. When he concludes his remarks, we shall yield back the remainder of the time available to our side, and shall be ready to have the vote taken.

Mr. President, at this time I yield to the distinguished majority leader whatever time he wishes to use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have heard the word "practicality" used. I think we should also consider the principle involved. Senators have spoken of "gold dangling." By the same token, I think we should also consider the balance of payments.

Although this proposal is not, per se, a wheat proposal, nevertheless, wheat is at the heart and center of this matter. In addition, although it was not a clear-cut issue, several weeks ago the Senate voted, by a vote of 57 to 36, to reject the proposal advanced by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Furthermore, that proposal was reported unfavorably—by a one-vote-margin—from the Banking and Currency Committee.

The arguments which held then also hold today.

Many Members speak consistently, at least on the platforms, about the cost to the Government of the huge stored agricultural commodity surpluses we have. I think we must remember that in the field of fiscal responsibility, if this sale of 4 million metric tons goes through, it will bring to the United States, in gold, or dollars, approximately $250 million, and to that extent it will reduce the gold drain.

Second, it will reduce our surplus of wheat now being held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and in so doing it will reduce the cost to the Government and will be a saving to the taxpayers of the United States. Incidentally, in the agricultural appropriation bill passed on September 30, approximately $2,700 million was voted for supports of various kinds.

Furthermore, in my opinion, if this transaction goes through, it will firm up the price of wheat, which under present estimates, if no legislation is passed, will be somewhere in the vicinity of $1.15 to $1.25 a bushel next year, compared to this year's price of approximately $2.

Furthermore, this wheat will not be diverted to Cuba or to Communist China under the terms of the export licenses to be issued.

The wheat sale will be known to the Soviet people through the Voice of America broadcasts, and it has been made known to the Soviet people.

In terms of the effect domestically, it will bring added employment to American shipping, longshoremen, and railroad workers, as well as to grain traders, millers, and farmers.

It will be conducted through the normal competitive channels of the private American grain trade.

Last of all, up to now the Soviet Union and Eastern European nations have been obtaining American wheat indirectly, by purchases from West Germany, France, and other countries, by purchasing flour made from American wheat and sold to those countries in ever-increasing quantities. In other words, if there is a possibility of a deal with the Soviet Union, and if it does not go through, we shall still sell wheat to Western Europe, and that wheat will find its way into the hands of the Soviets.

Mr. President, on November 15, the late President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, wrote me a letter relative to the Mundt proposal being considered at that time. I now read the letter to the Senate:

> THE WHITE HOUSE,
> *Washington, D.C. November 15, 1963.*
>
> Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I write to urge in the strongest terms that the Senate should not approve any amendment to the foreign aid bill which would prohibit the use of credit guarantees for trade with any Communist country. It would work against the interest of the United States in crippling the American exporter in fair competition with other free countries for nonstrategic trade with the Communist world. The principle of such an amendment would jeopardize not only the projected sale of wheat to the Soviet Union, but possible sales of important quantities of other products like tobacco, corn, and cotton.
>
> If this amendment is adopted, it is not primarily Communists who will be damaged, but the American producer and exporter. The Export-Import Bank exists to promote the trade of the United States. Its professional judgment is that the state credit of the Soviet Union and of other Communist countries is sufficiently reliable to justify a guarantee in support of U.S. exports. The judgment of the Bank on such matters of credit over a 29-year period has been outstanding—less than 1 percent is now in default on total credits of $11 billion—and in this process the earnings of the Bank after all expenses have been over $800 million.
>
> It is anticipated that the proposed sale of wheat will be made for payment in gold or dollars, either in cash or on short-term credit not exceeding 18 months. The reinforcement of our balance-of-payments position which such a sale will provide is obvious. The Export-Import Bank will, as usual, charge an appropriate fee for any guarantee.

In other words, it will make money on the transaction.

I read further from the letter from the late President of the United States:

> The proposed sale of wheat still depends upon negotiations between the Soviet Government and private traders.

That still holds good, today.

The remainder of the letter from the late President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, reads as follows:

> The availability of credit on normal commercial terms may be a central element in this negotiation. The interests of the United States will be advanced by a successful completion of this sale. The American farmer, the American exporter, the American shipping and railroad industry, and the American citizen concerned with the strength of our balance-of-payments position should all support this proposed sale. The guarantee of the Export-Import Bank is a normal element in a transaction of this sort, and to prevent such a guarantee by a legislative rider at this delicate stage of negotiations would be an act against the national interest.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> JOHN F. KENNEDY.

So President Kennedy said he thought this was in the best interests of the United States; and at that time he urged very strongly that the proposal advanced by the Senator from South Dakota not be accepted.

Mr. President, under date of today, I have received from the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, the following letter:

> THE WHITE HOUSE,
> *Washington, December 19, 1963.*
>
> Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
> *U.S. Senate.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I strongly urge that the Senate reject the amendment attached to the foreign aid appropriation bill which would prevent any use of the facilities of the Export-Import Bank in connection with all trade with Communist countries.
>
> The Senate has before refused to accept this proposal, and it is even less justified now than before. In one of the last letters of his life, President Kennedy pointed out plainly that the Export-Import Bank has a record of judgment which fully justifies confidence in its ability to use its powers wisely, with a net gain to the taxpayer; that the Bank exists precisely for the purpose of assisting American traders in their legitimate commercial interests; and that the proposed restriction would jeopardize not only the possible sale of wheat to the Soviet Union but sales of other important commodities, like tobacco, corn, and cotton, to a number of Communist countries.
>
> The present amendment is doubly objectionable in that it aims to insert a major shift of policy, already rejected by the Senate, into an appropriation bill.
>
> I can assure the Senate, which knows me well, that this administration proposes to protect the interest of the United States in all matters affecting trade with Communist countries. We will support such trade only where it is clearly in our interest to do so. In my judgment sales of wheat and other farm commodities, on reasonable terms, are now plainly in the national interest of the United States—good for our farmers and exporters, good for our shipping and railroad industry, good for our balance of payments, and good for the country. It makes no sense to jeopardize these possible gains by this legislative rider.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. President, I heard rumors last night and today to the effect that the other body indicated there would be no foreign aid bill if the proposal of the Senator from Rhode Island were agreed to.

I should like to say to this body that we are independent in what we do in this Chamber. I, for one, do not intend to be subjected to threats of any kind.

Either the principle is good or it is not. If it is good, and if Senators agree with their own consciences, and with two Presidents of the United States, they will uphold the position of the Senator from Rhode Island.

RETURN OF SENATOR ENGLE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we are honored by being afforded the opportunity to welcome back a most distinguished Member of this body who has been convalescing for the past several weeks.

If Senators will be in attention, he will be escorted into the Chamber by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. In the meantime I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

At this point, Mr. ENGLE was escorted into the Chamber by Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. DIRKSEN.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. I believe the Senate is ready for a vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has now expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it correct that an affirmative vote would sustain the Appropriations Committee in its deletion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have the question stated clearly?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business to attend the Presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is absent because of illness in his family.

If present and voting, the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 32, as follows:

[No. 282 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Aiken
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Ellender
Engle
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Humphrey
Inouye
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—32

Beall
Byrd, Va.
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Morse
Mundt
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—16

Allott
Anderson
Bennett
Carlson
Dominick
Eastland
Gore
Hill
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Morton
Pearson
Scott
Simpson
Tower
Walters

So the committee amendment to strike out lines 9 through 16, on page 17, was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I do not believe there are any further amendments to be offered. I believe the bill is ready for a third reading. I have nothing further to say.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 9499) was read the third time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Do Senators yield back their remaining time?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back my remaining time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back my remaining time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** All time has been used or yielded back.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business to attend the Presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is absent because of illness in his family.

If present and voting, the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 283 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Aiken
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Engle
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—25

Bennett
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Curtis
Ellender
Ervin
Goldwater
Hruska
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Morse
Mundt
Robertson
Russell
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—15

Allott
Anderson
Carlson
Dominick
Eastland
Gore
Hill
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Morton
Pearson
Scott
Simpson
Tower
Walters

So the bill (H.R. 9499) was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 791, Senate bill 792, but before doing so, I would be remiss in my obligations if I did not pay my respects to the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who is so modest that he will not remain in the Chamber to hear what I have to say.

He has rendered a magnificent service. He has shown that he has the ability to advance lucid arguments. He has been willing to listen to the arguments of the other side. He has conducted himself as a Senator should conduct himself. I think the Appropriations Committee is extremely fortunate to have on it a man of the character, integrity, and ability of the Senator who handled the bill on the floor, and I think the Senate is extremely fortunate to have among its membership a man of the standing of that son of St. Patrick, JOHN "O'PASTORE."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what the majority leader said about the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. He did a magnificent job in handling a very difficult bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many people at home and abroad may be concerned by the action of Congress in cutting the President's request for funds under the Foreign Assistance Act for fiscal year 1964.

Fears may be arising in the developing countries that the United States is drastically cutting back its aid effort on their behalf and may be preparing to pull out. Our allies and friends among the industrialized countries may feel we are downgrading free world security interests and abdicating from major joint responsibilities for assisting the development efforts of the developing countries. The Communist countries may conclude that we are lessening our aid efforts and thereby affording them greater opportunities for economic and political penetration.

I believe it is important that we make a clear record that congressional action on this year's aid bill means none of these things. The United States is not pulling out of the aid business. We are not narrowing our concept of our interests or our responsibilities or of the role that foreign aid must play in meeting them.

The sharp congressional cutback in the President's aid request is dismaying. It will have a restrictive effect this year on our ability to meet many important rising needs of developing countries. Some priorities will have to be postponed until next year. The stimulus our aid programs give to economic growth and social development will be less than it could and should be. But we will not fail to meet any of our basic commitments or discontinue support and participation in any of the programs we have intended to continue.

In spite of these cuts in the budget, the level of U.S. aid flows will remain substantial, both in new commitments and in expenditures against old commitments.

Under the Foreign Assistance Act in fiscal year 1963, obligations or commitments for economic aid totaled $2.5 billion. The amounts voted for fiscal year 1964 by the House and proposed by the Senate Appropriations Committee for economic aid, including carryover of unused authority from last year, are $2 and $2.5 billion, respectively. Thus the possible cut in actual commitment levels under the Foreign Assistance Act from last year, depending on final Senate-House compromise, is considerably less than may be commonly believed.

More important, however, is to look at the U.S. aid program as a whole. The Foreign Assistance Act is one portion. But the United States also makes a major effort in assisting developing countries through the food-for-peace program—Public Law 480—the Export-Import Bank, the Peace Corps, and our subscriptions to the World Bank and its affiliate, the International Development Association.

Thus while the level of new commitments under the Foreign Assistance Act will be affected by congressional action at this time, as I have indicated commitments under these other programs are likely to rise in fiscal year 1964, offsetting substantially or entirely any reduction in commitments necessitated by the appropriation cut under the Foreign Assistance Act.

Total combined commitments of economic aid to developing countries under the Foreign Assistance Act, Public Law 480, the Eximbank and the Peace Corps in fiscal year 1963 amounted to some $4.6 billion. A projected $300 million increase in Eximbank lending in fiscal year 1964 and smaller increases in the other programs may well enable the United States to maintain the $4.6 billion total commitment level. In addition to that we have recently agreed with other industrialized countries on a replenishment of resources for the International Development Association to which we will contribute about 40 percent of a $750 million total over the next several years.

Finally, it should be borne in mind that the actual benefit from aid comes when the committed funds are actually expended and the imported equipment or supplies or technicians arrive in the developing country for use. Since some types of projects take longer to be carried out—that is, reach the expenditure stage—than others, variations in commitment levels may not show up in expenditures. And in the critical expenditure measure of aid flow, U.S. aid has been rising for the past several years and is expected to continue to rise this year and next as a result of past commitments. Total net expenditures for all U.S. economic aid programs were $2.8 billion in calendar year 1960, reached $3.5 billion in 1961, $3.6 billion in 1962, and should soon reach the $4 billion level.

Summing up, the sharp cuts in the appropriations under the Foreign Assistance Act are damaging. They will impede the President's ability to meet many important rising needs of the developing countries and to meet problems with the effectiveness and decisiveness that our great country should display. Timetables will have to be stretched out where delay is politically risky, economically wasteful, or socially harmful. Flexibility to meet emergencies is minimal.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7332. An act granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8853. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs;

H.R. 9436. An act to amend the act of September 2, 1958, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 875. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 9413. An act to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; and

H.J. Res. 778. Joint resolution to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 7332. An act granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9436. An act to amend the act of September 2, 1958, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

H.R. 8853. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.J. Res. 875. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and

Welfare related to mental retardation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF SPACE SIMULATOR AT JET PROPULSION LABORATORY, PASADENA, CALIF.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of a 10-foot space simulator at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, Calif.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON HIGH COSTS PERTAINING TO SITES FOR SELECTED LOW-RENT HOUSING PROJECTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on high costs pertaining to sites for selected low-rent housing projects in the area administered by the San Francisco Regional Office, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXCESSIVE PRICE PAID FOR PROPULSION REDUCTION GEARS PURCHASED FROM WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the excessive price paid for propulsion reduction gears purchased from Westinghouse Electric Corp., Sunnyvale, Calif., Department of the Navy, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY COSTS BEING INCURRED AS A RESULT OF THE NAVY'S REFUSAL TO ACCEPT THE STANDARDIZED OFFICERS' DRESS SHOES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the unnecessary costs being incurred as a result of the Navy's refusal to accept the standardized officers' dress shoes agreed upon by the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps, Department of Defense, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADJUSTMENT OF IMMIGRATION STATUS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered in behalf of Ho Liu, Irene Liu, and Jefferson Liu, relating to adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce, Nashville, Tenn., relating to Federal expenditures, Federal income tax reduction, and sound fiscal policy; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Windham County Democratic Association, of northeastern Connecticut, favoring the enactment of legislation to designate November 22 as President Kennedy Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENTS IN FOREIGN SERVICE ANNUITIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 813)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably with amendments, the bill (S. 745) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators LAUSCHE, WILLIAMS of Delaware, and MUNDT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the minority views in connection with Senate bill 745, which has just been reported by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The minority views are as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS

It is our opinion that this bill should not be acted upon favorably because, if adopted:

1. It will grant to certain individuals rights to which they are not entitled and which will make these particular individuals the beneficiaries of grants not given equally to other persons in the Foreign Service retirement program.

2. Allow these special retirees now to designate their respective wives as beneficiaries, in the event they are survived by their wives, without requiring the retirees to pay back into the Treasury excess amounts which the fund paid them upon their retirement because they did not elect to have their wives designated as beneficiaries.

3. Treat unjustly those retirees who did designate their wives as survivor beneficiaries and thus suffered a reduction in the retirement pay which they received.

4. Create further complications and the need for further adjustments when those retirees who did designate their wives as survivor beneficiaries learn of the losses which they suffered through the reduction in retirement pay because they did designate their wives as survivor beneficiaries.

5. Definitely create an inequality of treatment of the persons covered by the fund.

6. Give encouragement to the administration of retirement funds completely inconsistent with prudence and actuarial rules.

7. Require the payment of the obligations created by the bill not out of the Foreign Service retirement fund but out of the general taxpayers' fund of the Federal Government.

Any beneficiary under this bill at the time of retirement from the Foreign Service had the option of either designating or not designating a potential surviving spouse as a beneficiary. The retiree had to decide whether he would prefer getting an increased retirement pay for himself without designating his wife as a beneficiary; or a decreased retirement pay by so designating his spouse.

Many retirees did designate their spouses as beneficiaries and thus received less money for themselves during their lifetime. There were others who exercised the option of getting more pay for themselves but excluding their spouses as beneficiaries.

If this bill is adopted it will result in unequal treatment as between these two classes of retirees. The retiree for whom this bill is being passed will now be allowed to designate the spouse as a beneficiary but will also be allowed to keep all of the excess pay that he received from the fund since his retirement.

However, the Foreign Service worker who, at the time of retirement, elected to have his spouse designated as a beneficiary, of course, received less money. There is no provision in the bill reimbursing those retirees for their losses. We are of the opinion that this latter class, when it learns of the discriminatory treatment to which this bill will subject them, will justifiably come before the Congress asking that they be given equal consideration.

With regard to this Foreign Service retirement plan, we have an exhibition of what reckless and imprudent disregard for actuarial rules does to the stability of a retirement plan that was originally set up on a sound basis. The retirement plan of the Foreign Service was adopted by Congress in 1924. At that time, it provided for employee contributions equal to 5 percent of salary up to $9,000; and Government appropriations necessary to continue the plan in full force, the aggregate total of Government appropriations not to exceed the aggregate total of officer contributions plus interest. However, at various times forces began to operate for liberalizations of rights and payments.

Some of the liberalizations that the Congress adopted are as follows:

1. In 1939, officers who had served 30 years could retire at age 60, on a reduced annuity.

2. In 1939, survivor annuities for wives were first provided.

3. In 1941, the act was changed to permit retirement with 30 years of service at age 50.

4. In 1946, voluntary retirement at age 50 with 20 years of service was permitted.

5. In 1946, disability retirement was liberalized so that when a participant in the system becomes disabled, if he has at least 5 years of service, his annuity is figured on the basis of a minimum of 20 years of service.

6. Also in 1946, the act was amended to provide that an annuity would be based on the officer's 5-year average salary next preceding retirement, rather than the 10 years next preceding retirement.

7. In 1955, it was changed to the best 5-year average, rather than the 5 years next preceding retirement.

8. In 1956, the limitation on years of service on which an annuity could be based was raised to 35 years, thus allowing 70 percent of the highest 5-year average salary as an annuity.

9. In 1960, the retirement system was changed to provide that Foreign Service Staff personnel, after they have served 10 years in the Foreign Service, become participants in the Foreign Service retirement system. During the first 10 years of their service they are subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act.

10. In 1960, survivor annuities for children were also granted.

11. And, in 1960, the act was amended to provide for recomputation of annuities of those who had retired prior to 1956 to allow those with more than 30 years to be given added credit for the difference up to 35 years.

A measure of the dollar impact of these liberalizations on the unfunded liability of the system is not available. But, partly as a consequence of these liberalizations the fund is now in an indefensible state of instability.

The limitation of 5 percent of salary up to $9,000 provided by the 1924 act was changed to $10,000 on February 23, 1931; changed to $13,500 on August 13, 1946; and removed altogether on August 5, 1955. The limitation on Government appropriations to the fund which was a provision from the establishment of the system in 1924, was removed on April 24, 1939. Government payments were to be in the form of annual appropriations based upon an actuarial determination of the contribution required. Frequently the Congress did not appropriate all or any part of the funds requested for this purpose.

Subsequently on September 8, 1960, the law was again changed with respect to contributions requiring that the employees and the U.S. Government each pay 6½ percent effective July 1, 1961.

Existing now with respect to this retirement program is the indefensible and unbelievable situation that because of liberalizations in rights and other causes it requires a contribution of 29.7 percent to maintain the fund. If the contributions were to be made on an equal basis by employer and employee, each would have to contribute 14.8½ percent of the payroll. The Government now owes $288 million to the fund; the receipts of the fund are now equal to 13 percent of the payroll of the Foreign Service which is approximately $250 million. It is essential that this inadequacy of contribution be solved.

We have been told that a proposal will be made to continue the payment of the employees at 6½ percent of their salaries but that the general taxpayers will then be required to contribute 23.2 percent of the payroll.

Illustrative of the unbelievable situation that prevails in the fund is the fact that into it now on the basis of a 13-percent contribution (6½ percent by the Government and 6½ percent by the workers) in fiscal year 1962, the fund received $6 million while it paid out for all purposes $5.5 million. An actuarial projection of funds, known obligations, and anticipated receipts reveals that unless measures are taken to improve the financing of the fund it will be depleted by 1977 and unable to meet future obligations. Obviously, this situation is bad. It is the result of failure to recognize when the liberalizations were made what the ultimate consequences would be. Many times when new rights were granted to one group, subsequently new rights had to be granted to another in order to equalize the consideration given.

We believe that Congress should not act favorably upon this bill because, if adopted it will treat persons covered by the fund unequally. In addition, its adoption would encourage the imprudent and actuarially unsound administration of retirement funds; and would further obligate the general taxpayers' fund of the Federal Government, rather than the Foreign Service retirement fund. We believe that rather than further adding to the unfunded liability of the Foreign Service retirement plan Congress should be considering viable proposals to solve the deficiency in the fund aggravated by the liberalizations adopted in the past.

Frank J. Lausche,
John J. Williams,
Karl E. Mundt.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this bill contemplates the liberalization of the retirement payments in the Foreign Service, because of previous liberalization running through the years. The situation now requires 29.7 percent of wages to be contributed to the fund in order to make it actuarily sound. It has been suggested that the workers in the Foreign Service put up 6½ percent and that the taxpayers put up 23.2 percent of the salaries in order to maintain it financially feasible.

It is one of the most indefensible, imprudent expansions of taxpayers' funds that is probably on record in the history of Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2402. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on polyethylene imine; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2403. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2404. A bill for the relief of Carleen Coen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. Douglas):

S. 2405. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for submission of certain claims agreements to the Senate for its advice and consent; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2406. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Kosmakos; and

S. 2407. A bill for the relief of Nikolaos Vilos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2408. A bill to provide for granting employees in the postal field service time off for one State holiday each year; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 140. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to create the offices of Executive Vice President and Legislative Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, WITH ADDITIONAL COPIES, MEMORIAL COPIES OF INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY ON JANUARY 20, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution which reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

Section. 1. That there be printed as a Senate document, in such style, form, and manner as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, memorial copies of the inaugural address delivered by the late President, John F. Kennedy, upon the occasion of his inauguration on January 20, 1961.

Sec. 2. There shall be printed 60,000 additional copies of such document, of which 20,000 shall be for the use of Members of the Senate and 40,000 shall be for the use of Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I send the concurrent resolution to the desk to have it appropriately referred. I have read the text of the concurrent resolution because I wish the Record to show that this procedure is now underway. I am very hopeful that early in January 1964, the committee will be able to report the concurrent resolution favorably. There is already a great demand for this particular document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

RESOLUTION

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A REPORT ENTITLED "PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATIONS OF AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT"

Mr. McGEE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 237); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a report entitled "Personnel Administration and Operations of Agency for International Development," submitted by Senator Gale W. McGee to the Committee on Appropriations and that 10,000 additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

CLAIMS AGREEMENTS SHOULD BE HANDLED AS TREATIES, KEATING URGES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, legislation to require Senate ratification of any claims agreement made with foreign nations for claims adjudicated by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

The purpose of this legislation is clear. In the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, the Congress has established the procedure whereby the Claims Commission investigates and adjudicates the claims of U.S. citizens against foreign countries.

At present most of the claims under consideration are for property seized and nationalized by Communist governments in Eastern Europe. In the future these claims may well include expropriation claims against other nations throughout the world.

What has happened so far in the settlement of these claims is instructive. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has set a total claims value for each nation involved. Then, time and again the State Department "has negotiated with the countries seizing U.S. property and settled for 40 percent, 30 percent, 24 percent, and in the Czech case less than 10 percent of the full amount determined by the Claims Commission." Explicitly or implicitly, the agreements reached have not been limited to claims settlements, but have included other points at issue and frequently trade agreements have been the quid pro quo to get agreement by the Communist governments on the claims owed.

The result of these actions by the Department of State has been to deprive U.S. citizens of property, in the form of validated claims, without due process of law and with no further appeal to any agency of the Government.

In the Czech case, for instance, the Department of State has in effect admitted that they would be prepared to settle for about $11 million of a total of $113.6 million, including both principal and interest. Furthermore, I should be glad to make available the contradictory correspondence which I have had on this matter to any interested Members of the Senate so that they can review it.

Mr. President, I introduced an amendment along these lines, but referring only to the Czech settlements, when the foreign aid bill was before the Senate. Basically I regard an agreement to accept less than 10 percent on a dollar of adjudicated claims as a form of foreign aid at the expense of U.S. taxpayers.

However, in a technical sense, this issue can even more properly be considered as an amendment to the International Claims Settlement Act, and I shall certainly press the matter again when a suitable occasion arises. "We must make clear to the State Department through this and other methods that we will not tacitly accept the seizure of U.S. property overseas and then settle for a mere pittance of the true value. This measure should appreciably strengthen the hand of our Government in all such negotiations," by giving the Senate an opportunity to pass on claims settlements before they go into effect.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2405) to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for submission of certain claims agreements to the Senate for its advice and consent, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended as follows:

Section 4, Title I, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(k) It is the sense of the Congress that any agreement hereafter entered into between the Government of the United States and any foreign government relating to the settlement of claims, determined or in the process of determination by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, by nationals of the United States against such foreign government shall be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent."

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION FOR TWO VICE PRESIDENTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment creating two Vice Presidents of the United States.

Mr. President, in the wake of the tragic assassination of the late President Kennedy has come a renewed and healthy interest in a number of proposals affecting Presidential succession and Presidential inability. From my own viewpoint, the problem of Presidential inability is far more serious than the problem of Presidential succession. In my judgment, action on inability is desperately needed and deserves the highest priority. The late distinguished Senator Kefauver from Tennessee and I had cosponsored a proposed constitutional amendment which would authorize the Congress to settle by ordinary legislation the means or mechanics by which inability problems could be resolved. This measure has already received the approval of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and is now pending before the full Committee on the Judiciary. In my judgment, the committee should take this proposed amendment up as early in January as possible, and I shall do everything in my power to do that.

The reason I stress inability as opposed to succession is that by the nature of things a President is more likely to be incapacitated for performing the duties and powers of his office than he is to be killed or to be removed from office or to resign.

Even in the old days, when Presidents did not take trips all over the world by airplane and did not ride in fast-traveling automobiles, the threat of serious physical injury was always present.

For example, in 1844, in President Tyler's term, a Presidential party went aboard a steamer called the *Princeton*. One of its new guns was fired in salute, but the gun exploded and killed two Cabinet officers, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Navy, and almost killed President Tyler.

In 1881, when President Garfield fell victim of an assassin's bullet, he lingered for some 80 days, during which he performed but one official act, the signing of an extradition paper. Vice President Arthur was in doubt as to whether to act, and he did not act. Eventually, of course, he succeeded to the Presidency upon President Garfield's death.

In 1919, President Woodrow Wilson suffered a severe stroke, as many of us remember. There were times when he was not able to function. Major foreign policy questions were unsettled, and a Cabinet member who considered asking the Vice President to act as President was sternly rebuked by President Wilson's secretary for his disloyalty to the President.

On three occasions, during the Eisenhower administration, the illness of the President was cause for serious public concern and brought into focus once more the need for dispelling uncertainties in cases of inability.

As a matter of fact, during the history of our Nation, there has been a total elapsed time of 1 year when we have not had a functioning President. So that this question of inability is important but likewise important is the question of succession.

And most recently, at Dallas, as much as it is distasteful to entertain the thought, only a matter of a few inches spelled the difference between the President's virtually instantaneous and painless death and a lifelong permanent injury.

Therefore, Mr. President, I do not wish to imply by the introduction of this proposed constitutional amendment that I now believe that the problem of Presidential succession is more pressing than that of inability. Both, of course, must be carefully considered anew. But in my order of priorities, inability should head the list.

The amendment I am introducing today would create two Vice Presidents of the United States. One is designated as the Executive Vice President, and would stand first in line to succeed to the Presidency in case of death, removal, or resignation of the President. The other would be designated as the Legislative Vice President, and stand second in line of succession. No further changes in the line of succession would be contemplated. In other words, the present succession law of 1947 could stand as it is, the only difference being that a second Vice President would be interposed in the line of succession between the first Vice President and the Speaker of the House.

Both Vice Presidents would be elected along with the President on a national ticket in 4-year elections as we have at present.

The amendment I am proposing would place neither Vice President within a hidebound scheme of duties and responsibilities. As proposed, the first or Executive Vice President would have no constitutional duties at all. He would be free, as is the present single Vice President, to take on any and all special assignments at the pleasure of the President. The main purpose is, of course, to retain the current practice, developed mostly within the last decade or so, of training the immediate successor to the Presidency into the highest level of executive policy circles in preparation for the eventuality we always pray will never occur.

The second or Legislative Vice President would succeed to the constitutional powers and duties now conferred upon the single Vice President; that is, he would be the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and would have the power to break a legislative deadlock on a tie vote in the Senate. In addition, much like the Executive Vice President under this proposal, and much like the single Vice President we now have, the Legislative Vice President would be free to take on additional assignments at the discretion of the President.

Since the relationship between the President and Vice President, and the degree to which the President will make use of the Vice President in performing basically executive-type duties, has always varied depending on the personalities of these two officers and a variety of political circumstances, it is my intention not to encumber either Vice

President, under this proposal, with a rigid set of duties and responsibilities, save in the case of the Legislative Vice President, who would have, as now, the two constitutional functions of presiding over the Senate and casting a tie-breaking vote.

If, under this proposal, the President were to die, resign, or be removed from office, the office itself would devolve upon the Executive Vice President, and the office of Executive Vice President would devolve on the Legislative Vice President. In the case of death, removal, or resignation of the Executive Vice President, his office would devolve upon the Legislative Vice President, and we would be in no worse situation than the present one, in which there is no Vice President endowed with the constitutional function of presiding over the Senate.

As I have said, I would make no change in the line of succession after the second or Legislative Vice President. In 1947, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, and also a member of its Committee on the Judiciary, which considered the bill which led to the Succession Act of that year, that plan had my full support. I believed then, and still believe now, with President Truman who recommended it, that it is preferable to have elected officials as opposed to appointed officials stand next directly in line to the Presidency after the Vice President. However, under the present succession law, that official is elected not by the people but by his colleagues in the body in which he serves. It is true, however, that both the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate are elected officials of only a small bailiwick, that is to say, either a congressional district or a State, and are elected to their special offices in the Congress only indirectly by the people—that is, by their representatives in the Congress. The single greatest advantage of interposing a second Vice President in the line of succession between a single Vice President and the Speaker of the House is that we would be assured that in the second Vice President we would have an official elected by all the people of the United States at the same time as the President.

There have been a number of other proposals made, all of which should receive our consideration when we take up this matter next year. One of them would have the Houses in joint session select a Vice President when a vacancy occurs. That proposal seems to be open to the same objection as the present succession law. The selection would be by his colleagues rather than by the people. It would also be subject to the same objection as the present law, that a successor could well be a member of the opposite party from the President, which is not desirable when the people have elected the President of one party which will remain in office for a 4-year period.

Purely as a matter of draftsmanship and convenience, I have incorporated the language of the Kefauver-Keating proposal for a constitutional amendment on inability (S.J. Res. 35) within the body of the proposed amendment I am introducing today. In doing this, it is certainly not my intention to preempt consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 35 by itself and on its own merits. I intend very shortly to separate from the amendment I am introducing today the second Vice President plan, in order that it may be considered separately and on its own merits.

It has already been announced by the leadership that there will be hearings commencing sometime in January on the problem of presidential succession. Numerous constitutional amendments have already been offered, and will doubtless receive consideration in that connection. It is my hope that the plan I am introducing today will likewise be taken up at that time and, though it represents somewhat of a departure from other, more limited proposals, will be accorded careful attention.

Finally, I have read with great interest the arguments of some, most notably Prof. Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., of Princeton University, to the effect that the present succession act is unconstitutional. The argument is that the provision which requires the Speaker of the House or the President pro tempore of the Senate, as the case may be, to resign from his office and from the Congress prior to succeeding to the office of President, and this provision was inserted in order to avoid violating the constitutional ban against a dual office for a Member of the Congress, runs afoul of another constitutional requirement that the person succeeding to the Presidency, under a line of succession ordained by Congress, shall be an "officer." The amendment I am introducing today would change the word "officer" to "person" and thereby put to rest any constitutional doubts which have been raised on this score. That party, in my judgment, should remain in office for a 4-year period.

Another suggestion which has been made is to have the President, at the time the Vice President takes over, appoint a Vice President as his successor. That seems to me to be open to the serious objection that it would allow a President to name his successor and to perpetuate a situation which might not be received with favor by the people of the country.

The presentation of this proposal is designed to provide that always there would be a President acting who had been selected by the people of the United States. I know of no other proposal which has been suggested—there may have been others; I simply have not been able to devise them in my own mind—which would provide for that situation, so that our selected President would be the selection of the people of this country rather than of a legislative body or of the President acting as such himself.

I hope very much that all these proposals will receive early consideration in the next session, and that we shall come to grips with this important problem promptly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 140) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to create the offices of Executive Vice President and Legislative Vice President, introduced by Mr. Keating, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 140

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"Section 1. The office of Vice President is abolished. There shall be an Executive Vice President and a Legislative Vice President of the United States, each of whom shall hold office during the term of four years and shall be chosen in the manner and begin his term at the time provided with respect to the Vice President whose office is abolished by this section.

"Sec. 2. If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President-elect shall have died, the Executive-Vice-President-elect shall become President. If at such time the President-elect and the Executive-Vice-President-elect both shall have died, the Legislative-Vice-President-elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President-elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Executive-Vice-President-elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified. If neither a President nor an Executive Vice President shall have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of the term of a President, or if neither the President-elect nor the Executive-Vice-President-elect shall have qualified, then the Legislative-Vice-President-elect shall act as President until a President or an Executive Vice President shall have qualified. The Congress may by law provide for the case wherein no President-elect, Executive-Vice-President-elect, or Legislative-Vice-President-elect shall have qualifed, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President, an Executive Vice President, or a Legislative Vice President shall have qualified.

"Sec. 3. In the case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the office of President shall devolve upon the Executive Vice President. In the case of the removal of the Executive Vice President from office, or of his death or resignation, or when he shall become President, the office of Executive Vice President shall devolve upon the Legislative Vice President. In the case of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office, said powers and duties shall devolve upon the Executive Vice President as Acting President until said inability is removed. In the case of the inability of both the President and the Executive Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, said powers and duties shall devolve upon the Legislative Vice President as Acting President until said inability of the President or of the Executive Vice President be removed. The Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability of the President, the Executive Vice President, and the Legislative Vice President, declaring what person shall then be President, or in the case of the inability of all of said officers act as President, and such person shall be or act as President accordingly until the end of the term for which the President was elected, or in the case of any such inability until such inability shall be earlier removed. The Congress may prescribe by law the method whereby the commencement and termination of the inability of any such officer shall be determined.

"SEC. 4. The Legislative Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote unless they be equally divided. The Senate shall choose a President pro tempore in the absence of the Legislative Vice President, or when he shall exercise the powers and duties of the office of President or Executive Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 5. Except as otherwise provided by this article, all provisions of this Constitution relating to the office of Vice President abolished by section 1 of this article shall have application to or with respect to the office of Executive Vice President and to the office of Legislative Vice President.

"SEC. 6. This article shall apply to the selection of an Executive Vice President and a Legislative Vice President for each regular term of President which begins more than one year after the ratification of this article as an amendment to the Constitution, and shall take effect for all other purposes at the beginning of the term of President for which the first Executive Vice President and the first Legislative Vice President may be chosen under this article.

"SEC. 7. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 375)

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The explanation presented by Mr. MORTON is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8363 DEALING WITH AMOUNTS RECEIVED FROM EMPLOYER ON SALE OF RESIDENCE OF EMPLOYEE IN CONNECTION WITH TRANSFER TO NEW PLACE OF WORK

In recent years large employers with plants and offices scattered about the country have frequently shifted existing employees from one location to another with the result that many employees are compelled for the convenience of their employer to dispose of their homes on short notice, at prices below fair value. Employers often reimburse their old employees for such economic losses. The Treasury (since winning the Bradley case, 36 T.C. 300, in the Tax Court last year) has taken the position that such reimbursed amounts are taxable as ordinary income to the employees. From 1947 to 1962 the only court decision on this issue (Schairer, 9 T.C. 549) had permitted such reimbursements to be treated as part of the sales price of the residence.

The amendment, which would add new section 224 to the code, would reinstate the rule of the Schairer case since it appears highly inequitable to impose a tax penalty on thousands of employees who must sell their homes under forced sale conditions because of moves connected with their work.

TECHNICAL EXPLANATION

Under the amendment, reimbursements within prescribed limits connected with the sale of his residence by a transferred employee are treated as part of the amount realized on the sale.

To provide uniformity and to prevent the possibility of abuse, the following conditions must be satisfied:

1. The reimbursed amounts treated as part of the selling price in the case of a forced sale cannot exceed the difference between the actual selling price of the house and its fair market value as of the valuation date selected by the employer falling within the forced sale period, plus the amount of the selling expenses incident to the transfer.

2. As a second limitation, the amount treated as an additional amount realized on the sale cannot exceed 15 percent of the gross sales price of the house.

3. In determining fair market value for this purpose, the average of two or more appraisals by independent real estate appraisers selected by the employer is to be used, but in unusual circumstance the validity of appraisals may be questioned by the Service.

4. Only "old" employees (those employed for at least 6 months) are eligible for the benefits of the amendment.

5. To qualify as a "forced sale," the sale of the old residence must occur during the period beginning 90 days before and ending 180 days after the date on which the employee starts work at the new job location.

6. The amendment has no application unless the distance from the employee's new job location is at least 20 miles farther from his old residence than was his old job location.

REVENUE COST

The Treasury, in opposing a similar amendment last June before the House Ways and Means Committee, stated that treating reimbursed closing costs and economic loss on the sale of the employee's house as part of the sales proceeds rather than as ordinary income would cost the Government $67 million annually in taxes.

It is believed that this estimate is unduly high for the following reasons:

1. The Government has not and is not, except in isolated cases, collecting tax with respect to amounts paid by employers to existing employees in connection with the disposal of their homes when occasioned by a move to a new job location. Consequently the Treasury's budget figures have not taken this item into account. Under the rule of the Schairer case the Government would receive little tax currently because employees have generally applied the amounts received from their employers to the purchase of homes at their new job locations, thus deferring the capital gains tax that might otherwise be payable.

2. In order not to benefit moves undertaken for personal reasons, the amendment covers only the case of the reimbursed "old" employee. Consequently there is no revenue loss attributable to "new" employees or to non-reimbursed employees (the nonreimbursed employee, since he has received nothing from his employer to treat as additional proceeds from the sale of his house, is not involved under the draft).

3. Any revenue which may be involved is at best "potential revenue" since it is dependent on the outcome of further litigation.

4. Finally, even if the Government attempts to collect taxes on such reimbursements, it is not likely to succeed for long. If necessary, many corporations may attempt to solve the problem by purchasing their employees' homes at appraised values, rather than continuing to utilize the more convenient reimbursement procedure. (See attached Prentice Hall Tax Service comment.)

[From Prentiss-Hall Tax Service]

HOW TO AVOID TAX WHEN YOU MOVE TO A NEW JOBSITE: HAVE EMPLOYER BUY YOUR HOME

Paragraph 32,605: If you have to sell your home at a loss when you move to a new jobsite, don't let your boss make up the loss. Ask him to buy your home, instead. It will cut your tax bill. Here's the story:

Suppose you're an employee who has to move to a new jobsite. You sell your house at a loss because you can't wait for a fair offer. If your boss agrees to make up the loss, are you taxed on what he gives you? Until recently, it depended on whether you were a new or an old employee. Now, it doesn't make any difference. You're taxed in either case.

THE OLD EMPLOYEE

Say you've been working for the company a year when it asks you to move to a new town. Once the Tax Court said the company's loss-cutting payment was part of your sales proceeds. There was no tax if you still had a loss or broke even. *Otto Sorg Schairer*, 9 TC 549. But last January, a majority of the court overruled Schairer, and the fourth circuit has just affirmed. *Bradley* v. *Comm.*, paragraph 63–5259, affirming 39 TC 652 (No. 64); see paragraph 32,050. The loss-cutting payments are now regarded as incentive pay, fully taxable to the employee.

THE NEW EMPLOYEE

Now say you have to move to take a new job with another company. Even before the Tax Court overruled Schairer, it refused to apply the rule of that case to new employees. *Arthur J. Kobacker*, 37 TC 882.

ROUNDING OUT THE PICTURE

If your boss gives you some money to help pay for a house at the new jobsite, that's income. *Rinehart* and *Le Grand*, paragraph 7031(20).

HERE'S A WAY OUT

If you face a loss, try to sell to your boss for a reasonable price, possibly your cost. That way, you'll cut down your loss with little risk of tax. And your boss is better off, too. With more time to resell, he has a better chance than you of breaking even or, perhaps, winding up with a profit. But make sure you back up the deal with an appraisal of value by a competent expert. That's to ward off any IRS claim that the sale wasn't at arm's length.

THE NEW TAX BILL

Section 212 of the new bill changes some of the rules for ordinary moving expenses (transportation of property and traveling expenses). It doesn't apply to losses on the sale of property.

Under current law, the distinction between an old and new employee is still recognized in the area of ordinary moving expenses. So if the employer pays these expenses, it's tax free to the old employee, taxable to the new. Section 212 would change this; give the new employee much the same tax break as the old.

For related material, see paragraph 7031 (15) and (20).

Mr. McCARTHY submitted four amendments (Nos. 376, 377, 378, and

379), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8363, supra, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE AGING

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the President pro tempore, the Chair appoints the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] as a member of the Special Committee on the Aging, vice the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

BOARD OF VISITORS, AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to section 9355 of title X, United States Code, the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] as members of the Board of Visitors of the Air Force Academy.

RESIDENCE FOR CONGRESSIONAL PAGES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 1847, to establish a residence for congressional pages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] be added as a cosponsor to amendment No. 329, providing income tax credit for college expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 19, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 212. An act for the relief of Yoo Sei Chun;

S. 697. An act for the relief of Misako Moriya;

S. 966. An act for the relief of Yukio Iseri;

S. 1097. An act for the relief of Despina J. Sanios;

S. 1129. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Bollers and Earlene Bollers;

S. 1172. An act to amend Public Law 86-518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86-518;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of the Arizona Milling Co. of Phoenix, Ariz.;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Dr. Demetrios Flessas and Dr. Eugenia Flessas;

S. 1516. An act for the relief of Ana Murgelj;

S. 1570. An act for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock;

S. 1698. An act to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds;

S. 1756. An act to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under this act;

S. 1767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the State of Delaware, and for other purposes;

S. 2228. An act to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks;

S. 2275. An act to revise the procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act, Public Law 86-3, for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; and

S. 2364. An act to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the postmaster nominations. All the nominations on the Executive Calendar are postmaster nominations.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Twenty-one postmaster nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the postmaster nominations will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Mr. Thomas C. Mann, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, which was reported today.

The committee approved the nomination unanimously. All the members who were available have been polled.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I made a long speech today on the Alliance for Progress, based upon the supposition that Tom Mann would become the Assistant Secretary. I could not think of a better thing the President could do. I am pleased that the Senator is bringing up the nomination at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The committee reported it unanimously. We wanted to bring this nomination before the Senate before the Senate adjourned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas C. Mann to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the President will be notified forthwith.

REQUEST FOR SENATORS' RECOMMENDATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask the two Senators from each State to be prompt in submitting their recommendations in regard to postmaster nominations to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to enable it to approve them this afternoon, or before the session ends.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

"SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK"

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 113) to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week," which was, to strike out the preamble.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

U.S. CUSTOMS YEAR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 680, requesting the President to designate 1964 as "U.S. Customs Year."

I have consulted with all the members of the subcommittee. As I have said, the President would be requested to designate 1964 as U.S. Customs Year because it is the 175th anniversary of the establishment of the Customs Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 680) requesting the President to designate 1964 as "U.S. Customs Year," which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 680) was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

HANNAH ROBBINS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1838) for the relief of Hannah Robbins, which was, in line 8, after "Act" insert ": *Provided*, That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on October 1, 1963, the Senate passed S. 1838, to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who is afflicted with epilepsy in behalf of the wife of a U.S. citizen member of the Armed Forces.

On December 17, 1963, the House of Representatives passed S. 1838, with an amendment to provide that if the beneficiary is not entitled to care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act that a suitable and proper bond be deposited as a guarantee that the beneficiary will not become a public charge.

Although the beneficiary is eligible for care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act, the amendment is acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 1838.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which were, on, page 2, after line 15, insert "A-12262419, Gee, Poy Jam."; on page 2, after line 15, insert "A-12358543, Lum, Cheung Yuen."; on page 2, after line 15, insert "A-11894360, Rodriguez-Blanco, Jose.", and on page 3, after line 7, insert "A-8538601, Wittenber, Jan Peter."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on August 20, 1963, the Senate agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 57 to approve the action of the Attorney General in granting suspension of deportation to certain deportable aliens.

On December 17, 1963, the House of Representatives agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, with amendments to add three cases inadvertently not included by the Senate, and to restore one case previously approved by the Senate and held by the House of Representatives.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Concurrent Resolution 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

MRS. SUSANNA GRÜN (SUSANNE ROTH)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1096) for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grün (Susanne Roth) which was, in line 6, strike out "section 101(b)(27)(B)" and insert "section 101(a)(27)(B)".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on October 1, 1963, the Senate passed S. 1096, to grant the beneficiary nonquota status as a returning resident alien. As thereafter referred to the House of Representatives, the bill contained an error in printing.

On December 17, 1963, the House of Representatives passed S. 1096, with an amendment to correct this error.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 1096.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

MRS. JOYCE MARK BOUVIER

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1014) for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier, which were on page 2, after line 3, insert:

> SEC. 2. Upon the naturalization of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier, as provided for in the Act, her child, Paula Bouvier, shall be held and considered to be a national and citizen of the United States pursuant to section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, subject to the provisions of section 301(b) of the said Act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier and Paula Bouvier."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on June 11, 1963, the Senate passed S. 1014, to provide for restoration of U.S. citizenship to the beneficiary.

On December 17, 1963, the House of Representatives passed S. 1014, with amendments to provide that the youngest child of the beneficiary shall acquire U.S. citizenship upon the naturalization of her mother.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE, MICHIGAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 791, S. 792.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 792) to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 11, after the word "water", to strike out "depicted on the map identified as numbered NS–SBD 7000, 'Proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Seashore', dated June 15, 1961, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior," and insert "described in section 12 of this Act and generally depicted in a map identified as NPS–101–SB which is on file in the office of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior,"; in line 20, after the word "Lakeshore.", to strike out "An exact copy of such map shall be filed for publication in the Federal Register within thirty days following the date of enactment of this Act."; on page 5, line 4, after the word "Secretary,", to strike out "with the approval of" and insert "after consultation with"; in line 8, after the word "and", to strike out "enjoyment. The Secretary shall, after consultation with such department," and insert "enjoyment and"; in line 11, after the word "section.", to strike out "The Secretary shall enter into agreement with the Michigan Department of Conservation providing for concurrent jurisdiction over the enforcement of the applicable hunting and fishing laws of Michigan."; on page 7, line 4, after the word "area", to strike out "depicted on the map referred to in section 2" and insert "defined in section 12"; in line 22, after the word "evidence,", to strike out "subject to the availability of funds,"; in line 24, after the word "value.", to strike out "In the event the owner and the Secretary cannot agree as to the fair market value, then, if the owner so requests, the United States district court, within whose jurisdiction such property is located, shall appoint three qualified persons who shall make an independent appraisal to determine the fair market value of such property and report such amount to the parties concerned and to the court. All costs of such appraisal shall be borne by the property owner."; on page 8, line 21, after the word "purchase.", to strike out "In the event the owner of such property and the Secretary cannot agree as to the fair market value of such property, then, if the owner so requests, the United States district court, within whose jurisdiction such property is situated, shall appoint three qualified persons who shall make an independent appraisal to determine the fair market value of such property and report such amount to the parties concerned and to the court. All costs of such appraisal shall be borne by the United States. In any case in which condemnation proceedings (where authorized under this Act) are initiated by the Secretary, no condemnation shall be ordered by the court in connection with such proceedings, if the Secretary fails to demonstrate to the court by substantial evidence that (1) he has specific authority under this Act to initiate such condemnation proceedings, and (2) he has complied with the provisions of this subsection and all other applicable provisions of this Act. If condemnation is thereafter ordered by the court, the owner of such property so condemned shall be paid the fair market value thereof as determined by the court entering such order."; on page 10, line 20, after the word "property", to strike out "situated within an inland lakeshore residential area or improved property located within an" and insert "within the"; on page 11, line 1, after the word "any", to strike out "such" and insert "improved"; in line 5, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to strike out "such" and insert "improved"; in line 8, after the word "any", to strike out "such" and insert "improved"; on page 13, line 15, after the word "any", to strike out "property" and insert "property, including improved property as defined in this Act,"; in line 17, after the word "within", to strike out "any inland lakeshore residential" and insert "the lakeshore"; in line 22, after the word "property", to strike out "lines;" and insert "lines."; at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "(5) provide that no moving, alteration, reconstruction, or enlargement of any improved property within the lakeshore area shall be permitted, if such moving, alteration, reconstruction, or enlargement would afford less than a 50-foot setback from all streets measured at a right angle with the street line, and 25-foot distance from the abutters' property lines, any" and insert "Any"; on page 14, at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "(6)" and insert "(5)"; in line 23, after the word "of", to insert "improved"; in line 24, after the word "within", to strike out "an inland lakeshore residential area or of improved property located within"; on page 16, line 5, after the word "before", to strike out "July 1, 1961," and insert "December 31, 1962,"; on page 17, after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 12. (a) Inland lakeshore residential areas are established under this Act to stabilize and protect the existing character and uses of the properties within these areas in order to preserve the scenic vistas and shorelines around the inland lakes. Except as provided in section 9, the Secretary is prohibited from acquiring any property within the inland lakeshore residential areas by condemnation.

(b) In addition to the areas described in subsection (d), additional acreage may be designated for inclusion in inland lakeshores residential areas, except that the total combined acreage of all inland lakeshore residential areas shall not exceed, in the aggregate, 3,500 acres. This additional acreage shall be in close proximity to the shorelines of the inland lakes, or the areas described in subsection (d), but in no event shall any additional acreage be added under this subsection if the effect of such addition would be to include substantially the entire shoreline of an inland lake within an inland lake residential area. This designation shall be made by the Secretary only upon recommendation and after consultation with the Lakeshore Advisory Commission.

(c) No new public use or access areas shall be opened or developed in the inland lakeshore residential areas by the Secretary for a period of twenty-five years from the establishment of the lakeshore.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "inland lakeshore residential area" means in part the following described areas together with adjacent waters:

PLATTE LAKE INLAND LAKESHORE RESIDENTIAL AREA NUMBERED 1

Beginning at the point of intersection of the east line of section 36, township 27 north, range 15 west with the south shore of Little Platte Lake, thence south to the northeast corner of section 1, township 26 north, range 15 west thence west along the north line of section 1 to the point of intersection with the east one-sixteenth longitudinal line of section 1, thence south along the east one-sixteenth longitudinal line to its point of intersection with the east right of way of Deadstream Road, thence southeasterly along the east right of way of Deadstream Road a distance of one-quarter mile, then due west to the shore of Platte Lake, thence northwesterly along the shore of Platte Lake to its point of intersection with the east one-sixteenth longitudinal line of section 27, township 27 north, range 15 west, thence continuing westerly along the shore of Platte Lake a distance of 300 feet, thence north to the south right of way of Michigan Highway 22, thence easterly along the south right of way of Michigan Highway 22 to a point of intersection with the east right of way with Deadstream Road, thence continuing easterly along the south right of way of Michigan Highway 22 of 250 feet, thence continuing south and southeasterly along a line 250 feet distant from and parallel to the east right of way of Deadstream Road until said line intersects the west line of section 27, township 27 north, range 15 west, thence south to the east right of way of Deadstream Road, thence continuing southeasterly along the east right of way of Deadstream Road to a point on the east right of way of Deadstream Road which point is northwesterly 1,600 feet long the east right of way of Deadstream Road from the point of intersection of the east right of way of Deadstream Road and the east line of section 35, township 27 north, range 15 west, thence north 25 degrees east to the south shore of Little Platte Lake, thence southeasterly along the south shore of Little Platte Lake to point of beginning.

PLATTE LAKE INLAND LAKESHORE RESIDENTIAL AREA NUMBERED 2

Beginning at a point on the south line of section 34, township 27 north, range 15 west, which point is 660 feet east of the southwest corner of section 34, thence east 1,056 feet, thence north to shore of Platte Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore of Platte Lake to its point of intersection with the north line of section 12, township 27 north, range 15 west, thence west along the north line of section 12 to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter, northwest quarter, section 12, thence south a distance of 1,320 feet more or less to south right-of-way of a public highway, thence westerly along the south right-of-way of said public highway to the east line of section 11, township 26 north, range 15 west, thence south on east line of section 11 to the northeast corner, southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter, section 11, thence west 660 feet, thence north 660 feet, thence west 660 feet, thence north to a point 300 feet south of north line of section 11, thence west to the west line of section 11, thence north 300 feet more or less to the south right-of-way of a public highway, thence northwesterly along the south right-of-way of said public highway to its point of intersection with the east-west quarter line of section 3, township 26 north, range 15 west, thence west along the east-west quarter line to a point 660 feet east of the northwest corner northwest quarter southwest quarter, section 3, thence north to point of beginning.

PLATTE LAKE INLAND LAKESHORE RESIDENTIAL AREA NUMBERED 3

Beginning at a point on the east line of section 33, township 27 north, range 15 west, which point is 1,056 feet north of the southeast corner of section 33, thence west 330 feet more or less to the north right-of-way of a public highway, thence west along the north right-of-way of said public highway to its point of intersection with the east sixteenth longitudinal line of section 33, thence north to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter southeast quarter of section 33, thence east to the shore of Platte Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore of Platte Lake to its point of intersection with the east line of section 33, thence south along the east line of section 33 to point of beginning.

PLATTE LAKE INLAND LAKESHORE RESIDENTIAL AREA NUMBERED 4

Beginning at the point of intersection of the west line of section 27, township 27 north, range 15 west with the south right-of-way of Michigan Highway 22, thence northeasterly along the south right-of-way of Michigan Highway 22 to its point of intersection with the west sixteenth longitudinal line of section 27, thence south along the west sixteenth longitudinal line to the southwest corner, northeast quarter southwest quarter of section 27, thence east 500 feet, thence south to the north shore of Platte Lake, thence southwesterly along the shore of Platte Lake to its point of intersection with the north sixteenth latitudinal line of section 33, township 27 north, range 15 west, thence west 200 feet along the north sixteenth latitudinal line of section 33, thence north to the north line of section 33, thence east to the southwest corner of section 27, township 27 north, range 15 west, thence north along the west line of section 27 to point of beginning.

LITTLE TRAVERSE LAKE INLAND LAKESHORE RESIDENTIAL AREA NUMBERED 1

Beginning at the point of intersection of the north shore of Little Traverse Lake with the north-south quarter section line of section 10, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence north along the north-south quarter section line a distance of 280 feet, more or less, to the north right-of-way of a public road encircling the north shore of Little Traverse Lake, thence easterly along the north right-of-way of said public road to point where it intersects the north-south quarter section line of section 12, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence west to the shore of Little Traverse Lake, thence westerly along the north shore of Little Traverse Lake to point of beginning.

LITTLE TRAVERSE LAKE INLAND LAKESHORE RESIDENTIAL AREA NUMBERED 2

Beginning at the point of intersection of the south shore of Little Traverse Lake with the east line of section 14, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south along the east line of section 14 to its intersection with the south right-of-way of Michigan Highway 22, thence westerly along the south right-of-way of Michigan Highway 22 to its point of intersection with the north-south quarter section line of section 14, thence south on the north-south quarter section line to its intersection with the east-west quarter section line, thence west on the east-west quarter section line to the west line of section 14, thence north on the west line of section 14 to the south shore of Little Traverse Lake to point of beginning.

GLEN LAKE INLAND LAKESHORE RESIDENTIAL AREA

Section 31, township 29 north, range 13 west

Beginning at the intersection of the south line of section 31 with the east right-of-way of County Highway 675, thence northerly along east right-of-way of County Highway 675 to the point of intersection with the west line of the southeast quarter of fractional northwest quarter, thence due north 880 feet more or less along the west sixteenth longitudinal line to the south right-of-way of a road running northeasterly across the northeast quarter of fractional northwest quarter, thence along south right-of-way to a point 100 feet west of the north-south quarter section line, thence north to the north line of section 31, thence west along the north section line, section 31 to point of intersection with the east right-of-way of County Highway 675.

Section 30, township 29 north, range 13 west

Thence along the east right-of-way of County Highway 675 across the extreme southwest corner of section 30, township 29 north, range 13 west.

Section 36, township 29 north, range 14 west

Thence continuing along east right-of-way of County Highway 675 across the extreme northeast corner of fractional section 36.

Section 25, township 29 north, range 14 west

Thence northerly along the east right-of way of County Highway 675 to the north line of section 25.

Section 24, township 29 north, range 14 west

Thence continuing northwesterly along the east right-of-way of County Highway 675 to the projected intersection of the west right-of-way of a north-south county road in the northwest quarter southwest quarter of section 25, thence southerly along the north-south county road to the south line of section 24.

Section 25, township 29 north, range 14 west

Thence south along the east right-of-way of said county road 1,110 feet more or less to intersection with an east-west county road, thence westerly along the north right-of-way of the east-west county road to the west line of section 25, township 29 north, range 14 west.

Section 26, township 29 north, range 14 west

Thence continuing westerly along the north right-of-way of said county road from the east line of section 26 to a point where the north right-of-way intersects the north line Government lot 3 to section 26, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence west along north line of Government lot 3 to the west line of section 26, township 29 north, range 14 west.

Section 27, township 29 north, range 14 west

Thence west along the north line of Government lot 1 to the northwest corner of Government lot 1, thence south on the west line of lot 1 to the south right-of-way of Lake Street, thence south along the south right-of-way of Lake Street to the intersection of a north-south county road, thence southwesterly along the west right-of-way of said county road to its intersection with Michigan Highway 22, thence across M22 to the west right-of-way, thence southwesterly along the west right-of-way of M22 to the south line of section 27, township 29 north, range 14 west.

Section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west

Thence west along the north line of section 34 to a point which is 400 feet west of the northeast corner of Government lot 1, section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south 200 feet, thence west 430 feet, thence south 805 feet, thence west 485 feet more or less to the west line of Government lot 1, thence south on the west line of Government lot 1 to the southwest corner Government lot 1, thence east 144 feet more or less to a point 661.49 west of the northeast corner of Government lot 2, section 55, township 29 north, range 14 west.

Thence south 8 degrees 45 minutes west 131.9 feet, thence north 81 degrees 02 minutes west 335.0 feet, thence south 8 degrees 45 minutes west 100 feet, thence south 30 degrees 37 minutes west 149 feet, thence south 89 degrees 38 minutes west 225.0 feet, thence south 18 degrees 13 minutes west 235 feet, thence north 71 degrees 30 minutes west 45 feet, thence south 18 degrees 30 minutes west 450 feet, thence south 71 degrees 30 minutes east 400 feet, thence south to the south line Government lot 2, thence east on the south line of Government lot 2 to a point 418.35 feet east of Glen Lake on the south line of Government lot 2.

Thence south 15 degrees 43 minutes west 100 feet, thence west 50 feet, thence south 2 degrees 59 minutes west 1,100.12 feet, thence west 43.1 feet, thence south 200 feet, thence west 50 feet, thence south 775 feet, thence west 225 feet, thence south 434 feet to the south line of section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence east along the south line of section 34 to the west right-of-way of Michigan Highway 22.

Section 3, township 28 north, range 14 west

Thence south 24 degrees 36 minutes west to a point on the west right-of-way of M22 directly opposite a point on the centerline of M22 which is south 24 degrees 36 minutes west 387.4 feet from the north line of section 3, thence north 65 degrees west to a point which is 228.27 feet from the centerline of M22, thence south 25 degrees west 100 feet, thence south 65 degrees east 46.17 feet, thence south 25 degrees west 225 feet, thence north 65 degrees west 400 feet, thence south 27 degrees 15 minutes west 130 feet more or less to the north right-of-way of a public road listed as Forest Glen Road. Thence northwesterly along the north right-of-way of public road to the west line of section 3, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence south along west line of section 3 to the south right-of-way of said public road.

Section 4, township 28 north, range 14 west, and section 33, township 29 north, range 14 west

Thence north 61 degrees 39 minutes west 186 feet along south right-of-way of said public road, thence south 16 degrees 28 minutes west 351.77 feet to the shore of Glen Lake, thence north 67 degrees 41 minutes west 200 feet, thence north 63 degrees 10 minutes west 160.48 feet, thence north 50 degrees 39 minutes west 39.52 feet, thence north 38 degrees 00 minutes east 367.16 feet to south right-of-way of public road, thence northwesterly along the south right-of-way of said public road to the west line of section 32.

Section 32, township 29 north, range 14 west

Thence continuing northwesterly along the south right-of-way of said public road to the north line of section 32, thence west along the north line of section 32 to the shore of Glen Lake.

Section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west

Thence continuing northwesterly along the shore of Glen Lake from the intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the south line of section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, to a point of intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the east line of Government lot 2, thence north along the east line of Government lot 2 to the south sixteenth latitudinal line, thence west along the south sixteenth latitudinal line to its intersection with the west line of Government lot 2, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south on the west line of Government lot 2 to the shore of Glen Lake.

Thence westerly and southerly along the shore of Glen Lake to a point of 664.77 feet east and 1,308.75 feet north of the southwest corner of Government lot 1, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north 89 degrees 39 minutes west 236.33 feet to the east right-of-way of Michigan Highway 109, thence southerly along the east right-of-way to a stake on the east right-of-way of M109 located north 345.5 feet and north 89 degrees 12 minutes east 1,190 feet from the northwest corner of Government lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west.

Thence from stake on east right-of-way of M109 north 89 degrees 12 minutes east 229.5 feet, thence south 18 degrees 03 minutes west 400.0 feet.

Section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west

Thence south 89 degrees 12 minutes west 1,242.0 feet to the west line of Government lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south along the west lines of Government lost 1, 2, and 3, section 31, to the southwest corner of Government lot 3, thence east on south line of Government lot 3 to the west right-of-way of M109 thence south-easterly along the west right-of-way to its intersection with the east line of section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north along east line of section 31 to the shore of Glen Lake.

Section 32, township 29 north, range 14 west

Thence from the intersection of the south shore of Glen Lake with the west line of section 32, township 29 north, range 14 west, southeasterly along the shore of Glen Lake to intersection with the south line of section 32.

Section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west

Thence from the intersection of the north line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west, and the south shore of Glen Lake southeasterly along the shore of Glen Lake to its intersection with the east line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west.

Section 4, township 28 north, range 14 west

Thence from the point of intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the west line of section 4, township 28 north, range 14 west, south on the west line of section 4 to the south right-of-way of a public road lying on the south line of Government lot 5, thence east along south right-of-way of said public road to its intersection with Michigan Highway 22, thence east across M22 to the south right-of-way, thence northeasterly along M22 to a point 476.5 feet west and 1,519.0 feet north of the southeast corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 4, thence south 400 feet, thence east 476.5 feet, thence north on the east line of the southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 4, to a point of intersection with the south sixteenth latitudinal line, thence east on the south sixteenth latitudinal line to a point on the west boundary of a cemetery which point is north 89 degrees west 222.75 feet from the intersection of the south sixteenth latitudinal line with the east line of section 4, thence south to the southwest corner of said cemetery, thence south 89 degrees east 222.75 feet to the west line of section 4, thence continuing east on the same bearing 33 feet more or less to east right-of-way of a public highway.

Section 3, township 28 north, range 14 west

Thence north to a point 554.2 feet south and 33 feet east of the meander corner at the north end of the west line of section 3, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east 233.0 feet, thence north 374.14 feet to centerline of a public highway, thence south 69 degrees 55 minutes east 49.01 feet, thence north 0 degree 47 minutes west 11.3 feet, thence east to north right-of-way of said public highway, thence southeasterly along north right-of-way of said highway to its intersection with the south right-of-way of a private road listed on the plot of McFarlane Woods numbered 2 as Beech Tree Road, thence southeasterly along the south right-of-way of Beech Tree Road to the northeast corner of lot numbered 14 of McFarlane Woods numbered 2, thence north 37 degrees 24 minutes east to the shore of Glen Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore of Glen Lake the intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the south line of section 3, township 28 north, range 14 west.

Section 10, township 28 north, range 14 west

Thence from the intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the north line of section 10, township 28 north, range 14 west, and continuing southeasterly along the shore of Glen Lake to the east line of section 10.

Section 11, township 28 north, range 14 west

Thence continuing from the intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the west line of section 11, township 28 north, range 14 west, southeasterly along the shore of Glen Lake south 54 degrees 28 minutes east 525.6 feet, thence south 66 degrees 33 minutes east 900 feet, thence south to the north line of the southeast quarter southwest quarter, thence east to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter southwest quarter, thence north along the west line of the northwest quarter southeast quarter 726.0 feet, thence east 538.56 feet to centerline of highway, thence east to a point 626.0 feet west of the east line of section 11, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence north 544.5 feet more or less to south right-of-way of County Road 616, thence east along highway to the east line of section 11.

Section 12, township 28 north, range 14 west

Thence continuing east from the west line of section 12, township 28 north, range 14 west along the south right-of-way of County Road 616 to a point where the south right-of-way intersects the east-west quarter section line, thence continuing east to a point 2,090.0 feet east of northwest corner of the northwest quarter southwest quarter, thence north 5 degrees 02 minutes west to the south right-of-way of County Road 616, thence northeasterly along the south right-of-way of County Road 616 to a point where the south right-of-way bears north 11 degrees 22 minutes west, thence northerly along the east right-of-way of County Road 616 to the southwest corner of the village of Burdickville, thence north 52 degrees east along the south boundary of the village of Burdickville to the west right-of-way of Division Street, thence south 51 degrees east 22.0 feet, thence south 9 degrees west 244 feet, thence south 81 degrees east 165 feet, thence south 9 degrees west 20 feet, thence south 81 degrees east 148.5 feet, thence north 9 degrees east 264.0 feet to the south right-of-way of a public road, thence north 81 degrees west 148.5 feet along south right-of-way of said public road, thence northerly to a point on the north right-of-way directly opposite the point on the south right-of-way, thence north 112 feet to a point which is 257.7 feet east of the east right-of-way of Division Street on the north line of section 12, township 28 north, range 14 west.

Section 1, township 28 north, range 14 west

Thence beginning at a point 380.08 feet west of the southeast corner of Government lot 2, section 1, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence north 13.13 feet, thence north 42 degrees 35 minutes west to the south right-of-way of County Road 675, thence northeasterly along the south right-of-way of County Road 675 to its intersection with lot numbered 18 of "Billmans Pioneer Park", thence south 117.5 feet, thence continuing northeasterly along the south lines of lots numbered 18 to numbered 1 of "Billmans Pioneer Park" to a point of intersection with the east line of Government lot 2, section 1, township 28 north, range 14 west.

Section 6, township 28 north, range 13 west

Thence north 48 degrees east 110 feet, thence north 42 degrees west 115 feet, to west line of section 6, thence north along west section line to the east right-of-way of County Highway 675, thence northeasterly along County Highway 675 to the north line of section 6, township 28 north, range 13 west, and point of beginning.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 12. The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore shall consist of the following described areas together with adjacent waters:

SOUTH MANITOU ISLAND

(a) All of an island in Lake Michigan officially designated as South Manitou Island lying in townships 30 and 31 north, range 15 west, and adjacent waters for one-quarter mile offshore.

GOOD HARBOR—SLEEPING BEAR BAY AREA

(b) Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at the northern line of section 6, township 29 north, range 12 west, and continuing east along said line to the east line of said section and thence south along the said east boundary to the south boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the north-south quarter section line of section 7, township 29 north, range 12 west,

thence south along said quarter section line to the east-west quarter section line of said section, thence west along said quarter section line and east-west quarter section line of section 12, township 29 north, range 13 west to the north right-of-way of a public road following the north shore of Little Traverse Lake,

thence in a general westerly direction along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southwest quarter of section 10, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 22, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west along the north boundary of said section to the northwest corner of the section, thence south along the west boundary of said section to the east-west quarter-quarter line of the northeast quarter of section 21, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west to the west boundary of said section, thence north to the northeast corner of section 17, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence west to the northwest corner of section 18, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the southeast corner of section 24, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence west along the south boundary of said section to the east right-of-way of county highway 675, thence continuing northwesterly along said right-of-way to the projected intersection of the west right-of-way of a north-south county road in the northwest quarter, southwest quarter of section 24,

thence southerly along the said right-of-way to the south line of section 24, thence west to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southwest quarter of section 23, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said quarter section, thence east to the north-south quarter section line of said section.

thence north to the south boundary of section 14, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence east along said south boundary to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southeast quarter of said section,

thence north to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of said section, thence west 660 feet, thence north to the north boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the shore of Lake Michigan,

thence offshore one quarter mile perpendicular to the shore, thence along said shore in a general easterly direction at a distance of one quarter mile perpendicular to the shore to a point one quarter mile offshore perpendicular of the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

PLATTE BAY AREA

(c) Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at the northern line of section 6, township 29 north, range 12 west, and continuing east along said line to the east line of said section and thence south along the said east boundary to the south boundary of said section,

thence west along said boundary to the north-south quarter section line of section 7, township 29 north, range 12 west, thence south along said quarter section line to the east-west quarter section line of said section,

thence west along said quarter section line and east-west quarter section line of section 12, township 29 north, range 13 west to the north right-of-way of a public road following the north shore of Little Traverse Lake,

thence in a general westerly direction along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southwest quarter of section 10, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 22, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west along the north boundary of said section to the northwest corner of the section, thence south along the west boundary of said section to the east-west quarter-quarter line of the northeast quarter of section 21, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west to the west boundary of said section, thence north to the northeast corner of section 17, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence west to the northwest corner of section 18, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the southeast corner of section 24, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence west along the south boundary of said section to the east right-of-way of county highway 675,

thence continuing northwesterly along said right-of-way to the projected intersection of the west right-of-way of a north-south county road in the northwest quarter southwest quarter of section 24,

thence southerly along the said right-of-way to the south line of section 24 thence west to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southwest quarter of section 23, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said quarter section, thence east to the north-south quarter section line of said section,

thence north to the south boundary of section 14, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence east along said south boundary to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southeast quarter of said section,

thence north to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of said section, thence west 660 feet, thence north to the north boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the shore of Lake Michigan, thence offshore one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore,

thence along said shore in a general easterly direction at a distance of one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore to a point one-quarter mile offshore perpendicular of the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at a point 1,491 feet due east of the west boundary of section 21, township 29 north, range 14 west and running south to the south boundary of said section, thence running east to north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northwest quarter section of section 27, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said quarter section, thence east to the west right-of-way of monument 22, thence south along said west right-of-way to the north line of section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence west along the north line of section 34 to a point which is 400 feet west of the northeast corner of Government lot 1, section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south 200 feet, thence west 430 feet, thence south 805 feet,

thence west 485 feet more or less to the west line of Government lot 1, thence south on the west line of Government lot 1 to the southwest corner of Government lot 1, thence east 144 feet more or less to a point 661.49 feet west of the northeast corner of Government lot 2, section 55, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence south 8 degrees 45 minutes west 131.9 feet, thence north 81 degrees 02 minutes west 335.0 feet, thence south 8 degrees 45 minutes west 100 feet, thence south 30 degrees 37 minutes west 149 feet, thence south 89 degrees 38 minutes west 225.0 feet,

thence south 18 degrees 13 minutes west 235 feet, thence north 71 degrees 30 minutes west 45 feet, thence south 18 degrees 30 minutes west 450 feet,

thence south 71 degrees 30 minutes east 400 feet, thence south to the south line of Government lot 2, thence east on the south line of Government lot 2 to a point 418.35 feet east of Glen Lake on the south line of Government lot 2,

thence south 15 degrees 43 minutes west 100 feet, thence west 50 feet, thence south 2 degrees 59 minutes west 1,100.12 feet, thence west 43.1 feet, thence south 200 feet, thence west 50 feet, thence south 775 feet, thence west 225 feet, thence south 434 feet to the south line of section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence west along the south line of section 34 to the east line of section 4, thence south along said east line to the north right-of-way of Forest Glen Road,

thence northwesterly along the north right-of-way of said public road to the north line of section 32, thence west along the north line of section 32 to the shore of Glen Lake,

thence continuing northwesterly along the shore of Glen Lake from the intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the south line of section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, to a point of intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the east line of Government lot 2,

thence north along the east line of Government lot 2 to the south sixteenth latitudinal line, thence west along the south sixteenth latitudinal line to its intersection with the west line of Government lot 2, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south on the west line of Government lot 2 to the shore of Glen Lake,

thence westerly and southerly along the shore of Glen Lake to a point 664.77 feet east and 1,308.75 feet north of the southwest corner of Government lot 1, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north 89 degrees 39 minutes west 236.33 feet to the east right-of-way of Michigan Highway 109,

thence southerly along the east right-of-way to a stake on the east right-of-way of monument 109 located north 345.5 feet and north 89 degrees 12 minutes east 1,190 feet from the northwest corner of Government lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence from stake on east right-of-way of monument 109 north 89 degrees 12 minutes east 229.5 feet, thence south 18 degrees 03 minutes west 400.0 feet,

thence south 89 degrees 12 minutes west 1,242.0 feet to the west line of Government lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south along the west lines of Government lots 1, 2, and 3, section 31, to the southwest corner of Government lot 3,

thence east on south line of Government lot 3 to the west right-of-way of monument 109, thence southeasterly along the west right-of-way to its intersection with the north line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east along the north line of section 5 to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 5,

thence by a straight line in a southeasterly direction to the intersection of the east line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west, and the south right-of-way of a public road lying on the south line of Government lot 5,

thence east along south right-of-way of said public road to its intersection with Michigan Highway 22, thence east across monument 22 to the south right-of-way, thence northeasterly along monument 22 to a point 476.5 feet west and 1,519.0 feet north of the southeast corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 4,

thence south 400 feet, thence east 476.5 feet, thence north on the east line of the southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 4, to a point of intersection with the south sixteenth latitudinal line,

thence east on the south sixteenth latitudinal line to a point on the west boundary of a cemetery which point is north 89 degrees west 222.75 feet from the intersection of the south sixteenth latitudinal line with the east line of section 4,

thence south to the southwest corner of said cemetery, thence south 89 degrees east 222.75 feet to the west line of section 4, thence continuing east on the same bearing 33 feet more or less to east right-of-way of a public highway,

thence north to a point 554.2 feet south and 33 feet east of the meader corner at the north end of the west line of section 3, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east 233.0 feet, thence north 374.14 feet to centerline of a public highway, thence south 69 degrees 55 minutes east 49.01 feet,

thence north 0 degree 47 minutes west 11.3 feet, thence east to north right-of-way of said public highway, thence southeasterly along north right-of-way of said highway to its intersection with the south right-of-way of a private road listed on the plot of McFarlane Woods numbered 2 as Beech Tree Road,

thence southeasterly along the south right-of-way of Beech Tree Road to the northeast corner of lot numbered 14 of McFarlane Woods numbered 2, thence north 37 degrees 24 minutes east to the shore of Glen Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore of Glen Lake to a point 1,850 feet due east of the west line of section 11,

thence south to the east-west quarter section line of section 14, thence west to the north-south quarter section line of section 18, thence south to the north line of section 19, thence west along north line of section 19 approximately 1,200 feet to a point north of northeast corner of Empire corporate line,

thence south approximately 1,300 feet to the northeast corner of Empire corporate line, thence west along said corporate line approximately 1,800 feet to the east shoreline of South Bar Lake, thence meandering in a general southwesterly direction along shoreline approximately 1,500 feet to a point,

thence south approximately 3,600 feet to a point along the corporate boundary line, thence east approximately 2,300 feet to the southeast corner of said corporate line, thence north to the north line of section 30, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter section of said section.

thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said section, thence east to the east line of said section, thence south to the southeast corner of said section, thence west to the north-south quarter section line of section 31, thence south to the north line of section 18, township 27 north, range 14 west,

thence east to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of said section, thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of section 19,

thence west to a point 500 feet perpendicular to, in a general easterly direction, monument numbered 22 and continuing along 500 feet from monument numbered 22 in a general westerly direction to a point 1,500 feet west of the east line of section 31, township 27 north, range 15 west, thence north to the southerly right-of-way of monument numbered 22,

thence westerly along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of section 36, township 27 north, range 16 west, thence south to the east-west quarter section line of said section, thence east to the shore of Long Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore to the east line of said section.

thence south to a point 1,000 feet south of the south line of said section, thence west to the west line of section 1, township 26 north, range 16 west, thence north to the shore of Lake Michigan, thence perpendicular to the shore one-quarter mile,

thence following along the shore at a perpendicular distance of one-quarter mile to a point one-quarter mile offshore perpendicular to the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to a point of beginning.

SCENIC PARKWAY

(d) In order to facilitate visitor travel, provide scenic overlooks for public enjoyment and interpretation of the national lakeshore and related features, and in order to enhance recreational opportunities, the Secretary is authorized to construct and administer as a part of the national lakeshore scenic roads of parkway standards generally located in accordance with the parkway zone designated on map numbered NPS–101–SB. Such scenic roads shall include necessary connections, bridges, and other structural utilities. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary may procure for this purpose land, or interest therein, by donation, purchase with appropriated or donated funds, or otherwise: *Provided*, That land and interests so procured shall not exceed one hundred and fifty acres per mile of scenic road, except that tracts may be procured in their entirety in order to avoid severances. Property so acquired in excess of the acreage limitation provided in this section may be exchanged by the Secretary for any land of approximately equal value authorized for acquisition by this Act.

On page 48, line 11, after the word "on", to strike out "July 1, 1961," and insert "December 31, 1962,"; on page 49, line 2, after the word "such", to strike out "sums" and insert "sums, not to exceed $4,750,000,", and in line 3, after the word "necessary", to strike out "to carry out the provisions of this Act" and insert "for acquisition of properties under the provisions of this Act"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, **That (a) in order to stabilize and preserve for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreational use, and enjoyment of the public a significant portion of the diminishing shoreline of the United States and its related geographic and scientific features, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to take appropriate action, as herein provided, to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.**

(b) In preserving the lakeshore and stabilizing its development, substantial reliance shall be placed on cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments to apply sound principles of land use planning and zoning. In developing the lakeshore full recognition shall be given to protecting the private properties for the enjoyment of the owners.

SEC. 2. The area comprising that particular land and water described in section 12 of this Act and generally depicted in a map identified as NPS–101–SB which is on file in the office of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, is hereby designated for establishment as the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage within the boundaries of the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Advisory Commission.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of ten members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) Four members to be appointed from recommendations made by the counties in which the lakeshore is situated, two members to represent each such county;

(2) Four members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Michigan; and

(3) Two members to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under the Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the lakeshore and with respect to the provisions of sections 9, 12, and 13 of this Act.

(f) Any member of the Commission appointed under this Act shall be exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (g) of this section.

(g) The exemption granted by subsection (f) of this section shall not extend—

(1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment; or

(2) during the period of such appointment, and the further period of two years after the termination thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his appointment during the period of such appointment.

SEC. 5. In administering the lakeshore the Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction in accordance with the laws of Michigan. The Secretary, after consultation with the Michigan Department of Conservation, may designate zones and establish periods where and when no hunting shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment and issue regulations, consistent with this section, as he may determine necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

SEC. 6. (a) The administration, protection, and development of the lakeshore shall be exercised by the Secretary, subject to the provisions of this Act and of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, relating to the areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service; except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such auhority will further the purposes of this Act.

(b) In the administration, protection, and development of the area, the Secretary shall prepare and implement a land and water use management plan, which shall include specific provision for—

(1) development of facilities to provide the benefits of public recreation;

(2) protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment; and

(3) such protection, management, and utilization of renewable natural resources as in the judgment of the Secretary is consistent with, and will further the purpose of, public recreation and protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment.

(c) In developing the lakeshore the Secretary shall provide public use areas in such places and manner as he determines will not diminish the value or enjoyment for the owner or occupant of any improved property located thereon.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as prohibiting any governmental jurisdiction in the State of Michigan from assessing taxes upon any interest in real estate retained under the provisions of section 10 of this Act to the owner of such interest.

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized, subject to the limitation, conditions, and restrictions imposed by this Act, to acquire the land, water, and other property, and improvements thereon, and any interests therein (including easements) comprising the area defined in section 12 of this Act by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated fuds, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or condemnation; except that such authority to acquire by condemnation shall be exercised only in the manner and to the extent specifically authorized in this Act.

(b) In exercising his authority to acquire property under this Act, the Secretary shall give immediate and careful consideration to any offer made by an individual owning property within the lakeshore to sell such property to the Secretary. In any case in which an individual owning property within the lakeshore submits evidence to the Secretary that the continued ownership by such individual of that property would result in hardship to him, the Secretary shall immediately consider such evidence and, if he determines on the basis of that evidence that a hardship would so result, he shall, within the one year following the submission of such evidence, subject to the availability of funds, purchase such property if offered for a price which does not exceed its fair market value.

(c) Any property or interests therein, owned by the State of Michigan, or any political subdivisions thereof, may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any property owned by the United States on the date of enactment of this Act located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(d) With respect to that property which the Secretary is authorized to acquire by condemnation under the terms of this Act, the Secretary shall initiate no condemnation proceedings until after he has made every reasonable effort to acquire such property by negotiation and purchase.

(e) In any case where the owner and the United States agree, the power of condemnation may, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, be used as a means of acquiring a clear and marketable title, free of any and all encumbrances.

(f) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property located within the area designated for inclusion and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within such area. Properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in value: *Provided,* That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. The Secretary shall report to the Congress on every exchange carried out under the authority of this Act within thirty days from its consummation, and each such report shall include a statement of the value of the properties involved and of any case in which equalization payments are made or received.

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary shall, at the request of any township or county in or adjacent to the lakeshore affected by this Act, assist and consult with the appropriate officers and employees of such township or county in establishing zoning bylaws for the purpose of this Act. Such assistance may include payments to the county or township for technical aid.

(b) No property within the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore shall be acquired by the Secretary by condemnation during the one-year period following the date of enactment of this Act. Thereafter the Secretary shall be prohibited from acquiring by condemnation any improved property so long as the affected county or township has in force and applicable thereto a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section and the use of improved property is in compliance therewith. In the event that the affected county or township does not have in effect and applicable to any improved property a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw so approved, the Secretary shall be prohibited from acquiring such property by condemnation, if the owner thereof notifies the Secretary in writing of such owners' agreement to use his property in a manner consistent with the applicable standard set forth in subsection (d) of this section, and such prohibition against condemnation shall remain in effect for so long as such property is so used.

(c) If the Secretary determines that any such property referred to in subsection (b) of this section covered by any such bylaw is being used in a way which is not in substantial compliance with such bylaw, or that any such property referred to in subsection (b) with respect to which an agreement has been made is being used in a manner which is not substantially consistent with such applicable standards, he shall so notify the owner of any such property in writing. Such notice shall contain a detailed statement as to why the Secretary believes that such use is not in substantial compliance with such zoning bylaw or why such use is not substantially consistent with such applicable standards, as the case may be. Any such owner shall have sixty days following the receipt by him of that written notification within which to discontinue the use referred to in such notification. Discontinuance of such use within such sixty-day period shall have the effect of prohibiting the Secretary from acquiring such property by condemnation by reason of such use. In any case in which such use is not discontinued within such sixty-day period and condemnation proceedings are thereafter initiated by the Secretary, no condemnation shall be ordered in any such proceedings if the Secretary fails to demonstrate to the court by substantial evidence that such a use was not in substantial compliance with such bylaw or was not substantially consistent with such applicable standards.

(d) Any zoning bylaw or amendment thereto submitted to the Secretary for approval for the purposes of this Act shall be approved by him if such bylaw or amendment contains provisions which—

(1) contribute to the effect of prohibiting the commercial and industrial use (other than a use for a commercial purpose as authorized under section 13 of this Act) of all property within the boundaries of such area which is situated within the county or township adopting such bylaw or amendment;

(2) are consistent with the objectives and purposes of this Act so that, to the extent possible under Michigan law, the scenic and scientific values of the lakeshore area will be protected;

(3) are designed to preserve the lakeshore character of the area by appropriate restrictions upon the burning of cover, cutting of timber (except tracts managed for sustained yield), removal of sand or gravel, and dumping, storage, or piling of refuse and other unsightly objects or other uses which would detract from the natural or traditional lakeshore scene;

(4) provide that no construction, reconstruction, moving, alteration, or enlargement of any property, including improved property as defined in this Act, within the lakeshore area shall be permitted, if such construction, reconstruction, moving, alteration, or enlargement would afford less than a 50-foot setback from all streets measured at a right angle with the street line, and a 25-foot distance from the abutters' property lines.

Any owner or zoning authority may request the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether a proposed move, alteration, construction, reconstruction, or enlargement of any such property would subject such property to acquisition by condemnation, and the Secretary, within sixty days of the receipt of such request, shall advise the owner or zoning authority in writing whether the intended use will subject the property to acquisition by condemnation; and

(5) have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under and of exception made to the application of such bylaw or amendment.

(e) The approval of any bylaw or amendment pursuant to subsection (d) shall not be withdrawn or revoked by the Secretary for so long as such bylaw or amendment remains in effect as approved. Any such bylaw or amendment so approved shall not be retroactive in its application.

Sec. 10. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property situated within the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain, for a term of not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such owner or owners, the right of use and occupancy of such property for any residential purpose which is not incompatible with the purposes of this Act or which does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the value on such date of the right retained by the owner. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for noncommercial residential purposes in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(b) Any deed or other instrument used to transfer title to property, with respect to which a right of use and occupancy is retained under this section, shall provide that such property shall not be used for any purpose which is incompatible with purposes of this Act, or which impairs the usefulness and attractiveness of such area and if it should be so used, the Secretary shall have authority to terminate such right. In the event the Secretary exercises his power of termination under this subsection he shall pay to the owner of the right terminated an amount equal to the value of that portion of such right which remained unexpired on the date of such termination.

Sec. 11. As used in this Act, the term "improved property" means a detached, one-family dwelling, construction of which was begun before December 31, 1962, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, such land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the lands so designated. The amount of the land so designated shall in every case be at least three acres in area, or all of such lesser acreage as may be held in the same ownership as the dwelling, and in making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use in which the dwelling and land have customarily been enjoyed: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary may exclude from the land so designated any beach or waters on Lake Michigan, together with so much of the land adjoining any such beach or waters, as the Secretary may deem necessary for public access thereto. If the Secretary makes such exclusion, an appropriate buffer zone shall be provided between any residence and the public access or beach.

Sec. 12. The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore shall consist of the following described areas together with adjacent waters:

SOUTH MANITOU ISLAND

(a) All of an island in Lake Michigan officially designated as South Manitou Island lying in townships 30 and 31 north, range 15 west, and adjacent waters for one-quarter mile offshore.

GOOD HARBOR—SLEEPING BEAR BAY AREA

(b) Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at the northern line of section 6, township 29 north, range 12 west, and continuing east along said line to the east line of said section and thence south along the said east boundary to the south boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the north-south quarter section line of section 7, township 29 north, range 12 west,

thence south along said quarter section line to the east-west quarter section line of said section, thence west along said quarter section line and east-west quarter section line of section 12, township 29 north, range 13 west to the north right-of-way of a public road following the north shore of Little Traverse Lake,

thence in a general westerly direction along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southwest quarter of section 10, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 22, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west along the north boundary of said section to the northwest corner of the section, thence south along the west boundary of said section to the east-west quarter-quarter line of the northeast quarter of section 21, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west to the west boundary of said section, thence north to the northeast corner of section 17, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence west to the northwest corner of section 18, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the southeast corner of section 24, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence west along the south boundary of said section to the east right-of-way of county highway 675, thence continuing northwesterly along said right-of-way to the projected intersection of the west right-of-way of a north-south county road in the northwest quarter, southwest quarter of section 24,

thence southerly along the said right-of-way to the south line of section 24, thence west to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southwest quarter of section 23, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said quarter section, thence east to the north-south quarter section line of said section,

thence north to the south boundary of section 14, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence east along said south boundary to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southeast quarter of said section,

thence north to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of said section, thence west 660 feet, thence north to the north boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the shore of Lake Michigan,

thence offshore one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore, thence along said shore in a general easterly direction at a distance of one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore to a point one-quarter mile offshore perpendicular of the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

PLATTE BAY AREA

(c) Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at the northern line of section 6, township 29 north, range 12 west, and continuing east along said line to the east line of said section and thence south along the said east boundary to the south boundary of said section,

thence west along said boundary to the north-south quarter section line of section 7, township 29 north, range 12 west, thence south along said quarter section line to the east-west quarter section line of said section,

thence west along said quarter section line and east-west quarter section line of section 12, township 29 north, range 13 west to the north right-of-way of a public road following the north shore of Little Traverse Lake,

thence in a general westerly direction along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southwest quarter of section 10, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 22, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west along the north boundary of said section to the northwest corner of the section, thence south along the west boundary of said section to the east-west quarter-quarter line of the northeast quarter of section 21, township 29 north, range 13 west,

thence west to the west boundary of said section, thence north to the northeast corner of section 17, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence west to the northwest corner of section 18, township 29 north, range 13 west, thence south to the southeast corner of section 24, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence west along the south boundary of said section to the east right-of-way of county highway 675,

thence continuing northwesterly along said right-of-way to the projected intersection of the west right-of-way of a north-south county road in the northwest quarter southwest quarter of section 24,

thence southerly along the said right-of-way to the south line of section 24 thence west to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southwest quarter of section 23, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said quarter section, thence east to the north-south quarter section line of said section,

thence north to the south boundary of section 14, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence east along said south boundary to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the southeast quarter of said section,

thence north to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of said section, thence west 660 feet, thence north to the north boundary of said section, thence west along said boundary to the shore of Lake Michigan, thence offshore one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore,

thence along said shore in a general easterly direction at a distance of one-quarter mile perpendicular to the shore to a point one-quarter mile offshore perpendicular of the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to the point of beginning.

Beginning on the shore of Lake Michigan at a point 1,491 feet due east of the west boundary of section 21, township 29 north, range 14 west and running south to the south boundary of said section, thence running east to north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northwest quarter section of section 27, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said quarter section, thence east to the west right-of-way of monument 22, thence south along said west right-of-way to the north line of section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west.

thence west along the north line of section 34 to a point which is 400 feet west of the northeast corner of Government lot 1, section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south 200 feet, thence west 430 feet, thence south 805 feet.

thence west 485 feet more or less to the west line of Government lot 1, thence south on the west line of Government lot 1 to the southwest corner of Government lot 1, thence east 144 feet more or less to a point 661.49 feet west of the northeast corner of Government lot 2, section 55, township 29 north, range 14 west.

thence south 8 degrees 45 minutes west 131.9 feet, thence north 81 degrees 02 minutes west 335.0 feet, thence south 8 degrees 45 minutes west 100 feet, thence south 30 degrees 37 minutes west 149 feet, thence south 89 degrees 38 minutes west 225.0 feet,

thence south 18 degrees 13 minutes west 235 feet, thence north 71 degrees 30 minutes west 45 feet, thence south 18 degrees 30 minutes west 450 feet,

thence south 71 degrees 30 minutes east 400 feet, thence south to the south line of Government lot 2, thence east on the south line of Government lot 2 to a point 418.35 feet east of Glen Lake on the south line of Government lot 2,

thence south 15 degrees 43 minutes west 100 feet, thence west 50 feet, thence south 2 degree 59 minutes west 1,100.12 feet, thence west 43.1 feet, thence south 200 feet, thence west 50 feet, thence south 775 feet, thence west 225 feet, thence south 434 feet to the south line of section 34, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence west along the south line of section 34 to the east line of section 4, thence south along said east line to the north right-of-way of Forest Glen Road,

thence northwesterly along the north right-of-way of said public road to the north line of section 32, thence west along the north line of section 32 to the shore of Glen Lake,

thence continuing northwesterly along the shore of Glen Lake from the intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the south line of section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, to a point of intersection of the shore of Glen Lake with the east line of Government lot 2,

thence north along the east line of Government lot 2 to the south sixteenth latitudinal line, thence west along the south sixteenth latitudinal line to its intersection with the west line of Government lot 2, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south on the west line of Government lot 2 to the shore of Glen Lake,

thence westerly and southerly along the shore of Glen Lake to a point 664.77 feet east and 1,308.75 feet north of the southwest corner of Government lot 1, section 29, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence north 89 degrees 39 minutes west 236.33 feet to the east right-of-way of Michigan Highway 109,

thence southerly along the east right-of-way to a stake on the east right-of-way of monument 109 located north 345.5 feet and north 89 degrees 12 minutes east 1,190 feet from the northwest corner of Government lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west,

thence from stake on east right-of-way of monument 109 north 89 degrees 12 minutes east 229.5 feet, thence south 18 degrees 03 minutes west 400.0 feet,

thence south 89 degrees 12 minutes west 1,242.0 feet to the west line of Government lot 1, section 31, township 29 north, range 14 west, thence south along the west lines of Government lots 1, 2, and 3, section 31 to the southwest corner of Government lot 3,

thence east on south line of Government lot 3 to the west right-of-way of monument 109, thence southeasterly along the west right-of-way to its intersection with the north line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east along the north line of section 5 to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 5,

thence by a straight line in a southeasterly direction to the intersection of the east line of section 5, township 28 north, range 14 west, and the south right-of-way of a public road lying on the south line of Government lot 5,

thence east along south right-of-way of said public road to its intersection with Michigan Highway 22, thence east across monument 22 to the south right-of-way, thence northeasterly along monument 22 to a point 476.5 feet west and 1,519.0 feet north of the southeast corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 4,

thence south 400 feet, thence east 476.5 feet, thence north on the east line of the southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 4, to a point of intersection with the south sixteenth latitudinal line,

thence east on the south sixteenth latitudinal line to a point on the west boundary of a cemetery which point is north 89 degrees west 222.75 feet from the intersection of the south sixteenth latitudinal line with the east line of section 4.

thence south to the southwest corner of said cemetery, thence south 89 degrees east 222.75 feet to the west line of section 4, thence continuing east on the same bearing 33 feet more or less to east right-of-way of a public highway,

thence north to a point 554.2 feet south and 33 feet east of the meander corner at the north end of the west line of section 3, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east 233.0 feet, thence north 374.14 feet to centerline of a public highway, thence south 69 degrees 55 minutes east 49.01 feet,

thence north 0 degree 47 minutes west 11.3 feet, thence east to north right-of-way of said public highway, thence southeasterly along north right-of-way of said highway to its intersection with the south right-of-way of a private road listed on the plot of McFarlane Woods numbered 2 as Beech Tree Road,

thence southeasterly along the south right-of-way of Beech Tree Road to the northeast corner of lot numbered 14 of McFarlane Woods numbered 2, thence north 37 degrees 24 minutes east to the shore of Glen Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore of Glen Lake to a point 1,850 feet due east of the west line of section 11,

thence south to the east-west quarter section line of section 14, thence west to the north-south quarter section line of section 18, thence south to the north line of section 19, thence west along north line of section 19 approximately 1,200 feet to a point north of northeast corner of Empire corporate line,

thence south approximately 1,300 feet to the northeast corner of Empire corporate line, thence west along said corporate line approximately 1,800 feet to the east shoreline of South Bar Lake, thence meandering in a general southwesterly direction along shoreline approximately 1,500 feet to a point,

thence south aproximately 3,600 feet to a point along the corporate boundary line, thence east approximately 2,300 feet to the southeast corner of said corporate line, thence north to the north line of section 30, township 28 north, range 14 west, thence east to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter section of said section,

thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of said section, thence east to the east line of said section, thence south to the southeast corner of said section, thence west to the north-south quarter section line of section 31, thence south to the north line of section 18, township 27 north, range 14 west,

thence east to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of said section, thence south to the east-west quarter-quarter section line of the north-east quarter of section 19,

thence west to a point 500 feet perpendicular to, in a general easterly direction, monument numbered 22 and continuing along 500 feet from monument numbered 22 in a general westerly direction to a point 1,500 feet west of the east line of section 31, township 27 north, range 15 west, thence north to the southerly right-of-way of monument numbered 22.

thence westerly along said right-of-way to the north-south quarter-quarter section line of the northeast quarter of section 36, township 27 north, range 16 west, thence south to the east-west quarter section line of said section, thence east to the shore of Long Lake, thence southeasterly along the shore to the east line of said section,

thence south to a point 1,000 feet south of the south line of said section, thence west to the west line of section 1, township 26 north, range 16 west, thence north to the shore of Lake Michigan, thence perpendicular to the shore one-quarter mile,

thence following along the shore at a perpendicular distance of one-quarter mile to a point one-quarter mile offshore perpendicular to the point of beginning, thence in a straight line to a point of beginning.

SCENIC PARKWAY

(d) In order to facilitate visitor travel, provide scenic overlooks for public enjoyment and interpretation of the national lakeshore and related features, and in order to enhance recreational opportunities, the Secretary is authorized to construct and administer as a part of the national lakeshore scenic roads of parkway standards generally located in accordance with the parkway zone designated on map numbered NPS–101–SB. Such scenic roads shall include necessary connections, bridges, and other structural utilities. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary may procure for this purpose land, or interest therein, by donation, purchase with appropriated or donated funds, or otherwise: *Provided,* That land and interests so procured shall not exceed one hundred and fifty acres per mile of scenic road, except that tracts may be procured in their entirety in order to avoid severances. Property so acquired in excess of the acreage limitation provided in this section may be exchanged by the Secretary for any land of approximately equal value authorized for acquisition by this Act.

SEC. 13. In any case, not otherwise provided for in this Act, the Secretary shall be prohibited from condemning any commercial property used for commercial purposes in existence on December 31, 1962, so long as the use thereof would further the purposes of this Act, and such use does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion in the lakeshore. The following uses, among others, shall be considered to be uses compatible with the purposes of this Act: Commercial farms, orchards, motels, rental cottages, camps, craft and art studios, marinas, medical, legal, architectural, and other such professional offices, and tree farms.

SEC. 14. The Secretary shall furnish to any interested person requesting the same, a certificate indicating, with respect to any property which the Secretary has been prohibited from acquiring by condemnation in accordance with provisions of this Act, that such authority is prohibited and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $4,750,000, as may be necessary for acquisition of properties under the provisions of this Act.

THE LIGHTED DOME OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as the result of the landslide agreement to the conference report on the legislative appropriation bill, which was passed last night by a vote of 42 to 40, I should like to announce that for the first time in the Nation's history the dome of the Nation's Capitol will be lighted all night. Before World War I it was lighted until midnight. Then it was darkened during that period. It was lighted again until midnight as the result of economizing in connection with the purchase of exhibit cases for the basement of the Capitol.

We have been able to provide $4,500 so that somewhere in the world, preferably where liberty began, the Capitol of the United States will be lighted throughout the dark hours of the night, so that nations of half the world which seek the path to freedom and liberty will have a light to guide them to their destination.

HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, one of the big problems in home building has always been trying to find a program whereby the lower middle income people are able to own or rent housing which is within their income.

At the present time there is being conducted at Tulsa, Okla., a very interesting project. It is described in the Journal of Homebuilding for December 1963. The article is entitled "FHA Insuring Tulsa Project for Low-Income Families."

It makes very interesting reading. I hope it may serve as a pilot project which will give us at least a part of the answer to this perplexing problem. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FHA INSURING TULSA PROJECT FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

FHA is insuring the Tulsa, Okla., demonstration project to move low-income families into new homes on a rental basis until they put into escrow enough money for a down payment to buy. The occupancy-purchase program, which was conceived about 2 years ago, will run for 5 years.

Purpose is to determine if low-income families will assume the responsibilities of homeownership if given the opportunity.

The plan is to build 100 three-bedroom detached homes with brick veneer exteriors and one-car garages, valued at $9,300. They will be built 25 at a time, making FHA's initial commitment $225,000 in insurance. Families will be drawn mostly from urban redevelopment areas and only those with incomes of $175 to $300 a month are eligible.

Principals in the Tulsa plan are the city of Tulsa, the Tulsa HBA, HHFA, FHA, and FNMA. The lending firm of Richard G. Hughes, an NAHB past president, will make the construction loan. Hughes, of Fort Worth, Tex., was instrumental in launching the plan. The Tulsa HBA has formed a nonprofit corporation called Home Builders Demonstration, Inc., which will build, own, operate, and sell the units on property already acquired in an urban-renewal area. The builders will be L. R. (Andy) Latch, Ramon L. King, and Don L. Herrington.

The three builders will receive the normal profit which is typical when a nonprofit corporation is the sponsor.

Here is how the Tulsa program will work: FHA will insure the project first under a rental program and then under a sales program as the tenants are able to buy. After the project is built under the conventional loan, Fannie Mae will buy the mortgage and the interest rate will be reduced to $3\frac{1}{8}$ percent under the 221(d)(3) rental program. Although the current interest rate under this program is $3\frac{3}{8}$ percent, the allocation was made by Fannie Mae before the rate was changed.

As renters accumulate enough money to buy, their units will be refinanced under 221(d)(2), which is a sales program for low-income families and allows a $5\frac{1}{4}$ percent interest rate. Fannie Mae will keep these mortgages. The mortgage term under both the FHA programs will be 40 years.

Rents will be $49.87 a month. This includes $9.75 in taxes, $2.50 for insurance, a partial allowance for maintenance of $6, and a management fee of $2. The remaining $29.62 will go for principal and interest. Only 20 percent of a family's income will go for rent. This means that some families won't have enough rent money but others would be able to afford even higher rent. For example, a family whose total income is $175 a month could pay only $35 a month. This is where HHFA's special fund for its low-income demonstration program comes in. HHFA will make up the difference of $14.87.

However, if a family's total income is $300 a month, it could afford about $60 a month, or 20 percent of its income. In this case the family pays its $49.97 rent, and the rest of the 20 percent goes into a special fund toward the downpayment. When a family has enough money in escrow for a downpayment, it must either buy or leave the project. If it does not buy, its money in escrow goes to reduce the overall project mortgage.

To help HHFA plan expenditures, it was decided to qualify families with an average monthly income of $250. Families will be sought under the following breakdown: 10 percent making $300; 15 percent making $275; 20 percent making $250; 20 percent making $225; 25 percent making $200; and 10 percent making $175 (these are approximate incomes). During the 5 years of the program, at the income levels figured, it is estimated that HHFA will not spend more than $136,000.

At $300 a month income, it would take about 30 months for a family to accumulate in escrow enough to buy. At $275 a month, it woud take 60 months. But below $275, income will have to be increased before families can qualify to buy under 221(d)(2). Notable is the fact that the top income for families moving into the propect is $3,600. Under a normal 221(d)(3) in Tulsa, the maximum incomes for families are as follows: Two-person family, $5,550; three and four persons, $6,500; five and six persons, $7,500; and seven or more persons, $8,450.

As families gradually qualify to buy, Home Builders Demonstration will close individual loans and the former tenants will become homeowners. The 221(d)(2) sales mortgages will be transferred by Fannie Mae from its project mortgage account to its home mortgage account.

Part of each month's rent will go to reducing the project mortgage. This means that when the tenant buys the unit he will get the advantage of the mortgage payments made by the nonprofit corporation. The monthly payment will be $59.27 under the sales program. (The main reason for the increase over the rental is the increase in the interest rate from $3\frac{1}{8}$ percent under the rental program to $5\frac{1}{4}$ percent under the sales program.) If he starts buying after 4 years of renting, the buyer will pay off the mortgage in 36 years instead of 40. The $59.27 will include principal and interest at $5\frac{1}{4}$ percent, taxes, insurance, and the mortgage insurance fee FHA charges under its sales programs.

A GOOD YEAR FOR BOTH HOUSING AND U.S. ECONOMY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the December 1963 issue of the Journal of the Home Building there appears an article entitled "Good Year Seen for Both Housing and U.S. Economy by NAHB Economists." I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAN NOW FOR 1964: GOOD YEAR SEEN FOR BOTH HOUSING AND U.S. ECONOMY BY NAHB ECONOMISTS

A good year for housing and for the economy in general in 1964 is forecast by the NAHB economics department. The only cloud on the horizon is the possible tightening of the mortgage money market sometime in the coming years.

There should be no changes now "or for some months to come," the NAHB Economic News Notes states, but the very fact of a strong and expanding economy might help cause a "firming of the interest rate some time next year." These factors were cited: (1) Pressure by business and industry for loanable funds; (2) high Government expenditures, increasing about $6 to $7 billion for Federal and $5 billion for State and local governments; (3) favorable outlook resulting in lesser savings and more spending; (4) smaller investors likely to return to stock market, thus drawing down savings; (5) restriction of dividend rates in many cases as a result of January 1 tightening of savings and loan regulations on distribution of fee income and reserve allocation.

There has been a slight decline in the saving rate recently, and lenders are less hungry for loans than at the first of the year, the report states. In a survey in March, only 8 percent of S. & L.'s reported not having enough money. In a current survey this figure had increased to 21 percent.

The savings level is so high, however, "it would take an excess amount of pressure to cause a supply-demand imbalance," the News Notes says.

In predicting a good year in housing, the department pointed to several forecasts of starts for 1964, including its own of 1.5 million units. The forecasts ranged from a low of 1.475 million units by Smith & Magee to a high of 1.640 million by Fortune magazine. By comparison, economists last year generally agreed that starts would total 1.4 million in 1963. Actual starts this year will total around 1.53 million.

The expectations of a continued strong economy in 1964 are based on the probability of an income tax cut, continued high Government spending, a high rate of expenditure for plant and equipment, particularly by the steel industry, and a conservative ratio of inventory to sales.

SLIGHT DROP EXPECTED IN MULTIFAMILY STARTS

A slight decline in the multifamily market will keep starts in 1964 from equaling the high rate which is now making 1963 the third best, or perhaps second best, year in U.S. housing history, according to the NAHB economic department.

About 1.5 million starts in 1964—of which about 525,000 will be multifamily units—is the department's prediction. The rental total would show a 2-percent drop, while the 975,000 single-family starts would equal this year's figure. The total should be about 1.530 million units in 1963, the special report (63-12) estimates. The report is available free to NAHB members and for $2 to others from the NAHB economics department, 1625 L Street, Washington, D.C.

In predicting a slight leveling off of building activity in 1964, the report cites uncertainties involved in a presidential election year and notes that a slight decline in the rental housing activity which has dominated the picture this year already has been detected in recent months. On multifamily housing it states: "In many localities there are definite signs of overbuilding In others this is not yet apparent, mainly because of the lag in time it takes to build these units and to rent them."

Total new construction in-place in 1964 should increase about 2 percent over 1963 to $64.7 billion, the department estimates. Of this, new housing units should total $19.7 billion, a 0.45-percent increase over 1963. Additions and alterations are expected to increase by 4.58 percent, to $5.7 billion. A 3.85-percent decrease for nonhousekeeping units to $1.2 billion is foreseen.

The report cites these reasons to support the prediction of "a relatively high level of homebuilding": (1) Rapid population growth; (2) expected increase in personal incomes; (3) expected increase in marriages; (4) high demolition rate; (5) optimistic long-range outlook for a stable, if not expanding, economy; (6) ample mortgage money and favorable interest rates.

Treated in more detail are the factors which would support the prediction of some leveling off. One is the decline in multifamily construction in the larger cities, which would not be compensated for by a recently noted increase in smaller communities.

The continued drop in FHA and VA activity, which will account for only about 15 percent of the total in 1963 compared to 20 percent in 1962, is cited. FHA insurance for multifamily units is expected to decline some 23 percent in 1963 from 1962. Favorable terms on conventional loans and uncertainty resulting from the Executive order on discrimination are listed as reasons.

The report also cites "increasing evidence" of a general reduction in inventory with less speculative building by individual builders. It adds: "It appears that this trend will continue well into 1964."

Some other factors noted as indicating a leveling off: (1) A decline in the number of persons 30 to 39 years of age; (2) mass transportation difficulties resulting in a return-to-the-city trend; (3) persistent increase in the mortgage foreclosure rate; (4) growth of one-person families; and (5) drop in birth rate.

Housing starts—Forecasts for 1964

[In number of housing units]

	Total	Singles	Multiples
NAHB	1,500,000	975,000	525,000
Colean	1,570,000	970,000	600,000
Fortune magazine [1]	1,640,000	(2)	(2)
Newcomb & Gillogly	1,585,000	985,000	600,000
Smith & Magee	1,475,000	1,018,000	[3] 457,000
U.S. Gypsum	[4] 1,525,000	(2)	(2)

[1] Fortune magazine builders survey; the editors are less optimistic.

[2] Not available.

[3] Given in a speech at Chicago American Marketing Association meeting, Sept. 23, 1963.

[4] U.S. Gypsum gave a range of 1,500,000 to 1,525,000 units and predicted singles would increase slightly and apartments drop slightly.

MORE NAHB BUILDERS TURN TO RENTAL UNITS

More NAHB builders are building rental housing for their own investment, despite their widely held belief that there is moderate overbuilding of apartments in their areas, according to preliminary tabulations of the Builders' Economic Council fall survey.

The BEC survey indicates also that builders expect little change in the number of housing starts in 1964 compared to 1963. Complete results of the survey of 800 representative builders throughout the country will be available this month from the NAHB economics department. In past years the BEC has successfully predicted the direction of the housing industry.

Preliminary results showed nearly two-thirds of the respondents indicating moderate overbuilding of rentals in their areas. Many of the respondents stated, however, that they are currently building or are planning to build apartments.

Of those building or planning rentals, 67 percent were doing so for their own investment, compared to 37 percent in this category in the spring. And 80 percent of the builders doing rentals for their own investment planned to manage and rent the units themselves.

The BEC survey deals with current economic conditions and the general housing outlook, coupled with housing characteristics and characteristics of the builders' operations, including diversification, type of organization, and number of employees.

New construction put in place, United States

Type of construction	Value (in million dollars)				
	1962	1963	1963-62 percent change	1964	1964-63 percent change
Total new construction	$61,010	$63,606	4.25	$64,820	1.91
Private construction	43,458	45,182	3.96	46,280	2.43
Residential buildings (nonfarm)	24,833	26,308	5.93	26,600	1.11
New housing units	18,252	19,610	7.44	19,700	.45
Additions and alterations	5,319	5,450	2.46	5,700	4.58
Nonhousekeeping	1,262	1,248	−1.11	1,200	−3.85
Nonresidential buildings (nonfarm)	11,331	11,348	.15	11,870	4.59
Industrial	2,814	2,862	1.70	3,120	9.01
Commercial	4,964	4,893	−1.44	4,950	1.16
Office buildings and warehouses	2,538	2,759	8.70	2,800	1.48
Stores, restaurants, and garages	2,426	2,134	−12.04	2,150	.74
Other nonresidential buildings	3,553	3,593	1.12	3,800	5.76
Religious	994	967	−2.72	970	.31
Educational	614	638	3.90	660	3.44
Hospital and institutional	925	1,028	11.13	1,120	8.94
Social and recreational	754	700	−7.17	790	12.85
Miscellaneous	266	260	−2.26	260	NC
Private construction—Continued					
Farm construction	$1,625	$1,672	$2.89	$1,700	1.67
Public utilities	5,392	5,554	3.00	5,850	5.32
All other private	277	300	8.30	260	−13.34
Public construction	17,552	18,424	4.96	18,540	.62
Residential buildings	938	858	−8.53	850	−.94
Nonresidential buildings	5,118	5,360	4.72	5,430	1.30
Industrial	395	420	6.32	430	2.38
Educational	2,984	3,010	.87	3,000	−.34
Hospital and institutional	397	450	13.35	500	11.11
Administrative and service	676	766	13.31	800	4.43
Other nonresidential buildings	666	714	7.20	700	−1.97
Military facilities	1,267	1,330	4.97	1,300	−2.26
Highways	6,100	6,600	8.19	6,550	−.76
Sewer and water systems	1,754	1,861	6.10	1,990	6.93
Sewer	1,072	1,125	4.94	1,225	8.88
Water	682	736	7.91	765	3.94
Public service enterprises	478	470	−1.68	420	−10.64
Conservation and development	1,514	1,555	2.70	1,560	.32
All other public	383	390	1.82	440	12.82

DISCRIMINATORY OCEAN FREIGHT RATES DAMAGE EXPORT PROSPECTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the development and the expansion of American exports is a matter of prime importance to this country. Present improvement in our rate of growth and our balance of payments is, to a degree, due to the emphasis placed upon this matter by our Government in the last few years.

The Senate Small Business Committee has long recognized the need for encouraging small business firms to develop their potential export markets. The committee held hearings on this subject in 1960 and 1962, and several of the recommendations that were made following those hearings have been put into effect. The result, I believe, has been increased participation and interest on the part of small business in export trade. Unfortunately, several problems remain to discourage the small businessman from reaching his full potential. One such problem has come to my attention this year. I refer to the matter of discriminatory ocean freight rates.

In May of this year the Joint Economic Committee, on which I have the privilege to serve, began hearings on this subject. The chairman of that committee, Senator DOUGLAS, has reported to the Senate some of the examples of discrimination against American exporters revealed by the testimony presented to that committee.

I was shocked, as I am sure other Members of the Senate were, to learn, for example, that to ship drugs and medicines from New York City to Venezuela costs an American businessman $35.84 per 1,000 nautical miles, while a European businessman can ship the same commodity to the same country on the same ship at a rate of only $15.09—a difference of 134 percent.

This sad tale was repeated before the Joint Economic Committee as to commodity after commodity—chemicals, appliances, farm machinery, textile machinery, fertilizers, and paper products.

A small businessman who manufactures cork products gave the committee the following testimony:

> For the first time we can now see a potential market in Great Britain and Europe of over $100,000 per year. We are in contact with firms abroad who want to buy from us. However, a freight disparity of 330 percent is a major barrier to achieving this potential business. (Hearings, p. 324.)

The same small businessman pointed out that if only 10,000 other American firms could surmount the freight rate disparity and realize a similar amount of business, our national exports would increase by $1 billion a year.

The joint committee heard further testimony that some American shippers learned of the rate discriminations, but did not know that anything could be done about them. On other occasions, firms which had lost business hesitated to complain because the moment had passed when the complaint could have recovered the business for them. Still other businesses undoubtedly lacked the informational and financial resources to become aware of potential remedies or to pursue them. Undoubtedly, these conditions weigh most heavily upon the small businessman.

I am convinced that our greatest potential for increased exporting lies with the Nation's small concerns. Any deterrent to the realization of that potential cannot be endured. Accordingly, I have asked the staff of the Senate Small Business Committee to explore the impact of this problem upon small business firms.

The Federal Maritime Commission has authority under sections 16 and 18(b)5 of the Shipping Act of 1916 to review the rates established by the Shipping Conferences, and to determine whether any rate is so unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States. It has additional authority to gather information under sections 22 of the Shipping Act and 212(e) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

I understand that when the joint committee concluded its hearings, the Maritime Commission issued an order to the major shipping conferences which would require the conferences to eliminate disparities between outbound and inbound ocean freight rates or to give full justification for these differences to the Commission. The Commission is also undertaking a revision of its procedures for receiving the complaints and requests of aggrieved American businessmen. These are steps which indicate that the Maritime Commission is now willing to take the initiative in this matter, and we shall be most interested in the results.

It is hoped that these actions by the Commission will lead to a thorough airing of the views and complaints of large and small business exporters, and to the elimination of the frustrating conditions described before the Joint Economic Committee. In any event, the Small Business Committee will be doing what it can to make it possible for small concerns to overcome these conditions and to participate fully in foreign trade.

The ingenuity, efficiency, and talent of American businessmen—large and small—are among the finest resources the United States possesses. It is a great inequity to allow these talents to continue to be shackled by a discriminatory freight rates system, when they could be winning the Nation great gains in this era of growing world trade.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE, MICH.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 792) to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I trust that the third reading will not be reached until an opportunity has been afforded Senators to offer amendments to the bill.

I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore bill, now before the Senate, would authorize the establishment of the first national shore area on the Great Lakes.

In the previous Congress we established the Cape Cod National Seashore in Massachusetts, the Point Reyes National Seashore in California, and the Padre Island Seashore off Texas.

Cape Cod was the second national seashore recreation area on the Atlantic. The other was Cape Hatteras, the first ever established. That area was given to the Nation by a foundation and by the State of North Carolina.

Point Reyes is our first on the Pacific, and Padre Island the first along the Gulf of Mexico.

All of the areas, including the Sleeping Bear Dunes, under consideration now, were classified among the first 8 or 10 finest available shoreline stretches in the Nation, possessing outstanding scenic, scientific, and recreational values, in a study of the Nation's shores conducted by the National Park Service in the fifties.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes on the shores of Lake Michigan in the northwestern corner of Michigan's lower peninsula, rise 460 feet above the waters of the lake. Included in the 42,000-acre area which the Nation would acquire are also the Empire Dunes, nearly as high, a few miles to the south of Sleeping Bear.

To the northeast of the Sleeping Bear Dunes, the bill authorizes the acquisition of another lakeshore strip, including a high lookout point from which visitors can look west over Good Harbor Bay, Sleeping Bear Bay, the Sleeping Bear Dunes, and out across the lake to North and South Manitou Islands.

Lobes of a great glacier formed the countryside of Sleeping Bear Dunes area. The lobes themselves dug depressions in the earth. Glacial debris was gathered up between the lobes and deposited to form high hills. As blowing sands formed dunes in the area, the glacial depressions were sealed off from Lake Michigan and formed inland lakes—Traverse, Big and Little Glen Lakes, Platte Lake, Crystal Lake, and many more. There are cedars, birch, pine, spruce, tamarack—a great variety of trees and rare plants on the hills and ridges and in the swales and swamps.

It is a beautiful country, and our committee is proud of the bill we are recommending today which, in addition to providing for the acquisition of the 5,300-acre South Manitou Island and 32 miles along the Lake Michigan shore, captures the values of the inland area by authorizing 30 miles of scenic parkway over the high ridges of glacial debris to all the finest lookout points and their vistas, without requiring the displacement of residents or compatible commercial establishments.

The original 77,000-acre Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore bill would have taken all of the inland area through which the proposed parkway will be routed, and it would have involved 1,587 structures. The committee bill has reduced the structures involved by 80 percent to 288. Residence owners will not be required to give up their homes if they maintain their properties in accordance with approving zoning standards, or if they file a statement of agreement to observe certain minimum standards. Commercial establishments compatible with the recreation area are also exempted from condemnation as long as they do not interfere with or detract from the park purpose.

The bill has within it what we call the "Cape Cod formula"—a suspension of condemnation of residential property where it is compatible and properly maintained. Owners may also sell to the Government, if they choose, and retain a right to use their homes for 25 years or the life of the owner or spouse.

The committee has been greatly assisted in the development of this bill, and the very useful provisions for giving maximum protection to existing property owners consistent with the National Lakeshore purpose, by Senator PHIL HART, of Michigan, and by his colleague, Senator PAT MCNAMARA.

At the outset, there was unusual opposition to the bill, which has been before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for several years. Much of it came from people who, understandably, went to that magnificent area in the summer months, and partook of its beauties during that particular season.

The staff of our committee, headed by Mr. Benton J. Strong, has been invaluable in attempting to remove as much controversy from the bill as possible. I am now proud to present to the Senate a bill which we think largely accomplishes this end.

The acreage has been reduced almost by half. Its price tag is less than the original indicated cost of acquisition. The present cost of acquisition is estimated to be $4,755,000. There are 288 structures within the seashore area but under the bill, the owners can have them exempt. If they are not acquired, the cost will be approximately $1,200,000 less than the $4,750,000 authorized.

This inland lake shore area was called to the attention of Congress by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. It is one of the very fine remaining shoreline areas in the United States that can be acquired and turned into national lake shore recreational area.

I believe the bill before the Senate is realistic as to size. It has ample built-in protection for the owners of both residential and commercial properties.

In the past few years the committee has worked on many bills of this type in which controversy was involved. We hope we have minimized the controversy in this particular bill.

In January, 1962, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission advised the President and Congress that there is a tremendous demand for water-based recreational facilities.

The Commission, created by an Act of Congress sponsored by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and of which Mr. Laurance Rockefeller was the chairman recommended:

> Immediate action by Federal, State and local governments to reserve or acquire additional water, beach and shoreline areas, particularly near centers of population.
>
> A most pressing problem of supply is ocean and Great Lakes shoreline. This resource is one of the most in demand, and it is one of the most scarce in public ownership.
>
> The need is crucial. Opportunity to place these areas in public ownership is facing each year as other uses encroach.

In view of this report, and the obvious need for such shoreline areas, our Public Lands Subcommitte of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has attempted to expedite shoreline bills, and particularly those dealing with areas classified in a national survey as the most outstanding remaining opportunities for public develpoment.

The committee has before it at present an interesting seashore, the Fire Island Seashore proposal, which lies off Long Island, near New York City. The Washington hearings on it were completed a few days ago. We hope we can move it forward sometime in the near future.

I hope and trust that the Senate will act favorably on the Sleeping Bear National Lakeshore bill and continue the progress that is being made toward meeting the Nation's needs for recreation areas of this kind, both along the oceans and in the inland areas.

There is a short supply of this type of area. The time in which we can properly preserve them is running out. The bill now before us would do that. I think it would do so with due regard for the protection of the owners of homes and commercial establishments in the area.

I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I oppose the bill—and I am for a park in this area and for parks in a good many other areas.

In my opinion, the condemnation provisions of the bill are unjustified. Condemnation provisions raise a serious question in regard to any such bill.

I deeply resent the reporting by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of a bill involving the Oregon Dunes. It has split the Oregon delegation. The committee will have to assume the responsibility for a bitter political controversy that will rage for some time in Oregon as a result of the proposal of that bill by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Condemnation should be used sparingly, and never used unless a real public necessity demands it.

The course of action followed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with respect to the Oregon Dunes bill will result in a series of mass meetings in my State in the months ahead. It has engendered a controversy in my State that will rock its politics for some time to come.

I do not believe we should proceed to the passage of park bills that contain condemnation procedures. The Department of the Interior, or whatever park group it is that will administer Federal parks, should see if it cannot acquire properties on a purchase basis, which I respectfully submit can be done. In most cases, the property that is needed to create a park can be purchased.

In Oregon, more than 50 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government. That is a great deal of land. Yet there is pending before this body, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, a measure for a dunes park on the coast of Oregon, and in that connection it is proposed to take more land, including privately owned land, for the Federal Government. We shall debate this issue at great length, after the first of the new year.

But for some years—as is shown by editorials and other materials, I placed in the RECORD on Tuesday, December 17, I have pledged to the people of Oregon that I would not support a dunes bill containing a provision for the condemnation of property which, in my judgment, is not necessary for the Federal Government to take. A great many of the people of Oregon are also of the opinion that we should not take, through condemnation, the privately owned property in the Oregon dunes.

I favor the establishment of a dunes park in Oregon.

It has been pointed out that there are significant differences between this proposal and the Indiana dunes case, the Michigan dunes case, or the Cape Cod case. That is true; but I also know that once a pattern is established, little attention is paid to such significant differences. That is why I must raise my voice in opposition to the condemnation part of this bill, although I think every other part of it can be supported. But that is why I oppose this part of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore bill.

Let me refer to some of the condemnation provisions of Senate bill 792. I now read from page 8:

> (d) With respect to that property which the Secretary is authorized to acquire by condemnation under the terms of this Act, the Secretary shall initiate no condemnation proceedings until after he has made every reasonable effort to acquire such property by negotiation and purchase.

That provision is only so much verbiage, for it provides the power to condemn, and the Secretary will determine whether he thinks he has used "every reasonable effort" to acquire the property.

I read now from page 9 and page 10:

> (e) In any case where the owner and the United States agree, the power of condemnation may, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, be used as a means of acquiring a clear and marketable title, free of any and all encumbrances.
>
> (f) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property located within the area designated for inclusion and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within such area.

I read now from page 12:

> Any such owner shall have sixty days following the receipt by him of that written notification within which to discontinue the use referred to in such notification. Discontinuance of such use within such sixty-day period shall have the effect of prohibiting the Secretary from acquiring such property by condemnation by reason of such use. In any case in which such use is not discontinued within such sixty-day period and

condemnation proceedings are thereafter initiated by the Secretary, no condemnation shall be ordered in any such proceedings if the Secretary fails to demonstrate to the court by substantial evidence that such a use was not in substantial compliance with such bylaw or was not substantially consistent with such applicable standards.

That is only more "gobbledygook." The fact is that this part of the bill would give the Secretary of the Interior the power to condemn.

In my judgment, the bill should not be passed until the condemnation provisions are eliminated. If, thereafter, it develops that the necessary purchases or trades cannot be arranged for property which would be vital, from the point of view of public necessity, condemnation then could be requested, under such circumstances. But that is quite different from providing such condemnation power at this time, as requested for the Secretary of the Interior.

We know that public necessity is the heart of eminent domain, and that as a legislature we should not proceed to grant blanket condemnation power, but should grant condemnation power only in relation to specific facts in connection with parcels of land as to which it can be shown that the absence of Federal ownership would be contrary to the public need.

I know there are those who would like to argue that if I did not object to the provisions authorizing condemnation proceedings in connection with other bills of this sort, I am, somehow, estopped from objecting to the condemnation provisions in the dunes park bill which the committee has brought before the Senate.

Mr. President, in Oregon, hundreds of acres of sand and sand dunes along the coastline are owned by the Federal Government—more sand dunes than the public park could ever use; and not one square foot of additional sand dunes need be condemned. Yet in the Oregon dunes case, the committee has reported the bill with a condemnation provision included in it.

For years, I have been trying to draft a bill which would avoid an unfortunate controversy in my State. The controversy in Oregon became so bad that, some months ago, when it was suggested that the late President of the United States visit Oregon and take an automobile tour to the area where the sand dunes are, it was said that if he did that, he would be picketed. That is the situation in Oregon into which the committee has walked.

In my opinion, when a State's delegation is not united in regard to such an issue, neither the Senate committee nor the Senate should seek to impose upon the State a proposed park which causes conflict of this kind within a State. It is not necessary, because we can have a good park in Oregon without the condemnation provisions of that bill.

It is argued, by the committee, so I understand, that only a small number of dwellings will be involved. However, I do not care if only one dwelling is involved, for certainly I hope we have not reached the point where if a principle of justice is involved, it will make a difference whether that principle of justice will be denied to only one landowner. My position as to principle will be maintained by me, regardless of whether only one landowner or 1,500 are affected. However, I point out that in this area of Oregon, many retired persons have built their own homes with their own hands. Nevertheless, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs says, in effect, "We will let them live on their land for 25 years." However, such a provision would destroy the market value of their homes, and would also destroy a good many other values which are dear to them.

So the question is whether it is necessary for the Federal Government to take this land, from the standpoint of public necessity. We shall further debate this point later.

There is developing in Oregon a situation in which the two political parties are taking opposing positions, and a split is also developing within my party on this issue—to the great glee of the opposition party. I did not ask for that quarrel, but I will not run away from it. I want the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Senate and the Democratic Party to know that I will take care of myself in Oregon; but in this fight, I urge the adoption of a sound Federal Government policy.

In my opinion, the tendency to pass bills which grant the Federal Government authority to condemn more and more land and to take over more and more property in some of the great public domain States must be stopped. Our States lose a great deal of potential revenue because of the Federal public domain; and if some Senators think we are repaid by the payments the Federal Government makes in lieu of taxes, in place of what would be the income to State if the property were owned privately, they could not be more mistaken.

Mr. President, I am in favor of public domain, and I have fought attempts by ranchers, livestock groups, and other groups in Oregon to have large areas of the public domain returned to private ownership; and I shall continue to fight such attempts, for they jeopardize a sound conservation program.

I wish to say to the conservationists that they are not supporting a sound conservation program when they take the position—every time they want a park—that they desire to give blanket authority to the Secretary of the Interior to take property that is not needed in order to obtain a good park.

I understand from my friends from Michigan that their situation is not comparable to the one in the State of Oregon. So the only objection I raise to the Michigan bill is that we should eliminate the condemnation sections in the bill and see what can be arrived at by way of Sleeping Bear Park on the basis of negotiation and purchase. Later, if a set of facts develops, that will stop them from having the park; if they find that later a situation should develop which, in order to get a certain piece of property from the standpoint of public necessity, would require action of the kind proposed, we can then enact special legislation providing for condemnation for those essential areas, and those areas alone.

I shall not say any more tonight, Mr. President. I believe I have served notice as to my position. I have kept faith with the people of my State to whom for years I have pledged that I would continue to oppose condemnation in regard to the Oregon Dunes Seashore Park, and that I would work as hard as I could to get a seashore park with the condemnation provision eliminated.

I well know what the opposition would try to say if I did not raise my voice tonight in opposition to the condemnation section of the bill. I have said few words—and they are relatively few compared to the discussion I shall have from time to time later on in the Senate, when the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee tries to get the Oregon Dunes bill through the Senate in its present form.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I have a few observations to make. I certainly respect the Senator from Oregon. He is a great fighter. He has served notice upon me, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, that he will wage a strong fight on the condemnation provision in the Oregon Dunes bill.

As I have said repeatedly, in working on these lakeshore and seashore proposals, there are still opportunities to arrive at some arrangement that will meet with the approval of the Senator from Oregon. I hope that can be done. We will not take up the Oregon Dunes bill tonight. I understand there might be some discussion on the project at a later date—in January or February. I hope that between now and that time we can work on this problem with the Senator from Oregon.

On the question of condemnation, I know there is some difference of opinion. Actually, there is no such thing as blanket condemnation in the bill before the Senate, the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore bill. Actually, as I tried to point out, it would permit owners of residential property, if they comply with the local zoning ordinances in the two counties involved in the Michigan situation, to stay there forever. They can alienate the property. They can do anything they wish with it. They can sell it to Uncle Sam if they wish to do so. If they sell it to Uncle Sam, they may retain a 25-year tenancy in it. The bill is patterned after the Cape Cod bill. From time to time we have checked back on the Cape Cod bill since the formula was built into the law, and we find it is causing no great hardship. It is working well. I believe it is a realistic approach to the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore bill. Homeowners can live side by side with the recreation development there. Their uses are not incompatible.

The same thing is true of commercial uses. The only area in which condemnation is permitted under the Sleeping Bear proposal is on unimproved real property.

I recognize the depth of feeling of the Senator from Oregon in regard to this question. I respect that feeling. We will certainly do everything we can to work out the problem between now and the time the Oregon dunes bill is placed on the calendar. If we cannot arrive at an adjustment, the Senator knows his parliamentary rights as well as any Senator, and we can consider the question on the various amendments which may be offered.

I do not believe the provision that is written into the bill is harsh or unfair. It seems to me it is a reasonable solution. I believe we have an excellent bill before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am glad that the Sleeping Bear Dunes bill is so close to apparent passage, because the inland States have suffered from not having an adequate supply of parks. We have great centers of population. Those populations are growing rapidly, indeed. We have beautiful areas, but those areas have been taken over largely by private interests and only a few remain.

I had hoped that my bill to establish the beloved Indiana Dunes Park would be the first of the inland lakeside park bills to be presented; but I am glad, indeed, to support the proposal of the Senators from Michigan.

I wish to say to my good friend from Oregon—and he is my good friend—that we have fought many times in the past, side by side, and I expect to fight side by side with him many more times in the future. As I understand, the bill provides that people who own houses may keep those houses and the land adjoining in perpetuity. They may retain the houses and the adjoining property for personal use. They can pass the property on to their heirs. However, if they wish to sell to others than their families, it is true, is it not, that the Federal Government has the first opportunity to buy?

Mr. BIBLE. If the Senator will yield——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. May I clarify the statement?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. BIBLE. There is a qualification. The property owner is not permitted to stay in Sleeping Bear Dunes in perpetuity unless—and this is the qualification—he conforms with the zoning ordinances in the two counties involved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. BIBLE. The second condition is that the owner may not put the property to an incompatible use. These are the only two cases in which condemnation would arise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That would be natural in any city which establishes a zoning ordinance.

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The constitutionality of the zoning ordinances have been repeatedly upheld by the Supreme Court.

Mr. BIBLE. Exactly.

One further observation, Mr. President. Under the Sleeping Bear proposal, the owner who conforms with the zoning ordinances would be able to sell the property to anyone he desires.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To anyone he wishes.

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That seems to me to dispose of the legitimate objections. I hope very much that the bill will be passed. I hope, also, that there will soon be action on the Indiana Dunes bill.

Mr. BIBLE. If the Senator will yield to me further——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BIBLE. I shall keep my commitment to the Senator from Illinois. The Indiana Dunes proposal has been before our committee for at least 8 or 9 years. I have assured the distinguished Senator from Illinois that hearings would be held on the Indiana Dunes project the latter part of January or the first part of February. We intend to accommodate ourselves to that date and to do everything we can to move it forward. I believe the bill for the Indiana Dunes is a realistic bill, and we will try to move it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MORSE. I do not know whether I am a cosponsor of the Indiana Dunes bill——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can assure the Senator from Oregon that he is.

Mr. MORSE. I rise to point out a great difference between the Indiana Dunes proposal and the problem that confronts me. In the Indiana Dunes project one has to take over property that is practically or entirely owned by private interests. It is not public property. If we are to have a public park there, which raises the principle of eminent domain and public necessity, there must be condemnation; and I heartily support it. In the Michigan case—and I do not know what the tract problems are; I do not know how much land is involved—the situation exists where, in order to obtain a park, private land must be taken. If justification for the park meets the legal test of public necessity, I am for it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Good.

Mr. MORSE. I am for it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Good.

Mr MORSE. I have always been in favor of projects for the public necessity.

The Senator, I know, sees the situation the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is maneuvering me into from the standpoint of the general public, who do not understand the legal niceties. My editorial opposition—and that includes almost all in my State—and my political opposition will say, "What kind of fellow is that MORSE? There he is voting for condemnation in one case and objecting to condemnation in another."

That is why I am making this record tonight. If I am in error on my facts, I want to know it. My understanding is that even in the Sleeping Bear area there could be quite a large park if there were not a requirement of condemnation of the relatively small number of private holdings which are to be condemned.

Let the RECORD be perfectly clear that in Oregon it is not necessary to condemn a square foot of property in order to have more park than can be used. That does not involve private ownership.

That is the great difference between the controversies. I want my friend from Illinois to know that he will not have a more ardent supporter of the Indiana Dunes program than I am. That is why I said I thought I was a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Good.

Mr. MORSE. I have always explained the difference between the Indiana case and the Oregon case in my battles over this in Oregon.

I just came through a campaign in Oregon for reelection. In that part of the State the dunes issue was probably the hottest issue of the campaign. I do not intend to walk out on my campaign promises of 1962. The people of Oregon reelected me, and I believe I have some responsibility to fight against condemnation provisions in the bill of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I tried to make this clear before the bill came from the committee. I tried to explain the problem in our State.

I do not like to see our delegation involve itself in a democratic civil war in my State, but that is what we are headed for. It ought to be avoided.

The only reason I pointed out why I would vote against the Sleeping Bear bill tonight was my understanding—if it is not factually correct, I should like to have it corrected—that the condemnation provision is not necessary in order to have a substantial park in the Sleeping Bear area. If that is true, I am against condemnation. If it is not true, I will be for it.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to S. 792.

First, I compliment the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for his diligence and the effort he made to conduct hearings both in Washington, D.C., and in Michigan in order to give everyone an opportunity to be heard.

The bill now before the Senate, as amended, is a bill drastically reduced from the original S. 792 as it came to the committee. As the chairman of the subcommittee stated, the private property holdings have been reduced from 1,587 to 288. The acreage has been reduced from 77,000 to 42,000 acres.

At one time the Secretary of the Interior asked to have 92,000 acres to be set aside for this project. In 1959, the National Park Service recommended a total acreage of about 30,000. So the acreage now in the amended bill, 42,000 acres, represents a substantial reduction from the request of the Secretary of the Interior for 92,000 acres, and the original acreage requested in S. 792.

Despite the reduction in acreage, none of the lake shore line has been sacrificed. There are still 32 miles of mainland lake shore line and 13 miles of lake shore line around South Manitou Island.

Also, the acquisition costs have been reduced from an original estimate of $17 million to the present estimate of $4,725,000.

The area included under the terms of the bill is still not as small as I should like to see it. I joined in minority views which called for reducing the acreage somewhat more, taking away some of the land north and south of the Little Glen Lake now held in private lands.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a statement which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] would deliver with respect to the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore if he were present.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement by Senator Gordon Allott on S. 792, Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore

As reported from the committee, S. 792, which provides for the establishment of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, includes lands within the boundaries of the proposed National Lakeshore that I consider to be totally unnecessary for the purposes of the bill as set forth in section 1, which reads as follows:

"That (a) in order to establish and preserve for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreational use and enjoyment of the public, a significant portion of the diminishing shoreline of the United States and its related geographic and scientific features, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to take appropriate action as herein provided to establish in the State of Michigan, the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshores."

There are two tracts of land—one on the north side of Glen Lake and one on the south side of Glen Lake—which in my opinion add little to the purposes of the proposed National Lakeshore as set forth in section 1, which I have just read, because these lands at no point touch the shore line of Lake Michigan. In fact, at the closest point of proximity, the lakeshore is approximately one quarter mile distant; and at that point, the village of Glen Arbor lies between Lake Michigan and the northerly tract.

I submit, therefore, that the inclusion of these lands does not preserve for the benefit of the public, any portion of the "diminishing shoreline" of the United States, and in fact, the inclusion of these lands is a contradiction of the declared purposes of the bill. Their inclusion in the boundaries of the national lakeshore could prove to be a source of harassment to the landowners and may have a deleterious effect upon land values without there being any hope for just compensation.

Some may argue that there are certain scenic values to these lands in question that must be protected. The bill provides for the establishment of a scenic parkway which takes advantage of the best of the natural scenery in the area in question. The Secretary is authorized to acquire up to 150 acres per mile of parkway, or in other words, a strip of land nearly a quarter of a mile in width on which may be established scenic turnouts and vantage points. I believe the scenic protection sought is already assured. We have a responsibility to protect the landowners of this country from unnecessary Federal encroachment. This is more especially true when a Federal taking does not serve the declared purpose of the bill. My amendment would eliminate the inclusion of these lands. It is as follows:

"After the word 'running', strike out all through the comma on page 45, line 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'west to a point on the north line of section 29 which is 500 feet west of the center line of Michigan Highway 109,

"'thence along a line in a general southerly direction at a distance of 500 feet perpendicular to the said center line of said highway to a point on the east-west quarter line of section 18, township 28 north, range 14 west, said point being the point of intersection of such line as protracted and the east-west quarter line of the said section 18,'."

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. I say to my distinguished colleague the Senator from Oregon that we who signed the minority views are not happy about the condemnation procedure provided for in the bill, either.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the minority views and additional minority views dealing with this subject.

There being no objection, the views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Minority Views

The bill, as reported from the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs, includes lands within boundaries of the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore that we consider unnecessary for the purposes of the bill, as set forth in section 1. The lands included that we particularly object to are those lands which are located directly north of "little" Glen Lake and those which are located directly south of "little" Glen Lake and "big" Glen Lake, all of which are located in Leelanau County, Mich.; i.e., T. 28 N., R. 14 W., parts of secs. 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, and 17, and all of sec. 9; T. 29 N., R. 14 W., parts of secs. 27, 29, 32, 33, 34, and all of sec. 28. At no point do any of these included lands touch the lakeshore. Their inclusion in the boundaries of the national lakeshore could prove to be a source of harassment to the landowners and may have a deleterious effect upon land values without there being any hope for just compensation.

Were the inclusion of these lands essential to the purposes of the national lakeshore, or were they at least necessary, we would withdraw our objection. But, in light of the fact that the bill provides for the establishment of a scenic parkway which takes advantage of the best of the natural scenery in the area in question, and that the Secretary is authorized to acquire up to 150 acres per mile of parkway, or, in other words, a strip of land nearly a quarter of a mile in width, we believe scenic protection is already assured.

We have a responsibility to protect the property rights within the area and the bill should be amended to do so.

THOMAS H. KUCHEL.
GORDON ALLOTT.
LEN B. JORDAN.
PETER H. DOMINICK.

Additional Minority Views

There is no justification or need for the establishment of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Area. The Federal intervention by the National Park Service in this geographic area would be unwise and unwarranted.

The State of Michigan has had a progressive program for conservation and park planning that has satisfied the recreational needs of that State and the traveling public. Michigan has 69 State parks (181,429 acres), 23 State forests (3,763,494 acres), 61 State game areas (195,000 acres), and 785 public fishing sites.

Michigan rates second in national forest acres among States east of the Rockies. In Michigan's Lower Peninsula both Manistee National Forest and Huron National Forest are closer to the large population centers than is the Sleeping Bear Dunes area. Over 40 miles of Great Lakes shoreline is included in these two national forests. It is interesting to note that these forests have had little development for public use and are largely ignored by the public. We feel existing forest lands and shorelines should be developed before additional private lands are condemned and added to the already abundant acreage in Federal ownership.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes area is a beautiful area which has been kept up and maintained by the citizens of the area. There is no need for Federal intervention to maintain the beauty of that area.

This proposed lakeshore area of 42,000 acres has within it 32,300 acres of privately owned land which would be subjected to condemnation or the threat of condemnation if this bill were passed. Spread out over these 32,300 acres of privately owned land you will find 301 structures. A good number of these buildings are the homes and cottages of the residents of Michigan.

We can find nothing in the record of the hearings nor did we see anything on our field trip which would justify the condemnation of these privately owned lands or the harassment and regimentation to which the homeowners would be subjected. Let us not forget that the basic policy of the National Park Service has been to eliminate all inholdings. And, for the most part, the Park Service has succeeded.

The proponents of S. 792 will attempt to rationalize the zoning and condemnation features of this bill by arguing that it follows the Cape Cod formula.

Perhaps the Cape Cod, zoning and condemnation features could be justified in that instance, but here the facts are different.

Let's look, for example, at the numbers of people served by the two areas, which is a measure of potential use or need. Within a 100-mile radius of the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Recreation Area there are 564,000 people. Within a similar 100-mile radius of the Cape Cod National Seashore there is a population of 5,310,000, nearly 10 times as many.

"Outdoor Recreation for America," a 1962 report to the President and to the Congress by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, points out (p. 3) that "Outdoor opportunities are most urgently needed near metropolitan areas." It also points out (p. 39) that nearly one-third of all vacation trips are confined to 100 miles or less.

Bearing in mind that the greatest need for recreation areas is near metropolitan centers and that about a third of all vacation trips are confined to within 100 miles, we then note these comparisons, or contrasts:

Within a 100-mile driving radius of Sleeping Bear there are only 2 cities of over 10,000 people. Their combined population is 28,544.

Within a 100-mile driving radius of Cape Cod National Seashore, there are 80 cities of over 10,000 people. Their combined population is 3,184,563. This is nearly 112 times as much as Sleeping Bear.

Within a 200-mile driving radius of Sleeping Bear there are 17 cities of 10,000 or more people. Their combined population is 990,804. The total population in cities of 10,000 or more within 200-mile driving radius of Cape Cod is 6,335,561, more than 6 times as many as for Sleeping Bear.

The report of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, already referred to, states (p. 49) that "Michigan has a vast recreation resource in public ownership, but most of it is located just beyond the range of mass recreation use for the people of Detroit." It might have added that half of Michigan's population lives within an hour's drive of downtown Detroit.

Now, let's see, on a per capita basis, how Michigan and Massachusetts compare in recreational resources, remembering that in density of population, Massachusetts has 618 persons per square mile, compared to 137 for Michigan and that the area of Massachusetts is 8,257 square miles, compared to 58,216 square miles for Michigan.

State parks: Michigan has an acre for each 44 persons; Massachusetts has an acre for each 538 persons.

State forests: Michigan has an acre for each 2 persons; Massachusetts has an acre for each 23 persons.

National parks and recreation areas: Michigan (Isle Royale National Park) has an acre for each 15 persons; Massachusetts (Cape Cod National Seashore) has an acre for each 192 persons. Incidentally, only about 7,000 persons visit Isle Royale National Park each year.

National forests: Michigan has an acre for each three persons; Massachusetts has no national forests, as such, only an experimental forest of 1,651 acres.

Shoreline: Michigan has 3,200 miles of Great Lakes shoreline; 545 miles of which are in public ownership; Massachusetts has 192 miles along the Atlantic coast.

Inland lakes: Michigan has 11,037 inland lakes covering 766,080 acres—an acre for each 11 persons; Massachusetts has 1,100 lakes and ponds covering 249,600 acres—an acre for each 20 persons. In addition, Michigan has 36,000 miles of rivers and streams.

The aforementioned comparisons clearly demonstrate that the needs for the States of Michigan and Massachusetts are not the same and consequently, the provisions which can be justified in one instance do not necessarily meet the needs of new legislation.

We recognize that there is a need for public recreational facilities and will support the establishment of those facilities when justified. But, in this instance we cannot support the establishment of a lakeshore area which is not needed by the public and not wanted by the citizens of the immediate area. We agree with the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission "that most of Michigan's recreation resources are located just beyond the range of mass recreation use for the people of Detroit" and other metropolitan centers. The Sleeping Bear Dunes Lakeshore Area is one of these areas outside the range of use by our urban citizens.

Consequently, there would not be enough public use to justify the zoning and condemnation features which are in this bill. And, further, there are presently more than enough parks and recreation facilities to meet the needs of the people of the Sleeping Bear Dunes area and the people of Michigan.

Therefore, we oppose the Federal intervention and the establishment of the Sleeping Bear Dunes Lakeshore Area.

MILWARD L. SIMPSON.
E. L. MECHEM.
PETER H. DOMINICK.
LEN B. JORDAN.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, we worked long and hard to bring out a bill which we thought would be accepted by this body. It is not the bill I personally would prefer. It is not the bill my colleagues in the minority would prefer. We regard it as the best bill we can get and still preserve the scenic grandeur of this dunes area.

The bill now before the Senate is very close in area to a similar bill introduced in the House by the distinguished Representative in Congress from the district, Mr. GRIFFIN.

I suggest that the Senate should approve the bill and send it to the House with a full record of our minority views, in the hope that the House can improve it toward a better solution of the condemnation procedures provided for in the bill, and also with respect to a further reduction in the acreage of private holdings.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I want to indicate my wholehearted support of S. 792, the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore bill and state to the Senate that one of the reasons for that support is my great confidence in the workmanship of the chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

I have been associated with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] for 5 years on the committee and the subcommittee. There is not another one of us in the Senate with a greater sense of responsibility, combined with unusual ability, patience, and energy, than the Senator.

Members of this body can be assured that when a bill comes to the floor from the Subcommittee on Public Lands over which he presides, that it has been studied in detail. It has been the policy of the chairman to insist upon an on-site inspection of every major park proposal so the boundary revisions made in the subcommittee are with full knowledge of the tract to be included or excluded by any change in lines.

There has been careful consideration of every provision of the various park bills. An apparent conflict between Federal and State interests as to the control of hunting and fishing in the Federal park and recreational areas has been worked out to the satisfaction of both sides. Limitations on the exercise of the power of condemnation have been developed which will permit private owners to enjoy residential property, and even retain commercial properties in the new type of shoreline and recreational areas we are establishing so long as their use is compatible with the Federal purpose. Boundaries in each of the individual measures have been drawn with care.

The chairman of the subcommittee has done an outstanding job of study, negotiation, and development of legislative patterns which have made it possible to make excellent progress in implementing an accelerated national recreational area program.

The same sort of careful but expeditious work goes into legislation which comes before his subcommittee involving the administration of the public lands.

Beyond his fine workmanship, the able Senator from Nevada is an outstanding presiding officer.

On July 4 of this year the senior Senator from Nevada found himself presiding over a hearing in a Michigan high school auditorium jampacked with 2,000 banner-waving partisans in the Sleeping Bear Dunes controversy. There was some fear of demonstrations—of a "scene." The remarkable good humor of the chairman, but his firm insistence on good order and a fair hearing for both sides, won him much-deserved plaudits for his performance as a presiding officer from people on both sides.

Feelings are almost always intense about national park and recreational area proposals. Every hearing, and particularly the field hearings, is a test of the chair. The Senator from Nevada has proved to us who work with him that he has no peer as a wielder of the gavel.

The workload of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is one of the heaviest of any subcommittee in the Senate.

Based on our November 12 calendar, the subcommittee had been referred 126 out of the 264 Senate bills sent to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and 9 out of 21 Senate resolutions. It had received 8 of 22 House bills or resolutions. It was responsible for 55 out of 130 reports and originated 18 of the 32 public laws which had stemmed from our committee in this first session of the Congress, plus 4 of 8 private laws.

The Senator from Nevada has thus not only produced unusually competent work, he has processed through the committee an unusual volume of work.

I am aware of the fact, Mr. President, that we are sometimes liberal about verbal bouquets in the Senate. This is no casual praise of the Senator from Nevada. He has done an impressive job in the Senator Interior Committee this year. He is admired and respected by every one of us on the committee familiar with his efforts and his great ability, and it should be in the RECORD.

I compliment the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] on a tremendous years' work—productive work—and want him to know that I appreciate what he has done for me, for the committee, for the Senate, and for all the people of this country. I say to the Senator, "The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore bill before the Senate at the moment bears your stamp—the mark of one of our finest legislative craftsmen—and it is a pleasure to support Senator HART and Senator MCNAMARA's great purposes, presented in the fine measure you have worked out."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, first I must express my thanks to the members of the Senate Interior Committee today before speaking in support of S. 792, the bill which my senior colleague, Senator MCNAMARA, and I introduced to establish in Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

We are especially indebted to the chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, Senator BIBLE, who has given most generously of his time, energy, experience, and ability to develop a bill on which there could be maximum agreement. We are indebted also to members of his subcommittee, who held a hearing in Michigan on a day when most Americans were vacationing—the Fourth of July. Present in Frankfort on that day, in addition to the chairman, were Senators GRUENING, JORDAN, and SIMPSON.

Very special thanks are due to Senator Moss, of Utah, who held the first hearings on this proposal on an earlier bill, S. 2153, in Traverse City, Mich., back in November 1961. He has contributed greatly to this legislation. And, of course, we underscore our gratitude to the chairman of the Interior Committee, Mr. JACKSON, for bringing the bill to the Senate floor in these crowded days.

Mr. President, the Sleeping Bear Dunes area is one of three on the Great Lakes identified by the National Park Service as of sufficient beauty and scope to be deserving of incorporation in the national park system. Senator MCNAMARA and I are proud that all three of these Great Lakes areas, first sketched in preliminary outline by a professional aerial survey of "our fourth shore" in 1957 and 1958, are located in the State of Michigan. The three are Sleeping Bear Dunes, Pictured Rocks, and Huron Mountains.

Today, we have before us a bill which seeks to preserve for the enjoyment of present and future generations the first of these three areas and the one nearest our great population centers.

In 1959, after detailed on the ground surveys and study, the National Park Service recommended an area of some 77,000 acres for establishment of a national lakeshore. Following this recommendation, Senator McNamara and I introduced S. 2153 in the 87th Congress.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes area is in Benzie and Leelanau Counties on the northeastern shore of Lake Michigan, approximately 25 miles west of Traverse City. It is an area of extraordinary beauty, as yet largely unspoiled. The massive dunes, towering 460 feet above the waters of Lake Michigan, combined with white sand beaches, magnificent deciduous forests and the giant cedar stands on the offshore island of South Manitou, offer one of the finest remaining opportunities for the preservation of outstanding scenic, scientific, and recreation values.

Mr. President, in the 5 years I have served in the Senate, it has been my privilege by my vote to take part in the creation of the Cape Cod National Seashore on our Atlantic coast, the Point Reyes National Seashore on our Pacific coast, Padre Island National Seashore on the Gulf, and the Canyonlands National Park in our Far West—among others. It is right that we now move to establish a national lakeshore on the Great Lakes.

The Sleeping Bear area, while still possessing most of its original beauty, unspoiled, is within an easy day's drive of 20 million people in the industrial heart of our Nation. It is 239 miles from Detroit, 294 miles from Chicago, and 400 miles from Cleveland. Indeed, a majority of those having summer homes and cottages there now are from States other than Michigan, and I know many of you have had cries of protest from many of these whom we enjoy having as summer neighbors.

The lakeshore which we here propose contains a mainland area—land and water—of 42,300 acres, plus 5,300 acres on South Manitou Island. On the mainland, there are 33 miles of shoreline, plus 13 miles of shoreline on South Manitou Island.

In addition, the bill authorizes the acquisition of right-of-way for a 30-mile scenic parkway which would traverse the highlands back from Lake Michigan, overlooking both Lake Michigan and the beautiful inland lakes.

As Members of the Senate well know, in every case where we endeavor to set aside a sizeable area of land for enjoyment by future generations, conflicts arise. Sometimes these conflicts come from mining interests, sometimes from grazing interests, sometimes from industrial interests.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes area has been no exception to this rule. In our case the opposition has come from those owning homes or cottages in the area. Although the bill made provision for continued private ownership of homes and cottages in perpetuity, the overwhelming majority of those around the inland lakes preferred to be excluded from the Lakeshore.

The Committee has met this problem by reducing the area to the present total of 47,600 acres, in the main, by carving out the land around Little Traverse Lake, Glen Lake, and the Platte Lakes where there was the heaviest concentration of residences. The number of structures within the boundaries was thus reduced from 1,587 to 288.

Senator McNamara and I included the inland lakes in our original proposal as an integral part of the area, as did the field survey; they are among its most beautiful features; and with the safeguards for private property contained in the bill, we felt the homeowner would be more effectively protected from overdevelopment if within the boundary than just on the outside. In this belief we were backed by all the experts in land use and land value whose views were presented to us. This, however, was not the opinion of those involved, and the inland lakes are excluded. History only will give the answer as to which is the more prudent course.

SAFEGUARDS FOR PRIVATE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY

Let me comment again on the statement made by the subcommittee chairman, Senator Bible, outlining the safeguards contained in S. 792 for the property owners. Those safeguards have accurately been described as the most far-reaching of any to be incorporated in a national seashore or national lakeshore bill. In essence, any home or cottage existing or under construction as of December 31, 1962, may remain in private ownership, may be sold to another individual, or may be willed to one's children or grandchildren, provided only that its continued use is in accordance with zoning standards spelled out in section 9 of the bill.

Further, S. 792 provides that if the county or township fails to zone, the individual homeowner may still protect his home in perpetuity by writing a letter to the Secretary of the Interior to the effect that he will use his property in accordance with these standards. Since the standards are written into the bill, they may not be changed by whim of any Secretary of the Interior; they may only be changed by act of Congress.

COMMERCIAL ESTABLISHMENTS

There is relatively little commercial development within the lakeshore at the present time. The bill prohibits condemnation of any commercial property in existence on December 31, 1962, so long as the use thereof would further the purposes of the lakeshore, "and such use does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area." Specifically listed as uses that would be compatible are: Commercial farms, orchards, motels, rental cottages, camps, craft and art studios, marinas, medical, legal, architectural, and other such professional offices, and tree farms.

HUNTING AND FISHING

S. 792 as reported permits hunting and fishing within the boundaries in accordance with the laws of the State of Michigan. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to consult with the Michigan Department of Conservation in developing the hunting and fishing regulations.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

Mr. President, our objective from the outset has been that, once alerted by the shoreline studies, we should proceed with a minimum of hardship to local property owners to insure the maintenance of the beauty and refreshment of the Sleeping Bear Dunes area which those now there love so dearly.

However, Senator McNamara and I have also been mindful of the economic benefit to our State—particularly to the northwestern lower peninsula from the establishment of a unit of the National Park System in that area. Benzie and Leelanau Counties are both redevelopment areas. Our magnificent throughway, Route 75, goes straight up through the center of the State and into Canada. What will attract the tourist—who is today Michigan's No. 2 industry—to spend his vacation days on the U.S. side of the Great Lakes? A national lakeshore, on every highway map that is printed, will attract visitors as nothing else could do.

Much has been made of the thousands of acres of Michigan land now in public ownership. The bulk of this, however, is tax-reverted land; only about 3 percent of it is of prime recreation quality. The outdoor recreation demand is increasing so rapidly that increasing thousands of would-be campers are turned away each year. Last year, for example, our State parks turned away 175,000 people from their gates.

S. 792 has the backing of all the principal conservation groups in the State of Michigan: the Michigan Audubon Society, Michigan Botanical Club, Michigan Forestry and Park Association, Michigan Natural Area Council, Michigan Parks Association, Michigan United Conservation Clubs, and the Recreation Association of Michigan. It is supported by the great national conservation organizations: the Izaak Walton League of America, National Wildlife Federation, National Audubon Society, Wilderness Society, National Parks Association, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, and the Sierra Club. Governor Romney has supported the principle of a national lakeshore in the area; Congressman Griffin—in whose congressional district the lakeshore is located—and Congressman Staebler—our Congressman at Large—have both introduced Sleeping Bear Dunes bills in the House. In October 1959, the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments recommended it to the Secretary of the Interior for his consideration.

The hearings on this legislation have been extensive. The subcommittee has worked on it diligently. Former President Kennedy strongly supported a Sleeping Bear Lakeshore. The bill which now comes to us with the approval of the full Senate Interior Committee is a bill which I believe all reasonable men and women can support. Division could continue of what would be the ideal park. All can agree this will be a fine park, a benefit to those who now and hereafter live in this America.

There is an urgent need for early action on the measure. The people who own property and do business in the area will be in a state of uncertainty until this issue is settled. I can report that everyone connected with this matter, no matter what his views, is united in desiring a decision without further delay.

In terms of what is being provided of significant mainland use, this bill is vastly better than the House bill H.R. 2400. There are several facts helpful in evaluating the several pending proposals. The bill reported by the committee and now before us provides on the mainland of Manitou 32 miles of lakeshore. The bill—H.R. 2400—mentioned by the Senator from Idaho as introduced in the House by the Congressman from the district, Mr. GRIFFIN, provides 14 miles of mainland shoreline. The bill before us provides 42,000 acres on the mainland. The mentioned bill in the House provides for 17,000 acres. Also, the bill here provides for 30 miles of scenic drive on the mainland.

Mr. President, those who have visited the Sleeping Bear Dunes will, I am sure, agree with Senator McNAMARA and me that this is an area of unique grandeur and beauty, indeed inspirational to those privileged to view it. It will be a worthy addition to the acreage which the Nation has set aside to be preserved that future generations may gain the refreshment of spirit from it that we do today.

I hope the Senate will act favorably.

Mr. President, I wonder if there would be objection if I asked unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, since the two minority views have been added to the RECORD, the majority committee view, which is a rather brief one.

Mr. BIBLE. I have no objection to submitting that for the RECORD as a part of the presentation of the proponents of the legislation.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND

The Sleeping Bear and Empire Dunes area on the northwest shore of Michigan's Lower Peninsula is classified as one of the nine most important remaining shoreline opportunities in the United States for establishment of a recreation area encompassing outstanding scenic, geologic, and scientific values in a near natural state.

The great Sleeping Bear Dunes, rising 460 feet above lake level, and the forested Empire Dunes 5 miles to the south, nearly as high, are unrivaled in the world by lakeside sand dunes. The area, in Leelanau and Benzie Counties, Mich., is within a 1-day drive of 20 million people in the heavily populated Detroit-Chicago area.

The proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore would include approximately 32 miles of shore on Lake Michigan on the mainland at Sleeping Bear Bay and Good Harbor Bay, plus 13 miles of shoreline on South Manitou Island, a 5,300-acre island lying 7 miles off the mainland, now half publicly owned, which includes dunes, an inland lake, and has a large, natural protected harbor on its eastern shore.

The original landscape in the area was formed by lobes of glacial ice advancing into the Grand Traverse-Sleeping Bear area. Between the lobes there was deposited great linear hills of glacial debris. The subsequent action of the wind in creating dunes, many now forested, has left the inland area marked with inland lakes. The whole region is one of hills and lakes affording unusual vistas from hilltops across the inland lakes and dunes to Sleeping Bear Bay, Good Harbor Bay, and Lake Michigan.

The geological formations created by ice, wind, and water are readily traced, and demonstrated to visitors in the area.

The biological features are many and varied, including plants which thrive on hills, ridges, and in swailes and swamps. A forest of maple and beech surrounds Glen Lake. There are cedar swamps underlain with marl, white birch, jack pine, tamarack, spruce, and many other species. Many rare plants are found on South Manitou Island, including the largest known northern white-cedar tree in the United States.

Also on South Manitou is a large nesting colony of herring gulls.

A large number of books, studies, and papers by geologists, biologists, and botanists written about the area make it well known in scientific as well as tourist and vacationist circles.

OUR NEED FOR SHORELINES

Congress has approved the establishment of shoreline recreation areas on the Atlantic, the Pacific, and gulf coasts—Cape Cod, Point Reyes, and Padre Island, respectively. Others, such as Oregon Dunes in Oregon and Fire Island off New York, are under consideration. Approval of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore would be the first such establishment in the Great Lakes region.

America's need for the preservation of shorelines for public enjoyment has been recognized for several decades. In 1935, a study of the Atlantic and gulf shores recommended Federal acquisition of 12 areas comprising about 600,000 acres and including more than 400 miles of shore.

Unfortunately, only one of these, Cape Hatteras, was acquired as a result of a donation to the Federal Government, until Congress authorized the purchase of a large part of Padre Island in 1962. Most of the remaining areas recommended for acquisition in the 1935 report have now been subdivided, and occupancy and land values are so high that acquisition would be impracticable.

The Nation was urged anew to acquire shoreline areas in the 1962 report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. After an extensive survey of the recreational preferences of citizens, the ORRRC reported:

"Most people seeking outdoor recreation want water—to sit by, to swim and to fish in, to ski across, and to run their boats over. Swimming is now one of the most popular outdoor activities and likely to be the most popular of all by the turn of the century. Boating and fishing are among the top 10 activities. Camping, picnicking, and hiking, also high on the list, are most attractive near water sites."

As one consequence of these findings, ORRRC recommended:

"Immediate action * * * by Federal, State, and local governments to reserve or acquire additional water, beach, and shoreline areas, particularly near centers of population."

ORRRC studies showed that 65 percent of vacationists travel a minimum of 250 miles on their vacation trips This is the approximate distance between the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore and Detroit or Chicago. A considerable part of the 20 million people within a day's drive would, of course, make the Sleeping Bear area the destination of weekend visits as well as annual vacation trips.

The ORRRC report said:

"A most pressing problem of supply is ocean and Great Lakes shoreline. This resource is one of the most in demand, and it is one of the most scarce in public ownership * * * The present supply of publicly owned shoreline for recreation is not adequate, and acquisition will be needed.

"The 13 shoreline areas that were recommended for addition to the national park system in a national shoreline review, are examples of areas that should be acquired for public use. The 87th Congress enacted legislation to authorize acquisition of one of these, the Cape Cod National Seashore. This is a significant forward step, but State and Federal agencies should act promptly to preserve for public use and enjoyment the remaining magnificent stretches of unspoiled coastline * * *. The need is critical—opportunity to place these areas in public ownership is fading each year as other uses encroach."

The Sleeping Bear Dunes area, herein recommended for Federal acquisition, was one of the 13 recommended in the national shoreline study referred to by the Commission in the quotation above.

Favorable action on the proposed lakeshore recreation area was also urged by the late President John F. Kennedy, in his message to the Congress on our conservation program submitted March 1, 1962.

THE REPORTED BILL

Discussions and hearings on how best to establish a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore have centered on size—boundaries—and treatment of private property owners within the area to be set aside.

Two major proposals have been made to Congress.

One, sponsored by Senators HART, McNAMARA, and Congressman at Large STAEBLER, proposed a 77,000-acre lakeshore including South Manitou Island offshore. Their bill provided for private residential zones within the exterior boundaries where private ownership would be undisturbed so long as properties were zoned and maintained. The purpose of the authors was to give the private owners, including owners of many fine summer homes, both undisturbed permament tenure and protection from deleterious developments in their vicinity. The exterior boundaries would have enclosed Little Traverse Lake, large and small Glen Lakes, and Platte Lake which have many of these cottages along their shores. The bill would have brought into the park the high ridges, scenic overlooks, swamps and forests, and intervening areas of lesser significance.

The second bill, sponsored by Congressman GRIFFIN from the congressional district involved, included 17,000 acres on the mainland, consisting chiefly of a strip along the westward Lake Michigan shore including the Sleeping Bear and Empire Dunes, but disregarding the inland features.

The boundaries of the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore proposed in the committee bill, although described at one time as "twice as big as the small bill and half as big as the larger area proposed" is not a compromise.

The committee feels that it has reported a bill which will preserve for public use on 47,600 acres maximum mileage on the shore of Lake Michigan (approximately 32 miles on the mainland), access inland to the finest overlooks and inland scenic features, and the most attractive and accessible of the two Manitou Islands, the 5,300-acre South Manitou with 13 miles of shoreline, dunes, forests, an inland lake, and a natural, protected harbor within the elliptic bay on its east shore.

A coastal strip up to a little more than 2 miles wide is to be acquired from Sleeping Bear Point south down the west side of the area to the vicinity of Crystal Lake. A second such strip at the north, starting east of Glen Arbor and extending eastward to a high overlook with a view across Good Harbor Bay, Sleeping Bear Bay, and Lake Michigan to Sleeping Bear Point is included.

Authority is then provided for the construction of a scenic parkway arcing around Platte Lake which can include the high, scenic overlooks and areas of interest within its right-of-way. A right-of-way of 150 acres to the mile is authorized, or approximately 1,000 feet. This is 25 acres to the mile greater than usual scenic parkway authorizations for the purpose of permitting protection of the roadway against unsightly developments and acquisition of turnouts and lookouts. A second parkway is authorized along the high moraine south of Crystal Lake, capturing the scenic values there. The total authorized scenic parkway, within designated zones, is approximately 30 miles.

The number of improved private properties included in the actual park boundaries has been reduced from 1,587 in the original major bill to 288. Under the terms of the bill, the residential properties among the 288 structures included in the lakeshore proper can remain in private ownership if properly zoned and maintained. Commercial properties are to be allowed to continue in private ownership if compatible with lakeshore purposes.

The general policy, first developed in the Cape Cod Seashore Act, is followed of not authorizing condemnation to acquire private residential property where locally zoned. Private dwellings built prior to December 31, 1962, together with at least 3 acres of land if the site is that large, can be owned, used, or sold within the area so long as they are used for residential purposes and local units of government have zoning laws which conform to a few minimum standards delineated in the bill, S. 792.

In the unlikely event that a local zoning law is not enacted, or at some future time repealed, an individual homeowner can continue to enjoy exemption from condemnation by filing a simple declaration of intent to use his property in accordance with the minimum zoning standards contained in section 9(a) of the bill.

The property owners are further protected by allowance of time to correct any abuses or violations of zoning brought to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior.

If an owner prefers to sell his home or residential property to the Government, he is given the right to retain, if he so desires, either a lifetime or a 25-year use, or tenure.

There are a limited number of commercial properties in the proposed taking area. Power to acquire these properties is not authorized if they were in existence December 31, 1962, are compatible with the national lakeshore purposes, and are properly maintained.

It is anticipated that private enterprise in the small communities of Empire, Honor, Glen Arbor, and Frankfort, towns near but not within the boundaries of the lakeshore, will provide necessary future expansion of commercial recreation and tourist accommodations for lakeshore visitors.

LOCAL LAND USE PLANNING

There will be a large number of private residential properties and considerable underdeveloped property in private ownership contiguous to the park.

The Government will have an interest in the orderly development and maintenance of property in the adjacent area, which is a part of the scenic asset of the total environment. Section 8(a) consequently provides for cooperation with, and assistance to, local and State units of government to make competent technical people available to local governments for land use planning.

Zoning has already been instituted by some of the townships. The committee feels that this initiative, coupled with proper advisory assistance from technicians, can assure orderly, attractive development of the land adjacent to the lakeshore to the best interests of all involved.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 1 is a statement of policy in regard to shorelines and authorization of the establishment of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. Subsection (b) is a statement of the committee's intention that private property rights be continued to fullest possible extent and that Federal, State, and local governments cooperate to achieve a desirable development of the area through zoning and land use planning.

Section 2 designates the area to be included in the lakeshore.

Section 3 states the procedure for formal declaration of the establishment of the lakeshore.

Section 4 establishes a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Advisory Commission through which it is hoped that the Federal, State, and local cooperation desired can be promoted and achieved. The Commission, to be composed of 10 members, will be advisory to the Secretary of the Interior in establishing and developing the lakeshore. Such commissions have been used and are functioning well at Cape Cod and other areas.

Section 5, governing hunting and fishing, provides that it shall be continued in areas acquired for the lakeshore in accordance with the laws of the State of Michigan.

In certain instances it may be desirable temporarily to limit hunting or fishing in certain areas of the lakeshore for certain time periods for public safety, because of intensive public use, or for other such administrative reasons. Such limitations can be put into effect only after consultation with the Michigan Department of Conservation, and it is not intended that the authority shall be utilized just to limit or prevent hunting or fishing within the lakeshore.

Section 6 states statutory sources of authority for administration and development of the lakeshore area. Subsection (b) provides guides or objectives for management of the lakeshore and it is expected that in implementing plans for renewable resources the Department of Interior will maintain the closest consultation and cooperative work with the Michigan Department of Conservation in regard to wildlife and game both in and adjacent to the lakeshore.

Section 7 makes clear that local governments can levy taxes on any interest in real estate retained by private persons within the lakeshore.

Suggestions were made to the committee that payments be made to local governments to offset any possible revenue losses. The committee has not provided for in lieu of taxpayments in any recent park or recreational area legislation because benefits to the State and localities involved should soon exceed tax losses. With the reduction in acreage from the original proposal, and the belief that the developed properties within the boundaries of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore will, for the most part, remain permanently in private ownership, the committee feels that the loss of local tax revenues from acquisition of undeveloped land will very soon be offset by the increased tourist trade and the increased residential and commercial growth that will occur in areas adjacent to the lakeshore. Economic studies so indicate.

The provisions of Public Laws 874 and 815 provide direct Federal assistance to any local school district whose school revenues are adversely affected by Federal land acquisition. While the committee believes this will not occur, the provisions of these acts are available to assist the local school districts if it proves necessary.

Section 8 gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to acquire lands within the lakeshore boundaries and prescribes the limitations under which it may be exercised. Properties of persons offering to sell or faced with hardship must be purchased as promptly as possible. Properties of the State of Michigan and local governments can be acquired only with concurrence of the governmental unit. Every reasonable effort must be made to negotiate purchases before condemnation. The condemnation procedure may be used upon agreement between the owner and the Government for the purpose of establishing clear titles. Exchanges of land are authorized.

Section 9 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with local governments in development of zoning and land use planning programs, and to make payments to them to obtain technical aid.

Subsection 9(b) provides that the power of condemnation shall be suspended as to improved (residential) properties when maintained in accordance with a duly adopted, valid zoning act. Subsequent subsections govern condemnation when there is violation of zoning, requires Secretarial approval of zoning laws which meet certain minimum requirements stated in the act, and prohibit withdrawal or revocation of the Secretary's approval of a zoning ordinance so long as it remains in effect.

Section 10 permits sellers of residential property to retain tenure for 25 years or life and to transfer such retained right provided the use does not impair and become incompatible with lakeshore purposes.

Section 11 defines an "improved property" as a private, noncommercial, residential property built prior to December 31, 1962, including not less than 3 acres or all of any lesser acreage, excepting Lake Michigan beach or waters necessary for public access.

Section 12 is a legal description of the areas included in the lakeshore. Subsection (a) includes South Manitou Island. Subsection (b) is a legal description of the section on Sleeping Bear and Good Harbor Bay east of Glen Arbor. Subsection (c) is the legal description of the area south from Sleeping Bear Point to the vicinity of Crystal Lake. Subsection (d) defines the area in which the scenic parkway may be built, by map reference, and controls the acreage in the right-of-way.

Section 13 prohibits condemnation of commercial properties so long as they do not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the seashore area, including farms, orchards, motels, rental cottages, camps, craft and art shops, marinas, professional offices, and tree farms.

Section 14 directs the Secretary to provide certificates of the status of properties exempt under the act from condemnation.

Section 15 authorizes appropriation of not more than $4,750,000 for acquisition of necessary lands for the lakeshore.

COST

The cost of real property acquisition for the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore are estimated at not more than $4,750,000 by the National Park Service. This includes a $1,425,000 valuation on structures in the area. To the extent that residential and commercial properties are retained by owners, the Government outlay will be reduced from the $4,755,000 figure. The committee has, however, authorized the full amount since actual appropriations will be subject to review by the Appropriations Committee.

The cost estimate and authorization include acquisition of rights-of-way for the scenic parkway but not construction.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I wish to begin by complimenting the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BIBLE], who is handling the bill on the floor, for his diligence, patience, and precise handling of this piece of legislation. It should be said that he made a trip to Michigan to look this area over; and the astonishing amount of knowledge he displays here today indicates how hard he has worked on the bill.

I do not want to take issue with the distinguished Senator from Oregon. We have worked together on too many matters to have that situation develop at this time. However, I wish to say for the RECORD, with respect to his statement regarding the Michigan problem, that there is no comparison between the situation in the Senator's home State and that in Michigan.

Land along the lakeshore of Michigan is fast disappearing. It is fast being taken over for various uses. This is one of the few places that will be so desperately needed, not this year, not next year, but in the very near future. We are not blessed with the great shoreline that Oregon has; and the population explosion is now affecting us rapidly. It will be a matter of only a few years when the people of the city of Detroit and other great cities in the lower peninsula will have to drive this far to get to the lakeshore.

The political situation as it involves the State of the Senator from Oregon was mentioned two or three times. I know this is something that concerns all of us. I point out to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that we have quite the reverse situation. We have seen indications of bipartisanship on the part of the committee; but, further than that, the bill introduced in the House was introduced by the Republican Representative from that district, Representative GRIFFIN. So, instead of a conflict, there is an agreement between the parties as to what should be done in this important area.

I believe this is an entirely different situation from that which exists in Oregon.

I hope, with the fine explanation that has been made, with an understanding of the minority views of the committee, and with the facts we have pointed out here, the Senator from Oregon will reconsider his position on this bill. I would be grateful to him if he did.

Mr. President, I do not want to relinquish the floor without complimenting my colleague [Mr. HART] for the great effort he has put into this matter, and for standing up in various places in the State of Michigan and taking tremendous "heat," for one reason only; namely, that he is dedicated to preserving this area for future generations. I compliment him, and I am happy to join in the effort to pass the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I assure my friends the Senators from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA and Mr. HART] that while I think it is true that there are differences in the two situations as between Michigan and Oregon, I have explained why I am concerned about the condemnation provisions of the bill.

If there is a situation in Michigan in which public necessity requires condemnation, I shall be the first one to recommend that condemnation be applied. I hope, when we get into conference, the matter can be settled very clearly, so that there will be no question about it.

I am concerned particularly, in my fears of granting unnecessary condemnation powers, because of the position taken by the minority when, on page 15 of the minority views, it is stated, "Consequently, there would not be enough public use to justify the zoning and condemnation features which are in this bill," and when earlier in the minority views serious questions are expressed as to the necessity for the condemnation procedure.

I have made my position clear. I would certainly be for every part of this bill for a public park. I do not think I am a competent witness, only because of the lack of information as to whether there is a need, based on public necessity, for condemning, or having the power of condemnation, under the parts of the bill that relate to condemnation proceedings. Therefore, I am willing to resolve my doubts in favor of the minority.

I think the record should show, because the Senator is not present, that I had a conference with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] before he left. He strongly advised me against the condemnation part of the bill, because he thought what the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee was doing was, bill by bill, building up a pattern for condemnation that would create a great deal of difficulty for Members of the Senate in some parts of the country in which it was proposed to establish public parks to object successfully to a provision for condemnation because of the fact that condemnation in those areas would not be needed. So I felt I owed it to my State and to the two Senators from Michigan to express these considerations; and I add, for the benefit of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], that the Indiana Dunes bill is not applicable to the problem I have raised. I have made my record, and will stand on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 792) was passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF PORTLAND, OREG., CLEARED OF RACIAL BIAS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the executive director of the Portland Housing Authority, of Portland, Oreg., in which he states:

> Again, the Housing Authority of Portland has been cleared of charges of racial bias, as per attached clippings.
>
> Our policies, procedures and actions relative to race relations and civil rights have now been investigated thoroughly by three governmental agencies at the three levels: Federal (Public Housing Administration); State (Oregon Bureau of Labor Civil Rights Division); and local (Portland City Commission on Intergroup Relations). In all of these investigations, no evidence of racial discrimination was found.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be inserted in the RECORD and that two newspaper articles supporting the conclusion of Mr. Rossman, executive director, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and news stories were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING AUTHORITY
OF PORTLAND, OREG.,
Portland, Oreg., December 13, 1963.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Again, the Housing Authority of Portland has been cleared of charges of racial bias, as per attached clippings.

Our policies, procedures and actions relative to race relations and civil rights have now been investigated thoroughly by three governmental agencies at the three levels: Federal (Public Housing Administration); State (Oregon Bureau of Labor Civil Rights Division); and local (Portland City Commission on Intergroup Relations). In all of these investigations, no evidence of racial discrimination was found.

We are asking those who have attacked us in the past to now join with us in following the often-quoted counsel of President Lyndon Johnson: "Come, let us reason together."

We have invited the Greater Portland Council of Churches to work with us in encouraging a greater degree and a better balance of voluntary racial integration in Portland's public housing through education, orientation and persuasion.

We are hopeful that these latest developments will tend to reduce racial tensions in our city.

Sincerely,

GENE W. ROSSMAN,
Executive Director.

[From the Oregon Journal, Dec. 12, 1963]

HAP AGAIN CLEARED OF RACE BIAS CHARGE

The Housing Authority of Portland has been cleared again of a charge of racial discrimination at Northwest Tower Apartments, the Journal learned Thursday.

State Labor Commissioner Norman O. Nilsen ruled there was no illegal practice following investigation of a discrimination charge by Jimmie Proctor, 58, of 1733 Northeast First Avenue, a Negro.

Proctor, who is retired and disabled, alleged he was denied a unit in Northwest Tower, Northeast Nineteenth Avenue, and Flanders Street, on the basis of race.

The complainant and HAP were notified of the ruling Thursday. Nilsen declined comment beyond saying that, as in all such matters, the determination is a private matter between the two parties.

The ruling applies only to Proctor's complaint, he said, however. Text of the ruling was not available immediately.

The late President Kennedy recently bypassed Portland and dedication of the building after the ceremony was threatened with NAACP picketing.

The incident brought about an investigation by the Public Housing Authority in Washington, D.C. It gave HAP a clean bill of health on its racial practices.

[From The Portland (Oreg.) Reporter, Dec. 12, 1963]

CHARGE OF HOUSING BIAS RULED UNSUBSTANTIATED

No discrimination was found in the case of alleged partiality in selecting tenants for

Northwest Tower, the Oregon Bureau of Labor Civil Rights Division has reported.

The charge was filed by a Negro, Jimmy Proctor, 58. His income is derived from social security disability payments.

Proctor was notified by letter Thursday from the office of Norman Nilsen, labor commissioner of Oregon, that his charge wasn't substantiated.

The Housing Authority of Portland said it had not received any official report and any statement would have to come from the board level.

Proctor had charged the HAP and Northwest Tower with listing him "800th" on the list for tenants.

He was 30th on the list when he filed a rental application October 14, 1961, Proctor claimed he was told by the investigator, Russ Peyton.

However, the report said his application was January 10, 1962.

The reason was that Proctor's uncle joined him in an application for a larger apartment on the January date. Later, Proctor's uncle withdrew and Proctor announced he wished his earlier application reinstated.

Many other applications for single apartments had been received in the interim.

A spokesman for the bureau of labor in Portland said that when Proctor's name was transferred to the single apartment list again, his name was further down the list.

The investigation lasted 10 weeks.

Proctor told the Portland Reporter Thursday, "They sided with the HAP."

According to an official report from the Federal housing administration in San Francisco, Proctor's application for a single unit was 209.

"It appears the 150 units in the tower structure will be filled and Mr. Proctor's number will not be reached during initial occupancy."

Mr. MORSE. I congratulate the Portland Housing Authority. This has been a problem which has plagued the Oregon delegation for many weeks. In my capacity as the senior Senator I was requested to make an official request. We took the position that the Federal Housing Authority should make a thorough investigation of the charges that were made by certain minority groups in our State that the Portland Housing Authority was guilty of racial bias in connection with housing practices.

The Senate may recall that in September, when President Kennedy was taking his western trip, he planned to stop off at Portland to dedicate a housing project for the elderly, and that then a controversy developed in Portland over the visit, with minority groups threatening to picket the President if he dedicated the project.

The Democrats in the Oregon delegation advised the President that we did not think he should come, because it would be very embarrassing to us. We certainly did not want any incident in our State to prove embarrassing to the Presidential party. We therefore asked the President not to come. He obliged us. We took full responsibility for the cancellation of the President's visit to Portland.

It was then that we asked for the investigation that Mr. Rossman reports to me in his letter. I am very glad that the investigation has cleared the Portland Housing Authority, and I am glad now to make it a matter of official record.

DISCRIMINATORY RATE PRACTICES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Senators will recall that one of the Senate's amendments dropped in the conference on foreign aid was that defining "economically developed" countries which no longer shall be eligible for American aid. The amendment I proposed, which was adopted, referred to the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations on this same matter, and provided that all the same countries listed in that resolution as being economically developed would also be so considered for purposes of American aid.

The resolution named, in addition to the United States, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Rumania, South Africa, Sweden, Ukrainian S.S.R., Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom. My amendment added to that list the Federal Republic of Germany and also Switzerland, which are not U.N. members.

Under the terms of the bill as it now stands, it will be up to administrators to determine what countries shall be considered "economically developed" for aid purposes.

However, aid sent to them in the current fiscal year—1964—is not affected even by the provision in the bill because it excludes what is sent in fulfillment of "previous commitments." As a result, the military aid for these economically developed nations as defined by the United Nations will amount to several hundred millions of dollars in fiscal 1964.

Yet even as these countries are receiving American subsidies for their military forces, they are holding up the United States with a thoroughly vicious manipulation of shipping rates, the net result of which is to charge the American exporter considerably more to ship his product to Europe than a European exporter is charged to ship his product into the United States.

The ugly facts of this differential in shipping rates that discriminates against American goods in international markets was brought to the attention of Congress and the American people by Senator PROXMIRE and Senator DOUGLAS, through their work on the Joint Economic Committee.

These shipping rates are fixed by international cartels. The Federal Maritime Commission supposedly exercises some oversight to make certain that the rates are applied equally to all customers; but apparently it has exercised little supervision over the application of the rates equally to all nations.

In the statement our friend from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS, made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 9, he showed that shipping rates charged American exporters of ingots, blooms, billots, and slabs of steel are 86 percent higher than the rates charged importers of the same goods hauled the same distance. To quote the Senator from Illinois:

> In the case of wire rods, 71 percent; in the case of structural shapes and piling, 69 percent; in the case of rails and accessories, 91 percent; in the case of wire nails, 34 percent; in the case of pipe and tubing, 45 percent; and in the case of barbed wire, 37 percent.

It is no wonder that as a result of these discriminatory rates on our shipping, American exports of steel have fallen by half while our imports have risen four times since 1955.

I am told that this pattern of discrimination is general among American products. The producers of American bourbon whisky, for example, point out that it costs considerably more to send a cause of bourbon to Britain than it costs to ship a case of scotch from Britain to the United States.

Within recent days, the Federal Maritime Commission issued a "section 21" order, requesting the rate conference for an explanation of the anti-American differential, or if it could not furnish one, the Commission asked that the rates be equalized.

What has the response been to this request of the Maritime Commission? In Great Britain, the response was an instruction from the British Transport Minister, Lord Marples, to all British companies to refuse to give any information to the American agency.

Lord Marples also announced he would seek to persuade other governments whose shipping is covered by these rate conferences to join Britain in refusing to honor the American request, a request which really only asks why U.S. exports are being discriminated against.

The countries he seeks to have join Britain in this refusal are Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden.

I shall not be surprised at all to read that Lord Marples has succeeded in his endeavor. After all, Great Britain prevailed on these countries to join her recently in enforcing higher international airline rates on American airlines and upon U.S. travelers, higher rates that were essential to reduce the operating losses of Britain's BOAC.

The timid men of the State Department prevailed on the President of the United States to go along with that British and European holdup of Americans, who provide the largest number of customers for oversea flights. The State Department was frightened of offending our so-called allies in Europe.

With that success behind them, I fully expect to see the same countries unite again on the issue of maritime rates. The unvarnished truth is that Britain and the countries of Western Europe are afraid of American competition. We already know that the Common Market is preparing to force out American steel. This discriminatory freight rate is only one means of doing it. It means that every ton of American steel delivered in Europe has a higher freight charge on it than 1 ton of European steel delivered in the United States before tariffs are ever applied. But to reduce the competition from the United States even more, the Common Market is preparing to raise the tariff.

Mr. President, the real reason we are taken time after time with these schemes is because we invite it. We have been a soft touch for Western Europe so long that neither we nor they know how to act any differently. We give and they take. In this foreign aid bill we are giving them hundreds of millions of dollars worth of military hardware and military training. They are taking it. They are also taking American exporters by forcing them to pay higher shipping rates than are paid by exporters of the same goods in other countries.

When are Members of Congress and the American people going to wake up to the fact that this is not 1948, or 1952; it is 1963. The United States cannot go on forever carrying the military and economic burdens of the free world, just because we did for a few years in the 1940's and early 1950's. Europe has been restored; it is now time for the aid to stop, for the military defense to stop, for the special trade concessions to stop, and for commercial, political, and economic concessions of all kinds to stop. Europe is fully able to take care of itself.

But the pattern of our generosity toward Europe is being followed everywhere in the world. For example, we financed the Marshall plan for the economic restoration of Europe. We said, and believed, that was a wise thing to do because it would eventually enable Europe to take care of itself.

While she was being rebuilt, we sent hundreds of thousands of American troops into Europe. We did that so the resources needed for restoration would not be drained off into military purposes. In fact, the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the NATO treaty stated specifically that economic development would always have priority over the military needs of the alliance, insofar as the European members were concerned.

Yet in 1963, with Europe fully recovered and economically prosperous, with stiff competition from her growing in commercial fields, the United States is still protecting Europe with our military forces. We have not built up Western Europe so it could take care of itself at all. It is built up, and we are protecting it with American forces, anyway. The six divisions which President Johnson has promised to keep there are, of course, in addition to the overwhelming nuclear forces that would be used if any attack were launched against a NATO partner.

These episodes over the airline rates and now over the shipping rates are only typical of how slow the U.S. Government is in returning to normal relations with Western Europe. We have nurtured and babied Europe so long we do not know how to stop.

While the European example is bad in itself, it is only typical of what we are doing in other parts of the world through the foreign aid program. In one breath we say we will send a country military aid and economic aid to build it up so it can resist communism; but in the next breath we say we are sending U.S. troops, or naval forces, to protect that country against Communist attack. That costs us additional hundreds of millions of dollars in our defense budget.

Certainly the Pentagon, the State Department, and whatever administration occupies office at a given time, are never going to stop this vicious circle. They have been its instigators and advocates.

If this vicious and costly circle is ever broken, it will have to be broken by Congress, under the direction of the American people.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, and I ask that the calendar call begin with Calendar No. 767 and run through to and including Calendar No. 792, with the exception of Calendar Nos. 770, 788, and 791.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HAROLD J. BURKE

The bill (H.R. 6468) for the relief of Harold J. Burke was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERNATIONAL PRINTING WEEK

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 109) designating the period from January 12, 1964, to January 18, 1964, as International Printing Week was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the period from January 12, 1964, to January 18, 1964, is hereby designated as International Printing Week, and the President of the United States is requested and authorized to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL ON CLAIM OF ROBERT ALEXANDER

The bill (H.R. 4505) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and determine a motion for a new trial on the claim of Robert Alexander was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HERBERT R. SCHAFF

The bill (H.R. 1532) for the relief of Herbert R. Schaff was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 790), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation to pay Herbert R. Schaff, of Altadena, Calif., $2,450 in full settlement of his claims against the United States for the value of a jeep purchased with money stolen from him, which vehicle was subsequently seized because the purchaser and the person registered as the owner were unlawfully using the jeep to transport narcotics in violation of the Internal Revenue laws of the United States.

STATEMENT

The Department of the Treasury in a letter to the Congress reports that it has no opposition to the enactment of the bill.

In its favorable report on the bill the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives has commented:

"In August of 1961, three men entered Mr. Herbert R. Schaff's home, bound him and his wife, and robbed him of $90,000 which was in his safe. One of the robbers used a portion of the stolen funds to buy a jeep automobile which he had registered in the name of another. These two individuals drove the vehicle into Mexico and upon their return across the border narcotics were found in the car, and it was summarily forfeited to the Government under section 1609 of title 19 of the United States Code. The jeep was subsequently delivered to officials of the Treasury Department in Alaska for their official use.

"When Mr. Schaff learned about the jeep, acting through his attorney, he asked for a return of the vehicle on the basis that it had been purchased with money taken from him. On November 8, 1961, the Internal Revenue office in Nogales, N. Mex., advised him that the petition for return of the vehicle could not be considered under existing laws and regulations. This fact is noted in the Treasury Department report to the committee on the bill which stated:

"'There is no legal principle that a person has an established equitable title in property purchased with money stolen from him. Furthermore, the statute authorizing discretionary relief, title 19, United States Code, section 1618, does not contemplate what would amount to adjudication by this Department of a private financial claim against property subject to forfeiture. Therefore, the petition had to be denied.'

"It is therefore obvious that Mr. Schaff's only recourse in this situation is to appeal to the Congress for legislative relief.

"The money taken in the robbery was traced to the purchase of the jeep on the basis of the police investigation. The person who purchased the jeep stated to one of the investigating officers, a deputy sheriff of Los Angeles County, Calif., that he purchased that vehicle with money taken in the robbery. Thirty-one $100 bills were used to pay for the jeep and the registration was made in the name of a woman who accompanied the purchaser to Mexico and was apprehended with him when they attempted to reenter the United States at Nogales, N. Mex.

"Mr. Schaff's request for a return of the jeep was based upon the assertion that he in fact had "equitable" title to the jeep, since it was purchased with money taken from him. As has been noted, the Treasury Department held that this did not form the basis for a return of the property. However, the committee feels that relief is justified by reason of the fact that it is analogous to the return of property permitted under the customs laws. In addition, the Treasury Department has indicated that it would have no objection to enactment of the bill."

MARVIN M. GREENLEE

The bill (H.R. 2292) for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 791), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Marvin M. Greenlee, of Fairbanks, Alaska, $5,000 in full settlement of his claims against the United States for the expenses he incurred in salvaging a Marine Corps helicopter HRS-2, which crashed December 5, 1952, on San Gorgonio Mountain, Calif.

STATEMENT

The Department of the Navy, in a report submitted to the House Committee on the Judiciary in the 87th Congress, opposed this bill on the ground that the salvage operation was not authorized, and judgment was given against Mr. Greenlee in Federal court where the Government defended on its immunity to a suit in contract on an implied-in-law basis.

On December 5, 1952, Marine Corps helicopter HRS-2 Buno 129037 crashed into the north side of San Gorgonio Mountain in California at the 9,200-foot level. The weather conditions of the winter months made salvage impossible until spring.

As spring approached, Mr. Greenlee became interested in salvage of the helicopter. He contacted Maj. Walter M. Vatcher, USMC, of El Toro Marine Base, who agreed to inspect the helicopter with him. About April 25, 1953, they inspected the aircraft and Major Vatcher decided the Marine Corps couldn't recover it and the helicopter would have to be destroyed. Mr. Greenlee then offered to salvage it for the Marine Corps with compensation or for his own benefit if the corps would convey title. Major Vatcher said he thought it could be arranged.

The following day Mr. Greenlee went to the Marine base and met with Colonel Carlson, USMC, the commanding officer. No one on the base knew the procedures to give a contract for salvage or convey title, so Colonel Carlson stated that he would send Major Vatcher to San Diego naval headquarters to secure a contract for salvage or, that failing, to declare the aircraft abandoned and convey title to Mr. Greenlee.

About May 4, 1953, Major Vatcher phoned Mr. Greenlee and told him that naval officials in San Diego had said that the final decision would have to be left to the officer of El Toro Marine Base in charge of salvage, a Major Cole, USMC. However, Major Cole was in Washington and would not be back for 2 or 3 days.

After 2 weeks, Mr. Greenlee called Major Vatcher who said that Major Cole had not returned yet. Mr. Greenlee found that parts were being stripped from the aircraft and reported it, but Major Vatcher was unconcerned.

After 2 more weeks, Mr. Greenlee again called Major Vatcher but Major Cole was still away. Another visit to the helicopter showed that further looting had taken place.

Considering that the aircraft might technically be abandoned, Mr. Greenlee consulted the Air Force base to find out if this view would be valid. He was told that if he held the opinion that it was abandoned he should contact the Secretary of the Treasury under title 40, section 310, United States Code Annotated. He started to do this but on hearing a rumor that looting was about to take place on a large scale, he decided that an emergency operation was necessary to protect what was left of the aircraft. This is supported by the affidavit of another. He stated that he was starting salvage operations in his letter and sent copies of this letter to the El Toro Marine Base, to the Forestry Service, and others.

The next 3 weeks were spent in removing the helicopter, part by part from the mountain. Toward the end of the removal process marines showed up on their way to destroy the aircraft and bury it. On hearing that Mr. Greenlee was removing it successfully, they went fishing for 2 days. Mr. Greenlee told them where he was taking the helicopter and said he would be in touch to make final arrangements.

On calling the base the next day to discuss the arrangements, he was threatened with arrest if he did not return the aircraft. The U.S. attorney and the FBI gave Mr. Greenlee 3 days to return the plane or be arrested. Under this pressure from the U.S. Marine Corps, the U.S. attorney, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. Greenlee surrendered the helicopter.

The next year was spent in trying to obtain compensation for the recovery of the aircraft administratively. This was denied.

A suit brought in Federal court was decided for the Government but the judge, while holding for the Government on the basis of the Government's immunity to an implied in law suit, said: "I feel that Mr. Greenlee should be pretty much commended for what he did, and if the parts retrieved were useful and had value it seems to me that some arrangements might be made to pay him." A good deal of weight is accorded these remarks of Judge Jertberg, now of the Federal court of appeals since he had the parties and the facts under direct study.

This is a unique situation where there is an aircraft down which the military holds no hope of salvaging itself and prompt action was necessary for any salvage. Mr. Greenlee did volunteer but was given every unofficial assistance that he would get the job. The only doubt seemed to be whether he would get it as owner of the helicopter or as an agent for the Government. Over the weeks looting had been taking place (the front wheels, all the instruments, all the radio equipment and some parts from the engine accessory section had been taken) and there was a rumor that as complete as possible a job of looting was about to take place. The situation demanded prompt action. While admitting that he was also interested in profit in his letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, he asserts as his principal reason the mutual loss that would result to both himself and the Government if he did not act. The fact that he did notify the Secretary of the Treasury of what he was doing and where he was going to store the parts would preclude any doubt as to his good faith.

As to his judgment in undertaking salvage, we can see that it did save many parts of an aircraft, one part of which alone was worth $15,000, and while the total value received by the Government cannot be determined because of the lack of records, it can only be assumed that a man of Mr. Greenlee's experience would not salvage equipment if it weren't valuable. The cost of the helicopter to the Government was $150,000.

The Government defended a suit by Mr. Greenlee on the basis of an implied-in-law contract by asserting its immunity from suit on that basis. For this reason the claim is here. There is Mr. Greenlee's affidavit as corroborated by the independent affidavits of two others as evidence of the encouragement he was given by Major Vatcher. The Navy report asserting that Mr. Greenlee told the Marines that he had authorization, must have resulted from misunderstanding on their part since it is not supported by either of the affidavits of two other men and both of them swear that Mr. Greenlee told the Marines that he would call the base to arrange for the written authorization.

Considering the encouragement received from a major and later a colonel, both of the Marine Corps, the emphasis on the mere formality of the approval of Major Cole, the openness of Mr. Greenlee, the opinion of Judge Jertberg, of Federal District Court for the Southern District of California, that "some arrangement might be made to pay" Mr. Greenlee, and that "Mr. Greenlee should be pretty much commended for what he did," with the fact that a valuable service was rendered to and accepted by the United States, there appears an equitable duty on the part of the Government for some compensation. It is concluded that Marvin M. Greenlee should be allowed $5,000 in full settlement of his claim for $10,524.52 as compensation for the salvage of a $150,000 helicopter that would otherwise have been a total loss. The committee is of the opinion that this is a meritorious claim and recommends that the bill be considered favorably.

CLAY COUNTY HOSPITAL, BRAZIL, IND.

The bill (H.R. 2364) for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 792), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization makes financial contributions to the States and their political subdivisions for civil defense purposes under the authority contained in section 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended. This section authorizes the director to prescribe terms and conditions upon which said financial assistance is made to the States. Pursuant to this authority, the OCDM prescribes the criteria upon which this financial assistance is made available to the States and through the States to their political subdivisions.

The Clay County Hospital, on July 21, 1959, acquired an emergency standby generator at a cost of $14,115 which in all respects qualified as an appropriate item for which a 50-percent Federal contribution is authorized.

Through an administrative inadvertence on the part of a hospital official the project application for the standby generator was not submitted to the State civil defense office until July 1960, at which time funds available during the fiscal year 1961 could not have been used to pay for one-half the cost of the generator. It was stated to the hospital when the application for the generator was prepared on June 15, 1960, that no funds were available for fiscal 1959–60 and to submit the application during fiscal 1960–61. This was done on the aforesaid July 6, 1960. It was stated also that the Battle Creek office of OCDM verbally recommended delay of the application for the above-related reason and resubmission after July 1, 1960, for special attention.

The generator itself was designed to meet civil defense disaster plans and specifications and it was flatly asserted that the generator was initially obtained to meet a recognized civil defense requirement; that the requisite paperwork was not accomplished in the prescribed time because the person charged with that responsibility was unable to devote sufficient time to his civil defense work. Furthermore, the hospital is located in an area immediately approximate to the large cities of Indianapolis and Terre Haute and a nuclear attack would result in thousands of persons seeking refuge at the hospital, especially so inasmuch as the two adjacent counties have no hospitals and since prevailing winds, from the southwest in this area, would make the hospital and the city of Brazil an evacuation point for the Indianapolis area. All these considerations and the emergency use for the described generator were considered in planning the hospital's emergency power situation.

The Clay County Hospital project application for a standby generator was never submitted to the OCDM regional headquarters by the Indiana State headquarters because they knew it would be rejected. The Comptroller General has ruled that project applications may not be approved where the procurement has occurred prior to the availability of the Federal appropriation (31 Comp. Gen. 308, Jan. 17, 1952). Therefore, funds available during the fiscal year 1961 could not have been used to pay for one-half of the cost of the generator.

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, in reporting on an identical bill for the relief of this claimant in the 87th Congress, advised the House Judiciary Committee that that agency cannot recommend favorable consideration in the instant case and pointed out that approval of this bill would form a basis for favorable legislative action in similar situations and would defeat the above-mentioned Comptroller General's ruling.

The committee is of the opinion that the facts outlined above create a situation justifying legislative relief. This committee in the 87th Congress recognized the equities of the situation in a similar situation whereby favorable consideration was granted to Elmore County, Ala., in settlement of that county's claims for reimbursement for one-half of the cost of certain civil defense communications equipment (H.R. 555, 87th Cong., 2d sess., act of October 23, 1962). The situation here is analogous to the legislation for Elmore County, Ala., and the committee therefore recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 2364, without amendment.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof is a report submitted by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization on a similar bill of the 87th Congress and other evidentiary data relating to this claim.

JESSE LEIGH, JR.

The bill (H.R. 4099) for the relief of Jesse Leigh, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 793), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

The facts regarding this legislation are contained in House Report 739 on H.R. 4099, and are as follows:

"The Department of the Army, which has no objection to the bill, reports that the Army vehicle involved was taken without authority from a bivouac area near Patrick, S.C., on the evening of August 5, 1961, by a member of an Army transportation unit. While proceeding through Hamlet, N.C., that evening, he failed to yield the right-of-way in turning left at an intersection and collided with the car owned by Mr. Jesse C. Leigh, Jr., and driven by his son causing damage to it to the extent of $826.21. Investigation by the Army did not disclose any evidence of contributory negligence on the part of Mr. Leigh's son.

"Mr. Leigh filed a claim against the United States for damage to his automobile, but it was denied on the ground that no authority existed to compensate Mr. Leigh because the driver of the truck who caused the accident was not acting within the scope of his employment. The Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. 2672) does not cover nonscope accidents such as this. However, subsequent to the accident, the Congress enacted Public Law 87-769 on October 9, 1962, which does permit the Secretary of the Army to settle claims occurring after that date for personal injury or property damage not exceeding $1,000 when caused by a member of the Armed Forces incident to the use of a Government vehicle.

"In the light of this legislative policy expressed in an enactment covering such claims after the accident occurred and the clear responsibility of the soldier causing the accident, it seems only proper that relief should be provided for Mr. Leigh.

"Investigation has disclosed that in addition to the collision damage of $826.21, Mr. Leigh also expended $190 for rental of a substitute vehicle during the period August 6 through 25, 1961, while his automobile was being repaired. He collected the sum of $726.21 from the Hartford Insurance Co. under his $100 deductible collision coverage, leaving the sum of $290 uncompensated out of the total $1,016.21 in damage. Mr. Leigh has reported that the insurance company indicated it is not interested in recovering the $726.21 subrogated.

"Under the facts and circumstances the committee feels it just and proper that Mr. Leigh be paid the sum of $290 and accordingly recommends that the bill be considered favorably."

After a review of the foregoing the committee is of the opinion that the legislation is meritorious and, therefore, recommends that the bill, H.R. 4099, be considered favorably.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof is the report submitted by the Department of the Army under date of August 2, 1963.

W. V. GRIMES AND OTHERS

The bill (H.R. 4759) for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, Frank Grove, Harry P. Nash, Jr., and Michael J. Neofitou was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 794), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

The facts of this case and conclusions of the House Committee on the Judiciary are set forth in House Report 741:

"In January of 1961, W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, Frank Grove, Harry P. Nash, Jr., and Michael J. Neofitou were employed by the supervisor of shipbuilding, U.S. Navy, at Newport News, Va. At that time there was a reduction in the ungraded force of the supervisor of shipbuilding. These employees accepted Classification Act positions in lieu of other reduction-in-force action. The activity unfortunately retained the ungraded salary rates for these individuals when assigning them to a lower paying Classification Act position. The supervisor of shipbuilding applied section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, 5 U.S.C. 1107. The provisions of this section provided for the retention for 2 years of the higher rate of pay, or a change to a lower grade, when both positions are Classification Act positions. However, these employees were changed from ungraded positions to Classification Act positions and were not entitled to retention of the higher rates. The activity discovered the error when adjusting the salaries of these individuals under the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. At that time the activity requested authority to waive collection inasmuch as the overpayments were through administrative error and the employees had no knowledge of them. No authority, however, was available to such a waiver and salaries were changed as of December 22, 1962, for those employees who were still on the rolls and collection action was initiated.

"As is noted in the Navy report, the records of that Department reveal the following amounts to be the exact overpayments in each case:

W. V. Grimes	$180.04
James A. Powell	2,360.00
Frank Grove	1,840.00
Harry P. Nash, Jr	376.32
Michael J. Neofitou	141.60

However, the committee finds that the figures noted above differ from those stated by the General Accounting Office which are those included in the committee amendment.

"The Department of the Navy in its report made no objection to legislative relief for these five individuals and stated in this connection:

"'The Department of the Navy recognizes that the overpayments in question here resulted from an administrative error on the part of the Government and that the employees bear no fault whatever. Accordingly, the Department of the Navy interposes no objection to the enactment of legislation for the relief of the above-named individuals in the amounts shown. It appears that either H.R. 4759 or H.R. 5300 could be amended to effect this purpose.'

"The committee has carefully considered the circumstances of these cases and finds that they are proper subjects for legislative relief. The impact of the requirement of repayment has created unusual hardship for these men.

"Mr. W. V. Grimes is 69 years of age. He retired in June of 1961, because of the permanent disability. The disability prevented him from supplementing his income by outside employment. His wife is also permanently disabled and medical costs for the couple are unusually high. His retirement check is small and the couple has no savings and are presently attempting to pay off indebtedness incurred prior to the outset of Mr. Grimes' disability. The committee is advised that the costs of maintaining himself and his wife have made it impossible for Mr. Grimes to make the refund which is the subject of the bill.

"Mr. James A. Powell is also 69 years of age. In a letter in the committee files dated February 21, 1963, Mr. Powell stated that he was then on terminal sick leave pending retirement for disability. Upon retirement, his only income would be his retirement check. He too had no savings and repayment of the amount stated in the bill would constitute a hardship to him.

"Mr. Grove is 68 years of age and has only a short time left until he reaches mandatory retirement age. He has no savings and his only asset is a small home. He and his wife are not qualified to receive social security payments and he must look to his civil service retirement as his sole source of income after retirement. It is obvious to the committee that here also repayment would work a hardship.

"In April of 1961, Mr. Harry P. Nash, Jr., became a victim of rheumatoid arthritis and was forced to discontinue his work. After using his accumulated sick and annual leave, he retired on disability in April of 1962. He is 50 years of age and is still unable to work and has no accumulated savings. He is still under medical care and faces the burden of the cost of that care. Here too the committee finds that overpayment will work a hardship.

"The Department of the Navy has brought to the attention of the committee that Michael J. Neofitou was also overpaid in the same manner as the persons referred to above. In the interests of equal treatment and a uniform settlement of the matter, his name has also been included in the amendment proposed by the committee."

The foregoing facts indicate that these instances satisfy the committee's criteria in such relief cases; namely, error on the part of the Government, good faith on the part of the employee, and hardship if repayment were to be enforced. The committee believes these cases to be meritorious and recommends favorable consideration of the bill.

Attached are (1) letter from the Department of the Navy, dated June 21, 1963, and (2) letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, dated May 20, 1963.

ROBERT G. BAGBY

The bill (H.R. 5746) for the relief of Robert H. Bagby was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 795), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

The facts of this case and the conclusions of the House Committee on the Judiciary are set forth in House Report 744:

"The favorable report of the Post Office Department on H.R. 5746 states that when Mr. Bagby was first appointed to a position in that Department on June 26, 1944, through error he was not allowed credit for the years he spent in military service. The resulting delay in earned promotions and underpayment of compensation was not discovered until 1959. By settlement of February 18, 1960, a salary adjustment in the amount of $2,545.96 was paid to Mr. Bagby for the amount of underpayment for the period March 2, 1949, to April 1, 1955. However, the statute of limitations precluded administrative settlement from July 16, 1948, to March 1, 1949, for which the sum of $478.68 is due.

"The Comptroller General of the United States expresses opposition to H.R. 5746 on the ground that to waive the statute of limitations is detrimental to the effective operation of the statute because it establishes an undesirable precedent for others to seek similar legislation.

"Since this bill would only place Mr. Bagby in a pay status similar to that occupied by employees who were correctly promoted and would only reimburse him for salary actually earned, but not received through error by the Post Office Department, the committee has concluded that in equity and good conscience the payment should be made."

This committee takes notice of the great complexity of the regulations governing the pay status, promotions, and retirement benefits of Government employees. Failure of an employee to have full knowledge of the various entitlements of his position is not, in the committee view, laches. Further, the Government has received the benefit of the claimant's services for which the sum here claimed was properly payable. The committee concurs in the report of the House Judiciary Committee and recommends that H.R. 5746 be given favorable consideration.

Attached are (1) letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, dated May 13, 1963, and (2) letter from the Post Office Department, dated July 12, 1963.

RUDOLPH SANDERSON

The bill (H.R. 6181) for the relief of Mr. Rudolph Sanderson, of Meriden, Kans. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

H. W. ROBINSON & CO., INC.

The bill (H.R. 6807) for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co., Inc. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FURTHER COMPENSATION TO MRS. JOHNSON BRADLEY FOR CERTAIN LAND IN ODANAH, WIS.

The bill (H.R. 7019) to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land in the village of Odanah, Wis., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANGELO COPPOLA

The bill (S. 1017) for the relief of Angelo Coppola was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angelo Coppola shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

WOO ZEE-CHING

The bill (S. 1328) for the relief of Woo Zee-Ching was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Woo Zee-Ching shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ARCHIE L. DICKSON, JR.

The bill (S. 1445) for the relief of Archie L. Dickson, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized and directed to determine the amount and effective date of the retirement pay to which Archie L. Dickson, Junior, would have been entitled if (1) the Office of the Surgeon General of the Army in reviewing his case in 1945 and 1946 had found that the said Archie L. Dickson, Junior, was, at the time he was relieved from active duty in 1946, permanently incapacitated for active service and that his incapacity for active service was the result of an incident of service as a commissioned officer in the United States Air Force incurred in line of duty not due to his own misconduct and such a finding had been approved by the President or his delegate, and (2) the Department of the Air Force thereupon had certified Archie L. Dickson, Junior, in the grade of first lieutenant to the Veterans' Administration for the receipt of retired pay under the Act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 557; 10 U.S.C. 3687).

(b) Upon such determination, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Archie L. Dickson, Junior, after deducting any disability compensation he has received from the Veterans' Administration, retired pay in such amount upon the conditions which would have been applicable if such certification had been made pursuant to the Act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 557; 10 U.S.C. 3687).

(c) From the date of enactment of this Act it shall be held and considered that Archie L. Dickson, Junior, has been retired for physical disability and the Secretary of the Air Force is directed to pay him retired pay accordingly.

ROZA FEUER

The bill (S. 2073) for the relief of Roza Feuer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Roza Feuer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CONSTANTINOS R. GRIGORAS

The bill (H.R. 1560) for the relief of Constantinos R. Grigoras was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSE L. RODRIGUEZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 439) for the relief of Jose L. Rodriguez which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose L. Rodriguez shall be held and considered to have retained his priority on the quota waiting list as of March 24, 1952, the date on which he first registered as an intending immigrant.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NINA MARIA CARMELA FIORE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2071) for the relief of Nina Maria Carmela Fiore which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 4, after the name "Carmela", to strike out "Fiore" and insert "Pirritano", and in line 7, after the word "fee.", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nina Maria Carmela Pirritano shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Nina Maria Carmela Pirritano."

YON OK KIM AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1887) for the relief of Yon Ok Kim, Chang In Wu, and Jung Yol Sohn which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 205(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, a petition may be filed in behalf of Chang In Wu by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Ainley, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the said Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Chang In Wu."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2125) to revitalize the American gold mining industry was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN FEDERAL ENCLAVES—PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON S. 815

The resolution (S. Res. 236) to print additional copies of hearings on S. 815, to adjust legislative jurisdiction over certain Federal enclaves was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of the hearings on S. 815, a bill to adjust legislative jurisdiction over certain Federal enclaves, held before its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations during the Eighty-eighth Congress, first session.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF TRIBUTES BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OF THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late President John F. Kennedy was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document all remarks by Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives in the Halls of Congress which constitute tributes to the life, character, and public service of the late President, John F. Kennedy.

Sec. 2. There shall be printed and bound as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies of such document, of which ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and twenty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

ADMISSION TO AMERICAN REGISTRY OF CERTAIN VESSELS

The bill (H.R. 1211) to admit the vessels *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Calendar No. 793, S. 469 is identical with Calendar No. 792, H.R. 1211, which has just been passed. In order to expedite the legislative process, I am sure the Senators from New York will wish to have Calendar No. 793, S. 469, indefinitely postponed. The Record will indicate that the bill the Senate has passed is identical with the bill which was introduced by the Senators from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. That is fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill S. 469 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which H.R. 1211 was passed.

Mr. JAVITS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE FOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an outstanding sermon by Rabbi Henry Segal, of Temple B'nai Israel. This sermon was delivered before a gathering of more than a thousand persons who assembled spontaneously before noon on the national day of mourning proclaimed by President Johnson. The physical miles separating the B'nai Israel Synagogue in which these people had gathered for a memorial service, and St. Matthews Church in which world figures had gathered for the funeral services for John Fitzgerald Kennedy, were dissolved by the grief that bound both congregations in spiritual unity.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Memorial Tribute Honoring the Memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States of America, Delivered on Monday, November 25, 1963, at 11 a.m. at B'nai Israel Synagogue, 16th and Crittenden Streets NW., Washington, D.C., by Rabbi Henry Segal

On January 20, 1961, the great American poet, Robert Frost, declaimed the poetic augury which he had penned, that with the inauguration of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as the 35th President of the United States, an age of poetry and power was commencing in Washington.

On this 25th day of November 1963, 2 years, 10 months and 5 days after that cold, snow-mantled and sun-drenched day of promise, when, alas, the heavy pall of gloom, in the wake of sudden, dark and bloody tragedy, has hushed the poetry and cut off the power of this great young profile in courage, we recall a verse from another beautiful poem from the pen of Robert Frost, "Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening," in which we discern a parable, poignantly depicting the shockingly incredible character of this unspeakable tragedy.

> "The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
> But I have promises to keep;
> And miles to go before I sleep,
> And miles to go before I sleep."

On Friday, November 22, 3 short days ago, this young and fearless champion of freedom started out in the company of his young, beautiful, and lovely helpmate, full of life and vigor, cheered by the friendly welcome of thousands who came to watch him gallantly continuing his eloquent intellectual combat with the forces of hate and bigotry. He was deeply aware of the "promises he had to keep," confident in the hope that he still had "miles to go before he slept, miles to go before he slept." Our Nation and the whole world shared his hope and confidence, and looked forward to the many more miles he had to go, the many more years of brilliantly competent and dedicated service that he had in him yet to give to an eager, free world sorely in need of a true champion such as he was. The future looked bright and promising, and the victories he had won for freedom and peace thus far seemed to augur greater and more decisive victories he would yet help the free world win in the months and the years ahead. And all of a sudden, out of nowhere, it seemed, death-dealing shots rang out and found their deadly mark in the stately, regal frame of this brave and intrepid warrior, cutting his life off at its prime, and leaving his loving wife widowed, his darling children orphaned, and a nation and a whole world bereft of their most formidable and distinguished defender against the sinister forces of darkness.

With heads bowed in sorrow, hearts heavy with grief, and eyes blurred by tears of weeping, we, together with millions all over the world, have these past 3 nightmarish days watched the lifeless, mortal remains of this classically immortal leader being brought back to this beautiful and historic Capital of our Nation, the scene of his beautiful and happy family life, and the arena of his brilliant and triumphal career as a leader of men, to be borne on his final journey to his eternal resting place in the hallowed ground directly across from the memorial honoring another great martyred champion of human freedom, Abraham Lincoln.

At the close of his inspiring biography of Abraham Lincoln, Carl Sandburg, the sage American poet, very significantly entitles the chapter in which he tells of the tributes voiced about the great emancipator after his death by the hand of a deranged assassin, "A Tree Is Best Measured When It Is Down." Perhaps unbeknown to himself, Carl Sandburg was thus paraphrasing a Hebrew proverb: Bi'nefol eytz rom ve'nisso yeyro'eh el nochon komoso, u'vemoss odom godol neyda el nochon geduloso ve'tzidkoso—"Just as when a tall, sturdy and stately tree is felled, one can best measure its true height, so, too, when a great man dies, it can best become known how truly great and righteous he was." This has been sublimely true of the 16th President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, the true stature of whose greatness has grown immeasurably with the passing of the years; and this is also unquestionably true, and will become ever more manifestly true of the martyred 35th President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Our rabbis of old were wise with the sense of history when they said: Gedolim tzaddikim be'missosom yosseyr mi'be'chayeyhem—"The great, righteous spirits among men are greater after death than during their lifetime." Not only is this true because the legend of a famous man's life grows, but because only in the passing of time can his true greatness be revealed.

The loss which has now been inflicted upon us and upon the whole world is an immeasurable and irreparable one. But time will prove more and more how very severe a loss this is, for it will tell how great was the influence of John Fitzgerald Kennedy upon his time, how deep and abiding was his mark upon history, and how truly creative were his achievements. Whatever we have loved, honored and benefited by in this great and good man, is ours for as long as life shall last for our Nation. What he was and did has become part of us, "interfused with our lives, blended with our hearts, minds and memory, joined to our souls," and merged with the rich legacy of our priceless American heritage. There is in us—there must be—the resolve that the good we knew and revered in him shall live in ourselves, and be passed on to the generations yet to be, immortal with God and with men.

When Abraham Lincoln died a martyr in the cause of human freedom, over doorways, in store windows, on arches spanning streets, were signs on which ran the legend, in the words of the Book of Genesis about the first Abraham, the Patriarch of Israel, "And The Lord Blessed Abraham In All Things",—V'adonoy beyrach es avrohom ba'kol.

That was positively and profoundly true of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. God blessed him, indeed, in all things. God blessed him with attractive good looks, and he cultivated in himself a good conscience. God blessed him with a brilliant mind, and he nourished in himself a great heart. God endowed him with the blessing of eloquence of speech, and he employed it to express the sincerity and truthfulness of his spirit. God blessed him with the gift of prophetic vision, and he used it to show a whole world the way to righteousness. God blessed him with an unmatched personal charm, and he carried himself with impeccable dignity and self-respect. God blessed him with a wonderful family, and he reciprocated with unswerving loyalty, love, and respect. God blessed him with the vigor and dynamism of youth, and he never failed to defer with deep reverence to those older than he. God blessed him with the gifts of greatness, and he bestowed their fruits on others with goodness. God brought him into riches, and he chose to be generous in sharing them with others less fortunate. God blessed him with wisdom, and he broadened it with a holy curiosity that thirsted for more and more knowledge and understanding. God blessed him in the fullest measure, but he chose to be himself a blessing unto multitudes not so richly blessed. He made us see the truth that God dwells not in temples made of stone and mortar, but in the great hearts and noble spirits of richly gifted men.

He gave us and all of humanity at fearful cost to himself a vision, a hope, a promise of a beautiful and good world of tomorrow, a tomorrow that he, alas, cannot now return to share. He infused in us the aspiration to make man's brightest dreams come true, dreams that for him must now, alas, remain unfulfilled. He "paid for our dreams with his blood, the blood of youth, pulse, and passion. This was the cost to him, the cost unspeakable." God grant that we be worthy.

To him, as to us, "life on earth was fair and bright." He loved the busy world and the works of its people. He loved his home, his family, his intimates, and his friends. He loved life, but, more than life itself, he loved "the virtue that mankind must live by," the truth that he saw being trampled, the freedoms that he witnessed being stifled, the visions that he beheld being blurred, profaned, and forgotten. "He loved honor and duty, and he gave to honor and duty his 'last full measure of devotion.'" With undaunted courage he fought for what he believed, and he died giving battle to hypocrisy.

He strove for truth, and when he found it, spoke it without fear. "When he saw evil, he cried out against it. He felt in his own heart the pain of injustice done to others, and he condemned oppression and fought for liberty."

He had "the power and the outreach of mind," with which he strove to light "the dark places of fear and ignorance," giving new understanding to multitudes, and leading us all to a "rediscovery of our unused resources."

He remembered with gratitude the "benefits which came to us from bygone ages, and he strove to make us worthy of our inheritance," by teaching us how "to sow much that shall be worth harvesting in the future."

He was part of all that looked and moved forward, and he inspired us to grope toward new frontiers, and to toil for better days to come.

He had a friendly face, showing a warm heart. He could make high professions real by joining them to high attainments. He could voice beautiful and eloquent words, revealing noble thoughts. He "weighed his words carefully, and his words carried weight with men everywhere." He was truly a great voice, not a mere echo.

He understood that man cannot have "peace without pain, security without sacrifice," and that we must assume the responsibilities of peace, so that we may be spared the frightful cost of war.

Above all, he strove to show all "other nations of the world an America to imitate," the image of a nation that truly prizes freedom and denies it to no one, the likeness of a people that loves fair play and deals honestly with all, and that keeps undimmed man's faith in God and in man.

He chose rather to "fail in a noble cause that must in the end succeed, than to succeed in an unworthy cause that must ultimately fail." Without fear he answered the call of duty, and joined battle with wrong, that right might triumph.

May the supreme sacrifice he made in this battle inspire us to melt away all bitterness and hate, to turn all harshness into gentle compassion and mercy, to displace all enmity with friendly understanding. If so much that was so precious in this great and good man can so soon be lost, may we forever cherish what remains with us as the priceless legacy of his life, and, by its inspiration learn to cultivate, nurture and help to increase the things precious in the lives of all the children of man.

As John Fitzgerald Kennedy goes to meet his Maker, the Lord will surely welcome him into the illustrious company of the great and noble spirits of all time, with the verdict about his life and work, "well done."

May the "poetry and the power" of his life not have been hushed and cut off forever, but may it live in us, as his spirit shall keep marching on. May we help fulfill the promises he strove so hard to keep before he went to sleep for we have many "miles to go" before we shall merit to receive from God and from history, likewise, the verdict about our performance of the great tasks remaining before us, "well done."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Chicago Daily News on Saturday, December 14, carried an editorial under the caption "A Hero for All Modest Men," which is indeed a wonderful salute to the majority leader, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent to have it made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HERO FOR ALL MODEST MEN

MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD, of Missoula, Mont., wriggled into the U.S. Navy in World War I at the age of 14. From there to the U.S. Senate is a long jump, from which it might be assumed that the jumper took off from a mat of swaggering nerve and flashy bombast.

Nothing could be further from the truth. MANSFIELD earned a graduate degree, became a college teacher of history, and offered himself on merit to the voters. Last week he penned a lecture on personal integrity that could serve as a text for all modest men everywhere.

Under attack as majority leader because of legislative delays, he compared records and found nothing for which to apologize. He then expressed his preference for quiet achievement over flamboyant pretense in phrases that should get into the textbooks:

"I am neither a circus ringmaster, the master of ceremonies of a Senate nightclub, a tamer of Senate lions, nor a wheeler and dealer. * * * When the Senate saw fit to designate me as majority leader, it was the Senate's choice, not mine, and what the Senate has bestowed upon me it is always at liberty to revoke.

"But so long as I have this responsibility, it will be discharged by me to the best of my ability by me as I am. * * * I shall not don any mandarin's robes, or any skin other than that to which I am accustomed in order that I may look like a majority leader or sound like a majority leader. * * * I am what I am and no title, political facelifter or imagemaker can alter it."

It may be that a flourish of pomp and even arrogance would be helpful to the majority leader, but we should think MANSFIELD's colleagues would be flattered to be told that he considered the proper tool of a majority leader to be the quiet voice of reason and not a cattle prod. Speaking for ourselves, we find much to admire in the words and actions of this unpretentious man.

NO ANSWER FROM NCI AFTER 52 DAYS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on October 16, 1963, after examining some 504 cases which were presented to them by Drs. Ivy and Durovic, the National Cancer Institute announced that, in the judgment of the committee, Krebiozen was not effective in the treatment of cancer and that they would not therefore test the drug.

I had a number of serious questions about their report because their proceedings were secret, neither the members of the committee, nor the place where they met, nor the procedures which they established were known either to the public or to the sponsors of the drug prior to their announcement.

Second, the committee did not see a single patient or a single doctor who had treated a patient.

In the third place, Dr. Andrew Ivy, the drug's chief scientific sponsor, was refused the right even to appear before the committee.

In addition to this, the NCI has refused to make available for independent analysis and review the results of their study.

Furthermore, they judged these cases by extremely harsh standards and threw out all the cases in which there was a decrease in pain or the withdrawal of narcotics, all the cases in which tumor growth was arrested, and all the cases in which the tumors actually regressed but which the regression did not exceed 50 percent.

Since, according to verbal statements made to my assistant, Howard Shuman, the Cancer Institute routinely tests thousands of substances a year on animals and at least a hundred substances a year on humans, it is clear that the standards they established merely to determine whether they were to test Krebiozen were exceedingly harsh.

Because of all of this, I addressed a letter to Dr. Kenneth Endicott, the Director of the National Cancer Institute, on October 28, 1963, in which I asked for a good deal of information. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter may appear at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I said in that letter that I wanted to get the information I asked for as soon as possible, and that it was not necessary to assemble all of the information before any of it was sent along. And I further said that a good deal of it should certainly be readily at hand.

Mr. President, today is December 19, 1963. I still have not received a reply. Fifty-two days have passed and I have no answer. This is 7 weeks and 3 days, or almost 2 months, without a reply to a letter which I wrote on October 28, and I said in the first paragraph that I wanted the information as soon as possible, and that it was not necessary to assemble all of the information before any of it or parts of it were sent.

Mr. President, this is typical of the way in which the NCI and the Food and Drug Administration have treated those who have shown an interest in Krebiozen and who have been seeking the truth about it. There have been stalls, delays, and pettifogging by the Government agencies involved, time and time and time again. I hope very much that one of these days some serious and unbiased and genuinely scientific attention will be given by the agencies of the Government who themselves should be independent of the influences from the AMA or organized medicine with respect to this matter. In the meantime I ask once again for a reply to my letter of October 28.

EXHIBIT 1

OCTOBER 28, 1963.

Assistant Surgeon General KENNETH M. ENDICOTT,
Director, National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ENDICOTT: I want to ask some detailed questions about the recent report of the committee which reviewed the records of the 504 patients treated with Krebiozen. I want to get the information as soon as possible, and it is not necessary for you to assemble all the information before any of it is sent along. In the case of much of it, I would think that you would have the facts readily at hand.

The questions I have are as follows:

Of the 288 cases which your group qualified as fulfilling the necessary conditions for evaluation, how many showed a decrease in pain and/or the withdrawal of narcotics?

In how many was the growth of the tumor arrested?

In how many was there regression of the tumor less than 50 percent; i.e., from 25 to 50 percent, etc.?

The next area of general questions I would like to have answered is this:

How many drugs or alleged anticancer substances or agents is the National Cancer Institute testing this year?

How many of these are being tested on humans this year?

In how many of these agents did you determine that there was more than a 50 percent decrease in tumors in a large number of cases prior to agreeing to test?

How much is to be spent this year on these drugs, agents, tests, and scientific evaluations?

In addition, would you provide me with exactly the same information for prior years—that is, how many drugs have you tested, how many have been tested on humans, what has been the cost, and how many met the prior criteria of a 50 percent regression?

Would you provide, in addition to the numbers, the specific names of the substances in each of these cases?

The third general area of questions I have concerns the members of the committee.

Would you provide for me the amount of funds that either the NCI or the NIH have provided to the various institutions represented by members of the committee since the NCI has been making grants of funds?

In addition, would you provide for me the amount of NIH or NCI funds which have gone directly to each member of the committee?

In addition, may I ask on what basis you selected Dr. Albert Segaloff in view of the fact that he was so prominently connected with the highly controversial status report of the AMA?

May I ask the same question about Dr. George Escher of the Sloan-Kettering Institute, which, as you know, has made prior pronouncements about the effectiveness of this drug?

In addition, would you provide for me tables, like table A of your release, on all of the 288 cases?

Furthermore, of the 216 which fell in the inadequate test situation, would you also provide to me information comparable to table A.

I note that you base your final opinion at least twice in part on the findings of the Food and Drug Administration that Krebiozen is creatine. In view of the previous NCI finding of 21 percent carbon, which is wholly incompatible with creatine, do you concur in this finding? Do you believe that there are other substances or "impurities" in the Krebiozen submitted in such quantities that the susbtance could not be as conclusively identified as done by the FDA when it said it was creatine?

Is it not true that with respect to biological effects and in the case of anti-bodies, amounts in the quantity of one part in thousands, or millions, or billions can and do have significant biological effects, and also that these are more often than not undetectable by spectrographic, chemical, and the other forms of analysis used by the Food and Drug Administration in their analysis of Krebiozen?

I would like very much to have very definite answers to this last set of questions.

With best wishes.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

BEST WISHES TO THEO W. SNEED

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, ever since I have served on the Public Works Committee I have been aware of the breadth of knowledge possessed by Theo W. Sneed about public works legislation.

Now that he is retiring after 17 years of service with the committee, I would like to express my thanks to him for his frequent help as well as my best wishes for a happy retirement.

It is difficult to think of him as "Mr. Sneed." Like most of those associated with the Public Works Committee, I still refer to him by his well-earned military title of "colonel."

The Public Works Committee will not be quite the same without Colonel Sneed to go to for information, but time brings changes and his retirement is well earned.

My staff and I wish him the very best of health and happiness.

WEST VIRGINIA AND MELPAR ARE PARTNERS IN PROGRESS—PLANT AT FAIRMONT CONTRIBUTES TO COMMUNITY STRENGTH

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the constructed contributions of private industry to national defense and the space effort are a matter of public knowledge. However, too often we tend to overlook the other values of these industries, even though they touch intimately our everyday lives.

An outstanding example of the harmony and mutual respect which can evolve between community and company is evident in West Virginia, where Melpar, Inc., has won the confidence and admiration of our citizens. A leading space and defense manufacturer, Melpar established a subsidiary in Fairmont, W. Va., over a year ago which was known as the Melpar-Fairmont Corp. Recently the name has been changed to Melpar-West Virginia Corp., which employs over 50 persons, with prospects for a larger work force.

Through this installation Melpar has voluntarily responded to the President's appeal for defense industries to alleviate unemployment in areas of substantial labor surplus. Contributions extend beyond the supplying of components and systems for our land's defense and space efforts; they train and educate personnel, give to local charitable organizations, aid local scientific and planning groups, and bring to the community an annual payroll which builds economic stability. Where possible, supplies, equipment, and services are contracted locally, thus providing added commercial impetus.

The Melpar payroll in Fairmont this year amounts to approximately a quarter of a million dollars. This is a financial influx for that area which was not present 2 years ago.

And, Melpar-West Virginia is presently opening a new plant in Beckley.

The Fairmont plant will continue to operate mainly in the metalworking field and the Beckley installation will, it is planned, be staffed for electronic assembly work. The continued growth and advancing spending power of these facilities will bring additional benefit to the communities in which they are located.

It is gratifying to know of the interest and energy of Melpar, Inc., as evidenced by its expansion in West Virginia. Citizens of the Mountain State are grateful to this industrial concern for the infusion of progress and purpose it has brought to our important communities of Beckley and Fairmont.

TAX RELIEF FOR COSTS OF COLLEGE EXPENSES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, in recent weeks increased attention has been given to the question of providing tax relief for those who pay the costs of college expenses. Last month 14 Senators joined with me in sponsoring an amendment to the pending tax bill to accomplish this objective. Since then expressions of support have come from many people, and there has been opposition as well.

The Finance Committee will soon take up the matter, and early next year the entire Senate will have an opportunity to express its view on this question.

The discussion that has been started by the public and the press has been extremely useful, and I hope it will continue so that this issue will be fully understood by the time a vote is taken.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of December 16, raising some objections to my amendment and my reply which was printed in the Post today.

There being no objection the editorial and reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 16, 1963]

TAX CREDITS FOR EDUCATION?

The proposal to grant tax credits in order to lighten the burden of parents who are sending their children through college has an instant but superficial appeal. It is frequently defended by invoking an analogy: if the Federal Government can subsidize home ownership by making the interest on mortgages tax deductible, why shouldn't the same principle be applied to expenditures for higher education? The answer is that the analogy is not very close, and even if it were, there are other considerations which make such tax credits thoroughly undesirable.

Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF and a number of his colleagues are sponsoring an amendment to the administration's tax bill which would provide for educational tax credits on a graduated basis. Taxpayers with income of less than $25,000 would receive a credit of $325 on the first $1,500 of tuition paid, a person with a $35,000 income would get a credit of only $225—and so on up the income scale where a taxpayer in the $60,000 bracket would get no credit at all. The cost of this proposal in terms of revenue losses would run to more than $700 million in the first year, and with added deductions for gifts to institutions of higher learning it would soon cost the Treasury more than a billion dollars annually.

Some of the objections to the Ribicoff proposal are immediately apparent; others are not. First, it discriminates against those families who cannot in any case help their children through college. And unlike direct Federal grants, tax credits would provide no assistance to talented young people of limited means who must work their way through college. Worse still, the granting of tax credits would encourage private and public institutions to raise tuition and other fees.

The prospect that the granting of tax credits will touch off another round of tuition increases, thus making it even more difficult for persons of limited means to obtain a higher education, was anticipated by Dr. Roger A. Freeman in his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee. According to Dr. Freeman:

"If you grant a tax credit * * * you give the institutions an opportunity to increase their tuitions without putting a corresponding burden upon the families and the students. The main purpose * * * is to increase the funds of the institutions."

The great State universities of this country, which are the beneficiaries of Federal land grants, have been guided by the principle that opportunities in higher education would be available to all talented young people, irrespective of financial resources. An adherence to that philosophy over the past century contributed rapid economic growth and greater social mobility. Granting tax credits in place of Federal grants will provide some relief for middle- and upper-income families. But by encouraging tuition increases which would tend to close the college doors to the children of the poor, the discriminatory tax credit plan would only set the clock back.

TAX CREDIT FOR EDUCATION?

The Washington Post's opposition to my amendment giving tax credits for college costs deserves further discussion. Let me deal with your three objections in order.

"First," you write, "it discriminates against those families who cannot in any case help their children through college." If this is a criticism, it applies with equal force to every deduction and credit now allowed by the Internal Revenue Code, for it simply means that those who pay no expenses and have nothing to deduct, get no deduction. Surely, that is not "discrimination."

The man too poor to pay his hospital bill gets no benefit from the medical deduction available to his neighbor who does pay his bill. That proves we need to help those who cannot pay their hospital bills; it does not prove that we should deny tax relief to those who pay these costs.

"Unlike direct Federal grants," you continue, "tax credits would provide no assistance to talented young people of limited means who must work their way through college." Not true. My amendment provides a credit for any person who pays for a student's tuition, including the student himself. A student working full time in summers and part time during the school year will pay, even under the new lower rates, $225 in taxes on $2,400 income. If his tuition and books are $500 or more, my credit proposal would wipe out that tax.

"Worse still," you conclude, "the granting of tax credits would encourage private and public institutions to raise tuition and other fees." First, colleges have been raising their tuitions anyway. A recent study showed that in just 4 years a group of private colleges raised student costs 29 percent and the increase for a group of public colleges was 21 percent.

Furthermore, you assume that colleges set their costs by what the traffic will bear. I do not. I believe their student charges reflect the increased costs they face, not the increased ability of parents to pay. But if you are right, then tuition costs are going up anyway, because every college will know that the basic rate reductions in the pending bill give parents funds, which can be absorbed through increased tuitions.

I think it unlikely that colleges would raise tuitions to cover the entire tax relief given to parents by the pending bill, with or without my amendment. Conceivably, there would be possibility of a slight increase due to tax relief, if the tuition increase were fully or even substantially deductible.

But under my amendment, the major share of the credit is based on the first $500 of tuition and books. The credit is 10 percent on the next $1,000. So every $100 increase in tuition above $500 gives the taxpayer only a $10 credit. There is no more reason to oppose this 10-percent credit because of tuition increase than there was to oppose last year's 7-percent investment credit on the ground that equipment manufacturers would raise their prices.

In sum, I believe those who pay the high costs of a college education are as entitled to some tax relief as those who receive a deduction for medical expenses or casualty losses. There is no doubt that we also need aid to the colleges, as provided in the bill signed by the President this week. And we also need scholarship aid. But it is time to extend some relief to the middle income person who pays in a short span of years a high cost that benefits the entire Nation.

The middle-income families are generally not eligible for financial aid. They are the ones my amendment benefits: 51 percent of the dollar benefit goes to families with incomes between $5,000 and $10,000, and 91 percent goes to families with incomes below $20,000.

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Senator From Connecticut.

EUGENIE ANDERSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a most brilliant and charming lady is in town this week. I speak of Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, native of Red Wing, Minn., and presently U.S. Minister to Bulgaria.

All Americans should be proud of the remarkable job this gifted diplomat is doing for the United States in Communist Bulgaria. She continues to win the hearts of the people there and, because she is our representative, their hearts go out to all of us.

When Mrs. Anderson was our ambassador to Denmark her popularity among the friendly Danes was immense. Now she is in a less friendly country. Yet her popularity among its people is a matter of record.

But more than popular, she is respected. She is respected for her brilliance, for her patience, her understanding, her willingness to learn, her vitality. She is demonstrating that intelligence, political experience, and understanding are the most potent weapons in the battle being waged by free governments against dictatorship.

Mrs. Anderson has come a long way since leaving Red Wing. She is a credit to that community, to her State, and to this great country. She could well serve with success and achievement in higher posts and thereby serve our country with even greater results. We are very proud of her.

Today, just as she did in Denmark, Mrs. Anderson speaks with the people of Bulgaria in their native tongue. She speaks of America and Americans. And as she does the people of Bulgaria listen. I am sure, Mr. President, that the people of this eastern European country know us a little better because of what Mrs. Anderson is doing.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD an article about Mrs. Anderson which appeared in the December 18 issue of the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 18, 1963]

DIPLOMATICALLY SPEAKING—ENVOY SAYS BULGARIANS GRIEVED FOR KENNEDY

(By Pat Saltonstall)

"Anything which makes people aware of their common humanity draws people together."

Deep inside Communist Bulgaria, the reaction to President Kennedy's death was the same: an electrifying shock, a wrenching ache.

The above quote from U.S. Minister to Bulgaria Eugenie Anderson summed up the homage paid by thousands of grieving Bulgarians who took up a vigil outside the American legation in Sofia.

"When you're representing your Government abroad and your President is assassinated, it's as though a member of your family had been killed," explained Mrs. Anderson in an interview yesterday at the State Department. She arrived Sunday for a week's consultations with Government officials.

No one, she went on, had expected the depth and breadth of the Bulgarian reaction. "We didn't know that they knew him well enough."

THEY OFFER TRIBUTE

She had expected government officialdom, but "to my surprise—and comfort—hundreds of ordinary citizens came." They, too, wrote their names and sometimes a tribute in the legation guest book.

What did they write, what did they say? "A man of peace," they declared; tomorrow's hope, a man of energy. "We loved him," they said.

All ages pressed at the legation doors, from babies to the old. But it was the 18- to 30-year-old group which made up half the mourners. When they spoke of his work for peace, they implied that it had made their own lives more secure, their futures more promising.

From the capital city of Sofia they came and from the country. A man wrote a musical composition. There were flowers, and original poems.

When they didn't come inside, they stood outside the legation window curtained in black, with the solitary photograph of President Kennedy. They were there 2 days.

On the fifth day their numbers swelled, a new note mixed with the mourning—of interest.

NEWS OF THE TRAGEDY

The curtains were drawn back on three more windows. Glossy photographs of the late President with his family, just flown in from Washington, were displayed. In a second window, printed in large lettering were eulogies from around the world. Pasted right across the glass were news pictures, clipped from the papers bringing the first accounts of the funeral pageantry. Large glossies of the funeral later were added.

A third window told a new story: photographs of the new President and his family.

The legation prepared a memorial service at Sofia's only Roman Catholic Church. The simple service, with two American flags in evidence inside, would have been impossible without the Bulgarian Government's cooperation, Mrs. Anderson said.

The church overflowed with mourners. The weeping came to the American Minister for solace. She gave it, she recalled, remembering as well her own checked anguish.

Asked by President Johnson to express his appreciation to the Bulgarian Government and people for their sympathy, Mrs. Anderson did the exceptional.

THANKS PEOPLE IN BULGARIAN

She took to the state-owned and controlled television and radio waves, and addressed them in Bulgarian.

It was the second time in 6 months that she had done so. She spoke on American independence in a July 4 telecast, which moved some of her audience to tears, it was reported. She was the first Western Minister ever to speak on Bulgarian television, the first diplomat from any nation to address Bulgarians on TV in their own difficult tongue.

Mrs. Anderson believes she is the only chief of mission to an Eastern European country to go on their state-controlled airwaves. She has studied Bulgarian an hour daily for 14 months, and a year ago this month during a visit here, heard the late President applaud this enterprise.

Mrs. Anderson called the "compounded tragedy of Oswald * * * deeply disturbing" to Bulgarians. No trial, no demonstration of American justice, Oswald never told his story. "You can imagine the propaganda advantages that are being exploited to the fullest extent."

But Bulgarians are getting a distorted picture, she said. They've heard nothing of Oswald's Marxist-Castro background. Most of them believe it was a rightwing plot, and not the sole act of a sick mind.

Chief Justice Warren's presence on the investigating commission was reassuring to them, however. And they are impressed with the swift and "masterful way" in which President Johnson has taken over and continued the Kennedy policies.

After talks here with Secretary of State Rusk, Under Secretary Harriman and others, Mrs. Anderson will spend Christmas with her daughter and her family, and her son, both in Vermont.

FEDERAL BAR JOURNAL ARTICLE SUPPORTS TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the most recent issue of the Federal Bar Journal—volume 23, No. 2, spring 1963—contains an excellent article discussing some of the legal and constitutional objections which have been raised against S. 750, the truth-in-lending bill.

The authors of this brief study of this legislation have, in my opinion, ably discussed those issues concerning the truth-in-lending bill which would be of primary interest to the legal profession. Moreover the article has, I believe, effectively refuted and laid to rest some of the legal sophistries raised against S. 750.

I might add that both of the able authors, Mr. Scott Hodes and Mr. Richard N. Flint, have pursued their legal studies at Northwestern University and are members of the bar of the State of Illinois. They have done an excellent job of presenting a brief summary of some of the questions concerning a Federal bill to require the full disclosure of the costs of consumer credit that have been argued before the Banking and Currency Committee during the hearings on this legislation. Their article will, I am sure, be of great assistance in assuring members of the legal profession who serve as Members of Congress that our truth-in-lending bill rests on a solid legal and constitutional base.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTES AND DEVELOPMENTS—FULL DISCLOSURE OF CREDIT CHARGES

(By Scott Hodes and Richard N. Flint)

How many Americans are aware that the small service charge of 1½ percent per month on department store charge accounts is often a true annual interest rate of 18 percent, or that the so-called 6-percent rate offered by some dealers for financing used cars is at least 12 percent and sometimes much higher when computed on the average outstanding balance? Studies reveal that the average consumer is aware only of the monthly cost to finance a new car or television set, for example, and seldom calculates the total annual interest rate on his repayment schedule. Paradoxically, he is extremely interested in annual interest rates prescribed for funds deposited in savings accounts.

Moreover, lending and borrowing is big business in the United States today. Studies by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee reveal that personal debt in the United States now totals over $230 billion, and the yearly interest and finance charges paid on this sum is $15 billion,[1] or 50 percent more than the carrying charges paid by the Federal Government on the national debt. Clearly, Americans have come to accept credit as a way of life, without concerning themselves with the staggering cost of such credit. This apathy may be traced in part to methods successfully used by many creditors to conceal the actual credit charges and interest rates. An experienced credit union manager described the dilemma of the average borrower today as follows:

"He is caught in a wonderland of credit where percentages multiply and divide at will, where finance charges materialize on command and fees are collected on the way out; where sharp practices and rackets not only inflate the costs of credit, but also impose enormous financial hardships on the debtor, particularly those who can least afford it."[2]

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, contends that the simple annual interest rate on the outstanding unpaid and declining balance of the debtor's obligation is the only meaningful standard of comparison available to evaluate credit costs. He has introduced a truth in lending bill[3] to provide machinery to aid the consumer in making intelligent comparisons with respect to alternative methods of financing. In the President's message to Congress, relating to his consumers' protection and interest program, President Kennedy urged the enactment of this bill. He emphasized that:

---

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2028 (1963).

[2] Id.

"Excessive and untimely use of credit arising out of ignorance of its true cost is harmful both to the stability of the economy and to the welfare of the public. Legislation should therefore be enacted requiring lenders and vendors to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amounts and rates which they will be paying for credit."[4]

SUBSTANCE OF THE BILL

The truth-in-lending bill is intended to require full disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; it does not regulate interest rates or other conditions of credit. Section 4, the operative section of the bill, provides that "prior to the consummation of the transaction," the creditor must furnish to the prospective borrower a clear statement in writing setting forth certain information, including the following:

"(1) The total 'finance charge' expressed in dollars and cents; and

"(2) The percentage that the 'finance charge' bears to the 'total amount to be financed,' expressed as a simple annual rate on the average outstanding unpaid balance of the obligation."

This written statement must also specify the cash price of the property or services being purchased, individual charges which are to be paid by the borrower but which are "not incident to the extension of credit," and the sum of the foregoing which, less the down payment, is the "total amount to be financed." Detailed rules and regulations for the disclosure of such information and for implementing the other provisions of the act are to be prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Complications arise in the so-called "revolving credit" arrangements operated by numerous retail establishments. Under these arrangements, a credit account is opened for the customer, various items may be charged to this account during the month, and a monthly credit charge is levied based upon the balance in the account. The written statement discussed in the foregoing paragraphs is clearly inapplicable to these "revolving credit" accounts because the total amount of credit to be financed, and therefore the total credit charge, is unknown at the time the account is opened. Accordingly, section 4(b) of the bill provides that before opening a revolving or open-end credit account, the creditor must furnish the borrower a statement clearly setting forth the simple annual percentage rate or rates at which the finance charge will be imposed. At the end of each monthly period (which need not be a calendar month), the creditor must furnish the borrower a statement containing certain information, including the dollar and cents finance charge for that month, and the monthly finance charge expressed in terms of a simple annual percentage rate.

The primary means of enforcing compliance is through civil suits in State and Federal courts of competent jurisdiction. Section 7(a) of the bill provides that any creditor who, in connection with any credit transaction, fails to disclose to any person any information in violation of the act or regulations thereunder shall be liable to such person in the amount of $100 or an amount equal to twice the finance charge levied in connection with the transaction, whichever is greater, but the maximum liability shall not exceed $2,000 per transaction. The creditor is also liable for reasonable attorneys' fees and court costs, but in the bill as presently drafted, it is not entirely clear whether these fees and costs are also included within the $2,000 maximum. In contrast to these civil penalties which do not require that the violation be willful, section 7(c) provides a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, in case of willful violations.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE

The constitutionality of S. 750 and its predecessor legislation has been discussed by a number of interested parties. The American Bar Association in an able opinion[5] concludes that while the issue is not entirely free from doubt, "the arguments against the constitutionality of this legislation * * * appear to us to have more weight." The Department of Justice, in an advisory opinion signed by Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach, concludes that the bill is constitutional.[6] In these opinions, three possible constitutional grounds are discussed: the commerce power, the money power, and the broad Federal power over finance.

In the truth-in-lending bill as presently before the Congress, there is no attempt to limit its application to those credit transactions which are directly involved in interstate commerce, and section 3(2) contains an extremely broad definition of "credit." On occasion the Supreme Court has ruled that any transaction, however local, which affects interstate commerce is subject to Federal regulation under the commerce power.[7] However, as the ABA opinion suggests, there are numerous cases limiting the "lengths to which courts will go in finding that a transaction has aspects of interstate commerce." And on reflection it is difficult to conceive of every credit transaction, no matter how local in character, as having sufficient effect on interstate commerce to bring it within the scope of Federal power.

The second possible constitutional basis for S. 750 is the "money power," the narrow power "to coin money" and "to regulate the value thereof." Testimony before the Douglas subcommittee indicates that the value of money is influenced by the use of credit because the excessive use of credit, as much as the overabundance of paper currency, tends to cause inflation and therefore lower the purchasing power of the dollar. Supporters of the truth-in-lending bill believe that in periods of inflation, when interest rates are rising, the higher cost of credit—if disclosed—will deter its use, whereas in periods of decline, when interest rates are depressed, the lower interest charges will encourage consumer spending and therefore stimulate the economy. While not necessarily in disagreement with the foregoing conclusion, the ABA opinion contends that the "money power" has been limited to regulating the metallic content of currency, and not its purchasing power.

The broad Federal power over finance, a power much broader than the simple "money power," is the third suggested constitutional basis for S. 750. The Justice Department opinion, quoting from an opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court, defines this power as follows:

"The broad and comprehensive national authority over the subjects of revenue, finance, and currency is derived from the aggregate of the powers granted to the Congress, embracing the powers to lay and collect taxes, to borrow money, to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standards of weights and measures, and the added express power 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution' the other enumerated powers."[8]

This is the same aggregate of powers which permitted Congress to establish a national bank, a national monetary system, and the Federal Reserve System to meet previous deficiencies in the economy. These same powers should be equally available to control and mitigate harmful economic fluctuations which result in part from the uninformed use of credit.

As stated in section 2 of the bill, S. 750 is a legislative effort to curb the cyclical fluctuations in the national economy by requiring the complete disclosure of credit charges. Whether or not this legislation will solve the problem is a question of policy which the Congress alone is competent to resolve. Constitutionally, however, the power would appear to be present.

THE PROPER SCOPE OF STATE AND FEDERAL REGULATION

From a policy standpoint, it has been argued that the subject matter of the Douglas bill is not an appropriate area for legislation by the Federal Government, and that the entire field should be left to the States. An ironic note was added to this argument in 1961 when a truth in lending bill was introduced before the Massachusetts Legislature. At that time the chief objection voiced by opponents of the bill in Massachusetts was that this is something that should not be handled at the State level but at the Federal level.[9]

State common law relating to fraud has proven inadequate to protect the borrower due to the numerous technical legal elements which must be proven to establish an allegation of fraud. This is particularly difficult where the lender makes no actual misstatement, but merely remains silent regarding particular aspects of the transaction.

Traditionally, of course, the States have regulated credit by means of usury laws which prohibit interest charges beyond a certain rate, usually about 6 percent. For the most part, these State usury laws have been ineffective in dealing with small loans and installment credit, the main reason being that the maximum legal interest rate under the traditional usury law was insufficient to allow the creditor a reasonable return because of the relatively high administrative costs and greater risks involved in small loans and installment credit. Thus, creditors who sought to comply with the law were not able to earn a reasonable profit and were displaced by disreputable lenders operating outside the law. Secondly, the so-called time-sale doctrine was used to exempt sales of goods on credit from the usury laws. According to this doctrine when the merchant charges a greater amount for a sale on time than he would for a cash sale, the difference in price if properly handled is considered a part of the time purchase price, and not an interest payment subject to the usury laws.

As a consequence of the failure of existing usury laws, there has been a great variety of legislation promulgated by State legislatures to control various aspects of the small

---

[3] S. 750, 88th Cong., 1st sess. (1963).

[4] Mar. 15, 1962.

[5] "Hearings on S. 1740 before the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency," 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961), pp. 822–826. Comparable legislation has been introduced by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, in previous congressional sessions, and lengthy committee hearings were held in 1961 and 1962.

[6] "Hearings on S. 1740 Before the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 87th Cong., 2d sess. (1962), pp. 112–115.

[7] *Wickard* v. *Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111 (1942).

[8] Note 6, supra, p. 114.

[9] Note 6, supra, p. 204.

loan and installment sales industry.[10] This legislation varies considerably from State to State, and even within a given State, different branches of the consumer credit industry are typically regulated by different, and often inconsistent, statutes. For example, the following legislation has been passed in one or more States to regulate various segments of the industry: small loan acts; retail installment sales acts, regulating credit offered by dealer to purchaser; installment loan acts, regulating loans made by a third person to finance consumer spending; revolving credit legislation; pawnbroker acts; acts chartering and regulating credit unions; and acts regulating industrial loan companies, also known as Morris Plan banks.

For the most part, disclosure requirements under these existing State laws are inadequate. Some State statutes require that the total financing charge in dollars and cents be disclosed and a few specify that the monthly interest rate be stated. But the requirement that the interest be stated as a simple annual percentage on the unpaid balance is conspicuous by its absence, appearing only in a few State small loan acts. Thus, the consumer is deprived of that one fact which will allow him to compare the credit terms offered by his local bank, for example, with the terms offered by the used car dealer or by the small loan company down the street. The truth in lending bill would make possible such a comparison by even the most unsophisticated borrower, and would therefore fulfill a need which is not presently being met by State law.

Moreover, as has been previously stated, the purpose of the truth in lending bill is not to preempt State regulation of credit transactions. Section 6(a) expressly provides that the bill does not excuse any creditor from complying with the provisions of State law unless the disclosure requirements of such State law are directly inconsistent with Federal law. Section 6(b) provides that the Federal Reserve Board shall exempt from the bill's application any credit transaction or class of transactions which is effectively regulated by State law so as to require the disclosure of the same information.

It should also be emphasized that S. 750's requirement of full disclosure in certain transactions is not an innovation to Federal law; disclosure requirements have been the central theme of numerous Federal statutes. To cite a few examples: the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, requires full disclosure of the material facts concerning an issuer of securities to the prospective purchaser;[11] the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938, as amended, requires full disclosure of the manufacturer and contents of certain packaged products;[12] and the Automobile Information Disclosure Act of 1958 requires full disclosure to the purchaser of the suggested retail price and other relevant information in conjunction with new car sales.[13]

FLOODING THE COURTS

Critics of S. 750 argue that section 7(a) of the bill, which provides for civil actions in State and Federal courts of competent jurisdiction, will result in numerous lawsuits and, in effect, flood the courts with petty cases. Thus, while Congress in 1958 sought to alleviate the backlog of cases in Federal courts by raising the minimum amount in controversy in certain cases from $3,000 to $10,000, the truth in lending bill would produce the opposite result by allowing suits to be brought for amounts from $100 to $2,000. However, this argument ignores the real issue: if there are not sufficient courts to dispense justice, the remedy is to increase the number of courts, and not to lessen the quality of justice. It should also be emphasized that there are numerous other Federal statutes, including the Securities Act for example, which provide for Federal jurisdiction where the amount in controversy is less than $10,000.

Moreover, the purpose of the civil and criminal penalty provisions is to deter prospective violations. As one witness before the committee stated: "We want the minimum of litigation arising out of this. We want the maximum of voluntary compliance with the bill."[14] Indeed, to argue that the civil litigation arising from penalties provided in S. 750 will flood the courts is to argue that credit institutions will not voluntarily comply with the provisions of Federal law.

CONCLUSION

The bill in its present form may not be perfect. For example, the American Bar Association has pointed out that the definition of "credit" in section 3(2) of the bill is extremely broad, and some tightening up in the drafting may be necessary here and elsewhere. But despite these minor defects in the bill as presently drafted, the bill is basically a noble one. It would appear that there is a need for fuller disclosure of finance rates and charges in the United States today—a need that is not being fulfilled by traditional State legislation. Senator DOUGLAS and his cosponsors have brought this problem to the public forum and have suggested a legislative solution within the framework of existing Federal disclosure legislation.

WAURIKA RESERVOIR

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, I am sure that my colleague, Senator MONRONEY, joins me in my gratitude to the chairman of the Public Works Committee, PAT MCNAMARA, and the members of that committee. They have made history by the manner in which they have handled the rivers and harbors bill upon which we have just finished action.

This bill was important to Oklahoma for two reasons. First, because it provided the authorization to carry on the great Arkansas River comprehension plan—now almost 50 percent completed. The bill carries an extension of authorization for 2 years and authority to appropriate $157 million. Secondly, it contains authorization for the $25 million, multipurpose Waurika project. This project will provide flood control, water for industrial and municipal use, recreation, water quality control, irrigation, and fish and wildlife.

This is a truly partnership undertaking. The local people who would use the water will repay almost 50 percent of the project with interest.

I am happy that Oklahoma has the services of three great Federal departments in the development of our resources: the Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

All three departments now have authority under laws enacted by Congress to make maximum use of water impounded in reservoirs built by them.

Under the Reclamation Act of 1908, the Flood Control Acts of 1944 and 1958 and under Public Law 566 and amendments to these acts each can and does develop municipal water supplies, recreation, irrigation, fish and wildlife, and water quality control as well as flood control.

For example, the corps has 15 projects in Oklahoma, constructed or under construction with contracts with local communities for municipal water supply. The Bureau of Reclamation has 5 and the Soil Conservation Service 10.

Every reservoir in Oklahoma provides flood control regardless of which agency builds them.

All three departments have projects embracing fish and wildlife and recreation. A number supply water for irrigation.

So we rejoice today, that again the Federal Government has come to aid us in solving our water problems. These projects are investments that assure growth and economic development, and make possible more business for Oklahoma and for the other States with which we engage in commerce.

THE NATIONAL REPERTORY THEATER

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, last Thursday I was delighted to join with my colleagues in welcoming to the Senate members of the cast, the producers, and the director of the National Repertory Theater, who were in Washington for an engagement at the National Theater. The National Repertory Theater is a permanent touring company of the highest caliber which performs a repertory of great plays which have demonstrated qualities of universality and timelessness. It is a nonprofit organization, sponsored by the congressionally chartered American National Theater and Academy.

I commend Senator PELL, chairman of the Special Senate Subcommittee on the Arts, for making it possible for the Members of the Senate to meet and talk with the members of the theater company. It was an interesting and pleasant occasion.

Especially, I am proud of the North Carolina connections of this fine repertory company. The National Repertory Theater, which is touring three classic plays to 20 cities throughout the country, opened its 1963-64 season in Greensboro, N.C., where, in addition to presenting their plays, the members of the company served as artists in residence at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

The unique "teaching-performing" visit was arranged by Dean Katherine Taylor of the university and Herman Middleton, head of the drama department. Three outstanding plays, Anton Chekhov's "The Seagull," Jean Anouilh's "Ring Round the Moon," and Arthur Miller's "The Crucible" had their national premiere at the university's Aycock Auditorium. The distinguished actors and actresses appearing in the plays included the first lady of repertory, Eva Le Gallienne, and Farley Granger, Anne Meacham, and Denholm Elliott. During their Greensboro visit, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro students received unique firsthand knowledge of the theater through lectures in their drama classes given by the actors and producers, and an opportunity to attend rehearsals of the plays. It was a mutually inspiring experience.

---

[10] In an article of this length, it is not possible to discuss in detail the laws of the various States, or even the laws of a particular State relating to small loans and consumer credit. For more detailed coverage, the reader is directed to the following additional source and the sources cited therein: "Consumer Credit Symposium: Developments in the Law," 55 NW. U. L. Rev. 303 (1960), particularly parts I, II, III, and VII.

[11] 48 Stat. 78 (1933), 15 U.S.C. 77g (1958).

[12] 52 Stat. 1042 (1938), 21 U.S.C. 331(b) (1958).

[13] 72 Stat. 326 (1958), 15 U.S.C. 1232 (1958).

[14] Note 5, supra, p. 870.

A number of the persons associated with the National Repertory Theater have a North Carolina background. Mrs. Frances Ann Cannon Dougherty, producer and founder of the National Repertory Theater with Michael Dewell, was born and reared in Charlotte.

Miss Susan Carr, a most appealing ingenue, is a daughter of Claiborne Carr, native of North Carolina, and the granddaughter of another distinguished North Carolinian, the late Julian Carr of Durham.

The wife of Denholm Elliott, who is one of the male leads in all three of the repertory plays, is the former Miss Susan Robinson, a native of Southport, N.C. She is the daughter of Susan Darby Robinson and Ted Robinson, Jr., who is literary editor of Newsweek.

Miss Barbara Stanton, who plays leading roles in all three plays in the repertory, lived as a child in Charlotte for a number of years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD several articles and editorials from North Carolina newspapers concerning the visit of the National Repertory Theater to Greensboro, and its association with the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greensboro Daily News, Sept. 10, 1963]

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The University of North Carolina and Greensboro are signally honored by the decision of the National Repertory Theater to prepare for its second coast-to-coast tour by a period of "in residence" here next month and the premiere of its three classic plays at Aycock Auditorium.

Eva Le Gallienne, Farley Granger, Denholm Elliott, Anne Meacham, and other theater notables—in all a company of 50—will be here for 12 days to rehearse, lecture, and share their theater lore with the theater of the University of North Carolina. Before departure they will present five campus performances of Jean Anouilh's "Ring Round the Moon," Anton Chekhov's "The Seagull," and Arthur Miller's "The Crucible."

The "in residence" project will give North Carolina theatergoers access to these great plays, representing France, the United States, and Russia. It will also contribute uniquely through special lectures and seminars to the academic life of the students.

Credited for this visit of the organization sponsored, on a nonprofit basis, by the National Theater and Academy are Herman Middleton, head of the drama department at UNC–G and Katherine Taylor, dean of women. Since last winter they have written and talked with National Repertory Theater representatives. It was their idea to bring the theater to the campus so that students could learn about it at firsthand and see distinguished professional artists at work. The theater's national tour, premiering here, will visit 20 major cities in the United States, all of them outside the South except Greensboro.

This project, of course, emphasizes the growing reputation of the Greensboro campus of the University of North Carolina as a nationally known center for the dramatic arts. It underlines, as well, the potential of the UNC–G campus as a logical location for the State-operated school for the performing arts, now in embryo stages.

Greensboro, along with the University of North Carolina, welcomes these distinguished visitors from the American theater.

[From the Greensboro Record, Sept. 11, 1963]

DRAMATIC NEWS

In less than a month, the curtain will go up in Aycock Auditorium on the first performance of the National Repertory Theater's season. The collaboration of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and the theater will have already begun. Students will watch and listen to the professionals in rehearsal as they give their repertoire a final polish before opening a national 36-week tour in Greensboro, the only southern city on the schedule.

All of this makes exciting news indeed for those interested in the arts. It is the finest possible sendoff for the cultural season in Greensboro, a season that is expanding and taking on new facets every year. The opportunity to see a repertory theater in action, the same company performing three different and outstanding plays, is one which stimulates the whole field of the arts here.

Gov. Terry Sanford, in a letter of greeting to the theater, had high praise for both theater and university here: "That your people are to be part of the teaching program of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro is a credit to the ingenuity and venturesomeness of that institution, which carries so much of our hopes for the further development of the arts and appreciation of the arts in our State."

As Chancellor Otis Singletary of UNC–G suggested in announcing the collaboration of university and repertory company, the theaters performing-teaching visit to the campus is an example of the breadth and scope of the school's program, and a reminder that the campus is an excellent site for the State's proposed school of the performing arts.

Certainly the performing arts will be brilliantly represented when the National Repertory Theater brings such performers as Eva Le Gallienne, Farley Granger, Denholm Elliott, and Anne Meacham to star in plays by Chekhov, Anouilh, and Miller. The opportunity for keen students to study a fine company in preparation and in performance is an exceptional one, brought about through the persuasive powers of Dean Katherine Taylor and drama department head Herman Middleton. Their enthusiasm for the experiment is shared by the theater's coproducers, Michael Dewell and Frances Ann Cannon Doughtery.

It is particularly valuable for the city, and the entire region, to have performances of classics—old and new. As Miss Le Gallienne has said: "What we want to do is meet the demand of the people to see great plays brought to life." The demand exists. The collaboration of the repertory theater and the university in Greensboro offers this whole region a chance to satisfy it.

[From the Greensboro Daily News, Sept. 11, 1963]

GREENSBORO'S CULTURAL INTERESTS AND RESOURCES

"Greensboro is the smallest town I've heard about with this much interest in the arts," said Stanley Young, executive director of the American National Theater and Academy.

Mr. Young, one of several theatrical celebrities here to unveil an "in residence" project for the National Repertory Theater, emphasized that the American theater is not only in New York; it is all around the country. By his testimony, and that of a cofounder of the NRT, Michael Dewell, it is very much in Greensboro, and especially at the University of North Carolina campus.

These distinguished theater people are establishing important and durable links between the American theater and the American university campus. They will kick off their effort next month at UNC–G, by holding final rehearsals for three classical plays and conducting lectures and laboratory work for UNC students.

What does all of this mean for the university, the city and the State?

It means Greensboro has been singled out for a significant experiment in the arts. But that choice would never have been made without the university's strong support for drama.

Mr. Dewell recalled that while at Yale he and other students interested in acting realized they needed dance and fencing instructions to help their stage movements; they had to hire dance and fencing instructors themselves. At Carolina–G undergraduates drama majors are required to take courses in both fencing and the dance.

This one example illustrates the potential of the local university campus. It is a logical place for the school for performing arts now under study by a special Governor's committee. Greensboro is a strong contender for the school both because of its central location and its cultural resources and interests.

[From the Winston-Salem Sentinel, Sept. 11, 1963]

PUTTING REPERTORY ON THE ROAD

Michael Dewell, one of the producers who will soon be bringing the National Repertory Theater to Greensboro, said in an interview not long ago that a touring company like his doesn't draw much audience "in the 40-year bracket."

It lures the elderly, who remember the good old days when Ethel Barrymore's arrival in town was occasion to run up the flags. And there is a growing audience of young people, who are being introduced to good theater in the burgeoning drama departments of colleges and universities.

But people in their forties grew up in the depression. "They were deprived of the theater," Mr. Dewell said, "and never got the habit."

It's a discomfiting thought. But Mr. Dewell would probably be the first to insist that the theatergoing habit is an easy one to acquire—even for us depression-deprived middle aged. All we need is exposure.

Unfortunately for this purpose, too much of the American professional theater has been concentrated in New York City. Few in the theater are willing any more to hit the road. And, more unfortunately, the companies that do venture into the hinterlands come only with bright, slick comedies or big, brassy musicals hot off the Broadway griddle.

People of any generation in areas like this seldom have a chance to see classic drama performed by the best in the professional field.

That's why the announcement this week that the National Repertory Theater is coming to Greensboro has generated so much excitement. This is a topnotch company, and it will be presenting three classics from Russian, French, and American dramatic literature. Moreover, it will be on the UNC–G campus for its final 2 weeks of rehearsals. This means that university drama students will have the rare opportunity to observe and work with top professionals in both the acting and technical phases of the theater.

North Carolina in general and the Piedmont area in particular can be justifiably excited at being able to participate in this venture. But underneath is a deeper excitement at what this venture represents—and promises.

Mr. Dewell and his associates—including North Carolina's Frances Ann Cannon Dougherty and the American theater's grand lady, Eva Le Gallienne—believe the salvation, indeed the rebirth, of theater in this country lies in replacing Broadway's "money and musicals" with "road and repertory." They envision many fine companies taking not one but several classic dramas to every city in America with a theater or auditorium—repertory on the road 52 weeks in the year.

Thus would they satisfy the nostalgia of the old, feed the growing drama appetite of the young and fill in for the rest of us a gap in drama pleasures that the depression has left too long open.

[From the Greensboro Record, Oct. 17, 1963]

Come Again

To judge from the audiences it furnished, Greensboro was pleased and proud to be the first town on the 1963–64 tour of the National Repertory Theater.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro made possible a cultural event for the whole area, even while it derived the benefit of having its drama department work with a professional company in a fascinating educational experiment.

Greensboro is no hick town by a long shot. If it were, it would not have seen capacity houses turn out for dramas of such playwrights as Chekov, Anouilh, and Miller. Unfortunately, however, Greensboro has so little live, professional theater that many in the audiences found the going slow at times. Most found the magic of the stage, the artistry of the players, and the skill of the set designers worked their spell in time, as they have on audiences over the centuries. What the city needs is more live theater, of the caliber which the National Repertory provided.

Greensboro was the smallest city on the 1963–64 tour of the theater. Hopefully, it has shown an interest, and given a welcome, which will give it a place on the repertory company's future schedule. The curtain should rise on many more dramas here as a result of renewed and deepened interest in the theater which the National Repertory Theater has left behind in the Piedmont.

[From the Greensboro Daily News, Oct. 12, 1963]

A Vital and Moving Experience

The National Repertory Theater's stunning presentation of Anton Chekhov's "The Sea Gull" Thursday night at Aycock Auditorium lived up to advance notices.

For a long time, indeed many years, the best minds in the American theater have dreamed of a truly national theater in the United States. Now they have one.

And the decision to focus its premiere on a university campus in a small American city, with preliminary "in residence" status and student seminars, was a felicitous one. The experiment, with its cross-pollination, has proved rewarding for campus and company—not to mention the theatergoing public.

Eva Le Gallienne's presence mixed a bit of theatrical magic in the brew. For the first performance she not only wrote the English translation; she performed the leading role, that of the fascinating, domineering Madame Treplev. To see such genius on stage at Aycock was to recognize the most rewarding side of this happy project.

In every respect NRT's production of "The Sea Gull" had the aura of professional skill. The cast, both talented and varied; the direction, the stage design, the lighting—all provided the essence of good theater.

President Kennedy's telegram of congratulations spoke of the efforts of the National Repertory Theater to "bring theater as a vital and moving experience to universities and student bodies" and to "give the American theater new distinction and at the same time a wider public."

That it has done this week in Greensboro.

HISTORY OF THE FIRST BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, 1963 marks the 100th anniversary of the national bank system and our dual banking system. Also, 1963 is the 50th anniversary of our central bank, the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve Act was approved by President Wilson on December 23, 1913. This system is a truly unique combination of centralization—represented by the Board of Governors and the Washington staff—and local activity—represented by the 12 Federal Reserve banks. It is also a unique combination of governmental participation, represented by the seven members of the Board, nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and acting pursuant to statutes vesting in the Board a substantial part of the Congress' power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, and private participation represented by member bank ownership of the stock of the Federal Reserve banks and the selection of six of the nine directors of each Federal Reserve bank from private enterprise.

For many years before the creation of the Federal Reserve System we had no central bank. Two earlier efforts to establish a central bank were made in the beginning of our Nation's history, and, as might be expected, they became the subject of violent political controversy. The first Bank of the United States was created in 1791, and it continued to 1811. The second Bank of the United States was incorporated in 1816 and continued under its Federal charter until 1836. Many of the documents relating to the first and second Banks of the United States have been reprinted by the Banking and Currency Committee in a committee print entitled "Federal Banking Laws and Reports, 1780–1912."

On October 16, 1963, I inserted in the Record a letter from the Honorable Laurens M. Hamilton, of Washington and Fauquier County, Va.—a direct descendent of Alexander Hamilton—in which Mr. Hamilton discussed the relation between the selection of a site for the District of Columbia and the assumption by the Federal Government of State obligations.

I should like to insert in the Record at this point another informative letter from Mr. Hamilton in which he sets forth many interesting facts concerning the first Bank of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington, D.C.,
November 14, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: With reference to your request of October 5 last and in supplement to my letter of October 15 (which you saw fit to have inserted in the Congressional Record of October 16) I am happy to submit for your information the following summary of Alexander Hamilton's part in the setting up of the first Bank of the United States.

When Hamilton, then Secretary of the Treasury, submitted to the Congress on December 13, 1790, his "Report on a National Bank" it marked the fruition of at least 10 years' study on his part. The first record I find of his interest in the subject is contained in a letter he wrote to James Duane on September 3, 1780, in which he went to considerable length as to improvments he thought essential for the establishment of a sound National Government. In that letter he took up in due coures the need for a central bank. Among other things he wrote: "And why cannot we have an American bank?"

Hamilton's next reference to this subject I find in his letter to Robert Morris under date of April 30, 1781. In this letter he wrote: "I mean the institution of a National Bank."

The latter letter no doubt played an important part in persuading Robert Morris to organize the Bank of North America which might be considered the precursor of the Bank of the United States. The Bank of North America was chartered by the Continental Congress in 1781 at the instance of Robert Morris and it is interesting to note that among its original stockholders and depositors, in addition to Morris himself, were Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, Jefferson, Monroe, John Jay, John Paul Jones, and Stephen Decatur. It is my understanding that this bank served a most useful purpose during the ensuing years but passed out of existence in 1787 or 1788 when the Articles of Confederation were replaced by our present Constitution.

Hamilton's "Report on a National Bank" was first considered in the Senate, while the House was busy debating Hamilton's proposed revenue system. His report was a lengthy one and contained a most detailed reference to precedents of banks established in different European countries and cities and even anticipated some of the possible objections to his proposal. The draft of the proposed bill, in Hamilton's own handwriting, was incorporated in his report. There was one blank space when it came to the name of the national bank he proposed, leaving it open as to whether the new bank should be the successor and namesake of the Bank of North America or, as was eventually decided, created as a new bank under the name of Bank of the United States.

Hamilton's draft was reported by Caleb Strong in behalf of the committee of the Senate on January 3, 1791. After debate and various unsuccessful attempts by Monroe and others to make various amendments the Senate passed the bill on January 20, 1791, and it is interesting to note that the question of the constitutionality of such a bank was not raised in that body.

The bill was read in the House on January 21, 1791, and, no amendments being offered, was reported to the House for third reading the next day. A motion to recommit made by Smith, of South Carolina, and supported by Madison was defeated.

The engrossed bill itself was then debated and I find here a reference which would explain and excuse the misapprehension you were under when you addressed the American Bankers Association on October 4. In J. C. Hamilton's "History of the Republic of the United States" I find the following comment on page 236 in volume IV:

"With these were mingled earnest denials of the charge that the opinions of the opponents of the bill had been warped by considerations connected with the future seat of government."

After 6 days of debate, the bill was passed by the House on February 8, 1791, by a vote of 39 to 20, and on the 14th of February was presented to President Washington for his approval or veto.

At this time strenuous efforts were made by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State to preoccupy Washington's mind. Randolph, the Attorney General, presented an opinion to the President on February 12, 2 days before the act of Congress was laid before him, in which he asserted that the power of creating corporations was not expressly given to Congress and that the proposed incorporation of a bank was therefore unconstitutional.

The opinion of Jefferson, dated the day after the bill passed the House and 6 days before it reached the President, followed the same general and even specific lines as that of Randolph.

The opinions of Randolph and Jefferson were communicated by the President to the Secretary of the Treasury on February 16, with a request that the latter would comment on the arguments for and against the measure before he [the President] expressed an opinion. On February 23, after an all-night discussion of the question with William Lewis of Philadelphia, a distinguished member of the bar, Hamilton submitted to the President his "Opinion on the Constitutionality of a National Bank."

This document is printed at length in volume 1 of "The Works of Alexander Hamilton," published in New York in 1810. It is too lengthy to include in such a summary as this, but it is interesting to note that in it Hamilton enunciated for the first time "the Doctrine of Implied Powers" which was subsequently upheld by Chief Justice Marshall in several cases and is as recognized today as part of our jurisprudence as it was at that time.

The arguments presented by Hamilton convinced the President who signed the bill on February 25, 1791, and thus made it the law of the land. It is of passing interest to note that Madison had prepared a veto message for the possible use of the President should he accept the reasoning of Randolph and Jefferson rather than the reasoning of Hamilton.

The Bank of the United States was incorporated with a capital of $10 million represented by 25,000 shares of $400 par value each. One-fifth of this capital was subscribed by the Government and the rest by private individuals who were listed by the act to 1,000 shares each.

The bank opened for business on December 12, 1791. Its head office was located in Philadelphia with branches later established in other cities. Its charter expired in 1811, and a proposal then to renew that charter was defeated by the "casting vote" in the Senate of the then Vice President, George Clinton. On liquidation, $434 was paid to each $400 par value share and in the interim annual dividends averaging 8⅜ percent had been paid.

That completes the history of the first Bank of the United States and I will not prolong this summary by giving the history of the second Bank of the United States which was incorporated in 1816 and of which, after some years of mismanagement, Nicholas Biddle of Philadelphia served as president from 1823 to 1833. In this latter year a dispute between Biddle and President Jackson led the latter to remove all Government deposits. The charter of this second bank expired in 1836 and there has been no central bank as planned by Hamilton since then. Today, of course, and for many years past, the functions of a central bank have been exercised by the Federal Reserve System of which the late Senator Carter Glass of Virginia was the creator.

I hope that this summary, which I have tried to make as brief as the importance of the subject permits, will serve your purpose.

With my respectful regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LAURENS M. HAMILTON.

SEC POSITION ON REGULATION OF COMMINGLED FUNDS MAINTAINED BY BANKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on November 20, 1963, a discussion occurred on the floor of the Senate concerning the question of the jurisdiction of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the bank supervisory agencies over the administration of commingled funds by banks. This discussion arose as the result of language inserted in the report of the Independent Offices Appropriations Act 1964 and referred particularly to a bill, S. 2223, introduced by the junior Senator from Colorado, which would amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the Investment Company Act of 1940 so as to eliminate from those acts any authority which may now be vested in the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate collective investment funds maintained by banks, whether they come under the head of common trust funds or Smathers-Keogh trust funds or pooled managing agency or custodian accounts. This bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and we are now awaiting agency comments on it.

As a result of the discussion of the question on the floor of the Senate on November 20, I ask Mr. Cary, the chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to write me setting forth the background of the matter and his views on the question of the new proposal.

Mr. Cary's letter setting forth the position of the Securities and Exchange Commission on this matter will be of interest to the public. It will supplement the explanation given by the Senator from Colorado when he introduced the bill on October 8—pages 18979–18981 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and the discussion of the matter on the floor on November 20—pages 22427–22432 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It will also supplement the discussion of the matter which occurred before the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs of the House Committee on Government Operations on May 20, 1963, which resulted in that committee's fifth report submitted June 19, 1963—House Report 429, 88th Congress.

I believe it would be appropriate to print Mr. Cary's letter in the RECORD. In requesting this, however, I want to make it entirely clear that I am doing so only so that his views may be brought to the attention of all interested parties. They refer to a bill now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee on which I wish to reserve judgment until we have had reports from the other interested agencies and until the matter has been fully explored. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cary's letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., November 27, 1963

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: This is in response to your request by telephone Friday for an expression of our views as to the applicability of the Federal securities laws to the proposed offering to the public of units of interest in common or commingled funds operated by banks.

Unlike the bank depositor who has the absolute right to receive the fixed amount he has deposited, the investor in the bank commingled fund will buy a pro rata share of a pool of largely equity securities, and the value of his investment will fluctuate in accordance with the market performance of the pooled portfolio. To us this is indistinguishable from the purchase of a share in the mutual fund. The only difference is one without substance or significance to our responsibility for investor protection—namely, that a bank will sponsor and manage the mutual fund rather than an investment banker, investment adviser, insurance company or some other organization. Accordingly, we have taken the position that the units of interest in the commingled fund must be registered under the Securities Act of 1933 and the fund itself registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940.

In the past the commingled fund activities of banks have been severely limited. The Federal Reserve Board was particularly sensitive to the problem of the banks entering the securities business, and during the more than 25 years that it had jurisdiction over bank commingled fund activities the Board restricted the use of bank common trust funds to trusts set up for "bona fide fiduciary purposes." The Board explained in the May 1940 issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin that the purpose of this prohibition was "that trust guise or form should not be used to enable a trust institution to operate a common trust fund as an investment trust attracting money seeking investment alone and to embark upon what would be in effect the sale of participations in a common trust fund to the public as investments."

Such strictly limited common trust funds were exempted by the Congress from the Investment Company Act, by section 3(c)(3) of that act. When, as happened in a few instances, a bank overstepped the boundaries set out by the Federal Reserve Board by advertising the availability of its common trust fund as an investment medium the Commission took the postion that the bank was operating an unregistered investment company in violation of the provisions of the Investment Company Act. In addition, the Federal Reserve Board warned the bank to cease engaging in the activity.

However, banks continually sought to expand the scope of permissible activity of common trust funds. These attempts were stepped up in the late 1950's as banks watched the spectacular growth of the mutual fund industry and looked for a way to capture some of the market for themselves. The Federal Reserve Board consistently resisted this attempt to enlarge the scope of common trust fund activity—in December 1960 even proposing to narrow the definition of the type of trust whose assets could be commingled in the common trust fund. The struggle between the banks and the Federal Reserve Board was described in an article which appeared in the November 1962 issue of Trusts and Estates by Joseph H. Wolfe, a vice president of the New England Merchants National Bank. (Mr. Wolfe was a member of the committee later appointed by the Comptroller of the Currency to assist him in drafting regulation 9.) Mr. Wolfe wrote:

"The memory of the bank holiday era was too fresh in the minds of the Board of Governors for them to promulgate rules and regulations that would really be effective for the type of service the banks needed to offer. A long struggle began on the part of trustmen to obtain a more liberal set of rules and regulations, with the administrative staff of the Board seeking to maintain the status quo. Trustmen wanted to explain and enlarge the theory of the common trust fund and to use the fund whenever it seemed appropriate in a growing market.

"One of the great fears in the minds of the Board was that trust departments would broaden the original scope and would be in a position to compete with savings departments and investment trusts. This feeling was so strong that the authors of the Trust Division's Common Trust Fund Handbook, second edition, published in 1948, gave the following warning to trustmen:

"'This emphasizes and clarifies the extent to which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System insists that a trust institution must go to avoid even the appearance of offering a common trust fund to the public as an investment.'"

In late 1962 two events occurred which were to lead to the presently contemplated expansion of bank commingled fund activity. Passage of the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1962 (the Smathers-Keogh bill) offered the opportunity of expanded activity by banks as well as others in the retirement plan area.

In addition, in September 1962 authority with respect to bank commingled funds including common trust funds was transferred from the Federal Reserve Board to the Comptroller of the Currency. In April 1963 the Comptroller issued new rules governing commingled funds in his revised regulation 9, which deleted the "bona fide fiduciary purpose" test that the Federal Reserve Board had used as a bulwark to keep the banks out of the mutual fund business and to limit their activities to traditional trust business. While the banks have traditionally provided investment advice for large individual accounts (which they call managing agency accounts) just as have investment counsellor firms, regulation 9 for the first time permitted the commingling of mangaging agency accounts, which would allow the banks to handle large numbers of smaller investment accounts on a pooled basis. When the investment counsellor firm provides advice on such a pooled basis, the pool is known as a mutual fund and is subject to the Investment Company Act.

It is interesting to note that bankers themselves have, in discussing the need from the bank's point of view for expanding the permissible scope of common trust fund activity, been well aware that they were entering the securities business. For example, when the chairman of the committee which assisted the Comptroller in drafting regulation 9, Reese H. Harris, Jr., executive vice president of Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., New York, urged at the Mid-Winter Trust Conference of the American Bankers Association in 1962 that the banks be given the powers which were eventually accorded to them by regulation 9, he concluded by saying:

"However, I believe we should be privileged to pool the investments of all sizes of managing agencies because collective investing is the best way to invest customers' funds in most cases. I realize that this probably means operating open-end investment trusts for selected customers, and perhaps eventually for the public. I am willing to accept this to permit us to take care of the needs of our existing customers and, in addition, serve others who may never enter the doors of our trust departments if we do not have a service that appeals to them as they accumulate an estate."

The interests in bank commingled funds which would be used for Smathers-Keogh retirement plans fall within the definition of a security contained in section 2 of the Securities Act. For such activity to be profitable to the banks the interests in such funds would, as bankers themselves have admitted, have to be widely merchandized to large numbers of people. Such public offerings would be subject to the registration and disclosure provisions of the Securities Act. They would, however, be exempt from the Investment Company Act, by section 3(c)(13) of that act as are other pension or profit-sharing plans qualified under section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code. The principles involved with respect to the applicability of the securities laws to the merchandising of bank sponsored Smathers-Keogh commingled funds are the same as those applicable when insurance companies offer interests in commingled funds for Smathers-Keogh plans, and when professional and other associations set up commingled Smathers-Keogh funds for their members. I might mention that the Prudential Insurance Co. of America has informed us that it plans shortly to file a Securities Act registration statement for its Smathers-Keogh plan; and several associations, including the American Bar Association and American Medical Association, have filed registration statements with us for their plans—which, incidentally, are to be trusteed by major banks. None of these registrants is contesting the applicability of the Securities Act.

With respect to bank commingled managing agency accounts, the banks, as pointed out above, are in effect now proposing to do precisely what the investment counselors did in the late 1920's and 1930's and what Congress in 1940 determined to be a mutual fund subject to the Investment Company Act. We have taken the position that both the Securities Act and the Investment Company Act would apply to such activities. The problem is the same as that presented by the variable annuity sold by the insurance industry, which the Supreme Court in 1959 determined fell within the scope of the Securities Act and the Investment Company Act. *S.E.C.* v. *Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co. of America*, 359 U.S. 65.

The Commission believes not only that the securities laws clearly apply to the contemplated expansion of bank commingled fund activities but that such applicability is necessary and appropriate. Investors in bank sponsored investment funds are entitled to the same protections as investors in funds sponsored by any other organization—whether a broker, investment counselor, insurance company, or other persons.

Some attack the necessity of applying the Federal securities laws on the ground that banks are presently thoroughly regulated and that investors are, therefore, furnished adequate protection. On the surface some might find this persuasive, but the reality is that this argument entirely misconceives the nature, purpose and thrust of bank regulation as distinguished from securities regulation. Bank regulation has the objectives of controlling the flow of credit in the monetary system, the maintenance of an effective banking structure and the protection of depositors. These are not designed to provide investor protection and any such protection they might provide is incidental. Investor protection is the precise focus of the Federal securities laws. I should add that the rationale of the bank regulation argument is not new. A comparable argument was repeatedly asserted as to insurance regulation by insurance companies who resisted the application of the securities laws to variable annuity programs. The Supreme Court rejected this argument in the Variable Annuity Life Insurance case mentioned above, and the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Brennan contains an excellent analysis of the differences in securities and insurance regulation and concludes that the latter is inadequate for investor protection.

The banking industry seeks to avoid the application of the securities laws to their proposed activities. Consequently, the American Bankers Association was instrumental in having introduced S. 2223, the so-called Bank Collective Fund Act of 1963, which has been referred to your committee. The Commission is opposed to this bill.

The bill would provide a separate standard of regulation for collective investment funds maintained by banks—standard specifically designed to replace that created by the securities laws. The bill would achieve this result by exempting interests in collective investment funds, as defined in section 2(c) of the bill, from the definition of a security in the Securities Act and the Securities Exchange Act and by exempting the funds themselves from the definition of investment company in the Investment Company Act.

This technique underscores the fundamental criticism which the Commission has of the bill. The bill says, in effect, that even though a bank merchandizes interests in one of its collective investment funds to the public, it has not entered the securities business. It is the Commission's position that the bank has, at that point, entered the securities business, and that the same rules for investor protection should, at that point, be applicable to the bank as are applicable to other persons in the securities business. The emphasis of the Congress and the Commission over the last 30 years has been on the development of uniform rules for the protection of all investors. No purpose seems to be served by enacting special legislation for the protection of investors whose contact with the securities business is through banks merely because the banks have decided that the securities business is a profitable one in which to engage.

One reason that the bill has been drafted to deny that banks have entered the securities business in certain of their commingled fund activity apparently is to avoid any problems which might be raised under those portions of the Glass-Steagall Act which prohibit commercial banks from engaging in such business. To the extent that such problems exist, Congress will no doubt wish to deal with them directly. They should not be disposed of by a drafting technique, particularly when such technique would entail the loss of important safeguards for investors.

The standards which the bill would supply in place of those in the securities laws are meager and inadequate. For one thing, although as pointed out above bank commingled managing agency accounts are in substance only bank-sponsored mutual funds, the bill would provide none of the many regulatory provisions and protections which the Congress through the Investment Company Act has specifically accorded to investors in mutual funds. The Investment Company Act is a complex 47 page statute and I shall not attempt to list all the provisions here, but among the more important ones are: Prohibition against changes of a fund's investment policy without the consent of the shareholders or investors; limitations on the borrowing powers of funds and their ability to purchase securities on margin; prohibitions against advisory contracts being binding obligations of the fund for long periods of time; prohibitions against assignments of advisory contracts without the consent of the shareholders or investors; limitations on joint activities by the fund with affiliated persons and of transactions between the fund and affiliated persons; requirements that the shareholders or investors be allowed to vote for directors for the fund and that a portion of the board of directors consist of persons not affiliated with the adviser or sponsor; and limitation on the extent to which the governing documents of the fund may contain provisions exculpating management personnel from liability.

The bill also provides inadequate substitutes for the disclosure requirements which apply to commingled funds under the securities laws. The securities laws require that full information concerning the fund be disclosed to prospective investors in a form which would permit them to make an intelligent investment choice. In addition they require the periodic reporting of information to investors which permits them to judge how well their investment is being managed.

Let me cite just a few of the important failures of the bill to provide adequate disclosures of these kinds. The banks may solicit investments in collective investment funds by using sales literature unaccompanied by anything in the nature of a prospectus. The prospectus itself as contemplated by the bill can consist of a plan (which may be a complex legal document) and a copy of the financial report of the fund for the latest year. As a consequence the investor is not told what his rights in the fund are in an intelligible form. The material the investor receives is not required to make disclosures with respect to matters as fundamental as who the persons are who will perform the advisory function for the fund (which may not be the bank) or the investment performance of the fund. Nor need periodic reports be sent to investors. Further, the bill does not provide the civil remedies for investors which are contained in the securities laws.

Finally, the bill contemplates that it would be administered by the three Federal banking agencies. While we do not object to the concept of a portion of securities regulation being administered, under certain circumstances, by other agencies, we do feel that with respect to the full range of regulatory and disclosure provisions which Congress has provided in the securities laws for mutual fund activities, governmental efficiency and uniformity of treatment would be served by having them administered by only one agency.

In short, our position is that the situation of all investors in commingled funds is the same whether the sponsor or the adviser is a bank, a private investment counselor, a broker-dealer, an insurance company, or some other person. Consequently, all these investors are entitled to the same protections. No purpose would seem to be served by enacting special legislation, let alone inadequate or discriminatory legislation, each time a new industry decides that the securities and commingled fund business is a profitable one in which to engage. Hence, we are opposed to the so-called Bank Collective Fund Act of 1963.

Sincerely yours,

William L. Cary,
Chairman.

CATHOLIC ORDER MARKS 75TH ANNIVERSARY IN INDIANA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I invite attention to the Sisters of Saint Joseph, Tipton, Ind., who are this year celebrating the 75th anniversary of the founding of their order. This group, dedicating themselves to our Lord and humanity, has woven love and learning into the religious fabric of our Hoosier State. Perhaps the best expression of our gratitude to these Sisters is found in a resolution honoring them which was adopted December 10, 1963. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be entered at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution Honoring the Sisters of St. Joseph of Tipton, Ind., on the Occasion of Their 75th Anniversary

Whereas the Sisters of St. Joseph of Tipton, Ind., are celebrating the 75th anniversary of their order's founding; and

Whereas they have been teaching in parochial schools throughout Indiana since 1888, and now staff 14 grade schools and 2 high schools; and

Whereas we students of the Catholic Youth Organization in the Indiana Muncie Deanery have all been taught by the Sisters of St. Joseph either in grade school or high school; Therefore be it

Resolved, That our public recognition of the great spiritual and scholastic contribution of the Sisters of St. Joseph to the youth of Indiana be hereby proclaimed; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be presented to the U.S. Congress through the interest of the U.S. Senator from Indiana Mr. Vance Hartke for inclusion in the U.S. Congressional Record; and be it further

Resolved, That the attached personal commendations of His Holiness Pope Paul VI to Mother M. Gerard Maher, Mother General of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Tipton, Ind., be appended hereto.

N. 6710 Dal Vaticano,
September 1963.

Dear Mother General: The holy father has learned that the Sisters of St. Joseph of Tipton are celebrating this year the 75th anniversary of their activity in the diocese of Lafayette and of Fort Wayne-South Bend; and he graciously directs me to send you this expression of his felicitations and good wishes.

From small beginnings your congregation has been blessed with admirable growth of vocations and institutions, and has contributed generously toward the spreading of God's kingdom through Catholic education, and the dispensation of His mercy and charity in your hospitals and nursing homes. The Sovereign Pontiff prays that the future may bring ever increasing graces to your institute, and through your beneficient activities to the church in Indiana.

"It is in pledge of that divine favor, and as a token of his cordial benevolence, that His Holiness bestows upon you, upon the sisters, novices, and postulants of your congregation, and upon all those to whom you minister in school or hospital, his special paternal apostolic blessing.

With the assurance of my personal congratulations and prayerful good wishes, I remain, faithfully yours in Christ,

A. G. Cardinal Cicognani.

Respectfully submitted.

Rick Cannon,
President, Catholic Youth Organization, Elwood, Ind.; Vice President, Muncie Deanery, Catholic Youth Organization.

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF DISARMAMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to an important speech by Robert E. Rose, Director of the Washington State Department of Commerce and Economic Development. Mr. Rose addressed the Association of State Planning and Development Agencies in Puerto Rico, on November 20, 1963, on the subject "Economic Consequences of Disarmament."

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Economic Consequences of Disarmament

(Address by Robert E. Rose, director, Washington State Department of Commerce and Economic Development, at the Association of State Planning and Development Agencies 18th annual conference, San Juan, P.R., November 20, 1963)

Paul Menk asked me several months ago if I would be willing to speak at our meeting on some phase of State economic development that I believe will be particularly significant during the decade of the sixties. In a weak moment I accepted. Subsequently, I wrestled with the problem of selecting a subject. The things that immediately come to mind are unemployment, industrial financing, State planning, industrial movements as related to expanding markets, and such similar engrossing subjects.

There is one subject, though, which stands out as we look to the years immediately ahead. While there is no certainly about it, it most assuredly can become an economic matter of considerable moment. There is widespread and fundamental disagreement among the lay public and among the experts about whether it should be done, and about what its consequences might be if we do pull it off. There is a manifest and disturbing lack of any action to prepare for it by State governments and by industry. These considerations persuaded me to get myself way out on a limb and talk about the economics of disarmament.

Now I know that the tough minded, pragmatic individuals here today—and in a highly complimentary sense, I think that perhaps this description fits all of you—tend to scoff at disarmament as a Utopian dream. Certainly, the monumental obstacles in the path make it a vague, other-wordly sort of thing in the face of all the real and urgent problems which we continually face. Even so, it can be demonstrated quite convincingly that the whole idea of disarmament is timely and plausible.

I think it fair to say that in our country today we find something closely akin to a fear of peace. Many people have allowed themselves to become mesmerized with the scale of defense expenditures to such an extent that they have some difficulty in conceiving of living without them. At the other end of the scale, there are those who take almost a blase attitude toward the economic consequences of disarmament. Their attitude apparently reflects a conviction that existing Government controls and cushions are sufficiently strong so that the economy could absorb the effects of any anticipated level of reduction, and hardly miss a step in the process.

Somewhere between these two, reason must lie. Both extremes, it seems to me, are fraught with danger.

The economic aspects of disarmament, which I want to talk about today, while of monumental proportions, are probably the easiest to cope with among the problems inherent in the concept of disarmament. Certainly the political problems are much more difficult.

To begin with, disarmament as now contemplated doesn't really mean to divest ourselves entirely of weapons and weapon systems. Only the purest moralist really advocates complete disarmament in that sense.

What we are talking about is arms control—stopping the buildup of arms, eventually reducing the stockpile of weapons, but retaining some firepower and the means of delivering. Any other view of disarmament, during our lifetime at least, is completely irrational; and it seems to me is completely out of step with the demonstrated spiritual and moral sophistication and maturity of men.

History is replete with civilizations and social systems that went out of business because of inability to protect themselves from internal insurrection or external aggression.

A people who had the misfortune to be judged by the English to be the long-sought missing link, halfway between men and animals, offers a dramatic illustration of the point. The English could tell they were not civilized because of various traits of theirs—not speaking English; not having high tea, and that sort of thing. They figured that anything this savage was not human. So the English—and I'm not really picking on them; any of the so-called civilized societies has similar distinguished episodes in its history—the English used to organize weekend hunting parties and shoot Tasmanians out of the trees.

The Tasmanians came out pretty poorly at this kind of warfare, having only bows and arrows for defense. They were cut down pretty well by the time the English decided there was a possibility that instead of being half animals they were simply primitive human beings and got them down out of the trees. Once down out of the trees, the rest of civilization hit them and venereal disease did away with a large number. What it didn't do, influenza and a few other things they had not been exposed to from Europe did; and there are only one or two left now. So within a few years Tasmania's social system will have ceased to exist because the Tasmanians couldn't maintain external order.

It still happens nowadays. You have got to have the ability to protect yourself. The need has not lessened in the mid-20th century.

Against this background and with these sorts of considerations, it seems to me that the possibility of working out a reasonable disarmament plan logically should be more real today than it has ever been before. I think this is true, not because of any increased love of humanity generated by moral disarmament groups, or any universal surge toward a real brotherhood of man; but because, for the first time in the world's history, there's a good chance that we could all end up quite dead if war occurred. This is rather a sobering thought for most of us, and is likely to slow us down at the threshold of all-out war. We know the devastating power of atomic weapons. We know the inadequacies of any civilian defense system, and for that matter, any general defense system.

The United States now has in the neighborhood of 3,400 intercontinental vehicles stockpiled in readiness for atomic war. This is the equivalent of over 7 tons of conventional explosives per capita for the entire population of the world. Even allowing for a relatively high percentage of loss in delivery, this destructive capability is equivalent to an overkill of 231 times for all Soviet strategic targets. Soviet Russia stands similarly ready to kill and be killed. Neither nation has any satisfactory defense against the threat which the other offers. And this is why I say that the receptivity and the practicality, and indeed the compulsions for disarmament, are more persuasive today than ever before.

The world as a whole is pouring billions of dollars into military programs which have become totally ineffective, if we are concerned, as we claim to be, with self-preservation rather than with mutual destruction. The $100 billion going into military programs is a defensive and aggressive waste equivalent to the total income of the poorer half of the world's population.

It must be readily apparent that while the economic effects of disarmament is one of the major problems associated with it, the economic effects could also represent not the smallest of the benefits to be gained.

Perhaps at this juncture we ought to define more specifically what we are talking about—at least in terms of probabilities. Among the disarmament proposals that have been advanced, the one which at the moment appears to be the most likely is that utilized by the Panel on Economic Impacts of Disarmament in its report to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, released in January 1962.

The Panel assumes that any ultimate agreement will be so constructed as to accomplish a reduction in defense expenditures over a period of years. The disarmament model assumed in the Panel report anticipates a reduction of defense expenditures to about one-fifth of their present size, over a period of 12 years. The total net reduction in expenditures would only amount to roughly one-half of the present defense budget, because of anticipated increased expenditures for international inspection and for other security and associated programs, such as NASA and the Atomic Energy Commission.

At present, our national defense budget is equal to about 10 percent of our gross national product. Employment in the Defense Establishment and defense industries stands at about the same percentage of our total labor force. So on the face of it, the disarmament model would appear to involve fairly minor adjustment problems for the economy as a whole, and this is pretty much the position that many economists have taken.

Certainly, on a cold statistical basis we have already dealt successfully with situations of much greater magnitude in 1945, and again in 1953, following the Korean conflict. During World War II, for example, the war or defense expenditures reached a peak of 42 percent of the gross national product. Employment in war industries, directly and indirectly, and in the armed services was at the level of about 40 percent of our total labor forces. In the Korean war, defense expenditures represented about 12½ percent of the gross national product.

Present circumstances, however, make the adjustment or transition problems in many industries considerably more difficult than they were in those periods. Back in 1945, for example, the shift from defense production to other kinds of production was roughly eight times what is presently contemplated. But there are a number of distinctions. That was a shift from a temporary makeshift production system back into a more normal pattern of peacetime production. During the war years personal savings reached unprecedented proportions. So with money available, and the tremendous pent-up consumer demand for products not available during the war, the outcome confounded many of the experts, and certainly went contrary to all previous postwar experiences. Instead of a depression or a recession, the country embarked on a postwar boom. In 1953 the adjustment was made from a similar temporarily distorted position. The circumstances today are quite different.

Our economy is expanding, but much too slowly. Our economic growth rate of 3 to 5 percent is a cause of considerable concern, as we look at the rapid growth rates in other countries. Soviet Russia is reportedly growing at the rate of 8 or 9 percent a year. The significance of this comes home when we recognize that an economy expanding at the rate of 9 percent a year will double in size every 8 years; while during the same period a growth rate of 4 percent means only about a 40-percent increase. Today we have the nagging problem of excessive unemployment. Employment of idle workers could add 2 to 3 percent to our growth rate at average levels of productivity. The increase in productivity per worker and the consequent declines in relative employment in agriculture and industry are also considerations. The estimated loss of jobs due to automation is at the rate of 40,000 a month. The problem is further compounded by a rapidly growing population and labor force. So it is against this sort of background that I think we need to look at the economic impact of disarmament today. The questions we must raise have to do with the effects of pyramiding losses and wrenches in the economy from disarmament on top of all of the other problems that we are now wrestling with. And we need to ask ourselves what we can do to avoid or minimize the economic hardships that may occur.

Now I believe that our economy is sufficiently strong and resilient to take the impact of disarmament successfully. I don't want you to construe my comments for one moment as being of an alarmist nature. I do believe that we are very foolish to sit idly by and do nothing in the way of developing plans and programs for the economic adjustments that must come with any disarmament program.

Last August the western edition of the New York Times carried a feature article on defense industry plans for conversion to civilian production. The title turned out to be a misnomer. The reporters who did the story conducted a survey of a number of industries now engaged in defense work. Incredibly enough they found virtually no one giving any thought at all to conversion plans for their company. Based on discussions with industry and government, the article closed with this comment, which pretty well sums up what I'm trying to say:

"But virtually no one predicts that the sophisticated defense industries of today will be able to make the transition to civilian production as easily as their ancestors did after World War II. The reason given on both sides is the lack of planning."

The effects of defense dollars reach into the economy of all of the States to some extent, although this is a difficult thing to measure with any exactitude. It appears that there are some 10 or 12 States with 10 percent or more of their manufacturing employment in defense industries. I wonder if it would not be a worthwhile project for ASPDA to arrange for a planning conference of these States. I don't mean another conference where we call in the experts and have them reel out figures and statistics. The economic adjustment to arms control is becoming a matter of serious concern. It is something that will most certainly affect the economies of our various States. It is therefore something which we who are concerned with the planning and development of our States cannot in good conscience ignore. The kind of conference that I am suggesting would be a working affair where we could get together, roll up our sleeves, and see if we couldn't arrive at some active approach that the various State agencies can begin to take now to the advance planning that we must have in order to minimize any harmful economic effects from disarmament.

Of course there is another side of the coin. The depressant effects of disarmament could become the economic "straw that breaks the camel's back." I prefer to think of it, however, as the "match that could light the tinder," for our economy is certainly capable of growth. What we need is some vigorous stimulus. And what better stimulus could we have than simultaneously relieving world tensions and transferring one-twentieth or more of our production to activities which would substantially increase our welfare?

What are some of these activities? The panel report which I mentioned earlier examines most of them in some detail. We could use more medical services, recreation, housing, education, research. We could improve our transportation, develop our water resources, including the oceans. We could make more rapid improvements in urban facilities; improve the efficiency of our production system through higher rates of investment in plants and equipment. We could increase our investment toward the advancement of the underdeveloped economies.

We need to begin now to develop and refine proposals which would supplant, either through public or private means, the production now devoted to military needs.

It seems to me that this potential offered by a shift from military production should be of special interest to the States, especially State planning and development agencies. Among the suggested list of needs toward which production might be directed are included many items which have a very direct and substantial bearing on the economic development of individual States.

Disarmament adjustments would be of critical importance to those States which are heavily defense oriented, such as Washington, California, Kansas, Texas, Florida, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and so forth. None of the suggested avenues of alternative production appears to offer any hope of full and immediate use of surplus resources which might be freed in these localities. The majority of the present defense industries face great economic and technical difficulties in making any sort of transition from military to civilian production. It is likely that there will be relatively large scale unemployment of labor in these areas. Programs need to be developed, and they need to be developed now, which would at least minimize the effects of the transition.

Planning, whether to lessen the impact of adjustment or to exploit the opportunities for growth, most certainly must be done by the public and private sectors of the economy. In the public sector a part of this, of course, involves the dispersion of public funds into nonmilitary programs, some of which I mentioned earlier. Also in the public sector, possibilities for easing adjustment problems may include special resource development programs; low cost industrial loans on a massive scale; research and development funding for many purposes; massive manpower retraining programs; industrial relocation loans.

The States will most certainly be involved in administration of these programs. The States have a vital interest. And I believe the States should have something to say about what programs are ultimately adopted and how they are to be administered.

Our Governor in Washington State, Gov. Albert D. Rosellini, is keenly aware of the potentially serious consequences of disarmament. He is also enthusiastic over the great benefits that could accrue to society, if we are smart enough to plan and act intelligently. It is at his urging that I am suggesting a conference of States on this subject.

Governor Rosellini has been greatly concerned about Federal-State relations. From his opening address as chairman of the Governors' conference at its annual meeting last July, I have taken this quote:

"My fellow Governors, I believe it is essential that the executive branch of the Federal Government and the national Governors' conference join in a major effort to create closer, more direct, and more regular consultation with one another on matters of anticipated national programs, and the administration of them.

"I propose that the executive committee of our organization devote itself during the next year to studying the means by which this could be accomplished."

A conference of the States on disarmament might well evolve some constructive steps toward the closer working liaison needed in this important area of planning and programing for disarmament.

As to the private sector, industry must somehow be persuaded to begin planning now on conversion possibilities. I believe that State development agencies have a responsibility not only to stimulate action by industry but somehow to coordinate and mesh State planning and programing efforts with those of private industry within the borders of each State.

These are our challenges.

In Washington State we are concerned about disarmament. Our concern stems from the fact that more than a quarter of our basic industry is defense oriented. It is conceivable that disarmament for our State could mean a great waste of community resources, and economic hardship for the people of the State, lasting for some period of time. I am sure the people of my State are ready to make such a sacrifice should it be necessary. But the question that we must ask ourselves is: Is it necessary? Isn't it possible now to prepare plans and decide what course we are going to follow so that we may take proper steps at the State level to adjust to this eventuality. I believe it is, and I believe that a conference of those States most directly affected can hammer out some valuable approaches to the problem.

DR. GASTON FOOTE'S EULOGY OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY AT A MEMORIAL SERVICE AT THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH, FORT WORTH, TEX.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Dr. Gaston Foote, one of the most learned and devout men in Texas, a great leader at the First Methodist Church of Fort Worth, preached a moving memorial service to the memory of our late martyred President, John F. Kennedy, on Sunday, November 24, at Fort Worth, Tex.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Foote's memorial tribute to the late beloved John F. Kennedy be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PRESIDENT—A MEMORIAL SERVICE, NOVEMBER 24, 1963

(By Gaston Foote)

PRAYER

Eternal Spirit of God, source of all light and life, the sudden cataclysmic events of the world have driven us to our knees. We humbly kneel at Thy feet today because, if we were not willing to come, we were forced to come. Our desolation and bewilderment has commanded us to seek Thy presence for Thou alone art the source of our strength. The frailties of man are apparent all about us. We are but passing shadows in the mighty parade of human history. Only Thou art from everlasting to everlasting.

We offer our prayer, O God, for our sinsick world. Millions of Thy children of every race, color, and creed have been stunned by the events of the moment. Perplexed by problems without solution, buffeted by sorrow, baffled by bullets of hate, we feel a dreadful sense of loneliness when men of great promise and power are taken from our midst. Bless the sorrowing peoples of the earth whose hope of freedom from the tyranny of oppression and poverty was centered in the devotion and the courage of the late President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

We offer our prayer, O God, for our own beloved country. We are a people of many nations. The cultural heritages of the entire world flow within the bloodstream of our beloved America. From Boston to San Diego, from Seattle to Miami, we are a varied people. But we are a united people in that we rejoice in our liberties and glory in our sacred traditions. May we never cease to thank Thee for the noble heritage of our forefathers, bequeathed to us as free citizens of a free country. We bless Thy Holy Name for such men as Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln who conceived a country that was, itself, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. We bless Thy Holy Name for John F. Kennedy, who so nobly and fearlessly epitomized this spirit of democracy with liberty and justice for all. We thank Thee for his strong heart, his indomitable courage, his untiring zeal, his unalterable belief in the American dream.

We raise our prayers to Thee, O God, for his beloved family. Bless his stricken father on his bed of affliction. Deal Thou graciously with his devoted mother. Hold within the hollow of Thy loving hand the gracious First Lady whose grief is beyond our power of comprehension. Fill with Thy love the great vacancy in the hearts of his beloved Caroline and John, Junior. May the united prayers of the Nation sustain them in this, their darkest hour.

We raise our prayers to Thee, O God, in behalf of John Connally, Governor of our great State. Bless the doctors and the nurses who assist the Great Physician in bringing him back to health and usefulness. Put Thine arm of love around the shoulders of his devoted wife, his sons, his daughter in this hour of trial.

We raise our prayers to Thee, O God, in behalf of our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson. Keep him in the strength of Thine undergirding love and sustain him in his momentous decisions by Thine infinite wisdom. May all of the finest resources of all of the people in America be put at his disposal that he may rise to greatness in this great hour. May he truly be our President, under the leadership of God.

We commit our lives, our fortunes and our future into Thy hands as we pray in the name of our crucified and risen Lord. Amen.

EULOGY

Four times in the history of the United States a President has died of an assassin's bullet. Abraham Lincoln was killed by John Wilkes Booth in 1865 while attending a play in the Ford Theater in Washington. James A. Garfield was shot by Charles J. Guiteau in 1881 while waiting to catch a train in the railroad station in the same city. William McKinley was killed while attending a reception in Buffalo, N.Y., by Leon Czolgosz. And now our own beloved President John F. Kennedy has been killed by an assassin's bullet.

As one of millions upon millions of persons who mourn his passing, I should like to lift up some of the many admirable characteristics of his short, eventful life.

He was a family man. He came from a closely knitted family of nine children. When the Kennedys all gathered at the family retreat at Hyannis Port, it must have been quite a hilarious occasion. And no man seemed to be more devoted to his own little family than our President. Despite the press of duties of the state which would have destroyed the ordinary man, John F. Kennedy took time to be with his children. Caroline, as familiar to most of us as are the children of our neighborhood, seemed to be "daddy's girl." John-John was the apple of his eye. It was not unusual for Washingtonians to see the Kennedys strolling across the White House lawn holding the hands of their two children.

In many ways the President showed his devotion for his brilliant and beautiful wife, Jackie. She in turn must have been extremely proud of her illustrious husband. One can well imagine what a different United States we would have if all our families were as devoted to each other as were the members of our first family.

Our President was a religious man. He never insisted that his faith be practiced by those of other faiths but he insisted on practicing his faith. Seldom did a week pass without some news photographer snapping a picture of the President, either alone or with his family, entering a church door for divine services. He did not take time out for worship to be seen of men but rather to get himself a clearer vision of God.

Moreover he was a devoted student of the Holy Scripture. His speeches were filled with quotations from the Prophets, the Psalms, the Gospels and the writings of Paul. Like his predecessor, Abraham Lincoln, he made wide use of the eternal truths recorded in Biblical literature.

What a reproach our President's record at church is to some of us. We frequently say we are too busy to attend church. But with the intolerable burden of the responsibilities of state upon his shoulders he found time for God.

Our President was a man of sympathetic, human understanding. Born to wealth, he never lost the common touch. His sincere sympathy seemed always to be with the poor. He said, "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor it cannot help the few who are rich." His major social legislation was in behalf of the poor, the sick, the unemployed, the exploited.

One reason for his sympathetic understanding was the many sorrows in his own life. His older brother, whom he idolized, was killed in World War II. A sister was killed in a tragic plane crash. His father almost died of a stroke 2 years ago. Barely 3 months ago he buried part of his own heart in a little grave in Boston when his second son died before he was 2 days old. As if this were not enough, he suffered throughout his entire adult life from an injured back. When he spoke feelingly of the needs of his fellow Americans, there was a ring of utter sincerity in his voice.

John F. Kennedy was a man of great wisdom. His mind seemed to be on fire. It sparkled with a scintillating brilliancy. He was a prodigious reader and had the uncanny ability to read with great speed and clear understanding. He could dip down in any period of American history and feel completely at home. His choice of words was superb, his profundity of thought was startling. Yet he was not bookish. He did not seek truth for truth's sake; rather for the sake of action in today's world. He knew whereof he spoke and sought to lead the Nation into greater fields of endeavor.

Our President was a man of great courage. He wrote a significant book, entitled "Profiles of Courage" which, in retrospect, epitomizes his own life. Upon enlistment in the Navy he was given a desk job in Washington. Quickly tiring of his routine labors he finally became captain of a PT boat in the Pacific. The boat was cut in two by the enemy and he and his crew floundered for hours in the water. He swam for miles to an island dragging an injured member of the crew behind him holding in his teeth a strap of his comrade's lifesaver.

In his inaugural address he numerated the hardships through which Americans must pass to effect world security. Then he said, "I do not shrink from this responsibility, I welcome it." Hardly had he taken his seat in the White House when the Cuban crisis broke in all its fury. At the time when we needed a strong hand at the helm of the Ship of State John Kennedy was equal to the occasion. We were perhaps never closer to world holocaust than when the voice from Washington said to Mr. Khrushchev, "We demand that the offensive weapons now in Cuba be removed." The quarantine of the island and the turning back of the ships from Russia laden with war supplies is familiar to us all. Only a man with great courage could do that.

He showed no less courage amid problems of a domestic nature. When the hands of history pointed to the University of Mississippi crisis as one that demanded immediate settlement the words from Washington were loud and clear. Said the President, "We have every right to disagree with the law of our land; we have no right to defy it. Defiance of any law upon which we disagree would lead to defiance of all law." Once again a courageous voice had given stability in a critical hour.

Our President was a committed man. He spoke to the youth of America about the American dream as being something yet to be realized. He challenged us all to make democracy real not to 85 percent of the American people but to all of them. He challenged each of us to make our individual contribution to human welfare by the words: "Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country." In the establishment of the Peace Corps he challenged youth to change its image of the "Ugly American" to one of service above self. He was committed to the great American dream.

He was committed to world peace. His efforts were conciliatory, calculated to calm. He said, "Let us never negotiate out of fear but let us never fear to negotiate." Stanch supporter of the United Nations, he felt that peaceful negotiation was infinitely better than provocative irritation. He gave the supreme measure of his devotion to his country under the leadership of his God.

And now the assassin's bullet has found its mark. Hate pulled the trigger that killed him. And we who have let emotion rather than reason lead us, we who were quick to be critical and reluctant to help, we who were blinded by our prejudices have allowed hate groups to grow up in our midst until the very atmosphere has been conducive to producing the tragedy that has befallen.

I call you to an altar of penance in this our darkest hour. Let hate give way to love and vindictiveness give way to valor. Rise up, O men of God, with love in your heart for all of your fellow Americans everywhere and with knees bowed in penance and your hand in the hand of God, act and live as men worthy of our great tradition.

There is no benediction to this service. After you have knelt at the altar, let only the benediction of God go with you into the dawn of a better tomorrow.

DR. E. S. JAMES CALLS IN BAPTIST STANDARD FOR SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, E. S. James, the widely read editor of the Baptist Standard, has written a thoughtful editorial expressing his support for President Lyndon Johnson. Mr. James' observations well illustrate the obligation of every citizen, whatever party allegiance, to give his honor and loyalty to our President. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "He Is My President" from the Baptist Standard of December 11, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE IS MY PRESIDENT

(By E. S. James)

Never in American history has any man inherited quite so heavy a burden as that which fell on the shoulders of Lyndon B. Johnson when President Kennedy was felled by an assassin's bullet. Washington, Lincoln, Andrew Johnson, Wilson, and Roosevelt were called to lead the Nation in its most difficult hours; but most of their enemies were local, and their problems concerned this one Nation. President Johnson takes the helm when communism seeks to encircle us, friends threaten to desert us, and a motley horde of would-be leaders seems determined to set the people against one another. More than at any time in the past the Nation is splintered into many groups, and each group seems sure it has the only answer to all the problems.

This man with the heavy burden is my President. I did not vote for his ticket in 1960, but I vote for him today and will support him with all my might so long as he lives in the White House. If I feel he is not the best man for the place 11 months from now I can register my disapproval in the voting booth; but today he is my President, and I am grateful that he was present and prepared for it when the emergency arose.

From earliest childhood we were taught to respect the office and the person of the President of this country. Through the years we have heard many criticize the decisions and the policies of a national leader, but until 10 years ago it was unthinkable that anyone would accuse the man in the White House with disloyalty to his oath of office or unfaithfulness to the Nation that had elected him. Since John F. Kennedy came into the office every form of communication media has been used to charge or insinuate that he and many associated with him in the Government were seeking to destroy American democracy. In many instances the press, the public forum, and the pulpit were used to attack his every word and act. The mails have been flooded with cheap printed matter pouring out vitriolic words that must have penetrated even more deeply than the bullet that took his life. All who sought to factually appraise him came in for the same kind of abuse. How could a sane nation have failed to see that such an attitude must invitably result in a national tragedy?

Now we have a new man of stature in the office. How long he will be there nobody knows, but it will not matter whether he is there 13 months or 61 or 109, he will be my President so long as he is in the office. As a citizen, I owe the President my loyalty, and as a Christian I am privileged to claim the promises of prayer in his behalf.

The new President is human, and he will err, but he will still be my President. I will not always be happy with his decisions, but I will never accuse him of acting from an un-American motive. Should he ever seek my opinion about any matter, I will offer what I believe to be constructive suggestions. If they are rejected, I will not consider it a personal offense. If it ever seems that he is too easy on our national enemies, I will try to remember that the President is in a position to know when to be firm and when to bargain in the interest of the total good of humanity. He is my President, and he has access to information about which most of us can only speculate.

Lyndon B. Johnson is your President and mine. We owe it to him to protect him from the onslaughts of those who put personal gain above collective freedom. His honor, his reputation, and his freedom to make his own decisions according to the best judgment God shall give him should be defended by every right-thinking American. We owe the same allegiance to every elected official of government, but in a very special sense the President of the United States is a symbol of American freedom, and he has a responsibility that no other person on earth has. How good it would be if every person in this Nation would, from his heart, renew his pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

A CHRISTMAS POEM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as we are about to celebrate the birthday of the Saviour of the world, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a poem by Inez Sheldon Tyler.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHRISTMAS KYRIELLE

Tonight the Christmas star hangs low,
Just as it hung so long ago;
Familiar carols sound again,
With peace on earth, good will to men.

Our candle-lighted windows glow;
On baby pines soft-cadenced snow
Falls gently, harbinger as then
Of peace on earth, good will to men.

We bow our heads in gratitude;
For sky both clear and rainbow hued,
For sun that smiles on hill and glen
With peace on earth, good will to men.

It is for us to seek and find
This light of love for all mankind;
When will the world be filled . . . oh when . . .
With peace on earth, good will to men?

When every heart becomes aware,
May come, through universal prayer,
A blessedness beyond our ken
With peace on earth, good will to men.

—INEZ SHELDON TYLER.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in the past few days I have inserted in the RECORD a number of articles and editorials dealing with the problem of Presidential succession. I have submitted them in the hopes that my colleagues will give this question the serious consideration it deserves.

Yesterday, I inserted a group of articles that dealt with the problem of Presidential disability—a subject covered in my proposed amendment—Senate Joint Resolution 139. Today, I would like to insert articles by Roscoe Drummond, David Lawrence, and the editors of the Washington Star dealing with the question of selecting a new Vice President, a subject covered in section 2 of my amendment.

There is little agreement as to the best way of choosing a new Vice President, but these three articles all point out the importance of finding some equitable mechanism for making such a choice. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 15, 1963]

PROBLEM FOR CONGRESS: SUCCESSION DEFICIENCIES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It is well that fresh and urgent consideration is being given to the twin problems of Presidential disability and Presidential succession.

Some of the most dangerous exigencies in the event a President is unable to perform his duties are left unresolved by the Constitution.

As to Presidential succession when there is no Vice President, there is a growing opinion among experienced students of government that this matter was badly resolved by Congress in its act of 1947 which put the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate next in line.

During the past 76 years Congress has provided two different lines of succession after the Vice President. In 1886 Congress stipulated that, beginning with the Secretary of State, the Cabinet officers would succeed. It repealed this law in 1947 and put the Speaker and the Senate's President pro tempore first in line.

The practical question—and now a most pressing practical question since there is no Vice President—is which line of succession (Speaker and Senate President or Secretary of State and Secretary of the Treasury) would better meet the requirements of the Presidency and the needs of the Nation?

To get the answer, we should examine what we most want the line of succession to provide. These are the essential ingredients:

Continuity of ability—as far as possible.

Continuity of policy.

Continuity of the party that won the previous presidential election.

On the basis of recent history the prospects of getting either continuity of party or continuity of policy through the succession of House Speaker or Senate President is slim and recurringly uncertain. The fact is that in 8 of the past 16 years—that is, from 1947 to 1963—the succession of the Speaker would have put into control of the White House the party which lost the previous presidential election. From 1947 to 1949, while Mr. Truman was President, the Speaker of the House was a Republican, and during six of President Eisenhower's years, the Speaker of the House was a Democrat.

Surely a system of succession which could put the opposition party in control of the Presidency after the country has defeated its nominee in the previous election is an immensely dubious arrangement.

On the positive side no successor to the Presidency, after the Vice President, would more likely produce continuity of policy—as well as continuity of party—than the Secretary of State. He would have been at the center of policy formulation all the time and would invariably be one of the President's most trusted associates.

Looking over the sequence of Secretaries of State from Mr. Hoover to President Johnson—Henry Stimson, Cordell Hull, Edward Stettinius, James Byrnes, General Marshall, Dean Acheson, Foster Dulles, Christian Herter, Dean Rusk—the ability to serve as President is so high that it causes one to wonder why Congress ever changed the law of succession.

President Truman urged Congress to change the statute soon after F.D.R.'s death in 1945 and before the exacting burdens and qualifications of the Presidency had come fully home to him or our world responsibilities had become so awesome. The one objective argument which Mr. Truman advanced and Congress eagerly embraced was that the Speaker was an "elected official," but popularly elected to be a Congressman from only one district. Would the country as a whole elect the Speaker over the Secretary of State to succeed the President? I doubt it.

The merit of having a party-sponsored elected official in line for the Presidency is obvious, if it can be obtained. When there is no Vice President, why shouldn't the party which won the previous presidential election convene its national convention and choose another vice presidential nominee which could then be elected by the same electoral college that had elected the previous presidential ticket?

In a word, why not choose a Vice President to fill the vacancy as soon as possible?

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Dec. 8, 1963]

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

In the view of most observers, the United States is now faced with a critical problem of succession to the powers of the Presidency. According to the law of 1947, proposed by President Truman and passed by a Republican-controlled Congress, should President Johnson die or become incapacitated those powers would devolve upon House Speaker MCCORMACK.

The flaws in this prospect, and in the system which produces the prospect, are apparent. The Speaker will be 72 this month. Moreover, the structure of Congress is such as to all but guarantee that a Member becoming Speaker will be a man of advanced age. He also will almost surely be a man whose career has fitted him for legislative rather than executive duties.

It is being proposed that the Constitution be amended to elect a second Vice President. More seriously, it is being proposed that the process of Presidential succession be made to revert to that in effect before 1947. Under that practice, succession passed from the succeeding Vice President to Cabinet members in order of the seniority of their departments, beginning with State.

The idea of an elected second Vice President hardly bears scrutiny. Lyndon Baines Johnson is a fortunate exception to the general rule that our political parties rarely nominate for the Vice Presidency a man previously considered qualified for the presidential nomination. If the parties have been unable to prevail upon qualified persons to take the second spot, how will they fare when it comes to a third spot?

Before reverting to the system in effect prior to 1947, as is being urged, it is well to remember the reasons for the change. President Truman's thought was that our Chief Magistrate in any circumstance should have been elected by the people, at one remove or another. The reasoning has lost none of its cogency. Cabinet members are not, in fact, elected by the people nor by their elected representatives. They are appointed by the President.

Mr. Truman's reasoning was that it is basically wrong, however convenient it may be, for a President in effect to appoint his successor. Whatever the state of current dissatisfaction with the 1947 law, this still seems a powerful argument, wholly in accord with the spirit of the Republic.

It seems to us that the 1947 law, though inadequate, aims in the right direction. Congress should indeed and urgently consider a new law of succession. But such a law should not retreat from the degree of democracy attained in the last change.

Rather than return to succession by appointment, Congress should consider making it law that upon the succession of the elected Vice President to the Presidency, the House of Representatives shall meet as soon as possible and elect, not necessarily from among its own Members, a new Vice President.

This official would assume the presidency of the Senate and stand next in order of succession to the Presidency of the Nation. Continuity of Government would be assured. And the will of the people, through their elected representatives, would have been expressed in the selection of the new leader.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 23, 1963]

CHOOSING A PRESIDENT

(By David Lawrence)

An editorial on this page on January 11, 1960, expressed the view that the existing method of choosing a President was not satisfactory. At that time, opinion had not yet crystallized as to who the Democratic or Republican candidates would be. The analysis, therefore, concerned primarily the method used in choosing a President rather than national issues. The editorial said:

"Our present system of choosing candidates for the Presidency relies on luck and chance.

* * * * *

"America has been lucky, generally speaking, in her selection of Presidents, but the sad truth is that several Presidents have not been able to do in their first term as good a job as in their second term.

"This is because the first term is often taken up largely with learning procedures and the background of national and international problems.

* * * * *

"Some of our Presidents, of course, have had legislative experience in Congress, but it is unfortunately true that no man who has been leader of his party in either the House or the Senate has been nominated for the Presidency in the last half century.

* * * * *

"Wouldn't it be much better if we had a modified form of the parliamentary system, wherein a Prime Minister must earn his spurs in years of legislative combat? In most countries, like England and Canada, this means a day-by-day interrogation and response on every kind of problem of executive administration.

"The two men in America who today are qualified for the Presidency by experience comparable to that of parliamentary leaders abroad are Vice President Richard Nixon, Republican, and Senator Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, Democrat. Mr. Nixon had served two terms in the House of Representatives and 2 years as a Senator when he was elected Vice President. He has been an unofficial spokesman of his party in Congress during the last 7 years, identifying the role of the Vice Presidency more with party leadership than ever before. In addition, Mr. Nixon not only has had frequent opportunities to sit with the President and his Cabinet and executive organizations like the National Security Council, but he has served effectively as liaison between the White House and Congress.

"Senator Johnson has shown the kind of skill and masterful knowledge in handling controversial legislation that is exhibited by the parliamentary leaders in other countries. No one else being prominently mentioned today for the Democratic nomination has had similar training. Mr. Johnson, to be sure, lacks administrative experience, but, if America had adopted some form of parliamentary government, a Senate leader like Mr. Johnson would have had plenty of opportunity to become familiar with executive problems."

This country is lucky again. President Johnson today brings to the White House many years of leadership experience in Congress.

But who would succeed him in an emergency? There is no Vice President now. Nobody is giving his full time to the Cabinet meetings and conferences such as those which Mr. Johnson attended.

A constitutional amendment is needed to require that Congress in joint session shall immediately elect a Vice President when a vacancy occurs in that office. He should be chosen not from the Cabinet but from the membership of Congress itself. He should be a man trained in a leadership position.

Sooner or later, as Woodrow Wilson wrote in his letter to Congress a few days before he was inaugurated as President in 1913, the American people must consider some change in their system whereby a President is "made answerable to opinion in a somewhat more informal and intimate fashion—answerable, it may be, to the Houses whom he seeks to lead, either personally or through a Cabinet, as well as to the people for whom they speak." Mr. Wilson added:

"But that is a matter to be worked out—as it inevitably will be—in some natural American way which we cannot yet even predict."

The time is ripe for a fundamental change. While Congress is elected by the people, Cabinet officers are not. We have, moreover, in recent years suffered from a divided Government. There are four blocs in Congress rather than two parties.

It is necessary to establish party responsibility. This can be done by eliminating the fixed dates of elections and giving the people an opportunity to vote into power a new President or a new Congress whenever a two-thirds majority in Congress declares that an impasse between the executive and legislative branch has occurred. It is then that an election by the people should be held. The people shouldn't be asked to wait 2 or 3 years to record their decision on a major issue.

This is a rapidly moving age, and the people should always have instant control over the public officials who are chosen to govern them.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AT THE U.N.

Mr. HUMPHREY. On Tuesday President Johnson told the United Nations that the United States wanted to end the cold war "once and for all." The President did not speak idle words, but matched his words to actions taken only last week. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara announced last week that a large number of military installations would be closed out, and that military expenditures could be expected to level off and possibly go down in the next several years.

President Johnson stated that the time has come for "a new era of hope"—"hope and progress for that one-third of mankind that is still beset by hunger, poverty, and disease."

A diversion of funds away from the weapons of war to the tools of peace could attack and eliminate this "hunger, poverty, and disease." Approximately $120 billion per year are spent in the world today for armaments. Even a small fraction of this amount would go a long way toward serving the basic needs of people. Weapons will not serve them and cannot protect them. Our own expenditures for defense are very great, but as the President pledged "the United States will do its full share."

The President reiterated our unswerving commitment to keeping and preserving the peace.

Peace—

He said—

is a journey of a thousand miles. It must be taken one step at a time.

We are willing to take those steps: to eliminate the cold war, prevent dissemination of nuclear weapons, press on with arms control and reduction, and to cooperate with other nations in the United Nations in conquering everywhere the ancient enemies of mankind, "hunger, disease, and ignorance." This was a great address—a noble and strong commitment to peace, freedom and strength.

I ask unanimous consent to include the full text of President Johnson's address to the United Nations, the text of a press conference of President Johnson, and an article by Walter Lippmann in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address, press conference text, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, NEW YORK, N.Y. (AS ACTUALLY DELIVERED)

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, distinguished delegates to the United Nations, ladies and gentlemen, we meet in a time of mourning, but in a moment of rededication. My Nation has lost a great leader. This organization has lost a great friend. World peace has lost a great champion.

But John Kennedy was the author of new hope for mankind, hope which was shared by a whole new generation of leaders in every continent, and we must not let grief turn us away from that hope. He never quarreled with the past. He always looked at the future. And our task now is to work for the kind of future in which he so strongly believed.

I have come here today to make it unmistakably clear that the assassin's bullet which took his life did not alter his Nation's purpose. We are more than ever opposed to the doctrines of hate and violence, in our own land and around the world. We are more than ever committed to the rule of law, in our own land and around the world. We believe more than ever in the rights of man, all men of every color, in our own land and around the world. And more than ever we support the United Nations as the best instrument yet devised to promote the peace of the world and to promote the well-being of mankind.

I can tell you today, as I told you in 1958 when I came as majority leader of the U.S. Senate to the first committee of this great tribunal, that the full power and partnership of the United States is committed to our joint effort to eliminate war and the threat of war, aggression and the danger of violence, and to lift from all people everywhere the blight of disease, and poverty, and illiteracy.

Like all human institutions, the United Nations has not achieved the highest of hopes that some held at its birth. Our understanding of how to live, live with one another, is still far behind our knowledge of how to destroy one another.

But as our problems have grown, this organization has grown, in numbers, in authority, in prestige, and its member nations have grown with it, in responsibility and in maturity.

We have seen too much success to become obsessed with failure. The peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations has worked in the Congo, in the Middle East, and elsewhere. The great transition from colonial rule to independence has been largely accomplished. The decade of development has successfully begun. The world arms race has been slowed. The struggle for human rights has been gaining new force.

And a start has been made in furthering mankind's common interest in outer space, in scientific exploration, in communications, in weather forecasting, in banning the stationing of nuclear weapons, and in establishing principles of law.

I know that vast problems remain, conflicts between great powers, conflicts between small neighbors, disagreements over disarmament, persistence of ancient wrongs in the area of human rights, residual problems of colonialism, and all the rest. But men and nations, working apart, created these problems, and men and nations working together must solve them.

They can solve them with the help of this organization, when all members make it a workshop for constructive action, and not a forum for abuse; when all members seek its help in settling their own disputes as well as the disputes of others; when all members meet their financial obligations to it; and when all members recognize that no nation and no party and no single system can control the future of man.

When I entered the Congress of the United States 27 years ago, it was my very great privilege to work closely with President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. As a Member of Congress, I worked with him to bring about a profound but peaceful revolution. That peaceful revolution brought help and hope to the one-third of our Nation that was then ill housed, ill clad, and ill nourished.

We helped our working men and women obtain more jobs and we helped them obtain better wages. We helped our farmers to own and improve their own land, and conserve their soil and water, and electrify their farms.

We harnessed the powers of the great rivers, as in the Tennessee Valley and lower Colorado. We encouraged the growth of cooperatives and trade unions. We curbed the excesses of private speculation. We built homes in the place of city slums, and we extended the rights of freedom of all our citizens.

Now, on the world scale, the time has come, as it came to America 30 years ago, for a new era of hope, hope and progress for that one-third of mankind that is still beset by hunger, poverty, and disease.

In my travels on behalf of my country and President Kennedy, I have seen too much of misery and despair in Africa, in Asia, in Latin America. I have seen too often the ravages of hunger, and tapeworm and tuberculosis, and the scabs and scars on too many children who have too little health and no hope.

I think that you and I and our countries and this organization can, and must, do something about these conditions. I am not speaking here of a new way of life to be imposed by any single nation. I am speaking of a higher standard of living, to be inspired by these United Nations. It will not be achieved through some hopeful resolution in this Assembly, but through a peaceful revolution in the world, through a recommitment of all our members, rich and poor, and strong and weak, whatever their location or their ideology, to the basic principles of human welfare and of human dignity.

In this effort, the United States will do its full share. In addition to bilateral aid, we have with great satisfaction assisted in recent years in the emergence and the improvement of international developmental institutions, both within and without this organization.

We favor the steady improvement of collective machinery for helping the less-developed nations build modern societies. We favor an international aid program that is international in practice as well as purpose. Every nation must do its share. All United Nations and their members can do better. We can act more often together. We can build together a much better world.

The greatest of human problems, and the greatest of our common tasks, is to keep the peace and save the future. All that we have built in the wealth of nations, and all that we plan to do toward a better life for all, will be in vain if our feet should slip, or our vision falter, and our hopes ended in another worldwide war. If there is one commitment more than any other that I would like to leave with you today, it is my unswerving commitment to the keeping and to the strengthening of the peace. Peace is a journey of 1,000 miles, and it must be taken one step at a time.

We know what we want: The United States wants to see the cold war end, we want to see it end once and for all; the United States wants to prevent the dissemination of nuclear weapons to nations not now possessing them; the United States wants to press on with arms control and reduction; the United States wants to cooperate with all the members of this Organization to conquer everywhere the ancient enemies of mankind—hunger, and disease and ignorance; the United States wants sanity and security, and peace for all, and above all.

President Kennedy, I am sure, would regard as his best memorial the fact that in his 3 years as President the world became a little safer and the way ahead became a little brighter. To the protection and the enlargement of this new hope for peace, I pledge my country and its Government.

My friends and fellow citizens of the world, soon you will return to your homelands. I hope you will take with you my gratitude for your generosity in hearing me so late in the session. I hope you will convey to your countrymen the gratitude of all Americans for the companionship of sorrow which you shared with us in your messages of the last few weeks. And I hope that you will tell them that the United States of America, sobered by tragedy, united in sorrow, renewed in spirit, faces the New Year determined that world peace, civil rights, and human welfare become not an illusion, but a reality.

Man's age-old hopes remain our goal; that this world, under God, can be safe for diversity, and free from hostility, and a better place for our children and for all in generations in the years to come. And therefore, any man and any nation that seeks peace, and hates war, and is willing to fight the good fight against hunger and disease and ignorance and misery, will find the United States of America by their side, willing to walk with them, walk with them every step of the way.

Thank you very much.

PRESS CONFERENCE NO. 2 OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1963

The PRESIDENT. You mean I have that many friends out there that I have been missing all of these days? I thought everybody I knew had been in here.

Question. Mr. President, could you give us an exposition of your attitude toward perhaps an early meeting with Premier Khrushchev?

The PRESIDENT. I am ready and willing to meet with any of the world leaders at any time there is any indication a meeting would be fruitful and productive. When there are such indications, I will be glad to make a decision and inform you of it.

I have already made a decision this morning, which I had anticipated opening the meeting with, to follow through on my December 14th announcement of Mr. Thomas Mann, as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin American Affairs.

Because I want Mr. Mann to be the one man in the Government to coordinate the policies of this hemisphere after consultation with the Secretary of State, I am going to make him not only the Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Latin American Affairs, but Special Assistant to the President. As Special Assistant to the President to coordinate our policies in Latin America, he will be dealing with many other American agencies and other international agencies. We expect to speak with one voice on all matters affecting this hemisphere. Mr. Mann, with the support of the Secretary of State and the President, will be that voice.

Question. Mr. President, do you plan to ask for any legislation in the area of Presidential succession or disability, after your experience of the last few weeks?

The PRESIDENT. I have no plans. I have already carefully considered the disability matter and taken the action that I thought was necessary and desirable. I have a complete understanding and agreement with Mr. McCORMACK.

Question. Would you spell that out, Mr. President. Your agreement with President Kennedy was rather carefully spelled out in writing.

The PRESIDENT. It is the same agreement.

Question. It is the same agreement. This is the same then.

The PRESIDENT. Identical.

Question. Mr. President, could you tell us any of the plans you have for Mr. Mann to take specific action? Apparently Latin America will also be one of your greatest problems and I wondered if you thought in terms of specific programs that can avert some dangers that seem to be in the making.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Mann is in Mexico now, getting ready to come up here. He will review with all of the agencies of the Government concerned with Latin America his and the President's ideas. I have spelled those out to a limited degree in my letter to Mr. Mann, released last Sunday, and any amplification of them will come from Mr. Mann after he is inducted.

Question. Mr. President, Ambassador of Costa Rica Raymond Telles is in town for consultation. I wonder if you have any new assignment planned for him, and if you will see him.

The PRESIDENT. I would be glad to see him. I have no new assignments planned.

Question. Mr. President, can you tell us whether the budget will be under $100 billion or over?

The PRESIDENT. No one knows what the budget will be now, because we are trying the case, so to speak. We have dozens of agencies, independent agencies and Cabinet departments, who have made their requests and have not yet had it acted upon. Once it is acted upon, they still have the right to appeal to the President. The Joint Chiefs will appeal to the President from the recommendations they have made on December 30 at Johnson City. We have set that date and at that time we will try to finalize the budget for the Department of Defense.

I am working from a budget of $98.8 billion this year. It appears that we will expend about that amount, and maybe a little under or a little over, but substantially $99 billion will be the expenditures this year. That was the amount of Mr. Kennedy's budget. There are built-in increases of $1,790 million that are mandatory—military pay increase for 9 months, military retired pay, civilian pay, National Aeronautics and Space contracts, the Agency for International Development, Post Office rise, Federal Aviation Agency, urban renewal, and public assistance grants.

They run about $1 billion 8, and you have no choice about that. You will have to add that much. Then we have, as a result of the education bills that we have passed, the mental retardation bill, the manpower bill, and what we anticipate in the Appalachian program on poverty, about $1 billion 615 million more. So roughly, you can say $1 billion 7, and $1 billion 8. That is $3 billion 5.

Now, in addition to that, you are going to have increases that are requested for additional functions in various agencies. Most agencies, I would say a majority of the agencies, asked for an increase of some kind. They have to, because first, the civilian pay increase just makes the budget higher. But they have some new functions. We will add those to the two amounts that I have given you, and then we will start reducing from there. That is what we are doing now.

So no one can say with any authority, the President or the Director of the Budget or any department, what the budget is going to be, because it hasn't been determined. We are going to cut out every dime of waste that we can in order to have as much to spend on the unfilled needs of this Nation. We are going to be very careful not to sacrifice our military posture or weaken our combat strength.

But where we can, we are going to reduce the expenditures that are not essential to the Defense Establishment. I anticipate that the first of the year, the Defense Department for the first time in 15 years will have below 1 million civilians employed. I anticipate there will be installations in 15 States that will be well on the road to being closed because they serve no essential defense need. I anticipate that other surveys will be made of the remaining 6,700 bases. When and if and as they may become surplus to our needs, we will take them up with the persons properly concerned and then make announcements as to their closing.

We do have an increase in population. It is up 21 percent since Mr. Truman was President, so we must expect an increase in expenditures. We will have an increase in expenditures. The father that adds two or three extra children to his home and takes in a few of his nieces and nephews has to expect an increase in the food bill. When we have an increase in population, we are going to have an increase in the budget.

But we are going to keep that increase at the lowest possible level, first because we believe in frugality and thrift, and second because we hope that we won't send to Congress a budget that will require severe and drastic reductions by the Congress. We think that they are overworked now, and we don't want to add to it.

Question. Assuming that you are the Democratic nominee for President in 1964, will you agree to debate your opponent?

The President. I will make those decisions at the time I am the nominee, and in the light of the circumstances existing then. For the present I am not going to discuss any political matter.

Question. Mr. President, do you have any plans, sir, to meet with any other world leaders in the near future that you might tell us about, after your meeting with Chancellor Erhard?

The President. Yes. First of all, yesterday was a meeting with world leaders from 113 countries. I had met most of them before. A good many of them had visited my home in Texas before. Some of them were here just a few days ago for the funeral. But it was a very productive meeting. I think it was very helpful to all of us. I think it created better understanding. I am very grateful for the invitation extended to me, and for the hospitality shown.

I expect to meet with Mr. Erhard and hold the meeting he had planned to hold with Mr. Kennedy. I will meet him on the 28th and 29th of this month at my home. I expect to meet with the President of Italy in the early part of the new year, with the Prime Minister of Canada, with the President of Mexico, and with any other leaders where it is indicated a conference would be mutually desirable.

Question. Mr. President, Secretary Freeman, referring to your remarks earlier, said he would consider poverty as an important concern of yours in the administration. Is there any attempt going to be made to coordinate the various approaches to the national problem in the rural areas?

President. Any kind of poverty will be a concern of this administration, and a very serious concern of it. All of us know enough about it to not want the people to have to experience it any more than is absolutely necessary.

I have in the next room now the leaders of the farm organizations of this country. I have asked them to try to find areas of agreement and to give me their recommendations and be prepared to give them to the Senate committee. We have passed a cotton bill and there are some indications that the Senate may desire to act on a more comprehensive bill this year. I have asked these leaders, these experts in the field of farm legislation, not by commodity groups but by national organizations, to come in and give us their best thought. High on that agenda of priority is poverty legislation. They are two different things but they relate to each other—a general farm bill and specific poverty legislation for the lowest income group.

I spent some time this morning with the Farmers Union and various groups. I am very hopeful that there will come from these meetings that they are having a consensus which will be helpful to me and helpful to the committee that is considering it. I think while this Nation is very prosperous at the moment, not all of our people are fortunate enough to be in the upper income groups.

As I talk now, I am told by the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers that we are now passing the $600 billion gross national product rate. That is about as fine a Christmas present as could come to the people of this country. I am very happy about it. If we get the tax bill, we expect to increase that rate substantially. About every month that the tax bill is delayed, we lose about half a billion dollars in our economy.

We are very hopeful that we can help solve this poverty question and create additional incentives for our private enterprise system, and particularly our businessmen and our workers, by the early passage of the tax bill.

Senator Byrd has given me assurance that he is willing to have the bill voted on as soon as it can properly be voted on after amendments are offered. Although he does not agree to vote for the bill, he agrees that it can be voted upon at an early date.

What is really important in connection with our Government budget and our poverty program, with our whole economic picture, is the percentage of our gross national product, what our gross national product is first, and second, the percentage of that that we are actually spending for governmental purposes.

In the Roosevelt war years we spent as high as 46 percent of our gross national product for administrative budgets. During the transition period under Mr. Truman we spent 29 percent. In 1954, under Mr. Eisenhower, we spent 18.6 percent. We are hoping that we can come under that figure in our budget next year—in other words, that our budget expenditure as a percentage of our gross national product will be less for the fiscal year 1965 than it has been for any of these periods I mentioned.

Of course, a good deal of that depends on the size of the budget, whether we can keep it within bounds, and the size of the gross national product.

Question. Mr. President, do you expect to propose any new programs that will cost money in the fiscal year coming up?

The President. There will be new programs. We are not going to stand still in this country; we are going to move ahead. We are going to be enlightened. We are going to be forward looking. We hope that our private sector can make substantial contributions after the tax bill is passed in relieving our unemployment problem and increasing the number of jobs.

But we do expect to have programs that will deal with new situations and we do expect never to just be content to sit in our rocking chair and enjoy the status quo. We are a growing Nation, and we expect to keep moving if we are to lead our own people, as well as lead the world.

Question. Mr. President, do you expect to send an administration wheat bill to Congress?

The President. I have discussed that to the extent that I think your question is answered by saying that I have asked the farm leaders to make their recommendations on an agricultural bill, to make them to the Senate committee. I should like to get the benefit of their recommendations, talk to the Senators concerned, and then determine what, if any, kind of comprehensive agricultural legislation could come from this next session.

Question. Mr. President, have you reached a hard decision on changing the space program, including eliminating the Rover project?

The President. No.

Question. Mr. President, is this the type of press conference you intend to hold? Is that the decision? Or is this just an interim press conference?

The President. I would say that we are going to maintain an adequate flow of information to the press at all times in the best manner that we can. We will do what comes naturally. Maybe it will be a meeting of this kind today; maybe a televised meeting tomorrow, with maybe a coffee session the next day. We don't want to be too rigid. We always want to be flexible.

One thing, though, that we are determined to do is to let you know as much about what goes on in your house and in your Government as we possibly can, consistent only with the interests of our country and self-preservation of our country.

Question. Mr. President, are you planning to send some warships to the Indian Ocean, part of the 7th Fleet?

The President. I think I will have no comment to make there about the details of it. I have seen the statements that have been made about it, and the character of the operation. The contemplated plans that may be in the offing should come from the Defense Department. Mr. McNamara will no doubt be glad to give you that when he gets back.

I talked to the Secretary of State this morning. He told me that his meetings in NATO were very satisfactory and he thought quite helpful. Everyone was quite understanding and united against any external dangers.

I talked to the Secretary of Defense. I told him how grateful we were that he had been spared this accident which could have been very tragic. He told me he expected to be in Saigon a little later.

No controversies came up in the NATO meeting. The conference was a very satisfactory one. We expect to name very shortly an Ambassador to the OAS and a replacement for Mr. Mann. We have invitations out, but because of a health problem in one of the men's families, not with himself but some member of his family, he wanted to consult them before final acceptance. If you want to force someone to leak those names, I will give them to you myself very shortly.

Question. Mr. President, does this elevation of Mr. Mann indicate any increased urgency on the hemisphere problems?

The President. We know of no more important problems anywhere, any time, than the problems of our neighbors. We want to see our relations with them be the very best. We think Mr. Mann, who was the Assistant Secretary in the last administration, under Mr. Kennedy's administration, and who has served with great distinction as attaché, minister, and counselor at many of the embassies in this hemisphere, who has also served with distinction in this place before, is the best man to do it.

We also feel that we want to coordinate these programs, not eliminate them; to coordinate them and try to make them efficient in order that we can do the greatest good for the greatest number. We think that he is the man to do this job.

We would hope that we could operate with the same efficiency in all parts of the world. It does not mean a lessening of interest in any region, but it does mean that we are excited about the possibilities of advancement in growth and prosperity in this hemisphere. We want it to be under the very ablest and most experienced leadership that we can find. We will take whatever steps it may be necessary to take in other parts of the world, when and if they are necessary.

Question. Mr. President, can you tell us about your Christmas plans yet?

The PRESIDENT. I asked Mrs. Johnson about those just before you came in. I cannot be positive about them because that will depend on the situation here in Washington. But if God is willing and Mrs. Johnson is willing, I plan to fly to my home either the night of the 22d, after I light the Christmas tree and appear at the Lincoln Memorial, or sometime the 23d. I hope to spend Christmas Eve with my sisters, my brother, my uncles, cousins, aunts, and my family. Immediately after Christmas I am going to relax a little. I might even—I don't want to keep my secrets from you people—I might even go hunting. I haven't had a chance to do that this year and I would like to go and spend a day out in the hills, communing with myself.

Some of my staff members will be coming right after Christmas and we will receive the Chancellor on the 28th and 29th. We will receive the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the 30th. We will be working on the state of the Union message during that period. Except for just the Christmas Eve and Christmas holidays, I expect to be quite busy.

Question. Mr. President, do you feel that you can live with the foreign aid bill that the Senate Appropriations Committee has come up with?

The PRESIDENT. That bill is pending in the Senate. I thought that the action they took yesterday was very constructive and very helpful.

I guess this ought to be off the record.

* * * * *

I do not like to start that, but since I lost my prestige the day before I am glad you gave it back to me yesterday. I have no doubt but what—

* * * * *

Question. On the record now, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT. I am on the record.

I have no doubt but what the bill that is the product of both Houses of Congress will be a satisfactory bill, and while it may not give us all that we would like to see, and it may have some limitations that we think are undesirable, it is one that the best minds of both Houses have produced. I think it will be substantial enough to advance our national interest and, if you want to so put it, to live with.

Question. Mr. President, coming to the international situation, what do you think would be the most appropriate basis, not only for lessening tension between the United States and the Soviet Union but also for improving relations between those two great powers?

The PRESIDENT. I think the realization that there are 3 billion people in the world and that the No. 1 obligation of the President of this country and every citizen of every country is to learn how to live together. Failure in that mission could mean disaster for most of the world. My No. 1 priority, my No. 1 goal, my No. 1 objective, my No. 1 ambition, is to try to provide the leadership for my country with vision, tolerance, patience, and strength that will convince the rest of the world that we court no territory, we seek no satellites, that we are trying to live in peace and prosperity, and we would like for our fellow man everywhere to be able to do the same thing.

The PRESS (AL SPIVAK, UPI). Thank you, Mr. President.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 19, 1963]

FRUGALITY AND RETRENCHMENT

(By Walter Lippmann)

In supporting Secretary McNamara's efforts to cut back military spending on superfluous installations, President Johnson is no doubt improving the prospects of his tax bill. But at the same time he has lifted the cover on a contradiction in our public life. The contradiction is between what we do and what is proper for public men to say out loud.

For the fact is that government—Federal, State, and local—buys about a fifth of the goods and services produced by the American economy. To cut back this public spending substantially would produce a strong reaction in employment and in business. Thus the two Republican Senators from New York reacted at once when they heard that seven installations in New York State might be closed down or their operations reduced.

Actually, the McNamara economies are a mere nibble at the immense costs of the Defense Establishment. The economy administered by the Pentagon is over two-thirds as large as the whole economy of Great Britain. Our military supply system is now some 17 times larger than the largest private enterprise, namely the gigantic General Motors complex. In seven States employment in defense industries is from 20 percent (Arizona) to 30 percent (Kansas) of total manufacturing employment.

In fact, then, the U.S. economy is no longer a plain private enterprise system. Under the impact of the Second World War and of the armaments of the cold war, the American economy has become an organic mixture of public money and private money, public and private management. Any serious reduction of public spending must, therefore, have far-reaching effects on the whole economy.

There are some who say they think that Government and big spending can be reduced by cutting down civilian expenditures while leaving alone or even increasing military expenditures. This is a device of politicians who are merely pandering to popular prejudices. There is only one way by which serious and substantial retrenchment can be made, and that is by a reduction of armaments.

Desirable, but comparatively minor, savings can be had by reducing the amount of some of the civilian subsidies. But the amount will be much too small to make itself felt in the burdens of the taxpayer.

The immediate military cutbacks we are hearing about are really concerned with waste. They will not reduce in any way the military power of the United States. They are directed only at useless expenditures, those which employ men and materials for no real military purpose. Although this kind of frugality will not affect the budget importantly, it will have a salutary effect nevertheless. For it is demoralizing to see public employees assigned to waste the public money.

But beyond the tidying up of waste, including a certain amount of lush and conspicuous extravagance, there is visible on the horizon the prospect of much more substantial retrenchment. I do not myself regard it as likely that we are anywhere near a general disarmament treaty. The fundamental issues of principle are stubborn and their reconciliation is probably too embarrassing to all participants. But while what is underway is not a negotiated agreement, there are parallel trends toward the stabilization and then toward the reduction of military spending.

These parallel trends are activated by a common realization, acknowledged in the test ban treaty, that neither side has anything to gain by spending hugely in pursuit of the will-o'-the-wisp of the absolute weapon. Once that point has been reached, there is a balance of power which, though relatively favorable to the United States, is tolerable to the Soviet Union and cannot be changed seriously by gigantic military expenditures. This is the origin of the present trend toward stabilization in both countries.

At the same time the Soviet Union has found that the burden of the existing armaments interferes with the vital needs of the people. It has been impossible to carry out the program for the modernization of Soviet agriculture by chemical means without cutting down the military budget. We can be reasonably certain that the Soviet arguments for a reduction of armaments are sincere. They spring from necessity.

The United States is under no comparable pressure, and it can be argued that we could exploit the Soviet predicament by accelerating rather than reducing the race of armaments. This is a conceivable line of policy, which can be held in reserve, if the Soviet Government took a provocative line, say in Latin America. But if it follows the present line, which appears to be one of gradual disengagement, the American people will, quite rightly, allow themselves to become conscious of the real burdens of our Defense Establishment. We are paying for our necessary, and invaluable, military power by a failure to provide the facilities of civilian living to keep pace with our needs.

Cutbacks in defense expenditures would cause less difficulty to the economy and encounter less political resistance if the economy were running at a good pace instead of sluggishly. When 5½ percent of the labor force is unemployed, and the national product is 35 or 40 billion less than it could be, the prospects of subtracting any part of the demand for goods and services is disconcerting. It is not too soon, therefore, to begin thinking about what we would do with the resources released by a cut in defense expenditures. We must prepare ourselves not only for the minor readjustments to the first McNamara cutbacks but also for the larger readjustments which will become necessary if and when we enter upon an actual reduction of armaments.

TRIBUTE TO FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday I inserted an editorial from the Washington Daily News which pointed out the magnificent record of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in solving kidnaping cases as recently exemplified in the Sinatra case.

Today I received an editorial from the Hartford Courant of December 17 which also pays tribute to the FBI for its handling of this crime.

I quote the last sentence of the editorial:

> Once again the FBI has earned the admiration and respect of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN CRIME

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has added to its fine record by the swift and businesslike manner in which it solved the kidnaping of Frank Sinatra, Jr. There was none of the hoopla that often surrounds the

activities of local police, as most recently in the Dallas murder of Lee Oswald. Instead the FBI moved in quietly and had little to say until it could announce arrest of the three men involved, and recovery of most of the ransom money.

Kidnaping, although an ancient crime, has in recent years been referred to in Europe as the American crime. The French called it that a few years ago when the child of a wealthy motor manufacturer was kidnaped. It was a dubious compliment, but it is a fact that kidnaping seems to be a peculiar product of the American culture.

Yet this dismal crime hardly ever pays off. The record is studded with case after case in which the criminal, despite every conceivable precaution, is finally convicted and the money recovered. Unfortunately a crime involving such a well-known character as Sinatra inevitably produced widespread publicity. Now authorities are fearful that they may be facing a rash of such cases.

The weakminded and the suggestible often react in this manner. But the best antidote to renewed popularity of kidnaping is the swift, sure way in which the latest felons were taken out of circulation. Theorists may speculate on the relationship between crime and punishment, but certainty of arrest and conviction is still the best antidote to crime. Once again the FBI has earned the admiration and respect of the country.

AFRICAN STUDENT RIOT IN MOSCOW

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday the press carried the sensational news that 500 African students had rioted under the very windows of the Kremlin in Moscow and less than 200 yards from Premier Khrushchev's office. According to the press, the students broke through police cordons, swarmed over and under a barrier of trucks that the police had thrown in their way, and stormed up to the massive doors of the Kremlin that had hastily been shut in their path.

More than one correspondent made the comment that this was perhaps the first truly spontaneous protest to be seen in Moscow since the revolution of 1917.

The riot has been described as a protest against the suspected slaying in Moscow of a 29-year-old medical student from Ghana. The Soviet authorities have thus far denied the report, claiming that the victim died of exposure after becoming intoxicated. The argument over whether or not the Ghanian student met a violent death should, however, not be permitted to obscure the basic causes which moved the 500 African students in the Soviet Union to congregate in Moscow and to storm the Kremlin for the purpose of stating their protest.

This was not a simple protest against the reported slaying of one African student, and it is important that the world should understand this. Such a demonstration would have been inconceivable had the African students in the Soviet Union not harbored the most profound discontent over the treatment they have endured in the so-called Socialist paradise. The fact is that over the past 4 years there have been a whole series of incidents involving African student protests, in the Soviet Union and in the other Communist countries.

In September 1960, the African Student Union in Moscow caused a major scandal when a group of them published in a western newspaper an open letter addressed to all African governments, complaining of the restrictions to which African students were subjected in the Soviet Union.

In February of this year, several hundred students from various African countries staged a mass exodus from Bulgaria after a series of violent clashes with the Bulgarian authorities. When the students organized a protest against their living conditions and against the racial discrimination which they encountered, the Bulgarian police broke up the protest meeting forcibly. Scores of students were injured in the clash and seven leaders of the All-African Students Union were arrested.

The Bulgarian Government announced at the time that Tatah Tawai, of Ghana, the leader of the students union, had been expelled from the country. But at this late date nothing is yet known of the whereabouts of Mr. Tawai.

In Vienna, some of the African students who had fled from Bulgaria told the world press that they have encountered racial discrimination almost daily in Sofia. They complained of the heavy-handed political indoctrination and antireligious propaganda to which they were subjected. They said that the Christians among them were even prevented from attending church. They further stated that they were frequently referred to as "black monkeys."

The Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security has in its files a voluminous documentation concerning the persecution and abuse of African students in the Soviet Union and other countries. In addition, the subcommittee has taken extensive oral statements from Mr. Kwadino Asafo Akwawuah, president of the Ghana Students Association of America, and Mr. Winfried Kwami Biddier, secretary of the association. I have asked that all of this information be brought together and published as soon as possible because I think it throws important light on the essential causes underlying the African student riots in Moscow.

The Communist propaganda apparatus has always painted the racial situation in the United States in the most lurid hues. The American Government and the American press have never minimized the problem of racial discrimination in the United States. On the contrary, they have dealt with it in a manner that conceals nothing and that shirks no responsibility. What the Communist propaganda apparatus ignores is that the American Government for decades now has used its authority to combat and reduce racial discrimination and to assure equality of treatment to our Negro citizens. This battle is far from won. But immense progress has already been recorded and I am confident that the years to come will witness even more dramatic progress, thanks to the leadership of the administration and to the action which, I am certain, Congress will soon take in the field of civil rights.

Herein lies the difference between racial discrimination in the United States and racial discrimination in the Communist countries. In our own country, the Government has thrown its full authority into the battle against racial discrimination; in the Soviet countries, in contradiction, the abuse, and discrimination, and humiliation to which thousands of African students have been subjected, have been government-instigated and government-directed. Herein, I submit, lies an important moral difference.

I hope that the Voice of America and the other instruments of the U.S. Information Agency will not seek to mute or minimize this story out of deference to Soviet sensitivities, but that they will, on the contrary, deal with this situation frankly and comprehensively for the information of the peoples of the world and especially of the Afro-Asian peoples who have recently won their freedom.

NOVEMBER 26, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Nation contained a memorable poem by Wendell Berry on the death of President Kennedy.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this poem, entitled "November 26, 1963," be printed in the RECORD, as I believe it is worthy of preservation along with the many other fine tributes to our late President.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 26, 1963

(By Wendell Berry)

We know the winter earth upon the body of the young President, and the early dark falling;
We know the veins grown quiet in his temples and wrists, and his hands and eyes grown quiet;
We know his name written in the black capitals of his death, and the mourners standing in the rain, and the leaves falling;
We know his death's horses and drums; the roses, bells, candles, crosses; the faces hidden in veils;
We know the children who begin the youth of loss greater than they can dream now;
We know the nightlong coming of faces into the candlelight before his coffin, and their passing;
We know the mouth of the grave waiting, the bugle and rifles, the mourners turning away;
We know the young dead body carried in the earth into the first deep night of its absence;
We know our streets and days slowly opening into the time he is not alive, filling with our footsteps and voices;
We know ourselves, the bearers of the light of the earth he is given to, and of the light of all his lost days;
We know the long approach of summers toward the healed ground where he will be waiting, no longer the keeper of what he was.

A TRIBUTE TO TOM CONNALLY (1877–1963); A SENATOR OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the death of Thomas Terry (Tom) Connally on October 28 of this year, who rose to national stature as a U.S. Senator from Texas, and who was an architect of the United Nations, marks the passing of a Texas titan. He was a man whose

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

intellect and personality marked him for greatness in youth. He fulfilled the the early promise with many notable achievements. Tom Connally was a giant here; he strode the Senate floor like a colossus.

Tom Connally, who was my personal friend, and who kindly and generously supported me in my campaigns, for which I will be eternally grateful, won my admiration when I was a young man listening to him speaking at the crossroads and villages of Texas. His name is a legend in Texas democracy.

He served as both a Representative and a Senator from Texas. Born in McLennan County, Tex., August 19, 1877, he was graduated from Baylor University in Waco in 1896 and obtained his law degree from the University of Texas in Austin in 1898. He was elected to the State house of representatives in 1901, where he served 4 years, and was prosecuting attorney of Falls County, Tex., from 1906–10.

He was elected as a Democrat to the 65th Congress in 1917 and to the five succeeding Congresses and was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1928. His service in the Senate extended from March 4, 1929 to January 3, 1953. He had decided not to seek renomination in 1952. Only two other men in the history of Texas served as long in this body.

Senator Connally became chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee where he helped steer us successfully through treaty obligations in World War II. He helped create the United Nations and helped the United States assume a leading role in that organization.

One of America's great statesmen is gone.

His autobiographical work "My Name Is Tom Connally" is his own modest narrative of a great senatorial record. He was a great orator, honored, enjoyed and beloved in an age when great orators are scarce. His papers have come to rest in an appropriate place, the Library of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the following articles from newspapers be printed in the RECORD:

"Senator Connally's Death Brings Words of Mourning, Praise," Corpus Christi, Tex., Caller-Times, October 29, 1963.

"The Very Image of a Senator," New York Herald Tribune, October 29, 1963.

"Tawl Tawn," Time magazine, November 8, 1963.

"Connally Gave No Quarter in Senate Debate," Dallas Morning News, October 29, 1963.

"Connally Anecdotes Abound in the Senate," Dallas Morning News, October 29, 1963.

"Tom Connally, Elder Statesman," Houston Chronicle, October 29, 1963.

"Tom Connally," the Houston Post, October 29, 1963.

"Tom Connally Made Vital Contribution to World," the Waco News-Tribune, October 30, 1963.

"Connally Was Towering Figure in Critical Era," Abilene, Tex., Reporter News, October 29, 1963.

"Connally's Greatness Was Rooted in Heart of Texas," the Waco Times-Herald, October 31, 1963.

"Tom Connally of Texas," the Houston Press, October 29, 1963.

"Tom Connally," the Dallas Times Herald, October 29, 1963.

"U.S. Ex-Senator Tom Connally Dies," Houston Chronicle October 28, 1963.

"Connally Mourned in Capital," the Houston Post, October 30, 1963.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Corpus Christi Caller, Oct. 29, 1963]

SENATOR CONNALLY'S DEATH BRINGS WORDS OF MOURNING, PRAISE

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy expressed regret Monday at the death of former Senator Tom Connally of Texas and said he had "served his State and Nation with great distinction."

Vice President Lyndon Johnson, once Connally's junior colleague in the Senate from Texas, spoke of Connally as "one of the authentic giants of the century."

Others joined in the chorus of regret and praise.

Kennedy's statement said:

"I have learned today with great regret of the passing of former Senator Tom Connally of Texas. As chairman and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Connally played an influential part in guiding the legislation that did so much in the difficult days following World War II to redress the balances on the side of freedom—the Trumon doctrine, NATO, the Marshall plan, and point 4.

"During his 36 years on the Hill, the Senator served his State and Nation with great distinction. He played an important role in the creation of the United Nations, recognizing it as an organization that would contribute much to the cause of world peace for which he strove so diligently."

Johnson said:

"I was greatly saddened to learn of the passing of Tom Connally.

"Tom Connally was one of the authentic giants of the century and he was a man who was not only a part of history but who helped to shape it.

"As a debater, he had no equal. His flashing wit and his zest for controversy marked him as a formidable proponent of those policies in which he believed.

"He left his mark on the traditions of the Senate and on the traditions of his native Texas. His position in history is endearing and his stature was such that in a real sense he will never leave us."

Former President Harry S. Truman, who had served with Connally in the Senate, said at his home in Independence, Mo., he was "shocked and bewildered" to hear of the death.

"I hardly know what to say," Truman said. "This is such a shock I can't immediately find words to express my grief."

Governor Connally of Texas said in Dallas when told of the former Senator's death:

"I am profoundly saddened to hear of Senator Connally's death. He devoted himself to service to his State and Nation. Few men have had a more splendid record of unselfish service. His influence and wisdom were felt not only in his native State and Nation but throughout the world. All of Texas is saddened by the loss of such an outstanding citizen and statesman."

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, announced Connally's death to the Senate, calling the Texan "one of the greatest Senators."

In a separate statement, YARBOROUGH said:

"As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he helped create the United Nations and was a leading influence in causing the United States to assume a leading role in the U.N.

"History and today's steady march toward a world at peace will prove him to be one of America's greatest Senators.

"Tom Connally looked like a Senator. He spoke like a Senator. He was a leader in the best traditions of our Government. This is the way I will remember Tom Connally."

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, dean of the Texas congressional delegation, said:

"I think we lost one of America's greatest statesmen.

"He demonstrated great knowledge of our country and its traditions and systems.

"His work in the United Nations will go down in history as one of the greatest achievements that any individual in the United States ever performed in connection with world affairs."

Senator JOHN TOWER, Republican, of Texas, in Texas Monday, issued this statement through his Washington offce:

"I regret to hear of the passing of Senator Connally.

"He served our State and Nation long and honorably. His influence is with us and will be with us in the form of wise and cautious legislation. We have all benefited from his service here."

Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, called Connally "one of the most forceful orators the Senate ever had."

Senate Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana said Connally had made "enduring contributions" to the country.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, said Connally was "a truly great American."

Representative W. R. POAGE, Democrat, of Texas, whose district Connally represented when he served in the House, said:

"The whole Nation has lost one of the great and last of the great statesmen of an earlier era. He and his associates builded very well for our country."

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, noted the long list of accomplishments Connally has recorded as head of that group.

"It was under his chairmanship that the Committee on Foreign Relations passed on the United Nations Charter, the North Atlantic Treaty, the Rio Treaty, the Japanese Peace Treaty, and many other measures which have shaped today's world," FULBRIGHT said.

Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State, said:

"Senator Connally skillfully cloaked a keen and shrewd mind and effective advocacy with an old-school senatorial appearance and manner, sparkling wit and, sometimes, florid oratory. But nothing could disguise one of the greatest advocates in the Senate's history.

"Behind the black clothes, the black bow string tie, the white curls over the collar, were irony and sarcasm. Under the irony and sarcasm were perception of the great issues to be decided in the war and postwar years, and strong, unfailing support for the measures to deal with them.

"Association with Tom Connally in great efforts was not always—or often—easy and tranquil; but it was stimulating, rewarding, and productive. He was among the great members of the postwar Senate; and one for whom I had deep respect and affection."

John M. Bailey, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, said:

"Senator Connally will be mourned by everyone in the Democratic Party.

"His stature in the Senate was a source of pride to Democrats, but we were even prouder of the fact that his service to his country, on the Foreign Relations Committee transcended party lines and worked for the welfare and security of all free men everywhere."

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

Tom Connally Dies at 86—The Very Image of a Senator

Washington.—In looks and deportment, the old man was the image of what the tourists in the galleries thought a Senator should look like: The winged collar, the black bow tie, the broad-brimmed black felt hat, the flowing gray hair that had been jet black when he came to the Hill 36 years before.

In 1952, he was quitting. At the age of 74 years, 7 months, and 6 days, he was just plain tired of political strife. Some of the reporters covering the Hill had prevailed upon him to hold a press conference in the news-conference room of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which he headed.

The old man had agreed in a gruff sort of way, "not because I have anything new to say but because you deviled me into having it."

Yesterday Tom Connally died—11 years, 5 months, and 19 days later—of pneumonia in his home here, where he had lived since his retirement. He was 86.

He had told Texas friends about his decision not to seek reelection a few days before his press conference and letters and telephone calls had been pouring in from well-wishers—all the way from Texas, from Waco, some of them, from out around Hewitt where the old man, as a little boy, had stood beside the lank, gray-haired old man, his father, and he had heard the stranger tell about the 30-mile trip from Belton. The man had found the bodies of a dozen men, accused of stealing horses, propped against a stonewall in the darkness, all dead, shot.

CHISHOLM TRAIL

"We had been traveling a lot today," said the stranger, telling how he hooked the mules right back to the wagon and hit out up the old Chisholm Trail, in its last days of use then.

Tom Connally, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and author of much of the World War II legislation, liked to harken back to the old days, to horsethieves and the times in central Texas, out west of Waco, when he was a little boy.

To a few reporters—intimates—he talked about vigilantes and horsethieves while young men from the State Department sat nervously in his outer office, jiggling briefcases on their knees.

As he waited for 2 p.m., the hour set for the press conference 11 years ago, Senator Connally showed a reporter a letter he had just received from a colleague.

"Now, don't you go mentioning his name," he said. "It's personal. But isn't it a nice letter?" And there was a trace of moisture in his own eyes as he handed the letter over.

It was a nice letter. It was in fact, just about the nicest letter any member of Congress could hope to get after announcing his retirement.

Senator Connally put the letter back in his pocket, looked up at the clock, looked down at the reporters around the conference table, and ran his fingers through his white hair.

"All right, all right," he said, "It's 2 o'clock or about. I reckon we'd better start. So many of you wanted some sort of conference that here it is. Go ahead."

A young woman reporter started to ask a question.

Senator Connally, a stickler for rules and seniority, observed that some order of seniority should prevail here. He turned to a male reporter and said, "Suppose you start it, oldtimer."

The Senator talked about his feelings on politics, his hope for world peace, and his belief that at least a billion dollars could be cut from the $7 billion foreign aid bill. The talk brought affairs pretty well up to date, to about where they were the day the old former Senator died.

He didn't see any prospect of a war with Soviet Russia in 1952, provided the United States remained vigilant and continued to build its defenses and helped to maintain the defenses and close mutual relations with Western Europe.

"LONG TOM"

"Long Tom," as some of his friends called him, came to the Senate in 1928, defeating Earle B. Mayfield, the "Klan" Senator, who had been elected in 1922 in a popular flare-up of the old post-Civil War vigilante organization, the Ku Klux Klan. The "Klan" in 1928 was a dangerous piece of foolishness, "Long Tom" said, and Texas agreed at the polls.

He had served 12 years in the House, as Representative of the Texas 11th Congressional District, casting his vote for a declaration of war against Germany. Almost immediately he enlisted in the Army, becoming a capitain in the 22d Infantry Brigade, 11th Division. But a siege of influenza prevented him from sailing with his unit for France.

[From Time magazine, Nov. 8, 1963]

Tawl Tawm

They called him Tawl Tawm. His flamboyant Senate oratory could drown an opponent in sweet molasses or hogtie him in barbed wire. He smoked ten 15-cent cigars every day and wore his white hair so long that it crested in curls at the nape of his neck. He dressed in modified swallowtail suits—a dignified black from October to May, a delicate gray from May to September. He was Texas' longtime Senator Tom Connally. He died last week in Washington at 86, and, recollecting his career, many a Washingtonian shed a tear for what he thought was a more pungent era.

"It is murder." Raised on an east-central Texas cotton farm, Connally went off to college in 1891, heard a speech by the Democratic idol of the day, William Jennings Bryan, and was so smitten that he copied the great man's bow-tie-and-frock-coat dress, his stentorian manner of speech and his shaggy haircut. Connally got his law degree at the University of Texas, practiced in Marlin, Tex., and served two terms in the State legislature. In 1916 he won the congressional seat from Texas' 11th District.

His first vote in Congress was in favor of the U.S. declaration of war against Germany, and even though he was then 41, Connally figured he could not just sit by and send other men to war. He vacated his congressional seat, joined the Army as a captain, sat out the war in the United States, and went back to the House after the Armistice.

Connally was regularly reelected to the House until 1928, when he decided to try for the Senate. He mounted a campaign that put him foursquare against the Ku Klux Klan and in favor of Al Smith for President. Neither position was popular in Texas, but he won anyway. In the Senate, Connally backed most of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal legislation, but he refused to vote for the National Industrial Recovery Act, battled fiercely against F.D.R.'s 1937 effort to pack the Supreme Court. In 1938, Connally led a filibuster to defeat an antilynching bill, claimed it violated States rights. "I am against the lynching of any man," he said. "It is murder. But I am also against lynching the Constitution of the United States."

Blood on the wall. Much of Connally's bluster was for show, and rarely was he deeply, genuinely angry. One such occasion was on Pearl Harbor day. Riding home from a White House meeting on the night of December 7, he was in tears of rage as he told a newsman: "That goddamned Frank Knox, that idiot, that fool. He told us only a week ago that the Navy was ready for anything. Now it's lying at the bottom of Pearl Harbor." As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and as an admirer of Woodrow Wilson and the League of Nations concept, Connally began working with Michigan's Republican Senator Arthur Vandenberg to line up Senate support for the United Nations. He helped draw up the U.N. Charter in San Francisco in 1945, made speech after speech on the Senate floor to assure its ratification.

At one point he arose to speak against Senators who proposed changes in the charter. Cried he: "They know that the League of Nations was slaughtered in this Chamber." Then he turned, pointed his glasses to the rear of the Senate and roared, "Can't you see the blood? There it is on the wall."

But Connally's internationalism had its limits, and his name is most prominently associated with the controversial Connally amendment, which restricts World Court jurisdiction over cases involving the United States to those that the administration decides are not within domestic jurisdiction.

Through the years, Connally's biting wit was feared by his Senate colleagues. He once snappishly advised New Hampshire Republican Styles Bridges that he should "approach these matters with an open mind instead of an open mouth." He left Ohio Republican Robert Taft speechless with shock by accusing him of "cravenly going around begging for a few dirty, filthy votes." He warned New Hampshire's Bible-quoting Republican Charles Tobey: "Don't you ever shake that lanky Yankee finger at me." He attacked Chiang Kai-shek for "stealing" U.S. aid money, advised that "the trouble with the generalissimo is that he doesn't do any generalissimoing." And once after a tough session with Soviet delegates at the U.N., he snapped, "They remind me of a difficult fellow I knew in Texas. He once told me, 'I'm going home and if my wife ain't got supper ready, I'll beat her up. And if she has got supper ready, I ain't gonna eat it.' "

The old man's strength began to falter in the early 1950's, and in 1952 he announced he would retire. Rather than leave Washington, Connally joined a law firm, used his office mostly for a spot to jaw with old pals about politics. He visited Capitol Hill regularly for a while. But more and more of his old friends disappeared. Feeble and ailing, he only went to the Capitol to have his hair cut—because the barbers there knew how to cut it just right. A couple of years ago, on one of his last trips to the Hill, he said sadly to an old newsman friend: "Reckon I won't be seeing you any more."

[From the Dallas Morning News, Oct. 29, 1963]

Colorful Fighter—Connally Gave No Quarter in Senate Debate

(By Arthur Edson)

Washington.—Tom Connally of Texas, who died Monday, was one of the most colorful, powerful, and razor-tongued Senators of them all.

Tall, courtly, with his bow tie and rumpled suits, his careless, flowing hair, his wit that could hit the mark as neatly as an icepick or as cruelly as a meat ax—Tom Connally seemed born for the Senate.

It's surprising to recall that he ever had any other life, that he had spent 10 years in the House, that he had served in both the Spanish-American war and World War I, although he never got overseas either time.

"I have been in more wars and done less fighting than any other American," he once said.

Connally saved his fighting for the Senate, where he spent 24 often tempestuous years, usually attacking the Republicans, sometimes pouring it on his own Democratic party and occasionally spanking the "striped britches" State Department.

His oratorical flights are out of style, but even now, in cold print, they have an effectiveness lacking in the pallid words so often used today.

Here's Connally, arguing that this country must join the United Nations and seeking to shame those opposed:

"They know that the League of Nations was slaughtered here in this Chamber." At this point he pulled off his glasses and pointed dramatically to the rear of the Senate. "Can't you see the blood? There it is on the wall."

Or in defense of President Wilson:

"When the history of this Republic shall be written, Woodrow Wilson's titanic figure will tower above the puny pigmies who now bark at his memory as Pike's Peak towers above the fog of an Arkansas swamp."

Or, if you would sample his wit, there's Connally squashing a foe in debate:

"The Senator should approach these matters with an open mind instead of an open mouth."

Naturally Connally didn't spend all his time enlivening an otherwise dreary legislative scene.

When he retired, Lyndon B. Johnson, then a Senator but now Vice President, pointed out that Connally had fought for soil conservation, for rural electrification, for small business, and since he was from Texas, for the oil industry.

"A statesman who belongs to the ages," Johnson said of Connally, with the easy sweep befitting a Texan and a Senator.

Yet it's true that, although Connally protested that he hated formal diplomacy, he played a major role as this Nation moved steadily toward greater involvement in international affairs.

But only Connally could give this biting observation of a peace conference:

"The work is so tedious, irksome and annoying. You sit there all day going yah, yah, yah."

Connally had his shortcomings. Like most people who value wit, he often was unfair. And he sometimes dismissed other nations and minorities with an airiness that rankled.

But he brought to the Senate a vitality, a feeling that important issues are worth quarreling about, that politics, and democracy, so badly need.

His arguments with the late Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio, the Republican leader, were classics in political knife-throwing.

Once, after Taft had made a criticizing speech in Texas, Connally replied on the Senate floor: "He is willing to subordinate his integrity and his truthfulness in order to grasp a few slimy voters * * * if three voters meet together and whisper something and he can hear them, he'll change (his opinions) again."

But Connally's humor could be infectious.

During a Senate argument Taft was making a point when Connally bellowed out:

"Don't shake your gory locks at me."

But Taft had no locks, gory or otherwise. Laughter rang through the Senate, and Taft's led all the rest.

[From the Dallas Morning News]

CONNALLY ANECDOTES ABOUND IN SENATE

WASHINGTON.—Senator Tom Connally, who died Monday, was famous in the Senate for his sharp tongue, his willingness to take on a political adversary, and the style of his oratory.

He left behind him a legacy of anecdotes—some of them true, some of them apocryphal.

But they are still told with relish whenever old Capitol hands gather. The memory of Tom Connally is not likely to die soon.

One of the most famous Connally stories concerned an appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which he was chairman, by Henry A. Wallace.

With Connally somewhat drowsing in the chair, Wallace recited his views on how to deal with Russia, concluding with the observation that unless the United States changed its attitude the U.S.S.R. might become "a cornered beast."

Connally roused from his drowsiness.

"Corned beef?" he exclaimed, "What's corned beef got to do with it?"

Wallace was virtually undone by the remark.

Another story related how Connally had gone into a small Texas town for a visit and found all the stores closed.

"Why are all the stores locked up?" he asked the village policeman.

"Governor Blank is in town," the officer replied.

"You mean," Connally demanded, "that he'd come in here and try to rob the town in broad daylight?"

In Washington, after his retirement from the Senate, Connally was introduced one day at a luncheon by a Texan who made some fun of the Senator's style of oratory.

Connally rose majestically and after a few polite words, paid tribute to the man who had introduced him, saying he had helped him in numerous campaigns. He recalled that the introducer had belonged to some famous youth organization.

"What was that organization?" Connally inquired.

"DeMolay," the Texan said, somewhat sheepishly.

"Demolay," Connally thundered. "That's it. And I want you to know he's been Demolaying ever since."

Among the apocryphal stories, was the one about the man who introduced himself to Connally as being from "UNESCO."

"Ah," Connally replied, "I'm always happy to meet anyone from your fine little country."

Connally's battles in the Senate were celebrated. Some of his more famous adversaries included Senators Robert A. Taft, Republican, of Ohio; Kenneth McKellar, Democrat, of Tennessee; and William Langer, Republican, of North Dakota.

He once accused Langer to his face of lying in the Judiciary Committee on how he voted on a Texas nominee for Federal judge. The uproar between the two loud, cigar-chewing Senators created an uproar in a Capitol corridor.

Connally was a great friend of Sir Winston Churchill and whenever the British statesman came to Washington they met for a lengthy session of business and storytelling.

But the Texan could be waspish about the British. After a visit of the late Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, seeking American money, Connally remarked:

"Whenever the British come over here we feel a little elevated, a little lifted up—a little lighter."

State Department officials soon learned that behind Connally's quips and sarcasm there was a broad understanding of international affairs.

But they weren't so sure that foreigners understood.

"Every so often," a State Department man once said, "our ambassadors have to run around to the foreign chancelleries and try to explain just what kind of a man Chairman Connally is—one of the most puzzling tasks in the history of diplomacy."

[From the Houston Chronicle, Oct. 29, 1963]

TOM CONNALLY, ELDER STATESMAN

Tom Connally, who died Monday, was one of the towering figures of the century in the United States Senate.

The noted Texan had been in retirement and in poor health for some years. He didn't seek reelection to the Senate in 1953, after 35 years' service in Congress.

Tom Connally was a Senator of the old school. More than anyone else in the Chamber he looked the part of a Senator and talked like a Senator. He was an eloquent speaker and a feared debater.

After serving in the Texas Legislature Connally was elected to Congress in 1916. His service in the House, which totaled 12 years, was interrupted during the First World War when he resigned and became a captain of infantry. He was elected to the Senate in 1928 and served continuously for 24 years. Thus his was one of the longer congressional careers in the Nation's history.

During his first years in the Senate Connally was most widely known for the Connally "hot oil" act which virtually dried up the production of oil in violation of State laws.

A staunch Democrat and in general a party regular, Connally defied the tremendous power of President Franklin D. Roosevelt more than once. He voted against the National Recovery Act—later found unconstitutional as he asserted it was—and he fought Roosevelt's Supreme Court "packing" measure bitterly.

In 1914 he became chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It was a crucial time, only 4 months before this Nation entered the Second World War. It was in this powerful position that Connally exerted his greatest influence on affairs. He was a great chairman of this most important committee until he retired from Congress, except for the two Republican years 1947 and 1948.

And it was his service in this position that causes the influence of Tom Connally to live on after his death. He was a strong exponent of international cooperation and vigorously supported the United Nations. He also is the author of the Connally reservation which limits the jurisdiction of the World Court over cases to which this Nation is a party. When efforts were made to repeal this reservation Connally, then in retirement, spoke up vigorously in favor of its retention.

[From the Houston Post, Oct. 29, 1963]

TOM CONNALLY

Former Senator Tom Connally, who died in Washington Monday, served Texas and the Nation long and ably. As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during and after World War II, he left an imperishable mark on the pages of world history.

He sometimes would quip that "a statesman is a dead politician," but long before his retirement from the Senate in 1952, the name Connally and the title of statesman were used together freely in the press of many nations.

During his 36 years in Washington, as a Member of the House and as a Member of the Senate, he became a figure of international renown, but he never forgot that he had his roots in Marlin, Tex. He fought as strenuously for the welfare of this State and and for his constituents as he did to make a better and peaceful world.

Anyone who ever watched Connally in action on the floor of the Senate almost certainly realized he was watching an expert. To begin with, Connally looked like a Senator. The long, flowing silver hair, the impressive face, the black suit, the boiled shirt with gold studs and the black string necktie gave the impression that this was a man born to the role in which fate had cast him. The Connally oratory was usually called "old school," but actually it was unique. He used the English language and a wide range of tones of voice as a master organist uses his keyboard. A Connally speech could pack the Senate galleries.

After serving in the Texas Legislature and as prosecuting attorney for Falls County, Connally was elected to Congress in 1916, and cast his first vote for United States entry in World War I. He then left Congress to joint the Army.

He returned to the House after the war, and in 1928 was elected to the Senate. In time, he became chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Probably Connally's greatest contribution as a statesman was his joining with his Republican opposite, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan, to form the bipartisan foreign policy that united the Nation as it took the leadership of the free world. The two agreed that political partisanship should end at the water's edge, and that is the way it was.

The record of Connally's legislative achievements is too long to recite. Not every cause he sponsored was overwhelmingly popular, but he fought for the right as he saw it.

Perhaps the high point of his long and distinguished career came when he won Senate approval of the United Nations Charter, with but two dissenting votes. Connally had been second man on the U.S. delegation to the San Francisco Conference at which it was drafted.

It probably is safe to say that Tom Connally's views will be quoted as long as American history is read.

[From the Waco News-Tribune, Oct. 30, 1963]

TOM CONNALLY MADE VITAL CONTRIBUTION TO WORLD

It was the natural thing to say, when former Senator Tom Connally died Monday in Washington, that his death marked the end of an era. For indeed it did. Tom Connally and the late Pat Neff were the most notable products of an era of deliberate, poised, oratorical political practice born of a study of the classics, endless hours of practice in debate and a tempo of living that allowed space and time between excitements.

Tom Connally represented Texas in both Houses of the Congress in an effective and distinguished fashion. He remembered where he originated, and the people whose votes elevated him to international usefulness. He did this not merely to stay in office but because he genuinely loved the people and the land here in the heart of the State.

Tom Connally represented qualities of character, too, that are worth recalling, for in some parts of the country these qualities of tolerance, respect for an adversary, and gentlemanly behavior currently are missing in the conduct of certain public figures and their adherents.

Like most Texas Congressmen, Tom Connally worked at his responsibilities. He learned all his life. His classical background gave him a perspective for learning and for appreciating the complexities not only of a giant of a nation but of a world filled with conflict and confusion.

The art of government was his lifelong concern and he became an artist in advocating the blend of force and persuasion by which this Nation governs itself—the force of the common good and the persuasion of individual intellect and enterprise.

Senator Connally achieved a lasting place in the history books for his work on behalf of founding the United Nations Organization as a climax to his illustrious career on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His support of intelligent efforts at international cooperation, running from Woodrow Wilson's administration through that of Harry S. Truman, was a stanch one in the face of repeated disappointments and frustrations. Senator Connally held true to his principles, defended them effectively whenever they were challenged.

The era that ended with the death of Tom Connally was an era that brought the United States of America to its position of world power. At any time along that road, lesser men would have thrown away our destiny in a welter of petty and ignorant controversies. Thanks to the leadership of many great Americans, of whom Tom Connally was not the least, the Nation avoided this dissipation of its strength. The thing to remember about Tom Connally is not his colorful dress and speech, or his masterful political techniques, but his breadth of vision and his courage when it counted. No nation ever has an oversupply of such character.

[From the Abilene (Tex.) Reporter-News, Oct. 29, 1963]

CONNALLY WAS TOWERING FIGURE IN CRITICAL ERA

Some men spend time in Congress.

Others become the architects of great decisions made there, and their deeds go into the history books, with the fruits of their services enduring after them.

Tom Connally of Texas was one of the latter. Now he is dead at 86 in Washington, 11 years after closing out a 36-year career in Congress which made him an international statesman.

Born in McLennan County, Connally was a country lawyer at Marlin and a prosecuting attorney before he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. He took his seat in Congress in March 1917, 1 month before the United States declared war on Germany. Already a veteran of the Spanish-American War, he also served in the Army in World War I.

In 1928 he won election to the U.S. Senate where he served until his retirement at the end of the session in 1952. Critical years and historic decisions in which he filled guiding roles marked the intervening time.

Senator Connally became chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1941, 4 months before Pearl Harbor, the most important era in the Nation's history to date to be in that position.

The treaties ending World War II, the founding of the United Nations, the Marshall plan were among the great issues that Senator Connally and his committee acted upon.

At the peak of his power and career Connally was the only Senator with a place on the Senate's big-three committees: foreign relations, finance, and judiciary.

At this time, on the eve of the Dumbarton Oaks postwar peace conference in 1944, the Associated Press said of him:

"He's just about the last of the ilk of Clay and Calhoun. He needs neither text nor microphone. Words roll over his tongue like rare wine."

He was known for his superb oratory, his rapier-like wit and his distinguished appearance and bearing. In 1943 the Office of War Information in a publication to be distributed in foreign countries described him as "a man who looks exactly as a Senator would be expected to look."

Connally will be remembered here for numerous speaking engagements and for having helped locate the present Dyess Air Force Base at Abilene.

Tom Connally was a great man who was in the right place in a troubled time. Texas was proud to have claimed him.

[From the Waco Times-Herald, Oct. 31, 1963]

CONNALLY'S GREATNESS WAS ROOTED IN HEART OF TEXAS

Central Texas, which has given over the past century many distinguished leaders to the State, the Nation and the world, buried one of the most distinguished of them all yesterday at Marlin.

Tom Connally rose in the classic pattern from a farm to international eminence as a U.S. Congressman and Senator. His roots always were firmly in central Texas soil wherever and whenever he went to the councils that guided the rise of this Nation to a world power and tried to guide a contrary world into the paths of peace.

With his hair falling in an upward curl over the back of his collar, in which was unfailingly tied a black string tie, and with his frock coat and black hat, Connally was a figure which attracted wide attention on the national scene. He was also the last of the old ante bellum type of politician, noted for its ability to be heard extemporaneously long before the microphone had been invented.

Connally helped to bring Texas into wide repute. He loved his State and his Nation. He loved the South, and sometimes got cantankerous when he thought Texas or the South was the target of captious criticism.

Connally was prominent, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in the drafting of the United Nations Charter in 1945 in San Francisco, and in bringing this country into that organization. He was author of the Connally "hot oil" law aimed at cutting down oil production and illicit abuse. It provided penalties for interstate oil shipments of oil that had been produced in violation of proration and conservation laws of Texas.

He was famed for his authorship of the "Connally amendment" to a resolution making this country a member of the World Court, with its stipulation that the Court shall not have jurisdiction over matters deemed of a domestic nature. The amendment provided that the United States shall be its own judge of what constituted a domestic issue.

Connally, among other activities as Senator, served as a U.S. delegate taking part in the ceremonies by which the Philippine Islands received their independence. Previously he has sponsored the action in the Senate which gave the Philippines its independence.

Connally, the man and his record, goes down in the annals of Texas' historic great. There are not many like him left.

[From the Houston Press, Oct. 29, 1963]

TOM CONNALLY OF TEXAS

"Long Tawm," he was called in Texas drawl.

Maybe because of his six-foot plus * * * his white mane of hair combed high and curling up * * * the high-crowned black hats he usually wore * * * his cutaway coats that flapped down to his knees and drew out his already generous proportions.

By whatever name, Tom Connally of Texas was for more than two decades one of America's most powerful men.

He served in the U.S. Congress for 36 years, 12 of them in the House representing the central Texas district of his hometown, Marlin, then 24 years in the Senate. For 10 of his senatorial years, he was chairman of the powerful Foreign Relations Committee.

He had split with President Roosevelt over enlarging ("packing") the U.S. Supreme Court in FDR's second term. When War II broke, however, he became the President's strong right legislative arm.

One of his major contributions to his home State was the "Connally Hot Oil Act." This Federal law finally restored peace and order to Texas' vital oil industry after the chaotic first years of the giant east Texas oilfield by putting Uncle Sam on guard at State lines to prevent interstate shipment of "hot oil," or oil produced in defiance of State regulations.

Tom Connally's wrath, simulated or not, was a thing to see. His repertory for spellbinding was complete with invective, anecdote and simile—always good for a crowded gallery.

When Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas came home from somewhere in 1951 and advocated recognizing the bandit government of Red China, the Senator flatly told the Senate the Justice "ought to stay home instead of roaming around the world and Asia making fool statements."

In an argument with the late Senator Taft of Ohio, he accused his adversary of "cravenly going around begging a few dirty, filthy votes."

And he once told the late Senator Styles Bridges he should "approach these matters with an open mind instead of an open mouth."

Although he freely admitted to a good bit of windmaking himself, Senator Connally once lectured the Senate on its favorite device by saying:

"Draco wrote his laws in blood; the Senate writes its laws in the wind."

Tom Connally died in Washington Monday. He was 86.

Ten years have passed since he retired from the U.S. Senate. The days of his senatorial glory have dimmed somewhat in the minds even of his contemporary observers.

Tom Connally generally is said to have been the last U.S. Senator who looked like—and orated like—a U.S. Senator, meaning of course those of the early days. He was colorful. He also was effective and gave Texas many a boost toward national prominence.

In changing times, "Long Tawm" served both his Nation and his State well, including active duty both in World War I and the Spanish-American War.

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Oct. 29, 1963]

Tom Connally

The death of former Senator Tom Connally put an end to his 86-year life, but as a nation we will continue to feel his presence, for the long-haired political symbol from Texas remains in history, one of the shapers of our present age.

Tom Connally was of a political generation long since gone from Capitol Hill. His very person spoke of the classical orator and the professional breed of man which, at one time, guided governmental affairs of the Nation from city hall level to the White House.

But Tom Connally managed to break this classic mold. And where his fellow orators contributed little to modern America except high-flown phrases, the Texan became an internationalist.

Human sympathy was the hallmark of Tom Connally, from his beginning in office to the time when illness denied the Nation his mind and talents. Because he saw the United States as one nation among a world of nations, he was a founding father for the United Nations Organization. Almost as much as Franklin D. Roosevelt, he was the American instrumental in shaping our role in that gathering, and in the immediate postwar world his role became even stronger.

But Tom Connally was more than a dedicated internationalist. His political span covered too many eras, too many incidents, to be summed with one event. He became the sign of a whole period, of a changing world stage with changing roles for every nation and political philosophy.

Tom Connally in death loses none of this identification with the Nation's affairs of the time he lived.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Oct. 28, 1963]

U.S. Ex-Senator Tom Connally Dies—Powerful Figure in War Days

Former U.S. Senator Tom Connally, 86, one of the giants of Texas politics and a man who stood in the highest councils of the Nation's Government, died of pneumonia today at his home in Washington.

As chairman of the powerful Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, Connally had a dominant role in formulation of foreign policy during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

President Kennedy mourned the death of Connally, recalling his influential part in the Nation's foreign policy. The President said he learned of Connally's death "with deep regret."

Only the late Morris Sheppard among Texans held a Senate post longer than Connally. Connally served for 24 years, Sheppard for 28. Charles A. Culberson equaled Connally's record.

Connally attended the San Francisco conference where the Charter of the United Nations was formed and later obtained Senate approval of the charter with just two dissenting votes.

He was the author of a phrase, in an amendment, restricting the participation of the United States in the World Court. The phrase in the amendment, "as determined by the United States," permits this country to determine which cases involving the Nation can be decided by the World Court. President Kennedy and Eisenhower have attacked this restriction and urged its repeal.

AGAINST NRA

Although he supported the Roosevelt administration in many of its important battles, Connally voted against the National Recovery Administration Act (NRA) in the early days of the New Deal, and was bitterly outspoken against President Roosevelt's attempt to reorganize the U.S. Supreme Court in 1937.

He was the archtype of the U.S. Senator. A striking figure of more than 6 feet, he had a flowing silver mane and always wore a black bow tie. Sweeping gestures embellished the oratory for which he was famous.

Connally was born in McLennon County, Tex., August 19, 1877, the son of Jones and Mary Terry Connally. He was educated at Baylor University and the University of Texas School of Law.

He married Louise Clarkson of Marlin in 1904. They had one son, Ben Connally, who is a U.S. district court judge in Houston. Judge Connally was on his way to his father's bedside when the elder Connally died. The former Senator is no kin to Governor John Connally.

Mrs. Connally died in 1935. In 1942, after the death of Senator Morris Sheppard, Connally married Sheppard's widow, who survives him.

Besides his wife and son, Connally is survived by a sister, Mrs. Sparks McKay of Tyler.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete. Burial will be in Marlin.

SAW WAR SERVICE

Connally was elected to the Senate in 1928 after serving 12 years in the House, service that was interrupted by Army service during World War I. He had resigned from the House to become a captain in the 22d Infantry Brigade of the 11th Division. He became ill and never got to France and the fighting, a circumstance he always deplored.

He served in the Senate until 1953, when he stepped down. Price Daniel, who was later to become Texas Governor, filled his place.

In the processes of the Senate's seniority system, the Texas Democrat came to the chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee in the critical summer of 1941—4 months before the Japanese surprise attack on Pearl Harbor.

Except for a 2-year break from 1947 to 1949, when Republicans controlled Congress, Connally was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee from 1941 until he retired from the Senate.

SPOKE FOR U.N.

During his chairmanship, Senator Connally gave heavily of his time to promoting President Roosevelt's dream of a world organization.

He urged it in the Senate and in speeches across the Nation.

In November 1944, Connally said: "If we are to secure the preservation of world peace—and that includes our peace—we must be willing to pay the price. That price is our cooperation with other nations of a similar mind."

In an impassioned speech before the Senate, Connally urged ratification of the U.N. Charter in words that became famous: "They know that the League of Nations was slaughtered in this chamber," he shouted, taking off his glasses and waving them in the air. "Can't you see the blood—there it is on the wall?" he said, pointing to the walls of the chamber.

Before he was elected to Congress, Connally was a lawyer in Marlin. Former Vice President John Nance Garner, a fellow Texan, often was credited with setting Connally's foot on the political path.

The first congressional session Connally attended after his election to the House was a special one which President Wilson called in April 1917, to act on his proposed declaration of war against Germany.

Garner, influential in House affairs, had the young Connally appointed to the Foreign Affairs Committee, which was pondering the war resolution. Connally afterward said he prayed long before casting a vote for war.

An ardent sports fan, he found relaxation from congressional worries by attending football and baseball games. In earlier years, he occasionally played golf. He was a 33d degree Mason. A favorite at Washington social gatherings, he was fond of dancing.

He loved to invite friends in for breakfast, his favorite meal. He served them steaks, chops, ham and eggs. He ate more for breakfast than the average man does for dinner.

FATHERED HOT OIL ACT

Despite his long years in Congress, few major pieces of domestic legislation bore his name. One of his most important early measures was the Connally "hot oil" act which prohibited interstate transportation of oil produced in violation of State laws.

During the war, he sponsored with Representative Howard Smith, Democrat, of Virginia, the Connally-Smith Act designed to curb strikes.

He led a filibuster in 1938 against an antilynching bill, commanding a corps of Southern Senators who successfully battled the measure.

"I am against lynching," he said. "It is murder. But I am also opposed to lynching the Constitution of the United States."

Answering a Republican Senator who charged on the Senate floor in 1936 that Woodrow Wilson had falsified the World War I records, Connally thundered:

"When the history of this Republic shall be written, Woodrow Wilson's titanic figure will tower above the puny pigmies who now bark at his memory as Pike's Peak towers above the fog of an Arkansas swamp."

NEEDED NO TEXT

Once chiding his colleagues, he said: "Draco wrote his laws in blood, the Senate writes its laws in wind."

He needed neither text nor microphone. Words rolled off his tongue with the greatest of ease. When he felt like it, he cast tact to the winds as he did the time he told a State Department official to "take your treaty out of here before it gets kicked in the pants."

Then there was the occasion when he told a colleague: "The Senate should approach these matters with an open mind instead of an open mouth."

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post]

Connally Mourned in Capital

(By Felton West)

Washington.—Washington mourned the passing Monday of one of the architects of the post-World War II world—and one of the liveliest wits the capital ever knew.

> Tom Connally—a lot of his contemporaries called him "Long Tawm of Texas"—died in his Washington home of pneumonia early Monday at the age of 86.
>
> It was almost 11 years ago that Connally retired from the U.S. Senate, but the memories of his contributions to the law and world peace live on.
>
> So do recollections of his biting tongue, his white mane, his appearance that was the way a Senator ought to look.
>
> The House of Representatives, where he once served, set aside an hour Tuesday for tributes to him.
>
> Connally served 12 years in the House of Representatives, then 24 in the Senate.
>
> In 1952, the year Texas Gov. Allan Shivers and Attorney General Price Daniel rallied Texas Democrats behind Republican presidential nominee Dwight D. Eisenhower in opposition to Democratic presidential nominee Adlai Stevenson's position on the Texas tidelands, Connally acknowledged he would really have to fight for reelection.
>
> He said he could win again if he made a vigorous campaign. But he was 74. "I don't think it's worth the price," he said. So he retired and Daniel was elected to succeed him.
>
> Since then, Connally has lived quietly in Washington with his wife.
>
> In 1954 Connally published an autobiography, "My Name Is Tom Connally." For a time starting in 1955 he came out of retirement to practice law here with a long-time Washington friend, Mastin White.
>
> He occasionally visited Capitol Hill to see old acquaintances. But for the past several years he had been in ill health.
>
> Connally became chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in July, 1941. He was chairman until his retirement at the beginning of 1953, except in 1947–48, when the Republicans controlled the Senate.
>
> He introduced the resolutions in 1941 declaring war on Germany, Japan, and Italy.
>
> He and the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Republican, of Michigan, were the congressional leaders in nonpartisan foreign policy during and after the war. He played a guiding role in the formation of the United Nations and getting the United States made a party to it.
>
> As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Connally guided through the Senate the treaty of Rio de Janeiro, the NATO Treaty and the Japanese Peace Treaty, and was a congressional leader in the establishment of the Marshall Plan and other foreign recovery efforts after World War II.
>
> There are at least two other monuments to his legislative career.
>
> One is the Connally Hot Oil Act, which made it a Federal offense to market petroleum in violation of State conservation statutes and regulations.
>
> The other is what has come to be known as the "Connally amendment"—a provision allowing the United States to reserve judgment on what disputes involving it will be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the Hague.
>
> Before coming to Congress in 1917, Connally served two terms as a member of the Texas Legislature and several years as prosecuting attorney of Falls County.

IMPORTS OF RESIDUAL FUEL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would like to add my protest, over the unnecessary and harmful restrictions on the importation of residual fuel oil, to those so ably expressed yesterday by my colleagues from New York, Mr. KEATING and Mr. JAVITS.

Residual fuel is actually a heavy fuel oil obtained from the refining of crude oil. Its very name derives from the fact that it is the residue left after extracting as much as possible of the more valuable products from the barrel of crude oil.

The highly industrialized eastern seaboard of the United States uses a very large amount of this residual fuel in its manufacturing plants, in its electrical generating stations and in the heating of its homes and offices.

The quantity of domestically produced residual fuel oil has been steadily reduced in recent years. The reason is simply that the price which it commands is so much less than that of the lighter petroleum products like gasoline, kerosene, and home-heating oil that the refiner, as a matter of simple economics, makes as little of it as he possibly can.

Consequently, while the east coast consumption of this heavy or so-called residual fuel oil has been growing at a moderate rate, the consumer has had to depend more and more on imports for his supply, almost all of which come from the high residual fuel content crudes produced in Venezuela.

When crude oil was placed under mandatory import restrictions in 1959, imports of residual fuel oil were likewise restricted. It is not clear to me why import restrictions, which were designed purely as a national security measure to insure a healthy domestic producing industry, should be placed on a product when there had been no finding that the national security required the action. Indeed, last February the Office of Emergency Planning, following a special investigation of this matter, determined that the national security factor does not apply to the case of residual fuel.

Nevertheless, the import restriction system imposed on this product in 1959 still continues to remain in force and to create hardships for the thousands of consumers of residual oil. By determining the total amount of permissible imports and their allocation among approximately 50 importers on the east coast, the system tends not only to create supply shortages but to force up the cost of a commodity which is essential to American industry and homes.

It seems absurd to me in the first place to restrict the imports of a product of which there is not a sufficient domestic supply. But the attempt to fairly divide an arbitrarily determined quota among all those deemed entitled to share in it has proved impossible and has resulted in gross inequities.

The upshot is a rigidity in the supply system which serves mainly to stifle competition and with it the right of every consumer to purchase what he wants, when and where he wants it at a reasonable price.

The situation on the east coast today is such that even the Defense Department has had great difficulty in securing its supplies and then only at enhanced cost to the taxpayer. Some of the largest electric utilities in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area with all the unpredictable severity of the worst part of the winter still ahead of them, are already facing a shortage of the oil essential to the life of the communities dependent on them.

Mr. President, in view of the problems that these restrictions on imports of residual fuel have created and since they have no foundation either in commonsense or in the essential element of national security, I ask that this shackle be forthwith stricken from our economy by returning the supply and demand of this vital commodity solely to the free play of the marketplace.

TRIBUTE TO THEO SNEED

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, during World War II when the Alaska Highway was literally carved out of wilderness, thereby linking the lower 48 States with the then territory of Alaska and joining the peoples of the northwestern North American continent, I had the privilege of first meeting Theo Sneed. The then Captain Sneed spent 2 years in Canada and Alaska as a construction engineer on the highway. I, at that time, was Governor of Alaska.

When I came to the Senate in 1959 and was assigned to the Public Works Committee, I had the pleasure of renewing my friendship with Theo Sneed. I learned that in 1946 when the Senate Public Works Committee was created that he had been "borrowed" from the Corps of Engineers to serve as a staff member.

Earlier this week the able chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], announced that Colonel Sneed was retiring. Many members of this body joined my distinguished chairman in expressing regret that Theo Sneed had decided to retire. It was not possible for me to be on the floor at that time.

I had the pleasure of traveling with Theo Sneed when the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and Public Works Committee traveled to the Soviet Union in September and October of 1959 to inspect the river development of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in order to compare that nation's development with our own. His contribution to that study was, as usual, outstanding, and I commend the reading of Senate Document No. 71 of the 2d session of the 86th Congress to persons who have not had the opportunity.

Theo Sneed, when commenting on "River Development in the U.S.S.R." pointed out why the water resources of the Soviet Union are being given such high priority in the long-range planning of the economy of that nation.

During the course of our inspection tour we saw impressive evidence that such was the case. Enormous dams, larger than any in the United States, were being constructed. Two then surpassed Grand Coulee. They were being constructed on the Volga River, one at Kuibyshev and another at Volgagrad.

For example, as I said on the floor of the Senate on August 8, 1960:

> As a member of a special subcommittee, authorized jointly by the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to make a study of Russion hydroelectric development, we saw these two dams in the fall of 1959, as well as one of about the same capacity as the Rampart Dam, nearing completion on the Angara River at Bratsk, in Siberia. A still larger

dam, with an installed capacity of 5 million kilowatts, was under construction at Krasnoyarsk, on the Yenesey River.

In May of 1961 Colonel Sneed was one of the persons who made an on-site inspection of the Rampart damsite proposed in Alaska. Again, as usual, his contribution to that investigation was outstanding.

The Rampart site is, unquestionably, the greatest hydroelectric power resource in the free world. Rampart could produce nearly 5 million kilowatts of electric energy—more than 2½ times the power produced at Grand Coulee and more than at all the installations of the TVA. Rampart is the only site now known on the North American continent where could be produced the same quantities of power now made available in the Soviet Union at two giant dams, the Russians have developed, at Bratsk and Krasnyarsk in Siberia—one of which is now producing and the other of which is close to production. Rampart power will cost less than any other in America—2 to 3 mills per kilowatt at tidewater locations.

The meaning of this to America is clear. The great power that Rampart will produce will be needed for the defense of our Nation, as will all the natural resources this Nation possesses.

Whenever I have needed specific information about public works projects in this country or in other parts of the world, I have found that Colonel Sneed either had the answer or could obtain the statistics quickly.

The work of staff members on committees all too often goes unnoticed. Therefore, I am pleased to have this opportunity to say a few words about Theo Sneed specifically and his colleagues generally.

I suggest that Ted Sneed now put to use his knowledge in a different way. It occurs to me, Mr. President, that he could, if asked, be a valued public works adviser to President Lyndon Johnson.

AN EMPHASIS REPORT ON POPULATION AND FOREIGN AID

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on December 9 the National Broadcasting Co. in its "Emphasis" report on the population problem observed that politicians see improvements in the underdeveloped countries "literally eaten up by additional people."

This statement and others contained in the report given by Mr. Robert McCormick of NBC News illustrates comments I have made previously concerning the foreign aid authorization and appropriation bills. On October 10 I suggested:

> It does us little, if any, good to provide economic technical assistance to nations which show no concern for their population explosion. Granted, we can help a developing nation grow more food by teaching its citizens better use of their land. But when such new skills simply keep that nation's burgeoning population merely alive, and no more, that part of the world will have taken a step backward—with our assistance.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Emphasis report be printed in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROBERT MCCORMICK, NBC NEWS, WASHINGTON, WITH "EMPHASIS U.S.A."

Congress probably would face up to one of the most serious problems the world faces today—the population problem—if it knew just how to go about it.

Congress—and the rest of the Federal Government—is giving a good bit of thought these days, to the problem that has come to be known as the "population explosion." But for once, Congress is trying to attract as little attention, in its activities, as it can.

The population problem is relatively new—is the direct result of advances in medicine, public health, and sanitation procedures which dramatically reduced the world's death rate. The Population Bulletin, published by the Population Reference Bureau, summarizes the speed with which the problem is growing; it says the world had about a quarter of a billion people on it, at the time of Christ; 1,600 years went by, before this figure was doubled; but it was doubled again, in only 200 years—and doubled again in only 80 years. And it will double a fourth time, in just 38 years. You probably have all heard these increases carried to extremes—showing that in a relatively few hundred years, at the rate we are going, there will be just 1 square foot of space available for each living person, and so on.

But politicians see more immediate crises developing. In foreign aid, for example, they watch our money being poured into so-called underdeveloped countries; they watch these countries make considerable progress, in improving themselves; but they also see these improvements nullified by the increases in population—improvements literally eaten up by additional people.

Some of these countries require more help than we can give them—probably more help than the whole rest of the world can give them—just to maintain their present economic levels, which often involve downright starvation of thousands of people.

Here at home our economy grows at a steady but not spectacular pace, at a rate that is not great enough to supply jobs for all the new, young people entering the labor market. This daily increase in the supply of people wanting and needing work is made more critical by the development of automation, which allows fewer people to do more work.

Thus it is that the number of people with jobs keeps going up—but so does the number of people without jobs. The entire subject for the first time has been thoroughly explored, on the floor of the Senate in recent months, with Democratic Senators CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and GRUENING, of Alaska, leading the discussion. There seems to be little argument over the existence of the problem—and somewhat diminishing differences over how it should be handled.

The Population Reference Bureau this month put out a summary of what's happened in recent years; among other things, it says that Dr. Vannevar Bush, the former White House scientific adviser, has taken a much more serious attitude toward the situation, than he once did. And it quotes the statement of former President Eisenhower, made 4 years ago, that population control "is not a proper political or governmental activity, or function, or responsibility."

But in October of this year, General Eisenhower wrote, in the Saturday Evening Post, that "As I now look back, it may be that I was carrying that conviction too far; I still believe that as a national policy, we should not make birth-control programs a condition to our foreign aid—but we should tell receiving nations how population growth threatens them, and what can be done about it."

But that's just what bothers Congress: what can be done. An obvious beginning—adopted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and slightly circumscribed by the House, is to furnish population-control information and technicians to foreign countries that ask for them. But that meets only a small part of the whole problem.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, 1ST SESSION, 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD a summary of activities of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for the 1st session of the 88th Congress. I should like to take this opportunity to express to all members of the committee on both sides of the aisle my appreciation of their diligence and cooperation in advancing the committee's work this session. The committee has enjoyed and is grateful for the consideration and cooperation of the leadership of the Senate, and I look forward to a continuation of this fine relationship in the coming 2d session of the 88th Congress.

Since the session convened January 9, 1963, 81 Senate bills, 2 Senate resolutions, 18 House bills and 6 commemorative stamp bills have been referred to the committee for consideration. The committee—or subcommittee thereof—has held 13 days of public hearings on 19 Senate bills and 6 House bills. Two days were devoted to hearings on two executive nominations. Three days were devoted to hearings before the Contested Nominations Subcommittee on postmaster nominations. The full committee met in executive session 14 times during the session.

The committee considered 21 Senate bills and 7 House measures. Two Senate resolutions, three Senate bills and five House bills were favorably reported. Many of the measures reported contained provisions of the 28 bills considered. One bill was referred to the committee. One remains to be acted upon in the Senate.

Nineteen hundred and eighteen postmaster nominations have been referred to the committee, of which 1,581 have been confirmed, not including 94 ordered favorably reported by the committee December 18, 1963. Thirteen nominations have been withdrawn by the President.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

A. SENATE BILLS

First. Improves and encourages collective bargaining between the management of the Alaska Railroad and representatives of its employees, and permits to the extent practicable adoption by the Alaska Railroad of the personnel policies and practices of the railroad industry. Reported S. 622 to the Senate June 17, 1963. Passed in the Senate June 24, 1963. Pending on House Union Calendar.

Second. Federal Employees Health Benefits Act, simplifying administration of the act and correcting certain inequities. S. 1561, including provisions of S. 127 and H.R. 7400, was reported to the Senate November 14, 1963. Passed in the Senate November 15, 1963. Pending in House committee.

Third. Transporting remains, families, and effects of Federal employees dying in Alaska and Hawaii. Reported S. 1973 to the Senate September 10, 1963. Rereferred to committee October 16, 1963.

B. HOUSE BILLS

First. Additional choice of health benefit plans. Reported H.R. 1819—S. 730, S. 778, and S. 992 were the Senate companion bills—to the Senate June 17, 1963. Passed in the Senate June 26, 1963. Public Law 88-59.

Second. Transportation of mail by passenger-carrying common carriers by motor vehicle. H.R. 5179 was reported to the Senate December 10, 1963. Passed in the Senate with an amendment to include provisions of S. 1789 December 12, 1963. House agreed to Senate amendment December 13, 1963. Awaiting approval of the President.

Third. Congressional retirement benefits extended to Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect's office. Reported H.R. 5377 to the Senate December 18, 1963.

Fourth. Extending the limitation within which stations, substations, or branches of post offices may be established. Reported H.R. 5778—S. 1730 was the Senate companion—to the Senate December 10, 1963. Passed in the Senate December 12, 1963. Awaiting approval of the President.

Fifth. Parcel post rates. Provides a 3-year suspension of law requiring adjustment of parcel-post rates by the Postmaster General with the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission pending further congressional study. Reported H.R. 5795—S. 433 was a similar Senate bill—to the Senate June 25, 1963. Passed in the Senate June 25, 1963. Signed by the President June 29, 1963. Public Law 88-51.

Sixth. Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy: Provides for office space, supplies, equipment, and staff for Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy's use; franking privileges and payment of expenses incident to the death and burial of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. H.R. 9291 passed House December 2, 1963. Passed Senate, amended, December 3, 1963. Senate agreed to House amendment to Senate amendments December 10, 1963. Signed by the President December 11, 1963. Public Law 88-195.

ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 1ST SESSION, 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, in my capacity as chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I am pleased to present to the Senate a report and review of the activities of this committee during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. The committee has seen a busy and, I believe, productive year as the statistics and explanations I will submit will support.

The Senate District of Columbia Committee is unique among Senate committees by virtue of the great variety of problems and legislative proposals that come before it. The committee in many ways is comparable to a State legislature and city council combined. Actually, the Senate, under the Constitution, is a legislative arm for the District of Columbia government.

Unquestionably, the first and foremost accomplishment was approval by the Congress of legislation increasing the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia from $32 to $50 million and an increase in the limit of borrowing authority from $75 to $150 million to finance needed Capital construction projects, including schools, libraries, health, welfare, and recreational facilities and a continuation of street-lighting and storm-sewer construction programs.

The problems of Washington, D.C., the central city of the country's third fastest growing metropolitan area, are increasing not unlike those of other great cities around the country. Money is not the entire answer in meeting these problems but they cannot be solved without it. The Senate approved the late President Kennedy's formula approach for computing the annual Federal payment to the District. The other body did not concur in this approach but I believe substantial headway was made in attempting to point up the unique responsibilities the Federal Government has for the financial well-being of the Nation's Capital City. The issue will continue to be not whether the Federal Government should contribute to the expenses of the government of the District but what measure can best be used to determine its fair share of the District's financial needs.

A major task which was begun but not yet finished during this session has been an in-depth examination by your committee of the need for strengthening the criminal justice code in the District of Columbia and a real effort to assist legislatively in curbing the upward crime trend in the Nation's Capital. The committee had 14 days of hearings, 3 of them in joint sessions with its counterpart in the House. Our committee records show that no single piece of legislation has received greater attention in this committee for many, many years than the House-passed omnibus crime bill which will be considered in executive session by the committee in January. The omnibus bill contains 12 proposed changes in law in 5 separate titles and deals with 2 of the most complex and difficult subjects in the criminal field today, the Mallory and Durham rules.

A forward step was taken by legislation to ease the burdens on many families and businesses who are being displaced by highway construction, general public works projects and the enforcement of housing regulations including condemnation of unsafe and insanitary buildings. Relocation costs would be paid for the first time to these displacees in addition to providing effective relocation services for families seeking new homes.

Other major legislation handled by the committee include:

First. A bill designed to refurbish downtown Washington under urban renewal processes.

Second. A 380-page bill enacting the uniform commercial code for the District of Columbia which will provide the broadest changes of law in day-to-day commercial and business transactions here in many years.

Third. A bill that should spark the construction industry in the city which permits horizontal property regimes, condominiums, for both business and residential high-rise units.

Fourth. A bill to assist health authorities in curbing the spread of venereal disease in this city, presently the fourth highest of any in this country.

Fifth. A bill to clarify the status of the location of the business offices of foreign governments in residential neighborhoods here.

Sixth. A bill to establish a junior college within the District of Columbia Teachers College, to provide improved educational facilities for many high school graduates.

Seventh. A bill to expand the driver safety education program in the District high schools.

The committee also held lengthy hearings on a proposal to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement.

Mr. President, as I have said before, the ever-increasing problems of great cities of America are not unlike those that Washington, D.C., faces day by day. It is my sincere hope that progress can be made during the next year toward a rapid transit program for Washington and its suburbs. Irrespective of what method is determined to be the best, this area's growing population must be moved from its home to its office or place of employment every working day. I am most hopeful that a spirit of cooperation and an understanding of the transportation problems this city faces more critically tomorrow than today, can be met with the assistance of the Congress next year.

I ask unanimous consent to include a brief statistical report of the Committee's activities for the first session of the 88th Congress.

Likewise, I ask unanimous consent that the committee be authorized to file in the RECORD, after the adjournment of Congress, a complete report of the committee's activities for the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statistical report presented by Mr. BIBLE is as follows:

Statistical data of action by the Senate District of Columbia Committee during the 1st session of the 88th Congress

Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations referred to committee	128
Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations reported to Senate	33
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions (hearings held)	59
Hearings held by subcommittees on Senate bills	29
Hearings held by subcommittees on House bills	13
Hearings held by full committee on bills and nominations	17
Hearings held by full committee in joint session with House committee	6

Statistical data of action by the Senate District of Columbia Committee during the 1st session of the 88th Congress—Continued

Number of bills which have become public law	13
Number of bills which have passed both Houses and are still awaiting President's signature	4

RÉSUMÉ OF LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, as the 1st session of the 88th Congress draws to a close, I desire to make a brief report on the accomplishments of the Committee on Rules and Administration during the past year.

During this period 209 items of proposed legislation were referred to or originated in the committee for consideration. More than half of those measures have already been agreed to by the Senate. The remainder are under active consideration.

To meet the challenge of the increased workload and complexity of operations of the legislative branch, the committee's Subcommittee on Standing Rules of the Senate held rather extensive hearings on several proposals relating to the reorganization of Congress and the expeditious conduct of legislative business on the floor of the Senate. As a result of those hearings, the full committee reported four significant resolutions. One of them, which authorizes former Presidents of the United States to address the Senate, Senate Resolution 78, was agreed to on October 1, 1963. Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, providing for a joint committee to study the organization and operation of the Congress; Senate Resolution 111, permitting committees of the Senate to meet during the morning hour; and Senate Resolution 89, providing for germaneness of debate for 3 hours on any calendar day are on the Senate Calendar pending consideration by the Senate.

During the past few weeks, the Committee on Rules and Administration has been intensively involved in the investigation into the financial or business interests of any officer or employee or former officer or employee of the Senate, pursuant to Senate Resolution 212, agreed to October 10, 1963, and Senate Resolution 221, agreed to November 1, 1963. For the purposes of this special investigation, the committee engaged outside counsel, doubled its staff personnel, formulated detailed rules of procedure, met in several lengthy executive sessions, and held one full-scale public hearing. The committee intends to pursue the project thoroughly and expeditiously.

To date during the 1st session of the 88th Congress the Committee on Rules and Administration has considered and processed requests from standing, select, and special committees of the Senate for additional funds in the amount of $4,764,950 for inquiries and investigations. Legislation providing for such expenditures in the amount of $4,358,333 has been approved by the Senate.

In addition to its heavy legislative docket, the Committee on Rules and Administration has had to take action in many administrative areas. In addition to issuing the usual multiple regulations, the committee has approved civil defense licensing agreements affecting Senate areas, effected improvements in Senate restaurant operations, and laid the groundwork for participation again in the highly successful Senate youth program of a year ago.

At this time, Mr. President, I would like publicly to extend my gratitude for the excellent support which has been given to me by all the members of the committee and by the committee's staff personnel. Without their willing cooperation and dedication it would not have been possible to make this favorable progress report today.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS AND NATIONAL ARTS FOUNDATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the so-called arts bill, Calendar 761, S. 2379.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2379) to provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is S. 2379, the arts bill.

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, December 20, 1963, at 9 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 19, 1963:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Betty J. Parker, Axis.
Rebecca H. Baker, Crossville.
Evelyn Y. Lambert, Darlington.
B. Kenneth Bennett, Grove Hill.
Marion L. Glass, Jemison.
David E. Dunn, Sr., Montgomery.
Margaret P. Gray, Sipsey.
Lillian E. Tyson, Toxey.

ARKANSAS

Pleasant I. Richardson, Ash Flat.
Lexie P. Woods, Crossett.
Hal E. Bodenhamer, Mountain Home.
Roman A. Anthony, Scott.
Jesse H. Dills, Sulphur Springs.
Lois M. Henry, Thornton.
M. Eugene Martin, Van Buren.
Henry R. Robinson, Wilson.

CALIFORNIA

James T. Smith, Banning.
Herbert V. Irey, Bridgeport.
Roberta M. Shriner, Burnt Ranch.
George N. Laird, Colusa.
Frank P. Slatt, Fremont.
Edith F. Turl, Five Points.
Mary M. Seegers, French Camp.
Alvin C. Blackford, Fullerton.
Herman W. Biggers, Sr., Graton.
Marie W. Forrest, Highland.
Dolly S. Condo, Hinkley.
Anna M. Brosh, Piru.
Joan E. Gold, South Pasadena.
John W. James, Upland.

FLORIDA

Raymond E. Chandler, Altamonte Springs.
Alfred J. Tracy, Palm Beach.
Lucille H. Pearce, St. James City.

GEORGIA

Wilfred E. Parrish, Chickamauga.
Guy C. Wallis, Conyers.
Maytrice M. Lindsey, Danburg.
Roselyn S. Tyson, Harrison.
John M. Johnson, Jr., Huber.
Louise D. Drury, Nahunta.

INDIANA

Marvin D. Helmerick, Boswell.
James L. Slough, Bourbon.
Kenneth W. Cochran, Flat Rock.
Clair T. Albin, Greencastle.
Eleanor N. Harness, Grovertown.
Ellsworth G. Hartley, New Albany.
Michael H. Faikel, Portage.
Malcolm W. Menke, Westphalia.

MARYLAND

Virginia M. Lochstamphfor, Burtonsville.
John B. Sewell, Henryton.
Mary L. Greiner, Queen Anne.

MASSACHUSETTS

Richard C. Bockus, East Templeton.
Theodore I. Piwowarczyk, Indian Orchard.
Charles F. Germano, Millis.

MICHIGAN

Vere W. Arend, Baroda.
Donald C. Brill, Brutus.
Arnold S. Keskimaki, Chatham.
Charles F. Collins, Flat Rock.
Bernard F. Beauchamp, Hubbell.

MISSISSIPPI

Everett M. Furtick, Rienzi.

MISSOURI

Warren H. Dial, Belton.
John R. Evans, Monroe City.
Jack Crafton, St. James.

MONTANA

Lawrence J. Driscoll, Charlo.
Florn K. Martin, Poplar.

NEW JERSEY

Raymond V. Lyons, Ridgewood.

NEW MEXICO

R. Warner Dutro, Anthony.

NORTH CAROLINA

H. Burch Idol, Colfax.
Opal W. Packard, Mooresboro.
Archibald L. Taylor, Oxford.
William A. Lovelace, Jr., Thomasville.
Robert S. Smith, Jr., Walnut Cove.

NORTH DAKOTA

Eldora M. LaBar, White Earth.

OREGON

Robert B. Roe, Gaston.

OHIO

Merrel D. Geiger, Pandora.
Donald S. Fankhauser, Perry.
Henri L. Mondor, Piedmont.
Victor C. Ramus, Sherwood.
Buel F. Collins, South Point.

PUERTO RICO

Carlos Oramas, Bayamon.
Julio C. Rivera, Moca.
Pedro J. Sandin, San Juan.

SOUTH CAROLINA

J. Ellison Deer, Ulmers.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Darlene E. Meyer, Conde.
Leo P. Harens, Marion.
Clifford R. Mitchell, Watertown.
Marion C. Nash, Yankton.

TEXAS

Cecil O. Burton, Waxahachie.

VERMONT

Nail P. McGin, East Fairfield.
Carroll P. Eastman, East Hardwick.
Barbara M. Champney, North Pownal.

VIRGINIA

Mary E. Farrar, Afton.
William E. Brubeck, Middlebrook.
Martha E. Deane, Nottoway.

WEST VIRGINIA

Cecil B. Niswander, Lesage.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Edwin M. Martin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 72: 17: *Men shall be blessed in Him; all nations shall call Him blessed.*

Almighty and ever-blessed God, as we continue to draw nigh unto that great day called Christmas, may it be for all of us not only a time of commemoration but of consecration.

Grant that we may pledge ourselves anew to every noble endeavor to hasten the dawning of that glorious day of prediction when men and nations shall embody and manifest those ideals and principles of love and mercy, of unselfishness and kindness, which were so grandly and completely set forth in the life of the Christ of Christmas.

May the glow of His incarnate love and glory warm our hearts, transfiguring and illumining the darkness which so often surrounds us, with the radiant light and splendor of the divine.

Hear us in His name and may the glory and praise be Thine forever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9413. An act to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; and

H. Con. Res. 246. Concurrent resolution relating to the enrollment of H.R. 8667.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 579. An act for the relief of Cilka Elizabeth Ingrova; and

S.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution providing for renaming the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1756. An act to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 36 and 40 to the bill (H.R. 6868) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7063) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7431) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 25 and 42 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8667) entitled "An act authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 26 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 86-42, had appointed the following Senators to serve as members of the United States group of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group at a conference to be held in Washington, D.C., beginning January 14, 1964: Mr. AIKEN, chairman; Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. DODD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HART, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, this House is to be commended for reducing the foreign aid appropriation. Under the able leadership of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] this House is responding to the wishes of the American people.

This Nation would be absolutely supreme in space and could very probably have bases on the planets in outer space today had we diverted just a little foreign aid to a space program in the 1940's and early 1950's. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if we had diverted some of the stupendous aid we sent to Soviet Russia, which enabled her to conquer central Europe in 1944 and 1945, to science, technology, and space I do not believe Cuba, China, and many other areas of the world would be under Communist slavery today.

The surest way for us to help our friends and allies around the world is to be militarily strong, supreme in space, and economically sound. Excessive foreign aid has very definitely weakened the United States position in the world, militarily, economically, and philosophically. By pouring billions of our taxpayers' money all over the world, we have created throughout the world a dollar image. Instead of the Stars and Stripes, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, our former friends around the world only see the dollar sign. We have sent them a blank check when they needed individual liberty, initiative, and a knowledge of the profit motive which creates jobs and develops the undeveloped.

Mr. Speaker, when people throughout the world are hungry and ill fed, we have helped and should help them; but this can be accomplished through the Red Cross, Salvation Army, the International Relief Organization, CARE, and many other organizations dedicated to this type of relief and to the world bank for loans. Mr. Speaker, it is a different proposition, however, when we take, I think illegally, the taxpayers' money to feed the ambition of some Socialist dictator and his coterie of greedy henchmen.

Our forefathers developed out of the most undeveloped continent in the world, the most highly developed. This foreign aid has become not only a millstone around the neck of the United States, but a millstone around the neck of South America, Asia, and Africa. They are being educated and taught to look to easy American dollars rather than to their own individual thrift, initiative, and opportunity. Our foreign friends formerly thought of the United States as a nation of pioneers with imagination and willing to undergo hardship to attain success. Now they look upon Americans as pampered, soft, and an easy touch for a buck. Easy money will destroy any nation or any individual. I urge my colleagues to stand fast and hold the line against further excessive exploitation of the American taxpayers and a weakening of our world position.

EQUAL PROTECTION FOR THE PRESIDENT AND THE SPEAKER

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker: In the new round of public discussion which surrounds the laws of succession to the Presidency, the real issue has been missed so far as the role of the Speaker is concerned.

Members of the House have deeply rooted confidence in the Speaker. The Speaker is elected by a time-honored and time-proven procedure of this body. Next to a national election in which the people make a direct choice from the candidates for President, only the vote of this body on election of a Speaker reflects the popular will of all the people of the United States. This fact springs from the recognition that Members of the House are close to the wish and will of the people and must face their constituents every 2 years in a process of popular judgment that only an elected Member of the Congress can fully comprehend and appreciate. This fact stands, regardless of widely publicized theoretical opinions and the current bevy of quasi-intellectual fishing expeditions outside the testing waters of political reality.

The Government of the United States is solidly based upon an ingenious concept of methods which insure that the popular will of our people shall be the real governing force of our country. For this guarantee against the advocates of dictatorship we must thank our Founding Fathers. Equally, we must accept the responsibilities which are ours as contemporary successors to the Founding Fathers.

In line with this responsibility, I have today introduced House Resolution 596, a resolution to amend the rules of the House to provide equal protection for the Office of the Presidency and the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives. My resolution is intended to clarify no more than the present situation we face with regard to any possible inability to act on the part of our great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, and the corresponding role which our great Speaker, John W. McCormack, may be called upon to undertake. My resolution is no panacea for all the theoretical problems which have been pumped into our public life in recent days. What I propose is a practical solution offered to meet a possible contingency of the next 13 months. All among us wish and pray for the good health and well being of our President.

Who among us does not wish that our distinguished Speaker shall promptly return to this proven forum of the people in the unhappy event that he shall be called upon to be acting President.

My resolution reads as follows:

H. RES. 596

Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives to make provision for certain matters when the Speaker of the House of Representatives acts as President of the United States

Resolved, That rule I of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"8. If, pursuant to section 19 of title 3, United States Code, the Speaker shall act as President because of the inability of the President or of the Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, (a) the majority leader of the House shall act as Speaker, and (b) when upon removal of a disability from either the President or Vice President, the Speaker ceases to act as President, he shall resume the powers and duties of the office of Speaker."

MAKING IN ORDER DECLARATION OF RECESS BY THE SPEAKER DURING THE REMAINDER OF THE SESSION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order during the remainder of this session for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, the majority leader and the Speaker have conferred with me about this. As I understand it, this is the arrangement that is normally made whenever we are coming to what we hope is the end of a session which has already gone too long and, to say the least, been slightly frustrating as far as I am concerned.

Mr. ALBERT. I would agree with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object I will have no objection to this unanimous consent request if I can be assured—and I suspect there are other Members of the House who would also like to be assured—that this will not mean that new legislation of major importance is brought before the House from now to the end of the session.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I can only advise the gentleman from Iowa that this will mean that there will be absolutely no change in the type of legislation which might be brought up later.

Mr. GROSS. I am not opposed to having conference reports brought up, but I do not want to see any new legislation of importance brought before the House with no previous notice between now and the end of this session.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say to the gentleman that no major new legislation will be brought up, and only legislation that can be brought up under unanimous consent or other procedures under the rules will be brought up except conference reports or agreements to Senate amendments.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman this question: There is a rule pending at the Speaker's desk dealing with the so-called Cultural Center. It is not the intention to bring that bill up, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. ALBERT. It is not intended to schedule that bill at this time; no, not during this session.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS ON SAME DAY AS REPORTED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of this week it shall be in order to consider conference reports the same day reported, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to make it very clear that it is understood, once this unanimous-consent request is granted, there still is reserved the right to any Member of the House to object to any matter going to conference if he wants to so object?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the Chair would rule on that matter, if there is a question of parliamentary procedure. But, I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. May I address a parliamentary inquiry to the Speaker under my reservation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. If this unanimous-consent request is granted, each Member of the House would still have his right protected to object to any matter going to conference, if he so wanted to object?

The SPEAKER. In relation to the parliamentary inquiry, and if this unanimous-consent request is granted, it would not interfere with the right of a Member to do so.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

GAMBLING

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, this Christmas is certain to be a merry one for 26 States which have had the wisdom and courage to recognize and capitalize on, at least in part, the natural gambling urge of the American people.

To those Members of Congress who react with shocked feeling at the mere thought of legalizing a national lottery, I would like to bring to their attention some very interesting figures, just released, which prove that more and more of our citizens enjoy the relaxation and pleasures of gambling.

During this calendar year, almost $4 billion were wagered in 26 States where gambling on horses is legal and proper—at least inside the track gates. This total amount bet on horses is about $300 million more than 1962.

The interesting part of this Christmas gift Mr. Speaker, is that the tax revenue to the 26 States—collected painlessly and voluntarily—amounted to over $300 million. This figure represents an increase over last year.

In spite of our sanctimonious attitude about gambling, the U.S. Treasury was the glad recipient of additional millions of dollars in admission taxes collected from about 55 million persons whose thirst to gamble brought them through the track turnstiles.

It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, for our American taxpayers to understand this Government's resistance to a national lottery when we know that gambling in this country has grown into a $100 billion a year tax-free industry which is and has been the chief source of revenue to the underworld.

Only a Government-run lottery can legally satisfy the American urge to gamble; only a Government-operated lottery can shut off the tremendous flow of billions of dollars to the underworld crime syndicates; only Government regulation and control of gambling, through a national lottery, can bring an end to our hypocritical attitude about gambling; only a Federal lottery can strike a lethal blow at organized gambling which has turned America into a gamblers' paradise; only a national lottery can remove our heads from the sand and put a halt to our crime subsidy.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for this Congress to realize and recognize the fact that a Government-run lottery is the only sensible, realistic, and painless way to raise over $10 billion a year in new revenue which can be used to reduce our national debt and cut our heavy taxes. What can be more logical?

TAX REDUCTION

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, when the tax bill was being debated on the floor of the House a few weeks ago, many of us warned that a reduction in revenue without a corresponding reduction in spending would ultimately lead to inflation.

But this argument was brushed aside as the bill passed by a substantial margin. Now it appears, however, that suddenly inflation is the big worry. In the December 23 issue of the U.S. News & World Report the following quotes seem important enough to cause some serious concern:

> Inflation warnings are being sounded once again. They come at a time when the cost of living is creeping up a little faster, when unions are preparing new demands for pay raises, when deficits of Government are growing.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Prices in some instances are beginning to reflect a revival of inflationary pressures.
>
> In recent weeks, prices have moved higher on commodities including tin, sugar, hides, cocoa, lead, zinc, rubber, wool tops, coffee and mercury.
>
> Consumer prices—the cost of living—keep inching upward. The rise in the past year was above 1 percent. Some items that cost more: men's suits, haircuts, tires, movie admissions, women's wool dresses and coats.
>
> For the period ahead, many economists expect a more pronounced rise in prices. Nothing drastic, but a somewhat faster rise than has occurred in the recent past.
>
> All the ingredients are there, say the economists: A strong rise in business, growing confidence of businessmen and consumers, a push by unions for bigger pay raises, big budget deficits—and a big tax cut.
>
> The lull in inflation of recent years now seems to be coming to an end.

When every sign points to the fact that we are on the brink of inflation, it seems incredible that we should be adding fuel to the flames with a $11 billion tax cut, a $100 billion budget, and more deficit financing.

DEFENSE ECONOMY

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to set the record straight. A recent speech of mine in the House has been misconstrued by an Associated Press writer who wrote an article inferring that I had protested the action of Secretary McNamara in curtailing defense establishments, and in particular, the cancellation of a contract affecting my own constituents.

Actually, what I said was that I asked only one thing, and that was that there be no favoritism or politics in such economy decisions. I mentioned reports that the Massachusetts delegation had succeeded in keeping the Boston Naval Shipyard open.

I am for economy and I take my hat off to President Johnson for his political courage in closing defense establishments when no longer needed.

As for the decision to cancel the Dyna-Soar project, which affects my congressional district, so far I have refrained from criticizing this action. I have withheld judgment. I want to evaluate its merit on the facts and when I am in possession of these facts I will speak my piece. I have asked Secretary McNamara to make available to me an Air Force memorandum on the subject. I want to find out the military view. When and if that memorandum is made available, I may have something to say. I understand this memorandum expresses the views of the Air Force as to the wisdom of cancellation of the project.

Meanwhile, just because the ax fell in my own backyard, I am not denouncing anybody. Nor is my drive to cut expenditures a fetish. I reserve the right also not to support cuts in any Member's district, including my own, that cannot be justified from a militarily strategic basis. So I am holding my fire and I will say what I think in due course, even if it hurts.

During the interim, I hope my position is clear, and I regret the allegation that I have differing positions.

Incidentally, on March 30, 1961, I took the floor, and I repeat and reiterate what I said then, after a similar announcement of the inactivation of military bases. I said I knew it took political courage to eliminate these installations and I commended President Kennedy for taking action. I said I did not know the merit of each one listed for closure, but added: "I am very glad to support the President in this regard."

THE 1963 PAGEANT OF PEACE

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson will signal the official opening of the Pageant of Peace on December 22 by lighting the national community Christmas tree, a spruce tree standing 71 feet high. There will be 53 smaller trees, each representing a State or Territory of the United States, plus 27 other smaller trees, forming a lighted cross. All of this will be located on the Ellipse.

The lamps and lighting for the entire Pageant of Peace this year, including the national community Christmas tree, will be furnished by the General Electric Lamp Division. You can imagine my pride when I tell you that this large lamp department of General Electric is located in my congressional district at Nela Park. There will be 7,500 lights on the national tree and 200 on each of the 80 smaller trees, more than 23,000 lamps in all.

Some of you may not be familiar with the Pageant of Peace and do not realize that it was begun in 1924 by President Calvin Coolidge as the National Community Christmas Tree Lighting Ceremony. It was held on the White House grounds until 1934, then moved to Lafayette Park, where it remained until 1939. At that time it was moved back to the White House grounds, where it was held until the present Pageant of Peace program began in 1954.

The avowed purpose of the Pageant of Peace is to emphasize this Nation's desire to promote good will and understanding with other nations of the world and to seek universal peace through the spirit and meaning of Christmas.

Thousands of people see this panorama of lights during the Christmas season each year. May we hope that all who see it this year will recall the true meaning and spirit of Christmas.

MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order during the remainder of this week for the Speaker to recognize Members for motions to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1 of rule XXVII.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this unanimous-consent request contemplate that no suspensions would be called unless those of us on the minority side would agree to such suspensions being called?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight Friday night to file a report on H.R. 7351.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. CRAMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the title of the bill?

Mr. ALBERT. It is my understanding that that is a bill to amend the accelerated Public Works Act.

Mr. CRAMER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 9436) to amend the act of September 2, 1958, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 3 of the Act of September 2, 1958 (Public Law 85-906), is amended to read:

"(c) Five members shall constitute a quorum."

Sec. 2. Subsection (e) of section 3 of that Act is amended to read:

"(e) The public members of the Commission shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, and the public members and the members who are officials of State government shall receive reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties."

Sec. 3. The second paragraph of subsection (b) of section 7 of that Act is further amended to read:

"The Commission shall submit its final report and the Commission and the Advisory Committee shall terminate and wind up their affairs prior to December 31, 1966."

Sec. 4. Section 8 of that Act is amended to read:

"Sec. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture on December 18, 1963, considered the following work plans transmitted to you by executive communication and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are:

STATE, WATERSHED, AND EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

Massachusetts, Bradley Brook, No. 1108, 88th Congress.

Massachusetts, Broad Brook, No. 1108, 88th Congress.

Pennsylvania, Little Shanango River, No. 1234, 88th Congress.

Pennsylvania, Marsh Creek, No. 1234, 88th Congress.

Pennsylvania, Briar Creek, No. 1398, 88th Congress.

Massachusetts, Clam River, No 1398, 88th Congress.

Georgia, Fishing Creek, No. 1398, 88th Congress.

Wisconsin, Glen Hills, No. 1398, 88th Congress.

Kansas, Grant-Shanghai Creeks, No. 1398, 88th Congress.

Illinois, Little Cache, No. 1398, 88th Congress.

Sincerely yours,
Harold D. Cooley,
Chairman.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 247]

Abbitt
Abernethy
Alger
Avery
Becker
Belcher
Bolling
Bray
Broyhill, N.C.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Cannon
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Colmer
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Diggs
Duncan
Ellsworth
Evins
Flynt
Foreman
Forrester
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Grant
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Hays
Hébert
Hoffman
Holifield
Hull
Hutchinson
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kelly
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lloyd
McIntire
McLoskey
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Moore
Morris
Morse
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Pilcher
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Riehlman
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Schwengel
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Sisk
Sullivan
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Trimble
Vanik
Van Pelt
Wilson, Bob
Wright
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 334 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ELECTRIC ENERGY GENERATED AT FEDERAL HYDROELECTRIC PLANTS

Mr. ASPINALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 1063)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
JAMES A. HALEY,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
JACK WESTLAND,
Managers on the Part of the House.
HENRY M. JACKSON,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
THOS. H. KUCHEL,
GORDON ALLOTT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, report that the conferees have been unable to agree.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
JAMES A. HALEY,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
JACK WESTLAND,
Managers on the Part of the House.

MENTAL RETARDATION

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 875) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Educational Improvement for the Handicapped

For grants for training and research and demonstrations with respect to handicapped children pursuant to the Act of September 6, 1958, as amended (20 U.S.C. 611–617), and section 302 of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (Public Law 88–164), and for salaries and expenses in connection therewith, $11,685,000, of which not to exceed $185,000 shall be for such salaries and expenses, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a): *Provided,* That the unexpended balances of the funds appropriated for "Expansion of teaching in education of the mentally retarded" and "Expansion of teaching in education of the deaf" in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1964, shall be merged with this appropriation.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Chronic Diseases and Health of the Aged

For an additional amount for "Chronic diseases and health of the aged", $2,277,000, of which $2,200,000 shall be available for grants under title XVII of the Social Security Act for planning comprehensive action to combat mental retardation.

Hospital Construction Activities

For an additional amount for "Hospital construction activities", $5,049,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be available until expended for grants under part B of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act (Public Law 88–164).

Grants for Construction of Health Research Facilities

For an additional amount for "Grants for construction of health research facilities", $6,000,000, to be available for grants under part D of title VII of the Public Health Service Act.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Grants for Maternal and Child Welfare

For an additional amount for "Grants for maternal and child welfare", $16,500,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be available for maternal and child health services, $5,000,000 for services for crippled children, $5,000,000 for special project grants for maternity and infant care pursuant to section 531 of the Social Security Act, and $1,500,000 for research projects relating to maternal and child health and crippled children's services: *Provided,* That $1,250,000 of the additional amount appropriated herein for maternal and child health services which is available under section 502(b) of the Social Security Act shall be used only for special projects for mentally retarded children, and $1,250,000 of the additional amount appropriated herein for services for crippled children which is available under section 512 (b) of such Act, shall be used only for special projects for services for crippled children who are mentally retarded.

Salaries and Expenses, Children's Bureau

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau", $375,000.

GENERAL PROVISION

Funds for salaries and expenses included in the foregoing paragraphs may be transferred between the appropriations contained herein.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have been able to present to the House, the bill and committee report on supplemental appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out the comprehensive program to combat mental retardation. I am especially pleased to give my support to those sections of the appropriations dealing with construction of comprehensive mental retardation research centers and university-based clinical facilities.

It is my opinion that approval of these appropriations represent another big step in bringing about the realization of a dream, long held by many persons in this Nation and in Congress, that of a nationally supported program for a concerted attack on the mental retardation problem.

Under authorization of Public Law 88–164 construction of comprehensive mental retardation research centers and university-based clinic facilities will provide the means of doing adequate research into the many aspects of retardation and quick implementation of findings by medical scientists in clinical facilities. Thus, it can be hoped that the many causes of mental retardation can be discovered and effectively attacked and that eventually these causes can be completely destroyed.

As chairman of the subcommittee concerned with appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have long been aware of the need for the constructive approach to the national problem of mental retardation. Many times in the past our committee has specifically earmarked certain appropriations for research and other activities related to this problem, but it was not until the current session of Congress that actual legislation focusing particularly on finding the causes, methods of treating and caring for the retarded, and ways of preventing retardation was initiated. Now we are giving the tools and building blocks to the scientists, and other professionals that they need to unlock the padlocks on doors containing the many unknowns related to this condition.

That Congress realized the vast magnitude of this problem is evidenced by its overwhelming approval of the legislation presented. Public Law 88–164 was passed by this body by a record vote of 335 to 18 and by the Senate, also by a record vote, 72 to 1. Public Law 88–156, dealing with maternal and child health was unanimously passed by a voice vote in both the House and Senate.

Surely we can all feel pride in our actions regarding mental retardation during this session of Congress for we have contributed in no small part to laying the groundwork for a solution to the mysteries of retardation which have for so long been deemed almost unsolvable. As legislators our part has not been a small one should significant findings be forthcoming, and they surely will be, for as the late President Kennedy told delegates and guests to the White House Conference on Mental Retardation last September:

> We have left behind prejudice, superstition and ignorance which since the dawn of time distorted our thinking about the mentally retarded. We have entered a new era of understanding, hope and enlightenment. We are on the threshold of an exciting and great achievement which is a tribute to the skills and devotions of thousands of dedicated scientists, professional persons, and public and private citizens.

As you know, my personal and deep concern for this problem and the concern of my committee has been in evidence for a number of years. My personal interest was brought to focus as long ago as 1955 when the plight of mentally retarded children in my State of Rhode Island and throughout the country was outlined in detail for me by the Parents' Council for Retarded Children of Rhode Island—the group out of which the present Rhode Island Association for Retarded Children has grown.

In hearings on the 1956 appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare it was noted that no Federal funds were set aside to combat mental retardation—though several millions of our citizens were afflicted by this problem. To get a program started our committee appropriated funds over and beyond budget requests made by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness and the Mental Health Institute, stating specifically that these funds be used for research on mental retardation problems. Since 1956 my committee and Congress have specified increased funds for these programs each year and during fiscal year 1963 nearly $30 million at the Federal level was earmarked for programs in the field of mental retardation.

With the election of President Kennedy in 1960, the snowball began to roll a little faster and to put on some weight as it gathered momentum. In January 1961 a report was given to then President-elect Kennedy by the Task Force on Health and Social Security which called for the establishment of a National Institute of Child Health within the National Institutes of Health. In February a Center for Research in Child Health was established in one of the divisions at the National Institutes of Health as partial fulfillment of this recommendation, and in July of that year legislation authorizing establishment of the national institute called for in the task force report was introduced into both the House and Senate. In April of 1962 a revised bill calling for the establishment of the new Institute was presented in Congress, this time emphasizing research on problems of maternal health and pregnancy, two items which are closely linked to the causes of mental retardation. In October of that year President Kennedy signed the bill authorizing establishment of the Institute and subsequently it was established and the Center for Child Health, along with the Center for Aging Research were transferred to the fledgling National Institutes of Health component. The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development was given the monumental task of seeking means through support of research for better health of infants, children, and adults, and aged persons by seeking means of gaining additional knowledge and deeper insight into normal growth and development.

Within the Institute of Child Health and Human Development various programs have been set up which will yield valuable knowledge as to the nature of the phenomenon of mental retardation. Specifically, the mental retardation program will support research into the causes, treatment, and possible prevention of mental retardation, and will also seek to train research personnel. Under this program area, the administration of research conducted in the complex mental retardation research centers, for which the appropriations to be voted on by this House today will supply the funds, will be guided and molded to fit into the complex search for solutions to the mental retardation puzzle.

In a report made in 1963 by the Chairman of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation, appointed by President Kennedy in the fall of 1961, Dr. Leonard Mayo said:

> The task confronting society insofar as mental retardation is concerned is twofold: (1) to push basic and clinical research, seek to improve methods of diagnosis and evaluation, and stress preventive measures insofar as present knowledge permits; and (2) to substantially improve teaching and curricula and methods of rehabilitation to the end that the retarded may realize the highest degree of independence and productivity possible for them.

The construction of research centers to study this problem will allow for the research push which must take place before a solution can be reached, and the initiation of a program for university-based clinical facilities will allow for implementation of knowledge gained and will help educate medical personnel in treating and caring for the mentally retarded.

Truly, today if we pass this bill, as I know we will, we have seen a milestone reached in the search for solutions to the many health problems facing this Nation. Already the fruits of research instigated by my committee and this House in past years, under general legislative authority, have seen significant advances made into unraveling the many threads around the mystery of mental retardation.

As examples: Chromosomal abnormalities which have a bearing on mental retardation have been discovered and research in this area is surging forward and it is expected that by doing chromosomal studies and correlating some of the abnormalities found with children's mental and physical defects that a determination of which chromosomes are responsible for specific aspects of human development will in time become possible. When such determinations are made then means of correcting the problem will be that much nearer to a solution.

Also for a small percentage of mental retardation cases, metabolic and genetic defects causing this disability have been found to be preventable. Phenylketonuria—PKU—and galactosemia are two specific examples of metabolic diseases resulting in mental subnormality which can be effectively treated by dietary means.

Prematurity has also been found to be a significant factor in "brain damage," mental retardation, and death among infants. Although the mortality for premature infants has declined, permanent brain damage in premature infants is still very strongly with us, as many children in this low birthweight group who survive are damaged for life. Studies involving animals are being carried on to seek better methods of preventing asphyxia which is a major cause of "brain damage" and death in prematures. Even though research is progressing in this area, if 1,000 babies were born today, prematurely, it is estimated that perhaps 10 percent of this group would be retarded to the extent that some degree of long-term specialized care and services would be necessary for these infants. This is rather a staggering number of defective infants and more research must be conducted so that this number will be cut down, thus effectively lowering the number of children who would suffer from mental retardation in future years.

I firmly believe that with the research tools and resources which we have been able to supply through the legislation passed during this session, we can be proud that we have had the foresight, justice, and humanity to consider the many millions of unborn children who may be born retarded, and those who are already here who must be adequately cared for, treated, and trained. As a result, we may someday see many individuals now in homes, institutions, and special schools take their rightful and productive places in the social and community life of this Nation.

In a letter to Dr. Stafford L. Warren, special assistant to the President on mental retardation, sent to the White House Conference in Virginia, President Kennedy said:

> Society for too long has closed the door against the mentally retarded. Too often many have been hidden in attics, locked up in institutions, shunned and neglected in their communities.
>
> We have, in the past, forfeited a unique opportunity to develop an otherwise wasted human resource. In 1961, less than 50,000 mentally retarded individuals were served in our psychiatric outpatient clinics and other federally supported, community based programs.

It is my belief that here today we are taking a giant step to open the door to the mentally retarded and release them from the attic, and to strive for the day when the opportunity to take their place in the Nation will no longer be denied to the retarded individual.

The words of Sargent Shriver, Peace Corps Director, and executive director of the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation, delivered at the same White House Conference in September, could have been directed to this House, when he said:

> You have the privilege to be in on the ground floor, to be the pioneers in putting to work, for the benefit of all mankind, the fruits of the finest flowering of human genius. On you, and others like you, lie the responsibility for assuring that future generations will have cause to bless—and not curse—the light being shed on the nature of man.

There is no doubt in my mind, nor should there be in anyone's here, that this light spoken of by Mr. Shriver will not illuminate the dark corners wherein the secrets of mental retardation lie. For we have supplied the tools to the scientists, of whom Dr. Allen C. Barnes, gynecologist-obstetrician in chief of the Johns Hopkins Hospital said in a recent Harper's article:

> Contemporary medical scientists hold in common one faith. * * * The medical researcher is guided by one tenet which has no shred of evidence to support it. That is the faith that for every disease there is somewhere a cure or a prevention. As we turn to look into the future, the light of this faith must illumine our crystal ball. The hazards of birth have already been somewhat reduced in the past 30 years; one could hope that the medical research of the next 30 years will lead to a still greater safety in the process of being born.

Mr. Speaker, before I close I want to bring up one more point. The parliamentary situation, as we approach adjournment of the 1st session of the 88th Congress is such that we likely could not have brought this bill before the House without the cooperation of Members on both sides of the political aisle. And with regard to the other side from where I am speaking, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], in his capacity as ranking minority member of the subcommittee handling this bill, has been one of the strong supporters of this program for many years. He has worked for this bill and has helped to make it possible to get it before this House today. I believe he plans to make a few remarks about it which will be well worth listening to in just a moment when I have finished.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriations contained in this bill will represent one of the greatest forward steps we have taken in establishing a really effective program to combat mental retardation and will hasten the day when we will win this battle.

I hope that the bill is agreed to unanimously.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, the supplemental appropriation for certain activities relating to mental retardation now before this House is an important appropriation. The chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from Rhode Island, and I cosponsored House Joint Resolution 875 which was reported to this House by the full Committee on Appropriations without amendment.

I urge that the House pass House Joint Resolution 875 with the full appropriation of $41.8 million. The problem of mental retardation has been with us a long time and the incidence has grown rather than decreased over the years. Nineteen hundred and sixty-four is the year to begin a comprehensive assault on this national problem and the resolution before us provides adequate tools with which to begin.

Mr. Speaker, there are an estimated 5 to 6 million mentally retarded persons in the United States. It is further estimated that about 3 percent of the more than 4 million children born each year are, or will be, classified as mentally retarded. More than 700,000 mentally disabled patients are currently in institutions in the United States—some 500,000 for mental illness and some 200,000 for mental retardation. We all know that the cost to the taxpayer of caring for these mentally disabled persons is staggering. It comes to something over $2.4 billion per year in direct public outlays. An effective program to combat the cause of this illness will result in the long run in reducing this cost to the American taxpayer. The resolution before us is a good beginning toward this end.

This Congress last October enacted two major pieces of legislation that deal with this problem. These programs now need funds. This new legislation—the maternal and child health and mental retardation planning amendments of 1963—Public Law 88-156—and Mental Retardation Facilities and Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963—Public Law 88-164—represents a wholly new emphasis and approach based on prevention and therapeutic restorative and rehabilitative services. To combat mental retardation, this new legislation calls for action on a broad front, including more research aimed at prevention, additional research facilities, improved maternal and child health care to reduce the incidence of mental retardation through preventive measures, provision for the construction of facilities in which a variety of badly needed services can be made available, and assistance in the training of additional teachers of handicapped children.

Mr. Speaker, the supplemental appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare provided in this resolution will permit an action program to reduce the tragic effects of mental retardation—effects that are perhaps measurable with respect to cost in dollars but totally immeasurable in terms of human suffering.

The action program that will be made possible through the passage of this appropriation will be accomplished through a number of coordinated and complementary steps. I would like to describe some of these for this House.

The first step is to assure that each State has a coordinated, properly integrated plan for a comprehensive program to attack the problems of mental retardation. This action is authorized in Public Law 88-156 and the amount appropriated in this bill for this activity is $2.2 million. This is a one-time appropriation which will be used to assist the States in determining what action is needed, in assessing the resources available, and in coordinating State and local activities relating to prevention, treatment and amelioration of mental retardation.

A second step deals with the research efforts in this field. They must be expanded and strengthened. To accomplish this, increased resources and facilities are an essential prerequisite. This bill will provide $6 million to initiate a program of grants for construction of centers for research on mental retardation. The objective of increased research is, of course, obvious. The causes and means of preventing or reducing the effects of mental retardation must be found. The way to find them is through research. Significant progress has been made in recent years. Substantial problems still remain, however. Only continued research in numerous and diverse scientific disciplines can uncover the interrelated factors affecting the origin and development of mentality. Although a number of specific conditions that produce retardation have been identified, by far the largest number of cases result from incompletely understood physical, psychological, environmental, or genetic factors. These many unknowns deserve the attention of the Nation's medical research talents and skills.

The establishment of a number of new centers for research in mental retardation will lead to an increase in the store of basic knowledge about the functioning of the human brain and the development of man's capacities. These centers will provide the fundamental prerequisites for a successful attack on the complex and many-sided problems of mental retardation.

In addition to research, however, experience has demonstrated that significant reductions in the incidence of this affliction can be accomplished through adequate care of expectant mothers.

To this end, an appropriation of $5 million will initiate a program of grants to public health agencies to provide necessary health care to expectant mothers who are unlikely to receive such care for economic or other reasons. The prevalence of mental retardation is higher in those population groups where maternity care is inadequate. This stems largely from the fact that the rate of mental retardation is substantially higher among premature births, and premature births are more common in this population group than in others. For the women who fall into this group—normally, from low-income families—it is of critical importance that good maternity care be provided in the prenatal and immediate postdelivery period. Many of these babies, especially if premature, will require intensive nursing care in hospitals. The project grants provided in this appropriation will enable State and local health agencies to provide comprehensive maternity care to selected high-risk patients. Adequate treatment of these high-risk patients should help to reduce the incidence of mental retardation caused by complications and should decrease the number of premature births among which there is a notably larger number of damaged and retarded infants.

Still another step is provided in this legislation which is aimed at those already afflicted rather than those who may be in the future. An additional $5 million is provided for project grants for the construction of university-affiliated facilities for the mentally retarded. About 96 percent of the Nation's 5.4 million mentally retarded persons are cared for outside of residential institutions. Few of the mildly retarded require institutional care, but a great number of the moderately retarded and almost all of the severely retarded ultimately require care in a facility that provides not only educational and training programs but also medical treatment for complicating physical problems.

Only those portions of homes for the mentally retarded which provide an active diagnostic, treatment, or nursing service are eligible for aid under the Federal-State hospital construction program. Relatively few projects of this nature have received Hill-Burton aid in the past, and even this limited assistance has not helped with the improvement and expansion of the educational, training, and residential services provided in these institutions.

These $5 million in project grants will be used in the construction of public and other nonprofit facilities for the mentally retarded which are associated with a college or university. These fa-

cilities will include, as nearly as practicable, a full range of clinical services, both inpatient and outpatient, for the mentally retarded. They will also aid in demonstrating the provision of specialized services for diagnosis and treatment, education, training, or care of the mentally retarded. In addition, they will assist in the clinical training of physicians and other specialized personnel needed for such work or for research in connection with the mentally retarded.

This bill will provide an increase of $5 million in funds for maternal and child health services and an increase of $5 million for crippled children's services under authority of the recently enacted legislation.

The Social Security Act authorizes grants to State health agencies for services for promoting the health of mothers and children, especially in rural areas and in areas suffering from severe economic distress. The States must provide matching funds for one-half of the amount appropriated; the remainder is not matched and is distributed to the States on the basis of the financial need of each State for assistance in carrying out its State plan.

Mr. Speaker, the increases in available Federal funds for this program will permit strengthening and expanding basic services to mothers and children. By improving health supervision of children, some primary and secondary prevention of mental retardation can be accomplished. At the same time, earlier and more effective detections of retarded children can be achieved. Most important, however, is that these increases would permit an expansion and extension of the special clinics for mentally retarded children, the development of new clinics where none exist at present, and the demonstration of ways of providing new types of services such as chromosome analysis and genetic counseling of mothers who have given birth to Mongoloid babies.

The Social Security Act also authorizes grants to State crippled children's agencies for services for locating crippled children and for providing medical, surgical, corrective, and other services and care, and facilities for diagnosis, hospitalization, and aftercare for children who are crippled or who are suffering from conditions which lead to crippling.

The increases under this program will permit the States to accept more of the doubly handicapped children who are also mentally retarded for corrective surgery and treatment of the physical handicaps. At present many States because of limited funds cannot serve the severely retarded. Some 16 States report that they are unable to make their crippled children's services available to patients in institutions. In an additional 24 States the institutions can refer patients for service but use of the services are limited by available clinics, and by funds and resources in the institutions for followup care. The increase in funds would also permit sufficient expansion of these services so that they could be offered more freely to mentally retarded children with physical handicaps who are in State institutions for the retarded.

The Office of Education under this bill will be provided $11.6 million to start a program to meet the urgent need for more and better qualified teachers to instruct handicapped children. At the present time only about one-fourth of the estimated 1.5 million school-age mentally retarded children are receiving the special education essential to their development. One of the greatest obstacles to expansion of special education programs is the extreme shortage of qualified teachers. The estimate is that an additional 50,000 teachers are needed in the field of mental retardation alone. The funds provided in this supplemental will provide for about 3,500 fellowships and traineeships and some 40 grants to institutions for the strengthening of teacher training programs. About $1 million of this money will be used for research and demonstration projects.

Mr. Speaker, appropriation of the money contained in this supplemental for the purposes I have partially outlined will provide a giant step forward in this Nation's continuing struggle against the incidence of mental retardation. I urge passage of the resolution as it was reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I note that by title this is a supplemental appropriation bill and it is dedicated to one purpose. I join with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], in hoping that when this bill emerges from the other body it will not come back to the House as a catchall deficiency appropriation bill containing amendments and spending items wholly ungermane to the bill. I trust this measure will go to the other body and be treated for what it is, an appropriation to implement a specific program and for no other purpose.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. That is the hope of our committee.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the problem of mental retardation in the United States is a matter of deep national concern. Since 1955 the Federal Government has taken a much greater interest in this field under the leadership of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, John E. Fogarty.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] has left no stone unturned in exploring every possible way in which effective help could be given. The legislation before us today represents another effort on his part, not only to promote research and treatment to benefit the mentally handicapped, but also to focus public attention on the great need which exists.

The supplemental appropriations provided for in this joint resolution will allow the U.S. Office of Education to assist the mentally retarded through a program of grants to States and institutions of higher learning for work in the area of educational improvement.

The funds will also make it possible for the U.S. Public Health Service to assist the States in planning comprehensive State and community actions to combat mental retardation. In addition, a program of university-based mental retardation clinics would be set up with moneys provided by this measure. Appropriations for construction grants to assist universities and other nonprofit institutions to construct and equip facilities for research on mental retardation are also included in the joint resolution.

The remaining allocations will enable the Children's Bureau to provide grants for maternal and child welfare and for administrative expenses and consultative services to the States.

Passage of this joint resolution will make possible the continuation of Federal interest and assistance in the struggle to aid our fellow citizens who are mentally handicapped. To do less would be to turn our backs on those who desperately need the help which this legislation provides. In the interest of the Nation and for the sake of humanity, I urge favorable action on this vital measure.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, having visited many of the mental hospitals in my congressional district, I have seen firsthand some of the pitiful cases. I believe it is urgent that we consider this problem in the interest of humanity.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I supported the mental health bill authorization, and I want to establish that I heartily endorse the appropriation which would implement the various aspects of that authorization.

This legislation is, of course, designed to combat mental illness and mental retardation through expanded research and community treatment centers, and I feel that this measure poses as one of the prime achievements of the currrent legislative session.

The basic authorization legislation provided for a 3-year program during which time $150 million would be extended by the Federal Government to the States as grants to effect the construction of community mental health centers for treatment of the mentally ill.

Mr. Speaker, this sort of assistance would provide great relief for our presently hard-pressed State mental institutions, for the community mental health centers that would come into being would draw off some of the patient pressures that are now pressing down on our State institutions. As a matter of fact, there are some authorities who state that such community centers would—over an extended period of time—drain off just about 50 percent of the mentally-ill individuals presently at State institutions.

It also has been announced that under this program the Office of Education will set up a new division for handicapped children and youth, thereby putting into operation the teaching and research program provided for in the authorization.

The authorization that has already been signed into law additionally provides $179 million over 3 years for construction of treatment and research facilities for the mentally retarded. Under this approach a program for training of teachers for mentally-retarded children also will be carried out.

I want to again establish that I heartily endorse legislation providing funds to advance these various mental health facilities—the merits of these programs and the legislation that supports them are radiantly obvious.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that some of my colleagues have expressed a desire to have a record vote, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 325, nays 4, not voting 105, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

YEAS—325

Abele
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murray
Natcher
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taft
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—4

Alger
Ashbrook
Beermann
Pool

NOT VOTING—105

Abbitt
Abernethy
Avery
Becker
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Bolling
Bray
Broyhill, N.C.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Colmer
Curtis
Dawson
Diggs
Ellsworth
Evins
Flynt
Foreman
Forrester
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Hays
Hébert
Hoffman
Holifield
Hull
Hutchinson
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
McIntire
McLoskey
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Morris
Morse
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill
Osmers
Patten
Pilcher
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Riehlman
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Shelley
Shipley
Short
Sisk
Sullivan
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Trimble
Vanik
Van Pelt
Watts
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Younger

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Short.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Riehlman.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Hall.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Burkhalter with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. Price with Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. Burke with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Younger.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Curtis.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. McLoskey.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Patten with Mr. Kyl.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Forrester with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Foreman.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Buckley.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Vanik with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Thornberry.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Hagen of California.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Thompson of Texas.

Mr. Casey with Mr. O'Hara of Michigan.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Harris.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Grant.

Mr. Cannon with Mr. Wright.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUTURE HIGHWAY NEEDS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8853) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. CRAMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman briefly discuss this bill for the purposes of the record?

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended, provides that the highway trust fund and the program for the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways will come to an end on October 1, 1972. The last apportionment to the States of funds for the program is scheduled to be made in the summer of 1969.

If we are to maintain continuity in the highway construction program—and continuity in planning is essential to efficient and economical operations, both by the highway departments and by industry—we must begin to lay the groundwork for policy decisions by the Congress.

The bill authorizes a comprehensive study of Federal-aid highway needs. The study would include, but would not be limited to, consideration of the need for extensions to the presently designated Interstate System. The study would include the whole spectrum of highway systems, rural and urban, primary and secondary.

The study would be conducted by the Bureau of Public Roads, with the cooperation of the State highway departments. Because of the complex and comprehensive nature of the study, it appears desirable to allow a minimum of 3 years for its completion. The bill provides for the submission of a report to Congress not later than January 1, 1967.

The testimony presented to the Committee on Public Works emphasized the urgency of getting the study underway at the earliest possible time so that the information needed as a basis for sound legislation can be assembled and analyzed in ample time for congressional deliberation without jeopardizing the continuity of the program.

The committee is unanimous in its support of the bill. Both the majority and the minority consider it to be urgent legislation.

The cost of the study would be paid from the research and planning funds regularly available to the Bureau of Public Roads and the States. Therefore, the bill requires no authorization or appropriation, either from the general fund of the Treasury or the highway trust fund.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in further discussion of this legislation, may I say that this contemplates a study to be made by the Bureau of Public Roads and other departmental agencies with the cooperation of the State highway departments. It does not call for further expenditure of funds. It is a study partially underway. The purpose of this legislation is to give legislative sanction and direction to what should be done after 1972 when the Interstate Highway System terminates with regard to the highway program and the interstate, ABC, and toll roads, and other matters involved in highway construction. Is that not correct?

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman from Florida is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the Record a copy of a joint resolution I introduced, House Joint Resolution 464.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The joint resolution referred to is as follows:

Whereas, by the provisions of section 101 (b) of title 23, United States Code, it is declared to be in the national interest to accelerate the construction of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, hereinafter called the "Interstate System", and the Congress expressed its intent that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over the period of availability of the appropriations authorized for its construction, reconstruction, or improvement, and that the Interstate System in all States be brought to simultaneous completion; and

Whereas appropriations have been authorized through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the Interstate System; and

Whereas, to carry out the intent of Congress, final contracts for construction of the Interstate System should be awarded during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and final design work and right-of-way acquisition should be underway no later than the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; and

Whereas, for the necessary and orderly continuation of needed improvement of the Federal-aid highway systems after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, construction planning, traffic surveys, and new route location studies should be commenced not later than the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; and

Whereas the undertaking of such construction planning, surveys, and studies is dependent upon prior determination by the Congress of the nature and extent of a program for continuing the improvement of the Federal-aid highway systems and the authorization of appropriations; therefor; and

Whereas to avoid the adverse impact upon the Nation's economy which would result from an abrupt substantial reduction in the amounts expended annually for the improvement of Federal-aid highways; to avoid the slow and costly replacement of staffs and equipment inventories again to accelerate the Federal-aid highway program at a later time; and to continue the effort commenced by enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to meet the growing transportation requirements of the Nation, it is essential that a study be made of the needs for further improvement of the Federal-aid highway systems after completion of the current program to enable the Congress to make timely provision for continuation to the extent and as determined necessary of the Federal-aid highway program after the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1971: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of Commerce, acting in cooperation with all other interested Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities and with the States (acting through their highway departments) shall make a comprehensive investigation and study of—

(1) types and volumes of estimated highway traffic as projected for twenty years;

(2) any changes (including the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of highways) which may be necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems needed to accommodate such traffic;

(3) the cost of such changes;

(4) the extent of Federal participation in the cost of such changes;

(5) methods for financing such Federal costs; and

(6) methods of apportioning Federal-aid highway funds among the States.

(b) The investigation and study authorized by this section shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(1) the estimated traffic and the required changes in each existing Federal-aid highway system on a State-by-State basis, as well as on a national basis;

(2) an examination of the present system of highway classification for the purpose of determining whether such highway classification should be continued or should be placed on a functional basis;

(3) an examination of the possible creation of a new Federal-aid highway system or systems;

(4) an examination of the possible extension of the Interstate System with particular reference to—

(i) additional mileage.

(ii) the use of such additional mileage to include in the System those highway links which should be supplied to more fully complete the System, and

(iii) revision of methods and standards for allocation of mileage and funds for such System; and

(5) an examination of toll road problems, the traditional policy that highways constructed with Federal funds should be toll free, the extent to which toll facilities have been or may be established on existing Federal-aid highway systems, and whether or not other toll facilities should be established on existing or future Federal-aid highway systems.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Commerce shall submit to Congress within ten days after January 2, 1966, the results of the investigation and study authorized by this joint resolution. This report shall include his findings and recommendations on each specific item referred to in the first section of this joint resolution and shall contain a recommended Federal-aid highway program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for each of the nine succeeding fiscal years, including recommendations with respect to the financing of such program.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make a comprehensive study of the needs of the Federal-aid highway system, including the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, after 1972. Such study shall be made in cooperation with State highway departments and shall include but not be limited to costs, possible extensions of such Interstate System, and such other considerations as the Secretary may deem advisable. The Secretary shall submit a report of his findings to Congress not later than January 1, 1967.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELAWARE RIVER COMPACT

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7332) granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]?

Mr. **CRAMER.** Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, the purpose of this legislation or compact is an amendment to the existing compact, is it not, and permits authority to build by bond issue a bridge? That is the purpose of the legislation; is it not?

Mr. **FALLON.** The gentleman is correct.

Mr. **CRAMER.** Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, the author of the bill [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. **CAHILL.** Mr. Speaker, I would just briefly like to explain the purpose of this legislation. This is a supplement to an agreement already in existence.

Mr. **FALLON.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **CAHILL.** I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **FALLON.** May I also add that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] introduced and supported the identical bill.

Mr. **CRAMER.** Yes; and I now yield further to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. **CAHILL.** Mr. Speaker, first I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Public Works Committee [Mr. BUCKLEY]; the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]; and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] for their outstanding cooperation in arranging for the expeditious presentation of this legislation to the House.

This bill is vital to the continued economic growth of the Delaware Valley and is, of course, of particular interest to the First Congressional District of New Jersey which I represent in the House of Representatives. This bill, H.R. 7332, will:

Authorize the construction of a new crossing of the Delaware River between Delaware County, Pa., and Gloucester County, N.J. Previously authorized legislation enabled the port authority to construct crossings between Philadelphia County and the State of New Jersey. Due to the fact that the proposed new bridge will have one of its terminals in Delaware County, this legislation is essential before the port authority may begin construction of this bridge.

In addition to this fact, the legislation will also permit the port authority to operate ferries for passengers and vehicular traffic until the new bridge is constructed.

I am happy to advise the House that, in addition to the crossings planned, the port authority also intends at the same time to provide a rapid transit facility between the city of Philadelphia and south Jersey communities, extending southwardly for a distance of approximately 20 miles.

I can assure the membership of this House that these new projects as contemplated by the port authority are essential to the economic growth of the Delaware Valley, U.S.A. Thousands of New Jersey citizens work in Pennsylvania and thousands of Pennsylvanians work in New Jersey. As a result vehicular traffic is a real problem and means of rapid transit permitting the citizens of both cities easy access to their employment is essential.

This legislation is bipartisan. My colleagues in the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLIKEN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN], both sponsored similar legislation. The legislatures of both States have unanimously approved it and the Governors of both States have, of course, signed the enabling legislation.

This bill authorizing the supplemental Delaware River compact will go a long way in aiding the industrial and economic growth of our entire Pennsylvania-New Jersey area.

Both political parties and to my knowledge all business and civic interests favor this legislation. I urge its immediate approval by the House of Representatives.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. **CRAMER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks as it relates to the bill previously passed, H.R. 8853.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **CRAMER.** Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the supplemental compact or agreement set forth below, and to each and every term and provision thereof: *Provided,* That nothing therein contained shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States or of any court, department, board, bureau, officer, or official of the United States, over or in regard to any navigable waters, or any commerce between the States or with foreign countries, or any bridge, railroad, highway, pier, wharf, or other facility or improvement, or any other person, matter, or thing, forming the subject matter of said supplemental compact or agreement or otherwise affected by the terms thereof.

SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY FURTHER AMENDING AND SUPPLEMENTING THE AGREEMENT ENTITLED "AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY CREATING THE DELAWARE RIVER JOINT COMMISSION AS A BODY CORPORATE AND POLITIC AND DEFINING ITS POWER AND DUTIES" ENLARGING THE PUBLIC PURPOSES OF THE DELAWARE RIVER PORT AUTHORITY AND EXTENDING ITS JURISDICTION, POWERS AND DUTIES AND DEFINING SUCH ADDITIONAL PURPOSES, JURISDICTION, POWERS AND DUTIES

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey do hereby solemnly covenant and agree, each with the other, as follows:

(1) Article I of the compact or agreement entitled "Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties", which was executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on July first, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-one, and on behalf of the State of New Jersey by the New Jersey Interstate Bridge Commission by its members on July first, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-one, and which was consented to by the Congress of the United States by Public Resolution Numbered twenty-six, being chapter two hundred and fifty-eight of the Public Laws, Seventy-second Congress, approved June fourteenth, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-two, as heretofore amended and supplemented, is amended to read as follows:

ARTICLE I

The body corporate and politic, heretofore created and known as the Delaware River Joint Commission, hereby is continued under the name of the Delaware River Port Authority (hereinafter in this agreement called the "commission"), which shall constitute the public corporate instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey for the following public purposes, and which shall be deemed to be exercising an essential governmental function in effectuating such purposes, to wit:

(a) The operation and maintenance of the bridge, owned jointly by the two States, across the Delaware River between the city of Philadelphia in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the city of Camden in the State of New Jersey, including its approaches, and the making of additions and improvements thereto.

(b) The effectuation, establishment, construction, operation and maintenance of railroad or other facilities for the transportation of passengers across any bridge or tunnel owned or controlled by the commission, including extensions of such railroad or other facilities within the city of Camden and the city of Philadelphia necessary for efficient operation in the port district.

(c) The improvement and development of the port district for port purposes by or through the acquisition, construction, maintenance or operation of any and all projects for the improvement and development of the port district for port purposes, or directly related thereto, either directly by purchase, lease or contract, or by lease or agreement with any other public or private body or corporation, or in any other manner.

(d) Cooperation with all other bodies interested or concerned with, or affected by the promotion, development or use of the Delaware River and the port district.

(e) The procurement from the Government of the United States of any consents which may be requisite to enable any project within its powers to be carried forward.

(f) The construction, acquisition, operation and maintenance of other bridges and tunnels across or under the Delaware River, between the city of Philadelphia or the county of Delaware in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the State of New Jersey, including approaches, and the making of additions and improvements thereto.

(g) The promotion as a highway of commerce of the Delaware River, and the promotion of increased passenger and freight commerce on the Delaware River and for such purpose the publication of literature and the adoption of any other means as may be deemed appropriate.

(h) To study and make recommendations to the proper authorities for the improvement of terminal, lighterage, wharfage, warehouse and other facilities necessary for the promotion of commerce on the Delaware River.

(i) Institution through its counsel, or such other counsel as it shall designate, or intervention in, any litigation involving rates, preferences, rebates or other matters vital to the interest of the port district: *Pro-*

vided, That notice of any such institution of or intervention in litigation shall be given promptly to the attorney general of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to the attorney general of the State of New Jersey, and provision for such notices shall be made in a resolution authorizing any such intervention or litigation and shall be incorporated in the minutes of the commission.

(j) The establishment, maintenance, rehabilitation, construction and operation of a rapid transit system for the transportation of passengers, express, mail, and baggage, or any of them, between points in New Jersey within the port district and within a thirty-five-mile radius of the city of Camden, New Jersey, and points within the city of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and intermediate points. Such system may be established by utilizing existing rapid transit systems, railroad facilities, highways and bridges within the territory involved and by the construction or provision of new facilities where deemed necessary, and may be established either directly by purchase, lease or contract, or by lease or agreement with any other public or private body or corporation, or in any other manner.

(k) The performance of such other functions which may be of mutual benefit to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey insofar as concerns the promotion and development of the port district for port purposes and the use of its facilities by commercial vessels.

(l) The performance or effectuation of such additional bridge, tunnel, railroad, rapid transit, transportation, transportation facility, terminal, terminal facility, and port improvement and development purposes within the port district as may hereafter be delegated to or imposed upon it by the action of either State concurred in by legislation of the other.

(2) Said compact or agreement is further amended and supplemented by adding thereto, as a part thereof, following article XII–A thereof, a new article reading as follows:

Article XII–B

(1) In addition to other public purposes provided for it and other powers and duties conferred upon it, and not in limitation thereof, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other article hereof, the commission shall have among its authorized purposes, and it shall have the power to effectuate, the construction, operation and maintenance of a bridge for vehicular traffic across the Delaware River, between a point or points in the township of Logan, New Jersey, and a point or points in the city of Chester, Pennsylvania, including approaches thereto.

(2) In addition to other public purposes provided for it and other powers and duties conferred upon it, and not in limitation thereof, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other article hereof, the commission shall have among its authorized purposes, and it shall have the power to effectuate, the establishment, rehabilitation, equipment, construction, maintenance and operation of ferries for passengers and vehicular traffic over and across the Delaware River within the port district between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey. Such ferries may be established either directly by purchase, lease or contract, or by lease or agreement with any other public or private body or corporation, or in any other manner, and may be established by utilizing any existing ferries within the port district across the Delaware River between said Commonwealth and said State and by the construction or provision of new facilities where deemed necessary. Any such ferry may include such approach highways and interests in land or other property necessary therefor in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or the State of New Jersey as may be determined by the commission to be necessary to facilitate the flow of traffic in the vicinity of any such ferry or to connect any such ferry with the highways system or other traffic facilities in said Commonwealth or said State.

(3)(a) For the effectuation of any of its purposes authorized by this article, the commission is hereby granted, in addition to any other powers heretofore or hereafter granted to it, power and authority to acquire in its name by purchase or otherwise, on such terms and conditions and in such manner as it may deem proper, or by the exercise of the power of eminent domain, any such land and other property which it may determine is reasonably necessary to acquire for any of its purposes authorized by this article and any and all rights, title and interest in such land and other property, including public lands, parks, playgrounds, reservations, highways, or parkways, owned by or in which any county, city, borough, town, township, village, or other political subdivision of the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has any right, title or interest, or parts thereof or rights therein, and any fee simple absolute or any lesser interest in private property, and any fee simple absolute in, easements upon, or the benefit of restrictions upon, abutting property to preserve and protect such land and other property. Upon the exercise of the power of eminent domain under this paragraph, the compensation to be paid with regard to property located in the State of New Jersey shall be ascertained and paid in the manner provided in title 20 of the Revised Statutes of New Jersey insofar as the provisions thereof are applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions contained in this paragraph, and with regard to property located in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall be ascertained and paid in the manner provided by the act approved the ninth day of July, one thousand nine hundred and nineteen (Pamphlet Laws 814) and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, insofar as the provisions are applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions contained in this paragraph. The commission may join in separate subdivisions in one petition or complaint the descriptions of any number of tracts or parcels of such land and other property to be condemned, and the names of any number of owners and other parties who may have an interest therein, and all such land and other property included in said petition or complaint may be condemned in a single proceeding: *Provided, however,* That separate awards shall be made for each tract or parcel of such land or other property: *And provided further,* That each of said tracts or parcels of such land or other property lies wholly in or has a substantial part of its value lying wholly within the same county.

(b) Whenever the commission acquires under this paragraph (3) the whole or any part of the right-of-way of a public utility located in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the commission shall, at its own expense, provide a substitute right-of-way, on another and favorable location. Such public utility shall thereupon provide for the transfer to, or reconstruction upon, in, under or above said substitute right of way of any structures and facilities of said public utility located upon, in, under or above said original right-of-way at the time the same is so acquired. The commission is hereby authorized to enter into agreements with such public utility to contribute toward the expense of such transfer or reconstruction, and in the event that they are unable to agree on the amount to be paid, the matter shall be referred to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission which shall, after hearing thereon, make a finding of the amount to be paid to such public utility by the commission. In case of failure of such public utility, within a reasonable time after notice so to do, to remove its facilities to such substitute right-of-way, the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission shall have jurisdiction, on petition of the commission to order such transfer or reconstruction. Any party to such proceedings shall have the right of appeal from the ruling of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. The Delaware River Port Authority is hereby authorized to acquire, by purchase or by the exercise of the power of eminent domain, any necessary land or right-of-way for the relocation of any such public utility right-of-way and facilities. The substitute right-of-way thus acquired shall be equal in estate to the original right-of-way acquired from the public utility, and the commission shall deliver to the public utility a deed, duly executed and acknowledged, conveying to it an estate in the substitute right-of-way at least equal to that owned by the public utility in the original right-of-way, or if such substitute right-of-way is to be acquired by purchase, the commission shall procure and deliver to the public utility a deed conveying such estate to it from the owner of the land on which such substitute right-of-way is located.

This subparagraph (b) shall have no application to the relocation of public utility facilities located in the beds of public streets, roads, or highways.

(c) In addition to any other powers heretofore or hereafter granted to it, the commission, in connection with construction or operation of any project for the effectuation of any of its purposes authorized by this article, shall have power to make reasonable regulations for the installation, construction, maintenance, repair, renewal, relocation and removal of tracks, pipes, mains, conduits, cables, wires, towers, poles, or any other equipment and appliances (in this subparagraph (c) called "works") located in the State of New Jersey of any public utility as defined in section 48:2–13 of the revised statutes of New Jersey in, on, along, over or under any such project. Whenever in connection with the construction or operation of any such project the commission shall determine that it is necessary that any such works, which now are or hereafter may be located in, on, along, over or under any such project should be relocated in such project, or should be removed therefrom, the public utility owning or operating such works shall relocate or remove the same in accordance with the order of the commission: *Provided, however,* That, except in the case of the relocation or removal of such works located in, on, along, over or under public streets, roads, or highways, the cost and expenses of such relocation or removal, including the cost of installing such works in a new location or new locations, and the cost of any lands or any rights or interest in lands or any other rights acquired to accomplish such relocation or removal, less the cost of any lands or any rights or interests in lands or any other rights of the public utility paid to the public utility in connection with the relocation or removal of such works, shall be paid by the commission and shall be included in the cost of such project. In case of any such relocation or removal of works as aforesaid, the public utility owning or operating the same, its successors or assigns, may maintain and operate such works, with the necessary appurtenances, in the new location or new locations for as long a period, and upon the same terms and conditions, as it had the right to maintain and operate such works in their former location.

In case of any such relocation or removal of works, as aforesaid, the commission shall own and maintain, repair and renew structures within the rights-of-way of railroad companies carrying any such project over railroads, and the commission shall bear the cost of maintenance, repair, and renewal of structures within the rights-of-way of railroad companies carrying railroads over any such project, but this provision shall not relieve any railroad company from responsibility for damage caused to any authority or railroad structure by the operation of its railroad. Such appoaches, curbing, sidewalk paving, guard rails on approaches, and surface paving on such projects as shall be within the rights-of-way of a railroad company or companies shall be owned and maintained, reported and renewed by the commission; rails, pipes, and lines shall be owned and maintained, repaired and renewed by the railroad company or companies.

(4) The power and authority granted in this article to the commission to construct new or additional approach highways shall not be exercised unless and until the Department of Highways of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall have filed with the commission its written approval as to approach highways to be located in said Commonwealth and the State Highway Department of the State of New Jersey shall have filed with the commission its written approval as to approach highways to be located in said State.

(5) The effectuation of any of the purposes authorized by this article, and the exercise or performance by the commission of any of its powers or duties in connection with effectuation of any such purpose, shall not be subject to any restrictions, limitations, or provisions provided for or set forth in article XII hereof. The bridge or ferries referred to in this article may be established, constructed or erected by the commission notwithstanding the terms and provisions of any other agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

(6) The commission shall not construct or erect the bridge referred to in this article unless and until the Governor of the State of New Jersey and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall have filed with the commission their written consents to such construction or erection.

(7) The commission is hereby granted the following powers in addition to any other powers heretofore or hereafter granted to it:

(a) To abandon, close off, dismantle, sell, or otherwise dispose of, any project or facility, or any part thereof, or any other property, which the commission may determine to be no longer useful or necessary for public use.

(b) To effectuate any of its authorized purposes either directly or indirectly by or through wholly owned subsidiary corporations. Any such subsidiary corporation shall be a public corporate instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey for such purposes and shall be deemed to be exercising an essential governmental function in effectuating such purposes. Any such subsidiary corporation and any of its property, functions and activities shall have such of the privileges, immunities, tax, and other exemptions of the commission and of the commission's property, functions, and activities, and such of the rights, powers, and duties of the commission, as the commission shall determine.

(8) The power of the commission, which is hereby confirmed, to purchase, construct, lease, finance, operate, maintain and own a terminal facility consisting in whole or in part of a parking area or place, garage, building, improvement, structure, or other accommodation for the parking or storage of motor or other vehicles, including all real or personal property necessary or desirable in connection therewith, shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this agreement, be exercised only at such place, in the vicinity of and in connection with, or as a part of any bridge, tunnel, ferry, railroad, rapid transit system, transportation or terminal facility, as the commission may determine to be necessary or desirable.

In Witness Whereof, this 25th day of June 1963, Richard J. Hughes has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the State of New Jersey and caused the great seal of the State to be attached hereto.

S/ Richard J. Hughes
Governor,
State of New Jersey

Attest:
S/ Robert J. Burkhardt
Secretary of State

In Witness Whereof, this 26th day of June 1963, William W. Scranton has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and caused the great seal of the Commonwealth to be attached hereto.

S/ William W. Scranton
Governor,
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Attest:
S/ George I. Bloom
Secretary of the Commonwealth

Sec. 2. Public Laws 573 and 574, being respectively chapter 921 and chapter 922 of the Public Laws, Eighty-second Congress, second session, both approved July 17, 1952, are hereby confirmed and continued and shall be construed to apply to the aforesaid supplemental compact or agreement as if the supplemental compact or agreement had been consented to by such Public Laws.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, immediately before the colon insert the following: "*Provided further*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed as granting the consent of Congress in advance to the performance or effectuation of any purposes set forth in article I, paragraph (1) not now otherwise permitted or provided for under the 'Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating The Delaware River Joint Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its power and duties,' which was executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on July first, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-one, and on behalf of the State of New Jersey by the New Jersey Interstate Bridge Commission by its members on July first, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-one, and which was consented to by the Congress by Public Resolution Number twenty-six, being chapter two hundred fifty-eight of the Public Laws, Seventy-second Congress, approved June fourteenth, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-two, as heretofore amended and supplemented and as amended and supplemented by the supplemental compact or agreement hereby consented to."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN G. RYAN

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will be in session, and I shall be here as I have been on every legislative day of the long session now approaching its close. I make mention of this to explain why I cannot be present tomorrow, as otherwise I would have been, at the funeral mass of a beloved friend for many, many years, the Honorable John G. Ryan, for 31 years an outstanding and dedicated member of the Legislature of Illinois. Few men in the history of the Legislature of Illinois have served so long continuously, and in the passing of Hon. John G. Ryan the community in which he lived, Chicago, and the State of Illinois have suffered a great loss.

To his devoted wife Agnes, his two fine sons, John G., Jr., and Robert L., his two noble daughters, Mrs. Mary O'Connor and Mrs. Patricia Leonard, and his 20 grandchildren I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express my deep-felt sorrow in the loss of my very dear friend John G. Ryan, and extend my sympathy to the members of his family who are bereaved by the loss of this great man.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ryan was a member of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois for a period of 31 years, representing the 25th District for the past 8 years. He was one of the outstanding members of the State legislature and was one to champion progressive legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of knowing John Ryan for over 40 years and knew him intimately because a part of his legislative district was in the 17th ward of which I was the Democratic ward committeeman for 24 years. I felt that he was a sincere, dedicated man, and most capable in not only his public position but in his civic activities and in the community and city.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Illinois has lost a man of great stature, a man who brought dignity to the State legislature, and one who was known far and wide for his sympathy and understanding of the problems of his fellow man. I regret my words are inadequate to express the deep feeling I have at the loss of a dear and close friend.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to join with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] in expressing sorrow in the passing of my former colleague in the Illinois General Assembly, John G. Ryan.

It was my privilege to serve in the Illinois Legislature with the late Representative John Ryan for more than a decade and to observe his devotion to public service and his deep concern in the problems of our beloved State of Illinois.

Mr. Ryan won the respect and affection of his fellow legislators and contributed generously of his time, counsel and energy in the public service.

I join the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] and the many others in Illinois and in the Nation who mourn the passing of John Ryan.

I extend my sympathy to his widow and other members of the family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks following mine on the death of Hon. John G. Ryan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NEWSLETTER OF CONGRESSMAN ABERNETHY

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newsletter by the gentleman from Mississippi, THOMAS G. ABERNETHY.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the newsletter of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY]:

IN THE NEWS

(By Congressman ABERNETHY)

Why did Lee Harvey Oswald take the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy?

As the years go by fiction writers will produce a variety of conflicting "authentic" stories. Columns and books will be filled with fanciful theories of why he committed the act. And in the absence of a confession and conviction, many will question that he did it at all. This tragedy will produce a Roman holiday for fiction writers, theorists, propagandists, and just plain cranks.

There cannot be the slightest glimmer of doubt that Oswald was the killer. His reason, no one knows. And we may never know. But reflected in the thoughts of "why" and "who" is one well accepted fact. That is, nothing is more repugnant to the American people than a cowardly assassination of their head of state.

Under our system every American has a perfect right to express his dislike, if he has such, for the President or any other public officials. But as someone, shortly after the murder, so well said, "We don't shoot 'em out; we vote 'em out." Every American may not always get who he wants, or what he wants. But one thing for sure, we do not tolerate or condone the firing of deadly weapons at those we dislike or with whom we disagree.

After the shooting a goodly number allowed their personal bias to associate the murder with a segment of our society which strongly opposed the policies of President Kennedy, particularly those who opposed his policy on civil rights. Even Chief Justice Warren, and a few others within Washington's officialdom, delved off into the realm of biased speculation. Statements promptly hit the wires about hatred, bigots, racial intolerance, and the like. Those who issued such statements spoke prematurely and quickly found themselves in a state of embarrassment when word poured back that the killer was a leftwing, militant, radical member of the Communist sect (the membership of which has been the beneficiary of numerous amazing decisions of Mr. Warren's Court).

We continue to read much about an alleged "growing wave of indifference, intolerance, bigotry, and race hatred." This should not go unchallenged. The spirit of hate does not prevail to any more extent today than it did in the days of the early settlers. If anything, there is less hate in our land now than then. It is nothing short of a heinous indictment of Americans to charge, or even suggest, that our President was mowed down because of a "growing spirit of hate and racial bigotry." Everyone from the FBI to the Dallas Police Department is convinced that Oswald, and he alone, planned the shooting. Why did he do it? No one knows. Malice (hate) precedes every murder. For some reason there was malice and hate in Oswald's heart. But the hate was his and his alone. There is not the slightest shred of evidence that it was associated with or sprang from an alleged wave of racial hatred or racial bigotry.

There has never been a time from George Washington to Lyndon Baines Johnson when it was safe for the President to freely mingle with the public. There has never been a time when the President was not under some degree of guard. Without such the probabilities are that every one of them would, at the hands of some hothead, crank, disgruntled extremist or anarchist, have met the fate of Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, and Kennedy. Jackson, Roosevelt, and Truman barely escaped. Although we live in one of the most civilized nations of the world, we still have and will always have some who will take human life, even that of the President.

Now to other thoughts. We are very fortunate to live in a land where not even the most sudden and tragic passing of the head of our country stalls the wheels of orderly government. There was no grab for power, no revolting military, no unauthorized takeover, no coup, and no panicking. Calm prevailed throughout the land, particularly in the Capital City. Within minutes a new President was sworn in. The brilliant architects of our Government provided well for such a contingency as the Nation experienced on that fateful Friday, November 22, 1963.

Except only for a respectful pause and a time out for quiet meditation and prayer, the business of this great and powerful Government moved steadily on in the midst of heart-rending tragedy.

CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM ON OTEPKA CASE INDICATES SECRETARY RUSK IS BEHIND MOVE TO HAVE OTEPKA OUSTED AND THREATENS FURTHER PURGE

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the facts stated in a confidential memorandum respecting certain conferences on November 19, 1962, presided over by Under Secretary of State for Administration, Mr. William Crockett, and attended by division heads and branch chiefs of the Office of Security, which memorandum comes from an unimpeachable source, indicate conclusively that Otepka is up before a kangaroo court, that the final outcome of the case is probably predetermined, and that a further investigation by Congress of the entire matter is fully justified.

I am placing a copy of this memorandum in the RECORD. The memorandum clearly reveals that Secretary of State Dean Rusk is not and cannot be in a quasi-judicial impartial position respecting the Otepka case but made up his mind some time ago that Otepka must be punished. The probability is that Secretary Rusk has previously called the signals covering past actions against Otepka and is admittedly still the quarterback on Otepka's review—so the same score after the replay will be no surprise.

The statement that the Secretary regretfully had to accept Reilly and Hill resignations means simply that they were let out not so much for what they did as for getting caught at it.

The statement by the State Department that the Reilly-Hill cases are unrelated to the Otepka case will not stand up under scrutiny. Reilly first went personally to the Justice Department with the Otepka case asking for an FBI investigation and seeking criminal action against Otepka for alleged violation of espionage statutes. When thwarted in this move, he then gave the instructions which led to the bringing of formal charges against Otepka within the Department. Reilly is the Department's principal witness against Otepka and Hill is an indispensable witness against Otepka if he is to be further prosecuted.

Evidence already disclosed indicating strongly that Reilly and Hill lied under oath about these matters, makes them unreliable witnesses and raises a serious question whether Otepka should be punished or disciplined in any way in reliance on their statements.

Investigation of staff members of a congressional committee by State Department personnel is not a proper function of the Department and destroys the legislative-executive constitutional separation of powers.

If congressional committee staff members receiving information for their committees are not authorized persons for that purpose, then it can be argued in the future, because it logically follows, that congressional committees likewise are not authorized to receive such information.

A copy of this confidential memorandum, dated November 21, 1963, which as I say comes from a high source and an unimpeachable source that has proven reliable in all other instances, is quoted hereafter:

NOVEMBER 21, 1963.

Crockett stated Secretary Rusk had "regretfully had to accept" the resignations of John F. Reilly and Elmer D. Hill. (Reilly was in charge of the Office of Security and Hill was chief of the Technical Services Division.)

Following the conference referred to above, Robert Berry, chief of the Division of Investigations, Office of Security (Headquarters), called a meeting of all the special agents of the Washington Field Office of that Division (located at 515 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C.). At this meeting Berry reported on the Crockett conference earlier in the day, covering the points referred to above. Berry also stated that disclosure to the press of the psychological tests given by the Office of Security was under investigation, but that he was not free to divulge the type of investigation involved. Berry added that only personnel of the Division of Investigations had access to these tests, and that accordingly such personnel provides all the suspects in the psychological tests "leak."

At this meeting George Spoth, special agent in charge, Washington Field Office, reminded Berry he had forgotten to report that Mr. Crockett had made a statement about channels being open to the Secretary, and that should anyone disagree with Department policy, if he so requested he would be granted an audience with the Secretary. Spoth pointed out Crockett had said: "We have lost face and it's up to us to regain it."

Mr. Berry was asked to comment about the report in the Allen-Scott newspaper column that two members of the Office of Security were investigating staff employees of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Berry said it was necessary to investigate the staff of the subcommittee because the Office of Security had information that classified information was furnished to such persons, who, Berry stressed, were unauthorized persons within the scope of the instructions respecting the safeguarding of classified information.

Also on November 19, 1963, Frederick Traband, chief of the Personnel Security Branch, Division of Evaluations, Office of Security, who had attended the meeting in Crockett's office earlier that day, told members of his staff they should not be concerned with the outcome of the Otepka case; that in due course Otepka definitely would be punished for furnishing information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

The Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Mr. William Crockett, on November 19, 1963, presided at a conference attended by division heads and branch chiefs of the Office of Security.

At this conference Crockett said he wanted the Office of Security to know that Secretary Rusk was very disturbed about the Otepka case and its related events, and that the Secretary further had stated he intended to insist upon loyalty to him.

Crockett reported the Secretary had indicated his opinion that the Department of State was wholly justified in its action against Otepka. Using a football simile, Crockett reported, the Secretary had said: "These men went out of bounds. When that happens, you cure the situation."

Crockett reported the Secretary had stated Otepka's case was to be vigorously pursued, and had declared that the Reilly and Hill cases were unrelated to the Otepka case, which would be dealt with on its own merits. According to Crockett, the Secretary further stated that after the Otepka case is all over other persons in the State Department who are disloyal to the Secretary will be identified and ousted. Secretary Rusk, Crockett reported at the conference, declared "we will sweep the place clean."

Crockett stated channels to the Secretary were open, that if anyone should disagree with Department policy, he would be granted an audience with Secretary Rusk upon requesting it.

Crockett declared: "We have lost face and it's up to us to regain it."

Crockett further reported that there is "a second underground" in the Department, besides Otepka, which has furnished information to the Internal Security Subcommittee; and that the members of this "underground" will be identified and dealt with soon.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I was downtown on the last rollcall. If I had been present, I would have voted "yes."

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a copy of a bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing "A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people and for other purposes." It has been assigned the number H.R. 9520. I would like to request unanimous consent to extend my remarks regarding this bill and to have printed at the close of my remarks the text of the bill showing in italics the portions differing from certain other wilderness bills.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

For more than 7 years Americans have been making a special national effort to preserve as wilderness some of the remnants of the primeval that our ancestors found on this continent.

For more than 7 years the Congress has had legislation pending before it that would establish a national policy for wilderness and a program to put such a policy into effect.

A large and an increasing number of citizens have become concerned. Magazines and newspapers across the country have urged support. And, President Kennedy placed wilderness legislation high in his conservation program.

As a matter of fact, when President Kennedy completed his conservation tour in October he said that he had come to three conclusions and the first was:

> We must mount a new campaign to preserve a natural environment worthy of the wealthiest nation on earth.

Wilderness legislation is an instrument of foresight and protection. It is a modest, reasonable proposal to insure that the American people of this and future generations shall be able to enjoy the benefits of an enduring system of wilderness. It is an investment in the future of America, but it can be lost forever unless prompt action is taken.

SPONSORS INTRODUCE REVISIONS

The advocates and sponsors of the wilderness bill have through the years shown a great willingness to cooperate with all interested parties in order to achieve a sound and enduring wilderness preservation policy and a program that can be truly national.

Recently a number of House sponsors of earlier wilderness bills have demonstrated this by introducing revised measures designed to meet, as far as possible, the objections that have so far prevented action by the House. I am today joining this group.

NEW BILLS COMPARED

The revised bills introduced recently are similar in many respects, but a careful review indicates that there are significant differences; that there are in reality two different bills. One is the measure, H.R. 9070, introduced by our colleague from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. SAYLOR]. The other is the bill H.R. 9162, introduced by my good and very able friend from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and several other Members.

Both of these measures meet the constitutional objection that has been raised to earlier wilderness bills, including my own H.R. 991. Both of these new bills satisfies the right of Congress to act affirmatively in the designation of any wilderness area. But in several other respects, including provisions both lacking in one and contained in the other, I believe that H.R. 9070 provides a sounder base for consideration; for action; for expeditious treatment early in the next session of this Congress.

The bill that I am introducing today, therefore, H.R. 9520, is patterned after H.R. 9070, but includes several perfecting amendments.

OMISSIONS CORRECTED

There are several significant omissions in H.R. 9162 and others that are corrected in this bill.

IMPORTANT S. 4 SENTENCES RESTORED

First. Three omissions are the sentences that are in the Senate-passed act S. 4, as well as in my own and other earlier wilderness bills—sentences that are of importance in the administration of the kind of wilderness program that this measure establishes. They are as follows:

At the end of section 4(a) the following sentence omitted in H.R. 9162 appears in the bill I am introducing:

> All accommodations and installations within any national park or monument shall, furthermore, be incident to the conservation and use and enjoyment of the scenery and the natural and historical objects and flora and fauna of the park or monument in its natural condition.

At the end of section 4(b) two sentences omitted in H.R. 9162 appear in the bill I am introducing, as follows:

> Except as otherwise provided in this Act, wilderness areas shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use. Subject to the provisions of this Act, all such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation.

A third such omission in H.R. 9162 and its companions is of a sentence omitted at the end of their section 5(e). This occurs in the similar portion of my newly introduced bill at the end of section 6(b), as follows:

> Any such contributions or gifts shall, for purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, be considered a contribution or gift to or for the use of the United States for an exclusively public purpose, and may be deducted as such under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, subject to all applicable limitations and restrictions contained therein.

PARK AND REFUGE OMISSIONS CORRECTED

Second. H.R. 9162 and its companions omit the language that would make applicable to park and refuge wilderness, as well as to national forest lands, the authority to accept gifts or bequests of lands, authority to accept private contributions and gifts to be used to further the purposes of the act, and authority to acquire inholdings of lands within areas of wilderness—an authority subject to prescribed restrictions. These omissions are corrected in the bill I am introducing by making applicable to the Secretary of the

Interior as well as to the Secretary of Agriculture the provisions of sections 5 and 6 of my bill—or sections 5 (c), (d), and (e) of H.R. 9162 and others.

HUNTING LIMITED TO NATIONAL FORESTS

Third. The limitation to national forests of the hunting permitted in one of the bill's special provisions is omitted from H.R. 9162, an omission that is corrected by the words "national forests" in section 4(d)(7) of the bill I am introducing.

In a similar way the words "national forests," also, are included in section 5(b) of the bill I am introducing.

PROVISION FOR FUTURE AREAS INCLUDED

Fourth. In a number of instances H.R. 9162 and its companions fail to make certain provisions of the measure clearly applicable to the areas of wilderness that will be established later by Congress in accordance with the program the wilderness bill sets up. This results from omitting the words "or in accordance with" in phrases that should read "by or in accordance with this act." This omission occurs in section 4(c), in section 4(d)(1), in section 4(d)(3), in section 4(d)(5), in section 5(c), and in section 5(d) of H.R. 9162 and others.

IMMEDIATE PROTECTION FOR PARK AND REFUGE AREAS

Fifth. Finally, a serious omission in section 3(c) of H.R. 9162 and its companions fails to provide desirable protection for the wilderness back country in parks and refuges while the review of these areas is in progress.

This omission is corrected in the bill I am introducing by including at the end of section 3(c), regarding park and refuge areas, the following provision: "and each such portion shall continue to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as roadless until Congress has acted on a recommendation of the President regarding the area, as provided in this subsection, or until Congress has determined otherwise."

Accompanying this addition is the insertion after the 19th word in this subsection—section 3(c) the words "comprising 5,000 or more contiguous acres," thus providing that the protection as roadless would apply, not to the portions of the parks and refuges where there are roads and accommodations for the public, but to those back country areas being considered for permanent wilderness preservation.

OTHER IMPROVEMENTS

Besides correcting the omissions thus set forth, the bill I am now introducing, H.R. 9520, like the Saylor bill, H.R. 9070, includes several other improvements, as I judge them to be, over H.R. 9162 and its companions.

One of these improvements is the omission of the confusing word "therefore" from section 2(b)(3) in the definition of wilderness, where H.R. 9162 says that a wilderness, and I quote, "has at least five thousand acres of land and is, therefore, of sufficient size." It is well to set 5,000 acres as a minimum. Such a size, however, may not be sufficient if the surrounding lands are not of such a nature as to make the 5,000 acres suitable for wilderness preservation. It is better to say "has at least 5,000 acres of land and is of sufficient size," omitting "therefore," and this language I have used.

Another improvement has to do with a distinction that may seem rather fine to some but one that to me seems important. It has to do with the "special provisions" in section 4(d). The last five of these are presented in H.R. 9162 not as special provisions (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) but rather as separate subsections and are lettered (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i). It seems important to me that these special provisions are clearly presented as exceptions and are not presented as though they are considered by Congress as characteristic of wilderness as such. Accordingly I have ventured to call attention to this and have seen that these provisions are numbered as among the bill's seven "special provisions."

PROVISIONS REGARDING MINING

Both Mr. Saylor's bill and the one introduced by Mr. DINGELL and others have made an effort to meet objections raised by those interested in mining provisions within the areas of wilderness to be protected under this act. Once again the provisions of H.R. 9070 appear preferable to me, and I have accordingly adopted them.

These provisions I have adopted to recognize that there may be occasions in particular areas where mining may become more important than continued wilderness preservation. This also is recognized in the Senate-passed S. 4 and in earlier bills introduced in the House. The objection, however, has been raised that the Senate act and the comparable House bills do not make possible a knowledge of what minerals may thus be available.

Accordingly there is an added provision for an inventory that will lead to an understanding of the minerals within our areas of wilderness even though we do not wish to use them as minerals, except in a case of actual need. This seems highly reasonable. We know, for example, what the forests are within wilderness areas, although we do not wish to cut them for timber except in actual need. So we may well know what minerals we have.

H.R. 9162 and its companions, on the other hand, go so far as to permit the continuance for 10 years of mining where it now exists in areas of wilderness that will be protected by this act. This seems unnecessarily hazardous to the relatively small remnant of wilderness that is available to us for protection, and accordingly I have rejected this provision in the bill that I am introducing.

I am glad to make plain the differences which I have been discussing by quoting the exact language in each.

The mining provision of H.R. 9162 and its companions is in section 4(d)(2) as follows:

> Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, until midnight December 31, 1973, laws of the United States pertaining to mineral leasing and mining shall, to the same extent as applicable prior to the effective date of this Act, extend to those lands designated by this Act as "wilderness areas"; subject, however, to such reasonable regulations governing ingress and egress as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture consistent with the use of the land for mineral location and development and exploration, drilling, and production, and use of land for transmission lines, waterlines, telephone lines, or facilities necessary in exploring, drilling, producing, mining, and processing operations, including where essential the use of mechanized ground or air equipment, and restoration as near as practicable of the surface of the land disturbed in performing prospecting, location, and, in oil and gas leasing, discovery work, exploration, drilling, and production, as soon as they have served their purpose. Mining locations and patents to mining claims lying within the boundaries of said wilderness areas shall be held and used solely for mining or processing operations and uses reasonably incident thereto; and hereafter all patents issued under the mining laws of the United States affecting lands designated by this Act as wilderness areas shall convey title to the mineral deposits within the claim, together with the right to cut and use so much of the mature timber therefrom as may be needed in the extraction, removal, and beneficiation of the mineral deposits, if needed timber is not otherwise reasonably available, and if the timber is cut under sound principles of forest management as defined by the national forest rules and regulations, but each such patent shall reserve to the United States all title in or to the surface of the lands and products thereof, and no use of the surface of the claim or the resources therefrom not reasonably required for carrying on mining or prospecting shall be allowed except as otherwise expressly provided in this Act: *Provided,* That unless hereafter specifically authorized no patent within wilderness areas designated by this Act shall issue after December 31, 1973, except for valid claims filed on or before December 31, 1973. Mineral leases issued under the Mineral Leasing Act covering lands within wilderness areas designated by this Act shall contain such reasonable stipulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture for the protection of the wilderness character of the land consistent with the use of the land for the purposes for which they are leased. Subject to valid rights then existing, effective January 1, 1974, the minerals in lands designated by this Act as wilderness areas are withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the mining laws and from leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act and all amendments thereto.

The provisions of the bill that I am introducing, with regard to mining, are in section 4(d)(2) and section 4(d)(3) as follows:

> (2) Nothing in this Act shall prevent within national forest wilderness areas any activity, including prospecting for the purpose of gathering information about mineral or other resources, if such activity is carried on in a manner compatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment. Furthermore, in accordance with such program as the Secretary of the Interior shall develop and conduct in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, such areas shall be surveyed on a planned, recurring basis consistent with the concept of wilderness preservation by the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines to determine the mineral values, if any, that may be present; and the results of such surveys shall be made available to the public and submitted to the President and Congress.
>
> (3) Within wilderness areas in the national forests designated by or in accordance with this Act, (1) the President may, after public notice and hearings (except in time of national emergency) if there is sufficient demand, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including

but not limited to exploration for oil and gas), mining (including but not limited to the production of oil and gas), and the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water-conservation works, transmission lines, and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof, upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial; and (2) the grazing of livestock, where established prior to the effective date of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture.

TEXT OF THE BILL

There follows the complete text of my new bill, H.R. 9520, in which the portions differing from H.R. 9162 and its companion bills, H.R. 9163, H.R. 9164, and H.R. 9165, are shown in italic.

I would commend the authors of these bills for bringing forth constructive new proposals, but I would respectfully suggest that H.R. 9520 contains a sounder and a more satisfactory basis for action.

Whatever form is followed, however, I would urge that meaningful legislation be enacted without delay; that a wilderness program worthy of our great country be established.

H.R. 9520

A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Wilderness Act".

WILDERNESS SYSTEM ESTABLISHED—STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) In order to assure that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, does not occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions, leaving no lands designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness. For this purpose there is hereby established a National Wilderness Preservation System to be composed of federally owned areas designated by Congress as "wilderness areas", and these shall be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character, and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness; and no Federal lands shall be designated as "wilderness areas" except as provided for in this Act or by a subsequent Act.

DEFINITION OF WILDERNESS

(b) A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) has at least five thousand acres of land and is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value. *For the purposes of this Act wilderness shall include the areas provided for in this Act and such other areas as shall be designated in accordance with its provisions.*

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—EXTENT OF SYSTEM

SEC. 3. (a) All areas within the national forests classified on the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as "wilderness", "wild", or "canoe" are hereby designated as "wilderness areas." The Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(1) Within one year after the effective date of the Act, file a map and legal description of each wilderness area with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, and such descriptions shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal descriptions and maps may be made.

(2) Maintain, available to the public, records pertaining to said wilderness areas, including maps and legal descriptions, copies of regulations governing them, copies of public notices of, and reports submitted to Congress regarding pending additions, eliminations, or modifications. Maps, legal descriptions, and regulations pertaining to wilderness areas within their respective jurisdictions also shall be available to the public in the offices of regional foresters, national forest supervisors, and forest rangers.

(b) *In accordance with the time requirements of this subsection,* the Secretary of Agriculture shall review each area in the national forests classified on the effective date of this Act by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Forest Service as "primitive" as to its suitability for preservation and shall report his findings to the President. *Within three years after the enactment of this Act with regard to half of the total number of such areas, and within two additional years with regard to the remaining such areas,* the President shall advise the United States Senate and House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the designation as "wilderness" or declassification as "primitive" of each area on which review has been completed, together with maps and definition of boundaries: *Provided,* That the President may, as a part of his recommendations, propose alteration of the existing boundaries, recommending the elimination and declassification as "primitive" of any portions not predominantly of wilderness value, and recommending the addition of any contiguous area of national forest lands predominantly of wilderness value. Each such recommendation of the President shall become effective only if so provided by an Act of Congress, *and each such primitive area shall continue to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as on the date of this Act until Congress has acted on a recommendation of the President regarding the area, as provided in this subsection, or until Congress has determined otherwise.*

(c) *In accordance with the time requirements of this subsection* the Secretary of the Interior shall review all roadless portions *comprising five thousand or more contiguous acres* of parks, monuments, and other units of the national park system, and *such* portions of, or roadless islands within, wildlife refuges and game ranges under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior on the effective date of this Act and shall report to the President his recommendations as to the suitability of each such portion for continued preservation as wilderness. *Within three years after the enactment of this Act with regard to half the total number of such areas and within two additional years with regard to the remaining such areas,* the President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to the designation as wilderness of each such portion for which review has been completed, together with maps and definitions of boundaries. Each such recommendation shall become effective only if so provided by an Act of Congress, *and each such portion shall continue to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as roadless until Congress has acted on a recommendation of the President regarding the area, as provided in this subsection, or until Congress has determined otherwise.*

(d) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall, prior to submitting any recommendations to the President with respect to the suitability of any area for preservation as wilderness—

(A) give such public notice of the proposed action as they deem appropriate, including publication in the Federal Register and in a newspaper having general circulation in the area or areas in the vicinity of the affected land;

(B) hold a public hearing or hearings at a location or locations convenient to the area affected. The hearings shall be announced through such means as the respective Secretaries involved deem appropriate, including notices in the Federal Register and in newspapers of general circulation in the area: *Provided,* That if the lands involved are located in more than one State, at least one hearing shall be held in each State in which a portion of the land lies;

(C) at least thirty days before the date of a hearing advise the Governor of each State and the governing board of each county, or in Alaska the borough, in which the lands are located, and Federal departments and agencies concerned, and invite such officials and Federal agencies to submit their views on the proposed action at the hearing or by no later than thirty days following the date of the hearing.

(d) (2) Any views submitted to the appropriate Secretary under the provisions of (1) of this subsection with respect to any area shall be included with any recommendations to the President and to Congress with respect to such area.

(e) Any modification or adjustment of boundaries of any wilderness area shall be recommended by the appropriate Secretary after public notice of such proposal and public hearing or hearings as provided in subsection (d) of this section. The proposed modification or adjustment shall then be recommended with map and description thereof to the President. The President shall advise the United States Senate and the House of Representatives of his recommendations with respect to such modification or adjustment and such recommendations shall become effective only in the same manner as provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of this section.

USE OF WILDERNESS AREAS

SEC. 4. (a) The purposes of this Act are hereby declared to be within and supplemental to the purposes for which national forests and units of the national park and national wildlife refuge systems are established and administered and—

(1) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to be in interference with the purpose for which national forests are established as set forth in the Act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11), and the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 215).

(2) Nothing in this Act shall modify the restrictions and provisions of the Shipstead-Nolan Act (Public Law 539, Seventy-first Congress, July 10, 1930; 46 Stat. 1020), the Thye-Blatnik Act (Public Law 733, Eightieth Congress, June 22, 1948; 62 Stat. 568), and the Humphrey-Thye-Blatnik-Andresen Act (Public Law 607, Eighty-fourth Congress, June 22, 1956; 70 Stat. 326), as applying to the Superior National Forest or the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) The designation of any area of any park, monument, or other unit of the national park system as a wilderness area pursuant to this Act shall in no manner lower the standards evolved for the use and preservation of such park, monument, or other unit of the national park system in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916, the statutory authority under which the area was created, or any other Act of Congress which might pertain to or affect such area, including, but not limited to, the Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; 16 U.S.C. 432 et seq.); section 3(2) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796(2); and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.). *All accommodations and installations within any national park or monument shall, furthermore, be incident to the conservation and use and enjoyment of the scenery and the natural and historical objects and flora and fauna of the park or monument in its natural condition.*

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, each agency administering any area designated as wilderness shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area and shall so administer such area for such other purposes for which it may have been established as also to preserve its wilderness character. *Except as otherwise provided in this Act, wilderness areas shall be devoted to the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use. Subject to the provisions of this Act, all such use shall be in harmony, both in kind and degree, with the wilderness environment and with its preservation.*

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN USES

(c) Except as specifically provided for in this Act and subject to any existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise within wilderness areas designated by *or in accordance with this Act,* no permanent road, nor shall there be any use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or motorboats, or landing of aircraft, nor any other mechanical transport or delivery of persons or supplies, nor any temporary road, nor any structure or installation, in excess of the minimum required for the administration of the area for the purposes of this Act, including such measures as may be required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within such areas.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

(d) The following special provisions are hereby made:

(1) Within wilderness areas designated by *or in accordance with* this Act the use of aircraft or motorboats, where these uses have already become established, may be permitted to continue subject to such restrictions as the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior deems desirable. In addition, such measures may be taken as may be necessary in the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such conditions as the appropriate Secretary deems desirable.

(2) *Nothing in this Act shall prevent within national forest wilderness areas any activity, including prospecting, for the purpose of gathering information about mineral or other resources, if such activity is carried on in a manner compatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment. Furthermore, in accordance with such program as the Secretary of the Interior shall develop and conduct in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, such areas shall be surveyed on a planned, recurring basis consistent with the concept of wilderness preservation by the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines to determine the mineral values, if any, that may be present; and the results of such surveys shall be made available to the public and submitted to the President and Congress.*

(3) *Within wilderness areas in the national forests designated by or in accordance with this Act (1) the President may after public notice and hearings (except in times of national emergency) if there is sufficient demand, within a specific area and in accordance with such regulations as he may deem desirable, authorize prospecting (including but not limited to exploration for oil and gas), mining (including but not limited to the production of oil and gas), and the establishment and maintenance of reservoirs, water-conservation works, transmission lines,* and other facilities needed in the public interest, including the road construction and maintenance essential to development and use thereof, upon his determination that such use or uses in the specific area will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial; and (2) the grazing of livestock, where established prior to the effective date of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) Other provisions of this Act to the contrary notwithstanding, the management of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, formerly designated as the Superior, Little Indian Sioux, and Caribou Roadless Areas, in the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, shall be in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the general purpose of maintaining, without unnecessary restrictions on other uses, including that of timber, the primitive character of the area, particularly in the vicinity of lakes, streams, and portages: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall preclude the continuance within the area of any already established use of motorboats.

(5) Commercial services may be performed within the wilderness areas designated by *or in accordance with* this Act to the extent necessary for activities which are proper for realizing the recreational or other wilderness purposes of the areas.

(6) Nothing in this Act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws.

(7) To the extent that it is not incompatible with wilderness preservation, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, in national forest wilderness areas designated by *or in accordance with* this Act, permit hunting and fishing: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the several States with respect to wildlife and fish in wilderness areas.

STATE AND PRIVATE LANDS WITHIN WILDERNESS AREAS

Sec. 5. (a) In any case where State-owned land is completely surrounded by lands designated as wilderness, such State shall be given either (1) such rights as may be necessary to assure adequate access to such State-owned land by such State and its successors in interest, or (2) vacant, unreserved, and unappropriated mineral or nonmineral lands in the same State, not exceeding the value of the surrounded land, in exchange for the surrounded land: *Provided, however,* That the United States shall not transfer to State any mineral interests unless the State relinquishes or causes to be relinquished to the United States the mineral interest in the surrounded land.

(b) In any case where privately owned lands, valid mining claims, or other valid occupancies are wholly within a designated national forest wilderness area, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, by reasonable regulations consistent with the preservation of the area as wilderness, permit ingress and egress to such surrounded areas by means which have been or are being customarily enjoyed with respect to other such areas similarly situated.

(c) Subject to the appropriation of funds by Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture *and the Secretary of the Interior* are authorized to acquire privately owned land within the perimeter of any area designated as wilderness if (1) the owner concurs in such acquisition or (2) the acquisition is specifically authorized by Congress.

GIFTS, BEQUESTS, AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Sec. 6. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture *and the Secretary of the Interior* may accept gifts or bequests of land within or adjacent to wilderness areas under their respective jurisdictions for preservation as wilderness, and such land shall, on acceptance, become part of the wilderness area. Regulations with regard to any such land may be in accordance with such agreements, consistent with the policy of this Act, as are made at the time of such gift, or such conditions, consistent with such policy, as may be included in, and accepted with, such bequest.

(b) *The Secretary of the Interior and* the Secretary of Agriculture are each authorized to accept private contributions and gifts to be used to further the purposes of this Act. *Any such contributions or gifts shall, for purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, be considered a contribution or gift to or for the use of the United States for an exclusively public purpose, and may be deducted as such under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, subject to all applicable limitations and restrictions contained therein.*

ANNUAL REPORTS

Sec. 7. At the opening of each session of Congress, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior shall jointly report to the President for transmission to Congress on the status of the wilderness system, including a list and descriptions of the areas in the system, regulations in effect, and other pertinent information, together with any recommendations they may care to make.

REVIEW OF THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the record of the congressional session just ended reveals a remarkable contrast between what critics often said Congress was doing and what Congress actually did. It was a session of substantial achievement, marked by a most sweeping set of bills designed to upgrade the country's educational system.

The achievements were not easily reached; the 1st session of the 88th Congress met for approximately 11½ months, and progress on bills and appropriations often seemed slow. But what counts is what has happened in the completed session, not the difficulties along the way.

Judged by this standard, the session could be called satisfactory. The educational policy asserted was a simple one: the Federal Government accepted responsibility for helping finance our school systems with a major transfusion of Federal funds.

One bill plowed new ground by authorizing a 6-year program of loans to students in the health field and a 3-year program of matching Federal grants for the construction and rehabilitation of medical, dental, and related professional schools.

A second bill authorized $1.2 billion across 3 years for grants and loans of Federal money for construction of public and private higher education facilities of all types—a total of some 2,100 colleges and universities being eligible.

A third bill authorized a major new program of vocational education, going far beyond the area of what in the past has been considered "vocational." This program is designed to finance the development of livelihood skills among our people; it recognizes that science and technology are changing the nature of job opportunities, that more complex training is needed by workers.

President Johnson remarked, after the second of these bills was passed:

> This Congress is well on its way to doing more for education than any Congress since the Land Grant College Act was passed 100 years ago.

It is indeed exactly 100 years since the Civil War Congress passed the Land Grant Act, sponsored by Senator Morrill, of Vermont. From the passage of that act the people developed our great system of State universities.

It seems clear that Congress in 1963 has scored another breakthrough. A great deal of care and hard work is needed to produce approval of new Federal programs. The proposal for aid to medical students and medical schools, for example, has been studied since 1951, before General Eisenhower was elected President. It has taken us 12 years to get that program alone, entirely apart from the broader programs of vocational education and college aid. Yet this year all three were passed.

The vocational education bill was an instrument for renewal of two other Federal projects—special assistance to colleges in fields particularly related to national defense and special assistance to primary and secondary social school systems required to meet the needs of children of Federal employees—the so-called federally impacted school districts.

The 88th Congress, in short, voted hundreds of millions of dollars to upgrade our people's educational potential. The parallel drawn with the Morrill Land Grant Act, which contributed federally owned public lands to promote education, is an excellent one.

This session met, for the past month, under the shadow of the savage, senseless assassination of President Kennedy. The impact was as shocking inside the Government as to the general public. The brutality of the deed contributed to the sorrow at the result.

The Nation will not soon forget the bright if brief career of John Fitzgerald Kennedy in the White House, in my belief. He brought a courage, a spirit of initiative, a gaiety and tone that strengthened the hearts of many. He was controversial indeed; many of his policies were controversial, as are the policies of all strong Presidents. He was only 46 years old when he died, victim of a witless murder, but he opened new avenues of national thought, new avenues of achievement, which we may walk for decades.

The Nation was fortunate indeed that President Kennedy in 1960 insisted that his Vice Presidential running-mate should be the then Senator Lyndon Johnson, whose experience and insight into our affairs equipped him admirably for the succession. The strength with which the new President took over gave heart to our people, gave us a feeling of continuity, a faith that our Government could surmount any challenge.

No Member of Congress across the past quarter of a century has been better informed than President Johnson in public policy. He bore the heavy burdens of Senate Democratic leadership most loyally and skillfully; he was a great help to former President Eisenhower in the field of foreign affairs for 8 years, when an irresponsible Democratic leader might greatly have handicapped a Republican Chief Executive. He is forthright, honorable, forward looking, and strong. He is well trained in both foreign problems and domestic affairs. The Members of Congress look with confidence to a fruitful relationship.

We are going into a new election year. The issues, as usual will be debated with full candor, and each of our great political parties will take its ultimate appeal to the people. The campaign, I am sure, will be hard fought as it has been in the past. But the relationship of Congress and the President will nevertheless be fruitful and cooperative. Partisanship is part of our system, but in the critical issues partisanship is never allowed to be paramount.

Having discussed the key achievement in Congress of a broad new educational program, let me review some other significant accomplishments.

Congress passed a bill providing that working women must be paid equal wages with men for equal work. The law does not protect all women workers, because the Federal Government has power to regulate only interstate commerce, leaving to the States the protection of workers in local and State business enterprises. A principle has been established, however, that the States can be expected to extend.

Congress authorized Federal funds to help the States build community mental health centers and to promote research into the increasingly serious problem of mental illness. It is a pioneering step. There is not a State unburdened by heavy costs for its mental institutions, not a State which has a wholly adequate research program in the causes and cure of mental ailments. The Federal Government has now moved to throw its resources into the field.

Congress also passed a pioneering law to undergo research into the causes and cure of air pollution, which is a major contributing cause of diseases of the respiratory and cardiac systems.

Congress passed a new law in the area of farm programs, an act to support the production of small grains, and new statutes in regard to wheat and cotton are expected early next session.

Congress renewed and expanded the brandnew 1961 Manpower Development and Training Act, which is a pilot operation in meeting joblessness caused by automation and technical changes, and educating and retraining displaced workers to earn their living again in new jobs.

An enormous amount of progress was made, in addition, in laying the groundwork for major programs that can be completed in 1964.

The House Judiciary Committee reported a comprehensive human rights bill with bipartisan support, and the process has begun of getting the bill to the floor. The civil rights program had the support of President Kennedy; it immediately got the support of President Johnson, who helped put through the civil rights measures of 1957 and 1960.

If we can continue to receive bipartisan support, a strong civil rights bill will be passed.

The House passed a sweeping tax-reduction bill, designed to bolster purchasing power and cut down the unemployment left hanging from the three last recessions of 1953–54, 1957–58, and 1960–61. The Senate Finance Committee has completed hearings and is now writing its own tax measure; we can be reasonably sure that a law will come out of the adjustments necessary between the two Houses of Congress.

Our tax system will be more equitable as a result; it will ease the burdens; and it will stimulate business so that a temporary loss of revenue through tax cuts can be more than balanced by increased business activity and earning power.

The Senate passed bills on youth employment and a national service corps on which the House has not yet completed action. The Senate also passed a measure to extend the Area Redevelopment Act. The House approved a civil defense program on shelters.

The House Ways and Means Committee, one of the most respected committees of Congress, began hearings in November on an administration bill to provide hospital and nursing-home care to aged citizens under the social security system. These hearings will be resumed in January, and votes may be expected on such a program.

In addition, the Senate ratified the limited nuclear test ban treaty negotiated under President Kennedy's initiative. Senator MANSFIELD, the Senate Democratic leader, lists this as the greatest accomplishment of the session just ended. It may prove a permanent Kennedy contribution, for the treaty gave the first glimpse of a future in which the constant threat of nuclear war might be lifted.

Our affairs, in summary, have been conducted prudently and effectively, and under President Johnson this prudence and effectiveness may be expected to continue. The "dollar drain" from the deficit in the balance of payments has been sharply reduced. The budget has not been balanced, but the answer is being sought through measures to get the jobless back to work, to restore millions to active, wage-earning, taxpaying jobs in our economy.

The record of three sessions of Congress with our late President shows remarkable progress—a new concept of job responsibility and minimum wages, a new concept of foreign trade to expand our exports, a vast new uplifting of investment in education at every level, from elementary schools to the college and graduate schools.

The stalemate that characterized the postwar years up until President Kennedy has been broken. We are moving forward to meet new problems and find solutions that will contribute to the security and well-being of our people a quarter century and a half century from now. Each session that served with the late President had a productive record in which our people could share a sense of accomplishment of moving forward again.

Our own congressional district is abundantly blessed with water courses and rivers, and under the Constitution the Federal Government has direct responsibility for navigable streams and has long accepted responsibility for flood control. I am happy to report that funds were voted for a number of projects in and near the counties of Madison and St. Clair that make up the district.

An additional $300,000 was provided to continue construction of flood control facilities in East St. Louis and the vicinity.

Another $300,000 was voted to continue preconstruction planning on the Kaskaskia River canalization project, which in the end is estimated as a $60 million development.

Another $100,000 was made available for preconstruction planning of flood control facilities on Richland Creek at Belleville.

Still another $400,000 was provided for continued construction of the emergency dam at Chain of Rocks to keep open navigation channels threatened by the low-water levels of recent years.

In areas outside the immediate 24th District but affecting the interests of the people living in it, there are two significant projects. Construction of the Shelbyville Reservoir was furthered by provision of $1 million, and another $5.7 million was made available for construction of the Carlyle Reservoir, which upon completion will help control floodwaters that in the past have devastated our communities and will also provide a major recreational facility for the use of all residents of our State.

Each session of Congress must be judged by its tone and style in dealing with a variety of issues, some of which may seem relatively small, or at least limited in impact. I often think that one of the significant tests is the care and attention paid to the veterans who served the Nation in time of war.

The recent session passed a number of bills in this field, bills very carefully drafted to forestall abuses but providing benefits that are significant to those needing them. One measure, for example, permits veterans to elect a new modified insurance plan with lower total premiums in exchange for lower benefits after age 65. The cost is lower and the benefit higher when the veteran has the greatest need to protect his dependent children.

Other measures provide increased benefits to veterans suffering from total speech loss or service-connected deafness. Another increases burial benefits and allowances to children and dependent parents of deceased veterans. Another allows the payment of burial benefits where a veteran's discharge is legitimately changed from dishonorable to other than honorable.

These bills, as I say, are limited in scope. But they show respect for those who served the Nation; they show a humane consideration of need. I consider them important.

The Congressional Record of December 2 carried a summary of activity up through November 30. The various committees of the House had studied and reported; that is, given approval to 580 measures originating in the House and 61 originating in the Senate. Senate committees had reported 298 measures of Senate origin, 192 of House origin.

Both Houses had completed action on 189 public bills—bills affecting the general public interest as distinguished from private bills for the relief of individual inequities—such as hardship cases under the immigration laws or claims against the Government. A grand total of 812 measures had been passed by the House and 699 by the Senate; these figures include bills, joint resolutions, concurrent resolutions, and what are called simple resolutions. There were 95 rollcalls in the House, calling on members to stand up and be counted on public issues, and 205 rollcalls in the Senate.

In addition, the Senate passed on more than 2,700 Presidential nominations for civilian posts in the executive and judicial departments. Such nominations are not given merely token consideration; it is unusual for an appointment to be rejected, but some are withdrawn and action is delayed on other nominations pending additional information on the persons proposed.

President Kennedy this year vetoed only one bill passed by Congress; the Congress did not override the veto and the President's disapproval therefore was final.

Much of the work of Congress, as I emphasize each year, is done in committee. In the House, most Members serve on only one legislative committee at a time, and in the course of extensive hearings each year they frequently become experts in the areas of committee interest. It is matter of great satisfaction to the House that in most cases the direction and thrust of legislation are initially defined in House committees, where witnesses have ample time to present their views and where the issues are clearly understood.

I have now served for many years on the House Armed Services Committee, which initiates the annual authorization for the expenditures in national defense. I have also served for years on a joint House-Senate committee, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which oversees the whole field of nuclear development. In these significant committees I have concentrated on broad issues of research, the lifeblood of our defense system, and the development of new projects.

For some years I have served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. This past year I was named chairman of a newly created research and development subcommittee of the standing House Armed Services Committee. These two subcommittees have jurisdiction in originating authorization of approximately two-thirds of all Government expenditures in this enormously important field.

The House of Representatives this year set up by special resolution its own select committee to consider all Government research programs, nondefense as well as defense, and inquire into their scope and effectiveness, and I was named by Speaker McCormack as a member of this blue-ribbon group.

It is a source of great satisfaction to report that President Kennedy in his term greatly strengthened the Nation's security, adding a balance and flexibility to our Armed Forces that had been allowed to lapse. Our forces in being are larger and better trained; they can be concentrated faster and more smoothly. We are better equipped to meet the wide variety of challenges flung in the cold war—so-called brushfire wars as well as the kind of major confrontation that made the Soviet Union back down last year and pull its missiles out of Cuba.

I have not agreed with every policy in national defense. In the Armed Services Committee I stood with the wise and experienced gentleman from Georgia, Chairman Carl Vinson, in supporting additional investment in the RS-70, a 2,000-mile-an-hour manned warplane, as an essential part of balanced defense. I hope that the administration will take a new look at the RS-70 and give support to its development. In addition, I thought an unwise decision was made in bowing to economy arguments and planning a new aircraft carrier with a conventional powerplant rather than nuclear power. It is my considered viewpoint that building an aircraft carrier the size of the *Enterprise*, and seeking to "save money" by using old-fashioned propulsion methods, would be matched by the railroads; buying old-fashioned steam locomotives when experience has shown that diesel power is superior. Our fleet must be modern and up to date, no matter what the expense, because no expense could be comparable to the disaster of a lost war.

But in the main the shortsighted emphasis of the past, in which our faith was put wholly in the "nuclear deterrent," has been reversed, and all our

Armed Forces have been restored to health and vigor. Our strategic concepts are better; our choice of weapons is broader; our tactical capacities are strong. It has been a remarkable achievement.

GOVERNMENT WHEAT SCHEDULED FOR DELIVERY TO AUSTRIA IN BARTER TRANSACTION HAS NOT BEEN DELIVERED IN LINE WITH THE AGREEMENT

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, to include a report by the Appropriations Committee investigators, together with a further request for investigation, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the attention of our Appropriations Committee was called to the fact that Government wheat which had been scheduled for delivery to Austria in a barter transaction had not been delivered in line with the agreement. At that time the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, of which I am chairman, requested a thorough investigation by the Appropriations Committee investigators.

These investigators have now submitted to us quite a bit of information with regard to these transactions, and they are engaged in further efforts to find out all the facts. In that connection I attach herewith copy of statement submitted to our committee. The name of the German company and the New Orleans firm are known to our committee; but I have omitted them from the statement because we do not wish to make charges against any firm until all the facts have been obtained.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit a request we are making for a followup on the grain transactions, as well as another request for full information on the report of recent irregularities in commodity trading in soybean and cottonseed oils on "cash" and "futures" markets.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture is itself engaged in tracing these matters down, although with regard to many of them there is real question of where the responsibility lies for handling of the transactions as well as for the followup. I assure the House that the Appropriations Committee expects to follow through on these matters.

1. PERTINENT PROVISIONS OF THE BARTER CONTRACT AND PROCEDURES FOR ENFORCEMENT

The most pertinent provision in the barter contracts from the standpoint of this investigation is found in article XIII of the Uniform Barter Contractual Provisions—form CCC-111—incorporated by reference into all such contracts. This article covers export requirements and holds the barter contractor and his commodity agent to the warranty that no portion of the commodity obtained from CCC for export only, under the contract, will be transshipped out of the country to which it is destined under the contract. He, in turn, must include this provision in his contract with the foreign purchaser. In proof of export he is required to furnish that amount of proof as required by the U.S. Department of Agriculture—USDA—commodity office furnishing the commodity. The article further provides that shipment must be to an "eligible" country and to a "friendly foreign country."

Under the terms of these uniform contracts, Austria is the only country in West Europe fully eligible to receive barter shipments of feed grain under openend contracts, that is, where there is no requirement that the strategic material received in barter must come in direct exchange either from the country receiving the feed grain or from a third country. Moreover, USDA has never prescribed for its commodity offices a uniform requirement relative to proof that the commodity has been exported and, in the main, these offices have been content with a copy of the ocean bill of lading. This bill of lading shows that the commodity has been exported but does not offer any proof that it has reached the qualified country of destination and USDA never adopted, during the period of the diversion of feed grains shipped to Austria, any procedure for providing such assurance other than the warranty of the shipper—American commodity agent. Further, the American commodity agent himself has no proof other than the required contractual provision, and in some few instances a copy of a forwarding certificate showing that the shipment has been unloaded at a European port and reloaded for transshipment to Austria. Even this certificate is no guarantee that the shipment will arrive in the qualified country. Thus, even though the contracts do provide for liquidated damages in the event of breach of contract, the discovery of such breach would be by the most chance coincidence. Particularly is this true inasmuch as USDA had not set up any procedure to statistically establish that the total of all such shipments exported from the United States to any country had, in fact, been imported into such country.

2. EXTENT OF THE DIVERSION

Although indications of possible diversions of grain shipped to Austria came to USDA's attention in the fall of 1961, the joint USDA-State Department investigation was not initiated until January 1963. This investigation has disclosed that for the fiscal years 1959 to 1962 a total of 1,010,380 metric tons of feed grain—corn, barley, and sorghums—were exported by the United States under the barter program with destination as Austria. As of November 1963, it had been determined that, of this total, 568,428 metric tons did not arrive in Austria and were diverted to other countries. An additional 13,500 tons have not yet been accounted for and recent investigation indicates that some part of this tonnage likewise was diverted. The Austrian importers to whom the known diversions were destined are the following:

	Metric tons
M. Friesacher & Sohne	301, 865
Prochaska et Cie	175, 667
H. & H. Putz	33, 299
International Getreide	55, 768
Friedrich Glatz	1, 829
Total	568, 428

The great bulk of the diverted tonnage was unloaded at the ports of Hamburg and Bremen, Germany. Of the total diverted tonnage, 448,656 metric tons thus far have been accounted for by investigation conducted in West Germany, where investigation is still in progress. Final destination of this tonnage accounted for were as follows:

	Metric tons
Quantity remaining in Federal Republic of Germany	266, 163
Quantity received by other countries:	
Denmark	65, 007
Netherlands	50, 502
Sweden	30, 915
Austria (relabeled as Argentine grain and reshipped to Austria)	10, 500
East Germany	10, 015
England	6, 710
Liechtenstein	2, 815
Switzerland	2, 671
Belgium	2, 258
Norway	1, 100
Total	448, 656

The initial investigation at Hamburg, Germany, was at the company and was predicated upon the receipt of information by the Austrian Economic Police to the effect that his firm acted only as a dummy for the German company, who was the true purchaser. According to a deposition to the Austrian Economic Police, the German firm made payment to the American supplier in the name of an Austrian through Swiss banks as a result of which the name of the German firm did not appear in the transactions. The Austrian Economic Police had also received information from International Getreide that this firm had sold its barter grain to an Austrian firm. Hamburg authorities, at the time of the staff's visit, had identified 327,889 metric tons as having been purchased by the company. Of this quantity, 148,307 tons was transshipped to other Western European countries and 179,582 remained in West Germany.

The investigation so far conducted reveals that of the total of 568,428 metric tons of grain which did not reach Austria, 448,656 metric tons, or 79 percent, have been accounted for by investigation in Germany, leaving remaining diversions of 119,772 metric tons still to be accounted for. Through arrangements made while in Europe, the staff is receiving current information with respect to the results of the continuing investigation at Hamburg, Bremen, and Rotterdam. Additional dispositions of the diverted grain may be available before completion of the staff's report. This investigation in progress at the three aforementioned ports, when completed, should account for most of the remaining 119,772 metric tons.

In connection with the diversion of grain to Germany, it will be noted that the investigation conducted to date discloses that a shipment of 10,015 metric tons of barter grain—barley and corn—exported from the United States in 1960 moved into East Germany where it was consigned to Deutsche Innen und Aussenhandel, the official East German trading agency. Of this shipment, 8,186 metric tons upon departure from the United States was destined for ——— Co. of Vienna, Austria, as buyer, and the balance of 1,829 tons was consigned to Austrian importer, ———, as buyer. Transshipment of this grain occurred at Hamburg, Germany, through the free port under controlled customs supervision. This is the only shipment to date which was found to have entered East Germany, or any other Soviet bloc country.

3. STRATEGIC MATERIALS RECEIVED FOR BARTERED GRAIN

Over $200 million worth of strategic materials have been received in connection with the barter contracts involved in the shipment of grain intended for Austria—which include the portions diverted. It is not possible to physically identify the specific materials received in return for the grain intended for Austria. The strategic materials received were, for the most part, commingled with similar material in the Government's stockpile and thus have lost their identity with the specific barter contract under which they were received. General Services Administration inspection procedures at the time such materials are received by the Government from the barter contractor serve to assure that this material meets Government specifications and that full value is received in return for the bartered grain. With respect to the barter contracts in which the diversions are involved, full value has been received. The nature of the commodities received in exchange for the barter grain included industrial diamonds, antimony, manganese, ferrochrome, and other metals.

4. RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE DIVERSION

Investigation to date has established that the diversion was knowingly accomplished by at least four Austrian grain importers who have been charged with violations of Austrian law. Two additional Austrian importers, also charged with violations of Austrian law which were developed during the Austrian investigation, may ultimately be found to have contributed to the diversion. Investigation clearly shows that West German grain importers conspired to obtain the diverted grain and at least one of these importers is conclusively identified. Because West Germany was not eligible to receive feed grains under the barter program, these German importers were motivated to obtain the grains at the lower prices available under the barter program. Investigation has raised the suspicion that certain officials of the Austrian Government may have closed their eyes to the apparent diversion, but there is no clear evidence to establish this. There is no suspicion attached to officials of the West German Government.

As pointed out, the diversion was made possible by the lack of established controls by USDA to discover any infractions of the barter contracts and to enforce the provisions thereof. No evidence has been developed to indicate that the American barter contractors were in any way involved in the conspiracy to divert the feed grains. However, there are strong suspicions to indicate that their commodity agents—U.S. grain exporters—may at least have had knowledge of the diversion, if not an actual party to the conspiracy. Insufficient investigation has been conducted to establish conclusive evidence thereof; there is circumstantial evidence indicating involvement of ——— Co. of New Orleans.

The joint investigation of the executive branch begun in January 1963 is continuing and should establish the destination of all diverted grains and possibly will shed more light on the culpability of those responsible for the diversion, particularly with respect to the American commodity agents. The results of the joint investigation to date have been brought to the attention of the Department of Justice and are under consideration there as to possible civil and/or criminal action against American commodity agents. In the meanwhile, it is reasonable to expect that the oversea investigation by the executive branch will extend well into 1964 and cannot possibly be completed in January 1964, as originally hoped. For the majority of the 10-month period of investgiation thus far pursued by the executive branch, two investigators were assigned. The adequacy and pace of this investigation will be the subject of comment in the staff's report.

DECEMBER 17, 1963.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It will be appreciated if, in accordance with the provisions of section 202(b) of Public Law 601, 79th Congress, you will direct that the investigation ordered on August 20, 1963, concerning alleged diversion of feed grain shipments to Austria be extended to develop additional information on the following points:

(a) Names and location of all United States and foreign concerns involved in this matter.

(b) Quantities and value of diverted grain handled by each, with detailed information on purchase price, sales price and profits made on each transaction.

(c) Legal recourse, if any, against the German company ——— of West Germany, the Austrian importers ——— and company of New Orleans, and all other dealers involved.

(d) Names of State Department, foreign aid and USDA officials responsible for auditing, reporting on and enforcing provisions of barter contracts under Public Law 480.

(e) Actions proposed by officials of these agencies to prevent recurrence of such irregularities.

(f) Other important and pertinent information which should be brought to the attention of the House Appropriations Committee.

Also, it is requested that an investigation be made of recent developments involving alleged irregularities in commodity trading in soybean and cottonseed oils on "cash" and "futures" markets. The following information is requested.

(a) Names and locations of all individuals and organizations involved in such transactions.

(b) Quantities and value of commodities involved, with detailed information on purchase and sales prices and profits involved.

(c) Legal action taken or expected against these involved.

(d) Additional legislation needed to prevent similar transactions in the future.

(e) Other significant and pertinent information.

Sincerely yours,
Approved:

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.
BEN F. JENSEN,
Ranking minority member, Committee on Appropriations.
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture Appropriations.
WALT HORAN,
Ranking minority member, Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture Appropriations.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt as to who leads the free world. President Johnson's speech to the United Nations this week clearly established our new Chief Executive in that role. The President made a deep and favorable impression on delegates to the U.N., on other world leaders, and on the press. Every American can be proud of the response to his address. Two items in the New York Journal-American of December 18 make that clear.

One is an editorial as follows:

L.B.J. AT U.N.

President Johnson has made an auspicious debut before the United Nations, many of whose members, for one reason or another were anxious to take the measure of the new leader of the free world.

The President made no new and startling pronouncements, but perhaps this was in keeping with his emphasis that there is no "Johnson policy" to the United Nations, as there was no "Kennedy policy" but merely a U.S. policy.

He made appropriate and detailed reference to the late John F. Kennedy, whose assassination still haunts and disturbs all at the U.N. who are sincere in the quest for lasting peace. And he left no doubt as to his personal views of the world organization by depicting it as the most effective instrument yet devised to achieve that peace.

With solemnity and dignity, the President urged an end to the cold war—once and for all—and placed the United States squarely in the ranks of those marching against hunger, disease, and ignorance.

Johnson drew resounding applause, an ovation joined by all present except the representatives of Cuba and Albania—an omission certainly adding to the stature of the address. Our new President has awesome tasks and responsibilities to face, and on the rostrum of the U.N. he looked like a man equal to the task.

The other is an article by Pierre J. Huss, as follows:

L.B.J. Gave Our Prestige a Big Boost, U.N. Delegates Say

(By Pierre J. Huss)

United Nations Headquarters, December 18.—U.N. delegates preparing to return to their homelands after adjournment of the 18th annual General Assembly today said President Johnson won considerable prestige for U.S. world leadership in pledging a stronger peace and calling for the end to the cold war.

Consensus among representatives of the 1,000 diplomats from around the world who heard the tall and trim American Chief Executive in the blue and gold Assembly auditorium indicates that he won the day by pledging undiminished U.S. support for U.N. and his call for joint efforts by the nations to eradicate hunger, disease, and ignorance.

A particularly heavy impact came from his assurances to the 113-nation assembly that U.S. foreign policy and objectives are guided by the principles laid down by the late President Kennedy.

A MAN TO TRUST

By now it has become clear that if President Johnson's strategy in coming to U.N. on the Assembly's last day was to create a favorable impression and personal imprint of him in delegates' minds, he succeeded beyond the most optimistic expectations.

Many of the Afro-Asians and Latin Americans said they would report to their governments that the new American President, if strikingly different in method and personality from the youthful magnetism of President Kennedy, is "a man we can look to and trust and certainly accept as a foremost world leader."

The final act of closing was a minute of silence in which all in the chamber stood with bowed heads. Then Assembly President Carlos Sosa-Rodriguez, of Venezuela, rapped the gavel for adjournment at 9 p.m. last night. The Assembly began its annual session exactly 3 months ago on September 17.

LEAST CONTROVERSIAL

On the whole, the Assembly sat during the least controversial months of its existence, and in fact was spared even a minor crisis. President Kennedy staged a personal visit to U.N. on September 20 and in a major foreign policy address challenged the Soviet Union to cooperate in ending the cold war and join the United States in a manned expedition to the moon.

The Soviet Union limited its participation to familiar Moscow propaganda lines on disarmament, colonialism, and "peaceful coexistence" speeches.

THE HONORABLE CHARLES E. CLARK, JUDGE OF THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the man who did more than any other to create modern rules of procedure for our Federal courts and thereby to strengthen our Federal court structure, died on December 9, 1963. Judge Charles E. Clark of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit died at his home in New Haven, Conn., quietly and peacefully at age 74, after a full and energetic lifetime of constructive work in law and teaching.

At the time of Judge Clark's sudden death he was in the middle of making plans for new adventures that would advance and strengthen the administration of justice in our country and build the rule of law everywhere. Judge Clark was first a teacher. Yale University is a great center of learning because of men like Judge Clark. For 10 years he was dean of the Yale Law School and before that a teacher for many years at the school. He was appointed to the Federal Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in 1939 and became chief judge in 1954. His opinions were masterpieces of scholarly writing and advanced the law into all the reaches of modern day life. He gave life and luster to the scholarly arts, to writing and teaching, to school administration, to the building of case law, and to the whole community which he served. All of us who knew Judge Clark will remember his wonderful twinkle, his chuckle and his happiness when he was with young people. He was so proud of his family and took so much comfort and joy from them that he gave pleasure to all who saw his happiness. Judge Clark's lovely wife, Dorothy, has many friends, young and old, who will share her memories and her bereavement. She was half his strength and we thank her for sharing him with us.

The sympathies of all who knew and admired "Charlie" Clark are with his dear Dorothy and with the Clark family and, if I may be permitted a personal note, the special sympathies of the Lindsay family go to our friend, Prof. Elias Clark of the Yale Law School, son of the judge, and to his lovely wife, Ann, and their seven children. The Clarks will carry on in this world for a long, long time to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point the obituary of Judge Clark that appeared in the New York Times on December 14.

Charles Clark, Ex-Chief Judge of U.S. Appeals Court, Is Dead

Judge Charles E. Clark of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit died Thursday night in his home at 36 Laurel Road, Hamden, Conn. He was 74 years old last Monday.

Judge Clark was appointed to the court in 1939 after 10 years as dean of the Yale University Law School. In 1954 he became chief judge of the Federal court, serving until 1959, when he reached the mandatory retirement age of 70. He then became an associate judge again. The court, one of the most important in the country, embraces New York, Connecticut, and Vermont.

Judge Clark was described yesterday by his colleague, Chief Judge J. Edward Lumbard, as "the principal architect of the Federal rules of procedure who led the way in liberalizing the judicial process and making our court machinery more efficient, useful, and inexpensive."

Judge Lumbard was referring to Judge Clark's service from 1935 to 1956 on the advisory committee on civil procedure of the U.S. Supreme Court. The committee prepared the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which were adopted for all Federal trial courts and copied by many State courts.

HONORED BY YALE

Judge Clark's work, in the field of judicial reform was recognized by Yale University in 1962 when it conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of laws. The citation described him as "an architect of court reform," who had "helped free the judicial process from obstructive and useless procedural technicalities."

Judge Clark was 5 feet 11 inches tall, with broad shoulders, blue eyes, a shock of iron-gray hair and a pleasant, almost cherubic countenance that could, however, become stern when occasion demanded.

His colleagues remember him as a warmhearted jurist, a scholar in the law, whose interest in students during his days at Yale Law School was reflected in a kindly attitude toward young lawyers who appeared in his court.

He was regarded as a liberal who viewed the law in the light of changing social and economic conditions.

He concurred in the unanimous ruling of the court of appeals on November 25, 1960, reversing the conspiracy conviction of 20 men who attended the meeting of alleged underworld leaders at Apalachin, N.Y., in 1957.

The court held that the Government's evidence in the district court trial was insufficient to prove that the alleged conspirators had made an agreement to lie to investigative bodies about the purpose of their meeting.

He also took part in the court's unanimous decision of August 4, 1958, reversing the conviction of six secondary Communist leaders for conspiracy to violate the Smith Act. The court ruled that mere teaching or advocacy of forcible overthrow of the Government did not amount to the "call to action" required to constitute violation of the law.

Judge Clark, who was born in Woodridge, Conn., was graduated from Yale College in 1911 and Yale Law School in 1913. He was admitted to the Connecticut bar the same year.

After 6 years of private law practice, he began his teaching career at Yale law and advanced through the academic ranks. His deanship was notable for a reorganization of the law school's curriculum to place more emphasis on the social functions of the law, including the interrelation between law and commerce, sociology, medicine, psychology, and economics.

SUPPORTED ROOSEVELT

Judge Clark, a Republican, was active in Connecticut politics and served on several committees seeking to improve the State government. He was a special assistant U.S. Attorney General in 1938, serving in the antitrust division. He supported many of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal policies, including the proposal for enlarging the Supreme Court.

He wrote and collaborated on several books and articles on legal subjects. He was a member of several national, State, and local bar associations and professional groups, including the American Judicature Society.

Surviving are his widow, Dorothy E. Gregory Clark; a daughter, Sarah Ann Hall; a son, Charles E., a member of the Yale Law School faculty, and two brothers, Samuel O. and Theodore.

A funeral service will be held on Monday at 2 p.m. in Battell Chapel of Yale University.

LINDSAY PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AMENDMENT

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **LINDSAY.** Mr. Speaker, in 1959 an amendment to the Housing Act was offered on the floor of the House by me during debate on the housing bill and was accepted by the House. The amendment required full public disclosure of all proposed contracts having to do with urban renewal areas, prior to such contracts being entered into by the various local public agencies.

The Lindsay public disclosure amendment is now part of the basic law. Because of a change in the language of the original amendment made by the Senate there has been some misunderstanding as to the intent of the Lindsay amendment.

I believe that an exchange of letters between Commissioner William L. Slayton of the Urban Renewal Administration and me has clarified the amendment. In order to improve urban renewal procedures in communities in the United States I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point this correspondence.

AUGUST 7, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM L. SLAYTON,
Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER SLAYTON: As you are undoubtedly aware, I offered, and the Congress adopted, an amendment to the Housing Act of 1949, section 103(a), which provided for full public disclosure of all proposed contracts having to do with urban renewal areas, prior to such contracts being entered into by the various local public agencies. I consider this a necessary piece of legislation to safeguard the public interest.

The amendment that I offered on the floor of the House in 1959 and which was accepted by the committee used the following language:

"No contract or commitment of any nature whatever shall be made between the local public agency and any person for development of any part of an urban renewal area unless," etc., etc.

At a later date, either in conference or when the new bill was drafted following the President's veto of the first two bills, new language was substituted:

"No understanding with respect to or contract for," etc., etc.

It was never my intention that the original language or the substitute language be interpreted as narrowly as to include a single exchange of correspondence, or early discussion involving an urban renewal project. A properly planned urban renewal operation should not be impeded and there is no reason, even under the final language, why this should occur. Urban renewal must operate in full public view, but unnecessary red tape and interference can and should be avoided.

In view of questions that have been raised as to the interpretation of the existing language, it seems clear to me that you should promulgate a regulation that would further define "understanding" to mean any "commitment," or other "contractural relationship."

Such a regulation, would, I believe, be consistent with the purpose of the Lindsay amendment and would permit sound urban renewal to move forward while at the same time would discourage anyone seeking special advantage.

The disclosure requirement of the present legislation would still be operative before any commitments could be made by a local public agency. At the same time, the local public agency would not find its bargaining power circumscribed or limited so as to defeat its purpose.

I would appreciate your considering this suggestion carefully and advising me as soon as possible as to your opinion of its worth. Also, I would appreciate advice at an early date as to the position of the Urban Renewal Administration and of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, as to whether such an interpretation can be placed on negotiations undertaken since the adoption of section 105(a).

I am sending copies of this letter to the Honorable ALBERT RAINS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and to the Honorable WILLIAM WIDNALL, ranking minority member of the subcommittee, with whom I have discussed this matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Member of Congress.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., August 20, 1963.

Hon. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LINDSAY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 7, 1963, concerning the provision of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, which requires public disclosure of understandings and contracts with respect to disposition of land in urban renewal project areas.

We appreciate your explanation of your intent in initiating this provision. As soon as we have had an opportunity to consider the matter fully in the light of the entire applicable legislative history and the practical effects of the requirement, we will advise you with regard to the interpretation suggested in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———,
Acting Urban Renewal Commissioner.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 28, 1963.

Hon. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LINDSAY: This is in further response to your suggestion that we consider a revision of our regulations pertaining to the public disclosure requirements of section 105(e) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, for the purpose of clarifying the term "understanding" as presently included in the legislation.

Your comments have been reviewed in the light of the legislative history of the cited provision and our urban renewal manual requirements concerning public disclosure by proposed redevelopers. We appreciate the explanation of your intent in introducing H.R. 6104 in the 86th Congress, although we are compelled, as you know, to recognize that the language of the provision which was finally enacted differs from that proposed in the bill which you sponsored.

In section 14-4-1 of the urban renewal manual, we have defined "understanding" in connection with requirements for public disclosure to mean:

"Any agreement or statement, written or oral, made by the LPA or by any person acting on its behalf which commits or purports to commit or obligate, the LPA to sell or lease land to a particular redeveloper."

We believe that the manual definition of "understanding" properly delineates the term as used in section 105(e). The commonly accepted usage of the term, court decisions in which it is defined, and dictionary definitions to which the courts refer all make it apparent that an "understanding" is an informal agreement which may be either written or oral.

The manual provision limits the application of the section 105(e) requirements to cases where the LPA itself is either actually or purportedly committed or obligated. There is no reason to conclude that conferences regarding a basis for agreement, an exchange of correspondence with a view to coming to terms, or similar activities cannot be conducted between the parties without requiring a public disclosure.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. SLAYTON,
Urban Renewal Commissioner.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity afforded to me to take the floor for a few minutes today to express my sincere admiration and gratitude for the truly splendid work of my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during this past year. The members of this subcommittee—on which I have the signal privilege and honor to serve as chairman—can, in my opinion, take deep pride in their legislative accomplishments during this session. The dedication so clearly demonstrated by these able men to provide constructive and farsighted legislative programs for the health, safety, and welfare of our people is a matter which I feel deserves special recognition by this distinguished body.

Three major bills which the subcommittee has considered during this session have now become law—the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, and the Clean Air Act.

It gives me great pleasure to report that just this week the President signed into law the Clean Air Act which represents a most significant step forward in combating the serious problem of air pollution. This legislation was based on a bill which I introduced early in this session. For many years the subcommittee has had this vital problem under consideration, and in 1955 the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported favorably on the basic legislation establishing the existing Federal air pollution research and technical assistance program.

The new act, which in addition to strengthening the current authority of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to its current activities in research, training, and demonstrations, provides a new program of Federal grants to State, regional, and local air pollution control agencies and a new program of Federal assistance and participation, under certain conditions, in actions directed toward abatement of particular air pollution problems. I would like to point out that all of us on the committee are especially fortunate to have served with Congressman Schenck, of Ohio, whose major contributions to these programs over the years merit high praise.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act encountered many hurdles during its consideration by the Congress in prior sessions. This legislation, which is designed to meet the Nation's critical need for more professional health personnel, is a necessary adjunct to programs provided for medical research, hospital construction, and others which the subcommittee has worked on long and hard in earlier years.

The new act provides a program of matching grants for construction of teaching facilities for the training of doctors, dentists, and other types of health manpower and, in addition, provides a program of loans to needy students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy. The subcommittee can justifiably share in the overwhelming commendation received by the Congress from across the Nation for its foresight in enacting such important legislation.

The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 will be recorded, I have no doubt, as a landmark in our effort to illuminate the dark recesses of our society to which the Nation has historically relegated the mentally ill and the mentally retarded.

In recognition of these serious problems the legislation authorizes a program of grants for construction of mental retardation research centers and facilities for the diagnosis and treatment of the mentally retarded and, secondly, authorizes a program of grants for construction of community mental health centers where it is anticipated the mentally ill will receive a range of services responsive to their particular needs. The new act also extends and strengthens existing programs concerned with reducing the critical shortage of teachers of deaf, blind, and other handicapped children.

In view of their complexity, the numerous bills on which the new act is based required a great deal of sustained and conscientious effort in the course of their consideration. I am proud to be able to report to you that the legislation was accorded—as it fully deserves—the sincere attention and devotion of each of the members of the subcommittee. It is indeed gratifying to know that our efforts will result in health programs which although they may require further implementation in future years, have received such unqualified support and praise from so many professional and lay organizations throughout the land.

And, gentlemen, before I close, let me add that little of what I have attempted to summarize briefly here would have been achieved without the gentleman from Arkansas Hon. Oren Harris, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. His integrity and wisdom are well known to students of the legislative process, and his devotion to serving the cause of humanity are known especially to those of us who have been fortunate enough to work closely with him.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the Members of this distinguished House for the confidence they have shown in us through their support of this legislation. It can truly be said, that in all my experience in Congress, never have I witnessed a more reassuring demonstration of the ability of the House to put aside minor differences in reaching for the good. Thank you.

HUMANITARIAN AWARD FOR JOHN FOGARTY

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an address given at a luncheon honoring John Fogarty when the Humanitarian Award was presented to him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, at a special award luncheon on December 6 of this year, the National Hemophilia Foundation presented its first Humanitarian Award to the gentleman from Rhode Island, the Honorable John E. Fogarty. It is not necessary for me to list his accomplishments or describe his endeavors, for these are familiar to all who have an interest in the health and welfare of our citizens. The Christmas season is a time of giving, and I think it appropriate to include in the Record the award luncheon address of Ivan A. Nestigen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in honor of this great humanitarian who has given so much to the sick, to the aged, and in fact, to every citizen of our Nation.

Remarks by Ivan A. Nestigen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

It is a pleasure and a privilege to share with you the honor of saluting Congressman John Fogarty for his humanitarianism. In a way, it is redundant to use the name John Fogarty and humanitarianism in the same sentence.

For, both as a friend and as a representative of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I can say—

Without his determination, his vision, his feeling for human beings and his interest in the physical ills of mankind, this country would not be the healthy Nation it is today.

Without John Fogarty, much of the scientific research on cancer, heart disease, mental retardation and many other illnesses would not now be going on.

Without his interest in older people, we would not have held the White House Conference on Aging nearly 3 years ago and drawn a blueprint for dealing with their difficulties.

The list of his accomplishments is almost endless. They are accomplishments of which not only he, but the entire Nation, should be extremely proud. And, to the credit of his fellow citizens, he is now being—and has been in the past—publicly recognized for his efforts.

The magnitude of his accomplishments and the awards he has received can, perhaps, best be measured by a remark made a day or two ago by one of my associates.

We were looking over the list of his honors and awards in preparation for my remarks here this afternoon. After studying the list, my associate dropped it on my desk and remarked:

"My gosh, Fogarty has won more awards than the New York Times."

He, for example, has been given an even dozen honorary doctorate degrees from various universities and colleges. And, despite his strong support of social security health insurance for the aged, he is still listed as an honorary member of the Rhode Island Medical Society. Even the American Psychiatric Association and the American Dental Association made him an honorary fellow.

Another measure of John Fogarty relates to his receiving the Albert Lasker Award in 1959 for championing the advancement of medical research and public health. As part of the award, he received a $5,000 honorarium. He turned the money over to the Rhode Island Parents Council for Mentally Retarded Children.

Yet—and this is a real measure of the man you are honoring today—his eight-line biography in Who's Who makes no mention of any of the honors he has received. It does note, however, that he began as a bricklayer and was president of a Rhode Island bricklayers union.

Despite this modesty about his accomplishments, he is widely—and best known—for his efforts on behalf of medical research. From the moment he became a member of the House subcommittee handling medical research appropriations back in 1947, he has been intensely interested in scientific research.

One way to measure the intensity of his interest is the fact that he has been primarily responsible for increasing the budget of the National Institutes of Health from $3½ million in 1947 to more than $900 million during this fiscal year.

A story I heard about him recently shows that his interest in medical research came early in his congressional career and has never waned.

The incident occurred in 1949—shortly after he became chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee—when he met a young fellow walking with the aid of two canes.

John Fogarty stopped the young man and asked him what was wrong. Why was he walking with canes? The man explained he had multiple sclerosis. Like many impatient and warmhearted Irishmen, Fogarty went into action.

He found out from the Surgeon General that almost nothing was known about the disease and that the Government was doing no research to find out about it. Within a few months, he pushed through Congress a $500,000 appropriation to start the research.

Thus, to a very large extent, what is now known about multiple sclerosis can be directly traced to John Fogarty's chance meeting with the young fellow with the canes.

This effort—I hasten to add—is no isolated incident in the life of Congressman Fogarty. He is constantly pushing our scientists to new and greater heights in looking for ways to cure old diseases.

You may wonder what has prompted his untiring efforts for medical research and his obvious deep feeling for people.

He explained it this way in a magazine interview a year or so ago:

"It's nothing personal. Nothing happened to me when I was a kid that made me decide that medicine has to be improved. It's just that I feel that as long as people are sick, something has to be done to make them better.

"The Government has to give most of the help," he said, "because there's no one else to give it. If kids are handicapped or sick and no one is going to try everything possible to help them, well, it just can't be that way."

You might also wonder whether his interest may have some political basis. Frankly—although I know he's always nervous about how he stands with the people in his district and whether he can be reelected—it would take a miracle to beat him in his congressional district.

THE 35-HOUR WEEK

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am today placing a bill in the hopper which would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for a 35-hour workweek and double-time pay for hours worked in excess of the maximum workweek.

We are today faced with a staggering unemployment problem which has persisted for much too long and for which proposed solutions have been far from adequate. Whether reducing the workweek by one-eighth will have the desired effect of spreading employment to those now out of work is a proposal deserving serious consideration. It is for this reason that I have introduced this bill and will ask that hearings be scheduled to begin in January 1964. I would hope to have witnesses called from all segments of the economy to discuss this proposal. My intentions are to have a record developed which will clearly indicate the economic realities involved in order to discern whether this is an effective means of reducing unemployment.

The bill which I have introduced today would, in its present form, eliminate section 7 (b) and (e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended. These sections, which provide for certain exceptions to the overtime requirements of the act where there are bona fide contracts involved, are quite complex. I have not dealt with this matter at this time because of the inadequate information presently available, but it is my intention to develop an intelligent substitute for the provisions currently excluded from the bill. It is also my intention to draw particular attention to this problem during the forthcoming hearings for the purpose of developing adequate solutions to these particularly involved situations. When more evidence is available for a rational decision relative to these special circumstances I will submit amendments to the proposal as presently drafted.

THE COLUMBIA PLAZA URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to talk about a subject that I think is very important—urban renewal. I realize that we are late in the session and I certainly want to make my remarks as brief as possible in order not to impose on the other Members of the House. But I do feel very much concerned about the question of the status of urban renewal not only in the District of Columbia but also throughout the United States.

I have had the privilege of serving on Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the District of Columbia which is under the chairmanship of the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY]. This subcommittee has spent a great deal of time this year in conducting hearings on the matter of urban renewal in the District of Columbia area.

At the outset I would like to indicate I am very much in favor of the program of urban renewal. I realize through my experience on the Rochester, N.Y., City Council of approximately 7 years that municipalities are more and more beset with financial difficulties. There is an ever-increasing growth of services required by the citizens and by the organizations and businesses in a community. The needs of education and all of the other problems that go with taking care of the city and its needs have created a great demand upon the tax revenues of the municipality. At the same time many of the businesses in the core of the city or the downtown area have been going downhill, to the extent that many of these properties have been abandoned and in some cases torn down. The result has been a great number of them have been going off the tax rolls. Therefore, with this increased need for revenue much of the high tax revenue producing properties in the downtown area have been going by the wayside and the cities have found themselves in a very tight squeeze with respect to their ability to meet their financial needs. I feel very much concerned that the Federal Government has a responsibility to help cities and urban areas in their renewal or redevelopment of slum areas and also in these downtown areas. Therefore, I am very much in favor of the program of urban renewal. However, I feel there are many problems in the urban renewal programs across the country and I think it is important for us as Members of the Congress to look at these problems and try to do more to help cities in this respect.

In urban renewal, the Congress has made what is probably the broadest grant of discretionary powers ever given to the administrative branch of government by a legislative body. The original grant of those powers was made in the Housing Act of 1949. Since that time urban renewal subsidies have been given to most States and cities. The results, at best, have been uneven.

Yesterday, a legislative investigation of one of the urban renewal projects was completed. That investigation, in which I participated, was made by Subcommittee No. 4 of the House District Committee under the chairmanship of the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY]. It had to do with the Columbia Plaza project in the District of Columbia.

I might say that the committee held 19 days of hearings and spent approximately 50 hours on those hearings. In addition to that, the committee also had 13 additional hearing days consuming some 47 hours, making a total of 32 days of hearings with approximately 100 hours of hearing time.

I feel it is pertinent to point out what I consider an injustice to the District of Columbia in regard to the urban renewal program. As I understand it, the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia has ruled that the District is not eligible to participate in the provisions of the urban renewal program applicable to downtown renewal or commercial renewal.

Public-spirited citizens in the District of Columbia have organized the Downtown Progress organization which has performed many services looking toward the ultimate renewal of downtown Washington. These services include vital planning and surveys which would be beneficial to a downtown urban renewal program.

This matter has been the subject of some of the hearings of Subcommittee No. 4 of the District of Columbia Committee. I am hopeful that the committee will be disposed to report out legislation which would make possible the inclusion of the District of Columbia in this phase of the program.

Although I am highly critical of the overall provisions of the law applicable to urban renewal, I feel the District of Columbia should not be denied the same privileges and opportunities that other cities are afforded.

The results of that investigation of the Columbia Plaza project raised questions about the grant of discretion which Congress has made and about the entire direction which future urban renewal should take.

Let me make it abundantly clear that in calling attention to the results of this investigation I am not opposing urban renewal. I am opposing some of the looseness and impropriety with which it has been administered. Urban renewal is essential to the constructive growth and development of most cities. Old and obsolete structures and patterns of land use must make way for new development and redevelopment. Better housing must be made available for all of our citizens. Probably the first mistake that has been made in urban renewal is to assume that there are only two alternatives facing cities; either the city will use Federal urban renewal and its funds under its wide delegation of discretion or that the city will rot. I am here to say that there are more than two alternatives. There is a third alternative. My home city of Rochester, N.Y., is a living example of the third alternative, a partnership between local government and private enterprise. In Rochester, N.Y., one of the finest urban renewal projects in the United States has been completed. It is known as the Midtown Plaza. That project went on the drawing boards in 1958 at a time when I was on the Rochester City Council. In 1962, just 4 years later, it was completed and is now in most successful use. It has helped to transform the downtown area of Rochester and has been a great stimulus to business. It produced a sizable increase in assessed valuations and in local tax revenues of the city. It has stimulated new construction in the area. Many new buildings are now under construction in the immediate area brought about by this development.

And I emphasize again that this is the most effective urban renewal program because there were no Federal funds involved. Private enterprise, in partnership with the local government, without the use of any Federal funds, was able within the space of 4 years to complete an urban renewal project in the heart of the downtown area.

No one interested in sound urban renewal can escape the comparison between the Midtown Plaza project, planned and executed locally in Rochester, and the federally aided Columbia Plaza project in the District of Columbia. The Columbia Plaza project after more than 5 years and the investment of millions of dollars is an expanse of bare land without a single new structure erected upon it. The delegations of discretion made by the Congress have, in this case, resulted only in wide differences of opinion, charges of favoritism, and perhaps serious violations of the law.

The ramifications of the Columbia Plaza project have been under investigation for more than 9 months by Subcommittee No. 4. The chairman of the subcommittee, its members and staff are to be congratulated for their persistence and for the care with which they have done their job. The results of their efforts to which I shall refer in more detail presently, raise important questions for every Member of the Congress. The evidence accumulated before that subcommittee of which I have the honor to be a member indicates that, in Columbia Plaza at least, the law has been misused. Reports from other cities suggest that similar abuses of discretion may have developed in other cities.

The jurisdiction of the House District Committee is confined to the District of Columbia. That committee is not free to investigate urban renewal in its national ramifications. However, Subcommittee No. 4 of that committee has uncovered enough abuses of the law to suggest that the appropriate committee or committees of the Congress, or a special committee created for that specific purpose, should make a thorough investigation of urban renewal and determine what changes should be made in the law to insure that it will contribute constructively to urban renewal.

Among the many problems of urban renewal which deserve critical examination is the burgeoning bureaucracy aspect.

In communities across the Nation which have entered into contracts with the Federal Government to conduct urban renewal programs, there have been established local government departments or agencies to administer the planning, the distribution of Federal funds, manage the property acquired, and, in general, supervise the overall implementation of urban renewal in the area.

Some of these local employees have a portion of their salaries paid by the Federal Government. This should be expected since the Urban Renewal Administration requires that those governments receiving Federal funds maintain adequate staffs to handle the various projects.

My concern, therefore, rests not with the need to set up these local bureaus—the fundamental requirement is obvious. The question is: why have the size and expense of these local agencies far outstripped the level of urban renewal accomplishment? The steady growth in employment in the local organizations administering urban renewal programs is not matched by comparable project progress.

Means to more effectively coordinate the admitted complexities of urban renewal, which result from necessary dealings with many agencies at all levels of government, must be found so that the function of these local departments can go beyond the receiving of planning money and the issuing of voluminous reports.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should require either administrative improvements or legislative changes so that urban renewal will stop being an example of "Parkinson's Law" and start answering the needs of American communities looking for revitalization assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the charges which I have made, particularly with reference to Columbia Plaza are serious. I do not take them lightly. In support of them, I would like to read from the summary of the Columbia Plaza investigation which was made by the chairman of Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

The summary referred to follows:

THE COLUMBIA PLAZA URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT

(Statement of Hon. JOHN DOWDY, chairman, Subcommittee No. 4, House Committee on the District of Columbia)

This ends the committee hearings on the Columbia Plaza project. Because of the volume of the testimony, the multitude of documents and records, it is impossible to make any detailed statement citing specific testimony and records in this summary statement. However, a summary of the principal facts can be made along with the impressions of the committee to the whole body of the testimony.

When the committee began its hearings on Columbia Plaza, it was announced that this project was being reviewed because after more than 10 years of urban renewal in the District of Columbia, it was the only entire project area which had progressed through all the urban processes from initial boundary studies to the final disposition of the land to a private redeveloper. The committee's interest has been in the procedures used in relation to existing law and regulations and not in any personalities which may be involved.

The Columbia Plaza urban renewal project area contains about 18.2 acres of land strategically located adjacent to the State Department, of which 7.8 acres were in private ownership. It was part of the Foggy-Bottom area which was rapidly changing in character. More than $40 million in new office and residential structures had been built or were planned during the past few years. A group of private developers had been acquiring property in the plaza area for a period of years. Prior to the acquisition of the land area by the Redevelopment Land Agency, this group had acquired about 90 percent of the total land in the three-block project area.

The Columbia Plaza area was part of an urban renewal project area proposed in 1957 but which was not eligible under law because of the lack of slum and blight conditions. The private developers who were purchasing land in the area were accelerating the demolition of old buildings and at the time of acquisition by the redevelopment agency there were only 21 buildings remaining, none of which were slum or substandard in character. The area had become predominantly open space. Their land holdings were mostly outside of the part of the area which was to be devoted to the interstate freeway which was to pass through the southern-most portion of the project area.

By January 1959 the private developer group acquiring property in the Plaza area had more than half the area under single ownership outside the freeway right-of-way. Their architect had prepared a proposal for residential apartment development and they presented their plans to the National Capital Planning Commission. The proposal called for closure of useless alleys within the boundaries which would prevent a sound development. Adequate parking was included in the plan. The private developers received no encouragement.

During the ensuing months, the private developers continued land acquisition and had further conferences with the Planning Commission and with the Redevelopment Land Agency concerning development of the area without Federal assistance. By August another architectural proposal was being developed and the private developers made application for zoning to accommodate their proposed development. On November 17, without previous public notice or announcement of intent, the Planning Commission suddenly released to the press information that the Planning Commission had designated the Columbia Plaza area as an urban renewal area. The Zoning Board shortly thereafter denied the pending rezoning application of the major property holders without prejudice and the applicants were advised that this was the result of the area having been designated by the Planning Commission as an urban renewal area.

The private developers, following their conferences with planning and Redevelopment Land Agency officials before mid-1959, were unaware of the actions being taken by public agencies. By June, the Planning Commission was in contact with the Redevelopment Land Agency preparatory to making the plaza area an urban renewal area. In September the Planning Commission had taken action establishing project area boundaries but without public announcement. Following that action, the Planning Commission began the preparation of an urban renewal plan for the area even though the legally required approval of area boundaries by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia had not taken place. On December 3, 1959, the Planning Commission adopted a resolution approving a project plan for the plaza area which lacked any legal boundaries.

Having been surprised by the November 17 announcement of the Planning Commission's approval of urban renewal area boundaries in the plaza area, private developers felt compelled to present to the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Land Agency its new proposal for private development of the area as a "Diplomatic City" for which they now had a prepared model. The conference held on December 2 disclosed the plan as a combination office and predominantly residential development with 1,800 parking spaces designed to meet a critical need in the capital for chancery offices and residential space for diplomatic personnel.

The private developers proposed that they be permitted to proceed with private redevelopment of their plan with no Federal funds involved or to have their plan considered for the urban renewal plan for the area. Along with the proposed development, the private developers demonstrated their ability, readiness, and financial responsibility for development of the area. Their land acquisitions by that date substantially exceeded the majority of the privately owned land. Objections were raised to the proposal because of the density of use, office use, and need for special purpose zoning which, it may be noted, was later provided for the approved project redevelopment plan.

The day following this conference, the Planning Commission adopted its resolution approving the Commission's plan for redevelopment of the plaza area under urban renewal procedures.

The private developers, through counsel, then advised the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Land Agency of their continued interest in the area and their desire to be considered as potential redevelopers for the area. Their communication went unanswered.

During this interim, apparently an agreement was reached by Planning Commission and Redevelopment Agency officials to apply a special rule on disposition of the project area lands to be acquired for the renewal project. This rule was to be that for this project, whoever owned more than 50 percent of the land area would be given a priority to become the redeveloper. The testimony before the committee indicates that this policy was carefully kept secret from the public and particularly from the then owner of more than 50 percent until after the lands of the private developers were safely under the control of a preselected group of redevelopers which later became the redevelopers without competition.

In late December of 1959 or January of 1960, another development, not disclosed to the public, took place. This was preselection of the redeveloper. Testimony disclosed that officials of both the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Land Agency cooperated in bringing this redeveloper forward. The former executive director of the Redevelopment Land Agency referred to this redeveloper as a "chosen instrument." The representatives of the "chosen instrument" redeveloper had increasingly frequent contact with agency officials during the months approaching May 1960.

In early May, agency officials, in conference with "chosen instrument" representatives, conferred on details such as total land footage available, land acquisition prices to be paid by the Agency, land disposition prices to the "chosen instrument" redeveloper, and other essential details vital to any party negotiating for the purchase of land from private parties.

The private developers, then holding more than 70 percent of the land area, were utterly frustrated for lack of any response to their efforts to become redevelopers. The "chosen instrument" group was now essentially assured that it would become the redeveloper under any project plan which was finally approved. They could so advise the private developer group. The private developer group, subject to suitable proof, reached an agreement with the "chosen instrument" group to transfer control of their land holdings. This proof was furnished by the executive director of the Redevelopment Land Agency by letter on May 17, 1960, after a telephone request from a representative of the "chosen instrument" group. On receipt of the letter, formal written agreement was prepared for signature by the parties. The following day, the corporate vehicle of the "chosen instrument" group was formed; namely, the Columbia Plaza Corporation, a District of Columbia corporation with an authorized capital stock of 1,000 shares issued at $1 per share to undertake a project which was to cost in excess of $20 million.

The May 17 letter from the Redevelopment Land Agency recited the 50-percent land ownership policy of priority for the redeveloper. This policy was disclosed to the private developer group for the first time. The letter further named the appraisers who would make the appraisals for land acquisition and the appraisals and the land reuse appraisals for the sale of the land back to the same "chosen instrument" corporation. Other persons interested in becoming redevelopers of the area were thereafter advised of the 50-percent land ownership policy which effectively precluded their participation since the "chosen instrument" corporation already held control of the necessary land to assure priority for redevelopment.

With this recitation of very general details leading to the qualifying of the "chosen instrument" redeveloper, it may be noted that following hearings by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on the urban renewal boundaries and later on the project plan, the "chosen instrument" corporation, Columbia Plaza Corp., was given the contract as redeveloper by the Redevelopment Land Agency following a land disposition hearing on October 3, 1961.

The testimony received during the hearings and the documentation examined by the committee revealed actions which raise substantial questions of legality and propriety. At this time, subordination of the public interest to private interest cannot be fully calculated. The "chosen instrument" redeveloper has now been declared to be in default. A short review of some of the legal deficiencies and improprieties may be made at this point.

AREA ELIGIBILITY SURVEYS

Testimony and records before the committee indicate that there was no actual recorded survey of the project area to determine the existence of slum and blight as a basis for application for planning and survey funds. Correspondence between the planning agency and the Redevelopment Land Agency indicates that each was relying on the survey of the other and neither made a survey. The survey figures used in the presentation to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and thereafter as a basis for application to the Urban Renewal Administration for advance of Federal funds demonstrably were taken from previous survey for another project proposed at an earlier date. Aerial photographs for the years spanning the period from 1955 to the date of application prove that many structures listed in the survey had been demolished. Records from the District of Columbia Board of Condemnation and the Permit Division of the Bureau of Licenses and Inspections verify the removal of buildings which were included in the survey as being slum in character.

SLUM AND BLIGHT

Testimony and documents indicate clearly that slum and blight did not exist to the extent of 20 percent. No slum residential structures were in existence at the time the project plan was approved.

Other factors used to show eligibility of the area lacked any substance. The claimed obsolete street pattern was identical to that in most of Washington. They were essential to the permitted land uses which existed. Only in the sense that a private redeveloper or a renewal project redevelopment no longer needed the land for streets and alleys was the street pattern obsolete.

Another factor used to support eligibility for Federal funds was mixed land use. There was limited mixed land use in the area for the redevelopment plan called for even more extensive mixed land use.

A further factor used in supporting the claim of slum and blight was separate ownership of land parcels. The contrary was the case since substantially more than half the land area was under single ownership and there was a very limited number of owners of the remainder of the area land parcels.

Neither a showing of slum conditions nor other blighting factors was sustained by any reasonable proof or demonstration to support the legal requirement of the existence of conditions which were detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of inhabitants of the District of Columbia.

THE 50-PERCENT RULE FOR LAND DISPOSITION

Testimony and documents indicate that this rule gained currency in Planning Commission and Redevelopment Agency circles in 1959. The former executive director of the Redevelopment Land Agency who knew that the private developers owned more than 50 percent of the land stated that the rule was developed particularly for this project and that it was the policy of the Agency. The Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Redevelopment Land Agency denied that it was ever adopted as a policy. His contention is borne out by the absence of record in the minutes of the Agency indicating adoption of a resolution to that effect.

Obviously, this disposition rule was not designed for the private developers who owned the great majority of the land. Their first knowledge of the rule came after they had committed themselves to the "chosen instrument" group to deliver their land holdings for the benefit of those who later became the redevelopers.

The principal land owning group was thwarted in its efforts to become a developer privately or to be considered as a redeveloper under urban renewal procedures. Had they known of the rule, they could have insisted on the priority. But the rule, kept secret, proved to be a most useful device in the hands of the "chosen instrument" group, enabling it to acquire the control of the majority of the land footage and thus qualify for the priority.

Knowing they could not develop the area privately because the area was to be designated an urban renewal area and having been ignored for consideration as a redeveloper under the proposed plan, the private developer group had the choice of awaiting the process of eminent domain under which their lands would be taken or of negotiating with the "chosen instrument" group for the best agreement they could get. They chose the latter course.

The clandestine establishment and use of the 50-percent rule and the acknowledged aid and assistance of public officials in guiding the "chosen instrument" group appears to the committee to clearly indicate subversion of public powers and processes for private purposes. Through the use of this rule and the threat of the public power of eminent domain, the course of the private ininterest was determined long before there was any determination of the public interest and the public use which matured on the adoption of the project plan by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, some 18 months later. The course of events indicates an action using public powers in the interest of a private user under the guise of a purported public use. The committee is aware of no such language or intent of Congress under the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Act as amended. Nor is the committee aware of any such language or intent in the Housing Act of 1949 as amended.

If the officials of the District of Columbia, the Redevelopment Land Agency, the Urban Renewal Administration, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency condone such practices and procedures, the Congress had better look again at the behemoth it has turned loose in the communities of our Nation and against the owners of private property.

LAND DISPOSITION

When the redevelopment plan for the Columbia Plaza area was presented to the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia for their approval, they were aware that about 90 percent of the land would be acquired from the "chosen instrument" group and would undoubtedly be resold to that same group. It was ordered that in any disposition of land, the Redevelopment Land Agency must receive the same amount for the land from the redeveloper as had been paid for it.

The land agency acquired all the property in the area including 118,000 square feet of streets and alleys belonging to the Federal Government for which lands there was no consideration. Of the total area acquired, the District of Columbia needed about 93,000 square feet for freeway development. The price of this land to the District of Columbia was $23 per square foot. The price of the land disposed of to the "chosen instrument" redeveloper was $14.88 per square foot. The committee is unable to fathom why land of equal value should not have been sold at the same price to a public agency as that given to a private user.

Although the Redevelopment Act provides specifically for the exchange of land by public bodies within an urban renewal area, this was not done. The 118,000 square feet of U.S. lands were thrown in the deal to the private developer and not exchanged for the land needed for the freeway. Thus, the Federal Government contributed this footage of land worth $21 a square foot at acquisition cost and also subsidized 90 percent of the freeway land cost of $2,151,000.

LAND APPRAISALS

The land appraisal procedures used create many questions of propriety. The former Executive Director of the Redevelopment Land Agency admitted that for the benefit of the "chosen instrument" group he contacted the appraisers and got their agreement to serve, and provide their names to the "chosen instrument" group, before there were any project area boundaries established and more than a year before the approval of any project plan. The same appraisers provided the reports for land acquisition values and the land reuse appraisals for land disposition purposes. The appraisals to be used for land disposition purposes were completed months before the approval of any project plan.

FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE REDEVELOPER

Prior to the formation of the Columbia Plaza Corp., the "chosen instrument" group needed financially responsible persons associated with the enterprise. The record indicates that the draft of a letter, the text of which was suggested by officials of either or both the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Land Agency, was presented to one of the Nation's most reputable builders. The first sentence of the draft carried the false statement that the builder had acquired the major land ownership in the project area. The builder refused to sign such a letter but he honored his word to become builder of the project and signed a letter to that effect. Thereafter he found it necessary to protect the use of the name of his firm implying that he was sponsor, or was responsible for the funds necessary to completely finance the project. Despite this consistent position on his part, when the Columbia Plaza Corp., was called upon to file its financial responsibility statement with the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the corporation presented the builder's name in such a manner as to indicate the builder's financial responsibility for the project.

While the "chosen instrument" group strongly proclaimed their moral obligation on financial advances to the Columbia Plaza Corp., the record did not reveal any legal obligations of consequence while they benefited by $90,000 in commissions, a 5-percent management contract with the corporation they formed, in addition to their stock interest. Repeated questions by the committee as to the existence of a firm commitment from any source for the financing of the project brought no answer.

THE REDEVELOPER CORP.

Examination of the Redeveloper Corp., revealed that its maximum net assets at any time was the $1,000 paid in for capital stock. Examination of stock records was essentially futile. The stockbooks were stated to be lost. Further examination of records indicated that there must have been two stockbooks. If the second stockbook existed it was not produced under subpenas. Shares called in and cancelled were likewise lost. Although several parties were not stockholders in the early months of the corporate existence, the shares presently issued are all dated as of the date of the first corporation meeting.

Among those appearing as stockholders about 2 years after the formation of the Columbia Plaza Corp., was the secretary to "the chosen instrument" group. This stock interest was represented to be a "gift" to an exceptional and faithful employee. However, the witness stated that she paid $74 for 74 shares. Testimony indicated that this interest had a potential value of $1,500,000 plus the share of the annual income which, if amounting to an average of 6 percent net on the investment, would make an additional $3,500,000 by the end of the mortgage period. This employee likewise testified to a stock interest in another renewal project which cost $100. The record indicates that this investment would provide a return to her of $127,000 within about 3 years following the date of the stock purchase. The committee recognizes that such arrangements are most generous to employees. But it likewise recognizes that in the usual run of private business such gratuities are an uncommon practice. The question presented is whether on projects where public funds and public powers are involved such fine gestures are more easily possible.

REDEVELOPER BENEFITS IN LAND PRICE ADJUSTMENTS

Another area of action indicating a callous attitude toward the public interest was disclosed in connection with the land acquisition prices paid by the Agency. The contract agreement between the original landowners and the "chosen instrument" group required penalty payments of $20,000 per month if payment were not made to the former for their lands by a date specified. By the time the Redevelopment Land Agency was ready to make its land acquisition payments, the "chosen instrument" group was in default to the extent of $60,000 on the contract. The land acquisition price for lands of the original owners, which they were to receive, had been set at $19 per square foot. To meet the $60,000 payment due, a representative of the "chosen instrument" group suggested that the land price be increased to $19.32 per square foot which price would cover the $60,000 accrued deficiency. The former Executive Director confirmed the arrangement with the statement that this was a matter of negotiation which would avoid the possibility of condemnation proceedings.

In the absence of the contractual agreement and the accumulated default in payments, such explanation might be plausible. But under the circumstances in this instance, it appears to be a method of bailing out at public expense of a "chosen instrument" redeveloper who was willing but neither ready nor able to meet his financial responsibilities.

PROJECT INCOME

In this instance, as appears common practice in urban renewal land dispositions, at least in the District of Columbia, the land disposition price was not determined on the basis of any type of competition, nor on the actual land use permitted under the project plan. The appraisal was predicated on the use proposed to be made by the redeveloper and his plans were used by the appraisers for that purpose. Regardless of the merit of the original disposition appraisals, there was application made for and approval given for a change in the project plan which would enhance the income from the project.

The Redevelopment Land Agency, despite the appraisal reports finally secured, held to their original decision that no increase in land price was justifiable. Study of these appraisals on the change in the redevelopment plan and evidences of additional income developed in testimony, showed an annual increase of anticipated income in excess of $600,000 above the amount shown in the original land reuse appraisal figures. This represented an increase of about 50 percent or approximately $25 million over the mortgage period.

Where there are changes in project plans which increase the income to the redeveloper, and no compensating increase in land price is made, a windfall is provided to the redeveloper at the expense of the local and Federal Government whose shares of the net project costs increase.

The committee will review the entire record on the Columbia Plaza case and a more detailed report will be made at a later date. Since the Columbia Plaza project has been found in default, the Redevelopment Land Agency and the Urban Renewal Administration are presented with urgent decisions. At this point in the examination, the committee would find that there was no legal basis for establishing an urban renewal boundary or for the subsequent approval of an urban renewal project.

Even on the basis of the purported survey of the area, which is clearly inaccurate as to conditions in the area, the Director of the Redevelopment Land Agency found that the slum conditions were of low priority. Such conditions did not in fact exist within the language or intent of the law. The obligation before the respective agencies is to determine the justification for accumulation for further public costs on this project.

The thread of the testimony before the committee was that there was an understanding between the Director of the Planning Commission, the Executive Director of the Redevelopment Land Agency, and the "chosen instrument" group that the latter would become the redeveloper.

Further, the degree of preferential treatment, shown by the records and admitted in testimony, accorded to a "chosen instrument" redeveloper coupled with special rules which brought into play the force of public powers for the benefit of one party to the exclusion of all others, and the continuing intimate working relationship from inception to the conclusion, raises serious questions of public policy. In any other area of contractual relationships with Government agencies, the selecting out of a "chosen instrument" with rules known only to such party, accompanied by the advice, counsel, and coaching to conclude an agreement which dissipates public funds, such would be labeled collusion or conspiracy. The boundaries of public policy should be clearly delineated for the Housing Agency, local public agencies throughout the Nation, and for the owners of private property. The facts of this case are of such a character and the issues so important that this committee believes that the Department of Justice should examine the record and take such action as is necessary and proper. The Justice Department may also be presented with the question of accuracy of sworn documents furnished to it in connection with court actions for the condemnation of project area lands.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have included this statement in the Record so that the Members will have an opportunity over the holidays to look at this very important summary of the results of these various hearings that lasted over some months.

Again, I would like to emphasize that I believe this whole program of urban renewal goes beyond the scope of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I feel that the appropriate committee or committees of the Congress should take a look at this entire program and come up with some answers so that we can get on with the business of planning redevelopment in residential and commercial areas in the heart of downtown areas throughout the country and so that it can be done with effectiveness and expediency.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman and the other members of the subcommittee under the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] for the work they have done for the people of this country and the Members of this House. They did an outstanding job. I want to commend the gentleman from New York for his presentation today and to assure him many Members, some not present, join with the gentleman in his efforts in this direction in the future when this matter is studied, and when this is brought to the floor of the House. I commend the gentleman for what he and his people have done for their own community, as we have in other communities, to solve local problems by local means.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. As a member of Subcommittee No. 4 of the House District Committee I wish to commend the gentleman from New York for his statement. I am familiar with the work of the subcommittee and can assure the Members of this body that a careful investigation has been made and a fair analysis of the results has been presented in the able summary of the chairman which has just been read.

During the course of the hearings on Columbia Plaza we had occasion to hear some testimony from my State of Ohio which seems to confirm the impression that conditions found in the District are national as well as local. This confirms the recommendation of the gentleman from New York that an appropriate committee of the Congress should make a national investigation or that a special or select committee should be appointed for that purpose.

The testimony to which I have referred concerning Ohio had to do with the Erieview project in Cleveland. That project has been justified largely on the grounds of the broad legislative delegation of discretion which exists in the Housing Act of 1949 as amended.

What happened in Cleveland was the same thing demonstrated to have happened in the Columbia Plaza project. Those in charge of the project chose to go beyond the mere delegation of discretion.

In the Erieview project in Cleveland, instead of relying on the broad delegation of discretionary authority made by the Housing Act, city officials chose to make specific inspections of buildings. They designated as substandard buildings which were almost new and against which no violations existed except minor ones which could have been corrected in a day and with small expense. There is no legal authorization Federal, State or local for any building standards which would justify such a substandard rating.

Cleveland property owners attempted to present this irregularity to the courts as a defense against the taking of their property for urban renewal purposes. The courts refused to entertain the evidence on the ground that the delegation of discretion in the Housing Act was so broad that the courts would not question any agreement between the city of Cleveland and the Housing and Home Finance Agency based on the Housing Act even if part of the evidence on which administration of the act was based could be shown to have been illegally obtained.

As indicated in the summary which my distinguished colleague has just read into the record, similar abuses of the Housing Act seem to have been involved in the Columbia Plaza project. They impose upon us an obligation to investigate this matter further and to reexamine the entire content of the urban renewal legislation. Congress must make certain that the abuses which have occurred are corrected and that the law be rewritten to facilitate rather than interfere with the orderly process of renewal which must take place in all our cities. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in my efforts on behalf of the urban renewal program, I have been operating under the assumption that officials responsible for this program on both national and local levels are as eager as anyone to profit from mistakes and improve the program. One criticism that has been prevalent for some time has been directed toward the unwillingness of these officials to follow their own rules and regulations, and I had expected that this criticism would have been taken to heart. The cavalier attitude of urban renewal and planning officials in the District of Columbia as disclosed by the statement of the chairman of the House District Subcommittee investigating the Columbia Plaza urban renewal project has disabused me of any such forlorn hope.

The facts of this unfortunate situation have already been detailed. In general, the record discloses the discouragement of private rehabilitation both before and after the designation of an area as ripe for urban renewal, and the subsequent additional costs to the American taxpayer. It raises serious questions with respect to the eligibility of the project itself. The actions of urban renewal officials in choosing and collaborating with a redeveloper to the exclusion of all others, the secretive nature of the rules and proceedings involved, and the preferential treatment shown to the "chosen instrument" developer by these officials raise even more serious questions.

Any one of these developments, in my opinion, would be sufficient for an in-depth study by the Urban Renewal Administration as well as Congress. The fact that all could occur in one project in one short space of time is simply incredible. If this could take place, in effect, under the very nose of the Federal Urban Renewal Administration here in Washington, I cannot have any great degree of confidence in that Administration's ability to supervise its numerous projects throughout the Nation.

The attitude of the Federal Urban Renewal Administration, as well as the District of Columbia officials, can best be ascertained by their reaction to the use of the secretive 50-percent rule in the disposition of the property and the selection of the redeveloper. In this instance, a decision was made to allow whoever owned 50 percent or more of the land area priority to become the redeveloper. This rule was never disclosed to the original owners of the majority of the property until after the favored redeveloper had succeeded in buying the land from them.

Had either Congress, or the courts, or law enforcement officials acted in a similar manner toward any individual, there would be little doubt in anyone's mind that this action constituted the deprivation of an individual right without due process of law. If this action on the part of local redevelopment officials goes uncorrected, the urban renewal program will suffer irreparable damage in the realm of public support, which is vitally necessary for the success of the program.

The subcommittee headed by our distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] has done a valuable service in its investigation. I will urge that the Special Housing Subcommittee, reviewing urban renewal in general, take into consideration the problems raised by the Columbia Plaza investigation, in order to seek legislative and administrative solutions on a national level.

Mr. Speaker, I have followed with great interest the work of the gentleman from Texas, John Dowdy, in the investigation of urban renewal in the District of Columbia. In my judgment the job done by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy], by his subcommittee, and by the staff with respect to the Columbia Plaza urban renewal project is one of the outstanding pieces of investigation completed during this session.

Recently my attention has been called to certain information gathered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] on the subject of "Unemployment Created by Urban Renewal Programs." This material seems to be of such importance that it should be made widely available. Accordingly I asked, and have received, permission to insert that statement in the RECORD.

In addition, I include the text of a speech by William L. Slayton, Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration, in which he stated that:

> It has now been 9 years since rehabilitation was made an integral part of urban renewal by the Housing Act of 1954. During a period of explosive growth in the program nationally, about 200 projects have reached the execution stage involving some degree of rehabilitation, and something in excess of 100,000 dwelling units have been scheduled for rehabilitation. But as to accomplishment, only a few thousand have actually been improved.
>
> The result of this relative lack of accomplishment—much of it understandable, to be sure—has been disillusionment and discouragement in many quarters.
>
> The renewal of our Nation's cities, as you so well know, will simply not be achieved without an effective rehabilitation program. Without rehabilitation, the cost in dollars and in human terms—the inevitable personal hardships caused by dislocation—are simply beyond our capacity.

The success or failure of urban renewal, then, can be measured in terms of the success or failure of rehabilitation, as Commissioner Slayton has so ably pointed out.

UNEMPLOYMENT CREATED BY URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS

Urban renewal programs all over the United States—while still small compared to what they are going to be—are destroying small businesses and jobs, and contributing to our unemployment problem. It was estimated that by 1960 more than 400 municipalities had over 650 redevelopment projects in various stages of planning and execution. These involved over 100,000 business firms and the jobs of several times that number of persons. Of the total projects reported in the March 1962 Urban Renewal Directory, 445 of the 1,929 projects (about 40 percent) had been approved at the planning stage. Only 11 percent of the urban renewal projects undertaken since passage of the 1949 Housing Act had been completed by the beginning of 1963. In the 1960–70 decade it is expected that the volume of business dislocation from renewal areas will be at least twice the 100,000 already underway.

A central factor in all renewal projects is that while most of the businesses do relocate either in a nearby area or further out, a substantial part of the businesses displaced never relocate at all. They are compelled by the severity of the jolt to discontinue operations and give up as independent businessmen, and this of course also involves such employees as were attached to the business. In various studies which have been made of numerous projects in different cities, it has been found that no less than one out of every four firms in a redevelopment or renewal project area has discontinued operations altogether. In some lines of business the proportion giving up and going on relief or pension reaches one-third of the number of what were going firms, or 40 percent, and even more. In a 500 page still unpublished study made at Brown University under the Small Business Administration management research grant program, the researchers found that 40 percent of the establishments in the urban renewal areas of Providence had to go out of business. With few exceptions, the nonsurvivors experienced a decline in income even though a majority reentered the labor force in some other capacity.

Urban renewal programs have thus created another type of "dropout" that has not been receiving the attention that is being given to the school dropout problem. It has resulted in significant increases in unemployment and reduction of the labor force. As these projects increase and get underway full scale, they will become an even more important factor in the unemployment situation.

Business dislocations to date have been incidental to clearing and redeveloping residential areas. Business displacements will increase sharply as the Housing Act of 1959 comes into full use, since this provides that 20 percent of the Federal renewal grants may be spent in nonresidential areas, regardless of whether new housing is created. Thus, localities are now able to initiate projects in which the relocation load will be almost totally composed of commercial and industrial establishments.

Businesses displaced by urban renewal projects are practically all small business. This is recognized by the Small Business Administration which has financed such studies of the effects of the program as we have. Their latest study—that in Providence, which indicates a situation quite similar to those found in New Haven and other places studied—shows that 18 percent of the displaced businesses were owner operated and had no employees, 31 percent had 1 or 2 employees, another 30 percent reported 3 to 9 workers, and 21 percent had 10 or more workers. Retailing and service establishments employed over 90 percent of the total and less than 10 percent were in all other businesses, including manufacturing.

Most of these people had been in business in the same neighborhood for a long time—about 86 percent over 5 years, and of the total 20 percent between 5 and 10 years, one-third from 10 to 20 years and another one-third over 20 years. About 9 out of 10 said that they would have continued to do business in the same neighborhood indefinitely if they had not been forced out by a redevelopment project. They went out of business because they could not find a suitable location or get license transfer or proper zoning; or it was too costly to start one; or they would lose contact with customers at any new location. Many of these people are still out of work in different areas of the country because they cannot find a site where they could continue to operate their business or obtain a license or meet the costs of setting up anew. Others, many in advanced years, discouraged by the obstacles, simply threw in the sponge.

The relatively high mortality rate of firms within urban renewal areas has resulted in a level of unemployed the magnitude of which can only be surmised from the reports and studies which have been made of these projects. No one has ever made a full accounting of the unemployment created. It could well total up into a significant proportion of the total number unemployed in the Nation and to be an important factor in hard-core unemployment.

It is no consolation to say that many of the firms which fail to relocate and go out of business are marginal firms. They had provided jobs and sustenance for those who had operated them in the old places and for their employees. This is a national loss hardly ever taken into account in the rosy descriptions of urban renewal.

REMARKS BY WILLIAM L. SLAYTON, COMMISSIONER, URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATION HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY BEFORE THE URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATION-FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION, WORKSHOP ON REHABILITATION, DINKLER-PLAZA HOTEL, ATLANTA, GA., NOVEMBER 14, 1963

You have now just about completed the second day of what could probably be described as a 3-day "cram course" in urban renewal rehabilitation.

I was reading over the agenda for your workshop the other day and I think that what you have heard so far and the topics to be covered during tomorrow can be of tremendous value. I mean this not because there is any such thing as easy rehabilitation, but more importantly, to lay the foundation for working toward a rehabilitation program that offers us our first real chance for success.

However, I did not come here to tell you how wonderfully the rehabilitation program has been doing thus far, even though we have had some successes. And neither am I going to say we now have all the problems mastered, or that the road ahead will be a smooth one.

The tightly packed agenda of this workshop, the weeks of preparation for it, the months spent in hammering out the new minimum property standards, the representation here of so many from local renewal agencies, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Urban Renewal Administration—all of these point up the seriousness of the task in which we are involved. Even more basic, they are an indication of a very important truth about rehabilitation in urban renewal.

That is: rehabilitation in the urban renewal program has not yet achieved its hoped-for success.

It has now been 9 years since rehabilitation was made an integral part of urban renewal by the Housing Act of 1954. During a period of explosive growth in the program nationally, about 200 projects have reached the execution stage involving some degree of rehabilitation, and something in excess of 100,000 dwelling units have been scheduled for rehabilitation. But as to accomplishment, only a few thousand have actually been improved.

The result of this relative lack of accomplishment—much of it understandable, to be sure—has been disillusionment and discouragement in many quarters.

Frankly, the accomplishments, both in this region and nationally, should have been much greater. The rehabilitation program to date has been too time-consuming, too difficult, and beset with too many uncertainties. And bear this in mind: the program is going to get much bigger. More and more cities are coming in with rehabilitation projects. I doubt that anyone facing a huge increase in the program would deny that a more effective rehabilitation operation is something we cannot merely hope for—we have no choice but to make it so.

These reasons point to one conclusion: the chips are down for rehabilitation. That is why we are meeting here today.

But if I have made rehabilitation sound so difficult, why do we bother with it at all?

One of the answers lies in the $500 billion investment in existing residential properties. This is the largest single component of our national wealth.

And another reason is equally important—the renewal of our Nation's cities, as you so well know, will simply not be achieved without an effective rehabilitation program. Without rehabilitation, the cost in dollars and in human terms—the inevitable personal hardships caused by dislocation—are simply beyond our capacity.

A third reason is that our vast stock of usable housing is our greatest resource of housing for low income and middle income families. New construction alone never has and never will be able to take care of this tremendous need.

Of course, a balanced urban renewal program is easier to prescribe than produce. Working out the rehabilitation phase is certainly the most difficult. If there is anything we have learned during these past few years, it is the real lesson that rehabilitation is plain hard work.

There is no such thing as "instant renewal," and of course rehabilitation is the hardest part of a complex program. If we did not recognize these facts at the outset then this meeting would be an exercise in futility.

However, we now have a new instrument of opportunity and achievement—a document that holds out a practical promise for making our hopes for rehabilitation come true.

In my opinion, the new FHA minimum property standards for rehabilitation in urban renewal areas represent a real breakthrough.

Certainly they don't provide quick, cheap, or easy panaceas for the problems of rehabiliation. The new minimum property standards cannot be accomplished merely with good intentions, noble plans, pep talks, and clean-up paint-up campaigns. But they do represent a serious and hard-headed approach.

The concepts involved in the new Minimum Property Standards were pounded out over months of discussion, trial and error, and what at times seemed like an endless process of reviewing every difficulty in the book.

I want to pay tribute here to the people in URA and FHA who were able to make and take criticisms in the true spirit of cooperation and desire to achieve a common goal—workable rehabilitation.

What we have here for the first time is a series of tools—working tools—which realistically face the hard problems that have so often been overlooked in the past. They lay the groundwork for a new kind of intimacy and problem sharing among local public agencies. The Federal Housing Administration and the Urban Renewal Administration.

As never before the new approach brings into play not only the desires and enthusiasm of the local members of this team, but also the experience and seasoned judgment of the Federal Housing Administration. We want and need to have FHA's talents working with us during project planning as well as execution. The intentions of both FHA and URA on this point are quite clear: by facing the problems and working them out during project planning, we mean to make these projects work—fast and effectively—during project execution.

As you know, we in the Urban Renewal Administration are so convinced of the necessity for close collaboration between FHA, URA, and the city prior to the adoption of the urban renewal plan that we will require agreement among all three parties on the standards for the area before authorizing the contract for loan and grant.

In reaching agreement the participants will find the minimum property standards of tremendous value. The important thing is that they were prepared by FHA in consultation with URA based on actual field experience. Once these standards have been modified to meet local conditions and have been agreed upon by FHA, URA, and the city, the city will be assured of FHA mortgage insurance for residential properties in the renewal area; provided, of course, that the properties are improved to meet the standards and the property owners have the resources to carry the mortgage. This is the FHA guarantee.

Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver said recently, "With these standards we hope we can bring to an end the numerous conflicts that have frustrated and delayed the progress of rehabilitation in urban renewal areas. We hope we will be able to move forward rapidly with a minimum of redtape, with the processing of loans that formerly would have taken weeks and months."

To which I can only respond, "Amen."

These are some of the elements in this "package" that I call a real breakthrough. They involve a level of teamwork between the Federal Housing Administration and the Urban Renewal Administration that is unprecedented—teamwork, I might add, finding its mandate in the commitment of President Kennedy to a broad program of community development.

The joint URA–FHA commitment is one part of the package and the new minimum property standards are another. They bring into focus a new concept of basing decisions on rehabilitation more realistically on what the structures in the area are actually like, rather than comparing them to new residences.

A third part of the package is the assurance that FHA assistance will be available when the urban renewal planning is actually being implemented.

This is the kind of backing and financial assurance that is essential if conservation is to work.

But let's be frank. This is not the entire package.

We in the Federal Government will provide all the assistance we can in leadership, guidance, financing, education, and information. But we do not carry out the program. This is the job of the city—the local renewal agency. And if the rehabilitation program has been beset with difficulties then I think we must all agree that there have been enough problems for all of us to share.

We have taken a good look at the entire program—not just the Federal side—and I think it not unfair to suggest to the localities planning or carrying out these projects that wishful thinking or trying to shift the responsibility to URA or FHA won't get the job done.

Some of the roughtest problems have to be handled locally—or they won't be handled at all. For example, Ed Logue, of Boston, has a saying which is, "In rehabilitation you can't plan for people, you have to plan with people." This has been true for so long that it should not need repeating. We all know that financing has been a basic difficulty in the rehabilitation effort. But just as basic are needs, desires, and abilities of the people in the area. Any local agency that plans a project without a sensitive awareness of these interests is simply not going to succeed. Rehabilitation can be carried out neither by edict or happy generalites.

The need to work with people also points up another problem—adequate staffing. This was discussed with you this morning by Edgar Ewing, of Baltimore, and Miles Knowles, of Cincinnati. But let me say this: Any local renewal agency that intends to carry out a rehabilitation program of any size had better face the need for attracting and training a staff adequate to do the job. Working with property owners is more than filling out a survey form. It involves getting to know them and acquiring the knowledge of what they can do and what they will do. It means communicating. And this means in turn a staff of competency and dedication.

Only with this kind of staff should rehabilitation be undertaken. We in the Urban Renewal Administration intend to look very closely at every local agency's capacity to undertake rehabilitation projects. We will frown on a staff that is inadequate in number and quality as certainly as we will turn thumbs down on a staff that is too large for the job to be done.

This matter of the capacity of a city to undertake renewal activities in general, and rehabilitation in particular, is one on which I cannot lay too much stress. The ability of the Urban Renewal Administration to provide additional Federal assistance is clearly dependent on the capacity and efficiency with which that assistance is used.

URA assistance is available across the board, but your performance is the most important single determining factor in the provision of such aid. President Kennedy and the Congress have made quite clear their determination that urban renewal assistance is to be provided where local performance—or ability and willingness to perform—demonstrates beyond doubt that the assistance is warranted.

So here you have the picture—perhaps too sketchy—of where we stand today in our rehabilitation effort. These are the facts on which I base a great hope for rehabilitation in the months and years to come.

There can be no doubt that if urban renewal is to succeed, rehabilitation must succeed.

Every house rehabilitated today, every effort made to upgrade a neighborhood, will return its investment many times in livability, stability, and financial soundness. We owe it to ourselves, our communities, our children to commit ourselves to a broadscale program of renewal in which neighborhood conservation and housing rehabilitation play a major role.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject I have just discussed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SLACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my recent privilege to have appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission, which has been holding hearings on the list of articles before considered for next year's trade negotiations. The significance of these negotiations to this Nation's agriculture is of great import and I am sure of interest to every Member of Congress.

I, therefore, take this time today in order that I might reiterate the statement I made to the Commission, which was as follows:

> I extend my compliments and pleasure to this Commission for arranging these hearings on this most important subject, and for permitting me to present statements in behalf of the American producers of agricultural commodities. These hearings are of particular significance to the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota, which I have the privilege of representing, as well as to other agricultural areas throughout the Nation. The economy of these areas substantially depends on agricultural income for survival, and I am pleased that their point of view has been solicited in this inquiry, designed to assist the President in trade negotiations next year.
>
> I am equally aware of the importance of next year's trade negotiations on the entire American economy. I realize that any negotiation of tariffs or other trade controls must be considered in the best interests of our entire national economy and that ample consideration must be given to all segments of that economy, including agriculture as but one facet of this total picture. We can well contemplate the complexities of such considerations. Even the balance-of-payments problem is a factor that cannot be ignored.
>
> While admitting that agricultural products do not constitute the entire scope of our negotiations, it is respectfully pointed out that many of us in farming areas of this country do not feel that agriculture has

been sufficiently considered in analyzing this total scene. There has been a general feeling among my people in rural America that past negotiations have too often resulted in concessions being made to other trading nations on agricultural products in order to gain concessions for ourselves in other trade areas. Sometimes lost in such considerations is the total effect not only on our farm economy but on the entire Nation of taxpayers and consumers who must in the final analysis pay the bill.

It is hoped that in future negotiations, proper consideration will be given to the relationship between controls imposed on agricultural products by other nations and the controls or lack of controls employed by the United States on our own commodities.

It seems to me that while the United States has relaxed controls over competitive imports, other countries have been tightening theirs. And tariffs aren't the only weapons used against us. We see all types of nontariff barriers such as quotas, licensing systems, variable import fees and the like. This was documented by the Department of Agriculture in their recent study entitled "Agricultural Protection by Nontariff Trade Barriers." The press release accompanying this publication states: "The study shows that all our major trading partners practice a higher degree of agricultural protectionism through nontariff barriers than does the United States." The study also identified that the United States and Canada were the only countries studied that refrain entirely from the use of all protective devices other than tariff on livestock and meat. (See chart I in appendix.)

Not only do we refrain from nontariff barriers, but now we appear to be considering the reduction of the already low tariffs presently in force. We are told that if we hold down or reduce our barriers against imports, other countries can be persuaded to do the same and thus foreign markets for our surpluses can be developed. Surely we ought to do everything possible to encourage trade wherever it serves to improve our own agricultural problem with surpluses and related costs. In too many cases, we have experienced a reverse effect which has rather contributed to our surpluses and to the costs of our agricultural programs.

Our entire Nation must then pay for this imbalance while our farmers experience a drop in income even while reducing their own production to accommodate the imports.

The 1964 outlook issue of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service quarterly Demand and Price Situation Report indicates that we can expect continued expansion in the domestic demand for farm products and can further expect record high exports in 1964. But in the same paragraph of that report it is stated that gross farm income will be down in 1964, and when coupled with an expected farm production expense increase of $750 million, realized net farm income is expected to be lower by perhaps 5 percent or more. This is startling news to the farmers who continue to be caught in the ever-tightening cost-price squeeze. The following table from the mentioned report shows how realized farm income has dropped during the current year. Coupled with the estimated additional drop for 1964, the picture is indeed dim. (See chart II in appendix.)

American agriculture is operating at the lowest parity ratio since 1939. Farming costs are at the highest level in history, now increasing by $750 million a year. Farm mortgages are at an alltime high. And farm surpluses continue at high levels.

While a drop in U.S. farm income is predicted, the Agriculture Department's Economic Research Service further reports that overall consumer incomes after taxes this year are running nearly 5 percent above 1962, with a further substantial gain in prospect for 1964. And it is further predicted that total consumer spending for food in 1963 is 3 percent more than in 1962 with a further rise indicated for next year.

Certainly this is an indication that agricultural income is not keeping pace with the rest of the economy. One of the many reasons for this situation is, in my opinion, the effect of imports.

This causes me to wonder whether or not it is good U.S. policy to ask our agricultural producers to reduce production by various programs of controls and incentives in order to make it possible for other nations to export these same commodities.

If and when imports have the effect of reducing the prices paid to American producers, our farm income or purchasing power isn't the only area to suffer. Whenever a Government control or incentive program is involved, there is a further effect on the rest of our economy.

Any time we import an item that is in surplus or covered by a farm program, we have an additional liability to the taxpayer through storage costs and other administering expenses. An additional reduction of our own production is then necessary to provide a market for foreign products.

But the American farmer is continually blamed for all of the problems facing his field. Simply because he has become efficient, he is blamed for the surpluses, for the cost of farm programs and for everything else. Actually, he's paying the bill himself through reduced production and lower income. And every year he must accept even further restrictions on his production. He now faces still another round of such controls in the many pieces of legislation currently pending in the Congress.

I am curious to know just how many other countries reduce their own production, at a resulting loss in domestic farm income, to accommodate foreign markets. From information we have studied, it would appear that the United States is alone in this field. While realizing that our overall trade policies must be considered and that agricultural products constitute but one segment of that relationship, it appears that our basic policy should be to sell our products to nations needing these products, and to encourage other countries to follow the same policy to the greatest possible extent. This is only good business from the standpoint of a lasting trade policy as well as our desire to provide for an ample supply of food and proper diet throughout the world.

The Congress recognized as early as 1953, when Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act was amended, that prompt consideration should be given to the problem of importing commodities already in surplus production. The Congress recognized that there would be times when emergency authority to establish import quotas should be used. The history of this authority, however, indicates that such actions have not been taken and that the import problems have not been adequately solved. Even though the authority is still there, we have witnessed commodity after commodity move into the surplus area and we have witnessed the government moving into still more agricultural areas with programs and restrictions on domestic producers.

Now we see still another area of agriculture moving firmly into the surplus and government control group. That is the area of dairy products.

I have expressed concern during the past year over the introduction of cream imports into the trade stream. Such imports started a little over a year ago. As of November 2 of this year, the total pounds of cream imported into the United States since January 1 equaled 5,658,344, according to the Bureau of Customs. This is the milk equivalent of 71,125,384 pounds. (See chart III in appendix.)

Every gallon or pound of cream imported into this country directly displaces a gallon or pound of domestic cream, a product already in surplus for which the American taxpayer must support in price and storage.

I have introduced legislation to tighten the provisions of section 22 in an effort to make the hearings by the Tariff Commission mandatory whenever any agricultural product is both in surplus and being imported.

As our dairy surpluses mount, and imports of these products increase, the American taxpayer gets hit once again when the Government finds it necessary to buy these products in an effort to stabilize or raise prices to domestic producers.

The 1964 Outlook issue of Dairy Situation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service's November 1963 issue, says that "prices for most dairy products are considerably higher in the United States than in other countries." And they also say that "without imports quotas and limitations, more dairy products would flow into the United States from other surplus-producing regions." The future possibilities are obvious.

Import quotas are not always the answer. A special report by the Comptroller General in September of 1961 indicated that since the institution of the initial import quotas on dairy products proclaimed by the President in 1953, there have been a number of instances where importers have, in effect, been able to avoid import quotas on dairy products. The objective could be better achieved with the establishment of a quota that would cover all dairy product commodities, based on butterfat content.

The attractiveness of the American market and the imbalance between countries is clearly shown by a number of examples such as this analysis of import and export figures relative to cheese transactions with Italy. The American Blue Cheese Association recently reported that Italy shipped nearly 24 million pounds of varied cheeses to the United States last year, yet applied for surplus American processed cheese for its national school lunch program. The United States in turn has recently purchased 2,841,000 pounds of processed American cheese from producers for 40.49 cents per pound, then sold it to Italy for the world market price of 25 cents a pound. There are indications that additional purchases and sales have been made with even greater price differential. Since such a transaction affects all of the consumers and taxpayers of the United States, it provides another example of how our trade policies in agricultural products fit into this country's total economic picture.

There was some rejoicing when USDA announced on October 9 that a number of principal U.S. supplying countries of Colby cheese, Junex, and frozen cream had indicated they will limit 1963–64 shipments to the U.S. market. But the self-imposed limitation on frozen cream, for instance, would still be 50 percent higher than the amount shipped this year. And the Department's Economic Research Service reported in November of this year that the history of such self-imposed limitations by major suppliers doesn't always work, because additional countries take up the slack by initiating new shipment of dairy products into this country. Section 22 action appears to be the only logical course in such situations.

Looking at another example of where imports are hurting American agriculture, permit me to quote from the October 28, 1963, issue of the USDA publication, Foreign Agriculture:

"U.S. imports of red meat in the January-August period of 1963 totaled 929 million pounds, up 18 percent from the same period last year.

"U.S. imports on boneless beef, the major category, rose by 20 percent to 605 million pounds, and those of canned meat by about 50 percent to 75 million pounds.

"Nine ships left Australia during the month of September, with 27,301,120 pounds of beef, 403,200 pounds of mutton, 51,520 pounds of lamb, and 24,640 pounds of variety meats, to the United States.

"Meat shipments to the United States from New Zealand, totaled 203 million pounds in the 11-month period beginning October 1, 1962. Beef and veal accounted for 94 percent of these shipments."

The threat of even greater imports, since the tariff is now only negligible, hangs over our cattle industry. The only thing that keeps them out of the country at this moment is the embargo on imports from most Latin American countries because of the prevalence of foot and mouth disease. Once these restrictions are lifted, our market could be flooded.

In the past when some of us have protested or questioned these rising imports of meat products we have been told that such imports have had very little if any effect on domestic livestock prices. Gentlemen, this is wishful thinking. The facts don't bear out that conclusion. Actually, we've reached a point of diminishing returns, as evidenced by the fact that the monthly average for choice steers in Chicago fell from $30.13 a hundred in November last year to $22.61 in May of this year.

Even the Economic Research Service of the Agriculture Department sees the folly in concluding that imports have no effect on prices. In its November 1963 report the Research Service says: "If imports are a smaller proportion of domestic production, the effect on fed cattle prices is less; if they are a larger proportion, the effect on prices is greater." The point here is that there is indeed an effect and the effect is increasing.

The Economic Research Service's Livestock and Meat Situation report for this November indicates that if beef imports should equal 10 percent of the total domestic beef production it would cause, on the average, a drop of about 1 percent in the price of choice steers and nearly 3 percent in the price of utility cows. When you project those percentages, the amounts run into the millions of dollars a year in lost income to our domestic producers. In fact, beef imports were running at a rate of 12.3 percent of domestic production in August of this year and averaged 11 percent during the first 8 months of this year.

Dairy products and meat imports are only two examples of the many instances in which agricultural surpluses, supplies and prices have been and are affected by continuing and increasing imports. I won't take the time today to go over each of these, commodity by commodity, for it should be recognized here that there is a relationship of all agricultural products, one to the other. When cattle are grazing on an acre of land, it means they can't raise wheat, corn or any other product on it. So meat, cream, or any other product imported has a direct relationship to the aggregate production of all agricultural products. A typical example is the meat and dairy industry as a consumer of feed grains.

We continually tell our farmers to reduce their output. Commodity after commodity is cut back, is stored at taxpayer expense, and is subsidized. And we now face the possibility of a vast amount of land coming out of the soil bank next year unless further provisions are made. These are factors that indeed contribute to the current and future problems of agriculture and problems to the taxpayers and consumers of this country. These factors should be considered in the light that the problems will be compounded if unfair trade balances continue.

It's time we begin to give American agriculture the same kind of consideration that producers in other countries receive from their governments.

It didn't take long for our friend to the north, Canada, or the Common Market countries, to close the doors when imports hurt their turkey and chicken markets, for instance.

When American agriculture is told to reduce production by 10 percent, why can't we require our foreign suppliers of the same products to reduce their exports to us by the same percentage? Actually, we might go even further than that.

Gentlemen, when international negotiations begin next year, it is my hope that much thought will be given to the total effect on our economy of the problems of agriculture. I hope serious consideration will be given to some method of limiting unnecessary imports, whether we employ higher tariffs, firmer quotas or other controls. None of us expect agriculture or any other segment of our economy to receive preferential treatment. But the American farmer should have a full voice at the international trade table. In more ways than one the economic outlook for agriculture reflects the economic outlook for the entire Nation.

APPENDIX

CHART I

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of the proportion of agricultural production benefiting from nontariff import controls in the United States and selected important agricultural countries*

Country	Percent
United States	26
France [1]	94
West Germany [1]	93
Netherlands [1]	79
Italy [1]	63
Belgium [1]	76
Greece [1]	82
Austria [2]	91
Denmark [2]	87
Norway [2]	97
Portugal [2]	100
Sweden [2]	[3]
Switzerland [2]	94
United Kingdom [2]	[4] 37
Canada	41
Australia	41
New Zealand	100
Japan	76

[1] European Economic Community countries.

[2] European Free Trade Association countries.

[3] Neither total output in terms of value, or representative prices for majority of commodities are available.

[4] Because this analysis is limited to direct restrictions on imports it does not take into account the operation of the United Kingdom deficiency payment system, extent or manner of payments to farmers, or impact of the system on prices and imports.

CHART II

TABLE 4.—*Agricultural prices, marketings and income, 1961 to date*

Item	Unit	1961—Year	1962			1963		
			Year	3d quarter	4th quarter	1st quarter	2d quarter	3d quarter
Prices received by farmers	1910–14=100	240	243	245	244	242	241	241
Crops	1910–14=100	227	230	229	225	233	245	234
Livestock and products	1910–14=100	251	255	257	260	250	238	247
Prices paid, interest, taxes and wage rates.	1910–14=100	302	306	306	308	311	311	311
Family living items	1910–14=100	291	294	294	295	297	297	297
Production items	1910–14=100	266	270	269	272	274	273	208
Parity ratio		80	79	80	79	78	77	77
Volume of farm marketings	1947–49=100	135	136	138	181	126	108	142
Crops	1947–49=100	128	130	136	216	114	61	139
Livestock and products	1947–49=100	140	142	139	154	135	143	144
Cash receipts from farm marketings [1]	Billion dollars	34.9	35.9	9.1	12.0	8.2	6.9	9.2
Crops	do	15.5	15.9	4.2	6.5	3.4	2.2	4.3
Livestock and products	do	19.4	20.0	4.9	5.5	4.7	4.7	4.9
Farmers' realized net income [2]	do	12.5	12.6	12.4	12.6	12.7	12.0	12.2

[1] Seasonally adjusted annual rates are: 1962, 3d quarter, $35,800,000,000; and 4th quarter, $36,200,000,000. 1963, 1st quarter, $36,400,000,000; 2d quarter, $35,600,000,000; 3d quarter, $36,100,000,000.

[2] Seasonally adjusted annual rates.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

CHART III

Imports of cream into the United States, 1963

	Gallons		Pounds		Pounds of milk equivalent (3.5 percent milk)	
	Bureau of the Census [1]	Bureau of Customs [2]	Bureau of the Census	Bureau of Customs	Bureau of the Census	Bureau of Customs
1963						
January	163,290	76,049	1,368,370	637,291	17,200,411	8,010,748
February	59,871	98,747	501,719	827,500	6,306,608	10,401,675
March	114,924	118,941	963,063	996,726	12,105,702	12,528,846
April	118,933	26,485	996,659	221,944	12,528,004	2,789,836
May	26,357	0	220,872	0	2,776,361	0
June	35,530	86,006	297,741	720,730	3,742,604	9,059,576
July	85,891	45,326	719,767	379,832	9,047,471	4,774,488
August	16,274	45,454	136,376	380,905	1,714,246	4,787,976
September		37,327		312,800		3,931,896
October		140,885		1,180,616		14,840,343
November						
December						
January–August	621,070	497,008	5,204,567	4,164,927	65,421,407	52,353,132
January to November 2		675,220		5,658,344		71,125,384

[1] Source: United States Imports of Merchandise for Consumption, FT 110, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Dept. of Commerce.

[2] Source: Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department.

NOTE.—Gallons converted to pounds on the basis of 8.38 pounds per gallon. Cream assumed to be 44 percent butterfat.

THE STATUS OF SOVIET JEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to discuss a subject of deepest concern to me and many other Americans—the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union. The defeat of Nazi Germany should have ended state-sponsored anti-Semitism for all time. Unfortunately, this is not the case. In the Soviet Union anti-Semitism is universally practiced and officially condoned despite the fact that, according to Soviet law and the Soviet constitution, the nationalities of the U.S.S.R. have the right of cultural freedom and freedom of religion is also provided in the constitution. However, as far as Soviet Jews are concerned, the constitutional guarantees are meaningless.

Recently the Soviet poet, Yevgeny Yevtushenko, confronted Premier Khrushchev with the facts about Soviet anti-Semitism which, Yevtushenko pointed out, de-Stalinization had not removed.

The omission of anti-Semitism from the catalog of Stalin's sins is very significant. Since Stalin's death the pattern of oppression and persecution has not changed, and Jewish culture is threatened with extinction.

After 1948, Jewish cultural institutions including Jewish newspapers, publishing houses, professional repertory theater, literary and cultural research institutes, a system of Jewish schools and other institutions were closed.

Since Stalin's death, only six Yiddish books by authors long dead have been published in the Soviet Union.

The once-proud Yiddish theater is no longer a professionally operated theater but is now represented by a handful of amateur groups which exist on a marginal basis. And there is no group in the major centers of Soviet Jewry, Leningrad and Moscow.

In the fall of 1961, a Yiddish literary journal was published. This was the first of its type to be published since 1948.

Not only are Jewish schools still forbidden, but classes in Yiddish and Hebrew are not allowed in the general schools.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Jewish community has no line of communication or contact with Jewish communities and institutions abroad.

Not only is Jewish culture being destroyed, but Judaism is under relentless pressure. While religion in general is under attack, Judaism is singled out for special persecution.

In December 1962 the religious leaders of the United States appealed to Khrushchev to lift the discriminatory restrictions and pressures.

Without a central federation to coordinate religious activity, rabbis and Jewish community leaders have no facility to govern religious functions, to sustain religious belief, and to strengthen communications and religious ties among congregations. There is nothing comparable to the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians-Baptists, the National Ecclesiastical Assembly of the Armenian Church, or the Moslem Board for Central Asia and Kazakhstan.

There are no publication facilities for religious books or periodicals. A Hebrew Bible has not been printed in the Soviet Union since 1917. No religious book has been published since the early 1920's. Religious calendars do not exist. Since the study of Hebrew has been outlawed, full participation in synagogue services is denied to younger people. Religious objects such as the tallis and teffillin are not available.

Other religious groups such as Russian Orthodox, Moslems, Baptists, and Lutherans have published religious books and have been allowed religious articles. In 1958, for example, the Moslem Directorates in Ufa and Tashkent produced respectively 4,000 and 5,000 copies of the Koran. And in May 1962 the Moslem Board for Central Asia issued a new edition. These editions of the Koran are in Arabic which is not spoken by Soviet Moslems but used for religious study and religious functions.

In the Soviet Union there are only 60 or 70 rabbis and synagogues for nearly 1 million Jewish believers. This amounts to only 1 rabbi for each 15,000 to 16,000 believers. Only recently the last remaining synagogue in Lvov was closed, depriving 30,000 believers of a place of worship.

Compare this situation to other religions. For the 40 million Russian Orthodox there are some 20,000 churches and 35,000 priests, 1 place of worship for each 2,000 believers and 1 priest for each 1,100 believers. For the 3 million Baptists there are approximately 6,000 churches and pastors, which amounts to 1 place of worship and 1 minister for each 500 believers.

The Soviet Government has also prohibited the public baking and sale of matzah, imposing serious restrictions on religious practices of the Jewish community.

Discrimination against Soviet Jews is widespread and not limited to religious life.

Their attendance in universities and institutions of higher education is restricted. While Jews represent 3.1 percent of the students in higher education as contrasted with 13.5 percent in 1935, during this 27-year period the Jewish proportion of the population only decreased from 1.6 percent to 1.1 percent.

There are also serious restrictions in the Soviet foreign service and in the armed forces.

During the last 5 years the active government campaign against economic crimes has concentrated on the Jewish people. Some have been executed; many have received long prison terms. It has been reported that in trials involving 140 persons, who were sentenced to death between July 1, 1961, and July 1, 1963, an estimated 83 were Jews.

On September 6, 1963, the Rabbinical Council of America filed a formal protest with the Soviet Ambassador to the United States over the death sentence imposed on a rabbi for alleged speculation in foreign currency and gold.

The official campaign propaganda against economic corruption reveals an anti-Semitic bias as the Soviet Union uses Soviet Jews as a scapegoat.

Mr. Speaker, I have described many aspects of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union which spell out a deliberate policy to destroy Jewish identity. The pursuit of this policy has been of deep concern to American citizens. For instance, on October 12, 1963, an all-day conference on the status of Soviet Jews was sponsored in New York City by the following distinguished citizens: Justice William O. Douglas, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Senator Herbert H. Lehman, Bishop James A. Pike, Mr. Walter Reuther, Mr. Norman Thomas, and Mr. Robert Penn Warren. Mr. Moshe Decter, the executive secretary of the conference, prepared detailed and incisive materials for the conferees. The conference adopted a resolution entitled "An Appeal of Conscience for the Jews of the Soviet Union." I am honored to subscribe to this appeal and include it at this point in the Record for the benefit of my colleagues:

An Appeal of Conscience for the Jews of the Soviet Union

[Statement adopted by the conference on the status of Soviet Jews, Carnegie International Center, 345 East 46th Street, New York City, October 12, 1963]

Having heard careful and objective evidence about many aspects of the life of Jews in the Soviet Union, we are moved to express unanimously our grave concern and to make the following appeals:

We appeal to all those in the U.S.S.R. who genuinely desire the eradication of the evils of Stalinism and who, with us, thirst for truth, justice, and decency.

We appeal to the Soviet authorities to act in this matter on the basis of their own ideological, constitutional, and legal commitments.

We fervently hope that the following specific steps may be taken—

1. Jewish education in all its forms should be permitted.
2. Jewish cultural institutions should be reopened and Jewish artistic life—literature, theater, music, in Yiddish and Hebrew—should be allowed to develop fully.
3. Central institutions to serve the religious needs of Soviet Jewry should be established; obstacles to the performance of sacred rites should be removed.
4. Formal religious and cultural bonds with Jewish communities abroad should be allowed, official exchange visits permitted, and the right to make religious pilgramages to the Holy Land granted.
5. Permission for Jews to leave the U.S.S.R., so that they may be reunited with families in other lands from whom they have been separated, should be implemented.
6. The anti-Jewish character that so strongly colors the official campaign against economic crimes should be eliminated.
7. A vigorous educational campaign against anti-Semitism should be undertaken.

We issue this appeal in all solemnity as a matter of urgency and elementary decency. We cannot keep silent so long as justice is not done on this problem.

Mr. Speaker, last week the 15th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was observed. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights should address itself to the issue I have discussed and bring pressure on the Soviet Union to cease its campaign of religious suppression and discrimination against 3 million of its citizens.

I urge that President Johnson use his good offices to appeal to Premier Khrushchev to lift the religious and cultural restrictions imposed upon Soviet Jews. We cannot rest as long as basic and inalienable human rights are denied.

SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the swift succession of events in the past few weeks have brought into new and urgent focus the processes under which our Government operates and it is especially noteworthy that our Constitution is silent on specific procedures to be followed in the event of a President's becoming seriously or critically incapacitated during his term of office. This is a matter of longstanding interest to distinguished scholars who have undertaken studies of our unique kind of representative democracy. People in and out of government, and notably Members of the Congress, over the years have questioned this apparent flaw in our Republic's structure.

The transition which was swiftly effected in the wake of the sudden and tragic death of the President short days ago is eloquent testimony to the inherent strength of our form of government. As we all know, there is much being said and written contemporaneously concerning the present provisions of our laws with respect to the line of presidential succession. I do not propose to go into a discussion about the pros and cons of the varying suggestions that have been advanced on this matter. But what about the specific procedures in the event of serious disability to our President? This is a problem which has long concerned me. I have introduced resolutions to amend the Constitution in three previous Congresses and did so at the beginning of the present first session of this Congress—House Joint Resolution 28—to spell out specific guidelines on this vital subject of presidential illness or disability. I think the time has come—the time is here—for the Congress to start legislation for a constitutional amendment which, once and for all, will serve to dispell the fears, uncertainties, doubts, and confusion which inevitably exists in the minds of all thoughtful men when they appraise the present lack of constitutional procedures on this problem.

The assassination of President Kennedy has pointed up, unfortunately, a deplorable weakness of the U.S. Constitution and Federal laws dealing with Presidential disability. The United States will be without a Vice President until January 1, 1965, when the President and Vice President chosen in November 1964, take office. No one can question the ability and competency of the men in line of succession. The real problem is how to decide when the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office in case of illness or incapacity. We live in an age when warnings of nuclear attack must be reacted to, literally, within minutes and split second decisions devolve upon the President in such terrifying fashion as to put fresh emphasis on the problem.

Of course, the Constitution as amended some years ago does spell out the line of succession to a Chief Executive in the event of death. But it is mute with respect to a manner and method of determining the ability or inability of a President of the United States to discharge the powers and duties of his office in instances where a critical illness or a disability of possible long-term duration may arise. Indeed, a President confronted by such misfortune of circumstance has no clearcut instructions to which he can look for guidance under the language of our Constitution.

Article II of the Constitution provides that the Vice President shall exercise the powers and duties of the President in event of the death, resignation, or disability of the Chief Executive, or his removal from office. To take care of further contingencies, a series of so-called "Succession Acts" were enacted by the Congress. The act of 1886 established a line of succession starting with the Secretary of State and going through the order of executive departments. On July 18, 1947, a new law was enacted to bring the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate in line of succession ahead of the Cabinet members. The philosophy behind this action in 1947, changing the line of succession, was that the spirit of the Constitution intended clearly that the Chief Executive should be an elected official rather than an appointive one. With this conclusion of reasoning, I can fully concur.

But the knotty question remains—who is vested with certain, sure authority to arrive at a determination of when is a President not able to discharge the powers and duties of his office? The answer is—no one, under existing processes.

In the conviction that here exists a procedural deficiency that should be corrected, I introduced on January 3 of this year a resolution—House Joint Resolution 28—proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to establish a Commission to determine the inability of a President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President.

This resolution would establish a unit to be known as the Presidential Inability Commission. The Commission would have the responsibility and authority to relieve the President or Acting President of the United States of his duties, "upon a determination that he is not able to discharge properly the powers and duties of the office of President, and after any such action, to restore the President or Acting President to the assumption of such powers and duties upon a determination within the same term of office that he is able to discharge properly the powers and duties of the office of President."

The aforementioned Presidential Inability Commission would be composed of eight members as follows: First, the Chief Justice of the United States, who would serve as Chairman of the Commission, and who would have no vote in the proceedings of the Commission except in the case of a tie; second, the Senior Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; third, the Secretary of State; fourth, the Secretary of the Treasury; fifth, the Speaker of the House of Representatives; sixth, the minority leader in the House of Representatives; seventh, the majority leader in the Senate, and eighth, the minority leader in the Senate.

Five members of the Commission would constitute a quorum. Members of the Commission would serve as such without compensation. Any two members of the Commission could cause the Chairman to convene the group without delay by communicating in writing to him, stating that they have sufficient cause to believe that the President is unable to discharge properly the powers and duties of the office. The Commission is then directed to seek competent medical advice as to the condition of the President and his ability to discharge properly said powers and duties. Should the Commission subsequently determine Presidential inability, it is bound to then notify the House of Representatives and the Senate—if Congress is then in session—the President and the individual next in line of succession to the Presidency. Thereupon, the Presidential powers and duties would devolve upon the individual next in line of succession. The same series of steps is established for the President's reassuming the powers and duties of the office if the Commission determines that the disability no longer exists.

As stated, this resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution, which requires the customary ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, within 7 years. This in itself is assurance that the entire subject of Presidential inability will be accorded the most deliberate and careful scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, establishment of a Commission vested with the responsibility and authority to arrive at a determination of any President's capacity to discharge the powers and duties of the office is a logical step that would correct an obvious fault in our Constitution. It would serve to remedy an imperfection that for most of our national life has disturbed authorities and scholars of American Government. In this day of challenge and stress, it is strongly advisable that the Congress clarify beyond any doubt or uncertainty the provisions of the Constitution with respect to execution of the duties of President in the event of disability.

I understand that during the last few years a form of agreement has been entered into between the President and next in line of succession to provide for this question of inability. Under the present state of our law, this is obviously a wise thing to do. However, it must be realized that this is only an unofficial, but necessary solution, made necessary by the lack of clear and definitive law. The illness of President Wilson during his term of office, the heart attack suffered by President Eisenhower during his term of office, and the recent tragic death of President Kennedy, to mention a few instances, point to the tremendous need for positive and prompt action in this matter.

This session of the 88th Congress is practically over. However, when we return for the second session in just a few days, I sincerely hope that affirmative action on this overdue problem is included in the early order of work of the committee to which this resolution was assigned, to be followed by prompt action on the floor.

REPORT ON 1ST SESSION, 88TH CONGRESS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. **Smith**] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, at the end of each session since I came to the Congress 5 years ago I have summarized the year's activities, reprinted them at my expense, and mailed them to my constituents. Of course my summary cannot include all of the hundreds of bills, but I believe it includes most of the bills that are of widespread interest in central Iowa. Never before has it been so late in the year when this was done. That is because this was the longest peacetime session in history.

Thanks to the terrific pace of the past 2 weeks, we have accomplished more than had been expected. I think changes in the House rules could have made it possible to do the same amount of work in much less time, and I think that we must adopt some changes. Unanimous consent is required for too many actions. One cantankerous publicity-seeking Member can cause us to lose at least 1 day per week. Out of 435 Members there will always be 1 or 2 such Members. I think we must permit the leadership to speed action unless at least five Members object. This is no revolutionary change, just a recognition of the increased workload without overriding an opportunity for even small minority groups to express dissent. If it causes enough Members to realize the need for updating the rules, the long and grueling session this year will be a blessing in disguise.

Some of the present Members of the House can remember when sessions adjourned in April and there was just a fraction as much work. The workload has increased so much that Members do not have enough time in the district they represent, and I think this is essential to keeping the Government close to the people and keeping it a government of the people.

Next year, I hope we will be able to adjourn and that I can make this summary shortly after Labor Day.

MEDICAL AND HEALTH

Public Law 88-129 provides for a 3-year program of $175 million in matching grants to expand facilities of medical, dental, nursing, and related type colleges and $30.7 million for student loans.

Public Law 88-156 provides for $350 million in aid to States for maternal and child health services, crippled children's programs, and maternity care and research projects to prevent mental retardation.

Public Law 88-164 provides $329 million to aid States in providing mental retardation research facilities and in constructing community mental health centers.

EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN

Public Law 88-38 prohibits discrimination in pay on the basis of sex in work that is subject to the minimum wage laws.

This measure had been before Congress for 18 years.

HOUSING

Public Law 88-158 increases to $275 million the loans to organizations constructing housing for the elderly.

Public Law 88-54 extends for 2 years the authority of FHA to insure mortgages.

MILITARY FORCES

Public Law 88-132 increases the pay for members of the Armed Forces and readjusts pay schedules to encourage reenlistments so that less men will need to be drafted.

EDUCATION

Public Law 88-204 authorizes $400 million per year to aid college classroom construction. Iowa's share will be over $4 million per year. Colleges and universities would be required to pay at least two-thirds of the cost of each construction project. An Iowa appointed committee will determine which schools receive the help and how much; but almost all schools are expected to double enrollments within 10 years and need to receive contributions.

Public Law 88-210 provides for new grants to States to expand vocational education programs and extends the National Defense Education Act for 1 year and the Impacted Areas Act for 2 years. The total amount of money available for student loans was increased by about 50 percent.

This is the most legislation for education that has been passed in any Congress since the Land-Grant College Act of 100 years ago.

AGRICULTURE

Public Law 88-26 extended through 1965 the feed grain program that was in effect for 1963. The bill contained my amendment permitting adjustments to make base acreages more fair next year. The State and county committees are working on this now. It also contained my amendment which will increase average yield bases in Iowa by about six bushels per acre by including the yields of the past 2 years in the base years.

The Mexican farm labor program was extended 1 year under unequivocal assurances that it will stop next year.

Public Law 88-74 authorizes some additional research facilities at Iowa State University and similar experiment stations.

The administration's proposal to extend conservation reserve contracts is bogged down by opposition from those who want to prohibit any of it from being grazed under any condition. The administration had proposed that those who would graze it instead of planting to corn could do so. They would receive one-half as much payment and be producing one-third as many nutrients that can be converted to meat.

RECREATION

Public Law 88-29 authorizes coordination of Federal and State outdoor recreation plans. Other legislation to provide recreation areas is receiving much attention and may be passed next year.

SAYLORVILLE DAM

Although it was not in the budget, money was appropriated to begin construction of Saylorville Dam just north of Des Moines. It will help control floods in Des Moines, increase minimum flow of water through Des Moines in dry weather, and provide a permanent lake of about 5,500 acres.

SQUAW CREEK AND SKUNK RIVER

Although it was not in the budget, money was appropriated to provide surveys for these projects. They are both near Ames. It is one of the few situations in the United States where dams at the upper end of the river can control flooding on the entire river. There would be at least one permanent recreation lake. They would also protect the Iowa State University building program and the industrial development area of Ames, as well as controlling floods for 150 miles downstream.

RED ROCK DAM

Another $11.7 million was appropriated to continue construction of the Red Rock Dam making a total of $30 million that has been invested in it so far. It is being built in three sections. The second spillway section is now under construction and progressing well.

HIGHWAY

Public Law 88-157 extends the interstate highway program through 1971 and continues the billboard control program for 2 years.

MANPOWER TRAINING

Amendments were passed to extend the job training program an additional year and make some 16-to-19-year-olds eligible who could not finish high school. It is in conference now.

INTERNATIONAL

Public Law 88-200 authorized an expansion of about one-half in the Peace Corps. Congress has indicated it intends to replace some foreign aid grants with Peace Corps programs which cost much less and most believe will be more effective.

Public Law 88-186 extended the Arms Control Research Agency through 1965.

The nuclear test ban treaty was negotiated by President Kennedy and ratified by the Senate.

Foreign aid was extended, but reduced about $2 billion below the recommendation of the bipartisan advisory committee headed by General Clay and forwarded as a part of the budget request. The formula under which it was reduced cut some of the grant programs which have not been very effective, but it also reduced some of the loan programs that have not been subject to criticism and limited the President in administration of the law so that he cannot now shift concentration to the more efficient aspects of the program.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Extended the Civil Rights Commission for 1 year and devoted several months to the development of legislation which will come up in the House in January. A discharge petition will either have enough names accumulated by then, or Representative **Howard Smith** of Virginia, chairman of the House Rules Committee, will have concluded hearings resulting in a rule. It is expected to pass the Senate following a long filibuster.

RAILWAY LABOR LAW

Passed a binding arbitration bill to apply to the specific labor dispute concerning the use of firemen and the makeup of yard and train crews. Public Law 88-133 increases benefits under railway retirement and unemployment acts, and strengthens the trust fund's financial position.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT CORPS

A bill authorizing a program to employ jobless youths between 16 and 22 years of age in conservation and hometown work passed the Senate and is pending in the House Rules Committee. Passage in the House is possible, but doubtful.

TAXES

A big tax cutting bill with some revisions in deductions allowable passed the House and is expected to pass the Senate in January. It will probably be effective to any income received after January 1, 1964.

Public Law 88-4 permits a deduction for money paid for child care by a wife who has been deserted by her husband.

VETERANS

Public Laws 21 and 134 increase payments to dependents of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities.

Public Law 88-151 permits the Veterans' Administration to waive recovery on home loans in certain hardship cases.

Public Law 88-20 provides additional compensation for service-connected loss of hearing in both ears.

Public Law 88-22 increases benefits for veterans suffering complete loss of speech.

DEFENSE COSTS

Most of our Federal taxes are still being spent for defense costs. Our inventory of modern weapons such as the Polaris submarine has been increased where we may be able to reduce annual purchases and still have an adequate supply for any eventuality. Savings of at least $500 million per year have been made by changing procurement policies in the past 2 years. Realinement of both Reserve and Regular units of Armed Forces is permitting the closing of some installations and providing us with a more ready-to-go force. Even though new weapons are more complicated and cost more per unit, it appears that it may now actually be possible to maintain our defense needs with less money or at least without the further annual increases that we have had for many years.

BUDGETS

Congress still spends most of its time working on appropriation measures and looking for places to reduce budget requests. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have become more and more aware of the need for a businessman's budget which more accurately reflects changes in accounts receivable, debts accumulated, and assets sold and purchased. A loan that will be paid back to the Government next year is now included the same as a nonrecoverable expense this year and contracts that obligate us for many years to come are only included to the extent we paid on them this year. I believe President Johnson will seek to change the budgeting procedures so they are more meaningful. The table below does not reflect these changes but is really a table showing budget requests and appropriations made. That is the only kind of a budget we now have.

RECAP

Total budget requests, $98,768,867,051.

Total authorized by Congress, $92,403,980,284.

Total reduction by Congress, $6,364,886,767.

Departmental appropriations, 88th Cong., 1st sess. (for regular activities)

Title	Budget estimates	Amount as passed (House)	Amount as passed (Senate)	Amount enacted
Interior	$674,169,000	$597,860,200	$627,859,900	$612,061,750
Related agencies	354,340,000	330,765,500	357,833,500	346,394,750
Treasury [1]	1,153,230,000	1,095,910,000	1,112,200,250	1,103,650,000
U.S. Tax Court	1,893,000	1,890,000	1,890,000	1,890,000
Post Office	4,976,964,000	4,885,000,000	4,940,750,000	4,925,500,000
Executive Office of the President	14,058,000	13,641,000	14,041,000	13,841,000
Labor	427,220,000	384,844,000	384,844,000	350,078,000
Related agencies [2]	30,940,000	29,550,000	29,550,000	30,105,000
Health, Education, and Welfare	5,301,314,000	5,035,542,000	5,036,742,000	5,090,904,000
Supplemental, 1963	1,641,507,106	1,438,691,506	1,488,683,841	1,467,430,491
Supplemental, 1963 (CCC)	508,172,000	508,172,000	508,172,000	508,172,000
Agriculture	1,582,417,000	1,530,934,000	1,562,957,340	[3] 1,546,945,000
Related agencies [4]	4,786,338,000	4,448,523,000	4,483,781,000	[3] 4,466,152,000
Legislative [5]	148,580,245	140,038,919	168,273,069	168,273,069
State	359,721,000	305,051,000	325,033,000	323,849,000
USIA	208,236,000	163,470,000	170,620,000	166,220,000
Justice	355,506,000	343,799,000	344,477,000	343,899,000
Judiciary	59,084,900	58,127,900	58,127,000	58,127,000
Commerce	996,572,000	833,818,000	798,300,100	795,625,100
Related agencies [6]	172,716,000	139,204,000	140,885,000	135,089,000
Defense	49,014,237,000	47,082,009,000	47,339,707,000	47,220,010,000
District of Columbia [7]	289,581,800	284,286,800	319,587,725	313,093,424
Independent offices [8]	14,658,588,000	13,102,718,700	13,300,214,650	13,224,518,000
Military construction	1,966,400,000	1,562,964,000	1,617,489,000	1,585,880,000
Public works	4,561,747,000	4,276,116,400	4,500,963,200	4,406,272,700
Foreign aid	4,525,325,000	3,097,280,000	3,299,503,000	[3] 3,200,000,000
Total	98,768,867,051	91,690,206,925	92,932,484,575	92,403,980,284

[1] Does not include permanent and indefinite appropriations for debt service, tax refunds, trust funds payments, etc.

[2] Includes National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, and Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service

[3] Estimate. No final figures available to date.

[4] Includes credit agencies and corporations (Rural Electrification Administration, Farmers Home Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, etc.) and special programs and functions, including school lunch and foreign assistance.

[5] Figures include funds for Library of Congress, Government Printing Office, Architect of the Capitol, etc., in addition to House of Representatives and Senate.

[6] Includes Small Business Administration, Civil Rights Commission, Maritime Commission, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Tariff Commission, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

[7] Includes Federal contribution of $37,500,000 and loan authorization of $8,000,000; balance derived from District of Columbia revenues.

[8] Principal agencies provided for in this bill: Veterans' Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Federal Aviation Agency, Housing and Home Finance Administration, General Services Administration, FCC, FTC, ICC, SEC, and National Science Foundation.

[9] Includes funds for Atomic Energy Commission, Army Engineers' programs for navigation improvements and flood control, Tennessee Valley Authority, Bureau of Reclamation and power agencies of Department of Interior, etc.

NOTE.—The Congress enacted Public Law 88-55, Public Law 88-109, and Public Law 88-162, joint resolutions, continuing appropriations through Aug. 31, Oct. 31, and Nov. 30, 1963, and Jan. 31, 1964, respectively.

THE CLOSING OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—A LOOK AT THE CASE BEHIND THE HEADLINES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. **Stratton**] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have risen in this well before to express my feelings with regard to the action taken by the Department of Defense the other day in announcing, with no prior consultation with the Congress, and with virtually no advance notice, the closing down of a number of military installations affecting something over 21,000 jobs of American citizens around the country.

As a Representative from New York State, and especially from the upstate area of New York most heavily affected by this particular action, I have tried to echo not only my own sentiments but those of the people I have the honor to represent on this particular question.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself in somewhat more detail to what I believe to be some of the basic and underlying issues which this action, and the precipitous way in which it was taken, have raised for us in this body and in America.

We who have had the misfortune to have areas of ours affected by this action have been accused in the press in recent days—I am sure we are all aware of it—of playing what one distinguished newspaper referred to as pork-barrel politics in objecting to the closing down of installations in our own States or in our own districts, and in objecting to people being thrown onto the relief and unemployment rolls as a result of action taken by this Government.

We have been accused of being opposed to economy. We have been accused of talking economy out of one side of our mouths and opposing it out of the other. We have been accused of opposing progress. Some newspaper cartoonists have even tried to make fun at the expense not only of those of us in this body who have spoken out on this issue but also, by extension, at the expense of thousands of Americans who are facing a bleak and unattractive Christmas today because of decisions announced last week by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, I do not imagine that there would be much opposition in this body to the proposition that unemployment is one of our greatest problems in America. In spite of the tremendous economic advances we have made in America, in spite of the phenomenal growth in our gross national product to a point approaching $600 billion, as the President of the United States commented yesterday in his press conference, the fact remains that unemployment is still a problem for us, and that unemployment is being suffered at a rate far greater than any we would like to contemplate.

We do not have to look abroad for disease and distress and unemployment, much as we are concerned with problems abroad. We have it right here in our own country. Many of us here in this body have devoted the bulk of our efforts to trying to meet this problem of unemployment.

But I find it difficult, Mr. Speaker, to see how anyone can be concerned about unemployment, for example, in the so-called Appalachian area; I find it hard to see how anybody can be concerned with the economic hardship and unemployment created by the announcement the other day, for example, that the Studebaker Co. is ceasing motorcar manufacturing in South Bend, Ind., thereby throwing 5,000 people out of work; I find it difficult to see why they should be concerned with these situations and yet regard unemployment created as the result of the closing down of defense installations as somehow a suitable subject for jests, for jokes, or for one more attack on the Congress of the United States.

When the announcement of the closing down of the Studebaker plant was made, for example, 5,000 people were thrown out of work, and this was front-page news in the papers of America. The machinery of Government began to move. The Secretary of Labor indicated he was distressed. I think the Secretary of Commerce indicated a similar concern, and very properly so. Those agencies of Government that might have to deal in any way with this increased problem of unemployment in this particular area began to move.

But, Mr. Speaker, with the closing down of two defense installations in upstate New York, another 5,000 people were also faced with unemployment, 3,400 in the Rome Air Materiel Area in Rome, and 1,700 in my former home city of Schenectady with the closing down of the Schenectady Army Depot. Five thousand people in upstate New York; 5,000 people thrown out with the closing down of Studebaker. Yet by some strange quirk of thought on the part of some writers and cartoonists and columnists, one case is a national tragedy, the other they seem to regard as a kind of grim national joke.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it makes really a great deal of difference what the circumstances are from which unemployment stems. A man or a woman out of work—a man or a woman faced with the loss of a job—a man or a woman—particularly one who has, let us say, reached the age of 55 or 57 or 60—and then faced with the elimination of his or her career, is certainly no subject for jest, regardless of what the circumstances may be.

In the 5 years I have had the privilege to serve in this body, Mr. Speaker, I have done everything I could to try to find an answer to the problem of unemployment, since it has long been a major concern to the entire upstate New York area.

I was a cosponsor of the area redevelopment bill which we finally succeeded in getting enacted into law.

I have supported the accelerated public works program and I am coauthor of legislation to extend the benefits of this program for another 2 years.

I supported the tax cut bill as an effort to try to stimulate new jobs and give private employment a much-needed boost.

So my concern with unemployment is nothing new, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure it is not new for most of the Members of this body.

I do not think anyone in this body is opposed to economy. I do not think anyone, or at least very many of us, could really genuinely be opposed to eliminating excessive military capacity. We are certainly not opposed to progress and the changes that come about as the result of progress. But, we do have to admit, it seems to me, that we have today in our Defense Establishment an agency with a tremendous potential for aggravating our unemployment problems, unless we recognize that threat now and act to do something about it.

If there is to be a major change in defense policy, then we ought to recognize the economic impact these changes will make. You cannot eliminate a Government defense contract, you cannot close down a base without throwing people out of work. We cannot simply ignore these job losses just because the result from defense shifts. As a matter of fact, if we really expect to achieve disarmament as people have been talking about, then we are going to have to face up to an even more extensive readjustment in our economy.

It is not enough, it seems to me, for the Department of Defense to say that every effort is going to be made to find other Government jobs for the people who are thrown out of work. This sounds good, but those of us who have seen these things happen in the past know that only a very small percentage of those who lose their jobs as a result of the closing down of a military installation are able to pick up another job of the same kind or on another Government payroll. I think the figure in general has been around 10 or 15 percent—and that is a pretty small figure indeed.

The fact is that not only the Defense Department but every agency of Government has an obligation before it begins major moves of this sort, to consider the impact of their decisions on our overall unemployment picture.

The incredible thing with these closings of last week, Mr. Speaker, is that the Defense Department for some strange reason has taken a kind of perverse pride in boasting that it reached the decisions it made in these particular closings without the slightest regard for the local employment pictures.

That is an incredible confession, Mr. Speaker. But that is was what Secretary Gilpatric said to those of us in the New York delegation when he tried to break the bad news to us the other day. He did not think that Defense had any possible concern for unemployment. The fact is that both of the major bases which were closed down in New York State—the Rome Air Materiel Area in Rome and the Schenectady Army depot in Schenectady—were located in serious unemployment areas. But the Defense Department said they just could not care less.

Now, it would seem to me that if the Government recognizes that unemployment is a problem for us, then if you have a choice of closing down one of two military installations, other things being reasonably equal, Mr. Speaker, it ought to be obvious that the installation already located in an unemployment area should not be the one to be shut down. Yet in both of these cases in New York State, the Defense Department closed down bases located in unemployment areas even though the rivals for consideration were located in both cases outside of unemployment areas.

I do not know how you could have done the job with any greater disregard for economic consequences than the way the Defense Department did it.

I was interested, Mr. Speaker, to read in the New York Herald Tribune this morning a piece by Walter Lippmann in which he raises this very point, that if we do mean what we say about wanting to achieve disarmament, then we are going to have to make a pretty sweeping survey of how to transform a $54 billion defense economy into a peacetime economy of the same size. This is, of course, a staggering problem, but at least we ought to start with the very kinds of problems which these closings have confronted us with. It is about time, Mr. Speaker, that the Defense Department was required to be as much concerned with unemployment as any other agency of the Government of the United States.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the text of the article by Mr. Lippmann.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Slack). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

FRUGALITY AND RETRENCHMENT

(By Walter Lippmann)

In supporting Secretary McNamara's efforts to cut back military spending on superfluous installations, President Johnson is no doubt improving the prospects of his tax bill. But at the same time he has lifted the cover on a contradiction in our public life. The contradiction is between what we do and what it is proper for public men to say out loud.

For the fact is that government—Federal, State, and local—buys about a fifth of the goods and services produced by the American economy. To cut back this public spending substantially would produce a strong reaction in employment and in business. Thus the two Republican Senators from New York reacted at once when they heard that seven installations in New York State might be closed down or their operations reduced.

Actually, the McNamara economies are a mere nibble at the immense costs of the Defense Establishment. The economy administered by the Pentagon is over two-thirds as large as the whole economy of Great Britain. Our military supply system is now some 17 times larger than the largest private enterprise; namely, the gigantic General Motors complex. In seven States employment in defense industries is from 20 percent (Arizona) to 30 percent (Kansas) of total manufacturing employment.

In fact, then, the U.S. economy is no longer a plain private enterprise system. Under the impact of the Second World War and of the armaments of the cold war, the American economy has become an organic mixture of public money and private money, public and private management. Any serious reduction of public spending must, therefore, have far-reaching effects on the whole economy.

There are some who say they think that Government and big spending can be reduced by cutting down civilian expenditures while leaving alone or even increasing military expenditures. This is a device of politicians who are merely pandering to popular prejudices. There is only one way by which serious and substantial retrenchment can be made, and that is by a reduction of armaments.

Desirable, but comparatively minor, savings can be had by reducing the amount of some of the civilian subsidies. But the amount will be much too small to make itself felt in the burdens of the taxpayer.

The immediate military cutbacks we are hearing about are really concerned with waste. They will not reduce in any way the military power of the United States. They are directed only at useless expenditures, those which employ men and materials for no real military purpose. Although this kind of frugality will not affect the budget importantly, it will have a salutary effect nevertheless, for it is demoralizing to see public employees assigned to waste the public money.

But beyond the tidying up of waste, including a certain amount of lush and conspicuous extravagance, there is visible on the horizon the prospect of much more substantial retrenchment. I do not myself regard it as likely that we are anywhere near a general disarmament treaty. The fundamental issues of principle are stubborn and their reconciliation is probably too embarrassing to all participants. But while what is underway is not a negotiated agreement, there are parallel trends toward the stabilization and then toward the reduction of military spending.

These parallel trends are activated by a common realization, acknowledged in the test ban treaty, that neither side has anything to gain by spending hugely in pursuit of the will-o'-the-wisp of the absolute weapon. Once that point has been reached, there is a balance of power which, though relatively favorable to the United States, is tolerable to the Soviet Union and cannot be changed seriously by gigantic military expenditures. This is the origin of the present trend toward stabilization in both countries.

At the same time the Soviet Union has found that the burden of the existing armaments interferes with the vital needs of the people. It has been impossible to carry out the program for the modernization of Soviet agriculture by chemical means without cutting down the military budget. We can be reasonably certain that the Soviet arguments for a reduction of armaments are sincere. They spring from necessity.

The United States is under no comparable pressure, and it can be argued that we could exploit the Soviet predicament by accelerating rather than reducing the race of armaments. This is a conceivable line of policy, which can be held in reserve, if the Soviet Government took a provocative line, say in Latin America. But if it follows the present line, which appears to be one of gradual disengagement, the American people will, quite rightly, allow themselves to become conscious of the real burdens of our Defense Establishment. We are paying for our necessary, and invaluable, military power by a failure to provide the facilities of civilian living to keep pace with our needs.

Cutbacks in defense expenditures would cause less difficulty to the economy and encounter less political resistance if the economy were running at a good pace instead of sluggishly. When 5½ percent of the labor force is unemployed, and the national product is $35 or $40 billion less than it could be, the prospects of subtracting any part of the demand for goods and services is disconcerting. It is not too soon, therefore, to begin thinking about what we would do with the resources released by a cut in defense expenditures. We must prepare ourselves not only for the minor readjustments to the first McNamara cutbacks but also for the larger readjustments which will become necessary if and when we enter upon an actual reduction of armaments.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago when I first entered Congress I introduced a bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to undertake a study of the economic effect of deactivating military installations located in areas of substantial unemployment. It was my intention to try to encourage some kind of coherent policy of this kind in connection with the closing of defense installations. I just cannot accept the idea—I could not accept it then and I cannot accept it now—that there is any excuse whatsoever for the right hand of the Government not to know what the left hand is doing, especially with reference to unemployment, one of the gravest problems we face. I have reintroduced that bill, Mr. Speaker, in every successive Congress in which I have had the honor to be a Member, and I introduced it again on January 9 this year as H.R. 607, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to undertake studies of the economic effects of deactivating certain permanent military installations situated in areas of substantial unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that I am delighted to see that our two Senators from New York State together with a substantial number of members of our delegation have now joined in introducing substantially this same legislation as a result of the recent closings announced for Rome and Schenectady.

I am hopeful that this fresh new support will speed the enactment of this vitally needed legislation. The bill which the Members of the other body introduced I have now also introduced, as H.R. 9448. I do not think there is any point in quibbling over authorship or precise format.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert at this point the text of H.R. 607 and of H.R. 9448.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

H.R. 607

A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to undertake studies of the economic effects of deactivating certain permanent military installations situated in areas of substantial unemployment

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That, whenever the Department of Defense announces plans to deactivate or is in the process of deactivating any permanent military installation or major unit thereof and such installation is situated in an area in which the rate of unemployment is 6 per centum or more, the Secretary of Commerce shall, upon the request of the Governor or Governors of the State or States in which the area is located, institute a study to determine the economic effects of the action which has been or is to be taken. In determining the economic effects of such action, the Secretary of Commerce shall, among other relevant matters, consider and make findings with respect to the approximate amount of money which has been, or may reasonably be expected to be, saved by any department or agency of the Government as a result of such action, compared with—

(1) the approximate costs or losses which have been, or may reasonably be expected to be, incurred by other departments or agencies of the Government, or by State and local governmental units, as a result of such action;

(2) the approximate losses which have been, or may reasonably be expected to be, incurred by private interests as a result of such action in connection with any facilities which they have provided to serve the needs of any such installation and which would otherwise have to be provided in whole or in part by the Government;

(3) the approximate cost to the Government of relocating any such installation in the event that such installation has been, or will be relocated; and

(4) the approximate cost to the Government of reactivating, in a national emergency or other contingency, any such installation with respect to which any such action is proposed to be taken.

Any such study shall be conducted as expeditiously as practicable, and the findings resulting therefrom shall be transmitted by the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of Defense and to the Congress.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to utilize information and facilities of the departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government to such extent as he may deem necessary in carrying out his duties under this Act. Each such department and agency is authorized to furnish such information and facilities on the request of the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 3. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

H.R. 9448

A bill to require an economic survey by the Area Redevelopment Administrator prior to the termination of operations at certain installations or facilities of the Department of Defense.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That, (a) prior to terminating any operations at an installation or facility of the Department of Defense situated in an area of substantial unemployment, the Secretary of Defense shall, if the termination of such operations would result in the laying off of one hundred or more civilian employees, give written notice of the proposed action to the Area Redevelopment Administrator. Upon receipt of such notice the Area Redevelopment Administrator shall forthwith undertake a survey and study with a view to determining (1) the immediate and long-term impact of the proposed action on the economy of the area, and (2) the approximate cost of providing an equivalent number of jobs under programs authorized by the Area Redevelopment Act or the Public Works Acceleration Act.

(b) Any survey and study undertaken by the Area Redevelopment Administrator under subsection (a) shall be completed as expeditiously as possible (in no event later than sixty days after receipt of notification), and the findings resulting therefrom shall be transmitted by the Administrator to the Secretary of Defense and to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, and such findings shall be made public. No action shall be taken by the Secretary of Defense to terminate operations at an installation or facility referred to in subsection (a) until such findings have been received and considered by the Armed Services Committees of the Congress and by the Secretary of Defense.

(c) As used in this Act, the term "area of substantial unemployment" means an area which is eligible for assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act or the Public Works Acceleration Act.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this body from the State of New York, I have been especially disturbed that this action taken the other day by the Defense Department has an inordinate and most unusual impact on the great State which I have the honor to represent.

Just consider these facts. The Department of Defense announced the closing down of 33 military installations in 14 different States. They have advised me that some 21,000 jobs will be involved in these closings. But the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that almost one-third of that total is located in New York State alone—1,700 jobs are involved in Schenectady, 3,400 jobs in Rome, 700 to 800 jobs are involved in the 5 relatively smaller installations located in the metropolitan area of New York.

Why do we have to have one-third of the total number of jobs eliminated in 14 States occur in New York? Why must proposed economies and changes in our defense program always seem to come at the expense of New York State? Is it not a little strange that this one State, with only one-tenth of the national population is now being asked to shoulder almost one-third of the burden of this latest defense cutback? And in an unemployment area, to boot. Is not this just a little bit more than our fair share? In fact, this new wallop for New York State is particularly hard to take when it comes on the heels of the recent announcement by the Defense Department that New York State, which only a little while ago stood No. 1 in the list of defense contractors, now occupies a poor fourth place with 6.5 percent of the total of prime military contract awards, behind California with 21.1 percent, Washington State with 10.9 percent, and Missouri with 7.8 percent.

Mr. Speaker, believe me, if those of us who were elected to Congress from the State of New York did not speak out to defend the economic interests of our State, if we do not try to voice the anguish and the concern of the people of that great State who sent us here to represent them, then who else is there to speak out?

But there is one other aspect of this problem, Mr. Speaker, that also concerns me. It would seem axiomatic that before the Department of Defense takes an action of this scope, it would at least consult with the Congress or with the appropriate committees. Yet it did not.

Oddly enough, the Pentagon cannot buy or sell a single acre of land today or switch a single contract dollar from one project to another without first coming to the appropriate committees of Congress. Yet here we find them seeking to add 21,000 persons to the unemployment rolls, largely in areas already suffering with high unemployment, without furnishing Congress in advance with information on which these decisions have been based.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Does the gentleman from New York make the argument that the Department of Defense should be used as a vehicle to solve the unemployment problem?

Mr. STRATTON. Certainly not, I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin. I am not suggesting at all that the Department of Defense ought to be used as a vehicle to solve the unemployment problem. What I am saying is if unemployment is a matter of concern to our Nation, as indeed it is, then no agency of Government can wholly absent itself from a recognition of that problem, and its actions ought to be taken, insofar as possible, in such a way as to have the smallest possible role in aggravating unemployment.

If the Department's actions are going to increase unemployment, then I say that we in the Congress have as much right to be advised of that decision, or at least be informed of what the supporting evidence is, as we are when the question concerns the sale of a single acre of real estate.

Mr. LAIRD. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman from New York fully realizes that the Committee on Appropriations in the defense appropriation bill for 1964 laid out very strong guidelines so far as the closing of defense installations was concerned. In those guidelines we instructed the Secretary of Defense to use every means possible to save taxpayers' dollars. Now, there were certain closings that were canceled last week at the last minute. I refer particularly to three Navy yards which were involved. The Navy put out the word that there were six, but on the list on Monday when it was set before the ranking minority member and the chairman of our subcommittee, there were only three Navy yards involved on that list, and that particular study had been carried on for over a year by the Department of Defense.

Mr. STRATTON. I want to thank the gentleman for his contribution. Unfortunately, I cannot yield further.

Mr. LAIRD. I have to support the Secretary of Defense in this particular matter.

Mr. STRATTON. Unfortunately, I cannot yield any further because my time is running out.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to make one final point. I have already referred publicly to the same incident to which the gentleman from Wisconsin has referred. I am sure that the gentleman would agree with me that while we do want to save money, we certainly do not want one arm of Government doing something that contradicts what another arm has been doing. They both have an equal obligation, within their framework, to support the aims of the Government as a whole.

Mr. LAIRD. Is the gentleman referring to Monday's list or Wednesday's list?

Mr. STRATTON. I am sorry but I cannot yield to my good friend further. I have got to complete my statement. If any time remains, then I will gladly yield to him.

I want to emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that I believe this Congress has the right to have the figures relating to alleged economies resulting from base closings. Anything that affects the economic future of 21,000 persons is as much a concern of this body as the sale of an acre of real estate or the switch of a contract dollar from one project to another.

I am happy to advise the House, Mr. Speaker, after consulting yesterday with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, that the chairman has assured me that officials of the Defense Department will be directed to make their figures on these alleged economies involved in the Rome Air Materiel Area and the Schenectady Army Depot available to members of the committee immediately after the opening of the next session. As a result of the chairman's action I hope we will get a good look at these figures next month. I have my doubts, based on the information I have, that the economies they claim can be supported by their figures. But we are going to make a very careful check of those figures.

What is also important is that this action may set a precedent that will require the Department in the future to present such computations to Congress before rather than after the closings have been announced and the damage has been done. That is what we need if we are going to have a chance to do our job. It makes little sense to put additional money into ARA and APW programs and then have the Defense Department, without prior consultation with any other agency of government, and without consultation with this Congress, create unemployment situations which will eat up all of those funds and require the appropriation of even greater sums.

I hope the Defense Department will soon come to recognize its obligations in this regard and will in the future consult more carefully with the appropriate committees of Congress.

WEST VIRGINIA CHRISTMAS TREE

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend a cordial invitation to my colleagues and friends to attend the lighting of the Christmas tree at the Ellipse on Sunday, December 22, at 5:30 p.m. by President Johnson.

This is a West Virginia Christmas tree, and it stands proud and tall in this centennial year commemorating President Lincoln's proclamation granting statehood to West Virginia in 1863.

A few days ago when Members of the other body eulogized our late President, West Virginia's Senator ROBERT C. BYRD stated:

> Now the period of mourning is drawing to a close, and the happy season of Christmas will be upon us. In the broad ellipse at the foot of the Washington Monument there stands a 75-foot Christmas treet sent from the mountain forests of West Virginia. I like to think that this tree is symbolic of the place that John F. Kennedy will keep in our hearts, a place forever green and bright with the joy of the spirit.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 7 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

> H.R. 9499. An act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore of the Senate, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 9355(a), had designated Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. MCGEE, and Mr. HRUSKA to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the conference report on H.R. 9499 at any time after it had been reported.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this applies only to this one bill; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 9499, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PASSMAN, GARY, NATCHER, RHODES of Arizona, and FORD.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a short recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 7 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Louisiana rise?

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1964

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that the Members are interested in the foreign aid bill and when it will be reported back to the House. It appears that we cannot have a conference before tomorrow. As far as the conferees on the part of the House are concerned they will be available from 6 a.m. on. When the Members of the other body can meet with us we will be available. I can assure you that after we start our conference we will bring the bill back to you as quickly as it can be done.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, the other body having asked for the conference, if the conferees are able to agree on a conference report then we would get the papers first.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to ask the gentleman if he will see to it that he gets the papers and brings them back over here first?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am a little quick on the draw.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in the event that the conference report is acted on first in the House, as we now understand it will be, would a motion to recommit with instructions be in order?

The SPEAKER. A proper motion would be.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, it would have to be germane. If so, a motion to recommit to insist on the wheat amendment, I take it, would be in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, of course, would pass upon any question at the appropriate time.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the Chair.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for today and the balance of this week, on account of personal matters involving his famly.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, on the first day of the next session.

Mr. RYAN of New York, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include tables.

Mr. STRATTON, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BROOKS and to include an article.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 579. An act for the relief of Cilka Elizabeth Ingrova; to the Committee on Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1289. An act for the relief of Maria Mereghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina);

H.R. 2513. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2985. An act to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to venue generally;

H.R. 4062. An act to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande;

H.R. 7044. An act to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission;

H.R. 9413. An act to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; and

H.J. Res. 778. Joint resolution to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 212. An act for the relief of Yoo Sei Chun;

S. 697. An act for the relief of Misako Moriya;

S. 966. An act for the relief of Yukio Iseri;

S. 1097. An act for the relief of Despina J. Sanios;

S. 1129. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Bollers and Earlene Bollers;

S. 1172. An act to amend Public Law 86–518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86–518;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of the Arizona Milling Co. of Phoenix, Ariz.;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Mr. Demetrios Flessas and Dr. Eugenia Flessas;

S. 1516. An act for the relief of Ana Murgelj;

S. 1570. An act for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock;

S. 1698. An act to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds;

S. 1756. An act to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under this act;

S. 1767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the State of Delaware, and for other purposes;

S. 2228. An act to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks;

S. 2275. An act to revise the procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act, Public Law 86–3, for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; and

S. 2364. An act to provide that the Commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 20, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1459. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on high costs pertaining to sites for selected low-rent housing projects in the area administered by the San Francisco Regional Office of the Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1460. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order entered under the authority contained in section 13(b) as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1461. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the excessive price paid by the Department of the Navy for propulsion reduction gears purchased from Westinghouse Electric Corp., Sunnydale, Calif; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1462. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs being incurred as a result of the Navy's refusal to accept the standardized officers' dress shoes agreed upon by the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1463. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382, 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of Conference. S. 1007. A bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1063). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 102. An act to provide for additional commissioners of the U.S. Court of Claims; with amendment (Rept. No. 1064). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3396. A bill to authorize the addition of lands to Morristown National Historical Park in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1065). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works: H.R. 7351. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to increase the authorization for appropriations under that act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1071). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 793. An act to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project; with amendment (Rept. No. 1072). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1450. A bill for the relief of Maria Mangano; with amendment (Rept. No. 1066). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1455. A bill for the relief of Ewald Johan Consen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1067). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2190. A bill for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo; with amendment (Rept. No. 1068). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5617. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Renee Louise Gabrielle Huffer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1069). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7347. A bill for the relief of Teresa Elliopoulos and Anastasia Elliopoulos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1070). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9520. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 9521. A bill to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 9522. A bill to authorize the modification of the John Martin Reservoir project, Colorado, in order to provide a permanent reservoir pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 9523. A bill to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the duty on certain hairsprings and hairspring assemblies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9524. A bill to designate Fishtrap Reservoir to be created by the dam authorized to be constructed on the Levisa Fork, in Pike County, Ky., as "Kennedy Lake" in honor of the late President John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9525. A bill to amend the maximum hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for a 35-hour workweek and double time for overtime; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 9526. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9527. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration cemetery, Houston, Tex., as the John F. Kennedy Veterans' Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 9528. A bill to require an economic survey by the Area Redevelopment Administrator in connection with the termination of operations at certain installations or facilities of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 9529. A bill to authorize the partition of the surface rights of the Hopi and Navajo Indian Tribes in undivided trust lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9530. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 9531. A bill to provide for the case of inability of the President or Vice President or interim successor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9532. A bill to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committtee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9533. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of U.S. citizenship by a person who applies for naturalization in a foreign state, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9534. A bill to provide for the case of inability of the President or Vice President or interim successor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUTEN:

H.R. 9535. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to conduct a survey on the engineering and economic feasibility of a cross-Georgia waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9536. A bill to provide that information about the United States prepared for dissemination abroad shall not be changed for dissemination in any particular country based upon any discriminatory practice or policy followed by such country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. Res. 596. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to make provision for certain matters when the Speaker of the House of Representatives acts as President of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Belgian House of Representatives, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Italian Chamber of Deputies, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Heinrich Von Brentano of Germany, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Storting of Norway, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the German Bundestag, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Second Chamber of the Netherlands, memorializing the President, and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the European Parliament of Luxembourg, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Iranian Parliament, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Jordanian House of Representatives, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Moroccan Chamber of Representatives, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Deputies of Chile, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Deputies of Brazil, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Mauritanian National Assembly, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Deputies of Bolivia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Deputies of Peru, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of Japan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the President of the Sejm of the Polish Republic, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Senate of the Republic of Venezuela, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Deputies of Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Ichiro Kiyose, House of Representatives of Japan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the National Assembly of Turkey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also memorial of the House of Representatives of Ceylon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the people and government of the city of Juarez, State of Chihuahua, Republic of Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Jordanian Senate, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the President of Siam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Tohwa of Japan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to paying tribute to the memory of John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROMWELL:

H.R. 9537. A bill for the relief of Despina E. Foundoulakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 9538. A bill for the relief of Enrique Aurelio Baca-Patlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 9539. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Choi Har Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 9540. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Viola Louise Bradley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9541. A bill for the relief of Henrique Botelho de Medeitros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 9542. A bill to provide that the entry covering certain colored glass windows for the use of Our Lady of Florida Passionist Monastery, North Palm Beach, Fla., shall be liquidated; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 9543. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 9544. A bill for the relief of Francisco Henares y Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

547. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Donald E. Hart, chairman, Wheat Ridge Congregational Church, Denver, Colo., relative to a resolution on human equality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

548. Also, petition of Mildred Jeffrey, Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan, Lansing, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to various measures pending before the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

549. Also, petition of O. E. Peterson, secretary, Kiwanis International, Chicago, Ill., relative to our spiritual heritage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

550. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to make a thorough study of reducing medical costs to the American people; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

551. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to renovate the "cata combs" of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AFL–CIO Hate Mail Directed at Senator Lausche

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions this week I have commented briefly on the current platitudes and noble pronouncements we are hearing about hatemongering in the United States. The political left has shed many crocodile tears over the lack of love and kindness in politics and, strangely, they seem to find that "rightists, radical rightists, self-styled patriots, conservatives, and constitutionalists" are the apostles of discord, distrust, and hate.

As a gesture toward balance, I will briefly outline innuendo and smear which is coming from the political left which meets the standards they have instituted for criticizing the political right with the charge of hatemongering. I have found that the greatest effort to induce prejudice and hate seems to come from those on the left who wave the flag of decency the highest. The Ohio AFL–CIO puts out a weekly newsletter entitled "News and Views." Their November 15, 1963, edition carries a prominent article with a lead sentence that is contrived to induce hate and contempt for our U.S. Senator from Ohio. It states:

> It's no secret that Ohio U.S. Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE is against decent wages.

Now this is an absolute lie. I do not know the Senator's thinking on many legislative proposals but I know personally that it is contemptible to say that he "is against decent wages." It may have been accurate to say that he opposed specific legislative enactments regarding wages and so forth because of a variety of reasons ranging from coverage to constitutionality, but it is not accurate or fair to say that he opposed them because he "is against decent wages."

The leadership of the AFL–CIO has its own particular tarbrush tactic. They are "for people" and those who oppose their legislative propositions are "against people." If you have many objections to their minimum wage proposals which are in no way related to whether a person should receive $1.25 or $1.50 per hour, this does not matter—you are against decent wages. If you would happen to oppose Federal aid to education, you are against kids. If you fail to see the advisability of a national socialized health insurance system it must be due to your lack of compassion for the older people. If you are against the so-called "clean air bill," you are for dirty air. Their strange code of ethics makes it impossible for anyone to be honest or humanitarian who opposes them or has legitimate objections to their program.

The AFL–CIO leadership could do far more for the country and the spirit of peace and brotherhood they supposedly are trying to foster if they would concede that there are many areas for honest disagreement rather than fill their pens with invective and hate in their effort to obliterate political opposition.

SBA Public Service Award Given to National Federation of Independent Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that on December 2, 1963, the Small Business Administration presented its Public Service Award for outstanding service to the National Federation of Independent Business in ceremonies at SBA's Washington headquarters.

The national federation, which was organized in 1943 as a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization to protect, promote, and improve the opportunities of independent business, is a rather unique group. It is the largest business organization in the Nation with about 194,000 members in 2,500 chapters throughout the 50 States.

Small Business Administrator Eugene P. Foley presented the Public Service Award in recognition of National Federation of Independent Business' efforts to promote independent businesses throughout the country, for support of legislation and Government programs beneficial to small firms, and for supporting the Small Business Administration and its programs of assistance.

Many of our colleagues know and respect the federation's vice president for legislative activities, the genial, and knowledgeable George J. Burger. I know that my colleagues on the Small Business Committee join with me in offering congratulations to George and to the federation for the well-deserved tribute on the National Federation of Independent Business' 20th anniversary.

Remarkable Lady Inspired Speech and Hearing Center at Gallaudet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, many times I am sure, we all do not have the opportunity to understand and appreciate fully institutions and influences in our Nation's life which are close around us.

I am pleased to be able to share an article which has been published in the January 1964 issue of Diplomat magazine which outlines the purposeful and courageous life of Mary L. Thornberry for which the Speech and Hearing Center at Gallaudet College is named.

And of particular interest to each of us serving in the Congress, this article was written by our former colleague, HOMER THORNBERRY, and is a profile of his mother:

> TRIBUTE TO A REMARKABLE TEXAN WHO INSPIRED SPEECH AND HEARING CENTER AT ONLY COLLEGE FOR DEAF—RETIRING MEMBER OF CONGRESS RECALLS MOTHER'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS DESPITE GREAT HANDICAP
>
> (One of the President's closest friends, HOMER THORNBERRY, who has represented the 10th U.S. Congressional District of Texas (once represented by Lyndon B. Johnson) since 1949, recently was appointed and con-

firmed Federal judge of the western district of Texas. This is his poignant profile of his mother, an extraordinary woman who was her own miracle worker under the most trying of circumstances and who was an inspiration not only to family and friends but also for the Mary L. Thornberry Speech and Hearing Center at Gallaudet College, the only college for the deaf in the world.—EDITOR.)

(By HOMER THORNBERRY)

When her father frowned at her for reaching across the table to grab some food, she jumped up, ran to fetch the broom, and returned to hit him over the head. With great interest a few days before this episode, she watched her grandmother milk a cow. Then the grandmother tried to teach the child how to milk. When she made a mistake, her grandmother corrected her. Furious, the child grabbed up the pail of milk and threw it in her grandmother's face.

This was my mother when she was 8 years old. Totally deaf, she had neither heard nor uttered a word since an illness in infancy. Born in a rural section of Texas into a large family who spoiled her, she had grown up almost without restraint or discipline.

It was not until she began to commit the more serious breaches of conduct that her parents would agree something had to be done. A family friend persuaded them to send her to the school for the deaf in Austin.

Having reached the difficult decision to part with this child whom they loved so much, the parents took her on the 200-mile trip by horse and buggy from our home to the State capital.

My mother never forgot that trip. She told me many times of the nights they camped out and of her first sight of the school now known as the Texas School for the Deaf.

Arrangements were made to leave her in the care of her first teacher, Miss Emily Lewis, whose memory is still revered by many deaf persons in Texas. When the hour came for parting, the tearful parents prepared to surrender their daughter to the stranger and to dark hours of homesickness, but to their amazement, when they went to bid the child goodby, she was happily poring over a book with her new teacher, and already learning the alphabet of the sign language. There were no tears in her eyes, only the dawning of new comprehension as she blissfully waved a farewell. Later, there would be times when she would be homesick and long to see her family, but her introduction to sign language was the real beginning of her life.

For all of her 85 years, my mother faced life with great courage and optimism. Apparently, never having heard the word "defeat," she was unwilling to accept it.

After graduation from the Texas School for the Deaf, she married my father, who was a teacher there. He had lost his hearing infancy and, because of his deafness, had not learned to talk—except by sign language. Twelve years after their marriage, I was born, and their joy was unbounded on learning that my hearing and speech were normal.

Because they could not hear me cry in the night, they took turns, each sitting up half the night by my crib in dim lamplight. In time, I learned to talk to them with my hands.

For the first 3 years of my life I did not speak at all; I communicated only by sign language. Then my parents asked a young girl cousin to live with us, so that she could teach me the use of my voice and ears. Kind and understanding neighbors also helped me learn how to speak.

When I started to school, I had some difficulty in learning how to read. One evening as I was studying my reading lesson at home, I ran across the word "town," the pronunciation or meaning of which I did not know. I showed it to my father. I was unable to grasp its meaning by the word he used in sign language. He then drew for me on paper, as best he could, a picture of a town. I still did not grasp the word. It was only the next day at school when one of my classmates pronounced the written word for me that I understood it.

Some problems experienced by deaf parents may be illustrated by three incidents from my childhood. Once when I had been quite ill all day, I finally dropped off to sleep. My parents kept waking me up every few minutes to inquire how I felt. Each time they awakened me I began to cry. Finally, in desperation during the night, they brought our nearest neighbor, Mrs. Simon Gillis, over to ask me why I continued to cry. My answer was, "I'm all right. If they would just leave me alone, I could sleep."

Another time, I climbed up on the buffet in our dining room and could not get down. When my mother missed me, she ran through the house clapping her hands, as was her habit, to call me. Each time she came through the dining room I could see her and I would hold out my arms, crying to her. But I was partially hidden by an open door and she never thought to look for me on the buffet. Frantically she summoned Mrs. Gillis, who promptly located me by my shrieks.

My mother told me of her embarrassment when once we dined with old friends in another city, and I used profane words, unaware of the meanings. The friends understood the problem and explained to my mother. She then made it clear that I was never to use those words again. As a result, as proficient as I became in the sign language, I do not know to this day whether profane or obscene words exist in that language.

From the time I first remember my father, he was in poor health. In 1918 he died of influenza, leaving my mother with an unfinished home, a mortgage and other debts all past due, and the responsibility of rearing and caring for a 9-year-old son.

Many friends, seeing little hope for the two of us, suggested that we move back to my aged grandmother's small farm. But my mother did not for a moment consider doing so. She was determined that we would remain in Austin, where my education could be continued. When the question as to how we would live was raised, she simply said she would succeed my father in teaching and she would rely upon friends to help her obtain the position. Her will and determination outweighed even the obstacle of her lack of a college education, for friends did see that she was placed on the teaching staff of the Texas School for the Deaf, a position she held for 26 years.

Soon after my father died I recall going with her, dressed in black, to the bank to explain that she could not pay a past-due note but would do so as soon as possible. I can still see the look of dismay on her face as I translated that the note was not the only one, that there was another one outstanding as well.

Gradually, over the years, the debts were paid; yet at the beginning of each summer, for a long time, it would be necessary to borrow money from the bank to tide us over for the 3 months' vacation period.

When I was 12, I began to supplement our income by selling newspapers and delivering milk. At 14, I became a page in the Texas Legislature, and with the money thus earned, my mother and I had our 11-year-old home papered and painted for the first time. Meanwhile, my mother had never allowed deafness, the inability to talk, poverty, adversity or temporary setbacks to discourage her. There was never a doubt in her mind that I would obtain a college education.

She was a firm disciplinarian and she did not spare the rod. Furthermore, she was scrupulous regarding my Christian education in the Methodist Church of our neighborhood, and she herself was active in church circles.

An extremely valuable heritage from her was the recognition of the importance of friends. She acquired hundreds during her lifetime—both among the hearing and among the deaf. Over a period of 70 years she knew the clerks in the grocery stores and the saleswomen in local shops, and often she would pause "to chat" with them by means of tablet and pencil.

After I received my bachelor's degree and my law degree from the University of Texas, I was elected, in turn, to the State legislature, the Office of District Attorney, and the City Council of Austin.

When war was declared and I left home for the first time for duty in the Navy, my mother was nearly 70 years old. And yet she was still alert and able to adapt herself to changing circumstances. She had retired from the faculty by this time, but she consented to be a substitute teacher during the war years.

At the close of the war when I brought my bride home to live with us, my mother welcomed her warmly. Our first child, my mother's namesake, was born when my mother was 73 years old. Absolute adoration. A short time thereafter we moved to a new home and sold the only one I had ever known. I could not hold back the tears on moving day, as I left the house that had meant so much to my mother and me. My mother, dry eyed, never glanced backward.

When, after my election to the U.S. House of Representatives, I moved my family to Washington, D.C., my mother with equanimity made her first plane trip to a strange city, far away from her lifelong friends and surroundings. She made new friends, of course, and found former ones associated with Gallaudet College, the only college for the deaf in the world. With interpretation, she also discovered the delights of television, and sightseeing in and around the Nation's Capitol never failed to thrill her. In the meantime, she had three grandchildren to idolize and she joyfully helped to care for them. No sooner would greetings be exchanged with visitors to our house than she would write on her note pad, "What do you think of my three lovely grandchildren?" They in turn were devoted to her and learned at a very early age to communicate with her in the sign language.

My mother was keenly interested in politics—I remember her going to vote the first time women were permitted to do so—and she was an avid supporter of the Democratic Party. Franklin D. Roosevelt she revered, and she admired the courage of Harry S. Truman. She thought Dwight D. Eisenhower had "a good face" and asked me many times how he "could possibly be a Republican."

She loved Speaker (Mr. Sam) Rayburn and Lyndon Johnson. Both knew her well and many times expressed their admiration for her.

As much interest as she took in politics, she never quite became acustomed to the vicissitudes of her son's political career. Now and then, she would spell out on her hands, "I wish Homer would get a good, steady job."

One of the most rewarding events in her life was my appointment by Speaker Rayburn to the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College. During the years I have served, the college has carried on a building expansion program and will soon accommodate three times the number of students, from all parts of the globe, as formerly.

Today there stands on the campus of that great institution the Mary L. Thornberry Speech and Hearing Research Center. As its dedicated and expertly trained personnel seek to find ways to brighten the future for handicapped infants and adults, it serves as a living memorial to my mother.

Throughout her long life, my mother seemed to be indestructible. In the face of every adversity, she looked to the future with strength and resolution. Even with a fractured hip at the age of 84, she held on with a tenacity which was characteristic of her entire life. She lived a year and a half more, but never once did she abandon her courage, her faith in her friends, nor her belief that, if we but do the right, all else in life will turn out satisfactorily.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1963

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 18, 1963)

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m. on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore, Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, as we go our differing ways across the Nation to the place hallowed as home, may the Christmas cradle bring to us a penitent revelation that in our smart sophistication and towering self-sufficiency, we have so often mistaken partial knowledge for final truth, and cleverness for wisdom, and so, alas, have sometimes trusted in a wisdom that is not wise. Now as the sands of this year of peril, toil, and pain run low, Thy public servants of the commonwealth, who carry out their stewardship within these walls as they are entrusted with the ministry of government, with burdened and sober hearts prepare to write the final word of an epic chapter of our national history whose last pages are bordered with the symbols of mourning. Frail human hands have carried the precious ark of our heritage through a threatened peace and through the encircling gloom; yet we dare believe that it is still Thy hand that guides and guards.

We ask the benediction of Thy grace upon all wise and good decisions, and beseech Thee to overrule all that denies Thy will for us and all mankind.

We ask it in the ever-blessed name of the Supreme Person of whom the holy prophets declared—"And the government shall be upon His shoulder." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 19, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Passman, Mr. Gary, Mr. Natcher, Mr. Rhodes of Arizona, and Mr. Ford were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. Mansfield, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is in order, under the 3-minute limitation which has been ordered.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, TO PAY A CLAIM AGAINST THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 50)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $120,000, to pay a claim against the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment:

H.J. Res. 875. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 814).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 2409. A bill declaring a portion of Bayou Black and Bayou Terrebonne, La., nonnavigable waterways of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2410. A bill for the relief of Erich Hoffinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. McNamara, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Hart, and Mr. Nelson):

S. 2411. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payments to reestablish the purchasing power of American fishermen suffering temporary economic dislocation; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PELL (for himself, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Keating):

S.J. Res. 141. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to the Touro Synagogue at Newport, R.I.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pell when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL:

S.J. Res. 142. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to extend the franchise accorded the District of Columbia for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President so as to include the right of the District to have one vote in the House of Representatives, or two votes in the Senate, as the case may be, whenever the election of the President shall devolve upon the House of Representatives or the election of the Vice President shall devolve upon the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pell when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

TO CONTINUE AUTHORITY OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE UNTIL NEXT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 238) continuing the authority of the Acting President pro

tempore until the next session of the Congress, which was considered and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the appointment of the Senator from Montana, Mr. Metcalf, as Acting President pro tempore be continued until the meeting of the second regular session of the Eighty-eighth Congress.

ISSUANCE OF A GOLD MEDAL TO THE TOURO SYNAGOGUE AT NEWPORT, R.I.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my three colleagues, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] and both Senators from New York [Mr. Javits and Mr. Keating], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a gold commemorative medal to the Touro Synagogue at my home city of Newport, R.I.

This historic synagogue celebrates, this December, its 200th anniversary. Its significance to our Nation is set forth in this resolution.

I am most happy to have Senator Pastore as a cosponsor of the resolution, and I am indeed grateful for the cosponsorship of Senators Javits and Keating, for New York's Congregation Shearith Israel gave generous assistance to the Newport congregation in the early days of its history.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 141) authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to the Touro Synagogue at Newport, R.I., introduced by Mr. Pell (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WITH REPRESENTATION IN THE EVENT THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION IS THROWN INTO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, a short while ago, one of my constituents, Mr. Albert Choquette, Jr., of Woonsocket, R.I., wrote to me regarding a question that was raised in the American history class he teaches in the Woonsocket Senior High School. Mr. Choquette's letter raises an important question of constitutional law that should be resolved.

That question, Mr. President, is whether the District of Columbia retains the franchise granted it by the 23d amendment in the event the presidential election is thrown into the House of Representatives. Although the question was briefly alluded to in the debate in the House when that body considered and passed the 23d amendment, it was deemed expedient at the time not to complicate that amendment.

The question is still before us. We have granted the District residents the franchise in voting for the President and Vice President in national elections. Yet through legislative oversight, these same voters lose their franchise if either election is thrown into the House or the Senate because a candidate lacks a clear majority of the electoral college vote.

Equity demands action in this case. There is no other course if we are to have any consistency in the rights granted under our Constitution. As a result, I am introducing a Senate joint resolution which amends the Constitution to provide the District with one vote if the presidential election goes to the House, and two votes should the vice-presidential election go to the Senate. At this point, I ask unanimous consent that my resolution be printed in full in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 142) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to extend the franchise accorded the District of Columbia for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President so as to include the right of the District to have one vote in the House of Representatives, or two votes in the Senate, as the case may be, whenever the election of the President shall devolve upon the House of Representatives or the election of the Vice President shall devolve upon the Senate, introduced by Mr. Pell, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"Article —

"Section 1. In electing the President or the Vice President in those cases when such an election shall devolve upon the House of Representatives or the Senate, respectively, the District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall be entitled to have one vote in the House of Representatives, or two votes in the Senate, as the case may be, to be cast for the person to be named by the electors appointed by the District."

"Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation".

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this resolution is very brief and uncomplicated. It merely grants the District the right to vote in the event of certain contingencies. It does not go into the mechanical procedure as to how the vote or votes shall be cast. This, I believe, should be determined by Congress and I have so provided in section 2 of my resolution, which grants to Congress the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

I wish to make it perfectly clear at this time, that my resolution in no way relates to the question of home rule for the District. That is a matter for Congress to legislate. This resolution does not provide for representation in either the House or the Senate. That, too, is a matter for Congress to determine.

In considering this proposed amendment, Congress may wish to grant authority to the electors chosen by the District in a national election to submit certified ballots of their vote to the highest officer of the respective Houses when the election of the President and Vice President, under the 12th amendment, devolves upon Congress.

Mr. President, the presidential election is almost upon us. It would be a gross injustice to the voters of the District if they should become disenfranchised in the possible eventuality I have discussed. It is my hope, therefore, that Congress will act promptly on this resolution so that the States will have an opportunity to ratify it before the next general election.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Choquette's letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Woonsocket, R.I.,
October 28, 1963.

Hon. Claiborne Pell,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: An interesting question regarding the 23d amendment to the U.S. Constitution has come to my attention—a question to which I have been able to find no satisfactory answer.

As I understand it, the District of Columbia is now entitled to three electoral votes. If, however, the electoral college fails to give a majority of its votes to any of the presidential candidates, the election would be turned over to the House of Representatives whose Members would elect the President from among the persons having the highest number of electoral votes not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President (amendment No. 12).

Am I to presume then, that since the District of Columbia has no representation in the House that it would lose its right to vote for President should the election be turned over to the Representatives as it did in 1801 and 1825?

If this is the case, it would seem that the 23d amendment should be clarified in order to guarantee the rights of the citizens of the District of Columbia should a situation as that outlined above occur.

I am interested in hearing your thoughts on the subject.

Very sincerely yours,
Albert Choquette, Jr.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

Speech delivered by Senator Cooper at the 45th annual convention of the American Legion, Department of Kentucky, in Louisville, Ky., on July 12, 1963, upon the occasion of the presentation to him of the distinguished service award of the American Legion.

TRIBUTE BY SENATOR ENGLE TO SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, last evening a group of Democratic Senators met for the purpose of paying their tribute to our very distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana, Mike Mansfield. It was a deserved tribute at a very appropriate time, and was done for the purpose of affording the Members on this side of the aisle an opportunity to show their esteem, affection, respect, and admiration for our distinguished majority leader, for the excellent job he has done in leading us during this session of Congress.

Preparatory to that meeting, I was handed a note from the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. Engle], who asked me to read it at the meeting—which I neglected to do. At this time, I wish to read it into the Record, as follows:

> I regret that I cannot be with you as you gather to salute our able majority leader, Mike Mansfield. My respect and affection go out to him, as always. I look forward to being back among the "troops" next session.
>
> Clair.

I did not have an opportunity to read the note at the meeting yesterday. It is in his own handwriting, and I thought I should read it in the Chamber this morning.

SOYBEAN FUTURES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, yesterday, I brought to the attention of the Senate—as appears on page 25126 of the Congressional Record—the activity of the soybean futures market, particularly the May futures market; and I pointed out that the maximum permissible limit of rise in the price had occurred all day long yesterday, as a result of the release, the afternoon before, of a report by the Crop Reporting Board of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, showing that there would be considerably lower production for 1963 than had previously been forecast.

I pointed out that the estimates by the Crop Reporting Board had been inexcusably optimistic; and I stated that I was writing to the Department of Agriculture, to request an explanation for this, and also that I was writing to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], a letter in which I suggested that the committee make an investigation, to ascertain whether any impropriety was connected with the gross overestimate of soybean production and the profiteering which occurred on yesterday's futures market.

Mr. President, in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal there appears an article entitled "Soybean Futures Jump Daily Limit of 10 Cents a Bushel Due to Prospects of Supply Shortage." I believe this article is an interesting followup of the comments I made yesterday; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Soybean Futures Jump Daily Limit of 10 Cents a Bushel Due to Prospects of Supply Shortage

Prices for soybean futures soared 10 cents a bushel, the daily permissible limit, on a rush of buy orders sparked by prospects of a shortage of supplies.

Heavy buying of vegetable oils, soybean meal and other grains followed the soybean action.

Brokers said "orders for millions of bushels" of soybeans remained unfilled at the closing bell because of a lack of sell orders.

Soybean meal futures rose $5 a ton, the daily limit for this market. But for the December 1963 contract, on which trading expired yesterday and no daily limit applied because it was a spot month, the price at one time was up $6.35 a ton and ended up $4.65 from Wednesday's close.

Soybean oil futures rose 1¼ cents a pound and cottonseed oil futures as much as five-eighths cent.

Other big gains included as much as 4½ cents for wheat, before profit taking pared this to 2 cents at the close, and 3¼ cents a bushel for rye.

EARLY WAVE OF BUY ORDERS

The wave of buy orders for soybean futures came at the start of trading and prices for most contracts were immediately bid up the daily limit. As the session progressed more buy orders poured in and the remaining contracts were bid up the daily limit. Thereafter, the unfilled buy orders continued to accumulate.

The heavy demand for soybean contracts followed news that the Government reduced its November estimate on U.S. production of the commodity.

The Government report placed this year's crop production at 701.5 million bushels, down 16.7 million bushels from the November 1 estimate. This was about 15 million bushels below previous trade expectations and it appears to be below Government estimated requirements of 732 million bushels for domestic and export needs. The carryover on October 1, the start of the crop year, was 15 million bushels.

One trader said the report was a "surprise, a real surprise." A soybean processor said the report was greeted by most of the industry "with shocked silence."

Brokers on the Board of Trade floor said most business in soybean futures was conducted at the top limits on the opening and for a short time later. Private observers said the day's business in soybean futures didn't exceed 10 million bushels, the lowest in more than a year.

There were practically no offers after prices for all contracts rose the 10-cent limit as sellers expected additional price rises. The estimated volume of trading in soybean futures contrasted sharply to the record of about 169 million bushels traded as recently as November 19. After the limit advance, brokers estimated that unfilled volume rose to between 25 and 35 million bushels.

CASH SOYBEAN PRICE

The cash price for soybeans yesterday rose about 14 cents a bushel to around $2.90 in the Chicago market, and some traders thought the quote might continue to rise above $3.

Dealers said, however, that sharply higher prices for soybeans could cut export and domestic needs, especially if buyers become sensitive to higher costs. This would trim anticipated requirements.

An industry spokesman said processor returns on soybean oil and meal from soybeans are below average. In the first quarter of the crop year, returns to processors are usually the most favorable, because supplies are large just after harvest. This year, however, the anticipated close supply-demand balance has kept prices contraseasonally high. One leading processor said his operations are at about 80 percent of capacity, when usually his firm is "going full blast at this time of year." He added that the processing industry generally is operating on a reduced basis.

Other soybean industry sources said huge supplies of vegetable oils in the United States and expectations of record production of world fats and oils in 1964 may keep a rein on soybean prices here.

Rising soybean prices also may attract more farmers to plant larger acreages to soybeans next spring, some trades said, but this wouldn't help in the current situation if demand remains heavy, because the new crop wouldn't become available until next October.

Soybean crushings and exports have been large becaues of huge foreign demand for U.S. soybean oil. Western European countries and Japan have been large buyers of U.S. soybean meal to feed their growing livestock populations.

One leading broker commenting on the soybean situation said, "The bulls appear to be in charge and likely will remain so until we run into some disappointing crush and export figures." Another said the market probably will stay strong until next spring.

A processor asserted that it was too early for the industry to assess the sharply lowered production estimate. But he said, "You can be sure they're all doing some quick refiguring."

Soybeans are the source of soybean oil and meal. The oil is used in the manufacture of margarine, shortening, salad and cooking oils. The meal is a high protein livestock feed.

INDIA'S ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there appears in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal an interesting article entitled "India's Economic Growth." The article was written by Mr. B. R. Shenoy. In connection with the consideration yesterday of the foreign aid appropriation bill and some of the comments with respect to the way the foreign aid program has been administered, I believe this article merits attention. It points out that, unfortunately, much of the foreign aid extended to India fails to aid the people who really need aid. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

India's Economic Growth—For Many Reasons, It Fails To Aid Most of the People

(By B. R. Shenoy)

The prime reason for promoting economic growth is to provide continuing improvement in the living standard of the masses of the people.

This is true in any country, but the objective acquires special urgency in India and other so-called underdeveloped lands. In these countries large proportions of the people are ill-clad and undernourished, and the prosperous segment of the population is no more than a thin upper crust.

In these countries, too, the United States since World War II has contributed many billions in economic aid to help produce sound economic growth. India has received more American aid than any other country. What has been the result?

In India, national income has grown by 54 percent during the past 12 years, a rate of increase that compares favorably with the gains of many industrialized nations. But it cannot be inferred from this statistic that the level of living of the Indian people has gone up correspondingly.

India's population has been rising at an annual rate of 2.2 percent. This alters materially the picture of swift economic progress painted by the figures on total national income. The rise in per capita income in the past 12 years was only 1.3 percent a year.

Even this slow rate of gain exaggerates the improvement in popular well-being. To produce a dependable picture of the status of the individual Indian, the statistics on national income, and thus on per capita income, need to be adjusted for the ballast they contain.

NONCONSUMER OUTPUT LARGE

First, part of the increase in these statistics represents unduly large output of nonconsumer goods, manufactured at the expense of consumption goods. More than 60 percent of domestic savings and foreign aid now is appropriated for government-run undertakings, and the output of this "public sector" is almost wholly nonconsumer goods. Part of the investment in the economy's private sector also is channeled away from consumer goods.

This presents the strange spectacle of a nation of hungry and poorly clad people busily turning out iron and steel, heavy chemicals and the like, when the masses so sorely need more food, clothes and fertilizers, better seed, agricultural implements and similar items.

Second, part of the increase in national income results from creation of excess production capacity and undue addition to inventories. In terms of popular well-being, this is wasteful. The excess capacity largely reflects government planning.

On the average, for example, only about 71 percent of the nation's irrigation capacity now is in use. The percentage has been showing little change; 2 years ago the figure was 70 percent. In 40 industries, excess capacity averages between 40 percent and 50 percent.

As for the undue additions to inventories, these are inevitable in an economy beset by inflation. As prices rise, any businessman naturally tends to build up his stocks. Except for brief breaks, India has had inflation for more than two decades, so inventory buildups have been the rule.

UPPER-INCOME GROUPS BENEFIT

Third, the past decade has seen substantial shifts of income which have benefited the small upper-income group at the expense of the masses. These shifts have resulted from inflation, from controls and from the undue expansion of the public sector of the economy.

Inflation obviously has cut into the buying power of those whose income rises very little or not at all, and this includes the majority of the population. Traders and industrialists, on the other hand, have often been in a position to profit handsomely from rising prices.

Economic controls, by creating monopolies and near-monopolies, often bring profits to the traders and industrialists they protect. Controls also provide incentives for black-market operators. And the monopoly and black-market gains ultimately are collected from the consumer through higher prices. So the more prosperous segment of the population, again, benefits at the expense of the bulk of the population.

From this standpoint, perhaps the worst controls are those over imports. Import licenses fetch enormous prices in the market, varying from 30 to 500 percent of their face value, depending on the commodity involved. If the average price runs about 75 percent, a not illogical assumption, the illicit gains from sales of import licenses run close to $1 billion a year.

These illegal gains are shared by government functionaries, contact men and the recipients of the licenses—all likely to be among the nation's more prosperous group. When the Indian consumer purchases an imported commodity, or a commodity produced from imported raw materials, he contributes from his meager income to the affluence of those who trade in these licenses.

IMPACT OF CORRUPTION

Import licenses are not the only source of opportunities for graft and corruption; the rapid growth of public sector investment has presented another. R. L. Garner, former president of the International Finance Corp., an affiliate of the World Bank, has observed: "There is no denying that in many countries graft and corruption in public office lay a heavy tribute on resources which should go into development. The less developed countries have no monopoly on public corruption. But its toll is more destructive in the poorer countries than in the richer societies."

Graft and corruption unquestionably have converted into private incomes a portion of the funds supposedly invested in India's state enterprises. These illicit benefits, like all the other income shifts, have tended to widen the gap between the prosperous Indians and the rest of the population.

This suggests that the economic position of the masses is at best hardly improving at all. Such a conclusion is supported by statistics on consumption of such basic needs as food and cloth.

Per capita consumption of food grains averaged 15.8 ounces per day in 1958, below the usual jail ration of 16 ounces, the army ration of 19 ounces and the current economic plan's target of 18 ounces. Since then, the average has fluctuated downward. Between 1956 and 1960 the annual per capita use of cloth fell from 14.7 metres to 13.9 metres.

Further evidence of the plight of the bulk of the population shows up in the wage rates of industrial and agricultural workers. Although the output of each industrial worker has risen by two and a half times in the past decade, wage rates on the average have gone up by only 10 percent. Agricultural wages have actually declined. In the context of steadily rising prices, both groups of workers, in real terms, have done even less well. Moreover, unemployment has increased.

Much publicity has been given to the fact that the life expectancy of the Indian people has risen to about 47.5 years, compared with 24 years a generation ago. It has been argued that this improvement reflects better health, better food and better living conditions.

Does this improvement conflict with indications that living standards of most Indians really have not improved very much? Not necessarily. Even if living standards remained entirely unchanged, better public health measures would increase life expectancy. In India, the credit for the extended average lifespan should go mostly to such things as DDT and public health programs in general. In due course, naturally, better public health conditions are likely to add to worker productivity.

Those who believe that the Indian economy is forging ahead should take a closer look at the economic indicators. The estimate of national income issued last month shows a decline from the previous year for the second year in a row. There is a very real danger that the topsy-turvy industrial structure that is being built will come crashing down when its main prop, foreign aid, is removed. Given the current mood of the U.S. Congress, that day could arrive sooner than some people seem to think.

IMPORTATIONS OF LIVESTOCK AND MEAT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, although the leaders of national farm organizations who met with President Johnson this week are poles apart in their views on many issues of interest to America's farmers, I was pleased to note that news reports indicate they are in accord on one matter of major importance.

That is the question of importations of livestock and/or meat. Mr. President, I and numerous of my colleagues have spoken out on this situation, calling for an all-out effort to curb these imports which are threatening a large segment of the Nation's agricultural community and are adversely affecting our general economy.

Many Nebraskans have written to me, are still writing, in support of my position. I include at this point in the RECORD excerpts from a few representative letters I have received on this subject.

A rancher in north central Nebraska told me:

> We do not want Federal aid for the cattle business. What we do want is a higher tariff so that the top quality beef we have does not have to go down to 4 to 6 cents a pound to compete with imported beef. We want equality. We think tariffs should be raised substantially on all beef, living or dead, from all foreign countries.

The Nebraska Stock Growers Association sent me a copy of that association's resolution directed to the President of the United States. That resolution said, among other things:

> We do hereby resolve that realistic quotas be imposed on foreign beef below the 11 percent now being imported so that our domestic production may operate on a sound and competitive basis within the framework of our free enterprise system. The entire livestock industry, and those dependent upon it, are suffering from increasing supplies of foreign beef and beef products being brought into this country.

The operator of an alfalfa dehydration plant in southern Nebraska wrote this to me:

> I experienced marketing fat heifers at Kansas City this week. One feeder experienced a $3 cut in 2-week period on same kind of cattle. If this prevails we are going to mushroom a depression condition in agriculture in the Midwest.

A man who raises Herefords said:

> I have been very proud and pleased with your efforts and that of the entire Nebraska delegation, to raise the tariff and establish quotas on the imports of beef and beef products into this country. I had a long visit with Oscar Evans of Louisiana, who was one of the American cattlemen who toured Australia and New Zealand recently. It is his conviction after this tour that we should direct most of our effort toward getting quotas of foreign beef set up. He feels that

> Australia has the potential to produce much more than the flood of foreign beef that is now coming into this country. Mr. Evans also feels that we should refer to the imports as foreign beef, since to many people imports of a product are quite often superior to the American product. He feels we should only refer to foreign beef instead of imported beef.

A banker, who has daily contact with farmers and is keenly aware of their financial dilemma, had this to say:

> Like many other people in this part of the country I am very much concerned with the declining fat-cattle market and the effect that the large beef imports are having on it. I know you are too, and are aware of the large losses many cattle feeders are taking and have been taking for the past 10 or 11 months. Having been in the cattle grazing and feeding business all of my adult life, I have been through many ups and downs and am well aware that one cannot expect to make money all of the time in this business any more than in any other business. However I am very much concerned about the future, unless the beef imports are curbed, at least to some extent.

Directors of a county feeders association in eastern Nebraska sent me a wire which said "We produce the best meat in the world. This week cattle dropped $2 per hundred in Omaha reflecting a trend which has continued for over a year." Then they asked my help "in the control of imported beef by higher tariffs and lower quotas. The economy of the American feeders desperately requires such action."

The president of another county feeders association wrote:

> It is our belief that imports of 1 billion pounds (1963), roughly the equivalent to 2,500,000 live cattle do exert considerable pressure on the price of beef in the marketplace. In the absence of this staggering tonnage, the retailer would most certainly have to reach into the lower grades of fed cattle for hamburger and sausage stock. The U.S. beef industry is set up in an environment that includes high capital investment, an artificial price structure on feed grains, and certain fixed costs, not the least of which are taxes, transportation, and labor. These circumstances combine to make it necessary to have more realistic tariff levels. In a fast moving world economy, it seems necessary that import tariffs be subject to constant review. The present import tariff of 3 cents per pound on boned beef and veal is a feeble gesture toward protection for the livestock industry. We cannot continue to appropriate billions of dollars for foreign aid, without some consideration for the profit potential of our domestic industries.

A Kansas woman, whose husband and father run cattle in southern Nebraska, told me:

> The beef industry has never wanted any special favors from the Government but the fact remains that we cannot compete with foreign imports of the present volume.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 9 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.) took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 9 o'clock and 59 minutes a.m., the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. AIKEN in the chair).

EXEMPTION FROM INDUCTION FOR SOLE SURVIVING SON OF A DECEASED VETERAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of House bill 2664, and that it be stated and laid before the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2664) to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand that the Senate is proceeding under a time limitation. Nevertheless I ask unanimous consent that at this time, I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and immediately thereafter may withdraw it, so that all Senators may be notified that the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the second committee amendment, which was reconsidered. It will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, beginning in line 6, it is proposed to strike out the following:

> (1) by inserting the words "the father or" after the word "Where"; and
>
> (2) by inserting the words "unless he volunteers for induction" after the words "of this title."

And to insert in lieu thereof:

> The sole surviving son of a family shall not be inducted under the terms of this title unless he volunteers for induction (1) where one or more sons or daughters of such family were killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service, or (2) except during the period of a war or national emergency declared by the Congress subsequent to the date of the amendment of this subsection, where the father of such family was killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order: That amendment has been adopted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thereafter, the action of the Senate in adopting the amendment was reconsidered.

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the second committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield approximately 5 minutes to me? I wish to make a brief statement about this matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this bill was reported from the Committee on Armed Services.

After the bill reached the committee, the committee decided that it was not wise to continue increasing the exemptions from all military service under all conditions for large categories of our citizens, without knowing how many persons would thereby be affected.

Therefore, the committee voted to amend the bill, in order to permit exemption from induction to be granted to all those in this particular class—to the sole surviving son of a family whose father had died as a result of military service, and thereby added a new category to those already in existence for exemption from induction for any military service or training.

The amendment did not affect the exemption in times of peace or in times of limited war, but provided that upon the determination by Congress by joint resolution or the determination by the President that the Nation was confronted with an unusual emergency, this exemption should not apply.

On reflection, it is evident that the same rule should be applied to all of those in the exempt categories.

Therefore, I had decided—before the measure was called up—to move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services, in order that it might examine all categories of exemptions and apply the same rule to all of them, and then report the bill to the Senate; and at that time, if the Senate is not satisfied with the rule recommended by the Committee on Armed Services, the Senate can change it and make it apply to all classes of those exempted from military service under any conditions.

I recognize the feeling—and I share it—of those who believe that certain categories should be exempted from military service; and under ordinary circumstances they should be exempted.

But, Mr. President, in this day of great revolutions in weapons, when all the people of a nation stand in danger of being wiped out in a matter of minutes, it seemed to me that the responsibility to preserve the Nation should come above even any humanitarian feeling which we might have in regard to sparing an individual who remained in a certain category.

Therefore, I requested the majority leader to have the bill recommitted to the Armed Services Committee, so that it may collect and examine all the statutes which provide such exemptions, and report to the Senate a bill to settle this matter.

In my opinion, it would be a mistake to increase the categories of those who are exempt under any circumstances from rendering military service to the Nation, for if the day were to come when a nuclear holocaust occurred—and God forbid that one ever would—every person in this land—all men, women, and children, all of any physical condition, including the halt and the lame—would have some responsibility to our land.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services, in order that it may study all of these exemptions and may deal with all of them on the same basis.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York; and in doing so, I wish to thank him for the spirit of fairness he manifested at the time when the bill was considered the other day. I did not know the bill was then before the Senate; there was some error—either in my office or elsewhere, with the result that I did not know that the bill had been considered and the amendment had been agreed to and the bill in its original form was about to be passed. At that point the Senator from New York moved that the action of the Senate in agreeing to the amendment be reconsidered, and that the bill be returned to the calendar, and be considered by the Senate on a subsequent day.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Georgia. I knew he was opposed to the proposal to reinstate the language voted by the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield himself time?

Mr. KEATING. Yes, Mr. President; I yield myself 5 minutes—chiefly for the purpose of naving a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am sympathetic with the desire of the Senator from Georgia and the committee to deal with all exemptions equally. I can see the merit of that arrangement.

The proposal to exempt the sole surviving son of a family of which the father was killed in the military service of the country seems to me eminently sound. Such an exemption is not now in the law, but I believe it should be written into the law; and I dislike to see this category placed in a secondary position, inasmuch as the same limitation about a national emergency does not apply to other exemptions.

I share the view of the Senator from Georgia as to the need to insure that we have sufficient manpower to support our national defense effort if we ever get into a nuclear holocaust or anything approaching one.

I understand from my conversations with the distinguished Senator from Georgia that it is his intention to have the Armed Services Committee and its staff go to work soon on this entire problem, in the hope of reporting, early in the next session, a bill which will deal with all these exemptions and will cause a uniform practice to be applied to all of them, so as either to provide a complete exemption or to provide that in all cases they shall be subject to this limitation. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. That is what I told the Senator yesterday in a private conversation. I undertook to express the same purpose on the floor today. I readily concede that if we are to have totally exempt categories, the sole surviving son of a father who lost his life in combat is as much entitled to exemption as would be the sole surviving brother or sister when other members of the family had been killed in combat. But I have some doubts as to the wisdom of continuing to increase these categories—and there are others which I cannot now recall—without knowing how many individuals would be involved. We have some estimates, but no data from the Selective Service System. No study has been made. I intend to invoke the assistance of the Selective Service System to assist the staff of the committee. At a reasonably early date in the next session of the Congress I hope to report a bill that will apply the same exemptions and the same responsibilities to all persons in various categories who are exempt by the law as it stands today, or who are proposed to be exempted by this measure or any other proposed legislation.

Mr. KEATING. I regret that the Senator from Georgia cannot be persuaded to allow the bill, in the House language, to pass, and then take up the problem about which he has spoken as a separate study.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me, he knows that from the parliamentary standpoint, there are certain material advantages in amending a bill that has already passed the other body. The process is greatly simplified. When the bill goes back, it does not have to go through committee process. There are a number of other reasons why it is much easier to handle it that way rather than to pass the bill and then start to work on new proposed legislation.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator feel that in the overall picture final legislation would be expedited if the pending House bill were used as a vehicle?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do. Otherwise, I would be glad to accede to the suggestion of the Senator from New York that the bill be passed and that we then begin de novo in the next session of Congress. I am convinced that from the standpoint of principle, the proposed legislation can be managed much more expeditiously and more surely enacted by amending the bill than by undertaking to deal with the question in new proposed legislation.

Mr. KEATING. The point involved is that those young men now being drafted will continue to be drafted, although their fathers were killed in service and they are the sole surviving sons. If the exemption is sound, it should be enacted into law. That is my reason for acting with all possible haste to amend the law to provide them with this exemption in what we generally term a period of peaceful coexistence.

Mr. RUSSELL. The argument the Senator makes is cogent and has much validity, but there is little possibility that any number of men will be drafted, or at least inducted through the application of the Selective Service System at this time. Only about 5,000 men a month are being inducted. We are getting a great many more than that in the services under the prod of the Selective Service, which assigns men to the armed services. Many young men who have to do military service desire to select their own branch of the service. They enlist and offer themselves for induction, acquire a commission from the military schools, and the Reserve Officers Training Schools throughout the system. Considering that situation, it is highly improbable that more than one could possibly be drafted, and while it would be an injustice to him, I am quite sure if the man affected brought the situation to the attention of his local draft board, they would be inclined to grant him a deferment for a period of months.

Mr. KEATING. I have a specific case in mind about which my office has been contacted. I would hope that the draft boards would defer the sole surviving sons, pending determination by Congress of the specific exemption which, hopefully, will be resolved one way or the other early in the next session.

Mr. RUSSELL. I subscribe to the hope that the Senator has just expressed. I trust that when any Selective Service Board in the country understood the conditions that apply to such a case as stated by the Senator, it would act. If the Board knew the case of an individual presented to them, having in mind the vast reservoir of men available for military service today, they would at least defer that individual for a period of 6 months so he would not be subjected to what could become a real injustice.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the courtesies of the Senator from Georgia. I appeal to him—and I am sure the plea will not fall on deaf ears—to have a bill before the Senate early next year.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit the bill (H.R. 2664) was agreed to.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF CARLSBAD CAVERNS NATIONAL PARK, N. MEX.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1175) to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That Carlsbad Caverns National Park situated in the State of New Mexico shall consist of the following described lands:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

Township 24 south, range 23 east: south half section 35; section 36.

Township 24 south, range 24 east: sections 25 to 29, inclusive; sections 31 to 36, inclusive.

Township 24 south, range 25 east: south half southeast half south half section 21; southwest quarter southwest quarter section 26; sections 27 to 33, inclusive; west half section 34; northwest quarter northeast quarter section 34.

Township 25 south, range 22 east: sections 24, 25, 35, and 36.

Township 25 south, range 23 east: sections 1 to 33, inclusive; northwest quarter section 34.

Township 5 south, range 24 east: north half section 1; west half section 2; northeast quarter section 2; sections 3 to 8 inclusive; west half section 9; northeast quarter section 9; northwest quarter section 10; west half section 17; northeast quarter section 17; section 18; northwest quarter section 19.

Township 25 south, range 25 east: north half section 5; north half section 6.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: north half section 1; west half southwest quarter section 1; section 2; section 11; west half west half section 12; northwest quarter section 14.

Township 26 south, range 23 east: northwest quarter section 6.

All of which contains 46,786.11 acres, more or less.

And the tract of land, including Rattlesnake Springs, lying in section 23, township 25 south, range 24 east, New Mexico principal meridian, acquired by the United States for water right purposes by warranty deed dated January 23, 1934, recorded in Eddy County, New Mexico, records in deedbook 64 on page 97, containing 79.87 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of acquiring the State-owned lands lying within the area described in section 1 of this Act, consisting of 2,721.12 acres, and described as follows:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

Township 24 south, range 23 east: section 36.

Township 24 south, range 24 east: section 32.

Township 24 south, range 25 east: section 32.

Township 25 south, range 24 east: lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, south half north half, southwest quarter section 2.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: south half section 2, the Secretary of the Interior may, subject to such terms, conditions, and reservations as may be necessary or are in the public interest, including the reservation of surface rights-of-way across Federal lands situated in township 25 south, range 24 east, New Mexico principal meridian, for the construction of roads and utility lines between park headquarters and Rattlesnake Springs, exchange the following described 2719.80 acres of public land of approximately equal value:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

Township 24 south, range 25 east: southeast quarter section 34.

Township 25 south, range 24 east: south half section 1; west half section 11; west half section 14; section 15; southeast quarter section 17.

Township 25 south, range 25 east: south half section 5; lot 6, northeast quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter section 6.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: west half west half section 13; north half northeast quarter section 14.

(b) For the purpose of acquiring the private lands or interests in lands lying within the area described in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may, subject to such terms, conditions, and reservations as may be necessary, exchange on an approximately equal value basis any of the following described lands:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

Township 26 south, range 22 east: south east quarter section 9; south half, northeast quarter section 10.

Township 26 south, range 22 east: south half, south half northeast quarter section 14.

(c) Notwithstanding section 2(a) of this Act, when an exchange involves lands in section 32, township 24 south, range 24 east, New Mexico principal meridian, which the State of New Mexico has leased, the Secretary may compensate a lessee for the reasonable value of his improvements to the lands. Reasonable value shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior by obtaining an impartial appraisal.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to convey to the State of New Mexico a right-of-way over lands between the western boundary of the southeast quarter of section 34, township 24 south, range 25 east, and the vicinity of the caverns for the use of the State in constructing a park-type road for public use thereon: *Provided*, That the State may construct a road which shall meet the general standards of National Park Service roads and shall agree to reconvey its interests in such lands and any improvements thereon, without cost to the United States, upon completion of such road. The location of the road shall be determined by the Secretary, after consultation with officials of the State of New Mexico.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $500 to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 5. Section 4 of the Act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 279; 16 U.S.C. 407c), is repealed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the amendment added by the House of Representatives would limit the amount of the appropriation that can be spent for the acquisition of real property under the act.

Frankly, I believe it is a good amendment. It is entirely agreeable to the sponsors of the measure. I therefore move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

TRIBUTES TO SENATORS

Mr. KEATING addressed the chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] may be permitted to talk as long as he desires.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the consideration of the majority leader but I wish to take only 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would turn out to be the situation.

Mr. KEATING. I deeply appreciate the unfailing courtesy of the majority leader. This being that particular time of year when we say kind and courteous things—Christmas courtesies to colleagues it might be called—I should like to say some kind and courteous things about our able majority leader. At one time or another we have all blessed him for his kindness. It is typical of the way he conducts his leadership in the Chamber. I could, with entire sincerity, talk all morning about the virtues of our majority leader and his leadership in this body. However, I shall not do so. Did I hear a sigh of relief, sighed in unison by my senatorial colleagues? I was afraid there might be some slight objection on their part.

However, all of us appreciate his constant consideration of our requirements and the unfailing courtesy he exhibits to all of us, regardless of political affiliation, in the conduct of the business of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe I can safely assure the Senator that there will be no objection on the part of any Senator, if he takes all the rest of the forenoon in extolling the virtues of the majority leader.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that, but the point is, that once I get started on that subject, I might get so carried away I would neglect the virtues of the distinguished Senator from Vermont who is the ranking minority Member of this body and who, like the majority leader, is always thoughtful and considerate of the needs of younger Senators—by that I mean Senators who have recently come to the Senate.

In fact, I should like to express the true spirit of Christmas by saying "all Senators are at all times thoughtful and considerate." If I had the time I should like to extoll the virtues of many other Senators on both sides of the aisle who have been helpful to all of us, even though we may have differed at times on this, that or the other question.

Mr. AIKEN. I must ask the Senator from New York to yield again since he is in such an "extolling" mood.

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. While I appreciate his remarks, I will say that any virtues I may possess may be due to the fact that the area that I represent is in such close proximity to the area represented by the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. We are all grateful for that proximity. We all admire the stalwart and granite character of our friend, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well, I give up.

Mr. KEATING. Now if I may extol one more of the Senators present I would like to extol the virtues of the present occupant of the Chair [Mr. METCALF]. I served with him in the House. He, like our majority leader, also comes from the great State of Montana. I served with him on the Committee on Science and Astronautics in the House. He is an expert in that field. I enjoyed our association. I believe the enjoyment was mutual. I know we have always been good friends.

One of the great things about this body is the friendships we form here. These friendships are cemented by the senatorial kindness and consideration that I mentioned earlier. People who are not in public life and who are not in the Congress often fail to realize how firm these friendships can be.

Mr. President, that was not my main purpose in rising. Before I proceed to that subject I have been handed a note to the effect that today is the natal day of our colleague the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], a former candidate for Vice President on the Democratic ticket—as I am sure Senators know, I hope soon to be able to say "a former candidate for Legislative Vice President" or "a former candidate for Executive Vice President." The Senator from Alabama would add dignity and courtesy to either spot. I do not have to tell Senators how thoughtful he has been in his conduct of the affairs of the Senate and how helpful he has always been with the problems under consideration.

The same is true of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], a great Senator; and of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who has been most helpful in respect to the great Fire Island project. I deeply appreciate his promptness in starting hearings on that project, so that it is now pretty well settled among various groups and may be consummated.

Mr. MORSE. Will my very able friend the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. KEATING. First I must finish extolling the virtues of the Senator from Nevada for his helpfulness in the Fire Island project hearings. It is of great interest to the people of that area. It now has bipartisan support. I hope that there will be further hearings in the spring and that a bill will be reported in the next session to bring this fine seashore into being.

I will yield to the Senator from Oregon in a moment. In the course of my remarks I extolled the virtues of the majority leader, and then as each Senator came to the floor I extolled his virtues. I am glad to be able to say that this was not difficult for me to do, since there is a great deal more good than bad to be said for every Member of this body.

Mr. MORSE. There is always good along with the bad.

Mr. KEATING. I saw the Senator from Oregon come into the Chamber. I have had fine relationships with him on so many matters, having stood shoulder to shoulder on the things we believed in together and toe to toe against each other on things as to which we differed.

Mr. MORSE. I do not recall such times.

Mr. KEATING. There were a few votes on the foreign aid bill as to which the Senator and I were in disagreement.

Mr. MORSE. I know there were times when the Senator was in error and did not follow me, but usually he is right.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the Senator to this extent: in many, many instances, particularly in the field of civil rights and human rights, we have fought shoulder to shoulder.

I shall yield the floor in a moment, and then the Senator may have all the time he would like to have. I rose only for a 1-minute remark about fashions, when I got into this colloquy.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield so that I may thank him for his complimentary remarks?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BIBLE. I assure the Senator, as I have many times in the past, that the Fire Island Seashore bill will move forward early next year. I say, by way of compliment to the Senator from New York, that with respect to all the lakeshore, seashore, and national park proposals I have been privileged to handle in the past few years, this one involved the nearest approach to unanimity. I have written to the Senator and I have written to the proponents telling them that I thought theirs was one of the best-presented cases with which I have been privileged to deal.

It is fortunate that the Senator is making these remarks when our wonderful friend, the senior Senator from Oregon, is present. He, too, has a dunes proposal, which involves a few more problems than the New York seashore proposal. I am sure that men of good will will be able to work on that bill and bring it to fruition somewhere along the way.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks by the Senator from Nevada. We have made a great effort to try to reach unanimity. I hope that effort will be helpful in expediting the legislation.

Mr. President, I see at my side the distinguished minority leader of this body. I cannot begin to extol his virtues the way I have those of other Senators, because his powers in that regard far exceed those of anyone else I know.

I have said some pleasant things about the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], who asked unanimous consent to extend my time for as long as I wished to talk and who was very courteous and gracious in that regard; and about the elder statesman and senior Republican, the great Senator from the Granite State [Mr. AIKEN]. Now I wish to take this opportunity to express my gratitude for the many courtesies extended by our minority leader, who renders superlative service for the minority, not only in his capacity as minority leader, but also as chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations of the Committee on the Judiciary, where he is so helpful to all of us in respect to our problems.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, words fail me. I cannot adequately express my appreciation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if I have robbed our minority leader of words I have performed an unusual feat today.

PROMOTING U.S. FASHIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, now, if I may, I return to the subject for which I rose.

Several weeks ago I spoke on the need for increased Government-industry participation in fashion events overseas. Speaking simply as an observer and not as a Senator, I am well aware that fashions in the United States, for both men and women are among the most attractive in the world.

As a part of our export expansion drive, we must direct more attention and more effort to consumer goods. Few elements in the consumer market are more important and more appealing than clothes and fashions. I am very glad to know that the Department of Commerce and the Department of State have already shown interest in this possibility, and I hope that continued efforts in this direction, both public and private, will have some effect, both in persuading U.S. clothing firms to look around overseas and in encouraging our Government to lend all appropriate assistance to such efforts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include, following my remarks in the RECORD, the text of letters I have received from the Department of State and the Department of Comemrce.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., December 6, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I am pleased to have your letter of November 13 because it affords me the opportunity to reaffirm my personal interest and the continued involvement of this Department in promoting exports of U.S. fashions and apparel. Your inquiry also has prompted a review of the efforts undertaken by the Department of Commerce in collaboration with U.S. industry to present to the world the latest and best in U.S. fashions, wearing apparel and accessory items.

Since 1957, U.S. Government/industry presentations included these kinds of products on no less than 17 occasions: Zagreb, 1957; Poznan, 1959; Milan, 1960; Zagreb, 1961; Tunis, 1961; Berlin, 1961; Helsinki, 1961; Mexico City, 1962; Buenos Aires, 1962; Izmir, 1962; Plovdiv, 1962; Damascus, 1962; Poznan, 1962; Limassol, 1963; Duesseldorf, 1963; Rio, 1963, and Tripoli, 1963.

Of these, 11 presentations featured fashion shows to dramatize the excellence of style and quality found in U.S. products.

The recent exhibit of U.S. apparel at the IGEDO Ladies' Outergarment Fair in Duesseldorf, West Germany, November 3–7, 1963, included participation by 34 American firms from seven States. By all accounts the show was a success, with sales estimated at $100,000, and predictions of additional sales approaching $900,000 by the end of 1964 as a direct result of contacts made at the show. More importantly, 33 of the participants new to the German market were finding good prospects for establishing long-term agency relationships.

Moreover, it is gratifying to note that of the first 18 product shows staged at U.S. trade centers, five featured fashion goods and apparel. The most recent, the Apparel Fabrics Show, June 18–28, 1963, prompted the Textile Export Association to write, in part: "All participants agree that it was a spectacular success." Sales during or as a result of this show were reported to exceed $1 million.

Encouraged by the recommendations of the White House Conference on Export Expansion, we will continue to sustain forceful and results-producing programs to promote U.S. export sales. Looking ahead a bit with respect to the products in question, a Women's Fashion Bazaar is scheduled at the U.S. Trade Center, Bangkok, Thailand, in April 1964. This first consumer goods show to be held at the Bangkok Trade Center will display dresses, skirts, blouses, sports and casual wear, beachwear and related apparel and accessories. Fashion shows using local models will be featured.

I note that you have sent a similar letter to the Secretary of State, and I understand that a reply from that Department will be forthcoming.

Sincerely yours,
LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 11, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I am writing with further reference to your inquiry of November 13 concerning the promotion of exports of U.S. fashions and clothing.

As you know, both the Departments of Commerce and State are concerned with our oversea trade promotional activities and the carrying out of this function abroad involves joint responsibilities. This close relationship exists because the Department of Commerce has primary responsibility for promoting both our domestic and foreign trade while the commercial officers of the Foreign Service constitute the U.S. Government's principal oversea arm for providing support to the U.S. business community's trade promotional efforts.

The Department of Commerce, which received a similar inquiry from you, is sending you a tabulation of specific presentations which have been made abroad for the explicit purpose of promoting the sale of U.S. wearing apparel and related items. It is believed that the Commerce tabulation will show that substantial efforts are being made by the Government to render assistance to our country's clothing industry in building and expanding its export markets through the staging of fashion shows and other suitable devices. The work of our officers overseas in bringing buyer and seller together is an integral part of these efforts. This activity will continue and will be intensified at every appropriate opportunity.

Current guidelines for the trade promotion activities of our ambassadors and their staffs were set forth in Secretary Rusk's letter of October 19, 1962, to all ambassadors. They included the following: "In today's competitive markets we can do no less than our competitors, short of participating in actual sales or giving unfair competitive advantage to one American company over another."

There is nothing explicit in the Department's regulations which prohibits the sponsoring of fashion shows by our embassies. Actually, in the absence of other suitable facilities, rooms in our chanceries have been used for this purpose. For example, at London in November 1961 there was a series of fashion shows in the embassy auditorium over a 2-week period for local buyers of all kinds, as well as for the trade and daily press fashion editors, newsreel cameramen and network television producers. These fashion shows aroused wide interest, achieved considerable national press notice and supported an exhibition of women's casual and sports wear at the U.S. trade center in London. Favorable sales results developed.

Possibly your question as to "Why U.S. embassies do not permit fashion shows as other embassies do?" relates less to fashion shows staged for actual sales to buyers in the trade, but more particularly to presentations at embassy residences arranged to enhance the prestige of designers and their products through appeal to invited prominent guests from the local community.

As far as we can determine no American fashion house has approached the Department concerning this kind of possibility. If an American fashion house desires to explore this matter with us we shall be happy to arrange a suitable meeting for this purpose with appropriate offices of our Department and of the Department of Commerce.

With reference to the recommendations of the White House Conference on Export Expansion we intend, in concert with the Department of Commerce, to sustain export programs which will produce further favorable sales results abroad.

Your interest in the export expansion program is appreciated. If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Frederick G. Dutton,
Assistant Secretary.

AMERICAN HEART MONTH

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me so that the Senate may consider a resolution designating the month of February as American Heart Month?

Mr. KEATING. I am so appreciative of such efforts that I hope the Senator will express my interest in it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate House Joint Resolution 848, a joint resolution calling on the President to proclaim annually the month of February as American Heart Mouth, which passed the House of Representatives on December 17. The Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, all of whom I have consulted, have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate House Joint Resolution 848, which will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution—House Joint Resolution 848—to provide for the designation of the month of February in each year as American Heart Month.

The resolution was read twice by its title.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be considered.

The House joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have the floor, unless there is objection——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will never interrupt the Senator from New York in the course of extolments that he has made during the morning hour, and if he desires to continue, the Chair is willing to have him do so.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the courtesy of the Chair. I rarely am in a position to having objection made to my taking my seat, but in this case I feel I should because, as of this moment, I have no further statements to make.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT FOR THE CIA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as Senators are all aware, that there has been a continuous concern on the part of many of us about the lack of congressional oversight over the Central Intelligence Agency with the consequent freewheeling on the part of that Agency in many parts of the world.

Without attempting to breach security or being specific, the not too invisible hand of the CIA can be seen in a variety of involvements in the domestic affairs of a variety of nations, and the results of these involvements are not always in our national interest or in the interest of the citizens of the countries involved.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an excellent editorial, which appeared in the Providence Journal for November 27, 1963, entitled "Congressional Oversight for the CIA."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Providence Journal, Nov. 27, 1963]

Congressional Oversight for the CIA

Congress recently was presented a bill asking for a special CIA retirement and disability system for a limited number of the Agency's employees—about 30 percent.

For men and women who risk imprisonment, torture, and death on hazardous missions in hostile lands, such special treatment is no doubt richly deserved.

The only trouble is, as some Members of the House took plains to point out in debate, Congress doesn't really know how many, if any, do deserve special consideration, nor what they do to earn it.

"Mr. Speaker, I am not refusing to support this measure because I do not believe that the employees are entitled to it," said Representative H. Allen Smith, Republican, of California. "My refusal is because I just do not know whether or not they are entitled to it. I know so little about the CIA and their activities, that I do not wish to pass further legislation which will further increase my lack of knowledge. It seems to me that Congress not only has the right, but that it has the responsibility to know more about the CIA."

Congressman Smith pointed out that the 30-percent figure cited by advocates of the measure is meaningless because Congress does not know how many CIA employees this percentage applies to. Nor does it know what they do; nor what is already being spent on CIA activities.

"Very frankly, Mr. Speaker," the Congressman continued, "I anticipate that Khrushchev and even the Russian Embassy here in Washington know more about CIA than I do."

He's probably right. Although several committees of Congress—including one the membership of which is itself secret—exercise some surveillance over intelligence operations, this surveillance appears to be "almost certainly both cursory and sporadic," as Congressman John V. Lindsay, Republican, of New York, put it in a floor speech last August.

If the attitude of Senator Leverett Saltonstall, Republican, of Massachusetts, a member of the Senate CIA Subcommittee, is any indication, present congressional oversight of cloak-and-dagger operations is, indeed, shockingly lax. After the U-2 incident, Senator Saltonstall said he did not want to investigate too intensely because "we might obtain information which I personally would rather not have." Such remarks lend support to charges voiced by Representative Paul C. Jones, Democrat, of Missouri, that some Members of Congress tend to be overawed by the great secrecy under which CIA operates.

There is no question that there are phases of the intelligence operation that ought to be treated with great discretion. But there is no reason not to trust a Special Joint Committee on Intelligence, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy now headed by our own Senator Pastore, to practice such discretion. Such a committee, long proposed, ought to be established before Congress gives CIA another cent.

In the meanwhile, Congress and the administration ought to give serious consideration to lifting fully the veil of secrecy from the more routine intelligence activities, such as the gathering and analysis of data which is available for the digging. Such activities probably account for the bulk of CIA's personnel and expense.

It is apparent that the CIA is playing a growing role in U.S. foreign relations and has become a major factor in determining U.S. policies. The American people, or at least their chosen and trusted representatives, ought to know who is doing what for how much in our name. This is, as Representative SMITH asserts, a congressional responsibility.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS AND NATIONAL ARTS FOUNDATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business, to make it the pending business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 2379.

The Senate resumed the consideration of S. 2379 to provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts and the National Arts Foundation to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to urge passage of S. 2379, a bill which provides for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation to assist in the growth and development of our Nation's cultural resources.

The National Council on the Arts will consist of a Chairman, and 24 members appointed by the President, in staggered 6-year terms. The members will be selected from among private citizens widely recognized for their broad knowledge, experience, and profound interest in the arts. The Chairman will be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of our body. This Chairman shall have the collateral responsibility of advising the President with respect to the activities of the Federal Government in the arts. He shall not serve in excess of 8 consecutive years.

The National Arts Foundation shall be governed by a Board of Trustees consisting of 21 members appointed by the President by and with the consent of our body, and will be selected by the same criteria as apply to the Council. The Foundation will handle the allocation of grants-in-aid, and the Director of the Foundation will be appointed by the President, also by and with the advice and consent of our body.

The bill, while not a giant step toward the full fulfillment of the cultural and artistic needs of our Nation, is a long overdue step in that direction.

It gives legislative sanction to a Federal Council on the Arts, a concept already established by Executive order by President Kennedy last June, and which was first asked for by President Eisenhower in 1955. It authorizes an appropriation for the present fiscal year of $5 million, and for subsequent years of $10 million. The Foundation may not be set up until 90 days following establishment of the Council. This is in accord with a Bureau of the Budget recommendation that there be an appropriate waiting period between the formation of the two bodies.

Grants-in-aid will be dispensed only on a matching basis to individual States and State agencies. Fifty percent of the total funds available will go to the States, and 50 percent to nonprofit professional groups meeting Foundation standards of excellence. The matching grant principle will also be applied to groups, except that no more than 20 percent of the total group funds may be used without this limitation in cases when particular groups may not have met full matching-grant requirements.

As was evident at the recent hearings before the Senate Special Subcommittee on the Arts, this principle of partial assistance is welcomed by our Nation's cultural community. The experience of the New York State Council on the Arts shows that the amount of private artistic activity resulting from public supported cultural programs is on the order of 8 to 1 over a 3-year period.

Our subcommittee had 5 full days of hearings. We heard testimony from 37 witnesses. Additional communications were received from almost 50 other distinguished representatives of our cultural life. Wholehearted and enthusiastic support for the legislation was virtually universal. It not only covered the spectrum of American art and talent, but came from all sections of the country—from the South, including the Carolinas and Texas; from the Middle West; from as far west as our new State of Hawaii; from the East, from such States as New York and New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and from my own Rhode Island and New England.

The hearings brought out the fact that private sources are simply no longer able to sustain the potentials of our cultural progress, that a financial crisis exists in the arts in this country, which bears on both our national well-being and on our prestige abroad. These hearings also brought out that one of the great advantages over the Communists enjoyed by the West is in the area of the creative arts, but that in the United States we are rapidly losing our relative advantage.

In supporting the "basic principles and fundamental values" contained in this legislation, the Bureau of the Budget said:

> We agree with [its] objectives of increasing the cultural resources and improving the cultural vitality of the United States. Accordingly, we look forward to the ultimate enactment of legislation to achieve these objectives.

This bill, supported by Democrats and Republicans, northerners, and southerners, easterners, and westerners alike, would seem a significant and helpful step forward to our national ethos. I urge its passage.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator has taken the lead in bringing the bill before the Senate. I particularly agree with what he said about the financial crisis that we face today in the arts. In the past, the arts have had their greatest support from private sources. In many instances those private sources have dried up, in part by reason of our tax programs. No longer is it possible to amass the great wealth needed to subsidize artists and cultural ventures. No individual or small group of patrons can be expected to assume this burden.

But in the days of the Medicis, culture was for the privileged few, and so a few paid the price. In 20th century America, however, music and art, ballet and drama should be available to all, and each citizen should contribute to the support and encouragement of the arts.

It is certainly true that our progress in the arts has had much to do with the impression which our country creates in other countries. Not only are they impressed, oftentimes, by our military might or economic power, but they are also impressed by our interest in the arts and in some of the finer things of life.

We are fortunate in having perhaps the most varied culture of any nation since we are truly an amalgamation of all the peoples of the world. Our heritage, while taking the best from every land, is still uniquely American and our culture is the expression of those two forces.

We have learned what cultural exchange can do to promote friendship among peoples, and as the leader of the free world, we have the responsibility to set an example of excellence. The Government, in turn, has the responsibility to foster the arts, not only for export, but for wide distribution here at home. While I am proud to represent the State which is perhaps the cultural center of the Nation, I know that even in parts of New York there are people who seldom have an opportunity to hear a symphony, or an opera, and rarely see a performance of the ballet. Even worse, promising youngsters are not given the help and encouragement needed to foster a career in the arts. Like Grey's roses, they are "born to blush unseen and waste their perfume on the desert air."

This bill will go a long way toward correcting these conditions. It will show the world that we are a nation concerned with our culture and will assure our own people that we value the arts and respect the artist. I intend to support this measure to establish a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from New York very much for his support and help.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I desire to comment on the bill, but first I wish to propound a query to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

It is well recognized that the Federal Government is a government of limited powers. The only powers possessed by the Government at the national level are those that have been delegated by the States, under the Constitution, to Congress.

Under what provision of the Constitution does the Senator from Rhode Island feel that the National Government has jurisdiction to act in legislation of this kind?

Mr. PELL. The Senator from South Carolina has raised a valid question. In the Constitution itself, in article I, section 8, there is a specific reference which, while it may not fully apply, brings into light the concern of the Federal Government for the arts. The provision reads:

> To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their respective writings and discoveries.

The only reason why I cite that clause is to show that the arts are recognized in the Constitution as a part of our national life.

But in direct answer to the Senator's query, I can only read from the Preamble of the Constitution, a part of the intent of which is "to * * * promote the general welfare." To my mind, the bill falls directly within the confines of general welfare.

I recognize that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has a narrower view or interpretation of the boundaries of the area covered by the general welfare clause than do I. This is a point on which friends can disagree; but I believe the phrase is open to this reading.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. I must say that I am in hearty disagreement with him as to his interpretation of the welfare clause, and also the clause pertaining to science and the useful arts. I do not believe either of those two provisions of the Constitution is applicable in matters of this kind. I think my remarks will cover the point mentioned about the welfare clause.

Mr. President, I desire to express my most strenuous objections to the enactment of S. 2379. This bill would create a National Council on the Arts within the Executive Office of the President and would also create a National Arts Foundation as an independent agency. The National Council on the Arts, which would be created by title I of S. 2379, is to consist of 24 members appointed by the President and a Chairman appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The function of the National Council on the Arts is largely advisory. Not only would they seem to duplicate the functions of the National Arts Foundation, which would be created by title II of this bill, but I am sure that they would duplicate the functions of the President's Advisory Council on the Arts, which is now in existence.

The National Arts Foundation, which would be created by title II of S. 2379, is to be governed by a board of trustees consisting of 21 members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Foundation is given the sole duty of distributing the funds which are authorized to be appropriated by this measure.

Mr. President, there is absolutely no constitutional authority for congressional approval of this measure. The declaration of policy contained in section II of the bill states in part that:

> (1) The encouragement and support of the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government; (2) the Nation's prestige and general welfare will be promoted by providing recognition that the arts and the creative spirit which motivates them and which they personify are a valued and essential part of the Nation's resources.

Thus, we see that only casual mention is given to the general welfare section of the Constitution. The general welfare provision of the Constitution does not authorize the Congress of the United States to engage in programs of this type. It gives no legislative power per se to the Congress, but merely acts as a further restraint upon actions which are taken under authority granted elsewhere in the Constitution. It would require an imagination of truly artistic, rather than legalistic. talents to justify this measure under the general welfare clause or under any other section of the Constitution.

Although the bill, in section 3, contains a prohibition against any exercise of direction, supervision, or control over the policy or programs of any group or State, this prohibition, I submit, will be ineffective. The Supreme Court has stated that the Federal Government has the power to control that which it subsidizes and experience proves that when the Federal Government has the power, that power is eventually exercised. In making grants to groups and State agencies, the National Arts Foundation will, of necessity, approve those programs and the art forms for which the money is to be expended.

Mr. President, this Foundation would have the authority to make outright grants to both individual groups of artists and to States.

For this purpose the bill authorizes the appropriation of up to $5 million for the current fiscal year and for each subsequent fiscal year a sum not to exceed $10 million. This is nothing but an outright subsidy to the arts, despite some attempts to label it as something else. One of the witnesses who testified on behalf of this legislation last year said:

> There would be Government subvention—not subsidy.

Not knowing offhand the exact meaning of the word "subvention" I went to the trouble of looking it up in the dictionary. Here is what Webster says of the word:

> 1. A subvention; 2. A grant of money; 3. esp., a subsidy from a government or foundation.

So it can be seen in whatever words it is expressed, it all amounts to the same thing—a subsidy.

Mr. President, the present national debt of the United States is in excess of $308 billion. There are many billions of dollars over and above this which are not included within the debt limit, which are firm obligations of the U.S. Government. The economic stability of our Republic is of grave concern to us all, and I do not believe that this measure can be justified in the light of the present situation. The bill will not provide jobs for the unemployed in many regions of our country, such as Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

It should be remembered that this is no temporary program. This is permanent legislation and although the amount of money involved is by some standards rather low, the principle of the subsidy is the same, and the dangers inherent in the program are many. First of all, Mr. President, the National Arts Foundation will have to determine the artistic worth or significance of the programs for which a subsidy is sought. This will eventually lead to sterility of thought and production. Centralizing the power of subsidizing the productions of their choice in such a few chosen trustees and officers of the foundation can result in nothing but the stifling of the truly creative mind. A great number of the works which have achieved immortality over the years were never accepted by the so-called "experts" when they were first written or produced. I submit that the proposed legislation, if enacted, will actually discourage original thought and our artists will be writing plays and other productions designed to qualify for a government subsidy.

Mr. President, on page 9 of the report, under the heading "reasons for the bill," appears this statement:

> Almost alone among the governments of the world, the U.S. Government has to date displayed little concern for the development and encouragement of the artistic resources of its people.

Far from being a justifiable reason for enacting this measure, I believe that the committee has clearly enunciated one of the principal reasons why the bill should not be enacted. Our form of government is unique among all the governments of the world, and it is not a proper function of the U.S. Goverment to supervise and finance the arts. The arts have flourished in the United States at an ever increasing pace; and our Government has enabled, even encouraged, them to do so completely independent of governmental control. This is the way it should and must remain. I am certain that we do not wish now to emulate other forms of government after the one under which we have thrived for over a century and a half has enabled the people of America to have the best of everything. Our form of government does not contemplate, nor condone, dabbling in the arts; and I am therefore opposed to the bill, S. 2379.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to make several points, in response to the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

First, Mr. President, I recognize the present existence, under an Executive order, of the President's Advisory Council on the Arts. However, there is no question that if this bill is enacted into law, that Executive order will be revoked.

The Senator from South Carolina also referred to the National Council on the Arts, which would be created by title I of this bill, and to the National Arts Foundation, which would be created by title II of the bill. Actually, the functions of each group will be very different. The Council, in addition to other responsibilities, is to advise the President in the area of the arts, whereas the Foundation is to administer the program of matching grants.

As to the question of subvention, it means in this context a partial grant and an assist; and I think one can differentiate between an outright subsidy and a subvention—which means partially assisting a group in need of assistance.

Another point which should be made is that the Foundation itself, through its Board, will not interfere with private endeavors in the arts but will be authorized to create committees, councils, and panels to advise it and make recommendations. These would be composed of professional people and members of the general public broadly representative of the various performing and visual arts, so as to eliminate any possibility of uniformity in viewpoint. The panels would judge the artistic worth and cultural significance of productions for which grants-in-aid are sought, to determine whether they merit the Foundation's support.

It is intended that the advisory panels, which shall be composed of highly qualified professionals, will give added assurance that governmental aid does not lead to governmental interference in or—much more to be avoided—governmental control in the practice or performance of the arts.

It is also the intent to have the Director, in making grants under the subvention principle, consult with and consider the recommendations of the appropriate committees, councils, or panels authorized under section 206.

Mr. President, when the position of the United States in the field of the arts is considered, in comparison with the position of the other countries of the world, we realize that our country has produced great art—great paintings, great literature, great musicians, great dancers; but we also realize that the rest of the world is progressing in the development of the arts and in the cultural and artistic development of its people at a faster rate than is the United States. Therefore, for the United States to move, in the days ahead, at the same pace at which it has progressed in the past will not be enough, I submit, inasmuch as the rest of the world is moving at an accelerated pace. So we have the responsibility—as we also do in connection with economic growth and other areas—to increase the tempo of our development, in line with the increase in the tempo among the other countries of the world.

It may be of interest to Senators to realize that at this time the Soviets are making all sorts of claims in connection with the field of cultural advance. It is evident that cultural programs will continue to occupy an important place in Communist propaganda operations.

Recently, the Central Party journal, Kommunist, stressed in an article that at this juncture in East-West relations, cultural contacts are an important Soviet weapon in the international arena. Indeed, said Kommunist, the Soviet Union has a "mission": to bring "the light of an advanced culture to the peoples of the whole world."

Currently, according to Kommunist, the Soviet oversea cultural program alone is quite extensive. The U.S.S.R. has cultural agreements with 27 "nonsocialist" countries, and cultural contacts with more than 100.

I am not saying that we should imitate them, because we never should. However, when we find that they are moving into an area which hitherto has been the domain of the free countries and the free societies, I think we should take heed and see where we are going and what we can do to increase our own efforts in this direction.

Mr. President, I wish to stress further the point that our national welfare is importantly involved. The United States is on the verge today of a cultural renaissance which could enhance in immense degree not only the well-being of our people, but the prestige of our Nation throughout the world. And we are also on the verge of seeing that potential renaissance stifled and rendered ineffective, both at home and abroad.

We are poised between the healthy, beneficial development of our cultural resources and the erosive, debilitating process of losing the very wellsprings of creative growth. We are at a point of crisis in our cultural life. We can surge forward, or we can stand still, which, in comparison with the rest of the world, means to go in reverse.

To many, this warning may seem an exaggeration. But, I believe it is not, although we can point with justified pride to such cultural developments as these:

During the past 30 years, the number of museums in our country has increased from 1,500 to 5,500—and they are being visited annually by 200 million people, according to the American Association of Museums.

Thirteen years ago, the number of community art councils throughout the United States was eight. Today there are approximately 90.

At least six arts councils have been specifically created by State legislatures. More are in the process of formation. A few years ago, there were none.

Some eight additional States have Governor-appointed commissions on the arts. Again, these are recent creations.

Indeed, the reason for the crisis I mention lies in the fact that throughout the United States, there is a burgeoning desire on the part of our people to participate in and to enjoy the great diversity of American art. There is a wish to learn and to appreciate and understand. This desire is wholly new in the breadth of its appeal. It springs from increased leisure, from improving education, from a more secure and rewarding old age.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask for the third reading of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, art is no longer the privileged domain of a relatively few practitioners and connoisseurs; it no longer exists in a remote and rarified atmosphere. It can no longer be considered as incidental or peripheral to our way of life. It is central to the life we cherish and to the beliefs we hold; for as a nation we are reaching toward maturity, and the surest sign of maturity lies in the growing expression of an indigenous and creative national culture.

President Kennedy and his First Lady gave extraordinary impetus to our cultural progress. This is why there has been such enthusiasm for linking his name to the construction of our National Cultural Center as a permanent and meaningful memorial.

To me, art can be defined as eloquence of expression—and it can be applied to words, to music, to a painting, to the design of a fine building; to the representation of an ideal in stone or marble or bronze; indeed, to any product of the truly creative mind which uplifts and inspires us, or gives us a glimpse of the meaning in life we seek.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]—who was the first witness before the recent hearings of our Senate Special Subcommittee on the Arts—spoke of the arts as expressing the spirit, mind, intellect, the very souls of the people, and as "the rock foundation of every great civilization since the dawn of history."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is an eloquent spokesman for the bill he has sponsored, and in favor of which I speak today as a cosponsor. I should like to read the list of distinguished cosponsors who have also joined with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in putting forward and supporting this legislation: Senators CLARK, COOPER, JAVITS, LONG of Missouri, METCALF, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SCOTT, and KENNEDY.

The members of the Special Subcommittee on the Arts are: Senators YARBOROUGH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, CLARK, JAVITS, and PROUTY. They have served on it with me for 2 years, and I am grateful to them and particularly to Senator HILL, our wonderfully wise, able, and fair chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, who constituted the subcommittee in the 87th Congress and reconstituted it in the 88th. The bill we have before us is in part due to the excellent work of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], whose own bill was before the subcommittee last year and whose concept of matching grants is incorporated in this year's legislation. The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] served as chairman of a Special Arts Subcommittee in the 86th Congress, and he has given valiant support once again this year.

But, Mr. President, this is a bipartisan bill we are considering, and I should like to pay special tribute to the Senator from

New York [Mr. JAVITS]. The senior Senator from New York is perhaps our most illustrious pioneer in the field of cultural endeavors in the Congress. Fifteen years ago he sponsored the first bill in the House of Representatives to establish a national cultural establishment, to provide for a national theater and a national opera and ballet. Throughout the years, he has championed consistently and with great dedication the basic causes we seek to implement today.

It has been a long and often frustrating 15 years from the standpoint of cultural legislation. Only once, as we have seen, in 1956, did the Senate pass a bill to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. The bill was subsequently tabled in the House Committee on Education and Labor. No House legislation in this area has ever received sufficient support for passage.

As Mr. August Heckscher, special consultant on the arts, has pointed out, at least 40 bills which concerned the arts were before the Congress in 1962.

But this is the year 1963, Mr. President, and we have before us now a bill which combines many previous concepts and ideas, and puts them, I am convinced, in the most comprehensive and effective form we can evolve.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me at that point?

Mr. PELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me at this time because I must attend a conference on the foreign aid appropriation bill.

From the brief study I have made of the bill—and I do not pretend to know a great deal about it—I believe the subject of the arts is a question which concerns our own personal judgment. My fear is that in establishing a commission, a committee, or a council of advisers appointed by the President, the counselors will change from time to time and they may have decided ideas on what is proper and what is not proper from the standpoint of art, and they may become somewhat dictatorial. It seems to me that the subject is one which could best be left to the heads of local art museums, or to the local directors of symphony orchestras, and so forth, rather than having an overall board that would try to stimulate action along any one line.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for permitting me to make these comments at this time.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts, for whom I have regard, affection, and respect. My own view is that those to be appointed would be appointed across the board from leaders in the various fields of the arts. They would be private citizens. We recognize the danger the senior Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned and we shall do everything we can to avoid it. The alternative to appointing a council is not to appoint one at all, which could lead to greater problems.

Mr. President, included in this bill is Senator HUMPHREY's concept of a National Council on the Arts and his and Senator JAVITS' concept of a National Arts Foundation. President Kennedy, in establishing last June by Executive order the President's Advisory Council on the Arts, expressed the hope that it would be given a statutory base. The Foundation, to which Senator JAVITS has particularly devoted his talent and efforts, gives new scope and shape to this bill, and is a most important part of the whole. In Senator HUMPHREY's final version, the definition of the arts has been broadened to cover the entire spectrum of American creative and interpretive activity.

The Bureau of the Budget submitted this statement to the subcommittee:

> We recognize that this legislation is the most comprehensive in the arts area to come before the Senate for consideration. We support the basic principles and fundamental values contained in [the legislation] and agree with their objectives of increasing the cultural resources and improving the cultural vitality of the United States. Accordingly, we look forward to the ultimate enactment of legislation to achieve these objectives.

Mr. President, support for this legislation has come through the opinions expressed by some 85 individuals and recorded in the subcommittee hearings. Support has come from the South of our country, from the Carolinas, from Texas; from the Middle West and the East, and from as far west as our new State of Hawaii.

The legislation is urgently needed. At the subcommittee hearings, witnesses, from the major fields of artistic accomplishment throughout the United States, emphasized over and over again that private sources are no longer able to sustain our cultural undertakings; that the performing arts have been forced to abandon many sections of the country, that they are concentrated now in the major centers of population, and even there struggling with backbreaking deficits; that the museums, despite their remarkable growth in numbers and attendance, are confronting the same financial problem, resulting in an insufficiency of funds available for research, conservation, and the training and attracting of new recruits.

U.S. Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, in testimony before the subcommittee, reported authoritative figures to show that the present unmet needs for cultural undertakings in this country stand at $320 million. The American Guild of Musical Artists reported that 90 percent of its members earn less than $5,000 a year. There are in the United States more than 1,200 symphony orchestras—at first glance, a remarkable number—but the vast majority of them perform on a limited and curtailed basis, and they are confronting growing deficits.

Another eminent witness, Mr. John D. Rockefeller, 3d, speaking of our potential renaissance, summarized the opinions of a great many experts who testified. He said:

> The rate of expansion is so rapid that neither private philanthropy nor subscription plans can keep up with the burgeoning requirements. It seems to me obvious—

Mr. Rockefeller continued—

> that only by enlightened government action at the municipal, State, and National level, can the gap between the inevitable needs and present resources be appreciably narrowed.

We reach the unmistakable conclusion, I submit, that here and now the Federal Government has a vital role to play in the fostering of the central, the basic cultural values in American life. If we fail to act, a cultural renaissance can become a cultural vacuum.

A generation of Americans may grow up who have never witnessed a live performance of the theater, who have never heard a great symphony orchestra perform in an auditorium. Already many American artists in a variety of fields—musicians, operatic performers, painters—are seeking satisfaction for their talents in foreign countries. Certainly we approve of cultural exchange; but just as surely we cannot approve of permanent cultural loss.

Why are American artists leaving our shores? And why do we find that the current Broadway stage, for instance, is peopled by numbers of British performers?

It is because we are lagging far behind the rest of the free world in government recognition of the significance of cultural activities, and government support for the arts.

There is extensive government support for the arts in such countries as Italy, France, and West Germany, to name a few. But let us look for a moment at the Arts Council of Great Britain, which has been credited with stimulating the cultural growth of that nation to its current high position in the world. This council functions with an annual government grant of approximately $5.6 million. It stimulates a wealth of enterprises, from literary activities to art festivals and associations, to the Royal Opera and the Sadler's Wells ballet; to almost 50 theatrical groups and repertory theaters, including the renowned Old Vic. The council's roots go back to the dark days of World War II, when the British Government recognized that there was a need for cultural inspiration over and above the stringencies of a wartime budget.

In the United States we have one National Repertory Theater, founded in 1961. It is sponsored by the congressionally chartered American National Theater and Academy, but the National Repertory Theater exists now on private funds. These are meager in comparison with the theater's potential value. We have welcomed its excellence to Washington; we have welcomed here in the Capital its distinguished cast. It is currently on tour to the number of communities its budget will allow. But these are limited to 22 cities in some 14 States; and if we are to reach the far corners of our country and reach into every State, our enterprises in this field alone must be greatly expanded.

The Arts Council of Canada is a closer example to us of government support for cultural achievement. It expends over $2 million in government funds. On a per capita basis of national population, the government expenditures of the British and Canadian Councils are remarkably similar. The figure is approximately 11 cents per person.

If we set our own appropriations on this basis—without taking into consideration the fact that citizens of the

United States enjoy the highest standard of living of any nation on earth on an average—our figure in this legislation would be $20 million.

Can we not afford in this Nation 10 cents per person per year for our cultural progress? That is why I say, Mr. President, that this bill contains a modest sum indeed.

It is modest indeed, when compared with what would be spent by the average family in a year for going to the movies or buying a television set.

We should not be testing with these funds untried practices. We do not have to look abroad to realize that the "subvention" principle, in the phrase the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] has often used, would work extremely well in this country. "Subvention" means partial assistance, the matching grant principle in the language of the bill. It also implies that the initial Government sum will be multiplied through subsequent private support.

In New York, for example, as I briefly mentioned earlier, the New York State Council on the Arts began with an initial State appropriation of $50,000. This year, 3 years later, the New York council had stimulated new theatrical productions to the point that $392,000 is being derived from private sources to help finance these new activities. In a period of 3 years, the ratio has become almost 8 to 1 between initial State expenditures and subsequent private financing.

It is readily seen how partial Government assistance can encourage private support. Repeatedly at the subcommittee hearings, this concept was stressed—from the private foundation standpoint, from the Governor-approinted Missouri Commission on the Arts, which has witnessed private business rally to support the committee's work. Artists repeatedly emphasized that they would welcome this form of Government assistance, which is so very different from direct subsidization or control. They stressed that this principle is in accord with the best traditions of our democratic process, because it would establish the needed working partnership between the Government and the individual citizen.

This legislation will give the Federal stamp of approval to this principle. It will encourage the formation of other State agencies and individual groups.

It will help to decentralize the arts, so that they will be no longer concentrated only in large cities, so that eventually each citizen may have a better opportunity of enjoying and participating in them.

It will increase the exposure of our citizens to creative and interpretive excellence, so that they may appreciate, and assimilate, and learn.

The National Council and the Foundation each will bring together the best talents in this country to plan how best to develop our cultural vitality. Never has this been more important.

The legislation will give to the American artist the recognition he yearns for, so that he will no longer need to seek elsewhere for higher satisfaction.

Under the cooperative and constructive combination of expert talent this legislation sets forth, better cities can be planned, better buildings, and better design for the products we produce in an increasingly competitive world market.

These are but some of the reasons for this legislation, Mr. President. I have left to the last an overriding factor which I believe makes it mandatory.

I have touched on this subject before. I emphasize it again in this light.

Our most needed scientific explorations, our scientific research, for which we spend billions of dollars annually; our billions spent to maintain the posture of strength we require in the world; our billions spent to provide the physical amenities of a better life for our citizens—all these will mean very little, if the culture of our people stands still or, worse yet, is allowed to erode. For, ultimately, what we pass on to our children and to the world must not be material values, but creative values.

We are in conflict today with the materialism of totalitarian forms of government, which by definition stifle creative thought. We must contribute to the world something better than this, something more lofty, something that is in tune with freemen, something to inspire them. In proportion as the best in our cultural life grows and is nourished, so will we give to our people what they are searching for and need, so will we demonstrate still another failure of communism in meeting a human need, and at the same time we will give to the world a meaningful heritage.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the first thing I should do properly is to thank so many Senators for "holding the fort" on this bill until I could reach the Chamber. I am especially grateful to the majority leader [Mr. Mansfield] and to my beloved colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], who has so graciously done this.

There is a very special reason for this. This is a bill for which I have been working for 15 years, since 1948, when I introduced the first measure of this character in the House of Representatives, I considered it to be one of the major developments in our Nation's life. In a sense, our Nation shows, by what I hope will be the passage of this bill today, a sense of maturity which brings it abreast of the other major countries of the world.

I am sure others of my colleagues have referred to the fact that this Nation is just about the last major country in the world that has not given recognition to artistic and cultural development; and the recognition that is represented by this bill is of a very modest character compared to what is being done all over the world in a very much more extended way.

Some of the celebrated cultural institutions within the knowledge of mankind are institutions supported by government; here we are proposing a very modest subvention, not nearly approaching in size and character the effort which has been made by most of the great institutions to which mankind looks for inspiration. For example, the Comedie Francaise, the great Vienna State Opera, the Old Vic Theatre, in London, the Danish Royal Ballet—all of these owe their activities to some kind of government assistance.

When I came to the Senate, I found the great warmth and agreeableness on this subject. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], a relatively new Senator, jumped into that effort with a spirit and understanding which I think auger most auspiciously for his future in the Senate. I shall always be grateful to him. Millions of Americans should be grateful to him, and they are, for the initiative he has shown in opening the hearings on the arts legislation, and for the manner in which he has persevered with understanding and tact to bring the issue to this point. There can be no greater tribute to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] than that we have reached the point I have tried to achieve in 15 years. He has been the principal factor in bringing about this result.

Also, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], sponsor of this bill, who joined in a bill with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], which resulted in bringing about a measure agreeable to our colleagues on the committee, and, I trust, to the Members of the Senate, has been instrumental in bringing this matter before us for action.

It will be remembered that in the previous Congress a bill was reported which was similar in content, but it was too close to the end of the session for it to be acted upon.

I also mention the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], whose initiative produced the idea of matching funds for States, an especially important development, as there are 15 States which have some form of State council for the arts. The matching aspect of the bill thus becomes of great importance.

The power of the Federal Government to act in this fashion is very clear. It started back in George Washington's day. Indeed, there is a quotation in the committee report from President George Washington, which was included in the testimony of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], in which in 1788 George Washington wrote:

> The arts and sciences are essential to the prosperity of the State and to the ornament and happiness of human life.
>
> They have a primary claim to the encouragement of every lover of his country and of mankind.

So we have the statement that this is properly a governmental activity. We have the Fine Arts Council. We have the Smithsonian Institution. We have activities which have never been questioned in terms of constitutional power.

I do not wish to delay the Senate, but I wanted to make this brief statement.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. When the Senator from New York and I were together in the other body, we worked on the same project. At one time, as a member of the Labor and Education Committee of the House, I was chairman of an ad hoc committee that attempted to bring about passage of a similar bill that had been sponsored by the Senator's predecessor. We have worked together in this field.

I am interested in the fine constitutional analysis of the bill that the Senator is making. It is an important contribution to this debate. I am proud to join in the sponsorship of this legislation, and congratulate the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] for his leadership in getting it through the Senate committee, and, I hope, through the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] has himself been a leader in this field, and is one of the copsonsors of this bill.

While I am on this subject, neither the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] nor I have mentioned that there is in the bill provision for a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, a very important aspect. This is a contribution of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. It is really an administrative matter, as President Kennedy had issued an Executive order providing for such a Council. The bill would provide legislative and statutory support for it. I express the hope that President Johnson will promptly appoint the Council. It would be auspicious if it were appointed under the terms of the bill.

To sum up, the four major reasons why the bill should be passed are as follows:

First. The grandeur and dignity of our Nation are at stake. We are unique among the great nations of the world in not giving recognition to our artistic development, especially one which is so rich in this country, and which is recognized throughout the world.

Second. To assist in the growth and development of the arts. This is, after all, as George Washington said, one of the fundamental reasons for our Nation to exist as a nation.

Third. To give broad encouragement to the expression of American creativity and to our artists.

When we remember that the total number of members of the Actors Guild is about 12,000, and that only 10 percent of that number, 1,200, have any kind of jobs at any one time during the year, and that that number has diminished by three-quarters over the past decade, one begins to realize how important it is to promote creativity in the American arts.

Third. Official recognition by our Government of outstanding performances of merit in the arts. President Kennedy, again in an act of great foresightedness, established a national award to give such recognition. Therefore it is highly important that the Nation should show it in its own activities.

Fourth, and very importantly, as an element of the whole aspect of the United States in the world. The Russians and Communist Chinese are making tremendous "hay" in terms of impressing upon other peoples the fact that they sponsor such extraordinarily gifted organizations and artists as the Bolshoi Ballet, Oistrakh, and others, while we operate our programs through the State Department on an emergency appropriation, when we have such great pride in our own Heifetz, Van Cliburn, Bernstein, Marian Anderson, Rubinstein, and other great artists.

This is a very important and felicitous day for me.

August Heckscher, the President's special consultant on the arts, made this program the central theme of his report to the President. When the strike affecting the Metropolitan Opera House was settled by Arthur Goldberg, now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, he again made this idea the central theme of what the Nation has to look forward to in terms of developing its arts.

As to the money that is involved, the amount in the authorization is very small, but it can have a tremendous effect.

I have estimated that for every dollar appropriated there is a multiplier of 5, thus producing $50 million of cultural activity for every $10 million appropriated.

In New York State we have made an estimate, because New York State operates such a program through the New York State Council on the Arts. I am very proud of the fact that we have legislated such a program and that it is in effect.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief analysis of the respective State programs in the various States which are involved with various State councils.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In California, a bill to establish a fine arts commission is expected to pass the legislature. The measure, modeled on the New York State Council, is supported by Gov. Edmund G. Brown.

Economy has influenced legislators to favor State assistance to the arts. Unions affected by the movie slump have argued that State and community help for theaters would ease the Hollywood recession.

A Connecticut bill creating a State commission on the arts was signed into law on June 6 by Gov. John Dempsey. The 15 members will survey public and private cultural facilities in the State.

In New Jersey, Gov. Richard J. Hughes recently named an 11-man commission to study the arts. Members include the artist, Ben Shahan, and the playwright, Selden Rodman. The State's first cultural center, which will cost $6 million, is being built in Trenton. It is scheduled for completion next year.

For many years, North Carolina has considered support of the arts a vital concern. It owns and supports an art gallery in Raleigh and has contributed to the North Carolina Symphony Orchestra and subsidized outdoor dramas.

The General Assembly of North Carolina is considering a proposal to appropriate $325,000 for a school for the performing arts.

The proposal, strongly supported by Gov. Terry Sanford, is said to have a better-than-even chance of acceptance. The State school for music, dance, and drama would operate at the high school and college levels.

In Missouri, Gov. John M. Dalton named a 25-member arts committee last December. A bill has been introduced in the legislature to create a Missouri Council on the Arts.

In Minnesota, the legislature has rejuvenated a lagging arts program that is 60 years old and has passed a State art council bill.

Kentucky has a varied program—all instituted since 1960. Through the State council on public higher education, the State contracts with the Louisville Symphony Orchestra—at $50,000 annually—for performances at State colleges. The Lexington Little Symphony, backed by State funds, plays in small cities in cooperation with local civic groups.

The Kentucky Council of Performing Arts was recently set up.

Michigan established a cultural commission in 1960, and it now has 100 members. William E. Stirton, a vice president of the University of Michigan who was serving as chairman, resigned in January, but he has continued his interest in the commission's activities.

Mr. Stirton said the commission had helped in establishing an artist in residence—a pianist—in Flint, and had encouraged communities to hold concerts and to develop arts centers.

VIRGINIA SUPPORTS THEATER

In Virginia, the Barter Theater at Abingdon has received an annual appropriation of $12,500 to $18,000 for many years.

The Virginia Museum of Fine Art in Richmond sends "artmobiles" with exhibitions to cities and towns. The museum helps plan programs through a statewide Confederation of the Arts established 2 years ago.

Nebraska created the Council for Nebraska's Cultural Resources in 1961. Its financing has come through private subscriptions and donations from individuals and corporations.

Dr. Walter Militmer, chairman of the council and dean of the University of Nebraska's College of Arts and Science, said that "at this point the council is a State coordinating agency for various local groups in cultural pursuits."

In Nevada, Gov. Grant Sawyer is appointing a 10-member committee to determine possible steps toward a program. Dr. Craig Shepherd, head of the University of Nevada's Art Department, will be chairman of the council.

Washington created a State arts council in 1961, but only $2,000 has been appropriated for the next 2 years.

In Ohio, a bill to create an Ohio Arts Evaluation Commission to help in determining the role of State agencies in the growth of the arts is being considered in the legislature.

"It has not yet been conclusively determined that new government support for the arts will be truly effective," Mr. MacFadyen said. "However, I believe that if this support develops with sound artistic objectives, a significant contribution to the arts, in America will follow."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the estimate which we have from New York is a ratio of 8 to 1; that is, funds which will be available privately from all nonprofit sources for the development of artistic endeavors in this country, compared with every dollar of federally appropriated funds.

This is really a signal day in our national history, of which we can be proud, honoring, as it does, a tradition which goes back to the days of George Washington. I hope very much that the Senate will pass the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as one of the sponsors of this bill and as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am delighted that this bill is now about to be passed by the Senate. The bill results from an extraordinary amount of work done by the able Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], but I think the highest praise should go to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], who was chairman of the special subcommittee which took the testimony on the bill, and who brought it successfully through the full committee and to the floor. The dedication of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] in the cause of the arts ought to get much more publicity than it has received. I commend him publicly on the floor of the Senate for his fine work.

This bill is a synthesis of bills introduced by me, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from Rhode Island. It is an important step forward in the sponsorship of the arts by the Government, a principle with which I am in complete sympathy.

I hope the bill will promptly be passed by the other body and will become law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] and all the members of his subcommittee. I would also like to thank the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the distinguished chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, who facilitated the expeditious handling of this fine bill. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] should also be commended for his generous action in incorporating his bill, which was very similar to the legislation now before us, into this bill and thus minimizing delay. I am hopeful that all this work and selfless cooperation will now be capped by speedy passage of this needed legislation.

You will recall that during the 87th Congress, I introduced a bill, S. 741, to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. After 3 days of public hearings, the Special Subcommittee on the Arts reported my bill with amendments incorporating some of the principal features of bills drafted by Senator JAVITS and Senator CLARK. I believe S. 741 would have passed the Senate if it had come to a vote last year. However, the 87th Congress came to a close without this legislation receiving consideration on the floor.

Nevertheless, the fact that S. 741 had been reported favorably by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee constituted a significant step forward in securing long-overdue support for and recognition of the cultural and artistic activities of this country.

Early in the present Congress therefore, the Senator from New York introduced a proposal which was almost identical to the reported version of S. 741 in its major provisions. His bill proposed the establishment of a U.S. Arts Foundation. I was privileged to cosponsor this measure which is S. 165.

However, I also perceived the value of a bill that would establish both the Arts Foundation suggested in Senator JAVITS' bill and a National Advisory Council on the Arts which has been recommended to every Congress since President Eisenhower suggested it in 1955. S. 2379 reflects my proposal in this regard. I am extremely pleased that Senators JAVITS, CLARK, COOPER, LONG, METCALF, RANDOLPH, SCOTT, RIBICOFF, and the distinguished chairman of the Arts Subcommittee, Senator PELL, joined me as cosponsors of this legislation.

Title I of this bill creates a National Council on the Arts in the Executive Office of the President. Last June, President Kennedy took steps to establish such a council through the issuance of an Executive order.

Our late President's action has been hailed by the artists of our country and by their vast audience. It was an action that was long overdue. S. 2379 now provides the vehicle for Congress to place its imprimatur upon this Council.

My bill proposes that this 25-member Advisory Council be established within the Executive Office of the President. Members would be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The Council would recommend ways to maintain and increase the cultural resources of the United States, propose methods to encourage private initiative in the arts, advise and consult with private and public groups and bodies concerned with the arts, and conduct research and surveys in the arts. The Council would be called upon to file an annual report with the Congress. This document should prove extremely valuable in providing the entire country with an annual inventory of major artistic and cultural activities in this country.

In effect, the Arts Council would serve as a national focal point for bringing together the most qualified and knowledgeable persons in the arts and as a vehicle whereby these persons could bring their thinking to the attention of Congress, the President, the States, and the general public.

Senator PELL has very ably reviewed the provisions of this bill and I would like to address myself to some of the questions about its effects.

Does this measure comprise a radical departure from our traditions of government? I think not. The importance of government assistance for the arts has been recognized by our greatest statesmen, the first being our first President himself. In 1788 he wrote:

> The arts and sciences are essential to the prosperity of the state and to the ornament and happiness of human life. They have a primary claim to the encouragement of every lover of his country and of mankind.

I underscore Washington's intention that the arts and sciences have a primary claim. For President Washington was fully aware that the main goal of every great society is to encourage the creative abilities of its members in those peaceful activities that make our lives rich and meaningful.

I believe that, over the years, Congress has shared this view. In 1846, the Smithsonian Institution was created to take advantage of a bequest of James Smithson to the United States. The Institution—under congressional care—has expanded over the years and now includes 10 bureaus, 4 of which are concerned with the arts: the National Museum, the National Collection of Fine Arts, the Freer Gallery—which operates partly on Federal funds—and the world renowned National Gallery of Art, in which we all take great pride. In 1910, Congress created the Commission of Fine Arts as guardian for the L'Enfant plan for the development of the Capital. Some of our finest artists and architects have advised our District government through this Commission.

The Library of Congress operates a Music Division which not only collects material relating to music but also conducts a performance program. The General Services Administration is charged, among other things, with the responsibility of design and construction of all public and administrative buildings of the Federal Government. Its annual payments to architects, muralists, sculptors, and painters are considerable. For many years, the Department of Agriculture has had a program of making and using motion pictures in its educational program. The National Park Service has a program for the conservation of our national historic and architectural monuments. The Office of Education has several specialists serving in areas related to the arts.

The Department of State has engaged in cultural enterprises for a number of years. Particularly since World War II under the foreign building program, the Department has brought in leading architects to design many of our new embassy buildings. Under our educational and cultural exchange program, representatives of our artistic community have traveled throughout the world, testifying to the vitality of our national life.

The Federal arts projects of the 1930's marked an extensively successful effort to participate in the artistic development of our country. Although primarily geared to the problem of employment, these projects had a significant effect on our national life.

An example of the success of our Federal programs of the thirties is apparent from an exhibit which is now touring the country. This exhibit consists of works by distinguished alumni of the WPA and the Treasury arts program. This exhibit had a highly successful showing at the Washington Gallery of Modern Art this summer. The artists in this exhibit who were given encouragement at that time by the Federal Government have gone on to be among the most successful artists of our time. Indeed it may be said that a significant proportion of the great living artists of America today were born of the Federal programs of the thirties. It is my opinion that we are on the verge of another great cultural advance such as the renaissance but I also believe as many others that if America is to take the lead in this advance we must have Federal participation such as that provided for by the bill under consideration here today.

Today, copyright laws, tax programs, and practically every action taken by the executive branch to administer our laws affect the artist as an individual or the various art institutions. It is clear that

Federal participation in the arts—directly or indirectly—is not a new development.

But much of what we have done has been haphazard and in many instances because the Congress and the Executive lack the benefit of experienced counsel in the art fields, the impact of Government activity has too often had a negative effect.

My bill will correct this situation. For the first time this Government will—in an organized manner—be able to call upon the best talents and most able administrators in the arts so that they may place their experience at the service of this Nation. The President is aware of the necessity for such coordination and consultation. In this regard, he shares a viewpoint expressed by many of his predecessors—Democrat and Republican—and as I have noted he has taken Executive action. Congress also requires closer contact with America's spokesmen in the arts. My bill will accomplish this.

We must be well advised and we must also be prepared to assist the American arts.

We hear a great deal about the so-called cultural boom in America—and, as a result, some people ask why it is necessary for Government to assist the arts when they are growing everywhere with private support. Indeed, there is mounting evidence of increased interest in the arts in America. I am impressed and heartened by such signposts as the growth in audiences for professional theater outside of New York, by the increase in the number of symphony orchestras across our land, by the numbers of people who visit our art galleries and museums. All this indicates that when more and more of the material wants of our people are satisfied and greater leisure time is given to them, their thirst for meaningful, enriching activity is increased. The "cultural boom," therefore, which is being hailed by many is in fact an expression of unsatisfied interests and desires which indicate the need for Federal legislation.

For the facts are that quality art activity has not increased to meet the demand. Despite a growing interest in art, our society finds it increasingly difficult to support true professional art work. In hearings before this committee last year and before a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee in 1961, testimony was taken from witness after witness regarding the economic depression in which most of our finest artists find themselves. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has compiled similar information substantiating the fact that the artist in our Nation cannot—except in few instances—earn a decent living through his art.

Harold Schonberg, music critic of the New York Times, has this to say in a recent Saturday Evening Post article:

> Strictly speaking, the United States does have over 1,200 symphony orchestras. This is not only an imposing number; it is a spectacular number. Or it is, until one realizes that of those 1,200, perhaps a dozen—if that—can support their musicians with a living yearly wage. The vast majority of the 1,200 are semiprofessional groups that give very few concerts—5, 6, 10 a year.

I was shocked and thoroughly dismayed when our Capital City became threatened with the loss of its only professional symphony orchestra because it was impossible for the management to pay its musicians more than $5,000 a year. It is disgraceful that in a major city such as the District of Columbia a professional orchestra cannot be paid a living wage.

Mr. Schonberg continues:

> We do have some of the best opera singers in the world—but they are not in America. Most of them are solidly entrenched in European opera houses. Naturally. Where else can they go? The sad fact is that America has only one major opera house—the Metropolitan. And there is only one ballet company in America with any sort of international standing.

In his statement announcing the creation of an Advisory Council on the Arts last summer, President Kennedy noted that although amateur theater can be found throughout our country, "the professional theater reaches only a limited part of the population. Indeed," the President said, "children are growing up who have never seen a professionally acted play."

We support libraries through the Library Services Act, and in so doing we hope to bring the works of Shakespeare, Moliere, Eugene O'Neil, Racine, and all the great playwrights within reach of our people. But these men wrote for a living state. How ironic that we assist in supplying these plays in written form but do nothing to bring these works to our population in the form for which they were written.

Title II of S. 2379 provides a modest fund to help communities throughout our land in bringing quality professional art to their citizens.

Art, gentlemen, determines significantly the direction of our culture and our culture is the sum total of what makes life worth living. It is through developing an appreciation of the arts that our new leisure time will be spent constructively. Thus promotion of the arts at a Federal level becomes indispensable in our changing way of life.

Throughout the Western World, many of the great artistic achievements today are being accomplished with the support of government. The Bayreuth Wagner Festival, the Scala Opera of Milan, the Vienna State Opera, the Amsterdam Concertgebouw are all government supported and are flourishing.

Why is it that their governments can encourage art and it is not retarded—instead it is enjoyed within each of these countries and admired throughout the world?

Art has not been stifled in these lands—it has not been subjugated—and neither shall it be in the United States. The contention that Government support for the arts in our country would lead to the ruination of our art forms is a counsel of fear born of a strange lack of faith in the American people and their institutions—both governmental and artistic.

We only do harm to ourselves by accepting the thesis that art and democratic government are natural enemies. Other nations and freedom-loving peoples know that is not so. And while many of our artists of great ability find it difficult to earn a living, and many of our art institutions fail for lack of funds, ironically, governments with far less financial resources have come to the aid of American art. It is worthy of note that in recent years the Italian Government has granted a subsidy to the Chicago Lyric Opera Co. and the West German Government has pledged $2,500,000 for the new Lincoln Center opera house in New York.

Technological improvements cannot be adopted to bring costs in line with our changing economy. Especially in the performing arts, quality work is becoming an economic impossibility. Unless we are to see these art forms disappear from our land at a time when our people—with greater leisure time to spare—seek and need such fruitful interests, we must be prepared to offer a modicum of financial assistance. We have done it in other areas of activity when we have found it necessary to the well-being and happiness of our citizens. I submit we must do as much in the arts, which have been the rock foundation of every great society since the dawn of civilization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2379) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1963".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that the encouragement and support of the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government;

(2) that the Nation's prestige and general welfare will be promoted by providing recognition that the arts and the creative spirit which motivates them and which they personify are a valued and essential part of the Nation's resources;

(3) that it is in the best interests of the United States to maintain, develop, and disseminate the Nation's artistic and cultural resources; and

(4) that, in order to implement these findings, it is desirable to establish a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation to provide such recognition and assistance as will encourage and promote the Nation's artistic and cultural progress.

ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN THE ARTS

SEC. 3. In the administration of this Act no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control, over the policy or program determination of any group, State, or State agency involved in the arts.

TITLE I—NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "National Council on the Arts Act of 1963".

Establishment of the Council

SEC. 102. There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President a National Council on the Arts (hereinafter referred to as the "Council").

Membership of the Council

SEC. 103. (a) The Council shall be composed of the Chairman provided for in section 104 of this title, and twenty-four members appointed by the President. Such members shall be selected (1) from among private citizens of the United States who are widely recognized for their broad knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in the arts; (2) so as to include practicing artists, civic cultural leaders, members of the museum profession, and others who are professionally engaged in the arts; and (3) so as collectively to provide an appropriate distribution of membership among the major art fields including music, drama, dance, folk art, literature, architecture and allied arts, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, industrial design, costume and fashion design, motion pictures, radio and television. The President is requested in the making of such appointments to give consideration to such recommendations as may from time to time be submitted to him by leading national organizations in these fields.

(b) Each member of the Council shall hold office for a term of six years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, eight at the end of the second year, eight at the end of the fourth year, and eight at the end of the sixth year after the date of enactment of this Act. No member of the Council shall be eligible for reappointment during the two-year period following the expiration of his term.

(c) Any vacancy in the Council shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

Chairman of the Council

SEC. 104. (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Chairman of the Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Chairman") from among private citizens of the United States who are widely recognized for their knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, the arts. In addition, he shall advise the President with respect to the activities of the Federal Government in the arts. If a vacancy occurs in the Office of the Chairman the President shall fill the vacancy in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) The Chairman shall serve at the pleasure of the President, but not in excess of eight consecutive years, and shall not be eligible for reappointment during the four-year period following the expiration of his last period of service as Chairman. The provisions of this subsection shall apply to any person appointed to fill a vacancy in the Office of the Chairman.

(c) The Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,000 per annum, and shall be reimbursed for travel and subsistence expenses incurred by him while away from his home or regular place of business in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 836–842), and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

Duties and responsibilities of the Council

SEC. 105. (a) The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less often than twice during each calendar year. Thirteen members of the Council shall constitute a quorum.

(b) The Council shall (1) recommend ways to maintain and increase the cultural resources of the United States, (2) propose methods to encourage private initiative in the arts, (3) advise and consult with the National Arts Foundation, and other local, State, and Federal departments and agencies, on methods by which to coordinate existing resources and facilities, and to foster artistic and cultural endeavors and the use of the arts, both nationally and internationally, in the best interests of our country, and (4) conduct studies and make recommendations with a view to formulating methods or ways by which creative activity and high standards and increased opportunities in the arts may be encouraged and promoted in the best interests of the Nation's artistic and cultural progress, and a greater appreciation and enjoyment of the arts by our citizens can be encouraged and developed.

(c) In selecting subjects to be studied pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, the Council (1) shall consider requests submitted to it by the Chairman of the National Arts Foundation, and the heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and (2) may obtain the advice of any interested and qualified persons and organizations. In making its studies pursuant to such subsection, the Council may obtain assistance from such committees and panels as may be appointed by the Chairman from among those persons professionally qualified in the fields of art with which studies are concerned, who are recommended to him by the Council.

(d) Not later than ninety days after the end of each fiscal year, the Council shall submit to the President and the Congress an annual report setting forth its activities pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. In addition, the Council shall submit to the President reports and recommendations with respect to its activities at such time or times as the President shall request or the Council deems appropriate. The President shall transmit such recommendations as he may deem fit, together with his comments thereon, to the Congress.

Compensation of members of the Council

SEC. 106. Members of the Council, and persons appointed to assist the Council in making its studies, while attending meetings of the Council, or while engaged in duties related to such meetings, or while engaged in the conduct of studies authorized by this title, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Chairman, but not exceeding $75 per diem and shall be paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Staff of the Council

SEC. 107. (a) The Chairman is authorized to appoint, subject to the civil service laws, such secretarial, clerical, and other staff assistance as is necessary to enable the Chairman and the Council, and its special committees, to carry out their functions and duties, and to fix the compensation of persons so appointed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949.

(b) The Chairman is authorized to procure in accordance with such policies as the Council shall from time to time prescribe, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of $75 a day.

Expenses of the Council

SEC. 108. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Council such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

General provision

SEC. 109. (a) This title shall not be deemed to invalidate any provision in any Act of Congress or Executive order vesting authority in the Commission of Fine Arts or any other statutory Federal advisory body.

(b) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to authorize the Council to undertake any duty or responsibility which is the duty or responsibility of any other Federal advisory body established by law as of the date of enactment of this title.

TITLE II—NATIONAL ARTS FOUNDATION

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "National Arts Foundation Act of 1963".

Establishment of foundation

SEC. 202. Effective as of ninety days after the date of the establishment of the National Council on the Arts, there is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the National Arts Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation").

Trustees of foundation

SEC. 203. (a) The Foundation shall be subject to the general supervision and policy direction of a Board of Trustees which shall consist of twenty-one members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such members shall be selected (1) from among private citizens of the United States who are widely recognized for their broad knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, the arts; (2) so as to include practicing artists, civic cultural leaders, members of the museum profession, and others who are professionally engaged in the arts; and (3) so as collectively to provide an appropriate distribution of membership among the major art fields listed in section 211(a) of this title. The President is requested in the making of such appointments to give consideration to such recommendations as may from time to time be submitted to him by leading national organizations in these fields and the National Council on the Arts.

(b) The term of office of each trustee of the Foundation shall be six years; except that the terms of the trustees first taking office after the enactment of this title shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, seven at the end of two years after the date of enactment of this title, seven at the end of four years after such date, and seven at the end of six years after such date. If a vacancy occurs in the term of office of a trustee, such vacancy shall be filled only for the unexpired portion of such term. Any person who has been a trustee of the Foundation for twelve or more consecutive years shall be ineligible for appointment during the two-year period following the termination of his duties as such a trustee.

(c) Any vacancy in the Foundation shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A majority of the trustees of the Foundation shall constitute a quorum.

(e) The President shall call the first meeting of the trustees of the Foundation, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman, who shall serve until two years after the date of enactment of this title. Thereafter each Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected for a term of four years in duration and each such election shall take place at the annual meeting occurring at the end of each such term. The Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman in his absence. In case a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship or vice chairmanship, the Foundation shall elect an individual from among the trustees to fill such vacancy for the remainder of such term.

(f) The trustees of the Foundation shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less than four times each year. The Chairman shall also call a meeting whenever one-third of the trustees so request in writing. Each trustee shall be given notice, by registered mail mailed to his last known address of record not less than fifteen days prior to any meeting, of the call of such meeting.

Director of Foundation

Sec. 204. (a) The Director of the Foundation shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In the appointment of the Director the President is requested to give due consideration to any recommendations submitted to him by the Board of Trustees. The Director shall serve as an ex officio trustee of the Foundation. In addition, he shall be the chief executive officer of the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,000 per annum and shall serve for a term of six years unless previously removed by the President.

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the Board of Trustees, a Deputy Director, who shall perform such functions as the Director, with the approval of the trustees, may prescribe, and shall be Acting Director during the absence or disability of the Director. In the event of a vacancy in the office of the Director, the Deputy Director shall serve as Acting Director until the President shall fill such vacancy. The Deputy Director shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed the scheduled rate of basic compensation provided for grade GS–18 in the Classification Act of 1949.

(c) The Director shall have general authority to carry out and execute the programs of the Foundation on a full-time, continuous basis, to recommend programs to the Foundation, and to discharge such other functions as the Foundation may delegate to him consistent with this title.

(d) The Director and the Deputy Director shall be reimbursed for travel and subsistence expenses incurred by them while away from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

(e) The Director and the Deputy Director shall be appointed without regard to the civil service laws and regulations.

(f) The Director and the Deputy Director shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as Director or Deputy Director, or hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Foundation makes any contract or other arrangement under this Act.

Grants to groups and States

Sec. 205. (a) (1) The Foundation is authorized to establish and conduct a program of grants-in-aid in a manner consistent with the declaration of policy set forth in the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1963, from the funds appropriated to the Foundation or otherwise obtained pursuant to section 207(a) (3) or (4) of this title, to nonprofit professional groups (and nonprofit groups meeting professional standards or standards of authenticity) engaged in or concerned with the arts, for the purpose of enabling such groups to provide (1) productions which have substantial artistic and cultural significance, giving emphasis to American creativity, (2) productions irrespective of origin which are of significant merit and which, without such assistance, would otherwise be unavailable to our citizens in many areas of the country, (3) projects that will encourage and assist artists who are citizens or who have evidenced their intention to become citizens of the United States, (4) projects that will encourage and develop the appreciation and enjoyment of the arts by our citizens, and (5) other relevant projects including surveys, research, and planning in the arts. No portion of any moneys granted under this subsection shall be applied to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or for the purchase or rental of any lands.

(2) No payment may be made to any group under this section except upon application therefor which is submitted to the Foundation in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Foundation.

(3) The amount of any grants allotted to any group pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of such project or production, except that not more than 20 per centum of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for the purposes of this section for any fiscal year may be available for allotment by the Foundation in such fiscal year without regard to such limitation in the case of any group which submits evidence to the Foundation that it has attempted unsuccessfully to secure an amount of funds equal to the grant applied for by such groups, together with a statement of the proportion which any funds it has secured represent of the funds applied for by such group.

(4) Any group shall be eligible for financial assistance pursuant to this section only if (A) no part of its net earnings inures to the benefit of any private stockholder, or stockholders, or individual or individuals, and (B) donations to such group are allowable as a charitable contribution under the standards of subsection (c) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(5) Except as otherwise provided in the second sentence of subsection (b) (3) of this section, the total amount appropriated to the Foundation for grants-in-aid to groups for any fiscal year shall be equal to the total amounts appropriated to the Foundation for grants-in-aid to States for such fiscal year.

(b) (1) The Foundation is authorized to establish and conduct a program of grants-in-aid, in a manner consistent with the declaration of policy set forth in the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1963, from the funds appropriated to the Foundation or otherwise obtained pursuant to section 207(a) (3) or (4) of this title, to assist the several States in supporting existing projects and productions which are making a significant public contribution in one or more of the arts, and in developing projects and productions in the arts in such a manner as will furnish adequate programs, facilities, and services in the arts to all the people and communities in each of the several States. No portion of any moneys granted under this subsection shall be applied to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings, or for the purchase or rental of any lands.

(2) In order to receive such assistance in any fiscal year, a State shall submit an application for such grants prior to the first day of such fiscal year and accompany such application with a plan which the Foundation finds—

(A) designates a State agency (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "State agency") as the sole agency for the administration of the State plan;

(B) provides that funds paid to the State under this title will be expended solely on projects and productions approved by the State agency which carry out one or more of the objectives of this title; and

(C) provides that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Foundation may from time to time require.

(3) Each State which has a plan approved by the Foundation in effect on the first day of the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, or any succeeding fiscal year, shall be entitled to a maximum allotment in any such fiscal year of an amount equal to half the total amount appropriated to the Foundation for the purposes of this section for such fiscal year divided by the total number of States. In the event that any sum is remaining out of the maximum allotment available for grants to each State in any fiscal year after all allotments are made to States with approved plans in effect on the first day of such fiscal year, the Foundation, in its discretion, may grant the aggregate of such remaining sums or any portion thereof to any group eligible for financial assistance under subsection (a) of this section or State agency for projects and productions which the Foundation finds will encourage the arts in areas where such assistance will be of value. In making grants to any group pursuant to this subsection, the Foundation shall require matching funds in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) (3) of this section.

(4) The amount of any grants allotted to any State or State agency pursuant to this subsection for any project or production shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of such project or production.

(c) Whenever the Foundation, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any group or State agency, finds that—

(1) any such group is not complying substantially with the provisions of this title;

(2) any such agency is not complying substantially with the terms and conditions of its State plan approved under this title; or

(3) any funds granted to such group or agency under this title have been diverted from the purposes for which they were allotted or paid

the Foundation shall immediately notify the Secretary of the Treasury and the group or State agency concerned that no further grants will be made under this title with respect to such group or State agency until there is no longer any default or failure to comply or the diversion has been corrected, or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until the group or State repays or arranges the repayment of the Federal funds which have been improperly diverted or expended.

Advisory committees, councils, or panels

Sec. 206. The Foundation may appoint persons other than trustees of the Foundation to committees, councils, or panels concerned with particular regions of the country or with particular aspects of the arts, or both, to advise and consult with the Foundation with respect to the duties of the Foundation and the projects and productions for which financial assistance is sought by groups and States. Such appointments shall be made without regard to the civil service laws and regulations.

Administrative powers and duties of the Foundation

Sec. 207. (a) The Foundation is authorized to—

(1) prescribe such rules and adopt such bylaws as it deems necessary to govern the manner of its operation and its organization and personnel, and to implement any of the provisions of the Act;

(2) make expenditures, and enter into contracts or other arrangements, as may be necessary for administering the provisions of this title, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (4 U.S.C. 5);

(3) acquire by loan or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this title;

(4) receive and use funds or marked gifts or property donated by others, if such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the general purposes of the Foundation;

(5) accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel;

(6) pay fees for and enter into contracts with persons for the performance of services required by the Foundation;

(7) pay to persons rendering services to the Foundation on an uncompensated basis or on a fee or contract basis, as provided in paragraphs (5) and (6) of this subsection,

travel and subsistence expenses while away from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations; and

(8) maintain an office in the District of Columbia.

(b) The Foundation is authorized to procure assistance, as specified herein, from any department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, or any independent agency of the United States, with the consent of the head thereof, and each such department, agency, or instrumentality is authorized to render such assistance to the Foundation by the donation or loan of employee services and by the donation or loan of supplies, office or building space, or other property, either on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, upon request made by the Director or Deputy Director of the Foundation.

(c) The Foundation shall not itself produce or present any project or production.

(d) Not later than ninety days after the end of each fiscal year, the Foundation shall submit to the President and the Congress an annual report summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

Staff of the Foundation

SEC. 208. The Director shall, in accordance with such policies as the Foundation shall from time to time prescribe appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that the Director may, in accordance with such policies as the Foundation shall from time to time prescribe, employ such technical and professional personnel or personnel with experience in or relating to any of the arts, and fix their compensation without regard to such laws, as he may deem necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Foundation under this title.

Compensation of the trustees of the Foundation and the members of its councils, committees, and panels

SEC. 209. The trustees of the Foundation, and the members of the councils, committees, and panels shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the President in the case of the trustees, and by the Foundation in the case of the members, but not to exceed $75 for each day in which they are actually engaged in the business of the Foundation pursuant to authorization of the Foundation, and shall be allowed travel and subsistence expenses while away from their homes or regular places of business in accordance with the Travel Subsistence Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

Appropriations

SEC. 210. (a) For the purpose of making grants authorized in section 205 of this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such sum, not exceeding $5,000,000, and for each fiscal year thereafter such sum, not exceeding $10,000,000 annually, as the Congress may determine. The moneys appropriated to the Foundation shall remain available for expenditure for two years following the expiration of the fiscal year for which appropriated.

(b) Moneys received by the Foundation under section 207(a) (3) and (4) of this title, shall not be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, but shall be kept in a special account, maintained by the Treasury Department, or kept by the Foundation in commercial banking institutions, or invested in securities eligible for trust funds in the District of Columbia, and shall be available to the Foundation for the purposes of this title.

(c) The Director shall determine any payments to be made under this title and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts thereof. Upon receipt of such certification, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay in accordance with such certification. Sums allotted to any group or State for any fiscal year under this title and not transferred during that fiscal year shall remain available to such group or State for the same purposes for the next fiscal year in addition to the sums allotted for such next fiscal year.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to administer the provisions of this title.

Definitions

SEC. 211. As used in this title—

(a) The term "the arts" means (1) the major art fields including music (instrumental and vocal), drama, dance, folk art, literature, architecture and allied fields, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, industrial design, costume and fashion design, motion pictures, television, and radio; and (2) the arts related to the presentation, performance, execution, and exhibition of such major art fields.

(b) The term "production" means plays (with or without music), ballet, dance and choral performances, concerts, recitals, operas, exhibitions, readings, motion pictures, radio, and television and any other activities involving the execution or rendition of the arts and meeting such standards as the Foundation may establish.

(c) The term "project" means programs organized by groups, States, and State agencies to carry out the purposes of this Act, including programs to foster American artistic creativity, to train artists, to commission works of art, and to develop and enhance knowledge and understanding of the arts.

(d) The term "group" includes any society, institution, organization, association, museum, or establishments, whether or not incorporated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] very much for his too kind words. He has made a considerable sacrifice to be present today. I know of the work he devoted to the bill over the past years and I would like to point out that he provided much of the basic thinking that went into the legislation. That is true also of other Senators who have served on the Special Subcommittee on the Arts, each one of whom has contributed something in his own way.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has shown a great interest in this subject; so has the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has added his wisdom to our deliberations and the Foundation proposed stems from his original bill. I thank him, too, for his very generous words about me. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has been the pioneer in these efforts over the longest period of time. I extend thanks also to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], for his good will and support. I should like to thank also the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] for his consideration in permitting the bill to be considered at this time, and for his help and generosity. Above all, I wish to pay tribute here to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the principal sponsor of this excellent legislation. He has inspired us all with his imaginative foresight and his leadership.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, would like to thank the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], who, if he had chosen to do so, could have made it much more difficult than he did to pass the bill. I have just told him personally, and I would like to tell him publicly, that personally I feel a great responsibility to the Senate, which I hope to discharge, with respect to the concerns which he expressed, quite sincerely and honestly, to the effect that the program may not be realized. We shall be very vigilant, especially with respect to the problems which he has pointed out.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island and the distinguished Senator from New York for their kind remarks. Of course, I believe that the Federal Government has no jurisdiction in this field. Even if it did, I believe it would be unwise for it to enter the field. Furthermore, I do not believe we have the money to put into new programs. I believe the Federal Government should not inject itself into this field. I predict that as the years go by the costs will greatly increase. I believe the bill to be a mistake. I hope I will be proved wrong, and that my colleagues will be proved right.

Mr. PELL. I should also like to thank those who have helped to do all the work that was necessary to be done in getting the bill into shape and guiding it through the labyrinth through which it has had to pass. I thank particularly Stewart E. McClure, who has been my friend for many years and who has devoted himself to this task with tremendous dedication. I thank Livingston Biddle, my special assistant and a friend for almost 30 years, who did a great part of the work and the thinking that has gone into the bill. And I thank Sheila Schermerhorn Scott, who gave me so much help in connection with the similar bill that got through committee, but not through the Senate, in the last Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. I join the Senator in those tributes, and express my appreciation for the work all these individuals have done. We all realize the great usefulness of their work. I should like to add the name of Al Lesser, of my own staff, who worked with Mr. Biddle; also the name of Barbara Donald of August Heckscher's staff when Mr. Heckscher was at the White House. I believe that the name of Dick Goodwin should also be mentioned, as well as that of Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and so many others who have done so much work on this project.

Mr. PELL. I should also like to extend our thanks to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who permitted hearings to be held on the bill at a crowded time in the schedule of the Senate and the committee, and did all he could to help bring about consideration of the bill by the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. I join the Senator in those remarks.

DISCONTINUANCE OF NO LONGER USEFUL GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, an article by Eileen Shanahan which appeared in the New York Times on December 18, 1963 states that President Johnson is considering a budget control proposal aimed at discontinuing no longer useful Government programs.

This proposal contemplates terminating certain Federal programs after they have been in operation for 5 years, or if not terminating then thoroughly reviewing them to determine if they should be continued. This proposal is very similar in nature to that of S. 2114, introduced by my good friend and colleague, Senator EDMUND MUSKIE of Maine—a bill of which I am pleased to be a cosponsor.

I believe, Mr. President, that these two proposals are a real indication that President Johnson and Congress are deeply concerned with sound fiscal policies, and that every effort will be made to effectuate such policies. Should the President make this proposal a part of his budget message to Congress in January, I know it will receive the most careful consideration in the hearings that Senator MUSKIE, who has exhibited a rare skill and the highest degree of competence in proposing this and other farsighted legislation, intends to hold on his similar bill on January 14–16, 1964.

I request that the New York Times articles I have referred to be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 18, 1963]

PRESIDENT WEIGHS A BUDGET CONTROL—HE CONSIDERS A PROPOSAL TO TERMINATE PROJECTS THAT OUTLIVE USEFULNESS

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, December 17.—President Johnson is seriously considering a new budget control device aimed at terminating Government programs that have outlived their usefulness.

Officials say there is a good chance that he will recommend it to Congress as part of the budget in January.

The budget device, in its most radical form, would simply provide that certain Government programs would automatically terminate after 5 years, unless Congress took affirmative action to continue them. The President's proposal, if he makes it, is not expected to go quite that far.

Instead, it is considered likely he will propose that Government programs be subject to an intensive review after 5 years, perhaps by some sort of special commission with both Government and non-Government members.

The commission would be required to report whether or not it considered a program worth continuing. The benefits to the Nation would generally be weighed against the cost to taxpayers.

At the outset, the President may propose that the automatic review be extended only to new programs that he will recommend to Congress in the budget presentation in January. Foremost among these programs is expected to be a many-sided attack on poverty in the United States.

No firm decisions have yet been made on the so-called poverty package. But work on it has been given high priority by several Government agencies, including the Council of Economic Advisers, the Labor Department, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

STUDIES GALBRAITH PLAN

The package is expected to be a conglomeration of existing programs, proposals put forth by President Kennedy that remain unenacted, and one or two new items.

Some established programs and Kennedy administration proposals may be modified somewhat to focus more sharply on the prevention and alleviation of poverty. These are expected to include an expanded job training program, various educational proposals and expanded public assistance payments, particularly to benefit the children of unemployed workers.

Among the new antipoverty programs that President Johnson is seriously considering is one advanced just last week by John Kenneth Galbraith, the Harvard economist. He proposed an emergency program to improve educational facilities and the quality of teaching in a specially selected "worst 100 counties" of the Nation, as a means of preventing poverty in the next generation through education.

In his budget message, President Johnson is expected to try to convince the economy-minded Congress that the price of needed new programs is the abandonment of outmoded ones.

The budget may contain specific recommendations for ending or at least reducing some old Government assistance projects that are now considered of relatively little benefit, compared with their cost.

It is possible that Mr. Johnson may seek to match specific programs, identifying the termination of old ones as the means of finding the money to finance new ones.

For example, President Johnson may seek to terminate the program under which the Government pays farmers for undertaking erosion control and other conservation measures. Congress has refused to accept recommendations to reduce or end the program.

The idea of submitting all Government programs, or at least all new ones, to review after 5 years is aimed at relieving the fears of Congress that all Government spending projects inevitably become permanent.

President Johnson's advisers apparently believe that the automatic termination feature is undesirable because there would be a rush to qualify for the available payments in the 5th year, leading to waste.

PROPOSED REVISION OF THE RULES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, several days ago in the course of a debate with the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] about the desirability of calling up by motion and hopefully adopting, with an amendment, Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, I placed in the RECORD a list of Senators who previously served in the House of Representatives. The list was placed in the RECORD with the thought that it might rebut a comment made by the junior Senator from Georgia that Members of the Senate know nothing about the rules of the House, and that, therefore, a joint committee to investigate ways of reforming the Senate and House, including rules, practices, procedures, and floor action, would be a useless project. That was a contention of the Senator from Georgia with which I disagreed. I therefore placed in the RECORD the list of some 40 Members of the Senate who formerly served in the House.

Inadvertently, and through a grievous error, the name of the able senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] was omitted from the list. Not only did the Senator from New Jersey serve with distinction in the House, but he was the cosponsor of an amendment which, had we been permitted to do so by our southern friends, we would have proposed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, had we ever been able to call it up on motion.

I wish to make this public apology for my inadvertence and to call the attention of Senators to the fact that there are 41, not 40, Members of the Senate who formerly served in the House of Representatives.

I do not know where one could find an equivalent body of experts, capable of advising our friends on the other side of the Capitol, as to the relatively few changes which they should make in their rules compared with the many changes which the Senate should make in its rules in order to make it possible for Congress to perform its constitutional responsibility.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INOUYE in the chair).

Mr. PASTORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on December 18, 1963, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1533. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.; and

S.2054. An act to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the Government of the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Rear Adm. John B. Colwell, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President in the grade of vice admiral while so serving, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

TAX REDUCTION LEGISLATION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, last month I received a letter from Mr. Donald C. Cook, president of the American Electric Power Co., Inc., which provides electric energy service to parts of Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. He urged early passage of the tax reduction bill, H.R. 8363.

Mr. Cook wrote that, as a result of the investment credit enacted last year, the American electric power system has been able to increase its capital expenditures and to put two rate reductions into effect in 1963.

His company is dedicated, he wrote, to furnishing service at rates as low as possible consonant with a fair return on investment.

Mr. President, I commend the American Electric Power Co. for its sound policy of passing on to ratepayers the benefits of tax reduction.

This policy contrasts sharply with that of the major private utility in my State, the Montana Power Co., which furnishes both gas and electricity. That company extracts from ratepayers the most exorbitant profit of any major electric utility. It, too, benefited from the investment credit enacted last year. But it did not pass those savings on to the ratepayer. Instead, the Montana Power Co. now seeks, through the Montana Railroad and Public Service Commission even higher rates from gas consumers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, Mr. Cook's letter of November 11 to me.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER CO., INC.,
New York, N.Y., November 11, 1963.
The Honorable LEE METCALF,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing you to urge the importance of early passage—passage this year—of the tax reduction bill now under consideration by the Finance Committee, H.R. 8363.

I am president of American Electric Power Co. and its subsidiaries. The American electric power system provides electric energy service to parts of seven States—Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. We sell more electricity than any other investor-owned utility in the country. We are dedicated to furnishing our service at rates as low as possible consonant with a fair return on our investment. Low rates benefit our customers and also insure our faster growth. Growth gives rise to capital investment, and this in turn benefits our entire service area.

Taxes, which are the biggest operating expense of the American electric power system, are a major expense for all business. Taxes increase the fixed charges associated with plant investment. They increase prices, thereby restricting the potential market for goods and services, and this in turn restricts capital investment. A decrease in taxes has opposite effects. As a result of the investment credit enacted last year, the American electric power system has been able to increase its capital expenditures and to put two rate reductions into effect in 1963.

We need a substantial reduction in prices to stimulate the economy—to enlarge our markets both here and abroad through lowering prices and placing more money in the hands of domestic consumers, and to encourage both plant investment and risk taking. This will provide more jobs for our growing work force and counteract the elimination of jobs through automation.

The principal argument which has been advanced against the tax reduction is that it would increase the deficit. An attempt was made in the House to provide that the tax cut should not take effect unless the estimate of Government expenditures is not in excess of $97 billion for fiscal 1964 and $98 billion for fiscal 1965.

I too am in favor of rigorous control of Federal expenditures, and I hope that Congress will act accordingly. But I think it would be a grave mistake to make a ceiling on expenditures a condition precedent to a tax cut. There are too many unpredictables which can affect Government expenditures, such as developments in the field of international relations. And the enactment of a tax cut would in itself serve as a strong motivation to hold expenditures within prudent limits.

We not only need a tax cut, but we need it now. The tax reduction bill should be enacted this year. Action on the part of business and consumers which will stimulate the economy and which can be expected from the tax cut will not take place until the present uncertainty has been removed. We need such action soon to insure further expansion, rather than a contraction, of our economy.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD C. COOK,
President.

DISCLOSURE OF ASSETS BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on July 23, 1946, I submitted in the Senate a resolution to require all Members of the Senate to file with the Secretary of this body a statement of the amount and sources of all income and all dealings in securities during the preceding year.

Today, 17 years later, Congress has made no progress whatever in coming to grips with what has periodically embarrassed its membership; namely, the criticism by the American people of a Congress that demands standards of ethics in the executive and judicial branches that it is unwilling to apply to itself.

In 1946, Congress was embarrassed by revelations of speculation in the commodity markets by righ-ranking members of the Committees on Agriculture. There was a flurry of concern and anxiety; there was a great deal of criticism that a Member of Congress who had inside information on what was likely to happen to commodity prices could speculate in those markets. I took the view then that it was perfectly proper for a Member of Congress to have income outside his congressional salary; but that its source should be public, so the public could judge whether that Member was improperly influenced in exercising his judgment on the legislative issues.

Since that time, there have been frequent political storms over proved and alleged conflict of interest in the executive branch. Each time a nomination for high Federal office is submitted to the Senate, we go into the financial background of the nominee. More often than not he is obliged to dispose of private financial holdings before he is confirmed; at least those holdings are usually transferred to some kind of trusteeship such as that utilized in recent days by President and Mrs. Johnson.

But Congress has steadfastly refused to set any standard for itself. Congress has steadfastly maintained that safeguards against conflict of interest are applicable only to executive and judicial officials, despite the obvious truth that Members of Congress, because of their costs of running for election, are more susceptible to being influenced by money or the promise of money than either executive or judicial officials.

The double standard which Congress insists on for itself is one of the major reasons for the ill repute among the public we have apparently engendered. All the tearful television performances, all the tearful speeches on the floors of these Chambers swearing good faith, do not wash away the blot on the name of Congress that this double standard creates. Until the entire Congress, as an institution, cleans its own house and applies public disclosure rules to its own membership, the American people will be right to suspect that we have something to hide.

I am not moved by the cries that public disclosure of income will make second-class citizens of Members of Congress. No Member of Congress suggests that we are making second-class citizens out of persons nominated to the Cabinet when we require them to divest themselves of business holdings that they could enhance by their official acts. I do not know of any Member of Congress who thinks that the statutes to protect the public from conflicts of interest in the executive and judicial branches should be repealed, least of all on the ground that they make second-class citizens of any of those people.

Over the years I have expanded my own resolution to apply not only to Members of Congress, but to all persons receiving salaries from the Federal Government in excess of $10,000 and to each member, chairman, and officer of the Republican and Democratic National Committees. In one form or another, I have introduced this bill into every Congress since 1946. In the 88th Congress, it is S. 148.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the list of public disclosure bills I have sponsored since 1946 and also the text of Senate bill 148.

There being no objection, the list and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCOME DISCLOSURE BILLS SPONSORED BY SENATOR WAYNE MORSE

Seventy-ninth Congress, second session (1946), Senate Resolution 306: Requiring Senators to file annual statements of income and financial transactions. Referred to Committee on Banking and Currency.

Eightieth Congress, first session (1947), Senate Resolution 31: Amending rules so as to require Senators to file annual statements of income and dealings in securities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eightieth Congress, first session (1947), Senate Resolution 33: Requiring Senators to file annual statements of income and dealings in securities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eightieth Congress, second session (1948), S. 2086: To require certain members of legislative, judicial, and executive branches of Government to file statements relating to amount and sources of income and dealings in securities and commodities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eighty-first Congress, first session (1949), S. 109: To require certain members of legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government to file statements relating to amount and sources of income and dealings in securities and commodities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eighty-second Congress, first session (1951), S. 561: To require certain members of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government to file statements relating to amount and sources of income and dealings in securities and commodities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eighty-third Congress, first session (1953), S. 334: To require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eighty-fourth Congress, first session (1955), S. 2747: To require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eighty-fifth Congress, second session (1958), S. 3346: To require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities.

Eighty-sixth Congress, first session (1959), S. 1603: To require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Eighty-seventh Congress, first session (1961), S. 165: To require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities.

Eighty-eighth Congress, first session (1963), S. 148: To require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities. Referred to Rules Committee.

Be it enacted, etc., That each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives (including each Delegate and Resident Commissioner); each officer and employee of the United States who (1) receives a salary at a rate of $10,000 or more per annum or (2) holds a position of grade GS–15 or above, and each officer in the Armed Forces of the rank of colonel, or its equivalent, and above; and each member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party shall file annually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

(1) the amount and resources of all income and gifts (of $100 or more in money or value, or in the case of multiple gifts from one person, aggregating $100 or more in money or value) received by him or any person on his behalf during the preceding calendar year;

(2) the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by or to him and any other person and the amount of each liability owed by him, or by him together with any other person as of the close of the preceding year; and

(3) the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year to any person who received anything of value on his behalf or subject to his direction or control or who, with his acquiescence, makes payments for any liability or expense incurred by him.

SEC. 2. Each person required by the first section to file reports shall, in addition, file semiannually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of all dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding six-month period.

SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the reports required by the first section of this Act shall be filed not later than March 31 of each year; and the reports required by section 2 shall be filed not later than July 31 of each year for the six-month period ending June 30 of such year, and not later than January 31 of each year for the six-month period ending December 31 of the preceding year.

(b) In the case of any person required to file reports under this Act whose service terminates prior to the date prescribed by subsection (a) as the date for filing any report, such report shall be filed on the last day of such person's service, or on such later date, not more than three months after the termination of such service, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

SEC. 4. The reports required by this Act shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, and dealings in securities or commodities, when separate itemization is not feasible or not necessary for an accurate disclosure of a person's income, net worth, or dealings in securities, and commodities.

SEC. 5. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this Act or who willfully and knowingly files a false report shall be fined $2,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 6. (a) As used in this Act—

(1) The term "income" means gross income as defined in section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(2) The term "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 77b).

(3) The term "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (U.S.C., title 7, sec. 2).

(4) The term "dealings in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

(5) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

(b) For the purposes of any report required by this Act, a person shall be considered to be a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives, an officer or employee of the United States and of the armed services as described in the first section of this Act, or a member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party, if he served (with or without compensation) in any such position during the period to be covered by such report, notwithstanding that his service may have terminated prior to December 31 of such calendar year.

SEC. 7. The Comptroller General shall have authority to issue, reissue, and amend rules and regulations governing the publication of reports, or any part of them. He shall prescribe fees to cover the cost of reproduction. In formulating such rules and regulations, he shall seek to maximize the availability of reports for purposes of informing the public and agencies and officials of the Federal and local governments, and to minimize use of such records for private purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in 1951, this proposal was endorsed in a message to Congress from President Harry Truman. He rightfully pointed out:

> As a general rule, I do not like to see public officials, or any other particular group, subjected to rules and requirements which do not apply to the rest of the population. But at the same time, public office is a privilege, not a right. And people who accept the privilege of holding office in the Government, must of necessity expect that their entire conduct should be open to inspection by the people they are serving.

President Truman recommended, and I quote again from his message:

> That the Congress promptly enact a statute which will require all full-time civilian Presidential appointees, including members of the Federal bench; all elected officers of the Federal Government, including Members of the Congress; and all other top officials and employees of the three branches of the Government—say those receiving salaries of $10,000 or more, plus flag and general officers of the armed services—to file annually a statement of their total income, including amounts over and above their Government salaries, and the sources of this outside income. Consideration should also be given to requiring other Government employees to file such statements if their outside income exceeds specified amount, perhaps $1,000 a year. Some items which are not ordinarily counted as income, such as gifts and loans, should be included in the statements filed under this statute. Penalties for willful violation of this statute should be equivalent to those for violation of the laws relating to the filing of income tax returns.
>
> These statements when filed should be made accessible to the public.

It will be noted that the position taken by President Truman outlines, for the most part, the provisions of the bills that I have introduced year-after-year since 1946.

I heartily endorse the sentiments expressed in that message. My bill carries out President Truman's recommendation that public disclosure apply to people in all three branches of Government. My bill further requires that not only income but assets and dealings in securities and commodities be included in the disclosure. And as I have already noted, my bill includes the top officials of the political parties, too, because their impact on public policy also carries the possibility of conflict of interest.

Moreover, my bill would require officeholders to report for publication all donations to campaign funds or to funds of any kind maintained to defray expenses of office. Sources and amounts of campaign funds must be reported under existing law; but the terms of my bill would also require the reporting of contributions to political expense funds that often are maintained in nonelection years and hence go unreported under existing law.

Many Members of Congress have already published some degree of information about their outside incomes and assets. I have no objection to that, but I think it is a rather meaningless gesture for the few of us who believe in public disclosure to take the step voluntarily, leaving secret all the incomes and assets of Members who for one reason or another do not favor public disclosure of their income and assets. Nevertheless, I shall, before I finish this speech, make a general statement and summary of my own assets and outside income.

As for me, once my bill or a similar bill becomes law, I shall file each year for public disclosure my Federal income tax return. I am not filing it as of now because I think the requirement should be a universal one, applicable to every public official whose position falls under the terms of my bill.

If only some officials disclose their Federal tax returns voluntarily, politics being what they are, their enemies in political opposition will endeavor to distort and misrepresent this or that item in the tax returns so disclosed.

However, if a public disclosure bill is passed requiring a full and uniform disclosure on the part of every public official covered by the bill, no unfair political advantage could be taken on any discriminatory basis as would be the case at the present time in respect to those who voluntarily disclose and those who do not disclose at all—although, Mr. President, today I am making a more complete disclosure than I believe any other Member of Congress has made to date with respect to his income and his assets.

Therefore, I stand ready and willing to make a public disclosure of all the details of my Federal income tax report, which is always prepared by a certified public accountant, whenever my public disclosure bill or any similar bill becomes the law of the land.

Until detailed disclosure is mandatory for all Members of Congress, the American public will have grounds to wonder why conflict-of-interest laws are not applied to Congress, when it is Congress that has applied them to the executive and judicial branches.

I hope the agitation in the press for this kind of law will continue. I hope the skepticism heaped upon Congress by the public will continue. Who watches the watchdog? The public. Who polices the policeman? No one but the American voter. Congress can and does watch and police the other branches for conflict of interest and unethical conduct. But Congress will never watch or police itself. Only the almighty voter can do that, and I include with him the American press.

Only the American public can raise the ethical standards of Congress. Public disclosure of the kind I am seeking does not even eliminate conflict of interest. It only reveals the possibility of such a conflict, leaving it to the voter to decide whether the conflict has influenced the official acts of the Congressman or Senator.

It is 17 years since conflict of interest within the Congress prompted me to propose a public disclosure measure. It is 12 years since a President of the United States called for such a measure to be applied to all branches of the Federal Government. How much longer will it be, and how many more scandals shall we have to suffer, before there will be action by the Congress? For how much longer will it be entirely up to the American press to ferret our financial conflict and wrongdoing among Members of Congress and our top-ranking employees, while the object of the questions ducks and hides, and finally weeps that he never meant any wrong?

There are many things wrong with Congress. Many things have brought Congress to a rather low estate in public opinion. The rejection of a mandatory public disclosure policy is one of the most important of these factors.

Since 1946, many Senators have offered modifications of this legislation. In 1957, Senator Langer, of North Dakota, introduced one such bill. In 1958, Senators Richard Neuberger and JOSEPH CLARK introduced one that included income disclosure among several provisions to raise congressional ethics. Also in 1958, Senator CASE, of New Jersey, introduced a bill that called for income disclosure, among other things.

Currently, there is pending in the Senate Rules Committee, in addition to my own S. 148, S. 1261, sponsored by Senators CASE, NEUBERGER, and CLARK. In addition to a requirement of disclosure of assets and income by all Federal personnel receiving salaries of $15,000 or more, it requires that communications from Members of Congress to regulatory agencies be made part of the written public record of the case involved. Their bill, S. 1261, also establishes an eight-member Commission on Legislative Standards, to conduct a thorough study of congressional conflict-of-interest problems and of the relations of Members of Congress with executive agencies.

Many versions of these bills have also been introduced in the other body in recent years.

I welcome these signs of added interest within the Congress for our reputation and well-being, though far more interest will have to develop if we are to enact any legislation. I am especially proud that the Morse public disclosure bill, which I have introduced repeatedly since 1946, has been the bellwether measure on this subject. I have spoken repeatedly in support of it, in and out of the Senate, but the Senate Rules Committee has shown little interest. It has dragged its heels even in respect to holding thorough hearings on the proposal. I have urged hearings on it time and time again.

Perhaps now that in late years more Senators are interesting themselves in this issue and introducing their own bills, we will eventually pass some much needed legislation. I sincerely hope so.

In the meantime, I shall continue to cooperate with authors of various versions of bills on public disclosure in the hope that a bill in some adequate form will win majority support.

The point is, however, that this is an old problem; the solution proposed for it is an old solution. I have presented the problem and proposed the solution to every Congress since 1946. I am sorry to read newspaper and magazine stories that leave the reader with the impression that this problem of conflict of interest within the Congress is just coming under study and that proposals that Members reveal their outside assets and income are some new "twist."

We have really been discouragingly slow to come to grips with the issue. Even now the public and the press would not have any interest in the subject were it not for the headline-making activities of one former Senate employee. I am not interested in making a scapegoat of one man, of seeing him pilloried with the idea that all the conflicts of interest within the Congress will be forgotten when his case is finished. The Rules Committee investigation into outside activities by Senate employees should be carried to its ultimate conclusion, and that includes everyone—Senators and Representatives—and anyone found guilty of wrongdoing should be punished, and their activities fully disclosed to the public.

But that must not be the end of the matter. If we let it be the end, then it will only be the end until some new scandal is uncovered. The issue itself will not be closed with this case unless Congress closes it by enacting legislation requiring disclosure of assets and income by all Federal employees, including Congressmen and Senators, who receive substantial Federal salaries. The people want it; the people are entitled to it. The Congress should respond to the people's wishes by passing the legislation.

Several Members of Congress in both Houses have in recent months disclosed their financial holdings in stocks and bonds and other property assets, although they have not given, to my knowledge, any detailed breakdown in connection with their income. Although in no case has there been presented a detailed accounting breakdown of assets, liabilities, and income, nevertheless, I think that the disclosures that these few Members of Congress have made have been salutary and helpful to the cause of seeking the passage of the full public disclosure bill.

In my own case, my property assets of this date are as follows:

First. Real estate: (a) Eugene, Oreg., farm, approximately 29 acres, estimated market value $200,000 to $250,000.

When Mrs. Morse and I bought this piece of property, in 1932, it was unimproved land and it was a considerable distance from the Eugene city limits. However, since that time the metropolitan area of Eugene has so expanded that one boundary line of our Eugene farm property is now the city limits.

This total piece of property, when I bought it as vacant land, cost less than $3,000 for 20 acres. Later I added other acres, so that the total investment in the real estate at the time of original purchase was less than $10,000. The city has grown around three sides of the farm. Although during the 30-year period that we have owned this property we have spent a considerable amount of money improving it by building on it our home and barns in 1936, connecting it with city water mains, fencing it, and making many other farm improvements on it, there is no doubt about the fact that its proximity to the Eugene city limits has resulted in a substantial increase in its value over the years. I believe we have an investment, including cost of improvements, of between $60,000 and $70,000 in the property, not including property taxes during the years of our ownership.

(b) Poolesville, Md., farm. At Poolesville, Md.. Mrs. Morse and I own a farm of 74 acres. We purchased it in January 1957, for $24,500. Its assessed value is $15,060. Since purchasing it, we have improved it by making substantial investments in the main house remodeling, plus tenant house repairs, land clearance, construction of two cattle barns, new fencing, and numerous other farm improvements. Our total investment in the farm is approximately $50,000, not including real property taxes paid during the period of our ownership. The estimated market value of the property on today's market is probably about $75,000.

Second. Mortgages: Another of our assets is mortgages held on farm property amounting to $17,500.

Third. Stocks and bonds: As to stocks, bonds, and securities, all we own are five shares at $10 each, totaling $50 of stock interest in the Portland Reporter newspaper of Portland, Oreg.

Fourth. Bank savings: As to savings bank accounts, we have on deposit in the savings department of the Riggs National Bank, Dupont Circle branch, Washington, D.C., $10,000.

Fifth. Accounts receivable: Payments receivable on credit sales of livestock and personal loans amount to $5,700.

Sixth. Accounts payable: None except the usual monthly bills for rent, food, and living incidentals which are due and paid monthly.

Seventh. Livestock: It is very difficult to estimate with absolute exactness the value of the group of assets we own which are in the form of livestock. Over the many years that I have raised horses and cattle, which have been my major livestock interests, I have built up a herd of Devon beef cattle which is recognized as one of the prize herds of the breed. I also always keep a few high quality saddle horses. In addition to cattle and horses, I usually have other farm animals, consisting of a few hogs, sheep, and poultry. Listing my livestock assets at the present time, I have on my Eugene, Oreg., and my Poolesville, Md., farms a total of 200 heads of Devon cattle, including yearlings and calves.

I should point out that during this past year in the Poolesville area I operated 675 acres, but outside of the 74 acres the land was rented, not owned. If it became necessary to place this herd of cattle on the market for quick sale, it is my estimate that it would probably sell at an average of $200 a head, or $40,000. I would hope to do even better than that amount. Some of the animals, particularly the top show animals, are worth much more than that but, on the other hand, the calves and yearlings would sell for much less and the producing females, which consist of the bulk of the herd, would probably average $200.

At the present time I own only four saddle horses and only two of them are young top horses. The old stallion is now 20 years old and our old brood mare is now 19. Of course, these two horses are of practically no market value but they are priceless from the standpoint of their sentimental value. I would estimate that the four horses would bring a total market price of $800.

In addition, we have three ponies, only two of which could be sold for any price at all, and that maximum price would be $100 each. The third pony is really a member of the family, being 32 years old. We have owned her for 30 years. It was on this pony that each of our three daughters learned to ride, and now we have the emotional thrill of teaching our grandchildren to ride on the same pony their mothers learned to ride on.

At the Poolesville, Md., farm we have a small flock of eight registered Oxford sheep, which we might be able to sell if we had to for $25 each, or a total of $200. We also keep a few hogs each year for butchering, and with the hog market being what it is at the present time, I would guess that the four feeder hogs we now have might be worth $25 apiece for a total of $100. Our poultry flock of about 100 birds would probably market for about $150.

Eighth. Farm equipment: Another block of substantial assets we have is the farm machinery and equipment which we have on our two farms, consisting of such farm items as three tractors, farm truck, hay baler, rake, plows, wagons, small grain combine, grass seeder, grain drill, fertilizer spreaders and mowers. In addition, there should be included saddles, bridles, horse carts and buggies, and the many other farm equipment items that are usually on auctioneers' sales announcements listed as tools, appliances, barn equipment, and items too numerous to mention. This grouping of personal farm equipment items would probably bring at a farm auction between $15,000 and $20,000.

Ninth. Household items: Our household personal property located in our Eugene, Oreg., home and our rented apartment in Washington, D.C., probably would bring on the market $10,000 maximum.

Tenth. Motor vehicles: We also own two automobiles—a 1963 Nash Rambler station wagon and a 1961 Ford Fairlane sedan. Their trade-in value on a new car I guess would be in the neighborhood of $1,000 for the Rambler and $500 for the Ford.

Eleventh. Insurance policies: The only other material assets that I personally possess are my life insurance policies. However, they are straight life insurance policies which, of course, will be left to Mrs. Morse and members of my family as beneficiaries. These policies carry a small cash value in case some emergency might make it necessary to turn them in, but I do not contemplate such an eventuality. I think their cash turn-in value would be in the neighborhood of $7,500.

In addition, I hold a Federal term insurance life insurance policy available to members of the Senate and Federal employees in the amount of $20,000. I am advised by the Senate financial clerk that its minimum cash value is $5,000.

In addition, I have kept up-to-date payments on the Federal civil service retirement pension program.

My public disclosure bill calls for a listing by a public official covered by the bill to not only assets but also income. My income for 1962 was as follows:

1. Senate salary	$22,500.00
2. Honorariums from lectures	10,364.01
3. Service as impartial chairman of National Electrical Benefit Fund of the National Employees Benefit Board	5,000.00
4. Interest	432.00
5. Gross farm income	27,512.61
6. Other (official travel allowance, Portland, Oreg., Senate office allowance, U.S. Senate communications allowance)	3,439.28
Total	69,247.90
Less:	
Farm operation expense, depreciation allowance, Senate cost-of-living allowance, official travel, additional Senate office expense personally paid (newsletter expense, communications expense), Federal income tax withheld	59,662.28
Net	9,585.62

With reference to the additional Senate office expense personally paid, I plow a great deal of money into operating my Senate office, because the Senate appropriation does not begin to pay for the expenses of my office. People would be surprised at how much I pay out a month for telephone messages and telegrams over and above the amount the Federal Government makes available to a Senator.

I think the foregoing covers all my material assets, but I have some incorporeal assets which I am proud to list and which are much more valuable to me than material things.

For example, I possess the treasure of an understanding and wonderfully helpful wife who has put up with me for 39 years. We, in turn, have a precious family of three lovely daughters, three grand sons-in-law, and four grandparent spoiling grandchildren. God's endowment upon us of such a family makes us rich in human values, which in turn make material values of little account.

In addition, I enjoy the priceless wealth in the form of the trust placed in me by the wonderful people of my State. Four times they have sent me to the Senate. Their repeated confidence in and trustful reliance upon my service to their interests in the Senate is the most valuable compensation I could possibly receive. The many true friends and warm personal supporters I have made during my many years in academic and political life fill to bulging a storehouse of incorporeal human values which in comparison makes corporeal possessions insignificant.

I am privileged to file this accounting of my worldly goods in keeping with the spirit and intent of my public disclosure bill, S. 148.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLOMBIA REFUSES RECOGNITION OF MILITARY REGIMES IN HONDURAS AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday entitled "Colombian Recognition Denied Coup Regimes."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLOMBIAN RECOGNITION DENIED COUP REGIMES

BOGOTÁ, December 18.—Colombia announced today it would refuse to recognize the regimes that were established after military coups in Honduras and the Dominican Republic.

The United States extended recognition to the two countries earlier this week.

Today's announcement by President Guillermo Leon Valencia said recognition of the two governments would be tantamount to support for military coups.

Valencia said President Kennedy had confined Alliance for Progress aid to democratically established governments. Valencia warned yesterday that Colombia would not "march at the side of the United States" if the Alliance proved to be a failure.

Neighboring Venezuela is continuing its policy of refusing to recognize governments put in power by force.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the article shows, as I warned some days ago, that many friendly democratic governments in Latin America are greatly concerned by U.S. recognition of the Dominican Republic's military junta and the military dictatorship of Honduras.

I said then, and repeat now, that it was a grievous mistake. It is a sad blot on the foreign policy history of the United States, because this refusal on the part of the democratic government of Colombia—and other governments in Latin America are also withholding recognition—to recognize the Dominican Republic is a clear demonstration of my warning, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, of the fears of democratic leaders in Latin America.

Why in the world the powerful Government of the United States should recognize the military dictatorships, and thereby weaken our best friends in Latin America, I will never be able to understand. Recognition has been granted. I hope that my Government does not proceed now to give economic and military aid to these military dictatorships. Let us not fool ourselves about the facade of the Dominican Republic. The group of stooges that can form a commission in the Dominican Republic are naught but the hirelings of the military junta that controls the country. We must not give aid to them, and we must not give aid to Honduras.

Recognition is one thing—and that was bad enough—but aid would be shocking to our friends throughout Latin America.

The position of the United States must be that there can be no economic intercourse, no military cooperation, until both those countries restore constitutional democratic government, such as existed before the overthrow. That is the test of the good faith of the United States. This voice will continue to be raised, not only here, but in this hemisphere, in opposition to any policy of doing business with military juntas that have destroyed the freedom of constitutional government.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, 1964

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, there is at the desk House Joint Resolution 875, making supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1964. I ask unanimous consent that this supplemental appropriation measure be considered by the Senate at this time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 875) making supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment, which was read, as follows:

On page 4, after line 15, to insert:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

"For an additional amount for 'Payments to school districts', $216,204,000."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I shall explain this measure.

First, I ask unanimous consent that pages 1 and 2 of the report be printed at this point in the RECORD, in explanation of the first part of this joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 875) making supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

Amount of House joint resolution as passed House	$41,886,000
Amount of increase by Senate committee	216,204,000
Amount of joint resolution as reported to the Senate	258,090,000
Amount of estimates, 1964	41,886,000
The joint resolution as reported to the Senate: Over the estimates for 1964	216,204,000

The resolution as passed by the House contained six items for supplemental appropriations, all of which relate to the comprehensive program to combat mental retardation authorized by two recently enacted laws, the maternal and child health and mental retardation planning amendments of 1963, Public Law 88–156, and the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, Public Law 88–164. The estimates were allowed in full by the House, and the committee recommends approval in the same amounts.

Account	Positions	Amount
Educational improvement for the handicapped	20	$11,685,000
Chronic diseases and health of the aged	6	2,277,000
Hospital construction activities	11	5,049,000
Grants for construction of health research facilities		6,000,000
Grants for maternal and child welfare		16,500,000
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau	60	375,000
Total	97	41,886,000

The committee also recommends one additional item, $216,204,000, for "Payments to school districts," as outlined below.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this item of $41,886,000 is required for the new mental retardation program which has to do with mentally retarded children and adults.

Part 2 is for $216,204,000, which has been added for the operating phase of the impacted areas bill. Unless this amount is appropriated, I understand that many of the communities will be hard pressed to continue the education of the children who live in the areas which are impacted because of governmental activities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I verify what the Senator from Rhode Island has said; and, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I assure him that I have received many communications in regard to this matter, as another member of the committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] can verify.

As we know, the Vocational Education Act, which recently was passed by Congress and was signed by the President, provides for the vocational education program. But until that program is established many of the communities will be out of funds. Furthermore, there is the problem of making it possible for them to plan for their future expenses.

If ever there was before the Senate an emergency appropriation item affecting education, this is it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as this supplemental appropriation measure came to the committee, it called for only $41 million-plus, to support the mental retardation activities, did it not?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is the purpose of the committee, I believe, to add an appropriation of $216 million for impacted school districts.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So, Mr. President, this measure will make appropriations for only those two items.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

The committee was very amenable in regard to adding other items—such as the milk item, in which the Senator from Wisconsin is interested; an item for the scholarship loan program, which is in dire need of funds; and also an item for the medical school and dental school construction program, together with scholarship money. But the committee has been advised that if the bill is encumbered beyond the original provisions passed by the House, in all likelihood the bill might be sent to the committee and would not pass until after the return of Congress in January. We felt that, in spite of the omission, the $216 million for aid to the impacted areas is so pressing and so urgent that we decided to add that item. We did not go beyond that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been thinking seriously of offering another amendment to this bill. I deeply appreciate the quandary in which the committee finds itself. The amendment I propose does not concern itself with a future contingency. The school milk program was cut back on December 1—and I emphasize the words "cut back"—by 2 percent. Educational leaders in every State of the Union were notified they would have to cut the program, and that the Federal Government reimbursements would be cut 2 percent, and they were in fact cut 2 percent.

That means that either children will not get milk or the States will have to pay more for it. I believe that all Senators on both sides of the aisle and all Representatives on both sides of the aisle know that this is a good program. It is not an agricultural program. It is a program for providing milk for schoolchildren who need it. Inasmuch as we have a vast surplus of milk, it is disgraceful not to provide for a constructive school milk program. I cannot think of any thing more insane than to provide that milk go into surplus when children want it and cannot get it.

This is the situation at the present time. I have discussed this question with the majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and he agrees with me. He pressed the amendment in the Appropriations Committee last October and November, and I supported him on it. We were defeated because we did not have the information at the time, but the Appropriations Committee members thought the Department of Agriculture had enough money to meet Federal obligations under the program. It is clear that if we do not add this kind of amendment for the rest of this year and part of January, at the very least, schoolchildren will not get the milk they need. When we have the vast milk surplus we have, this is ridiculous.

I have been importuned by the leadership on both sides of the aisle not to press the amendment because they say, it would kill the bill. I do not wish to kill the aid to impacted areas program; and I do not wish to kill the mental retardation program.

The conflict places me in a difficult position. I should like to ask for the advice of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] at the very minimum, I wish to get a firm commitment that they will use their strong influence to see that in the next supplemental bill that comes along they will do everything they can to obtain the appropriation about which I have spoken.

Mr. PASTORE. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared today to give to the Senator from Wisconsin a gilt-edged commitment. After all, who wishes to keep milk away from school children? No one will do that. We are met with a situation in which, because of the timing involved, we are caught in the position that if the bill is encumbered, an objection will be raised in the House and the bill will go to committee. Then nothing will happen in relation to the bill until the first of next year.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Supplementals and Deficiencies, I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that he can bet his bottom dollar that if I am handling the bill, the milk fund will be in it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to assure the Senator from Wisconsin that when the Senator from Rhode Island makes a commitment, every possible assurance has been given. The Senator also knows that the committee itself is basically in sympathy with the objective of the amendment of the Senator. I met with the Senator from Wisconsin a short time ago. He came to my office so that we could discuss the matter. We had hoped we might be able to include the amendment. But, after talking with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], it was clear that the amendment might jeopardize some of the important items in the bill, such as the mental retardation program and the aid for school districts in impacted areas. We do not wish to do that. We do not want that to happen.

So I would encourage the Senator from Wisconsin, who has done a great job of fighting for the school milk program, to withdraw his amendment. I was a cosponsor with him on that amendment and I asked to join with him on it. We will press it in January. The supplemental bill will be in the Senate during the second week in January, and I am sure we shall succeed in our efforts at that time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished assistant majority leader. I believe the course he has proposed is wise. I know how he and the overwhelming majority of Senators feel. As I have stated before, this program should be continued, and that Congress should provide all the funds necessary to provide a school milk program which our schoolchildren need, want, and should have, especially when there is such a vast milk surplus going to waste.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 875) is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 875) was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move that the vote by which the joint resolution was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MAIL-ORDER GUNS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, an outstanding series of articles by Miss Josephine Ripley, Washington correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, on mail-order guns has very appropriately been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

The Christian Science Monitor's nine-article exposé of mail-order guns, which began on October 26, 1963, concluded with an editorial entitled "Murder by Mail Order," published on November 19, 1963, 3 days before the assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy. I ask unanimous consent to have that editorial and later articles by Miss Ripley in the December 3, 1963, and December 16, 1963, issues of the Christian Science Monitor placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 19, 1963]

MURDER BY MAIL ORDER

Congress has been handed an anti-weapon-weapon with which to crack down on crime, crime made easy through the wide open sale of mail-order hand guns.

This weapon is in the form of a new bill introduced by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, and now before the Senate Commerce Committee.

The committee so far has taken no action on this legislation which would crack down on "murder by mail order," as it has been called, through an amendment to the Federal Firearms Act.

If passed and enforced, it would keep mail-order guns out of the hands of trigger-happy juveniles, criminals, mental defectives and others who use the anonymity of this type of purchase as a means of obtaining firearms.

To the extent that these guns have contributed to the Nation's crime wave—and the Monitor's series of articles on mail-order guns has shown they have—enactment of the Dodd bill would be an important crime deterrent.

Not that guns are the only weapons used by the criminal, or that this bill pretends to offer a complete solution to the firearms problem.

But it would help by requiring all purchasers of mail-order guns to furnish a sworn affidavit as to age and criminal record, if any. It would also require firearms dealers and manufacturers to notify express companies in writing whenever these guns are being shipped in interstate commerce.

It is not a tough bill, probably not tough enough to suit many.

It does not attempt to point up the glaring inadequacy of many State and local laws over firearms, or their lack of uniformity. It does not call for gun registration or for the fingerprinting of purchasers of guns.

It is minimum legislation, but it is realistic legislation, the only kind which stands any chance of passage. The Federal Firearms Act has been amended only once since its passage in 1939, so strong is the opposition to firearms controls.

The Dodd bill avoids this opposition by concentrating only on unscrupulous gun merchants. It would infringe in no way on the right of law-abiding citizens to possess firearms for purposes of defense or what is called sport.

It has the support of the National Rifle Association of America and other influential organizations, as well as law enforcement authorities across the Nation.

The legislation is deserving of—and needs—support, encouragement and a vigorous public push to spur Congress to action.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 3, 1963]

MAIL-ORDER GUNS

(By Josephine Ripley)

Four days after the Christian Science Monitor's editorial urging enactment of stronger laws to curb and control the sale of guns, the imperativeness of such legislation was thrust home under dreadful circumstances.

This editorial was published at the conclusion of a series of nine articles pointing out the lack of effective and enforcible Federal legislation covering the sale and possession of weapons and the chaotic disunity between States on firearms laws.

This lack spawned what is known today as the mail-order gun, a method of gun purchase that makes it possible for almost anyone to buy a gun without the knowledge of authorities, even though the purchaser may be a minor, an enemy of the Government, a mentally confused person, or a criminal.

Such people have bought these guns; they have used them in holdups and crimes. Lee Harvey Oswald, of Dallas, purchased an Italian military rifle in just this way—by mail order.

He signed a fictitious name to his mail order, had the gun sent to a Dallas post office box. No one checked his statements or investigated this purchase, the purpose of it, and the need for the weapon until the Federal Bureau of Investigation traced the murder weapon back to a sporting goods, mail-order firm in Chicago—after it had been used, so the FBI reports, in the assassination of a President of the United States.

Laws alone will not stop crime or killings, to be sure. But there can be no excuse for inviting such acts by making the purchase and possession of guns easy—for almost anyone.

A congressional investigation subcommittee spent 2 years probing into the mire that surrounds much of this kind of mail-order business.

After the conclusion of that investigation, Chairman Senator DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, termed the mail-order gun business "a national scandal of growing proportions." He went even further, saying: "We uncovered a situation that has been described as 'murder by mail order,' and I feel our findings conclusively prove the need for amendment of the Federal Firearms Act."

It is an astonishing fact, now obvious, that the public in general has no idea how lax are the laws of the land and the laws of the 50 States governing the sale and possession of guns.

Only 21 States and the District of Columbia require dealers to obtain licenses to sell handguns at retail. Only seven States require a permit to purchase a gun. Only seven States and the District of Columbia require a waiting period between purchase and delivery.

Only in New York State is a license required to possess a handgun. Only in Hawaii must guns be registered. Only in South Carolina is it against the law to sell a gun.

The national Government has only two laws governing firearms. Both were passed long ago—following the gangsterism of the 1920's. They are mild, compared to the restrictive laws governing possession of weapons in practically all of the other major nations of the world.

U.S. laws are aimed at control of machineguns and sawed-off shotguns, the popular weapons of that day. It required that these weapons be registered with the Treasury Department which is charged with enforcing the act.

But this law—passed under the guise of a revenue act—defined firearms in such a manner as to exclude pistols, revolvers, and most rifles from this minimum control.

Shotguns and rifles may be sold freely not only to dealers and manufacturers, as would be expected, but to private individuals provided they have not been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment of more than one year, or are under indictment for such a crime, or are fugitives from justice.

No one filling out a mail-order gun form with these questions—a form which today is not checked by local authorities and which is not made out under oath—is likely to say he has no right to a weapon.

A strong and insistent opponent of further gun regulations is the National Rifle Association of America and the powerful munitions industry.

They contend that any laws which would infringe on the right of citizens to keep and bear arms would be unconstitutional. The Constitution states that "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

This is recognized by all. There is no move to restrict the sportsman, the hunter, the genuine gun collector, or any reputable individual who wants a gun for self-defense, from the ownership of such weapon.

Regulation is not aimed at them, officials insist, but the Constitution does not make it unlawful to regulate the conditions under which citizens may keep and bear arms. Nor would reasonable restrictions put gun dealers out of business.

The only people who should be put out of business, if possible, are criminals or those in whose hands a gun would be a dangerous weapon. Of course crime and shootings would not cease with stricter gun laws, but they would help.

Members of Congress need to know how their constituents feel on this subject. If the majority of the people of this country feel stronger laws are needed, as a Gallup poll of a few years ago indicated, they should speak out now.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 16, 1963]

THE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

(By Josephine Ripley)

Critics who oppose closing the loopholes in the Nation's firearms laws to prevent that all-too-easy acquisition of guns by juveniles, the mentally disturbed, and those with criminal records, do so mainly on two arguments:

That it is unconstitutional to deprive citizens of the right to bear arms.

That any legislation, weak or strong, will take guns out of the hands of law-abiding citizens and not keep them out of the hands of criminals who, they say, will get them anyway, whatever the law.

What does the Constitution say? In the second amendment, it is stated that: "A well-regulated militia being necessary for the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

This amendment was framed in colonial days and became a part of the Constitution in 1791. In other words, it was designed to apply at a time when the principal weapons of the day were guns—not nuclear bombs.

The U.S. Supreme Court on several occasions has ruled that there is no violation of the Constitution in the regulation of guns providing this does not interfere with the continuation of a well-regulated militia.

When the constitutionality of the National Firearms Act of 1934 was challenged in the courts (*U.S.* v. *Miller*, 307 U.S. 174, 1939), the Court stressed the point that the second amendment applied to the militia.

In the absence of the showing of any reasonable relationship between the regulation of weapons under the National Firearms Act and the maintenance of a well-regulated militia, the Court ruled that there was no violation of the second amendment.

In another case, challenging regulation of guns by States, the Court pointed out that the second amendment does not give any right to the citizens to bear arms, but merely states that such a right shall not be infringed by Congress.

Again, the Court said the purpose of the amendment—the preservation of a well-regulated militia—must be considered in applying the amendment.

There is no proposal to take guns out of the hands of the law-abiding citizen. Neither the Dodd bill nor the Scott bill, now under consideration by the Senate Commerce Committee, would restrict ownership of guns, except in the case of juveniles, the mentally unbalanced, and those with a criminal record.

Hunters, sportsmen, gun collectors, and law-abiding citizens who want a gun for protection, would be as free as ever to buy and own one.

This right is not questioned. Nor is it claimed by proponents of this gun legislation that it will eliminate crime, any more than a police force does.

And it is true, of course, that criminals who want weapons will find them, one way or another. But why make it easy for them to do so? Mail-order guns today are almost as readily available as a bar of candy.

In South Carolina, which prohibits the ownership of pistols and revolvers, mail-order guns are reported flowing freely into the State by railway express. Lee Harvey Oswald, in Texas, purchased his Italian-made Mannlicher-Carcano rifle from a mail-order firm in Chicago.

Well, argue critics, guns are not the only weapons used in crime and killing. "What about cars? No one is proposing to abolish cars because some people are injured or killed in automobile accidents."

That is true, but it is also true that cars are registered and drivers must have licenses.

Many people are urging Congress to adopt far stiffer firearms regulations than now proposed—regulations more in keeping with the laws in most other major nations of the world.

In Australia, Ireland, Israel, Great Britain, Sweden, and New Zealand, for instance, a license is required to obtain a pistol or revolver. One thing that led to Lee Oswald's disenchantment with Soviet Russia—by his own witness—was that he couldn't own a rifle.

Many letters call for the registration of guns here and the licensing of individuals who purchase them. The Justice Department, in giving its opinion on the Dodd bill, proposed that the mail ordering of guns in interstate commerce be stopped completely.

Nothing of this kind is contemplated however, and even the moderate Dodd bill, as amended, is under fire by the National Rifle Association which objects to the authentication of mail-order gun purchase affidavits by police authorities.

Such affidavits otherwise would be certified merely by notaries.

Members of Congress are always under heavy pressure from gun manufacturers who abound in Eastern States, from dealers and pawnbrokers in all States, and from the millions of hunters and sportsmen who insist that any legislation threatens their right to possess a gun.

It is hard for an elected official to withstand these arguments unles he hears from people on the other side too.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the series exposed the shocking growth of the mail-order gun business, by which guns are purchased by mail order and delivered to individuals by railway express—thus circumventing the postal laws against the mailing of guns to individuals other than dealers.

A gun, Miss Ripley said in her series, may be purchased today almost as easily as a tube of toothpaste. Mail-order guns have gone to juveniles, criminals, and mental defectives. Police officials around the country told a congressional investigating committee that the easy availability of these guns has contributed to the Nation's upsurge in crime.

J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, said only last June that "the easy accessibility of firearms is a significant factor in murders committed in the United States today."

Miss Ripley's series performed a needed public service in bringing this dangerous situation to public attention—and is a brilliant chapter in her long record of outstanding and distinguished reporting.

CONGRESS MUST PROVIDE FOR FUTURE HIGHWAY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the House of Representatives yesterday passed H.R. 8853, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the State highway departments, to make a comprehensive study of the needs of the Federal-Aid Highway System, including the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, after 1972.

As Members of the Senate know, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended, provides that the highway trust fund and the program for the completion of the Interstate System will come to an end on October 1, 1972, with the last apportionment of funds to the States scheduled for the summer of 1969.

In order to maintain continuity of planning for our highway needs after 1972, we must begin at an early time to lay the foundations for policy decisions by the Congress. H.R. 8853 would provide for a comprehensive study and the submission of a report to the Congress not later than January 1, 1967, on the basis of which the Congress could then make its deliberations regarding future highway planning.

The House of Representatives is to be commended for its expeditious action on this important matter, and though there is not time remaining for Senate action during this session of the Congress, I take this occasion to give assurance that the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works will give early consideration to the measure in the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

A MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, recently I have received a copy of a most moving tribute to our late President John F. Kennedy. Delivered by Pastor H. Clarence Johnson to the Kiwanis Club of Ortonville, Minn., on November 26, it was also delivered as a Thanksgiving Day message in Tabor and Grace Lutheran Churches in Strandburg and La Bolt, S. Dak., on November 28.

This is a most eloquent memorial tribute to President John F. Kennedy.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorial tribute be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No one speaks in these days or even thinks—in these days of mourning, these days of grief, and even in these days of a shared sense of guilt for the taking of a life. The life of a person whose only object in life was to live for the welfare of his country and for the benefit of humanity.

One cannot help but have all of his thoughts, and all of his speaking, colored by the somberness and the sobriety of these days through which we have passed. I suppose that if it were not for the fact that during these days that I was in the process of preparing a talk for the Kiwanians at Ortonville, which I had opportunity to deliver on Tuesday, I do not know whether this particular message would be my Thanksgiving message to you or not.

But, I've searched my heart and soul these days asking the question—when one thinks of the very sordid nature of the crime that has been committed in a civilized nation one cannot help ask—for what shall we be thankful and render thanks to God? And then, one cannot help but allow the thoughts to begin to gather, and then the answer begins to come. And in the middle of this answer that comes to us is the image of a man. The image of a man whose life will likely mark the pages of history, comparable perhaps, to men like George Washington and Abraham Lincoln.

And, I would give thanks today for some of the ideals, as well as the accomplishments, of President John Kennedy. I would give thanks, first of all, for the faith of this man: A faith which he didn't carry about offensively—ever. A faith which he didn't hold up as something to be cherished over and above the faith of other men. But a faith to which he constantly bore witness, unashamed. But with it all, a faith that lacked bigotry.

Here was a man that, it seems to me, was born for the hour. Not for the time in history when division was the order of the day. Not for the time in the development of our country when, almost of necessity, there had to be the springing up and the growth of diverse groups of religions, almost religious factions, as it were. Religious elements of every kind spring forth in a new and fertile ground of liberty that we have known in these United States. It could hardly be otherwise for when those who left their home countries to seek a land where they might have their liberty, and worship God according to the dictates of their consciences, it could hardly be otherwise. The very rigor of these people meant that they would give birth to independence. And, I suppose it's true, I'm sure it's true, that in no nation have there been as many expressions of various kinds of a faith of people as we have found under the name of Christendom in this country. This is not the day in which we live.

And here, it seems to me, a man of firm faith and loyalty to his own particular church, nevertheless, personifies the ecumenical age in which we live. This is the day when men do not look for their religious convictions to divide. But the age in which, into which you and I have been ushered, together with this great leader who met his untimely death, is a day when we look for our religious convictions to unite; to bring together, and to make whole.

Along with this I think, then, of President Kennedy's, shall we say, fraternalism, with the proper connotations to that word. A man who indeed wanted to be brother not only to his countrymen, but to all the peoples of the whole wide world. He was thinking first and foremost, of the general well being of all people. Treating mankind, applying in his relationship the Golden Rule toward all of us.

In the next place, I thank God for the fidelity of this man: For his faithfulness to what was reiterated again by President Johnson yesterday—the American dream. (Incidentally, I want to say here that anything I say that sounds like President Johnson's message yesterday is purely coincidental because these notes were written before I listened to him yesterday. And, as a matter of fact, in its essence delivered at the Kiwanis Club Tuesday.) I said, I thank God for the faithfulness, the fidelity of our martyred President, to the American dream. This man had caught the vision of what was in the heart and in the mind, which it couldn't realize fully how it would develop, and how it would unfold, and how it would grow, and finally blossom into its fullness, when they framed the Constitution of these United States. When they put in words something like this—that this Nation was to stand for the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness of all mankind.

Here was a man who saw within such a dream, who found in it, a challenge to which to dedicate his life. Just written lines can often very conveniently be tucked away in the closed chapters of history and not come into vital meaning in the expression of the life of a society. That which could happen to the Constitution of the United States, that it could become and be thought of only as written sacred words—just as we have sometimes been guilty of in the church, of thinking of our Bible only as sacred written words—and almost untouchable as far as full application in the lives of men.

I see in his fidelity, also, his vision of putting into living practice the meaning of those words that were once written in the Constitution. We have to grant that there is, that there is a time when we can only progress by stages. Maybe it's always true, and it was certainly true at the time of the writing of the Constitution of our country.

I just discovered this past week, in paging through some history pages, that a surprising thing happened at the time when the Constitution was framed. In setting up the form of government, in setting up a representative type of government, in the South where the slaves were found, only two-thirds of those slaves were counted in the census. In other words, as I understand it, what was actually done—if their particular community would have a hundred slaves only 66 of them would have to be counted in the census. And so, in a sense, one-third of them were completely and entirely forgotten. It was necessary that the North had to settle for this kind of a halfway satisfying proposition in order to get the new Nation underway. And with this, there was also an agreement passed that there would be no law that would be passed the first 20 years prohibiting the importing of more slaves.

Just as President Kennedy expressed himself in his beautiful inaugural address—that he gave at the time of his inauguration when he challenged America to at least begin toward the goal that he envisioned—so we must recognize that our forefathers realized then that theirs was only a beginning; and that there is an ideal in the American system that we're always reaching, we're always progressing, we're always growing toward that goal of which we dream and for which we pray.

We can also say such things as this about our martyred President—we can thank God for his fortitude. For few men, it seems to me, have had the energy, and the ambition, and determination, that he displayed. But there is another phase to this gratitude that ought to be ours today. And that is that John Kennedy does not stand alone today expressing himself, in a way, and now giving us memories, in a way, for which we shall be very grateful.

There is a counterpart to this, and this is—I thank God today for the American people. I thank God for the oneness of the American people in a crisis. All of the free world, as well as all of humanity, could not but recognize the unity that actually exists among this generation today and with this unity a beauty and a dignity, I do not know how else to describe my impression. We can get good impressions today of what goes on—through the medium of television and radio. In this scene that so many of us witnessed in the grief, and the sorrow, and the mourning, of a nation, in which we all participated; the attendance, as if we were there in person, almost, at the burial service. This is something for which we thank God today.

In epitomizing this, for some strange reason, there was in the White House a young wife of a President who, by the way, as far as I know was unknown a few years ago. But now she has risen to a place where she shall never be forgotten. She shall be recognized for meeting a situation with beauty of character, and poise, and dignity, and honor, and, if you please, nobility. It did not spring from a particular line of kings such as was thought necessary at one stage in history in the world, if there was to be that kind of womanhood demonstrated. But, here is one who had come, we hardly know from where, who now stood to mourn and to play her role; for it's necessary at times, even in sorrow and grief, to be strong enough to play the role that has fallen upon our shoulders. I think we shall have to agree and thank God that there is this kind of character present in our society today. When it is possible for such character to be generated and borne through the years in which we have lived, then I see there is great hope—despite the shame that we feel today—there is great hope for America.

One could also see the things that are to be regretted and grieved, such things as are still present in our society—such things as the hostility bred in an Oswald. Or, what to me is equally serious, the anarchy and lawlessness in a Rubenstein. But perhaps these—these dark spots only tend to set in bold relief the reality of the glorious age in which God has called us to live.

There is then, a third place. Besides thanking God for the ideals of our former President, and the character of today's generation of people in this country, I would like to observe, also, that I thank God for a new partnership that I see in church and state. Now, please note, I did not say union of church and state—for that American ideal, the American dream, will best be fulfilled if church and state stand separate. But, the fact that we believe that we have been called to be separate identities does not mean that we cannot stand strong and God-like in the partnership that we must seek to establish as a nation. Together, the church and state. The one representing temporal society, and then the other representing the eternal kingdom of God. Neither is to rule or subdue the other, or to be either embarrassed or reluctant to walk together down the unfolding pages of American life—as we saw in our hour of grief, effective, beautiful. May we seek, friends, to see in this tragic hour some of the hopeful things that God would have us see.

I want to close by saying two things. That is, first of all, one of the problems that I had as I was thinking about preparing this talk, I couldn't remember who I voted for in the last election. And, I can't. I know I voted for Roosevelt, once or twice, I know I voted for Eisenhower. But for some strange reason, I cannot recall when I went into that wonderful place of privacy that we have in the American life—the voting booth—I can't remember what I finally decided, as to what side to place the X. I guess I shall never know. And I say that for this reason, that I hope that there has been no gleaming on the part of anybody there's politics in my thinking today. And I have tried to leave this particular—in fact, we have a glorious way of balancing the conservative and the liberal that we certainly want to cherish, and want to keep. And I wouldn't want to predict—I made a little prediction in my own mind that, sometime when I'm not in the pulpit I'm going to pass it on to some of you—of what I think is going to happen in the next few months, or few years.

Of course, politics is only an instrument to the shared life in the American way. And so, we may debate, and we may argue, and we may tussle, with the problem of what is the greatest way, the rights of future pages of American history. But, it is wonderful to know that we stand united as a people.

God will bless such a people and use such a generation. Amen.

ON SCHOOL PRAYER AND BIBLE READING

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, ever since the Supreme Court decisions of last June concerning Bible reading and prayer in the public schools, I have been receiving letter after letter from constituents taking issue with the decision and asking often, "What can you do about it?" Doubtless the other Members of this body have had the same experience.

At the time, 2 days after the decision, I introduced a simple resolution, Senate Resolution 164, asserting that it is the sense of the Senate that any public school system may provide time for "prayerful meditation if no public official prescribes or recites the prayer which is offered," and that such a practice is deemed proper under the first amendment to the Constitution. I would hope that this resolution may receive a favorable report from the Committee on the Judiciary and be enacted during this Congress.

In the meantime, there has been a great deal of confusion in the minds of the public concerning just what the Supreme Court did or did not say. One of the best brief expositions of the facts in this matter, and one whose reading should clarify the issues for many people, appeared as an editorial in the Indianapolis Star last Sunday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial, entitled "The Court Said 'No Law,'" printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Court Said "No Law"

Many questions are being asked as to just what the U.S. Supreme Court said about prayer and Bible reading in public schools.

There isn't space to publish the Court's opinion, which is lengthy. But some of the questions being asked can be answered flatly. And perhaps it would be helpful, even at the risk of oversimplification, to summarize the Court's finding in brief form.

Does the Court decision give the State a right to tell schools they can't worship God? No, it does not. The Court is quite specific in saying that a State cannot have a law which in any way inhibits religion or religious practices.

Did the Court say atheism is permitted to be taught in school but not Christianity? No, it said nothing of the kind. The Court clearly states that it has not prohibited teaching about religion in courses on history, literature, and such.

What, then, did the Court say? As briefly as possible, it said this:

A State may not by law require religious exercises in the schools. The Court held that reading from the Bible without comment in opening exercises is unquestionably a religious exercise, and in the cases being reviewed was intended by the State to be such. Following the Bible reading with the Lord's Prayer confirms the fact that it is a religious exercise.

The fact that individual students are permitted to be absent from the exercises, or to decline to participate if present, does not change the Court's opinion that required religious exercises are in themselves unconstitutional.

There is a difference of view as to whether the Court's decision has ruled out Bible reading or prayer conducted by an individual school, or an individual teacher. Some lawyers think it has, others that it has not. The Court's opinion says that "the exercises and the law requiring them" violate the Constitution. This could be interpreted to mean that any public school religious exercise, on any basis, is forbidden.

However, the opening paragraph of the Court's opinion stipulates that the issues are presented to the Court "in the context of State action requiring that schools begin each day with readings from the Bible." This could mean that the entire opinion must be read in that context, which would leave unsettled the question of what one teacher may do on his own initiative, or what one school or one school system may do, in the absence of requirements laid down by State action.

The gist of what the Court has said, as we read it, is that a State may not make a law either requiring or prohibiting a religious exercise.

WHY NOT TREAT THE CATTLE INDUSTRY AS WELL AS COFFEE?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last May the Senate gave its advise and consent to the International Coffee Agreement, a multilateral treaty designed to stabilize world coffee prices through the regulation of the international trade in coffee, worldwide. Soon, probably next month, we shall be asked to approve legislation already passed by the House, H.R. 8864, implementing this agreement. The proposed implementation involves the delegation of authority to the Executive for two types of controls to be imposed on all imports of coffee into the United States. First, we would impose quotas—quantitative limitations which could not be exceeded—on the imports of coffee from nonmember countries. The purpose of that is to keep world coffee surpluses out of our markets and thereby strengthen the prices for the coffee from member countries of the International Coffee Organization. Second, we would require a certificate of origin on each shipment of coffee imported into the United States. That requirement is for the purpose of policing the quotas.

Mr. President, my object today is to inquire why it is that the coffee producers of foreign countries receive such favored treatment while the cattle industry, an important and vital segment of our own American economy, is denied similar action.

During the past year imports of beef have mounted and U.S. cattle prices have collapsed. Repeatedly, some of us have called for international agreements to regulate imports of beef in order to stabilize prices. I have introduced a bill, S. 2168, providing for just such an agreement. Every day my mail is full of letters from cattle producers and cattle feeders, asking that limits be placed on the quantities of beef imported.

In short, what our cattle industry is asking for with respect to beef, is exactly the same thing we are in process of giving to the coffee industry—an international agreement regulating the international trade in the commodity for the purpose of stabilizing the price, with quotas on imports to implement the provisions of the agreement.

Why the discrimination? What does coffee have that we do not have?

Have coffee prices collapsed? So, too, have cattle prices. Are coffee quotas needed to stabilize the market? So, also, we believe, are quotas on imported beef.

During the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last spring it was argued by the State Department spokesmen that the agreement was necessary because of the drastic fall in the price of coffee. Coffee had fallen by 50 percent or more in price since 1954.

That is true as far as it goes, but it is a rather deceptive way to describe it. During the war coffee prices were controlled as were most other prices, and in 1945 the annual average price of Brazil "Santos 4's" was 13.6 cents a pound. By 1954 that price had climbed to 78.3 cents a pound, an increase of no less than 475 percent in 9 years. Thereafter, it is true that it declined fairly steadily, and in 1962 averaged 34.4 cents a pound. That is a decline of more than 50 percent from the peak, but it is still 2½ times their wartime level.

There was a day when the price of cattle was above the price of coffee. In 1945 choice steers in Chicago averaged 16 cents a pound, compared with 13.6 cents a pound for Brazilian coffee delivered in New York. Since the war cattle prices have risen some, naturally, but not on anything like the skyrocketing path of coffee prices. Cattle prices have averaged as high as $35 or $36 a hundred—in 1951—have mostly stayed in the range between $25 and $30. Most recently, in November of 1963, they have fallen to $23.51, the lowest November average price since the end of OPA ceilings in 1946, with the exception of a single year. In November of 1962 choice steers in Chicago averaged $30.13; since then they have fallen 22 percent within a single 12-month span.

If coffee is in distress, at 34 cents a pound, then certainly cattle are in distress at 23½ cents a pound.

Throughout the hearing on the Coffee Agreement and the debate in both the House and the Senate, it has been made abundantly clear that the whole purpose is to stabilize the price of coffee and at least put a floor under it. The Presidential message urging House enactment of the implementing legislation stated:

> The purpose of the agreement, which I fully endorse, is to check the disastrous decline in coffee prices that began in 1955, by holding a floor under these prices at the general level prevailing in 1962, and to bring stability to coffee markets by preventing major fluctuations in price.

The report on the agreement itself by the Committee on Foreign Relations said:

> The main purpose of the agreement is to prevent a further decline in the world price of coffee which has dropped more than 50 percent since 1954, the year of the alltime highest price. To this end, the agreement establishes quotas for exporting countries and binds importing countries to limit their purchases of coffee from countries not parties to the agreement.

If this agreement succeeds in stopping any further decline in coffee prices, the benefit, of course, will accrue almost entirely to Brazil, Colombia, and other Latin American and African countries, the principal coffee-producing countries. If prices are maintained and pushed upward, the cost will fall heavily on the American housewife, since this country is the importer of more than 50 percent of the total coffee imported throughout the world.

That is the kind of international agreement that is heavily backed by the administration. As the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, pointed out during the course of the hearing before his committee:

> It seems to me to make an argument that this agreement is in the interest of the consumers is something less than frank. It is really in the interests of our national foreign policy, isn't it? * * * It is in the interest of our foreign policy like our foreign aid bill.

If such an international agreement, establishing export quotas in order to help the price, is justifiable for coffee, why is it not justifiable for cattle and beef? Is not sauce for the goose also sauce for the gander?

In previous statements in the Senate I have called attention to the alarming increase in imports of beef, and their depressing effect on cattle prices. Imports of beef increased more than 3½ times between 1957 and 1962, and apparently imports in 1963 will be at least 20 percent higher than last year. This problem is discussed at length in my statement beginning on page 17835 of the RECORD for September 24 of this year. At that time I introduced S. 2168, calling upon the administration to initiate negotiations promptly for an international agreement on cattle and beef under the provisions of section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. By the terms of such an agreement it would be possible to establish limits on the quantities of beef and cattle permitted to be imported to this country, in order to stabilize our domestic price levels.

Mr. President, why should there be such reluctance on the part of our administration to proceed with such a necessary safeguard? Other countries are not reluctant about insisting on limits on the quantities of meat which may be shipped into their markets. In studies by the Department of Agriculture which I have referred to in my previous statements on this problem, it has been found that virtually every other major trading nation, except Canada and Australia, impose nontariff trade restrictions against a large part of their imports of livestock and meat.

Formerly, Great Britain was always considered the home of free trade, at least with respect to agricultural imports. Until recently, it was the largest importer of meat in the world. Now, even Britain seems to be moving in the opposite direction. It is beginning to limit imports of meat, both through the imposition of quotas on imports, and through the negotiation of what are called gentleman's agreements with exporting countries, by which those exporting countries impose quotas on their own exports.

Following is a quotation from a recent article in the magazine Foreign Agriculture by Mr. Raymond Ioanes, Administrator of the Foreign Agriculture Service:

> We also are interested in recent British actions to limit meat imports from non-Commonwealth sources. We are interested because of the effect of these British moves on the U.S. meat import situation and the effects on international trade policies generally.
>
> Both beef and pork are affected by the British actions. Under a gentleman's agreement established earlier this year, Argentina will limit exports of beef to the United Kingdom market in accordance with voluntary quotas. The quotas, though subject to periodic revision, are considered binding by both countries. Yugoslavia reduced meat shipments to the United Kingdom by about 35 percent this year. Yugoslavia's action was taken after the British Parliament showed increasing concern over unlimited imports entering the United Kingdom.
>
> Just a few days ago the United Kingdom established import quotas on bacon (Wiltshire sides) with seven supplying countries—

Denmark, Hungary, Ireland, the Netherlands, Poland, Sweden, and Yugoslavia—and established the quantity of British-produced bacon that is to be supplied. The shares of the market are to be established by a Bacon Market Council, composed of representatives of the participating governments under the United Kingdom chairman, assisted by necessary industry and trade advisers. The council also will allocate shipments from reserve supplies to satisfy unforeseen demand and to maintain price stability.

The British appear to be closing their doors somewhat on beef imports. The action is perhaps not so significant in its present form as was the termination of long-term meat supply contracts with Commonwealth countries which took place a few years ago. But the effect of the new action, particularly if it is extended to other exporting countries and a minimum import price feature added, could throw a greater trade burden on the remaining importing countries of the world.

The United States is, of course, the most important of these. A few years ago we took 26 percent of the world's trade in beef. Today, however, we take over 50 percent. We have replaced the United Kingdom as the world's leading beef importer. Obviously we are directly affected by any action which is taken to restrict exports to other markets of the world, such as the United Kingdom.

Mr. President, the ideal of a world where there are no trade barriers may be fine. The fact is that such a world is little more than a dream today. When other countries limit their imports of agricultural products, as the article I have just read states, it throws a greater trade burden on the remaining importing countries of the world, that is, chiefly on the United States. Then we have little choice except to provide similar protection for our own producers.

Under the provisions of the International Textile Agreement we placed quotas on imports of cotton textile products which threaten to disrupt market conditions. Under the provisions of the International Coffee Agreement, it is proposed that we shall impose quotas on imports and require certificates of origin in order to maintain the price of coffee for the benefit of coffee producers of other lands.

It is time to recognize the problems of the cattle industry, and proceed to give the same or some equally effective protection against the excessive imports of beef we have experienced in recent years, which have played such havoc with our domestic cattle markets.

NEGLECT OF TAX REFORM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the cause of tax reform is being unduly neglected, yet it is one of the most necessary causes before the Congress. Our tax system is filled with injustices which in the main overwhelmingly favor those in the upper income groups. Some of us have been trying to introduce a greater degree of justice in the current tax bill with indifferent success to date.

I am happy therefore to see the leading editorial in the New York Times for this morning urging the course of tax reform and an able letter to the Chicago Daily News for December 16 of Prof. Robert Eisner of Northwestern University and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Dec. 20, 1963]

The Economy's Missing Link

President Johnson's economic policy contains more promises than he can hope to achieve. He repeatedly emphasizes the need for thrift in the new Federal budget. At the same time he calls for an expansion in spending programs to meet "the unfilled needs of this Nation."

The President is also determined to keep the proposed budget deficit at or below the present level while continuing his demand for across-the-board tax reductions. Yet he has made no mention at all of tax reform, which is the one weapon that could help him to attain his conflicting objectives.

Mr. Johnson noted that the new budget cannot avoid an increase in built-in expenditures, including pay rises for military personnel and civilian Government workers, additional costs for servicing the national debt, higher outlays for space exploration, new costs for education. But this rise endangers the President's "compassionate program" for the aged, the sick, the unemployed. Without big cuts in outlays for defense or space or the farmers, Mr. Johnson cannot spend much more for necessary social services and at the same time hope to hold down the deficits.

The prospects for reduction in defense or agriculture are slim. Instead, the President seems to be counting on the rise in economic activity created by tax reductions to produce an immediate increase in tax receipts and limit the amount of the deficit. But this result may not occur. For it is now apparent that the tax structure is not the intolerable burden depicted by most economic authorities. Taxes even at present levels have failed to slow the current expansion and they are not even taking as large a bite out of personal incomes and corporate profits as might have been expected.

The reason seems to be that the loopholes in the tax structure are holding down collections. As long as these loopholes remain, there is no certainty that a higher level of business activity will generate the revenues needed to meet the increase in spending.

We applaud the President's ambitious objectives. We welcome his desire to cut out every dime of waste in Federal outlays, to go forward with new social welfare programs, to press for tax reductions. But we doubt that these policies alone can meet the needs of a growing population or balance the budget. Essential tax reform is the ingredient that the President must add to his list of economic pledges.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Dec. 16, 1963]

Change in Tax Law Opposed

Attention has been called recently to a widespread practice of amending the tax laws to satisfy various individuals and special interests.

A salient illustration is what has been referred to as "an obscure provision" in the pending tax bill (H.R. 8363), involving treatment of the investment tax credit by regulatory agencies.

This obscure provision would, within the relatively near future, cost consumers as much as $1 billion annually. That amount would grow year by year, amounting to anywhere from $30 to $70 billion over the next 30 years.

Apparently at the behest of gas pipeline companies and in order to secure one supposedly key vote in the House Ways and Means Committee (by Congressman Thompson of Texas), the administration agreed some months ago to include in the current tax bill section 202(e), prohibiting Federal regulatory agencies, without the agreement of the regulated companies themselves, from "flowing through" to consumers any but a very minor portion of the annual benefits of the 1962 investment credit law.

If this provision becomes law, all Federal regulatory agencies will be prevented from exercising their administrative judgment in setting fair rate of return after taxes, plus the extra return of the investment credit. And inevitably State regulatory agencies would also be affected, so that users of gas, electricity, public transport and all other services of regulated companies throughout the country would soon be facing higher costs.

Unless the body politic can be informed and act effectively, this provision, like so many others engineered by special lobbies, will be enacted at great cost to the economy and the general public.

Robert Eisner,
Professor of Economics,
Northwestern University.

KREBIOZEN—SERIOUS CHARGES AGAINST THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following article written by Mr. Oliver Starr, Jr., and published in the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune of December 18, 1963, and which reports on the speech and report I made in the Senate on Krebiozen on December 6, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, Dec. 18, 1963]

Starr Gazing

(By Oliver Starr, Jr.)

If Krebiozen, the controversial cancer drug, ultimately receives a fair test, the day of Friday, December 6 may well be remembered as the turning point.

Krebiozen had come to its darkest hour as the Federal Food and Drug Administration had banned interstate shipment of the drug and was talking of pushing prosecution of its backers in Illinois.

Then Senator Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, stood up in the U.S. Senate and leveled some of the most serious charges against the Federal Food and Drug Administration and the National Cancer Institute that have been heard against any Government agencies in recent years. Specifically he charged that the FDA had overlayed the graphs of spectrographic tests to give a deceptive result, and that the NCI had set "extremely harsh and severe" standards for reviewing 504 cases of patients treated with Krebiozen.

This was no spur-of-the-moment speech. Douglas and his staff had been at work 3 months in gathering the evidence to be presented. Douglas had three large display boards brought into the Senate Chamber for his speech, and also illustrated it with 4-by-6-foot enlargements of the FDA's spectrographic graphs. He told the Senate that he had been "shocked and surprised" by the FDA's September announcement that it had established that Krebiozen was only creatine, and therefore worthless in treating cancer.

The Illinois Senator said that he decided to launch his own probe because of his great respect for Dr. Ivy whose scientific research had gained him world renown, and because he [Senator Douglas] had interviewed as many as 100 patients who have been treated with Krebiozen.

"Many of these patients have told me they were on the point of death from cancer until Krebiozen treatments arrested their decline."

"Knowing of the way the medical profession has often historically persecuted its pioneers and pathbreakers, I resolved to push on and to continue to ask for an honest test."

DOUGLAS appointed Dr. Miles H. Robinson, of Potomac, Md., to make an independent appraisal of the FDA and NCI findings. Robinson located two Illinois scientists, Dr. Scott Anderson and H. C. Clark, a chemist, both of whom had been conducting independent tests of Krebiozen over a number of years. They were joined by DOUGLAS' administrative assistant, Howard E. Shuman in drawing up the final report after 3 months of investigation.

They reported to Senator DOUGLAS:

That in 1951 the Abbott Laboratories had offered Dr. Durovic $1.6 million for 200,000 ampules of Krebiozen, and that the Lilly Research Laboratories made offers totaling at least $2 million for its formula and patent. Dr. Durovic told the investigators that he turned down the offers because he could not get the companies to agree on a ceiling price that would be charged to patients.

That the Food and Drug Administration "has been grievously biased, and that the claimed identity between Krebiozen and creatine definitely is mistaken." And that the "deceptive result" was obtained because the Food and Drug Administration did not squarely overlay the Krebiozen and creatine graphs, but dropped one graph 7½ percent below the other to obliterate the areas of maximum differences.

That the National Cancer Institute's committee of 24 cancer experts met in secret, refused to allow Dr. Ivy to appear before them and "imposed unduly harsh and severe standards of judgment upon Krebiozen which apparently they do not impose upon most, if any, of the other substances which they test." Many of the cases appeared to have been thrown out for reasons which were questionable or not adequately explained.

As a result of his investigation, DOUGLAS made five specific requests of the Senate:

1. That an appropriate Senate committee conduct an open investigation of the accuracy of the public statements made by the FDA and the NCI in regard to Krebiozen.
2. That an independent scientific investigation be made of Krebiozen and creatine to determine whether they are, as the FDA charges, identical.
3. That the case records of the 504 cases submitted by Dr. Ivy and Dr. Durovic be reexamined by neutral scientists.
4. That the FDA "retract the false statements it has made about Krebiozen and Dr. Ivy and Dr. Durovic and apologize to them for the reflections they have made upon their characters."
5. That the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reply to DOUGLAS' letter in which he asked searching questions about the criteria used in appraising Krebiozen.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the bylaws of the Smaller Business Association of New England states that one of its goals is "to protect and promote the welfare of small business in New England and elsewhere." This provision accurately summarizes the efforts and achievements of this organization during the past 25 years.

Soon after the organization was established, the United States was confronted with problems of converting much of its economy to defense and later to war production. The Government found it to be easier to deal with a few large corporations rather than with a myriad of small firms. The Smaller Business Association of New England, better known as SBANE, worked with other groups to develop practical subcontracting methods which enabled small business to contribute significantly to the war effort.

In this connection, it did much to advance the formation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Many small concerns throughout the Nation owe their very existence to the achievements of this Government agency.

When World War II ended, small business was once again confronted with a difficult problem—that of converting to peacetime production. Only through determined effort were SBANE and similar groups able to overcome the fears of banks about extending the credit which was essential to adjusting and expanding production facilities.

Every year since the end of the war, representatives of SBANE have forwarded recommendations for a program of small business to the Senate and House Small Business Committees, to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and to the New England congressional delegation. This annual presentation is indicative of the positive steps taken by SBANE to promote the welfare of its members. The practical nature of the program has contributed significantly to increased mutual understanding between Government and small business.

SBANE has an educational program designed to promote an understanding of the crucial role that small businesses play in the stability and growth of the American economy. This program is also of direct assistance to businessmen by keeping them up to date regarding the most modern management techniques. In seeking to achieve a better situation for its members, the association works toward adequate credit and contracts, equitable taxation, improved labor-management laws and relations, and increased foreign trade.

Although SBANE has been in existence for only 25 years, it has made significant contributions to the growth and development of small businesses in New England and the Nation.

Through my work on the Senate Small Business Committee, I have come to respect the association as a reliable and prudent spokesman for the interests of New England's small businesses. Therefore, I wish to congratulate the Smaller Business Association of New England on its 25th anniversary of service to business and Government.

UNITED NATIONS OUTER SPACE RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on December 5, the First Committee of the General Assembly took several important steps toward the creation of a regime of law in outer space. By acclamation, it approved a resolution on outer space legal principles which had been submitted by the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. As you know, my colleague, the senior Senator from Maine, and myself, are senatorial advisers to the U.S. delegation to this Committee. The text of the resolution on legal principles was reached only after long months of negotiations with the Soviet Union and believe, to frame in a legal document the total area in which the interests of all members overlap. On certain issues, on which the Soviet position was unacceptable, the Soviets have dropped their demands. They agreed not to include in the resolution a ban on private enterprise in space, and a ban on observation from space.

In addition, an omnibus resolution, also passed by acclamation in the First Committee of the General Assembly, requests the United Nations Outer Space Committee to arrange for the prompt preparation of draft international agreements on liability for damage caused by objects launched into outer space and on assistance to and return of astronauts and space vehicles—steps which for some time we have advocated. The omnibus resolution also contains a number of recommendations on the work of the United Nations Outer Space Committee, the World Meteorological Organization and the International Telecommunication Union.

On December 2, Ambasasdor Stevenson made a major address to the First Committee outlining our outer space policy. His address included a reaffirmation of President Kennedy's offer to explore with the Soviet Union and others cooperation in the conquest of space, including a manned landing on the moon.

Mr. President, these resolutions represent a long step forward in the continuing effort of the United States to establish a rule of law in outer space, so that honest differences can be settled honorably and without recourse to the employment of space weapons.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF HIS ASSETS, LIABILITIES, AND OUTSIDE INCOME

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement of my assets, liabilities, and outside income.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

ASSETS

I have a brokerage account with Lehman Bros. in New York City. This account is managed entirely by Lehman Bros. and I exercise no control over it. At the present date it holds securities of the following: American Greetings Corp., American International Bowling Corp., City Products Corp., Eastern States Corp., IBM, Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Co., Seeburg Corp., Northern Ontario Natural Gas, Ltd., Southern California Edison Co., and U.S. Treasury bills. In addition, I hold directly shares of General Motors Corp. and Marine Midland Corp.

Mrs. Case and I have a joint checking account with the National State Bank, Rahway, N.J., branch, and I have savings accounts in the Seamen's Bank for Savings in New York City and in the Rahway (N.J.) Savings Institution.

Mrs. Case and I also jointly own residential property in Rahway, N.J., and Washington, D.C.

I have life insurance policies and/or annuity contracts with U.S. Civil Service retirement system, U.S. Group Life Insurance, Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, College Retirement Equities Fund, Aetna Life Insurance Co., Connecticut Life Insurance Co., Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co., Continental Assurance Co., Equitable Life Assurance Society, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Philadelphia, and Travelers Insurance Co.

I am the beneficiary of a small trust fund of which the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York City is trustee. The annual income from this trust does not exceed $45.

LIABILITIES

None, except on mortgage covering house in Washington, D.C.

INCOME

In addition to interest and dividends from the accounts and securities, life insurance and annuity contracts and trust above listed, I received fees for articles, lectures, and talks during 1963 from New York Times magazine, Saturday Review, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., Calvin Bullock Forum, New York City, Cleveland, Ohio, Civil Liberties Union, Ford Hall Forum, Boston, Mass., Bowling Green State University, Ohio, Cedar Crest College, Pa., Colby Junior College, N.H., Dartmouth College, N.H., University of Massachusetts, University of New Hampshire, and Syracuse University, N.Y.

CLIFFORD P. CASE.

DECEMBER 20, 1963.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BIBLE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, when the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore bill was passed last night, Senator **FRANK E. MOSS** paid a tribute to Senator **ALAN BIBLE** in which I want to join.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is blessed with highly capable members. Every subcommittee is chaired by Senators who are not just interested in processing the bills referred to them, but in developing legislation to meet the national need in their field.

Senator **FRANK CHURCH**, chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, successfully developed a measure dealing with the vexing Indian heirship problem. It has been with us for years and now appears to be on the way to solution.

Senator **FRANK E. MOSS**, chairing the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, has dealt with the projects which regularly come to that group for consideration, and also is engaged in review of reclamation programs and policies. The Department of the Interior has just given the committee a review report on the Missouri Basin which will assure full reimbursement of the Treasury for the irrigation and power projects in that area.

Senator **ERNEST GRUENING**'s Minerals Subcommittee has recently reported two major bills to improve the situation of the vital minerals industry in the Nation.

The Senator from Nevada, Mr. **BIBLE**, who heads the Public Lands Subcommittee, has not only patiently carried a heavy schedule of bills, hearings and executive sessions, but he and his subcommittee have, in the course of handling the individual measures, forged a great deal of park, recreation and public lands policy.

Guidelines for uniform procedures in the acquisition and administration of the new type seashore, lakeshore and national recreational areas which we have just started to establish have had to be worked out. The interests of State conservation departments, private property owners, some commercial and industrial interests, the Federal Government, and of the public, have had to be identified and conciliated to the fullest extent possible.

The chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, a very able presiding officer and fine legislative workman, is at his best in the conciliation of apparently conflicting interests. Each of the seashore, lakeshore, and recreational area bills which has been presented to the Senate has had problems of conserving existing social and economic values already within the area. In each instance, it has been achieved with a high degree of satisfaction to both sides. The Padre Island recreational area is not going to injure the petroleum industry in that area. The Cape Cod area and the Point Reyes areas are not going to dispossess residents and compatible commercial establishments.

Conflict between State and Federal agencies over hunting and fishing in new Federal recreational areas has been resolved and standard language developed satisfactory to both sides. At one time, it seemed as though the two sides were about to use their hunting gear on each other.

Despite a heavy workload, the Public Lands Subcommittee chairman takes the time necessary to consider all worthy bills. His calendar is always in good order, and none is refused a hearing.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Nevada is making an outstanding contribution to the work of the Senate and the Congress. He was a great attorney general in Nevada. He is a great national legislator. I want the **RECORD** to show my appreciation to the people of Nevada for sending him here.

As chairman of the full committee, I have an especially great appreciation of Senator **BIBLE**'s work, and the fine measures he has reported to the full committee for its consideration.

The senior Senator from Nevada has done a tremendous job—both in terms of quantity and quality—throughout his chairmanship.

PROGRESS IN LATIN AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last week the President discussed with me certain Latin American affairs. Since I have an abiding interest in the field of Latin American affairs, I made certain recommendations to the President. He suggested that I reduce them to writing. I did so in my letter to the President of December 16. The President answered those recommendations on December 20.

In view of the President's great interest in Latin American affairs during his 24 years of service in the Congress and his service as Vice President, before he assumed the office of President of the United States, I ask unanimous consent that the exchange of letters be printed at this point in the **RECORD**.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the **RECORD**, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 20, 1963.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RALPH: I appreciate your fine letter of December 16. I am convinced we have no more important work than what we must do in the hemisphere among our good neighbors to the south. Your specific suggestions are excellent. I appreciate them. We need the ideas and guidance of men who know the people and problems of Latin America firsthand, as you do.

I agree with you on the necessity of showing the workers in Latin America the leadership and benefits of our free, anti-Communist trade unions—and have directed Tom Mann to make full use of this resource of talent. I also hope we can bring more Latin students to our campuses. I should like to see the enrollment at our universities on the increase. Our exchange programs are most important.

I am grateful for your support of Tom Mann in his new duties. I will be looking to you for more suggestions on what we must all do together in this vital sector of our national interest—and the interest of world peace.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Senator **YARBOROUGH**'s letter of December 16 to President Johnson follows:

DECEMBER 16, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Following our brief discussion last week of the Latin American affairs and the Alliance for Progress, and your expressed determination to work for an improvement in Latin American relations, your action in appointing Ambassador Thomas Mann as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs shows your determination to move upon that field.

Since I practiced law in El Paso for 3½ years, have visited Mexico often, and last year was one of the congressional representatives to the Interparliamentary Union meeting at Brasilia, I have a keen interest in Latin American affairs, and have continued my study of Latin America in 6½ years in the Senate.

Based upon this continuing observation, I believe that much more should be done in Latin America, to strengthen and speed up the Alliance for Progress, and in other fields. To help achieve these aims, I recommend the following:

1. That the assistant secretaryship for Latin America be elevated to a deputy secretaryship. This would impress the world with the importance we attach to Latin America.

2. Separate the Alliance for Progress from AID. Give the Alliance for Progress that status and dignity that would say to Latin America: "This program for Latin America is not under or part of something else; its importance in this world entitles it to independent existence, of, by, and for the Western Hemisphere alone." This would give the Alliance a level in our own governmental structure commensurate with the importance we are placing on our working partnership with our Latin American neighbors.

3. There is attached hereto a letter addressed to me on December 13, 1963, by William C. Doherty, Jr., Director, Social Projects Department of the American Institute for Free Labor Development, which outlines efforts being made in the anti-Communist trade unions of Latin America—this is noticeable in Lima, Rio de Janeiro, and other cities I visited. It should be pushed fast, as a bulwark of democracy.

4. I recommend the support, stimulation, and encouragement of the State-Nation brotherhood concept, by which an American State collaborates with a Latin American country, somewhat like the California-Chile program. But the present program is a successful variation, because emphasis is on local groups sharing a significant share of the financing, and State groups, business and labor, are responding very, very well. Mr. Moscoso has brought Jim Boren back from Peru, where he was deputy director of the AID mission, and has put him in charge of this cooperative State-country program. It is a form of people-to-people program, and is very successfully building real grassroots support for the Alliance, both here and in Latin America. I recommend the encouragement and strengthening of this work.

5. On my trip to Latin America last year, I found the Peace Corps one of the most respected and beloved of all American efforts overseas, either public or private. I recommend its continuance, support, and enlargement. It is America's export of working compassion.

6. The Trade Fair at Buenos Aires was creating a very favorable impression. Europe is competing heavily with us in Latin America. I recommend the continuance of our trade fairs abroad, and of our tourist bureaus to attract tourists to the United States.

6. One of the critical long-range needs I find is opportunity for more Latin American students to attend universities in the United States. The FULBRIGHT scholarships, other exchange programs, and many private agencies, are stimulating study here by Latin American students, but the unfavorable (to them) rate of exchange sharply curtails the ability of adequate numbers of Latin American students to attend our universities. All existing programs, public and private, should be broadened and strengthened.

7. I recommend that appropriations for the Alliance for Progress not be cut.

Your drive and encouragement can do much to make the Alliance for Progress move for progress. By upgrading the officials administering Latin American affairs in our Government, all of these programs can be upgraded in the mind of the world.

Respectfully recommended,

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB: A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with the death of Walter P. Webb, the Nation has lost its greatest living historian of the American West, and Texas has lost one of its foremost men of letters. Of the great Southwestern triumvirate of Roy Bedichek, Walter Webb, and Frank Dobie, only Dobie is left.

Walter Webb, as author and educator, made people of the Southwest conscious of the effect of geography on human action and development. He trained a whole generation of historians. He planted scholarship in the vast reaches of the West, and taught legions to think for themselves. A giant is gone.

He, more than any man I have ever known, possessed the ability to relate the importance of the history he treasured to the people he loved.

His unlimited wisdom, his devotion and dedication to academic freedom of thought, his respect for truth and integrity, and his concern for the individual will have their continuing effect upon the persons who were privileged to know him.

In commenting on the passing of Dr. Webb, J. Frank Dobie made the following tribute:

> No person who has added as much to the heritage of human life as Walter Webb added ceases to be.

His influence on young people is a lasting tribute to the great esteem in which he was held at the University of Texas and in fact wherever students of history are found. His unexpected death leaves a void in the field of history and of education in the great Southwest, but America is fortunate that this scholar was a vigorous and exceptionally talented writer who left much of his knowledge permanently recorded.

As a recorder of the history of the Southwest, so is his own historically important life due preservation in these archives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following articles and editorials:

Mr. Webb's bibliography, "Webb Requiem," published in the Daily Texan of Tuesday, March 12, 1963; published in the Daily Texan, "Dobie: Webb in Thought Power," of March 10, 1963; "Thirty-Two Years of Praise Given Webb's Writing," published in the Daily Texan, March 10, 1963; "Texans Comment on Webb," published in the Daily Texan, March 10, 1963; "On My Friend Walter Webb," written by J. Frank Dobie, and published in the American Statesman, March 17, 1963; "An Honest Postscript to Dr. Webb," published in the Daily Texan, March 19, 1963; an editorial entitled "Walter P. Webb," published in the Dallas Morning News, March 12, 1963; an editorial entitled, "Walter Prescott Webb," published in the Austin Statesman, March 12, 1963; "Webb Noted for Histories," published in the Austin American, March 9, 1963; "Gone From the Land, Ten-Gallon Texan," published in the American Statesman, March 17, 1963; an editorial entitled, "Walter Prescott Webb Left Imprint on State and Nation," published in the Houston Post, March 12, 1963; "History May Decide Webb Was Writer of the Century," published in the Houston Post, March 12, 1963; an editorial entitled, "Walter P. Webb," published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, March 12, 1963; "Dr. Walter Prescott Webb," a funeral sermon written by Dr. Edmund Heinsohn, March 11, 1963; "On My Friend, Walter Webb," written by Joe B. Frantz, volume 1, No. 2, spring, 1963, Texana; and from the July 26, 1963, special issue of the Texas Observer the following articles: "For Years We Three Sat Together," written by J. Frank Dobie; "An Unfashionable Kind of Historian," written by John Fischer; "Going to Places in the Pasture," written by Rodney Kidd; "Webb My Teacher," written by Wilson Hudson; "Webb's Politics," written by Joe B. Frantz; "The Great Plains," written by R. D. (Ronnie Dugger); "The Great Frontier," written by Hubert Mewhinney; "Three Friends," and "Meetings in Dallas," written by Lon Tinkle.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB

"The Great of a Nation," with E. C. Barker and W. D. Dodd, 1928.

"The Story of Our Nation," with E. C. Barker and W. D. Dodd, 1929.

"The Great Plains," 1931.

"The Texas Rangers," 1935; moving picture, 1936.

"Divided We Stand: The Crisis of Frontierless Democracy," 1937.

"The Great Frontier," 1952.

"More Water for Texas," 1954.

"An Honest Preface," 1959.

"Handbook of Texas," editor, 1952.

[From the Daily Texan, Mar. 12, 1963]

WEBB REQUIEM

(By Helen Yenne)

In the Texas State Cemetery between Stephen F. Austin and Albert Sidney Johnston, a university professor of history now lies buried.

Dr. Walter Prescott Webb, 74, who died in a car crash Friday, was interred there Monday. The cemetery is reserved for members of the legislature, elected State officers, and appointed officers who must be confirmed by the senate. Only by gubernatorial proclamation can anyone else be so honored.

But Gov. John Connally considered that Dr. Webb had devoted his life to making the world understand Texas and to making Texas understand its potentialities and was therefore deserving of the honor.

In a proclamation issued Tuesday, the Governor said of Dr. Webb:

"Through his writings he made the world conscious of the Texan's fight to triumph over water, of the meaning of courage as exemplified by the Texas Rangers, and of the struggle of Texas to stand tall and proud.

"As student and professor, he served the University of Texas for more than half a century and helped bring it international acclaim.

"As director of the Texas State Historical Association, he helped others understand their heritage; as father of the junior historical movement, he helped the youth of Texas to appreciate that heritage; and as originator of the 'Handbook of Texas,' he helped people everywhere to know accurately the facts behind the Texas story."

Funeral services for the historian Monday at University Methodist Church were attended by hundreds of mourners.

They came from all over the State and elsewhere in the Nation to hear Dr. Edmund Heinsohn, who had known Dr. Webb since 1909, deliver an unusual eulogy.

As Dr. Heinsohn was telling an amusing story about Dr. Webb, most of the mourners found themselves laughing. Many later remarked that they had not remembered laughing during a funeral service before—but that it was precisely the type of service Dr. Webb, a superlative raconteur himself, would have wanted.

Three of Dr. Webb's survivors were present: a daughter, Miss Mildred Alice Webb, of Austin, and two sisters, Mrs. Irma Wright, of Austin, and Mrs. Ruth Nations, of San Angelo.

His wife, Mrs. Terrell Maverick Webb, critically injured in the crash in which he died, was still in an intensive care unit at Brackenridge Hospital.

Speculation continues as to how the accident Friday occurred. Mrs. Webb was reported as driving the car at the time.

The Daily Texan learned in a telephone conversation Sunday with Mrs. Florence Rosengren, owner of a San Antonio bookstore, that when Dr. and Mrs. Webb left there Friday at 5:30 p.m. headed for Austin, Dr. Webb was driving and that Mrs. Webb had goodhumoredly complained of being very tired.

If Dr. Webb had been the driver, some of his close friends have suggested that he might have either suffered a stroke or nodded at the moment the car went out of control.

No autopsy, however, was performed because the justice of the peace, summoned to the scene of the accident near Buda, south of Austin on Interstate Highway 35, did not order one.

Although it had been suggested that instead of flowers, friends of Dr. Webb send contributions to the Hinds-Webb Memorial Fund at the University of Texas, a number of floral offerings were received. Among the senders were Gov. John Connally, the Amalgamated Drag Dwellers Coffee Club (old friends with whom Dr. Webb regularly drank coffee), Oxford University (where Dr. Webb was Harmsworth professor of American history), Texas State AFL–CIO, Texas State Bank, and Hugh B. Patterson, Jr., publisher of the Arkansas Gazette.

The Webb-Hinds Fund was set up by Dr. Webb to aid needy students at the University. William E. Hinds, of Brooklyn, N.Y., was the man who helped Dr. Webb finance his education at the university.

[From the Daily Texan, Mar. 10, 1963]

DOBIE: WEBB IN THOUGHT POWER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—J. Frank Dobie, controversial Texas author and onetime English faculty member, submitted to the Texan the following comments on the death of his close friend of 40 years, Dr. Walter Prescott Webb.)

The one thing needful for a writer is vitality of mind. (Dr. Walter Prescott) Webb had it. He observed, made deductions, thought. In 1925, while I was in Oklahoma, he wrote: "We are both in a hole on this Ph. D. degree proposition. The consciousness that I do not have the degree does a lot to deter me from achieving that freedom and independence essential to high-power work."

He needed the degree to fulfill academic requirements. He attained it by writing a book that for more than 30 years has been a highwater work among American histories—"The Great Plains." He wrote it to be read and to give understanding. Instead of being a thesis, it served as one.

Webb's superiority as a historian lies to no small degree in power of thought, in revealing the meaning of things as well as character and interpreting the ever-evolving currents of human affairs. His last big book, "The Great Frontier" (1953), interprets the Western Hemisphere as a frontier for the expansion of Europe. It says plainly and emphatically that in prospering America has been consuming irreplaceable resources and that the future of such a policy is not bright.

Any man who has seen life and been a part of life wants to leave it before decomposing into a senile vegetable. Webb died standing up, as Caesar considered it mete for a man to die. No person who had added as much to the heritage of human life as Walter Webb added ceases to be.

[From the Daily Texan, Mar. 10, 1963]

THIRTY-TWO YEARS OF PRAISE GIVEN WEBB'S WRITING

(By Richard Cole)

Dr. Walter Prescott Webb first gained international prominence as an author in 1931 with "The Great Plains."

"One of the most original, suggestive, and thoughtful contributions to the science of history in recent years," H. S. Commager wrote of the work in "Books."

"A volume as interesting to a wide field of readers as it is monumental in the field of social and environmental research," the Engineering News-Record said. The work earned him the Loubat Award.

Later made into a movie, "The Texas Rangers" (1935) received excellent notices.

"For years Mr. Webb studied the rangers, gathering data, and now he gives us the thoroughly satisfying result * * * the best work of its sort ever to come out of Texas," the New York Times wrote.

His book, "Divided We Stand," brought criticism in 1937. The thesis of the work is that since the Civil War the United States has been steadily developing a new sectionalism, under which the North has gained domination in political and economic affairs over other regions.

NOT A SCHOLAR

"Mr. Webb has not pretended to originality or to scholarship. His own contribution is in the skillful popularization of the findings of others, in the provocative restatement of their arguments, and in the humanization of their statistics," Commager wrote. "His book is meant for the layman, not the scholar. It should be widely read and pondered, for its argument is of utmost significance to the future of American democracy."

In 1952, "The Great Frontier" brought acclaim and disdain.

"The argument presented here is highly reasonable, and it is developed with courage and wit. Neither Mr. Webb's penchant for pungent expressions nor his use of large strokes of the brush should minimize the attention which his book merits," the New York Times reviewer ventured.

"To be forced to say of a man who has written so well that he has simply wasted his time in producing his most recent book affords the reviewer no satisfaction but only discomfort and regret," J. H. Hexter said in "American History Review." "Unfortunately in writing 'The Great Frontier' our Homer did not merely nod; he mumbled in his sleep."

Oscar Handlin in "Nation" wrote, "In 'The Great Frontier' Professor Webb of the University of Texas reduces the frontier conception to its ultimate absurdity. * * * It will be enough to indicate the fatal weakness in Webb's central conception of the great frontier."

"Professor Webb supplies no solution, but in giving the story of the exodus to and the exploitation of the frontier, he provides clues and possible guideposts for the future," the Chicago Sunday Tribune printed.

"An Honest Preface" (1959) was the result of Webb's effort and his collaboration with Dr. Joe Frantz, professor of history.

"Even this unpretentious volume of essays bears Webb's usual trademark: an artistic talent for imaginative synthesis fused with tough-minded analysis," the Chicago Sunday Review wrote.

The Christian Science Monitor said of Webb:

"Mr. Webb is one of America's notable historians. * * * He is also one of the most engaging writers the American school of historiography has produced—humorous and pithy, with the iconoclastic touch of the village intellectual and the all-encompassing grasp of the learned theorist."

[From the Daily Texan, Mar. 10, 1963]

TEXANS COMMENT ON WEBB

(By Rodney Davis)

"We're all saddened by it.

"We didn't even feel like opening the library this morning, but several students have an hour quiz Monday which they must study for," a staff member at the Eugene C. Barker Texas History Center said Saturday, describing general reaction to the sudden death of Dr. Walter Prescott Webb.

The passing of the internationally known historian drew comments from across the Nation as friends and acquaintances learned of the tragic automobile accident.

DR. SMILEY

"I'd like to say that the University of Texas and the entire scholarly world have lost an intellectual giant in the tragic passing of Walter Prescott Webb," Dr. Joseph R. Smiley, president of the university, said.

"He has brought signal honor and worldwide distinction to the university department of history with which he was associated all the years of his adult life. With typical vigor and imagination, he was in the midst of a new experiment in teaching, bringing to the campus the world's outstanding historians to record for posterity the significant lessons of man's past."

LEWIS

Archie R. Lewis, acting chairman of the department of history, said: "Walter Webb proved that history was a vital inheritance to strengthen our resolution and sharpen our intelligence. He also dealt with two generations of students and faculty colleagues with warmth, understanding, and salty wisdom. We shall not see his like again."

GOVERNOR CONNALLY

"I am profoundly saddened about the tragic news of Dr. Webb. We can be thankful, however, that his genius will be preserved for posterity through the great works he left behind and the inspiration he has given to so many. I join his countless friends in extending our deepest sympathy to all the family," Governor Connally stated.

VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON

When contacted by the Daily Texan, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson was at the White House. He gave the Texan the following statement:

"The hand of death has removed one of my closest friends. We pray that his wife will be spared.

"Walter Prescott Webb was the great chronicler of the Southwest and West. He was a man of original thought and one of the most distinguished sons of Texas. He was a man of profundity leavened with a sense of humor, one of the outstanding scholars of our time. Surely all who love honesty and excellence of thought will grieve."

DR. WILSON

Former president and chancellor of the university, Logan Wilson, now president of the American Council on Education in Washington, told the Texan: "Dr. Webb was one of the greatest figures in the history of the University of Texas. He was my personal friend, and the news of his death has been a great shock. He was a man of fundamental honesty; he had character and flavor—he did not try to be pleasing. Yet he made a tremendous impression on those who knew him. His influence was manifestly far reaching."

SENATOR YARBOROUGH

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, said, "A giant is gone.

"With the death of Walter Prescott Webb, the Nation has lost its greatest living historian of the American West, and Texas has lost one of its foremost men of letters."

SENATOR TOWER

Senator JOHN TOWER, Republican, of Texas, felt Webb's death was "a great loss to Texas as well as the world. Not only was he a superb historian, he had a fine wit and style."

DR. RANSOM

"Walter Webb was a great man. He made his greatness, as few men are able to do, out of simplicity. He was the complete Texan, but each of his main Texas qualities was universal—honesty, concern for the individual, and devotion to truth as he saw it.

"He leaves a tradition which is the making of universities. His own university will stay in debt to the man himself, to his mind, and to the example he set in courage and integrity," Dr. Harry Ransom, chancellor of the university, said.

DR. BURDINE

"I think the university has lost one of its most dedicated people, I think he was typical of the university and the growth of the university," Dr. John Alton Burdine, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, said.

JUDGE HART

"Dr. Webb combined fearless devotion to academic freedom with brilliant scholarship. I believe that my best single act as chancellor of the university was to insist that Dr. Webb's active participation in controversial issues should not prevent his richly deserved appointment as distinguished professor," Judge James P. Hart, former chancellor of the university, stated.

[From the American-Statesman,
Mar. 17, 1963]

ON MY FRIEND WALTER WEBB

(By J. Frank Dobie)

I cannot speak freely of Walter Webb apart from personal life. Each of us was born in the year 1888 and reared in the country. We were underling instructors together, he in history and I in English, in the University of Texas; we came to know each other better along in the thirties. The evening he was killed in a car accident March 8, 1963, I and two other men were sitting down to dinner as guests of Frank Wardlaw, director of the University of Texas Press, all of us expecting Webb to appear before long.

Many times in newspapers and elsewhere I've seen the names of Roy Bedichek, naturalist and humanist, Walter Prescott Webb, historian and thinker, and Frank Dobie linked together as a triumvirate of writers.

Bedichek, the dearest comrade of my life, died in 1959. For maybe 20 years before this I had closer association with Webb than at other periods. With Mody Boatright, Wilson Hudson, Frank Wardlaw after he came to Texas, Glenn Evans and John Henry Faulk whenever either was available, we three not infrequently went out in the country late in the day to cook steak and eat it along with a bottle of beer.

Bedichek was the planner of these parties, also the cook. He saw that each man paid his part of the expenses. There was no host. There was not much drinking. Webb didn't care for beer. A sip of wine suited him. If he took whiskey, he didn't take more than a jigger without water.

The site for our camp suppers came to be Friday Mountain Ranch in the hills 17 miles southwest of Austin. It consists of approximately a section of land; an ancient two-storied rock house on it was once a kind of academy. After Webb acquired the place it entered into his bones—into the very fibers of his being.

He spent an enormous amount of time and money restoring the soil and brining back a turf of grass. Bear Creek, normally running, twists through the land. Webb dammed it, compounding a fine hole of water. The water, the soil and the grass restored him as much as he restored the land.

In 1945 or 1946 Roy Bedichek was provided with a grant of money by a civilized man who demanded anonymity. He spent a year at Friday Mountain batching and writing the book published in 1957, "Adventures With a Texas Naturalist." Webb wanted humanity to benefit from the land. Without living on it and there associating with himself and with nature, free from everything else but the occupation of writing, Bedichek probably could not have achieved the classic that he did achieve.

It was only after rains broke the terrible drought of the fifties that grass really came back on Friday Mountain land. In 1962 it was at its prime and Walter Webb was also.

He wrote an essay, published in Harper's Monthly and then reprinted in Reader's Digest, telling of the poverty of his boyhood and of a stranger in New York who sent him books to read and aided him in getting a college education. William E. Hinds died many years ago. Webb never saw him and remained to the end concerned over some way to pay him back. His paying back seems to have lain in aiding certain struggling and able students.

He was always on the side of humanity, the people. One of his books, "Divided We Stand" (1937), analyzes the dearth of prosperity in the South while the North burgeoned and for a long while treated the South pretty much as a colony. Webb himself prospered through investing earnings from teaching and writing—especially from two textbooks—in real estate. A few years ago he drew up a plan to enable faculty members of the University of Texas who so wished and had the money to invest in real estate. I don't think, however, that this plan got into operation.

Several times I have heard him speak of the influence of Prof. L. M. Keasbey on his life. Before World War I, Keasbey, a professor in the university, gave a course on economics in which he made plain at least one way to get money: Invest in land that the activities of an increasing population will make more valuable—very valuable if the land be chosen judiciously. At the time Webb was absorbing directions to the unearned increment an Austin peddler and then wholesale shipper of vegetables named Crockett took the Keasbey course. He, as I saw and as he told with pride, became expert in anticipating traffic routes of the city; he died one of the richest property owners in it.

Webb had a dim view of certain English teachers under whom he had studied in the university. He wanted to write but learned by himself the craft of writing. Some time after World War I, he was avidly reading O. Henry and writing some short stories of his own. One that I remember was based on an electric sign above Joske's store in San Antonio that flashed every night, showing a cowboy roping a steer. Webb taught for a while in a San Antonio high school.

His superiority as a historian lies to a marked degree in power of thought, in revealing the meaning of things as well as characters, and in interpreting the ever-evolving currents of human affairs. Not long after his first major book, "The Great Plains," came out in 1931, a writer of western fiction, named Clem Yore, living in Colorado, wrote me that a gathering of writers of westerns confessed to not knowing the real meaning of barbed wire, of windmills over wells drilled into the ground, and of the treeless plains themselves until Webb taught them.

His last big book, "The Great Frontier," (1953) interprets the western hemisphere as a frontier for the expansion of Europe. It says plainly and emphatically that America has been consuming irreplacable resources and that the future of such a policy is not bright. This book came out during the outrage of McCarthyism, and some fanatics, without reading it, slammed it as a rebuke to "free enterprise."

When Webb took a stand, he took it. If the radical right seemed to him unjust and undemocratic, the radical left annoyed him. He was not a crusader and was not contentious. Much went on in his mind that he never gave words to. He sometimes wishes, he once told me, that he didn't have to think. He discerned a certain strengthening of the mind through playing poker. He liked to play poker, but attending to the cards seemed not to bother his peace of mind.

One time while we were walking along the railroad about Third Street in Austin, we stopped beside an oldtime steam locomotive. It was stationary but was throbbing with power. Webb said, "That is the greatest manifestation of power in the world." I told him that out of respect for its power and the symbolism of power old Dr. Sanders, professor of Latin and Greek at Southwestern University about the beginning of this century, would remove his hat in salute to a steam engine pulling a train past him.

Whether Webb actually ever hated anybody or not I cannot say. I never heard him express hatred toward anybody. He was more inclined to set forth the facts about a man than to praise or condemn. He was tolerant of the vagaries of individuals.

He developed as a professor and historian under the late Dr. Eugene C. Barker, for years head of the History Department of the University of Texas. The older Barker grew, the more conservative he grew. His directness and his integrity were admirable. I myself owe considerable to him. He came to think that the masses of mankind need a kind of dictatorial direction in religion, in politics, and in other regions.

While Dr. Barker was actively against Homer Price Rainey as president of the University of Texas and was standing with the by-no-means-intellectual regents who deposed Rainey, Webb was for Rainey. At the same time, he was never against Barker. "I did not understand him," I heard him say not long ago, "but he stood by me. He was generous. He stood for fine things. I remember him with respect and gratitude."

The first Mrs. Webb, after having been married to Walter for more than 43 years, died in the summer of 1960, survived by a daughter, Mildred, of whom Dr. Webb as well as Mrs. Webb was very fond.

In December of 1961 he married the widow of the late Maury Maverick of San Antonio, a very spritely mind and a delightful lady. Considering his love for her and her marrying him, he said, "This is an unexpected dividend from life." He was frank about this love. During the summer of 1962 while he was lecturing at the University of Alaska, she unable to accompany him, he wrote her every day. He was openly naive in expressing his ecstatic delight in her being and in married life with her.

Any man who has seen and been a part of life wants to leave it before decomposing into a senile vegetable. Webb died standing up, as Caesar considered it mete for a man to die. In a flash he passed from wisdom and happiness to whatever death means. No person who has added as much to the heritage of human life as Walter Webb asked ceases to be. His living, thinking, writing, standing up will surely continue as parts of his projected shadow.

[From the Daily Texan, Mar. 10, 1963]

AN HONEST POSTSCRIPT TO DR. WEBB

In one respect I always disagreed with Walter P. Webb. In his gruff way he liked to say that one day the flags of the University of Texas would fly at half-mast for him, and after that this big educational complex that he had helped nurture from adolescence would go on its way, swallowing his memory as wholly as if he was merely one more statistic. I don't believe this for a moment.

Walter Webb gave the university some of its most champagne-clear and heady thinking of the past three decades. He plowed his own furrow regardless of criticism, showed an impatience for detail and for the academic tendency to stall on points of difference, never sought a fight and never dodged one. Without any administrative ambitions himself, and seeking nothing from the university except to be let alone intellectually, he gained such respect from his fellow faculty members that his advice was sought and cherished by men of all persuasions, many of whom disagreed diametrically with his scholarly findings. Probably there has been no professor with greater power on the campus, simply because the faculty and administration both knew that his answers would be straightforward and unsubtle.

So we say adieu to a scholar of world renown who proved that you do not have to leave home to strike a blow for intellectual excellence. But more than that, we say goodbye to an influence that pervaded many portions of the life of the university, of Austin, of Texas, and of the Nation. And we say goodbye to a courageous, craggy character who will still be missed the day after the flags are returned to the top of their masts, and for as many days thereafter as we who loved him as a friend and respected him as a man have the capacity for remembrance.

Dr. JOE B. FRANTZ,
Chairman of Department of History.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Mar. 12, 1963]

WALTER P. WEBB

Of the Texans of this century whose careers will still be meaningful to future generations as long as civilization exists, Walter Prescott Webb is surely one. "I have no more books in me that I want to write," the great historian told friends in Dallas only a fortnight before his tragic death in a car accident March 8, just outside Austin—the city which he loved above all others and where he carved out a career at the university which won him international renown.

When Arnold Toynbee and such other famous British historians as Geoffrey Barraclough came to this country, they came to Texas to see Walter Prescott Webb. Webb's two most ambitious books, "The Great Plains'"" and "The Great Frontier," will endure among the printed words that have shaped the world. As the New York Times Book Review put it in an anniversary issue assessing books of the first half of the 20th century, Webb's "Great Plains" was generally considered "the most important single-volume contribution to American history in our times."

The west Texas farm boy who achieved this distinction was properly described in the Associated Press story of his death as a "shy dreamy youth." From boyhood on, when he discovered the delight of reading, all he wanted to be was a writer. He knew it would be a struggle, but he enjoyed struggle. That is why he helped so generously many a student born with brains but without adequate financial resources. He cherished, privately, Hans Christian Andersen's story of "The Ugly Duckling"—and gave copies to anxious students battling against odds.

Though reserved on the surface, he had a genius for friendship. The personal memory of this exceptional and great man will long enrich life in Texas, as his books will enrich posterity.

[From the Austin Statesman, Mar. 12, 1963]

WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB

Dr. Walter Prescott Webb departed from us in the twinkling of an eye, the victim of a tragic automobile accident while he and Mrs. Webb were nearing their home after a visit in San Antonio.

Austin, Tex., the Nation, and the world of the intellectually great who recognized his greatness, suffer a tremendous loss. It is difficult to adjust to the fact that he is gone.

Walter, as his friends called him and they were legion, was a quiet, humble man who never willingly referred to the many honors that had been bestowed upon him. A democratic individual, the catholicity of his friendships was shown by his friendship with many who had no claim to fame, his interest in people as well as in the subjects he discussed in his books and lectures.

His friendliness overflowed like an over filled cup, and his memory held a great collection of experiences and anecdotes of the Texas he loved and which he was at his best in relating in informal gatherings or to a group of his cronies. He greatly enriched, in his chosen field, the literature of his day. He warned of the attritions that go along with civilization and the change from land abundance to shortage which with the years would be more pronounced.

He was easy to approach, easy to talk to, and easy to show a friendly sympathy. He never claimed vocal eloquence, this being reserved for his writings, with which almost every sentence was underscored.

He was a man of parts, though sometimes his conclusions caused controversy. On these occasions he was willing to be shown, but it is something of a remarkable fact that not often did he feel impelled to recede. His photographic mind absorbed everything, but he was quick to recognize and discard the chaff which clutters so much modern-day thinking.

One with the qualifications of Dr. Webb comes along about once in a hundred years. It is too bad that such a person cannot remain with us always to embellish the world's mentality.

[From the Austin (Tex.) American Statesman, Mar. 17, 1963]

GONE FROM THE LANDS TEN-GALLON TEXAN

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—With the tragic death of Dr. Walter Prescott Webb one of the finest writers of the Southwest put the final period to his chronicles. Dr. Joe B. Frantz, chairman of the Department of History of the University of Texas, says he was one of the legion who felt complimented to know Dr. Webb well. Here is Dr. Frantz' tribute to his friend and colleague.)

(By Joe B. Frantz)

Every newspaper of any size in the State—and many outside the State—have carried tributes, written editorials, and devoted both news and editorial columns to the late Walter Prescott Webb this past week. The weekly, monthly, and quarterly publications will begin their paeans soon.

What does that leave to be said that isn't repetitious?

Although this is a book page, I would prefer—in trying to avoid reiteration—to concentrate on Walter Prescott Webb the man rather than Webb the writer or the historian. This approach is legitimate, because every author writes a bit of his autobiography, reveals a glimpse of himself, everytime he sits down at his typewriter. And Webb and his typewriter were almost inseparable.

So what do we who read books and write books and review books, remember about Walter Webb? The thoughts cascade. A unique puckering of lines about his mouth as he grinned. A grin that—pardon the bromide, but it fits—looked like the cat who had swallowed the canary. Unexpected laughter that could explode at the most unexpected moments. None of us could ever anticipate what would titillate his somewhat puckish sense of humor, but usually we found we were being excruciatingly funny when we were never more serious—or just plain everyday bantering.

Sample: The Department of History installed a lounge this fall where faculty and graduate students could talk shop, profoundities, and trivialities over coffee. Just last week Dr. Webb called aside Colleen Kain, the department's administrative secretary.

"I'll give you $5 if you'll get those girls to make the coffee stronger," he said with all the air of a conspirator.

The next day Miss Kain went in the lounge to find Webb drinking coffee. He raised his cup in a half-gesture.

"Much better," he said.

"Then where's my $5?" she countered.

He laughed till his face flushed and the tears flowed.

Sample: A golfer friend was telling Webb about his day on the course and particularly about an especially deliberate member of the foursome.

"We are on No. 17 tee near the road, and this guy is ready to drive. A truck pulls up alongside the fence and its keeper watches. Sam addresses the ball, then steps back and sights. Then he steps up, but he can't get his feet right. He tries again, but the ground isn't even. He adjusts the height of his tee. This goes on for what seemed like 10 minutes. All of a sudden the truck driver leans out of his cab and yells, "For the luvva God hit the sonuvabitch."

Webb was prostrated

We remember, as Dr. Edmund Heinsohn said in his eloquent funeral tribute, a man who loved sinners but not their sins. Everyone of us felt that he had a friend or two we just couldn't understand. How could Webb tolerate him, each of us has said at some time but his taste was as catholic in friends as it was in literature.

A Mr. Garrett was his caretaker at Friday Mountain. Mr. Garrett was one of the most obscene, profane, and colorful, and nonstop talkers Webb had ever heard, and Webb would invent all sorts of projects for Friday Mountain in order to increase his contacts with Mr. Garrett. Mr. Garrett died while Webb was at the University of Alaska. This winter Webb told me, "I think I'll sell my ranch. It's no fun without Mr. Garrett to listen to."

Webb himself could get garrulous. But not consistently. Barnes Lathrop of our department is rather taciturn, which is a distinct relief at times. Lathrop once told me that he felt extremely close to Webb, "though some people would wonder if they could see us. I've ridden 30 miles with him without a word passing between us."

He was extremely sensitive to the possibility of boring others. And if he were bored, he could never hide it.

In writing he circled a task like a dog trampling tall grass before lying down. But once he started writing, he wrote like a professional. His favorite writing day was 3 hours in the morning, an afternoon spent in napping and attending to odds and ends, and 3 hours at night. Usually he arrived at the office about 9 o'clock in the morning. Until his marriage in December 1961, he was frequently there at 10 o'clock at night.

He wrote after considerable reading. Without the instincts of a true researcher he liked to be full of the story of a topic, and then write without pausing to check fugitive facts. He rewrote very little. And with all the unfeigned enthusiasm of a child asking his mother to tell the relatives what bright thing he said today, whenever Webb wrote a passage he particularly liked, he would read it to everyone who dropped into his office.

Webb had no use for avant-garde literature, nor for the "dead baby" school. Over a period of years I urged such a mild and humorous novel as "Tortilla Flat" on him, but he could never get beyond the first chapter to the savory portions—too much poverty and chicanery, he said. His heroes were O. Henry, Damon Runyon, and Eugene Manlove Rhodes, none exactly a giant. He thought English historians were infinitely superior writers to American historians, because they told the story without detail and with style.

Perhaps a feeling for style—for the telling phrase—for pace—was the key. Not solidity. Certainly his work was vulnerable to the criticism of the guild. Economists blasted him, historians demurred, and environmentalists faulted him and environments faulted him then.

"Any time I publish anything, it's no longer mine," he liked to say. "Good books and articles outlast the critics, and if you are going to be thin-skinned, you're not a writer."

When Fred Shannon of the University of Illinois wrote a book charging that "The Great Plains" was defective in both historical conception and execution, Webb made one of his few replies to a critic.

He hadn't thought of it as history, he said; to him it was a work of art, and art is supposed to express the artist, not to be accurate reproduction.

Around Texas he felt that Fred Gipson was the most underrated writer in the State—the best writer in his genre since Mark Twain. He was jealous of Frank Dobie's greater fluency, but not jealous of Dobie himself. Not exclusively, he thought Roy Bedichek was the greatest intellectual Texas had produced. He resented what he considered Tom Lea's commercialism, although he liked Lea personally. "But I can't see Tom ever taking a month off to help someone else," a statement which reveals more of Webb than it does of Lea.

Everyone felt a peculiar kinship to Webb, almost as if he owned a piece of him. Because Mrs. Webb was critically injured, I had to participate in his funeral arrangements more heavily than I would have liked. I faced a continual barrage of long-distance calls and telegrams, and my home and office telephone virtually rang around the clock—all telling me how they knew Webb would have wanted things done.

At the hospital Mrs. Webb sent for Frank Wardlaw and me, and said, "On pallbearers start with you two and then it's up to you—just make it representative." The preliminary list included 23 who had to be included. Someone else could have drawn up an equally long list with just as much claim to personal attachment.

Webb was so multifaceted that any account of him must necessarily be partial and incomplete, or else interminable. Frank Dobie spent most of Saturday after the wreck writing a tribute to Webb. "I can't do it right," he complained; "It's an artistic problem in what to omit, and what I omit is more important than what I put in."

Since Adam men have argued the probabilities of immortality. In Webb's case the argument is reasonably academic. Certainly so long as the generations who knew him continue, he will live on. Certainly too, so long as there is a Texas, he will be remembered for such things as his history of the Texas Rangers, his "Handbook of Texas," his founding of the Junior Historian movement, and his efforts to make Texans realize that water, not petroleum or cattle, is their most precious resource. And certainly so long as men study the American frontier, Walter Prescott Webb will continue an earthy immortality.

But while we will respect his contributions to learning, we who knew him will remember his delight in relating an impious story, in being bested by an impertinent child or shine boy, in the latest drollery of Terrel Webb, whom he adored with all the happy blindness of a sophomore; his distinctive walk and his way of shuffling through a room without seeing anyone; his embarrassed pleasure in being complimented on a new suit or a new Stetson; his excitement when he was chasing a real estate purchase; his softie heart underneath his alligator-like exterior; his ability to get any friend to drop whatever he was doing and follow him like a disciple, and yet Webb never opportuned; his almost fearful—or was it Victorian?—respect for Eugene C. Barker—in a third of a century in the same department, he never called Barker by his first name; his disrespect for the Ph. D. degree or examination scores.

And we will remember things around here that were big at the time—how he introduced a no-confidence motion on President T. S. Painter, and how President Painter, with a spirit that most men couldn't match, year after year recommended him for a distinguished professorship, only to have a powerful regent veto the recommendation, an impasse that might have continued forever if James P. Hart hadn't given the regent his choice of Hart's resignation as chancellor or the honor that was long overdue Webb.

We will remember Webb lecturing the faculty on its poor sportsmanship when it was hung on dead center. All sorts of once-younger faculty and staff—Alton Burdine, Jitter Nolen, Oliver Radkey, George Watt, Harry Ransom, just to specify a few and give some idea of range—will remember that time of crisis in their respective lives when Walter Webb, who hardly knew them, seemed to appear from nowhere with the suggestion, "let's go to lunch," or "let's go out to Friday Mountain"; and without knowing it, the man was pouring out his problem and if it weren't solved, he knew at least that someone cared.

Webb is all around Austin, in people, in places, in incidents. Archie Lewis wrote at the time of his death—"we shall never see his like again." This is one time I wish Archie were wrong, but unfortunately I have to agree with him. If part of the purpose of life is to leave the world and its people better than you found them, Walter Prescott Webb fulfilled his purpose. As much as I distrust comprehensive adjectives, I would be less than truthful if I didn't say that to untold numbers of us—and to each of us for a different reason—he is irreplaceable. He leaves our lives richer, but with such a hurt and emptiness.

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 12, 1963]

Walter Prescott Webb Left Imprint on State and Nation

He was born in east Texas in 1888; 6 years later his family moved to the Western frontier that would dominate his life, his thought and his provocative legacy to Western culture. Walter Prescott Webb is perhaps the only Texan ever to alter the mind of man. He was killed last week on one of the highways that helped cause his frontier to vanish.

He made it possible for man to see the present—this century—not as a continuation of but as a break with the past. His work was inspired, of course, yet its roots were prosaic. He took what everybody already knew, but he put it together with meanings that had previously escaped detection. That is called thinking.

Yet this scholar, this thinker, never saw an ivory tower from the inside. Few know that he died a wealthy man. He saw no reason why a college professor should be poor, so he began buying Austin land during the great depression, financing his early investments with the profits from a textbook. "Just get in the way of progress," he said; he bought land that others later needed.

His appearance recalled his boyhood, for he looked—and talked, too—like a west Texas cattleman come to town in his store clothes. One saw Webb as a professor only with effort, only with the knowledge that he had filled an important chair at Oxford University, that two of his books were studied throughout the world. The thousands of students whose hearts and minds he won at the University of Texas thought of him as preeminently a scholar only after an interval of years separated professor and students.

His monuments are two of his books—"The Great Plains" but especially "The Great Frontier." It is the latter work that will give his reputation its strength. Only recently has the book, which was published in 1952, begun to shake free of the opposition that could have been expected in an optimistic culture.

Describing a frontier as "a vacancy inviting occupancy," Webb showed that since 1492 history was shaped mainly by the expanding frontier, which created a 400-year boom ending early in the 20th century. The frontier created the institutions of democracy and capitalism; with the frontier gone, he said, democracy and capitalism will be altered.

Few men of his time lived richer lives; perhaps none could have died so content. Weigh Dr. Webb by his affections, his loves: Good food, good company, above all good talk; his Friday Mountain Ranch, near Austin, with its great L-shaped Johnson Institute, a two-story ante bellum structure built of stone; and always his coming to grips with the frontier, not as a cowboys-and-Indians subject, never to escape the present but only to reveal the future.

A man of well-tempered crotchets, of seasoned frugality, stern of face and merry of disposition, a man with the rare capacity to infect others with his own glow of life, Walter Prescott Webb used life to his heart's content, but was infrequently used by life, for 74 years. And he informed his State and his Nation with inspiration.

His epitaph might well read: "Here, but for his grace and power, would lie a college professor."

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 12, 1963]

History May Decide Webb Was Writer of the Century

It may well turn out that Walter Prescott Webb, the historian who was buried Monday in the Texas State Cemetery at Austin, wrote the most important book that was written anywhere in the world in this century.

It is also likely that nobody now living in the world—not even the tiniest child—will live long enough to be sure. It is not that depopulation and massacre by nuclear warfare are necessarily so likely; it is only that new technologies and the mere random and almost incomprehensible physical events come so fast now that man's future has become less predictable than at any other time since he first appeared in the world. Man is now traveling through history almost as fast as he travels through space and much less controllably.

That book was "The Great Frontier." In it Webb undertook to study, not particular aspects of the North American scene as in his other books, but the course of the Western World, the same theme that had occupied Oswald Spengler and Arnold Toynbee.

Between the two wars, there was a great cult of Spengler in what for want of a better term one must call intellectual circles. There is still a cult of Toynbee. Webb, although widely attended both here and in Europe, attracted fewer devotees.

But to people of a certain turn of mind Webb's account of the course taken by the Western world is more convincing, if less picturesque, than those of Spengler and Toynbee. Webb's great quality was a sort of calm and massive commonsense, much like that possessed by Charles Darwin, a willingness to follow the evidence wherever it might lead instead of beginning with a theory and then looking for evidence to support it.

Webb decided that the fantastic 500 years' flowering of Western Europe—say, between Prince Henry the navigator and Adolf Hitler—came about chiefly because the West found a frontier to plunder and occupy; that it was the capital accumulated by plundering that frontier—the Americas and Africa, as well as the ancient nations of the Far East—which really brought about all the cumulative marvels of modern science and technology, the productiveness of the industrial revolution, and the astounding abundance now enjoyed in a few happy countries of the West, where, for the first time since the wheel and the plow came into use during the new stone age, men can easily produce more food and more luxuries of every kind than they can eat or put to use.

Whether Webb's interpretation is right or wrong, it is an astonishing story. When Henry the navigator of Portugal first started sending out expeditions to explore the coast of Africa and look for a sea route to the Indies, the petty kingdoms of Western Europe gave little promise of ever amounting to much. The great power in that part of Eurasia was the empire of the Ottoman Turks. What seems still queerer is that those petty peoples of Western Europe had no advantage over the Turks or even the Chinese in science and technology and very little advantage over the Aztecs whom they were yet to discover in Mexico.

They had gunpowder, indeed, but the arquebus was a less efficient weapon than the crossbow. The peasants in Europe plowed their fields with ox-drawn wooden plows and sowed wheat by hand, as in Roman or Egyptian times. The roads were so muddy that most travel was on foot. Wealthier people rode horses. People rich enough to light their houses at night used candles or torches. There was no electric light, no gaslight, no kerosene lantern, not even a whale oil lamp. There was not a telescope, a rubberband, or a paper clip anywhere in Europe. There was not a watch that would keep time. Not even the flintlock musket had been invented.

The only item of technology those fellows had that really worked was the sailing ship. They set out in those frail and tiny craft and plundered the world of its gold, silver, fish, furs, sugar, chocolate, tobacco, and ship timber. They accumulated the capital that cleared the way for the scientists and the inventors, for Galileo, Newton, Franklin, Watt, Faraday, Edison, the Wright brothers, and all the rest.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Mar. 12, 1963]

WALTER P. WEBB

There is almost an irony in the death of Dr. Walter Prescott Webb, Texas distinguished historian of the U.S. western frontier, in an automobile wreck on a modern superhighway.

His passing, however, is a reminder of the closeness of history to all of us and the regard its chroniclers can win if they are attuned to its meaning and have the genius to interpret it.

Dr. Webb was almost an Olympian figure in the area of his specialty, but his eminence arose from a deep and abiding love of his region and his State and his understanding of their place in the total history of mankind.

He was a gifted writer, perhaps first a writer and then a historian. He was a great teacher at his alma mater, the University of Texas. Although the most productive years of his life had already passed, his death at 74 was a tragic truncation of a career which might have resulted in yet new contributions to America's knowledge of its past and new appreciation of its present.

(Funeral sermon by Dr. Edmund Heinsohn, Mar. 11, 1963)

DR. WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB

Dr. Walter Prescott Webb was born in Panola County, Tex., on April 3, 1888, and departed this life on March 8, 1963, having reached the age of 74 years, 11 months, and 5 days. He leaves surviving his wife Mrs. Terrell Maverick Webb, of Austin; his daughter Miss Mildred Alice Webb, of Austin; and two sisters: Mrs. Ima Wright, of Austin, and Mrs. Ruth Nations, of San Angelo. Many are praying today that Mrs. Webb, Miss Mildred, Mrs. Wright, and Mrs. Nations may be comforted, and that Mrs. Webb may experience a complete restoration to health and strength.

Herbert Butterfield, British historian, in his "Christianity and History," describes history as being "the business of making personalities, even, so to speak, by putting them through the mill; and though it fails us if we expect it to hand us happiness on a spoon, its very vicissitudes bring personality itself to a finer texture."

Butterfield sees history in two aspects: first, history as "part of that historymaking which goes on almost, so to speak, above our heads"; second, the characteristic of a historical religion which he sees "to be rooted in earthiness and to have a vivid apprehension of material things."

It was a far piece and great distance from that poor farm in Stephens County to the giving of the Harkness lectures in American history at the University of London and the serving as Harmsworth professor of American history at Queens College, Oxford; it was a far piece and great distance from the little newspaper office in Ranger, Tex., where he picked up discarded newspapers and magazines, to the presidency of the American Historical Association and the giving of an address to the International Conference of Historians in Paris. In these intervening years history produced one of our Nation's finest men and one of the world's greatest historians.

We deal first with Dr. Webb, the historian. The cost of the journeys to which we have referred involved much more than boat and plane passage. It involved the acceptance and practice of rigorous intellectual disciplines, and years and years of hard work. During his student days here at the university he had a certain toughness of body and of mind. This toughness has stood him in good stead, for without it he would not have survived as history put him through the mill to turn out a great historian.

As historian he was not a photographer; he was an artist. In the Austin Town and Gown Club men undress their minds. It was always an exciting privilege that members of Town and Gown had when they watched Dr. Webb undress his mind. One close friend said that Dr. Webb was the most powerful thinker he had known, that Dr. Webb could wring more meanings out of facts than any man within his knowledge. This same friend remarked that Dr. Webb never permitted the evidence to obscure the truth. Some men pile up evidence to arrive at the truth. But this was not Dr. Webb's method. With unusual perception he could see immediately through a mass of material to the truth. And then he would marshal the evidence, not for the purpose of proving a point, but for the purpose of embellishing the truth as he had already perceived it. Many men have come to the university faculty and have gone, but he stayed, and here he spent his years looking down the long gun barrel of history; here he has written down what he has seen and his interpretations of what he has seen. We believe that all the while his study of history has been informed by that history which is being written above our heads.

Now, Dr. Webb, the man. History has run him through the mill and has produced not only the historian, but also the man. It would be impossible to bottle him up in the university community, because in a rare sense he belongs to the entire human race, the entire human family. He loved all kinds of people, he loved the sinners, but not their sins. Shine boys and members of all classes and races were his friends. He and an associate made a trip to Kingsville where he was to deliver a commencement address. It took him 5 days to go and return. In every community he wanted to stop and get some friends for a coffee drinking conversation. Many of these friends were not academicians. But to him they were important persons. In a great university, what the administration thinks, is important; what the student body thinks, is important; and what the faculty thinks, is important. The faculty did not always follow Dr. Webb, but the thinking of the faculty was never ready to jell until first the voice of Dr. Webb had been heard. Men of power, whether power of material wealth, power of position, or power of brain, sometimes can be mean. Dr. Webb was never mean. He was blunt and gruff at times, but never mean. He had an innate courtesy and a genuine sympathy that a member of the University of Texas administration said could not be accounted for except by saying that these were rooted in a good heart. He was averse to hurting the feelings of others. Sometimes to avoid becoming involved in an argument he would simply state his position and then disappear.

To the basic loyalties of life he was true. The elemental human relationships he would not violate. He was also true to himself, and to do this he kept himself in proper perspective. He said that when he thought himself "a big shot," all he needed to do to get himself in right perspective, was to go to San Antonio and stand on the street corner at the Gunter Hotel and ask himself how many of the passing crowd had ever heard of Walter Webb, and how many knew of the University of Texas and had any interest in it. Seeing himself in proper perspective made it possible for him to be courageous and unafraid. A short time before his controversial article in Harper's magazine appeared, he and two friends were together in El Paso. Both of these friends warned him that if that article was published he would lose every friend he ever had. He was silent for a few moments, and then answered: "I can't help it. I'll have to publish it." He had a conscience about helping students who were in need of help. Applicants for help were never asked about their grades. This was his way of trying to pay the debt he owed to William E. Hinds, the man who had made possible his early college education. A man came into Dr. Webb's office one day for financial assistance. Another faculty member came in a short time after the visitor for help had left. The faculty member inquired if Dr. Webb had had a caller and if he gave him anything. Dr. Webb replied that he had let the man have $100. The faculty member retorted: "That fellow is a professional bum; he has gotten money from a number of men, is leaving the city and is down at the railway station now." Dr. Webb jumped up and said: "I'll get that guy." He rushed down to the station and found the man already on the train. Dr. Webb boarded the train and found his man. Later in the day the faculty member saw Dr. Webb and asked him what had happened when he confronted the man. Dr. Webb answered: "You know, that fellow was so open and aboveboard about the whole matter, I let him have another $100." Dr.

Webb always liked a consummate artist, even though he be a crook and scoundrel.

Beneath his occasional bluntness and gruffness there was a fine sensitivity. He could even become deeply sentimental. The Friday Mountain Camp had meant much to him. He could cry while giving expression to his great concern for the preservation of the grass at Friday Mountain Camp. He was asked one time if he had ever done anything that now he looked back to with regret. The answer came in the affirmative. He had been visiting Houghton Mifflin in Boston, and he was given a copy of Walter Millis' "The Road to War" to look over. The jacket on the book was in vivid red. He went out into a park to sit down. He had the book lying on the bench beside him. Two little Italian children, a girl about 9 years old, and her little brother about 5 came by. It was obvious that they were poor and dirty. The little boy was attracted by the book, and he edged up to the bench and was reaching his hand out to the book, whereupon Dr. Webb reached out and pulled the book away. As he did so, the little girl very calmly said to her brother, "Don't touch the book, it's too nice for you." There was no resentment and no complaining by the little sister, just a statement of fact. "It's too nice for you." Dr. Webb said: "I would give anything to be able to live that over, and not to move the book away. It has bothered me for years."

We come to the end of Dr. Walter Prescott Webb's earthly career, and what do we have to say? Well, we bring an epitaph: "An Honest Preface With Still More Frontiers Ahead."

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, Mar. 9, 1963]

TEXAS COUNTRY BOY: WEBB NOTED FOR HISTORIES

(By Nat Henderson)

The personal history of 74-year-old Dr. Walter Prescott Webb closed Friday night in a tragic automobile accident near Austin, but the histories he left behind will remain classic examples of nonfiction for posterity.

Dr. Webb, a country boy born in Panola County in 1888, grew up to write primarily about the great West in which he was reared. In doing so he gained international fame for his chronicles of the West among other historians, critics, scholars, and the ordinary readers who read his renowned history books only because they also loved the West.

Dr. Webb not only was a respected author and historian. He taught the subjects he wrote about to thousands of students over a period of almost 45 years.

Webb entered the University of Texas in 1909, but did not receive his bachelor of arts degree until 1915. Nine years after becoming a freshman, he was an instructor of history at the university.

Until his death Friday night, he had taught continuously at the university except for brief periods as visiting professor at several other universities and colleges around the world.

His visiting professorships were at the University of North Carolina, Northwestern University, Harvard, University of Wyoming, University of Montana, Rice University, University of Houston, and the University of West Virginia. In 1938 he gave his famed series of Harkness Lectures at the University of London. In 1942–43 he was a visiting professor at Queens College of Oxford University.

After becoming an instructor at the University of Texas, he was awarded a masters degree in 1920 and doctorate in 1932. He was honored many times with honorary degrees from other universities.

Dr. Webb first gained international fame as an author for "The Great Plains," which won him the Loubat Award. He won the Collins Award for "The Great Frontier," and received the $10,000 award from the American Council of Learned Societies for serving as editor in chief for the monumental work, "The Handbook of Texas."

Dr. Webb himself considered the two books were the most ideal of his writings. However, all of his books were acclaimed by critics as superb examples of histories.

His book, "The Texas Rangers," was filmed by Paramount Pictures in 1936. Among other noted writings by Dr. Webb were "Divided We Stand," "More Water for Texas," and "An Honest Preface."

Dr. Webb was a former director of the Texas State Historical Association and edited its Southwestern Historical Quarterly for several years.

He was president of the American Historical Association in 1958 and president of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association in 1955.

In spite of the time taken for his prolific writings, Dr. Webb continued to teach until his death, even during the last 2 years when he was working under a $91,000 Ford Foundation grant for videotaping the great names in contemporary history into an integrated course in American civilization.

Although all scholars and critics respected his abilities as a teacher and author, some of his historical theories nevertheless brought sharp criticism. A story he wrote for Harper's magazine picturing the American West as a desert of varying intensity in the cultural, geographic, political, and historical fields touched off the biggest storm of his career. Chambers of commerce from 17 States howled loudly about the article.

His book, "Divided We Stand," brought much criticism from the South in 1937. But it touched off such a storm of political and economic soul searching that President Franklin D. Roosevelt designated the South as an area in need of much economic aid after he had read the book.

Among Webb's many honors were Guggenheim Fellowships and a Bureau of Reclamation Award.

Webb's courses at the University of Texas and his lectures at other universities, along with his many books, resulted in his being invited to address the International Congress of Historians of the United States and Mexico and the International Historical Congress in Paris. In addition to his books, he authored numerous articles and pamphlets.

FOR YEARS WE THREE SAT TOGETHER

(By J. Frank Dobie)

Walter Prescott Webb and I were born in the same year, 1888. He belonged to one drought-scarred part of Texas, I to another. His father was a country school teacher who homesteaded a quarter-section of poor land; mine was a rancher who rather expected that education would lead his sons to a better occupation. Webb came to the University of Texas as instructor in history in 1918, while I was a soldier in France, 4 years after I had come as instructor in English. We advanced concurrently, along divergent ways, as underlings at the university.

Our friendship developed more after about 1930, it seems to me, but I was never close to him as I was with Roy Bedichek, the dearest comrade of my life. Webb had sides never revealed directly to me. Bedichek died shortly before noon of May 21, 1959, while sitting in a chair waiting for his wife's cornbread to cook so that he could eat an early lunch and then drive me and Wilson Hudson in his pickup out to Paisano, my place on Barton Creek in the hills west of Austin. When he drove to where cedar stumps were available he liked to haul some in for his fireplace. As writers and men, Bedichek, Webb, and Dobie have been linked together—mostly by Texas people—many times in speech and in print.

On the evening of March 8, 1963, two other men and I sat down as guests with Frank Wardlaw in his home. He said, "Walter Webb thought he would join us, but he will be late." After conversation and "the better adjuncts of water," we went to a Mexican restaurant. Nobody knew where we were. Before we got back to our homes a number of people had tried to telephone Wardlaw and me. About 6:30 o'clock Webb and his wife had been found on the ground near their overturned car, he dead and she so severely injured that she had to remain in a hospital for 3 months.

Bedichek was a kind of peg on which my happiest associations with Webb hung. For years we three sat together, with other men, at the same table during fortnightly dinners, "papers," and discussions of the Town and Gown Club of Austin, but talk at our table was seldom so free and personal as it always was at prolonged picnic suppers in the country. Bedichek was the habitual planner of these supper parties, also cooker of the steaks. A vegetarian by philosophy in the later years of his life, he never threw off on his own steaks. The earliest of these picnic suppers that I remember were not far beyond the Rob Roy ranch, some distance off the Bee Caves road in the hills west of Austin. Bedi liked to camp high up. At one hilltop camp we looked down on bullbats (nighthawks) booming as they dived for insects. After Webb, in 1942, acquired Friday Mountain ranch, a location there on Bear Creek became our supping and conversation grounds, though in the fifties we went several times to a place I then owned in Burnet County named Cherry Springs—on account of wild cherry trees growing by Fall Creek.

I got so that I took along potato salad prepared by Bertha Dobie as nobody else could prepare it. Someone might take something else, but Bedichek brought steaks, bread, tomatoes, lettuce, beer, and so on, and then saw that each man paid his share. Nobody was host and the drinking was moderate—one can of beer for Bedi. Webb did not really care for any. When he took whisky, on other occasions, a jigger without water would do him all evening. He had not drunk at all until he was about 50. Sitting with the dons after dinner at his college in Oxford, he had developed a mild taste for wine. He craved coffee, which Bedichek was particular in boiling and which he furnished, along with pot, tin plates, knives and forks.

Mody Boatright and Wilson Hudson, both of the University of Texas English department, were regulars at these campfire suppers. After Frank Wardlaw came as director of the University Press, he added to talk and geniality. Any time that John Henry Faulk or Glen Evans was in town, he was there. One time, during World War II, Faulk brought an Englishman along, and in capping limericks with each other both proved themselves bottomless artesian wells. I remember Coke Stevenson, then Governor, saying at one supper—the only one he attended—that the American frontiersman carried a rifle, and axe, and a Bible. This was at Friday Mountain. We were by the same water when Homer Price Rainey, president of the university, told us that the regents were out to gut him. Ours was no club in any organized way, and we never had regular gatherings, but all of us were liberal enough to be for Rainey and against the reactionary regents who for several years dominated the university.

While dismissing Rainey, the regents, in October 1944 elected Dr. T. S. Painter as acting president. Immediately thereafter he said in a letter addressed to the faculty: "I want it definitely understood that I am not a candidate for the position of permanent president, and I would not accept it if it were offered to me." The regents wanted an agent. Before long it was clear that they had what they wanted. When, in May 1946 they elected him president and he accepted the offer, a caucus of faculty men asked Webb to formulate their opinions. At a special meeting of the faculty a few days later Webb countered a resolution "assuring President Painter of our support and cooperation" with one expressing "deep regret that Dr. Painter has not reciprocated the trust the faculty reposed in him, but has, on the contrary broken faith and violated his pledge." The Webb motion of disconfidence failed to carry by a vote of 160 to 186.

His "Divided We Stand" (1937) was a stand for fairness. Based on figures in the World Almanac and the U.S. census, it made out a case against the prospering North for keeping the South in poverty as a colonial dependent until Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal reversed the trend. Later Webb made clear that vast oil fields and rising industrialism in the South resulting from World War II advanced the region's prosperity.

Few other men of his stature and intellectual power had experienced so intimately the choke of poverty. The extremity of it is set forth in his essay, "The Search for William E. Hinds." As prosperity made him aware of the independence that it gives to an individual, he became, it seems to me, more actively considerate of that basis of freedom for other individuals and for Texas and the South.

In his later years Webb drew a good salary as distinguished professor. Beyond salaries (and motion picture rights amounting to $10,000 on his book "The Texas Rangers") he prospered through investing earnings from teaching and writing—especially from two textbooks—in real estate. A few years ago he drew up a plan to enable faculty members of the University of Texas who so wished and who had the money to invest in real estate. This plan, as far as I know, never got into operation.

Several times I heard him speak of the influence of L. M. Keasbey on his life. Before World War I, Keasbey, a professor in the university, gave a course on economics—though it was entitled "institutional history"—in which he emphasized one way to get rich: invest in land that the activities of an increasing population will make more valuable, very valuable if the land be chosen judiciously. At the time Webb was absorbing directions to the "unearned increment," an Austin peddler and then wholesale shipper of vegetables named M. H. Crockett took the Keasbey course. He, as I observed and as I heard him tell with pride, became expert in anticipating traffic routes of the city; he died one of the richest property owners in it.

Webb wrote little on civil rights. A few years after the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on the desegregation of public schools, he could write and speak on the South's advancing economic prosperity without touching on the Negro economically or otherwise. Yet he did not ignore the subject. In a paper to have been delivered at Rice University shortly after he died, he said: "The southerner is so concerned with the racial issue that he has no time for anything else. This is the first issue that has plagued the South since 1820. The racial issue is too heavy to move; it is too green to burn; the best we can do for the present is to plow around it and cultivate the rest of the field."

Friday Mountain Ranch in the hills 17 miles southwest of Austin, consists of approximately a section of land that was, when Webb acquired it, eroded, devoid of humus, bare of vegetation beyond trees, cedars on the hills, and broomweeds in the valley. He had wastage accumulated at cotton gins east of Austin hauled out to spread on the ground. He applied commercial fertilizer to plots no longer tillable. While he was Harmsworth professor of American history at Oxford University, 1942–43, he gave his address to the English "Who's Who" at Friday Mountain Ranch, Austin, Tex. He belonged to it. During the terrible drought that began late in the 1940's and did not end until 1957 he made slow progress in restoring the soil and growing a turf of grass—a turf that reached its climax the spring he died.

He figured that the land should someday pay for the expenses he had been out on it. It did, by increase of real estate prices. Beyond all, he valued and enjoyed grass for itself, beautiful on any land, the mark of bounty on ground once impoverished. Several times when I was with him where grass flourished I saw him gather seeds of sideoats grama, little bluestem, Indian grass, and switch grass to take to Friday Mountain and scatter around. I suppose he bought seeds by the bushel also. In planning near the end of his life to transfer title to the land, he chose as purchaser a friend, Rodney Kidd, who would maintain the turf.

He was not a naturalist in the way that Bedichek was, but he observed. Twice at least he told me that we had missed much out of life by not learning botany while growing up in the country. One time as four or five of us were riding in a car along Fall Creek in Burnet County he called out to halt. He had spotted a hackberry, about 20 feet high, growing up through the hollow trunk of a big dead live oak. He did not swim, but the pools of water impounded by dams he had constructed across Bear Creek gave him as much pleasure as any swimming hole ever gave any swimmer.

His brief book "Flat Top: A Story of Modern Ranching," printed and published by Carl Hertzog of El Paso in 1960, is on grass and a man of grass named Charles Pettit. In 1938 Mr. Pettit bought 7,000 acres, to which he added 10,000 of wornout, eroded farms. Year after year he combated weeds, prickly pear, and other competitors of grass. Year after year he applied fertilizer, planted clover, put out seeds of native grasses. He impounded over 3,400 acre-feet of water, brought back a turf of grasses waist high. After living with the land for a quarter of a century, he made the ranch pay. "The man really loves grass," Webb wrote. If Webb also had not loved grass, he would never have written this account of a model ranch in conservation practices.

About the time I was leaving for England late in 1945 to teach in a GI university, a civilized man of wealth who demanded anonymity granted a sum of money to relieve Roy Bedichek for a year from his duties as director of the Interscholastic League of Texas. He had a book to write. Webb invited him to take over a big upstairs room with a fireplace in the old Friday Mountain rock house, originally built for a boys' academy. Here, eager in his liberation, Bedichek made shelves of apple boxes to hold his books, carried water by bucket from a dug well, brought up wood, cooked over the fire. Through the year 1956 he worked at a table in front of the fireplace.

Chickens mechanically grown in rooms downstairs did not bother him. In fact, he based one of his richest chapters on "Denatured Chickens." Association with himself, letting his richly stored mind play, adding meanings to long-accumulating observations on people, birds, wild flowers, trees, and other forms of life, he achieved "Adventures With a Texas Naturalist." Published in 1947, it was 14 years later taken over by the University of Texas Press, an institution that Webb, more than any other man in the faculty, had furthered. "The Bedichek Room" remains, through Webb and Rodney Kidd, a feature at Friday Mountain.

Webb's "The Great Frontier," officially published December 8, 1952, won the Carr P. Collins award of $1,000 given annually by the Texas Institute of Letters. His response to the presentation was the after-dinner address to the institute, and mighty fidgety he was before dinner. He asked me, also others, to notice how people received what he had to say, something so intimate to him that he shrank from making it public. He read his say. It was the most moving I have heard any man utter. It moved deeply all who heard it. He waited a long time to publish it, with some added details, under title of "The Search for William E. Hinds," in Harper's magazine, July 1961. Reader's Digest published a condensation of it the following month.

The subject of autobiography came up several times among us while Bedichek was still on hand, iterating that he lacked the genius of Jean Jacques Rousseau for confession. As Webb was leaving my room one day in 1960, I again spoke about autobiography. He volunteered that he had written one while at Oxford University, 1942–43. He did not go into detail. The whole cannot, I believe, have anything else so intensely, so poignantly personal as the chapter in which he tells of a response received in 1904 to a letter he had written to the letter column of the Sunny South. It was from William E. Hinds of New York, an utter stranger, not only commending his ambition to be a writer but offering to send him books and magazines. Later this William E. Hinds urged him to get a college education and loaned him money while he was attending the University of Texas. Hinds died 45 years before Webb's obligation to him became a chapter in published literature.

It resulted in many letters from unknowns, some sending money to help students as Hinds had helped Webb. For years he had been concerned over some way to requite Hinds and had given financial aid to able but needy students. He now set up the William E. Hinds scholarship fund at the University of Texas. After his death a check donating money to it was found in his pocketbook; it is an ultimate beneficiary in his will. The Hinds-Webb scholarship fund is now the official name.

I have no recollection of having heard Webb speak at any time of his soul, his religion, or God. He belonged to no church, ignored churches, liked some freethinkers, some churchmen, especially Dr. Edmund Heinsohn, long pastor of the University Methodist Church in Austin. After Heinsohn became a member of Town and Gown years ago, he often sat with Bedichek, Webb, and Dobie. He conducted Bedichek's funeral services, reading into them an interpretation of the man's character. At Webb's funeral he read an interpretive sketch of Webb's life. "I remain an agnostic," Somerset Maugham wrote in "The Summing Up," "and the practical outcome of agnosticism is that you act as though God did not exist." As far as I can see, Walter Webb's positive goodness bore no relation to what is called God. His conduct was not determined by Biblical injunctions or by expectation of reward in some sort of post mortem existence. His mother is said to have been a fundamentalist, his father a skeptic who read the Bible in order to refute more specifically some of her credulities.

I cannot imagine Webb's "praying for guidance," but at one time he believed in something beyond. After he married in 1916 he was teaching in San Antonio and became so low spirited over the future that he, as I recall his story, was about to take a job in a jewelry store. He consulted a noted fortuneteller known as Madam Skirls. She said: "The child will be a girl. I see nothing but books." With books he continued.

If the radical right appeared unjust and undemocratic to him, the radical left increasingly annoyed him. He was not a crusader and was not contentious. He sometimes wished, he once told me, that he did not have to think. He hungered after brightness and cheerful talk. His sense of humor tended to progress from anecdotes of rusticity to sharp wit. He loved stories, especially of people, and told them well. He held—at one time, at least—that a certain strengthening of the mind comes through playing poker. He liked to play poker and played with skill.

One time while we were walking along the railroad about Third Street in Austin, we stopped beside an oldtime locomotive, stationary, throbbing with power. Webb said, "That is the greatest manifestation of power in the world." I told him that out of respect for its symbolism of power, Dr. Sanders, professor of Latin and Greek at Southwestern University about the beginning of the century, would remove his hat in salute to a steam engine pulling a train past him.

Whether Webb actually ever hated anybody I cannot say. I never heard him express hatred of any kind. He could be caustic, as when he wished that birth control had been in practice before a certain individual was born. He was more inclined to set forth the facts about a man than to praise or condemn. He inclined to the policy of Gov. Jim Ferguson, who said, "I never use up energy hating." He was tolerant of human vagaries. He had developed as professor and historian under the late Dr. Eugene C. Barker, for years head of the history department of the University of Texas. Barker's directness and his integrity were admirable. I myself owe considerable to him. The older he grew, the more conservative, even reactionary, he grew. He seemed in his later years to think that the masses of mankind need a kind of dictatorial direction in religion, politics, and other regions of life. While Dr. Barker became hostile, in his acrid way, to the New Deal and a strong bolster to the by-no-means-intellectual regents who deposed Rainey, mainly for being a New Dealer, Webb was strong for Franklin D. Roosevelt, as he was later for Truman. But he was never against Barker. "I did not understand him," I heard him say, "but he was my friend and supporter. He was open, generous, fearless. I remember him with respect."

Webb maintained a dim view of certain English teachers under whom he had studied in the University of Texas. He acknowledged no debt to them in mastering the craft of writing. Some time in the 1920's he was avidly reading O. Henry and trying out his own hand on short stories. I remember one based on an electric sign above Joske's store in San Antonio that every night flashed on the picture of a cowboy roping a steer.

I wish he had written more on the craft of writing. I quote from his essay "On the Writing of Books," published in the Alcalde, June 1952 (and repeated with changes and additions in his presidential address to the American historical association, reproduced in the Texas Observer, January 24, 1959):

"It takes a good deal of ego to write a book. All authors have ego; most of them try to conceal it under a cloak of assumed modesty which they put on with unbecoming immodesty. This ego makes itself manifest in the following ways: (1) The author believes he has something to say. (2) He believes it is worth saying. (3) He believes he can say it better than anyone else. If he ever stops to doubt any one of these three beliefs, he immediately loses that confidence and self-deception—that ego, if you please—so essential to authorship. In effect, the author, to write a book, spins out of his own mind a cocoon, goes mentally into it, seals it up, and never comes out until the job is done. That explains why authors hide out, hole up in hotel rooms, neglect their friends, their family, and their creditors * * * they may even neglect their students. They neglect everything that may tend to destroy their grand illusion."

The longer Webb jousted with words and thoughts, the finer tempered his blade became. His use of the specific to bring home an idea suggests in style Jesus' application of the parable. His "The American West, Perpetual Mirage" (Harper's magazine, May 1957) is as brilliant as any historical essay I have read. With what economy does he set forth the core:

"The overriding influence that shapes the West is the desert. That is its one unifying force. It permeates the plains, climbs to all but the highest mountain peaks, dwells continuously in the valleys, and plunges down the Pacific slope to argue with the sea."

Webb's generalizations are conclusions drawn from and supported by the concrete:

"Western history is bizarre because of the nature of what it has got. The historians and other writers do what men have always done in the desert. They make the best of what little they do have. Westerners have developed a talent for taking something small and blowing it up to giant size, as a photographer blows up a photograph.

"They write of cowboys as if they were noble knights, and the cowmen kings. They do biographies of bad men, Billy the Kid, the Plummer gang, and Sam Bass, of bad women like Calamity Jane, of gunmen like Wyatt Earp and Wild Bill Hickok. They blow the abandoned saloon up into an art museum, and Boot Hill into a shrine for pilgrims. In Montana Charlie Russell is better than Titian, and in the Black Hills Frederick Remington is greater than Michelangelo. Custer, who blundered to his death, taking better men with him, found a place in every saloon not already preempted to that travesty on decency and justice, Judge Roy Bean."

Some commentators have characterized Webb as a great Texan. "We Texans," he wrote me in 1957, "have been as insular as Kansas—God save the mark." I remember well, with a certain personal shrinking, a period when his boundaries and my boundaries were to an extent circumscribed by the boundaries of Texas. Each of us in his way passed to a perspective beyond geographical lines, though each remained deeply marked by the land he lived in and by the inhabitants of that land. The greatness of Webb was as a man. "Man thinking"—Emerson's definition of a scholar—does not have around his head a band welded there by the confines of a province, by clerical ukases, or by any other mundane restrictions. Webb was not finely suited to life at Oxford University. He belonged to and marked the University of Texas. Only a few months before the end he published an opinion that it now had within its grasp the long-sought-for status of "a university of the first class." All the while he maintained the critical judgment of "man thinking":

"Men at Oxford are free to follow their compass of truth wherever the needle points without looking over their shoulders to see what hounds are pursuing them. Professors are not even under suspicion. An Oxford man can attend a mass meeting in London and participate without jeopardizing his job. England is not afraid to have views expressed. England, with all its apparent stupidities, seems to know what a university really is."

In "For Whom the Historian Tolls," in "An Honest Preface and Other Essays," with an introduction by Joe B. Frantz (1959), Webb provided this economical illumination:

"Articles by historians in historical journals are correct, the sentences usually—after the editors get though with them—are grammatical, and the footnotes are properly right at the bottom of the page. But one finds in them little charm, few vivid figures of speech, and practically none of that soft luminosity—an indefinable quality—which suffuses good writing. The reader may be informed, but he is rarely lured, enthralled, or captivated by the art of the performance."

Webb's chief research was for facts to lead to understanding. His superiority as an historian lies in his perception, his power of thought, his mastery of language, his interpretations of the land and the ever-evolving currents of human affairs. Not long after his first major book, "The Great Plains," came out in 1931, Clem Yore of Colorado reported on a gathering of Western fiction writers who had been unaware of the meaning of barbed wire, windmills over wells drilled into the ground, the treeless plains themselves until Webb enlightened them. In his last big book, "The Great Frontier," he interprets the Western Hemisphere as a frontier for the expansion of Europe. He says plainly and emphatically that America has been consuming irreplaceable natural resources and that prosperity based on such procedure cannot continue. He even questions the continuance of democracy. This book came out during the outrage of McCarthyism and of the House Un-American Activities Committee's blackguard betrayals of human rights. Some fanatics, without reading the book, slammed it as an "un-American" rebuke to "free enterprise." Webb never considered boosters as exemplars of patriotism.

The first Mrs. Webb, Jane Oliphant, after having been married to Walter for more than 43 years, died in the summer of 1960, survived by a daughter, Mildred, of whom father as well as mother was very fond. In December of 1961 he married Terrell Maverick, widow of the late Maury Maverick of San Antonio, vivacious in mind and body, delightful and sensible too.

Considering his love for her and considering her marrying him, he said, "This is an unexpected dividend from life." He was openly naive in expressing joy in her being. He had, as it were, been born again. His happy ardency made his friends rejoice. During the summer of 1962 while he was lecturing at the University of Alaska, she unable to accompany him as both had planned, he airmailed a letter to her every day. He had never seemed so eagerly active over the publication of one of his own books as he was over publishing "Washington Wife," by Ellen Maury Slayden, the manuscript of which Terrell Webb had inherited and which both of them foreworded. They autographed the book in a San Antonio bookstore the last afternoon of Webb's life.

Any man who had seen and been a part of life wants to leave it before decomposing into a juiceless vegetable. Webb died standing up, as Caesar considered it meet for a man to die. In a flash he passed from wisdom and happiness to the finality of death. No person who has added as much to the heritage of human life as Walter Webb added ceases to be. His thinking, his writing, and his standing up will surely continue as elements of his projected shadow.

AN UNFASHIONABLE KIND OF HISTORIAN

(By John Fischer)

To the joy of his editors, Walter Prescott Webb was an unfashionable kind of historian. Some of his colleagues, indeed, regarded him as a scandal to the profession, because he shamelessly practiced three heresies:

1. He believed that history was a branch of literature. Consequently he tried to write as well as he could; and he was still laboring to perfect his craftsmanship in prose almost till the day of his death. He had no patience with the view, so widespread among his contemporaries, that any scholar who writes with grace, clarity, and style must be a "popularizer," and therefore unsound. Quite the contrary: Dr. Webb cherished the old-fashioned notion that anything worth writing ought to be worth reading too, and that a wide audience in no way cheapened a conscientious author. The result was that he earned himself a place among that handful of contemporary American historians—including such people as Garrett Mattingly, Bernard DeVoto, and Barbara Tuchman—whose work is read by laymen with genuine pleasure. (In England, of course, this sort of historian is less rare; but the tradition there has seldom confused scholarship with pedantry.)

2. He believed that a historian's objectivity need not bar him from holding, and expressing, strong convictions. His studies—and his deep involvement in the life around him—led him to certain conclusions about American politics, economics, and leadership. He urged these views right out in public, even when they were considered unseemly—or downright dangerous—for a man in academic life. Dr. Webb expected retaliation, and he got it. For example, he always believed that his appointment to a distinguished professorship was delayed for years by members of the board of regents who felt that teachers should keep their mouths shut on public issues—especially when they disagreed with the Texas Establishment. But I never heard him complain about such treatment. "Anybody who walks into a fight," he once remarked, "has got to expect to get some lumps." I got the impression that he enjoyed the fight, and felt he had dealt out more lumps than he got.

3. He wasn't afraid to tackle big subjects. Now and then he would talk—with a mixture of sorrow, amusement, and contempt—about fledgling historians who would devote years of labor to some safe, respectable little theme such as "Some Aspects of Southwestern Agrarian Policy Between 1868 and 1875," for example, or "Sources of Economic Data on Early Settlements Below the Brazos"—two mythical Ph. D. dissertations he used to cite when bemoaning the caliber of latter day graduate students. For himself, Dr. Webb preferred subjects that offered plenty of elbow room. How the South and Southwest had been treated like exploited colonies of the predatory easterners * * * what the closing of the last frontier would do to society, not just in America but throughout the world * * * what price we would have to pay for our folly in building cities where God meant to have a desert: these were ideas of a size he thought worth tackling.

Some critics objected that his subjects were so sweeping as to be unmanageable, and that his intuition and eloquence occasionally outran his documentation. (They also were horrified when he expounded them, not in professional journals, but in Harper's magazine and other lay publications.) This didn't bother him. Dr. Webb thought of himself—if I understood him correctly—as a kind of scout on the frontiers of history. His job was to explore the terrain, to spot the big ideas, to discover new watersheds of the mind. More pedestrian characters could follow later, to document his findings and stake out the section lines with surveyors' accuracy. After all, Kit Carson never had time to carry a theodolite and plane table, either.

Immodest? Maybe so. Most big men (and good writers) are not noted for their modesty. In demeanor and personal behavior, I never knew a man more modest than Walter; but about his work he did have an outsized self-confidence. Indeed, I am convinced that this is an essential characteristic of any writer who amounts to much. The vocation is so lonely, demanding, and beset with discouragements that men with shrunken egos are likely to give it up pretty quickly for some less demanding work, such as plumbing or the oil business.

So I was not surprised when Walter told me one night, over a glass of bourbon, that his main ambition was to found a school of historians. He wanted to gather a band of disciples, who could grasp his main ideas and develop them in a series of books to be written over a period of maybe 20 years. He would like to serve as general editor for the series, and if he could get a foundation grant perhaps he could gather the main contributors together under one roof somewhere in Texas.

Well, it didn't work out quite that way; and perhaps he never really expected it to—after all, he was nearly 70 at the time of the conversation. But I could never be sure how serious Walter was about his future plans, because it never seemed to occur to him that he was growing older. He was always as eager to take on new projects—a major television series, a marriage, the editing of the Slayden Diaries—as if he were a youngster just starting out.

It was significant, I think, that the magazine article which gave him most pleasure was "The Search for William E. Hinds," published in Harper's in July 1961. This was really the story of his own beginnings, and of the unknown benefactor who helped Walter to climb up from the cotton patch. In his later years he had become obsessed with the notion that he ought to find out all he could about this obscure and long-dead New York businessman, and to create a literary memorial to Hinds' goodness. The result, in first draft, was overwritten and sentimental. A suggestion that a little editorial pruning might help made Walter indignant; but after snorting and stomping for a few days, he came around. The final version was still charged with emotion—with a deep feeling that the Webb debt to Hinds still had not been fully repaid—and it evoked a remarkable response from hundreds of readers. When the article was reprinted in the Reader's Digest, the flood of letters redoubled; many of them contained checks for the Hinds Fund, which Walter had established to help students as needy as he once was.

In our last conversation, Walter told me he was as proud of that article as anything he had ever written "because it moved so many people to do something worthwhile." This, I suspect, was the yardstick he applied subconsciously to all his writing. Unconventional as it may be for a historian, I don't know where any writer can find a better measure.

GOING TO PLACES IN THE PASTURE

(By Rodney Kidd)

Dr. Webb and I met at the Night Hawk on South Congress on a wet, rainy November day in 1946 and decided to open a boys' camp at his Friday Mountain Ranch in the summer of 1947. He gave his word and I gave mine and the agreement was in effect. He liked to operate on a simple, man to man basis, your word and his word. We did business that way for 17 years and never a cross word passed between us.

Mr. Bedichek told me, "Kidd, Dr. Webb is a very sensitive person. His feelings are very tender and they can be hurt easily. He is a man of few words. He will not impose on you and neither will he let you impose on him. You will always know how he stands on matters. You will find him intensely honest, and he knows how to make money."

After we had been in business for about a year, I found out that Dr. Webb had borrowed $10,000 to repair the old Johnston Institute Building on the ranch and to get things ready for the camp. I was a country boy from Georgetown and Kingsville, just out of a long depression and Southwestern University, and this move by Dr. Webb scared me. When I mentioned it to him, he said he did not tell me because he was afraid I would back out.

The ranch seemed to provide him the kind of relaxation, rest, and diversion he wanted and needed. He enjoyed going to the auction barns on Mondays with Mr. Garrett, either to sell or buy a few head of stock. Many times in the summer he would go without a coat, and one could see his wallet in his back pocket, with several hundred dollar bills exposed. Mr. Bedichek was afraid someone might rob him.

The year the camp opened, a 5-year drought began. Bear Creek and Onion Creek dried up, except for potholes of water. Windy Cove, a favorite swimming hole, and the Archer Pool were not fit for swimming. While I was primarily interested in working with the boys and developing their capacities, Dr. Webb was interested in restoring the soil, in resodding the native grasses, and in having fun with Mr. Garrett in his ranching program. Dr. Webb refused to have any thing to do with running the boys' camp. However, he liked to see the crowds from a distance, enjoying the beauty and tranquillity of the ranch. When the last parent had pulled out, he would come up to find out how things had gone. "Rodney," he would say, "you talk to the parents and run the camp. I will communicate with the grass and with nature. There is no back talk from my project."

Mr. and Mrs. Garrett were devoted to him. Mrs. Garrett always prepared the kind of meals he liked. Dr. Webb furnished the money and materials and Mr. Garrett the labor for a cottage that was the site of many happy storytellings, domino games, and plans to get rich in the livestock business. Dr. Webb told me he never expected to make any money from his farming, ranching, or hog raising. He explained that some men spent their money for country clubs, travel, wine, or other things, but he liked to spend his at the ranch, experimenting with Mr. Garrett's get-rich plans. Together they built barns, bought cattle, sold cattle, bought hogs, sold hogs, planted grass, cut cedar, and cleared land. They told a lot of stories but they never made money on a single project.

Mr. Garrett had a great deal of native ability but very meager education. He was a carpenter, mechanic, electrician, plumber, and stockman; he could do all kinds of chores around the ranch. Besides, he was a marvelous storyteller, and I think this is what Dr. Webb loved most. Gathered around the Garrett table, we would listen to the host tell about the time he was electrocuted doing some repair work at Robstown. The people called a doctor, and the doctor pronounced him dead; they called for the undertaker to come and pick him up. He could hear all of this, but he could not move an arm or a muscle, or raise his voice. He said he realized that unless something was done he would wind up in the funeral home and in a hearse on the way to the graveyard. Finally, he was able to move an eyebrow, and someone happened to see it. An hour later he was back on the job.

When Dr. Webb and Mr. Garrett were in the cattle business, Mr. Garrett would get out his pencil and paper, and they would sit around the dinner table figuring how they could make $10,000 next year by planting a certain field in oats, another in maize, and by marketing their stock at certain seasons. Dr. Webb knew very well that these figures would not work out, but he said that this was a better life than belonging to a country club.

In June of 1962, while Dr. Webb was in Alaska, Mr. Garrett went down to the field to check on some sheep. While there, he had a heart attack and passed away. When I drove my car into the field to pick up the body, I watched his eyebrow for some time, hoping to see it twitch again. But the man Dr. Webb described as "the bull of the woods" was gone. I called Dr. Webb in Alaska. With the death of one of his best friends, Dr. Webb found that the ranch had lost some of its appeal, and his interest in farming and ranching began to wane.

Frequently, I would look out across the pastures at Friday Mountain and see someone moving about, bending over, examining the flowers, the weeds, the blades of grass. It would be Dr. Webb, going to places in the pasture where he had planted native grasses. He liked to bring to the ranch people who were interested in the soil, the water, and the grasses. Annually he purchased commercial fertilizer for the pastures where the land had been barren for many years. Bulldozers were brought in to remove the cedar from the hills so the grass and the oaks could grow. For many years no hunting was allowed.

Dr. Webb loved the simple, quiet things of life. He did not indulge in strong drink; he did not relate dirty and smutty stories; he was a great lover of the out-of-doors. I have been with him at the camp, in the woods, around campfires, at banquets, in hotels, with his family and with my family. At all times he was the same: humble, quiet, and considerate of the wishes and desires of others. He never pressed or pushed for the things that he personally might choose to do. He "cast a long shadow."

IMPORTANT PERSONS

In the course of his memorable oration at Dr. Webb's funeral, Dr. Edmund Heinsohn told some stories that brought Webb vividly into view:

"He loved all kinds of people. He loved the sinners, but not their sins. Shine boys and members of all classes and races were his friends. He and an associate made a trip to Kingsville where he was to deliver a commencement address. It took him 5 days to go and return. In every community he wanted to stop and get some friends for a coffee-drinking conversation. Many of these friends were not academicians. But to him they were important persons."

To the basic loyalties of life he was true. The elemental human relationships he would not violate. He was also true to himself, and to be so he kept himself in proper perspective. He said that when he thought himself "a big shot," all he needed to do to get himself in right perspective was to go to San Antonio and stand on the street corner at the Gunter Hotel and ask himself how many of the passing crowd had ever heard of Walter Webb, and how many knew of the University of Texas and had any interest in it. Seeing himself in proper perspective made it possible for him to be courageous and unafraid. A short time before his controversial article in Harper's magazine appeared, he and two friends were together in El Paso. Both of these friends warned him that if that article was published he would lose every friend he ever had. He was silent for a few moments, and then answered: "I can't help it. I'll have to publish it."

He had a conscience about helping students who were in need of help. Applicants for help were never asked about their grades. This was his way of trying to pay the debt he owed to William E. Hinds, the man who had made possible his early college education. A man came into Dr. Webb's office one day for financial assistance. Another faculty member came in a short time after the visitor for help had left. The faculty member inquired if Dr. Webb had had a caller and if he gave him anything. Dr. Webb replied that he had let the man have $100. The faculty member retorted: "That fellow is a professional bum; he has gotten money from a number of men, is leaving the city and is down at the railway station now." Dr. Webb jumped up and said: "I'll get that guy." He rushed down to the station and boarded the train and found his man. Later in the day the faculty member saw Dr. Webb and asked him what had happened when he confronted the man. Dr. Webb answered: "You know, that fellow was so open and aboveboard about the whole matter, I let him have another $100." Dr. Webb always liked a consummate artist, even though he be a crook and a scoundrel.

Beneath his occasional bluntness and gruffness there was a fine sensitivity. He could even become deeply sentimental. The Friday Mountain camp had meant much to him: He could cry while giving expression to his great concern for the preservation of the grass there. He was asked one time if he had ever done anything that he looked back to with regret. The answer came in the affirmative. He had been visiting Houghton Mifflin in Boston, and he was given a copy of Walter Millis' "The Road to War" to look over. The jacket on the book was vivid red. He went out into a park to sit down and laid the book on the bench beside him. Two little Italian children, a girl about 9 years old and her little brother about 5, came by. They were poor and dirty. The little boy was attracted by the book, and as he edged up to the bench and was reaching his hand out to it, Dr. Webb reached out and pulled it away. As he did so, the little girl very calmly said to her brother, "Don't touch the book, it's too nice for you." There was no resentment and no complaining by the little sister, just a statement of fact. "It's too nice for you." Dr. Webb said: "I would give anything to be able to live that over, and not to move the book away. It has bothered me for years."

WEBB MY TEACHER

(By Wilson Hudson)

On March 2, 1963, Walter Prescott Webb wrote this on one of the end leaves of "Washington Wife": "To my friend from away back." Our friendship began in 1925 and lasted until the fatal automobile accident on March 8. Through all the phases of his career he was the same—straightforward, cheerful, and companionable. He was always ready for a chat or a cup of coffee, no matter how busy he was.

It was my good fortune to take history 9 as a freshman under Webb and Duncalf, who has also left us. They took turns in lecturing to about 150 students in the big auditorium of the old Law Building. On Fridays we were divided into quiz sections, and Webb happened to be my quizmaster.

He lectured from notes, with the corners of his mouth turned down as if he were not particularly enjoying what he was doing. It has been my impression that he did not care to speak before large groups of people, nor did he like to get very far from written copy. He had the information and he knew how to impart the maximum in 50 minutes; he did not consider himself an entertainer and he made no use of attention-catching tricks or gadgets. In the Friday quiz sessions he would give us a short discussion question and then make us talk about the week's work. He dealt in ideas and drew us out. In taking notes on the Monday and Wednesday lectures and making summaries of collateral reading, I wrote much more than in freshman English and learned a great deal more about writing.

One of the books on the collateral list was Ellen Semple's "Influences of Geographic Environment," which Webb later told me he had placed there himself. In the first week of school I dipped into this book and experienced a strong intellectual thrill. The first sentence was loaded with implications: "Man is a product of the earth's surface." In a wide-ranging discussion Semple showed that men's way of life, laws, myths, mental attitudes, and even their bodies vary according to their geographical situation. To someone who had not gone very far beyond the dogma that man is a special creation of the Deity formed in His image to do His will, this was illuminating and liberative. In Semple's book I was being introduced to what was a basic element in Webb's approach to history: Environment comes first and strongly influences human institutions. This, I learned years afterward was the orientation of Lindley Miller Keasbey, Webb's teacher at the university. As the shadow of the library crept up the side of the old main building, I sat reading. I was late for supper that night.

I took no more courses in history but continued to see Webb from time to time. I became a page in the library, and he was a frequent visitor to the stacks. When he began to work on "The Great Plains" he went at such a pace that he could not come for the books he needed but would leave a list to be gathered together and brought to his office. He paid another page, who came at 7 in the morning, to bring the books to him. He was so immersed in study and writing that he seemed to be in a daze; the unifying idea for "The Great Plains" had come to him so forcefully that he had set aside "The Texas Rangers" and was working at a white heat. He practically lived in his office.

A graduate student who had seen some of Webb's manuscripts made this comment on his style: "He's no Macaulay, but he gets there in his homely way." Today we give thanks that he didn't take Macaulay for a model. No small part of the merit of "The Great Plains" is its directness, simplicity, and clarity of expression. In freshman English, which he took at the university, Webb had not fared well under the instruction of a man who wanted his students to write like Charles Lamb. As a writer Webb totally eclipsed this instructor, who in a long life of composing little articles never faced a task of any magnitude or produced a single book. When "The Great Plains" appeared in an inexpensive edition, at my suggestion it was made one of several optional texts in freshman English. I have taught it repeatedly as a model of historical writing, first at the University of Chicago. It has a clear-cut pair of basic terms, land and people, and it is beautifully organized.

It is well known that Webb befriended many students and even lent money to them without looking up their grades. Once he gave me some much-needed help. On the eve of graduation day in May of 1930, when I was to receive an M.A. in English, I was walking along Congress Avenue. As I approached Sixth Street I heard someone call to me from a car stopped in the middle of the street. I went out and found Dr. Webb (as we always addressed him even before he had the degree) seated beside the driver.

"You're getting your master's degree tomorrow, aren't you?" he asked.

"Yes, sir."

"You want a job this summer?"

"Yes, sir."

"This is Mr. Ferguson, dean of Stephen F. Austin State Teachers College in Nacogdoches. He's taking his doctor's tomorrow. Meet him after the ceremony and he'll tell you how to get to Nacogdoches and when to be there."

This was all. The next afternoon I was on board a train for Jacksonville, where I had to change to a bus in order to reach Nacogdoches. Of course I was very grateful to Webb at the time. When I reminded him of this incident years later and expressed my gratitude again, he said, "Wilson, you shouldn't be grateful to me." I was puzzled, but after the appearance of the story of how William E. Hinds had helped him obtain an education I understood.

In the fall of 1930 I began teaching at Rice and continued there until 1937. During these years I saw Webb on occasional visits to Austin, and I bought and read "The Great Plains" and "Divided We Stand" when they appeared, in 1931 and 1937. Through his books he has continued to be my teacher down to the present day.

The publication of "Divided We Stand" came just at the time when I had become a traveler for a publisher whose home office was in Massachusetts. In this book Webb stated that if everyone in the South and West who was working for a northern firm were in uniform the South and West would look like any army camp. The book made me acutely conscious that the more successful I was in obtaining orders in my territory the more I was contributing to the eocnomic dominance of the North. Not long after the appearane of "Divided We Stand" Webb made a talk at the Cokesbury Book Store in Dallas which I was able to hear by accident of being in Dallas at the same time. He told a story to illustrate how he felt when he sold Hollywood the movie rights to "The Texas Rangers." A Texas cowman was riding a pullman to Kansas City for the first time—he had always ridden up with his cattle on a freight and back on the chair car. He knew he was to tip the porter but he didn't know how much.

"George, how much am I supposed to tip you when I get off at Kansas City?" he asked.

"Just whatever you think right, suh."

"How much do they usually tip you?"

"It ranges. Some tips one way and others another."

"Well, George, what would you say your average tip is?"

"A dolluh, suh."

When the porter brushed him off as they were pulling in, the cowman gave him a silver dollar.

With a big smile George said, "Thank you, suh! That's the first time I ever made my average."

The fee for the movie rights gave Webb a start toward a fortune. With it he bought an old church bordering the capitol grounds, rented the building to the State for years, and eventually sold it to the State for a good profit. He made other investments in Austin. Webb was a fine businessman as well as a fine scholar.

He loved a good story, though he was not given to joking in the classrooms. Once I heard him tell a story which he later used, in a revised form, for the conclusion of "How the Republican Party Lost Its Future," which appeared in 1949. A certain man kept telling himself about the great things that he would do in the future, but he never got down to work. One morning while shaving he was struck by the lines in his face and the thinness and grayness of his hair. After a long look he exclaimed, "My God, my future is now my past!" This story is capable of producing a bad case of the midnight shakes—even of extracting work from ex-fairhaired boys.

Webb liked folk sayings, though he did not use many himself. One day while he, Mody Boatright, and I were having coffee together, he suddenly asked, "Mody, what was that about the cat?" Mody's reply, "I'll do it if it hairlips all the cats in Grimes County," brought a burst of hearty laughter. The laughter of Webb and his good friends Dobie and Bedichek was marvelous to hear. It rang out on the picnics we used to have. It might not keep a man from committing suicide but it would make him laugh before pulling the trigger. Webb, Dobie, and Bedichek were accustomed to thinking about and discussing the world's most serious problems, but they had a playfulness of mind on appropriate occasions that indicated freedom and flexibility. In this respect they were like Erasmus and Sir Thomas More. To be deeply concerned for the welfare of mankind in perilous times and yet to be able to laugh at the right moment, not to lose the joyousness of life—this is a great gift that perhaps can be cultivated.

After World War II and 4 years in the Air Force I had returned to Texas to teach in the university. I just missed the time of troubles set off by the Rainey affair, in which Webb played a courageous part representing the faculty. One day at coffee Webb told me about his experience at the University of Chicago, where I had taken my last degree. At his oral examination he "froze" when the first question was asked, nor could he say anything in response to the second question. He turned on his heel and walked out. "My mind was racing. I went straight to the apartment and told my wife to pack. We got out of Chicago before sundown." Webb was always kind to nervous doctoral candidates at their orals; he found the right questions to get them started and give them a chance to show their knowledge. Eugene Barker, recognizing that Webb was an original and independent thinker who had to make his own way, had asked for two copies of "The Great Plains," which he accepted as Webb's dissertation, and granted him a degree.

Webb was a learned man with a capacity for hard thinking and sustained effort, but he was not academic. He did not immure himself in the university or cut himself off from the outside world. He wanted to communicate with the general reader and he succeeded admirably in doing so. Once at a meeting of the university faculty he alluded to "professors who write little articles for their colleagues to read." His unemphatic tone gave no clue to the scorn he felt.

In an essay solicited but rejected by the editor of American Heritage because it was too strong, he charged that academic training produces timid and self-repressed historians who write in a colorless way on the assumption that they are being objective. "In graduate schools the student is taught to select a subject of such small dimensions that it offers no challenge to the intellect, does not develop the mind, and has little or no significance when developed. He is encouraged to write without benefit of imagination, to avoid any statement based on perception and insight unless he can prove by the documents that his idea is not original." "An Honest Preface" is a brilliant satire on the academic game of writing a little book to get a little promotion; the central idea of the professor's book is "an entirely new theory as to the relationship existing between the physical law governing the refraction of light and the incidence of the high cost of living on tenant farmers among the Eskimos."

Webb had intellectual daring. Without this quality he would not have attempted the grand synthesis of modern history represented in "The Great Frontier." Once while he was on leave to work on this book I met him on the campus as he was walking along with his slow, swinging stride, looking at the ground and putting a cigarette to his mouth. I had to call his name twice before he noticed me. Over coffee I asked him what he was working on. After telling me he said. "This is the biggest thing I've tackled yet, but I think I can handle it." And handle it he did. About a year later I happened into his office at the moment when he was putting the manuscript into a box to send to his publisher. "I wonder how they'll take this," he said when the package was wrapped and addressed. He did not mean the publishers but the historians and critics who would read the book. At such a time a writer almost always experiences a moment of self-doubt. "Well," he said, lighting a cigarette, "if all you write is what everybody agrees with, you haven't said much. Let's mail this and get a cup of coffee." Some months after the book was published I asked him what the reviewers were saying. "They say it isn't Toynbee." And he laughed with amusement.

In his choice of subjects Webb showed courage and a high regard for the public good. He was not afraid to deal with "controversial" subjects—a word now beloved by radical rightists and moral cowards. In the manuscript of "Divided We Stand," in which he attacked the economic dominance of the North, there was a chapter on the ruination of a small independent bottle factory at Santa Anna, Tex., by the monopolistic Hartford Empire Glass Co. The publishers removed the chapter, but Webb restored it in augmented form when he republished the book at his own risk in 1947. "The Parabola of Individualism," a chapter in "The Great Frontier," is the best existing explanation of what has happened to individualism in America.

Webb wished to see an increase in the well-being and prosperity of the West, the State of Texas, and his city. Aware of the basic importance of water, he studied and wrote about this problem in the West and in Texas as a part of the West. He rewrote a government report in an effort to reach the general public and show what could be done to utilize the water of Texas streams for manufacturing and urbanization as well as agriculture. In "More Water for Texas" he explained, with his usual lucidity, a breathtaking plan which one day may be put into effect. To the Austin paper he contributed articles on the future development of the city and of the South. Webb was no cloistered man shrinking from the world and its problems.

As honest as he was courageous, Webb was committed to the truth. He was not like some westerners of the booster type who are unwilling to admit that there is a shortage of water in the West. When in 1957 he published "The American West: Perpetual Mirage" in Harper's, he offended many westerners with his thesis that the key to the understanding of the West is the existence of a vast desert in its heart. Several Senators, led by GOLDWATER of Arizona, vilified him and even accused him of historical ignorance. Protesting editorials, some later inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, appeared, and letters came through the mail, one Denverite saying he would like to use Webb for target practice.

Webb had pointed out that the West has certain negatives or deficiencies (water, timber, cities, industry, labor, Negroes) and certain positives (land, grass, minerals, natural wonders, Indians, and orientals) and that historians have not written about the negatives but have made the most of the positives. The westerner, he said, is like a musician performing on a stringed instrument with many of its strings missing; he has to make up in agility and virtuosity what the instrument lacks. Webb grew up in west Texas on the edge of the desert and he loved the West, but he possessed clarity of insight and powers of self-criticism beyond the capacity of most westerners.

He had a capacious and penetrating mind. Recently I have been turning over many books written about the West, and again and again I have found them illuminated by what he said in the essay in Harper's or in "The Great Plains." He also has a very fine article "On the Cultural Resources of Texas" buried in a book that became a casualty of the Rainey troubles, an article that I might never have known about if it hadn't been mentioned to me by Mody Boatright when I began to teach Life and Literature of the Southwest, a course which J. Frank Dobie originated and made the most popular elective in the university as long as he taught there. "My theory holds that the true distinctive culture of a region, in this case of Texas, springs from the soil just as do the plants." First there was the land and then came the people, whose lives were shaped by the land. An indigenous culture should and does make use of locally available materials; this is true of literature and art as well as of architecture. As an example of a man who made use of locally available materials for cultural purposes, Webb referred to his friend Bedichek (without giving his name), who in the course of traveling over the State incidentally observed birds and built up a remarkable knowledge of them. Webb was not boasting about the cultural attainments of Texas; rather he was pointing out that the materials were plentiful but as yet had been little used.

Webb used the materials that were available to him, including his own mind and energy. He was not erratic, but moved steadily in one direction. His was a fine contribution to the university and the State of Texas and to the Nation. He was an intellectual and moral force in our lives.

In the last year I frequently saw him as he walked past the window of my office on his way across the campus. Sometimes we would meet and he would tell me about the video series of lectures on American life that he was supervising. He was happy to be at work. No more can the tall man be seen striding along, wrapped in thought and carrying his head low.

Webb's Politics

(By Joe B. Frantz)

Since that March night when I was called out of a dinner party by the late Miss Ione Spears, herself an associate and admirer of Walter Prescott Webb for more than a quarter of a century, I have had frequent requests from newspapers, television stations, and historical periodicals to write a few words of tribute to Dr. Webb. As with many great men of varied talents, he is an ideal subject, for he was multifaceted; some aspect of his life always waits to be explored and explained.

Dr. Webb—or preferably Mr. Webb, for he disdained titles—has been talked or written about as a man, a companion, a poker player, a realtor, a historian. And as a historian he has been dissected—for a Texas-oriented audience, for an agricultural history periodical, for the American Historical Review, and so on. In each of these a different Webb has been described.

But for the Texas Observer I feel frustrated. Because the qualities which make Webb vital for the Observer encompass all his facets—the civilized, variegated human being who along with a very few others stands as a symbol of the intimation and realization of greatness that can be Texas, as well as some of its glaring faults.

Let's talk politics, for instance. By nature and upbringing Webb was a devoted liberal in the best sense of that often-bromidic word. He believed that the world could be improved, that truth was sufficient excuse for objective investigation, that a weak link anywhere in the complex of civilization represented challenge and opportunity. He saw no contradiction in being for Ralph Yarborough and for Lyndon Johnson, and indeed counted both among his close friends. Whenever he thought either was right, he gave that one his unqualified support; if he thought either was wrong, he was equally unhesitant to upbraid, or perhaps "chide" would be a more precise word.

As far as party affiliation was concerned, he lost his objectivity somewhat. He welcomed "that other party" into prominence in Texas, but he was almost yellowdog in his devotion to the Democratic banner. With characteristic quick humor, he was wont to say, "I believe in a strong Republican party, but not strong enough ever to win—only to keep the Democrats honest." Or in another vein, "What did the Republican party ever do for Texas?"

In another sense he reflected his boyhood background in barren west Texas with a true agrarian brand of old-time populism. Deep down, one suspects, he distrusted urbanism, bloc voting, and bankers. Certainly he showed strong nativist tendencies and his views on racial matters were not exactly progressive, even a bit barbaric.

On the other hand, he went into the State of Mississippi and told the local citizenry at Oxford that the State was plain stupid if it permitted its historic adherence to racial segregation to bar its material progress. The talk was straightforward enough that the professor who invited him, a head of a department, was promptly removed from that position for having imported such a radical.

Again, he told an audience of several thousand at Texas A. & M. that conditions that had spawned the capitalistic, democratic world of the United States up to 1920 had passed, and that his listeners could be wistful and sentimental if they chose, but they might as well accept the fact that a new social, economic, and political order was at hand and figure out their place in this new world. Before he could drive the 110 miles back to Austin, telephone calls and telegrams were being sent in numbers to the board of regents demanding his resignation.

"I must not have given them enough hope," he said half ruefully, half impishly.

In 1959 Houghton-Mifflin brought out a collection of his essays, "some * * * written in blood, some in lye, some in honey." The collection included two of his presidential addresses before major historical associations, essays in which he purposely set out to be significant and profound. But the essay which he often said was the best in the book was neither of these, but the one entitled "How the Republican Party Lost Its Future," which he dashed off for the Southwest Review in 1949.

When General Eisenhower spread his arms V-fashion and grinned his then irresistible smile in 1962, many people twitted Webb for his article, suggesting that few essays purporting to be historical and objective had ever been refuted so quickly. Webb didn't think these gibes were especially funny, nor did he lose his confidence that he was essentially right. As the congressional races of the later 1950's showed a rising Democratic tide and much of the leadership of the Republican administration seemed to be in the hands of Democrats, especially Sam Rayburn and Senator Johnson, Webb felt confirmed. Never did he retreat from his position that the Republican Party had "successively turned its back on one great segment of society after another, on the farmer, on small business, on labor." The party, in his words, "quit the people long before the people quit it."

These few paragraphs have dwelt on Webb's political outlook, perhaps the least important side of his public face. He advised the mighty and he advised the lowly. He advised the losers more often than winners, for he never stooped to be popular. His value was not as a precinct worker, not as the torchbearer in a political crusade. Instead, his political value lay in the fact that people could examine issues in his presence, aware that he did not operate in spiritless objectivity but also aware that somewhere in the conversations and examinations would come a moment of revelation, of crystallization, of insight, of simplification. The man who sat with him over coffee might go away with views diametrically opposite to Webb's, but he would know why.

To my way of thinking, this is teaching at its best.

So Miss Spears, sitting alone at her radio, heard the news flash and sought me out. She was crying as she talked, and she never really recovered. Within a month she, too, was dead.

Those of us who remain behind have survived and some of us—not me—may even walk with a spring in our step. But there's a whole host of us in the wider community who died a little too. We lost someone to talk with, and in this world such persons are rare.

The Great Plains

" 'For what do we know—and what do we know—what do we really and truly know about what a friend of mine will insist on calling our "insides"? Meaning not our lights, livers, and other organs, but that part of us where the mysteries are.' Thus wrote W. H. Hudson, the field naturalist, who loved to seek truth, which so often eluded him and so often eludes us all, in the recesses of the unknown."—Webb in "The Great Plains."

Walter Webb's article in Harper's late in his life on the great American desert is certainly one of the best essays written by a man from this part of the country. Its themes were not new in his work. In 1931, there appeared under his name a clear, witty, and original book of history, "The Great Plains." One cannot read it now without knowing from the occasional loveliness of language and the occasional flights of fancy that Webb never gave up wanting to write novels; without knowing from his contempt for hidebound laws, his yawps of exhilaration, and his sardonic jests that he was himself a westerner; without knowing from his splendid powers of generalization that he was one of the most intelligent men this Nation has had to think about its ways; or without discerning from certain other passages that, though his experiences went back to ancient scenes of travail on the farm and his attitudes on race were rough hewn, he had no fear of radicalism, whenever it is called for.

Not many historians, accustomed to withering scrutiny of the form of their footnotes by septuagenarian Ph. D.'s, would have dared leave in their manuscripts this passage on the cattle kingdom, in "The Great Plains":

"A thousand farms in the East will each have 6 or 7 cows, with as many more calves and yearlings—10,000 head. But they attract no attention. They are incidents of agriculture. In the West a ranch will cover the same area as the thousand farms, and will have perhaps 10,000 head, roundups, rodeos, men on horseback, and all that goes with ranching. Hot days in the branding pen with bawling calves and the smell of burned hair and flesh on the wind. Men in boots and big hats, with the accompaniment of jangling spurs and frisky horses. Camp cook and horse wrangler. Profanity and huge appetites. The East did a large business on a small scale; the West did a small business magnificently."

To get at the truth of the past, Webb wrote, "we must make use of the imagination"; and in a single sentence he could send a reader into a wonderland of future possibilities: "If the Mississippi, draining the humid eastern country, could be induced to flow into the arid West, it would be almost impossible to imagine the possibilities of irrigation." While portions of his work in 1931 thudded along the way most scholars' always do, he tended, even then, toward rhythms—"If the rain falls on the windward side of the mountains, the leeward side must suffer all the more";—a buffalo's sense of smell was useless to it "when it was approached from down the wind"; and toward romantic musing: "Cowboys at work, 18 hours a day, for the herd left the bed ground by daybreak and kept it until dark; cowboys at work, riding, singing, nursing the cattle; yet it is difficult for those who now read of their hardships to realize that they worked at all." Ballads, songs, and novels were part of the historical evidence, as far as he was concerned, for the literature of the Great Plains had to deal "with the aspects of nature—the somber, far-spread, ocean-like plain; the arid mountains; the quicksanded rivers; the drought, the hail, and the wind." In the last chapter of the book, "Mysteries of the Great Plains," he wrote that the evidence indicated that "the plain gives man new and novel sensations of elation, of vastness, of romance, of awe, and often of nauseating loneliness." He knew that a book of history is only a man writing about the past and cannot be more than that.

He was not a nit-picker; he wanted to have some fun as he went along with his work. Plains Indians were willing to eat their horses if they had to; therefore, "The Indian rode his commissary into battle." When the settlers from the East first crossed the 98th meridian onto the plains, there was little thought of general irrigation. "The people were settling there under the illusion that rainfall would follow agriculture." It did not. Then, "In the shadow of the drought men turn to prayer (at least some of them do), led by the more religious-minded, and the skeptical acquiesce, with the stoic philosophy that it may do no good, but they guess it won't do any harm. Sometimes the rains come, proving the efficacy of faith."

As his whimsey never got in the way of his intelligence, neither (as he said) did facts that fall contrary to a general truth. Again and again, discussing geology, rainfall, "the horse culture of the woodland" and "that of the plains," the great configurations of environment and civilization, he attained peaks of generalization that no man could have without first storing up the facts and then extending the powers of a lithe intelligence. Consider these scattered passages:

"The position of the grassland in the United States and in North America may be most accurately pictured when taken in connection with the timber regions or the rainfall map. The eastern forest and the western forest come together in Canada, where they form a continuous subarctic forest extending from ocean to ocean. In the south the two forest belts unite in Mexico. Between these belts is a great oval whose characteristic natural vegetation is grass and desert shrub. This grassland 'acts as a barrier between the species of the two regions even more effectively than a body of water of the same extent.'

"European civilization has developed largely in a forested region rather than in a plains environment.

"The history of the Plains is the history of the grasslands. Civilization develops on level ground. The fundamental problems that man faced when he crossed the line are not problems of the mountains but of the Plains.

"The Great Plains presented a barrier which arrested for a time the whole westward movement, but the barrier was greater for the South than for the North. The northern system, founded in individual ownership of land and free labor, was modified when it entered the Great Plains region, but its essential character was not changed. The southern system, founded on slavery and cotton, was barred by an infrangible law—bounded on the west by aridity just as effectually as it was on the north by cold. Thus did the Great Plains break the balance between the North and the South and turn the advantage to the northern section, making its ideals, rather than those of the South, national."

Webb's approach to history sometimes seemed racial. The blood of pueblo or sedentary Indian stock, compared with that of the Plains Indians, "was as ditch water"; on southern plantations, worked by Negroes before mechanization, "one man was doing only the work of a man, if that"; "For ingenuity of design no one can beat a Mexican"; the Spanish failed at conquering the plains Indians, and "The problem of subduing them had to be solved by another race." Yet it would be unfair to hold these ways of thinking to the standards of current times. When he wrote this book, for example, he could still say, as none of us who have been city raised could say now:

"We are still a farm people. There is for us nothing new on the farm. We know it all intimately—the long hours, the sweaty, stinking, heavy underwear, the debt and the mortgage, the way it feels to drag in at twilight after a day in the field and to sit on the doorstep and pull from our aching feet our brogan shoes before we eat the coarse evening meal. That is the common heritage of the majority of American people."

Webb's freedom of spirit was a freedom of his own times and place—a frontier honesty. He had, for instance, nothing but contempt for Spain's church-shielded forays in America. "Spain's fourfold purpose" [he wrote] "was to conquer, convert, exploit, and incorporate the natives. For conquest, there was the conquistador; for conversion, there was the friar, the emissary of the church, the religious campaigner; for exploitation after the conquest was over, there was the encomendero, whose function it was to make a profit from the native and share it with the king. Finally, in 1772 the whole policy of peace was abandoned in desperation, and the Spaniard undertook the destruction of the plains Indian even before his soul had been saved."

He did not blink the fact that after the Texas Revolution, Texans stole the cattle defeated Mexicans left behind, or the likelihood that during the Civil War, some Texans got rich staying behind while their neighbors were off fighting. He persistently sided with the plainsmen who practiced "a little judicious fraud" to evade unreasonable laws limiting arid-land ranching, passed by uninformed eastern lawmakers.

Of course, he wrote, political radicalism on the plains began with the farmers—the Grange, the Farmers' Alliance, the Farmers' Union. "They were far from markets, burned by drought, beaten by hail, withered by hot winds, frozen by blizzards, eaten out by the grasshoppers, exploited by capitalists, and cozened by politicians. Why should they not turn to radicalism? When men suffer, they become politically radical; when they cease to suffer, they favor the existing order." Women got the vote first on the plains. Why was that? There is hidden somewhere in the cause the spirit of the Great Plains which made men democratic in deed and in truth," Webb said. He hoped that out of the high adventure and intense suffering of the plains "may come in time a mystical and spiritual quality contributing much to a civilization that thus far is notorious for its devotion to material things."

I did not know Webb. We exchanged remarks on a few occasions; once or so I was able to see through his storied gruffness to a warm, heartily laughing man. Just one memorable thing happened between us. We were having lunch over a manuscript of a speech he had made, that I was going to print in the Observer. We found ourselves in a congenial rapport over political matters (though we must have differed a good deal on what a man should do as to politics). As we parted, he quoted something out of John Dewey, a passage that was, as I vaguely recall, intelligent and idealistic in Dewey's matter of fact way. It has been in my memory that it was from "Human Nature and Conduct," at the end of a chapter, but I have looked and cannot find it there. Anyway, I remembered it at the time, and also, as I said to Dr. Webb, that Dewey had gone on to conclude that human affairs are necessarily tending toward more and more socialism. I doubt I asked Webb why he had not recited the whole thing, but that was an import of my mentioning it. He replied, I remember very clearly, for I thought about it a good deal for some time afterward, and my mind has come back to it often since then, that the role of some men is to work within existing institutions, cultivating the ground for the changes that are to come.

THE GREAT FRONTIER

(By Hubert Mewhinney)

Walter Webb's great quality was a sort of massive and inexorable commonsense.

In this respect he was something like Charles Darwin. And it was this quality that finally led him, when he was almost an old man, to write what I think is likely to prove the most important book written anywhere in the world during this century. This was "The Great Frontier."

I knew Mr. Walter for almost 40 years. But he had other friends who knew him better and longer. If nobody minds, I should prefer to use this space to write about that one book and the effect it had on my own thinking rather than about Mr. Walter himself.

It is worth remarking that the three friends so often called the triumvirate—Webb, Bedichek, and Dobie—were all clearer thinkers and sounder artists as they grew older. That is unusual in our country and in our century. Most American artists, and the novelists in particular, commit themselves to certain views and attitudes before they reach 30. Then they never outgrow those views. They are much like the Mexican axolotl, who matures enough to reproduce his kind but never enough to grow out of the tadpole stage.

In "The Great Frontier" Webb addressed himself to the grand and terrible theme of our time, to the theme that under varied aspects so fascinated Oswald Spengler and Arnold Toynbee and even, for that matter, H. G. Wells. What really made the Western World what it is?

How was it that the petty and insignificant kingdoms of Western Europe—almost beneath the contempt of the Ottoman Turk—peopled by men so poor, dirty, and ignorant that they took Marco Polo for a liar when he came home to tell about the magnificent court of Kubai Khan—how did these fellows ever manage to set forth and plunder the world?

And all the more especially, how did it happen, after technology had been nearly at a standstill for something like 3,000 years, that the western Europeans began that astonishing career in the physical sciences that brought us steamships, electric lights, airplanes, spacecraft, and nuclear bombs, so that now we wallow in our own riches and tremble at the deadliness of our own weapons?

So that now we are astonished and outraged when those peoples of a different complexion, whom our plundering forefathers somehow forgot to annihilate, suddenly come forth demanding a share both in the riches and in the knowledge of the techniques.

The Tasmanians and the Karankawas are gone. But the Chinamen are very much with us.

We are taught in high school, although none too clearly or explicitly, that Western Europe did not amount to much until Henry the Navigator came along in the middle 1400's and started sending out expeditions to reconnoiter the coast of Africa and look for a way to the East.

Webb set out to clarify the matter. He had been influenced by Frederick Jackson Turner's famous paper about the influence of the frontier on American history. He had been prepared by years of studying the frontier, especially of studying the effects of inventions so simple as that of barbed wire. That is to say, like Darwin, he was not offering a theory that nobody had ever thought of before; he was systematically arranging the arguments for the theory or perhaps even the proofs.

He contended that it was the white man's looting and plundering of the frontiers—of the Americas, Africa, Australia, and the ancient kingdoms of the East—that really created the modern world; that brought on the sudden acceleration in technology, in the study of the physical sciences, and even in literature; that but for Columbus and Vasco da Gama there might never have been a Shakespeare or even an Einstein. That is, it was simply the loot—gold, silver, fish, furs, ship timber, sugar, chocolate, tobacco—that furnished the capital for the fantastic development of Western Europe in learning, science, and inventions; that for a few centuries made those petty peoples the lords of the earth; that led Kipling to write such nonsensical and pharisaical admonitions as "take up the white man's burden."

One may reflect sardonically that if there had been no plundering of the frontiers there would have been no industrial revolution, no Marx, and no Stalin.

All this from Webb, basically simple as it is, is far more convincing than Spengler's hypothesis that the major cultures grow, flourish, and decay as inevitably as the individual organism, like so many rosebushes or cockleburrs; more convincing than Toynbee's ideas of challenge and response.

For the sudden technological flowering of Western Europe was quite unlike anything that ever happened in Egypt, or Mesopotamia, of Greece.

When Henry the Navigator came along, the techniques and the sciences had been at a standstill, or worse, for many centuries. Remember that Phoenician seamen in the service of Pharaoh Necho had actually circumnavigated Africa 2,000 years earlier, about 600 B.C. Eratosthenes had measured the circumference of the earth quite accurately about 200 B.C. There had been palaces in Egypt, in Babylon, in Crete, and in Nero's Rome larger and more magnificent than anything standing in Europe in the times of Prince Henry. The very Aztecs had botanical and zoological gardens long before any such thing was thought of in Madrid.

Prince Henry's men had only one item of technology that really worked. That was the sailing ship. And it worked none too well. Remember that Pharaoh Necho's men circumnavigated Africa on their first and only attempt. It took Prince Henry's captains years of trying.

Prince Henry's men knew the use of gunpowder but the arquebus was a less efficient weapon than the crossbow. Not even the flintlock had been invented yet.

There was not a telescope anywhere in Europe. There was not a watch that would keep time. The peasants tilled their fields with much the same sort of wooden plow that had been used in Neolithic Egypt. There was not an electric light, a kerosene lantern, or even a whale oil lamp. The rich had torches. The poor had the light of the hearth. The roads were far worse than in Roman times. The rich went on horseback. The poor walked through the mud.

There actually must be some kind of determinism or inevitability in mankind's affairs, whether it is the kind suggested by Webb, or by Spengler, or by Toynbee, or even by those 19th century socialists whose doctrines are now most familiar in the version offered by Karl Marx.

For it is at last becoming plain—and more so from what the prehistorians rather than the historians have learned in the past century—that certain advances or at least certain changes occur in techniques, sciences, arts, modes of though, and modes of behavior whenever particular conditions occur.

The British anthropologist Gordon Childe argued brilliantly that the two most important things that ever happened in mankind's career on earth both happened before written history, as such, even existed.

The first was what Childe called the Neolithic Revolution, when bands of men settled down in particular places and began to make their living by growing crops rather than by hunting, or fishing, or gathering nuts and berries.

The other was what Childe called the Urban Revolution, when men began to live in true cities, when trades became specialized, when the social structure, too, became more elaborate, when there were kings, priests, and nobles rather than chieftains, shamans, and warriors, and when writing was invented.

The prehistorians are still far from sure about the details. But it is fairly certain now that both revolutions, in all their complexities, occurred quite independently in Eurasia and in the Americas. Likely enough, there were independent developments in several centers.

There seems to have been little interchange of views between Webb and Childe or between Childe and Spengler. I am not even sure that Webb ever read a line that Childe had written.

The changes in the Western World that Webb, Spengler, and Toynbee discussed in their several ways have no name in common use as yet. But in essence this is a third revolution and likely to prove even more fateful than the other two.

Nowadays for the first time since the gorilla-brained Australopithecinae were hunting pigs and antelopes on the thornbrush-studded plains of South Africa—and that was a million and three-quarters of years ago, if Leakey's dates turn out to be right—men have learned in a few happy countries of the West to grow more food than they can eat and to manufacture more devices than they can use or can even sell to one another. Not Sesostris, nor Sardanapalus, nor Nero could have imagined such luxuries as an automobile mechanic or a television repairman now enjoys every day.

Both we and the Russians are preparing to send explorers to the moon—certainly the most expensive luxury ever imagined.

But a great part of the world enjoys none of the luxuries, is restless, and is envious of them. And the Russians, to the deadly danger of us all, have made a sort of lunatic religion out of the doctrines of a fellow who was merely one more misinformed 19th century economic theorist, with little knowledge of prehistory, of ancient history, of anthropology, or of human or of animal behavior. Why, Marx wrote that book before Schliemann excavated Troy, before Evans excavated Knossos, before Sautuola found the paintings in the Altamira cavern, before the Wrights flew the first airplane, before Ford simplified factory production.

If only the Russians could read Webb instead of Marx.

COMMENTS BY THREE FRIENDS

It was in the history class of the late Eugene C. Barker during the spring of 1922 that I first knew Walter Prescott Webb. Both of us had grown up in Stephens County, but our trails had not crossed before. At that time he was an instructor in history, a part-time instructor in government, and we were both working toward advanced degrees in the University of Texas.

One day Dr. Barker touched upon the subject of western extension of settlements. With his gift for clarity and orderly development of a topic, he made a swift survey, pointed to the Great Plains on the wall map, and said: "Here this advance stopped, or moved very slowly for several decades. I am not certain why. Does anyone have a reason to suggest?" Two or three facts were mentioned; I called attention to the lack af available water; and then Webb spoke up and put the explantion in a form that I had not heard before. "These people came from a timbered country and had developed a timber civilization; when they reached the land where forests ceased they were confused and did not know what to do. Before they could occupy the country they had to develop a new way of life, and it took them decades to do it."

I was impressed with the statement, but I did not then realize that Webb had just set forth the thesis of what was to become one of the great books of our times: "The Great Plains."

Webb was interested in ideas and was a genius at developing them. To him facts meant nothing unless one was able to discover their meaning. It was with this point of view that he became a great historian. To his friends, however, the man was even greater than the historian.

RUPERT N. RICHARDSON.

"Everyone who creates anything needs an audience, even if it's only an audience of one," Walter Prescott Webb was saying. I had asked him when we were together in Lincoln, Nebr., in 1957 to tell how he had got started in writing. The meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association had closed, and the hundreds of eager and talkative historians who had attended were now on their way home. Walter and I were left in the wake of the meeting. "Come to my room and we'll swap yarns," he had said over the telephone.

Fifty years before, Walter said, he had been a teacher in a one-room schoolhouse in east Texas. He taught all grades and did the school chores as well. Among his pupils was a 10-year-old named Henry Woods, who was part Indian. Henry was a helpful and admiring friend to his teacher. He always managed to arrive at school in the morning, as Walter did, much ahead of the other youngsters, to help wash down the blackboards, bring in wood for the stove, and sweep out. He was the very soul of helpfulness.

One spring morning, when the turf under the piney woods was beginning to show early wildflowers, the 20-year-old teacher hurried along to school a little after sunup, well ahead of his usual schedule. On his arrival, instead of going about his chores, he sat down at his desk and began writing. Half an hour later, little Henry Woods came through the schoolhouse door, ready to assist Walter Webb.

"Good morning, Henry," said the teacher. "Why don't we change our plans a little today? Sit down in your place, if you will. I've written a little word sketch of you that I'd like for you to hear."

Henry Woods took his place and, cupping his chin in his hands, he listened as his teacher read. When the word sketch was finished, little Henry looked up, starryeyed, and said, "Professor, that was purty."

"He was my first audience," Walter told me. "I've been writing ever since."

Many things could be said about Webb's power as a historian—his skill in arriving at historical meaning, his breadth of concept, his deceptively simple narrative style, his originality, and his courage in taking new paths—but at heart his craft was directed to conveying meaning to people. The lesson the teacher learned from the pupil more than half a century ago had lasted a lifetime.

SAVOIE LOTTINVILLE.

Recalling a friendship of half a century, I remember the smalltown country boy who arrived on the campus of the University of Texas, with its 1,800 students. He was ill-prepared, but eager and filled with curiosity. One pauses over the fact that, as Webb came from Stephens County, Roy Bedichek hailed from a spot on the road called Eddy, and Frank Dobie from a ranching section.

When Webb delivered his presidential address to the American Historical Association in Washington in January 1959, he invited, in addition to friends from Texas, three of us who were living in the East and had been students with him. We sat together with some of the Texans immediately below the dais. Personal details, trials, and tribulations, a reference to "the accursed Ph. D.," nothing was left out of this engaging address, charged with wit and pathos. This auditor saw the shocked and wondering faces of the pundits and their ladies at the head table. There were attempts at smiles, but they shriveled as the ivy of cloistered halls must have shrunk that night. In spite of all, the speech was received with great gusto by the young Ph. D.'s. We had no apologies to make for our regionalism.

Memories of other occasions arise. When "The Search for William E. Hinds" was instituted, Walter sought my aid in finding information in the East. I combed probate records and microfilms of newspapers in New York, all with no results. Finally he wrote me to communicate with a family in New Jersey. It seemed there was a real clue leading to Vermont. I was preparing to go to New Jersey when word came that a survey had been made there, with tangible results.

On returning to Texas, I called at Walter's cubbyhole of an office and found him deluged with letters from people in many parts of the world who had been touched by the story. A paper carton was filled to overflowing with letters; he was bewailing the fact that he could not find one he had received from a Chinaman in Hong Kong who had told of his reading the story to his family.

In a talk delivered 3 days before his death, titled "The Confessions of a Texas Bookmaker," Webb said in his blunt way:

"The subject of the Texas Rangers took me to the frontier, opened up a field in which I could work for a lifetime, a field that was to become my own. Here I learned something very important for a writer, extremely important to me. Up to that time I had in my efforts to write been going against my own grain, going against my own background—the frontier. I did not like the environment I grew up in, and I worked hard to get away from it, to get into that other world that I had found in the books where people wore good clothes, spoke clearly, and spent money freely. But you do not escape your background. A perceptive friend, a poet, said to me one day: 'Webb, you are a frontiersman,' and he implied that I could never be anything else. This came as something of a shock, but I thought about it a great deal, and finally I said to myself, 'All right, OK, if that is what I am, then, by God, that is what I will be.' I decided to go with the tide of my nature rather than against it, to row with the current rather than against it."

His gruff exterior concealed a gentle, sentimental spirit. In this last talk, he told of his reading a childhood story: "I read the story over and over and every time it made me cry, the first time I ever cried over a book. I loved to read that book and I still love books that make me cry. The only thing I like more is to write something that makes others cry, which I have done a few times."

RICHARD T. FLEMING.

MEETINGS IN DALLAS

(By Lon Tinkle)

When the New York Times celebrated its 100th anniversary in 1951, its Sunday Book Review assessed American writing during the first 50 years of this century. Henry Steele Commager, writing on history, concluded that Walter Prescott Webb's "The Great Plains" was entitled to be called the best single-volume contribution to American history published between 1900 and 1950. As Walter Webb commented so often to friends, honors, and recognition seemed to have been reserved for him for his last years. He was not ungrateful about the sudden avalanche of acclaim—but he noted the irony of it with a wryness that had become habit. Unorthodox and ferociously independent, he must have thought of himself as an ugly duckling of the academic world.

At any rate, he had a great fondness for the Hans Christian Andersen tale, and gave it a personal twist. Once, in a fit of weariness and of self-pity, I raged for an hour over the penalties and miseries of a Texas rearing for a man who wanted to be an expert on European literature. I related to Walter the backgrounds (privileged, as I thought) of some of my classmates at Columbia and the Sorbonne, specialists of whom people have heard. He listened with sympathy. A few days later I got from an Austin bookstore a very handsomely illustrated copy of Andersen. "Read this," his note urged, 'it will do you good." He told me later it was one of his favorite gestures to cure depression in his friends. I rarely think of the Andersen fable, but, in these days when nearly anybody over 30 thinks himself an anachronism, I do often think of Webb.

Two years after Commagers tribute, the president of Oxford University Press told me in New York that Arnold Toynbee was coming to this country and specifically wanted to come to Texas to see Walter Prescott Webb. Toynbee did come, on a famous visit. His plane had a layover in Dallas, and the Oxford Press man advised me to run out and talk to Toynbee at the airport about a plan for him also to speak in Dallas, a plan Toynbee had steadily rejected. Bolstered by a promise from the late E. DeGolyer, of Dallas, to post any necessary fee, I met the plane. Toynbee, his white mane of hair afloat in the airport blows, was polite but unshakable.

"I have only limited time, as I stated by letter," he explained, "and I want to spend what time I have in Texas with Professor Webb."

Mrs. Toynbee took pity on me. "Don't feel too bad," she said. "The money you offer, why, the government wouldn't let him keep it anyway."

I told Walter this story later, when he was killing a layover at the Dallas airport. It became a sort of ritual after that for me to visit with him during stopovers in Dallas, and his many engagements brought him through with regularity. When I recall memories of talks with him, the scene is usually the airport. He was, of course, brimming with ideas and projects every time I saw him. He had a plan for the Texas Institute of Letters, or a program for the Southwest Review, or some advice for the Texas Almanac, or a way to revolutionize book selling in the Nation (it was a wonderful idea, too), or more mundane things about how to improve the duck situation on a little pond our house overlooks or how to arrange the education of the Tinkle boys, or where to buy up land in north Texas. I do not recall ever encountering a more fertile mind.

One night in the summer of 1961, Walter called me from Austin to say he had an hour's wait next morning in Dallas. He had something he wanted to tell me. There was a crush at gate 12, where his plane was to leave, so we turned a corner and sat down at vacant gate 13.

What he had to tell me was engrossing indeed. So much so, it was I who had to remind him it was about time for his plane. "Oh, they'll announce it, don't worry," he said, and told me some more. But presently, he asked, "Why dont they call that plane?" and we got up to check.

Outside gate 12, both signs were astounding—the gangplank had been removed and all propellers were whirling.

"Why, that fool plane's trying to take off," he exclaimed as he dashed out and, as though heading off a west Texas mule, ran in front of the ship and signalled the pilot to be sensible.

Airport flunkies, recovering, began to run around in circles. A jeep scouting the field made a beeline for Webb. The pilot sadly shook his head, "no." On Webb's heels I too was making frantic and righteous signs when the man in the jeep grabbed me. Luckily, he was Braniff's stationmaster and had sized up the situation at once.

"Jump in," he yelled above the engine roar, "another plane leaving over here." The jeep made a broken-field run through taxiing and arriving planes and its driver said, "I know who you are, Professor Webb."

Not much mollified, Webb spoke scathingly of planes that leave unannounced, especially when he had to be in Minneapolis on time for a speaking engagement. The second plane was also already locked tight. Our jeep-host was undaunted. "Maybe I can get you on an American Airlines jet leaving for Chicago." We whipped across the field again. "I'm sympathetic to an absent-minded professor," the station manager said, "but you know, Professor Webb, that plane was announced several times."

Walter ignored the latter comment. Cutting his eyes at me, he muttered, "two absent-minded professors." But after a bit more maneuvering, we made the jet. Walter had to wait in Chicago for his baggage, on the first plane, to catch up with him.

It made an amusing story for the paper and Paul Crume, former Webb student and longtime friend, wrote it up with style. But I may now divluge what I could not reveal then, now we didn't hear the plane called. Walter was telling me he thought he had been lucky enough to persuade Terrell Maverick to marry him in the autumn. He was a happy man that morning at Love Field.

Joe Frantz characterized him as a man whose sophistication was generally unsuspected. I remember, though this is only marginally what Joe meant, a dinner Herbert Gambrell and I once had with him at Dallas' Old Warsaw restaurant. After a meal that would have satisfied even Alfred A. Knopf, Walter asked the waiter to bring an orange, a sharp knife, and a bottle of cognac. With precise skill, he cut the peeling around the middle of the orange, gently worked the top and bottom parts of the rind loose from the pulp, and turned the top half into a cup and the bottom half into a base for the cleanly skinned fruit in the middle. Into the cup at the top, Webb poured cognac and then set it aflame. A round of applause came from neighboring tables, where guests had watched the maneuver with fascinated attention. Webb set the orange cup on a plate and asked our waiter to offer ceremonial sips to our neighbors. They spooned it out. A memorable literary occasion at Old Warsaw which several have tried to duplicate, always without success.

The last time I saw him was 2 weeks before his death. He gave a talk at Southern Methodist University on February 19, then

came over to our house for a little meal. "I have no more books in me that I want to write," he said. "At my age you live from day to day. Terrell and I aren't waiting to celebrate our anniversaries in terms of years. We celebrate each month. Just last week we observed our 15th anniversary. I am a happy man, a very happy man."

THE CRISIS IN THE SERBIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR AMERICAN SECURITY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in July of last year, I announced that I had asked the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security to look into the increasingly frequent visits to this country of church delegations from the Communist-bloc countries.

I said at the time that there was strong reason for believing that the motivation for these visits was not entirely spiritual, that the visits were, on the contrary, designed to extend the influence and control of the mother churches in the Communist-bloc countries over the Orthodox Church organizations and church communities in this country. And I further stated that this situation was of direct concern from the standpoint of internal security because what is involved here is an effort to subject the several hundred American orthodox church communities and their diocesan organizations to the control of clerical authorities who are, in turn, under the direct control of their Communist governments.

Since that time, the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security has been gathering information relating to the situation in the Serbian, Rumanian, Russian, and Bulgarian church communities in this country.

In a statement on the floor of the Senate on November 5, I pointed out, among other things, that the effort to subject the Serbian Orthodox Church community in this country to the direct control of the Belgrade Synod had produced an open split in the Serbian orthodox community and that the majority of Americans of the Serbian orthodox faith had voted a resolution calling for spiritual unity with the mother church but for independence from its heirarchal control.

In taking this stand, they stated that the Belgrade Synod is not free since it must make its decisions in collaboration with and with the approval of the so-called Federal Commission for Religious Questions of the Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia; they claimed that the continued existence of their diocese required a determined struggle against all efforts at Communist infiltration; and they declared that their attitude would be in harmony with the welfare of the United States and Canada.

The Belgrade Synod ignored the expressed wishes of the majority of the Serbian Orthodox community in this country and, over their opposition, divided the North American diocese into three new dioceses and appointed and consecrated three new bishops to take control of these dioceses.

These bishops were consecrated by the delegation of Serbian Orthodox clergy who visited this country during the months of July and August. The delegation consisted of Bishop Visarion, Bishop Christon, and the Very Rev. Mladen Mladenovich. In addition to consecrating the bishops who had been appointed by the Belgrade Synod, they used their presence in this country to endeavor to seize control of the real estate and assets belonging to the Serbian diocese and affiliated organizations.

Since the visit of the Serbian Orthodox clergymen to this country and especially since the visit of Marshal Tito to this country during the month of August, the rupture in the Serbian Orthodox community in America has resulted in a series of violent encounters between the majority, which had voted to establish an American church free of Belgrade control, and the pro-Belgrade faction.

There is a consistent pattern to the many incidents that have taken place. The pro-Belgrade faction will send a group of stalwarts along to a church meeting and attempt to break it up by shouting and hooting and stamping, even when the priest is delivering a benediction. Sometimes they have held up the business of meetings for hours on end. In many instances, they have thrown chairs and started fist fights and physically beaten up leaders of the opposition.

There have been incidents of violence over the past 2 months in virtually every important Serbian Orthodox community in the country—in Pittsburgh, in Chicago, in Youngstown, Ohio, in Detroit, in Cleveland, in St. Louis, Mo., in Akron, Ohio, in Gary, Ind., and at many other points. In many of these centers, the police riot squads have been called out repeatedly to quell disturbances or to prevent further bloodshed.

In Chicago, Ill., three men were hospitalized after one fight at a church meeting.

In Los Angeles, a member of the anti-Belgrade church group was beaten up and suffered a broken arm.

In Bellwood, Ill., a member of the anti-Belgrade church board was hospitalized after being severely beaten at a church board meeting, while an anti-Tito radio announcer was beaten up on his way to a broadcast.

Everything indicates that these persistent incidents in every part of the country are the product of a planned campaign of physical violence, which is condoned, if it has not been directly instigated, by the Belgrade authorities.

Other things have happened which I should also like to bring to the attention of my colleagues.

First of all, there is the fact that litigation has been initiated or is anticipated, involving the two rival groups of the Serbian Orthodox communities, in Joliet, Ill., in Detroit, in Cleveland, in Youngstown, Ohio, and in Chicago. On the one hand, the American Serbs who have voted to break with Belgrade must finance this costly litigation out of their own hard-won earnings; on the other hand, the pro-Belgrade faction apparently suffers from no shortage of funds for purposes of litigation in American courts. I have been informed by members of the Rumanian Orthodox Church in this country that they have already spent some $200,000 in defending themselves against court actions initiated, in a similiar situation, by the pro-Bucharest group in the Rumanian-American community. I fear that the American Serbs who refuse to take dictation from Belgrade may have to pay a similar high price for their loyalty to America.

Second, it has come to my attention that Americans of the Yugoslav origin applying to the Yugoslav consul in Chicago for visas or for the certification of documents have been asked which side they are on in the Orthodox Church dispute in this country, the clear implication being that those on the pro-Tito side will be favored. I consider this an intolerable intervention by the Yugoslav authorities in what is essentially an American domestic situation, and I have asked the State Department to look into this matter because of its grave implications.

Third, in their desperate efforts to maintain control over the 70-odd Serbian Orthodox Church communities in this country and Canada, the Belgrade authorities have threatened to excommunicate Serbian clergymen and laymen who do not accept the control of the Belgrade Synod.

Finally, the committee staff is currently studying the transcript of a deposition by the Very Reverend Mladen Mladenovich, secretary of the Belgrade Synod, in the circuit court of Lake County, Ill., on November 29, 1963. This deposition was given in connection with pending litigation involving the assets of the Serbian Orthodox diocese.

In his cross-examination, Reverend Mladenovich was obliged to admit that the Orthodox Church in Yugoslavia received a very large part of its income directly from the Communist Government of Yugoslavia and that it functions under the direct supervision of the Federal Committee for Religious Affairs, which, in turn, is appointed by the Executive Council of the Federal Government, consisting of Tito, Rankovich, Kardelj and other members of the Yugoslav Politburo.

Let me quote to you a brief exchange that took place between the examining counsel and Reverend Mladenovich.

> Question. Are these three men—Tito, Rankovich and Kardelj—members of any church?
>
> Answer. I cannot say that, because it is unknown to me.
>
> Question. Well, let's take Tito. Is he a member of any church?
>
> Answer. He knows. I don't know.
>
> Question. Is he an atheist?
>
> Answer. I know for myself; but as for him, I don't.
>
> Question. Do you know whether Tito is a member of the Communist Party?
>
> Answer. I know, inasmuch as I read in the newspapers that he is Principal Secretary of the Party.
>
> Question. Is he a member of the Central Politburo?
>
> Answer. Yes, he is. From the press I learn that he is the General Secretary.
>
> Question. Did you ever talk to him?
>
> Answer. No.
>
> Question. Did the patriarch talk to him?
>
> Answer. Yes.
>
> Question. What about Rankovich? Is he a member of the Communist Party?
>
> Answer. I don't know. I presume that he is.

Question. Is he a member of the Central Politburo?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What about Kardelj?

Answer. Same.

Question. Member of the Communist Party, and a member of the Central Politburo?

Answer. Yes.

The Reverend Mladenovich at another point was asked about the imprisonment of the American-born Bishop Nascitich by the Belgrade Government. Let me quote a few pages from the exchange on this point.

Question. Do you know Bishop Nascitich?

Answer. Yes, I know him.

Question. Is he now under suspension?

Answer. It is not clear to me. What kind of suspension?

Question. Any kind.

Answer. He has the right to serve as Bishop, and he has no diocese. He is in pension.

Question. He's an American citizen, isn't he?

Answer. Possibly.

Question. Was he arrested by the Communist government?

Answer. He was sentenced by a regular court, and as such, was sentenced.

Question. Was that a Communist court?

Answer. It was a Government court.

Question. Was that the Communist government?

Answer. Yes, in the country, there is a Communist government.

Question. Was Bishop Nascitich arrested because he insisted he was still an American citizen?

Answer. No.

Question. Are you familiar with why he was arrested?

Answer. Because in one of his preachments in the church, he has violated their laws, that priests are not permitted to attack the Government and the party.

Question. By that, you mean they're not entitled to attack the Communist Party or the Yugoslav Government?

Answer. Yes, in the preachment. The priest is permitted to talk about what is in the Bible, and in his own services, but is not permitted to attack the Government, and carry on political activity in the churches, in his speeches, political subjects.

Question. Now, ask him this question. Do you mean not permitted to attack the Yugoslav Government?

Answer. Not only him, but no priest, anywhere, is permitted to attack.

Question. The Communist government?

Answer. No priest, anywhere, is permitted to attack the Government. It is only permitted to interpret the Bible, and whatever is part of his ecclesiastical service.

The Very Reverend Mladenovich also confirmed that when he arrived in New York in June 1963, he and his party were met either by the Yugoslav consul or by a representative of the Yugoslav consul.

The Very Reverend Mladenovich was asked the following:

To whom are the three new bishops that are plaintiffs in this case responsible for their actions in the United States?

In reply to this question, he made the following statement:

They are not responsible to anyone in America. They are responsible to the holy bishops assembly, which elected them, for the performance of their duties. No one else has a right to judge the bishops, except the holy bishops council and the holy bishops synod.

I am not sure that the Reverend Mladenovich realized the profound significance of this statement and the impact that it would have on American readers. For, what the Reverend Mladenovich was admitting, in effect, was that the newly appointed Serbian Orthodox bishops in this country are completely and exclusively responsible to the synod in Belgrade, which, in turn, is responsible to and functions under the supervision of the Yugoslav Communist Government.

Mr. President, only the Communists stand to gain from the violence that has now erupted in the American-Serbian community on the issue of accepting or rejecting the discipline of the Belgrade Synod.

The situation is doubly tragic because, as I already pointed out, the overwhelming majority of those Serbs who have refused to break with the mother church are not in any sense pro-Communist. On the contrary, they are anti-Communists; they are, by and large, decent American citizens who have been swayed by the strong traditional attachment to the mother church and by the clever propaganda of Belgrade.

I have received two letters from Serbian-American clergymen who belonged to the group who refused to break with the Belgrade Synod. I am impressed by the sincerity of these letters; and it is clear from their content that the authors are strongly anti-Communist. I want to assure these clergymen that they will have an opportunity to present their point of view fully to the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security when the hearings get underway. But I must say that the letters I have thus far received fail to adduce any evidence that in any way rebuts the evidence that the Belgrade Synod functions to a large measure under the control of the Belgrade Government.

I have asked the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, in anticipation of early hearings on the subject, to accelerate the tempo of its investigation, and I have asked in particular that they look into the epidemic of violence and bloodshed that has now erupted in Serbian Orthodox communities throughout the country.

EXERCISE BIG LIFT—CONCLUSIONS OF AN ABLE PUBLISHER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Edward W. Sowers, publisher of the Rolla (Mo.) Daily News and Waynesville Fort Wood Gateway Guide personally took part in Exercise Big Lift, that epochal demonstration of the "central reserve" concept which is steadily picking up favor in the military thinking of our country.

Mr. Sowers wrote many articles about this experience, all interesting and revealing; his talks with the crews, his reaction to the various briefings, and so forth.

The articles themselves are too long to place in the RECORD. Sowers' conclusions, however, are most interesting. His thinking represents what might be termed the "inside" of the Voice of America—what people in my part of the country are thinking about, on many subjects we discuss here on this floor.

I ask unanimous consent that these conclusions be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the conclusions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG LIFT CONCLUSIONS

1. The exercise was an important demonstration of U.S. ability to strengthen NATO forces in Europe—or the free world's peacetime police force anywhere on earth.

2. The quick-strike (by air) force is being uncloaked now so all the world may know not only of our ability but our willingness to use it as a deterrent to a future war.

3. It could lead to a reduction of our forces overseas, now that we have proven that we can deliver reinforcements with knockout power (and with conventional weapons) to any troubled spot in a matter of hours, thus reducing the drain on our economy while we endlessly sustain world peace.

4. During the exercise it was also made crystal clear by President Kennedy's Cabinet members that our NATO (and other) allies must do their part, too, in maintaining the free world's international police force.

5. Congress should provide funds for further strengthening of our quick-strike force, such as for the most modern TAC fighter-bombers, using high-powered but conventional (not atomic) weapons; for refueling tankers to "nurse" them anywhere; and for cargo airlift giants, such as the 200 Starlifters now needed by MATS.

6. And while we're building physical strength abroad, we should build prestige through more adroit diplomacy with trained diplomats and foreign service workers—men and women trained for this purpose in a U.S. academy such as proposed by Missouri Senator STUART SYMINGTON (S. 15, 86th Cong.) This, and other "refinements" in foreign aid are in order.

As an average American father, I feel these opinions very strongly after talking to many other average Americans as well as high-level officials on three separate defense exercises—Puerto Rico's big slam in 1960; Alaska's timberline last winter; and Europe's big lift this fall. My sincerity is heightened, no doubt, by the fact I have three sons—Steve and Tom in college at MU, Jim in high school in Rolla—an influence upon my thinking even as millions of other free-world families are influenced.

INQUIRY INTO STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, one result of the inquiry into the strategic and critical materials stockpiles of the United States by the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves Subcommittee was new stockpile legislation prepared and approved by the subcommittee.

We introduced that legislation (S. 2272) on October 31, 1963, and on December 3 and 4 the subcommittee held hearings on this bill so all those ready to testify could do so at that time.

At the request of the American Mining Congress, further hearings have been postponed until January 23, 1964.

Some person, or organization, has spread the idea that, under the new legislation, the Congress would no longer control disposals. That is not correct.

The new legislation leaves under congressional control the disposal of unwanted materials now held in the national stockpile; and also now places the disposal of surplus materials in the DPA inventory under congressional control.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], requested that the Office of Emergency Planning—OEP—prepared for the Record an analysis of the time that elapsed between the date approval was requested of the Congress for disposals, and the date the Congress finally gave that approval.

The director of OEP has now sent this information to the subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent that the table showing the time in question required be printed in the Record at the conclusion of this statement.

In most cases, elapsed time was in excess of 6 months. Often it was in excess of a year. Once it took 58 months before congressional approval.

Not even the most ardent advocate of holding materials in surplus would argue against correcting such a situation.

The purpose of this proposed bill, on which hearings will continue next month, is to pass legislation that will protect the taxpayer and at the same time place the program on a more orderly and businesslike basis.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congressional actions requested and authorizations granted on disposals of strategic and critical stockpile materials

Commodity	Quantity	Unit	Approval requested		Approval granted		Elapsed time for approval (months and days)		Remarks
			Date	Market price or estimated value per unit	Date	Market price or estimated value per unit	Months	Days	
Brass scrap	520	Short ton	July 13, 1961		June 21, 1962		11	8	Sold for scrap, sales value per short ton, $476.35.
Bronze, silicon, and copper scrap.	74	do	do		do		11	8	Sold for scrap; sales value per short ton, $514.30.
Cadmium	2,000,000	Pound	Oct. 16, 1962	$1.70	Apr. 1, 1963	$1.85	5	15	Published prices were proved to be nominal. GSA sale Apr. 30, 1963, showed value to be $2.3615.
Castor oil	155,676,000	do	Sept. 6, 1961	.17	June 21, 1962	.16¼	9	15	
Celestite	28,816	Short dry ton	Mar. 9, 1961	27.69	do	27.69	15	12	Low-priced commodity; freight rates are important factors.
Chromite, metal, ground	1,890	Long ton	Oct. 11, 1961	36.00	do	36.00	8	10	Market price is for specification grade ore. This material bears no relation to specification grade.
Cobalt carbonates	5,500	do	Sept. 20, 1961	1.45	do	1.45	9	1	
Cobalt metal, rondelles	9	Short ton	Jan. 16, 1961	1.50	do	1.50	17	5	
Cobalt oxide	265,000	do	Sept. 20, 1961	1.10	do	1.10	9	1	
Copper-beryllium scrap	11	do	July 13, 1961		do		11	8	Sold for scrap; sales value, $1,296.91 per short ton.
Cordage fiber:									
Abaca	7,500,000	Pound	Jan. 18, 1961	.31	do	.22¼	17	3	Based on grade J-1.
Sisal	9,983,000	do	do	.13	do	.12½	17	3	
Cotton, extra long staple	109,384,000	do	Aug. 29, 1957	.63	July 26, 1962	.38	58	28	Karnak, fully good grade, at Alexandria, Egypt.
Diamonds, gem	55,465	Carat	July 29, 1958	42.49	Sept. 9, 1959	53.68	13	10	$42.49 represents actual appraised value. $53.68 represents auction receipts.
Ferromanganese	63	Short ton	Nov. 28, 1961	220.00	June 21, 1962	190.00	6	23	
Ferrovanadium	65,447	Pound	Oct. 26, 1961	3.20/3.40	do	3.20/3.40	7	25	
Manganese metal, electrolytic.	4½	Short ton	Nov. 28, 1961	725.00	do	725.00	6	23	
Molybdenite	5,000,000	Pounds	Apr. 24, 1962	1.40	do	1.40	1	27	
Nickel, cobalt, copper calcines.	3,374	Short ton	Jan. 16, 1961		Mar. 29, 1961		2	13	Commodities have no market quotations. Sales prices determined by contained metal quotations, freight rates, processing costs and other factors. Sold for $697,537.
Nickel, cobalt, copper matte	87	do	do		do		2	13	
Nickel ingots	96	do	do	.74	June 21, 1962	.79	17	5	
Nickel oxide powder	10,000,000	Pounds	Mar. 1, 1962	.8125	do	.79	3	20	
Nickel, sintered powder	4	Short ton	Jan. 16, 1961		do		17	5	Sales value $1,455.50 per short ton.
Platinum group metals:									
Osmium	27	Troy ounce	Aug. 8, 1958	70/90	Sept. 9, 1959	70/90	13	1	
Rhodium	2,524	do	do	118/125	do	122/125	13	1	
Ruthenium	51	do	do	45/55	do	55/60	13	1	
Platinum scrap	4,471	do	July 13, 1961	80.85	June 21, 1962	80/85	11	8	Quoted prices are for refined platinum mets.
Rubber	470,000	Long ton	Sept. 11, 1959	896.00	May 4, 1960	930.80	7	24	Based on No. 1 ribbed smoked sheets.
Silk noils	439,630	Pound	Aug. 18, 1960	1.00	June 21, 1962	.30	22	3	
Tin	50,000	Long ton	Sept 1, 1961	1.25½	do	1.11⅞	9	20	
Vegetable tannins (Government use):									
Chestnut	650	do	Mar. 8, 1961	[1] 156.80 [2] 176.40	do	[1] 168.00 [2] 190.40	15	13	Prices are for extract free of any copper content. Extract for disposal contains copper.
Quebracho	2,100	do	do	132.00	do	172.08	15	13	
Wattle	650	do	do	151.20	do	158.80	15	13	
Zirconium ores	15,902	Short dry ton	Mar. 6, 1959	51.56/53.76	Sept. 9, 1959	56.00	6	3	
Coconut oil	265,000,000	Pound	June 23, 1959	.213	(3)	0.177			Eligible for disposal Dec. 23, 1959.
Feathers and down	2,000,000	do	Mar. 30, 1961	.95/1.06	Sept. 21, 1961	1.10	5	21	Price advanced to $1.30 in July 1961 but was on decline in September 1961.
Tin	10,000	Long ton	Sept. 8, 1961	1.22⅛	(3)				Waiver request for authorization of 10,000 long tons out of the 50,000 long tons.
Vegetable tannins (chestnut).	12,245	do	Aug. 2, 1962	[1] 168.00 [2] 190.40	Sept. 28, 1962	[1] 168.00 [2] 190.40	1	26	H.R. 12416 introduced July 5, 1962, to waive waiting period on 4,000 long tons of the 12,245 long tons.

[1] Solid.

[2] Powdered.

[3] Not granted.

FOREIGN AID REORGANIZATION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, regardless of how any Senator voted on the foreign aid bill yesterday, every Member of this body knows there is something basically wrong about the current concept and operation of the foreign aid program.

I was glad to read a press report that President Johnson is giving consideration to a more definite segregation of the military aid program from the economic aid program, because I believe such action would help materially to improve the present program.

I was also glad to hear an able Member of the other body, Hon. Gerald Ford, of Michigan, in a recent telecast, state that the figure of around $3 billion discussed is not entirely right, because through such devices as Public Law 480, $2 billion of agricultural products should actually be added to any figure that is passed.

In addition, the United States has committed, or plans to commit, for use in foreign countries, hundreds of millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money through various international financial agencies, a matter already discussed at some length on the floor because these latter commitments do not contain certain restrictions included in the foreign aid bill itself.

As one gets further into the subject of AID, it appears that almost anywhere one turns in Government, there is further utilization of some piece of legislation, or Executive order, or international agreement, to give, or loan, more money and/or materials to other countries—often the terms of said loans are such as to force one to conclude that the net result is actually a gift.

The Senate cleared up many of the problems contained in the proposed foreign aid authorization bill.

In conference with the House, however, many of these improvements the Senate placed in the bill were subsequently deleted by the conferees.

I ask unanimous consent that a report made up by the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, showing the provisions of the Senate bill later deleted in conference, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
December 16, 1963.

Memorandum
To: Senator SYMINGTON
From: Pat M. Holt.

Set forth below is a summary of the provisions of the Senate passed bill which were deleted by the Senate-House conferees.

1. The Dominick amendment to section 203 to require that the reuse of all receipts from development loans be subject to annual appropriations.

2. The Lausche amendment adding a new section 211 to the act to require that no technical assistance program be undertaken unless, prior to the commencement thereof, the recipient country agrees to "accept the responsibility for the continuation and financing of such program after the expiration of a reasonable time, not to exceed 7 years, unless the program is scheduled for completion within such time."

3. Section 221(b)(2) prohibits payments under all risk guarantees in cases where the loss is attributable to "fraud or misconduct for which the investor is responsible." The Lausche amendment to add the word "negligence" to "fraud or misconduct" was dropped by the conferees.

4. Ellender amendment requiring redemption of Treasury notes issued under Economic Cooperation Act or reserves for investment guarantee program.

5. The Dominick amendment to require that the reuse of all receipts from Alliance for Progress loans be subject to annual appropriation.

6. The Morse amendment prohibiting assistance to any Latin American government which "has come to power through the forcible overthrow of a prior government which has been chosen in free and democratic elections."

7. Mansfield-Dirksen amendment to section 611(a), relating to completion of plans and cost estimates, requiring in any case where the estimate of cost of a project exceeded $500,000, that the feasibility of the project and the cost estimates be approved by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or by a reputable U.S. private firm of engineers.

8. The Proxmire amendment to take away President's special discretionary authority to furnish aid to Yugoslavia.

9. The Lausche amendment to take away President's special discretionary authority to furnish aid to any Communist country.

10. The Dirksen amendment to prohibit the furnishing of assistance to Yugloslavia unless and until it makes arrangements for the payment of claims of U.S. citizens whose property was nationalized or taken by that government.

11. The Lausche amendment to prohibit assistance for Government-owned enterprises, except where it clearly appears that goods or services of the same general class cannot be provided by private businesses.

12. The Kuchel amendment to prohibit assistance to any country which extends its jurisdiction for fishing purposes over an area of the high seas beyond that recognized by the United States, or imposes any penalty or sanction against a U.S. fishing vessel on account of its fishing activities in such area.

13. Miller amendment limiting U.S. contributions to Food and Agriculture Organization to $5 million a year.

TRIBUTES TO PRESIDENTS KENNEDY AND JOHNSON

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the current issue of the Officer, monthly magazine of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States appear two brief editorials which pay tribute to the late President John F. Kennedy and to the Nation's succeeding Commander in Chief, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

There is also an article in the Officer by Col. John T. Carlton, the association's executive director and editor of the magazine, which gives a personal view of both of these great Americans.

Colonel Carlton formerly was the administrative assistant in the Senate of my colleague, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and is known to many of us. For this reason, as well as for the subject matter of the pieces he has written, I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE MINUTEMAN HALL OF FAME

In February of 1962, recognizing the place he already had earned in history, our association claimed for John F. Kennedy "A place in the Nation's 'Minuteman Hall of Fame.'"

At that time, just well into his service as President, Mr. Kennedy received ROA's leaders for one of their occasional conferences with the Commander in Chief. He appeared surprised and highly pleased that the occasion also brought to him the handsome plaque which was designed to hang with a select few in a hall which ROA's Minuteman Memorial Building, to be constructed in the Nation's Capital at No. 1 Independence Avenue, will make a reality.

The ROA recognition was to a Lieutenant Kennedy, not to the President, or the Commander in Chief, and it was received by him as such.

ROA claims him and his war record to emphasize and exalt the vital role in national security of the citizen-reservist.

Mr. Kennedy was a young man when World War II opened. In a manner that is typical of the spirit which always has protected America, he volunteered for military service and chose one of the most hazardous roles—with the fragile PT-boats, and the doughty sailors who manned them, in the South Pacific. It was there that young Kennedy almost lost a life and suffered injuries which plagued him for the rest of his life. ROA's national treasurer, himself a Medal of Honor winner, was an instructor of the young officer whose valor was to become a legend.

President Kennedy's leadership of this Nation, and his considerable impact upon history already have been extolled by the most eloquent throughout the world which continues to mourn him. Many in a sorrowing nation, and a sorrowing world, as do we among the Nation's reservists to whom he was a brother officer and an inspiration, have observed, as of Lincoln, "Now he belongs to the ages."

He belongs also to this great Nation's "Minute Man" tradition, which has given to the citizens of the United States of America the clarity of allegiance, the commitment of stout heart, resolute character, and personal resources which insures our way of life for posterity.

THE NEW COMMANDER IN CHIEF

Lyndon Baines Johnson, upon whom tragedy has thrust the awful burden of the Presidency, is a man who, like his predecessor, has answered his country's call in war as in peace. The new President entered the Navy as a Reserve officer at the start of World War II, risking the loss of his seat in Congress to go immediately into uniform. His service was brief because then President Roosevelt ordered all Members of Congress out of the service and back to their duties on Capitol Hill. But in his tour in the Pacific he won the Silver Star. The citation accompanying the medal noted his "marked coolness" under fire.

We suspect that "marked coolness" will be displayed again as he takes on the job of leading the defense of the free world. Probably no President in history has had more experience at the highest national level to fit him for the office. His deep knowledge of Government includes special schooling in defense matters as a former member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, where he chaired the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, and served as chairman of the Senate Space Committee and as Senate majority leader. We are sustained by the knowledge that our new President is capable of the burden of his office.

As Americans our hearts go out to him. As officers we salute him and pledge him our faithful support.

IN MEMORIAM: RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION MOURNS PASSING OF COMMANDER IN CHIEF, HAILS STRENGTH OF SUCCESSOR

The world-shaking events of late November shocked Reserve Officers Association as it did the body of the American people. So much has been written about the cruel death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy that we hesitate to attempt to add any words to those already burned into the pages of history.

Yet we too sustain a personal loss, and experience personally the impact which has jarred the Nation. We knew "Jack" Kennedy both as an individual and as the President. He was warmhearted, in many ways quite unassuming, and genuinely devoted to friendships he had acquired throughout his life. Those who knew him on Capitol Hill enjoyed his warmth. History will record his impact on the world, which was considerable; it was most difficult to conceive of anyone directing real hate toward him.

Even in the personal paralysis that many friends experienced, we felt that he would have been the one to be proud that nothing could stop our Nation.

It was Mr. Kennedy who chose Lyndon Johnson as his running mate, and subsequently as his Vice President.

Johnson had been a master in the forensic and legislative arena where both received their seasoning for leadership. In the Senate, he was Kennedy's senior both in years of service and authority. Senator Kennedy looked up to his leadership and history may indeed record that his insistence, at Los Angeles in 1960, upon his running mate may have been his most significant exhibition of leadership.

One incident in the Senate service of Mr. Kennedy I will always remember, because it reflects his deep sense of loyalty and his recognition of the worth of his seniors.

The late Senator Walter F. George, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during the Eisenhower administration, was working in the twilight of his career to liberalize the social security system. It was a close issue in the Senate and as Senator George's assistant I was on the floor with him. The venerable chairman worked the cloakroom and the floor diligently, looking for that vote which would put his bill across.

He walked over to Senator Kennedy, who was not favorable to the bill, and put his arm across his shoulder.

"You're going to be with me on this aren't you, Jack?" he asked.

Senator Kennedy looked up, and I saw in his eyes a swiftly changing mood. After some hesitation, he said.

"Senator George, I don't think I could vote against you."

The bill carried, as I recall it, by two votes.

Lieutenant Commander Johnson also is a Reserve Officer Association member who pays his own way.

The hallmark of our association is its dedication to our congressional mission. In our membership are men and women of all walks of life who may differ on everything else, but who are brought together in support of adequate national security. That now is President Johnson's foremost concern and responsibility. In his capable hands are many fateful duties, but none transcend that embodied in his cloak as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

With the recent fuss about a phony issue, Lyndon Johnson's record which endears him most to reservists is that during World War II he left his seat in the Congress and went into the Navy, making a fine record. On orders of the Commander in Chief he was brought back to Washington. There in both House and Senate, his personal experience in combat proved of transcendent value to him in various assignments in the Senate Armed Services Committee, including chairmanship of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee.

President Johnson has experience in this field which probably fits him for his role as Commander in Chief more than any President in recent history.

We in the Reserve Officer Association, too, look to him as our Commander in Chief. While free in a certain sense from his command, we still honor his office and dedicate ourselves to abide by his decisions. We are confident that in advance of major decisions our association will be welcomed in exercise of its right to join in recommendations.

OTTO OTEPKA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as my colleagues will recall, I have several times spoken on the floor about the so-called Otepka case.

I took the floor the first time to speak about this matter on November 5, when it was announced that Mr. Otepka had been dismissed on the basis of the charges brought against him. I said on that occasion that Mr. Otepka's dismissal was an affront to Congress and to the right of congressional committees; I stated further that if Otepka could be dismissed for the simple reason that he had given honest testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, then it would become impossible or, at the best, very difficult for any congessional committee in the future to obtain uninhibited testimony from Executive officials and employees.

In the colloquy that followed, there was discussion of the possibility of perjury charges against some of the State Department officials.

On the following day, the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security received parallel letters from three of the State Department officials—Mr. John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, Mr. David I. Belisle, deputy to Mr. Reilly, and Mr. Elmer Dewey Hill, Director of the Division of Technical Services in the Office of Security—asking to change their testimony. Whereas they had previously sworn that they knew nothing about the installation of a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office, they now confirmed that they had taken part in the installation of such a device or were aware of its installation.

Two of the witnesses, Mr. Reilly and Mr. Belisle, when they were recalled before the committee, stated that none of Mr. Otepka's conversations had been overheard or compromised because of electronic difficulties. The third witness, however, an electronics expert, Elmer Dewey Hill, testified that tape recordings had been made of several conversations, that Mr. Reilly had expressed particular interest in one conversation, and that he had turned the tapes over to an unidentified third party at Mr. Reilly's direction.

The Otepka case goes to the heart of security procedures in the Department of State. It has the greatest significance from the standpoint of relations between the legislative and executive branches. In addition, it has profound elements of personal drama. It is not surprising, therefore, that the press of our country has displayed very great interest from the beginning in the story of the Otepka case.

The Subcommittee on Internal Security has literally thousands of press items, both articles and editorials, relating to this case. A few of the editorials support the State Department's position. The overwhelming majority of them, however, are strongly critical of the action that has been taken.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point some representative editorials, both pro and con, that have appeared in our national press. I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of these editorials the exchange of correspondence between Mr. Otepka and the Department of State.

There being no objection, the editorials and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 6, 1963]

OTEPKA CASE

The showdown which is shaping up between the State Department and the Senate Judiciary Committee, or rather its Subcommittee on Internal Security, is both necessary and desirable. For the issues are of highest importance.

What is involved here is a seeming collision between the undoubted right of the State Department to maintain proper security procedures within the Department and the equally undeniable right of the Senate (and the public) to know whether sloppy State Department procedures have been endangering national security.

The Department has preferred charges which could lead to the dismissal of Otto F. Otepka, Chief of State's Security Evaluations Division. These charges were developed after such spy-thriller techniques as searching Mr. Otepka's "burn basket," reading the imprint on his carbon paper, deciphering used typewriter ribbons, patching together torn up notes, etc. Furthermore, a Department official has issued an order forbidding employees to appear before the Senate subcommittee without obtaining advance clearance from State. It is also specified in the order that "this includes contact or interviews with any members of the staff of the subcommittee." This covers a lot of territory.

Naturally, the Senators, or at least those immediately involved, are up in arms. And they should be. For the order to the employees and the action against Mr. Otepka could serve to clamp down the lid on information from the State Department to which the Senate, if not the public, should have access. If this is what is being done, every possible pressure should be brought to bear to stop it.

We find it hard to believe, however, that Secretary Rusk would condone any such activity. It runs counter to his nature, and he is too sensible. Nevertheless, it is good that the Senate has called upon him to testify and that he has agreed to do so. The issue comes down to a question of just what Mr. Otepka was doing. The typewriter ribbons, the used carbon paper, and the rest should tell the story.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 10, 1963]

EXECUTIVE AUTONOMY

For all of Senator DODD's sputtering, he must know that what Otto F. Otepka did was not only unlawful but unconscionable as well. Mr. Otepka certainy knew this himself—which is no doubt why he did it covertly instead of candidly. He gave classified information to someone not authorized to receive it. And he prepared a list of questions to help a Senate subcommittee trip his superior in the State Department. No one can be surprised that the State Department does not want to keep him any longer in a position of trust.

It really does not matter that the recipient of the information he disclosed was an employee of the Senate. He had no authority to give it. If the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee felt a need for classified material in the State Department, its proper course was to summon the Secretary of State and ask him for it. If any underling in the State Department were free at his own discretion to disclose confidential cables or if any agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation could leak the contents of secret files whenever he felt like it, the executive branch of the Government would have no security at all.

Senator EASTLAND, chairman of the subcommittee, has said that "the powers of Congress are at stake" and that he intends "to protect Mr. Otepka by every means at my command." All that the State Department has done is to fire an insubordinate employee. Its power to do so is fixed by the Constitution and was recognized as long ago as the very first Congress. The Congress has power, of course, to fix qualifications for employment in the executive branch and to prescribe procedures for hearing and review in dismissals. It has done so in the civil service acts, and those procedures are being followed in Mr. Otepka's case. Indeed, he can, and may, go to court about the matter.

Without authority to fire subordinates in the executive branch, the President would be powerless to fulfill his constitutional responsibility to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." Congress no more possesses the power to reinstate Mr. Otepka as an employee of the State Department than the President possesses power to remove Mr. J. G. Sourwine as counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 12, 1963]

Lying in State

The Department of State must be a delightful place to work these days. The atmosphere of affectionate camaraderie and warm mutual confidence prevailing there has probably not been matched anywhere since the heyday of the Medicis in renaissance Italy.

Consider the situation, for instance, in the office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, Mr. John F. Reilly. Mr. Reilly was going quietly along minding everybody else's business when he discovered that one of his assistants, a Mr. Otto F. Otepka, was telling tales about him to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

How did Mr. Reilly find out about Mr. Otepka? Why by pawing through the contents of Mr. Otepka's "burn basket", of course, and by tapping Mr. Otepka's telephone. How else?

Mr. Reilly appears to have been assisted in this snooping by another of Mr. Otepka's colleagues, a Mr. Elmer D. Hill, Chief of the Security Office's Division of Technical Services. When these worthy fellows were asked by members of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee if they had ever done any prying into Mr. Otepka's private affairs, however, they looked quite scandalized at so offensive an imputation and replied as blandly as you please that they certainly had never done anything of the sort.

But the fact of the matter appears to be, nevertheless, that, although they may momentarily have forgotten about it, they did actually "bug" Mr. Otepka's quarters in that elegant State Department Building; they now acknowledge as much, although they insist that they didn't really hear anything interesting. So, by "mutual consent," they have been ordered to go on leave until the whole affair is looked into.

What kind of State Department has the United States got these days? One supposes that workers in the Foreign Commissariat of the Kremlin look over their shoulders at their associates with a certain amount of apprehension and anxiety. But who would have supposed that Americans in the American Department of State would need to employ official tasters when they venture into the departmental dining room?

This kind of bugging and spying and tattling produces no kind of security at all. It produces nothing but an atmosphere of crippling and suffocating suspicion. Decent men should not be asked and cannot be expected to work in such an atmosphere. The foreign affairs of a free people should not be conducted in so malign and miasmic a climate.

[From the Washington News, Nov. 13, 1963]

Discord at State

It sounds like a pretty mess at the State Department with one official fired for slipping unauthorized information to Congress and three others charged with snooping on the first man, then denying it to a committee of Congress.

Otto F. Otepka, former Department security risk evaluator, provides the affair with its name—the Otepka case. His dismissal was based, among other things, on the charge he gave a senatorial committee confidential information from security files so touchy it is supposed to be released only with the personal approval of the President.

He has a right to appeal but if the charges stand up, he clearly was insubordinate and ought to stay fired.

Senators defending him, including such powerful figures as Dodd, of Connecticut, and Eastland, of Mississippi, consider the case a test of the powers of Congress as opposed to the Executive powers of the President. This recurring conflict provides the case with added drama.

Senator Dodd demands that, instead of firing Mr. Otepka, the Department get rid of three other officials, at least two of whom denied to a Senate subcommittee they had installed a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office, then later admitted it. These charges are under investigation. These men, it seems to us, also have placed their jobs in grave jeopardy, if not for spying on Mr. Otepka, then for misleading the Senators.

But all question of degrees of guilt aside, the incident lifts the curtain on a nasty internal condition at State which is highly disturbing.

This is the Department which works in a thousand ways to uphold the dignity of the United States around the world, and to keep us out of war. Whether speaking to Congress or to Khrushchev the Department should speak with one voice and that voice should be the voice of the Secretary of State.

If tenure imposed by civil service regulations prevents this and institutionalizes disharmony, then there is something badly wrong with civil service regulations. The security of the United States, upon which the smooth function of this Department measurably depends, is vastly more important than the right of an uncooperative Government employee to hold on to his job.

[From the Richmond News Leader, Oct. 22, 1963]

Otepka Day

Tomorrow is Otepka Day. It is the day that Otto Otepka, career State Department security officer, is scheduled to be released from his job. He is getting fired because he thought that full security procedures should be followed in evaluating the cases of such prize State Department errors as Alger Hiss, William Arthur Wieland, and John Stewart Service. Worse yet, he revealed the laxness to Senate investigators.

There are really two Otepka cases. The most recent began last month when Otepka, an old-line security officer responsible for assembling and evaluating personnel security data, was summarily barred from his office by his new chief, Abba Schwartz. Before Otepka's eyes, six security men set about searching his files and changing the locks on his safes. He was assigned to writing a security handbook, and relieved of all his responsibilities.

Otepka was lectured on institutional loyalty. This meant that Otepka had testified freely before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, frequently contradicting the testimony of his superiors. He told the Senators in closed session about gross ignoring of the State Department security evaluation procedures under the Kennedy administration. Dean Rusk, for instance, had backdated more than 150 high-level security clearances, using special powers intended for emergencies; the Eisenhower administration had used this power five times. Lower echelon clerks handling classified information were given blanket waivers. At times important positions were filled without any notice passing through the security evaluation office.

Otepka also strenuously objected when Harlan Cleveland, an Assistant Secretary of State, named a panel to study security procedures—and some of the men named, in Otepka's experienced opinion, had personnel records so derogatory that they should have had a full FBI investigation. Cleveland even went so far as to inquire what clearances would be necessary to bring Alger Hiss back into the State Department.

At first Otepka testified with the permission and advice of his superiors. But then his superiors flatly contradicted many of his statements. To vindicate himself of possible charges of perjury, Otepka returned to the committee to name names, without asking his superiors if he would be allowed to prove them wrong. By revealing names and classified information to the subcommittee counsel, Otepka was in technical violation of the rules; the irony of it all was that he was the very person who had classified the information.

But even though the State Department was incredibly lax in its general interpretation of security, it began to put the screws on Otepka. His phone was bugged. The sheets of carbon paper that he used were examined to discover his correspondence. Letters that had been shredded and deposited in a sealed "burn bag" for security waste were painstakingly puzzled out. At last the zealous sleuths found what they needed: a memorandum, pieced together from plastic typewritten ribbons, in which Otepka provided some embarrassing questions for the Senators to ask his superiors.

For institutional disloyalty, the loyal Otepka got the pink slip. This was the second go-round. Once before the Department had tried to get rid of him.

Otepka, in testimony a year and a half ago, revealed that the State Department's handling of William Wieland was particularly lax. From testimony by Wieland and others, the Senate subcommittee concluded that Wieland was responsible for much of the Caribbean policy that led to U.S. support of Castro in the late fifties. Wieland had hard information that Castro was a Communist, yet he suppressed any references to this problem in his policy reports.

From Otepka, it was discovered that Weiland had falsified his application and personal history, and had never been properly cleared. And in fact, no clearance of any sort had been entered into the file until the day after President Kennedy told a press conference that he had personally approved the Wieland case.

Moreover, Otepka himself evaluated Wieland as "not a security risk, but unsuitable," with regard to personal conduct under the rules of the Civil Service Commission. Such a ruling requires a mandatory dismissal, unless it is overruled by the top level. Earlier Otepka had made a similar finding in the case of John Stewart Service. But neither Service nor any other Foreign Service officer has been dismissed outright in the past two decades.

These touchy questions of "suitability" refer to both personal conduct and judgment. The Senators found Wieland's administrative judgment both weak and doubtful. Wieland, although involved in personnel administration, did not know whether homosexuality was a problem in the State Department, and said that he had never had to deal with the problem in any way. A more experienced State Department officer called this judgment "incredible." And as far as Wieland's personal conduct is concerned, the Senators directed the Justice Department to study conflicts in Wieland's testimony for perjury action. Wieland is still a high-grade State Department officer, and no action has been taken.

A year ago, the State Department tried to get rid of Otepka by reorganizing the security office, and cutting down on the number of employees. Then they tried, without success, to ship him off to study at the War College. Now he is being fired for cooperating with the Senate.

And tomorrow is Otepka Day. It stands as a symbol, not of one man's lost job, but of a fundamental sickness in the State Department. Behind the foreign policy decisions of the United States stand the men of the State Department. Otepka Day is a day for reckoning.

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) World, Sept. 28, 1963]

A Highly Suspect Flap

Surely the Department of State should be able to perform better than it has over the flap that seems to be developing in the case of a departmental security officer, Otto F. Otepka.

Otepka has been handed a State Department letter of charges, which is the forerunner to dismissal unless cause can be shown that discharge would be unwarranted.

Strangely, the case involves, in part at least, Otepka's submitting to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee departmental information that is classified or secret.

Even stranger is the direction from which has come objections to the Department's handling of the Otepka case. From way-off Dallas, Tex., Robert Morris, former chief counsel for the subcommittee, said he had been informed Otepka's dismissal is being pushed by reason of his too close cooperation with the subcommittee. Morris insists the committee is entitled to the information.

It is a sensitive situation all around.

If the Morris view is correct, it would appear the State Department has been high-handed in seeking to protect its records from warranted scrutiny by a top congressional group. By the same token, the case seems to furnish further evidence that Washington's bureaucracy has reached a dangerous point of untouchability if Congress, which provides its wherewithal, is refused information on its internal workings.

Certainly the Department may have every bit of evidence it needs to dismiss Mr. Otepka. It is also possible Otepka's projected dismissal is not base solely upon Mr. Morris' understanding of the evidence; yet, this has not been denied.

Otepka has served as security evaluations officer for 10 years. It is obviously one view inside the State Department that, whereas Otepka does have a responsibility for working with congressional security forces, he does not have the authority to divulge specified information or information zealously guarded by the Department.

A missing link in the flap is the absence of congressional interest in the case. At least there has been no Senate subcommittee move publicly to defend Otepka's right to continuance on the job.

Secrecy in public office is repugnant to the American people. If the State Department feels justified in its plans to dismiss its security official, surely it has the responsibility for making that justification apparent. Too much secrecy, as the Department seems to be displaying, is as bad or worse than too much conversation on sensitive national secrets.

We think further enlightenment is called for from all parties in the Otepka case, for the bureaucracy has no more privilege to prosecute in secrecy than do the courts of America—and it has no such privilege.

[From the Perth Amboy (N.J.) News, Nov. 22, 1963]

Otepka Case Raises Security Concern

Congressmen and other officials concerned with the scope of Communist influence in the State Department will keep alive the case of Otto F. Otepka.

It will not be filed quietly in some dark nook at the Department.

The latest of the shocking disclosures in the Otepka case is the clear-cut evidence that high State Department officials were "out to get" the dismissed security officer.

Two high-ranking officials resigned (under pressure) recently because they attempted to "bug" Otepka's telephone.

These officials, little more than hatchetmen, conceded that the electronic device they used failed and was removed.

Otepka's "crime" was cooperating with the chief counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. (State Department officials call this "leaking" classified information to Congressmen.)

The issue is simple: Does Congress have the right to find out what is going on in the State Department and what security risks are being shielded by that agency's entrenched bureaucrats?

It is no oversimplification to say that, over the years, the State Department's policies have been questionable, if not downright suspect.

There have been many questions raised on subversives in the State Department in recent years.

When Otepka, a key security official, informed the Senate investigators of questionable security activities in the Department, he was fired.

It appears that the State Department is more interested in protecting its own incompetence than in rooting out subversives.

The Otepka case must serve as a focal point for justifiable concern over the subversion of national security.

[From the Times, Oct. 19, 1963]

Sanity in Internal Security

How far the Nation has moved from the excesses of the McCarthy era is reflected in the instructions the Defense Department has issued to the Armed Forces to respect "lawful civil and private rights" of persons questioned in security investigations. Specifically excluded under the new guidelines are inquiries into such matters as whether an individual considers himself a liberal or a conservative or whether he belongs to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

It is, of course, shocking to think that any military security officer would have ever dreamed of asking such questions in the misguided believe that the answers would provide an index of loyalty. Yet even more outrageous invasions of individual conscience were a frequent part of security procedure in the heyday of McCarthyism a decade ago.

The whole tone of the new instructions, sent out last November but not previously brought to public attention, is one of regard for free thought and expression. The American Civil Liberties Union has rightly praised the memorandum as a "significant forward step" in adjusting the Pentagon's security program to fuller observance of constitutional rights. National strength is best protected by the establishment of a sound balance between the need for guarding against subversion and the need for respecting the privacy of individual beliefs.

[From the Monroe (La.) News-Star, Oct. 7, 1963]

Government Security Risks

Several days ago, the case of Otto Otepka, 48-year-old chief of the evaluation division in the State Department's office of security made secondary news. Accounts said Otepka had passed along confidential State Department information to a Senate subcommittee and had been given 10 days to explain why to the Department's satisfaction or lose his post.

What sort of cat was Otepka about to let out of the bag? This is the question many observers asked. But news stories were sketchy.

The story is of particular interest in this part of the country because the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee works under the Senate Judiciary Committee headed by Mississippi's Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND.

Another personality involved indirectly is former State Department adviser Alger Hiss. In digging into the information furnished by Otepka, who has cooperated in the past with congressional committees with State Department approval, the Senate probers have uncovered an effort within the State Department to clear the way for a number of former security risks—including Hiss—to make their way back to the payroll.

According to information secured by Columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, sworn testimony before the subcommittee revealed that one of the central figures in this maneuvering is Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs.

Cleveland touched off a row within the Department by appointing several persons with questionable security backgrounds to an advisory committee to study the staffing of Americans in international organizations.

This same testimony said Cleveland inquired as to the possibility of bringing Alger Hiss back into the Department.

Hiss, who served as a State Department adviser during the Yalta Conference, was convicted of perjury during the Truman administration. He denied before a Federal grand jury he had served as a relayman for passing official documents to a Soviet agent. The documents were produced and Hiss was convicted.

This is the man who has been in and out of the limelight since he was released from prison in the mid-1950's. He appeared on an air "interview" entitled, "The Political Obituary of Richard Nixon," shortly after the latter had been defeated in the California gubernatorial contest in 1962. And now it seems his name is up for reconsideration by the State Department.

The former Vice President had headed a congressional committee which uncovered the evidence of perjury concerning Hiss back in 1948–49. When this came out in the open, it provided the Republicans a springboard for the 1952 elections.

As a result, the liberals never forgave Nixon, though he never made capital of the incident nor even the principle of seeking out Communists in government while he served as Vice President or during the 1960 campaign.

But the hastily thought out "Political Obituary of Richard Nixon" complete with the appearance of Alger Hiss was supposed to indicate Hiss was now dancing figuratively on Nixon's grave.

If Otepka's leads are based on solid substance, and Hiss indeed returns to the Federal payroll as a State Department employee, he will be able to dance on any number of person's graves. It will also indicate there is still a mess to be cleaned up in Washington.

As a result of Otepka's testimony, only three other State Department employees were questioned by the Senate subcommittee. Then Secretary Rusk instituted a ruling whereby no employee could testify before the committee without his advance approval.

The stage could be set for another clash between a Senate committee and the State Department which could shake the country more so than did the investigations of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy.

But this time, the chief probers will be Senators JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, and THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, both conservative Democrats.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 14, 1963]

The Congressional Underground

The dramatic turn in the Otepka security case—raising questions about the tactics of the accusers as well as the accused—threatens to obscure the real issue involved. If, as charged, Mr. Otepka's State Department accusers employed dubious eavesdropping procedures against him and then deceived a Senate subcommittee about their actions, suitable disciplinary measures against them should be taken. But none of this, in itself, exonerates either Mr. Otepka or the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee from criticism for the practices in which they engaged.

The essential facts in the Otepka case are not in dispute. Mr. Otepka, a State Department security officer, turned over confidential documents on loyalty and security matters to the Senate subcommittee without authorization from his superiors. For this he has been dismissed. His ouster is now subject to appeal to Secretary Rusk, the Civil Service Commission, and, ultimately, to the courts. Whether or not the punishment imposed on him is proper and legal is best judged there.

The disturbing aspect of the case is that both Mr. Otepka and members of the Senate subcommittee have defended their actions on grounds of "higher loyalty." This is a matter that goes beyond the clear right of congressional committees to investigate executive agencies. Orderly procedures are essential if the vital division of power between the legislative and executive branches is not to be undermined. The use of "underground" methods to obtain classified documents from lower level officials is a dangerous departure from such orderly procedures. And nowhere more so than in matters of loyalty and security.

The McCarthy era amply demonstrated the abuses that can result from the publicizing of raw material from loyalty files. Under an Executive order issued in 1948, the authorization of the President himself is required before loyalty information is turned over to congressional committees.

The desirability of such a limitation was upheld in the report of the select committee in 1954 that led to Senate censure of the late Senator McCarthy. It endorsed the President's "power to safeguard from public dissemination" information of this kind, "notwithstanding that the regulations might indirectly interfere with any secret transmission line between the executive employees and any individual Member of the Congress." The same report criticized "failure of the Congress or any Member to adapt itself or himself to reasonable regulations by the President or his authorized department heads * * * with respect to matters involving national security."

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee will best protect American principles by heeding this admonition.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) News, Nov. 9, 1963]

DOUBLE STANDARD OF SECURITY

A good deal of nonsense has emanated from both sides in the dispute over the State Department's removal of Otto F. Otepka as its chief security evaluations officer. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee chairman, Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, went so far as to view Otepka's firing as "a serious challenge to responsible government."

At the other extreme, a State Department spokesman, trying to prove that Otepka was "out of step with the times," made the ridiculous assertion that the Department "has no security risks, and he knows it."

We would be equally astonished if the State Department were proved 100 percent pure or if Otepka's removal crushed responsible government. The truth of the matter seems to be that this is merely a case in which zeal outstripped judgment.

A State Department inquiry indicated that Otepka had fed classified documents to the Senate subcommittee in defiance of his superiors at State. However noble his purpose may have been, if this be true it was an act of disloyalty to his employers and he should scarcely expect to be rewarded.

At the root of the trouble is the ever-present jealousy and bickering between the legislative and executive departments. Senator Dodd was delighted to have a pipeline into State, shortcutting the usual route via the head of the Department. He says that Otepka's violation of executive department orders was "only technical." One may wonder if the Senator would be as lenient if secrets held by his committee were leaked to the executive branch.

Otepka's acquaintance with the State Department's security problems dates back to the days of Senator Joe McCarthy's rampages. It is said that he has passed at least preliminary judgment on the security credentials of more Washington officials than has any other person.

He will have a chance to appeal his dismissal. But on the showing thus far it would appear that he set himself a different standard of security than he helped impose on others.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 7, 1963]

WILL SENATE FIGHT?

The State Department has shown its contempt for the prerogatives of the Senate and its indifference to security risks within its own ranks by dismissing its Chief Security Evaluations Officer. It did so in the face of a direct warning carried by a member of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to Secretary of State Rusk.

The victim of the purge, Otto F. Otepka, is a veteran of 27 years of Government service. For the last 10 he has been the man who gives security clearances to State Department employees. So well and efficiently did he perform that in 1958 he was awarded the State Department's Meritorious Service Award.

But, as Senator Dodd, of Connecticut, has said, in the topsy-turvy world of the State Department, the idea is to catch the cop and not the culprit. So charges were brought against Otepka for having engaged in conduct unbecoming a diplomatic officer—namely, in collaborating with the Senate Security Subcommittee. He was accused of having disclosed secret Department documents to Senators.

In the Department it was said that Otepka "is out of step with the times." A spokesman remarked, "We are not witch hunting any more. We have no security risks, and he knows it." The Senate subcommittee's reaction is one of skepticism. Its investigation of Department wirepulling to picture Castro as the "liberator" of Cuba and not as a Communist, hardly persuaded it that there's nothing kinky in the Department.

It has since been trying to evaluate the security practices, or lack of them, in the Department. It was hampered by a Department order, issued under the cloak of "executive privilege," directing that State Department officials remain away from the subcommittee and give it no information. Otepka freely cooperated with the subcommittee.

Chairman Eastland, of the subcommittee, commented, "The powers of Congress are at stake, and I intend to protect Mr. Otepka by every means at my command against accusations which complain, in effect, that he told the truth when asked to do so by a Senate subcommittee."

There can be no doubt that this case reflects an intention by the Kennedy administration to conduct a purge of patriots. The subcommittee feels that the often misused doctrine of executive privilege can be claimed only by the President, not by any bureaucrat who feels like thwarting Congress. We trust that the Senate will press this central point, for if it lets the issue go by default, Congress will soon find itself hamstrung by the bureaucracy in looking into any facet of public business whatsoever. It would be salutary if it invoked its powers to punish for contempt.

Meanwhile, it should exert its utmost efforts to safeguard Mr. Otepka's career through avenues of appeal which ultimately permit reviews of his case by Secretary Rusk and President Kennedy. We have no great faith that there will be sympathy for Mr. Otepka in any of these quarters, for it is obvious the administration was out to get him, and did. These are the kind of rewards a loyal American can expect from a crowd which can always find excuses for Khrushchev or Tito but none for a vigorous anti-Communist.

[From Glen Falls (N.Y.) Post-Star, Oct. 2, 1963]

ANOTHER OUTRAGE

Washington is able to live only so long before, periodically, it is confronted by a clash between the rights of the executive branch and those of the legislative branch. The latest case concerns a State Department officer who reportedly faces discharge for leaking information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee during the Truman administration. Representative H. R. Gross of Iowa, a Republican, terms the reported threat an outrage.

According to press reports, the man in question dealt with the Department's security information. It is further reported that he is accused of violating an Executive order by giving information in his care to the Senate committee. The order in question provided that records on the loyalty of Government employees were to be kept in confidence in the executive branch.

According to the Constitution the Government is divided into three separate branches, the executive, legislative, and judicial. None is actually independent of the others but none can give orders to the other, either. Congressman Gross asserts that the Senate committee "had every right to know" the information it is supposed to have received. That is a debatable point depending upon the nature of the information. The question to be settled, however, is whether it had the right to obtain the information as it did or, more precisely, whether the State Department employee had the right to give it as he did.

One of the constant complaints related to loyalty information in the past was that unevaluated, unverified information—gossip—was tossed into the public record causing injury to innocent persons. Congress did not have a "right" to this kind or to use it as it often did.

However, the claim that Representative Gross appears to be making is that State Department aids are employed by Congress and should respond with information in their care on request. This cannot be so This man was under Department orders and those are the orders he should have obeyed. As a matter of fact we do not know that he didn't; he is only accused of "leaking" information. However that may be, he is responsible to his superiors, not to Congress.

If Representative Gross sincerely believes that an outrage is being perpetuated—legally perhaps—one is tempted to offer a suggestion. Why not give this man a position with one of the congressional committees? Or would these committees feel that their secrets would not be safe with him?

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic, Oct. 18, 1963]

MORE EVIDENCE OF ARM TWISTING

Two new incidents this week were added to the growing pile of evidence that the New Frontier will go to great lengths to apply the hammerlock to any person who dares to disagree with the policy of the moment.

Otto F. Otepka, veteran Chief of the Evaluations Division of the State Department's Security Office, charged that he has reason to believe that his office telephone had been tapped and that his desk and safe have been opened and searched "with the knowledge and approval of my superiors, if not by their express direction."

Otepka got into hot water with his superiors when he allegedly gave classified information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Otepka said he did not furnish any information until confronted with testimony by his superiors which appeared to make him a liar under oath.

Then, Senator Albert Gore, Democrat, of Tennessee, charged that the Democratic National Committee was attempting to use the tax reduction bill to purge him from office.

Senator Gore, who opposes the measure, accused his own party leaders of political intimidation. He said seven-page telegrams urging support of the tax bill had been sent to Democratic leaders throughout Tennessee.

Otepka is a marked man. His days in the State Department obviously are numbered. Senator Gore is a tougher opponent. His continued life in the Senate is measured by his constituents' votes, not the whim of high party leaders. But the road to reelection could be made rocky by opposition from within his own party.

These are not isolated incidents. They are symbols of a growing panic at the slow pace at which the administration's legislative program is moving.

They are examples of exerting "muscle" to force the puppets to dance when the strings are pulled. Attempts to "lean" too hard on either elected or appointed Government officials in efforts to bring them back into line are not palatable to the majority of Americans.

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Times, Nov. 6, 1963]

The Otepka Case

The name might suggest to many an espionage case, and that's practically what it is, but with a difference. Otto F. Otepka has been removed by the State Department from his post as chief security evaluations officer because he gave confidential documents to the "enemy"—the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

There has hardly ever in the history of the Republic been a time when governmental departments and bureaus did not wrestle with this enemy within: congressional prying. The Otepka episode is only the latest. Congress will now bend every effort to make the State Department sorry that it fired Mr. Otepka because he gave the legislative branch of the Government some inside information on what the executive branch is doing. Senator Thomas J. Dodd, vice chairman of the Senate subcommittee to which Otepka told tales out of school, has risen to the State Department's challenge, and the State Department will find that it has provoked one of the Senate's touchiest on the subject of security. Senator Dodd rates himself high as a judge of loyalty.

The gist of the State Department's grievance and dismissal of Mr. Otepka is that he conspired with the Senate subcommittee in its investigation of departmental security practices in an effort to make his superiors look bad, and that is one of the best known ways for anyone, in or out of Government, civil service or not, to lose his job.

Mr. Otepka, a career man in Government service, has as his specialty the sifting of the backgrounds of prospective Government officials for compromising breaches of accepted standards of patriotic conduct. He came to State from the Civil Service Commission in 1953 as Chief Evaluator of Security Clearances, and he has made a reputation for himself for upholding his own judgments, for or against a person under consideration, regardless of any political pressures that may be brought. The trouble is that it seemed to the State Department that he did finally yield to some political pressure; namely, from the Senate investigatory body, in trying to lend assistance. When a Senate committee decides to investigate, it intends to find something.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Oct. 25, 1963]

Mr. Otepka's Duty

Alarmed at the possibility of senatorial and public indignation over its treatment of Otto F. Otepka, Chief Security Risk Evaluator, the State Department may be planning to reprimand Mr. Otepka rather than seek his dismissal from Government service. This is the report from Roulhac Hamilton, News and Courier Washington correspondent.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, of which Senator Olin D. Johnston is a member, should no more tolerate a reprimand than dismissal of Mr. Otepka. His crime is that he informed the Senate that high State Department officials were planning to bring known security risks back into the Department. Because he furnished this information to the legislative branch of Government, Secretary of State Dean Rusk wants to oust Mr. Otepka.

The Internal Security Subcommittee should make clear that all Government employees owe their loyalty to the United States of America, not to any Department thereof. If Mr. Otepka had evidence of actions hurtful to the security interests of the United States, he had a right—indeed it was his duty—to report it to officials who would take action.

To reprimand a U.S. citizen for doing his duty would be a shame and an outrage. It would be an unmistakable signal to other State Department employees to cover up evidence of disloyalty.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Nov. 5, 1963]

On Firing Otepka

The State Department acted forthrightly and courageously in firing Otto Otepka, its former Chief Security Risk Evaluator, on charges of unbecoming conduct. If the State Department accusations are factual, Mr. Otepka is himself a security risk and should not hold a sensitive post. If Mr. Otepka thinks they are not, he has ample avenues of appeal.

Mr. Otepka, who has been under suspension since September 28, was charged with declassifying and mutilating certain documents and with having prepared questions for the counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to ask State Department witnesses. He denied violating the spirit of the departmental regulations. The subcommittee was then investigating State Department attitudes toward Fidel Castro in the period of Castro's rise to power.

The subcommittee, through its vice chairman, Senator Dodd of Connecticut, strongly supported Mr. Otepka, contending that violations, if they occurred, were "technical." They seemed to us, and obviously to the State Department, to be anything but that. And they must have seemed substantive to the White House—President Kennedy promised on October 9 to examine the matter himself when the time came for disciplinary action.

As we have noted previously, there is more involved here than the activities of Mr. Otepka. The question, and it is not a new one, is whether congressional witch hunters are to be allowed to reach down to minor officials in the executive branch and use them to promote their own causes. It is not a question of getting information; that could properly have been obtained through legitimate channels.

A decade ago the State Department knuckled under to Senator McCarthy on the same issue as the one presented in the Otepka case. We congratulate the Kennedy administration for putting the Senate inquisitors in their place.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Nov. 13, 1963]

Discord at State

It sounds like a pretty mess at the State Department with one official fired for slipping unauthorized information to Congress and three others charged with snooping on the first man, then denying it to a committee of Congress.

Otto F. Otepka, former Department security risk evaluator, provides the affair with its name—the Otepka case.

His dismissal was based, among other things, on the charge he gave a senatorial committee confidential information from security files so touchy it is supposed to be released only with the personal approval of the President.

He has a right to appeal, but if the charges stand up, he clearly was insubordinate and ought to stay fired.

Senators defending him, including such powerful figures as Dodd of Connecticut and Eastland of Mississippi, consider the case a test of the powers of Congress as opposed to the Executive powers of the President.

This recurring conflict provides the case with added drama.

Dodd demands that, instead of firing Otepka, the Department get rid of three other officials, at least two of whom denied to a Senate subcommittee they had installed a listening device in Otepka's office, then later admitted it.

These charges are under investigation. These men also have placed their jobs in grave jeopardy, if not for spying on Otepka, then for misleading the Senators.

But all questions of degrees of guilt aside, the incident lifts the curtain on a nasty internal condition at State which is highly disturbing.

This is the Department which works in a thousand ways to uphold the dignity of the United States around the world, and to keep it out of war.

Whether speaking to Congress or to Khrushchev, the Department should speak with one voice and that voice should be the voice of the Secretary of State.

If tenure imposed by civil service regulations prevents this and institutionalizes disharmony, then there is something badly wrong with civil service regulations.

The security of the United States, upon which the smooth function of this Department measurably depends, is vastly more important than the right of an uncooperative Government employee to hold on to his job.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, Nov. 11, 1963]

Fired for Cause

The State Department's firing of Otto Otepka, its former chief security risk evaluator, has occasioned a flurry in Washington.

One critic has asked, "Why is it wrong to give information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; it's on our side, isn't it?"

Mr. Otepka was charged with unbecoming conduct. He had been under suspension since September 23, charged specifically with declassifying and mutilating certain documents and with having prepared questions for the counsel of the subcommittee to ask State Department witnesses. The subcommittee at the time was investigating State Department "attitudes" toward Fidel Castro during the period of Castro's rise to power.

Vice Chairman Dodd of the subcommittee contends that any violations of which Mr. Otepka might be guilty were purely "technical." Involved in the total issue is whether congressional probers can reach into the executive department and have an official surreptitiously do their work for them. The issue goes beyond getting information which could have been obtained through legitimate channels. It strikes at the system of checks and balances.

The Kennedy administration has rightfully acted in defense of the executive department. A decade ago when a similar issue was presented, the State Department surrendered to Senator McCarthy. The country did not benefit.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Nov. 7, 1963]

Otepka Pays the Price

The dismissal of Otto F. Otepka, a State Department security officer, is sad evidence that the outspoken anti-Communist has everything to fear in the diplomatic bureaucracy, and the leftwinger is assured of the ultimate in protection.

Otepka was the principal witness before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that made an 18-month investigation of why U.S. diplomats were so misinformed as to the Communist orientation of Fidel Castro.

Otepka discussed in detail the background of one William Arthur Wieland, who had charge of the State Department's Cuba desk during Castro's rise to power.

The subcommittee reported that Wieland, who formerly lived in Cuba under the name Montenegro, a fact he had not disclosed on his employment application—had been guilty of grave errors of judgment and had failed to forward to State Department superiors material concerning Castro's Communist ties.

A State Department investigation of Wieland concluded he was not disloyal but that, as the subcommittee concluded, his judgment was faulty.

The net result: Wieland is still holding a comparable important position in the State Department; Otepka is now dismissed for alleged furnishing to the subcommittee copies of classified documents concerning the case, in violation of a Truman administration order on executive department privilege with reference to classified papers.

Is the American public supposed to believe that Otepka's alleged violation is the first instance of classified information finding its way out of the State Department? Has not the administration, and others before it, constantly leaked the imports of such documents to news media when the objective was considered of sufficient importance, political or diplomatic?

Security officer Otepka may have violated a regulation. But, if so, it was in cooperation with a sensitive and security-conscious arm of the Government, an important agency of the U.S. Senate, and his motives could only have been of the highest.

Had Otepka belonged to the powerful, intrenched "fourth floor" of the State Department, there can be little doubt a way would have been found to excuse his transgression. But he does not belong, as Wieland apparently does. For the one, retribution is inexorable, speedy and harsh; for the other, long-winded extenuation, security, preferment. This is a miserable contrast in how not to beat the enemy.

[From the Perth Amboy (N.J.) News, Nov. 8, 1963]

Skeletons in State's Closets?

A high-ranking State Department security aid is facing disciplinary action, and the bitter reaction from Congress is just starting.

The issue is simple: Can Government agencies work behind closed doors, hidden from the watchful eyes of Congress and the taxpayer?

Otto F. Otepka was in the post of chief security evaluation officer in the State Department until his dismissal by that agency this week. It had been coming.

He was accused of "leaking" to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee what the State Department considers classified documents.

This is by no means the end of the Otepka case, because Congressmen have pledged to have the full story told.

Moreover, it is by no means the end of congressional efforts to find out what is going on behind curtains of secrecy. This curtain is dropped by the entrenched bureaucracy under the tired label of the "national interest."

When a security aid is fired, the logical question is, What does the department in question have to hide?

What is the department afraid of Congress uncovering?

Full disclosure and the public's basic right to know demands a full investigation of the Otepka case and continuing efforts to prevent Government agencies at any level from clandestine operations.

[From the Alexandria (La.) Town Talk, Nov. 1, 1963]

Only in Washington

Otto Otepka is a security specialist in the State Department who has been charged with breaches of security. The State Department has not suspended him.

Meanwhile, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee pursued an investigation of the State Department's investigation of Mr. Otepka, who is charged specifically with leaking classified information to the subcommittee's counsel, J. G. Sourwine.

At last report from the wonderful wizards of the Potomac, it had not been determined who would investigate the Senate committee's investigation of the State Department's investigation of Mr. Otepka.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Nov. 3, 1963]

A Question of Security

To the Editor:

Otto Otepka, a civil servant of the State Department, is about to be fired by Dean Rusk, an executive appointee, or by other civil servants because he answered questions posed by members of the Senate Internal Security Committee, sent to Washington by constituents.

It was intended by our Founding Fathers that checks and balances be set up whereby control would remain in the hands of the people through their elected representatives. But the burgeoning bureaucracy of the Kennedy administration is audaciously attempting to cashier a faithful employee who was merely obeying the law.

Richard Wilson (October 20) pinpoints the real reason: "The truth is that Otepka follows too hard a line in security evaluations to satisfy his immediate superiors." Is it any wonder the State Department is charged with being soft on communism?

R. L. Heunisch.

Minneapolis.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) News, Nov. 8, 1963]

Otepka Day

Tuesday, if the gentle reader is not aware of it, was "Otepka Day" at the State Department in Washington—that is to say, the day on which State handed Mr. Otto Otepka, its chief security risk evaluator, his walking papers. It has been so designated by the silly-willies who lavish martyrdom on anyone who resists the State Department's dark conspiracy against the American way.

Mr. Otepka has been fired (subject to review by the Civil Service Board) for "conduct unbecoming an officer of the Department of State"—more specifically, for turning classified information over to J. G. Sourwine, the chief sleuth of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, whom we seem to remember as a hand-me-down from the McCarthy days. Mr. Otepka has not denied that he provided classified information as "exhibits" for Mr. Sourwine's use.

Prominent Senators—themselves members of the Internal Security Subcommittee—have sprung to Mr. Otepka's defense; and Representative Gross of Iowa calls his firing an outrage.

Is it really? The public has no way of knowing, at this point, whether the classified information Mr. Otepka turned over to the Senators should be "classified"; but that is essentially beside the point—which is simply that a State Department employee may not convey classified papers to unauthorized persons.

This was, of course, the original charge against Alger Hiss—that he had turned over secret papers to outsiders. And it is passing strange that those who so mercilessly pressed for justice to Mr. Hiss would now make a martyr of a man who is apparently guilty of the same indiscretion. What sort of double standard is this? Are the learned Senators attempting to maintain that when Mr. Hiss relayed classified papers to outsiders—if he did so—it was high treason, but when Mr. Otepka did the same it is patriotism?

[From the Philadelphia News, Nov. 9, 1963]

Conflict of Interest Case Leaves Otepka in Middle

A conflict of interest case unlike those we usually hear about has aroused the ire of a number of Congressmen. This one involves Otto F. Otepka, who has been removed from his post as Chief Security Evaluations Officer of the State Department.

Otepka's conflict of interest involves his loyalty. He worked for the State Department, but was called upon to give information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

This put him squarely in the middle of a longstanding struggle between Congress and the executive branch over how much information the executive branch has a right to withhold from legislators.

The State Department charges that Otepka handed over confidential documents, and even suggested a line of questioning that the subcommittee's counsel should follow in quizzing Otepka's superiors. State obviously feels that Otepka's usefulness is ended.

Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, vice chairman of the subcommittee, accuses the State Department of treating Otepka worse than someone guilty of disloyalty or espionage.

The conflict between Congress and the executive branch is an old one, and is, in fact, a conflict no one really wants to see ended.

But a delicate and useful system of checks and balances is at work here and the case of Otepka is a classic example of divided loyalty.

Otepka has said he will appeal. His dismissal is subject to review by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and President Kennedy.

In the meantime, how about some guidelines for people like Otepka? There will certainly be others in the future.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Nov. 9, 1963]

When Did This Become a Crime?

The curious case of Otto F. Otepka is bound to have serious repercussions in Washington for many weeks to come.

Mr. Otepka was fired by the Department of State on official grounds of "conduct unbecoming an officer" of the Department.

Stripped of officialese, this means that Mr. Otepka got caught giving the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee information on State Department policies and policymakers involved in the Cuban situation.

He is accused of turning over classified documents and helping prepare questions for J. G. Sourwine, subcommittee chief counsel, to put to witnesses during an investigation into the Cuban crisis.

Already members of the subcommittee are protesting the action. Senator THOMAS DODD of Connecticut, a Democrat, interprets the dismissal of Mr. Otepka as a direct slap at Senate authority and as a "serious challenge to responsible government."

Senator DODD points out that Mr. Otepka is not charged with having falsified information but with simply handing the group some facts it might find useful in its efforts to preserve the Nation's security.

Although the punishment meted out to Mr. Otepka is severe, his actions are not unprecedented. Officials in executive departments have "leaked" information to Members of Congress from time out of mind, just as Congressmen have "leaked" information from Capitol Hill.

Admirals have leaked information bolstering their case against the Army and Air Force. The Securities and Exchange Commission has been accused of leaking reports on its proceedings in cases. And who can surpass Brother Bobby's Justice Department for skillful leaking of progress reports on criminal cases?

Is anyone prepared to propose that the middle Kennedy brother be fired for giving out "secret" information?

The executive department, the Congress and enterprising reporters have all benefited from this loose handling of so-called "secret" information. On balance, we are sure that the American public has benefited as well.

But rarely if ever has a member of a department been fired for this almost commonplace act. If it should become a hard and fast precedent the civil service rolls will shrink to almost nothing.

It is hard to understand why Mr. Otepka's "crime" is any more heinous than the thousands which have gone before. It leads almost inescapably to the conclusion that the State Department has something dreadful to fear from such leakage.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee should launch an immediate investigation into the State Department's suspiciously harsh treatment of an old and able employe. We shall look to Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, a member of the subcommittee, for a report soon.

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, Nov. 9, 1963]

OTEPKA'S OUSTER DISTURBING

The dismissal Tuesday of Otto F. Otepka from his job as chief security evaluations officer for the U.S. State Department raises new and disturbing questions as to what's going on in Washington.

Otepka was fired on charges of conduct "unbecoming an officer of the Department of State." Under suspension since September 23, he was accused among other things of giving confidential information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

The ouster of Otepka recalls a column we published a few weeks ago in which Washington writers Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott reported that Senate probers digging into the case "uncovered a backstage effort within the State Department to clear the way for a number of former security risks, including Alger Hiss, to worm their way back onto the Government's payrolls as either employes or consultants."

Otepka reportedly was so shocked by the activities of one of the central figures in the maneuvering in behalf of the former security risks that he sent a series of reports to his superiors, including one that was routed through channels to McGeorge Bundy, President Kennedy's chief White House adviser on foreign policy.

Otepka was quickly placed under surveillance and then removed from security operations, according to the Allen-Scott report, and charges of "misconduct," involving the alleged turning over of documents to the Senate subcommittee, were filed against him.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, attacked Otepka's ouster as an affront to the subcommittee, which he heads, and to the Senate as a whole.

"In the topsy-turvy world of the State Department, 'security violations' have come to mean not the act of turning over information to an alien power but the act of giving information to a Senate subcommittee," DODD told the Senate.

"The charges boil down to the simple fact," DODD said, "that Otepka testified honestly before the subcommittee about matters relating to security in the Department of State."

The Senator also said that the State Department in the Otepka case has in effect nullified statutes establishing the right of Government employes to furnish information to Congress and has "issued a warning to all employes who cooperate with the Internal Security Subcommittee that the giving of testimony unpalatable in the higher echelons of the Department is a crime punishable by dismissal."

Asked about the case at a news conference October 9, President Kennedy said, "I will examine the matter myself, when it comes time to take any disciplinary actions, if such a time does come."

Evidently somebody in the State Department decided the time had come Tuesday. It raises the question of whether Kennedy did examine the case and, if so, whether he goes along with the dangerous notion that security officials are supposed to guard the the security of departmental officials against congressional investigations or the security of the Nation against its enemies.

[From the Anniston (Ala.) Star, Nov. 7, 1963]

STATE DEPARTMENT THROWS BOOMERANG

There are some painful and unanswered questions left in the wake of the State Department's firing of Otto F. Otepka, its chief security risk evaluator.

Although the evidence is not yet conclusive, the Department may be the guilty party.

It may be guilty of getting rid of an officer who had the disconcerting habit of providing Congress with keys to unlock the musty vaults where evidence of official mistakes are kept.

Second, it opens the Department and the entire administration to charges by the fevered rightwing that may stick.

Two of the 13 specific charges against Otepka accuse him of preparing questions for a Senate Internal Securities investigator. The committee was conducting an inquiry into the reasons the State Department did not know that Fidel Castro would turn sour.

While it is a natural instinct to hide mistakes, the airing of these mistakes is a basic safeguard of our governmental system.

The ability of Congress and newsmen to present to the American public the whole record—both good and bad—affects the flow of information with which we can make a judgment about whether an administration should be reelected or turned out.

Critical examination is equally as vital in Democratic administrations as in Republican administrations.

Of course, the fact that Mr. Otepka is the chief security risk evaluator is incidental. But the frantic rightwing will probably translate his firing as an attempt by the administration to protect the "thousands of Communists in the State Department."

These charges, when they come we will brand as patently false because the sources that make them never have evidence, only suspicion.

Certainly, Government employees owe their superiors loyalty. They can and should be replaced if they are not doing a good job. Carefully prepared leaks aimed at specific personalities in any department involving information it is not necessary for the public to know to evaluate an administration could be considered a firing offense.

But, if the whole case against Mr. Otepka is no more damaging than providing clues to a Senate committee to get answers that should be found, the State Department itself will be on trial for his firing.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Press, Nov. 13, 1963]

OTEPKA CASE PUTS SPOTLIGHT ON NASTY CONDITION AT STATE

It sounds like a pretty mess at the State Department with one official fired for slipping unauthorized information to Congress and three others charged with snooping on the first man, then denying it to a committee of Congress.

Otto F. Otepka, former Department Security Risk Evaluator, provides the affair with its name—the Otepka case. His dismissal was based, among other things, on the charge he gave a senatorial committee confidential information from security files so touchy it is supposed to be released only with the personal approval of the President.

He has a right to appeal but if the charges stand up he clearly was insubordinate and ought to stay fired.

Senators defending him, including such powerful figures as DODD of Connecticut and EASTLAND of Mississippi, consider the case a test of the powers of Congress as opposed to the Executive powers of the President. This recurring conflict provides the case with added drama.

Senator DODD demands that instead of firing Otepka, the Department get rid of three other officials, at least two of whom denied to a Senate subcommittee they had installed a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office, then later admitted it. These charges are under investigation. These men, it seems to us, also have placed their jobs in grave jeopardy, if not for spying on Otepka, then for misleading the Senators.

But all question of degrees of guilt aside, the incident lifts the curtain of a nasty internal condition at State which is highly disturbing.

This is the Department which works in a thousand ways to uphold the dignity of the United States around the world, and to keep us out of war. Whether speaking to Congress or to Khrushchev the Department should speak with one voice and that voice should be the voice of the Secretary of State.

If tenure imposed by Civil Service regulations prevents this and institutionalizes disharmony, then there is something badly wrong with Civil Service regulations. The security of the United States, upon which the smooth function of this Department measurably depends, is vastly more important than the right of an uncooperative Government employee to hold on to his job.

[From the San Antonio News, Nov. 8, 1963]

STATE DEPARTMENT'S NEW SECURITY CASE

Firing of State Department security investigator Otto F. Otepka brings to the fore once again the problem of independence between executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Otepka was dismissed for giving what the State Department says is classified information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Specifically, he offered data for questions to be asked by the subcommittee's staff lawyer.

Otepka very probably violated Department rules. The question is whether such violation was in the public interest—as it very well could be. At any rate, the subcommittee now is duty-bound to justify its probing into whatever it was the Department finds so objectionable about the disclosures.

State Department "spokesmen" say the kernel of the controversy is that "Otepka is out of step with the times. * * * We are not witch-hunting anymore. * * * we have no security risks, and he (Otepka) knows it."

That is a sweeping statement, even naive. Security clearances are sensitive matters; they should be handled fairly and carefully. It is always a big surprise to find some trusted employee has been some kind of a spy, so it is better to err on the side of caution than on the side of carelessness in security matters.

We certainly do not presume to judge the case. We think that where executive employes have information they believe to be for the public good, they should place it where it will get adequate consideration. This clearly places the burden of proof upon the Senate subcommittee to justify what has been done.

[From the Roswell (N. Mex.) Record, Nov. 7, 1963]

Senators Kept in Dark?

Why should any information be withheld from the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee? How can such a committee operate unless it has all the facts in hand to judge any case of security violation.

It seems strange to us that Otto F. Otepka was dismissed from his job as State Department security officer for, among other things, giving confidential information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Is this a crime? Is this reason for dismissal?

How can our Senators do their jobs properly unless they have access to information concerning security violations? It appears here that the executive branch of the Government is usurping the constitutional power of the legislative branch of Government.

Would the same thing happen to a State Department employee who gave information to the House Un-American Activities Committee?

The formal charge against Otepka was conduct "unbecoming an officer of the Department of State."

Did this conduct merely mean that the man was cooperating with the U.S. Senate?

Now, there may be more to this case than meets the eye. But, it seems to us that Senators charged with security matters should have access to any information that is pertinent.

Are the branches of Government in competition with one another—the State Department hiding facts—the Senate and the Senate forced to scratch for information.

We feel that the public is due a complete explanation of Otepka's firing. Does the State Department consider a request from the Senate for information "none of the Senate's business?"

If so, things are in a sorry state.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, Nov. 7, 1963]

The Price of Disclosure

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is charged with the responsibility of attempting to weed out subversive characters who have had a way, during the past 40 years, of infiltrating places both high and low in the Federal bureaucracy. This committee carries on its work by summoning witnesses whose testimony it is felt will shed light on matters related to national security.

The committee is bipartisan, and over the years has managed to provide substantial protection for the Government in this fashion.

Now the country is faced by the spectacle of the firing of the chief security officer of the State Department by Secretary of State Dean Rusk on charges that this career employee had disclosed departmental secrets. One might conclude from this bare recital of the facts in the case of the security officer, Otto F. Otepka, that this man had handed over to some potential enemy, such as Russia, vital information. The fact is that he is being fired because his testimony before the Senate committee made liars out of several of his superiors in the State Department who had, either in ignorance or purposely, connived at the employment of persons in the Department who were doubtful security risks.

Members of the Senate committee are naturally indignant that Otepka has been dismissed on charges of conduct "unbecoming an officer of the Department of State." Several of these Senators are predicting the security officer's reinstatement. Not as a partisan matter, but as one of concern for the continued seeking out of subversion, we hope that the Senators are right.

Of course, Mr. Otepka may be in the process of being blessed if his discharge stands. We recall that in 1957 the Tennessee Valley Authority fired Joseph C. Swidler for preparing loaded questions to be asked by U.S. Senators during the course of hearings on the confirmation of Arnold R. Jones, nominated to membership on the TVA board. Swidler's firing was handled under the cloak of resignation, but there was never any question about the real facts in the case.

This appeared to be a sad blow to Mr. Swidler's career, but the next thing anyone knew, he bobbed up as the President's Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, a post which he holds today. Mr. Otepka may take some comfort from this occurrence so far as the future is concerned.

We hope, however, that before he takes a new job anywhere, he will write a book giving the American people the facts on his discharge and the identity of his accusers. Subversion is nothing new in Foggy Bottom, but the only protection against it is full disclosure when it appears.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Nov. 7, 1963]

A Riproaring Evening

One of the most important developments in modern political affairs has been the appearance of a healthy dialog in the realm of political science.

Basic issues are being explored as never before. Positions are being articulated with more skill than has been evident in years.

Bay area residents will have a chance to observe political exchange at its very best in a few days. On the evening of November 18, in the Berkeley Community Theater, there will be a debate between the eminent conservative editor and columnist, William F. Buckley, Jr., and the distinguished University of California Professor Joseph Tussman.

To top it off, the moderator of the debate will be Eugene Burdick, author of the bestseller, "Fail-Safe."

The debate will be conducted on the subject, "Resolved: The Communist Investigating Committees Have Been Beneficial to the American People." In other words, it will undoubtedly center upon the activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

This particular debate will be conducted Oxford style, which allows the opponents to cross-examine each other. We can scarcely imagine a more lively and enlightening evening. Both as sheer entertainment, and as a means to achieve enlightened citizenship, the debate promises to be unusually fruitful.

Why don't you plan to see it?

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Nov. 20, 1963]

Some Clarification

Caught up in their own and the State Department's lies, two of the Department's security officials have found it advisable to resign after first having been put on "administrative leave." The two who have departed under fire of the Senate distinguished themselves as the administration's hatchet men in a campaign to get rid of Otto F. Otepka, the Department's security evaluations officer.

The State Department had aroused the anger of a Senate security subcommittee by firing Otepka after he had testified before the committee about disloyalty within the State Department. The Department accused him of telling secrets to the Senators and charged him with conduct unbecoming a diplomatic officer. Otepka is still on the payroll pending an appeal.

Called before the committee to explain the charge against Otepka, John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, and Elmer Dewey Hill, a subordinate, told the Senators under oath that they knew nothing of any attempts to tap Otepka's telephone.

Last week the two men—plus a third who had given similar testimony but is still on duty—sent letters to the subcommittee purporting to "clarify" their testimony. This "clarification" consisted of an admission by Reilly that he had given orders to "survey feasibility of intercepting conversations in Otepka's office." There, according to the letters, Hill and the third man "altered the existing wiring in the telephone in Otepka's office to the division of technical services laboratory by making additional connections in the existing telephone wiring system."

Their purpose, according to this lame excuse, was not to monitor the telephone but to pipe all of Otepka's office conversation into Hill's laboratory. Having thus bugged all of his conversation by way of his telephone, and searched his classified wastebasket as well, the three men had the nerve to swear that they knew nothing of attempts to tap his telephone.

For telling the truth to the Senators, Otepka was fired. For lying to them, Reilly [said to be a close friend of Attorney General Kennedy] and Hill have been reluctantly and belatedly allowed to go their way. Thus has the State Department demonstrated its measure of ethics: To collaborate patriotically with Congress is conduct punishable by dismissal; to impede and mislead Congress and to persecute those who collaborate with it is preferable. The testimony of Reilly and Hill is not the only thing in the State Department that needs "clarification."

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Nov. 7, 1963]

Meanwhile, for Telling Truth, Otepka Lost His Job

If it shocks that Otto Otepka—the State Department's chief evaluator of security risks—has been fired for telling the truth, the shock isn't relieved by disclosure of the methods employed in the search for grounds of dismissal. By reports now current in the Senate, Government "cloak and dagger" operatives used all the tricks in the trade in "investigating" him. They checked discarded carbon papers, looked at used typewriter ribbons, and one Senator claims they put a "tap" on the Otepka telephone.

One would assume that this technique is reserved for spies, serving some unfriendly power. Mr. Otepka was not engaged in espionage. His "offense" was that of testifying before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in connection with its investigation of State Department Cuban policies; and answering some questions put to him by that body. The truth of his answers isn't in dispute.

But as a result of this intra-Department sleuthing, Mr. Otepka has been dismissed, presumably with the sanction of Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Although Republican members of the subcommittee have been outraged by this action, it is more significant that the most telling criticism has come from Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut Democrat and vice chairman of the body.

Terming the firing of Otepka a serious challenge to responsible government, Senator DODD added: "This man was not charged with giving the committee false information. He was fired because he gave the committee true information that embarrassed someone." It was DODD who said he had "proof positive" that Otepka's phone was bugged.

It is the contention of other subcommittee members that the information received from the security officer was needed in order to establish that other State Department officials were not telling the truth.

Obviously, there must be a great deal about the administration's Cuban policies which would "embarrass someone." But any effort on the part of any official to cover up by telling lies is beyond the pale.

Apparently, the subcommittee, which naturally would be dominated by Democrats, was attempting to find out Cuban policies—past and present. The Nation would like to know what they are, or were. Though the administration's record is not one it can point to with pride, the story should be told short of violating national security regulations. The mistakes of the past cannot be hidden on an "out of sight, out of mind" in departmental files.

The Civil Service Commission will review the case and President Kennedy has promised to look into the matter personally.

But as of this moment, it appears that a career State Department official has been "sacked" for telling the truth to a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate who was trying to find out nothing but the truth.

[From the Spokesman-Review, Nov. 11, 1963]

OFFICIALS LIED TO NAIL OTEPKA

One of the strangest and most shocking stories to come out of the State Department in recent years is the acknowledgement that three of its officials did not tell the truth when they were questioned with respect to the case of Otto F. Otepka.

The questioning was done before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee months ago when that group was trying to find out why and how Mr. Otepka was being harassed by his own State Department superiors. He is the 27-year career man who was fired last week for conduct unbecoming an officer of the State Department.

Citizens who have been following this strange case will remember that Mr. Otepka had cooperated with the Senate committee in its investigation of how Fidel Castro came to power in Cuba and what was happening in our State Department before and after the Communist takeover.

The State Department apparently tried to brand Mr. Otepka as disloyal to the Department because he was more loyal to the U.S. Government and to the inquiries in the U.S. Senate.

Now it has been revealed that in their effort to discredit Mr. Otepka, three officials of the Department not only tried to "bug" the Otepka office but they misled the Senate committee when it was probing into that incident. Just the other day they corrected their earlier testimony before the committee and have since been suspended by the Department.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut Democrat, who is vice chairman of the committee, declared after this acknowledgement last week that "in effect, they lied under oath to a Senate committee; these are the fellows the State Department should prefer charges against, not Otepka."

Under the Kennedy administration the State Department has developed all sorts of justifications for conforming with the peaceful coexistence policies of such Communist leaders as Khrushchev and Tito. Yet there has been, among various State Department officials, little or no sympathy for men like Mr. Otepka, who was for several years the Department's chief security evaluations director.

The Otepka "crime" was to pass along to the Senate committee some information which other State Department personnel considered confidential.

It certainly is time for the Senate committee to get to the bottom of this case. Senator DODD and others on the committee should not be deterred by the mere fact that the Department itself has suspended the "bugging" officials and has tried to cover up the trail of mistakes previously made.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times, Nov. 11, 1963]

LOYALTY TO WHOM?

Another unhappy episode has been added to the long series of controversies between the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government over the latter's right of access to information about agencies operating under the executive department. The question involved seems no nearer resolution now than at any time since it first became a bone of contention.

The current case is that of Otto F. Otepka, who was removed by the State Department as its chief security evaluations officer because, the Department charges, he gave confidential information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Last month the State Department revealed how it put its own internal security apparatus to work on Mr. Otepka. In an opperation with cloak-and-dagger aspects, the agency says it found evidence obtained by checking the contents of Mr. Otepka's "burn bag" that he had clipped "secret" classifications from some documents and had turned the documents over to the chief counsel for the Senate subcommittee. "Burn bags," it should be explained, are receptacles for officially destroyed papers. The Department's investigators also claimed they found evidence that Mr. Otepka had supplied the subcommittee's council a list of questions to be asked of State Department superiors of Mr. Otepka during a probe of State Department matters.

If Mr. Otepka appeals his removal from his $16,900-a-year position, the case could reach the courts after administrative channels are exhausted. Mr. Kennedy told a news conference last month that he would review the case before a final decision was reached. Whether this means the Chief Executive has already studied the case or whether he will take a hand in the likely appeal to Secretary Rusk is unclear.

At any rate, a serious question has arisen over the matter of loyalty of Government employees. In this context the issue is not one of loyalty to country but of loyalty to a branch of Government. The State Department decision in the Otepka case suggests it considers that loyalty to an agency of the executive branch supersedes loyalty to the legislative branch. If this is to be the standard, then, as Vice Chairman DODD, of the Senate subcommittee, charges, the American system of checks and balances in Government is at stake.

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer, Nov. 10, 1963]

CHASING THE POLICEMAN

"(d) The right of persons employed in the civil service of the United States, either individually or collectively, to petition Congress, or any Member thereof, or to furnish information to either House of Congress or to any committee or member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with."

The foregoing excerpt from a Federal statute is basic to the American system of governmental checks and balances. It is not a license to the legislative branch of the Federal machinery to abscond with the constitutional prerogatives of the executive branch; but it does assure to Congress and to its legislative committees the right to secure the facts and figures without which their Members must legislate in darkness.

The provision has particular relevance in view of last week's dismissal of Otto F. Otepka for conduct "unbecoming an officer of the Department of State."

Another view of the charge against Mr. Otepka was offered by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, on the Senate floor Tuesday. "The charges on which Mr. Otepka's dismissal is based," Senator DODD told the Senate, "boil down to the simple fact that he testified honestly before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security on matters relating to security in the Department of State."

BEHIND OTEPKA: A RECORD OF EXCELLENCE

Had he not been singled out for dismissal, Otto F. Otepka very probably would have devoted his entire adult life to Government service without coming to the attention of the American public. He has behind him some 27 years of Government service. In the course of his career, he had risen to be Deputy Director of the State Department's Office of Security and officer in charge of evaluations. His efficiency ratings over the years have been nothing but "excellent." In 1958, in fact, he was singled out by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to receive a Meritorious Service Award.

Quite suddenly, Mr. Otepka's prospects changed.

First of all, his State Department superiors installed a tap on his telephone. (A State Department official subsequently denied under oath that such was the case, but the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee purports to have evidence that the tap was in fact installed.)

Then they began to piece together scraps from Mr. Otepka's wastebasket.

Next they locked him out of his office and denied him access to his office files—all without bringing formal charges against him.

EVEN ENEMY AGENTS ARE NOT SO TREATED

As Senator DODD told the Senate Tuesday, "No one suspected of espionage or disloyalty has to my knowledge been subjected to such surveillance and humiliation."

The gist of the case against Mr. Otepka is that he helped to prepare a series of questions for J. G. Sourwine, counsel to the Internal Security Subcommittee, to put to State Department witnesses in the course of a recent inquiry into U.S. Cuban policy.

Mr. Otepka, it turns out, was convinced that the State Department officials were lying to the Senate subcommittee.

About other reasons for the sudden anti-Otepka vendetta there can be only speculation. The conservative fortnightly, National Review, contends that Mr. Otepka objected strenuously to the security clearance granted to Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for international organization affairs. An additional Washington rumor has it that a plan is afoot to bring Alger Hiss back into the State Department as a consultant.

Subcommittee members have indicated that Mr. Otepka is also concerned about the presence of men of questionable background in influential State Department assignments. Some of them purportedly helped to draw up the test ban treaty. Others, the same report goes, are working on additional agreements with the Soviet Union.

Mr. Otepka also is reportedly concerned about the Kennedy administration's practice of granting so-called emergency clearance to top State Department personnel at the rate of 150 a year (compared with two or three emergency clearances a year during the Eisenhower administration). This means that such personnel go to work immediately without awaiting the normal procedures through which the State Department and other Federal agencies have traditionally protected themselves from subversives and others unsuited for access to Government secrets.

A final cause of concern to Mr. Otepka has been the constant juggling of Office of Security affairs since the very outset of the Kennedy administration. These successive reorganizations aroused the concern of John W. Hanes, who served as head of the office during the Eisenhower years. "I can only say," Mr. Hanes declared, "that this either is due to incompetence or a deliberate attempt to render the State Department's security section ineffective."

Whatever the specific facts of the case, there has been no hint of partisanship in the congressional outrage at the anti-Otepka campaign. When the Otepka crackdown began, in fact, the full Senate Judiciary Committee (of which the Internal Security Subcommittee is a part) voted unanimously to lodge a formal protest with Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Among those supporting the protest: Senator Edward Kennedy, of Massachusetts, the President's brother.

It is small wonder that Senator Dodd declared in his Senate speech Tuesday: "In the topsy-turvy attitude it has displayed in the Otepka case, the State Department has been chasing the policeman instead of the culprit."

Senator Dodd is unquestionably aware that he has undertaken a fearful responsibility in registering so vigorous a protest against a department of the Federal Government. He is aware that allegations of incompetence—or worse—in the handling of security affairs are of the gravest nature.

So are we.

But if the Otepka case is weighed alongside the whole drift of the Kennedy administration in its frantic efforts to justify an "accommodation" with international communism, there is cause for the deepest concern on the part of every American.

From the wining and dining of J. Robert Oppenheimer at the White House to the selection of Alexander Meiklejohn (who has given his name to a campaign to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities and to an almost infinite variety of other leftist causes) to receive a Federal medal on the Fourth of July, the Kennedy administration has closed its eyes to what could happen and to what has happened in the past.

Such a line, far from reducing tensions in today's troubled world, has earned for the Kennedy administration the contempt of our enemies, the anxiety of our friends and the apprehension of the 180 million Americans the administration is sworn to protect.

[From the Texarkana (Tex.) News, Nov. 18, 1963]

OTEPKA REPERCUSSIONS

The firing of Otto Otepka raises a stench in the State Department. Though Otepka has been ejected from his job as a Department security officer, the last has not been heard of his case.

Otepka has the right of appeal, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is showing a great deal of interest in how and why his dismissal came about.

Facts behind the case are strange. Otepka was charged with 13 violations of regulations, but most if not all of these were technicalities. His real "crime" in the eyes of top State Department officials, was his cooperation with the Senate subcommittee in its investigation of alleged laxity in security in the Department.

Moreover, the State Department apparently resorted to illegal wiretapping in its effort to get Otepka. Senator Thomas Dodd, vice chairman of the subcommittee, said his group has proof that Otepka's phone was tapped. State Department officials first denied, then admitted, that at least an attempt was made to do so.

Dodd also reported that Otepka was locked out of his office, was denied access to his files which were rifled, and was humiliated before his fellow employes.

But the heart of the issue is whether a Federal employe should be harassed and fired for talking to a committee of Congress. The subcommittee had a right to the information it wanted.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 19, 1963]

NO TRADE

The resignation of two high officials in the Security Division of the State Department who figured in the recent dismissal therefrom of Otto F. Otepka, may strike some as a sort of poetic justice trade-off.

The immediate cause of the resignations has to do either with belated admission of using or trying to use a wiretap or "listening bug" in early stages of a checkup on Mr. Otepka; or with early denial or disclaimer of this attempt; or with both.

But behind this development are some other matters involving officials in the Department and Mr. Otepka which still keep alive the question of whether he was justly treated from the inception, and particularly with respect to the main gravamen of the charges against him—the disclosure of nominally "classified" documents, etc.

The Senate Judiciary Committee is very disturbed about the handling of the Otepka affair by the State Department. Leaving aside the matter of congressional-executive relations, the picture that has been drawn, and so far not contradicted, is that of a zealous security officer whose very zeal got him into hot water; of an officer whose only real recourse to protect himself in a situation of conflict in sworn committee testimony was to effect declassification, borderline or otherwise, of certain material. Until these points are cleared up, it cannot be assumed that anything less than reinstatement of Mr. Otepka, apart from resignations made or perhaps pending, will serve justice in his case.

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Enterprise, Nov. 21, 1963]

THE OTEPKA CASE

Nobody, but nobody, comes off well in the case of Otto Otepka.

Mr. Otepka, veteran Chief Security Evaluator in the State Department, was caught playing footsie with congressional investigating committees. Not only did he give a Senate subcommittee access to classified personnel files, but he coached committee members in methods of grilling his own superiors.

This is scarcely tolerable behavior, even assuming that Mr. Otepka was operating from the purest of patriotic motives. How can you run a department of government with this concept of internal loyalty?

But in order to complete the evidence on which they fired Mr. Otepka, two of his superiors tapped his telephone, rummaged through his desk and his wastebasket, and then falsely denied that they had done so.

This was sneaky business compounded by perjury, of which the pair may or may not have purged themselves by volunteering to correct their original testimony.

Now these two men, at first sent on leave when the case became sticky, have been allowed to resign. That is gentle treatment for such serious trespasses. Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who admittedly has other worries, nevertheless owed the country a more indignant reaction.

This does not complete the roll of inglorious behavior, however. Some Senators have been overplaying the affair as much as Mr. Rusk has been underplaying it. They have been trying to make a hero out of Mr. Otepka. Shades of the McCarthy era.

The whole thing has been a sorry mess. And it certainly has turned up no heroes.

[From the Terre Haute (Ind.) Star, Nov. 20, 1963]

OTEPKA REPERCUSSIONS

The firing of Otto Otepka raises a stench in the State Department. Though Otepka has been ejected from his job as a department security officer, the last has not been heard of his case.

Otepka has the right of appeal, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is showing a great deal of interest in how and why his dismissal came about.

Facts behind the case are strange. Otepka was charged with 13 violations of regulations, but most if not all of these were technicalities. His real "crime," in the eyes of top State Department officials, was his cooperation with the Senate subcommittee in its investigation of alleged laxity in security in the Department.

Moreover, the State Department apparently resorted to illegal wiretapping in its effort to "get" Otepka. Senator Thomas Dodd, vice chairman of the subcommittee, said his group has proof that Otepka's phone was tapped. State Department officials first denied, then admitted, that at least an attempt was made to do so.

Dodd also reported that Otepka was locked out of his office, was denied access to his files which were rifled, and was humiliated before his fellow employees.

But the heart of the issue is whether a Federal employee should be harassed and fired for talking to a committee of Congress. The subcommittee had a right to the information it wanted.

Otepka has been dismissed for telling the truth—his right under the U.S. Civil Service Code which states that such "shall not be denied nor interfered with." He has been the victim of illegal tactics—wiretapping. The Senate committee should pursue the scent.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, Nov. 16, 1963]

ONLY FACTS ARE NEEDED

Once upon a time, a radio character made famous the phrase: "If it's not one thing—it's the same thing." And, of course there is that ancient French proverb: "The more things change, the more they remain the same."

All of which is an oblique introduction to some views on the case of Otto F. Otepka, erstwhile Security Evaluations Chief of the State Department. Otepka, it will be recalled, was fired last week on charges that he had given confidential data about the Department's operations to the Senate Internal Security Committee's counsel without first obtaining his superiors' consent and approval.

Senators and Members of the House have arisen in what they obviously believe to be righteous wrath, led by Senator Thomas J. Dodd, to defend Otepka and to demand his reinstatement. The State Department, until now, has remained adamant in his dismissal, which he has the right to appeal.

All of this harks back to the McCarthy era and is the basis for referring to the illusion of change. The late Senator Joseph McCarthy, Wisconsin Republican, it will be remembered, even went so far as to appeal on the Senate floor to Federal employees to ignore their bosses' orders and provide him with data he needed to fuel his machine. It was mainly because of such tactics that he eventually was censured by the Senate itself.

On the other side of the coin there is an inscription that requires the rendering to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and in this case, it means information that belongs to the people, or their duly elected representatives. Congressional inquiries are conducted, ostensibly, to obtain information for use in drafting corrective legislation, and the executive department has a duty to provide it, without inforcing rules and regulations that tend to make its officials "squealers" if they feel their higher loyalty rests with the Nation rather than with the bureaucracy.

President Eisenhower evidently thought he had solved the issue when he accepted responsibility for approving the furnishing, or refusing to furnish, sensitive data to Congress, a step in which President Kennedy has concurred. But once again, in the Otepka case, the so-called foolproof solution has been punctured.

There obviously are some areas in which the national security is involved and which it would not be justifiable to publicize. We have enough confidence in the patriotic commonsense of most Members of Congress to believe they would recognize such areas and refrain from invading them. On the other hand, the executive departments, and especially the State Department, are inordinately jealous of guarding "secrets" that may be general property.

The methods apparently used to "get" Otepka are reprehensible, spying on his mail, tapping his telephone, locking his files away from him and similar tactics that smack more of college sophomores than responsible officials to whom our national policy enforcement is entrusted.

In any case, the sooner the Otepka case is cleared, the better everything will be for a while until another official decides to let the Congress "seduce" him.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Union, Nov. 18, 1963]

Otepka's "Reprehensible" Ouster

Because Otto F. Otepka, veteran career officer, was dedicated to national security and believed Congress ought to know of security failures, the State Department fired him yesterday.

Specifically, he was discharged for giving confidential information to a Senate subcommittee, conduct described as unbecoming an officer of the Department of State.

The confidential information involved data on wretchedly bad advice by official State counselors which contributed to the Government's failure to realize in time that Fidel Castro was a plain Cuban Red.

Is it conduct unbecoming an officer to reveal facts, involving among others William Wieland, a top-ranking State official, and the ill informed, stupid recommendations they made in sugaring over or disclaiming Castro's communism?

Are we to believe it more becoming in the chief security evluation officer of the State Department to hide the shells of grave errors and incompetence?

Congressman H. R. Gross, of Iowa, called Mr. Otepka's ouster "most reprehensible." He declared the State officer was fired for providing a committee of Congress with information necessary to show that "other officials of Government were not telling the truth."

Acting Chairman Dodd of the Senate subcommittee previously stated discharge of Mr. Otepka would be "a great tragedy," indicating State Department is more interested in prosecuting employees who want to clean up the Department than employees accused of practices injurious to national security.

The dismissal of Mr. Otepka, a conscientious and courageous State Department official, is indeed reprehensible. He simply didn't want sleazy security methods in sensitive areas and is convinced, as we are, that far too many dubious characters are ensconced in the Department's advisory echelon.

As to the charge made against him of giving classified information to Congress—that holds about as much water as a cheesecloth sieve.

There is a long tradition that the executive department can withhold some documents from the Senate. This, we submit, cannot govern when the security of the country is at issue.

Congress has a right to make security laws. It cannot possibly do so if it doesn't accurately know the needs.

The Otepka case is not finished. It should be appealed, to the courts if necessary.

What irony to punish him for baring State Department security errors and do nothing about the men who were miserably taken in by the Castro flimflam.

[From the Missoula (Mont.) Missoulian, Nov. 15, 1963]

Versions Differ on Otepka's Difficulty

In 1942, Otto F. Otepka became a wartime security officer for the Civil Service Commission. He was recruited a year later by the late Scott McLeod, a zealous investigator of security risks, as his chief evaluator of security clearance at the State Department. Now he has been dismissed from his $16,900 a year job, and a State Department spokesman says Otepka is "out of step with the times. We are not witch hunting any more. We have no security risks, and he knows it."

However, that is not quite the way Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, sees it. As vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcomittee, Dodd says that Otepka was fired because he "testified honestly before the panel on matters relating to security in the Department of State." The dismissal was on 13 charges of giving confidential documents to the committee, and furnishing questions to be asked Otepka's superiors.

The case emphasizes the difficulty Congress has in getting information on disloyalty, malfeasance, conflict of interest, or other wrongdoing in the executive branch of the Government.

Otepka is, of course, entitled to a State Department hearing on the charges. Should the decision be against him, he is entitled to appeal to the President and to the courts.

Should the dismissal be upheld, personnel of the executive branch of the Government undoubtedly will be more reserved in the future in answering questions of congressional investigators.

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette, Nov. 19, 1963]

Honest Testimony in Washington

Otto F. Otepka, Chief of Valuations in the Security Office of the State Department, was dismissed from the service early this month on charges of conduct unbecoming a State Department officer.

Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, took the floor of the Senate to declare Otepka's sole offense was that he had "testified honestly" before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee about security in the State Department.

Many Senators have been upset over Otepka's dismissal, claiming that if this action should stand, the Senate would thereafter be in a poor position to get honest testimony from any Government employee. Recently, however, three State Department officials have written to the Internal Security Subcommittee asking to change the testimony they gave at a secret subcommittee meeting last July. Their testimony at that time was that they had no knowledge of an attempt to tap Otepka's telephone. All swore they knew nothing of such an attempt.

The officials named as testifying were John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security; David I. Belisle, special assistant to Reilly, and Elmer D. Hill, Chief of the Division of Technical Services, Office of Security.

Upon receiving the letters the subcommittee without comment released both the sworn testimony of the three officials and their letters. News reports indicate that the testimony revealed repeated denials that Otepka's phone had been tapped. All three said they had no knowledge whatever of such an attempt.

However, the clarifying letters told a different story. Summarized in news reports the story is that Reilly became suspicious that Otepka might be privately furnishing information to J. Sourwine, chief counsel of the subcommittee. He and his assistant, Belisle, discussed a variety of investigative techniques which might be used to determine whether their suspicions were correct. On March 18, Mr. Reilly asked Hill to "undertake a survey of the feasibility of intercepting conversations in Otepka's office." Hill and Clarence J. Schneider, chief of the technical operations branch, altered the wiring in the telephone in Otepka's office and established a circuit from Otepka's office to the Division of Technical Services laboratory by making additional connections in the existing telephone system wiring.

They declared they were not trying to monitor Otepka's telephone but overhear conversations in his office. Later the telephone system was disconnected as Reilly reported he had found information he was looking for from the examination of Otepka's classified trash basket.

Senator Dodd's comment was that "although the State Department official has denied under oath that this was done, the subcommittee has proof that the tap was installed.

"The State Department official who told the untruth is the man who ought to be dismissed. The only man dismissed thus far is the man who told the truth."

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who is reviewing the Otepka appeal from the dismissal order, should set this matter straight.

[From the Memphis, (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Nov. 20, 1963]

No "Big Brothers"

Otto F. Otepka, a longtime State Department security officer who won particular praise during the tenure of the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, fell from favor in the hierarchy headed by Secretary Dean Rusk. He was fired under accusation of leaking information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

As a result of the ensuing furor, two other State Department security officers were relieved of duty, and subsequently they have resigned. These men, John F. Reilly and Elmer D. Hill, testified under oath before the Internal Security Subcommittee in July and August that they never had bugged the office or telephone of Mr. Otepka or taken papers from his "classified trash." Later they were forced to admit there had been tampering with the Otepka phone and other clandestine efforts to undermine the security conscious official.

The case seemed to raise the issue of whether loyalty to the present high command of the State Department was to be ranked higher than loyalty to country.

Powerful Senators have sided with Mr. Otepka, and their efforts have revealed the shocking interdepartmental ax wielding that made of Otepka a crucificial object.

The resignation of Mr. Reilly and Mr. Hill, who admitted they had not told the Senate Internal Security the full truth, puts the State Department, and the Kennedy admin-

istration, on notice that such tactics are not to be condoned by Congress or the public.

It is highly fortunate that this move toward the "big brother" attitude of a totalitarian state has been thwarted in the glare of publicity.

[From the Springfield (Ill.) State Journal, Nov. 22, 1963]

Otepka Incident: Loosening of Security

For the life of us we can't understand the reason for the continual dispute between the executive branch of the government and the Congress over matters of security involving U.S. personnel.

Aren't we all for rooting the untrustworthy out of sensitive spots and exposing traitors and spies?

But we read of State Department employees attempting to "bug" the telephone of a security chief of their own branch and quarreling with the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee over confidential information about employees.

Ever since the Kennedy administration has come into office there has been a general loosening of security regulations within governmental departments, and a growing tendency to resent and resist efforts of congressional committees to find out what is going on and why.

The administration continually seeks to hide behind the so-called executive privilege.

The latest incident was dismissal of Otto Otepka, the State Department security officer who was fired for allegedly giving classified information to a Senate committee, and the subsequent suspension of two department employees for giving conflicting evidence on whether they had sought to "listen in" on Mr. Otepka's telephone conversations.

Mr. Otepka's crime is that in testifying before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on Loyalty Matters, supposedly as required under civil service legislation, he gave some information he should have kept secret.

This seems an odd way to waste the energies of Government when, as a Navy flag officer pointed out at a recent conference of top defense industry management officials meeting in Pomona, it is obvious the Communists are intensifying their efforts to steal the secrets of the United States.

The admiral's remarks were not in relation to the Washington controversy but in regard to industrial security on the part of management in a time when we "are target No. 1 for all others who are seeking to improve their political, economic, and military position."

In his annual report for the 1963 fiscal year, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, warned that the Communist Party in the United States, despite all the legal actions taken against it as a result of FBI investigations, is continuing its untiring efforts to advance the cause of world communism, but again has shifted its tactics.

Its major aim now, the Bureau's report says, "is to convey the impression that Communists are loyal citizens of the United States who merely hold political views which differ from those currently prevailing. They deny any direction from abroad and allege they are seeking change only through legal means."

Thus, under that guise, Communists have been able to invade our campuses and increase their contacts within Government as well as industry.

Instead of fighting each other, the congressional committees and the executive branch had better set about fighting the Communist conspiracy. There should be no secrets from each other regarding loyalties.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Herald, Nov. 15, 1963]

Affront to Democracy Itself

If America ever has a dictator, he will not ride into office at the head of a revolutionary parade, preceded by a military coup and followed by a goosestepping private army.

He will assume dictatorial powers little by little: Through reduction of powers of the States, transfer of decisionmaking from the Congress to the White House, intrusion of Government into all areas of the economy, and grabbing of legislative reins from State legislatures and from the Congress by an Executive-appointed U.S. Supreme Court—all heralded as social progress.

He will be assisted by departments and bureaus which insist increasingly on rendering allegiance only to the would-be dictator, and not to the voters:

The United States, we Americans always have maintained, comes closest among the world's governments to being a government by the people. Yet in recent years—so many citizens maintain—some of these trends which have been listed as the preliminary steps to a dictatorship have been greatly accelerated.

The latest example of action designed to saddle this Nation eventually with a totalitarian system is in the State Department. This is the Department which in past years has been shown to be a haven for security risks, and which is in a position, because of its field of activity, to compromise the Nation's safety should it employ persons sympathetic to communistic regimes, or who are careless of security. An example of the dangers is apparent in our Nation's complacency while a Communist took control in Cuba.

A clear demonstration that the State Department scorns the people as a source of its authority came recently with the firing of a Department security official, Otto F. Otepka, because he answered questions of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Other Department officials, in order to prove the guilt of Otepka in acknowledging allegiance to the voters' representatives in the Congress, tapped Otepka's telephone and conducted searches of his wastebasket.

To compound the devious means by which they hoped to enforce statism, they lied to the subcommittee about their snooping and later admitted they lied.

U.S. Senator Thomas Dodd, of Connecticut, calls the State Department's contempt for the subcommittee an affront to the Senate. It is more than that. Since the Senate speaks for the voters who elect its Members, it is an affront to the voters and to democracy as a system of government.

We cannot afford a system of bureaucracy operated along the line of their counterparts in the Kremlin. The most thorough investigation, and the strongest possible action, should be taken in the Otepka case.

[From the Monroe (Mich.) News, Nov. 18, 1963]

Strange Federal Goings-On

There was considerable consternation when a Federal official voiced the policy that it was our Government's right—if not obligation—to lie to preserve its position. This philosophy of a new era in Government shocked many an observer. Many, however, just put it down as an imprudent remark that was made off the cuff and had no basis in fact as a method of Federal operations.

But an increasing—and disturbing—number of revelations has been made that gives some credence to the opinion that there are those in Washington who do indeed believe it is all right to lie in order to keep opposition and criticism to a low level.

Take, for example, the case of the Reverend Martin Luther King who, it was charged, was driven around Alabama in transportation supplied by the U.S. Government. During October, when civil rights unrest was at a razorsharp edge, Governor Wallace of Alabama charged that the Justice Department was paying for Reverend King's excursions in Alabama stirring up further unrest. In response, the Justice Department said Governor Wallace's charge was "either a gross mistake or a deliberate attempt to mislead the people." Earlier this month, on the eve of a Dallas (Ala.), County grand jury inquiry, the Justice Department retracted its earlier statement and admitted that a Department lawyer had lent a Government-rented car to a person who drove Reverend King around in it. The Department said Governor Wallace had been correct.

Then there is the case of Otto Otepka, fired State Department security employe. During Senate Internal Security subcommittee hearings Otepka made a number of statements regarding State Department handling of persons alleged to be security risks taken into the Department. Otepka said that Department efforts to humiliate and embarrass him included wiretapping of his office telephone. He named those who he believed to have done the wiretapping. The subcommittee quizzed the three who are supposed to have done the wiretapping. The three vigorously denied the charge. On November 9 the State Department said that two of three later admitted that they lied during the subcommittee hearings and that they had, in fact, attempted to eavesdrop on Otepka's telephone.

These aren't the only two cases of Federal bureaucratic deliberate lying. Others have been revealed. It is this trend that disturbs so many citizens. To be effective a government has to be believed.

[From the Washington (Pa.) Observer, Nov. 13, 1963]

Information Challenge

In 1942, Otto F. Otepka became a wartime security officer for the Civil Service Commission. He was recruited a year later by the late Scott McLeod, a zealous investigator of security risks, as his chief evaluator of security clearance at the State Department. Dismissed from his $16,900 a year job, a State Department spokesman said Otepka is "out of step with the times. We are not witch hunting any more. We have no security risks, and he knows it."

However, that is not quite the way Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Connecticut Democrat, sees it. As vice chairman of the subcommittee, Dodd says that Otepka was fired because he "testified honestly before the panel on matters relating to security in the Department of State." The dismissal was on 13 charges of giving confidential documents to the committee and furnishing questions to be asked Otepka's superiors.

The case emphasizes the difficulty Congress has in getting information on disloyalty, malfeasance, conflict of interest, or other wrongdoing in the executive branch. If upheld—Otepka can appeal to the President and the courts if his departmental trial goes against him—it would discourage others from testifying honestly.

[From the Pine Bluff (Ark.) Commercial, Nov. 19, 1963]

The Otepka Case

The Otepka case is complex enough, certainly, but the heart of the controversy in the case seems to us as simple as it is fundamental.

The basic question posed is whether any Federal employee has the right to disclose information which he holds in trust. Mr. Otepka is alleged by his defenders to have violated State Department regulations in pursuit of a transcendent loyalty to his country. But this defense won't wash.

Fundamental to effective security procedures is that no leakage of classified material can be sanctioned—whether the leakage is to the Soviet Embassy or a Senate committee.

Of many objections to the higher loyalty doctrine which can be voiced, the most important is perhaps that the resolution of security problems cannot be left to the individuals directly affected. Mr. Otepka felt impelled by conscience to give confidential information to people not authorized to receive it. Mr. Otepka felt that agents of the U.S. Senate should be the recipients of his confidence. His good judgment in the selection of confidants ought perhaps to be congratulated but we don't see how an exception can be made for those who betray a public trust only with the best people. The next executive employee may feel as strongly impelled by his conscience to give information to the Order of Hibernians, or the Interior Department, or the Ambassador of the United Arab Republic. It should not be forgotten that the real security problems during and just after World War II were with a few people who felt that they were helping the war effort or the establishment of a peaceful world by passing information to our allies, the Russians.

[From the Lewistown (Pa.) Sentinel, Nov. 15, 1963]

OTEPKA REPERCUSSIONS

The firing of Otto Otepka raises a stench in the State Department. Though Otepka has been ejected from his job as a Department security officer, the last has not been heard of his case.

Otepka has the right of appeal, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is showing a great deal of interest in how and why his dismissal came about.

Facts behind the case are strange. Otepka was charged with 13 violations of regulations, but most if not all of these were technicalities. His real "crime," in the eyes of top State Department officials, was his cooperation with the Senate subcommittee in its investigation of alleged laxity in security in the Department.

Moreover, the State Department apparently resorted to illegal wiretapping in its effort to "get" Otepka. Senator THOMAS DODD, vice chairman of the subcommittee, said his group has proof that Otepka's phone was tapped. State Department officials first denied, then admitted, that at least an attempt was made to do so.

DODD also reported that Otepka was locked out of his office, was denied access to his files which were rifled, and was humiliated before his fellow employees.

But the heart of the issue is whether a Federal employee should be harassed and fired for talking to a committee of Congress. The subcommittee had a right to the information it wanted.

Otepka has been dismissed for telling the truth—his right under the U.S. Civil Service Code which states that such "shall not be denied nor interfered with." He has been the victim of illegal tactics—wiretapping. The Senate committee should pursue the scent.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, Nov. 18, 1963]

OTEPKA OUSTER FORTHRIGHT STEP

The State Department acted forthrightly and courageously in firing Otto Otepka, its former Chief Security Risk Evaluator, on charges of unbecoming conduct. If the State Department accusations are factual, Otepka is himself a security risk and should not hold a sensitive post. If Otepka thinks they are not, he has ample avenues of appeal.

Otepka, who has been under suspension since September 23, was charged with declassifying and mutilating certain documents and with having prepared questions for the counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to ask State Department witnesses. He denied violating the spirit of the departmental regulations. The subcommittee was then investigating State Department attitudes toward Fidel Castro in the period of Castro's rise to power.

The subcommittee, through its vice chairman, Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, strongly supported Otepka, contending that violations, if they occurred, were "technical." They seemed to us, and obviously to the State Department, to be anything but that. And they must have seemed substantive to the White House—President Kennedy promised on October 9 to examine the matter himself when the time came for disciplinary action.

There is more involved here than the activities of Otepka. The question, and it is not a new one, is whether congressional witch hunters are to be allowed to reach down to minor officials in the executive branch and use them to promote their own causes. It is not a question of getting information; that could properly have been obtained through legitimate channels.

A decade ago the State Department knuckled under to Senator Joseph McCarthy on the same issue as the one presented in the Otepka case. We congratulate the Kennedy administration for putting the Senate inquisitors in their place.

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer, Nov. 14, 1963]

THE OTEPKA PLOT THICKENS

Were it not for the vigorous protest lodged by the Senate Judiciary Committee and its Internal Security Subcommittee, Otto F. Otepka would very probably have been driven from Government service in disgrace, and the American people would have known nothing of the circumstances of his humiliation.

Now, however, the State Department, which Mr. Otepka served as Deputy Director of the Office of Security, has granted what is known as administrative leave to two other Department officials directly involved in the Otepka case.

The two officials testified under oath before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that they had not installed a tap on Mr. Otepka's telephone while he was still serving as a security evaluator in the State Department. Subsequently, when the committee made it clear that it had evidence to the contrary, they asked permission to amend their testimony.

Hence, pending further inquiry into the question, the State Department has granted them administrative leave.

In this circumstance, alone, there is enormous irony.

Mr. Otepka's grave crime, in the State Department's eyes, is that he testified truthfully before a Senate committee. For this offense, his telephone was tapped, his wastebasket was pilfered, he was locked out of his office, and denied access to his files. His humiliation, in brief, was as ostentatious and complete as the State Department could make it.

The two others in the case, however, who apparently have confessed to lying to a Senate committee, are simply put on administrative leave, drawing their full salaries and knowing nothing of the opprobrium heaped upon Mr. Otepka.

The overriding significance of the entire Otepka case, we believe, is the widespread assumption in official Washington that the threat of Communist infiltration into sensitive area of the U.S. Government is nonexistent.

This conviction, in turn, stems from the article of faith, altogether too widely held in the so-called liberal community, that McCarthyism was a far more loathesome chapter in American history than Hissism or Harry Dexter Whiteism.

There was a time, curiously, when Mr. Kennedy had the courage to speak up against what he called "the Lattimores and the Fairbanks" whose State Department machinations resulted in the loss of China to the free world. But the realism of that, John F. Kennedy seems to be something today's John F. Kennedy is trying to live down.

And the Nation is the loser.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review, Nov. 20, 1963]

STATE DEPARTMENT COY OVER OTEPKA

Two officials of the State Department, who first denied and then acknowledged covert efforts to undermine Otto F. Otepka, have now resigned under fire.

Mr. Otepka is the former head of the Evaluation Division of the State Department Security Office. He was fired early this month after a long period of harassment. His major crime which was termed "conduct unbecoming an officer of the State Department" was to pass along to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee some information which some of his superiors and associates considered confidential.

The loyalty of Mr. Otepka has never been in question. But there now has arisen some question of the loyalties of other State Department personnel who did not like U.S. Senators probing into State Department operations, especially those dealing with the Castro Communists in Cuba.

The Otepka case presents only one aspect of the "mess in Washington" under the present administration. The State Department has been exceedingly coy about the Otepka case because it deals with the very heart of the conduct of American foreign policy.

State Department officials have spent considerable time in the last 3 years in the briefing of selected citizens and so-called opinionmakers—briefing them in the points of view considered acceptable to the American people. But State Department officials have been less than candid in revealing some of the matters that Mr. Otepka thought essential for our national lawmakers to know.

The deception which the two recently resigned officials had practiced before the Senate committee does not speak well for the quality of intellectual honesty which the public has a right to expect. The fact that these two men have quit under fire should stimulate a thorough senatorial check into why and how our foreign policy operations have been conducted with respect to our relations with the international Communist conspiracy.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) News, Nov. 20, 1963]

IS LOYALTY A MISTAKE?

The State Department has dispensed with the services of two officials who lied to a congressional committee about their improper conduct in the Otepka case.

The Department's action was appropriate, but it doesn't clear up all the questions the firing of Otto Otepka has raised. Mr. Otepka's long and faithful service as a security officer is a matter of record, and his dismissal still carries a heavy stench of foul play.

Mr. Otepka's only crime was cooperation with Congress and concern about the Nation's security. If he violated department technicalities, as his critics charge, his transgression hardly equaled those of his persecutors.

The defense being offered for the State Department—that its hirings and firings are not any business of Congress—is no defense at all. The national security is a valid concern for Congress and for the public and so are the credentials of those who serve in key positions. The apparently unjustified dismissal of a loyal and efficient public servant is the business of Congress.

Mr. Otepka appears to be the victim of a vendetta within the State Department. It is ironic that the Department's defenders are those who complain about "witch hunts," and in some cases, those who have helped to shield persons guilty of graver mistakes—if you want to call Mr. Otepka's loyalty that.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 19, 1963]

No Trade

The resignation of two high officials in the Security Division of the State Department who figured in the recent dismissal therefrom of Otto F. Otepka, may strike some as a sort of poetic justice trade off.

The immediate cause of the resignations has to do either with belated admission of using or trying to use a wiretap or "listening-bug" in early stages of a checkup on Mr. Otepka; or with early denial or disclaimer of this attempt; or with both.

But behind this development are some other matters involving officials in the Department and Mr. Otepka which still keep alive the question of whether he was justly treated from the inception, and particularly with respect to the main gravamen of the charges against him—the disclosure of nominally "classified" documents, etc.

The Senate Judiciary Committee is very disturbed about the handling of the Otepka affair by the State Department. Leaving aside the matter of congressional-executive relations, the picture that has been drawn, and so far not contradicted, is that of a zealous security officer whose very zeal got him into hot water; of an officer whose only real recourse to protect himself in a situation of conflict in sworn committee testimony was to effect declassification, borderline or otherwise, of certain material. Until these points are cleared up, it cannot be assumed that anything less than reinstatement of Mr. Otepka, apart from resignations made or perhaps pending, will serve justice in his case.

[From the Terre Haute (Ind.) Star, Nov. 20, 1963]

Otepka Repercussions

The firing of Otto Otepka raises a stench in the State Department. Though Otepka has been ejected from his job as a Department security officer, the last has not been heard of his case.

Otepka has the right of appeal, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is showing a great deal of interest in how and why his dismissal came about.

Facts behind the case are strange. Otepka was charged with 13 violations of regulations, but most if not all of these were technicalities. His real "crime," in the eyes of top State Department officials, was his cooperation with the Senate subcommittee in its investigation of alleged laxity in security in the Department.

Moreover, the State Department apparently resorted to illegal wiretapping in its effort to "get" Otepka. Senator Thomas Dodd, vice chairman of the subcommittee, said his group has proof that Otepka's phone was tapped. State Department officials first denied, then admitted, that at least an attempt was made to do so.

Dodd also reported that Otepka was locked out of his office, was denied access to his files, which were rifled, and was humiliated before his fellow employees.

But the heart of the issue is whether a Federal employee should be harassed and fired for talking to a committee of Congress. The subcommittee had a right to the information it wanted.

Otepka has been dismissed for telling the truth—his right under the United States Civil Service Code which states that such "shall not be denied nor interfered with." He has been the victim of illegal tactics—wiretapping. The Senate committee should pursue the scent.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, Nov. 11, 1963]

Wrong Person Discharged

Reference has previously been made here to the dismissal of Otto Otepka, a senior security officer of the State Department, because he gave to members of the Senate Judiciary Committee information concerning irregularities and probable illegalities affecting the security of the United States.

On Tuesday, Senator Thomas H. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, asserted that "the dismissal of Mr. Otepka by the Department of State is a serious challenge to responsible government and to the system of checks and balances on which it is based."

Those American citizens who have tried to keep conversant with the sprawling Department of State since the era of Alger Hiss first brought its security weaknesses into the limelight will suspect there is a good deal more to the firing of this employee than the public yet knows about. After Senator Dodd made his speech three State Department officials "came clean" with the Senate committee, admitting that the telephone wiring in Otepka's office was rigged with the purpose of monitoring his conversations with counsel for the Senate body.

The statements of the three State Department employees were volunteered to the committee after Senator Dodd had said in a Senate speech that "although a State Department official has denied under oath that this (a phone tap) was done, the Subcommittee on Internal Security has proof that the tap was installed." The three statements agreed that the tap had not actually been used for two reasons. One of these was that it did not work. The second was that a careful scrutiny of Otepka's wastebasket gave his superiors in the State Department the information which they apparently sought.

On the face of it, it looks as if for a few days there was a little perjury involved here where these three State Department officials, who presumably engineered Otepka's firing, were concerned.

Most of us will side with Senator Dodd, it is believed, when he said: "An employee of the State Department came to our subcommittee and, under oath, said that the telephone had not been tapped—which was an untruth. This is the man who ought to be subject to charges. When an employee of the Government comes before a congressional committee and either makes willful misstatements or tells untruths under oath, I believe dismissal charges should be preferred against him. But up to the present hour, the man who has been dismissed is the man who told the truth, and so far as I know, the man who told the untruth has not been moved against."

Doesn't the Senator from Connecticut remember where he is—right in the middle of the Kennedy administration's "managed news" operation?

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, Nov. 13 1963]

A Slight Case of Lying

Judgment on Otto F. Otepka, the State Department security officer fired last week, will have to be reserved until more evidence and testimony are released to the public. But already the State Department has smudged its case by admittedly lying to the Senate subcommittee that was hearing Otepka.

Last summer, the committee asked John F. Reilly, Otepka's boss, whether any listening devices had been installed in Otepka's office. Reilly's answer: "No, sir."

The committee asked the same of Dewey Hill, another security chief, "No, sir."

This was sworn testimony. After Otepka was fired, Senator Dodd said the committee had clear evidence that a listening device was installed in Otepka's office in the hope of catching him passing information to the committee.

After this, Hill and Reilly sent letters to the committee admitting they tried to install a listening device.

Their explanations leave something to be desired. Reilly said he ordered the tap to see if it could be done "without undue risk of detection." Hill said he made the tap and took it out after 2 days because he couldn't hear anything. Neither of them sought to defend what he did.

One other salient factor is that the State Department keeps saying that Otepka violated an Executive order in passing classified information to the Senate committee. It has not come to grips with his testimony that there are weaknesses in the security system.

On the other hand, the two State Department officials have admitted one lie in their testimony.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal, Nov. 12, 1963]

Sensible Turn in Otepka Case

A glimmer of sense finally is showing up in the topsy-turvy case of Otto Otepka, the State Department security officer dismissed for what his superiors regarded as giving information to the enemy—in this case, to Congress.

In one of the few understandable moves of the whole affair, the State Department has given "administrative leave" to two officials who "bugged" Otepka's telephone and then lied to the Senate about it. They now must stay away from their desks while their activities are examined.

At the same time, Otepka is set to file an appeal of his dismissal order.

It is established that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee was not given the truth in earlier testimony by John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, and his aide, Elmer D. Hill.

Last summer the two men, along with another Reilly assistant, denied before the subcommittee that they had tapped Otepka's phone in an attempt to gain evidence that Otepka was passing information to Members of Congress.

After it became apparent that the subcommittee had learned differently, the three admitted they had tapped Otepka's phone.

In an attempt to excuse their action, they contended that the device was never used and was removed after 48 hours. But the only reason it was removed, it now develops, was that they found the evidence they wanted in Otepka's "burn bag," a depository for confidential material.

All this bolsters the demand of Nebraska Senator Roman Hruska, a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee, that the men who lied to the subcommittee should be fired, "at a minimum."

The separate, and even graver, issue still centers about Otepka himself. If his dismissal is upheld, no employee of the Federal administration ever would be free to enlist the aid of Congress, even if he were convinced that his superiors were giving jobs to security risks, as was the case with Otepka.

This would be a highly dangerous situation and surely one not sanctioned by any appreciable portion of the U.S. public.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic, Nov. 15, 1963]

CONDONING A WITCH HUNT

If it had been discovered that officials of congressional committees investigating Communist influence in the Government had attached an electronic eavesdropping device to the telephone of a loyal U.S. employee, the Nation's newspapers, radio, and television networks would be up in arms.

Yet although two State Department officials recently admitted that they attached just such a device to the telephone of Otto F. Otepka, former Chief Security Evaluation Officer of the State Department, there has been little or no protest from the Nation's most conspicuous opinion moulders.

The reason for the silence—even though the pair, in secret sworn testimony to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, previously denied knowledge of the installation of a listening device in Otepka's office—is that the investigators were not checking on Otepka's loyalty to the United States. They were looking for a way to get rid of Otepka because of his testimony before a congressional committee in which he furnished information about lax security procedures in the State Department.

Therefore, those who cry loudest about congressional "witch hunts" now find themselves in the position—because of their failure to protest the illegal harassment of Otto Otepka—of condoning a witch hunt carried out by high State Department officials.

As Senator Thomas Dodd commented, the State Department should prefer charges against its own gumshoers, rather than against Otepka.

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Nov. 13, 1963]

IT'S CLARIFYING, ALL RIGHT

An official printed transcript has just come to hand of the testimony given under oath before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee by John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, and Elmer D. Hill, head of the Division of Technical Services in Mr. Reilly's office.

The two men are now under what is euphemistically termed "administrative leave." This means that the taxpayers continue to pay their salary though the pair do no work, pending a departmental investigation of their conduct in the Otepka case. The immediate question is whether the two men committed perjury in testifying before the committee last summer, during the course of an investigation into the dismissal of Otto Otepka, veteran State Department security officer.

The following questions and answers are reported as to Mr. Hill on July 9:

Mr. Sourwine (committee counsel). Do you know of any instance where a listening device has been placed in an employee's office?

"Mr. Hill. Not to my knowledge.

"Mr. Sourwine. Specifically, did you ever have anything to do with tapping the telephone of Mr. Otepka?

"Mr. Hill. No sir."

On November 6, nearly 4 full months after he so testified, Mr. Reilly wrote a letter to Senator Eastland, committee chairman. It should be noted that the committee's staff had been busily investigating various angles of the Otepka case throughout this period. Now, in November, Mr. Hill reached an interesting conclusion: He concluded that mention of an incident which occurred last March "would serve to clarify my responses to Mr. Sourwine's questions." In his letter of clarification, Mr. Hill says this:

"On Monday, March 18, 1963, Mr. John F. Reilly * * * asked me to explore the possibility of arranging some way to eavesdrop on conversations taking place in Mr. Otepka's office. That evening Mr. Clarence J. Schneider and I altered the existing wiring in the telephone in Mr. Otepka's office."

Mr. Reilly had testified under oath on August 6. At that time, this colloquy took place:

"Mr. Sourwine. Have you ever engaged in or ordered the bugging or tapping or otherwise compromising telephones or private conversations in the office of an employee of the State Department?

"Mr. Reilly. No, sir.

"Mr. Sourwine. You never did?

"Mr. Reilly. That is right, sir.

"Mr. Sourwine. Specifically in the case of Mr. Otepka you did not do so?

"Mr. Reilly. That is correct, sir.

On November 6, precisely 3 months later, Mr. Reilly also was struck with second thoughts. Now he would like "to amplify my testimony." In a statement to Senator Eastland, he added this amplification:

"On March 18 * * * I asked Mr. Elmer D. Hill * * * to undertake a survey of the feasibility of intercepting conversations in Mr. Otepka's office. On March 19, Mr. Hill told me that he and Mr. Schneider * * * had conducted a feasibility survey by connecting spare telephone wires from the telephone in Mr. Otepka's office to the Division of Technical Services laboratory."

When the wretched John Profumo was caught lying in the House of Commons last spring, in the midst of the Keeler case, there was never the slightest question of his instant resignation from the British Government. He was o-u-t. Here we seem to view questions of honor rather differently. The strangest aspect of this whole Otepka case, so far, is that Messrs. Hill and Reilly are still on the payroll, and Otto Otepka, whose only sin was to assist the U.S. Senate, is the only one fired. If the U.S. Senate does not force a showdown in the Hill-Reilly case, the U.S. Senate will have degenerated into a far feebler body than the powerful institution we believe it to be.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) News, Nov. 12, 1963]

LEAKY MEMORIES IN TOO-HIGH PLACES

The public is permitted a brief glimpse into the inner workings of the State Department as a result of dismissal of Otto F. Otepka, veteran department security officer.

He was fired on charges of unbecoming conduct, with the principal accusation being he supplied confidential employee loyalty information to the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

In the course of the Senate panel's investigation, department authorities disclaimed any knowledge of a listening device having been placed on Otepka's telephone. Under the baleful eye of Senate investigators, the officials refreshed their memories later and decided such a device had been employed, but that it didn't work well.

The bold loss of memory under oath by highly placed members of the executive branch of Government should not be condoned by the Senate subcommittee. Strong effort should be made to punish the uncooperative witnesses and to bar them from responsible positions.

An extensive investigation of the Otepka incident should be conducted to see what further cloak-and-dagger revelations are forthcoming. The firing of the department security officer suggests—as only one possibility—that security risks in the Department scored a victory.

Or, if the dismissal stemmed from intradepartmental politics, the public and the Senate internal security panel are entitled to know, with full, truthful answers to the original questions.

[From the Vicksburg (Miss.) Post, Nov. 17, 1963]

ANOTHER TYPE OF FOREIGN AID

While the debate goes on in the Senate on the foreign aid bill, the one which involves an outlay of money, there is another type of foreign aid which has been disclosed in a report issued by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of which Senator James O. Eastland is chairman. It involves the rapid strides which Russia is making toward the expansion of her maritime fleet, and also displays the deterioration of our own strength in that area. While we have been so busy bolstering up foreign nations, our own lifeline, our merchant shipping, has been allowed to steadily decrease. The figures of the committee are somewhat alarming, and they should be a matter of deep concern to the Congress and to the administration.

According to the report, in 1950, the Russians had a total of 432 merchant ships, which represented 1,797,000 deadweight tons. At that time the United States had 1,090 ships, 13,440,000 tons. This was a ratio of 2½ to 1 in our favor in the number of ships and a 7 to 1 advantage in deadweight. By 1962 this advantage had been filtered down, and by December 31, 1962, Russia had 1,002 ships as compared to 843 of the United States.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Nov. 13, 1963]

DISCORD AT STAKE

It sounds like a pretty mess at the State Department with one official fired for slipping unauthorized information to Congress and three others charged with snooping on the first man, then denying it to a committee of Congress.

Otto F. Otepka, former Department security risk evaluator, provides the affair with its name—the Otepka case. His dismissal was based, among other things, on the charge he gave a senatorial committee confidential information from security files so touchy it is supposed to be released only with the personal approval of the President.

He has a right to appeal but if the charges stand up he clearly was insubordinate and ought to stay fired.

Senators defending him, including such powerful figures as Dodd, of Connecticut, and Eastland, of Mississippi, consider the case a test of the powers of Congress as opposed to the executive powers of the President. This recurring conflict provides the case with added drama.

Senator Dodd demands that, instead of firing Mr. Otepka, the Department get rid of three other officials, at least two of whom denied to a Senate subcommittee they had installed a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office, then later admitted it. These charges are under investigation. These men, it seems to us, also have placed their jobs in grave jeopardy, if not for spying on Mr. Otepka, then for misleading the Senators.

But all question of degrees of guilt aside, the incident lifts the curtain on a nasty internal condition at State which is highly disturbing.

This is the Department which works in a thousand ways to uphold the dignity of the United States around the world, and to keep us out of war. Whether speaking to Congress or to Khrushchev the Department should speak one voice and that voice should be the voice of the Secretary of State.

If tenure imposed by civil service regulations prevents this and institutionalizes disharmony, then there is something badly wrong with civil service regulations. The security of the United States, upon which the smooth function of this Department measurably depends, is vastly more important than the right of an uncooperative Government employee to hold on to his job.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Nov. 13, 1963]

UNTRUTHFUL TESTIMONY

Whatever the rights of executive privilege to withhold certain information from Congress—and every administration in recent years has been out of line in trying to conceal embarrassing situations by such claims—there can be no defense for giving false or deliberately misleading testimony to congressional investigators.

This is why the Kennedy administration now is faced with the problem what action to take against three State Department officials. The officials testified under oath before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that they had no knowledge of tapping the telephone wires of Otto F. Otepka, who was dismissed last week as chief security evaluations officer in the State Department.

The Senate committee had information about the wiretapping incident and made this public after the officials had testified. Two officials thereupon made additional statements to "amplify" and "clarify" their testimony. The amplification and clarification made it clear that their earlier testimony was deliberately misleading.

There have been no charges, or indications, that either the President or Secretary of State Dean Rusk had knowledge of the wiretapping or the falsification of testimony. They, of course, have the responsibility of disciplining the guilty individuals. Indications are that Rusk will ask for the resignation of at least two of the officials. One of them, John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, now accepts full responsibility for the telephone tapping incident.

Reilly and his assistants wanted to fire Otepka because of disagreement about security policy and because Otepka was giving information to the Senate investigating committee. They claim Otepka was releasing confidential information.

Otepka may have been guilty of doing this, which would give the State Department cause to oust him. Whether the information he gave investigators was properly classified as confidential is a question that can't be answered at this time. This has a bearing on Otepka's conduct. He apparently takes the view, judging by his comments, that out of loyalty to his country, he felt impelled to give information to investigators, that the State Department was attempting to conceal. The investigation may throw more light on this phase of the case.

The Senate committee apparently thinks there has been laxity, or too much "softness," in security matters. It believes the Department isn't living up to the standards provided by law. Whether this view, which is also the view of Otepka, is correct or not, State Department officials have made serious errors in harassment of Otepka and in misleading a congressional committee. The State Department will be making equally serious errors if it does not give the investigators all information essential for the study and if it does not get rid of those employees who have misled the investigating committee.

[From the Abilene (Tex.) Reporter News, Nov. 12, 1963]

LYING IN HIGH PLACES HARMS CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

In Alabama, the Justice Department denied that one of its rented cars was loaned to the Rev. Martin Luther King and two others to drive from Birmingham to Selma.

Later, the Justice Department admitted that one of its attorneys did, in fact, loan such a car for that purpose. The Department said the attorney had since resigned.

Two Alabama grand juries, at Montgomery and Selma, are nevertheless investigating.

In Washington, three State Department officials denied under oath before a Senate subcommittee any knowledge that listening devices had been installed in the office of Otto F. Otepka. Otepka is a veteran State Department security officer who was fired, over protests of some Senators, on the charge that he supplied them with confidential information from employee loyalty files.

Late last week, the three State Department men sent statements to the Senate subcommittee admitting that they did know that listening devices had been installed in Otepka's office.

They said no actual interception of conversations had taken place, none was authorized, and the wiring on Otepka's phone was disconnected within 48 hours after a test of the reception showed it unworkable. It can be presumed that if the contraption had worked, it would have been used.

The moral to be drawn from these two incidents is obvious.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, draws it well. He said:

"This is a shocking matter. The [State] Department ought to move on this—and quickly. When three officials of the State Department admit, in effect, that they lied under oath to a Senate committee, every American and every Member of Congress ought to be concerned.

"These are the fellows the State Department should prefer charges against, not Otepka."

The Senate subcommittee should turn its information over to a Federal grand jury and press for perjury indictments against the trio.

We have come to the time when occurrences such as the ones cited here, while not everyday happenstances, are common enough that the confidence of the public in its Government is being eroded.

The State Department should, without any coaxing, move immediately to dismiss the three officials involved, and any of their superiors who might have had knowledge of their perjured Senate testimony. Anything less will leave serious doubts of integrity in the public mind.

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman, Nov. 13, 1963]

INFORMATION CHALLENGE

In 1942, Otto F. Otepka became a wartime security officer for the Civil Service Commission. He was recruited a year later by the late Scott McLeod, a zealous investigator of security risks, as his chief evaluator of security clearance at the State Department. Dismissed from his $16,900 a year job, a State Department spokesman said Otepka is "out of step with the time. We are not witch hunting any more. We have no security risks, and he knows it."

However, that is not quite the way Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut Democrat, sees it. As vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, DODD says that Otepka was fired because he "testified honestly before the panel on matters relating to security in the Department of State." The dismissal was on 13 charges of giving confidential documents to the committee and furnishing questions to be asked Otepka's superiors.

The case emphasizes the difficulty Congress has in getting information on disloyalty, malfeasance, conflict of interest or other wrongdoing in the executive branch.

[From the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal, Nov. 14, 1963]

THE OTEPKA CASE

Otto F. Otepka, the security officer who was dismissed by the State Department for insubordination as a result of his giving to a congressional committee certain information the Department regarded as classified, must file his appeal from the Department decision this week if he intends to do it at all. There is every reason for his being encouraged to file somewhere in protest at what seems to have been a basically wrong decision.

If we understand the circumstances of the case accurately, Mr. Otepka furnished to a congressional group that is legally entitled to the information, certain facts about State Department security procedures. But long before that he was resented by some of the Department's personnel, apparently because of his relatively tough ideas that security measures should be tight instead of loose, and hard instead of soft. We gather the basic trouble in his case is that he refused to go along with watered down security measures that others in the Department, including his immediate superiors, desired to see in effect.

Considering the sad state of "security" in our own Government and that of Great Britain, as suggested by the headlines over recent months and years, the dismissed security officer is much more right than wrong. We hope he does appeal, and if the Department ruling continues against him, we hope he takes it on to the Civil Service Commission and to the courts. Apparently he was within his rights to do what he did, even though it was contrary to some of the Department's wishes. On that basis he should fight for the principle under which he acted, and on that basis he should have all the help he can get in that fight.

[From the Monroe (La.) News-Star, Nov. 13, 1963]

TAPS FOR WIRETAPPERS?

The case of Otto Otepka, recently discharged State Department security official, has received a certain amount of coverage in the wire service news releases if readers worked their way past the first four paragraphs. Now it appears more persons may become involved.

Otepka was finally told he was guilty of conduct "unbecoming" a diplomat because he gave information on the State Department's emergency security clearance policies to a Senate subcommittee.

At least part of the material used by the Department as a basis for firing Otepka was obtained through wiretapping. So now, the agency has placed two more officials on administrative leave for having given out the information that wiretapping was carried out.

Prior to his own discharge, Otepka was on such administrative leave for several weeks. Now, his former superior, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State John F. Reilly, and Chief of the Division of Technical Services in the Office of Security, Dewey Hill, will also go on administrative leave.

A State Department spokesman said the move making Reilly's and Hill's suspensions effective on Tuesday of this week was a result of a "complicated and potentially serious" matter.

But viewed from a distance, the dismissal of Otepka appears to have resulted from his telling the Senate Investigations Subcommittee that there were certain laxities in the emergency security clearance for State Department employees since 1961.

[From the Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel, Nov. 15, 1963]

PERJURY?

Because he allegedly talked too freely to members of a U.S. Senate commitee, Otto F. Otepka, a highly valuable and experienced security officer of the State Department has been unceremoniously "fired."

A couple of witnesses from the State Department testified under oath before a committee of the Senate that Secretary Rusk's Department had not attached a wiretap to his phone. The State Department now concedes that Otepka's phone had been tapped and that they knew it when they swore it had not been. Senator Dodd has urged a full dress inquiry into this apparent perjury and the reasons for Otepka's firing. The State Department answered by sending a couple of Otepka's former associates on "administrative leave."

Well, why not a full dress inquiry to clear this thing up? Do representatives of the State Department enjoy a privilege of making deliberately untrue statements when under oath?

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) News, Nov. 16, 1963]

Big Brother in Foggy Bottom

Last week, if the gentle reader will recall, Congress was celebrating "Otepka Day" when howls of anguish penetrated the environs of Congress because of the firing of a State Department official who had been leaking classified information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

This week Washington is observing "wiretapping day" as Otto Otepka's superiors find themselves on the hotseat for bugging his office and inspecting his trash baskets to indict him, then lying about it.

The sad part about all these proceedings is the atmosphere of big brotherism evident in the glistening offices and halls of Foggy Bottom.

Otto Otepka deserved to be fired for exposing classified information. And his superiors—John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security; David I. Belisle, special assistant to Reilly, and Elmer D. Hill, Chief of Technical Services in the State Department's Security Office—have shown their unfitness for their jobs as well.

Security may be messy business. It invariably requires snooping. But it emphatically does not require officials who engage in the Kremlinesque tactics of wiretapping followed by the big lie.

No wonder a whole passel of American citizens are beginning to worry about the police state.

[From the Vicksburg (Miss.) Post, Nov. 13, 1963]

Bureaucrats in Action

Our State Department, which urgently needs investigating and a complete overhauling, is a perfect example of arrogant bureaucratic action. Otto F. Otepka, a veteran security officer of the Department, was dismissed on charges of unbecoming conduct. His biggest crime was supplying the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee with information from confidential files covering employees' loyalty. Then three State Department officials testified before the committee that there had been no rigging of telephones wires in Otepka's office, to thus enable eavesdropping. Now, the testimony is reversed, and it is admitted that the rigging was done, but "no actual interception of conversations took place."

First of all, is it within the realm of our form of Government that an executive department can be a law unto itself, and refuse to give a committee of the U.S. Senate, composed of elected representatives of the people, information regarding the loyalty of any person within that department? Then, to dismiss an officer with a long record of service, branding him as one charged with "unbecoming conduct," because he so testified, is designed to circumvent the efforts of the committee in seeking to smoke out those in our governmental agencies whose loyalty is suspect.

Further, it is now announced that two Department officials have been put on indefinite leave, for their part in this fiasco. Was it because they testified falsely, in the first place? Or, instead, was it because they finally had the courage to come out with the truth?

This Nation is in a sad state of affairs when the people of the Nation, through their elected representatives, are denied the truth about employees of any department of the Government. The conclusion must be drawn that the State Department fears that disclosure to the Senate committee will verify the strong suspicion which has been held by many that the security of the Nation is endangered because of loyalty risks. Instead of blocking the efforts of the Eastland committee, there should be open and full cooperation to the end that no one with the slightest suspicion of disloyalty should be retained, particularly on a sensitive job in a department as important as the State Department.

This matter should make it clear that bureaucrats are not elected officials, and should respond when called to task by those who directly represent the people. Otherwise, the continuing process of bureaucratic rule will finally engulf us. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has performed a wonderful service to the Nation in exposing those who are not loyal. Above everything else, the arrogance and disregard of the rights of our people to the truth, as exercised by so many of the intrenched bureau chiefs and their subordinates, should be displayed to the Nation, so that a resultant cleanout of all who persist in this type of action will be demanded by the public.

The latest State Department mess smells to high heavens, and even that is a charitable statement.

[From the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, Nov. 14, 1963]

An Important Right at Stake

The current dispute over the firing of a State Department employee because he allegedly gave information to a Senate subcommittee may indicate why a "freedom of information" bill now pending in the Senate is important.

One Otto F. Otepka, chief of the evaluation division of the Department's Office of Security, was fired because he answered questions of a Senate subcommittee.

Senators regard his firing as an attempt to muzzle State Department witnesses before Senate committees by showing them the consequences of testimony not agreeable to their State Department superiors.

If it is possible to keep Members, or committees, of Congress, or the Senate and the House themselves, from getting at the truth of what goes on in the executive branch, what chance do the people have to get at the truth?

The "freedom of information" proposal is aimed to clarify and protect the public's right to information about the operation of governmental agencies. It would amend the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946, which ostensibly was intended to keep government agencies from imposing secrecy on administration actions but which, it is feared, has been twisted to do the opposite.

Examples of this subversion of the public's right to know have been given:

A list of private offices rented by the Federal Government in Philadelphia was denied the public because the information from the landlords was confidential.

The names of persons granted the privilege of a Federal export license are withheld because the information filed to qualify for the privilege is "submitted in confidence."

Details of compromise settlements of liquor law violations were covered up because they involved material of a "secret nature."

The list is long, and none of the items are even remotely related to national security. One was a security item in reverse, however.

In the latter case, Senator Williams of Delaware referred to the Agency for International Development a report which charged that under our foreign aid program we were furnishing gasoline for use by Soviet planes flying to Cuba. He received a reply denying the allegation—but the reply he received was marked "secret" and therefore could not be made public.

Not even Congress, which provides the funds these bureaucrats spend, can get the information it ought to have to guide its deliberations and decisions.

Anyone who is interested in the preservation of the democratic system of government has an interest in the information amendment. A government which can operate in secrecy can operate free of responsibility to its people. They can't exert a check on it if they can't know what it's doing. Involved is a fundamental right which badly needs protection.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, Nov. 18, 1963]

Repercussions on Otepka

The firing of Otto Otepka raises a stench in the State Department. Though Otepka has been ejected from his job as a Department security officer, the last has not been heard of his case.

Otepka has the right of appeal, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is showing a great deal of interest in how and why his dismissal came about.

Facts behind the case are strange. Otepka was charged with 13 violations of regulations, but most if not all of these were technicalities. His real "crime," in the eyes of top State Department officials, was his cooperation with the Senate subcommittee in its investigation of alleged laxity in security in the Department.

Moreover, the State Department apparently resorted to illegal wiretapping in its effort to "get" Otepka. Senator Thomas Dodd, vice chairman of the subcommittee, said his group has proof that Otepka's phone was tapped. State Department officials first denied, then admitted, that at least an attempt was made to do so.

Dodd also reported that Otepka was locked out of his office, was denied access to his files which were rifled, and was humiliated before his fellow employees.

But the heart of the issue is whether a Federal employee should be harassed and fired for talking to a committee of Congress. The subcommittee had a right to the information it wanted.

Otepka has been dismissed for telling the truth—his right under the U.S. Civil Service Code which states that such "shall not be denied nor interfered with." He has been the victim of illegal tactics—wiretapping. The Senate committee should pursue the scent.

[From the Hopkinsville (Ky.) Kentucky New Era, Nov. 16, 1963]

Otepka Talks

The firing of Otto Otepka raises a stench in the State Department. Though Otepka has been ejected from his job as a department security officer, the last has not been heard of his case.

Otepka has the right of appeal, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is showing a great deal of interest in how and why his dismissal came about.

Facts behind the case are strange. Otepka was charged with 13 violations of regulations, but most if not all of these were technicalities. His real "crime," in the eyes of top State Department officials, was his cooperation with the Senate subcommittee in its investigation of alleged laxity in security in the Department.

Moreover, the State Department apparently resorted to illegal wiretapping in its effort to "get" Otepka. Senator Thomas Dodd, vice chairman of the subcommittee, said his group has proof that Otepka's phone was tapped. State Department officials first denied, then admitted, that at least an attempt was made to do so.

Dodd also reported that Otepka was locked out of his office, was denied access to his files which were rifled, and was humiliated before his fellow employees.

But the heart of the issue is whether a Federal employee should be harassed and fired for talking to a committee of Congress. The subcommittee has a right to the information it wanted.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Nov. 14, 1963]

A Case of Confused Loyalties

Unfortunately, the controversy surrounding the dismissal of Otto F. Otepka from a State Department job has been clouded by the disclosure that Mr. Otepka was the victim of electronic eavesdropping by security officers in the Department.

To make matters worse, the eavesdroppers had testified earlier that they knew nothing about the installation of a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office.

Such blunders as these make it difficult for the Department's reasons for dismissing Mr. Otepka to be considered on their merits. Yet, if the charges against Mr. Otepka are true, there is solid justification, based on well-established precedent, for his dismissal.

Mr. Otepka, who had been with the State Department for 10 years, was chief of the Evaluation Division of the Department's Office of Security. He was charged with giving the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee information from loyalty files that can be released only with personal approval of the President, because of the damaging character of the information. If he wishes, Mr. Otepka may appeal the dismissal.

The firing of Mr. Otepka has brought anguished cries from some Members of Congress. Senator Dodd of Connecticut charged that Mr. Otepka did no more than to cooperate with the subcommittee and provide it with information "that some of his superiors found embarrassing or objectionable."

The feud between executive departments and congressional investigators dates back many years.

The House Un-American Activities Committee, seeking information in 1948 about the loyalty of a Government employe, instructed the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to it the full text of a letter from J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, reporting on the employee. The committee was rebuffed by President Truman, who ordered all Federal officials to reject any request from Congress for material from the loyalty files. He said the request should be referred to him for such response as he might determine to be in the public interest.

Similarly, President Eisenhower refused to give the late Senator McCarthy access to privileged papers relating to the loyalty of Army personnel.

Mr. Truman's order, which is still in effect, was cited by the State Department as the basis for Mr. Otepka's dismissal.

Mr. Otepka, as a veteran security officer in the State Department, surely was aware of his obligation to safeguard confidential information which only the President is authorized to release. Yet he professed a "higher loyalty" to tell the truth, overriding the "letter" of any regulations. On this basis, he slipped information from loyalty files to the counsel of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

The trouble with Mr. Otepka's reasoning is that he had his loyalties confused. As an employee of the executive branch of Government, Mr. Otepka's primary obligation was to abide by the rules governing communications within the executive branch. Congress has never contested the validity of those rules. It can hardly condone a breach of the rules, even by an employee who did one of its committees a favor.

[From the Atlantic City (N.J.) Press, Nov. 15, 1963]

Coverup Charged in State Department

Three State Department officials are in trouble—and two of them have been "furloughed"—because they willfully deceived a Senate committee. At the same time, Otto Otepka, until recently the chief security evaluations officer at State, is fighting to get back his job. The State Department reluctantly acted against the three officials—and only after some pretty strong language from Senator Thomas Dodd of Connecticut. It acted ruthlessly against Otepka, whose only crime was to obey the law by cooperating with the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee then probing lax security procedures in the sievelike State Department.

What this proves is that the Department remains unchanged. It continues to think of itself as a private club, privileged above ordinary society. It continues to act as if it were more important to cover up its misdeeds than it is to think in terms of the national security.

The Otepka case is important because the man was treated unjustly. But it is also one more exhibit in a lengthy list which shows that U.S. officials cannot seem to understand the dangers of bad security. The State Department is still doing its best to hush up the scandal—and for a while it reportedly had cooperation from Senator James O Eastland, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which is parent to Internal Security.

It was Senator Dodd who forced into the open some of the more unsavory aspects of the Department's treatment of Otepka. In this way he made it impossible for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to sit on evidence in its files.

On July 9, 1963, Elmer Dewey Hill, chief of the Division of Technical Services, testified under oath before the Senate subcommittee as follows:

"Question. Do you know of a single instance in which the Department has ever listened in on the telephone of an employee?

"Answer. I cannot recall such an instance.

"Question. Do you know of any instances where a listening device has been placed in an employee's office?

"Answer. Not to my knowledge. * * * I have never engaged in this—in that type of security measure * * *.

"Question. Did you ever have anything to do with placing a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office?

"Answer. No, sir."

On November 6, 1963, after Senator Dodd had begun to make his charges of perjury against unnamed State Department officials, Hill wrote to the subcommittee amplifying his testimony of July. Hear this:

"On Monday, March 18, 1963, Mr. John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, asked me to explore the possibility of arranging some way to eavesdrop on conversations taking place in Mr. Otepka's office. * * * Later that day I discussed the technical aspects of this matter with Mr. Clarence J. Schneider. * * * We agreed on the approach to be used. * * * That evening Mr. Schneider and I altered the existing wiring in the telephone in Mr. Otepka's office. We then established a circuit from Mr. Otepka's office to the Division of Technical Services Laboratory by making additional connections in the existing telephone system wiring. (We) tested the system and found we would be unable to overhear conversations in Mr. Otepka's office * * * because electrical interference produced a loud buzzing sound. * * * I reported our unsuccessful effort to Mr. Reilly the following morning. Mr. Schneider has told me that during that day he asked an officer in the Division of Domestic Operations * * * whether he had, or knew where to acquire, equipment which would eliminate such a buzzing sound."

This is only a part of the story. I will return to it in my next column.

[From the Annapolis (Md.) Capital, Nov. 20, 1963]

Otepka Repercussions

The firing of Otto Otepka raises a stench in the State Department. Though Otepka has been ejected from his job as a Department security officer, the last has not been heard of his case.

Otepka has the right of appeal, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is showing a great deal of interest in how and why his dismissal came about.

Facts behind the case are strange. Otepka was charged with 13 violations of regulations, but most if not all of these were technicalities. His real "crime," in the eyes of top State Department officials, was his cooperation with the Senate subcommittee in its investigation of alleged laxity in security in the Department.

Moreover, the State Department apparently resorted to illegal wiretapping in its effort to "get" Otepka. Senator Thomas Dodd, vice chairman of the subcommittee, said his group has proof that Otepka's phone was tapped. State Department officials first denied, then admitted, that at least an attempt was made to do so.

Dodd also reported that Otepka was locked out of his office, was denied access to his files which were rifled, and was humiliated before his fellow employes.

But the heart of the issue is whether a Federal employee should be harassed and fired for talking to a committee of Congress. The subcommittee had a right to the information it wanted.

Otepka has been dismissed for telling the truth—his right under the U.S. Civil Service Code which states that such "shall not be denied nor interfered with." He has been the victim of illegal tactics—wiretapping. The Senate committee should pursue the scent.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Nov. 16 1963]

Secret Trash

It may be no laughing matter, but one can't help being amused by what goes on under the name of security in the State Department.

A peek into this box of suspicion and intrigue is provided by a reading of the revised testimony offered by three State Department agents to a Senate subcommittee looking into the case of Otto F. Otepka, dismissed State Department security officer.

In the course of correcting (amplifying, they call it) earlier answers to committee questions about "bugging" Otepka's telephone, the three agents reveal how operatives on our side spy on each other.

For example, John F. Reilly relates how he spied on Otepka, whom he suspected of "illegally" giving information to the Senate Internal Subcommittee. First, he said, he decided that the best technique would be to recover and examine Otepka's "classified trash from his burn bag." This was done on March 14, but nothing of significance was revealed.

Next, Reilly arranged to have undertaken "a survey of the feasibility of intercepting conversations in Mr. Otepka's office." "I made it clear," he adds, "that I was not authorizing the actual interception of any conversations. Rather, I desired to know whether this technique could be used without undue risk of detection in the event that subsequent examination of Mr. Otepka's burn bags continued to reveal nothing of significance."

On March 19, Reilly says, he was informed that a "feasibility survey" had been conducted by connecting spare telephone wires from Otepka's phone to the division of technical services laboratory. He said he was also informed that the system attempted had not proved successful when tested and that it was uncertain whether it could be made to work. "I made it clear," he says, "that I did not wish any conversations to be intercepted at that time."

Later the same day, Reilly said, a second bag of Otepka's classified trash was recovered and examined. "Its contents revealed that Mr. Otepka had furnished certain material to Mr. Sourwine (the committee's counsel)," he said, adding that he then ordered the telephone tap disconnected.

Reilly testified that he understood Otepka had his telephone system checked, but that no evidence was found that it was tapped. Sounding somewhat plaintive, he concluded by saying that he and a colleague "have both noticed unusual sound phenomena on our telephones and have had our telephone systems checked" but that "these checks have not produced any evidence that our telephone systems had been interfered with."

So goes the life of insecurity in State Department security. One can only hope that our security is as zealously protected from outsiders as it seems to be from insiders. It would be funny, if one weren't left with the uneasy feeling that the real threats to security are being neglected while the security officers are spying on each other.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger, Nov. 17, 1963]

ARROGANT CHALLENGE TO POWER OF CONGRESS IS CONTEMPT FOR PUBLIC

The U.S. State Department dismissal of Otto F. Otepka, its Chief Security Evaluations Officer, is not only a serious blow to the Nation's internal security but also poses a direct and brazen challenge to the authority of Congress.

Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee made this point clear when he said: "The powers of Congress are at stake and I intend to protect Mr. Otepka by every means at my command against accusations which complain, in effect, that he told the truth when asked to do so by our Senate subcommittee."

State Department action in firing Mr. Otepka has shown obvious contempt for the prerogatives of the Senate and alarming indifference to security risks within the Department. Mr. Otepka, victim of this outrageous purge, is a veteran of 27 years of Government service.

For the past decade or so, Mr. Otepka has been the official who gave security clearances to State Department personnel. His ability in this key post is quite evident from the fact that several years ago he was awarded the State Department's special award for meritorious service.

Because Mr. Otepka testified before the Eastland Internal Security Subcommittee, leftists and pinkos in the State Department decided to give him the bum's rush. He was accused of disclosing Department secrets to a duly authorized inquiry by Congress, into matters directly affecting national security.

In the words of an arrogant bigwig of the Dean Rusk hierarchy, Otepka "is out of step with the times. We no longer hunt witches. We have no security problems and he knows it." The Senate subcommittee's reaction has been one of skepticism—mindful that the State Department has aided the rise of Fidel Castro, promoted aid projects for Red-controlled nations, and otherwise given aid and comfort to international communism.

Nor is it likely that Senate—and public—skepticism can be allayed by the Department's clumsy, belated effort to make amends by suspending (at full pay) a couple of insignificant underlings who have aided in the persecution and harassment of Otto F. Otepka because he cooperated with Congress.

In the topsy-turvy attitude it has displayed in the Otepka case, the State Department has been chasing the policeman instead of the culprits; and the words "security violation" have come to mean not the act of turning over information to a foreign power but the act of giving information to a committee of the U.S. Senate.

If Mr. Otepka's dismissal is permitted to stand, it will be very difficult if not impossible to elicit any information from workers in the executive department that bears on disloyalty, malfeasance, conflict of interest, or other wrongdoing by their superiors.

It is not enough that the Civil Service Commission will review the Otepka case and that President Kennedy has promised to look into the matter. Congress itself—and particularly the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee—must insist on a complete reversal of this unjust State Department action and assurances that the legal authority of our legislative branch will be respected henceforth.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Nov. 11, 1963]

TWO EAVESDROPPERS GO ON LEAVE

Two of three State Department officials who have acknowledged that the telephone wiring in Otto F. Otepka's office was rigged for eavesdropping will go on administrative leave Tuesday.

Meanwhile, the Department has launched an inquiry into the incident and said it will move as promptly as possible.

Going on indefinite leave, depending on the termination of the inquiry, a Department source said, are John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, and Elmer Dewey Hill, Chief of the Division of Technical Services in the Department's Office of Security.

They and David I. Belisle, Reilly's special assistant, have told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that wires were connected to Otepka's telephone to permit eavesdropping on conversations.

They also said no actual interception of conversation took place and that the wiring was disconnected after a test showed it unworkable.

[From the Jefferson City (Mo.) Capital News, Nov. 9, 1963]

THE FIRING OF GOOD OFFICIAL

(From St. Louis Globe-Democrat)

Because Otto F. Otepka, veteran career officer, was dedicated to national security and believed Congress ought to know of security failures, the State Department fired him Wednesday.

Specifically, he was discharged for giving confidential information to a Senate subcommittee, conduct described as "unbecoming an officer" of the Department of State.

The confidential information involved data on wretchedly bad advice by official State counselors which contributed to the Government's failure to realize in time that Fidel Castro was a plain Cuban Red.

Is it conduct unbecoming an officer to reveal facts, involving among others William Wieland, a top-ranking State official, and the ill-informed, stupid recommendations they made in sugaring over or disclaiming Castro's communism?

Are we to believe it more becoming in the Chief Security Evaluation Officer of the State Department to hide the shells of grave errors and incompetence?

Congressman H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, called Mr. Otepka's ouster most reprehensible. He declared the State officer was fired for providing a committee of Congress with information necessary to show that "other officials of Government were not telling the truth."

Acting Chairman DODD of the Senate subcommittee previously stated discharge of Mr. Otepka would be a great tragedy, indicating State Department is more interested in prosecuting employees who want to clean up the Department than employees accused of practices injurious to national security.

The dismissal of Mr. Otepka, a conscientious and courageous State Department official, is indeed reprehensible. He simply didn't want sleazy security methods in sensitive areas and is convinced, as we are, that far too many dubious characters are ensconced in the Department's advisory echelon.

As to the charge made against him of giving classified information to Congress—that holds about as much water as a cheesecloth sieve.

There is a long tradition that the executive department can withhold some documents from the Senate. This, we submit, cannot govern when the security of the country is at issue.

Congress has a right to make security laws. It cannot possibly do so if it doesn't accurately know the needs.

The Otepka case is not finished. It should be appealed, to the courts if necessary.

What irony to punish him for baring State Department security errors and do nothing about the men who were miserably taken in by the Castro flimflam.

[From the Kokomo (Ind.) Tribune, Nov. 8, 1963]

A FIRING IN WASHINGTON

Has the State Department erred in firing 48-year-old Otto Otepka, a veteran of 27 years of Government service? It discharged him this week for disclosing lax security conditions in the division he headed.

Otepka was responsible for giving security clearances to employees of the State Department. He checked on the background of applicants for jobs in the Department to determine whether they were security risks.

He must have been an efficient official, for in 1958 he received the Department's award for meritorious service.

The Department asserts that he engaged in conduct unbecoming a diplomatic officer—namely, collaborating with the Senate Security Subcommittee by informing it of what he regarded as security risks.

Senator DODD, Connecticut Democrat, charges the State Department with interpreting "security violations" not as the act of turning over information to an alien power but as the act of giving information to a Senate committee.

If what Otepka did was warn the Senate of persons he considered risky, he may have gone over the heads of his superiors. That is always a questionable procedure for a subordinate to engage in, but if Otepka was convinced that his superiors were not taking sufficient action in cases of doubtful loyalty it is difficult to see where he was doing the country a disservice.

As Senator DODD says, "the right of Government employees to furnish information is established by the U.S. statutes."

Otepka's dismissal is subject to review by Secretary of State Rusk, and Mr. Rusk's decision will be awaited with much interest. In Senator DODD's words, "if the dismissal stands, it will be impossible, or exceedingly difficult, to elicit any information from employees of the executive branch about disloyalty, malfeasance, conflict of interest, or other wrongdoing by their superiors."

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Nov. 8, 1963]

WHAT KIND OF LOGIC IS THIS?

The firing of the State Department's chief evaluator of security risks demands not only the routine hearing and review by the Civil Service Commission that he has been promised, but a full congressional inquiry as well.

On the surface, it appears that Otto F. Otepka's only crime was, in reality, his determination that appropriate action be taken in situations involving security risks in the State Department. Apparently stymied in his efforts to get action within his own Department, Otepka gave the information he had to the subcommittee. For this he was guilty of giving confidential information to Senate investigators and fired on charges of conduct unbecoming an officer of the Department of State.

Thus a man who occupied one of the most sensitive posts in our Government appears to have been fired not for incompetence, but for being too competent in his resolution that no security risks would be tolerated in the supersecret chambers of the State Department. He was fired because he disclosed confidential information to Senators whose access to classified data is well-established, Senators whose committee is motivated by the same antisecurity risk drive possessed by Otepka.

Perhaps Otepka violated some rule or regulation of the State Department. But what kind of logic is it that permits the detective to be fired on a technicality while the clues to identity of a potential criminal are swept under the rug?

The American people need to be told the whole truth about the Otepka episode. Our representatives in Congress should not relent until that demand in our behalf is met.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Nov. 8, 1963]

OTEPKA PROBE

Senator Scott of Pennsylvania has joined in demands for investigation of the dismissal of veteran Otto F. Otepka of the Security Division of the State Department. The dismissal will be appealed to the Civil Service Commission, but several disturbing questions have arisen concerning the full story behind the ouster which have not been officially clarified. Besides this, it appears that Mr. Otepka was "put in the middle" as a result of a conflict between what a Senate subcommittee wanted to find out, and what has been described as "institutional" (State Department) loyalty. It behooves Congress at least to stand by and do its utmost for the victim.

A serious charge that remains unsubstantiated, in all this, is that Mr. Otepka also was put on the spot by superior officers who allegedly reflected on his integrity by testifying he had failed to advise them about certain matters or certain individuals; and that Mr. Otepka was able to prove the contrary to the Senate subcommittee by documentation. It was use of this documentation (classified, or either properly or improperly declassified) that figured heavily in Mr. Otepka's dismissal. How else he could have cleared himself of negligence is not apparent.

The secrecy classification (which he says he himself originally ordered for the material) does not relate to facts prejudicial to national security, but to the security of individuals relative to premature or otherwise improper disclosure of confidential information concerning their status as national security risks, etc.

[From the Levittown (Pa.) Times, Nov. 7, 1963]

AFFAIR OTEPKA

The State Department this week summarily dismissed a longtime, high-ranking employee named Otto F. Otepka amid a rash of charges and a good bit of resulting confusion.

If the confusion is to be cleared up, the State Department owes us a full explanation of the affair Otepka and one certainly should be forthcoming.

Otepka was second in command of the Department's security office. He was subpenaed to appear before the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee and in response to the subpena he did so appear.

No one has questioned the accuracy of his testimony. Otepka was bounced not for stretching the truth but, in effect, for testifying at all and for suggesting questions the subcommittee might ask.

Democratic Senator Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut, has called the firing an affront to the Senate as a whole. He asks how any Senate committee can obtain information if a man can be fired for this reason.

It's a good question.

Breach of security or denial of an individual's rights hardly can be involved, for this particular subcommittee has acted always with reserve, releasing no information that might endanger in any way either this country or any of its citizens.

At the heart of the squabble is the question of whether a legislative group should have access to the files of an executive branch of our Government.

We feel it should. To echo Senator Dodd: How else is our Legislature to be properly informed and guided?

And if this is not what was involved, then where is the truth of the matter?

[From the Chicago American, Nov. 7, 1963]

STATE DEPARTMENT DEFIANCE

In firing Otto F. Otepka, the State Department makes it plain that it considers Congress, and not the Communist conspiracy, its enemy. The Department's charge against Otepka was that he gave confidential information (meaning information the State Department preferred to keep concealed) to the Senate.

Representative H. R. Gross, Republican, of Iowa, has said Otepka got into trouble with his State Department superiors by "giving Congress information it had every right to know," and this seems to be exactly what happened. Obviously the State Department had set out to conceal facts from Congress and fired Otepka because he did not go along with the concealment.

And what was the matter the State Department was trying to keep Congress from looking into? Otepka has said it was loose security practices, meaning that people of doubtful loyalty were being hired for positions in the State Department. And this was Otepka's very special business because he was the Department's chief security risk evaluator.

The Senate Subcommittee had been trying, too, to find out why State Department officials—particularly William A. Wieland, State Department desk officer on Cuban affairs—had been so slow about recognizing the fact that Fidel Castro was a Communist. The State Department, in firing Otepka, takes the position that this is none of the Senate's business—meaning also, naturally, that it is none of the American people's business, either.

The administration and the State Department have been allowed to assume for too long that they are privileged to conceal their blunders in Cuba. Now let us hope the Senate and the House both dig into the department's impudent firing of Otepka and keep on going until they expose a lot of facts about Cuba.

Congress controls the financing of the State Department, and it should use that control to find out what is going on in the Department.

[From the Syracuse Post-Standard, Nov. 7, 1963]

PENALTY FOR TRUTH?

The firing of the State Department's chief security risk evaluator, whose only crime apparently was to give confidential information to Senate investigators, is certain to raise a storm in Congress.

As Senator Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut, says, Otto F. Otepka was not fired for giving the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee false information, but "because he gave the committee true information that embarrassed someone."

If Otepka was dismissed merely for telling the truth even though it reflected on the State Department, he should be reinstated. Government agencies are in a bad way if they must take such action to retaliate for disclosure of critical data.

Otepka apparently knows a great deal about what goes on in the State Department. If he felt the subcommittee should have information on slipshod administration of the agency in matters of security, it was his duty to convey it. After all, that is the business of the subcommittee.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Post, Nov. 7, 1963]

THE CASE OF OTTO F. OTEPKA

Another controversy has been added to Washington's growing list in the State Department's action against Otto F. Otepka, its chief security risk evaluator. He was fired on charges of conduct "unbecoming an officer of the Department of State." It was claimed he had supplied the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee with classified documents.

Immediate protests came from congressional voices.

Representative H. R. Gross, of Iowa, said the Department's action was "the most reprehensible thing I've heard." Previously he had labeled the charges against Otepka as an outrage.

A member of the subcommittee, Senator Roman L. Hruska, of Nebraska, described Otepka as "a man of unquestionable integrity," and predicted the decision would be reversed on appeal, and if it weren't the dismissal of the official would "be a great loss to the Government and to the career service."

Something of a Congress-administration battle seems to have been launched.

Representative Gross said Otepka was fired "for providing a committee of Congress with information that was necessary to demonstrate that other officials of the Government were not telling the truth."

It seems to us that a Senate Internal Security Committee should have full and free information concerning the State Department's activities, that its very purpose carries with it the right to know. There is a constant cry against questionable secrecy in various Government offices. Congress has vital responsibilities and its committees should have access to public business. Evidently Mr. Otepka believed that and gave testimony to which he felt the committee was entitled.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Nov. 9, 1963]

SECURITY OFFICER FIRING SETS UP SENATE SHOWDOWN ON NEW FRONTIER SECRECY

As of this date there are not too many people in this country who are familiar with the case of Otto Otepka and what has happened to him at the hands of our State Department for doing nothing more than observing the law.

In the days ahead, however, we think a great many more people are going to become better acquainted with the Otepka case because the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is not going to permit the dismissal of this man after 27 years of valuable and loyal service to his Government to go unchallenged.

Prior to his dismissal Otepka had held the post of deputy director of the Office of Security in the State Department and was the officer in charge of security evaluations. His efficiency ratings had always been "excellent" and in 1958 he had been given the Meritorious Service Award from Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

All this, however, was before the New Frontiersmen moved into the State Department and started to get rid of old-line employees who believed in tight security screening. They brought in people who would have clearly been classified as security risks in previous administrations. To clear these people and their own skirts, they revised the definition of a "security risk" to such an extent that it opened the door for just everybody they wanted in the department including, it has been reported, Alger Hiss.

As the officer in charge of security evaluations Otepka soon found himself at odds with some of his superiors over their liberal views on this security risk business. Then, when Otepka was requested to provide information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which was looking into State Department handling of Cuban affairs during the period of Fidel Castro's rise to power, Otepka really became persona non grata to his superiors by supplying the subcommittee with the information it had requested.

That's when Otepka really started getting the works. According to Senator Thomas J. Dodd, a leading member of the subcommittee, the first actions taken against Otepka was to restrict his functions.

Then, according to Dodd, a tap was installed on his telephone and with the assistance of Bobby Kennedy's minions in the Justice Department his "burn" basket was monitored every night in an effort to find some kind of evidence upon which they could pin a charge on him.

Eventually, they found some evidence indicating he had furnished what they termed "classified" information to the Senate subcommittee, but even before they were ready to bring charges against him he was locked out of his office and denied access to his files.

Finally, charges of conduct unbecoming a State Department officer were lodged against him and he was given notice of dismissal. The charge and the dismissal notice were later reviewed by top level authorities in the Department and a few days ago Otepka got his walking papers.

This, however, isn't the end of the story by any means. The information Otepka furnished the Senate subcommittee was of such an explosive nature that a 10-page memorandum summarizing the Otepka case was drawn up and signed by every member of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and ordered to be delivered to Secretary of State Dean Rusk personally by Dodd. The Senator was also instructed by his colleagues to notify Rusk that the committee would force a showdown on the entire matter if the Secretary continued to forbid employees of the State Department to testify before the committee.

Senator Dodd pointed out just this week that Federal law specifically declares that persons employed in the civil service of the United States have an undeniable right to furnish information to either House of Congress or to any committee or member thereof. He contends that the dismissal of Otto Otepka is not only a direct affront to the Senate subcommittee but an affront to the Senate as a whole and a denial of its powers as established by legislation.

He has further declared that the State Department, by its action in the Otepka case, has, in effect, nullified a Federal law and issued a warning to all employees that cooperation with established committees of the Senate, if this cooperation involves testimony considered unpalatable at higher echelon, is a crime punishable by dismissal.

To meet the challenge posed by Otepka's dismissal Dodd has asked for an emergency meeting of the full Senate Judiciary Committee to consider the implications posed by the dismissal. He has further asked that the 10-page memorandum on the Otepka case which was delivered to Rusk be circulated to all Members of the Senate.

If the Otepka dismissal is permitted to stand, Dodd has declared it will become virtually impossible or exceedingly difficult to elicit any information from employees of the executive branch that bears on disloyalty, malfeasance, conflict of interest, or other wrongdoing by their superiors.

Dodd is absolutely right. The Otepka case furnishes further evidence that the New Frontier is running a closed shop operation that is immune from congressional scrutiny and this is something that must be challenged and stopped if Congress and the people are ever to learn even the partial truth about what's going on in the Government they are paying so very heavily to support.

JACK W. GORE.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Nov. 7, 1963]

PATRIOT IS DISMISSED

Dismissal of Otto F. Otepka, State Department security evaluator, because he gave information to members of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, is grossly unfair to a patriotic citizen and an affront to the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Otepka's alleged crime is that he told Senate investigators that high-placed State Department officials intended to bring known security risks back into the Department.

The subcommittee warned Secretary of State Dean Rusk against this kind of drastic action. President Kennedy gave assurances that Mr. Otepka would have a hearing before the Civil Service Commission. All that was conveniently forgotten by the State Department. The Department apparently would not relent because Mr. Otepka was more loyal to his country than to the State Department club of insiders.

The Senate subcommittee, of which Senator Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina, is ranking member, has received a slap in the face from Mr. Rusk. We trust that the subcommittee will uphold the right of Congress to investigate and confer with Government officials, and also express disapproval of the unconscionable abuse to which Mr. Otepka has been subjected.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Nov. 7, 1963]

MORE ON MR. OTEPKA

Since the case of Otto Otepka was mentioned, sorrowfully, in these columns a few days ago, our readers may be interested in a further comment on the same subject—this one by the able Democratic Senator Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut.

First, a brief review of the facts:

Mr. Otepka was an employee of the State Department for 27 years. He had served as Deputy Director of the Office of Security and officer in charge of evaluations. In 1958 he received the Meritorious Service Award from the late Secretary John Foster Dulles.

This year, after Mr. Otepka had testified rather frankly before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, someone higher up decided Mr. Otepka had to go. A tap was installed on his telephone. Mr. Otepka's "burn" basket was searched. He was locked out of his office and denied access to his files. Finally he was fired.

Now to pick up part of Senator Dodd's comment:

"No one suspected of espionage or disloyalty has to my knowledge been subjected to such surveillance and humilitation. But Mr. Otepka was not suspected of disloyalty or espionage. He was suspected very simply of cooperating with the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and of providing it with information that some of his superiors found embarrassing or objectionable.

"In the topsy-turvy attitude it has displayed in the Otepka case, the State Department has been chasing the policeman instead of the culprit, and the words 'security violation' have come to mean, not the act of turning over information to an alien power, but the act of giving information to a committee of the Senate of the United States."

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Nov. 10, 1963]

STATE OUSTS SECURITY AID

Secrets are secrets, the State Department decided last week, and you can't trust anybody these days.

So saying, they fired their 10-year veteran security officer, Otto F. Otepka, because he talked to the Senate's Internal Security Committee.

The reaction from Congress was swift and bitter. Senator Thomas Dodd, of Connecticut, charged that Otepka's only violation was testifying "honestly" on matters relating to the "security" in the Department of State.

But State said Otepka had given "confidential documents" to the committee and out he went.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette, Nov. 11, 1963]

THE OTEPKA CASE

There is more to the case of Otto F. Otepka than has thus far met the eye.

Otepka, chief security evaluations officer of the State Department, was recently dismissed for his role in providing confidential documents to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee without the prior consent of his superiors. That is a matter that can be argued till doomsday—whether a Government official owes his complete loyalty to his department or whether he has the right to go behind their backs in matters he feels involve the vital interests of the Nation. At any rate, there is little question that Otepka overstepped the bounds of usual procedures when he passed over some confidential documents to the subcommittee counsel, J. G. Sourwine. It is said that some of the documents had had their confidential stampings snipped off of them, which, if true, is certainly not good.

But if Otepka is guilty of disobedience and poor judgment, some of his accusers in the State Department are guilty of misrepresentations that can hardly be distinguished from perjury. Three of them—John F. Reilly, David I. Belisle, and Elmer Dewey Hill—all high up in the Department's ranks, allegedly spied on Otepka because they suspected he was secretly handing information to the Senate subcommittee. They treated him exactly as if he were an agent spying for the Communists.

When they were questioned by the Senators, the three denied that they listened in on Otepka's telephone. Now they say, in amplifying their remarks, they did actually set up a tap on Otepka's phone, but they never listened in and never used any information gleaned from the tap. Reilly and Hill have been placed on administrative leave pending a final decision by Secretary Rusk. The chances are that all three may have to leave the Government.

The whole unpleasant incident will leave a bad taste in American mouths, and a great many questions to be answered. If Otepka showed such poor judgment, for example, why was he kept in such an important role for so many years? And why was the Department so anxious to keep information from the Senators, who presumably, are not enemies of the country?

Unfortunately, this is not the first time that an executive department has acted as if Congress were the enemy. The bureaucracy hates to have legislative emissaries snooping around in bureaucratic affairs. Unfortunately, also, the Congress has not always used its privilege with complete discretion.

No one wants to see the Government become a huge nest of informers telling tales out of school. Certain sensible administrative procedures must be set up, and these include a proper chain of command in which subordinates do not defy their superiors.

But the executive departments have an obligation to cooperate with Congress instead of setting up needless road blocks to legislative inquiry. The Otepka case may be hard to judge, but it certainly indicates that something has gone wrong somewhere.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press, Nov. 12, 1963]

Hardly a Confidence Generator

As Senate investigators were looking into the hideous Cuban debacle and seeking information about those in the State Department who had a hand in it, the Kennedy administration didn't like it at all when Otto F. Otepka, a veteran State Department security officer, cooperated with the Senate and gave information and suggested questions that should be asked to develop the evidence.

In the course of the matter, the State Department fired Otepka. But interesting facts came out. Some State Department officials at first denied before the Senate committee in secret session that they had any knowledge of installation of listening devices by which Otepka's critics could eavesdrop on his telephone—then later admitted that such devices had been installed.

With this conflict in testimony made public, the State Department has not treated the officials with leaky stories the way it treated Otepka for cooperating with the Senate investigators. The State Department has confirmed that it has given "leave" beginning today to two of the officials who finally acknowledged the telephone wiring.

This provides an interesting comparison of State Department values—and an explanation, in part, at least, of why we have such failures as that in Cuba:

The man who cooperated with the Senate to try to discover what went wrong has been fired.

The men who had twisted stories in evident effort not to cooperate are on "leave."

The men who knew about Communist Castro yet aided in bringing him to power and who since have hindered efforts to topple him are still at work in the State Department.

This doesn't exactly generate confidence, does it?

[From the Rocky Mount (N.C.) Telegram, Nov. 12, 1963]

Big Brother Still Watching

Serious indeed is the situation in the State Department in which two high officials admitted that telephone wiring in Otto Otepka's office had been tapped for eavesdropping on conversations. Otepka, a veteran State Department security officer, was dismissed on charges of "unbecoming conduct."

Actually, Otepka was fired for bringing to the attention of the Senate Internal Security Committee certain facts concerning the conduct of affairs of the State Department in several oversea countries. These facts, embarrassing to the Department, brought his dismissal because he refused to be hushed up on the matter.

It is a shocking situation when a longtime official of the Federal Government is victim of such police state tactics as wiretapping and eavesdropping. The two officials who admitted the wiretapping were men of responsible positions. One was Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security John F. Reilly, and Elmer Dewey Hill, Chief of the Division of Technical Services in the Department's Office of Security.

They admitted no actual interception of conversations took place, none was authorized and that the wiretap was eventually removed. It was noted by the Senate subcommittee that earlier testimony of these officials denied knowledge of the installation of any listening devices in Otepka's office. In the words of Senator Dodd, chairman of the committee, they had in effect admitted that they lied under oath by denying knowledge of such wiretapping.

"When officials of the State Department admit, in effect, that they lied under oath to a Senate committee," said Dodd, "every American and every Member of Congress ought to be concerned."

Of even more concern is the situation in Washington that permits such activity to take place. Wiretapping of this nature is not new; Bobby Kennedy advocates legislation even now that would permit the Justice Department to make legal use of wiretapping. Such legislation has no place in American Government or anywhere else. It is an invasion of privacy.

In a government where an official cannot be trusted to the extent that his private conversations are bugged by snoopers, we see the opening phases of a system that is strongly reminiscent of police state regimes, and such phases are always the signal for the beginning of the end for democratic government.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Nov. 11, 1963]

Otepka Case Has Great Significance

The action of the State Department in removing Otto F. Otepka as its chief security evaluation officer already has stirred up a mighty controversy in Washington and in all probability the repercussions will be heard for many months to come.

On the face of it, the case is fairly simple. He is charged with "conduct unbecoming an officer of the Department of State" on grounds that he clipped labels denoting classifications of secrecy off classified documents which he then turned over to the chief counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The Department also contends that Mr. Otepka wrote out questions which the counsel was to ask Department officials during the subcommittee's investigation into State Department matters.

There seems to be no question that Mr. Otepka did what he is accused of doing. The only question is whether or not he was wrong in doing it. The Department, on the other hand, has made no claim that the distribution of the documents or the preparation of the questions was of any direct benefit to enemies or potential enemies of this country.

The Department certainly was embarrassed to have the information get out and into the hands of the people who are investigating its operations and no boss wants to have under him an employe who deliberately causes his superiors embarrassment. So, said the Department, Mr. Otepka must go.

But this situation is different from the underling-superior relationship which applies in private business. In a democratic government, everything that a department head and those responsible to him do should be open to public scrutiny unless the security of the Nation—as distinct from the Department head—is involved.

The executive departments of the Nation under Republicans and Democrats have more and more been inclined to hide their actions from the public. Executive orders started under former President Eisenhower and continued and expanded under President Kennedy have built a wall of secrecy around much of the activity of administration figures. This wall—which in our opinion is even more dangerous than the one the Communists built in East Berlin—must be destroyed and if Mr. Otepka breached it, he deserves the thanks, not the censure of the public.

It is quite possible that his actions will make it more difficult for the State Department to operate. But if executive departments are permitted to cover up errors, goofs, frauds or derelictions by arbitrarily slapping a "secret" classification on documents pertaining to the action, even though no security is involved, then our democracy is in tough straits. In a democracy, Government is still the people's business. Let's bring it all out in the open and let the people be the judge.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) News, Nov. 12, 1963]

Straighten Out the Bureaucrats

The State Department has some strange ideas concerning its responsibility to the public, not to mention its relationship to Congress.

Everyone must know by now that the State Department has dismissed an official for, of all things, cooperating with with a committee of Congress. Now it has been established that the same official's telephone lines were tapped, even though State Department spokesmen denied this in testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

We share the committee's dissatisfaction with the attitude and behavior of the State Department, which by its actions implies that it has something to hide from the Congress and the American public.

The executive branch of the Federal Government has established a precedent of ignoring the intent of Congress and the desires of the public. Perhaps the State Department has been infected with the same disregard for the legislative branch.

Every American citizen should resent the Washington bureaucracy's expression of contempt for Congress. The Members of the legislative bodies in Washington are the representatives of the people, and affronts of Congress are, in effect, a demonstration of scorn for the U.S. public.

We hope the Senate Internal Security Committee will carry out its investigation of the State Department regardless of obstacles, and expose those who are attempting to hamper its work.

The true facts about the firing of a loyal official who made the mistake of speaking frankly to congressional investigators should also be brought to light. It is ironic that the State Department has dismissed this man while bureaucratic secrecy still protects those who have made errors detrimental to the Nation's security, in connection with the rise of Fidel Castro in Cuba, for example.

We view with extreme concern the attitude the administration and some of its agencies have taken in respect to the public and the Congress. This attitude implies that the American citizen and his representatives have no right to know what is going on in Government, and no right to have a voice in policy. That is contrary to our ideals of government, and it just won't work.

[From the Kansas City (Kans.) Kansan, Nov. 11, 1963]

The Strange Otepka Case

The way in which the case of Otto Otepka (as related elsewhere on this page) was handled does not reflect credit to the State Department.

Though Otepka now has been officially fired from his job as a Department security officer, the last of the case has not been heard.

Otepka has the right of appeal, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is showing a great deal of interest in how and why his dismissal came about.

Facts behind the case are strange. Otepka was charged with 13 violations of regulations (see article) but most if not all of these were technicalities. His real crime, in the eyes of top State Department officials, was his cooperation with the Senate subcommittee in its investigation of alleged laxity in security in the Department.

Moreover, the State Department apparently resorted to illegal wiretapping in fashioning its case against Otepka. Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, vice chairman of the subcommittee, said his group has proof that Otepka's phone was tapped. State Department officials later admitted that at least an attempt was made in this direction.

DODD also reported that Otepka was locked out of his office, was denied access to his files which were rifled, and was humiliated before his fellow employees.

But the heart of the issue is whether a Federal employee should be harassed and fired for talking to a committee of Congress. The subcommittee had a right to the information it wanted. Perhaps it should have sought first to obtain it through Secretary Rusk, but in some instances investigations demand more indirect means if the truth is to be learned.

In essence, Otepka has been dismissed for telling the truth (or at least what he considered the truth)—his right under the U.S. Civil Service Code which states that such "shall not be denied nor interfered with." Further, he has been the victim of illegal tactics—wiretapping. The State Department does not look good.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot, Nov. 10, 1963]

THE OTEPKA FIRING CASE

It is easy to see how the particulars of the Otto F. Otepka case could become submerged in a debate—perhaps a useful debate—over the areas of responsibility of Congress and the executive branch. This appears to be the Senate's approach in its spirited defense of the State Department's top security officer, fired for turning over confidential documents to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

But the immediate issue seems to us to be whether Mr. Otepka broke the rules. He is accused of drawing from State Department files confidential documents on Cuba, defacing them by scissoring out the "Confidential" classification, and delivering them to the subcommittee's legal counsel. He is accused also of helping the subcommittee's legal counsel prepare questions to be asked of various Department officials concerned with developing Cuban policy.

Violations of this magnitude would seem to us to be sound grounds for dismissal.

Nor are we impressed with Senator DODD's warning that punitive action against Mr. Otepka makes it difficult to get future information about malfeasance or disloyalty in the State Department. Employees of the State Department, or any other Department, are entitled to work free of the fear that information gained by spying will not be used one day to question their loyalty or their competence. The State Department, meanwhile, has some explaining to do about its counterspying on Mr. Otepka.

Mr. Otepka had the right to question the judgment of others in his Department. He did not have the right, though, to mount a one-man information service within the Department for a Senate subcommittee. He has at his disposal now adequate appeals procedure to defend himself against this charge.

[From the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune-Democrat, Nov. 11, 1963]

INTERNAL SECURITY CONGRESS' JOB, TOO

The case of Otto F. Otepka, career civil service employee with an outstanding record, who has been fired because he gave confidential documents dealing with internal security measures to the Senate Internal Security Committee, is surely one of the strangest on record.

One may assume that the interests of the State Department and those of the Senate subcommittee are identical: To keep security risks out of the sensitive areas of the State Department. That being so, it must also be assumed that the State Department would welcome any investigation which would further that end.

However, when Mr. Otepka gave the subcommittee information to which it certainly was entitled—though he may have committed a technical violation of the rules—he was first spied upon, then refused access to files, and ultimately ordered dismissed subject to appeal. Now two more State Department employees—perhaps three—who have "corrected" earlier testimony indicating there had been no tapping of Mr. Otepka's telephone may have to be dismissed. And this case isn't over yet.

An unidentified spokesman for the State Department has been quoted by the New York Times as saying that Mr. Otepka was out of step with the times; that "we are not witch hunting any more," and that "we have no security risks, and he knows it." Apparently this skilled security officer doesn't know it. And, for that matter, it is very unlikely the State Department has reached any such degree of absolute, clinical sterility.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut Democrat who heads the Security Subcommittee, said that "in the topsy-turvy world of the State Department" security violations have come to mean, not turning over information to an alien power, but giving information to a Senate subcommittee. The charges, said DODD, boil down to "the simple fact that Otepka testified honestly before the subcommittee about matters relating to security in the Department of State."

Senator DODD calls this an affront to the whole Senate, which does not seem to be an exaggeration. It suggests that the executive branch of the Government has concluded it has no accountability to the legislative branch, and that is out of line with our constitutional system of divided powers. While a President may, and sometimes does, withhold confidential information from Congress, that power does not reside in any lesser official.

The handling of the Otepka case implies that Congress has no right to look into the manner in which internal security measures are being taken in the most vital area of Government. It hardly seems likely any public official would uphold such a contention openly. And this challenge to congressional authority should be met vigorously, since Executive accountability to the representative branch of Government is a fundamental part of our constitutional system.

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, Nov. 10, 1963]

A COLLISION OF BRANCHES

The firing of the State Department man, Otto F. Otepka, if it does not arise specifically out of the ageless jealousy between the executive and legislative branches of Government, will nevertheless give another airing to that conflict.

Because he allegedly passed on classified material to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Otepka stands accused, in a sense, of consorting with the enemy, the enemy being Congress.

What he told the subcommittee is an embarrassment to the administration. Besides supplying the committee with documents, Otepka is accused of helping the committee counsel prepare a list of piercing questions to ask of his superior in the State Department, Security Chief John F. Reilly.

It is the more extraordinary because Otepka, far from being a minor figure, was chief security evaluations officer of the Department.

It is authoritative when his testimony suggests boneheadedness in the State Department security system, a system that has long been under attack for its porousness.

But in testifying as he did to the committee and supposedly furnishing documents to support his charges, Otepka has cut across an executive order that dates back to President Truman. This order specifically denied loyalty files to Congress for the purpose of protecting individuals.

If this order is being used to chop down Otepka and conceal the flaws that he has described in the State Department security system, the executive branch is guilty not only of an affront to the Senate, as Senator DODD charged, but an affront to the Nation.

There'll be plenty of opportunities for Otepka to vindicate himself through appeals. If nobody expects Otepka to get a fair hearing from the administration officials to whom he may appeal, including the President, Otepka has the opportunity to go to court.

Besides that, Otepka has a powerful defense battery in the U.S. Senate.

Unless Otepka and the Senators he talked to are witless, there is substance to his charges, and if the act of supporting these charges violates an executive order, hang the order. The checks and balances system won't perish from a mining of the truth.

[From the Dothan (Ala.) Eagle, Nov. 12, 1963]

STRANGE BUSINESS

Some strange things are always going on in the Federal Establishment, it seems, and currently it's the firing of Otto F. Otepka by Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Otepka, until his dismissal, was a veteran security official for the State Department.

Secretary Rusk said Otepka was let out "for conduct unbecoming a State Department officer." Interestingly, one of the charges so "unbecoming" was that Otepka "provided a committee of Congress with information that was necessary to demonstrate that other officials of the Government were not telling the truth." What an offense—providing a committee of Congress with information. And information to help such a committee get at the truth.

What goes on here? Perhaps the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier has put its finger on the answer in the following editorial:

"The U.S. State Department has brought charges against Otto F. Otepka, Chief of the evaluation division of its security office, of conduct unbecoming a diplomatic officer.

"Is Mr. Otepka charged with promoting the cause of Fidel Castro? Has he a record of associating with leftwingers? Is he soft on communism? No, he is not charged with such offenses. Mr. Otepka is known as a determined foe of leftism.

"Mr. Otepka's alleged offense is that he collaborated with the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Such a charge could be brought only in the U.S. State Department. Only in the State Department would official anger be aroused by a Department member reported to be collaborating with Congress.

"If Mr. Otepka had favored the Castro regime, as was the case with William Wieland, former head of the Caribbean Division, the Department would protect him to his dying day. Mr. Wieland is still on the payroll, out of sight but protected. It is an anti-Communist official who is in hot water."

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic, Nov. 11, 1963]

SHAMEFUL OTEPKA CASE

By firing its chief security evaluations officer, the State Department decided to drive from Government service a man whose only crime is that he was both honest and conscientious. As Democratic Senator THOMAS DODD charged, the victim, Otto F. Otepka, has been treated by the State Department to "more humiliation and surveillance than anyone ever suspected of espionage or disloyalty."

Otepka, the son of an immigrant blacksmith from Czechoslovakia, is a veteran of 27 years of Government service, 10 of them with the State Department as a security expert. Throughout his Government career he consistently has received the highest ratings. In 1958 he received the State Department Meritorious Service Award. Last year he was recommended for advanced executive training in the National War College.

Now, suddenly, Otepka is charged with conduct "unbecoming an officer of the Department of State," and accused of violating rules which even first-year Government employees would be expected to know. Why?

Otepka's fall from grace is said to date back to the time when Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs, appointed a number of persons with questionable security backgrounds to an advisory committee to study the staffing of Americans on international organizations. According to sworn testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Cleveland also inquired as to whether it would be possible to bring former Soviet spy Alger Hiss back into the Department.

Otepka, whose job it was to evaluate security information about State Department employees, was so incensed that he sent reports to his superiors, listing those persons with questionable security backgrounds whom Cleveland either brought into the State Department or was trying to obtain job clearances for.

At that Otepka himself was placed under surveillance. A secretary was assigned to intercept his "burn bag," a wastebasket for classified material, on its way to the incinerator. His telephone was tapped. Investigators examined impressions on carbon paper and typewriter ribbons found in the burn bags. And they pieced together torn-up letters.

Meanwhile, Otepka, with the approval of his superiors, testified before a Senate subcommittee investigating lax security procedures in State. Information he gave helped block the appointment to a sensitive foreign post of William Wieland, described by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as having been "an active apologist for Fidel Castro" who had failed to report to his superiors information about the pro-Communist nature of Castro's regime.

State Department spokesmen contradicted Otepka's testimony. So after reading transcripts of State's testimony, Otepka gave to the subcomittee's chief counsel a 39-page memorandum, complete with exhibits. The memo proved conclusively that State Department officials lied under oath in an effort to conceal evidence. Therefore, when it no longer could accuse Otepka of lying, the State Department charged him with violating a 1948 directive forbidding Congress access to loyalty files—the charge that eventually led to his dismissal.

The Otepka case is more than just a controversy between Congress and the executive branch over the right of departments and agencies to withhold information from legislators. As Senator DODD noted, the State Department in effect has issued a warning to all employes "that the giving of testimony unpalatable in the higher echelons of the Department is a crime punishable by dismissal." As such, the ruling is an affront to the Senate and to representative government.

Mr. Otepka will appeal the case, and it is scheduled to be reviewed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and President Kennedy. But there is no doubt that the ruling will be upheld. This is unfortunate. For, as Senator DODD added, "In the topsy-turvy world of the State Department, security violations have come to mean, not trying to turn over information to an alien power, but testifying truthfully before a body of Congress."

[From the Springfield (Ohio) Sun, Nov. 12, 1963]

THE OVERSHADOWED MR. RUSK

Dean Rusk, who has established himself as anything but a contentious figure as Secretary of State, seems headed for a hot-spot over the Otto F. Otepka case.

Mr. Otepka has been dismissed as chief security evaluating officer in the State Department. He is charged with passing on confidential documents from the Department to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

But Senator THOMAS J. DODD, vice chairman of the subcommittee, says that Mr. Otepka was punished because he simply testified honestly on matters relating to security in the State Department. The Senator, backed by other Members of Congress, is thundering that the dismissal of Otepka is an assault on the checks and balances of the three divisions of Federal Government.

That's the sort of talk which could lead to a congressional scalping party for Mr. Rusk. This could be a mistake, since there is no proof that Mr. Rusk has been anything but Secretary of State in name only. The man they want might just as likely be found in the Attorney General's office or some other division of the executive branch.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 23, 1963.

Mr. OTTO F. OTEPKA,
Office of Security,
Department of State.

DEAR MR. OTEPKA: This is a notice of proposed adverse action in accordance with the regulations of the Civil Service Commission.

You are hereby notified that it is proposed to remove you from your appointment with the Department of State, as supervisory personnel security specialist, GS-15, in the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, 30 days from the date of this letter.

On August 16, 1963, at Washington, D.C., you executed a voluntary sworn statement, dated August 15, 1963, before Carl E. Graham and Robert C. Byrnes, special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. A copy of this statement is attached as exhibit A. Information contained therein will be referred to specifically in some of the charges listed below.

Furthermore, during the period March 13, 1963, to June 18, 1963, Mr. John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, caused the following procedures to be instituted:

(a) Mrs. Joyce M. Schmelzer, secretary to Mr. Frederick W. Traband, supervisory personnel security specialist, periodically observed your classified trash bag (hereinafter referred to as "burn bag") which was in possession of your secretary, Mrs. Eunice Powers. Mrs. Schmelzer and Mrs. Powers were located in the same room and across from one another.

(b) When Mrs. Schmelzer saw that your burn bag was full, she would ask Mrs. Powers if she wanted her (Mrs. Schmelzer) to take your burn bag to a Department mail room with Mr. Traband's.

(c) When Mrs. Powers accepted Mrs. Schmelzer's offer, Mrs. Schmelzer would inform Mr. Traband of this fact. Mr. Traband would then call Mr. Rosetti, supervisory security specialist, or Mr. Shea, supervisory general investigator, if Mr. Rosetti was not available, and inform him that your burn bag was being delivered to the mail room.

(d) While carrying your burn bag and Mr. Traband's to the Mail Room, Mrs. Schmelzer would mark your burn bag with a red "X" (with a crayon or pencil mark) and deposit both burn bags in the mail room, room 3437.

(e) Mr. Rosetti or Mr. Shea, and on one occasion Mr. Robert McCarthy, supervisory security specialist, would obtain your burn bag from the mail room within 5 to 10 minutes after Mrs. Schmelzer left it there and would turn it over to Mr. Reilly or Mr. Belisle (special assistant to the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security), in their office, Room 3811. (On one occasion when Mrs. Powers herself took your burn bag to the mail room, Messrs. Rosetti and Shea picked it up from the mail room immediately after Mrs. Powers deposited it there.) Your burn bag was then transferred to Mr. Reilly's brief case.

(f) Mr. Reilly's brief case was then taken by Mr. Shea to room 1410, 2612A or 3811 for examination of its contents. Your burn bag was inspected by Mr. Shea either alone or with Mr. Belisle and/or Mr. Rosetti.

(g) The contents of your burn bags were carefully examined. All carbon paper or copies were read by turning the carbon side toward the light thus allowing the paper to be read from the back. Torn pieces of paper were grouped together and then pieced together to make readable documents. One-time typewriter ribbons were also read on occasion.

During the course of inspecting the contents of your burn bag on May 29, 1963, a typewriter ribbon was retrieved. This ribbon has been read and the contents are reproduced as exhibit B. Information contained therein will be referred to specifically in some of the charges listed below.

1. You have conducted yourself in a manner unbecoming an officer of the Department of State:

Specifically: You furnished a copy of a classified memorandum concerning the processing of appointments of members of the Advisory Committee on International Organizations Staffing to a person outside of the Department without authority and in violation of the Presidential directive of March 13, 1948 (13 Fed. Reg. 1359). This directive provides:

"All reports, records, and files relative to the loyalty of employees or prospective employees (including reports of such investigative agencies), shall be maintained in confidence, and shall not be transmitted or disclosed except as required in the efficient conduct of business."

You were reminded of the prohibition contained in this directive on March 22, 1963, when you received and noted a copy of a letter from Mr. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State, to Senator EASTLAND, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, dated March 20, 1963. A copy of this letter, indicating that you "noted" it, is enclosed as exhibit C.

In your sworn statement, referred to above and enclosed as exhibit A, you stated on pages 7 and 8 that you gave a copy of a classified memorandum entitled "Francis O. Wilcox, Arthur Larson, Lawrence Finkelstein, Marshall D. Shulman, Andrew Cordier, Ernest Gross, Harding Bancroft, Sol Linowitz," to Mr. J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel, U.S. Senate Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary. This memorandum concerns the loyalty of employees or prospective employees of the Department within the meaning of the Presidential directive of March 13, 1948.

This is a breach of the standard of conduct expected of an officer of the Department of State.

2. You have conducted yourself in a manner unbecoming an officer of the Department of State:

Specifically: You furnished a copy of a classified memorandum concerning the processing of appointments of members of the Advisory Committee on International Organizations Staffing to a person outside of the Department without authority and in violation of the Presidential directive of March 13, 1948 (13 Fed. Reg. 1359). This directive provides:

"All reports, records, and files relative to the loyalty of employees or prospective employees (including reports of such investigative agencies), shall be maintained in confidence, and shall not be transmitted or disclosed except as required in the efficient conduct of business."

You are reminded of the prohibition contained in this directive on March 22, 1963, when you received and noted a copy of a letter from Mr. Dutton, to Senator EASTLAND, dated March 20, 1963. A copy of this letter, indicating that you noted it, is enclosed as exhibit C.

In your sworn statement, referred to above and enclosed as exhibit A, you stated on page 9 that you gave a copy of a classified memorandum entitled "Processing of Appointments of Members of the Advisory Committee on International Organizations Staffing," to Mr. J. G. Sourwine. This memorandum concerns "the loyalty of employees or prospective employees" of the Department within the meaning of the Presidential directive of March 13, 1948.

This is a breach of the standard of conduct expected of an officer of the Department of State.

3. You have conducted yourself in a manner unbecoming an officer of the Department of State:

Specifically: You furnished a copy of an investigative report concerning a prospective employee of the Department to a person outside of the Department without authority and in violation of the Presidential directive of March 13, 1948 (13 Fed. Reg. 1359). This directive provides:

"All reports, records, and files relative to the loyalty of employees or prospective employees (including reports of such investigative agencies), shall be maintained in confidence, and shall not be transmitted or disclosed except as required in the efficient conduct of business."

You were reminded of the prohibition contained in this directive on March 22, 1963, when you received and noted a copy of a letter from Mr. Dutton, to Senator EASTLAND, dated March 20, 1963. A copy of this letter, indicating that you noted it, is enclosed as exhibit C.

In your sworn statement, referred to above and enclosed as exhibit A, you stated on page 10 that you gave a copy of an investigative report dated May 27, 1960, to Mr. J. G. Sourwine, concerning Joan Mae Fogitanz. This report concerns "the loyalty of employees or prospective employees" of the Department within the meaning of the Presidential directive of March 13, 1948.

This is a breach of the standard of conduct expected of an officer of the Department of State.

4. You have been responsible for the declassification of a classified document containing classified information without following the procedures set forth in volume 5, section 1970, et seq., of the Department's Foreign Affairs manual as supplemented by FAMC 102, dated January 30, 1963. This document, which was classified confidential, was addressed to Mr. McGeorge Bundy, the White House, and was signed by Mr. William H. Brubeck, special assistant to the Secretary and Executive Secretary of the Department:

Specifically: On June 18, 1963, the Xeroxed copies of the tops and bottoms of the pages of the aforementioned document were retrieved from your burn bag. This burn bag was obtained from the mail room in accordance with the procedure outlined above. These tops and bottoms had been cut from a Xeroxed copy of the Brubeck document and have been matched with a complete copy for identification purposes.

The act of cutting the classification indicators from a copy of a document declassified that copy of the document. Exhibit D is a statement from Messrs. Belisle, Rosetti, and Shea, attesting to the fact that they have identified these clippings as having come from the classified document referred to above.

5. You have been responsible for the mutilation of a classified document in violation of 18 U.S.C. 2071, which provides:

"(a) Whoever willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, or destroys, or attempts to do so, or, with intent to do so takes and carries away any record, proceeding, map, book, paper, document, or other thing, filed or deposited with any clerk or officer of any court of the United States, or in any public office, or with any judicial or public officer of the United States, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, having the custody of any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing, willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both; and shall forfeit his office and be disqualified from holding any office under the United States. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 795.)"

This document, which was classified confidential, was addressed to Mr. McGeorge Bundy, the White House, and was signed by Mr. William H. Brubeck.

Specifically: On June 18, 1963, the Xeroxed copies of the tops and bottoms of the pages of the aforementioned document were retrieved from your burn bag. This burn bag was obtained from the mail room in accordance with the procedure outlined above. These tops and bottoms had been cut from a Xeroxed copy of the Brubeck document and have been matched with a complete copy for identification purposes.

The act of cutting the classification indicators from a document "mutilates" that document within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. 2071. Exhibit D is a statement from Messrs. Belisle, Rosetti and Shea, attesting to the fact that they have identified these clippings as having come from the classified document referred to above.

6. You have been responsible for the declassification of a classified document containing classified information without following the procedures set forth in volume 5, section 1970, et seq. of the Department's Foreign Affairs manual as supplemented by FAMC 102, dated January 30, 1963. This document, which was classified confidential, was addressed to SY—Mr. Belisle from SY/EX—Mr. John Noonan, supervisory security specialist, and was on the subject "Security meeting".

Specifically: On June 18, 1963, a Thermo-Faxed copy of the tops and bottoms of the pages of the aforementioned document was retrieved from your burn bag. This burn bag was obtained from the mail room in accordance with the procedure outlined above. These tops and bottoms had been cut from a Thermo-Faxed copy of the document and they have been matched with a complete copy for identification purposes.

The act of cutting the classification indicators from a copy of a document declassified that copy of the document. Exhibit D is a statement from Messrs. Shea, Belisle and Rosetti, attesting to the fact that they have identified these clippings as having come from the classified document referred to above.

7. You have been responsible for the mutilation of a classified document in violation of 18 U.S.C. 2071, which provides:

"(a) Whoever willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, or destroys, or attempts to do so, or, with intent to do so takes and carries away any record, proceeding, map, book, paper, document, or other thing, filed or deposited with any clerk or officer of any court of the United States, or in any public office, or with any judicial or public officer of the United States, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, having the custody of any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing, willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both; and shall forfeit his office and be disqualified from holding any office under the United States. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 795.)"

This document, which was classified confidential, was addressed to SY—Mr. Belisle from SY/EX—Mr. John Noonan, and was on the subject "Security meeting".

Specifically: On June 18, 1963, a Thermo-Faxed copy of the tops and bottoms of the pages of the aforementioned document was retrieved from your burn bag. This burn bag was obtained from the mailroom in accordance with the procedure outlined above. These tops and bottoms had been cut from a Thermo-Faxed copy of the document and they have been matched with a complete copy for identification purposes.

The act of cutting the classification indicators from a document mutilates that document within the meaning of 18 United States Code 2071. Exhibit D is a statement from Messrs. Shea, Belisle, and Rosetti, attesting to the fact that they have identified these clippings as having come from the classified document referred to above.

8. You have been responsible for the declassification of a classified document containing classified information without following the procedures set forth in volume 5, section 1970, et seq. of the Department's Foreign Affairs manual as supplemented by FAMC 102, dated January 30, 1963. This document which was classified confidential was, addressed to you from Messrs. Traband and Levy (supervisory personnel security specialist), and on the subject "SY Evaluative Services to ARA and OIA."

Specifically: On June 18, 1963, a Xeroxed copy of the tops and bottoms of the pages of the aforementioned document was retrieved from your burn bag. This burn bag was obtained from the mailroom in accordance with the procedure outlined above. These tops and bottoms had been cut from a Xeroxed copy of the subject document and have been matched with a complete copy for identification purposes.

The act of cutting the classification indicators from a copy of a document, declassified that copy of the document. Exhibit D is a statement from Messrs. Shea, Belisle, and Rosetti, attesting to the fact that they have identified these clippings as having come from the classified document referred to above.

9. You have been responsible for the mutilation of a classified document in violation of 18 U.S.C. 2071, which provides:

"(a) Whoever willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, or destroys, or attempts to do so, or, with intent to do so takes and carries away any record, proceeding, map, book, paper, document, or other thing, filed or deposited with any clerk or officer of any court of the United States, or in any public office, or with any judicial or public officer of the United States, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, having the custody of any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing, willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both; and shall forfeit his office and be disqualified from holding any office under the United States. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 795.)"

This document, which was classified Confidential, was addressed to you from Messrs. Traband and Levy, and was on the subject "SY Evaluative Services to ARA and OIA."

Specifically: On June 18, 1963, a Xeroxed copy of the tops and bottoms of the pages of the aforementioned document was retrieved from your burn bag. This burn bag was obtained from the mailroom in accordance with the procedure outlined above. These tops and bottoms had been cut from a Xeroxed copy of the subject document and have been matched with a complete copy for identification purposes.

The act of cutting the classification indicators from a document "mutilates" that document within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. 2071. Exhibit D is a statement from Messrs. Shea, Belisle, and Rosetti attesting to the fact that they have identified these clippings as having come from the classified document referred to above.

10. You have been responsible for the declassification of a classified document containing classified information without following the procedures set forth in volume 5, section 1970, et seq. of the Department's Foreign Affairs manual as supplemented by FAMC 102, dated January 30, 1963. This document, which was classified confidential, was drafted by ARA/RPA: JMBarta (international relations officer), and concerned the procedure for reviewing and disposing of adverse information on employees of International Organizations dealing with Inter-American Affairs:

Specifically: On June 18, 1963, a Xeroxed copy of the tops and bottoms of the pages of the aforementioned document was retrieved from your burn bag. This burn bag was obtained from the mailroom in accordance with the procedure outlined above. These tops and bottoms which were cut from a Xeroxed copy of the Barta document, have been matched with a complete copy for identification purposes.

The act of cutting the classification indicators from a copy of a document declassified that copy of the document. Exhibit D is a statement from Messrs. Shea, Belisle, and Rosetti, attesting to the fact that they have identified these clippings as having come from the classified document referred to above.

11. You have been responsible for the mutilation of a classified document in violation of 18 U.S.C. 2071, which provides:

"(a) Whoever willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, or destroys, or attempts to do so, or with intent to do so takes and carries away any record, proceeding, map, book, paper, document, or other thing, filed or deposited with any clerk or officer of any court of the United States, or in any public office, or with any judicial or public officer of the United States, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, having the custody of any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing, willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both; and shall forfeit his office and be disqualified from holding any office under the United States. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 795.)"

This document, which was classified confidential was drafted by ARA/RPA: JMBarta, and concerned the procedure for reviewing and disposing of adverse information on employees of international organizations dealing with inter-American affairs.

Specifically: On June 18, 1963, a Xeroxed copy of the tops and bottoms of the pages of the aforementioned document was retrieved from your burn bag. This burn bag was obtained from the mailroom in accordance with the procedure outlined above. These tops and bottoms which were cut from a Xeroxed copy of the Barta document, have been matched with a complete copy for identification purposes.

The act of cutting the classification indicators from a document "mutilates" that document within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. 2071. Exhibit D is a statement from Messrs. Shea, Belisle and Rosetti, attesting to the fact that they have identified these clippings as having come from the classified document referred to above.

12. You have conducted yourself in a manner unbecoming an officer of the Department of State:

Specifically: On March 19, 1963, carbon paper consisting of seven pages was recovered from your burn bag. This burn bag was obtained by Mr. Rosetti from the mail room after it had been placed there in accordance with the procedure outlined above. The burn bag was inspected and carbon paper recovered from it by Mr. Shea. Mr. Rosetti's signed statement regarding this incident is enclosed as exhibit E. Mr. Shea's statement is enclosed as exhibit F. The carbon paper has been reproduced and copies thereof are attached as exhibit G. This carbon paper contains questions which you prepared and furnished to a person or persons outside the Department for the use of Mr. J. G. Sourwine, in the interrogation of Mr. Reilly. Mr. Sourwine subsequently asked these questions of Mr. Reilly when he appeared before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws, of the Committee on the Judiciary. Mr. Reilly's signed statement is enclosed as exhibit H.

This is a breach of the standard of conduct expected of an officer of the Department of State:

13. You have conducted yourself in a manner unbecoming an officer of the Department of State:

Specifically: On June 10, 1963, a one-time typewriter ribbon was recovered from your burn bag. This burn bag was obtained by Mr. Rosetti from the mailroom after it had been placed there in accordance with the procedure outlined above. Mr. Rosetti's signed statement regarding this incident is enclosed as exhibit I. This type writer ribbon has been read and the contents are reproduced as exhibit J. The ribbon contained 24 questions which you prepared and furnished to a person or persons outside the Department for the use of Mr. J. G. Sourwine in the interrogation of Mr. Belisle. Mr. Sourwine subsequently asked 15 of these questions of Mr. Belisle when he appeared before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws, of the Committee on the Judiciary. Mr. Belisle's signed statement is enclosed as exhibit K.

This is a breach of the standard of conduct expected of an officer of the Department of State.

Copies of the memoranda and documents referred to in the charges which are classified and concern "the loyalty of employees or prospective employees" of the Department are available for inspection by you and your attorney upon request to Mr. John W. Drew, Jr., of my staff, in room 2239.

You are hereby given 10 days from the date of this letter to answer these charges. You may reply both personally and in writing if you so desire. Any written reply you wish to make should be addressed to my attention. You may furnish affidavits or other evidence in support of your reply if you so desire. If you wish to make an oral reply you may call Mr. Drew, extension 6251, for an appointment.

As soon as possible, after your answer is received, or after the expiration of the 10-day limit, if you do not answer, a written decision will be issued to you.

During the 30-day notice period to which you are entitled, you will remain in an active duty status at your present grade and salary.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN ORDWAY,
Chief, Personnel Operations Division.

WHEATON, MD., *October 14, 1963.*

Hon. JOHN ORDWAY,
Chief, Personnel Operations Division,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ORDWAY: This is my answer to the charges preferred against me by your letter of September 23, 1963.

CHARGE 1 AND CHARGE 2

Before turning to the specific charges, a general statement of the background of this entire matter is in order.

I have been an employee of the U.S. Government for 27 years. From 1936 until 1942 I occupied minor positions in the Farm Credit Administration and the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and for 3 years during that period attended law school. In 1942 I was appointed an investigator and security officer with the U.S. Civil Service Commission. I served in that capacity until 1943, when I entered the U.S. Navy as an apprentice seaman. I served in the Navy from 1943 until 1946, being discharged with the grade of petty officer first class. Returning to the Civil Service Commission in 1946, I served there as an investigator and security officer until 1953 when I came to the Department of State as a security officer. I have been with the Department ever since 1953.

My efficiency ratings at the Civil Service Commission for the years 1948–53 were all "excellent," the highest ratings attainable under the system then in effect. During my service in the Department of State, all of my efficiency reports have been highly favorable. For example, for the year 1959–60, when I served as Deputy Director of the Office of Security, my efficiency report contained the following comment by the Director of that office, Mr. Boswell:

"He has had long experience with and has acquired an extremely broad knowledge of laws, regulations, rules, criteria and procedures in the field of personnel security. He is knowledgeable of communism and of its subversive efforts in the United States. To this, he adds perspective, balance, and good judgment, presenting his recommendations and decisions in clear, well-reasoned, and meticulously drafted documents. He has brought these attributes to bear during periods totaling almost 4 months when he has been Acting Director in my absence and throughout the rating period as the State Department representative on an intragovernmental committee concerned with security matters."

In April 1958, I received a meritorious service award signed by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles for sustained and meritorious accomplishment in the discharge of my assigned duties. The justification for this award included the following statement: "He has shown himself consistently to be capable of sound, independent judgment, creative work, and the acceptance of unusual responsibility."

It may be noted that I have received no efficiency report since September 1960, although the regulations require that each employee receive such a report annually, and I have on several occasions requested my superiors to give me my efficiency reports. However, until recently none of my superiors ever complained to me about my performance of duty.

Beginning in November 1961, an investigation into certain security practices of the Department of State was conducted by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate. I first appeared before that committee at its request and with the express permission of the Department of State, together with two other members of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. I responded to the questions of Mr. J. G. Sourwine, the subcommittee's chief counsel, frankly and truthfully to the best of my knowledge and ability. Subsequently, in April 1962 I reappeared before the subcommittee also at the committee's request and with the permission of my superiors. Also appearing at or about that time were my superiors. In October 1962, the committee publicly released the transcripts of my testimony and that of other Department of State personnel, together with a report of the committee containing the committee's conclusions and recommendations with respect to the security practices and procedures of the Department of State.

Beginning in February 1963, and during March 1963, I appeared on four occasions before the same subcommittee in accordance with its request and with the knowledge of my superiors. I was given to understand that the committee was seeking to ascertain from the Department of State whether or not the Department had implemented the committee's recommendations to improve certain security practices found by the committee to be deficient. During April and May 1963, my immediate superior, Mr. John F. Reilly, testified before the committee on five occasions. Prior to his first appearance, and at his request, I obtained from Mr. Sourwine the stenographic transcripts of my testimony of February and March 1963, and I furnished those transcripts to Mr. Reilly. Mr. Reilly indicated to me he had not read my transcripts before. I do not know the reason why, as the transcripts had been available to him through regular Department channels.

Following the appearance of Mr. Reilly, he came to my office and informed me that Senator Thomas F. Dodd, the presiding chairman of the subcommittee, had given him, Mr. Reilly, "a bad time" on that day. Mr. Reilly related to me that he had told the subcommittee that I had voluntarily disqualified myself from the evaluation of the case of William A. Wieland. Mr. Reilly asked if I could "straighten out" Mr. Dodd on this matter. I said I did not know Mr. Dodd but were I to be again questioned by the subcommittee I would be very happy to state for the record what had transpired between me and Mr. Reilly when on a prior occasion he discussed with me, at his request, my future role in the reevaluation of the Wieland case.

Following the conclusion of Mr. Reilly's testimony, Mr. J. G. Sourwine, the chief counsel of the subcommittee, requested that I come to see him, which I did, after working hours on the day of his request. To the best of my recollection this was on May 23, 1963. Mr. Sourwine voluntarily informed me that there were conflicts between my testimony and the testimony of Mr. Reilly. He offered to let me read the stenographic transcripts of Mr. Reilly's testimony and said that when I had done so, I should give him a memorandum that would answer point by point all of those portions of Mr. Reilly's testimony which conflicted with my testimony or which I found inaccurate or untrue. After carefully reading the transcripts of Mr. Reilly's testimony I was both shocked and amazed. I therefore prepared a memorandum consisting of 39 double-spaced pages annotated by exhibits, and I furnished a copy of this memorandum to Mr. Sourwine together with copies of the exhibits mentioned therein. This memorandum was furnished to Mr. Sourwine as the chief counsel and authorized representative of the subcommittee. It was intended to serve as my reference in rebuttal, explanation, or clarification of statements made by Mr. Reilly, in any future appearance I made before the committee. I was told that I would be recalled to testify again before the committee.

I was especially disturbed by two statements made by Mr. Reilly in his testimony which was shown to me by Mr. Sourwine. First, Mr. Reilly testified, concerning eight prospective appointees to the Advisory Committee on International Organizations, that there was no substantial derogatory information respecting any of the prospective appointees, and that the case of only one of them had even been brought to his attention prior to their appointment. This testimony I knew to be incorrect, for on September 10, 1962, before the appointments were made, I had submitted to him a memorandum with respect to each of the individuals in question. This memorandum strongly recommended that certain of the prospective appointees not be cleared without further investigation. On September 17, 1962, Mr. Reilly himself directed a memorandum to Mr. George M. Czayo in the office of Mr. Harland Cleveland with respect to these cases, and this document reflected that Mr. Reilly was familiar with my memorandum of September 10.

I gave to Mr. Sourwine a copy of my memorandum of September 10, 1962, and a copy of Mr. Reilly's memorandum of September 17, 1962. While these documents were classified "confidential"—the one of September 10 having been classified by me—they contained no investigative data. The only substantive data contained in my memorandum of September 10 consisted of references to certain matters which had been mentioned in published reports or hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee or which were otherwise in the public domain. The Reilly memorandum of September 17 contained no substantive data whatever with respect to the prospective appointees, but related for the most part to the procedural steps involved in their clearance.

Charge 1 in your letter is based upon my action in giving a copy of my memorandum of September 10, 1962, to Mr. Sourwine. Charge 2 related to my action in giving Mr. Sourwine a copy of Mr. Reilly's memorandum of September 17, 1962. You allege that my actions were in violation of the Presidential directive of March 13, 1948 (12 Fed. Reg. 1359) which forbids the disclosure, except as required in the efficient conduct of business, of "reports, records, and files relative to the loyalty of employees or prospective employees."

It is a familiar rule that regulations, like statutes, must be interpreted with commonsense, that a thing may be within the letter of a regulation and yet not within the regulation, because not within its spirit, nor within the intention of its makers. This has been the law for centuries. Poffendof mentions the judgment that the Bolognian law which enacted "that whoever drew blood in the streets should be punished with the utmost severity," did not extend to the surgeon who opened the vein of a person that fell down in a street in a fit. Plowden cites the ruling that the statute of 1st Edward II, which enacts "that a prisoner who breaks prison shall be guilty of a felony," does not extend to a prisoner who breaks out of prison when the prison is on fire "for he is not to be hanged because he would not stay to be burnt." See *Church of the Holy Trinity* v. *United States*, 143 U.S. 457.

Applying this doctrine to the present case, and assuming without conceding that the memoranda of September 10 and September 17, 1962, fell within the letter of the Presidential directive of March 13, 1948, I submit that those memorandums were not within the spirit of the directive nor within the intention of its author. As President Truman stated in his letter to the Secretary of State, dated April 2, 1952, the purpose of the directive was "to preserve the confidential character and sources of information, to protect Government personnel against the dissemination of unfounded or disproved allegations, and to insure the fair and just disposition of loyalty cases." The memoranda of September 10 and September 17, 1962 referred to no confidential information, disclosed no confidential sources, and made no allegations. My memorandum of September 10, 1962, merely referred to matters of public record and recommended that these matters should be investigated. There was no loyalty case, pending or contemplated, involving any of the individuals mentioned. In short, in the context of the Presidential directive of March 13, 1948, the two memorandums were completely innocuous and clearly not the kind of papers that the directive was designed to protect.

My interpretation of the Presidential directive of March 13, 1948, is apparently in harmony with the interpretation placed upon the directive by Secretary of State Rusk. Thus, the statement of Senator Thomas J. Dodd, appended to the report of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security in the matter of State Department security, published in 1962, contains the following:

"Subsequent to the preparation of this report, I had occasion to discuss the Wieland case with Secretary Rusk and to examine certain documents which he showed me in confidence.

"On the basis of these conversations, I am satisfied that, prior to September 15, 1961, Secretary of State Rusk had examined the material pertaining to the Wieland case in considerable detail, including reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

See Senate report, State Department Security, "The Case of William Wieland, etc., 87th Congress, 2d session—page 197. The intendment of Senator Dodd's statement is that Secretary Rusk disclosed to him documents from the security file of Mr. Wieland, in order to establish that the Secretary did examine this material prior to September 15, 1961. It seems obvious that, in the judgment of Secretary Rusk, a reasonable and commonsense interpretation of the Presidential directive did not prevent the disclosure of the security material to Senator Dodd. If it was proper for Secretary Rusk to show such material to a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee, then it was proper for me to disclose the innocuous memoranda of September 10 and September 17, 1962, to an authorized agent of that subcommittee, in order that the committee might know the truth and to refute unwarranted and scandalous charges against me and my record.

Mr. Reilly's testimony that the cases of the prospective appointees had not been brought to his attention seriously disparaged my performance of duty and impugned my integrity. In other words, had I failed to bring such matters to his attention, I would have been guilty of a dereliction of duty. In this context, I submit that I had not only the right but the duty to defend myself, to correct the committee record, and to support my oral testimony by the memoranda of September 10 and September 17, 1962.

The provisions of the United States Code, title 5, section 652(d) plainly gave me the right to respond to the request of the Senate committee and to answer Mr. Reilly's attacks upon me. That statute provides:

"(d) The right of persons employed in the civil service of the United States, either individually or collectively, to petition Congress, or any Member thereof, or to furnish information to either House of Congress or to any committee or member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with. As amended June 10, 1948, c. 447, 62 Stat. 354; 1949 Reorg. Plan No. 5, eff. Aug. 19, 1949, 14 F.R. 5227, 63 Stat. 1067".

If the provisions of the directive are construed to prohibit the disclosure by me of the memoranda here involved, under the circumstances of this case, then I submit the directive is in violation of the statute.

It must be emphasized always that I gave the memoranda in question to Mr. Sourwine, not as an individual, but as the authorized agent of a committee of the U.S. Senate; and I gave them to him only to be used as exhibits in connection with my forthcoming testimony before that committee in executive session.

CHARGE 3

Charge 3 alleges that in violation of the Presidential directive of March 13, 1948, I furnished to Mr. J. G. Sourwine a copy of an investigative report dated May 27, 1960, concerning Joan Mae Fogltanz.

My answer to charges 1 and 2 is in large part applicable to charge 3 and I adopt it as part of my answer to charge 3.

Specifically, the facts relating to and justfying my delivery of a copy of the Fogltanz report to Mr. Sourwine are as follows: In his testimony before the committee Mr. Reilly swore that in a memorandum dated October 29, 1962, I had made certain recommendations for the improvement of the organization and operation of the Division of Evaluations; and that I thereafter complained when the very changes I had recommended were put into effect. He produced a copy of my memorandum of October 29, 1962, introduced it into the committee record, and discussed it in detail. Furthermore, he said that my "recanting" of that memorandum caused him to question my integrity and my emotional balance. This was the second statement by Mr. Reilly that disturbed me.

One specific recommendation which Mr. Reilly claimed I had repudiated was my recommendation that "short-form reporting" be used in the case of certain applicants for employment. By short-form reporting I meant a procedure whereby investigative reports on applicants for minor clerical positions which were entirely favorable would be condensed and summarized eliminating long and repetitious endorsements and descriptive statements. I recommended that such short-form reporting be used only in cases of applicants for positions in grade GS-4 or lower. After receiving my memorandum and contrary to my recommendation, Mr. Reilly ordered that short-form reporting should be used for all reports of investigation, including reports on prospective appointees to high office in the Department. Since Mr. Reilly's order was not in accordance with my recommendation, I respectfully opposed it.

In view of Mr. Reilly's testimony, it was necessary for me to explain to the committee the matter of short-form reporting and my consistent position on the subject. It was in this connection and for this purpose alone that I gave Mr. Sourwine, as the agent of the subcommittee, the Fogltanz report. This report was marked "Official use only." The report, relating to an applicant for a minor clerical position in the Department of State, consisted of five and a half single-spaced typewritten pages and reflected interviews with a large number of people. All of those interviews attested that Miss Fogltanz was a young lady of splendid character, a loyal American, moral, religious, and in every way suitable and qualified for appointment. In short the report was completely favorable and completely innocuous. I gave the report to the subcommittee as a striking example of the needless repetition and prolixity which my recommendation for short-form reporting was intended to eliminate. Along with this report, I also presented an example of the same material digested in a short-form report. My purpose and my only purpose, was to explain the recommendation I had made to Mr. Reilly and to make it clear that I had not deviated from that recommendation.

All that I have said in my discussion of charges 1 and 2, to demonstrate that the memoranda involved in those charges were not within the scope of the Presidential directive of March 13, 1948, applied with even greater force to the innocuous Fogltanz report.

CHARGES 4–11

Charge 4 alleges that I was "responsible for the declassification of a classified document" by cutting the classification indicators from the tops and bottoms of the pages of a Xeroxed copy of the document.[1] It is alleged that the severed tops and bottoms of the pages were found in my burn bag on June 18, 1963. It is charged that such declassification violated various sections of the Department's "Foreign Affairs Manual." Charges 6, 8, and 10 made similar charges with respect to the Xeroxed or Thermo-Faxed copies of other documents, it being alleged in each instance that the severed tops and the bottoms were recovered from my burn bag.

Charges 5, 7, 9, and 11 relate to the same Xeroxed or Thermo-Faxed copies and the same clippings referred to in charges 4, 6, 8, and 10. It is alleged that I was "responsible" for the clipping of these documents, and that such clipping constituted a "mutilation" of the documents in violation of 18 U.S.C. 2071, relating to the mutilation of official documents and records.

By letter of October 4, 1963, my counsel requested you to specify the particular manner in which it is claimed that I failed to follow required declassification procedures as alleged in charges 4, 6, 8, and 10. He also requested you to advise whether or not it is charged that I personally clipped the documents, and if not, then who is alleged to have done the clipping. By your letter of October 8, 1963, you responded to the first question by stating only that "The methods by which the classified documents in question were declassified are not authorized by the abovecited reference" (to the Department's "Foreign Affairs Manual"). This response of course does not answer the question. Answering the second question you stated that it is not charged that I personally declassified or mutilated the documents. You did not respond at all to the request for specific information as to who is alleged to have done the clipping or mutilation.

In the absence of the specific information requested by my counsel's letter of October 4, 1963, these charges are defective. I do not waive this point.

Turning to the facts, the allegations contained in charges 4–11 inclusive can be answered in a few words. I did not clip the documents in question. I was not responsible for the clipping directly, or indirectly. I do not know who did it, or why, or who placed the clippings in my burn bag—assuming that they were there. In short, I had absolutely nothing to do with clipping these papers and know nothing about it.

What has been said is a full and complete answer to the charges of clipping and mutilation. It may be appropriate, however, to point out the flimsy nature of the circumstantial evidence upon which these accusations against me are based. You apparently rely upon the theory of guilt by association with my burn bag. The facts are that there were three burn bags and three secetaries in the reception area where my burn bag was located. The secretaries sat within a few feet of each other and there was a burn bag beside the desk of each secretary. There was no rule or custom that trash from the office of each official would be deposited only in his burn bag; on the contrary, trash might be thrown into whichever burn bag was the most convenient. It follows that even if the clippings here involved were found in my burn bag this does not demonstrate that they came from my office or had any connection with me. In other words, the presence of such clippings in my burn bag is entirely consistent with the hypothesis that they came from one of the other two offices in the suite. It should be added that both Mr. Traband and Mr. Levy had copies of the documents in question.

Further analyzing the circumstantial evidence, it is significant that one page of the four-page document involved in charges 4 and 5 and one page of the two-page document involved in charges 6 and 7 were not clipped at all. If the purpose of whoever clipped the documents was to declassify them by removing the classification indicators, it is singular that the indicators on these pages were left untouched.

As I have said, I do not know who clipped the documents in question. You have not answered the request of my counsel for specific information as to who is alleged to have done the clipping. Were I permitted to examine my burn bags and their contents, referred to in your letter, I might be able to reach some conclusion on this point; however, you have denied my counsel's request, by his letter of October 8, 1963, that we be permitted to examine the burn bags and their contents. I must say, with great respect, that your ruling is puzzling, especially since it is alleged that the contents of the burn bags came from me, and since the Department of State in the case of John Stewart Service permitted him and his counsel to examine all documents and papers in the files which were prepared by him or in connection with the missions on which he served, which might be material to his defense.

Finally, it should be noted that 18 U.S.C. 2071, relating to the mutilation of records and documents, furnishes no support for your charges. It is plain on the face of this statute that it is intended to prohibit, and does prohibit, only the mutilation or destruction of record or file copies. The statute by its terms relates to papers "filed or deposited * * * in any public office, or with any * * * public officer of the United States." It has no application to work papers or working copies which of course may be destroyed when they have served their purpose. If this were not so, there would be little need for trash baskets and burn bags. In this connection, you are of course familiar with the departmental rule that unneeded copies shall be destroyed by tearing them and depositing them in a burn bag for classified trash.

CHARGE 12 AND CHARGE 13

Charges 12 and 13 allege that I furnished to Mr. Sourwine certain questions, to be asked of Mr. Reilly and Mr. Belisle when they testified before the Senate subcommittee. It is charged that my action in furnishing these questions "is a breach of the standard of conduct expected of an officer of the Department of State."

---

[1] The charge alleges that the document in question was signed by Mr. William H. Brubeck. The document exhibited to me and my counsel by your office, as a copy of the one referred to in the charge, is signed "J. T. Rogers, for William H. Brubeck." The inaccuracy is of course unimportant.

By his letter of October 4, 1963, my counsel asked that you specify the regulation alleged to have been violated by my conduct, which is the basis of charges 12 and 13. In your letter of October 8, 1963, you responded that "no allegation is made that the conduct of Mr. Otepka referred to in charges 12 and 13 violated a specific Department of State regulation." It thus appears that my conduct is to be judged under some vague and amorphous standard, setting out no objective guidelines, but existing only in the minds of my superiors, and subject to change according to their notions or whims of the moment. Such a standard, I submit, does not meet the fundamental requirements of fairness and due process, nor does a charge based upon such a standard fulfill those requirements.

The vagueness of the standard of conduct to which you refer and the need for a more precise definition and explanation of that standard are well illustrated by the facts of this case. In addition to the surveillance of my activities disclosed by your letter, I have reason to believe that in recent months employees of the Department of State have secretly employed listening devices to eavesdrop on conversations in my office. I have reason to believe that my office telephone has been tapped and that my desk and my safe have been surreptitiously opened and searched. These things have been done with the knowledge and approval of my superiors, if not by their express direction. They were done in the absence of any effort whatever to secure from me, by direct and open means, the information which was desired and which I would have been glad to furnish. When the Department of State approves such conduct and adopts such methods the meaning of your phrase "the standard of conduct expected of an officer of the Department" becomes lost in obscurity.

Turning to the factual allegations of charges 12 and 13, it is true that I furnished to Mr. Sourwine, as the chief counsel and authorized representative of the Senate subcommittee, questions to be put to Mr. Reilly and Mr. Belisle when they testified before the committee. Some of these questions are reflected in the exhibits attached to your letter, although in many instances they have been garbled in transcription.

My action in furnishing these questions to Mr. Sourwine was clearly within the protection of 5 United States Code, section 652(d), quoted above on page 6.

Whatever the standard of conduct expected of an officer of the Department of State may be, it is my conviction that any standard of conduct worthy of the name demands honesty and integrity. Certainly honesty and integrity are the fundamental tenets of my personal standard of conduct. Consistently with this belief, I hold that when one is called upon to speak he must speak the whole truth; he must not attempt to pervert or suppress the truth by concealment, evasion, half-truths, or misleading silence. I believe that every man has the right to defend himself against false accusations. I believe in the Code of Ethics for Government Service, expressed in the House concurrent resolution agreed to on July 11, 1958, and promulgated by the U.S. Civil Service Commission in departmental Circular 982 on December 2, 1958. That code states that "any person in Government service should put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department." When I appeared as a witness before the Senate subcommittee I, of course, had this credo in mind. I believed then and I believe now that it was my duty to tell the committee the whole truth. By the same token, I believed then and I believe now that I would have been derelict in my duty, if by my silence I had permitted untrue and inaccurate statements, of which I had personal knowledge, to remain unchallenged in the committee record, or if I had otherwise failed to give the committee my full cooperation in its search for the truth. It was and is my understanding that it was my duty to assist the committee to develop the truth, and it was for this purpose, and for this purpose alone, that I cooperated with the committee counsel by suggesting to him fair, proper, and impersonal questions designed to bring the truth to light. It is difficult to understand why the Department and the witnesses did not welcome such questions. In any event, I cannot believe that my action was a breach of any standard of conduct properly expected of an officer of the Department of State.

I submit that the charges against me are without foundation and should be dismissed.

Very respectfully,

OTTO F. OTEPKA.

I, Otto F. Otepka, being first duly sworn depose and say that I have read the foregoing answer subscribed by me and know the contents thereof; that the matters and things stated therein as of my personal knowledge are true and those stated upon information and belief I verily believe to be true.

OTTO F. OTEPKA.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 14th day of October 1963.

(Signed) CHARLOTTE D. KIMBALL,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

My commission expires August 14, 1968.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 5, 1963.

Mr. OTTO F. OTEPKA,
Office of Security,
Department of State.

DEAR MR. OTEPKA: On September 23, 1963, you were notified of 13 charges on the basis of which it was proposed to remove you from your appointment as supervisory personnel security specialist, GS–15, in the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security in the Department of State. Your written reply, dated October 14, 1963, has been carefully considered. As you know, you did not request an opportunity to make an oral reply. I find that you have not refuted the charges set forth in my letter of September 23, 1963.

Charges 1 and 2 allege that you gave copies of classified memoranda relating to the loyalty of prospective employees of the Department of State to a person outside the Department without authority and in violation of the Presidential directive of March 13, 1948. Charge 3 alleges that you gave a copy of an investigative report concerning a prospective employee of the Department to a person outside of the Department without authority and in violation of the Presidential directive.

In your reply you admit giving these documents to Mr. J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. You argue, in defense, that the Presidential directive, properly construed, does not apply to the documents in question because the memoranda contained no investigative data and no substantive data that was not in the public domain and the investigative report was completely favorable and innocuous.

The Presidential directive provides that:

"All reports, records and files relative to the loyalty of employees or prospective employees (including reports of such investigative agencies), shall be maintained in confidence, and shall not be transmitted or disclosed except as required in the efficient conduct of business.

"Any * * * request for information, reports, or files of the nature described * * * shall be respectfully declined, on the basis of this directive, and the * * * request shall be referred to the Office of the President for such response as the President may determine to be in the public interest in the particular case. There shall be no relaxation of the provisions of this directive except with my express authority."

The directive recognizes that, because of the nature of the material they contain, reports, records, and files relative to loyalty of Government employees and prospective employees must be specially safeguarded. Only in this way can the personnel loyalty-security program be carried out with appropriate regard for both national security and individual rights. The directive does not prohibit the disclosure of such information absolutely, but provides a special procedure for determining whether it is in the public interest that such information be disclosed. Under the procedure, that determination is made by the President, to assure that all relevant considerations will be taken into account and given proper weight. The directive thus removes from the purview of the individual employee's judgment the many questions that may arise—whether the source of the information must be protected; whether the information is substantive in character; whether it is innocuous; whether a proposed disclosure is accompanied by adequate safeguards; in sum, whether a particular report or record contains information that should not be disclosed in the circumstances.

Accordingly, the only relevant question is whether the documents were "relative to the loyalty of employees or prospective employees." Of the documents you gave to Mr. Sourwine, the September 10, memorandum specifically deals with the loyalty of prospective employees and, in fact, contains at least two statements clearly based on information contained in investigative reports. The September 17 memorandum specifically refers to loyalty matters with respect to the prospective employees. The third document is an investigative report and is thus of a class expressly named in the directive. The documents thus fall within the classes of papers protected by the directive.

You also contend that the memorandums and the investigative report were furnished to Mr. Sourwine to correct inaccurate testimony of your superior, Mr. Reilly, and that under 5 U.S.C. 652(d), dealing with the right of persons employed in the civil service to furnish information to or petition Congress, you were free to give the documents to Mr. Sourwine in spite of the Presidential directive.

I cannot agree with this position. No organization, especially a large one like the Department of State, could function if subordinate officers disregarded established procedures as they chose. As you know, there are a number of such procedures by which you could have brought your disagreement with Mr. Reilly to the attention of superior officers in the Department. In addition, you could have sought the opportunity to testify again before the subcommittee to make any necessary clarifications. If you believed disclosure of papers relative to the loyalty of employees or prospective employees was necessary, the procedure prescribed in the Presidential directive was available.

Title 5 U.S.C. 652(d), is not designed to permit employees to short cut such procedures. The question of the scope of that section was raised during the Senate select committee hearings concerning censure charges against the late Senator McCarthy. It was argued that under the statute "no qualifications or restrictions are imposed upon the right of Federal employees to take up matters with and give information to Members and committees of the Congress of the United States." This interpretation was rejected by the select committee. It concluded that the section does no more than "affirm that Federal employees do not lose or forfeit their rights merely by virtue of their Federal employment." An employee does not forfeit his rights when he complies with reasonable and orderly procedures for the exercise of those rights. The committee recognized that the President could prescribe reasonable regulations to safeguard information "notwithstanding that the regulations might indirectly interfere with any secret transmission line between the executive employees and any individual Member of Congress." Senate Report No. 2508, 83d Congress, 2d session, page 35.

Accordingly, I find that charges 1, 2, and 3 are sustained.

Charges 4, 6, 8, and 10 allege that you were responsible for cutting the classification indicators from the tops and bottoms of certain classified memorandums thus declassifying the documents without complying with prescribed procedures. Charges 5, 7, 9, and 11 allege that, by the same acts, you were responsible for mutilation of the documents in violation of section 2071 of title 18, United States Code.

In reply you deny that you clipped the documents in question or that you were responsible, directly or indirectly, for the clipping. You argue that the presence of the clippings in your burn bag is consistent with the hypothesis that they came from one of the other two offices in the suite. You also argue that section 2071 of title 18, United States Code, has no application to work papers or working papers, which may be destroyed when they have served their purpose.

With respect to section 2071 of title 18, United States Code, you are not, of course, charged with destroying the documents, lawfully or unlawfully, but with unlawfully mutilating them. Since only the carefully clipped classification indicators appeared in the burn bag and not the remainder of the documents, the inference arises that you were not seeking to destroy the document in accordance with prescribed procedures or in the ordinary course of business.

Although the documents involved were not originals, they are not thereby exempt from the protection of section 2071, which covers "any paper, document, or other thing filed or deposited with any public officer of the United States."

As to the factual issues, each of the other two officers occupying the suite has made a statement denying that he clipped the documents in question, or placed the documents or portions of them in your burn bag, or that he knows who did. Each of the secretaries of these officers as well as your own secretary has made a statement denying that she clipped the documents in question, or placed them or portions of them in your burn bag, or knows who did. The clippings were found in the burn bag available specifically for your use. The documents all dealt with the same specific subject as 10 other documents which, in a signed statement dated August 15, 1963, you admitted giving to Mr. Sourwine. In these circumstances, I have concluded that you were responsible for clipping the documents.

I find that these charges are sustained.

Charge 12 alleges that you prepared and gave to a person or persons outside the Department a series of questions for the use of Mr. Sourwine in the interrogation of your superior, Mr. Reilly. Charge 13 alleges that you prepared and gave to a person or persons outside the Department a series of questions for the use of Mr. Sourwine in the interrogation of another officer of the Department, Mr. Belisle.

In your reply you admit having prepared the questions and given them to Mr. Sourwine to be put to Mr. Reilly and Mr. Belisle when they testified. You argue that the standard of conduct you are charged with violating is so vague as to be unfair and lacking in due process and that, as with charges 1, 2, and 3, your action was justified under 5 U.S.C. 652(d), and was taken to defend yourself against false testimony. You also state that you considered it your duty, in loyalty to your country and consistent with the Code of Ethics for Government Service, to assist the committee to develop the truth.

Departmental Regulations (3FAM 1611) provide:

"The policy of the Department is to protect its employees against arbitrary separation or removal for reasons having no relation to the good of the service. Employees are required, however, to render honest, efficient, and loyal service and shall be separated or removed when necessary to maintain the required discipline and efficiency of the service."

This standard of service as well as basic concepts of administrative responsibility require that an officer of the Department should first seek to correct asserted deficiencies within the Department in accordance with the procedures provided. Unless this proves impossible the question of a conflict of loyalties cannot arise. As noted above, there were proper ways available to make your views known, and thus there is no deprivation of the rights referred to in 5 U.S.C. 652(d). The right to free speech and loyalty to country on which you rely do not render meaningless your duty of loyalty to superiors and fellow employees and are not incompatible with that duty.

I find that these charges are sustained.

You are hereby notified that you will be removed from your appointment with the Department of State. The effective date of your removal will be November 15, 1963.

You are hereby notified of your right to appeal this decision to the Department of State or to the Civil Service Commission. If you appeal initially to the Department, the effective date of your removal will be postponed pending the appellate decision. Your attention is directed to the Foreign Affairs Manual of the Department, volume 3, section 1840, a copy of which is enclosed, for detailed information concerning an appeal to the Department. Once you have appealed to the Department, you may appeal to the Civil Service Commission only if:

1. you request that the appeal to the Department be terminated, or

2. an appellate decision has been rendered sustaining this decision.

If you appeal initially to the Civil Service Commission, you cannot appeal to the Department. An appeal to the Department and to the Civil Service Commission may not be pursued concurrently.

Any appeal you wish to make to the Department should be submitted in writing to the Assistant Secretary for Administration. It should set forth, clearly the basis for your appeal and state whether you desire a hearing in connection with your appeal.

In appealing to the Department, you have the right to a full and fair hearing. You may appear in person or through or accompanied by a representative. If you avail yourself of this, the hearing will be held prior to a decision on your appeal. A decision on this appeal would be made only after review of the matter by the Secretary.

If you appeal initially to the Civil Service Commission from this decision, you should address the Appeals Examining Office, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington 25, D.C. Such an appeal must be in writing, setting forth your reasons for contesting the removal, with any supporting offers of proof or documents. The appeal to the Civil Service Commission must be submitted no later than 10 calendar days after the effective date of your removal.

In accordance with the President's statement in his recent news conference, I understand that he will review the matter before any final decision.

Any further information about the appeals procedure may be obtained from Mr. John W. Drew, Jr., of my staff, on extension 6251.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN ORDWAY,
Chief, Personnel Operations Division.

POETICAL EULOGIES ON THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in the past few weeks, I have received many communications from my fellow Rhode Islanders consisting of expressions of grief as a result of our recent national tragedy. The extremely sad circumstances which surrounded the loss of our great President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, has led many Rhode Islanders to express their thoughts in many different ways. Some desire construction of a suitable memorial, such as the National Cultural Center. Others wish the minting of a coin or the naming of a square in order to commemorate our late President. However, the majority of the citizens who have written to me from my State have expressed their grief in a more personal manner. Along this line, I have received two rather exceptional communications which are symbolic of the thoughts of all Rhode Islanders during this period of national mourning. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent at this time, Mr. President, that two poetical eulogies, which have been written by the Reverend Jessie Koewing Brown and Patrolman Robert E. Taylor, both of the city of Providence, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NATION MOURNS

A Nation sadly mourns; we bow our heads in grief,
As in deaths' cruel cold embrace, lies our beloved Chief.
So truly dedicated he, so dauntless, young, and brave,
Must he forever silent be, in a martyrs' lonely grave?

Ah no, his spirit calls us, we see him through our tears,
He bids us carry on his work, he gently stills our fears;
He says "take up the burden where I had to lay it down,
And together we will fight and win, and gain a victors' crown.

"We must ne'er negotiate through fear, nor fear to negotiate,
Our forefathers' dream of liberty we must perpetuate,
It is a lonely battle, this fighting for world peace,
But trust in God, keep praying, and may your faith increase."

And so the spirit of John Kennedy will lead us in the way
To worldwide peace and understanding, and bring a brighter day;
But the challenge is a great one, we must abolish fears and hates,
And give our all as he did, to these United States.

With grateful hearts o'erflowing we thank Thee Lord for him
Whose faith, intelligence, and love, endeared him to all men:
God rest his stalwart soul in peace, and to his loved ones, God be good,
And in his memory may hands 'round the world, be joined in brotherhood.

—JESSIE KOEWING BROWN.

NOVEMBER 24, 1963.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Dear God, send forth the inspiration I need
To write poetic words the whole world can read.

Just simple words from my deep, saddened heart
About John F. Kennedy, whom from life did part.

A man so much loved by one and all.
A symbol of peace that stands so tall,
Has now passed on from the living race
To join great men at a far distant place.

Arriving in Dallas with a large motorcade,
T'was a heart broken city in which history was made.
From a building up high the fatal shot came
The assassin we know, without trial, without name.

On his death bed, for life they did fight
Two priests near by gave the last rites.
His final breath gone Jackie reached for his hand,
Placed on his finger her gold wedding band.

A mental picture now comes to mind
Of a Texas boy holding a sign.
It said, "Yankee Go Home," painted in red
A few moments later, John Kennedy lay dead.

He did return home, in Air Force One
A casket of bronze, beneath the bright sun
His wife as always there by his side,
What a stout hearted women he chose for a bride.

I'll say in closing of he who is gone
In our hearts, our minds, he will always live on.
Now dear God, our prayers shall be
For strength and guidance to his bereaved.

—Patrolman ROBERT E. TAYLOR,
Providence Police Department, Providence, R.I.

THE SENATE LEADERSHIP AND THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, as the 1st session of the 88th Congress draws to an end, I know that we all reflect upon the accomplishments and the disappointments which have transpired. Yet we look to the future—to the second session of this Congress which will convene within less than 20 days. While we have made immeasurable progress, we have unfinished work and so I, for one, do not believe we can evaluate correctly the progress of our Senate body until the final chapter is written.

We have in our distinguished majority leader, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, one of the most considerate and respected leaders of all times. I want to thank him and pay tribute to his thoughtfulness, his kindness, and his complete understanding of every individual Senator's problems. He has shown the ability to work under demanding pressures—pressures which would tax the patience of Job. Throughout the trying demands of his office, he has maintained a calmness and an open mind, and always demonstrated his responsiveness to his position.

Most, if not all of us, have from time to time sought his counsel. He has been generous in giving us assistance, in lending a sympathetic ear, and doing what he could to be helpful. Our majority leader deserves the commendation of this body, and I wish him to know my sentiments come from the heart. It is easy for one to be critical, yet it is quite another thing to put oneself in the majority leader's position. He has been a tireless worker for the overall welfare of our Nation.

I would also be remiss if I did not pay tribute and similar respects to our Democratic majority whip, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. The senior Senator from Minnesota has boundless energy. He has done his work well. He is always on the job, attending the Senate's business in an orderly, businesslike manner, and he has demonstrated his leadership and capability in pushing and prodding for progressive legislation, always demanding the Senate take action. These are men of courage and determination, who need our support, who need our understanding—for they are the ones charged with more responsibility than any individual Senator. I am pleased and happy that I have had the privilege of working with them.

On the other side of the aisle, we have had in the minority leader, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, and the minority whip, Senator TOMMY KUCHEL, men who have not been obstructionists. They are formidable foes on matters of policy where they disagree with the Democratic position. They have fully measured up to their responsibility in bringing out and developing their side and position of the various issues that have come before this body. This is the democratic way and the way which, I believe we can all agree, should be and will be maintained.

LATIN AMERICA AND JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, "Let the Alliance for Progress be President Kennedy's living memorial," said President Johnson in his first official public statement. These words were spoken to all the peoples of the western hemisphere. To the United States they say, "let us continue," and to those south of the Rio Grande they say "let us continue."

Did these words fall on unhearing ears? The record we in this hemisphere write next week, next year, and from then on will tell whether we heard, and heeded, but the grief of our partners in the Alliance over the loss of our President gives proof of their commitment to this task, and to this hope.

Reports of their grief are flowing to Washington from the capitals and villages of the Latin American countries.

As President Johnson's words of reaffirmation reached the Latin cities, expressions of confidence and gratitude accompanied the expressions of grief. For the RECORD, I offer a sampling, so that we may know the quantity and quality thereof, and pay heed to the strength of this partnership.

ARGENTINA

The shocking, tragic death of President John F. Kennedy plunged the Argentine people into a trauma of unprecedented proportions and evoked an outpouring of deeply touching expressions of condolences.

For the first time since his inauguration—October 12—President Illia gathered his entire Cabinet together to issue a decree invoking an 8-day period of national mourning and to declare the day of the funeral an official holiday. Personal visits and telephone calls expressing sympathy for the Kennedy family and the American people deluged the Embassy and the homes of its officers. Books, opened for signature at the Embassy Chancery and the residence drew long lines of people, many standing for hours, to record their grief. Some 5,000 letters, cards, and telegrams have been received from all over Argentina. Over a hundred floral offerings, ranging from elaborate wreaths to simple bouquets placed by children, flooded the chancery. Some 40,000 portrait photographs of President Kennedy were handed out by USIS in response to requests. A solemn Requiem Mass at the Buenos Aires Cathedral was attended by President Illia, top officials, diplomats, and a crushing capacity crowd on the day of the funeral. Other churches, of all denominations, held memorial services at one time or another during the week. Practically all top officials of the present government and the last government, as well as political leaders of all persuasions—Peronist, Christian Democrats, Socialists, and so forth—personally paid their respects to the Ambassador. The Ministry of Education named the National Normal School for Modern Languages after President Kennedy in a formal ceremony on November 28, and all Argentine national schools held special classes on November 29 on the contributions of President Kennedy to the cause of world peace. The foregoing serve merely as indications of the sincere and deeply emotional reaction of Argentina to this tragic event. The national mourning brought official and political activity nearly to a standstill, with attention universally focused on the assassination, the funeral, the attendant developments in the United States, and a widely voiced marveling at the manner in which the people and Government of the United States took the tragedy in stride, named the new President, and carried on.

President Johnson's address to Congress received top billing in all papers. The influential La Prensa calls the President's speech "a piece of singular worth that can be considered his first victory"; asserts this means "leadership of the great Republic has changed neither course nor level"; and hails the speech as a "political message of singular beauty" and as coining phrases that will last as models of expression and norms.

La Nacion, November 28, observes Johnson "not a President by mere chance" and "entering presidential stage with dignity of a master in his legitimate domain."

Said La Razon:

> The President is dead, but another man identified with his ideals and principles is already at the helm, and within the Democratic Party and the administration the spirit of teamwork continues * * * based on the presence of men of thought and action, advisors noted for their scholarly qualities and intellectual devotion, who from now on will apply themselves to the programs and plans which they conceived in simple and friendly comradeship with the young statesman

> whom humanity has lost * * *. It is certain that in the United States everything will go on as if John F. Kennedy was still at his White House desk.

RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL

News of the death of President Kennedy was received with shock and sorrow throughout Brazil, and with considerable speculation as to what the death meant in terms of Brazilians and their interests. President Goulart decreed 3 days of national mourning, personally called on Ambassabor Gordon on Friday evening, and offered a Requiem Mass at Planalto Palace in Brasilia on November 25. Governor Lacerda called on the Ambassador immediately upon hearing the news and decreed 5 days of mourning in the State of Guanabara. Tribute is still being paid to the late President in municipal chambers, State legislatures, and the National Congress, which on November 27 initiated a motion to recommend President Kennedy for the the Nobel Peace Prize for 1963.

Public reaction was, to all appearances, overwhelming. Crowds flocked to the Embassy and the Consulates for news. Four of Rio's morning dailies issued special editions on Friday evening, and up to 80 percent of the regular editions of all Rio papers through November 26 were devoted to news from Dallas and Washington. Rio's radio and television stations were, and still are, on strike. News to the city's radio audience was supplied in special and lengthy broadcasts by Government-owned Radio Nacional, and from stations in Niteroi, São Paulo and Belo Horizonte, which on Friday and Saturday devoted almost all of their air time to coverage of the events. Outpouring of sentiment from all over Brazil was expressed as for over 2 days radio announcers read message after message from civic, social, sports, commercial, industrial, and professional associations, private citizens and public officials. Special memorial services were held and reverential minutes of silence were observed throughout the nation. In various cities housewives lit candles in their windows on the night of President Kennedy's funeral.

SÃO PAULO, BRAZIL

Paulistas forgot politics when the news came of President Kennedy's death. Few cities in the United States could have been more deeply upset. Public figures flocked to the Consulate General, often in tears, till late at night. Crowds gathered where news was available downtown. Another in the succession of petty political crises seemed to die in the bud. Brazilians called at the homes of American friends. Americans were stopped on the streets for condolences. The press ran what is said to have been the biggest extra edition in years. A Gazeta changed its customary red headlines to black. All commentators agreed that John F. Kennedy had appealed to Brazil as had no other American President except F.D.R.

On Monday, the Legislative Assembly held a special commemorative session. Its President then flew to the United States with condolences, as did Auro Moura Andrade, President of the Federal Senate. The capital city and many smaller towns announced the intention of naming streets, squares, and schools after President Kennedy.

SALVADOR, BRAZIL

The shock of the news of President Kennedy's assassination is still reverberating throughout the district. The Governor of Sergipe sent a telegram stating that 5 days' official mourning were declared in that state. Three days' mourning were declared by Governor Lomanto for Bahia. The expressions of grief cut across all party and ideological lines. Local commentators and orators have likened the President to Pope John XXIII, Lincoln, and Roosevelt, as a figure who had shaped the destiny of the world.

President Johnson's prompt assurances that the Alliance for Progress will be carried on with vigor have been very welcome.

COLOMBIA

Colombian reaction to President Kennedy's death was shock, grief, and initial disbelief. Mourning was widespread, and deep seated, with perhaps more surprising manifestations of grief and desire to honor the dead President from the common people, than even from the country's leaders.

A 3-day mourning period was immediately declared by President Valencia, and a requiem mass was celebrated on Monday with the attendance of Valencia, the diplomatic corps, the Cabinet, and other high Government and military officers.

On November 22, President Valencia sent a message to President Johnson stating that—

> As the days pass, the figure of President Kennedy will grow in the consciences of men as the most determined paladin of liberty, of human rights, of understanding, and harmony among men and peoples, and of world peace.

A flood of telegrams, letters, and phone calls from Colombian groups and individuals reflected this sentiment.

Perhaps the most touching manifestation of solidarity was the decision of the citizens of Ciudad Techo to change the name of their housing project to Ciudad Kennedy. The project was inaugurated by President Kennedy in December 1961. The Colombian national housing authority, which has the primary responsibility for the Alliance-sponsored project, seconded the name-changing proposal.

The chancellery announced that a book for those wishing to sign would be placed at the Embassy. In 3 days more than 1,800 people used this way of expressing sympathy. The signers represented all strata of Colombian society from day laborers and soldiers to bankers and political leaders.

The former President of Colombia, Alberto Lleras Camargo, a man who knew John F. Kennedy and who knows Latin America, put it this way:

> Never has a President of the United States devoted so much and such affectionate interest to Latin American affairs, particularly to the affairs of the less fortunate * * * he was the principal author of the Alliance, its defender and supporter. His enemies sought to hurt him through the Alliance, knowing him to be more vulnerable there than in any other part of his program. For Latin America, Kennedy's passing is a blackening, a tunnel, a gust of cloud and smoke. Until it dissipates, until someone takes up the fallen banner, there will be uncertainty and danger in that part of the world.

COSTA RICA

Immediately upon hearing of the death of President Kennedy on November 22, President Orlich, accompanied by several of his closest advisers, called on the Ambassador to present condolences. Within hours, the Council of Government, "profoundly and grievously moved by the tragic death of the President of the United States, Mr. John F. Kennedy, and feeling the sentiments of sorrow of the Costa Rican Nation," decreed 5 days of national mourning. Within hours, too, the Legislative Assembly had paid final tribute to the President and dispatched a delegation to call on the Ambassador to express its sympathy. Thousands of messages poured in via telephone, telegraph, and mail as well as through cards left at the Embassy and chancery. Masses and Protestant services were held during the official period of mourning which ended November 27 with a state funeral service attended by the President, Cabinet, Justices of the Supreme Court, legislators, the diplomatic corps, and guests at the Metropolitan Cathedral. Statues to the former President have been proposed in San Jose and in several towns.

Deputy Alberto Canas expressed the deep feeling of the Costa Rican people when he said of President Kennedy that—

> When this man spoke, he was saying in a loud voice and beautiful prose, that which we, simple citizens in a small country, were thinking and yearning for. And that sensation, we are sure, has been common to all the simple citizens of the land.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

El Caribe reported the tragedy in an extra edition Friday evening. The following day the paper carried a front-page editorial stating that—

> Kennedy had undertaken the mission of defending freedom, social justice, and peace in the Western World as an example of American democracy.

The editorial added that—

> His death means the offering on one more martyr in the defense of these principles, which are the principles of a free people.

Listin Diario ran a moving biographical editorial entitled "John F. Kennedy, a Profile of Courage." The editorial suggested that "his legacy of justice, courage, and liberty may be converted into a spiritual inheritance, not only for the United States but for all the countries of the world."

ECUADOR

Ecuadoreans of all classes, professions, and regions were stunned and universally grieved by the death of President Kennedy. As one Ecuadorean put it, never in the history of the Nation has the death of a world figure so moved and distressed the people. Many donned mourning immediately, and men as well as women were seen weeping in the streets. Flags appeared at half-mast in all parts of Quito, and the grief of the people seemed almost a tangible thing throughout the long, gray, November afternoon.

Reports of the assassination first reached Quito by radio at approximately 2 p.m. on Friday, November 22, and within a half hour a stream of visitors, faces drawn with grief and bewilderment, began to pour through the Embassy gates. Throughout the afternoon and into the evening they came, including the four junta members, Ministers of State, the diplomatic corps, former Presidents and Foreign Ministers, delegations of students, military, businessmen, clergy, and others, most of whom were received personally by the Ambassador. Equally impressive were the numbers of workers, shopkeepers, taxi drivers, men from every walk of life, many in tears, who came or telephoned, each with his own tribute to the man, each expressing an obviously profound sense of personal loss. An estimated 200 to 300 people visited the Embassy during that Friday afternoon, some only to drop cards, some to say a few words of sympathy to the Embassy officers in the lobby to meet them. These visits, both at the Embassy residence and the Chancery, have continued unabated.

The normal rhythm of life in the capital city slowed and seemed almost to halt as the horror of the events in Dallas became known. The strike at Central University, which, in any event, had failed, with only a small minority of the students participating, lost its steam entirely; public absorption in the President's death was total. All other activities and problems seemed tasteless and insignificant.

No single event in memory has received greater news coverage in Ecuador than the assassination of President Kennedy. Immediately following the President's death, all radio stations interrupted their normal programing and carried nothing but news bulletins, memorial programs, and appropriate music. Most stations devoted themselves entirely to relay of the VOA Latin American Spanish transmission. On the afternoon of November 22, for example, 25 of the 26 Guayaquil radio stations were noted to be relaying VOA. During the following 2 days 65 stations throughout Ecuador relayed VOA sporadically, breaking into programing with VOA bulletins. President Kennedy's funeral services—attended by Ecuador's Foreign Minister—were carried in their entirety by a known 91 stations, the largest network in Ecuadorean history. A 2½-hour TV memorial to President Kennedy was shown in Guayaquil and Quito on Saturday evening, November 23, and film coverage of President Johnson's inauguration, as well as President Kennedy's last major address—to the Inter-American Press Association in Miami—were shown on TV in these two cities on November 26. Several newspapers published extra editions on November 22, and all papers devoted almost the entire front page and several interior pages to President Kennedy on November 22 and the 3 days following. To date, in Quito alone, 217 paid announcements expressing condolences have been published in the press by various public and private organizations.

Religious ceremonies honoring President Kennedy began on Saturday, November 23 and have included, thus far, an English language mass at the Quito Anglican Church and innumerable Catholic masses which will continue throughout the officially proclaimed 8 days of national mourning. The focus of religious activity, however, and perhaps the climax of Ecuadoran emotion over the loss of the former President was a pontifical requiem high mass offered by the Embassy and other U.S. missions and said by the Papal Nuncio at the National Cathedral on the morning of November 26. Attended by the junta, Ecuadoran dignitaries, and the diplomatic corps, this mass was a profound tribute to the dead President as an estimated 4,000 to 5,000 Ecuadorans, most of whom had to stand throughout, filled every corner of the cathedral and overflowed into the plaza outside where they listened to the mass and the Nuncio's moving eulogy over loudspeakers. Many were weeping.

The personality of President Kennedy, his programs, ideals, and family life seem to have struck a chord deep within even the simplest, least sophisticated Ecuadoran. The genuine and unreserved grief throughout all strata of Ecuadoran society, down to the last "common man," resulting from his death have revealed the fund of good will, perhaps previously unguessed, for the deceased President and his programs. Although criticism of various U.S. programs in Latin America had been expressed in Ecuador, as elsewhere, and sometimes these voices of criticisms are the only voices heard, there now is little doubt that there exists a wealth of faith in the Alliance for Progress and good will for the United States, which were manifested so vividly only in the spontaneous emotional aftermath of a President's tragic assassination. President Kennedy's death, which was felt as a personal blow to almost every Ecuadoran, has demonstrated the hope of the common man in Ecuador in the one great idea given them by a lost idol, the Alliance for Progress proposed to them by the North American President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

EL SALVADOR

Local political developments were completely overshadowed by the tragic news of President Kennedy's death. Many expressions of condolence were tinged with concern over the future of U.S. relations with Latin America, particularly because of the late President's personal identification with the Alliance for Progress, but President Johnson's assurances regarding the continuity of U.S. policy have gone a long way to assuage these fears.

With the arrival of the first reports of the President's death came several personal inquiries from President Rivera to the Chargé, urgently requesting whatever information was available.

On the morning of November 23, President Rivera visited the Embassy with the President of the National Assembly, the President of the Supreme Court, the Foreign Minister and other high dignitaries. He delivered a eulogy to the assembled Embassy staff and the other officials, in which he officially declared a 3-day mourning period.

A memorial mass was conducted at the cathedral on November 25. It was attended by the diplomatic corps, government officials, Americans, and Salvadorans of all social classes spontaneously demonstrating their grief.

Thousands of letters and telegrams were received at the Embassy expressing the great sorrow of people from all walks of life.

Salvadorans gathered in groups throughout the center of town and in the markets, overcome with the loss of their friend.

Press reaction to President Kennedy's death was continuous and complete for at least 4 full days. Editorial and news comment on radio and TV, as well as press, was exclusively and deeply sympathetic.

FRENCH WEST INDIES

Martinique and Guadeloupe mourned John Kennedy as one of their own, and the colored people of the islands seem to have placed his memory beside that of Abraham Lincoln in the pantheon of the benefactors of the Negro race. The imagination of humbler folk has established a causal connection between the fact of his assassination and the fact that in life he took up the cause of Negroes. They have concluded that in some sense he was martyred for them.

A solemn high requiem mass was sung for the repose of his soul on Monday evening, November 25, in the cathedral of Fort-de-France. The church was packed 20 minutes before services began, and 200 to 300 people crowded outside; this in a town of 80,000. The fervor and intentness of the worshipers, mostly Negroes, was almost palpable.

Groups of 20 to 30 people have been continually in attendance at the USIS window display of photographs of the funeral of the President and of major events in his life. When some move on, others take their place. A good half of them are young people under 20. All week, people have filed in to sign the book of condolences, most of them writing a word of tribute to President Kennedy and of sympathy to his widow and family. Thursday, when schools were closed here, high school students queued up to sign. Repeatedly they would ask for a photograph of the late President.

The wave of shock and sympathy that followed the news of the assassination embraced people of all categories and every social condition, colored and white. Hundreds called personally to present condolences, hundreds of others sent telegrams, cards, or letters of sympathy. The principal of a boys' orphanage drove some distance to sign the book of condolences and to say that her young wards had put the institution's flag at half mast immediately upon learning of the President's death, and the president of the local taxi drivers' union, in mourning black, called personally to express the sorrow of his members. Heads of every imaginable kind of association called or wrote on behalf of the membership, people composed poems to his memory, and a town council passed a formal motion of homage saying that President Kennedy "joins the lineage of the great benefactors of humanity".

The French civil and military officials were animated by a chivalrous desire to pay fitting respect to the memory of a man they greatly liked and respected. The prefect and all his ranking associates came in full dress uniform to the mass sung in the President's honor, as did the commanding general and some 20 of his senior officers. The general, at his own initiative and not at our request, had an honor guard and the military band in front of the cathedrals, and the two national anthems were played before the official procession entered the nave of the church.

GUATEMALA

The shocking news of the assassination of President Kennedy, and the President's funeral, monopolized Guatemala's attention this week. The Embassy and other U.S. Government agencies received hundreds of telegrams, letters, telephone calls, and personal visits of condolence from representatives of all sectors of Guatemalan life; and many labor, student, commercial, and other organizations issued formal proclamations of sorrow and indignation over the terrrible crime.

The Government of Guatemala, in a proclamation which eulogized the late President and took special note of his efforts to promote the development of Latin America and of his consideration for Guatemala, declared 3 days of national mourning.

Diario de Centro America, the Government newspaper, declared that—

> Central America keeps for Kennedy its highest affection and will not forget that he was the first President of the United States who honored the Isthmus. For Latin Americans he, who was the youngest U.S. President and the first Catholic in the White House, will always be remembered as the creator of the 10-point plan that, in the historic meeting of Punta del Este, was transformed into the monumental Inter-American Program of the Alliance for Progress—the first collective strike against the viciousness of economic underdevelopment.

HONDURAS

The assassination of President Kennedy November 22 caused shock and profound grief throughout Honduras and completely overshadowed internal concerns throughout most of the week. The Government decreed 3 days of official mourning and late in the day Chief of Government Col. Oswaldo Lopez made a statement over a nationwide radio hookup, warmly praising President Kennedy as a true friend of Latin America and lamenting his shocking and untimely death.

The report of the assassination was immediately followed by visits to the Embassy, and also the AID and USIS offices, from individuals and representatives of organizations offering their condolences. The Embassy has also received several hundred telegrams and letters of condolence and a number of floral wreaths.

MEXICO

The death of President Kennedy caused an unprecedented manifestation of shock and grief in all sectors of Mexican life. Immediately upon the receipt of the first bulletin on the assassination, arrangements were made for Mexican television stations to hook up directly with U.S. networks via microwave. The Mexican television audience was given approximately 14 hours daily of direct broadcasts from the United States in this unprecedented public service coverage and at considerable cost and loss of revenue to the Mexican stations.

More than 4,000 Mexicans from all walks of life came in a steady stream to sign the condolence books in the Embassy lobby, while many dignitaries personally presented their condolences to the Ambassador. The Embassy switchboard was jammed on the day of the assassination and calls offering condolences continued to be received throughout the weekend. Large numbers of Mexican families followed the funeral mass on television in their homes, many of them kneeling in prayer before their sets. Most churches in Mexico offered special masses and services in memory of the President, and the mass at the Basilica of Guadalupe, where President and Mrs. Kennedy worshiped during their visit here, was attended by an overflow crowd including a large part of the diplomatic corps. Another mass was held at the National Cathedral and special services were scheduled at Protestant churches and synagogues throughout the city.

The press was completely dominated by the tragic news and subsequent events, and was filled with eulogies of the late President. Almost every editorial declared that the world has lost a great statesman and they spoke of President Kennedy as a true friend of Mexico.

There are now numerous reports of movements underway to name a street in Mexico City, a park, and a school after President Kennedy, and a report has also been heard of erecting a statue of him in Mexico City.

Excelsior:

> We are sure that under the Presidency of the ex-Senator from Texas the relations between the White House and Mexico will continue friendly. Clear indication of this is his declaration of friendship made to the Government and people of Mexico.

In another editorial:

> Notwithstanding that John F. Kennedy left behind a formidable luminous star in the White House, President Johnson will not be a poorly defined and opaque figure. He is a capable citizen and worthy of his post. A man of political vocation and great skill.

La Prensa: Banner headline: "Forward the Alliance, Says Johnson." The paper editorially cited Johnson as a true friend of Mexico and said:

> The only thing desired is that he maintain the ideals of Kennedy.

Novedades:

> The neighboring country continues its forward march, still carrying the spiritual havoc of its tragedy, but with a singleness of purpose and a resolve to rise above adversity. This is an example of a moral consistency and an institutional strength which highlights the excellent features of a solid and harmonious democracy.

NICARAGUA

The practically unanimous demonstration of mourning for the late President John F. Kennedy, which has been exhibited by all sectors of Nicaraguan life, is overwhelmingly impressive. It is hard to imagine how Nicaraguans could or would have shown deeper and more genuine sadness if the assassinated Chief of State had been a well-loved President of Nicaragua itself.

President Schick issued a proclamation expressing profound regret and decreed 8 days of official mourning in Nicaragua. He also canceled all public observances of his birthday the following day, November 23.

In a great variety of official and unofficial circles the reaction was likewise prompt and spontaneous. The Nicaraguan Military Academy canceled the gala dance with which it was going to cap the climax of its anniversary celebrations on November 22. The professional baseball league, with the season in full swing, canceled all games for the day in Nicaragua's No. 1 sport. The Club Terraza, one of Managua's principal social clubs, postponed until December the annual debutante ball for which Managua's Garden Club had spent hundreds of dollars and scores of hours in preparation.

The Ambassador and other Embassy personnel began to receive telephone calls and personal visits in ever-increasing numbers as soon as the tragic news came over all Managua's radio stations, which canceled programs to play funeral music between news bulletins the rest of the day. In the late afternoon the Ambassador and Mrs. Brown, accompanied by personnel of the Embassy and other U.S. Government missions here, received a constant flood of visitors expressing condolences at the Embassy residence.

Meanwhile, Nicaraguan press and radio organs have been outdoing each other, not only in news coverage of the startling events but also in their own expressions of regret and mourning. Editorials in all the daily newspapers and broadcasts by prominent local radio commentators have produced several notable examples of unusual eloquence.

The tragic death of President Kennedy was clearly felt throughout Nicaragua. The Ambassador has attended requiem masses at Leon and Granada. Eyewitnesses have told us of the sincere consternation felt by peasants in rural areas when news of the tragedy reached them. The Embassy has been swamped with telegrams of regret and condolences from all over the country, coming from local officials, schoolteachers, and ordinary citizens.

In all the tremendous display of Nicaraguan emotion, no event was more touching than the visit to the Embassy chancery on the afternoon of November 25 of some 200 children from the Larreynaga public school, who had marched 6 kilometers from their school in an outlying district of Managua, carrying American and Nicaraguan flags linked with black ribbon, and led by the school principal and four teachers. Under the principal's direction, the school children marched to the Embassy flagpole, each boy and girl carrying a flower or two, which had been picked from woods and fields and were halfwilted from the long hot march in the children's hands. At the base of the flagpole with its half-masted flag, they deposited their flowers in the form of letters until they had spelled the Spanish word "dolor"—"grief."

Standing then by his pupils' flowers, the principal made a heart-warming speech of tribute to President Kennedy on behalf of his school, its teachers and pupils and pupils' parents, from a very humble section of the city. After the reporting officer attempted a grateful reply and the students closed their ceremony singing the Nicaraguan national anthem, they reassembled for the 6-kilometer march back home. Behind them by the flagpole they left their wilted wild flowers and an overwhelmed little group of Americans.

PANAMA

The Government of Panama and its people joined the rest of the world in displaying deep sorrow and shock at the death of President John F. Kennedy.

The National Assembly on November 23 approved a resolution "sharing the deep sorrow of the United States to which Panama is linked by special bonds." Assemblymen then paused for a moment of silence and adjourned the session for the remainder of the day as a tribute to the fallen President. In public statements, letters, telegrams, and press releases, civic and professional organizations, political parties of every coloration, labor unions, schools, businessmen's groups, government agencies, the supreme court, political and society leaders, and the man in the street have voiced their shock and dismay at what they consider a tragedy for the United States and all the world. School children, government officials, and citizens from every walk of life have called at the Embassy for expressions of sympathy and to sign the condolence book. A special requiem mass November 25 at Panama City's Metropolitan Cathedral was thronged by Panamanians and Americans.

PERU

All local events were subordinated to the tragic death of President Kennedy during the past week. The reaction of the Peruvian Government was immediate. President Fernando Belaunde Terry was conducting a Cabinet meeting when he was informed and immediately drove to the Embassy accompanied by his entire Cabinet to express his shock and dismay to Ambassador Jones. Belaunde declared November 25 a day of official national mourning. His visit to the Chancery was followed by a stream of visitors from both high and low who wanted to show their deep sense of regret and solidarity with the United States. The three American churches in Lima held memorial services on Sunday, and on Monday a high requiem mass in honor of President Kennedy was said in the church of Santa Maria Reyna attended by the President, the Prime Minister, the Presidents of both Houses of Congress, the President of the Supreme Court, Cabinet Ministers, members of the Diplomatic Corps, and private citizens from all walks of life. The Congress also passed a resolution calling for the award of the Nobel Peace Prize to President Kennedy. The love and respect held by the people of Peru for the late President were also evident in the outpouring of messages and spontaneous demonstrations of grief and loss from all sides.

The people of Arequipa took the sudden death of President John F. Kennedy as a personal loss. From all walks of life—authorities, professional men, businessmen, teachers, students, trade unionists, laborers, and the poor—came to the consulate and to the consul's residence, to express their grief and sympathy, often in tears. Telegrams, letters, cards and telephone calls flooded the consulate to manifest condolence. Many Arequipenos canceled social engagements and flew the Peruvian flag at half-mast with a black ribbon above it to demonstrate their deep sorrow. The Cathedral of Arequipa, which held its first Requiem Mass for a foreign President on November 25, was packed with mourners. Religious services were also held throughout the city in honor of President Kennedy. The major proposed that a street of Arequipa be named after the late President.

URUGUAY

Uruguayans in general respected President Kennedy highly and a large majority gave him their sympathy and even affection. His death, therefore, struck this small country perhaps as deeply as the death of one of its own leaders. The National Council of Government met in special session Friday evening, November 22, as did the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. Speakers of all political persuasions eulogized the President, and the Parliament, at the request of the NCG, unanimously voted the day of the President's funeral a day of national mourning. Perhaps more significant and more meaningful was the reaction of the people of Uruguay, from the humblest to the wealthiest. Many expressed their sorrow and condolence for the American people in a flood of messages and calls on the Embassy, including a silent march of some 3,000 people from the center of Montevideo to the Embassy residence on November 22, a distance of about 2 miles.

VENEZUELA

The image of President Kennedy was far greater in Venezuela than the Embassy realized. The outpouring of condolences from all sectors of Venezuelan life, from President Betancourt to humble campesinos, took the form of telegrams, letters, telephone calls, and personal visits. Hundreds paid their respects to the Ambassador at the residence and at the chancery, where guest books were signed. Despite the fact Venezuela was in the final stage of a heated, emotional political campaign, the country seemed numb with the news. Political parades and speeches were stilled for 3 days of Venezuelan mourning, even though last weekend was expected to see the climax of political activity. Venezuelans were choked with emotion. News coverage here of the President's assassination and the funeral was probably the most complete of any major event in history. All radio stations played funeral music during the 3-day Venezuelan mourning period, and 52 of them were hooked up to the USIS radio studio for direct relay of the Voice of America broadcast of the funeral. Newspapers and magazines devoted page after page to news and features on President Kennedy and President Johnson. All television stations carried hours of programing on President Kennedy, including newsreel coverage out of Dallas.

On November 26 Venezuelan authorities announced that the newly built AID-financed housing project being dedicated that day near the Caracas area is being named "Barrio John Fitzgerald Kennedy" to commemorate the late President's leadership in the Alliance for Progress.

All these words are not in vain, or mere bombast, as our partners realize as well as we what is ahead. In the words of one envoy who heard President Johnson's pronouncement—reported by R. H. Boyce, Scripps-Howard staff writer:

> Johnson is wise to continue the Alliance program. He couldn't quickly change it if he wanted to. The Alliance is a program already underway. Its ideals are perfect. Its success depends on how well those ideals are practiced—on both sides of the Rio Grande.

Lest we deceive ourselves and think that it is only we who practice the ideals, I offer this one last article for insertion in the RECORD. This is a portion of an editorial from La Prensa, Nicaragua, November 2, 1963:

COMMUNITIES THAT ARE REDEEMING THEMSELVES BY THEIR OWN EFFORTS

(By Pedro J. Chamorro)

> In many places in Nicaragua, especially in the small villages, an interesting phenomenon is occurring that awakens in those who view it many hopes for the future of our country. We refer to the community action of the inhabitants of some localities, who, tired of waiting for social or economic salvation as a gift from the hands of the government or politicians, are redeeming themselves by their own efforts. In more than one locality, progressive committees have been formed to establish dispensaries, to open schools, to repair roads, to teach literacy, and to create in the end an achievement of progress that benefits the entire community.

Without a doubt the Alliance for Progress has contributed to this, since in these small villages it has presented in its true role the first creative step which gives the citizens confidence in their own possibilities. The schools built with a high percentage of voluntary community labor are the beginnings of the achievements that are going to come much later when, after seeing that progress does not depend only upon the government but can be realized with citizen effort, the people, joined together for these tasks, undertake new tasks to raise their own economic and social levels.

It is moving to see a worker giving a substantial part of his labor—as for example a day of work—in benefit of his own people. It is moving to see a humble man, like the citizen of Mateare who showed up at the offices of La Prensa yesterday, who had given many weeks of voluntary labor for the construction of a school and who gave as his reason for his actions that of being convinced that this place of study was indispensable to improve the future for his sons.

These examples are moving, and what is more they awaken hopes in the future of Nicaragua.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MANSFIELD, MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the able and informed news commentator for NBC, Mr. Bob McCormick, recently made a couple of newscasts commenting on the leadership of my senior colleague, MIKE MANSFIELD, the majority leader.

Mr. McCormick has developed a thesis that is irrefutable for this Congress, and one in which I wholeheartedly concur.

I ask unanimous consent that the newscasts may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the newscasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The hoopla over Congress, reached another peak this past week or so. The Congress itself has been too busy trying to get away from a few days, to continue its own morbid sort of self-criticism—but most everybody else has gone right on accusing Congress and its leaders of all sorts of dreadful things.

Some of these accusations are true. This may be the first Congress in history to be one long, unbroken filibuster. It's a different sort of filibuster; it has been staged in committees, and not on the floor of Congress, but still a filibuster.

There can be no question that it began when the late President Kennedy finally felt compelled to demand strong civil rights action from this Congress.

Starting, it seemed, within a matter of hours, the work of committees went into slow motion—a nightmarish state, where business that would normally take 1 hour, took 3—and a subject that would normally take 1 day, took 3.

No one could prove that it was either inspired or organized; and it may have been only coincidence that southern Senators (for example) seemed to have many more points to discuss, at committee sessions, than they customarily have. This is a privilege of any Member; and when a particularly strong and stubborn committee chairman, or party leader, tries to short circuit committee members, he is accused of being a tyrant, of stifling democracy, and frustrating free speech.

In such an atmosphere it's almost a miracle that anything was done; but strangely enough, this Congress has put through an amazing lot of truly historic legislation—although it should be axiomatic that a Congress cannot be judged simply by how many bills it approves; the quality of the bills must be considered—as well as the number and quality of the bills not approved.

But Congress did lay the legislative basis for great advances in public health—and in education.

There were conservation measures—pay increases for the Armed Forces, equal pay for women requirements, air pollution controls, a nuclear test ban treaty, an international coffee agreement.

The list goes on and on; but so does the criticism. The criticism, combined with the long and tedious hours, and the frustration of failing to get action on civil rights and tax cuts, have produced jangled nerves, exhaustion, and short tempers that could have exploded at any moment into a perfectly disgraceful catfight, particularly in the Senate. It came hair-raisingly close many times.

In the opinions of many oldtimers at the Capitol, the Senate would have gone off like a nuclear bomb, if it had been given one extra shove, one ill-natured prodding—by the leadership.

This neither Senate Democratic Leader MANSFIELD nor Republican Leader DIRKSEN has done. MANSFIELD carries the heavier responsibility; he has moved quietly, patiently, and sympathetically among his tired troops, getting more production than was expected, or is appreciated, getting little in the way of thanks. And this sort of thing will undoubtedly continue, off-and-on, according to Senators themselves, until civil rights is disposed of, and that could be years.

It's just possible that the much-criticized 88th Congress may wind up in a blaze of glory.

Senate Democratic Leader MANSFIELD has, several times recently given what amounts to justifications for the current Congress—the 88th Congress—and he can, indeed, make a convincing case for the theory that this Congress actually has accomplished a great deal. In the area of education, for example—Chairman POWELL of the House Education Committee said this on the floor of the House last week:

"The late President Kennedy said that the passage of the higher education bill, and the vocational education bill, would mark the most significant year in American educational history, since the enactment of the Morrill Land Grant College Act of 1862."

Both these bills have been approved. So MANSFIELD has some grounds for contending that this Congress has not been a total waste of time as you might judge from reading some of the critical things that have been said about it.

But MANSFIELD goes further, than merely trying to rationalize the 1st session of this 88th Congress; he says it may be considerably better in the next session, beginning January 7. As MANSFIELD put it: "With the leadership, the forcefulness and the determination of President Johnson" Congress will dispose of all the major problems it faces, in the next go-round. Actually, MANSFIELD isn't just whistling to himself. He and President Johnson are very close; there was a time, right after Mr. Johnson became Vice President, when their cooperation wasn't quite as smooth as it might have been, because MANSFIELD thought that, as Senate leader, he should lead the Senate. But that got straightened out fairly quickly.

Most people have forgotten that MANSFIELD was a Johnson-for-President rooter at the Democratic convention in 1960; MANSFIELD voted with Mr. Johnson, most of the time, when Mr. Johnson was Senate leader. Also, when Mr. Johnson was Vice President, he frequently dropped into MANSFIELD's Capitol office, to talk politics.

So it is, that the President and MANSFIELD may make a most effective combination, at the next Congress; Mr. Johnson is persuasive, but also abrasive; he can be very rough; he has the means, and the inclination, to clamp down on those who desert him in critical periods.

But MANSFIELD is the man almost everybody likes, as well as respects. With his soothing, friendly approach, he can reach people the President can't; but by the same token, the President can slam people around in a fashion MANSFIELD could never match. It could be the greatest combination since Jack Spratt, who could eat no fat, and his wife, who could eat no lean. The legislative platter may really be licked absolutely clean.

ANNUAL REPORT BY SENATOR JAVITS TO THE PEOPLE OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, every year I make a report to my constituents in New York. I shall do so again as we approach the end of the current year, not that we have accomplished too much, but to let people of New York know what we have done and why.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD my annual report to my constituents.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL REPORT, 1963

It has been my custom throughout my congressional service to report annually to my New York State constituents on each session of Congress and on my own activities during the past year.

This—my 15th such report—is perhaps the most difficult of all to present, for 1963 has been a year of unfulfilled promise, of deep frustrations, and of painful legislative stagnancy—and all of it has been climaxed by the profound national tragedy of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

It will not be easy for the Nation to shake off the sadness of that terrible event in Dallas, Tex., on November 22. No matter what political differences one might have, all would agree that John F. Kennedy brought a brilliant mind, an exciting style, and the spirit of youth to the Presidency. His passing in the prime of life was a devastating blow to the Nation. I could not leave the subject without noting the pride of the Nation in the dignity and grace of his widow, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, in her time of bereavement.

In the aftermath of this tragedy, I urged the Congress to agree on one authoritative investigation to study all aspects of the assassination and supported the President's appointment of a Federal Commission for this purpose. I also cosponsored legislation to make an attack on the President a Federal crime and to regulate more effectively the sale and shipment of firearms, especially by mail order. I joined in legislation to establish the John F. Kennedy Cultural Center in Washington and to establish a Kennedy Memorial Commission to evaluate the countless proposals for memorials to the late President; and I introduced a constitutional amendment to improve the procedure for presidential succession by providing for the election of a Vice President by a joint session of Congress when the elected Vice President succeeds to the Presidency.

Out of the shock and sorrow of the assassination came a spirit of unity. Longfellow had written, "Sail on, O Ship of State; Sail on, O Union, strong and great." And it was most encouraging to see the American constitutional system working so smoothly in transition, as Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson took hold of the Presidency without any break in continuity.

I joined many of my colleagues in pledging cooperation with the new President as he sought to project a spirit of reassuring unity to the Nation and the world. His appeal for prompt congressional action on major issues facing the Nation needed to be made; but whether the Congress, which his party controls with heavy majorities, will heed his plea remains to be seen.

Certainly, the record of the 1st session of the 88th Congress was not encouraging. The brightest accomplishments were Senate ratification of the test ban treaty, which I supported with enthusiasm as at least a first step forward in the effort to control the arms race; and the enactment of bills for aid to colleges and for medical and vocational education in which I took an active, and, I believe, effective role as committee member and conferee.

I received special satisfaction with the passage by the Senate of a bill providing for a National Arts Foundation and a National Council on the Arts, a program which I have been sponsoring for the last 15 years.

The first session of this Congress was one of the longest sessions in history. By session's end, the only other major legislation enacted into law by Congress, according to the Congressional Quarterly boxscore, were extension of the excise taxes, mental health program, feed grains legislation, railroad strike settlement, and foreign aid authorization.

Legislation on civil rights, tax cut and tax reform, medical care for the aged, youth employment, domestic Peace Corps, Federal pay raise, Urban Affairs Department, mass transportation, amendments to securities regulatory laws, area redevelopment, conservation and wilderness system, cotton controls, and civil defense shelters are all still pending—some passed by the Senate, but not by the House; some passed by the House, not by the Senate; and others not yet acted upon in either body.

The first session's record on appropriations was indeed desultory. Although appropriations bills are supposed to be approved by the end of July each year, the Congress had enacted only four of the regular annual appropriations bills by mid-December. It passed the rest just before Christmas.

I think it can correctly be stated, to paraphrase Churchill, that never had so many taken so much time to do so little.

As early as last July, I warned that Congress was losing respect in the Nation and was earning the title of "standstill Congress." I believe more dynamic, activist leadership is needed as well as meaningful reform of the archaic legislative machinery, especially in the Senate.

Particularly distressing was the failure of Congress to deal with the civil rights crisis. The justified demands of our Negro citizens, ignored for far too long, reached a climax during 1963's "summer of discontent," threatening the Nation's domestic tranquillity. The use of dogs by Birmingham police to thwart Negroes seeking to exercise their constitutional rights sickened the entire Nation. Following that came such appalling events as the assassination of NAACP leader Medger Evers and the killing of Negro children in the bombing of a Birmingham church. The Negro yearning for equal rights was eloquently expressed in the August 28 March on Washington, which I was privileged to witness at the Lincoln Memorial as an invited guest. It was an extraordinarily patriotic demonstration which touched the conscience of the entire Nation.

But at year's end, civil rights has not reached the floor of either the House or the Senate. The prospects are for early House passage in 1964, followed by a historic battle in the Senate where the southern Democratic bloc continues to have the advantage of the Senate rule which allows filibusters. To this upcoming struggle, my head and heart are committed, and I will devote all my powers to achieve meaningful results for our Nation.

Also pending as we move into 1964 is the tax reduction bill, essential as one means of revitalizing our economy. Additional measures are needed to solve endemic unemployment and to spur economic growth, but I support tax reduction as a vital element in a program and will continue to work for its enactment.

With the foregoing as the highlights of the past year, I will now go into the details of the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The year, which held such promise for meaningful civil rights legislation, ended with a record of mass demonstrations in the streets and tragic racial violence, but with little concrete action in Congress. The session began with an unsuccessful effort to amend the Senate rule which permits filibusters—the unlimited debate which has been used for so long to defeat legislation dealing with civil rights, the No. 1 moral issue facing the country. For the first time in this long struggle, a majority of the Senate voted to end debate, but then Vice President Johnson, as presiding officer of the Senate, did not follow former Vice President Nixon's earlier parliamentary advisory opinions that a majority vote in a newly organized Senate is sufficient to end debate on a rules change after a reasonable time and to get to a vote.

In March, a group of Republican Senators, including myself, introduced comprehensive legislation based on the 27 legislative recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in the fields of education, voting, employment, housing, the administration of justice, and public accommodations. We put special emphasis on a measure authorizing the Attorney General to institute or intervene in civil injunction suits to safeguard, by court order, the rights of U.S. citizens under the 14th amendment, including the increasingly vital right to assemble peaceably and petition for the redress of grievances.

When the rising tide of demonstrations throughout the Nation resulted in violence in Birmingham, Ala., and elsewhere, I called for a Republican Senate conference, which met on June 5 and issued a statement of consensus, reaffirming the Republican civil rights tradition and supporting further appropriate legislation. Later the administration sent its first comprehensive rights legislation to the Congress, and it included many of the provisions in the earlier Republican package. Despite the magnificent march on Washington which brought the peaceful demonstration movement for civil rights to a climax, the Congress was slow to respond. I repeatedly opposed the Senate leadership's strategy of withholding action until the House passed a bill, and urged that debate—and the inevitable filibuster—begin with the Senate public accommodations bill. At session's end, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission had been extended for only 1 year, and a reasonably strong bipartisan omnibus measure was pending in the House Rules Committee. I vigorously urged support for the discharge petition needed to get the bill acted on there. I will work to strengthen it in the Senate and for its ultimate passage as early as possible in 1964.

Throughout the session, in accordance with a specific 1962 campaign pledge, I sought to eliminate the spending of Federal funds, collected from the taxes of all citizens regardless of color, for programs, such as the Hill-Burton hospital construction program, which allow racial discrimination or segregation. I pressed each Federal department and agency for details of their practices and established that in most cases they agreed that the Constitution requires the withholding of Federal funds from such programs. On seven occasions, where the Federal department concerned refused to acknowledge such authority, I attempted through amendments on the Senate floor to provide a congressional mandate against Federal subsidization of discrimination. In each case the amendment was tabled on motion of the Senate leadership. I will continue to try to halt these practices.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The National Committee on Health Care of the Aging which was organized at my suggestion in 1962, issued its long-awaited report on November 13 which stirred fresh interest in this vital subject. I joined a group of distinguished citizens who presented the report to President Kennedy a week before his assassination. The President said then that this report made sure the enactment by this Congress of this badly needed legislation. The Committee recommended a dual public-private insurance program which would cover the greatest part of the total health care needed by older citizens.

I am introducing with some of my colleagues legislation incorporating its recommendations. It provides for a Federal program, under social security, of 45 days of hospital care for all persons 65 or over, without deductible or option; up to 180 days of post-hospital nursing home care, or over 200 days of home nursing care. The bill also makes Federal expansion in this field unnecessary by providing for a standard, supplementary private medical-surgical program on a tax-free, nonprofit basis which would be available to those 65 or over without exception. The premiums for this program would be well within the financial ability of most aged persons—an estimated $2 a week. The bill uses the social insurance approach but avoids the dangers of socialized medicine, preserves the traditional doctor-patient relationship and provides for the participation of cooperatives like Blue Cross, insurance companies, and similar organizations. The prospects are good for passage of a law, based on this bill, in 1964.

I supported the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act which authorized $329 million for matching grants and other assistance, including a 3-year program of training grants for teachers of handicapped children. I cosponsored a resolution calling for a fair test of Krebiozen, but the report of the National Cancer Institute, compiled by 24 recognized cancer authorities, concludes that Krebiozen is ineffective as an anticancer drug. I am cooperating with Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota to determine what further steps are warranted.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act was enacted in recognition of the need for more doctors, dentists, nurses, and other public health personnel. It contained provisions I had been advocating for many many years—grants for construction of medical and public health teaching facilities and loans for students of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry.

Extensive hearings were held by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, on the administration's omnibus education bill. But, at year's end, most of it was bogged down in the legislative mill though the need remains most urgent.

Federal aid to higher education was finally approved by Congress based on the college academic facilities construction bill I offered earlier this year. The bill provides a 5-year program with a 3-year authorization of $230 million a year, for construction grants for science, engineering, mathematics, modern foreign language, and library facilities.

I also worked out a formula to resolve the basic deadlock on the vocational education bill, which is now law, and provides $730.5 million for vocational education in the next 4 years. I also supported a 1-year extension of the National Defense Education Act, including an annual increase of $35 million in the student loan program; and a 2-year extension of the federally impacted school aid laws.

An amendment to the Library Services Act of 1956, which I supported and the Senate adopted, added $17.5 million to the annual matching grants, increased allotments to the States and authorized a new $20 million a year matching grant for library construction for 3 years.

I supported several measures aimed at the problem of school dropouts and unskilled, unemployed youth which is reaching shocking proportions. I helped obtain Senate passage of the youth employment bill, which would provide a 5-year program of useful work experience for unemployed youth by enrolling them in National, State and community work projects. The bill is still pending in the House. It would establish a Federal Conservation Corps for outdoor conservation work and a State and community youth employment program, both to be coordinated with training and education. I opposed the provision for a conservation corps because I did not believe a new version of the Civilian Conservation Corps of 1932 would meet the problems of 1963. Instead I favored expanding the youth employment program which would work with the full cooperation of the States.

To meet another phase of this problem, by strengthening community service programs, I cosponsored, and the Senate passed, the National Service Corps bill. The House has yet to act on the bill. I sponsored an amendment to the 1963 supplemental appropriations bill which provided $1 million for child day care services and for the training of child welfare personnel in which I greatly believe. This was approved by the Congress.

DOMESTIC ECONOMY

In his budget message, President Kennedy had estimated spending at $94 billion and revenues at $83 billion. To me, the budget demonstrates the size of our responsibilities in the world, but it also requires careful scrutiny to minimize the deficit and guard against national waste and inefficiency. When I was not convinced that the need for expenditures had been demonstrated adequately, I voted for reductions, as in the case of certain aspects of the independent offices appropriation bill and the river basins bill. I also voted to hold the debt limit to $313.4 billion. I joined in sponsoring a Senate-passed bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget, which would provide more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of executive agencies, and I favor authorizing the President to veto individual line items in appropriation bills.

The expected deficit caused great controversy over the administrations' major economic proposal, the $11 billion tax rate reduction bill, which after almost a year had not yet reached the Senate floor. I support, as I was among the first to do in 1962, an incentive tax cut as a vital first step to spur growth in our lagging economy, which continues to be plagued by chronic unemployment of almost 5 million. But I believe the tax cut alone will not cure endemic unemployment. Revision of our antitrust laws, stimulation of profit sharing and stockownership, expansion of exports, and machinery to avoid crippling national emergency strikes are also necessary as incentives to expand investment and create new jobs, and I introduced legislation to achieve these goals.

The need for techniques to deal with automation, as well as with national emergency strikes, was again demonstrated in 1963 by the New York City newspaper strike, the east coast dock strike, and the threatened railroad strike, all of which required hurried stopgap action. Following my earlier proposals and the President's endorsement of the concept in his railroad strike message, I introduced a bipartisan bill to establish a Presidential Commission on Automation to assemble the available data, make forecasts and submit recommendations to the Congress. The bill was made part of extensive hearings in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and is ready for action in the next session.

Another bill which I supported was enacted to guarantee to women equal wages for equal work. I cosponsored six measures designed to aid migratory farmworkers and their families. All were passed by the Senate. The Manpower Development and Training Act, enacted in 1962, was amended, with my cosponsorship, to provide much-needed basic literacy tools and to make eligible for occupational training the 16–19 "school dropout" age group. I sought to increase, above the existing unemployment compensation levels, the allowances received by trainees, so that potentially employable persons would be able to afford retraining. I cosponsored legislation to include fringe benefits in the prevailing wage under Government contracts, to make permanent the 1961 temporary unemployment compensation extension, and to extend unemployment compensation to employees of nonprofit institutions. I supported expansion of the Area Redevelopment Act, which passed the Senate.

I cosponsored the measure, based upon the extensive study of the securities markets ordered by the Congress, to bring trading in over-the-counter securities under the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission and to provide additional safeguards for the investing public. After being developed by the Securities Subcommittee, of which I am the ranking Republican member, the measure was passed without opposition in the Senate.

The small business investment company program was amended in the Senate, with my cosponsorship, to expand the assistance available to small businesses from the small business investment companies and to the investment companies, on a matching basis, from the Small Business Administration.

To provide an effective voice for the consumer in the many governmental actions affecting him, I introduced a bipartisan resolution to create a Select Committee on Consumers in the Senate and joined in the late Senator Kefauver's proposal for an Office of Consumers in the executive branch. I continued my efforts to remove the unwarranted restriction on the importation of residual fuel oil, which results in higher fuel costs in New York for heating and electricity.

URBAN AFFAIRS

Perhaps the most significant program for relief of traffic-jammed urban areas, in which two-thirds of our Nation's population now live, was the mass transit bill, which I have long cosponsored. It passed the Senate but became bottled up in the House Rules Committee. The Senate adopted my proposal to encourage multistate arrangements for solution of commuter snarls, like our New York-New Jersey-Connecticut Tri-State Transportation Committee, by permitting the States which enter arrangements in congressionally approved interstate compacts to pool their shares of Federal aid. I also introduced, as an amendment to the administration's omnibus transportation bill, which is still in committee, an amendment permitting financially hard-pressed U.S. railroads to obtain loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), which has successfully financed a number of other nations' railroad modernization plans. I joined with others of my colleagues in successful efforts to continue the important experiment in helicopter service in which New York City participates.

The Housing Subcommittee, of which I am a member, held hearings on the development of an International Home Loan Bank, which I support, to sponsor housing in underdeveloped countries along the lines of the Federal Home Loan Bank. Hearings were also held on my bill to authorize the Federal Housing Administration to repair substantial defects in FHA-insured homes when a homeowner is unable to get relief from the builder.

I introduced a series of measures to help deal with narcotics addiction, without relaxing the already heavy penalties against "pushers" of narcotics. My bills would establish a Federal-State program to construct and operate narcotic hospital and outpatient facilities in areas of need such as New York City; permit civil commitment of addicts to the custody of the U.S. Surgeon General; stimulate research activity under an existing federally aided mental health research program; and extend the Youthful Offenders Act to young narcotics addicts.

The Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act, of which I had been a sponsor when it was first enacted in 1961, would be extended for 3 years under a Senate-passed bill which I supported.

A special subcommittee on the arts in late October held a week of hearings on my bill to establish a U.S. national arts foundation and on a measure I cosponsored with Senator HUMPHREY, which combined the arts foundation idea with a national council on the arts. An amended version of the latter bill was reported favorably by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and was passed by the Senate hours before it adjourned for Christmas.

PEACE AND FREE WORLD LEADERSHIP

The signing of the partial test ban treaty created a major impact on the world this year. I supported the treaty and voted for its ratification by the Senate because I believed it was a useful first step toward restraining further escalation of the arms race and in reducing radioactive fallout. The treaty may have opened the way for other agreements in areas of mutual self-interest, such as the joint United States-U.S.S.R. resolution in the United Nations designed to promote cooperation in exploring the peaceful uses of space. I supported the full budget request of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in the Senate. I also called for a six-point policy on Cuba, which included the formation of a Caribbean and Central American defense organization.

The demands upon the foreign policy leadership of the United States were especially noteworthy this year in developments such as the Skybolt controversy, and the proposed European multinational nuclear surface fleet; in Cuba and Berlin; and in the ramifications of the Soviet-Chinese split.

I have continued to support the bipartisan foreign policy and to urge a policy of Atlantic unity in military and economic matters because Europe is so vital to our defense.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 was under very heavy attack in the Congress and the authorization emerged from Congress at $3.6 billion, a cut of about $1 billion below the administration request. I feel that properly applied foreign aid is vital to our offensive against communism, and therefore fought to restore some of the cuts, particularly in Alliance for Progress funds. I also voted for a substantial increase in appropriations for the Peace Corps. In my view, the foreign aid program must be revised to admit private enterprise to a much greater role. I proposed, and the Congress adopted, two "private enterprise" amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act. One established an Advisory Committee (of nine) on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, designed to harness the resources and imagination of the private sector in the foreign aid program; and the second called for agreements with aided countries to accommodate a U.S. private investment guarantee program. I endorsed a proposal by David Rockefeller to establish an Industrial Peace Corps, a concept I also suggested in 1959. I am gratified that the executive branch is about to create an organization based on this principle.

A direct outgrowth of the work of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, of which I am Chairman, was the formation of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America (ADELA). ADELA is seeking to bring equity capital and technical know-how into Latin America under a partnership of the private sectors of Europe, the United States, and Latin America. The program has every likelihood of beginning this spring.

With Senator GRUENING, I proposed an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, which was approved by the Congress, giving the President authority to withhold aid from any country if he determines this aid will be used to prepare for aggression against the United States or any country receiving our aid. This was triggered by threats to the peace in the Middle East and against Israel. I regarded U.S. recognition of the new Yemen regime as premature, and protested continuation of our aid to Egypt when President Nasser failed to withdraw his troops from Yemen.

I also protested the presence in Egypt of German scientists, many of them unrepentant Nazis, who are seeking to develop advanced weapons. Because of the Egyptian arms buildup, I introduced a resolution calling for a collective defense agreement among the United States, France, Britain, Israel, and any other Middle East state willing to preserve peace.

I spoke out many times against Soviet persecution of religious groups, particularly its campaign to make Jews the scapegoats for the Kremlin's domestic failures. The military takeovers in the Dominican Republic and Honduras triggered me to join in a resolution giving the President authority to deny recognition to military juntas, to cancel aid programs, and to come to the aid of constitutionally elected governments beset by oppression or terror—as in Venezuela. Shortly before the coup, a group of U.S. firms, at the invitation of the democratically elected President, Juan Bosch, and on my recommendation, airlifted 1½ million doses of polio vaccine to stem an epidemic threat to the Dominican Republic.

FOREIGN TRADE

The critical problem of our imbalance of international payments and the importance of foreign trade to the economy of the United States—and of especial importance to New York and its port and as an arm of U.S. policy, was made evident again during the year.

The debate over the Soviet wheat deal—which I approved as a one-shot measure in view of our surplus—showed the divergence between this country and our allies on East-West trade policies. I opposed the amendment which would have barred the Export-Import Bank from guaranteeing loans to be used in the wheat deal. In the Senate and in the NATO Parliamentarians' Economic Committee, I urged a united policy which would make trade a means to advance the free world's cause. I introduced bills designed to improve the effectiveness of the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921 in preventing Soviet bloc exports from disrupting free world markets; to lessen the dependence of free world countries on trade with the Soviet bloc; and to stress maximum allied cooperation in the emergency provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Adverse developments in Western Europe have tended to negate our own foreign policy objective, to expand worldwide trade through the mutual elimination of trade barriers. The rejection of Britain's application to be admitted to the European Economic Community and the unfavorable effects of our "chicken war" with the EEC throws into doubt the adequacy of our negotiating position at the coming trade talks. On January 30, I introduced a bill to enable the United States to offer full economic partnership to Great Britain and to authorize the President to make substantial tariff concessions on the products of industries with the greatest growth potential and the highest productivity if our allies likewise reduced their barriers.

The bill would restore meaning to the dominant supplier authority in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. This authority, based on the assumption that Britain would be part of the EEC, would allow tariff concessions on 26 categories of goods. Without Britain, only two categories would meet the requirements for tariff reduction, making the President's tariff authority almost meaningless.

The continued balance-of-payments problems facing the United States prompted me in May to introduce a bill designed to develop a unified export-expansion policy. The top-level council envisioned by this bill has since been appointed by the President. In July, I introduced a resolution urging the President to seek an international conference to devise a better international monetary system, which would not depend, as the present one does, on continuing U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. The announcement by the International Monetary Fund that the 10-member "Paris club" and the IMF staff would begin a full-scale review of the existing world monetary system—the first review since 1944—is a clear recognition by trading nations, including the United States, that the system urgently needs improvement.

I urged the administration to take immediate action to curb the outflow of private capital by establishing a capital issues committee to regulate U.S. capital exports in conformity with national policy objectives. I feel the interest equalization tax proposed by the administration will prove to be ineffective for this purpose. I have also suggested reconsideration of the 25-percent gold reserve requirement for Federal Reserve notes, while we still have gold reserves in excess of this requirement, to demonstrate our determination to defend the dollar.

IMMIGRATION

Substantial revision of our outmoded immigration national quota system has long been essential, and I sponsored and cosponsored bipartisan measures to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. My bill would update the 1920 census basis for quotas, permit pooling of unused quotas, eliminate discriminatory provisions against Asiatic and colonial peoples, establish a Board of Visa Appeals to review visa denials, eliminate discriminations against certain naturalized citizens, and permit admission of fourth preference quota immigrants. When the administration later sent its first immigration reform bill to the Congress, I joined in sponsoring it and will participate in hearings on it which are scheduled for early in 1964. I also introduced legislation to allow war claims for loss at the hands of the Nazis by those who later became U.S. citizens.

THE SENATE ITSELF

After much-publicized congressional scrutiny of the ethics of executive branch officials, the conflict-of-interest scandal surrounding the resignation of Senate Majority Secretary Robert Baker brought to the Nation's notice the need for a congressional code of ethics. Measures which I have repeatedly introduced and which, if enacted, might well have prevented such cases, would establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Ethics to develop a comprehensive code of ethics for Members of Congress as well as their staffs and would require that communications of Senators and Representatives to regulatory agencies about cases be made part of the public record. One bill incorporates an interim code of ethics which, in part, requires public disclosure of any substantial financial interests of Members in companies subject to regulation by Federal regulatory agencies. I have voluntarily published my financial holdings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in accordance with my proposed measure.

The lacklustre legislative performance of the Congress this session also highlighted the great need for a general overhaul of congressional procedure. I joined in sponsoring bills calling for a thorough study, along the lines of the study which resulted in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Apart from modification of the archaic Senate rule which permits filibusters, the Senate needs uniform committee rules and floor procedures to expedite consideration of bills. I also introduced measures to increase public awareness and understanding of congressional action—and inaction—by installing a public address system in the Senate Chamber and permitting the broadcasting of the Senate proceedings, under appropriate procedures, on radio and television.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE

A bill, which would grant new salary increases to Federal workers, on top of those already scheduled to take effect January 1, is bottled up in the House Rules Committee. I continue to favor pay increases for civil service and postal employees to allow the Government to retain the best qualified employees, which can only be done if Federal pay scales are equal to those in private industry. The proposals to increase the salaries of Congressmen and Senators and other high Government officials should be measured by the same principles. I voted for the Uniformed Services Pay Act, which Congress adopted to raise the basic pay of military personnel.

DEFENSE

Congress appropriated $47.2 billion for defense for fiscal 1964—a slight decrease from the 1963 level. This amount includes $15.7 billion for procurement and $7 billion for research and development. Missiles and missile systems development will benefit from the new budget. Some $447.1 million—an increase over 1963—is provided for the manufacture and modification of missiles, launching sites, and control devices. Funds were also made available for six additional Polaris submarines and for more emphasis on surface-to-air missile systems such as the Nike-Zeus and the Nike X systems, designed to defend us from long-range ballistic missile attack. I participated in the extended investigation by the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the award of the TFX airplane contract to the General Dynamics Corp. and Grumman Aircraft Corp. Our committee has received detailed testimony which as yet fails to indicate fraud, venality, or abuse of executive judgment.

AGRICULTURE

Continuing to see real disadvantage to New York farmers in programs of strict production control and supply management, I voted against the administration's 2-year extension of the feed grains program as well as its proposed milk marketing base plan legislation. Both measures failed to receive the support of a consensus of New York farm opinion and were not, in my opinion, in the best interests of New York farmers. They imposed strict, regimented production controls and limitations on New York agricultural producers. The dairy measure, as introduced, cannot, in the Secretary of Agriculture's own views, solve the basic problems—reduction in total milk production and substantial improvement in the income of dairy farmers.

The influence of pesticides on farm and urban life was scrutinized in detail by a subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee of which I am a member. I cosponsored legislation, passed by the Senate, which sought to improve pesticide registration and labeling procedures. This measure is still pending in the House. I strongly opposed the Department of Agriculture's amendment to the New York-New Jersey milk marketing order which permits a negotiated hauling charge on bulk tank milk to be imposed on New York dairy producers.

NEW YORK STATE AFFAIRS

The continuing effort to insure for New York State a fair share of U.S. defense procurement produced results in some areas. Overall, however, defense procurement policies continued to work to New York State's disadvantage. Our share of the national total dropped from 17 percent in 1954 to 9.9 percent in fiscal 1963. Principal factor behind this pattern is the Defense Department's emphasis on awarding close to 90 percent of its contracts on the basis of negotiation rather than formally advertised procedures. Despite passage of legislation in 1962 to encourage increased competitiveness in defense procurement, there has been no increase in competitive bidding. My efforts will continue in this field.

In response to the Defense Department's proposed closing of seven military installations in New York, I cosponsored legislation to delay the closing until a thorough study is made to determine the impact on unemployment, and whether the closings are consistent with the public interest and our national security.

My activities as vice-chairman of the New York State congressional steering committee covered many areas of New York interest. Principal efforts involved the successful fight to prevent the transfer of the New York regional office of Internal Revenue to Boston; to secure and improve the employment picture at the Brooklyn Navy Yard; and the effort to expand the potential of ports along the St. Lawrence.

I worked to obtain Defense Department assurances that New York State's pioneer atomic pulsed reactor, northeast of Schenectady, would be utilized by Federal agencies.

In cooperation with Nassau County officials, I waged a long fight to secure the greatest possible public and educational use of Mitchel Field, resulting in some positive results. While a decision by General Services Administration, which I considered arbitrary, was sustained, the fight brought about a review of surplus disposal procedures which may prove beneficial in the long run. The disposal of Ellis Island continued to pose a dilemma, as continuing efforts have yet to produce an agreement on appropriate public use of that historic island.

I introduced legislation to authorize a study of a proposed interstate national parkway from Stroudsburg, Pa., through to Kingston, N.Y.; cosponsored legislation to establish Fire Island in Suffolk County as a publicly owned national seashore; and sponsored legislation to provide compensation to the Seneca Nation of Indians, displaced from their homes by Federal construction of the Allegheny Dam, and sponsored a bill authorizing the striking of medals commemorating three national historic shrines in New York—Federal Hall, Castle Clinton, and the Statue of Liberty, which was passed by the Senate.

I participated actively in the investigation of organized crime syndicates, exposed by Joseph Valachi in public hearings before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of which I am a member. The inquiry gave impetus to the need for legislation in various fields of crime detection, including wiretapping, if consistent with civil liberties, which is still pending in committee.

In order to improve New York State's capacity to carry out effectively the much needed Federal air pollution program, I introduced amendments to the Federal air pollution law, requiring top Federal officials to consult with State governments before Federal program grants could be made, and to increase the role of the States in intrastate air pollution abatement proceedings. These amendments are now in the law.

In an attempt to contribute to the development of New York's great potential in the water transportation field, I introduced legislation calling for additional funds for the improvement of the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, a channel through which much of New York commerce moves.

I also cosponsored a bill to reimburse the New York police force for extraordinary expenses incurred during the 1960 United Nations session.

And to end this report on a note of great promise, I would like to call attention to the 1964–65 New York World's Fair, which opens on April 22, 1964. Our Empire State and New York City will be playing host to the world with an exciting and historic fair which promises to transcend all the superlatives in the book. I am particularly gratified that I could join in helping to secure a spectacular $17 million U.S. Pavilion—of which all Americans will be proud.

I received special satisfaction with the passage by the Senate of a bill providing for a National Arts Founadtion and a National Council on the Arts, a program which I have been sponsoring for the last 15 years.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had concurred in the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3 to the bill (H.R. 5945) to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House concurred in the amendment of the Senate to the title of the aforementioned bill.

RECESS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

(The Senate being in recess at the hour of 2 o'clock a.m., the proceedings of today will be continued in the next issue of the RECORD.)

AFTER RECESS

At 6 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m., on Saturday, December 21, 1963, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. CAREY, of New York, to be a member of the board of directors of Gallaudet College, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey, chairman, Mrs. KELLY, of New York, Mr. DULSKI, of New York, Mr. MURPHY, of Illinois, Mr. GIAIMO, of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSON, of California, Mr. SLACK, of West Virginia, Mr. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan, Mr. TUPPER, of Maine, Mr. ROBISON, of New York, Mr. BATTIN, of Montana, and Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group on the part of the House, for the meeting to be held in the District of Columbia, commencing on January 14, 1964.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2311) to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college debate topics.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) to print for the use of the Committee on Public Works certain information on water pollution control.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6754) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier and Paula Bouvier;

S. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grun (Susanne Roth);

S. 1319. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents;

S. 1838. An act for the relief of Hannah Robbins;

H.R. 1211. An act to admit the vessels *Fort Town*, *Maple City*, and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Herbert R. Schaff;

H.R. 1560. An act for the relief of Constantinos A. Grigoras (Gregoras);

H.R. 2292. An act for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee;

H.R. 2364. An act for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.;

H.R. 4099. An act for the relief of Jesse Leigh, Jr.;

H.R. 4157. An act to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 4505. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and determine a motion for a new trial on the claim of Robert Alexander;

H.R. 4759. An act for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, Frank Grove, Harry P. Nash, Jr., and Michael J. Neofitou;

H.R. 5746. An act for the relief of Robert H. Bagby;

H.R. 6181. An act for the relief of Mr. Rudolph Sanderson, of Meriden, Kans.;

H.R. 6468. An act for the relief of Harold J. Burke;

H.R. 6807. An act for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co., Inc.;

H.R. 7019. An act to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land and improvements in the village of Odanah, Wis., taken by the Federal Government;

H.R. 8667. An act authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins;

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as Save Your Vision Week; and

H.J. Res. 680. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate 1964 as "U.S. Customs Year."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6754) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have a statement to make on certain items in the conference report. I believe a few facts should suffice at this early hour in the morning. The total appropriations are $6,224 million-plus. It is interesting to note that the bill, which covers twice as much as the foreign aid bill in appropriations, does not seem to have made a ripple on the public consciousness, whereas it has a great impact upon the Nation and upon the world.

The total amount provided in the conference report is $144,384,785 under the budget estimates, $176,381,875 over the bill as it passed the Senate, and $244,913,215 over the amount in the bill as it passed the House. This strange situation results from the way that we have had to treat the appropriations for the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Public Law 480 activities under the facts as they appeared before the conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a more detailed statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill provides total appropriations of $6,224,370,215.

These appropriations finance the many and diverse program and administrative operations of the Department of Agriculture.

The total amount provided in the conference report is $144,384,785 under the budget estimates, and $176,381,875 over the bill as it passed the Senate, and $244,913,215 over the amount in the bill as it passed the House.

These conference changes which result in larger amounts than the bill as it passed each body are due to action in the conference committee to provide the maximum amount carried in the House and Senate versions of the bill, for appropriations to the Commodity Credit Corporation to enable it, under the $14.5 billion borrowing authorization, to carry out the several programs authorized to be administered.

Under the law, the CCC must be reimbursed by appropriations for losses incurred resulting from the regular price support, supply, crop diversion and payment program activities of the farm program.

Also appropriations must be made to cover the costs of the foreign assistance programs and other related programs authorized by these respective acts. I will deal with the specific amounts involved for these items later in my statement.

GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL ACTIVITIES

The general activities of the Department are financed under titles I and II of the bill.

The conferees agreed to a general formula of accepting 60 percent of the pay costs which had been restored by the Senate. This amounts to about $4.2 million of the approximately $7 million restored by the Senate for mandatory pay costs.

The Senate committee report carried a provision to reserve the increases over 1963 level during the current fiscal year—month by month from the beginning of the fiscal year to the date of enactment of the bill. Under this provision the full amount provided would have been in the base for 1965 without further justification again next year.

The House conferees insisted that specific amounts be agreed to rather than the formula recommended in the Senate committee report.

I still believe the procedures recommended by the Senate committee would have resulted in a more orderly method of granting modest increases for well-justified projects and activities, since under the conference report a number of these small items will have to be dealt with again to enable the Department to carry out the increased activity as originally contemplated by the committee and approved by the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Senators will recall that the House had proposed to realine agricultural marketing research under the Agricultural Research Service. By this means, it was stated that better coordination of research would be achieved. The Department appealed this action taken by the House and stated that it would review research programs of the two agencies, especially in regard to quality research and advise the Appropriations Committees of the results of this study. The conferees have agreed to the following statement:

"Eliminate House language providing for marketing research as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree that quality research could be appropriately conducted under the agricultural research as indicated by the Department."

It is expected that the results of this study by the Department will be submitted to the committee next year in connection with the justifications for research appropriations for fiscal year 1965.

As stated in the Senate committee report on page 6, better correlation of research as well as better coordination of research investigations is necessary to make certain that maximum efficiency is achieved in these entire research programs.

For example, all research dealing with the effect of machines upon cotton fiber should be better coordinated. At present, harvesting, ginning, spinning and utilization research on cotton—all of which activities directly affect the quality of cotton for end-use purposes are widely scattered. Since the quality of a commodity when it reaches the marketplace is a dominant factor in its market acceptance, the committee believes it would be very unwise to take any general action affecting quality research which would have a tendency to subordinate the potential need for greater emphasis on such research activity.

The appropriation bill as passed by the Senate included funds for three feasibility studies on research as follows:

(1) $25,000 to survey and report upon the need for and scope of work to be undertaken at a proposed regional research station to conduct research investigations on fruit crops in the northeastern Appalachian region;

(2) $25,000 for a feasibility study to evaluate the need, purpose, and scope of a proposed wool quality research program; and

(3) $25,000 for a feasibility study in regard to the need, cost, and related pertinent factors relative to a national grain marketing research facility.

The House conferees declined to agree to funds in the conference for the preparation of these reports. I am sure that the Senate agrees with the need for these reports, and I expect the Secretary of Agriculture will see to it that these feasibility studies are made and the results are reported to the Committee on Appropriations as soon as possible next year irrespective of the fact that no specific funds are carried in the bill for the costs incidental to the preparation of them.

PLANT AND ANIMAL DISEASE AND PEST CONTROL

The conference bill carries $64.5 million for the conduct of regulatory and control programs administered by the Agricultural Research Service, some of which receive cooperation and cost-sharing from State and local sources.

The conference bill is $4,944,000 over the amount carried in the House bill of which $2,750,000 is for the cooperative program to eradicate the screw-worm. This amount was inadvertently omitted in the bill as passed by the House. Other increases approved were $200,000 over the House bill for strengthening plant quarantine at ports of entry, making a total increase of $361,000 under this activity. For the eradication of hog cholera, the conferees agreed to an increase over 1963 of $1,396,000. This is $600,000 over the amount in the House approved bill, and makes a total of approximately $3.5 million of Federal appropriations available for this program activity.

For the eradication of the fire ant, the conferees agreed to an increase of $500,000 over the amount carried in the House bill. This will continue the Federal funding of this program at approximately $3.4 million.

For the cooperative program to eradicate sheep scabies, the conferees have agreed to an increase of $300,000 over 1963, making available $843,000 of Federal financing on this cost-sharing eradication program.

PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK AND STATE EXPERIMENT STATION

The conferees agreed to one-half of the Senate increases to be directed toward adjusting the pay of cooperative extension workers and employees at State experiment stations, who are paid in part from Federal funds carried in this bill.

The specific amount of increase agreed to was $2,705,000 of $5,410,000 for payments for cooperative extension workers; and $1,250,000 of $2,500,000 increase proposed by the Senate for payments to State experiment stations.

It is expected that the remaining amounts of additional Federal appropriations necessary to bring about comparable salary adjustments will be considered in the consideration of the appropriation bill for 1965.

TITLE II—CREDIT AGENCIES

The conferees have directed that the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration prepare and issue the necessary regulations in the Federal Register to carry out the procedural requirements set forth in the respective committee reports in regard to the consideration and major approval of generation and transmission loans.

These procedural requirements and the regulations shall be printed in the Federal Register within 90 days of enactment of this Appropriation Act.

RURAL HOUSING LOANS

The Senate had provided an increase of $25 million in the borrowing authorization for rural housing loans, authorized under title V of the House Act of 1949, as amended.

The conference committee agreed to a direct appropriation instead of additional borrowing authorization.

This is the principal change in conference in regard to programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration.

Some modest increases were provided for other new programs. The amounts provided appear in detail in the table on appropriations which will be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of Senate consideration of the conference report.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Under title III of the bill $2,699,400,000 is appropriated to reimburse the CCC for net realized losses in fiscal 1963. This amount is required to repair the capital structure of the corporation for losses already incurred in connection with regular farm program costs. This is the amount carried in the Senate bill, and is $100 million below the estimate and $199,400,000 over the amount in the House bill.

TITLE IV—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The bill as agreed to in conference carries a total of $1,889,044,000 in advance appropriations to conduct the various foreign assistance programs, authorized by acts of Congress, principally Public Law 480.

Within these totals the specific appropriations are: $1,452 million for sales for foreign currencies under title I of Public Law 480; $215 million for emergency famine relief; and $52,515,000 for title IV, long-term contracts. This makes a total of $1,719,966,000 for advance appropriations to carry out the various activities under that act.

There is also included $82,218,000 for expenses of the International Wheat Agreement, and $82,860,000 for expenses under the barter program for materials in the supplemental stockpile.

In total the amounts recommended are $167,377,000 over the Senate bill and $195,978,000 under the 1963 appropriations.

In summary the conference committee has agreed to the larger amounts carried in both versions of the bill in order to provide the Commodity Credit Corporation with the maximum amount of capital restoration and advance appropriations needed to carry out all of its authorized program activities. I earnestly hope that the total amounts agreed to, which amount to a grand total of $4,588,444,000 will be sufficient to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out all of its authorized programs without the need for a supplemental appropriation early in the next session. However, if it develops that additional funds are required, that need will have to be considered as and if it develops.

PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION RESEARCH

The conferees have experienced considerable difficulty in arriving at a mutually satisfactory agreement in regard to expansion of utilization research and cost of production research, together with a legislative provision inserted by the House in regard to the use of section 32 permanent authorization.

I intend to move for the Senate to accept the amendment as now revised and agreed to by the joint conference committee.

In regard to amendment No. 7, the House version of the bill provided $5 million to be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation for cost of production research on surplus commodities, such research to be conducted through contracts and grants. The Senate Committee struck this provision and inserted language which would authorize not to exceed $35 million to be transferred and used for utilization research and development as well as cost-of-production research on surplus commodities. Of this total amount, $30 million had been for the purpose of carrying out the accelerated utilization research program as proposed by the Department in Senate Document No. 34.

As finally agreed upon by the conferees, Senate amendment No. 7 has been rewritten to transfer a total of $15 million of which $14,750,000 is for utilization research facilities, and for the acceleration of utilization research.

The uses of these funds for facilities and for research are listed in the statement on the conference report.

Now reverting again to amendment No. 27, it has been revised in the conference to provide that $11 million of section 32 funds be used for the construction of research facilities as follows: $9.5 million for the construction of a utilization research facility to be located in the Southeastern States; and $1.5 million for the construction of a laboratory to carry on intensive research for weed control, this facility to be located in Mississippi. In addition $5 million is provided for accelerating production research.

As agreed to in conference, amendment No. 27 will likewise provide for $5 million to be authorized to be transferred to the Commodity Credit Corporation to be used to increase domestic and foreign consumption of any farm commodity or farm commodities. Further, this language proviso sets a limitation whereby hereafter such sums not in excess of $25 million as may be approved annually by the Congress shall be available for each purpose.

In view of this agreement dealing with these two amendments, I shall move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7 and 27, as amended.

Mr. HOLLAND. Briefly, I invite attention to five items which I believe should be mentioned because of their size and importance.

First, there was an item for rural housing loans placed in the bill in the Senate in the amount of $25 million. It was put in as an amendment of the basic act. Under the conference report, that provision was receded from by the Senate, but the same amount of $25 million was provided by way of direct appropriation for the same purpose.

Second, the House version of the bill had taken the appropriation for marketing research out of the Agricultural Marketing Service and placed it in the Agricultural Research Service. The Senate committee reversed that process so as to leave it as it has been in the past. The Senate approved that action, and the conference approved the action of the Senate in that regard.

Third, the proposed peanut laboratory has been a subject of some contention because of certain facts beyond the control of the Senate and the House at the present time. The House and the Senate have both receded, without prejudice, from the three amendments which cover that field, with the distinct understanding, as stated in the conference report—to which the leadership on both sides are committed—that the same item shall be taken up again in the first supplemental bill next year.

Fourth, for the first time the Senate is making progress on the question of utilization research, on which it has been working for some years, under items 7 and 27, which were in disagreement, and which are described in greater detail in my statement.

A real start is made on utilization research. For example, under amendment 7, a total of $15 million will be provided, of which $14,750,000 is for utilization research, and the construction and renovation of existing utilization research facilities. Under amendment No. 27, as reported back from the conference, a total of $16 million would be provided for research purposes, including $11 million for facilities and $5 million for production research.

I shall not go into the subject in detail unless I am questioned. The three Senators on the committee who have been most concerned in relation to the subject—the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]—were pleased with the result on that question, and regard the action as a distinct step in the right direction toward the fulfillment of the utilization program covered by Senate Document 34, which is the report—and a very full report—of the Department of Agriculture in this field received by the Senate during this session.

I should like to make one comment on the REA. Senators will recall that the committee of the other body and the Senate committee made reports trying to tighten up the administration of the REA both on section 5 loans and on the generating and transmission loans.

There was some difference in wording. I note from the report of the managers on the part of the House that they have said they do not agree with some of the requirements which the Senate committee put into its report. Because the Senate committee very strongly believes in those recommendations and desires to reiterate them, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the committee report relating to those recommendations be printed at this point in the Record. I intend to insert the committee report statement again to show that it is the understanding of the conference that we stand by that report, and we will expect the Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out our recommendations in that report in its dealings with this body.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

With regard to any further generation and major transmission loan approved in excess of $2 million, the Administrator shall certify to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Comptroller General, and the Congress, that each of these steps has been taken and that the private supplier had been given an opportunity to make the contract reasonable, specifying the details, and had refused or failed to do so.

The Administrator also shall furnish the Comptroller General and the Congress on the date of approval of each such loan application, the following information:

(1) The name and address of the applicant borrower and the date of the application.

(2) Description and estimated cost of the proposed generation facilities. Indicate if the proposed facilities are the initial or additional unit or units of a plant comprised of one or more units.

(3) Description and estimated cost of proposed transmission facilities, including any immediate or future plans to interconnect with other transmission systems.

(4) Description of any long-range plans the applicant may have for construction of additional generation and transmission facilities and the estimated cost of the planned facilities.

(5) Comparison of the estimated costs of generation by the applicant borrower with the cost of power available from existing suppliers, including the final offer by the private supplier including terms and conditions he offered to meet applicant's long-term energy needs.

(6) Summary of the efforts made by the applicant and by REA to obtain the applicant's power and energy requirements from existing power suppliers and the reasons why such efforts have not been successful

(7) Explanation of the applicant's reasons for seeking an REA loan.

(8) The amount of electric energy which the applicant will cease to purchase from present power suppliers upon construction of the generating plant for which REA financing is being sought.

(9) Explanation of the extent to which the feasibility of the requested loan for generation and transmission facilities depends upon the use of a portion of the facilities by others (including Federal power marketing agencies).

(10) Details of the applicant's plans to sell or otherwise make available any of the power and energy from the proposed generation facilities to others (including Federal power marketing agencies).

(11) Names of State agencies and commissions having jurisdiction over the applicant borrowers.

With respect to each generation and transmission loan application, processed by REA in accordance with the foregoing procedures, the Administrator should, in order to avoid dilatory tactics or protracted delays on the part of either party in such negotiations, establish a publicly announced period of time during which the survey, determinations, and negotiations will be carried on prior to a definite cutoff date set by the Administrator.

The committee is opposed to the imposition of dual rates in power supply contracts and believes that the cooperatives should state their needs clearly and concretely, and that the suppliers of power should in turn clearly set forth the terms and conditions of power supply contracts.

The committee expects the Administrator to examine into all complaints which may come to his attention concerning territorial disputes between REA cooperatives and commercial power companies, except in States having adequate statutory provisions for determining territorial and service rights, and report to the committee in January of each year the salient facts involved, the disposition of the complaints, and the basis for such dispositions.

The committee instructs the Administrator of REA to report to both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees in writing 60 days in advance of approving allocations of funds for acquiring or building generating plants of over $2 million and major transmission lines, and such other information as the committee may request.

SECTION V LOANS

The committee concurs in the recommendations in the House committee report that the Administrator of REA should not make section V loans in competition with private sources of credit, or as a replacement or substitution for loan funds available under the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87-27. Such loans should be very limited. The committee requests the Administrator of REA to provide it with a summary of pending section V loan applications as well as a copy of his certification to the Secretary on the necessity for making these loans.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the five amendments which are in disagreement, which I have mentioned rather sketchily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6754, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to the bill (H.R. 6754) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted and stricken by said amendment insert: ": *Provided*, That, in addition, not to exceed $15,000,000 may be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation to this appropriation, in accordance with the Act of June 29, 1948 (5 U.S.C. 714b), for utilization research and development, cost of production research, and other related research designed to reduce surplus commodities held or to be held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, including $10,000,000 for the planning, construction, alteration and equipping of research facilities, which amount shall remain available until expended."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

"In lieu of the sum of $2,500,000 named in said amendment, insert: $1,250,000."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted and stricken, by said amendment, insert:

"MARKETING RESEARCH AND SERVICE

"For expenses necessary to carry on research and service to improve and develop marketing and distribution relating to agriculture as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627) and other laws, including the administration of marketing regulatory acts connected therewith; research and development, including related cost and efficiency evaluations, and services relating to agricultural marketing and distribution, for carrying out regulatory acts connected therewith, and for administration and coordination of payments to States; and this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), and not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for employment at rates not to exceed $75 per diem under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) in carrying out section 201(a) to 201(d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1291) and section 203(j) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, $42,498,975: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 565a for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided, the cost of erecting any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $20,000, except for one building to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $45,000, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $7,500 or 7.5 per centum of the cost of the building, whichever is greater."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted and stricken by said amendment insert: ", and (5) not more than $16,000,000 for transfer to the Commodity Credit Corporation to be used to increase domestic consumption of any farm commodity or farm commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply, and hereafter such sums (not in excess of $25,000,000 in any one year) as may be approved by the Congress shall be available for such purpose, such authorization not to restrict authority in existing law, of which amount $11,000,000 shall remain available until expended for construction and equipping of research facilities determined to be needed as a result of a special survey."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"Rural Housing Loans

"For additional rural housing loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words with respect to amendment No. 27, which I believe relates to the proposed peanut facility.

Mr. HOLLAND. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is that section 32?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, that is the section 32 amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the Senator proposed that the Senate recede on the marketing or so-called peanut amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. The report showed that both the Senate and the House receded from all amendments on that subject without prejudice for future consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I feel that I should make a brief statement in view of the unusual hour at which the Senate is meeting.

First, I wish to congratulate the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] upon the ability, patience, and tenacity with which he defended the position of the Senate on all of the items in the bill. The bill is very complex. It was my privilege, as chairman for some 26 years, to handle the bill, and 4 years as ranking Democratic member of the subcommittee. The bill deals with over 2,000 different activities scattered over the entire length and breadth of our land. Not all of them are directly related to farming and agriculture, but they are related to almost every aspect of American life. The Senator from Florida has mastered the bill to an unusual degree in the first year he has handled it.

With respect to the difference between the two bodies on the peanut laboratory, the Senate has twice approved the budget estimate for the laboratory which was to be located at Dawson, Ga., which is in the third congressional district of Georgia. The Representative from that district, the Honorable E. L. (TIC) FORRESTER has, of course, been vitally concerned with that subject and has worked very earnestly on it. He was prepared to defend the item on the floor when it went back in disagreement.

Early in the conference, the conferees agreed that the amendment would go back in disagreement for a special vote on the floor of the House. Mr. FORRESTER had consulted me the day before yesterday and asked me what the prospects were with respect to the conference. I said, "They are very bleak." We agreed not to have another meeting until after the Christmas holidays. So he checked in with the leadership of his own body, the able Representative from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and received the same judgment there. Due to the illness of his wife, he started to his home in Georgia. Today, the President, being naturally very anxious to have these bills cleared before the Congress should adjourn, approached the conferees, and we got in touch with Representative FORRESTER. It was impossible for him to fly back to Washington to defend the amendment on the floor of the House today. In all frankness, had he done so, I doubt that he could have handled the bill because the debate would have postponed action on the conference report.

I believe Representative FORRESTER has made a very generous gesture in agreeing that these matters should be taken out of the bill, and that the issue should be determined in the first supplemental bill or in the Agriculture Department appropriation bill for 1965, whichever may come first. I am sure that all his constituents will understand that he has not surrendered any right which is his, that his interest has not waned in the slightest, and that on the proper occasion, when the question is before the House, he will be there defending this important facility with all his considerable strength and ability.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I shall make my remarks brief. I commend the Senator from Florida for the outstanding job he did in handling this difficult bill. This is one of the most complicated of all the appropriation bills. It was not easy for him to take over the chairmanship of this subcommittee as successor to our distinguished Senator from Georgia, Senator RUSSELL, who did a superb job for a quarter of a century. I believe that Senator HOLLAND exacted the maximum amount of economy.

The bill may seem large, but there are many items in it, such as $495 million for REA and RTA loans, which have almost a 100 percent repayment record.

There is $68 million for FHA loans, which have excellent repayment records.

There is $237 million for the school lunch program and the milk program, which bears little relation to agriculture.

One of the few places where we were a bit liberal with funds was in the field of utilization research. This is an area in which the Senator from Georgia has really fought a tough battle to obtain the funds, which I believe eventually will result in a great saving. If we can find new uses for agricultural commodities we can save hundreds of millions of dollars for the Commodity Credit Corporation in storage and other costs.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], two members of the conference committee who have spoken in praise of the excellent work done by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who for the first time was the chairman of this particular subcommittee.

Despite the fact that it was his first experience in engaging in the rather sustained discussions which we have with House conferees on a measure of this kind, I want the Senate to know that the Senator from Florida defended the Senate position both persistently and successfully. His persistence and persuasion paid off, as demonstrated by the fact that though it is somewhat late in the day—or early in the morning—and certainly late in the session, we have finally arrived at a working agreement.

Of the many decisions which were made, the one which to me gives the most hope for the ordinary taxpayer and farmer is the fact that we have finally made a real breakthrough in the bill for industrial utilization research. We have been nibbling away at this program in recent years.

In the Senate a substantial effort has been made to accomplish this purpose several times in different ways by passing various bills. This is the first time that we have obtained a concession from the House of a size which is significant enough to make a real dent in the problem.

Evidence has been made available from the laboratory at Peoria and from other laboratories dealing with this subject—interesting, intriguing, impressive, encouraging—in a report prepared by the Department of Agriculture, to show the various industrial uses now available. We require studies in marketing and studies in further fabrication. These show that we can put the acres of America back to work at a profit for the farmers by adding industrial utilization to the ordinary utilization for the comforts of human beings and for the feeding of livestock.

I believe this is a really encouraging advent for American agriculture. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Florida and all the other conferees. The House conferees are to be congratulated for finally seeing what we believe has been a clear light in the sky for a long time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator. At this hour I shall not speak on this subject. I wish to express my gratitude to the members of the Committee on Appropriations and the conference committee for what they have done in the field of industrial utilization.

I have nothing further to say. I believe an excellent piece of work has been done.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator. The Senator from Nebraska is a pioneer in this field.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not believe this occasion should pass without my saying that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has been one of the voices crying in the wilderness to encourage this program, ever since he became a Member of this body.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, that is an accurate statement.

Incidentally, I now sit in the seat formerly occupied by another pioneer, former Senator Capehart of Indiana. Along with many others, the former Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Nebraska have been urging this program, from the Senate side. The House now has taken the first big step. We hope the House will become as enthusiastic about this program as is the Senate.

This will mean that with a small actual expenditure we will realize a tremendous return for American agriculture.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friends, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], for the kind things they have said about me. No one has ever worked with more indefatigable, capable, generous associates in a labor of love such as this conference committee has undertaken.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was the other member of the conferees. He had to leave late this afternoon. He worked with equal dedication.

I am happy at the outcome, and happy that the House conferees likewise were exceedingly cooperative. I hope that we have embarked in several respects, under the terms of the bill, upon new programs which will pay off handsomely, particularly in respect to the disposition of commodities which are in heavy surplus.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to the Senate amendments Nos. 7, 11, 24, 27, and 38.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate concurred in the House amendments to the Senate amendments listed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief observation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe I should say, in justice to the Representative from this district, who has put all he has had for the past 3 years into the laboratory to which I referred, that all the conferees on the part of the Senate were gracious enough to say that they would assist in inserting this item in the supplemental bill, so that he would not be deprived of an opportunity to make a fight on the floor of the House.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the budget estimate, the House, Senate, and conference allowances on the various appropriation items in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1963 and estimates for 1964, and amounts recommended in bill for 1964, and conference allowances

TITLE I—GENERAL ACTIVITIES

Agency or item	Total appropriations and loan authorizations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	House bill, 1964	Senate bill, 1964	Conference allowance, 1964
Agricultural Research Service:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Research	[1] $88, 182, 550	[1] $90, 554, 000	$94, 445, 000	[1] $91, 811, 700	[1] ($91, 496, 700)
Plant and animal disease and pest control [2]	59, 504, 980	65, 148, 000	59, 505, 000	67, 071, 500	64, 449, 000
Meat inspection	25, 907, 150	28, 502, 000	27, 638, 000	28, 126, 250	27, 931, 000
Total, salaries and expenses [3]	173, 594, 680	184, 204, 000	181, 588, 000	187, 009, 450	183, 876, 700
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	5, 265, 000	2, 500, 000		2, 500, 000	1, 250, 000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	178, 859, 680	186, 704, 000	181, 588, 000	189, 509, 450	(185, 126, 700)
Cooperative State Experiment Station Service:					
Payments and expenses	38, 262, 950	40, 383, 000	40, 383, 000	42, 883, 000	41, 633, 000
Extension Service:					
Cooperative extension work, payments, and expenses:					
Payments to States and Puerto Rico	[4] 63, 180, 800	64, 590, 000	64, 590, 000	70, 000, 000	67, 295, 000
Retirement and employee compensation fund costs for extension agents	6, 765, 000	7, 110, 000	7, 110, 000	7, 435, 000	7, 272, 500
Penalty mail	[4] 2, 801, 250	3, 113, 000	3, 113, 000	3, 113, 000	3, 113, 000
Federal Extension Service	[4] 2, 597, 450	2, 515, 000	2, 500, 000	2, 500, 000	2, 500, 000
Total, Extension Service	75, 344, 500	77, 328, 000	77, 313, 000	83, 048, 000	80, 180, 500
Farmer Cooperative Service	1, 155, 900	1, 280, 000	1, 195, 000	1, 201, 000	1, 201, 000
Soil Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	93, 975, 500	99, 453, 000	97, 480, 000	99, 000, 000	98, 339, 000
Watershed protection [5]	61, 376, 350	63, 992, 000	63, 222, 000	63, 992, 000	63, 607, 000
Flood prevention [5]	25, 325, 850	25, 576, 000	25, 465, 000	25, 465, 000	25, 465, 000
Great Plains conservation program [5]	12, 353, 550	14, 640, 000	12, 994, 000	14, 640, 000	13, 622, 000
Resources conservation and development		6, 275, 000	1, 200, 000	2, 200, 000	1, 500, 000
Total, Soil Conservation Service	193, 031, 250	209, 936, 000	200, 361, 000	205, 297, 000	202, 533, 000
Economic Research Service	9, 511, 150	10, 301, 000	9, 832, 000	9, 965, 700	9, 912, 000
Statistical Reporting Service	10, 021, 850	11, 552, 000	11, 079, 000	11, 486, 000	11, 290, 500
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing research and service	[6] 40, 897, 170	[6] 44, 505, 000	[6] 37, 061, 000	[7] 44, 514, 100	42, 498, 975
Construction of facilities		(8)			
Payments to States and possessions	1, 425, 000	1, 425, 000	1, 425, 000	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000
Special milk program	100, 000, 000	102, 000, 000	100, 000, 000	100, 000, 000	100, 000, 000
School lunch program [9]	125, 000, 000	137, 000, 000	137, 000, 000	137, 000, 000	137, 000, 000
Limitation on use of sec. 32 funds:					
Food stamp program	(51, 500, 000)	(51, 500, 000)	(40, 000, 000)	(51, 500, 000)	(45, 000, 000)
Transfer to Commodity Credit Corporation			(25, 000, 000)		
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	267, 322, 170	284, 930, 000	275, 486, 000	283, 014, 100	280, 998, 975
Foreign Agricultural Service:					
Salaries and expenses [10]	17, 135, 270	19, 039, 000	18, 505, 000	19, 039, 000	18, 699, 500
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	3, 994, 000				
Total, Foreign Agricultural Service)	21, 129, 270	19, 039, 000	18, 505, 000	19, 039, 000	18, 699, 500
Commodity Exchange Authority	1, 060, 950	1, 095, 000	1, 093, 000	1, 095, 000	1, 095, 000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:					
Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service [11]	95, 423, 000	114, 944, 000	105, 737, 000	107, 091, 400	106, 549, 500
Sugar Act program	77, 650, 000	80, 000, 000	78, 000, 000	78, 000, 000	78, 000, 000
Agricultural conservation program [12]	212, 900, 000	220, 000, 000	215, 000, 000	215, 000, 000	215, 000, 000
Advance authorization	(250, 000, 000)	(150, 000, 000)	(250, 000, 000)	(250, 000, 000)	(250, 000, 000)
Conservation reserve program [13]	304, 000, 000	294, 000, 000	294, 000, 000	294, 000, 000	294, 000, 000
Land-use adjustment program [13]	2, 000, 000	19, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	12, 150, 000	11, 350, 000
Total, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	691, 973, 000	727, 944, 000	702, 737, 000	706, 241, 400	704, 899, 500
Office of Rural Areas Development	87, 850	134, 000	120, 000	120, 000	120, 000
Office of the General Counsel	3, 854, 600	3, 987, 000	3, 953, 000	3, 987, 000	3, 973, 500

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1963 and estimates for 1964, and amounts recommended in bill for 1964, and conference allowances—Continued

TITLE I—GENERAL ACTIVITIES

Agency or item	Total appropriations and loan authorizations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	House bill, 1964	Senate bill, 1964	Conference allowance, 1964
Office of Information	$1,662,220	$1,684,000	$1,684,000	$1,684,000	$1,684,000
National Agricultural Library:					
Salaries and expenses	1,185,320	1,695,000	1,420,000	1,426,140	1,426,140
Library facilities		450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
Total, National Agricultural Library	1,185,320	2,145,000	1,870,000	1,876,140	1,876,140
General administration [14]	3,397,000	3,975,000	3,735,000	3,760,550	3,750,000
Total, title I, general activities	1,497,859,660	1,582,417,000	1,530,934,000	1,564,207,340	1,548,973,315

TITLE II—CREDIT AGENCIES

Rural Electrification Administration:					
Electrification loans:					
Direct authorization	($300,000,000)	($350,000,000)	($275,000,000)	($275,000,000)	($275,000,000)
Contingency authorization	[15] (100,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)
Total	(400,000,000)	[16] (425,000,000)	(425,000,000)	(425,000,000)	(425,000,000)
Telephone loans:					
Direct authorization	(80,000,000)	(70,000,000)	(70,000,000)	(70,000,000)	(70,000,000)
Total	(80,000,000)	(70,000,000)	(70,000,000)	(70,000,000)	(70,000,000)
Total, loan authorizations	(480,000,000)	(495,000,000)	(495,000,000)	(495,000,000)	(495,000,000)
Salaries and expenses	10,442,200	11,344,000	11,162,000	11,287,000	11,247,000
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	10,442,200	11,344,000	11,162,000	11,287,000	11,247,000
Farmers Home Administration:					
Direct loan account:					
Real estate loans	(50,000,000)	(60,000,000)	(60,000,000)	(60,000,000)	(60,000,000)
Operating loans [17]	(290,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)
Total, direct loan account	(340,000,000)	(360,000,000)	(360,000,000)	(360,000,000)	(360,000,000)
Rural housing loans (authorization) [18]				(25,000,000)	25,000,000
Rural renewal		2,350,000	1,000,000	1,350,000	1,200,000
Rural housing for the elderly revolving fund	1,000,000	5,000,000	2,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Salaries and expenses [19]	35,778,900	39,367,000	38,367,000	[19] 39,367,000	[19] 38,925,900
Total, Farmers Home Administration	36,778,900	46,717,000	41,367,000	44,217,000	68,625,900
Total, title II, credit agencies:					
Loan authorizations	(820,000,000)	(855,000,000)	(855,000,000)	(855,000,000)	(855,000,000)
Appropriations	47,221,100	58,061,000	52,529,000	55,504,000	79,872,900

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Operating and administrative expenses	$6,799,000	$7,210,000	$6,950,000	$7,210,000	$7,080,000
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund (operating expenses payable from premium income)	(3,265,250)	(3,480,000)	(3,530,000)	(3,480,000)	(3,505,000)
Total, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	6,799,000	7,210,000	6,950,000	7,210,000	7,080,000
Commodity Credit Corporation:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses	2,278,455,000	2,799,400,000	2,500,000,000	2,699,400,000	2,699,400,000
Reimbursement for special milk program	92,243,150				
Administrative expense limitation	(43,188,500)	(41,650,000)	(41,650,000)	(41,650,000)	(41,650,000)
Total, Commodity Credit Corporation	2,370,698,150	2,799,400,000	2,500,000,000	2,699,400,000	2,699,400,000
Total, title III, corporations	2,377,497,150	2,806,610,000	2,506,950,000	2,706,610,000	2,706,480,000

TITLE IV—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Public Law 480:					
Sales for foreign currencies	$1,588,804,000	$1,452,000,000	$1,452,000,000	$1,252,000,000	$1,452,000,000
Emergency famine relief	250,000,000	215,451,000	215,451,000	215,451,000	215,451,000
Long-term supply contracts	40,000,000	79,000,000	52,515,000	79,000,000	52,515,000
Total, Public Law 480	1,878,804,000	1,746,451,000	1,719,966,000	1,546,451,000	1,719,966,000
International Wheat Agreement	81,218,000	92,356,000	86,218,000	92,356,000	86,218,000
Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile	125,000,000	82,860,000	82,860,000	82,860,000	82,860,000
Total, title IV, foreign assistance programs	2,085,022,000	1,921,667,000	1,889,044,000	1,721,667,000	1,889,044,000

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

Farm Credit Administration: Administrative expense limitation	($2,631,500)	($2,785,000)	($2,785,000)	($2,785,000)	($2,785,000)
Total, title V, related agencies	(2,631,500)	(2,785,000)	(2,785,000)	(2,785,000)	(2,785,000)

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1963 and estimates for 1964, and amounts recommended in bill for 1964, and conference allowances—Continued

SUMMARY BY TITLES I-V

Agency or item	Total appropriations and loan authorizations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	House bill, 1964	Senate bill, 1964	Conference allowance, 1964
Appropriations:					
Title I, general activities	$1, 497, 859, 660	$1, 582, 417, 000	$1, 530, 934, 000	$1, 564, 207, 340	$1, 548, 973, 315
Title II, credit agencies	47, 221, 100	58, 061, 000	52, 529, 000	55, 504, 000	79, 872, 900
Title III, corporations	2, 377, 497, 150	2, 806, 610, 000	2, 506, 950, 000	2, 706, 610, 000	2, 706, 480, 000
Title IV, foreign assistance programs	2, 085, 022, 000	1, 921, 667, 000	1, 889, 044, 000	1, 721, 667, 000	1, 889, 044, 000
Title V, related agencies	(2, 631, 500)	(2, 785, 000)	(2, 785, 000)	(2, 785, 000)	(2, 785, 000)
Total appropriations in bill	6, 007, 599, 910	6, 368, 755, 000	5, 979, 457, 000	6, 047, 988, 340	6, 224, 370, 215

---

[1] Excludes "Marketing research" and "Construction of facilities," Agricultural Marketing Service, which were merged by the House under "Salaries and expenses," Agricultural Research Service. The Department recommended appropriation of these items in the Agricultural Marketing Service.

[2] Includes contingency funds of $1,500,000 for use to the extent necessary to meet emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases.

[3] In addition, a reappropriation of $1,000,000 of prior-year funds for work at field stations is authorized.

[4] Reflects transfers between subappropriations for postal costs as follows: From "Payments to States and Puerto Rico," $316,500; to "Penalty mail," $311,250; and to "Federal Extension Service," $5,250.

[5] In addition, prior-year balances available.

[6] Includes funds for "Marketing research" and "Construction of facilities," Agricultural Marketing Service, which were merged by the House under "Salaries and expenses," Agricultural Research Service.

[7] Includes $1,600,000 estimated under "Construction of facilities," merged by the House under "Salaries and expenses," Agricultural Research Service, and merged herein under this head.

[8] Estimate considered under the item "Marketing research and service."

[9] In addition, a transfer of $45,000,000 from sec. 32 funds for purchase of agricultural commodities for distribution to schools is authorized. Also, the 1964 budget estimates provided, and the House and Senate bills deleted, language proposing the use of $2,000,000 for special assistance to needy schools.

[10] In addition, a transfer of $3,117,000 from sec. 32 funds is authorized.

[11] In addition, the 1963 appropriation act provided that $81,379,500 may be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation fund; the 1964 budget estimates propose, and the House and Senate bills allow, the transfer of $94,885,000 from the Commodity Credit Corporation fund including not to exceed $40,051,000 from the limitation on CCC administrative expenses.

[12] Advance authorization for the 1964 program is proposed in the budget estimates at $150,000,000, compared with $250,000,000 approved for the 1963 program. The House and Senate bills provide $250,000,000 for the 1964 program authorization.

[13] In addition, prior-year balances available.

[14] In addition, the 1963 appropriation act provided that not to exceed $225,000 may be transferred from other appropriations available to the Department.

[15] 1963 contingency authorization available for both electrification and telephone loans, in 1964 contingency for electric loans only.

[16] Legislation will be proposed for the establishment of a "Rural Electrification Administration loan account" which will reflect the net cost of loan programs in relation to receipts on loans previously made.

[17] Includes $50,000,000 contingency authorization, not estimated for 1964, but continued in the bill.

[18] In addition, an estimated $150,000,000 is available from prior authorizations, Senate bill provided increased borrowing authorization, conference bill provides direct appropriation.

[19] In addition, a transfer of not to exceed $500,000 of the funds available to the Farmers Home Administration for temporary field employment is authorized.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I should like at this time to yield briefly to the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who has an announcement to make as to the future plans with respect to the foreign aid conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I surmise that Senators have already heard that the House, by a vote of 136 to 141, voted to recommit to conference the foreign aid bill. A new conference has been asked for, and the conferees are meeting at 10 o'clock. The House is in adjournment until 12 o'clock. I understand that the distinguished majority leader intends either to recess or adjourn until 12 o'clock noon. That is his decision to make.

I assure Members of the Senate that we will sit in conference and listen to what the House Members have to say.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I express the hope that Senators who have remained in the city of Washington will remain in the Chamber throughout the day, until a decision, if at all possible, is reached on this question. It is my intention to dispatch telegrams to Senators who are not too far distant and who are absent because of official business, illness, or other reasons, to return to the city.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that if the foreign aid bill comes back before the Senate, the majority leader contemplates calling for a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not intend to call for a quorum, but I understand other Senators do.

Mr. MORSE. I shall, because this bill is fundamental to many things involving the welfare of this country. In this highly controversial matter—whereas the agriculture appropriation conference report was not such—the American people are entitled to have Members of the Senate present, and I shall ask for a live quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope Senators will heed that statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wonder if it has been determined whether any Senator will request a yea-and-nay vote on the new conference report on the foreign aid bill in the event the conference reaches agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I know of none.

Mr. MORSE. I did not hear the inquiry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Georgia raised the question whether any Senator had indicated he wished to ask for a yea-and-nay vote in the event the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I shall ask for one. I think Senators should stand up and be counted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope Senators will heed that statement.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns this morning, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF RESTRICTIONS ON MARKETING OF DOMESTICALLY PRODUCED SUGAR UNDER SUGAR ACT OF 1948

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to suspend during the calendar year 1964, restrictions on marketing of domestically produced sugar under the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY COSTS INCURRED FOR TEMPORARY STORAGE OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred for temporary storage of household goods for military personnel, Department of Defense, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Gloucester City, N.J., Lions Club, favoring the establishment of the birthday of the late President John F. Kennedy as a national holiday, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Three postmaster nominations.

ADDITIONAL BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 2412. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lutz Adolf Kiesow, his wife, Ursula Elfriede Kiesow, and their daughter, Marion Kiesow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 2413. A bill for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli; and

S. 2414. A bill for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 875) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation, and for other purposes.

The message communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

NATIONAL ENQUIRER RETRACTS FALSE DIRKSEN STORY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in its issue of October 13, 1963, the National Enquirer, a weekly publication in New York with a nationwide circulation, published a completely false and libelous story, which I set forth at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J.F.K. SWAPS FAVORS WITH DIRKSEN

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The White House is now convinced that it pays off to help the nephew of a politically powerful Senator collect the debts owed to him by a foreign government.

President Kennedy personally interceded with Haiti's President Francois Duvalier to help a nephew of Senate Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, collect $96,000 that the Haitian Government owed him, by threatening to cut off diplomatic relations.

In exchange, DIRKSEN came out at the strategic moment in favor of President Kennedy's test ban treaty—to the surprise of both Democrats and Republicans in the Senate. It was DIRKSEN's support for the treaty that broke the back of the opposition and left only Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, among the Republican leaders still opposing the treaty.

Until President Kennedy threw his full weight behind collecting the bill owed to DIRKSEN's nephew, President Duvalier had flatly refused to even recognize the claim. J.F.K.'s move brought quick action.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no time to pursue libelous statements or threaten suit for libelous attacks, and have always gone on the theory that if a statement about me is false, malicious, and damaging, and that can be established to the satisfaction of the publisher, such a publisher, if he is an honorable person, will make retraction and apologize.

I had this article brought to the attention of the publishers in New York, and they have agreed to publish a retraction.

That retraction is set forth as follows in the January 5, 1963, issue of the National Enquirer, and speaks for itself.

I only emphasize what the retraction says, and that is that the story was absolutely false and that the publication does apologize.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTIGATION UNCOVERS INACCURATE INFORMATION

(By John Henshaw)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—This column sincerely regrets having printed an inaccurate story which reflected on the integrity of Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois. It was erroneously stated that President Kennedy had threatened to cut off diplomatic relations with Haiti as a favor to Senator DIRKSEN to help collect a $96,000 debt the Government of Haiti owed the Senator's nephew. Later investigation has shown this story to be false. We, therefore, wish to retract the story printed on October 13, 1963, and apologize to Senator DIRKSEN for its publication.

STATEMENT BY THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership have, this afternoon, released to the press a statement which goes far toward placing the efforts of the 88th Congress, 1st session, in proper focus.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP (SENATOR DIRKSEN, SENATOR KUCHEL, SENATOR HICKENLOOPER, SENATOR SALTONSTALL, SENATOR MORTON, REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK, REPRESENTATIVE ARENDS, REPRESENTATIVE BYRNES, REPRESENTATIVE FORD, REPRESENTATIVE BROWN, REPRESENTATIVE WILSON)

On February 8, 1963, the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, with all 11 leaders signing, issued its initial statement on the new legislative year. After examining the economic recommendations of the Kennedy administration, which included a proposal for a $10 billion tax cut, a $4.5 billion increase in Federal spending, and a planned $12 billion deficit, the joint leadership declared:

"The Republican goal in this Congress will be a reduction in Federal spending which can lead to a reasonable tax cut. It can be done, because we have done it. The only two major tax cuts in the last 30 years were enacted by Republican Congresses, and both times we cut spending substantially.

"We suggest to the President that full employment is much more likely by this historically sound method, than by deficit financing, which has never achieved full employment yet. Despite the fact we are outnumbered 2 to 1 in the Senate and 3 to 2 in the House, we shall strive for this sound objective in the conviction that the unemployed are only being duped by the administration's proposals.

"The Government can help solve unemployment by encouraging industry and investment capital to promote expansion and new ventures. It can help by convincing workers, consumers, and small business that inflation is not ahead. Chronic Government deficits will never stimulate American ingenuity, build confidence, or create jobs."

On February 28, the joint Senate-House Republican leadership approved an announcement by Mr. HALLECK that we had taken three steps to encourage a reduction in spending, so a tax cut would be possible.

"1. Our members of the House Appropriations Committee have set up a task force headed by Representative FRANK BOW, of Ohio, to propose cuts in Mr. Kennedy's all-time high budget.

"2. Former President Eisenhower's Budget Director, Maurice Stans, has joined the task force as an adviser.

"3. Republican members of the Senate Appropriations Committee have met with Mr. Stans and are being kept advised of the preliminary studies.

"This is not going to be a partisan effort. Many Democratic Members of Congress are just as disturbed as we are, and so are millions of Americans."

Our plan was widely ridiculed, the President proclaimed his budget "hard" and uncuttable, and the administration launched a counterattack filling 33 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with lists of projects, programs and Federal operations and Government offices that would have to shut down if we Republicans pursued our objective.

(NOTE.—These lists were produced by the White House and distributed to the press by the Democratic National Committee.)

In addition, our task force members were challenged repeatedly to make public their "worksheets" showing exactly where we proposed to cut. The challenges were steadfastly refused because we knew that every pressure that a hostile bureaucracy could exert would be brought on Members of Congress to force them to vote against reductions. The bureaucrats, even without access to our worksheets, lived up to form.

Throughout the long months of labor on the appropriations bills, the pressures exerted on the Congress by officials of the executive branch to restore cuts were, as expected, enormous. The Post Office Department threatened to curtail mail deliveries. Defense and other departments kept up a steady drumfire of protests. Even contractors to the Government were enlisted to bring pressure on Congress. Only the taxpaying public, which polls showed as believing a reduction in spending should accompany a tax cut, seemed to approve.

To their everlasting credit, our Republican Members worked tirelessly, without flinching and without limelight or fanfare, to cut spending and waste.

To their everlasting credit, a substantial number of Democrats in both the House and

Senate joined in the effort which, because of the heavy Democratic majorities in both branches, could not be successful without them. It was truly a bipartisan effort but we take satisfaction in having initiated it and having overwhelmingly supported it.

Here are the amazing results which were achieved:

Appropriation bill	Budget request	Finally approved by Congress	Net reduction
Interior	$998, 009, 000	$952, 456, 500	−$45, 552, 500
Treasury, Post Office	6, 146, 842, 000	6, 045, 466, 000	−101, 376, 000
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare	5, 759, 489, 000	5, 471, 087, 500	−288, 401, 500
Agriculture	6, 368, 755, 000	6, 224, 370, 215	−144, 384, 785
Legislative	182, 218, 450	168, 293, 069	−13, 925, 381
State, Justice, etc	2, 159, 891, 900	1, 820, 093, 000	−339, 798, 900
Defense	49, 014, 237, 000	47, 220, 010, 000	−1, 794, 227, 000
District of Columbia	52, 868, 000	40, 368, 000	−12, 500, 000
Independent offices	14, 658, 588, 000	13, 224, 518, 050	−1, 434, 069, 950
Military construction	1, 966, 400, 000	1, 585, 880, 000	−380, 520, 000
Public works	4, 561, 957, 000	4, 406, 272, 700	−155, 684, 300
Foreign aid:			
Title I	4, 525, 325, 000	3, 000, 000, 000	−1, 525, 325, 000
Titles II, III, IV, V	349, 075, 330	298, 705, 607	−50, 369, 723
Total	96, 743, 655, 680	90, 457, 520, 641	−6, 286, 135, 039

Beyond any doubt this congressional reduction of $6,286,135,039 in appropriations is the major achievement of the legislative branch during this long year, in fact, in any recent year. If the Johnson administration's budget for next year contains the economies promised by our new President, this historic action by the Congress can set the stage for a tax cut in 1964.

This $6,286,135,039 reduction in appropriations is the second largest cut in history and far exceeds any previous effort except for the action of a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and the Republican 83d Congress in cutting President Truman's budget requests for 1953–54 by $14 billion.

We, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, believe the Republicans in this Congress have again set an example and a pattern for the future in promoting sound fiscal policy. If any hardships have resulted, they are not in evidence. On the other hand, it now appears—assuming an economy budget next year—that Congress, in good faith, can enact a tax reduction in 1964, and the American people, in good conscience, can accept it.

Because of its success this year, we hope to continue our Republican task force operation in 1964. It has proven it can help eliminate waste, fat, and extravagance in even a "hard" budget.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have added, at the next printing of S. 1275, the names of the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SALES OF FARM COMMODITIES TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, at approximately 5 o'clock this morning the House voted, by a vote of 141 to 136, to recommit the conference report on the foreign aid appropriations bill to the conference committee, with instructions to the House members to refuse to concur in the amendment by the Senate deleting from the bill the provision whereby the Export-Import Bank would not be permitted to underwrite the credit of Communist countries in connection with the purchase by those countries of any products from private exporters of the United States.

This action by the House was taken in the face of a last-minute speech by the Speaker of the House himself requesting that the House not recommit the bill.

The House made this decision following debate which clearly defined the issue. The conference committee had proposed to water down the provision to which I have referred by language to the effect that the Export-Import Bank could not extend such credit, and then providing that the President of the United States could ignore this prohibition if he determined that it would be in the national interest to do so. Only yesterday the President advised the majority leader of the Senate as follows:

> In my judgment sales of wheat and other farm commodities (to Communist countries) on reasonable terms are now plainly in the national interest of the United States.

I have quoted from the President's letter which is reproduced at page 25144 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 19.

Plainly, the House by its vote does not believe that such sales on reasonable credit terms, with the credit guaranteed by the American taxpayer through the Export-Import Bank, are in the national interest. It is possible that the administration may be able to recall a few of its absentees to reverse the action of the House. But even should it be able to do so, it is evident that substantial doubt exists over whether or not the American taxpayer should underwrite the credit of Communist countries in connection with such sales. Decisions affecting the national interest should command greater support.

In my humble opinion, this controversy is both unfortunate and unnecessary. It need not have arisen at all. Only yesterday, I pointed out to my colleagues that Soviet spokesmen were recently quoted as saying that Moscow was prepared to pay for the wheat in gold or hard currency anyway, because the Soviets would prefer to take advantage of a better price for cash or at least to avoid the payment of interest on credit terms to our bankers. It seems to me that this is sufficient answer to those who have suggested that adoption of such a prohibition as has been demanded by the House would endanger sales to Russia.

I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the article from the Washington Evening Star appearing on page 25136 of yesterday's RECORD be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEADLOCK SEEN ON U.S. WHEAT SALE TO RUSSIA

Negotiations for the sale of $250 million worth of wheat to the Soviets appear to be deadlocked.

State Department officials said yesterday they knew of no indication that talks have broken off between the Soviets and American grain dealers, but Sergei A. Borisov, head of the Soviet governmental wheat group, left the United States last Wednesday without giving any sign when he would return.

* * * * *

Senate defeat earlier this week of a bill by Senator MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, to prohibit the Export-Import Bank from guaranteeing commercial credit to finance the wheat deal left the Soviets unimpressed, diplomatic informants declared. They said Moscow was prepared to pay for the wheat in gold or hard currency anyway.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, this controversy has been aggravated by an incomprehensible insistence by the White House for action on this bill before adjournment. The Agency for International Development is operating under a continuing resolution whereby it can spend money at a rate of $3.9 billion per year; whereas under the bill, when passed it will be limited to a rate of $3 billion per year. Delay of this bill until after the Christmas holidays would, if anything, enable the Agency to spend more—not less—money. Still there was insistence that the bill be passed now. Why? Not one good reason has been advanced why this bill had to pass now instead of some 2 weeks from now, when we reconvene for the second session of this Congress.

This insistence has resulted in Members of the House and Senate, who saw fit to remain in Washington, staying here on Capitol Hill since 9 a.m. Friday morning. It is now 6:30 Saturday morning. Many of us have had no sleep since Thursday night, waiting around for the House to take action, and the House Members have been similarly inconvenienced while they waited for the conference committee and Rules Committee to take action. I find this treatment by the executive branch of the legislative branch to be most inconsiderate. If there was a good reason for it, that would be different. If this were the end of the second session of the Congress it would be necessary. But there is no good reason for it now. It is whimsical and unreasonable.

I say that this controversy is unfortunate, because it has produced needless friction between the two branches of the Government at a time when mutual trust, confidence, and respect between the two branches is needed to enable them to fulfill their grave responsibilities to the American people.

Members of the legislative branch are human beings—not automatons. Many of my colleagues are not young men, and this sort of treatment is dangerous to their physical well-being. They are willing to do all they are able to do in the service of their country—even when such demands on their energies are unnecessary. But it is not fair to them.

I hope it will not happen again.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I listened with interest to what the distinguished Senator from Iowa has just said, and if I ever heard anyone crying against a wall, this is it. I do not think we were inconvenienced. I think we are here to serve the people's interest, and I think we should be here as many hours as necessary. The executive branch in no way forced us to stay in session tonight, and it is not to blame in any way possible. What we do is our responsibility as Senators of the United States, and I for one do not intend to let anyone in the executive branch tell me, or tell this body, if I can help it, whether it should stay in session, because I feel we are independent, we are responsible, we are mature people, and what we do we do on our own.

So I would not join those at the wailing wall. I would not blame the executive branch for our actions, and I would say that, if need be, we will continue to act in this matter.

As far as the health of anyone in this body is concerned, I think my record in that regard shows that I am as solicitous of it as anyone else.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished majority leader heard what I had to say.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did.

Mr. MILER. I hope he will recognize that not one word of what I had to say was directed at him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand.

Mr. MILLER. Without revealing any confidences, the inconvenience to which we have been subjected—and it has been a great inconvenience to everyone—has not been of any making whatever of the majority leader of the Senate.

I repeat what I said. With all due deference to our great majority leader, I say that this situation is not good, and that it does not make for good relations between the two branches. I still would like to find out what the great importance is of passing the foreign aid bill now, especially when the rate of spending would be greater if the bill laid over for another 2 weeks instead of having the bill, which will total approximately $3 billion, passed now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is probably one of the reasons why the Senate should consider the bill.

I point out to the Senator that Congress has been in session for almost 12 months. It is up to us to face our responsibilities as they come along.

So far as inconveniencing anyone is concerned, I do not believe any Senator has been inconvenienced. We are paid by the people of the United States to look after their interests. We may disagree on legislation. However, so far as meeting tonight is concerned, I take full responsibility for it. I do not attribute any blame to the executive branch. It does not deserve it.

Mr. MILLER. I am not criticizing our leader at all. If anything, I praise him, because I think he has been attempting to avoid this situation. It is my understanding that he attempted to avoid it.

Many Members of Congress have left Washington. The fact is that many of them became sick and tired of the continued delay and great inconvenience and decided to go home. They decided to do so particularly when they could not see any good reason for disposing of this bill now. I do not know of any Member of Congress who would not have been present if he could have seen a good reason for action on the foreign aid bill appropriations bill at this time.

I believe the relationship between the two branches has been unnecessarily strained, as I said before. Not one word of criticism is leveled by me at the majority leader. I know he understands that. If anything, I praise him for attempting to avoid this unfortunate situation. However, I hope other parties involved will take appropriate action to see that the situation will not be repeated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the Senator's statements.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 599), as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.
>
> *Resolved,* That a committee of 32 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
>
> *Resolved,* That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 239) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the second resolving clause, the Chair appoints the two Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT] the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

ADJOURNMENT TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move, as a further mark of respect and honor to the memory of the late Representative WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., of Pennsylvania, that the Senate adjourn, in accordance with the order previously entered, until 12 o'clock noon today.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), Saturday, December 21, 1963, the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until 12 o'clock noon of the same day.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate December 20 (legislative day of December 18), 1963:

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. John B. Colwell, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 20 (legislative day of December 18), 1963:

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Marguerite M. Fanning, Burbank.

CONNECTICUT

Elizabeth N. Bojarski, Hanover.
James A. D'Amato, Morris.
Helen D. Whitaker, Suffield.

IDAHO

Eugene W. MacDonald, Coeur d'Alene.
Parlette W. Petersen, Rexburg.
Ella M. Dixon, Stites.

ILLINOIS

Glenn E. Jones, Bulpitt.

LOUISIANA

Earline F. Lowrey, Lisbon.

MINNESOTA

James F. Kuelbs, Gaylord.
Earl W. Rueckert, Grove City.
Edward W. Appel, Millville.
Alvin H. Groen, Murdock.

MISSISSIPPI

Lawrence C. Skipper, Jr., Gholson.
Lula L. Chatham, Rose Hill.

NEVADA

Susan I. Brizendine, Black Springs.
Charles L. Connor, Henderson.

OKLAHOMA

William L. Bond, Madill.
Charles B. Harjo, Sasakwa.
Betty J. Lozano, Wann.
Charles M. Horner, Welch.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace and good will toward men.

O Thou God of love and of light, may the beautiful spirit of the gracious and hallowed Christmas, which is the high festal day in the annals of time, now possess and permeate the heart of all mankind with joy and peace.

May that great and glorious day, whose meaning our finite minds cannot fully comprehend, send forth its radiant splendor and healing flame into every land and life, every heart and home, for no explorer has ever discovered a place where hearts do not break or a clime where tears do not flow.

Grant that the Christmas spirit of generosity and good will, of sympathy and service, may last through all the coming days, encircling them with happiness and hope, and safeguarding them from greed and selfishness.

Hear us in the name of our Saviour, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1211. An act to admit the vessels *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point to* American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Herbert R. Schaff;

H.R. 1560. An act for the relief of Constantinos A. Grigoras (Gregoras);

H.R. 2292. An act for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee;

H.R. 2364. An act for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.;

H.R. 4099. An act for the relief of Jesse Leigh, Jr.;

H.R. 4505. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and determine a motion for a new trial on the claim of Robert Alexander;

H.R. 4759. An act for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, Frank Grove, Harry P. Nash, Jr., and Michael J. Neofitou;

H.R. 5746. An act for the relief of Robert H. Bagby;

H.R. 6181. An act for the relief of Mr. Rudolph Sanderson, of Meriden, Kans.;

H.R. 6468. An act for the relief of Harold J. Burke;

H.R. 6807. An act for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co., Inc.;

H.R. 7019. An act to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land and improvements in the village of Odanah, Wis., taken by the Federal Government;

H.J. Res. 680. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate 1964 as "U.S. Customs Year"; and

H.J. Res. 848. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of February in each year as "American Heart Month."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1887. An act for the relief of Yon Ok Kim, Chang In Wu, and Jung Yol Sohn.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier;

S. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grün (Susanne Roth);

S. 1175. An act to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

S. 1319. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents;

S. 1838. An act for the relief of Hannah Robbins;

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; and

S. Con Res. 57. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 439. An act for the relief of Jose L. Rodriguez;

S. 1017. An act for the relief of Angelo Coppola;

S. 1328. An act for the relief of Woo Zee-Ching;

S. 1445. An act for the relief of Archie L. Dickson, Jr.;

S. 2071. An act for the relief of Nina Carmela Pirritano;

S. 2073. An act for the relief of Roza Feuer;

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution designating the period from January 12, 1964, to January 18, 1964, as International Printing Week; and

S. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late President, John F. Kennedy.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

DECEMBER 20, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as member of the board of directors of Gallaudet College.

Highest regards.

Respectfully,

HOMER THORNBERRY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the board of directors of Gallaudet College the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in the District of Columbia, commencing on January 14, 1964, the following members on the part of the House:

Mr. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey, chairman.
Mrs. KELLY, of New York.
Mr. DULSKI, of New York.
Mr. MURPHY, of Illinois.
Mr. GIAIMO, of Connecticut.
Mr. JOHNSON, of California.
Mr. SLACK, of West Virginia.
Mr. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan.
Mr. TUPPER, of Maine.
Mr. ROBISON, of New York.
Mr. BATTIN, of Montana.
Mr. ANDREWS, of North Dakota.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 249]

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Ashley
Ashmore
Bass
Becker
Belcher
Blatnik
Bolling
Bray
Brock
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Colmer
Conte
Cramer
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derounian
Devine
Diggs
Donohue
Dorn
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Evins
Fino
Flynt
Foreman
Forrester
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodell
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Hall
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lesinski
Lloyd
McCulloch
McIntire
McLoskey
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Minshall
Montoya
Morris
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Ostertag
Philbin
Pilcher
Powell
Purcell
Quillen
Rains
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Staebler
Stephens
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Van Pelt
Watson
Wharton
Whitener
Williams
Willis
Wydler
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 288 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ETHICS, ADVERTISING, AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an informative speech made by David J. Murphy, Director, Bureau of Deceptive Practices, Federal Trade Commission, entitled "Ethics, Advertising, and Responsibilities," before the Georgetown University and Catholic apostolate of mass media.

It is indeed a pleasure to participate in this conference on "Ethics, Advertising, and Responsibilities."[1]

May I observe that in relation to advertising it may be more descriptive to refer to the responsibilities and obligations of the advertiser rather than his ethics and morals. These words—"ethics" and "morals"—are high-sounding terms and appear to belong more in a philosophical frame of reference rather than in a reference to advertising—whether it is deceptive or not. At the same time, we recognize that there is a moral concept involved in the observance of law generally, even though compliance with law may provide only a minimum standard of conduct. There is an element of "morality" inherent in the Federal Trade Commission Act in prohibiting "unfair" practices which includes deceptive advertising. However, rather than calling it "moral" or "ethical" to obey the law, may I refer instead to legal responsibilities and obligations.

The courts have recently reminded us that there is no constitutional right to disseminate deceptive advertising.[2] On the contrary, there is a constitutional responsibility and obligation not to disseminate deceptive advertising.

There is severe criticism of certain current advertising practices. Complaints by consumers and business competitors are appreciably increasing. We appreciate the great contributions advertising has made to the economic and business life of the country, so we do not subscribe to the extreme criticism that advertising is an unproductive industry.

But it must be recognized that deception does exist in a wide variety of advertising, not only locally but also nationally and regionally, and there are involved certain responsibilities and obligations.

A prominent advertising manager at a meeting of advertising men asked:

"How many of us here can say that he's never been a party to deceptive advertising; that he has never, at the very least, allowed advertising of one kind or another to go by him that encouraged favorable but untrue inferences about his product?

"And who among us has not been so mesmerized by the lyricism of a piece of copy, or the beauty of a layout, or the poetic tintinabulations of a musical commercial, that he has ignored the consumer's rightful desire to be held told quickly and clearly—without a lot of meaningless guff—how the product will benefit him?"

It is no answer to say deceptive advertising represents only a small percentage of the $12½ billion figure for all yearly advertising. It may be a small percentage, but it is a loud and dramatic percentage, a persistent and repetitive percentage. Moreover, it is a harmful percentage—it hurts everybody—the advertiser, business, consumer. It operates against the public interest and at times insults public intelligence. It cannot be ignored.

It is no answer to say there has been a vast improvement throughout the years in advertising standards. While this is acknowledged, it must be admitted that there is still room for further vast improvement. While the outright lie may not be evident slick, clever, sophisticated choice of words and pictures which convey an implication and impression contrary to fact is many times quite evident.

It is no answer to say there is no intent to deceive. Intention is not necessary. The test is not the intent of the advertiser, but the understanding of the consumer. The question is, "Does the advertising have the capacity to deceive?" Many times the motivation is quite clear—to place an impression in the minds of consumers in regard to a product or a service, an impression that is simply not true.

Let us look at a few examples:

A. The problem of hair loss and baldness. There is no known drug preparation, device or method of treatment which may be truthfully advertised as a cure or competent treatment for common baldness. The common baldness (male patent baldness), which constitutes 95 percent of all baldness, is considered permanent and incurable. Despite a large number of actions by the Federal Trade Commission, advertising for worthless preparations, devices and treatments continue to defraud the gullible public. It is estimated that 25 percent—one out of four, of men 25 years old—have some stage of baldness and that approximately. $12 million are spent annually on these preparations.

B. Arthritis and rheumatism are common ailments of aged people. It is estimated there are about 12 million people in the United States afflicted in some manner with these illnesses. It is estimated that about $32 million were spent during 1962 for arthritic and rheumatic pain-relieving drugs. These drugs include pills, salves, ointments, rub-ins, devices—claiming adequate and permanent cures. The Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation estimates that all forms of "frauds and fallacies" cost arthritis sufferers $250 million annually. The Commission has issued several complaints and orders to cease and desist prohibiting these extravagant claims and, in any event, limiting claims to temporary relief of minor aches and pains. Yet advertisers, with claims for cures, still continue to give empty hope to the afflicted.

C. Cold and cough product advertising. It is estimated that about 500 million cases of common cold occur annually. This provides a wide and fertile area for the advertiser in making extravagant claims for the various products with respect to relief of symptoms. But the overall effect is an implied representation that colds can be cured. There is, at the present time, no drug or combination of drugs known to medical science which will prevent or cure the common cold. It is estimated that the consumer spent about $375 million in 1962 for these cold products. Advertisers compete with each other in the extravagance of their claims. Where is the responsibility of the advertising industry?

D. Consider the full-page nationwide newspaper advertising of so-called land developers. Thousands of families have been attracted by clever advertising to buy, sight unseen, marginal land with the hope of establishing retirement or vacation homes. In most instances the land—arid, desert wasteland—is extravagantly advertised. A brief, on-the-scene inspection would have disclosed that, contrary to the advertising, there were no utilities, no streets, no schools, no churches, and, in a few cases, there was no water or vegetation. It is estimated that last year alone $500 million was paid out or committed for payment on installment plans, for mail-order land. The Commission initiated over 15 investigations in this area—these actions are being coordinated with activities of the Post Office Department and the Department of Justice to prevent fraudulent use of the mails.

E. Fictitious prices. Probably the primary evil of deceptive advertising involves fictitious pricing. Fictitious pricing may be defined generally as a representation that a selling price of a product is a bona fide reduction from a former price, when, in fact, the product rarely, if ever, has been sold at the former price, in the trade area where the product was offered. The Commission issued guides against this practice which is common to many industries. The Commission has also in this area issued several complaints and orders to cease and desist—it has many times been sustained by the courts in these matters—yet advertisers continue to use this technique and are inventing new terms and phrases to cover the same practice.

Perhaps the answer to these problems lies with an industry program of self-regulation that is effective and realistic with an adequate and recognized authority. Attempts heretofore made in self-regulation have not generally been successful.

The Federal Trade Commission has responsibilities in this area of advertising. It has the widest advertising jurisdiction of any Federal agency. This jurisdiction extends to all media and with few exceptions to all commodities. The Federal Trade Commission is the only Federal agency equipped by statute, by personnel, by experience, and by procedures to perform this most vital responsibility. It is meeting its responsibilities by promulgating new procedures and techniques to speed up the administrative process.

In addition to its formal proceedings, the Commission has adopted and employed several informal procedures and techniques in meeting the challenges of deceptive advertising, including consent settlement procedure, trade practice conference rules, advertising guides, trade regulation rules, advisory opinions, assurances of discontinuance, and compliance advertising.

Once again—in a period of 2 years—we have overhauled and revised our rules of practice in order that we may more expeditiously be of genuine assistance to business and the public; in order that unfair acts and practices, including deceptive advertising, may be eliminated. We have employed the industrywide approach, when practicable, to avoid the singling out of one competitor when his competitors are engaged in the same practice.

It is not practical to think the Federal Trade Commission can, by itself, regulate and control all deceptive advertising. We are comparatively a small institution. Each of the 100 largest advertisers spends in excess of $6,900,000 per year for advertising—an amount which is more than 6 times greater than the total allocation of funds to the Bureau of Deceptive Practices of the Commission. The Bureau's funds must be used not only for regulation of advertising but for prevention of deceptive labeling and numerous other forms of deceptive schemes and practices.

---

[1] Remarks are personal and not official.

[2] Murray Space Shoe Corp., et al., FTC docket 7476 (CCA 2, June 7, 1962); the Regina Corp., FTC Docket 8323 (CCA 3, Aug. 19, 1963).

Advertising, with its twelve and one-half billion dollar budget, exerts a vital and tremendous force in the growth and prosperity of a free American economy. Because of this vast influence, the advertising industry— its whole chain of command—the advertiser—the agency—and the advertising media—has corresponding responsibilities and obligations.

It is appreciated that—stripped of its fanfare—the primary purpose of advertising is to sell advertising—is salesmanship—whether in picture, in print, or in voice. In the selling process advertising men have a right to make a profit. But they have no right, in selling, to deceive the consumer. I do not think it is an unjust criticism of advertising to allege that advertising men are more creative in promoting or selling a product or a service than they are in avoiding deception.

Business and the advertising fraternities must assume greater responsibilities of properly and honestly informing the consumer of the qualities and value of their products and services without the use of false and misleading statements and without disparaging observations of competitive products.

The advertising industry should be aware, and no doubt is, of two very important factors:

1. There are approximately 200 bills which affect advertising, directly or indirectly, which have been introduced in this 88th Congress.

2. In July 1962, the President appointed the Consumer Advisory Council to provide Federal agencies with advice on broad issues of economic policies and on governmental programs protecting consumer rights, the right to safety, the right to be informed, the right to choose, the right to be heard. Thus, the consumer heretofore not effectively organized—is now being recognized in an advisory capacity in governmental deliberations of these problems. It has recently rendered its first annual report to the President.

It behooves the advertising industry, therefore, to appreciably intensify and coordinate and strengthen its attempts at self-regulation or assume the serious risk of increased regulation by the Federal Government.

BANK ENCROACHMENT INTO THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIELD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prohibit banks from performing certain nonbanking services.

The bill would prohibit any national bank, banks operating under the laws of the District of Columbia, banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System, or banks whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, from performing any clerical, administrative, bookkeeping, statistical, accounting, or other similar services for its depositors, borrowers, or other customers, except to the extent that such services are necessary and incidental to the proper discharge of the lawful functions of such banks.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, banks and other financial institutions are increasingly offering to their business customers, bookkeeping, accounting, and clerical services which would not ordinarily come within their province under the traditional concept of banking as it has developed in this country. These additional services are made possible by extensive investments in data processing and other automated recordkeeping equipment. No one can object to these financial institutions acquiring this equipment to better enable them to service their customers during the course of their normal banking functions. To broaden these services, however, to include the taking over of bookkeeping and accounting functions for businessmen should not be allowed to continue. Not only is it outside of the realm of normal banking procedure, it is also a serious encroachment into the sphere of those professionally trained and equipped to perform these services for their business community. There is no substitute in the accounting field for the competence and judgment of trained individuals. No data processing machine or its automation-oriented technician can supply that competence and judgment.

The accounting profession, like the medical and legal professions, is and should be confidential, individual and personal.

Congress should take a very close look at this problem and adopt legislation such as I have proposed to return the banks to their proper functions and get them out of the accounting business.

THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, you will please allow me to express my gratification to the conferees on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the House and Senate on H.R. 7885, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, upon their refusal to accept the amendment to this bill by the Senate which provided that funds made available by the act "may be used to conduct research into the problem of controlling population growth and to provide technical and other assistance to cooperating countries in carrying on programs of population control."

While the House managers did have to agree that funds under the act would be available to conduct research into the problems of population growth, such funds cannot be used in any way toward assisting a recipient country in birth control. I believe that our providing funds to any country to implement such a population control program is totally beyond the proper concept or purpose of our foreign assistance program. This involves questions of morality and propriety which are personal to the people involved and to their own government, if any government has anything to do with the subject.

I warmly commend the farsightedness on the part of the managers of the House on this matter and I am particularly gratified that the House supported its managers in respect to this subject and that the Senate also has retreated from the position it first took respecting the matter.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH LANGUAGE PRESS IN AMERICA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the people of Chicago will pay tribute this Sunday, the 22d of December, to the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Polish language press in the United States.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, we in the Government, and outside the Government, overlook the one single factor which has made America the great nation that it is; the fact that we have brought to this country the best of traditions and cultural contributions from all other countries of the world.

Those who have come to this country from Poland can look with pride upon their own contributions, just as quite properly those who have come from Ireland, France, Italy, Germany, the Scandinavian countries, Russia, and all the other countries can look with pride to their own ethnic contribution to America.

The impressive contribution made by Americans of Polish descent to their newly adopted country would not have been possible without the untiring efforts of the Polish language press.

In Chicago, to this day, we have three excellent Polish language newspapers, two published daily except Sunday and a third published bimonthly. The Chicago Polish Daily News, published by the Resurrection Fathers, is the oldest Polish language newspaper in America today. The Polish Daily Zgoda, published by the Polish National Alliance, is the other Polish language daily published in Chicago.

The Narod, published by the Polish Roman Catholic Union, is circulated twice a month.

There are also Polish language newspapers in New York, in Milwaukee, in Cleveland, in Detroit, and many other communities in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, these Polish language newspapers have provided the bridge toward becoming loyal Americans to millions of immigrants who have come to this country from Poland during the past 100 years. The Polish language press has been the catalyst for bringing together in America, all of those highly desirable attributes of struggle for freedom and respect for human dignity which have been so much a part of the Polish spirit for centuries.

We cannot pay too high a tribute to the great contribution made by these Polish language newspapers toward orienting the new immigrant with America's democratic processes.

Even though there are more than 15 million Americans of Polish descent scattered throughout the United States, it is a known fact that these Americans of Polish descent have produced no defectors to an alien cause; they have produced among the most gallant soldiers for our armies; the crime rate is impressively low in the Polish communities of America; and those activities which emphasize religious scruples and strong family ties are exceptionally high in Polish communities.

It is a known fact that employers throughout this country shower high praise on these people for their reliability and industriousness.

All of these attributes can be traced, to a great extent, to the guidance and influence of the Polish language press and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have taken the time today to call the attention of my colleagues to this impressive anniversary.

It is important to recall that the foreign language press in this country, whether Polish or otherwise, has operated under extremely difficult conditions. These foreign language newspapers have been high on ideals but always low on financial support. Yet, in the highest tradition of American journalism, they have managed to keep their publications going because of their deep belief in a cause for America.

I know that the editors and reporters who publish the foreign language press of America traditionally have been underpaid for their efforts. Most of these men could apply their talents to any number of other occupations much more rewarding financially. It has been my privilege to live closely with the dedicated men of the foreign language press and I know, Mr. Speaker, from my own observations, the extreme difficulties under which these foreign language newspapers have continued to operate. Yet, we today as a nation, are that much richer in culture and social standards because the foreign language press was able to provide that guidance and inspiration to millions of America's loyal immigrants which the English language press could not accomplish simply because they could not communicate with these people in their own native tongue.

In paying tribute to the 100th anniversary of the Polish language press in America, we are at once paying tribute to the imposing contributions made by Americans of Polish descent to this country. The two are inseparable. It would be my hope that those sophisticates in America who have never been able to quite appreciate the inspiring contributions made by immigrant groups in this country, would on this 100th anniversary recognize how shortsighted are their views; how unfair are their conclusions. It would be my hope that on this 100th anniversary of the Polish language press in America, we Americans could adopt a new attitude toward the entire foreign language press of this country and recognize that it continues to play an integral role in our development. More so, Mr. Speaker, we should recognize that as America becomes not only the crossroad but the leader of the world, bilingualism becomes even more important to us as Americans. The foreign language press in this country can be the most effective instrument for developing bilingualism among our people, and it is for this reason that I sincerely hope we, as free Americans, will do everything possible to help assure continued operations for the foreign language press in our country. I hope that American industry, above all, will help these foreign language newspapers continue publication by using their advertising facilities and want ad columns when they need help for their factories.

May we all join in paying tribute on this 100th anniversary to the Polish language press of America. Those who publish it, have made as great a contribution to America's survival as any other warrior in our noble cause.

SECOND AMENDMENT OF OUR CONSTITUTION IS NOT A BLANKET LICENSE FOR INDIVIDUALS TO BEAR ARMS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the tragic events of November 22, a great deal of discussion is being carried on throughout the Nation and here in Congress regarding legislation to restrict the sale of arms to unauthorized persons.

I am sure we can all understand the great concern of our citizens over this subject when the mad killer who murdered our late President Kennedy was able to purchase his rifle through the mail under an assumed name.

There is a very formidable movement among the citizens of our Nation for legislation to impose greater controls on this distribution of weapons. In my own district, the Nor'wes'ton Congress, representing a large number of civil and social organizations on Chicago's Northwest Side, is strongly in favor of stronger legislation to deal with this subject.

Those who oppose most suggestions for greater control of the sale of arms in this country usually argue that such restrictions would prove ineffective to the criminal who is intent upon getting a gun. I have previously cited strict laws in England dealing with guns and how this makes murder virtually unknown in the British Isles.

Also in this group of opponents are those who strongly argue that the second amendment to the U.S. Constitution clearly establishes a right for citizens to bear arms.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself today expressly to the subject of constitutional guarantees. Several of my constituents, who apparently are interested in this subject by virtue of their own gun collections or hunting activity, have stressed the constitutional guarantees.

My own research in this subject indicates that, all other considerations being equal, the argument that there are constitutional rights for an individual to bear arms does not seem to stand up in the light of known facts.

The second article of the Constitution provides:

> A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

I have long contended that this provision applies to the State militia and its collective right as a group to bear arms. I submit there is nothing in this second amendment that guarantees a constitutional right to bear arms to the individual.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in the Declaration of Rights, it was complained that kings had disarmed the people. We all know that the early colonists were, by the very nature of their circumstances, bearers of arms.

But the right to bear arms was not regarded in English law as a fundamental right. The Statute of Northampton—2 Edward III, chaper 3; 1328—prohibited armed rides at night and by day in certain public places.

On the other hand, from very early times landed proprietors were required to have in readiness, according to their degree and estate, specified arms, equipment, and men-at-arms for military service when the Government called upon them. These landed proprietors, with their armed tenants and retainers, constituted the military forces—milites—the militia of the land; no other armed force was recognized as lawful.

Charles II and James II sought, however, to establish royal armies and to disarm the militia. After the Revolution of 1688, the Declaration of Rights declared that these efforts of the Stuart monarchs had been an "endeavour to subvert and extirpate the laws and liberties of this kingdom" and were contrary to law. In the subsequent statutory Bill of Rights based on that declaration, it was enacted "That the raising or keeping a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace unless it be with the consent of parliament is against the law."

It was the evident purpose of this guarantee of the right to bear arms to preserve the laws and liberties of England and not to enable a subject to violate them.

In the American Colonies every able-bodied man capable of military service was required to enroll himself for such service, provide himself with guns and be ready to use them in the common defense. Later, when royal oppression—particularly in the form of royal soldiers stationed in the Colonies in the time of peace, who were often quartered in citizens' homes against their will—threatened, the citizen-soldiery was relied upon for the defense of basic rights and eventually to fight the Revolutionary War against England.

The Federal Constitution and the Bills of Rights of the new States, therefore, included guaranties of the right to bear arms, to insure that their freedoms would not be infringed upon by the Central Government. All of these guaranties of the right to bear arms, however absolute they may appear to be as words, must be construed in connection with the well-known objection to standing armies and the general belief in the need and sufficiency of a well-regulated militia for the defense of the people and the state. Thus construed it is a provision for preserving to the people the right and power of organized military defense of themselves and the state and of organized military resistance to unlawful acts of the government itself, as in the case of the American Revolution. The right to bear arms does not refer to the individual or the unorganized crowd, but organized military units of the state.

On August 17, 1789, the House of Representatives of the First Congress took up the proposed second amendment to the new Constitution, 1 of 12 amendments—10 passed Congress—which were to compose the Bill of Rights. As originally proposed, this amendment read as follows:

> A well regulated militia, composed of the body of the people, being the best security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed; but no person religiously scrupulous shall be compelled to bear arms.

Mr. Gerry, at page 749 of volume 1 of the Annals of Congress, said:

> This declaration of rights, I take it, is intended to secure the people against the maladministration of the Government; if we could suppose that, in all cases, the rights of the people would be attended to, the occasion for guards of this kind would be removed. What, sir, is the use of a militia? It is to prevent the establishment of a standing army, the bane of liberty. Whenever governments mean to invade the rights and liberties of the people, they always attempt to destroy the militia, in order to raise an army upon their ruins.

The rest of the debate in Congress on this amendment was to the same effect. The "religious scruples" section was taken out, but its original inclusion clearly showed that the right to bear arms was only a group right related to the militia service felt necessary to bolster a free State.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a whole series of judicial cases dealing with the subject which I shall be very happy to include in the record today along with my remarks.

I do not believe that anybody wants to interfere with the legitimate gun collector. I myself have enjoyed viewing some extremely interesting collections of weapons assembled by my closest friends. Nor would I ever want to do anything to interfere with the legitimate hunter who possesses effective rifles to pursue his sport. I am also cognizant of the fact that even at this late date, there are still many people in our country who rely on hunting for their livelihood, especially in the barren areas of our country.

No legislation that I would suggest would ever deny these legitimate users of weapons the right to continue using such weapons. But it is my understanding that every hunter in this country must first get a license to hunt and therefore I don't see how any legislation requiring a national registration of firearms, for instance, would in any way affect the hunter. He now is already registering his rifle.

Nor would laws more thoroughly controlling the sale of weapons interfere with the legitimate gun collector.

The legislation now pending in Congress is designed to protect our communities, not from the legitimate hunter or the bona fide gun collector or even the citizen who purchases a gun to protect himself and his property in our teeming urban communities, but from the killer who has no respect for law and order when he pursues his path of crime.

I am confident that none of the good people could have any bona fide objection to this law because I do not believe these people buy their guns through the mail. I am confident that these people buy their weapons from duly authorized and responsible gun dealers. I do not see how any law mentioned so far, including a proposal that hereafter any one purchasing a gun would have to first file his application with local police authorities, could be objected to. Nor could I see any objection to having local police screen mail-order applications for the purchase of weapons. There are those who argue that this provision would give the police department a record of where all the guns are and that if some diabolic scheme ever comes around for the overthrow of our Government, the first victims would be those who possess firearms in this country. I cannot help but feel that this argument just would not hold water. Those who point to countries that were taken over by dictators ignore the fact that many other factors contributed to the collapse of freedom.

It is my belief that the Congress should study all aspects of this problem. I believe the American Rifle Association should be given ample opportunity to present its views, but I think that those proposing this legislation should have an equal opportunity to state their views. I would be my hope that an appropriate committee would start holding hearings on this very important subject right after the first of the year so that we can indeed pass meaningful legislation without disturbing the legitimate rights of legitimate weapons owners in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe, however, that this entire subject should wait any longer. It is one that affects our Nation very vitally and certainly is deserving of at least a very thorough discussion of the subject. I am confident that responsible men here in Congress can recognize the inconveniences that legislation now before the Congress would create for gun owners, and I am sure that this Congress can take all of these factors into consideration before reporting out a workable bill.

But I firmly believe that we have waited much too long in dealing with this problem. We were all stunned with the tragic assassination of our President but, it is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that other tragedies occur all over America every day and it is absolutely inconceivable to me how responsible organizations in this country and well-meaning citizens can continue to oppose all efforts to at least control the fantastic flow of weapons in this country.

We are a young nation as the histories of other nations of the world are measured. Because we are a young nation, I believe it is imperative that we start a logical program to bring this whole question of firearms into proper perspective. Mr. Speaker, following are the judicial cases which I have referred to earlier and which, in my judgment, certainly fortify my contention that there is no constitutional guarantee to an individual for the carrying of arms. I cannot help but feel that unless this relatively young nation deals with this problem forthrightly, by the end of this decade and certainly by the end of this century this whole business of weapons will become so monumental it may very well inundate us.

Before coming to Congress I was a police reporter for the Chicago Sun-Times. I saw the ravages of murder. I saw what this does to the bereaved family. I saw, only too frequently, how a completely irresponsible crazed killer with a gun in his hand turned to murder when there was no other way to escape.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware that any law that we pass here in Congress will not be able to deal completely with this problem. But as our late and beloved President once stated in recalling an old proverb, "Even a journey of 1,000 miles requires a first step."

Mr. Speaker, let us begin.

The court decisions follow:

In *United States* v. *Miller*, 307 U.S. 174 (1939), the defendant was prosecuted for the interstate transportation and possession of a shotgun in violation of the National Firearms Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1237). The defendant asserted that the act was invalid under the second amendment. The trial court agreed with this claim, but the Supreme Court reversed the judgment, holding that—

> In the absence of any evidence tending to show that possession or use of a "shotgun having a barrel of less than 18 inches in length" at this time has some reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well regulated militia, we cannot say that the second amendment guarantees the right to keep and bear such an instrument. Certainly it is not within judicial notice that this weapon is any part of the ordinary military equipment or that its use could contribute to the common defense.

The Court declared that the "obvious purpose" of the second amendment was to render effective the provisions in the Constitution providing for the maintenance and calling forth of the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions. The Court said:

> It (the second amendment) must be interpreted and applied with that end in view.
>
> The Militia which the States were expected to maintain and train is set in contrast with troops which they were forbidden to keep without the consent of Congress. The senti-

> ment of the time strongly disfavored standing armies; the common view was that adequate defense of country and laws could be secured through the Militia-civilians primarily, soldiers on occasion.

The Court went on to review the history of the right to bear arms, including debates in the Constitutional Convention, the history and legislation of Colonies and States, and the writings of commentators, and found that they all plainly show that the State relied on the organized body of all able-bodied men, equipped with their own weapons and ammunition, for the preservation of liberty, order, and independence. Adam Smith, in his "Wealth of Nations"—book V, chapter 1—stated:

> Men of republican principles have been jealous of a standing army as dangerous to liberty.

Osgood, in "The American Colonies in the 17th Century," volume 1, chapter XIII, notes that in the New England Colonies, as in England, the militia system was based on the principle of the assize of arms, that is, the general obligation of all adult male inhabitants to possess arms and to cooperate in the work of defense.

Clauses intended to insure the possession of arms and ammunition by all who were subject to military service appear in all the important enactments of these Colonies which concern military affairs. He notes that New York and Virginia had similar laws.

United States v. *Tot*, 131 F. 2d 261 (1942; 3d C.C.A.) involved the prosecution, under the Federal Firearms Act, of the unlawful possession of a .32 caliber Colt automatic pistol by a person who had previously been convicted of a crime of violence. The Court upheld the act against a claim that it contravened the second amendment, saying:

> Weapon bearing was never treated as anything like an absolute right by the common law. It was regulated by statute as to time and place as far back as the Statute of Northampton in 1328 and on many occasions since.

States having a similar constitutional provision have long upheld regulations of the carrying of firearms under their police powers. The Court held that the classification of the act—persons dangerous to society—was entirely reasonable—comparing it to the situation of a child or mentally unstable person—and did not infringe on the second amendment.

The Court reviewed the discussions of this amendment contemporaneous with its proposal and adoption and those of subsequent commentators and recognized that the second amendment, unlike the first amendment, "was not adopted with individual rights in mind, but as a protection for the States in the maintenance of their militia organizations against possible encroachments by the Federal power." The experiences in England under James II of an armed royal force quartered upon a defenseless citizenry was fresh in the minds of the Colonists. They wanted no repetition of that experience in their newly formed government. The Tot case was reversed on other grounds not involving the second amendment in *Tot* v. *United States*, 319 U.S. 463 (1943).

In the Miller case the rule announced was that any weapon not bearing some reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well-regulated militia was not protected by the second amendment and thus was subject to Federal regulation. In *Cases* v. *United States*, 131 F. 2d 916 (1942), the First Circuit Court of Appeals doubted that the Supreme Court meant this as a comprehensive and complete statement of the rule, because this would lead to anomalous results; virtually every lethal weapon has military application, and to follow the Miller case absolutely would limit the Federal Government to the regulation of flintlock muskets, matchlock harquebuses and other such curiosities having no military efficacy. The court in Cases preferred to proceed on an ad hoc basis, deciding each case on its own facts, thus picking out what is and what is not valid Federal regulation by the decided cases falling on each side of such division. This case involved a .38 caliber Colt type revolver which the defendant used to shoot up a nightclub. The Court decided this use of a firearm was not within the second amendment because the defendant was not a member of any military organization, his use of the weapon was not in preparation for a military career: he was "simply on a frolic of his own without any thought or intention of contribution to the efficiency of the well-regulated militia which the second amendment was designed to foster as necessary to the security of a free State."

Presser v. *Illinois*, 116 U.S. 252 (1886), makes it clear that the term "militia" in the second amendment means the National Guard or other State-created bodies of troops, and not private military units.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express appreciation to the members of the House Committee on the District of Columbia for their extraordinary efforts, cooperation and diligence during this session of the Congress. By their studies, considerations and dispositions of legislative matters before them, they have so ably assisted the Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibility of governing the Nation's Capital.

This has been perhaps the busiest session our committee has experienced, certainly in recent years. Within a month of the convening of this Congress, the House Committee on the District of Columbia commenced hearings and investigations, starting with joint sessions, initiated by our committee, with the District Committee of the other body, to look into the alarming crime situation in this Capital City. Hardly a week has gone by since that the committee or subcommittees have not been in session, either in open hearings taking evidence, or in executive meetings thrashing out legislation deemed by the committee to be necessary for the District officials to carry out their delegated responsibilities.

The subcommittee chairmen, in particular, have contributed materially and magnificently by their advices and time, their study and devotion to the committees' tasks, and to the record of achievement summarized below.

The committees are deserving of well-earned respite from their labors, and I wish for them all a refreshing holiday season with their families. We shall be on hand again, with the convening of the next session in the new year, to continue in our determined efforts to meet the needs of the Nation's Capital.

Specifically, I wish to report on the activities of the committee in this session as follows:

First. During this first session of the 88th Congress, 201 bills and joint resolutions have been referred to the House Committee on the District of Columbia, 183 of these being House bills and joint resolutions and 18 being Senate-passed bills.

Second. Over 166 scheduled meetings have been held by the committee or subcommittees thereof. Of these, 122 were open hearings, of which 90 were subcommittee hearings on various bills and 32 were hearings of the full committee and subcommittees on diverse subjects including joint crime and joint fiscal hearings with the District Committee of the other body, investigations of urban renewal programs in the District of Columbia, and so forth; 44 were executive meetings of the full committee and subcommittees perfecting drafts of legislation for report to the Congress.

Third. During this session, 40 bills have been reported by the District Committee to the House. All these bills have been considered and approved by the House and sent to the other body. A brief summary of the bills so reported to and approved by the House follows:

H.R. 1982—accidents, traffic reports—to require that all collisions involving motor vehicles in the District of Columbia which result in property damage in excess of $100, or in personal injury to any degree, be reported immediately to the District of Columbia Chief of Police. Presently, only collisions involving personal injury are required to be so reported.

H.R. 39—Armory Board—to increase its membership to five, by adding two additional civilians, to make three civilian members plus President of the D.C. Board of Commissioners and the commanding general of the District of Columbia militia.

H.R. 5342—Association of Universalist Women—a nonprofit corporation in the District of Columbia—authorizes consolidation thereof with the Alliance of Unitarian Women—a nonprofit corporation in the State of Massachusetts. The proposed consolidation of these two women's organizations is desirable at this time for the reason that they are affiliated with the Universalist Church and the Unitarian Church of America, respectively, and a merger of these two churches has already taken place.

H.R. 4277—borrowing authority—increasing the amount which the District might borrow from $75 to $150 million, which in conference between the Houses was further increased to $175 million.

H.R. 4330—Business Corporation Act of 1954—amending the same to correct inaccuracies, improve the language of the act, and to make substantive changes to keep the act current and similar to the Model Business Corporation Act prepared by the American Bar Association, and with the statutes of the States.

H.R. 1935—Canine Corps of the Metropolitan Police Department—authorizing the expansion of said corps, presently having a strength of 50 dogs. Provision for 25 additional man-dog teams has been included in the conference report just adopted by the House in the District of Columbia appropriations bill.

H.R. 8313—credit unions—repealing the D.C. Credit Union Act as amended, to permit 16 local credit unions, presently incorporated thereunder, to be chartered under the Federal Credit Union Act along with 159 credit unions in the District already chartered under the Federal Act.

H.R. 7525—Crime and criminal procedures—an omnibus crime bill consolidating various bills and proposals into amendments to the D.C. Criminal Code in order to provide the police with additional tools for law enforcement and to assist the prosecuting officials and the courts in ameliorating crime conditions in the Nation's Capital.

H.R. 7441—dangerous and unsafe buildings—amending the act of March 1, 1889, as amended, to provide for uniform assessment of costs incurred by the District in making repairs to unsafe buildings, and providing for removal of dead or diseased trees, among other nuisances.

H.R. 7440—District of Columbia Training School—providing for voluntary admissions to this institution for mentally retarded citizens of the District of Columbia, in addition to admissions presently authorized by commitment through court order.

H.R. 682—deeds of trust—to provide for the substitution of trustees under deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by means of a written instrument entered into by all the parties or their successors in interest, notwithstanding any provision of the deed of trust to the contrary.

H.R. 6350—dental hygienists—to authorize the District of Columbia Board of Dental Examiners to waive any theoretical examination of an applicant for a license as a dental hygienist if he holds a certificate from the National Board of Dental Examiners.

H.R. 4333—discharge of parolees from supervision—to authorize the Parole Board for the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision when the Board deems that the purpose for which the parole was granted has been accomplished.

H.R. 2485—disease, communicable—to prevent the spread thereof by amending existing law so as to authorize the Department of Public Health of the District of Columbia to treat minors for venereal disease upon their own consent, when they present themselves voluntarily to the Department's health centers, rather than having to obtain such permission from their parents or guardians.

H.R. 5337—educational employees on leave—amending the act of June 12, 1940, to increase partial pay for public school teachers and other school employees while on leave of absence for educational purposes.

H.R. 7882—exemptions from attachment—amending the act of March 3, 1901, to stop the practice which has been developed of filing in the District of Columbia actions for garnishment against an employer who also has a business in Maryland, so as to secure payment by attachment of wages of an employee who is a nonresident of the District.

H.R. 6177—Federal payment to the District—increasing the authorized Federal contribution to the District from $32 to $45 million. This authorization was subsequently increased to $50 million in conference between the two Houses.

H.R. 5044—fire protection—amending the act of August 14, 1950, to require that the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia, all parties to mutual-aid firefighting agreements, indemnify each other from all claims arising from the operations of firefighters outside their own jurisdictions.

H.R. 4276—horizontal property regimes—condominium ownership—to provide for establishment of same in the District of Columbia by permitting fee simple ownership of a unit in a multiunit structure which may be designed for residence, office, the operation of any industry or business, or any other type of use, with its accessory units.

H.R. 5871—judges retirement—amending the act of April 1, 1942, to permit retirement of local judges after 10 years' service and providing for disability retirements of judges or annuities for their widows or children.

H.R. 8355—Life Insurance Act of 1934—amending the same by increasing capital stock requirements of life insurance companies organized in the District of Columbia from a minimum of $100,000 to $200,000, and other provisions respecting changes in the corporate charters and unissued stock.

H.R. 7497—Life Insurance Act of 1934—amending same with respect to the filing of annual statements by life insurance companies and publication thereof in local newspapers.

H.R. 1937—Life Insurance Act of 1934—amending same to make the District of Columbia perjury statute applicable to those persons who make false statements under oath when applying for licenses or renewal of licenses as insurance agents and brokers in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6128—Life Insurance Act of 1934—amending same to permit life insurance companies to maintain current and complete records of all stockholders either at their principal places of business or with their stock transfer agents.

H.R. 3191—life insurance companies—amending the act of February 4, 1913, regulating the lending of money on securities in the District of Columbia, so as to exempt life insurance companies from the so-called loan shark provisions, just as banks and building and loan associations are already so exempt.

H.R. 6413—milk and ice cream containers—amending the act of March 3, 1921, to permit the packaging of smaller quantities of milk, ice cream, and other dairy products than is permissible under present law.

S. 490 (H.R. 6348)—motor vehicles liens files—amending the act of July 2, 1940, by eliminating the requirement for maintenance of duplicate alphabetical files for recording and releasing liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3537—municipal court—amending the act of April 1, 1942, to increase the court's jurisdiction in cases involving $3,000 to $10,000; extending the subpena power of the court to a 25-mile jurisdiction; changing the name of the court to District of Columbia court of general sessions; changing the name of the local appellate court to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

H.R. 7399—municipal theaters—to provide for the preparation of plans for the utilization of Loew's Capitol theater and Keith's theater by purchase, lease, or otherwise, and for their operation as municipal or semimunicipal theaters.

H.R. 1933—nurses—amending the act of February 9, 1907, so as to lower from 21 to 19 years the age requirement for registration as a nurse by the Nurses' Examining Board of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3190—pour over trusts—amending the act of March 3, 1901, to authorize a testator, by the terms of his will, to pour over or add properties passing under his will to existing inter vivos trusts or testamentary trusts and thus give increased flexibility in the distribution of funds by a testator.

H.R. 4274—pupils, disciplining of—amending the act of June 20, 1906, so as to permit principals and teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia to use reasonable force in exercising their lawful authority to maintain order in the schools, and to forbid the Board of Education to abrogate this authority. At present, the District of Columbia statutes are silent on this point.

H.R. 4273—pupils, dismissal—amending the present District of Columbia compulsory school attendance law (D.C. Code, 31-207) so as to permit the suspension or dismissal of unruly pupils within the age limits of compulsory attendance.

H.R. 5081—Right-of-way over District of Columbia Training School grounds—authorizing the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell to the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co. a right-of-way for the construction of towers for a high-voltage transmission line to cross a portion of the grounds of the District Training School at Laurel, Md.

S. 489 (H.R. 2696)—Small Claims Act—amending the act of March 5, 1938 to correct an inconsistency between two provisions of law relating to actions in the small claims and conciliation branch of the court now designated the District of Columbia court of general sessions.

H.R. 6353—Unemployment Compensation Act of August 28, 1935—amending the same to require the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board to advise the Department of Public Welfare whether an applicant for public assistance is eligible to receive unemployment compensation.

H.R. 5338—Uniform Commercial Code—providing for the adoption by District of Columbia of the Uniform Commercial Code already adopted in over 23 States.

S. 933 (H.R. 5097)—Practical Nurses' Licensing Act of September 6, 1960—to permit grandfather clause licensing without written examination for applicants living in the District and practicing in the Metropolitan area for at least 6 months during the base period.

S. 1533—D.C. Transit System franchise—amending the act of July 24, 1956, so as to eliminate duplicate auditing and authorize the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, in lieu of the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission, to make an annual determination of the D.C. Transit System's net operating income, and to certify the same to the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners for the purpose of computing exemptions from the District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel and real estate taxes.

S. 2054 (H.R. 8377)—unclaimed moneys in trust—providing procedures whereby the District of Columbia government can be relieved, after a period of 10 years, of the administrative burden of maintaining unclaimed accounts of money that have been deposited in trust with an agency or department of the District government, totaling at present some $25,000.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the printing of committee activity reports for the session, as vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, I wish to remind the chairmen of all committees that the Joint Committee on Printing has very properly ruled that the printing of such reports, both as committee prints and in the RECORD, is duplication, the cost of which cannot be justified.

It is requested that committee chairmen decide whether they wish these reports printed as committee prints or in the RECORD, since the Government Printing Office will be directed not to print them both ways.

POLITICAL STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5945) to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico, with Senate amendments thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 17, after "Rico" insert ", unless prohibited by other law,".

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 1 with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. ASPINALL moves that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 1 with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment, insert: "unless prohibited under any law effective on the date of enactment of this Act,".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 2: Page 3, strike out all after line 20 over to and including line 3 on page 4 and insert:
>
> "(c) The Commission is authorized and directed to call upon the head of any Federal department or agency to furnish information and assistance which the Commission deems necessary for the performance of its functions, and the heads of such departments and agencies are authorized and directed to furnish such assistance and information, unless prohibited under other law, without reimbursement."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 2 with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. ASPINALL moves that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 2 with amendments as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment insert:
>
> "(c) The Commission is authorized and directed to call upon the head of any Federal department or agency to furnish information and assistance which the Commission deems necessary for the performance of its functions, and the heads of such departments and agencies are authorized and directed to furnish such assistance and information, unless prohibited under any law effective on the date of enactment of this Act, without reimbursement."
>
> And in section 3, subsection (a) strike out "$50" and insert in lieu thereof "$75."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 3. Page 4, line 11, strike out "at" and insert: "no later than".

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. ASPINALL moves that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 3 with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment, insert "not earlier than the later of the two following dates:
>
> "(i) one year from the date of the meeting called for organizing the Commission as provided in section 2(d) of this Act;
>
> "(ii) one year from the date on which the additional six members for which provision is made in section 2(c) of this Act are appointed, if such appointment occurs within six months after the effective date of this Act,
>
> and not later, in any event, than".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment to the title. Amend the title to read: "An act to establish a United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the title.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

MATHIAS F. CORREA

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the recent passing of Mathias F. Correa, former U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York, is a great loss to the State of New York and to the Nation.

Mr. Correa's broad service in public life and in private practice was characterized by a high sense of purpose and a unique warmth of heart.

His accomplishments in the public interest were significant and will live on.

Freedom of the press in America today is stronger for his fight to uphold the confidentiality of reporters' news sources.

U.S. intelligence has come of age due to his foresight and recommendations—as a member of a three-man panel appointed by Secretary James Forrestal—which led to the establishment of CIA.

And the cause of justice in the courts is more secure as it was eloquently upheld by an attorney of rare skill and high principle.

I extend for my part and on behalf of the Members of this House our deepest condolences to Mrs. Correa and the family. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the obituary in the New York Herald Tribune be included in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

MATHIAS F. CORREA DIES, A U.S. ATTORNEY AT 30

PORT CHESTER, N.Y.—Mathias F. Correa, 53, former U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York, died yesterday at United Hospital here after an internal hemorrhage.

Mr. Correa, a partner in the New York law firm of Cahill, Gordon, Reindel and Ohl, was only 30 when he was appointed to the chief prosecutor's post by President Franklin D. Rosevelt in 1941. He was believed to be the youngest ever appointed, and the first district staff member ever promoted.

He held the position for only 2 years, amassing an impressive record of indictments and convictions, before resigning to accept a commission in the Coast Artillery.

After serving as chief prosecutor for the Allied Military Government in Naples, he was transferred to the Marine Corps, promoted and assigned as a special assistant to Navy Secretary James H. Forrestal. This assignment led after the war to his appointment to a three-man commission that surveyed American intelligence operations and led to the establishment of the Central Intelligence Agency.

In later years he also served as head of an eight-member commission appointed by Governor Harriman to review the parole system. The commission's report resulted in a number of legislative reforms.

Mr. Correa also managed an extensive and distinguished private practice. In 1958 he carried the defense of Marie Torre, then TV-radio columnist for this newspaper, to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Miss Torre had refused to disclose her source for certain statements in her column, which quoted an unidentified CBS executive on entertainer Judy Garland. Miss Garland sued CBS for libel, and Miss Torre was called upon to divulge her source in the Federal court trial.

LOSES APPEAL

She refused, and was cited for contempt by Judge Sylvester J. Ryan in a historic case dealing with a reporter's right to protect his or her sources. "The protection of confidentiality of reporters' sources is important, Mr. Correa argued. He maintained that preservation is essential to the maintenance of a free press."

Mr. Correa lost the appeal, and Miss Torre served 10 days for contempt of court, but legislation was later introduced in Albany and Washington to protect a reporter's right to protect news sources.

Most recently, Mr. Correa had been active on behalf of the board of higher education in a suit brought by two Queens College associate professors who charged they were denied promotion because they are Roman Catholics.

Last month, he opposed an appeal by the professors before the court of appeals.

Born in Brooklyn, where his father was in the real estate business, Mr. Correa attended Brooklyn Prep and Fordham College before taking his law degree at Columbia, where he was an editor of the Law Review.

After graduation, he became associated with John T. Cahill, an attorney about 5 years his senior, in the firm of Cahill, Gordon, Zachry & Reindel.

This was an association that was to last a lifetime. When Mr. Cahill was made special assistant to the New York County district attorney in 1936, he named Mr. Correa as his special assistant in the prosecution and conviction of three officers of the Bond & Mortgage Guarantee Co.

Three years later when Mr. Cahill was appointed special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General in charge of investigating the affairs of Martin T. Manton, senior judge of the U.S. court of appeals, he brought Mr. Correa back into Government service. The two men worked together to convict Judge Manton of bribery.

In March 1939, Mr. Cahill was named U.S. attorney, and his first act was to name Mr. Correa his chief assistant.

In this capacity, Mr. Correa successfully handled the Government's prosecution of Grover Cleveland Bergdoll, World War I draft dodger when Bergdoll appealed a 7-year sentence on the ground that the Selective Service Act of 1917 was unconstitutional.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Mr. Correa also took a personal hand in the prosecution of three cases involving attempts to undermine justice in Federal courts. He won convictions in all three.

Promoted to the $10,000 a year U.S. attorney's post in February 1941, when Mr. Cahill retired to private practice, Mr. Correa continued his practice of personally prosecuting the most important cases to come under his jurisdiction.

Of particular concern to Mr. Correa was labor racketeering, and he personally accounted for indictments and convictions of George E. Browne, onetime president of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Motion Picture Operators of the United States and Canada, AFL, and William Bioff, a west coast racketeer. They were sentenced to 8 and 10 years respectively on charges of extorting $1,200,000 from motion-picture corporations and union members.

On December 5, 1941, 2 days before Pearl Harbor, Mr. Correa was the major speaker at a dinner of the New York County Lawyers' Association—a dinner at which Judge Learned Hand, of the court of appeals, and Attorney General Francis Biddle also spoke.

Mr. Correa urged labor to "put defense first" and to realize that its own welfare depended on the success of the defense program. He also urged unions to rid themselves of racketeers.

EXPLOITER

"Most insidious," he said "is the form of that evil which crops out where unions seem to have lost their autonomy, their power to rid themselves of leadership which seeks to and does exploit the organization for personal ends which are alien to true union objectives."

When necessary Mr. Correa was also successful in the prosecution of captains of industry. He obtained a conviction of Joseph M. Schenck, former chairman of the Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp. on income-tax evasion charges, and on a perjury charge resulting from his testimony in the Bioff case. Mr. Schenck's 3-year sentence on the tax-evasion charges were suspended after he recanted the perjury, but the film magnate did have to serve a year for perjury.

Another precedent-setting prosecution by Mr. Correa was that of the first espionage convictions of the war. Twenty-year sentences were meted out to the leaders of a gang of five men and a woman who obtained information on U.S. shipping for Germany. Because the espionage took place before the outbreak of World War II, the defendants escaped the wartime death penalty.

In 1943, Mr. Correa also prosecuted German Bund Leader Fritz Kuhn and 19 other Bund members in denaturalization proceedings, in what he termed an effort "to drive the Bund out of business." Kuhn and 10 others were eventually stripped of their citizenship.

But Mr. Correa's most notorious defendant was a man who never stood trial. He was Frank (the Enforcer) Nitti, a first cousin of Al Capone, and the man who inherited the Capone mantle. Nitti shot himself in the head in Chicago a few hours after he and eight henchmen were indicted in New York for their part in the motion picture extortion that sent Bioff and Browne to jail.

Also successfully under Mr. Correa's direction were the first black-market cases in this area and the first tests of the price-administration laws.

In 1943, after performing a special inspection of Justice Department facilities in Alaska for Attorney General Biddle, Mr. Correa resigned to accept a commission as a coast artillery lieutenant.

F.D.R. TRIBUTE

In accepting Mr. Correa's resignation, President Roosevelt expressed his "deep appreciation for the splendid service which you have rendered." He said Mr. Correa's "ability, industry, and integrity" made "an inspiring example for those who will follow you."

Mr. Correa did not remain in the coast artillery long. He was soon assigned as prosecutor in Naples and was promoted to captain after initial successes in breaking up the wartime black markets in that area.

In mid-1944, an old acquaintance from his law practice days sent for Mr. Correa. He was Navy Secretary James Forrestal, and Mr. Correa switched uniforms. As a Marine lieutenant colonel, he became Mr. Forrestal's aid, and continued in that capacity after the latter became Secretary of Defense.

His wartime service won Mr. Correa the Letter of Commendation and Commendation Ribbon from Secretary Forrestal; the Bronze Star Medal from the Army, and from Italy, the Croce di Guerra.

Lieutenant Colonel Correa's service to the Government was not to end with the war, however. Even after his return to practice as a partner of Cahill, Gordon, Reindel & Ohl at 80 Pine Street, Mr. Correa was selected by Mr. Forrestal as a member of a three-man board to overhaul American intelligence efforts.

His fellow committeemen were William Jackson and Allen W. Dulles, the first and second heads of the Central Intelligence Agency, which was set up as a result of their report.

"Our report was so top secret, I couldn't even keep a copy of it for my own records," he said later.

There was one final service Mr. Correa could do for Mr. Forrestal. After the Secretary's suicide May 22, 1949, Mr. Correa became an executor of his estate. Later, in 1951, he assisted in the long defense of Dillon, Read & Co., Mr. Forrestal's old banking firm, which had faced Government antitrust action.

Mr. Correa, who lived in Dogwood Lane, Rye, made only one attempt to enter the political field, running as a Democrat for Rye City Council after his return from wartime service. He said he had no illusions that he would win, and was not surprised when he lost.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Louise Kennedy Correa; three daughters, Mary Elizabeth, Louise Erene, and Ann Correa; his mother, Mrs. Erene F. Correa; and a brother, Rodolfo A. Correa, Jr.

A Requiem Mass will be celebrated Saturday at 10 a.m. at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York. There will be a military funeral at Arlington National Cemetery Monday at 11 a.m.

Fred C. Shapiro.

DANGER OF COMMUNISM

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States was assassinated by a Communist. Yet many people do not seem to understand the danger that communism represents to our country, our lives, and civilization today.

THE SHEVCHENKO FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that history is filled with ironies. A little over a hundred years ago Taras Shevchenko, the great poet laureate of Ukraine, fought for the freedom of all subjugated nations under the heel of the czarist Russian conqueror and oppressor. Today, in our United States, supporters of this historic figure are fighting for the freedom of honoring this early freedom fighter with a statue in our Capital. Ironical, indeed; yet a sad commentary on controversies in our society.

EUROPE'S FREEDOM FIGHTER

Much has been produced, not only in the recent period but for the past 3 years, about the freedom light of Shevchenko. His tremendous stature in eastern Europe is beyond rational question. Recently this was eloquently brought out again in an address delivered by our colleague, the Honorable Thaddeus J. Dulski, at the Shevchenko groundbreaking ceremonies. I ask that the full text of Mr. Dulski's address, titled "Taras Shevchenko—Europe's Freedom Fighter," be incorporated in my remarks:

Taras Shevchenko—Europe's Freedom Fighter

(By the Honorable Thaddeus J. Dulski, U.S. Congress, address delivered at the Shevchenko Memorial banquet, held on Saturday, September 21, 1963, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

We have gathered here in Washington today to celebrate a major new event in man's long struggle for national independence and for individual liberty.

We have come from cities and towns all over the United States to honor a poet. He was not an average man. During his lifetime, he rose from serfdom, and once his own freedom was won, he dared losing it in his fight for the freedom of all Ukrainians and of all peoples.

Taras Shevchenko has been the national hero of Ukraine for over 100 years.

Today, with the groundbreaking for a memorial statue to him in Washington, D.C., we proclaim him as a champion of liberty for all mankind.

I am proud that, as a Member of Congress, I had the opportunity to help in making U.S. soil available for the erection of the Taras Shevchenko Memorial.

All of you here tonight, and the many, many thousands elsewhere who join us in spirit, deserve the credit for this vision and generosity which has made this memorial a reality.

I feel humble as I stand before you on this great occasion tonight. Your fathers and mine came to this land, drawn by the bright flame of liberty about which Shevchenko wrote so eloquently and so movingly.

We gained our freedom from Russian czarist imperialism and from Russian Communist imperialism.

In our freedom, we are mindful of the legacy Taras Shevchenko has left to us and to all mankind. His legacy is an insistent demand that we, in our lifetime, risk whatever may be necessary to carry forward and complete the struggle he fought so courageously for, the national independence of Ukraine, and all nations.

Others here tonight, far more talented at reading poetry than I, would be better able to convey to you some of the most meaningful and beautiful passages from Shevchenko's poetry. But, if you will bear with me, I want to read just a few lines. These lines from "God's Fool" were addressed to those who defended freedom too weakly, and to those who bowed down before the Russian imperialists and did their dirty work for them. I read:

"You were not fit to rise in the defense
Of justice and our sacred liberty.
You have been taught to torture your own brothers,
And not to love them. Ah, you miserable
And cursed crew, when will you breathe your last?
When shall we get ourselves a Washington
To promulgate his new and righteous law?
But some day we shall surely find the man."

Ladies and gentlemen, there are those among the Russian Communist, imperialists, and colonialists, who would claim that the man who wrote these lines would be a Bolshevik if he were alive today. Never. Those who believe such claims deserve the whiplash of Shevchenko's lines—"You have been taught to torture your own brothers, and not to love them."

I leave it to you. Were Shevchenko alive today, he would be a hero in the fight against Communist imperialism for Ukrainian independence, as he was a hero in the fight for Ukrainian independence against czarist imperialism.

Taras Shevchenko is alive today. He is alive in his vibrant poetry. He is alive in the minds, and in the hearts and spirit of everyone who has read his poetry, and who has gained his inspiration.

This is the significance of the memorial statue to Shevchenko which will rise at 22d and P Streets in Washington. This memorial will be an inspiration to the peoples of Ukraine, of the other non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. of East-Central Europe, and of Cuba, in their courageous fight for national independence and human liberty.

Shevchenko fought for the freedom of all peoples, regardless of creed, color, or national origin, and the memorial statue initiated today will rise as a beacon of liberty for the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America as well.

To our fellow Americans, the memorial will have a double significance. It will be a constant reminder that the monolithic might of the U.S.S.R. is a myth, that the U.S.S.R. is composed of many non-Russian nations which once were independent and whose people today wish to regain their independence. It will remind fellow citizens here that Russian imperialism and colonialism remain as the major threat to the peace and security of our world.

The memorial will hold a second and even more important significance. It will represent to the entire world the American love of liberty, and the constant support of the American people for the just aspirations of the captive peoples for national independence. Our world, sadly, is divided today, part slave, part free. The free and independent nations, while in the majority, are under serious siege. Even we in the United States are threatened by the Russian Communist imperialists ambitiously grasping for universal power.

If freemen lose, and God forbid, it will not be to lack of economic power, nor lack of military power. It will be due to imprisonment in false concepts of the world forced upon us by massive and world-embracing Russian Communist propaganda.

If we should lose, we can also blame the lack of vigor and the lack of understanding in fighting for national independence and for human liberty.

We must not fail. We must know that knowledge is power even greater than the power of money and of machines.

The words of great poets, the words of Taras Shevchenko, have power to move men and shape human destinies, which is even greater than the physical might to imprison them. It is this great power which has made Shevchenko the national hero of Ukraine, and a champion of liberty for all peoples. It is this great power that the memorial statue to Taras Shevchenko will unleash throughout the captive world.

We, who meet here tonight, have our eyes focused on the future, just as we are mindful of the past.

May I at this time propose that we initiate action now to establish a Shevchenko memorial library as a section of the U.S. Library of Congress. This would be most helpful in infusing the heroic spirit of Shevchenko into others, and further inspiring them to join in the struggle for national independence and liberty. This should be given serious consideration by the Congress.

It has been my privilege to submit House Joint Resolution 174, providing for the issuance of a Shevchenko champion of liberty stamp in 1964. It would be most appropriate and most telling to have this stamp issued on the day the memorial statue to Taras Shevchenko is unveiled in this Capital of the free world. This would crown the whole action that began with approval of the use of American soil for this memorial.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are on the threshold of great events. In our power is the ability to carry forward the great struggle for the national independence of Ukraine, and of every other enslaved and subjugated nation of the world.

It is an undertaking in which we must not fail.

It is an undertaking in which we must overcome, and be victorious.

THE OPPOSITION

Despite the open record on the Shevchenko statue and its need in our Capital, there suddenly developed, as we all know, an opposition to its erection next May. Many aspects of this opposition have been elaborated upon by my colleagues and also myself. The latest phase is most interesting and should be placed for public view. It makes for additional absorbing reading for those who are concerned with our Nation's respect and esteem for the world's foremost exponents of personal liberty and national freedom. The following items relate this particular story vividly, and I include them in logical order as part of my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 8, 1963]

Statue to Ukrainian Meets Renewed Opposition

The National Capital Planning Commission was asked by one of its members yesterday to cancel its approval of a monument here to Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian poet.

Walter C. Louchheim, Jr., served formal notice on his fellow members that he will make such a motion at the Commission's next meeting December 5. He sought to make it yesterday but procedural rules blocked consideration.

The statue, authorized by Congress and financed by anti-Communist Ukrainian-American groups, is to be erected on a small triangular park at 23d and P Streets NW. A ground-breaking ceremony was held September 21.

Louchheim, who opposed approval of the statue earlier this year, said he based his renewed opposition on a belief that the Commission had acted upon "misinformation on several rather substantive points."

Recently, he said, "the Washington Post brought out information" that provides "an opportunity to reconsider."

Editorially, this newspaper's main point was that Shevchenko bore no relationship to the United States that would justify a memorial here.

Louchheim made this point, calling Shevchenko "an inconspicuous figure" in American terms. He also said the poet was "both anti-Semitic and the idol of the Communist Party."

There was no direct comments by Commission members dealing with Louchheim's views. However, one alternate member, Joseph Barnett, declared that he felt the Commission staff "did damn poor homework when the statue approval resolution was presented before us."

The Commission was told, Barnett said, that Congress in authorizing the statue had made the final decision, and that the Commission's role was finding a site and approving the statue's design.

However, he said, Congress authorized it "subject to the approval of the site and design"—not necessarily a mandate that it be built.

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

Udall Urges Review of Shevchenko

Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall has encouraged a full restudy of plans to erect a statue to Taras Shevchenko.

In a letter from Udall cited yesterday by Walter C. Louchheim, a member of the National Capital Planning Commission, the Cabinet member said he hoped the Commission would make such a restudy before it proceeds.

The Commission had been scheduled to reconsider its approval earlier this year of the location of the statue of the Ukrainian poet in a small park at 22d and P Streets NW.

But Louchheim, who served notice he would move for such action, said the background material for his presentation had not been completed. The action was postponed until January.

Congress authorized anti-Communist Ukrainian groups to erect the statue on National Park Service land in Washington subject to administrative approval of the site and statue. These were given by the Interior Department and the Planning Commission, among others.

Since that time, however, questions have been raised whether the freedom-cherishing poet is the proper subject for a statue in this Capital of a country that has no connection with him. The Soviets have favorably cited his writing as anticzarist.

In the letter, Louchheim said, Udall reiterated his view that a special commission be set up to screen the subjects of memorials proposed in Washington.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 6, 1963]

Shevchenko Statue Site Study Will Continue

The National Capital Planning Commission is going to continue its study of a location and design for the Taras Shevchenko statue.

The Commission voted at its monthly meeting yesterday to have its Federal Projects and Planning Subcommittee make a further check into the matter. A year ago the organization approved a location at a little park at P and 23d Streets NW. for the statue, and then last May approved the design.

Congress directed that the Commission give its approval for the location and design before a Ukrainian organization erects the statue.

Commission Member Walter Louchheim tried last month to get the Commission to rescind its previous approval, but failed because he could not get a second for a motion.

Yesterday Mr. Louchheim read a letter from Interior Secretary Udall calling for more study of the proposal.

Shevchenko was a 19th century Ukrainian poet who is now revered by organizations of Americans descended from Ukrainians.

In other action yesterday, the Commission approved three District Highway Department projects, the Ninth Street expressway, widening New York Avenue NE., and interchanges for Missouri Avenue between 16th and Eighth Streets NW.

The Missouri Avenue project should be carefully studied, and two overhead bridges at 13th Street and Georgia Avenue might have to be built so that a four-lane freeway could have room for expansion later to six lanes, the Commission said.

The Commission also postponed action on a proposal to widen South Dakota Avenue NE., between Rhode Island Avenue and Bladensburg Road, to eliminate treacherous traffic conditions which have resulted in the deaths of several persons in the past 2 years.

December 10, 1963.

The Honorable Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I was amazed to read in the Washington Post issue of December 6 the caption "Udall Urges Review of Shevchenko." In light of the Post's malicious, smear campaign against the Shevchenko statue, I cannot but feel that this has been slanted. To resolve my doubts, I would very much appreciate receiving your comments on this.

At the National Capital Planning Commission meeting last Thursday, Mr. Louchheim injected your letter as a seeming basis for the Commission's restudy of the Shevchenko site. I don't know whether you have been apprised of the smear campaign being waged by really only two men—Mr. Wiggins, the editor of the Post, who admitted early that he had never read a verse of Shevchenko's writings, and Mr. Louchheim who has associated himself with the baseless charges and bigotry of the Wiggins' editorials. But the impression conveyed last Thursday was that in view of these charges, malicious and unfounded as they are, you are encouraging a restudy of the site.

Despite the fact that Congress had examined the issues involved 3 years ago and that in this period every charge made by both Mr. Wiggins and Mr. Louchheim had been exploded, the latter has now maneuvered the Commission into an untoward position of "reviewing the legislative history" (as he put it Thursday) of this matter. So much as to suggest that the Commission will examine Congress own determination of this. Going far beyond the technical jurisdiction of the Commission, it is quite evident that Mr. Louchheim's aim is to bring about the rescission of the Commission's approval of the present site for the Shevchenko statue and the provision of a much inferior site, thus satisfying both the letter of Public Law 86–749 and his and Mr. Wiggins' desire to affront all who had sponsored this legislation and had participated in the huge groundbreaking ceremonies last September, including your own representatives. It appears that your letter encourages him to realize this aim. It also appears that you have been drawn into this ugly situation after Mr. Louchheim's motion to rescind failed even to obtain a second.

This case has now become somewhat farcical. The Washington Post consults with a puppet Soviet Ukrainian representative in the U.N. to elicit his opinion about a statue here; it highlights a thoroughly irrelevant New Jersey case about changing an avenue's name to Shevchenko; and the NCPC is maneuvered into a totally unrepresentative position of examining the worth of Congress decision in this on the basis of the Post's mendacious and bigoted editorials and also, apparently, on the basis of your recent letter.

We, of course, do not intend to let these intolerant and ignorant actions go unchallenged. The Post has virtually closed its pages to our challenge. However, congressional supporters of the statue at the ground-broken site are carefully observing this fantastic development and recording it for public view. Since you have now become involved in this, I urge that you read all of the material printed in the Congressional Record issues of November 13, 14, 20, 21, and December 4, and 6. I cannot believe that knowingly you would want to lend encouragement to the smear campaign launched by Mr. Wiggins and nurtured by Mr. Louchheim. Indeed, if there is any investigation or study to be made, in all justice it should be directed at the outrageous charges advanced by these two individuals. With clear civic and national responsibility, the Washington Star has accurately sensed all this. I enclose a copy of its recent editorial on the subject.

Our committees are proceeding, nevertheless, with set construction plans for the unveiling of the statue at the present site next May 30. We've acted openly, democratically, and faithfully in terms of the law and the approvals granted by you, the Fine Arts Commission, and the National Capital Planning Commission. I understand the site designs have been approved with minor changes by your Department. I request that since nothing has changed in the status of this important project, these designs be sent to our architect so that our plans may be fulfilled according to schedule.

I cannot believe that you would want to support any attempted rescission based on the untruthful and bigoted editorials of one man and the brazen maneuvers of another. They have taken upon themselves not only to flout Congress but also virtually to ridicule the statements of our late President, as quoted in my letter to Mr. Dutton, a copy of which I enclose. In fact, their reprehensible actions may also be construed as a slur against the wise judgment of President Johnson, who was responsible for the expedition of the legislation in August 1960.

If it is possible to receive a copy of your recent letter to the NCPC, I shall be deeply appreciative. In any case, I look forward to your reply concerning the other points raised herein.

With grateful thanks for your solid representation at our ground-breaking ceremonies last September and best wishes.

Sincerely,

Lev E. Dobriansky.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Dec. 15, 1963]

Association Again

I wish to express my gratitude as one of the many thousands of Ukrainians who are deeply appreciative of your December 4 editorial, "Association Again."

Your editorial was like a ray of sunshine breaking through the dark storm clouds of vicious attacks and distortions being stirred up by another Washington newspaper in opposition to our efforts to erect a statue to Taras Shevchenko.

The Russian Communists naturally wish to give the world the impression that the Ukraine is happy with its Communist rule and that this Communist "paradise" is what Shevchenko had hoped and died for, when, in fact, Shevchenko cried out for a free Ukraine—free, like the land founded by Washington and not that the Ukraine should become the enslaved and captive nation that it now is. The Communists have taken the ideals of this great man and twisted them to suit their propaganda. How clever they are to take the side of Shevchenko and present themselves as freedom-loving too. Too well they know that the Ukrainian blood is seething, that desire for Ukrainian national independence is burning, and that a blunder like opposing the revered hero, Shevchenko, could well erupt into another bloodbath like Hungary.

NADIA O'SHEA.

FREEDOM HAS ALL TO DO WITH AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. Speaker, among the many arguments raised against the Shevchenko statue here is that Shevchenko had nothing to do with American history. The fact is that both in terms of the unfolding of world freedom—of which our history is an inseparable part—and on the scale of personal affinity and absorption Shevchenko is very much a part of American history. And when we begin to consider the freedom force and spirit his name and works represent in Eastern Europe today, he is very much a valuable part of our historical struggle against Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism. These facts and his unprecedented personal orientation to Washington are a matter of history.

Indeed, with this view of the subject one can rightly maintain that for both the present and the future, not to speak of the past, a Shevchenko statue in our Capital would have a symbolic significance not easily shared by other statuaries. Without in any way reducing their importance for the reasons they were erected, I have in mind monuments such as Simón Bolívar, Edmund Burke, Dante, Discobolos, John Ericsson, Japanese pagoda, Jeanne D'Arc, Jules Jusserand, Marconi, Gen. Jose de San Martin, the Netherlands carillon, and others. When in one breath an individual advocates a statue for Shakespeare and in the next opposes the Shevchenko statue, he has good reason to examine his own charges.

Arguments to halt the statue of Shevchenko are an object of serious concern for every informed and right-thinking American. Furnishing examples of this, the concise statement on "The Desperation of Reckless Irresponsibility," issued by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, is very much to the point. I submit it at this point as part of my remarks:

THE DESPERATION OF RECKLESS IRRESPONSIBILITY

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

On the subject of the Shevchenko statue, anyone who since the end of September has followed the editorials written by Mr. Wiggins in the Washington Post cannot but feel an intellectual nausea and distaste produced by their mass of contradictions, fabricated information, and base motivation. These unbelievable editorials appearing in a modern press organ have to be read in their successive entirety to experience this nausea. Doubtless, the editor wasn't counting on anyone doing this. Side by side, and with appropriate replies, these editorials have been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that our citizenry may have the opportunity of reading these gems of journalistic irresponsibility in toto.

However, because of an avalanche of protesting letters to the Post, Mr. Wiggins apparently decided to end his editorial campaign on November 12 and shifted gears of the smear campaign by producing semieditorialized "news items" on the pages of the Post. These reports have undoubtedly added humor and amusement to this whole episode. They are prime exhibits of what might properly be called the desperation of reckless irresponsibility. More, they show the levels to which men of bigotry and ignorance inevitably must succumb.

The first of these "news reports" appeared on the first page of the November 29 Post under the howling and dramatic caption "Communists Love Shevchenko." The obvious aim of the "news item," which I attach here, is to associate Shevchenko with the Communists and thus influence the unwary or ignorant reader to disassociate himself from Shevchenko. Humorous? Yes, and for a number of reasons. One, the great "anti-Communist" newspaper, the Washington Post, decided now to play the anti-Communist angle, at that with a technique which it railed against some 10 years ago. Two, of all things, Wiggins had to turn to a Soviet Russian puppet in the United Nations for his opinion about a Shevchenko statue here.

Three, the editor in his frenzy then discovered that Communists "love" Shevchenko, apparently ignorant of their "love," too, for Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, etc., when such "love" serves their purposes. Had Wiggins bothered to read House Document 445 and the testimonies given in 1960, he would have learned then that perverse Communist "love" embraced even Shevchenko. Fourth, failing to understand this whole project, the Post editor failed also to note in this first-page, semieditorial "news report" that the U.N. puppet omitted to praise Shevchenko for his cardinal teaching on the freedom and independence of nations and their liberation from foreign yoke, Russian or otherwise. This, in fact is the essence of the whole project. Shevchenko, his works, his towering symbol belong to the conservators of freedom, not to the destroyers. Sheer bigotry has blinded a few to this fundamental truth.

The other "news item" about a "New Jersey Town Kills Proposal for Shevchenko Street" is almost puerile. The December 5 "report" under this caption was the second on this matter, ostensibly to show that others think like Wiggins about Shevchenko. I attach also this "report" for the reader's interest. It, too, shows the desperation of reckless irresponsibility. What this incident has to do with the statue is anybody's guess. I myself would have objected to an imposition of Shevchenko's name on an already identified avenue. One can rest assured that this insignificant incident in a New Jersey town would never have appeared in the Post if the editor didn't find himself hard pressed for arguments that have ranged from salacious anti-Semitic and anti-Polish accusations to an avenue sign in a New Jersey town. In short, this instructive episode in journalistic bigotry has assumed the proportions of a comedy.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 29, 1963]

COMMUNISTS LOVE SHEVCHENKO

Warm support for a Shevchenko statue in Washington has come from the quarter which the American sponsors of the statue intended as its political target.

This man-bites-dog turn, giving Communist and Soviet backing to what was conceived as an anti-Communist and anti-Soviet project, was accomplished by the chief of the Soviet Ukraine's mission to the United Nations.

This official, L. Y. Kizya, said that he favors a statue here of the 19th century Ukrainian poet. It is to be erected on the triangle of land at P Street, between 22d and 23d Streets NW.

But, said Kizya, he protests the efforts of the American sponsors of the statue to use it "to fan up animosity toward the Soviet Ukraine, and all the more to aggravate the cold war."

Kizya fueled a growing controversy, Congress approved the statue, private funds are to pay for it and dedication is scheduled next spring.

But because of the poet's questionable significance and the statue sponsors' tactics in gaining congressional sanction, the National Capital Planning Commission is about to review its earlier approval of the project.

Kizya's comments were made in a statement sent to the Washington Post 4 weeks after this newspaper solicited his views.

He showed a reverence for Shevchenko equal to that displayed by the poet's American admirers. Terming him a "great son of the Ukraine, an uncompromising fighter against slavery and injustice, against social and national oppression," Kizya said Shevchenko "deserves to have his statue decorating one of the squares of the U.S. Capital."

But where Ukrainian-American sponsors see Shevchenko as the focus of an anti-Russian and anti-Communist campaign for Ukrainian nationhood, Kizya portrayed him as a man with deep ties to the Russians and revolutionaries of his day and as a man now widely respected by all Soviet nationalities, not just by Soviet Ukrainians.

These contrasts are typical of the tug of war for Shevchenko's mantle between the Soviets and some Americans of Ukrainian descent.

Kizya said that the 150th anniversary of Shevchenko's birth next year will be marked in the Soviet Union by "nationwide festivities," including erection of a monument in Moscow. The Washington statue of Shevchenko is due to be erected at the same time and for the same purpose.

"Nowadays in the age of radio, movies, and television (Shevchenko) can play an important role in the enrichment of the culture of the American people," said Kizya. He noted that Mark Twain is revered in the Soviet Union.

Kizya is the top official of the Soviet Ukraine in the United States, which considers the Ukraine as being 1 of 15 constituent republics of the Soviet Union, not a sovereign state. The Ukraine and another Soviet Republic, Byelorussia, have U.N. General Assembly seats through a proviso that Stalin demanded and received at Yalta in 1945.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 5, 1963]

NEW JERSEY TOWN KILLS PROPOSAL FOR SHEVCHENKO STREET

Washington no longer has company in its misery over Taras Shevchenko.

In New Jersey's Hamilton Township, civic uproar greeted a proposal several weeks ago to change the name of one of the small Trenton suburb's streets to Shevchenko Boulevard, in honor of the 19th-century Ukrainian poet. This week, the suggestion was killed.

In Washington, controversy has developed over a plan to erect a statue of the poet on a small park at 22d and P Streets NW.

The New Jersey proposal was offered by a township committeeman on behalf of some Ukrainian-Americans who see the poet's nationalistic verses as being anti-Soviet.

But reaction came immediately from residents along Deutz Avenue, the street to be rechristened. Angrily, they paraded in protest, scuffled with police and bombarded the township officials with petitions.

Wednesday night the committee backed off quickly from the explosive issue. "It is clearly evident the committee has made a mistake," declared Mayor George R. Holland, whereupon the five voted unanimously to drop the subject.

In Washington, no easy way out is in sight. The statue was authorized by Congress, has cleared all necessary reviewing agencies and is scheduled to be put in place next May.

The problem here is that the Kremlin also views the poet as a hero and has given his name to at least 1,620 public facilities in the Soviet Union. The Russians interpret his revolutionary writings as anticzarist.

THE SPIRIT OF SHEVCHENKO

Mr. Speaker, much also has been written and uttered about the indomitable spirit of Shevchenko. That spirit is one of freedom coupled with humanism. All of us know all too well the character assassination that can result from excerpting so-called "anti-" statements from contextual verse. This technique is both dishonest and disreputable. The Shevchenko spirit cannot be perhaps better expressed on this score than in the following letter to the chairman of the National Capitol Planning Commission, written by a close and long-term student of Shevchenko, and also the article written about the most outstanding exponent of Shevchenko's works in pre-World War II Poland, Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky, an illuminating article penned by an Israel journalist. I ask that both pieces be appended to my remarks:

THE SHEVCHENKO AFFAIR

DECEMBER 17, 1963.

Mrs. JAMES H. ROWE,
Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D.C.

The vigorously pressed assault of the Washington Post on the Shevchenko statue in the Nation's Capital should be carefully scrutinized.

It is interesting to note that commencing with the editorial blast on October 18, 1963, all subsequent salvos (without benefit of corroborating exposés as the label "Affair" implies) draw their firepower exclusively from a calculated use of words and phrases of bias and prejudice.

As one who has read all the published works of Shevchenko in the original Ukrainian and being familiar with the rather extensive bibliography on the poet and his writings, I obtain a very sick evaluation chart when I apply my Rotary Club's four-way test to the charges of the Washington Post:

Is it the truth?

Is it fair to all concerned?

Will it build good will and better friendship?

Will it be beneficial to all concerned?

The term "affair" conjures up in the reader's mind the infamous Dreyfus case of France involving malign influences and false charges which lead to the court-martial and public degradation of Capt. Alfred Dreyfus for treason, to be followed by a violent national storm of charges and countercharges inflamed by prejudice, bigotry, and misguided patriotism before reason, fairness, and justice could prevail and the shame of France redeemed by vindication, reinstatement, and promotion of Captain Dreyfus to new honors in 1906.

When the Washington Post gives as its first reason for objecting to the approval of the project adopted by Congress that it was the "effort of a tiny group" only, the editors would have you believe that the project was neither endorsed nor supported by the vast majority of the more than a million Americans of Ukrainian origin in the United States.

The truth of the matter is that the project has the backing of thousands of persons who donated money to the statue fund. Lay and church organizations from every State in the Union, representing Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant faiths, support the project. All the Ukrainian fraternal orders have worked for it. All Ukrainian-language newspapers and radio programs, excepting the Communist-controlled ones, have given the project their wholehearted support and encouragement. This phenomenon is not surprising, because Ukrainians in all walks of life know their Shevchenko, like the Irish know their St. Patrick, and revere him as a great poet who established the literary quality of their language; returned self-respect to the enslaved peasant serf; recalled the past glories of national freedom and independence and dedicated his gifted muse to a vigorous defense of the individual against governmental tyranny, religious bigotry, economic exploitation of the disenfranchised serfs, and prophesied the coming of an era of brotherhood of men under God. In the treasury of world's lyric poetry, Shevchenko has few peers. Why it is so difficult for a non-Ukrainian to appreciate Shevchenko as a great poet may be gained from the following quotation from the "Greek Way" by Edith Hamilton, when she wrote about Pindar: "He is securely seated among the immortals. And yet only a few people know him—and of all the poets there ever were, he is the most impossible to translate—one feels 'life abundantly' within him, inexhaustible spontaneity, an effortless mastery over treasuries of rich and incomparably vivid expression, the fountain shooting upward, irresistible, unenforced—and beyond description. But in spite of this sense he gives of ease and freedom and power, he is in equal degree a consummate craftsman, an artist in fullest command of the technique of his art, and that fact is the other half of the reason why he is untranslatable. His poetry is of all poetry the most like music."

An examination of the card index in the Congressional Library in Washington, the great libraries of New York City, Chicago and the libraries of any outstanding university in this country will reveal the existence of an extensive bibliography on Shevchenko. He is known; he is established; he is accepted as a great world poet who endures.

If the Ukrainians' love of Shevchenko is an "errant private passion," then they have multitudinous company among Americans (including Ukrainians) who show an "errant" passion for the author of the Gettysburg Address.

While it is true that it is the Ukrainians who know him best and that the average American knows little if anything about him, the same may be said about a number of outstanding world figures of the 19th century or even of this century, thanks to the impact of the former isolationist policies of our Nation.

America is an outgrowth and development of many ethnic streams. Each has added its particular share to our national development. Shevchenko is symbolic of the best cultural and national qualities of Ukraine. In him we have a unique situation of a great poet as a national hero. His universal appeal is evidenced by the large number of books, articles and translations by English, French, Italian, German, Slavic and oriental language writers. Reject him and you reject the great universal ideals he symbolizes to millions of people around the globe.

Alice L. Sickels, a sociologist who headed the International Institute in Minneapolis and later in Detroit, Mich., wrote a book entitled "Around the World in St. Paul" in which she said among other things:

"America is an idea. This idea is being worked out in the United States by carriers of historic civilizations who have gathered here from every corner of the world, largely from Europe. Democracy is the end toward which they aim; it is also a process by which we move forward. How long it will take to bring the real America into full expression will depend on the men and women through whose faith and effort it must be achieved. Our America, an idea in action, is, in the last analysis, 'only you and me.'" The following statement from the book's jacket too has relevancy to the "Shevchenko Affair."

"America is a laboratory. Its cosmopolitan cities, mosaics of peoples from many lands, offer an unprecedented opportunity for America to practice living in an interracial and international world order. When we have learned to live harmoniously and justly in our own country, we shall have learned also to live peaceably with the peoples of the world."

Another objection to the statue raised by the Washington Post is that the Communists also "love" Shevchenko. The Communists also love and make use of our constitutional Bill of Rights and our system of courts of justice which they have invoked on innumerable occasions. They also love our Mark Twain and our Van Cliburn. Is that any reason why we should do away with our Bill of Rights or our system of courts of justice, or renounce Mark Twain or Van Cliburn?

It can be truly said that because of his immense popular appeal for over a century, Shevchenko is the one mighty voice of Ukraine crying out for truth and justice that even the ruthless Communist system cannot suppress. Ironically, if not tragically, the Washington Post, an exponent of the freedom of the press in the Nation's Capital, is crusading militantly, persistently to still the voice of Shevchenko and downgrade and humiliate him before the eyes of the world.

In the nature of things, it would be unusual for a man of Shevchenko's public stature in the field of letters and national acclaim not to have enemies and detractors at home and abroad. The statesmen whose profiles grace the Halls of Congress, the national leaders like Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and others whose statues and monuments constitute some of the finest attractions in the Nation's Capital were often the targets of similar attacks in their private as well as public life.

A notable example of such tragic attack on character is that of Thomas Paine, Revolutionary pamphleteer and patriot, attacking the character of George Washington in a letter addressed to the President: "And as to you, sir, treacherous in period of friendship (for so you have been to me, and that in the day of danger) a hypocrite in public life, the world will be puzzled to decide whether you are an apostate or an imposter; whether you have abandoned good principles or whether you ever had any."

Even in this respect Shevchenko has something in common with George Washington. Truly, it may be said that Washington had his Paine and Shevchenko has his Wiggins.

Obviously Washington's detractors failed because the charges were without foundation. No such methods detracted from Washington's greatness or prevented a grateful people from honoring his memory. Yet human nature had its fling before Congress could decide on a suitable memorial for Washington as evident from the extensive debates in Congress in the winter of 1800. For example, Congressman Sheppard rose to say: "I will do as much as any man to honor the memory of Washington. I have fought and bled with him several times. I have always supported and will continue to support him. But on the score of expenses, I think we are going too far. I will go so far as to have his remains placed decently within these walls. Further, I will not go; for I do not think we have a right to throw away the public money." He was answered by Representative John Randolph from Virginia: "Shall then a mistaken spirit of economy, and a still more mistaken jealously arrest us? Honor him, it is true, we cannot. The world has charged itself with that task * * * but though we cannot honor him, we may dishonor ourselves; though we cannot increase the luster of his fame, we may show our own meanness, cowardice, spite and malice; and show an astonished world that we are deplorably unworthy of the high honor conferred by Nature in giving us a Washington."

The mistaken and ill informed voice of prejudice from the pages of the Washington Post ought not to be the means for either Congress or the responsible planning commission to demean the profile of Shevchenko, whose presence in the Nation's Capital would add luster to the spirit of America as personified by George Washington. They are kindred in spirit.

The proposed statue symbolizes Shevchenko's respect for as well as his yearning for the American ideal to take root in other lands, a yearning which was expressed in their day also by Marquis de Lafayette, Shelley, Hugo, Byron and others. Lord Byron in his "Ode to Venice" expresses this common bond between souls like Shevchenko and Washington in these words:

"Better be
Where the extinguished Spartans still are free,
In their proud charnel of Thermopylae,
Than stagnate in our marsh, or over the deep
Fly, and one current to the ocean add,
One spirit to the souls our fathers had,
One freeman more, America, to thee."

Shall we accept Mr. Charek, son of Ukrainian parents, as president of our most advanced system of world communication, the Tel-Star Corp., and reject the spiritual father of his parents, Taras Shevchenko?

To charge that Congress was misguided and careless in this matter comes with ill grace from a newspaper whose editorial is so lacking in decent respect for truth and so biased in its views. Surely the normal procedures applicable to adoption of joint resolutions were followed in this matter. Appropriate committees considered the resolution. It was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Printed information and references covering the subject of the statue were made available. Opportunity for hearings and study were given. No substantive objections to the proposal were voiced in Congress. No costs were incurred by the Government for the realization of the project. The whole "Shevchenko affair" appears unworthy of the Washington Post.

Though this letter is already long, I cannot overlook the arrogant affront, the calculated inflammatory statement and brazen appeal to bigotry reflected in the charge that: "It is perhaps enough to say that both in the writings of the poet and in the efforts to exploit him there are elements which are offensive in various ways to Americans of Russian, German, Polish, Catholic, Jewish, Orthodox, and even Ukrainian background. A statue of Shevchenko would be a monument to disunity and recrimination among Americans."

Shevchenko was an inherently religious man. Old and New Testament influences affected his writings profoundly. His poetry is permeated with appeals to and respect for God. He is honored by Ukrainians of all religious faiths. The joint resolution of Congress authorizing the project was sponsored by Congressmen of Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant faiths. This is not to overlook the fact that religious "arguments" have been utilized on occasion by some of his detractors through distortion just as the Washington Post has done.

No doubt references have been made to anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic expressions in his poem Haydamaky. The theme of a fierce economic, political, and national struggle which inspired this historical poem did not minimize scenes of bloodshed, conflagration, and carnage of Jews, Poles, Ukrainians, women and children.

I have read Shevchenko's poems many times since boyhood. In the poem Haydamaky, Shevchenko expressed his personal abhorrence of the massacres and acts of fratricide by poetic interjections. In his prose preface to the poem, giving information on his source material, Shevchenko says:

"Thank God, that it's all past. When you recall that we are all children of the same mother, that we are all Slavs. Though it may be painful, it must be told: Let the sons and grandsons see that their parents were in error. Let them reestablish brotherly relationship again with their enemies."

Shevchenko was a great admirer of King David as a national hero of the Jews. Like himself, David started out as a shepherd boy adept with the harp and possessing a good singing voice. In translating David's Psalms, Shevchenko attuned his fervently lofty ideals to David's harp.

In conclusion, I am reminded of the last two stanzas of a poem dedicated by William Cullen Bryant to the memory of William Leggett, which expresses the enduring quality of Shevchenko for those who have ears and hearts to listen:

The words of fire that from his pen
 Were flung upon the lucid page,
Still move, still shake the hearts of men
 Amid a cold and coward age.
His love of truth, too warm, too strong
 For hope or fear to chain or chill,
His hate of tyranny and wrong,
 Burn in the breasts he kindled still.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN PANCHUK.

[From the Jewish Digest]

THE FORGOTTEN EPIC OF COUNT SHEPTYTSKY

(By Leo Heiman)

A letter written in Latin and postmarked Vatican City was delivered a few months ago to the desk of Col. David Kahana, chief chaplain of the Israeli Air Force. It was signed by a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church, who is the head of a permanent commission that investigates beatification claims and makes final recommendations concerning eventual elevation to sainthood. The communication sought information about the late Count Andrew Sheptytsky, metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

To millions of Ukrainians, the count is a true Christian saint, but Moscow is trying to prevent his beatification at all costs. Because the Ukrainians venerate the count as their greatest nationalist leader, Moscow is trying to prove that he was not a saint but a pro-Nazi collaborator, and war criminal. Books, films, and other propaganda have been employed by Moscow to villify the late metropolitan as an agent of the Gestapo.

The only surviving witness who personally knew the late count and who can disprove the Soviet charges is Rabbi Kahana. I met the tough-looking rabbi-colonel, known as the fighting rabbi throughout the Israeli armed forces, in the concrete and steel building which houses the general headquarters of the Israeli Air Force.

When I brought up the name of Count Andrew Sheptytsky, Chaplain Kahana was visibly moved. For a moment the clock of history seemed to turn back from July 1962 in Israel to July 1952 in the Ukrainian city of Lvov (Lemberg), where Nazi officers amused themselves by using Jewish children for target practice. Placing his right hand on the Holy Book, Colonel Kahana said:

"I am willing to swear on the Bible that Count Sheptytsky was one of the greatest humanitarians in the history of mankind, certainly the best friend we Jews ever had. I say this not just because he saved my wife, my child, and myself, but because he was instrumental in rescuing hundreds of other Jews from certain death.

"When I met him, he was over 80, paralyzed and near death but not broken in spirit. He was well past the need to seek 'respectability insurance' or political gain. And he was aware that when the Nazis found Jews hiding in a church or monastery, they shot all the priests and monks, and either razed the buildings or converted them into barracks. If the metropolitan was willing to risk his priests and churches, he was moved by true Christianity, by love of our Jewish people, and by a sense of national responsibility. He realized that the enemies of the Ukrainian people would blame the actions of pogrom mobs and rag-tag militia on the entire Ukrainian nation. He therefore decreed that it was the sacred duty of every nationally conscious Ukrainian priest to save as many Jews as possible. Sheptytsky was a Zionist sympathizer and a firm believer in the messianic mission of the Jewish people. In 1942, when Jews were being butchered in the gas chambers of Auschwitz and Treblinka and slaughtered in the lime-filled pits on the outskirts of a thousand European towns and cities, Sheptytsky predicted the creation of an independent Jewish state in the Holy Land."

Pausing only to brush away tears of emotion from his steel-gray eyes, Chaplain Kahana recalled that before World War II Lvov was part of the Polish Republic. "I was the Jewish military chaplain attached to Lvov garrison troops," he said, "rabbi of the Syxtus Street Synagogue and Jewish theology teacher in the city's high schools.

"After the German invasion of Poland, the Nazis tried to wipe out the 200,000 Jews of Lvov and the surrounding hamlets with the aid of pogrom mobs, drunken peasants, and locally recruited militia. But when the Nazis saw that there was more looting than actual killing, and that criminal elements were fighting each other over the spoils rather than murdering Jews, the Nazis brought in the notorious Sinsatz-Komando Lemberg and got down to business with Teutonic thoroughness. Slave-labor roundups, street massacres, and mass executions followed with agonizing frequency.

"Helpless against the tidal wave of murder and destruction, we sought to save our Torah scrolls, synagogue records, and various sacred books. The only safe place was in the crypts of Catholic monasteries and churches. Together with Rabbi Hamaydess, a famous leader of Polish Jewry, I went to see Dr. Kostelnik and asked for an introduction to Metropolitan Sheptytsky. We had already been herded into a ghetto, forced to wear yellow badges, and forbidden to enter the city proper on pain of death. Rabbi Hamaydess could not pose as a Christian, but I shaved off my beard, tore off my yellow badges, and stole out at night to see the metropolitan in his palace on Mount St. George.

"In the old-fashioned, high-ceilinged room that was the metropolitan's office, I saw him pushed in, in his wheelchair. Grasping my hand in his two hands and gazing at me kindly, he said gently: 'I see trouble brings you to me, my son. Please sit down and tell me about it.'

"When I described the sufferings of my people, he broke down and cried. 'I know all about it,' he told me quietly, 'and I have sent several letters to all priests, with orders to have them read to their congregations in all churches. I have warned my people that any person helping the Nazis to persecute or kill Jews will be doomed to eternal damnation.

"'But I am sorry to say there is little more I can do than protest. I have also sent notes to all German officials of the occupation administration and to Himmler himself, protesting against the use of Ukrainian troops in anti-Jewish actions. These young Ukrainians volunteered to fight Communists, but instead of deploying them at the front, the Nazis are forcing them to participate in massacres of helpless Jews. The answer I received was an insulting warning to mind my own business and that but for my age I would have been shot for interceding on behalf of the Jews. My son, I can only pray for you and your people, and hope that prayer helps. Tell me how I can help, besides praying, and I'll do everything in my power * * *'

"I asked the metropolitan to save the Torah scrolls from the synagogues and the children whose parents have been killed by the Nazis, and who were due to die themselves in the next German roundup. The metropolitan called in his brother, Clement, who was in charge of all Ukrainian Catholic monasteries, and the Ihumenia Josepha, the head of all convents. Both declared themselves ready to help. But since the Nazis were raiding Christian orphanages and ordering all boys to parade naked to see whether any of them were circumcised, I was asked to select mostly Jewish girls for the first rescue operation.

"The first rescue operation took place on the night of August 14, 1942, when 200 Jewish children, including the sons of Rabbis Hamaydess and Levin and my own daughter, were smuggled out of the ghetto to monasteries and convents where they were concealed in crypts and given forged certificates of baptism and Ukrainian-sounding names. Then they were dispersed among convent schools and Catholic orphanages in and around Lvov. All of them survived the Nazi occupation and that was because the priests, nuns and monks risked torture and death as they played a deadly game of outwitting Nazi spies, collaborators and stool pigeons. The greatest satisfaction of my life was to gather these Jewish children after the war and to smuggle them out of Soviet Russia to Israel via an underground Zionist railroad and then to watch them grow up in a land of their own, serve in the armed forces, get married, raise families and forget their tragic past.

"After hiding my daughter safely, the Ihumenia Josepha asked me to bring my wife to the convent. The mother superior took my wife to the priest in charge of administration registers who provided her with forged documents identifying her as a native-born Ukrainian Catholic. He also furnished her with a false birth certificate, threw a nun's homespun brown robe around her shoulders and escorted her to the German Population Registry Office. There my wife received a Ukrainian identity card, stamped by the German Occupation Administration, food ration tickets, a domicile permit, and all other essential documents.

"Thanks to the mother superior and the priest, whose name I never learned, my wife was able to pose as a Ukrainian nun and to move freely about the city. She was my principal contact between the ghetto and the monasteries. When the ghetto was liquidated, she maintained a liaison between fugitive Jews and the Ukrainian church leadership. She slept in the Ihumenia Josepha's own cell at the convent, went to church to avoid suspicion and thus avoided exposure and capture for 2 years.

"When the Nazis liquidated the Lvov ghetto, I was among the Jewish men grabbed by the Nazis and thrown into the Janowski concentration camp. Each day thousands were killed by the Nazi guards while others were crippled and emaciated by hunger, beatings, and disease. During those terrible weeks in Janowski camp, I lost all faith in humanity and I might have lost my faith in God too, but for the shining example of Metropolitan Sheptytsky, his brother Clement, the Ihumenia Josepha and hundreds of nameless Ukrainian monks, priests, and nuns.

"Desperately looking for a chance to escape before the Nazis killed me in one of their cruel and senseless games, my opportunity came during a sudden rainstorm that flooded the drainage ditches and turned the camp into a morass. While the guards huddled in their watchtowers, studded with searchlights and machineguns, and the police dogs took cover beneath the watchtower trestles, I crawled on my belly through mud and puddles to the northernmost corner in the fence. Earlier I had noticed that some ricocheting bullets fired by the guards into a group of Jewish prisoners had torn down a few strands of the barbed wire which the Germans had not yet repaired.

"It took me an eternity to get through the gap in the first row of wire and to disentangle myself from the twisted concertina wire of the second security fence. Rolling in the mud to hide from a searchlight's probing beam and burrowing through excrement and pools of coagulating blood to kill the scent of a human body whenever a dog barked, I managed to reach the dilapidated wooden buildings of a Lvov suburb. From there I ran uphill toward the metropolitan's palace on Mount St. George.

"When a sleepy monk finally opened a small barred window in response to my frantic knocking at the night gate, he took one look at me—ragged, dirty, emaciated, bleeding from wounds and scratches, and evil-smelling—crossed himself and shut the gate in my face. I knocked again but there was no answer. Just as I heard the jackbooted steps of a Nazi police patrol approaching, the gate suddenly opened and another monk dragged me inside. 'Brother Mykola almost fainted when he saw you.' the monk explained. 'He was sure you were a ghostly apparition.'

"I must have been a repulsive sight as I followed the monk to the metropolitan's private apartment. But the prelate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church embraced me and kissed me and then ordered his secretary to take me to a hot bath, burn my rags, and dress me in a monk's robes. The metropolitan was still waiting for me, despite the late hour, when I came out of the bath. He wept again, and asked me to tell him of my life in the Nazi camp. For 2 hours I talked, until at dawn the metropolitan asked me to join him in prayer. I helped him out of his wheelchair and supported him as he knelt before the crucifix. He prayed in his way and I in mine.

"I remained hidden in Count Sheptytsky's private library. Food was brought to me there. Only at night did I go out for a walk in the walled palace garden. In the spring of 1943, the metropolitan was taken down in his wheelchair to the garden every day at dusk. He sent away the monk who was his guide and I pushed the chair for an hour through the flower-rimmed garden paths as we talked about politics, philosophy, psychology, and theology. Needless to say, the metropolitan never tried to convert me. Once he gave me an old book to read. It was a Ukrainian priest's account of a visit to the Holy Land which ended with a description of Jewish suffering throughout the ages and a prediction that the Jews were doomed to weep forever because they had rejected Jesus.

"When the metropolitan inquired if I had finished the book and I replied in the affirmative, he suddenly seized my hand, kissed it and, in a voice choked with tears, apologized. Everybody kissed the metropolitan's hand, and he himself had to kiss only the Pope's hand, so I could not understand why he was apologizing so tearfully to a fugitive rabbi. The metropolitan said that at a time when the Nazis were butchering Jews, it was a tactless mistake on his part to let me read a book whose author denied the Jewish people all hope unless they accepted Christianity. He insisted that I accept his apology.

"When I tell you that Andrew Sheptytsky was a saint, I do not exaggerate. I am a professional officer, with 20 years of military service—5 in the Polish Army and 15 in the Israeli Armed Forces. I am an Orthodox rabbi and a doctor of philosophy and theology. I know human nature and I know that the qualities which make a saint are so rare as to be almost nonexistent. But Count Sheptytsky possessed them all.

"Besides the count's brother Clement, the Ihumenia Josepha and the hundreds of Ukrainian clergy who risked their lives to save Jews, there was Father Marko, a village priest who rescued more than 40 Jewish children from Nazi firing squads. Later, I had an opportunity to help him escape to the United States, where he now lives.

"After World War II, following Count Sheptytsky's death and the suppression of an anti-Soviet uprising by Ukrainian guerrillas, the Soviet authorities imprisoned, exiled or executed most of the Ukrainian priests. I was then a colonel in the Polish Army and also associated with an underground Zionist organization which operated an escape route from Russia across Poland and Czechoslovakia to the American occupation zones in Germany and Austria.

"To avoid certain death, the Ukrainian priests who had helped me masquerade as a Ukrainian, now had to pose as pious Jews with beards and sidelocks. After crossing the River San into Poland, they made their way to Warsaw where they contacted me. Now I was able to repay their kindness. I lived next door to Wladyslaw Gomulka, now the Communist boss of Poland, and our apartment block was guarded by security police but no one suspected my links to an underground Zionist organization. When elderly, pious-looking Jews were seen entering my apartment, the security officers assumed that leaders of surviving Jewish congregations had come to ask me for assistance or to discuss religious problems.

"I gave the priests false Jewish identification cards and smuggled them out of Poland with transports of Israel-bound Jews. When the transports passed through Western Germany, the priests were guided to Ukrainian DP camps where they received new documents and visas for the United States and Canada. I compiled a list of over 240 such priests and monks who had rescued Jews from the Nazis. But this list is not complete. And now the Russians come up with documentary proof that the Ukrainian Catholic Church was a pro-Nazi organization and that the late Metropolitan Sheptytsky was a war criminal.

"The scientific triumphs of the Soviets are more than nullified by their basic attitude of deceit, contempt for human decencies and crimes of genocide committed in the name of communism. In this respect, at least, the Kremlin is ruled by the same kind of gangster regime which brought shame and ruin to Nazi Germany. That is why I felt it my duty to speak up and tell the truth about Count Andrew Sheptytsky, the only saint I recognize."

As Colonel Kahana accompanied me to the headquarters gate on my way out of his office, supersonic Israeli jet fighters streaked across the sky. Rabbi Kahana pointed upward and said: "You see this fighter formation? Four pilots in this squadron are among the Jewish children saved by Metropolitan Sheptytsky and his heroic assistants."

NAVAL REPAIR FACILITY, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House joint resolution calling for a continuation of the

Naval Repair Facility at San Diego, Calif. I feel that the contemplated closing of this very important facility will in fact be damaging to the defense posture of the Nation. The Naval Repair Facility serves as a service station to the Pacific Fleet and it is essential that it always be immediately available to the important naval commands stationed in the San Diego area.

I have called the importance of this facility to the attention of the Secretary of Defense and have requested that any final action be deferred until the newly formed Defense Department-Navy Board can make an objective survey of the situation. I am convinced that an impartial study will provide more than ample justification for the continuation of the facility.

The resolution reads:

> Whereas since World War I the Naval Repair Facility at San Diego has served as a vital repair and overhaul base serving all elements of the Pacific Fleet in wartime and peacetime; and
>
> Whereas the men and women of the repair facility have established an outstanding record of production efficiency; and
>
> Whereas San Diego as the home port of many Pacific-based ships of the U.S. Navy as well as headquarters of numerous important naval commands, must be in a position to immediately service elements of the fleet on an emergency basis during peacetime activities or during the exigencies of war; Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of Congress that the Naval Repair Facility at San Diego should be continued as a vital adjunct to the U.S. Fleet.

THE NEED TO SET A NATIONAL EXAMPLE OF ECONOMY BY STRESSING REHABILITATION AND THE ROLE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IS BEING IGNORED IN THE URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in his inspirational address to the joint session of Congress, President Lyndon B. Johnson included a pledge which I hope heralds a new approach to the problems of a growing Federal budget. I refer to that part of his speech in which he said:

> I pledge that the expenditures of your Government will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality. I will insist that the Government get a dollar's value for a dollar spent. The Government will set an example of prudence and economy.

The sincerity of the President's remarks has drawn the plaudits of such conservative newspapers as the Wall Street Journal, and the head of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Edward Neilan.

Here in Congress, the President will find many allies for his economy drive. I would like to suggest that a good place to start the introduction of thrift and frugality in the Federal Government would be the federally aided urban renewal program. The key to success in economizing in this area, however, is to place a new stress on rehabilitation and the central role of the private homeowner and businessman. This will preserve urban renewal without its excesses, and without losing the many benefits of which this program is capable.

In the Housing Act of 1949 Congress defined the national housing policy in section 2 and declared that:

> Private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can; governmental assistance shall be utilized where feasible to enable private enterprise to serve more of the total need.

Emphasis on this clear policy statement by Congress has been particularly lacking in the District of Columbia. The situation as has been uncovered by the hard work of a House District of Columbia Subcommittee, and reports in the press reveal a number of factors inhibiting both local control and individual effort with inflated costs and poor results the invariable result. These factors have kept urban renewal from obtaining the most beneficial results in the most economical manner.

Several things have gone wrong in the District of Columbia's urban renewal program.

First, despite the disclaimers of Federal urban renewal officials that they have no desire to seek Federal control over local programs, the Federal Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia has imposed its vague and inadequate standards for housing codes upon District property owners. It has scorned the use of the housing codes and regulations of the District government. Not only does this Federal policy raise doubts as to the validity of local urban renewal agency findings of District areas in need of urban renewal, but an atmosphere of confusion is created. Businessmen and homeowners who wish to keep their property up to standard are discouraged from doing so. I spoke on this on December 12, 1963—Congressional Record, pages 24321–24323—and include, as part of my remarks, a legal opinion by the District's Corporation Counsel.

Second, projects in the District of Columbia have stressed luxury apartment projects and prime office space. Apartments renting for $175 per month do not qualify as moderate or low income housing and do not meet the intent of the 1949 act to provide better housing for those who cannot find it, or afford it. Many families, a large proportion of them Negro, formerly living in urban renewal project areas, have not been substantially aided in their attempts to find decent housing they can afford. The pattern in the District of Columbia in this regard follows the national pattern, so much so that urban renewal has come to mean "Negro removal" in the minds of those it was intended to help.

Third, businessmen and homeowners point to the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project where the ill-advised removal of 141 small businessmen from that project area, without any structural survey and analysis of the condition of their business buildings, proves that the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency and the National Capital Planning Commission, both Federal agencies, have not heeded national housing policy regarding private enterprise. These businessmen and homeowners point out, in their frustration and exasperation, that the 1950 comprehensive plan for the District of Columbia—the basic and official plan for the District's long-range development—calls for the location of business in the very area now occupied by these 141 small businessmen. No Federal agency, or Federal or District official, should have such unlimited power to rewrite this local plan at will. Moreover, Congress must not support an urban renewal policy which, in practice, sounds the death knell of small business. I am pleased to say that the District's Republican Party leaders have protested the administration of the District's urban renewal program as injurious to the District as well as its citizens.

Clearly, urban renewal officials should not be permitted to exercise a policy which deliberately ignores and frustrates efforts by local businessmen, apartment owners, and private homeowners to rehabilitate their own property at no cost to the American taxpayer. This policy, however, has been adopted by acquiescence by both the Federal Urban Renewal Administration, and the District of Columbia Commissioners as well.

The difficulties of persuading urban renewal officials to make use of the rehabilitation concept is not limited to the District of Columbia, of course. In the 9 years since rehabilitation was stressed in the Housing Act of 1954, only a few thousand of the 100,000 or more dwelling units scheduled for rehabilitation have actually been improved. Yet, the Federal Urban Renewal Commmissioner, William L. Slayton, has said that:

> The renewal of our Nation's cities, as you so well know, will simply not be achieved without an effective rehabilitation program. Without rehabilitation, the cost in dollars and in human terms—the inevitable personal hardships caused by dislocation—are simply beyond our capacity.

In the Columbia Plaza urban renewal project rightful owners of property tried, in vain, to proceed with redevelopment and improvement of their private holdings without any governmental subsidy. Officials of the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, however, had other plans for the area, and another redeveloper, selected in advance by them, stands to reap a $3,500,000 taxpayer subsidy and untold benefits beside. This subsidy would have been wholly unnecessary had the original owners been encouraged and assisted, under the direction of the Housing Act of 1949, to redevelop their own property as they were prepared to do, and were capable of doing.

This policy of extravagant waste has been repeated in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area. At hearings held by the District's Commissioners on July 1, 2, and 3, 1963, Fontaine C. Bradley appeared for the Eugene Meyer family and heirs, urging the removal of the 6-acre Henderson Castle site from the

Adams-Morgan plan. The owners of the Henderson Castle site further indicated that their own development of the property would proceed more rapidly than any development under urban renewal, would not cost the taxpayers a single dollar of urban renewal funds, and would yield a far greater return to the District of Columbia if privately developed. Yet the District's Commissioners, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency have failed to respond to this commonsense appeal.

In a public statement on December 4, 1963, the Property Owners Protective Improvement Association of the District of Columbia reported that subsequent to the National Capital Planning Commission declaring, on June 16, 1960, "that Adams-Morgan is not a slum," many private improvements have been made, or are in process, in areas "B" and "C" in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project without subsidies of any kind, Federal, or local. I include here the impressive list of these improvements set out in the association's statement:

1. First of them is the $30 million Hilton Hotel in area "B."

2. The two Cafritz office buildings, costing $24 million, in area "B."

3. An office building on the south side of Florida Avenue, costing $3 million just outside of area "B."

4. Owners of 35 pieces of property in areas "B" and "C," namely the Fulton Brylawsky interests, even now are rebuilding approximately 10 lots in area "B" on Belmont and Kalorama Roads. These efforts involve both restoration and new construction.

5. The A. M. Associates, of which Messrs. Gerald J. Miller, Donald J. Brown, and Melvin Lenkin are the trustees, have purchased on Wyoming Avenue, between 18th and 19th Streets, approximately 13 lots on which they are preparing to build luxury apartments in area "B." We understand the new owners of this land are asking for zoning to permit higher buildings. In like manner, most of areas "B" and "C" eventually will be zoned for higher buildings. We believe the present owners should receive the benefit of higher zoning values rather than friends of RLA.

6. Mr. Roscoe Jones owns properties in Adams-Morgan in area "B." He is restoring at least one house on Kalorama Road.

7. Mrs. Emma Parker is restoring a house on California Street, spending thousands of dollars in area "B."

8. Mrs. Alva Dawson owns a large former embassy on Vernon Street, area "B." She purchased the property to restore it into apartments. Mrs. Dawson is justifiably afraid to spend money on it while the RLA hangs over us. Interest payments and no rentals coming in are costing her a sizable amount.

9. Mrs. Dawson also has an apartment house at 1919 19th Street NW. She spent $22,000 restoring it. This property is threatened by RLA to make a playground in area "B."

10. Mr. Zatinsky has just renovated an apartment house at 2110 19th Street NW., in area "B."

11. Mrs. Mildred Gott Bryan testified before the District Commissioners' hearing on July 1, 1963, that she is able and willing to modernize her Imperial apartment house on Columbia Road between Ontario Road and 18th Street, in area "C." The RLA will demolish that property for parking if urban renewal is approved for this area.

12. Stant Lithograph, Inc., on Champlain Street wants to erect a new and beautiful building in area "C."

13. Jarboe Printing Co. will enlarge its new building on Champlain Street in area "C." It is noteworthy that the Jarboe Printing Co. had its property in the Southwest seized under that urban renewal project and was forced to relocate. He did relocate in Adams-Morgan and, if urban renewal is initiated in this area, his property again will be seized and police powers used by RLA to force him to relocate for the second time because of urban renewal. RLA would demolish it.

14. The C. I. Smith Paint Co. will erect a new building on Champlain Street in area "C." RLA would demolish its present building.

15. Mr. Thomas J. Folliot, at 2407 18th Street NW., has done extensive modernizing of his building in area "C." RLA would demolish all of the east side of 19th Street from Columbia Road south to Florida Avenue, if urban renewal is approved for Adams-Morgan.

16. Mr. Tom Smith, on 18th Street, has modernized his building inside and out. He is in area B. Urban renewal would demolish it.

17. Colortone Press, at 2400 17th Street, has spent thousands of dollars on its building and will spend thousands more in area C. Urban renewal plan proposes demolition of this building.

18. Miss DeWitt Plummer has spent several thousands of dollars restoring her house at 2514 Ontario Road, NW. in area C. Urban renewal plan calls for property to be demolished for parking for the benefit of merchants on Columbia Road.

19. Mrs. Angela Fox has spent several thousand dollars modernizing her home at 2517 Ontario Road, NW. in area C. RLA proposes demolition of her property for parking for the benefit of Columbia Road merchants.

20. The M. & M. Pharmacy has spent $45,000 or more remodeling its building at Ontario and Columbia Road in area C. RLA would demolish it for parking.

21. Recently, Avignone Freres has spent an enormous amount of money on an enlargement of its restaurant on Columbia Road in area C.

22. The Park Plaza Apartment House, 276 apartments being restored inside and out by Sidney Mensh. Area C.

23. Argonne West Apartment House recently restored by Sidney Mensh. Area C.

24. Woodly Apartment House, Columbia Road, completely restored. Area A.

25. The new Rock Creek Park Hotel, 1925 Belmont Road. Mr. Louis Montague. Area A.

26. Several houses on Calvert Street, west of 18th Street.

27. Mr. J. B. Shapiro is trying to get permission to build a high-rise apartment house on Adams Mill Road, NW., a few feet from area C.

28. Three huge luxury apartment houses have been built just south of area C on 18th Street. They are the Dupont East, Imperial House and the Corcoran House.

In addition to these improvements in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project, the Kalorama Triangle Restoration Society recently pointed out more than 80 of 287 homes in the Kalorama Triangle—area A of the Adams-Morgan project—have undergone substantial restoration since 1959.

Also, of the 43 apartment buildings in this famed and historic triangle, 16 have been modernized and restored recently.

The Kalorama Triangle Restoration Society has long been on record as opposed to urban renewal for the Kalorama Triangle. Yet this area—known as "the Gold Coast" of the Nation's Capital—was included in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project at the whim of the officials of the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency. When the House District subcommittee members asked Phil A. Doyle, Executive Director of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, why this area was included, in view of the fact that it is one of the finest residential areas in the Nation, his answer was that Connecticut Avenue provided a better boundary than Columbia Road. This proves that whatever is included, or left out, of the District's urban renewal program is dependent entirely on the fancies of nonelected officials in charge of the District's urban renewal program. Hard facts about structural soundness have no place in their decisions.

Business is being stifled and discouraged as a result. MBG Associates recently announced their plan for a modern apartment building at 1851 Wyoming Avenue, in the heart of the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project, "not predicated on urban renewal." This business firm states that "private lending institutions are willing to go into the area, to finance both restoration and modern, new buildings without Federal Government assistance through urban renewal." The question which naturally arises is, why not encourage this type of private enterprise? Why do the Federal agencies concerned with urban renewal insist on doing the job themselves?

MBG Associates urged that the A and B areas of the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project be eliminated from the plan. Yet the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency seeks to turn the entire Adams-Morgan area over to the federally aided program which it administers. It would be far better to encourage and assist owners of private property to rehabilitate their own property. There is nothing wrong with selective urban renewal. Rather than spend $20 million of public funds unnecessarily in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project, the Federal policy of thrift, frugality, prudence, and economy advocated by President Lyndon B. Johnson can be carried out best by encouraging and assisting private property owners in the Adams-Morgan project area to do their own improvement work without Federal subsidy, Federal controls, Federal redtape, and other Federal handicaps imposed on an unwilling and voteless citizenry by an overzealous Federal bureaucracy.

The property owners of the Adams-Morgan project area have already done a great deal to improve their property, and undoubtedly could do much more if the Federal Urban Renewal Administration and the District's urban renewal officials, including the District's Commissioners, devoted themselves to encouraging and assisting them in this enterprise.

Washington, D.C., as well as other cities needs a workable urban renewal rehabilitation program. The URA Commissioner, William L. Slayton, says the urban renewal program cannot exist without a rehabilitation program. To be successful, a rehabilitation program must encourage and assist private rehabilitation of private property by private property owners.

Rehabilitation programs such as Adams-Morgan, which must of necessity be long term, should be planned to take advantage of changes in environment. It may be necessary to build into the Federal urban renewal regulations, and into the housing law as well, requirements for additional flexibility, but with appropriate safeguards.

Meanwhile, urban renewal officials at the Federal and local level, and the District's Commissioners as well, should take immediate steps to clean up their urban renewal program. They must bring it into line with the spirit and intent of the Housing Act of 1949, not just pay lipservice to that act. Since the District Commissioners have ordered a resurvey of the condition of the buildings in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area, and have admitted they may have made a mistake in the Columbia Plaza project, the responsible officials in the District and in the Federal Urban Renewal Administration have a duty to start anew.

The problems I raise here, using the District of Columbia as an illustration, are not confined to the Nation's Capital.

Next year, the Special Housing Subcommittee of the House of Representatives will be holding additional hearings on urban renewal. There is ample time for the District projects to be corrected and improved in the direction of rehabilitation and the use of private enterprise. This will enable the committee to tell whether the fine words of Urban Renewal Commissioner William L. Slayton in Georgia this past fall, stressing that rehabilitation was the key to urban renewal's future, are more than lipservice paid to a recognized policy objective of the Congress.

If this administrative change of heart is not carried out, then I will move to improve this situation through legislative channels. It may well be necessary to redefine our national goals for urban renewal, to reemphasize the intent of Congress with respect to rehabilitation and the role of private enterprise, and to redefine the present wide areas of discretion left to nonelected officials. Under the circumstances, I would suggest that legislation for the District, such as S. 628 as presently written, should be held in abeyance until national policy is put back on the right track.

In a speech on December 12 in this House I discussed the importance of objective criteria and standards to a successful Federal urban renewal program. I said, among other things, that:

> It is apparent that Mr. Slayton is determined to force on the District of Columbia the same inadequate and vague standards that plagued urban renewal in Cleveland's Erieview I urban renewal project. Under these standards almost any building, no matter what its structural condition may be, even the U.S. Capitol Building itself, it was pointed out in the hearings by a witness for the General Accounting Office, can be declared substandard and almost any project can be justified. Efforts by the District's Commissioners to fulfill their responsibilities to the citizens will be useless unless Mr. Slayton allows for the local initiative he has so often talked about approvingly in the past.
>
> The Department of General Administration of the District of Columbia has expressed great concern, on behalf of the District's Commissioners, over the present practice and apparent future plans of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency to set up and enforce its own housing standards separate and distinct from those of the government of the District of Columbia. In a memorandum under date of February 1, 1962, it said that:
>
> "Some additional questions which we have in the area of enforcement are: When is RLA through with the area? When does Licenses and Inspections start enforcing the minimum standards in the area? Who inspects (polices) periodically for violations of the requirements imposed by the urban renewal plan that are either above, variations of, or inconsistent with, the minimal standards? Why was the covenant technique applied to the urban renewal area? Was the 40-year time increment chosen because it is consistent with the financing of the project? Will our courts, in the years ahead, be clogged with the increased workload that would be generated by the civil actions instituted by RLA in enforcing these voluminous maverick requirements? We use the word "voluminous" because in 40 or 50 years, if we impose dozens of requirements not contained in our codes and regulations upon each urban renewal project and ultimately have 40 or 50 projects in the city, we could have literally thousands of these special requirements imposed upon a picture-puzzle city.
>
> "Cognizant of the temptation to say zoning is too weak an instrument to do a more satisfactory urban renewal job, therefore, we should resort to the more drastic techniques available through the urban renewal process. This matter has given us great concern for some time. We have carefully weighed the pros and cons and believe that the best interest of the Nation's Capital can be best served over the future years by tailoring our urban renewal plans and programs consistent with our minimal standards contained in the building, zoning, housing, sign and related codes and regulations.
>
> "This, of course, would not preclude reasonable special rules for the initial development of an area, but in general the present trend toward setting up myriad special rules for longtime application leads to benefits difficult to prove, and most certainly leads to confusing and expensive enforcement situations."
>
> The Federal Urban Renewal Administration, in the interest of sound government, as well as in the interest of prudence, thrift, and economy should support the District's building, zoning, and housing codes and regulations, rather than undercut them as it has been doing. The problems facing the District of Columbia are common to other cities and towns in our country. Only chaos can result from the present course of the Federal Urban Renewal Administration. Obviously, the properly constituted governing bodies of our cities and towns, conversant as they are with their own local conditions, are much better qualified to establish and enforce building, zoning, and housing codes and regulations for their local jurisdictions than is some Federal official, even if it is Mr. Slayton, sitting behind a desk in Washington.

I include as part of my remarks the opinion of the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia on this point which I mentioned briefly in passing earlier.

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C., December 16, 1963.

Re Whether section 110 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is an integral part of the D.C. Redevelopment Act of 1945. (CCO: 755.1—sec. 110, Housing Act of 1949, as amended.)

The COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

GENTLEMEN: At a meeting of the Board of Commissioners on November 14, 1963, you requested that an opinion be rendered by this office concerning certain questions raised by Phil A. Doyle, Executive Director, District of Columbia Land Agency. Specifically, Mr. Doyle inquired as to whether section 110 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, may be taken into account in determining the eligibility of an area in the District of Columbia for designation as an urban renewal project area.

In further elaboration of this question, Mr. Doyle by letter to me stated as follows:

"I raised this question with the District Commissioners at this morning's meeting because it appears to me that if section 20(i) of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 is interpreted by you and the District Commissioners to mean, as it seems to us to mean, that an area with the characteristics described in section 110 is eligible for designation as an urban renewal project, we would, in a survey of an area, include criteria which could not be included if section 110 is not an integral part of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945. The important criteria included in section 110 but not mentioned in the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 are stated under paragraph (c) of section 110.

"If section 110 is not an integral part of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, that act would appear to me to be so limited in its description of eligible areas that it would be infeasible to undertake in the District of Columbia conservation and rehabilitation projects of the kind contemplated by the Housing Act of 1949, as amended."

The question raised involves, first, the scope of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 and, second, the extent to which section 110 of the Housing Act of 1949 affects that act.

By the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (60 Stat. 790, sec. 5–701, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), Congress declared that "owing to technological and sociological changes, obsolete layout, and other factors, conditions existing in the District of Columbia with respect to substandard housing and blighted areas, including the use of buildings in alleys as dwellings for human habitation, are injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and welfare, and it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to protect and promote the welfare of the inhabitants of the seat of the Government by eliminating all such injurious conditions by employing all means necessary and appropriate for the purpose; * * *."

Congress further declared that it was necessary to acquire property to effectuate its declared policy "by the discontinuance of the use for human habitation in the District of Columbia of substandard dwellings and of buildings in alleys and blighted areas, and thereby to eliminate the substandard housing conditions and the communities in the inhabited alleys and blighted areas in such District, * * * and it is necessary to modernize the planning and development of such portions of such District."

In its declaration, Congress also spoke of the "accomplishment of the necessary social and economic benefits" and referred to the portions of the District with which it was concerned as "obsolescent or obsolescing."

In order to achieve its purpose Congress, in section 5 of the act, granted to the Redevelopment Land Agency the "power to further the redevelopment of blighted territory in the District of Columbia and the prevention, reduction, or elimination of blighting factors of causes of blight and for that purpose to acquire and assemble real property."

In section 3(n) of the act, "redevelopment is defined as including "the replanning, redesign, and original development of undeveloped areas, which by reason of street layout, lot layout or other causes, are backward and stagnant and therefore blighted."

The act contains no definition as such of "blight" or "blighting factors." The usual meaning of these words is "something that impairs or destroys", "to cause to deteriorate", and "marked by termination of healthy growth and development accompanied by deterioration and decline of property values," (Webster's Third International Dictionary) and Congress referred to blighted areas as "obsolescent or obsolescing" and as "backward and stagnant."

In the case of *Schneider* v. *District of Columbia, et al.* (117 F. Supp. 703), the Redevelopment Act was challenged as being unconstitutional on two grounds, (1) that it authorized the taking by eminent domain of the fee title to private property and the sale or lease of that title to other private persons for private use; and (2) that the statute authorized the taking of property in "blighted areas" without defining that term and thus failed to establish any standard sufficiently definite to sustain the delegation of power.

That court approached the constitutional challenge in three parts. First, it considered a slum; second, the land upon which the slum exists; and third, the "blighted areas." The court described a slum as being "made up of houses (or substitutes for houses), the appurtenances thereon and people. The houses and appurtenances are such that the people live in filth and breed disease and crime" (Schneider, supra, p. 704).

The court described blighted areas as: "sections of cities which are not at the present time used to their fullest economic possibility or are not arranged to fit current ideas of city development. An outstanding example is Trinity Church and its surrounding cemetery at the corner of Wall Street and Broadway in New York City. Apartment houses would be more economically efficient than are single dwellings. Phrases used to describe this situation are 'inadequate planning of the area,' 'excessive land coverage by the buildings thereon,' 'defective design and arrangement of the buildings thereon,' 'faulty street or lot layout,' 'economically or socially undesirable land uses.' The statutes dealing with these areas are usually called urban redevelopment laws. The areas are frequently called blighted. They are in no sense slums or similar to slums; they are out of date. They do not breed disease or crime; they fail to measure up to their maximum potential use in terms of economic, social, architectural, or civic desirability" (Schneider, supra, p. 714).

The court proceeded to consider the problem of the slum. It held that the Redevelopment Act is valid insofar as it authorizes the condemnation of improvements upon lands which are the creating or perpetuating causes of conditions injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and welfare, as that term is used to describe breeding grounds for crime and disease.

In connection with the constitutionality of seizure of title to the land upon which slums exist, the court held that such title cannot be seized merely because a slum presently exists upon the land. The court's view was that some further necessitous circumstance must exist to validate such a seizure. It must be either that the clearance of the slum is impracticable without taking the title to the land or that proposed restrictions which can be imposed only through the medium of a resale are fairly calculated to prevent recurrence of slum conditions.

Considering the third problem, that is, the blighted or deteriorated area upon which no slums presently exist, the court held that the act did not extend this far and that if it did it would be invalid for two reasons; viz (1) a public purpose would not be served and (2) "blight" was not sufficiently defined in the statute.

The court considered blight as covering two possible factual situations, one where the plan is to redevelop an area in which no slums exist and the other where the plan is to redevelop an area which the Government deems appropriate for redevelopment but only a part of which constitutes slums. As to the first such situation, the court described the area as one which failed to meet modern standards. "Let us suppose that it is backward, stagnant, not properly laid out, economically 18th century—anything except detrimental to health, safety, or morals" (Schneider, supra, p. 719).

As to this type area, the court held that the Congress, in legislating for the District of Columbia, has no power to authorize the seizure by eminent domain of property for the sole purpose of redeveloping the area according to its, or its agent's, judgment of what a well-developed, well-balanced neighborhood should be.

As to the second phase of this problem, the court, reciting that the Government claimed power to seize all the property in any area which it might select as appropriate so long as the area included some slums, held that the act did not reach this far and stated that, if it did, it would be invalid.

The Schneider case, having been decided by a three-judge statutory court, was appealed directly to the Supreme Court of the United States, sub nom, *Berman* v. *Parker* (348 U.S. 26; 99 L. ed. 27). In reviewing the District court's decision, the Supreme Court held that the act was not limited to slums as narrowly defined by the District court and that the standards prescribed were adequate in connection with "the blighted areas that tend to produce slums." Thus, the Supreme Court held that the term "blight" is, together with the other references in the act, a sufficient standard to support the delegation of power to acquire areas that tend to produce slums. Stated otherwise, the act is not limited in its application to existing slums but also reaches to those areas in which slums do not presently exist, i.e., blighted areas which, because of the conditions existing therein, are inclined toward becoming slums.

It should be noted that the District court's concept of a "blighted area" was confined to areas which presently are not injurious to the public health, safety or morals. However, the Supreme Court referred to such areas as they relate to slums, that is, as forerunners of slums. Since the term "blight" is not defined in the act, those administering the act are left to ascertain and judge which factors are causing the deterioration or decay of the area and thereby making it prone to the eventual creation of slums. (See *Lichter* v. *United States,* 334 U.S. 742; 92 L. ed. 1694.)

The case history being thus established, it becomes appropriate to undertake a consideration of the effect of section 110(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, on the scope of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act. Prior to 1954, financial assistance was available under the Housing Act of 1949 only in connection with the acquisition of properties in slum or blighted areas and the clearance and redevelopment of said properties. In 1954, Congress determined to broaden the Federal assistance by enlarging the Housing Act so as to include conservation or rehabilitation type projects. By section 311 of the Housing Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 590, 626), these projects were defined as follows:

"For the purposes of this subsection, 'rehabilitation' or 'conservation' may include the restoration and renewal of a blighted, deteriorated, or deteriorating area by (1) carrying out plans for a program of voluntary repair and rehabilitation of buildings or other improvements in accordance with the urban renewal plan; (2) acquisition of real property and demolition or removal of buildings and improvements thereon where necessary to eliminate unhealthful, insanitary or unsafe conditions, lessen density, eliminate obsolete or other uses detrimental to the public welfare, or to otherwise remove or prevent the spread of blight or deterioration or to provide land for needed public facilities; (3) installation, construction, or reconstruction of such improvements as are described in clause (3) of the preceding sentence; and (4) the disposition of any property acquired in such urban renewal area (including sale, initial leasing, or retention by the local public agency itself) at its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan."

By section 316 of the Housing Act of 1954 Congress amended the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 by adding the following to section 20 thereof:

"In addition to its authority under any other provision of this Act, the Agency is hereby authorized to plan and undertake urban renewal projects (as such projects are defined in title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended), and in connection therewith the Agency, the District Commissioners, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the other appropriate agencies operating within the District of Columbia shall have all of the rights and powers which they have with respect to a project or projects financed in accordance with the preceding subsections of this section: *Provided,* That for the purpose of this subsection the word 'redevelopment' wherever found in this Act (except in section 3(n) shall mean 'urban renewal' and the references in section 6 to acquisition, disposition, or assembly of real property for a project shall mean the undertaking of an urban renewal project."

In previously considering the effect of this amendment, I have expressed the opinion that it did not broaden the scope of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act by extending it to areas other than those described in said act. (CCO: 775.1–Bolling Air Force Base, dated May 17, 1961) In a supplemental opinion dated July 13, 1961, there are set forth the reasons upon which this view is based. In summary, those reasons are that a literal incorporation of the definition of urban renewal projects as found in the Housing Act of 1954 which lead to absurd results. In particular, a part of that definitions reads as follows: "*And provided further,* That financial assistance shall not be extended under this title for any project involving slum clearance and redevelopment of an area which is not clearly predominantly residential in character."

If such language were incorporated in the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act it would obviously convey no meaning since the District does not give but rather seeks financial assistance. For this and other reasons more fully set forth in the Bolling opinions, I concluded that the legislative history must be considered in determining the effect of the reference to the definition of urban renewal projects in the Housing Act of 1954. This history makes it perfectly clear that Congress intended only to authorize the local agencies to engage in the new kind of projects which, as stated above, were added and were the conservation and rehabilitation type projects. Accordingly, it is my view that the above-referenced amendment serves to incorporate the definition of urban renewal project in the Housing Act of 1954 as it relates to such new activities.

The "criteria" to which Mr. Doyle refers in section 110(c) is set forth in the definitions of conservation and rehabilitation type projects. It is my opinion that this portion of the definitions is an integral part of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945. However, the inclusion of this part of the Housing Act of 1954 did not serve to broaden the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act since that act, as construed by the Supreme Court, already extended to the blighted areas which tend to cause slums. The so-called criteria contained in the definition of rehabilitation and conservation are related to removal of conditions which are causing the area to be blighted. A fortiori, these conditions are clearly relevant in determining whether any particular area is blighted so as to be within the scope of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Section 110 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended by the Housing Act of 1954 is not "in toto" an integral part of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945.

2. Those portions of the definition of urban renewal project contained in the Housing Act of 1954 relating to rehabilitation and conservation type projects are an integral part of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945.

3. The conditions referred to in the definition of rehabilitation and conservation type projects in the Housing Act of 1949 as amended by the Housing Act of 1954 are relevant in determining whether any particular area is blighted so as to be within the scope of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended.

Respectfully,

CHESTER H. GRAY,
Corporation Counsel,
District of Columbia.

H.R. 7278, TO RELEASE SURPLUS CADMIUM

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of December 18, 1963, reported that the price of cadmium has shot up to $3 or more a pound compared to a price of only $1.70 a pound earlier this year.

I am sorry to say that our Federal Government is guilty of causing this increase in price and in fact is the reason for widespread speculation in this important metal.

We have a substantial surplus of cadmium in Federal stockpiles over and above our anticipated maximum needs in an emergency. Yet, redtape, bureaucratic delay and governmental tampering with the law of supply and demand have caused artificial shortages of this metal.

Our Federal surplus of cadmium is equal to more than a year's total domestic need. The amount we have in surplus over the maximum Government objective would balance supply and demand for a 5-year period at the present rate.

Interested Federal agencies seem favorable to releasing these excess stocks. Yet, nothing happens. The shortage of cadmium worsens and some firms have been forced to the wall because they cannot get cadmium at any price.

More than a year ago, I introduced legislation to release 2 million pounds of surplus cadmium. Delay in answers from the executive agencies involved caused the bill to die before it could be reported out by the House Armed Services Committee.

On the first day of this current session, I again introduced a bill for the release of 2 million pounds of surplus cadmium. Because of the urgings of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], this bill was acted upon promptly and became Public Law 88–8.

In an almost unbelievable method of disposition of this surplus metal involving something called an "upset price," the General Services Administration managed to drive up the price of cadmium and encourage speculation in this important metal.

In an attempt to offset the damage caused by GSA mishandling, I introduced another bill on June 26, H.R. 7278, calling for the release of an additional 5 million pounds of surplus cadmium. That was almost 6 months ago. Despite inquiries to the executive agencies by the House Armed Services Committee, no official reports on this bill have as yet reached the committee.

We hear through the grapevine that the reports are favorable. Yet, somehow, they never reach the committee so that hearings can be started and this latest bill can be acted upon swiftly.

Meanwhile, the price of cadmium continues to go up. Metal platers, paint and chemical firms and even bicycle manufacturers have been unable to obtain adequate quantities of cadmium for their products.

The Federal Government continues to play dog in the manger with its tremendous excess stores of this metal.

Justice too late is no justice at all.

Let us hope that the executive branch will see its way clear in the near future to taking a look at this problem and, for a moment, consider the damage it has done to business and industry.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the article from the Wall Street Journal follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 18, 1963]

PRICE OF CADMIUM INCREASED AGAIN BY FIVE U.S. FIRMS: RISE OF 35 CENTS LIFTS QUOTE ON BIG LOTS TO $3 A POUND; METAL ALSO UP IN CANADA—OTHER CONCERNS STUDY MOVE

NEW YORK.—The price of cadmium was raised another 35 cents a pound by five U.S. producers to $3 a pound for lots of 2,000 pounds or more and to $3.05 a pound for lots of less than 2,000 pounds.

The boost is the latest in a string of increases that has lifted the U.S. price for the metal from the $1.70 a pound charged early this year.

Cadmium is recovered as a byproduct in the processing of zinc concentrates into metallic zinc. About 60 percent of the cadmium recovered is used in electroplating, 20 percent for pigments and paints, and the rest for such purposes as low-melting-point alloys for solder, in nickel-cadmium batteries and in the chemical, plastics, and ceramics industries.

CANADIAN PRICE RAISED

In Canada, Consolidated Mining & Smelting Co. of Canada, Ltd., increased its price to Canadian users by 45 cents a pound, Canadian funds, to $3.25 a pound in lots of 5,000 pounds and over, and to $3.45 a pound for smaller lots.

The rise in the U.S. price was initiated by American Smelting & Refining Co. The boost has been followed by American Metal Climax, Inc.; St. Joseph Lead Co., U.S. Smelting, Refining & Mining Co., and American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.

Other producers, who said they were studying the increase, include Anaconda Co. and New Jersey Zinc Co.

A split price of $2.50 to $2.65 a pound for cadmium had existed from mid-September to mid-November, when the quote became uniform at $2.65. Previously the price had been $2.35 a pound since May 1, when it had risen to $2 a pound from $1.85. Before that the price had been $1.70 a pound, for lots of 2,000 pounds or more, from February 1962 until January 14, 1963, when it rose to the $1.85 level.

SCARCITY IN BRITAIN NOTED

The rise in cadmium's price reflects a scarcity of the metal and continuing rising prices in the United Kingdom, where the metal is said to be quoted at levels ranging from $3.50 to $3.85 a pound. The U.S. Government, in a move to relieve the tight supply, sold 2 million pounds of cadmium to U.S. buyers in April through September. The metal came from Government surplus stocks; the sales were approved by Congress. Bids for this metal ran well above prices quoted by producers, industry sources said.

U.S. consumption of cadmium in 1962 was about 12 million pounds, and production about 10 million pounds.

THE INTERNATIONAL YOUTH SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA AND INTERNATIONAL YOUTH MUSIC COMPETITION AT INTERLOCHEN, MICH., IN AUGUST OF 1964

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, with considerable pride, I rise to advise my colleagues about an ambitious and praiseworthy cultural program which has been launched from Interlochen, Mich., in the congressional district which I represent.

Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, president of the world-famous National Music Camp and Interlochen Arts Academy, and one of our country's best loved music educators, has embarked on a unique project which might well serve as an effective force for world peace and understanding. I am referring to the organization of an International Youth Symphony Orchestra, composed of young student musicians from all over the world, and an international youth music competition to be held at Interlochen, Mich., next summer.

The purpose of the International Youth Symphony Orchestra, as Dr. Joe Maddy has pointed out, is to promote world friendship through music, the universal language of friendship. This orchestra is already in the process of being assembled and our U.S. State Department has pledged its support through our embassies around the world. The orchestra will be composed of young musicians between the ages of 14 and 18 from countries all over the world. They will spend 8 weeks of intensive training in symphonic musical performance at Interlochen next summer, and will perform at both the New York World's Fair and the United Nations.

The Members will recall that in August, 1962, Dr. Maddy brought his National High School Symphony Orchestra and ballet corps from Interlochen to perform a concert on the White House lawn, at the invitation of the then First Lady, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy. The late President Kennedy was so impressed with the performance of these young student musicians that he invited the entire group into the rose garden to meet with them and to congratulate them personally. He told them they had given a magnificent performance. In a talk with Dr. Maddy, the late President indicated his support and endorsement of Dr. Maddy's plans to broaden the scope of Interlochen to foster international good will and friendship through the universal language of music and the arts.

By now, most Americans are aware of the cultural explosion in our country which was stimulated in large measure because of the keen interest of the late President and Mrs. Kennedy in music and the arts.

No one is better qualified to expand the horizons of our cultural renaissance than Dr. Joe Maddy who is known as Michigan's "Music Man" and who, at 72, is undertaking one of the biggest and most worthy projects of his career with the organization of an International Youth Symphony Orchestra and International Music Competition. In many respects, a symphony orchestra is the same in New York, Moscow, Tokyo, or Singapore—performing the same music from identical scores printed in many countries, for audiences of all nationalities with comparable understanding and appreciation. Imagine an orchestra of 100 talented young musicians from 50 countries—after 8 weeks of living and working together—playing the world's musical masterpieces of Beethoven, Tchaikovsky, Debussy, Rossini, Gershwin, and Strauss.

The International Youth Symphony Orchestra will be worldwide in scope, and the International Youth Music Competition will be the first of its kind in history. It will bring prestige to Michigan, to the Midwest, and our Nation.

A project of such magnitude has never been done before on the high school age level. There are international music competitions in special categories sponsored in many countries, but none yet has staged such a competition for young musicians on all orchestral instruments. The distinguished young American pianist Van Cliburn, for example, rose to fame after winning an international piano competition in Moscow. Similar competitions in string instruments also are held in Moscow. Israel holds an international harp competition. The International Music Competition at Interlochen will be the first in the United States—or anywhere in the world—to be open to players of all orchestral instruments from all over the globe.

It seems only natural, with the gathering of young musicians for the International Youth Symphony, that Interlochen should be host to the first international competition in the United States for players of all orchestral instruments.

The Philadelphia Orchestra, one of the world's finest orchestras is scheduled for a series of concerts at Interlochen next August, and members of this orchestra will serve as judges for the international competition.

It is impossible to measure the effect of such an experience on the young students who will come here from foreign lands. They will study and train at Interlochen, they will go on concert tour in New York and Washington, living, working, and playing with America's most talented young musicians. Such an experience can contribute significantly toward better international understanding by exposing the youth of foreign countries to our own country's most talented youngsters in a wholesome, cultural, American setting. Moreover, the entire International Youth Symphony and competition program is to be an integrated part of an annual Interlochen Arts Festival each summer which is being planned on a scope similar to that of the historic Salzburg and Edinburgh, Scotland, festivals.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this cultural center located in my congressional district. On behalf of Dr. Maddy and Interlochen, whose influence is already felt in the far corners of the world, I am pleased to extend to my colleagues in the Congress an invitation to visit Interlochen and to help support in any way possible Dr. Maddy's goal of promoting world friendship through an International Youth Symphony Orchestra and competition.

LIGHTING OF THE CAPITOL DOME

Mr. **STEED**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **STEED**. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a statement for the Record to show that as a result of authority contained in this year's legislative appropriation bill, the beautiful dome of the U.S. Capitol remained lighted under floodlights all night last night for the first time and will be so lighted henceforth.

THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. **SAYLOR**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SAYLOR**. Mr. Speaker, after more than 14 years in Congress, I am not easily disturbed at criticism of elected government officials. Censure is justified and constructive when members of the legislative or executive branch employ political expediency in substitution for public welfare. I must in conscience, however, take vehement exception to unwarranted scandalous attacks upon my fellow public servants whether or not they are party brethern or share my political philosophy.

It is for this reason that I rise today to express resentment and contempt for the devious and unjust character assassinations, implications, and innuendos that have become a popular pastime for those who seek to eliminate by intrigue and intimidation the presiding Speaker of the House as heir apparent to the office of President of the United States. I consider this insidious campaign an affront to every Member of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that President Lyndon B. Johnson will remain in his present state of health and vigor so long as he is in office. Whatever disagreements in policy may arise in the days ahead, he has the unqualified wishes and hopes of every loyal American for a successful, fruitful, and enjoyable term in the White House. By the same token, however, if it is God's will that his career should have an early termination, no one should doubt or question the capacity and ability of the individual upon whom the law of succession would place the mantle of Chief Executive.

The man upon whom the trust would fall is today Speaker of the House of Representatives. He is a public servant of long experience, proven wisdom, infinite understanding, and unassailable character. As Speaker he is exceptionally competent, efficient, and effective. Though we are of opposite political affiliations, I am honored to sit in the legislature over which he presides. I know no man more honest or trustworthy. I have profited by his advice and counsel and have been enriched by his friendship.

Because there is no blemish of any kind on his record of public service or his personal history, his opponents have sought to slander him on the spurious grounds that his age stunts necessary qualifications to our highest office. Let me remind my colleagues that our Speaker is younger than seven of the chairmen of the standing committees of the House, and it would be patronizing to attempt to substantiate their qualifications. He is 10 years younger than Ben Franklin was when he became a delegate to the convention which framed the Federal Constitution. He is 10 years younger than Winston Churchill was when that outstanding British statesman again became prime minister in 1955. He is a year younger than Charles de Gaulle of France and 14 years younger than Konrad Adenauer, who only recently retired as chancellor of West Germany. He is, in fact, at the age when General Eisenhower retired from office in 1961, and you know and I know that there are millions of Americans who would cherish the opportunity to vote that former Chief Officer back into the White House.

Pope John 23d, who in his last years as head of the Roman Catholic Church contributed so effectively to the brotherhood of man, did not become supreme pontiff until he was 5 years beyond the age of our Speaker. To have ruled him out because of his age would have constituted an irredeemable disaster in world history.

Our late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, served nobly through his 79th year, and I challenge any Member of this legislative body to deny his intelligent leadership or capacity through the final years, or months, or weeks of his tenure. Nor would any responsible Member of Congress, or representative of the press, or knowledgeable individual question the ability of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Tomorrow our Speaker observes his 73d birthday. I ask my colleagues to join in an expression of confidence and congratulations to a dedicated and able statesman.

THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. O'NEILL Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, we have all noted since the sad day in Dallas that there have been a number of unfounded imputations laid against our distinguished and beloved Speaker. It is, however, reassuring to note that many people, here in the House he has served so well, and all over the Nation, have taken strict issue with those who impugn the ability and record and greatness of our learned Speaker. The record, dedication, ability, achievements, and greatness of our Speaker have been too numerous to state with any brevity. However, James G. Colbert has recently written a column which does show to us the legend of one of the grandest statesmen in the history of our Nation. I insert at this point in the Record this article by Mr. Colbert, which does considerably more justice to the past, present, and future of a man who has done so very much for all of us:

The Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Well Fitted To Assume Presidential Post

(By James G. Colbert)

If Speaker John W. McCormack isn't the best qualified person to step into the Presidency in the event anything happened to Lyndon Johnson, it would be difficult to figure out who is.

That's why objective observers of the political scene can't quite understand what is behind the attacks leveled at McCormack by certain self-annointed pundits.

When a law was enacted back in 1947 providing that the Speaker of the National House of Representatives would be next in line for the Presidency, there was no outcry of protest.

An extraordinary situation was created at that time. Harry S. Truman had taken over the Presidential reins upon the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt. There was no Vice President. Congressman Joseph W. Martin, Jr., was Speaker of the National House as a result of the Republican wave which rolled across the Nation in 1946.

Had Truman died in either 1947 or 1948, he would have been succeeded by Martin, and the Presidency would have passed from a Democrat to a Republican.

That would have represented an upheaval rather than a smooth transition in the National Government. But the columnists now questioning whether McCormack should remain next in line for the Presidency raised no objection to Martin back in 1947 and 1948.

With all due respect and deference to Joe Martin, who was an able Speaker, it would be preposterous to claim that McCormack is any less qualified for the Presidency today than Martin was 16 years ago.

A legitimate argument could be raised against McCormack if he were to stand for election as President. That is that he has reached the age where the enormous Presidential burdens could prove too heavy for him to assume for a 4-year period.

McCormack, however, isn't running for office. He simply is holding himself in readiness in case any emergency should develop in the next 13 months.

With the possible exception of Lyndon Johnson, John W. McCormack probably is better qualified to be President than any Vice President back through the sweep of the years who stood only a heartbeat from the Presidency.

It is fair to say that John McCormack is better prepared for the Presidency at this moment than was Harry Truman when Franklin D. Roosevelt died in 1945.

John McCormack fills the second most important and powerful post in the National Government. His power far surpassed that of Lyndon Johnson when John F. Kennedy was President.

The truth is that some Washington commentators have never given John McCormack full credit for his outstanding work and his great accomplishments in Congress.

That is largely because McCormack is a modest, self-effacing man who does not shoulder anyone aside to get the spotlight.

He shuns Washington's social life and cocktail parties to which some of the commentators attach so much importance. He is too busy working to attend such affairs. That may be a grievous failing in the eyes of some Capital pontificators.

McCormack was seriously boomed for the Democratic nomination for Vice President back in 1948. He had widespread support and would have been a potent contender if there had been an open convention fight. Instead, he stepped aside when Harry Truman indicated he wanted Alben Barkley as his running mate.

In 1956 Massachusetts Democrats voted 3 to 2 for McCormack as their presidential preference over Adlai Stevenson who was subsequently nominated a second time as the Democratic candidate for President.

Many honors have come to McCormack in his public career. Except for his election to the speakership, it's doubtful that he values any of them more highly than the vote of confidence the people of Massachusetts gave him in the 1956 presidential primary.

One can't help but wonder what kind of man the columnists, who have been rapping McCormack, think should be standing next in line for the Presidency.

Shouldn't he be a man experienced in Government who could move into the breach in a national emergency? If so, who better can meet that test than John McCormack?

It's also becoming a little wearying to read in syndicated columns that John McCormack is no Sam Rayburn. Of course he isn't. The two men were different in many ways. There was only one Sam Rayburn just as there is only one John McCormack.

But it would be just as fair and accurate to observe that in some respects Sam Rayburn was no John McCormack.

John McCormack really needs no defense from this writer or anyone else. His record speaks for itself. His name will live in history long after those who directed barbs at him are forgotten.

SCHOOL-TO-SCHOOL PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, to my desk today came the current issue of the General Electric Forum, an issue devoted to probing in depth "The Developing Nations." Included is an "Editor's Note" outlining a school-to-school program that should command the pride and respect of all members of this body—indeed of all Americans.

Mr. Gene Bradley, editor of the Forum, is president of the PTA of Rosendale School, Nisayuna District in Schenectady. In researching this issue of the Forum, he became intimately involved with the problems of education in Latin America. Last year, he recalled, the Rosendale PTA had raised $750.

"What," he asked a U.S. AID official, "could you have done with that $750?"

The official replied: "I would have built a school." Not by sending in construction crews, he explained, but by providing a couple of supervisors and letting the villagers build it themselves—through self-help.

Intrigued by the idea, Mr. Bradley talked with leaders from the Peace Corps, CARE, the Alliance for Progress. And everywhere the answer was the same. For a relatively few dollars and through existing channels, it would be possible for education-hungry nationals of other countries to build their own schools and educate their children.

Students in Rosendale School have already raised $250 of the $750 needed to build a school in Colombia, South America. The money will go to CARE. CARE will provide a brickmaking machine and cement. Peace Corps volunteers will help organize a community action group in El Roble. And the people of El Roble will build the school.

In the Forum introduction, Mr. Bradley writes:

> The revolution of rising expectations is real and immediate. There is no more possibility of turning it back than there is of taking back the shot that was fired at Concord. Whether we fan it into a flame of freedom or permit it to smolder into Communist dissatisfaction is our choice.

Students at Rosendale School are beginning to fan that flame. At this Christmas season, their action uniquely represents the spirit of concern and compassion that is so much a part of our heritage. And their program brings renewed validity to the truth that in giving, the giver is more blessed. Already, the students at Rosendale—like the thousands of Peace Corps volunteers at work around the world—are finding that they are the principal beneficiaries of their program. They are more interested in their neighbors, more aware of their world, and more conscious that there is something they can do for their country and their world.

I am proud of them and hope that their efforts can be an inspiration for hundreds of other schools throughout America. For groups interested in expanding this school-to-school program, the Rosendale PTA has agreed to serve as a clearinghouse of information. To provide more detailed information on the program, I am including Mr. Bradley's "Editor's Note" in my remarks:

There is wide agreement that help to developing nations should begin to lay more stress on private initiative and self-help, rather than government-to-government assistance of the kind that tends to stifle local or private initiative.

It was in this frame of reference that I asked Stewart Van Dyke, AID Mission Director to Turkey, what he could do with $750. This was the amount raised last year by the local Parent Teachers Association in our community.

SELF-HELP SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

His immediate response was, I'd build a school. I don't mean sending in construction crews. No; I mean buying the cement and the block-making machines and providing a couple of supervisors to oversee the construction. I mean self-help."

With these encouraging words, I went to the people in the Peace Corps, CARE, the Alliance for Progress: everywhere the answer was the same. For a relatively few dollars and some professional supervision, it would be possible for education-hungry nationals of other countries to build their own schools and educate their children.

I took the idea of an international "school-to-school program" back to the PTA and was given the mandate to explore the subject on my trip to South America in connection with this issue of Forum.

The objective was to see whether the Rosendale PTA in Schenectady, N.Y., could sponsor a much-needed school as a pilot program in an underdeveloped area for $750.

Officials of the Peace Corps and CARE wrote ahead to their Colombian representatives outlining the project.

EL ROBLE SCHOOL A MUDHOUSE

Upon my arrival in South America, there was a letter from Duane Bensel and Larry Jasman, two Peace Corps volunteers, describing the need for a school in El Roble, about 85 miles northeast of Bogotá. The present school is a rented house made from mud which, the letter said, "may give way on the students any day now." Its location near a railroad track and main highway had resulted in the death of several students. The local Junta Accion Comunal (Citizens Committee for Community Action) had selected a new school site, but no funds were available for the basic construction materials. The school as it now stands can accommodate only about 20 percent of the children (boys only) and then just to the third- or fourth-grade level.

This was the type of spot we were looking for. With the Peace Corps volunteers, I visited the site.

The case was not overstated. And the enthusiasm of the local community action group, who had already undertaken a substantial rebuilding program, was more than enough to convince me that the project should go forward and at the earliest possible date.

ACTIVE GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

On our return to Bogotá, we discussed the practicalities of the program—such as providing teachers—with the Minister of Education for Colombia, Dr. Pedro Gomez Valderrama, and Gov. Fernando Laverde, both of whom gave their wholehearted support and cooperation. In addition, Mrs. Fulton Freeman, the U.S. Ambassador's wife, graciously agreed to provide liaison and counsel through the American Women's Club in Colombia.

Back in Schenectady, the idea was presented to the entire Parent Teachers Association. The vigorous response of not only the parents but also of the faculty members stimulated us to telegram our pledge of support to the responsible officials in South America—asking them to request the local citizens group to proceed with the ground-clearing phase of the project.

This is a pilot project. Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver told us that the mechanism exists—now—to expand the concept into a program that would oversee the construction of 3,000 such schools around the world. In addition, the hope was expressed that such an undertaking would stimulate teachers to seriously consider active participation in the Peace Corps program, an area which needs strengthening.

NOT AN ACT OF CHARITY

This undertaking is not an act of charity; it is an opportunity for self-help on an individual basis. Here are two groups of people in different continents, each with a common desire to educate its children. In El Roble the need is for adequate facilities and program guidance. In Rosendale the need is for the children to become better acquainted with the people of the world in which they will live as adults.

OPPORTUNITY FOR UNDERSTANDING

In entering this international self-help school-to-school program, its sponsors believe that their effort reflects the feeling of the American people that we have a moral obligation to those less fortunate than ourselves; a feeling of responsibility to take action in the national interest; and a desire to give our children an opportunity for understanding of which we as parents have, for the most part, been deprived.

In the last analysis, this is the translation of large efforts back to a local scale with the resulting benefits that people-to-people association can bring about.

Already, inquiries are being received from other schools on how similar programs might be initiated. For those sharing this interest, the General Electric Forum will be honored to serve as a clearinghouse for information.

AN OPEN DISCUSSION ON SHEVCHENKO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 months we have carefully observed the discussion that has taken place on the forthcoming erection of the Shevchenko statue. Actually, there was nothing new in this discussion. All of the baseless and misinformed charges made by a local newspaper had been properly countered 3 years ago when the legislation was prepared and considered.

However, what has been most disconcerting is the fact that the editor of a local newspaper refused to publish highly informative and striking replies to his self-contradicting editorials. The contention that little space was available for the publication of these letters holds no water when the amount of space taken up by the paper for a one-sided discussion is considered. This practice is scarcely in line with the established principles of a free press.

SHEVCHENKO IN OPEN DISCUSSION

One positive result of this whole episode has been a wider appreciation of the universal significance of Shevchenko. Other papers have with fairness and objectivity commented on him, and scores of citizens have come to know more about the poet by reading House Document No. 445.

Mr. Speaker, Shevchenko deserves a just and open discussion. In furthering such public discussion, I include the very able letter written by Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki, of Marquette University, as part of my remarks:

SHEVCHENKO SCIENTIFIC SOCIETY, INC.,
New York, N.Y.

To the EDITOR,
Washington Post
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, the first Ukrainian Academy of Liberal Arts and Sciences (founded in Lviv-Lemberg in 1873), I kindly request this opportunity to comment on your editorials "The Shevchenko Affair" (of October 18), "The United States, Russia To Share Ukrainian Poet as Hero" (of October 25), and "Monument to Ignorance" (of November 1). The purpose of this and a succeeding letter is to correct the misinformation upon which these editorials were written and the distortions which they in turn conveyed to your readers.

Among the first of your many statements which justice requires be corrected is the following of October 18: "In the writing of the poet and the efforts to exploit him there are elements which are offensive in various ways to Americans of Russian, German, Polish, Catholic, Jewish, Orthodox, and even Ukrainian background. A statue of Shevchenko would be a monument to disunity and recrimination among Americans."

You returned to this line of argumentation in your editorial of November 1 in describing Shevchenko's writings as "an affront to the Jewish community of this country" in spite of the fact that you also mention that "he did oppose Jewish persecutions on one occasion." In that same editorial of November 1 you repeat that Shevchenko's "flaming nationalism [is] an affront to members of the Polish minority, which also is a very large one in this country."

Let me establish the proper background for this discussion. In every ethnic group of Americans there are two fringe elements: the one includes old reactionaries and imperialists; the other is comprised of Communists who hate the basic principles of our Declaration of Independence. They have the right to do so; by mental distortion and contortion, however, they also transfer this hate into the past histories of their old countries and consequently emerge hating those nations which endanger Moscow's imperialism as well as those persons and principles which destroyed or undermined their empires, privileges, and monopolies. Let me tell you with deep assurance, however, that the vast majority of the ethnic and religious groups you enumerated are made up of truly liberal and democratic Americans who are dedicated to the ideals of our Declaration of Independence. And among those with even the slightest knowledge of their own ethnic history and of Shevchenko's works none would approve of your statement. Consequently, ideological disunity and recrimination exists among Americans simply because we are an open society and not because of the projected statue of Shevchenko.

Let me now present the facts about the relations and attitudes of Shevchenko to the various ethnic groups of Americans enumerated in your editorials.

Among Shevchenko's many friends were many great personalities of Russian literature and of Russian intellectual life; some, like the poet Zhukovsky, Count Fedor Tolstoy, and the brothers Zhemchuzhnikov, were his benefactors. He was not only acquainted with contemporary Russian literature but also met personally many leading writers, including Chernyshevsky and Turgenev. Shevchenko even wrote some poems and his diary in Russian. What all this evidence tends to prove is that he had absolutely no animosity or hate for either the Russian nation nor its language. Not once did he ever commit an infringement against the legitimate, human, and God-given rights of the Russian people. Up until 1938, when I published a volume on Shevchenko in translation, there were 70 Russian poets who had translated Shevchenko into Russian. Among them were such famous Russians as Briussov, Bunin, Kurochkina, Mey, Michailov, Drozhin, and Surikov. Today that number has exceeded 100. Consequently, no Russian with humanism and democracy in his mind and heart can regard the statue of Shevchenko as an "affront." Shevchenko never expressed an idea that violated the ethnographic unity and indivisibility of Russia. What he did do, however, was to claim the same rights for Ukraine and all other colonial victims from Finland, the Baltic States, to Rumania, from Poland to the Caucasus nations. What he did more than that was to oppose Russian imperialism and colonialism as it was based in his time on the serfdom of the peasantry and the tripartite official ideology: Russian Orthodoxy, Russian autocracy, and Russian chauvinism—all used for the one aim of Russifying all non-Russian nationalities including the Poles, Lithuanians, and the Jews. But the same opposition to Russian imperialism was led in London by the famous Russian, Herzen, who respected even Ukraine's right to independence (See A. Herzen, "Polnoe sobranie sochinenij i pisem," ed. by M. Lemke, VI, p. 303). In Shevchenko's funeral in St. Petersburg many distinguished Russian liberals participated and before his coffin eulogies were delivered by Kukochkin and Uzhakov.

No great Russian scholar regarded the name of Shevchenko as an "affront." In fact, the following members of the Imperial Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg accepted election to active membership in our society (then in Lviv-Lemberg): Prof. Vladimir Bechterew, Prof. Fedor Korsch, Prof. Alexander Pypin, and Prof. Alexey Schachmatov.

Your contention that Shevchenko is "offensive" to Americans of German descent is also contrary to the facts. In 1913 I was an assistant to the great German Slavicist at Munich University, Dr. Erich Berneker. In his graduate studies seminar he ordered me to render an interpretation of Shevchenko's poems. Shevchenko also had many cordial German friends in Russia such as Sternberg (to whom he dedicated a poem), the families Schmidt, Vitzthum, and Joachim in St. Petersburg, and many in Ukraine. Even in exile he was treated well by the distinguished scientist and academician, Von Baer, and by Captain Gern. Baron Klodt von Jurgensburg was his teacher and protector in the Imperial Academy of Fine Arts in St. Petersburg.

In addition, may I draw your attention to a complete bibliography of excellent translations of Shevchenko's works into German done by Obrist, Franzos, Kawerau, Bosch, Virginia Lengsdorf, Wutsky, Hans Koch, Specht, and other scholars. The excellent biography of the famous Scandinavian Slavicist (Alfred Jensen, Taras Shevchenko, Ein Ukrainisches Dichterleben, Wien, 1916) was also translated into German.

And still another and final convincing proof that Shevchenko's name was never "offensive" to Germans is the following list of distinguished German scholars who were or are active members of the Shevchenko Scientific Society: Friedrich Kaindl, Max Vasmer, Theodor Gartner, Karl Mayer, David Hilbert, Felix Klein, Albrecht Penk, Max Plank, Friedrich Prege, Erwin Koschmieder, Heinrich Schmidt, and Hans Koch.

Your comments regarding the attitude of Americans of Polish descent toward Shevchenko are the climax of cheap demagogery and complete ignorance. Shevchenko's whole life was merged into the lives of many Polish friends, writers, revolutionaries, and Polish ideological trends. Shevchenko was completely familiar with the works of the Polish national poet, Mickiewicz; he spoke Polish; even his first love in Warsaw was a Polish girl. Shevchenko was also a champion of the St. Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood in Kiev; of interest in this connection is that the real roots of the brotherhood's ideology, the "Book of Genesis of the Ukrainian People," was in Mickiewicz's "Books of Polish People." A Pole, Wielhorski, helped him gain liberty from his master in St. Petersburg; as an excellent student in the Russian Imperial Academy he shared an apartment with the Pole, Demski, a revolutionary; in Asiatic exile as he arrived in Orenburg (where there were more than 2,000 Polish political exiles), the Poles welcomed Shevchenko with a banquet headed by the Polish poet and lifelong friend, Bronislaw Zaleski. Shevchenko also addressed the Poles in a special poem of his wherein he stated that he regarded the fall of Poland as a catastrophe for Ukraine.

Among Shevchenko's many Polish friends who attended his funeral in St. Petersburg were Sierakowski, Zheligowski, Kruniewicz (all of whom later became leaders of the Polish revolution of 1863); and a Polish student, W. Choroszewski, took leave of Shevchenko. Again, a Pole spoke before his coffin in Kiev.

How allegedly "offensive" Shevchenko was and is to the Poles is clarified in this quotation from a book recently published in Warsaw by two scholars of Warsaw University ("Ukrainian Literature," by Mariam Jakobiec and Tatiana Holynska-Baranowa, p. 116):

"Shevchenko's poems enjoyed great popularity among Poles. The bibliography includes over 200 different translations. No other nation can be proud of such an imposing number of translations. Among the Polish translators are the names of Leonard Sowinski, A. Gorzalezynski, Pauline Swiencicki, Stefan Zheromski, Leo Belmont, Gustav Danilowski, Wilhelm Feldman, Yaroslaw Iwaszkiewicz, Wlodzimierz Slobodnik, and many others." In addition I call your attention to two other volumes of importance in this connection: "Shevchenko and World Literature" (Philadelphia, 1962) by a leading American scholar of Polish descent, Mieczyslaw Giergielewicz of the University of Pennsylvania; the other is a special study by academician W. Shchurat, "Shevchenko and the Poles" (Lviv-Lemberg: Zapiski of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1917, pp. 217–347).

I am a former professor of the Warsaw University and general secretary of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw, a Polish state institution. With the full approval of the Polish Ministry of Education our institute published a 16-volume edition of the works of Shevchenko with volume 14 completely dedicated to translations of Shevchenko's poems into Polish by leading past and present Polish poets. On the 70th anniversary of Shevchenko's death the Ukrainian Scientific Institute organized in the Aula of the Warsaw University a memorial conference attended by the Minister of Public Education, Professor Swientoslawski, the president and faculty members of the university including the rabbi of Warsaw, Professor Schorr, and the Polish political and intellectual elite of the capital.

The consequence of these old Polish-Shevchenko traditions was that in 1917 the Poles received not only full autonomy in the Ukrainian Democratic Republic but even had a Polish minister in the government. (Compare Henryk Jablonski, "The Polish National Autonomy, 1917–18," "Historical Publications of the Warsaw University, Warsaw, 1948.")

Any Pole knows how closely related are Polish and Ukrainian history, as well as Lithuanian and Beloruthenian, and in addition, the history of the Jews of Eastern Europe. By the Treaty of Hadziacz (1658) Hetman Wyhowsky attempted to reorganize the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth into a tripartite Union of Poland-Lithuania and Ruce-Ukraine. Even one Polish king, Wisnowiecki, was of Ukrainian descent; and the savior of Vienna, Sobieski, used the title "Rex Poloniarum, Magnus dux Lithuaniae et Ukrainae."

The following great Polish scholars were or are members of the Shevchenko Scientific Society: Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, Alexander Brueckner, Oswald Balzer, Henryk Ulaszyn, Jan Los, Cezarya Baudouin de Courtenay–Jendrzejewiczowa, Kazimierz Nitch, Kazimierz Moszynski, and Stanislaw Kot.

In your editorials you also describe the proposed statue as "offensive" to Americans of Catholic, Jewish, and Orthodox backgrounds. What you fail to point out is that Shevchenko himself was an Orthodox. Many of us Americans of Ukrainian descent are Catholic (I, myself, am one) or Orthodox; a small number are Evangelical. I doubt that you are authorized to speak on behalf of the Catholics, Orthodox, and Evangelicals. Therefore, may I once again correct your misinformation with the true facts. How, for example, could the hierarchy and priests of the Christian churches find the statue "offensive" at the same time that many of them participated in the groundbreaking ceremonies for the monument? The Orthodox archbishop, His Grace Mstyslav, opened those ceremonies with a prayer; the Catholic priest of our Washington parish, the Reverend Theodore Danusiar, a native American, delivered a moving benediction based on quotations from Shevchenko's poems; in addition, many Christian clergy were present at the ceremony including representatives of the Evangelical Church.

The Catholic Metropolitan of the Ukrainians in Lviv, Count Andrej Sheptytsky, was an active member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society; the Catholic Metropolitan of the Ukrainians in Canada, Maxime Hermaniuk, Winnipeg, is an active member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society; the Catholic archbishop, Ivan Bucko, residing in Rome, is an honorary member of our learned society; finally, the heroic metropolitan of Lviv, Joseph Slipy, who, after 18 years in Siberian concentration camps was liberated by the previous holy father and arrived in Rome for the Vatican Council, is also an old member of our society. In addition, the absurdity of your statement that Shevchenko's name is an "affront" to Catholics is also demonstrated by the fact that his poetry was translated into Slovenian by a Catholic priest, the Reverend Joseph Abram, and that the Catholic Bookshop in Ljubljana published it in 1907 and 1908. To Father Abram we are indebted for the statement, "My first book is the Gospel, my second is Shevchenko's 'Kobzar-Minstrel,' a more beautiful work than the 'Haydamaky' I do not know in the world." (Cf. Shevchenko's "Collected Works," Warsaw ed., 1948, p. 347.)

Now, in spite of all this, can you still say that the name of Shevchenko was ever "offensive" to the Catholics?

In addition, the orthodox metropolitan of Canada, Ilarion, Winnipeg, is also a distinguished member of our society.

Even in the Russian empire under the absolute rule of the czar, Shevchenko's name was not offensive to the orthodox church as is evidenced by the sermon delivered in Kaniv at his grave by the Reverend Machevych:

"How is this light, about which the Lord is speaking (Matthew 5: 16) and which has among human beings to shine? That is a clear light, unfalsified, not an illusion, but a true light. Here, brother Christians, before you is the light which did shine over the whole of Ukraine—before you is Taras Shevchenko.

"You hills of Kaniv, forest and valley of Ukraine. You see before you an enlightened man, a man who loved and was loved by Ukraine. From the northern capital of Russia to the most modest of towns—whose remains traveled? Who is thus accompanied to the grave with such a reverence? Who—a man with many war achievements, or a dignitary—famous in the field of politics, who acted by the power of the government and laws? No, brothers, it is Taras Shevchenko. Who does not know him?"

The priest then asked that all present pray for the soul of Shevchenko and regretted that he could not raise his voice so loud that all of Ukraine on both sides of the river Dnieper could join together in a prayer for his soul. Finally, he finished his eulogy:

"Thus, deceased in God brother—the wish of your heart is fulfilled: you wished to live in Kaniv and here you will rest. Come in pilgrimages to our town, Ukraine, with us here rests the remains of Taras Shevchenko. Here on one of the highest hills of the Dnieper River bank will rest his ashes, and, as to the Golgatha hill, which can be seen from all Jerusalem and Judea—so similar to the cross of our Lord there, will be here erected a cross, which will be seen from both sides of our famous Dnieper River." (This monument of a huge iron cross was removed by the government in 1931 and replaced by a monument of Taras Shevchenko.)

In regard to Shevchenko's relationship to the Jews, let me call your attention to the Jewish descent of that distinguished lady who objected to your editorials with a letter published on November 1, Prof. Lubov A. Margolena, the daughter of the late Arnold D. Margolin, judge of the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian Democratic Republic and Ukrainian Ambassador to Great Britain in the 1920's.

Active members of the Shevchenko Scientific Society were the following people of Jewish descent: Albert Einstein (elected March 17, 1929) and the Soviet academician, Abram Joffe.

Another distinguished member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society was the late Catholic metropolitan of Lviv-Lemberg, Count Andrij Sheptytsky (who is now in the process of beatification). It was he who saved Jewish rabbis, women, and children during the Nazi occupation. (Cf. the article in the "Jewish Digest" by Leo Heiman, "The Forgotten Epic of Count Sheptytsky," reprinted in the Catholic monthly, "The Light" of Toronto, Canada, in November 1963.)

Before World War II the Jewish poet, Szymon Melzer, Wilno, ably demonstrated that the name of Shevchenko did not represent an "affront" to Jews when he cordially collaborated with me in the preparation of volume 15 of the "Collected Works of Shevchenko, Warsaw, 1938." He contributed the following article to this volume (pp. 437–444):

SHEVCHENKO IN THE JEWISH LANGUAGE

"The critical literature on Shevchenko in the Jewish language appeared long before the Jewish translations of the works of Shevchenko. It prepared the basis for the grasping and understanding of the poems of the Ukrainian genius although Shevchenko was known in Jewish literary circles and already appreciated in the nineties of the previous century. For instance, the well-known Jewish poet, A. Reizen ('Epizodn Fun-Majn Lebm, Wilno, 1921' I, p. 55) still as a 17-year-old boy was enthusiastic over the lyrical poems of Shevchenko and in spite of the fact that he still did not know Ukrainian perfectly. He confesses in his recollections that he long remained under a deep influence of the beauty of Shevchenko's poetry. The same applies to other Jewish poets born in Ukraine including David Hofstein and Osher Schwartzman. Before World War I both were very interested in Shevchenko's works. Translations of his poetry started only after World War I and since then the popularity of Shevchenko in Jewish literature increased every year. Therefore, the information about the project of the publication of all of Shevchenko's poetry, which appeared in the daily in Charkiw (Stern, 12 III, 1929) made the impression of something completely natural. In this edition the following people collaborated: L. Kvitko, P. Markish, D. Hofstein, L. Reznik, and E. Fininberg. In 1937 there appeared in Kiev a volume of Shevchenko's poetry translated by D. Hofstein but we could not get it. Therefore, we must limit ourselves in this survey to translations which appear sporadically, especially because of the anniversaries or jubilees of the poet. S. Gorelik is the first insofar as I could establish, among the Jewish writers who became deeply acquainted with Shevchenko, and speaks about him with the greatest sympathy as, above all, a national and supraclass poet (a poet standing over classes of society). As such he also remained for the not numerous translators from eastern Galicia. The opinion that Shevchenko was prejudiced against the Jews did scatter N. Maizel, the present editor of Literarische Bleter, in Warsaw, translating from manuscript an article of Cherkasenko (a distinguished Ukranian writer) which proved that humanism is the characteristic of Shevchenko's world outlook.

When Shevchenko proclaimed that truth and right must reign in the world it could not help but reecho in the literature of an unhappy nation, of which the Jews are one and whose national consciousness developed almost simultaneously with that of the Ukrainian nation. The ethical national world outlook of Shevchenko appealed to the translators from East Galicia: B. Horowitz, A. Klein, Sh. Melzer. Horowitz, born in Maiden near Stanislaviv and a Jewish poet of the younger generation, translated Ukrainian folk songs and published translations of several of Shevchenko's poems in 1924–25 which can be regarded as equal to the originals. In the same years A. Klein and at that time still a student of the Ukrainian Gymnasium of Kolomea, published for the Jewish youth of this school a handwritten paper Der Eigener Klang which was permeated with the cult of Shevchenko. The author of this article, who also finished the mentioned gymnasium, prepared a whole series of Shevchenko's poetry for printing as early as 1923 (e.g., Hamalia, Ferebendia, Ivan Pidkova, Do Osnovianenka, Topocia, and many others). But all that, as the previous mentioned translations, remain yet in manuscript form while waiting for better times.

The Jewish literature in the Soviet Ukraine underscores in Shevchenko, above all, the anticzarist and antireligious tendencies and regards him as an expression of the torments and the rebellion of his peasant class, putting into the background his ethical and national world outlook. Of all the translators in Soviet Ukraine perhaps the most noted is one of the chief representatives of Jewish poetry—the already mentioned D. Hofstein. It was he who translated the poems, "The Caucasus," "The Dream," "Saul," and many others. Seldom do we find in his translations mistakes of syntax of the Jewish language, casually he uses the white verse where Shevchenko uses assonances. Another excellent translator is M. Chashche Wacky; Reznik and Fininberg, however, are disappointing in spite of the fact that their names are popular in the Jewish literature on the other river bank of Zbruch.

The work on the translation of Shevchenko's works continues and the near future can bring us a full Jewish edition of Shevchenko's poetry."

SIMON MELZER.

Let me now explain frankly to whom Shevchenko was and is an affront. He is an affront to all open and secret champions of dictatorships, to all dreamers of neoimperialism, to some unenlightened descendants of the old nobility of imperial Russia (Russians, Poles, Ukrainians, Germans) whose ancestors kept the peasant masses of Shevchenko's lifetime bound in cruel serfdom and in the most brutal manner exploited them while degrading their human dignity. He is an affront to some descendants of the administrators of this despicable institution of serfdom—an institution abolished in England in the 14th century but not in imperial Russia until after Shevchenko's death in 1881. Shevchenko's revolutionary poems, the martyrium of his life, contributed not only to the later emancipation of the serfs in Ukraine but to those in the entire Empire, the Russian serfs included. Shevchenko also defended the freedom of the non-Russian peoples in the Russian Empire and for that reason he is an affront to all present Russian imperialists.

In this struggle for social justice and national freedom, Shevchenko fought as a champion of George Washington's just and new law of the ideas of the American Declaration of Independence, which he regarded as an ideal to his mother country. To all champions of Russian imperialism and colonialism, to enemies of this new and just law, Shevchenko is and will always remain an affront.

Thus are Washington's ideas, propagated 100 years ago in the czarist Russian Empire of Eastern Europe by the national bard of Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko. Thus are these same ideas now regarded as an affront by contemporary American Democrats in the United States of 1963—the centennial of the Gettysburg Address.

But in Soviet Ukraine, before Stalinist fascism in the 1930's, the Shevchenkologist, Richyckyj, could publish the following (cf. Taras Shevchenko, 1814–61, A Symposium, Slavistic Printing and Reprintings, vol. 31, edited by C. H. Van Schoonefeld; Stanford University, Mouton & Co., 1962, Gravenhage, pp. 268–269): "Richyckyj held that Shevchenko sought a modern form for his ideas of nationality and the national state of the future when he wrote: 'When shall we get our Washington with a new and just law? One day we shall.' Here the author (Shevchenko) has in mind nothing less than his people's struggle for their liberation from a foreign yoke and the creation of a Ukrainian state, namely a republic. Here in the image of Washington with a new and just law, in the image of the national and military leader of the American bourgeoisie in its war of liberation against England, and in the image of the first President of the North American Republic, Shevchenko expressed his program for a revolutionary war for the independence of the Ukraine as a republic."

Spiritually, Shevchenko was the first American among Ukrainians.

All other questions mentioned in your editorials will be discussed in my second letter.

Sincerely,

R. Smal-Stocki.

November 25, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, moreover, to obtain still further insights into this episode, I append a few letters that I have received concerning the local newspaper's position and also letters which the newspaper in question refused to publish:

New York, N.Y.,
November 7, 1963.

The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen: About 2 weeks ago I had occasion to write you as president of Branch 19 of the Ukrainian National Association, commenting on the article in your newspaper "The Shevchenko Affair."

Your most recent article on this subject, "Monument to Ignorance" in the issue of November 1, 1963, prompts me to make a few remarks again, this time in an individual capacity.

Aside from the fact that the very title of your last article is insulting to the 1½ million of Americans of Ukrainian descent and to those American leaders in an out of Congress who have been espousing the cause of freedom for Ukraine and less ignorance and prejudice about matters Ukrainian, it is also replete with misstatements of fact and wrong conclusions. As regards the alleged affront to the Jewish and Polish community in this country, you are on very weak ground, since even you admit that Shevchenko did oppose Jewish persecution; and, of course, your newspaper reported the participation of many Members of the U.S. Congress of Polish descent in the Shevchenko ceremonies. Do you really believe that had Shevchenko been "anti-Semitic" as you allege, the eminent U.S. Senator from New York, Hon. Jacob K. Javits would have been one of the earliest sponsors of the Shevchenko monument in Washington? Senator Javits is far too good an adroit political leader to fall for any possible entanglement with anti-Semitism, and you can be sure that he thoroughly ascertained all facts, circumstances and the historical background of the matter, before committing himself to the sponsorship of the monument. And what about the Congressmen of Polish descent: Dulski, Machrowicz, Lesinski, and others? You surely know that there are many Polish institutions of learning and research in New York, Chicago, Detroit, and elsewhere which would have alerted these honorable gentlemen to anything anti-Polish in the works and life of Shevchenko, had there been any trace of it. Your farfetched conjecture about a statue to Shevchenko in Tel-Aviv or Warsaw is not so farfetched as regards Warsaw. For, indeed, Warsaw had erected a monument much better than a statue to Taras Shevchenko: in the 1930's, the Polish Government subsidized "The Ukrainian Institute" in Warsaw, a scholarly academic institution headed by Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki, now the chairman of the Slavic Institute of Marquette University in Milwaukee, and this institute, with money provided by the Polish Government, published the first complete and fully unabridged edition of the works of Shevchenko, plus an exhaustive biography of the poet, which first brought to light the fact that Shevchenko had a good knowledge of the Polish language, had read the masterpieces of Polish literature in the original, and was an admirer of his contemporary, the poet-prophet of Poland, Adam Mickiewicz.

Your entire line of making Shevchenko appear to be the idol of the Soviet Communist Party also seems to rest on false assumptions. The fact that there are monuments to Shevchenko in Ukraine and in a very few other places in the Soviet Union and that his works are being published does not prove that he and his works have become a fetish of the CPSU. All it proves is the truth of the old American political saw "If you can't lick 'em, join 'em." It proves the truth of what Khrushchev told the 20th Congress of the CPSU that Stalin would have sent all Ukrainians to Siberia, except that there were too many of them. Indeed, with 45-odd million Ukrainians in the Soviet Union, 90 percent of whom revere Shevchenko, what else is there to do for the Kremlin leaders, but to placate to the Ukrainians by likewise admiring Shevchenko, but at the same time subtly twisting, distorting and "officially interpreting" his works in the light of Marxist dogma, and thus making him appear as the most revolutionary and most democratic poet of the 19th century. Surely Shevchenko was revolutionary and democratic, but never Marxist. And were not our Founding Fathers the same way, too?

You also deny universality to this great poet. At the same time you make an oblique reference to "American nationalism." I do not know what you mean by the latter, whether Ku Klux Klanism, "John Birchism," or simply insularism within the so-called English-speaking world. From your previous references to Shakespeare, I suspect that it is the latter. Incidentally, the Ukrainians are not as insular as you, and more Shakespeare is shown on the stages of Kiev than New York. Now, to speak to you through the instrumentality of one of the great literary figures of the English-speaking world, I will attempt to set you straight on Shevchenko through none other than Charles Dickens.

The London weekly All the Year Round, with Charles Dickens as its chief editor (All the Year Round, a weekly journal conducted by Charles Dickens, vol. XVIII, London 1877 (issue of May 5, 1877, No. 440, pp. 220–224)), publishing a biographical sketch of the Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko, made numerous interesting references to the poet, both concerning his literary worth, as well as the then already prevalent cult of him, particularly among the Slavic peoples. I am not saying that the article was written by Charles Dickens himself, although it might have been. In any event, he fully approved and concurred with the article by publishing it. This article of 1877 already admonishes the English-speaking world about the need to make the acquaintance of Shevchenko: "Whatever you may think of him as poet, he has made such a name for himself that you ought to know something about him." And Mr. Dickens' author is not ashamed to call this Ukrainian poet "genius." The author also informs his readers that "the last complete edition of his works was published last year (i.e., in 1876) in Prague," and that the poet is hailed and read "all Slavdom over."

It is significant that the author of the article mentioned above was able to recognize the poet's universality by making his words fit conditions in England in his time: "Some of Taras' saddest poems would apply, almost word for word, to our own land; but there is just this difference, that feudalism in England is weak. Americans wonder how strong it still is; yet we know that feudalism among us is weak indeed compared with what it was in Russia a few years ago. * * * Emancipation * * * must come (Shevchenko) thought, as part of an ideal republic—a poet's dream of the restitution of all things; such a reign of justice and brotherly love as seems very glorious when we read about it in Isaiah, but very dreadful when fifth-monarchy men or socialists try to carry it out in practice. Under such a republic all the Slav states would form a grand federation; the Ukraine should be once more independent * * *" and the author continues with reference to Ukrainians: "There are 14 million of them, a good slice of that strange conglomeration of peoples who make up the Russian Empire; and now that nationalities are so much talked of, they will scarcely be content to give up their language and customs—to be, in fact, Russianized."

Thus we see that the author working for Charles Dickens in 1877 correctly appraised the position of Shevchenko as champion of liberty, not only individual, but also social and national, of his own Ukrainian and of the other enslaved peoples of the Russian Empire, but 86 years and several wars and revolutions later, an author working for the Washington Post fails to see the universal human significance of this poet's work, and dismisses those who know and understand him, as being "gullible."

This writer is personally opposed to public monuments of marble or bronze as providing more parking space for the already pestilential pigeons; he would rather see a "Shevchenko Library" or "Shevchenko Institute" in Washington, dedicated to the dissemination of his works and ideas among the English-speaking people so that there would be no need to wage battles against prejudices like those displayed by you. But since the Ukrainian community in the United States can, for the time being, only afford a statue of the poet, I will battle for his integrity, good name and reputation of genius against all comers, and on all occasions.

Lest you come to the erroneous conclusion that this writer is a flaming Ukrainian nationalist, let me explain that although a Ukrainian, I worked in the foreign service of Poland (1936–39), being a member of the legal profession in Poland prior to that, and a member of the New York bar at present. I have never experienced any feeling of prejudice against any neighbors of Ukraine, and this includes the Jews, with whom I grew up in a small town in Galicia, and whose language (Yiddish) I have mastered in my teens.

Very truly yours,

Roman Olesnicki.

Fedir F. Iskalo,
Buffalo, N.Y., November 20, 1963.

The Washington Post,
1515 L Street NW.,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Editor: After reading your articles on the Taras Shevchenko monument, printed in "The Washington Post" I have this to say.

I am very disappointed with your attack and misrepresentation of the Taras Shevchenko monument.

Your apparent distortion of the facts makes me wonder why you are opposing the erection of a monument honoring a great poet and humanitarian.

In one of your articles you mentioned that Shakespeare does not have a proper memorial.

If I may ask you, why not? Who tries to oppose erecting one?

What would happen if someone like you tried to stop William Shakespeare from being recognized as a great poet and dramatist?

Maybe Taras Shevchenko is another Shakespeare? What authority do you have to decide, who can come in and who should stay out?

You stated that Shevchenko's statue would be "a monument to disunity and recrimination among Americans," if so, what do you consider yourself?

As I see it, you are destroying the basic Constitutional right, "Equality and justice for all."

It is my sincere belief that you owe an apology to 2 million Americans of Ukrainian decent.

Thank you,

Fedir F. Iskalo.

November 21, 1963.

Dear Congressman Dulski: I am deeply disturbed with the inflammatory "Washington Post" editorials because they do not reflect the principles of American democracy. For years, the United States has been honoring all those who fought for freedom and human dignity irrespective of their birth, creed, or nationality. We should not change these principles now. I support your resolution for the issuance of a Shevchenko commemorative stamp.

Sincerely yours,

Michael Woloschuk,
Jamaica Plain, Mass.

November 22, 1963.

Dear Congressman Dulski: Certainly, the provocative editorials in the Washington Post against the Shevchenko monument, and previously against the Captive Nations Week Resolution, will not win friends in this country, nor among the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain. We need a Shevchenko stamp, therefore, I support your House Joint Resolution 174.

Very truly yours,

Mr. Mychajlo Frankius Ryj,
Jamaica Plain, Mass.

Falls Church, Va., *November 13, 1963.*

Mr. J. R. Wiggins,
Editor, the Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Wiggins: In your renewed editorial attack on the proposed Shevchenko memorial of November 12, you advance the following points:

One, Shevchenko is a hero of the Soviet Union and his monuments are the object of annual Communist adulation.

Two, the approval of the memorial was a result of "the most artful and arrogant of lobbies ever operated by a minority group."

Three, the National Capital Planning Commission and other agencies involved should review their decision of approval because Shevchenko did not have anything to do with Americans.

Four, the money raised by the Ukrainians be better spent for a memorial to some "Ukrainian-American whose genius reflects the success of their countrymen in embracing the cause of this country."

The points are irrelevant and your analysis parochially shortsighted.

First, Shevchenko is a spiritual giant of Ukraine, but not a Communist. The Soviets are using his name, but not his ideas. While using his name, they vigorously suppress his ideas.

Second, Washington is not only the Capital of the United States, but also the spiritual focus of the ideology of freedom in the world. The efforts to erect a memorial to the freedom fighter Shevchenko in Washington, assume both of the attributes, not only the Capital.

Third, the approval of putting up a memorial to Shevchenko in Washington is a bargain to the United States. For a small piece of real estate this country is getting friendship and loyalty of 40 million Ukrainians in the Soviet Union, the long-run benefits of which might prove to be worth millions of American lives and billions of dollars. The United States has never made such a bargain before.

Fourth, Mr. Lev E. Dobriansky, the principal of the "lobby" arguing for the Shevchenko memorial, is acting in the best interest of the United States. He is still young. Before his life is out, he might emerge as the Ukrainian-American who deserved an American memorial.

Sincerely yours,

Michael Boretsky.

New York, N.Y.,
December 7, 1963.

To The Editor,
Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I would like to thank you for your fantastic attack against the erection of the Taras Shevchenko Monument in Washington, D.C. By your outraged campaign against the poet and against the entire Ukrainian people you have aroused my compatriots, Americans of Ukrainian descent and many other Americans to action. (One result of the above, I hope, Shevchenko, will soon cease to be a "cipher" in many minds, including yours.) You have awakened Ukrainians in this great country and in the Diaspora from their lethargy and reminded them that nobody is going to deliver freedom and independence to Ukraine on a platter; that an enemy of liberty and of national dignity of a people might be hidden even in a place where one would least expect—in a respected and supposedly democratic newspaper.

In your vicious attack you have shown that there is a real master of demagoguery on your editorial staff. (It is an interesting coincidence that, a few weeks before the beginning of your anti-Shevchenko Mounment and anti-Ukrainian campaign, the Russian Communists in Moscow and in Washington attacked the erection of the monument, too.) You have called T. Shevchenko a Ukrainian nationalist and a Communist idol. Well, who is he? This "cipher" as you call him, more than 100 years ago, cried out: "When are we going to receive our Washington with a just and righteous law? One day we will." Doesn't the above phrase tell you that the great Ukrainian poet advocated the American type of democracy in Ukraine. And if you read his other poems like "Caucasus" or "Jan Huss," you poor soul, you will find out that Shevchenko fought tyranny everywhere.

You called the great humanitarian an anti-Semite. By now, probably you know already that T. Shevchenko signed a protest against the Russian pogroms published in St. Petersburg "Illustration" in 1858.

In one of your anti-Ukrainian editorials, you argued that the T. Shevchenko Monument will antagonize some American minorities such as the German, Polish, Russian, etc. You ought to know that the U.S. Congressmen of Polish descent are the stanchest supporters of the Taras Shevchenko Monument and of the Ukrainian drive for freedom and independence. I do not know why the German minority should be against the monument. And I will let you be the judge of some Russian dislike of the Shevchenko Monument. Not the Taras Shevchenko Monument but your malicious articles of ignorance smearing the entire people might antagonize various ethnic groups.

Shevchenko all his life fought for truth and for the "just law of Washington" for all people and, therefore, a monument honoring him will be erected because "Truth shall win" as the great Czech liberator, T. G. Masaryk said—despite your incomprehensible hostility.

Very truly yours,

Michael Spontak, BBA.

Boston College,
Department of Economics,
Chestnut Hill, Mass., December 9, 1963.

J. R. Wiggins,
Editor, Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Editor: The unprecedented effort of the Ukrainian-Americans to honor their former homeland's champion of liberty—Shevchenko—with a monument in Washington has a deep significance. First, it rededicates these people to the ideals of freedom and liberty—the ideals of American democracy. Second, it demonstrates that freedom of expression is possible for all Americans, even those belonging to the less influential minority groups, and, third, it underscores the solidarity of not only the diverse ethnic entities but of America itself with the aspirations of all subjugated nations to attain their national rights.

The pertinent legislation that had been passed, especially when received favorably by the public opinion, seems an appropriate tribute to those millions of Ukrainian immigrants and their descendants who helped with their sweat in the coal mines of Pennsylvania and their blood on the battlefields to make this country the bastion of freedom and democracy.

Your editorial in an October issue of the Washington Post together with several subsequent articles seems to unfold a hostile campaign against the honoring of a poet whose writings epitomize to Americans of Ukrainian descent the ideals of the American dream. I suggest you stop this infamous campaign exciting public opinion against the decisions of a representative Congress. I hope you will personally acquaint yourself with the role of Shevchenko's ideals in the life of Ukrainian communities throughout the United States for almost a century. If you do, I am confident the Shevchenko project will gain a firm supporter.

Sincerely,

Dr. V. N. Bandera.

Astoria Committee for
Captive Nations,
Long Island City, N.Y., December 15, 1963.

Dear Sir: Our Ukrainian committee is surprised by your editorial of October 18, 1963, under the heading "The Shevchenko Affair." It is well known that the Shevchenko affair started in 1959–60. Your editorial and opposition began only this year. Several weeks before the October 18 editorial appeared, your paper was praising the plan to erect a statue of Shevchenko in Washington. This was enough opportunity in the past 3 years for you to express your opposition to the plan—but you did not do this.

It is well known to us that the U.S.S.R. is planning to erect a statue of Shevchenko in Moscow. Our question to you is, "If Moscow builds a memorial to Shevchenko, does that mean that we cannot erect a statue of him in Washington? Can things be done in Moscow only?"

This reminds us of the long years of diplomatic maneuvering concerning the banning of atomic weapons which was concluded only when everyone went to Moscow. We are not surprised that the Russians living in the United States are opposing this project.

Let us adhere to the principles expressed by the words of President Johnson:

"* * * The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and respect one another. So, let us turn away * * * from those * * * who pour venom into our national bloodstream."

Yours truly,

Nicholas Rywak,
First Secretary.

Mrs. Iryna Kostyniuk,
Rochester, N.Y., December 9, 1963.

Editor,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: It was with great concern and deep disappointment that I read the remarks of your newspaper about Shevchenko. I cannot understand how you could allow that kind of unfair evaluation of this great man who dedicated his life to the cause of freedom, for which he suffered and finally died, to be displayed on the pages of your paper.

Freedom is the tradition of the United States and it has always honored fighters for man's liberty, regardless of national origin. Why is your paper retreating from this tradition?

I ask the Washington Post to stop rendering bad service to the cause of freedom.

Very truly yours,

MRS. IRYNA KOSTYNIUK.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *October 20, 1963.*

The EDITOR,
Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Your recent pseudo-messianic editorial ("The Shevchenko Affair," October 18, 1963) calling for the immediate cessation of the construction of Taras Shevchenko's statue since it would be a "monument to disunity and recrimination among Americans" is a good example of bad writing. The only real conclusion one can reach after stumbling through this statement of strained polemic character is that you object to the construction of the statue, with a valid reason for this objection, if any, hidden fortuitously or intentionally in a mass of dishonest reasoning. Your concern for national unity would be laudable if you only did not stretch that concern to obfuscate the point that you are attemping to make, whatever that may be. A catastrophe such as you describe in terms of disunity and recrimination resulting from the construction of Schevchenko's statue could only occur in the passionate imagination of an editor who has space to fill and nothing to fill it with. The alarmist conclusion—which is quite simply an appeal to the readers' emotion to provide his own reason for the editor's conviction, and in so doing agree with the editor—is laughable since it is rooted in that imagination.

However, you are partly right when you state that the statue was "conceived as a blunt weapon in the cold war." This weapon is not so blunt as you might think. And the "implausible goal of Ukrainian nationhood" does not seem so implausible when you consider that the Thirteen Colonies also held an implausible goal of nationhood. If you are so anxious to find a "monument of disunity" you have only to look at the Berlin wall. No great mind is required to see its significance; you should not miss its point. Richard Nixon in "Khrushchev's Hidden Weakness" (Saturday Evening Post, October 12, 1963), states that "only the mobilization of an aroused and informed American public opinion will prevent the sellout of the right of 97 million enslaved peoples in Eastern Europe to be free." When you say that "as a poet Shevchenko has no universal significance for Americans" you put the proverbial foot in your mouth. Quite simply you don't know what you are talking about, for freedom has universal significance not only for Americans, but for all nations.

MARK IWASZ,
Secretary for English Correspondence.

NOVEMBER 8, 1963.

EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial, which appeared in your publication on Friday, November 1, 1963, under the title of "Monument to Ignorance," which lambasted the authorities for approving the erection of a monument to Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian poet, was not only shocking but out of character for an American newspaper, and certainly out of character for an American editor.

To you, Taras Shevchenko may be as meaningless as the great men of your ancestors are meaningless to me, but that does not necessarily negate their greatness. The monument to Taras Shevchenko is not being erected in Washington to glorify the history of America because he was not an American patriot or poet, but rather, because he represents a dynamic figure in the movement for human freedom and dignity of the Ukrainian nation.

In your article you state: "it is inconceivable that a statue be dedicated to him in Tel-Aviv or in Warsaw." I ask you, Why is that inconceivable? Do you not think it is probable that if there were a sufficient number of Ukrainians residing in Tel-Aviv or in Warsaw who desired that such a monument be erected that that could not be accomplished?

In your article you also state, knowing too well that your statement is erroneous, that Taras Shevchenko "is the idol of the Communist Party members who have caused the Soviet Union to flower with libraries, collective farms, etc." For you to make this statement constitutes the grossest abuse of editorial integrity for the reason that you must be aware that the Communist Party will pervert history to suit its own aims and purposes. On the contrary, Taras Shevchenko was not only an avowed enemy of slavery, despotism, and monarchial tryranny, but he was also an avowed enemy of the ideology which is known today as communism.

I certainly hope that your paper does not embark upon many more editorials as irresponsible and ill conceived as your editorial on Taras Shevchenko, regardless of the reason you may rationalize to be justifiable for your actions.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. DEMER,
President.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *December 14, 1963.*

Mr. J. R. WIGGINS,
Editor, the Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIGGINS: As a group of women of Ukrainian descent formed in a branch of the Ukrainian National Women's League of America, Inc., a cultural and educational organization, we are greatly disturbed by your attacks against the Shevchenko statue project in Washington, D.C.

Taras Shevchenko was born a serf, but through his immortal poems in the Ukrainian language, which were translated into scores of other tongues, he became one of the great champions of human liberty. For his rousing words he was sentenced to 10 years in exile and came back a broken man. He died at the age of 47, but his heritage has been passed on to future generations who continue the struggle to free Ukraine and other enslaved nations. He remains a symbol of the universal striving for justice, humanity, and understanding among all people. We trust you will desist in your campaign against the Shevchenko statue and will heed the voices of all those who are writing you with clarifications and explanations and are setting forth valid reasons for this project.

Yours very truly,

BRANCH 72, UKRAINIAN NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.
Mary Dushnyck, president; Mary Lesawyer, vice president; Anna Kosciw, secretary; Anne Bezkorowajny, treasurer; Millie Smejka, Dorothy Chupa, Olga M. Liteplo, Tanya K. Kravitz, Stella Klawsnik, Adele Wasylciow, Sophia P. Kotyk, Anne Harrison, Mae Demey, Mary Pisanick, Helen Prociuk, M.S., Tessie Husiak, Olga S. Liteplo, Ann Redosh, Katherine Lucyshyn, Mary Tollock.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
December 14, 1963.

MR. J. R. WIGGINS,
Editor, the Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIGGINS: This is to voice my objections to your editorial attacks against the erection of the Shevchenko statue in Washington, D.C.

You state we have "an implausible goal of Ukrainian nationhood." In 1776 many thought the goal of the American revolutionists was also implausible.

You write that Ukrainians favoring the statue are a tiny group. Ukrainians total almost 2 million in the United States, most of whom favor the statue project. A small group has a right to be represented and to seek freedom. There are scores of countries with populations of less than 2 million. Then you say, "Shevchenko has no universal significance for Americans—he is the pet of a small minority." Shakespeare was at one time the pet of a small English minority, but eventually his appeal became universal. Shevchenko's life and works were dedicated not only to freedom for his own Ukraine but for the liberty of all the oppressed people.

Your statement that a statue of Shevchenko "would be a monument to disunity and recrimination among Americans" is a gross exaggeration. Almost every project brings forth differences of opinion. Today many people do not approve of changing the name of Cape Canaveral to Cape Kennedy.

You suggest "* * * the Ukrainian group * * * leaving the quarrels of their ancestral homeland where they originated." This is cynical. Would you have us forget the captive nations such as Poland, Czechoslovkia, the Baltic States, Bulgaria, etc., or would you just forget the non-Russian nations enslaved in the Soviet Union?

As for the statement of Mr. W. Loucheim of the National Capital Planning Commission that Shevchenko was "both anti-Semitic and the idol of the Communist Party," perhaps he would also call Shakespeare anti-Semitic because of the shylock characterization in "The Merchant of Venice." Would Mr. Loucheim want us to forget the Bard of Avon for this reason?

You remark that Shevchenko's name is an affront to Jews and Poles. However, the statue project was supported by a Jewish Senator and several Congressmen of Polish descent.

Your editorials could be refuted on several other points but these examples show the misinformation and misstatements which you are printing to stir up dissension and antagonism toward a great literary and historical figure, Taras Shevchenko, and toward the Ukrainian people who are ever striving for the freedom not only of Ukraine but of the other enslaved nations.

Yours very truly,

MARY DUSHNYCK
(Mrs. Walter).

Finally, a letter written to the Washington Star for its excellent editorial "Association Again" is indicative of the wide response given to the just and fair observations made by that large organ. I request that this letter, which was published in part, be included in my remarks:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The candor and clarity with which this paper's recent editorial "Association Again" expressed its sentiments regarding the erection of the Shevchenko statue in our Nation's Capital was one of intellectual honesty. Most welcomed after the recent vilifications by a few fanatical bigots who oppose the project by engaging in a continual malicious smear campaign, and who finally, in abject misery, felt the need to solicit approval for the statue by a Kremlin-supported puppet of Soviet Ukraine in the United Nations.

But throughout their venom of hate operation, these illiberalists have lost the prime purpose of the erection of the Shevchenko statue—a memorial to a universal poet and national hero, a humanitarian who so loved justice that his most earnest desire was freedom for all oppressed peoples. In his yearning for freedom for his own nation, he has the finite distinction of mentioning in one of his great works our own George Washington, expressing the hope of such a man to free his Ukrainian people.

At a time when nullification and bigotry have taken perhaps their greatest toll, it would do well for those who so vehemently oppose this commemoration to freedom to return to reason and reality, to logic and clear thinking.

Contemplate the many memorials in our melting pot of nations. What lack of perspective it would be to question the affinity of the many statues we have of individuals who have no direct relation to America, but what pride we can take in our Nation and its leaders, who saw fit to approve the building of these monuments in respect to the historical heritage of its people.

The statue of Taras Shevchenko will be a commemoration to one who dedicated his life to the preservation of the dignity of man—a potent force in world freedom. This is very much contrary to the concepts of a puppet Soviet Ukrainian representative.

VERA A. DOWHAN.

DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICA'S RESOURCES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth in a series of speeches on development of America's resources, particularly through land and water reclamation projects. Because of the current drive for economy in government, there are some Members who may be willing to see our program of investment in reclaiming potentially useful land cut back. Mr. Speaker, the wise saver knows that prudent frugality demands a sound plan for the future; he knows that at the very moment he cuts unnecessary expenses, he must take care to maintain development of wealth-producing assets.

Perhaps the most important asset any nation has is its water. One of the greatest historical bases of America's strength and prosperity has been our seemingly endless water supply. We now are able to see that without wise management, we will very soon be faced with a severe shortage. It is through reclamation that we make certain that future generations will have enough to go around.

SALT RIVER, ARIZ.

In March of 1963 the Salt River Federal reclamation project observed the 60th anniversary of its approval for construction. It is one of five pioneer reclamation undertakings, authorized upon passage of the 1902 Reclamation Act, and has surpassed even the fondest dreams of its early supporters. Only a few of the early stalwarts live today who saw the 25-car caravan bearing Theodore Roosevelt wind its way up Arizona's dusty Apache Trail in March of 1911 to dedicate the completion of the world's largest masonry dam. The Honorable CARL HAYDEN, Arizona's distinguished senior Senator, is among these. Sharing his experience with those who saw the Salt River Valley grow and prosper in the years that followed, the Senator remarked:

> Observance of the golden anniversary of the dedication of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam and the coming into being of the Salt River project is a source of pride and satisfaction to me as one who was there at the time.
>
> In 1910 there were about 35,000 inhabitants in Maricopa County. Today over 650,000 people live and work there. This growth is attributable almost solely to what is now the Salt River project and to the faith and hard work of those who have maintained it throughout the past half a century.
>
> Today, besides the vast agricultural economy and the preference of thousands of persons annually for the resorts of the area, which are so well known throughout the world, there are several hundred manufacturing establishments—all of which are welcome contributors to the good of Maricopa County and Arizona—and all of which are dependent to a greater or lesser degree on the water and electricity available because Theodore Roosevelt Dam and the Salt River project exist. Water for irrigation, industrial, and domestic use, and electricity for farms, homes, and plants are responsible for the $100-million-a-month retail sales in Maricopa County—for the nearly 150,000 family homes in the county—and for the more than one-quarter of a billion dollars of State and Federal taxes derived each year from Maricopa County.
>
> These figures are firm evidence that the Federal funds expended for the costs of dam and downstream irrigation works and electrical generating capacity, all of which have been or are being repaid, are a sound capital investment. Not only is the Federal Government getting its construction money back, but the economic results are enriching the Treasury by many times the original costs through taxes on activities which could not have been without the Theodore Roosevelt Dam.

Senator GOLDWATER, too, is among those who realized early the wisdom of water resource development through reclamation. Said the Senator:

> The United States is indebted to the pioneers of the Salt River Valley whose foresight and resistance resulted in the construction of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam. This structure, together with those which have come after it, have provided the water which has turned our valley green and has attracted to it people from all over the world who have added their contributions as farmers, merchants, bankers, the professions and labor.
>
> It is proper that * * * the name of Theodore Roosevelt be remembered as the President who was the "Father of Reclamation" in this country, and it is proper that the observance take place at the dam carrying his name.

Time rushes on inexorably. In the interval, Maricopa County has increased its population to more than three-quarter million, and Phoenix, the largest city in the county and in Salt River Valley, swelled to more than a half million people. Monthly retail sales in the county neared the $125 million mark.

The gross value of crops produced on the 117,000 acres of land irrigated through facilities of the Salt River project came to $69.2 million in 1962. This represents an increase of more than $1 million over the previous year, despite continuing losses of large areas of fertile cropland to the growing pressures of urbanization. The total value of crops produced on the project since 1908 now stands at $1,835 million; this is 183 times the project's original cost of about $10 million.

The reclamation program in the Salt River Valley of Arizona has performed an invaluable service to the State and the Nation. It has helped to transform a barren wasteland of cactus and mesquite into one of the richest and fastest growing sections of the United States. Only a few decades ago, the city of Phoenix was a dusty little place covering less than 6,400 acres. With the introduction of water from facilities of the Salt River project on the fertile lands of the valley, an oasis of productive endeavor and bustling enterprise was created which soon served as a magnet to those in search of economic opportunities.

Today, the incorporated area of the city of Phoenix encompasses more than 220 square miles of land. Urbanization has taken over more than 62,000 acres of Salt River project lands, transferring the use of project-furnished water from irrigation to domestic, municipal and industrial uses. Great industrial plants have located on valley lands once growing lettuce, or citrus, or some other valuable crop: Motorola, with three big plants in the valley, General Electric, Reynolds Aluminum, Goodyear, U.S. Steel, Sperry-Rand.

Was it wise of Uncle Sam to spend those original $10 million on behalf of reclamation back in 1906? I daresay the Nation was much the richer even if the irrigators had not repaid a single cent. The $10 million was repaid "in toto" some years ago. The Salt River Valley Water Users' Association is now repaying to the Treasury the additional $6½ million invested in the Bartlett Dam completed in 1939 and the $11 million spent in the 1950's to rehabilitate and modernize the project irrigation works.

The story does not stop there. In the physical plant, property, and equipment of the Salt River project, the American public owns a $20 million asset which produces dividends in other ways as well. In addition to serving a farm population of 29,000 people, and a nonfarm population of more than one-half million persons, project facilities control floods, generate hydroelectric power, and enhance fish and wildlife and recreation resources.

In 1962, the six project reservoirs attracted nearly a million visitor-days of use. Recreationists could avail themselves of 184 miles of shoreline and 81,000 acres of land and water area given over to recreational pursuits.

Mr. Speaker, even the vision of men like Teddy Roosevelt probably did not foresee what 60 years would bring the

Salt River Valley. Just so, today we probably fail to fully comprehend what additional benefits the years will bring through reclamation projects being built in our day. Of one thing we can be certain: the demands upon our water supply, for food and for fun, for commerce and for energy, are going to continue to multiply. We must act now, wisely, judiciously, but positively, to preserve for the future the great land and water resources that still lie undeveloped all over America.

MANPOWER UTILIZATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I invite the special attention of all Members of the House to the very fine memorandum of December 13, 1963, which President Lyndon B. Johnson sent to the heads of all departments and agencies of the executive branch. President Johnson in this memorandum appealed to every employee in every agency, at every location in the Government, to "give your best to the job and to your country."

As chairman of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I take this opportunity to assure President Johnson of the full support of our subcommittee. We concur fully in his inspirational message which follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 13, 1963.

MEMORANDUM TO HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

I ask that you convey this personal message to all of your employees:

In these first days, men and women of all ranks within the Government have asked me, "What can I do to help?" Many more of you, deeply committed to the Federal service, are undoubtedly asking yourselves the same question. It is impossible for me to make a direct and personal response to all of you, much as I would like to do so. Yet there is an answer which I would like to express to every employee in every agency at every location in the Federal Government. It is simply this: Give your best to your job and your country.

As your Chief Executive, I will do my utmost to maintain the high quality and character of the career service in the Government and to advance its usefulness through improvement. I will look to those who direct the day-to-day activities of this great work force and to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission for continuing reports and recommendations to assist me in this purpose.

We have a great resource of abilities and talents among the people serving our Federal Government. We have career systems to assure continuity of people and programs. We are organized for the job and the work is before us. President Kennedy did not shrink from his responsibilities, but welcomed them, and he would not have us shrink from carrying forward the great work he began so well. I say to you as I said to the Congress: "Let us continue."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. Speaker, when Congress reconvenes in the second session I plan to present a report in detail to the Members indicating the accomplishments of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee during 1963 and also to reveal the plans for our subcommittee during the second session of this Congress. For several years this subcommittee has, in cooperation with the departments and agencies, worked to improve the control and utilization of civilian employment in the Federal Government, knowing that this would, in turn, improve the services of Government for its people, reduce the cost of Government, strengthen our defense effort, and better the career program of the civilian employees in the Federal Government.

President Johnson's message of December 13, 1963, reflects the objectives of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee; and, therefore, may I again indicate to the Members and to the White House the complete backing of our subcommittee in the President's noble efforts.

BLUEPRINT FOR MURDER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the October 1963 issue of the Americas, monthly magazine of the Pan American Union of the Organization of American States, published on pages 10 and 11 a "cubistic" poem by Homero Aridjus suggestive of individual and wholesale assassination of political leaders.

In all of my experience and observations, I have never seen in any newspaper or periodical disseminated in the United States such an outrageous and monstrous incitement to downright assassination of those charged with the responsibilities of government. In this country, we do not teach and have never taught so foul a doctrine. The use of the word "tyrant," in the alleged poem means that anyone in authority who incurs the displeasure or opposition of others, not in authority, may be denominated as a "tyrant" by the latter and be removed by bloody assassination. This is the naked teaching and practice of international communism; and wherever that odious system is permitted to fester, the murder of authorities of state may be expected. Certainly, the foul murder of President Kennedy by one who was an avowed Communist is ample proof of what I say.

Furthermore, since funds appropriated for the Department of State are allocated, in large measure, for the operation and maintenance of the Organization of American States and the Pan American Union, it is a frightful commentary on our easygoing foreign policy and practices that within our midst a supposedly friendly inter-American establishment should so grossly abuse our courtesy and all the proprieties involved.

It may be significant that the publication and dissemination of this monstrous item took place several weeks before the assassination of President Kennedy and about the time when the murderer Oswald made a trip to Mexico, the home country of the author and perhaps, Oswald did confer with communistic elements there.

Under the setup involved, the Government of the United States itself must share the responsibility for this emanation from the pen of one who openly espouses the process of murder to accomplish political ends. Our Government jointly shares with Latin American governments the responsibility for the Organization of American States and for the principles and practices thus involved. The Congress should never appropriate another dollar for this organization unless and until it makes a public apology and retraction for such inflammatory and revolutionary political propaganda which is well calculated to provoke in all countries of this hemisphere the practice of murder for political ends. It is shocking, indeed, that our Latin American neighbors and ourselves already plagued by the sanguinary processes of communism, should be subjected to the downright incitement of murder clothed with the dignity of the Organization of American States, which was created and dedicated for the purpose of promoting—not assassination and murder—but the evolution of the principles of constitutional liberty for the betterment of the peoples involved.

It is, indeed, impossible to describe adequately the monstrous evil that has thus been inflicted on the countries of the Western Hemisphere, in all of which the indicated magazine is widely circulated.

I am introducing a bill in the Congress to denounce as a crime the publication and/or dissemination through the mails, or any interstate processes, of any communication or publication which urges murder for political or other purposes as well as for the commission of any other criminal offense. The murder of President Kennedy and the publication and distribution of the mentioned poem are well calculated to lend color to the criticisms so often of late that our people and their Government have been "soft on communism."

I am not including the text of the indicated poem because of its horrible and provocative nature; but I have sought to indicate its fearful import. I am also writing to the Secretary of State enclosing a copy of these remarks and asking for an explanation in the premises.

THE HONORABLE HOMER THORNBERRY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY leaves us with mixed emotions. For in accepting an appointment from the late President John F. Kennedy as Federal judge for the western district of Texas, we who have known and admired our distinguished colleague from Texas felt pride in his assumption of this new honor and responsibility, but we also feel a sense of loss. Our distinguished colleague has left the House and that is a loss.

His record as the Representative from the 10th Congressional District of Texas, the seat formerly occupied by President Lyndon B. Johnson, is a matter of history. And posterity will note the fact, just as many of us present today know from personal experience, that in the votes he cast on the floor of this House since his initial election in 1948, as in the votes he cast as a member of the Rules Committee since 1955, the gentleman from Texas, Congressman THORNBERRY, has faithfully represented the people and has been a force for good.

Judge THORNBERRY has been my friend for a number of years, and he has been not an acquaintance but a true friend.

An example of the warmth of his friendship was manifested to me in November of 1961. During that month I came to Washington, D.C., in my official capacity as Congressman for the first time. As a freshman and a stranger, awed by the size of this city and my responsibilities to my constituents and the people of this Nation, the Capital seemed a cold, lonely place, the gentleman from Texas, HOMER THORNBERRY, changed all that. He searched me out that day in 1961, he greeted me and made me welcome. All of us who have known the discomfort of being transplanted from one part of the country to another, know that such a gesture is not a small thing.

I have been fortunate to be a friend of HOMER THORNBERRY. This Congress has been fortunate to have had him as a Member. And though his abilities and his goodness will now flow from the Federal bench, the people, as always, will remain his ultimate beneficiaries.

INVESTIGATION OF CRASH OF JET AIRLINER AT ELKTON, MD.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the investigation into the crash of the Boeing 707 four-engine jet airliner that occurred at Elkton, Md., on December 9, 1963, in which 81 persons were killed is now in progress. That investigation will probably go on for several months, and the probable cause of the crash will not be determined until its completion. But the strange circumstances surrounding the tragedy and the bizarre events that have followed have raised questions and doubts in the minds of many people, and these circumstances and events should be discussed fully.

First. It is known that the Boeing 707 was flying in a holding pattern at the time of the crash, awaiting clearance to approach the Philadelphia International Airport, and that there was a great amount of turbulence in the atmosphere. It is not known at this time whether the immediate cause of the crash was a lightning strike, whether static discharge ignited the fuel, whether the plane broke apart because of the turbulence, whether the turbulence ruptured a fuel tank and caused enough friction to ignite the fuel and caused an explosion, or some other reason.

Yet one question does naturally follow from the facts that are known. That is, why did not the FAA approach controller instruct the Boeing 707 to fly in a holding pattern outside or away from a turbulent area?

In this connection, it has been brought to my attention that it is common practice for FAA towers to give takeoff clearance to pilots even though the takeoff route may bring the airplane into the teeth of great turbulence. I have been informed of such an incident occurring at an airport in one of our major cities within the last 45 days. In that incident, an airlines pilot while awaiting takeoff clearance at the end of the runway, observed on his cockpit radar severe thunderstorm cells adjacent to the airport, and directly in line with the departure route specified by the control tower. The pilot requested a different routing, but was advised by the tower to follow their instructions or return to the ramp. Rather than fly directly into what he considered a hazardous condition, the pilot did return to the ramp.

This incident illustrates one case where the pilot refused to succumb to the instructions and pressures of the FAA tower when in his judgment it was unsafe to take off. I am advised that tower instructions in similar situations sometimes include a warning that failure to take off as instructed may cause a delay for as much as a week. How many pilots have succumbed to such pressures and taken off under hazardous conditions and along routes which carried aircraft and their passengers into turbulent weather? How many airplanes have crashed and how many passengers have died as a direct result of flying into such danger?

I repeat my first question: Why did not the FAA approach controller instruct the Boeing 707 to fly in a holding pattern outside of or away from a turbulent area?

Second. It will be recalled that officials of both the FAA and the CAB rushed immediately to the scene of the crash, and that the earliest stories contained quotes from officials of both the Agency and the Board. It will further be recalled that the newspapers carried the story that there was a tape which had recorded the conversation between the Philadelphia Airport tower and the Boeing 707, containing the following message from the pilot of that plane:

> Clipper 214 is going down in flames.

Now it has been revealed that this message came not from the ill-fated Boeing 707, but from another plane nearby which witnessed the jet airliner going down.

What may not be generally known is that officials of the CAB and others participating in the investigation had been studying this tape and had not yet decided which pilot made the statement in question, when officials of the FAA caused the tape to be removed from the place where it was being studied. The FAA officials then played the tape for the benefit of the news media. The result was the erroneous and misleading conclusion that the message on the tape had been given by the pilot of the Boeing 707. After the tape was returned by the FAA for further study, the CAB was able to determine that the voice on the tape came from another airliner in the vicinity of the Boeing 707.

The result of the FAA's rash decision to release the tape prematurely was not only to perpetrate a hoax on the public. This interference into the due course of the investigation also had the serious effect of delaying and sidetracking that investigation.

And the public may justly ask, Who is in charge of investigating airplane crashes, and is the FAA conducting itself properly in connection with such investigations?

In regards to the question of who is responsible for instructing the Boeing 707 to fly in a holding pattern in a turbulent area, it is reasonable to assume that the turbulence played some part in the tragedy. But even if the turbulence had nothing to do with the crash, the question is still pertinent. For almost everyone agrees that turbulence in the atmosphere presents a hazardous condition for aircraft. But the Federal Aviation Agency does not seem to agree with the statement and has exhibited a dangerous indifference to the hazards of turbulence. To the FAA, air traffic lanes are the same as superhighways, and planes are routed along these lanes with regard only to whether or not they are free from other air traffic. But turbulence or other atmospheric conditions may present as dangerous a condition to airplanes as a huge rut in a road or the washout of a bridge presents to automobiles.

I feel confident that the CAB will conduct a thorough investigation, and that in its final report the questions I have raised, and which are in the minds of many people, will be answered.

And in regards to the question of who is in charge of investigating airplane crashes, it may be recalled that in previous speeches delivered on the floor of this House, I have pointed out that in the last three reports published by the CAB the finding of probable cause has in each instance implicated the FAA as contributing to the crash in question. In addition, there is strong evidence that the FAA was at least partially responsible for the midair collision over New York City in December of 1960. These are serious charges, but they are completely supported by the CAB aircraft accident report of the Eastern Air Lines crash in New York City on November 30, 1962, by the CAB report of the Slick Airways crash in San Francisco on February 3, 1963, by the CAB report of the

Zantop Air Transport crash in Puyallup, Wash., on February 16, 1963, and by the recently announced agreement between the Federal Government, United Air Lines, and Trans World Airlines, whereby the Attorney General overruled the decision of the FAA Administrator and agreed that the Federal Government shall pay 24 percent of the damages ultimately fixed in lawsuits growing out of the midair collision over New York City on December 16, 1960.

These facts serve to illustrate one important point: that the FAA is a party to the investigation of every crash involving civil or commercial aircraft in the United States. The FAA is a party in the same sense that the pilot of the plane that crashes is a party, and in the same sense that the owner and the manufacturer may be a party. For either or all of these individuals or companies may be responsible for a crash. Under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the FAA is not only responsible for certifying the airworthiness of all aircraft, but is also responsible for maintaining the safety of air traffic.

The Federal Aviation Act of 1958 also leaves no doubt as to who has charge of investigations of air crashes. Section 701(a)(2) of the act states that the CAB shall "investigate such accidents and report the facts, conditions, and circumstances relating to each accident and the probable cause thereof," and section 701(g) of the act states that the CAB shall provide for the appropriate participation of the FAA Administrator in any investigation conducted by the Board "provided, that the Administrator or his representatives shall not participate in the determination of probable cause by the Board under this title."

The latter provision obviously was put into the law by Congress to prevent the FAA from assuming the power of investigating itself. It would be anomalous if a party to a collision could investigate himself, and certainly this is a wise provision of the law and one that ought to be closely guarded by the CAB and by Congress.

So we look forward to the final report of the CAB on this terrible crash at Elkton, Md., in the hope that the CAB will be able to complete its investigation unobstructed by the grandstand tactics of the FAA, and in the further hope that the knowledge gained from this investigation will help us avoid similar crashes.

"THE EDUCATION CONGRESS"

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson rightly called this "the education Congress" as he signed into public law the Higher Education Academic Facilities Act on December 16 and the Vocational Education Act on December 18.

This and several other bills which have had their origin in the Committee on Education and Labor, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York, Congressman ADAM C. POWELL, have caused Americans to rededicate themselves to the realization that if America is to remain free, its citizenry must be educated. To this end, the gentleman from New York, Congressman POWELL, introduced the most comprehensive measure in education that has yet been brought to the floor of Congress. During this 1st session of the 88th Congress, five of the measures have been approved by the House, and each has added an important dimension to the picture of American education.

H.R. 6143: HIGHER EDUCATION CONSTRUCTION FACILITIES ACT

Title I, undergraduate academic facilities provides for matching grants to insituations of higher learning—$690 million for 3-year program—$230 million per year for 3 years. Twenty-two percent of that amount has been earmarked for public community colleges and technical institutes—equivalent to $50,600,000 per year for 3 years.

Title II, grants for construction of graduate academic facilities—$145 million for a 3-year program, broken down into $25 million for the first year; and $60 million for each of the 2 succeeding years.

Title III, loans for construction of academic facilities, graduate and undergraduate: $360 million for a 3-year program, or $120 million annually. The total money authorized under this legislation is $1,195 million for the 3-year program. With the signature of the President affixed to this legislation, it is now Public Law 88–204.

H.R. 4955: VOCATIONAL EDUCATION; EXTENSION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT; AND FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS PROGRAM

The vocational education aspect of this bill, signed by the President on December 18, calls for a 5-year program, and authorizes expenditures of $1,031 million on new programs in this area, in addition to the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden vocational education legislation already in existence. Amendments to the National Defense Education Act legislation, including a 1-year extension, calls for $319,600,000.

Impacted areas legislation has a 2-year extension, through fiscal year 1965, and money authorized in the amount of $527,600,000. These three programs total $1,879,200,000.

First year funds for vocational education amount to $60 million; second year $108,500,000, and the third year $177,500,000. Beginning with fiscal year 1967 and for each succeeding year thereafter $225 million. This amount of money will be available annually as a permanent authorization of this program. Part of the money is earmarked for the development of work-study and residential schools in a 4-year program. After fiscal year 1968, this would phase out. For this purpose $30 million is available in fiscal year 1965; $50 million in fiscal year 1966; $35 million in fiscal year 1967; and $35 million in fiscal year 1968—a total of $150 million for the 4-year program.

Also included in the vocational education segment of the bill would be an additional amount for title VIII of the National Defense Education Act—technical education—which also becomes a permanent authorization: $15 million for fiscal year 1965, and thereafter $60 million annually.

The practical nurse training program also becomes a permanent aspect of this vocational education program, beginning in fiscal year 1966, with $5 million being annually authorized for this program. For fiscal year 1964 and fiscal year 1965, $5 million is included in the bill, making $15 million available under the totals of this bill for practical nurse training.

In summary, then, the basic program of vocational education, covering fiscal years 1964 through 1968, provides $806 million; residential schools and work-study programs, $150 million; technical education under the National Defense Education Act, $60 million; and practical nurse training, $15 million—making for a grand total for these fiscal years in this bill of $1,031 million.

H.R. 8720: Amendments to Manpower Development and Training Act

Fiscal year 1964	$161,000,000
Fiscal year 1965	407,000,000
Fiscal year 1966	281,000,000
Total	856,000,000

This legislation includes extension of occupational training; special youth program to permit 25 percent of all trainees to be selected from age group 17 to 22; authorizes a pilot program permitting the Federal Government to assist workers and families to move to new areas providing bona fide jobs are available; and augments present subsistence payments with up to $10 weekly "incentive payments"; and trainees able to work part time with no deduction in allowances.

This bill is now awaiting signature of the President.

H.R. 4879: LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION BILL

This bill is almost identical to the Senate-passed S. 2265. H.R. 4879 is now pending floor action, a rule having been granted last week. It provides two main things:

First. It will increase the present act which is now a rural library services legislation providing $7,500,000 annually in matching grants to $25 million annually for a 3-year period. It will be expanded to include all communities of all sizes. Total money available for the 3-year program is $75 million.

Second. Construction grants of $20 million annually for a 3-year period, totaling $60 million under this portion of the bill.

A total of $135 million is authorized under this legislation for 3-year program of library services and construction.

H.R. 6060: EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

This bill has become Public Law 88–38, and defines the inherent right of all individuals without regard to sex to work in areas for which they are qualified and to be paid for their labors at an equal rate.

Thus as one views H.R. 3000, the National Education Improvement Act recommended by the late President Kennedy, one finds that parts of every title have been accepted by the 88th Congress:

First. Title I, expansion of opportunities for individuals in higher education has been adopted through amendments to title II of National Defense Education Act.

Second. Title II, expansion and improvement of higher education has not only been accepted as recommended in aid to public community college academic facilities, but also a broader measure of aid to colleges, both undergraduate and graduate, through the adoption of H.R. 6143.

Third. Title III, improvement of educational quality was met in part through adoption of H.R. 4955.

Fourth. Title IV, strengthening elementary and secondary education was realized through amendments passed to the National Defense Education Act, titles III and V.

Fifth. Title V addressed to expansion and improvement of vocational education saw an even greater development than was originally envisioned by passage of H.R. 4955.

Sixth. Title VI, expansion of continuing education is reflected through the adoption of an amendment to Manpower Development and Training Act, and the ruling permitting debate on the Library Services Act.

These major measures coupled with other bills passed by other committees in the House makes this truly the "education Congress."

I commend my colleague from New York upon his outstanding leadership.

PRESENTATION OF AWARD FOR HUMANITARIANISM TO HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the proceedings I wish to include in the RECORD an address eloquently presented by our colleague, Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, when accepting the First Annual Award for Humanitarianism given by the National Hemophilia Foundation at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington on Friday, December 6, 1963.

All of those in attendance were profoundly impressed with the sincere and humble acceptance of this award which is one of so many JOHN has received for his accomplishments in behalf of the people of our Nation. The list of JOHN's accomplishments is endless and they are accomplishments of which not only he, but the entire Nation, should be proud. It is to the credit of the National Hemophilia Foundation that he has again been publicly recognized for his humane efforts.

I would like to share with my colleagues the story of an incident which occurred early in JOHN FOGARTY's congressional career and which did much to trigger his interest in medical research. The incident occurred in 1949, shortly after he became chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, when he met a young man walking with the aid of two canes. JOHN stopped him and inquired as to what was wrong and why was he walking with canes? The young man explained that he was a victim of multiple sclerosis. JOHN, with his impatient and warm-hearted Irish drive, went into action. At that time very little was known about the disease and JOHN found that the Government was conducting no research on it whatsoever. Within a relatively short period of time he was successful in pushing through Congress a $500,000 appropriation to commence research on multiple sclerosis. It is through his efforts that what is now known about this crippling disease resulted directly from JOHN's chance meeting with the young man with the canes.

I cite this incident to illustrate the intensity of his interest and the measure of our colleague. The address he gave on December 6 is another measure of this man and a fine example of his willingness and ever intense desire to be of service to his fellowman:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY, NATIONAL HEMOPHILIA FOUNDATION, SHERATON PARK, WASHINGTON, D.C., DECEMBER, 6, 1963

I am deeply grateful to the members of the National Hemophilia Foundation for the honor which you have bestowed upon me here today. To be designated a humanitarian, to be recognized for my efforts on behalf of the health and well-being of the American people by an organization whose whole purpose for existence is humanitarian—many of whose members literally contribute their lifeblood each week to preserve the lives of others—is truly gratifying.

The National Hemophilia Foundation is only 15 years old, yet the underlying principle upon which it is based is centuries old. This principle is behind the moral teaching that we should help one another. And this principle is behind the democratic faith in the value of individual human life—a faith which crystallized in the cry of liberty, equality and fraternity which caught the conscience of the peoples of the world.

The humanitarian impulse was behind the dramatic conquest of the infectious diseases which we have seen in our country in this century. Fifty years ago epidemics of diphtheria, scarlet fever, smallpox and typhoid ravaged this Nation. And it is still the humanitarian impulse which today is behind efforts to conquer and vanquish the chronic and metabolic diseases—diabetes, congenital heart ailments, cystic fibrosis, and, of course hemophilia.

In attempting to prevent these disorders, the humanitarian effort to promote the welfare of humanity through the elimination of pain and suffering is at present helpless, because the secrets of these diseases are locked in the germ plasm. Children do not catch diseases like hemophilia; they are born with them, or with the tendency to develop them. Medical treatment can save and prolong the lives of those afflicted into the years of reproduction—and then the disorder is passed on to their children.

This paradox of increasing the magnitude of the disease as progress is made against it is particularly true of hemophilia. For hemophilia is not only a hereditary disease, it is a sex-linked trait. As the life of a hemophiliac is prolonged by new methods of treatment, sons and daughters are born who will inevitably carry to future generations the tendency toward hemophilia or the actual disorder itself.

Several years ago I had the privilege of addressing the board of trustees of the National Hemophilia Foundation at an annual meeting such as this. At that time, in noting the historical significance of this disease I was struck by the fact that in the days of Queen Victoria, hemophilia was a rare disease, a "disease of kings." Today, this is no longer the case.

Due in a large measure to the efforts and interests of this organization and its 24 local chapters, great strides have been made in hemophilia. Since 1940 the average life span of hemophiliacs has been increased from 14½ years to 29 years af age, allowing plenty of time for hemophilia to be passed on to progeny. I am told that in the United States alone, there are about 100,000 known hemophiliacs with probably an equal or even greater number of females who, although not afflicted with the disorder, carry the trait in their genes. Year by year the incidence of hemophilia multiplies.

The only answer is in continued research, for only by ferreting out the secret of the genes and learning to control the paths of inheritance will we ever eliminate the problem.

Day by day research is continuing. Hemophilia is now being fought on many sides and at many levels—by Congress, by Government-supported research, by this organization in numerous ways, and by the contributions from the general public. The increase in the life expectancy of the hemophiliac attests to the progress made, and the growth of the National Hemophilia Foundation shows the growing awareness of the problems presented by this disease.

One of the most noteworthy advances in the care of hemophiliacs seen in this country in recent years is the development and clinical use of a highly concentrated form of antihemophilic factor, the vital factor missing in the blood of persons suffering from the most prevalent type of hemophilia. With the use of this plasma concentrate, I am told, a hemophilia patient can undergo surgery and have almost the same chance for survival as persons without this disorder. Formerly, at least 25 percent of hemophilia patients who underwent surgery died from loss of blood.

Unfortunately, this lifesaving therapy is far beyond the reach of most hemophilic families. The plasma concentrate sufficient for 1 operation can cost from $2,500 to $5,000 and occasionally $10,000, and 600 donors must give their blood in order to obtain enough of the concentrate for 1 treatment.

Investigators at the National Institutes of Health are now concentrating on the development of better methods of purifying and separating out this concentrate in an attempt to reduce the cost of treatment and the number of donors necessary.

Much more research is needed to simplify the fractioning process and studies are now going on investigating the therapeutic use of this fraction concentrate in surgical cases to determine how long this factor survives in the body, where it is localized, and its period of effectiveness.

At the same time, better ways of concentrating and assaying the factor are under study, and a new method has been developed to detect relatively small amounts of antihemophilic factor within the body. This new method provides a basis for developing better therapeutic regimens with the antihemophilic agents now available, and will permit easier evaluation of new agents.

Another area of research which I believe needs strengthening is the epidemiological study of hemophilia. There is much work to be done before all hemophiliacs in this country are located and diagnosed. By way of contrast, Sweden has a complete record of each of its hemophiliacs, including family histories. Of course, in a country with a population of 7 million—less than the population of our New England States—the identification of any segment of its population is a much simpler matter than it is in the United States.

I have heard of recent reports of circulating anticoagulants in the blood of hemophiliacs. The inactivation of the antihemophilic factor by circulating anticoagulants is enzymatic in nature and may be a kind of antigen-antibody response. Hemophiliacs with a circulating anticoagulant represent, of course, a difficult treatment problem, as they will not respond to any substance injected or transfused that might aid the clotting mechanism. As fast as such a substance is transfused, it is deactivated by the circulating anticoagulant.

Scientists from Buenos Aires, Argentina, working with investigators of the National Cancer Institute, have recently developed a new experimental method of isolating this plasma factor in a purer form. A research foundation in New England is also devoting much of its time to this problem.

I have seen another recent report indicating that a researcher in Boston has found that flavinoids, found commonly in "cold cures," may be effective in reducing the severity of bleeding episodes of hemophiliacs by as much as 50 percent. Others are studying the basic mechanisms of blood clotting in an effort to discover the role played by various enzymes in the clotting process. Several of the enzymes studied have been shown to possess certain clot-accelerating activities.

The National Hemophilia Foundation has a significant role in research support, but you and your members do far more than that. You have helped to lift the veil of secrecy and ignorance which obscures many hemophiliacs by disseminating information to the general public and community health organizations on the problems and treatment of hemophilia. Through your efforts, medical records and family histories of hemophiliacs are being made and studied. Through your work, blood donors have been organized to keep a sufficient supply of the precious life-saving plasma on hand. I wish to commend you for this work.

I am delighted to see the National Hemophilia Foundation grow in size and strength, for you have the power to help the individual hemophiliac and his family adjust to the disease and the forced sedentary life which accompanies it in a way no Government agency can do. What reassurances it must be to the family with the problems of a hemophiliac child suddenly thrust upon them, just to know that there is a National Hemophilia Foundation, to realize that thousands of private citizens have banded together to help each other face their problems.

Certainly we can say that our combined efforts have done much to lessen the suffering of the hemophiliac. Still it remains very clear that much more must be done, for the problem will continue to plague our people until a method for curing and preventing the occurrence of hemophilia is found. This requires more basic research.

Some years ago biologists began to turn from the study of disease on the gross level to the study of disease on the microscopic level. With the invention of the electron microscope, biology plunged deeper into the mysteries of life. Today scientists are working at the molecular level, where the secret of hemophilia lies locked in the genes.

Gradually, progress is being made; slowly, the genetic code is being broken—the code that will reveal the mysteries surrounding hemophilia and similar "inborn errors of metabolism." It is here that we place our hope and our concentrated efforts.

I need not explain to those of you here today why we must continue our research, nor why we must discover the secret of these tragic disorders. Many of you have children or close relatives afflicted with hemophilia, some of you may yourselves be hemophiliacs; you know the agony, the pain, the tragedy of these diseases. You understand the need for continuing the humanitarian efforts of our forefathers, for you know, better than I could ever tell you, why the fight for freedom from disease must be won.

We have seen in our generation great advances in forging powerful new weapons in the war against disease. We must continue our efforts, we must measure ourselves against the challenge—it must not be said of us that "The century has brought forth a great era, but the great moment finds a generation of little men."

U.S. FOOLISHNESS IN CAMBODIA

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, a former head of our foreign aid program once told me that in his opinion half of the money being spent on aid was wasted. He acknowledged that unfortunately he did not know which half, nor had he been able to correct this during his administration of the Agency. The accomplishments of his successors in this regard do not appear to be much better.

The firm position which the House took last Monday on foreign aid funding should suggest to AID and the Department of State that the elimination of waste must receive priority attention. A diligent effort in that direction could produce sufficient economies to permit our foreign aid program to be carried on without impairment and even, perhaps, with greater effectiveness. A good starting place would seem to be with the funds the Agency has budgeted for countries which have made it plain by words or actions that our aid is not wanted or appreciated. A distinguished member of my former Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, who also serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee, our able colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [John S. Monagan], made this point in a statement on the floor last Wednesday and his remarks resulted in a sharp editorial in the Waterbury American of December 16.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

U.S. Foolishness in Cambodia

> The right hand so often doesn't know what the left hand is doing, in these days of big government.
>
> Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodia's chief of state, has delivered himself of a diatribe against the Government of the United States, announcing that he would be "happy to break diplomatic relations with the United States." Indeed he expressed the hope that there would be "an early break in relations between the United States and us."
>
> Yet at almost the same instant this vitriol was being poured out, Representative John S. Monagan, Democrat, of Connecticut, announced that he has reliable information that there is "a belief in the high level of the State Department that further funds should be expended on the Cambodian Port Highway."
>
> This is the highway which was the subject of a hearing and report by the Hardy subcommittee more than 2 years ago—a project which the committee found to have been so badly mangled as to injure our prestige. Some $34 million was expended on the highway, yet even 2 years ago it was found that one-third of it was in need of repair.
>
> Mr. Monagan minces no words: "This highway was foolish in its conception; it was criminal in its construction. In view of the present situation in Cambodia, it is my belief that it would be the height of folly to spend more American funds on this construction project * * * I will do all in my power to prevent such expenditure."
>
> Hear. Hear.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LOCAL 66 OF THE INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS' UNION

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the year 1963 marks the 50th anniversary of a remarkable labor union, local 66 of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

As this golden anniversary year draws to a close, I am honored to salute local 66 and its manager, Murray Gross.

I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in reading the following passages from "The Fight's Just Begun," a history of local 66 over the last half century published by the local.

> Formally, local 66 has a mouth-filling title: Bonnaz, Embroideries, Tucking, Pleating and Allied Crafts Union, Local 66, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, AFL-CIO. But in the shops, over the bonnaz machine, or the embroidery frame, the workers call local 66, "the union."
>
> Over the years, local 66 through the dedicated efforts of its members and officers has built a structure of benefits, duties, and rights that touches upon each individual within the union. From the highly skilled bonnaz operator or tucker to the unskilled floorworker, the oldtimer and the newcomer, all the members of local 66 enjoy the same basic benefits and rights.
>
> Where do these rights begin? They begin with each union member; perhaps it might be said that they begin with the latest member to join local 66, a young girl, say, who has just found work as a floorworker in an embroidery shop. Typically, she is a recent migrant from Puerto Rico or the South. Chances are, she's married and helping to support a growing family. Whatever her personal circumstances, she's new to the union and is entering a new way of life.
>
> Here is a beginning that has repeated itself many times over the last 50 years within local 66. The new member may not realize it yet but she now belongs to a union family of 9,000 members. Most of these are women—about 80 percent of the local's membership.
>
> The local 66 family, however, reaches beyond the confines of the canyons of New York City's teeming garment center. As each individual within the local is related by the bonds of union brotherhood to each other, local 66 is tied to over 500 locals of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union

(ILGWU) and local 66 members are part of the great family of some 450,000 other workers in the ladies garment industry organized in the mighty ILGWU throughout the country and in Canada and in Puerto Rico.

Solidarity, says the dictionary, is an "entire union of interests and responsibilities in a group." Joseph Conrad wrote of the "invincible conviction of solidarity that knits together innumerable hearts." And, in the words of the song, "When the union's inspiration through the workers' blood shall run," there is solidarity and "no greater power anywhere beneath the sun."

Union solidarity, however, is not solely confined to a local union or its parent international union. By its affiliation to the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL–CIO), the ILGWU brings the members of local 66 within a brotherhood of some 12½ million workers that covers the United States and Canada as well as every craft and industrial occupation. Through its ties with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), the AFL–CIO in turn links up America's union families with some 56 million workers throughout the free world.

Local 66, it has been said, is a "little United Nations" because so many workers of different creeds, color, and race are under its banner. With its multiplicity of crafts as well as ethnic groups, it might be more apt to call local 66 a miniature ICFTU. Bonnaz embroiderers, tuckers, pleaters, crochet beaders, nailhead and rhinestone setters, covered button and tubular piping workers, to name only a few, work in local 66 organized shops.

A vast majority of local 66 members are skilled workers, practicing their arts on possibly the widest variety of crafts and on the largest assortment of machines to be found within the jurisdiction of any single garment industry local union.

Local 66 unites these Jacks and Jills of all the trades into a common organization striving for common goals. Participation is the key to the union democracy that flourishes within the local.

Mr. Speaker, I am also glad to bring to the attention of my colleagues a message from ILGWU President David Dukinsky to local 66 to mark its 50th anniversary:

As local 66 celebrates half a century of its existence and progress, there comes to mind the fact that in the early days, it was often argued that "professional pride" among the bonnaz embroidery workers, considered an "elite" element in the needle trades, would be an insuperable barrier to unionization. (In other trades, at the same time, a variation of this theme was that "girls can't be organized," or some other rationalization.)

Fortunately, the determined pioneers of unionism among the embroidery workers, such as Nathan Riesel, Ossip Wolinsky, Zachary L. Freedman, and others did not share this pessimistic outlook. If one attempt did not take hold, they tried again—and again—until the present local gained a permanent foothold in 1913.

Major improvements obtained in the first collective agreement in 1915, such as cutting back the workweek from 53 to 50 hours and setting minimum scales for operators, may not seem earth-shaking today. But they laid the basis for the steady achievements through the years that raised workers' standards to the levels enjoyed now.

Though the work opportunities for local 66 members, whose ranks now also include crafts such as tucking, pleating, stitching, tubular piping, Swiss handloom, covered bottons, nailheads and rhinestones, vary to such a great degree, with the whims and vicissitudes of fashion, the unchanging devotion of the local to the ideals of progressive trade unionism is a source of continued strength, both to its members and to the ILGWU as a whole, in meeting the challenges ahead.

I know that under the constructive leadership of Manager Murray Gross, the local's future course will remain constant to IGLWU concepts of decent, democratic trade unionism.

DAVID DUBINSKY,
President, ILGWU.

THE REVEREND DR. JOHN COLEMAN BENNETT

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Reverend Dr. John Coleman Bennett, a distinguished theologian, was elected president of Union Theological Seminary in New York. Dr. Bennett, author, scholar, and educator, served as dean of the faculty and professor in the years before he became acting president last June. Under his leadership and wise guidance Union Theological surely will continue as one of the world's foremost educational institutions.

I include at this point in the RECORD two articles about Dr. Bennett published in today's New York Times which I know will be of considerable interest to my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 20, 1963]

SEMINARY ELECTS A NEW PRESIDENT: BENNETT FOLLOWS VAN DUSEN AT UNION THEOLOGICAL

(By George Dugan)

The Reverend Dr. John Coleman Bennett was elected president of Union Theological Seminary yesterday.

He succeeds the Reverend Dr. Henry Pitney Van Dusen, president emeritus since last June, as head of the world's largest interdenominational training school for ministers.

Since Dr. Van Dusen's retirement Dr. Bennett had served as acting president in addition to filling the Reinhold Niebuhr professorship of social ethics. From 1955 until assuming the active presidency the 61-year-old theologian had been dean of the faculty.

Most of his teaching career has been devoted to this seminary, which was established in 1836 to train for the ministry students of every denomination.

As its name indicates, the school is dedicated to the goal of Christian unity. Its faculty includes many leaders in the so-called ecumenical movement for a worldwide united church.

SPREAD OF STUDENT BODY

Union's current enrollment numbers nearly 600 students representing more than 60 Protestant denominations. There are about 80 students in residence from 28 countries.

And, for the first time, three Roman Catholics are doing graduate work at the seminary.

Most of the students come from six major denominational groupings: Presbyterian, Protestant Episcopal, Methodist, Congregational, Baptist, and Lutheran.

The seminary is at Broadway and 120th Street, adjacent to Columbia University and the complex of educational institutions in the Morningside Heights area.

Its English Gothic architecture blends with the nearby towering spire of the Riverside Church.

Last year Union completed a $4 million residence hall for married students and faculty members. It is called Van Dusen Hall, in honor of Dr. Bennett's predecessor.

Like Dr. Bennett, "Pit" Van Dusen is one of Protestantism's leading ecumenists and was one of the architects of the World Council of Churches.

He was elected president of Union in 1945, succeeding the Reverend Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin.

QUALIFICATIONS SET FORTH

Dr. Bennett was named to the seminary post by its board of directors, headed by John N. Irwin 2d.

In announcing the election, Mr. Irwin noted that the new president had been associated with Union in his student days and had continued through 23 years as a faculty member.

"In these days of critical tensions," Mr. Irwin said, "we are fortunate to have in him a man of keen social sensitivity and insight as well as an awareness of the ethical demands of the Christian Gospel.

"Under his leadership we anticipate continued advance in the seminary's program for serving the church by providing well-trained men and women for its various ministries.

"Union's more than 6,000 alumni around the world will be happy at this distinguished appointment and Christian leaders, in this country and abroad, will feel closer to the seminary because of their acquaintance with John Bennett through his scholarly books, his timely articles, his lectures in the classroom and on television and radio, and his participation in the highest councils of the church.

"He will also be welcomed in his new position by all of those who are concerned to bring about interfaith understanding and cooperation."

WORLD CHURCHMAN: JOHN COLEMAN BENNETT

Like his predecessors for more than 125 years the man who was elected president of the Union Theological Seminary yesterday is dedicated to Protestant unity and freedom of inquiry in religious studies. Thus, no sudden change in policy is indicated under the leadership of the Reverend Dr. John Coleman Bennett. In fact, Dr. Bennett has been acting president since last June, when the Reverend Henry Pitney Van Dusen retired. Before that, Dr. Bennett was dean of the faculty for 6 years.

Both men have an abiding interest in the ecumenical, or Christian unity, movement. They have long been active in the affairs of the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches.

OPENING INDIVIDUAL WAY

Their dedication to the training of a clergy in "solid learning, true piety, and enlightened experience" is well known in church circles—as is their rejection of a "Union position" on theological issues. Each student must seek and arrive at his own answers.

Dr. Bennett is regarded as a brilliant theologian, somewhere left of center. Precise of speech and quickly sharp in debate, he has made a lifelong study of communism.

More than once he has warned his fellow Christians that God is not automatically on the side of the West.

Three years ago he wrote these words to buttress his thesis: "The very atheism of communism is a judgment upon the churches, which for so long were unconcerned about the victims of the industrial revolution and early capitalism and which have usually been ornaments of the status quo, no matter how unjust it has been.

"The temptation to turn the cold war into a holy crusade is ever with us, and insofar as we yield to it, we make impossible the tolerance and humaneness which must yet come into international relations if there is to be a future for mankind."

Dr. Bennett was born in Kingston, Ontario, Canada, on July 22, 1902, the son of a Presbyterian minister.

After his family moved to New Jersey he attended Phillips Exeter Academy and Williams College and then went on to graduate work at Oxford University in England.

PREFERENCE TO TEACH

He took his bachelor of divinity degree at Union in 1927 (magna cum laude) and 2 years later earned a master's degree in sacred theology (summa cum laude).

An ordained minister of the United Church of Christ, Dr. Bennett immediately eschewed the pulpit in favor of education.

He began his teaching career on the Union Seminary faculty the same year he received his degree.

Three years later he was named assistant professor and then associate professor of Christian theology at Auburn (N.Y.) Theological Seminary. Auburn was later to move to New York as part of Union.

After 8 years at Auburn Dr. Bennett went to the Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, Calif., where he was a professor of Christian theology and philosophy of religion.

He returned to Union in 1943 as a professor of Christian theology and ethics. In 1957 he was appointed to the William E. Dodge, Jr., chair of applied Christianity and in 1960 to the professorship of social ethics named in honor of his colleague, the Reverend Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr.

Dr. Bennett was named dean of the faculty in 1955, a post he held until last summer when he became acting president.

The new president of Union (he will be installed next spring) is the author of eight books, including "Christianity and Communism Today," "Christian Ethics and Social Policy" and "Christians and the State."

Dr. Bennett was married to Anne McGrew, at Auburn, in 1931. They have a daughter, Elizabeth, and two sons, John and William. The Bennetts will continue to live in Knox Hall on the seminary quadrangle.

VETERANS' PENSIONS

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to liberalize certain provisions of the law relating to veterans' pensions.

This bill is the result of a vast amount of study undertaken during this, my first year in Congress, stimulated by many conferences and conversations with veterans of World War I. All of its provisions are not limited exclusively, however, to these veterans, but as a practical matter would be of the most advantage to them.

This bill would provide that any veteran who reaches the age of 65 would be considered permanently and totally disabled. It would liberalize the income limitations in the first two brackets of the non-service-connected, totally and permanently disabled, single veteran, and of widows without children. It would increase from $70 to $90 the monthly regular aid and attendance benefit to those veterans unable to take care of themselves. It would exclude the income earned by employment of a World War I veterans' wife in computing the income available to the veteran.

Mr. Speaker, this bill addresses itself to the most troublesome areas of disagreement in our veteran benefit legislation, and to those areas where there is the greatest demonstrated need. It is a practicable bill and one which I think has a good chance of passage.

Mr. Speaker, through my entire legislative career, both in State government and here, I have always tried to treat all citizens fairly. The charge is made that our pension laws have discriminated against veterans of World War I. This charge is just as vigorously disputed and true comparisons are difficult to make. The universal pension bill which many of the World War I veterans want is entwined in a controversy which does not auger well for success. Many who have signed the discharge petition will not support the bill on the floor and a Presidential veto is a possibility if not a probability.

I am not prepared to say that equity does not demand the passage of the veterans of World War I sponsored bill. But I prefer to get something accomplished for those most in need while there is still time for them to enjoy it rather than giving tacit support to the unattainable and accomplishing nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will hold hearings on this bill early next year. Although the chairman has been subjected to a great deal of criticism, I should like to say that in my opinion, he has proved himself over the years to be a real friend of the veteran. He has been honest and at times, blunt, but always compassionate, understanding, and practicable.

A controversy over one piece of legislation should not prevent us from agreeing on other things that should be done. I hope this bill will make some small contribution toward better and more equitable treatment to those older and more impoverished veterans of World War I for whom we all recognize the need and the justice.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, MR. SPEAKER

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no more fitting way to end this session than by wishing you a most happy and blessed birthday tomorrow.

I join in the expressions of congratulations which have been given to you here today and add my own thoughts of esteem and appreciation.

As you celebrate this birthday anniversary, Mr. Speaker, you truly may have a sense of fulfillment for a job well done during the past year.

Our times are trying ones. The work of a Congressman, as we well know, increases with each passing year. Yet none of us carries the awesome burdens and responsibilities which are yours, Mr. Speaker. Faced with what often must appear to be insurmountable problems, you have fulfilled your office with knowledge and ability.

You have shown skill in the parliamentary rules of this body. You have demonstrated a keen sense of political wisdom. You have given leadership—not just to the fellow members of your party—but to the Congress as a whole, and, therefore, to the Nation.

For your accomplishments, for your diligence in the work of your office, for your guidance of our Nation's affairs, we humbly salute you today.

To your already staggering burdens, an assassin's bullet has added new responsibilities. For now you stand next in line to the succession of our Nation's most lofty position, the Presidency of the United States.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself fully with the remarks of our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. I am completely confident that you could capably and effectively discharge the duties of any of the highest offices of our land.

THE 73D BIRTHDAY OF THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE, THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] has sort of jumped the gun. I have discouraged a lot of Democrats from making advance announcement of the Speaker's birthday. But seriously I am happy that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has noted the imminence of this important occasion. However, I would like to take this time to state that the best birthday present we can give the Speaker is for every Member to be here until we finish the program of the House, and for those who are not here to return. One of the most important measures before the Congress this year is now in conference on the foreign aid appropriation bill. We want to dispose of this matter and dispose of it finally in this session. So I urge all Members to remain here and all Members who are absent to return here. There is no business anywhere more important than the disposition of this bill.

THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we have been here in this session of the Congress for almost a year. Many members have expressed their feeling of frustration at the face that week after week after week we were here with very little legislation of any particular consequence to be considered.

Obviously every Congress wants to complete the work that needs to be completed. I am not saying it is the fault of anyone on the other side of the aisle—but certainly it is not the fault of anyone on our side that the foreign aid appropriation bill has not yet been enacted into law. The fact is that the foreign aid program has been carried on for the past 6 months under a continuing resolution which now extends to January 31 of next year. If the conferees can agree with some expedition on that measure and it can be finally acted upon, that is fine with me. I am going to stay here, I will say to the Majority Leader, but I do not know how many others will. Today 288 Members answered to the quorum call. But I am ready to stay here.

On the other hand, having gone along under a continuing resolution for almost 6 months I cannot see any particular reason why we could not let it go a couple of weeks more, although again I say I am ready to stay here and do whatever needs to be done.

By the same token, I can understand the anxiety of Members who, in good faith have made transportation reservations to go home, and who, in all probability, will not be able to reschedule their arrangements over the weekend because of the circumstances.

I voted on the so-called wheat amendment. I understand, of course, that is considered a matter of great consequence by many people, but I am not particularly interested in staying here to help finance the Russians and the Communists because such an arrangement does not appeal to me.

I thank the Speaker for his indulgence.

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION ON THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision of the U.S. court of appeals that the Communist Party did not have to register as an instrument of the international Communist conspiracy defies all understanding. The court has apparently chosen to disregard American security interests and the manifest intent of Congress to expose the membership of such subversive organizations.

An ironic aspect of this decision in favor of the Communist Party is that it comes on the heels of the President's assassination by a Communist. This decision is a bitter pill for all patriotic Americans, and we wonder what it will take to shock the courts into a realization that atheistic communism is a deadly menace to this Nation.

"DEPOSITION ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION"

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I returned from Brazil a week ago and brought with me a translation of an article written by Mr. F. Do Nascimento Brito and published in the newspaper, Jornal Do Brasil, Rio De Janeiro, Sunday, July 7, 1963. It is entitled "Deposition About the Soviet Union," and as I read it on the plane returning to the United States I was reminded of my own trip to the Soviet Union several years ago and the impressions which I gathered and acquired with my own eyes.

This article is the result of Mr. Do Nascimento Brito's experience. It is based on what was seen through Brazilian eyes. His picture of Soviet life has an angle which millions of persons would like to be able to examine: Through the eyes of the man on the street.

In the 8 months preceding his visit, the author devoted himself to a systematic understanding of the books which analyze the Soviet Union, studies of the Communist economy and social organization, examinations of the reality in the light of political doctrines, reports by personalities and writers who know the Communist regime intimately. These studies prepared the journalist to view almost half a century of the Communist regime with critical eyes.

This deposition mirrors the observations of a democratic Brazilian journalist, and I believe them to be of paramount importance, particularly at a time when this Congress is giving more and more attention to our Latin American neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the article to be reprinted in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

DEPOSITION ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION

(By M. F. Nascimento Brito)

From high above the Aeroflot jet offers the arriving visitor to Moscow an extensive view of enormous, empty avenues; of century-old houses and enormous modern residential blocks.

Moscow is not a hospitable city, and the first moments on land are sufficient to reveal and confirm this impression; the army comes aboard and the passports are collected.

The first and most constant presence in the Soviet Union is the uniform. When it is not the militia, it is the armed forces; this is a dramatic picture of a nation which prepares for war but so far speaks of peace.

It was 8 p.m. and still clear on this sunwashed summer evening in Moscow. On the road to the city, after the first encounter with the militia we noticed the fever of construction. Entire neighborhoods were being created to house the Soviet citizen, who dwells badly and lives badly, as we will demonstrate later.

Coexistent with this delirium of construction, on the margin of the route from the airport to the Hotel Ukraine, a huge slum sprawls before the eyes, arousing the curiosity of the visitor. It is the first thing we see.

The new constructions impress one with their quantity, but their quality is not convincing. They are far below the taste and the minimum requirements of a westerner, and this is true not only in Moscow. Leningrad, one of the most beautiful and fascinating cities of Europe, shows the poverty, and it is the same also, I have been told, in the remainder of this agglomeration of Republics united politically under Communist tutelage, but without doubt separated by national characteristics which Marxism-Leninism have not succeeded in destroying.

It is necessary that we explain that these Republics which today form the Soviet Union were too crushed before to permit them later to surge anew with national characteristics, but rather with a culture integrated with communism.

As strong as the presence of the police is the propaganda which makes only one concession: Priority to peace while the nation works for war. The peace propaganda is the happy note which distracts the eyes of Russians and visitors alike from the sadness which impregnates the construction material in the residential blocks; the clothing which covers the people, but which makes the women appear ugly and awkward, without the least feminine vanity, and which sets a pattern of masculine inelegance.

The quality—if one can call what exists there quality—is patternized, and consumption also follows rigid patterns. The public is not given any choice: the visitor confirms and conforms to the daily way of life.

In the stores, in the restaurants, at the spectacles, the state sets the pattern and the people accept it.

And it is only just that we point out the high level of the theatrical spectacles. Symphonic concerts are of impressive quality, but present only Russian composers. The spectacle of the closing of ballet in the Bolshoi Theater is something marvelous and rarely seen. The regional dances, the typical ballets which are exhibited, impress with their beauty, their perfection and their technique.

But there does not exist any option, even in the color of the costumes used, because who decides this is a bureaucrat who lives well, dwells well, and is the owner of an automobile, a privilege which escapes patternization to which everyone is subjected. It is worth noting here the presence of ticket scalpers at the doors of the theaters.

Beginning with his first contacts on the streets of Moscow, the visitor feels the extreme poverty and tension under which the people live, humbly and silently affable.

The inexpressive faces reflect the tension which is not lost in either the work or the patterns of consumption to which all are held prisoner. The high quality of the artistic spectacles does not compensate for the lack of freedom to speak, to meet and to act.

They seek in synthesis that which we classify as downward leveling. They are not a badly educated people, but an uneducated people, uneducated in their manners and their personal behavior.

THE STATE AND THE DESTINY

Nobody choses his destiny. The aptitudes of each one are used by the state, where and how the political directors desire; in the diplomatic life, in a military career, in scientific research, in spacial conquest, in the labor of industry, which is heavy, for peace and for war, which they prepare under the pretension of "defense against imminent attack by the capitalistic countries."

I was the witness to the drama of a father whose son had just completed a course in foreign languages. He wanted his son to enter a diplomatic career, and the son shared this desire. But I was told by the father, with a certain air of desolation: "It appears that the Government will send him into the army. It does not matter. He can become a military attaché in some embassy."

A student studies, but he does not know what he will become. It is not his father and his brothers who decide his future with him. The final word is that of the state. If he does not care to submit himself to the designated officials, he probably will become a marginal in the Soviet society. If he resists, he becomes a political case and in the Soviet Union a political case is a police case.

Mothers also are required to work to provide the necessities to sustain their home. During the day they leave their children in the nurseries, first instrument in the preparation of what the state calls "a harmonious man in the Communist society."

Later, when the child becomes an adolescent, it goes to a city of the pioneers, or to primary school. And later enters the middle education, where work becomes obligatory, and thus attains the university level, if he has aptitudes and understandings.

Everyone is obliged to work in the universities. The examination I made in the University of Moscow over the young people who do not want to either work or study, brought the response that they were sent to other parts of the country, where they were obliged to work. Work is obligatory in the Soviet Union, equally for the man as for the woman.

The visitor is surrounded everywhere by groups of closed faces, faces closed and sad. No human communication is transmitted. The silence, trademark of the Russian people, is the legitimate defense of the Soviet citizens who make no effort to break the language barrier with a smile, or those interjections which in any Western country establish a friendly interchange between any two persons.

Any contact with foreigners can signify a summons to the police, for interminable questioning. The climate of suspicion is permanent, and causes each Soviet citizen to conceal a feeling of fear.

Even foreigners learn, in a short time, to look around before they speak. To speak is suspicious in the Soviet Union. Speak carefully, because a strange sensation of government control weighs on everyone.

The presence of the uniformed police reminds the people that the secret police could be at their side in the person of any companion at work, or in any attempt to establish a free conversation.

The records of the secret Russian police provide material to write volumes. The victims of the secret Russian police, according to what I was told there, principally during the regime of Stalin, were estimated in round numbers at 10 million Russians and foreigners. Who does not remember the Moscow purges?

It is this tension which consumes the Russian soul, and perhaps from this is derived the habit of Russian citizens to walk; to walk silently throughout the night in the streets of Old Moscow. It is a terribly beautiful spectacle they present as they pass, women and men, when they are not the militia, shrouded in their heavy capes, walking through the dark alleys of the older part of Moscow. They probably are consuming energies and liberating tensions which are not consumed and liberated in their work, and which are aggravated by the lack of liberty to do as they please.

We saw this frightful picture after we discarded the guide charged with supervising our official program. People who have lived long in Russia took us to see that other Moscow, which does not figure in the routine of political propaganda. Seeing it is indispensable so that one does not capitulate before the systematic preaching with which they attempt to convince one that there is no lack of liberty and human felicity, and besides, what they have constructed in half a century is justified. It is not. And the proof is the anguish which one sees in the spirit of the Russians. Anguish that is the prime material of political propaganda. From this the Russian citizens make sacrifices to give priority to the national force, which signifies the production of arms instead of better homes; airplanes instead of domestic articles; rockets in place of liberty.

Communist propaganda channels the fear which dwells in the innermost soul of the Soviet citizen into the fear of war, which twice has swept over this sad and suffering people. They dream of peace, but they are paying an excessive price for it.

SLEEPWALKING MOSCOW

The people who walk through the Muscovite nights are an authentic page from Dostoievski. It is possible that the Russians walk because they cannot sleep and find the peace of those who work. The nervous tension that accumulates, through the much that they give and the little they receive—only the little to live—impels them to walk, forced to wander aimlessly by the consciousness that they do not enjoy the liberties; by the omnipresent agents of the KGB, the commissioners, the building agents, the ever-possible watching eye even within their own homes—in finale, all the police apparatus and the invisible net of terror which circles even the dignitaries of the regime, because this is the terrible price which must be paid by those who implant terror.

What a violent contrast exists between the barely finished apartments, with their narrow areas, lugubrious and empty of all family happiness, and the luxurious residence which the visitor can view only from afar. In these latter the leaders of communism enjoy the advantages of the dominating class. Along the banks of the Moscow River impenetrable doorways bar access to the Avenue of the Birds. Here the great ones of the regime live. And what a violent contrast we encountered on this avenue, in a small and ancient church located only 600 meters away.

We arrived in the middle of worship by the cult of the Orthodox Russian Church, with its marvelous icons. The beauty of the hymns, the humility of the priest and the poverty of the faithful, old, young people, and children alike.

The people live badly and reside in badly arranged spaces, while the fever of second-class construction continues. Any citizen, head of a family, is subject to accept the arrival of one or more families whom he does not even know to share his little space with those whom the Government selects.

Between this avenue and the slums we have already mentioned—enormous, sprawling, where the women, like the women of Rio de Janeiro carry cans to draw water from the collective outlets—reminded us that there are many scenes like this in underdeveloped lands which would appear impossible in a socialist country. But they exist.

The visitor who wants to see slums in Moscow need only walk around the city a little, without a guide. On the road leading to the city from the airport there are slums. And in many other sections. But one of the largest is found adjoining Sakolkini Park—one sees it and returns without ever learning what name the Communist regime reserves for such a manifestation of underdevelopment.

The regime designed the broad avenues in Moscow with two white lanes; isolated in the center is a strip reserved for the circulation of the Chaikas and Zios, which are used by the owners of the regime.

The only exceptions are ambulances and fire apparatus. Those luxurious automobiles are the owners of the lanes, and the Communist bureaucrats are the only owners of automobiles.

But they are not to be seen, because the curtains are always drawn over the windows. It is not easy for the people of the Soviet Union to see the bureaucrats and dignitaries of the regime.

The ministries are closed, as are all public offices. One can enter them only with a paper which authorizes such entrance. The militia notes the time of entering the gate, as well as the name of the dignitary who is sought and notes the time and collects the pass. This is authentic.

As you can see, the institution of the Chapa Branca (white license plates for official cars) also affects in Russia the same inevitable reactions on the psychology of the bureaucrats, the superior social group in rights and privileges. They alter the dignity of people through servile adulation of chiefs with whom they cannot disagree.

We went to Piridielkino, when, in a new escape from our guide, we decided to pay homage to Pasternak, who is buried there. Another hard and realistic contrast with respect to residence and of the very system of the regime was brought to our attention: The beautiful "datchas," country homes which we read about in Tolstoi, show that the Russian rulers patternize the life of the people but reserve for themselves those privileges which mark the degeneracy of the revolution in which so much blood was shed.

Communism has not altered, after almost half a century of political intolerance and suppression of liberty, human nature: The Soviet citizens continue being Russians and are human beings. The bureaucrats pervert themselves in a soft life which fools the political police, between the hardships of ideological exercises practiced in public and private exorcisms and degrading self-criticism.

The collective farm experiment, according to what I was informed, is passing through a serious crisis. Production becomes impossible when the fieldworker becomes a public functionary. The lack of liberty destroys initiative. Only part of the youth, and a reduced minority of fanatics work for the sake of work in that which the propaganda calls "Stakanovism." The people, in the immense majority which includes young men, remain silent or are forced to remain silent. And the leaders accept that silence which is imposed rigorously by the police as consent.

And the day when these people wake up? Hungary woke up, and Poland, also. East Berlin is another example, but for a very short time. The arms produced in the name of a defense invoked against a theoretical attack serve to tyrannize the people.

What threatens the Communist government is not the arms of the West, but the most elementary rights to which the Russians, and all those under domination, aspire, and which are denied them by a bureaucracy armed to the teeth.

The architectural style, which contrasts with the ancient lines, is always monumental. We have the impression that Soviet architecture attempts to impress the man in the street, making him feel small before the state. This would be a form of intimidating him, to frustrate the most profound anxieties for freedom of thought and action.

The monumental line of Soviet architecture, above all that of the Stalinist era which had its own architectural style, can also be seen in the ruins of the architecture of Hitler's national socialism, of the false classicalism of the era of Mussolini, in the dictatorial falsifications of Trujillo—and to a greater or lesser degree, in all those countries which have been saddened by dictators of the left or of the right.

If the visitor is a journalist, he attempts to learn something about the Soviet press, where it is easy to establish that freedom has absolutely no opportunity other than to bootlick the powerful and injure those who fall into disgrace.

In the Soviet Union you oppose only the dead. A powerful man who is still living is untouchable—and who does not agree with him in his thought is acting like a national enemy. The picture of these powerful ones, who never are seen by the people except at solemn ceremonies, and then only at a great distance, travel in automobiles with drawn curtains. They surround themselves in their palaces with an impenetrable security service.

Speaking of the Soviet press, it is enough to cite the Moscow newspapers.

Two of them are national organizations, and centralize information. The official truth which illuminates the opinions of Moscow feeds the entire country with material for the press.

And it is well to take into account that in the Soviet Union—in the 15 republics which compose it, comprising 220 millions of inhabitants—two state organizations edit Pravada and Izvestia. You can change the name, even on an afternoon paper in Moscow, or in the most distant regions, but the material of all is manipulated, directed, controlled, and distributed through these two organizations.

Pavel Sartiakov, director of Pravda, is a personal friend of Khrushchev, an influential member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party—much more, very much more than Alexei Adjubei, the "globetrotter" director of Izvestia, and son-in-law of Khrushchev. These are the men who control the information and the interpretive distortions in the Soviet Union. I have the impression that Sartiakov is very much stronger than Adjubei.

The Russian people read the news items, the editorials and the articles which these gentlemen permit, or else in a variety of publications in various languages, offered in the different newsstands—but all, without exception in the service of Soviet communism.

From other countries, such publications as L'Humanité of France, the Italian L'Unita, the English Daily Worker, are permitted to circulate.

The Russian man in the street, the man of the people, after all is the one who pays for the existence of this repugnant political system. Dying from overwork, the Russian dares not touch any foreign publication because he knows that he can be denounced, perhaps even inside his own home, for exposing himself to "capitalistic contamination." And for this only, he can be called to a questioning by the police, which many times is only the first step on the road which ends in Lubianka, the famous prison located under one of Moscow's principal squares.

Thousands of vehicles pass this square daily, circling the statue of the sinister Dwerjinski, the creator of the Soviet police apparatus. They say of Lubianka Prison that its doors open easily for suspects to enter, but rarely open for any of them to depart.

There is only the Soviet radio, which maintains high standards in its musical programs. The Western radio suffers the effects of jamming ordered by the Government.

We went to the Soviet Union after a long and well-organized preparation for the journey, which we intended to put into practice, contrary to those unprepared tourists who fall under the control of Intourist the minute they leave a European capital to walk on Soviet territory. On the contrary, those who are received with those magnificent Chaikas automobiles, with receptionists in the Western style and an irritating manner of attempting to make converts, these see that Moscow which Moscow wants to show them—and they never will discover what the regime is trying to hide.

And Moscow shows proudly a swimming pool for 10,000 persons, broad and modern thoroughfares, a university whose architecture is typical of the Stalin era, the Dynamo Stadium, the city of the movies—seen only from outside, the Palace of the Congress, the theater constructed in the Kremlin in only 1 year and a perfection of skill and comfort, for grand assemblies, the Red Square, of bewitching beauty; the Cathedral of St. Basil and that wall of barbarous beauty—foundation of a Russia which communism has taken over, the Kremlin wall.

The tomb of Lenin is located in Red Square—he who declared that "the revolution is above the truth," justifying the lie as a means to attain an end.

The official visitor, only because of this, passes in front of 2,000 persons who stand silently in a long line every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, to see the body of Lenin, a scene which reminded us of the dead Christ on Good Friday. It is not a religious devotion, it is an exercise of impressive mysticism.

I saw a little boy of 10 years walking in front of me, take off his Georgian beret, and with glassy-eyed mysticism, pay reverence to what was embalmed, something more than a political leader of a triumphant revolution. Today Lenin is the mystic leader of a philosophical thought that cannot be sustained by any reason, but which survives through religious impulse. Lenin is the god of a Russia also without freedom, like that which he destroyed.

The Russian Government denies the people the existence of the spiritual values that are the salvation of humanity, the faith in God, and an eternal destiny of the human soul, and substitutes the spiritual necessity of a divine faith with a political mysticism that cannot last eternally because it is founded on perishable and material values.

The visitor will be accompanied by a guide who is incapable of any conversation beyond what he has been given to say; to see the subway of Moscow, with some of its stations located 250 meters below the surface; with an impressive luxury, with marble walls, and enormous statues to call the attention of Brazilians to something they have suspected for some time, and of which I am now convinced, convinced by my visit to the Soviet Union: Part of the Soviet Union campaign in Brazil is the work of attempting to separate us from the United States, pointing out and accenting the failings in the relations with Brazil—and they exist—and everything that possibly can be used for this purpose.

Official guests never fail to see one of the Moscow watch factories, where watches are made that can be found in the Western European capitals, and be told that 8,000 persons work in them.

"Do you only manufacture watches?" we asked with an ingenious air.

"No; we also manufacture other precision instruments," was the reply.

"What other instruments?"

"Those that the Government asks us to make."

Half a word is enough for complete understanding.

The visitor only sees two floors, and in his passage from one floor to another, he climbs the stairs because the elevators are for freight only. He finds the entrance completely blocked, with militiamen watching each access to every floor, and workers who come and go showing their identity cards, and all in an uncommon hurry. And the workers do not indulge in that normal movement of heads, which is human and a universal habit when visitors arrive or show feminine curiosity by lifting their eyes to the visitor. But it is certain that at those workbenches located beyond the production line there are watchers, with production schedules controlling the workers.

After traveling the length of the production line, from the raw material to the final touching-up process, the accompanying manager said, with Communist enthusiasm and Marxist tranquillity, that the Russian system of manufacturing watches is better that that of Switzerland.

We were perplexed, but since we still wanted to learn about Russia, we continued.

We returned to our hotel for our meals, because Moscow is a city where restaurants exist only to serve quick lunches, like a cafeteria, to the working folk. In order for a tourist to frequent such a restaurant, he must possess a card which is furnished by Intourist.

When we asked the reason for the card we were told:

"It is a kind of travelers' check." And nothing more.

Anyone who wants to learn about Russia must strain his brain, he must prepare; it is not enough to ask because the Russians are not always disposed to answer. Generally the guide repeats only that which he was ordered to say. It is useless to attempt to converse with the driver of your car. Besides the language barrier, you never succeed in knowing any of them. During 7 days in the Soviet Union seven different tovarichies drove the automobile which carried us around.

The visitor who expects to receive benefits from his invitation should not fail to visit the Kremlin, the assembly of chapels which compose the interior of the medieval citadel which is the heart of Moscow.

And we continued to discover marvelous icons, some of them deprived of the precious stones which had been encrusted on them, a lack which was not clearly explained to us. It is possible that these precious stones will be restored, because at the moment Russia is in an enthusiastic fever of restoration of monuments and artistic and historic things.

We visited several of the Kremlin chapels. There is, however, one door prohibited to visitors. This is to the seat of the Government of the U.S.S.R. The guide pointed out, with national pride, that Khrushchev worked behind a certain window. We were at least 70 meters away from that window, but the presence of militiamen was most intense.

What beautiful churches and chapels we saw in the Soviet Union, all with Byzantine towers making a strange and fascinating effect. And one of the most beautiful views we have ever seen is the spectacle of those towers against the gray background of a Muscovite night.

We went to one of those Moscow churches to watch the religious ceremony, where the people worship freely. Not even Communist propaganda and brutality can suffocate the religious spirit. The religious cult overcomes part of the sadness of a people who are submitted to a pitiless process of oppression. It is the sorrowfully beautiful hymns of this cult that is revealed the humility of a people who seek on the road of their faith the redemption of a brutalized destiny.

We visited the Leningrad cemetery, where 600,000 inhabitants of this city are interred, and who were killed in the 900 days of the battles with Hitler's army.

But it also was necessary that we visit diplomatic friends in Moscow, because it is not possible to go there and not meet old friends, in a visit which joins Brazilians in a cult of homesickness.

We sought a telephone book to learn the number of the Brazilian Embassy, and to our surprise discovered there are no telephone books in Moscow. It is necessary to ask the telephone operator for information, and for this we had recourse to an interpreter who, with speed and efficiency, put us in contact with the Embassy.

In Moscow a group of the elite of our Foreign Ministry, led by the extraordinary figure of the diplomat that is Vasco Leitão da Cunha, with his entire life dedicated to the international affairs of Brazil, working and studying day and night.

When we were still in Brazil and preparing for our visit to Russia, we heard unacceptable comments about Vasco Leitão da Cunha.

I was told that he is not suited to the Embassy in the U.S.S.R. because he is not understanding. And why not? Because he is intelligent, experienced, and prepared? Because he does not live in puerile preconceptions?

Our diplomats live in Moscow without enjoying the liberties which are granted here to the Soviet diplomats. You must know that the Soviet Ambassador in Brazil can, whenever and wherever he wants, meet with Luis Carlos Prestes to give him instructions, bawl him out for talking too much, and receive information—and even berate him for erroneous information sent to Moscow by Brazilian Communists.

We consider necessary, and even indispensable, diplomatic relations between Brazil and the Soviet Union. Our Ambassador in Moscow is important, even from the viewpoint of national security, because we must not fail to know, for example, how the interpretations sent from here by the representatives of the Kremlin circulate there.

We continue to accept the hypothesis of commercial relations with the U.S.S.R. although today we have sufficient valid facts so that we do not believe in them as we believed before, accrediting for various reasons that are not pertinent at the moment. But we understand that reciprocity of treatment is indispensable, and the reciprocity that we ask fits very well in the Communist regime, which has refused to concede it because of a strange love for a privilege which is not founded in Marxism.

And it fits well into the Brazilian democracy, because democracy does not presuppose the disuse of these elements necessary to guarantee its intangibility.

And how do the Brazilian diplomats live in Moscow?

It is necessary to know that with the exception of the Ambassador, all the personnel of our diplomatic representation reside in the so-called ghettos, gigantic residential structure of the category reserved for the residence of diplomats, with militiamen at the doors noting punctually every departure and every arrival.

The social intercourse between the personnel of the diplomatic corps does not figure in the social columns, but in the police registers. For this reason when they wish to converse they take a ride in an automobile. No one has confidence, no one trusts anyone. Wherever there is a wall, there could be, who knows a hidden microphone. There are incredible stories about microphones and this permanent vigilance of foreigners and diplomats.

I received from one diplomat who resides in the Hotel National the complaint that he cannot open the windows of his room on days when there is a parade or other ceremony in Red Square. The police will not permit it.

Vigilance over diplomats was accentuated in a peculiar way after the Penkowski case. The press, in suspicious editorials, called upon the Russian people to keep away from foreigners. In order for a Brazilian member of the diplomatic corps to travel more than 40 kilometers, counting from kilometer 0 in Red Square, he is obliged to communicate his desire 48 hours in advance. And he is obliged to tell where he will go, where he will stop for luncheon or dinner, where he will sleep.

During the entire trip he is watched by militiamen with their motorcycles, automobiles, and telephone patrol posts. And this does not include the role played by the secret police which, as is obvious, is invisible.

Can it be that here in Brazil we are conceding this reciprocity, as was established in the protocol of the reestablishment of relations? There is very little that we can do.

It is necessary that we know that the United Kingdom Embassy in Moscow has an entire wing of its building devoted only to researchers and analysts of Soviet life. Political, economic, and social facts are analyzed to establish an understanding of Soviet reality.

The U.S. Government, we know, offered Brazil an opportunity to send Brazilian diplomats chosen to serve in Moscow to a high course of Russian studies at Harvard University. The response was that while the offer was interesting, politically perhaps this was not the proper time. They train U.S. diplomats for Russian service in 9 months—and the Russian is not easy to know and understand. He is fascinating and complex material.

In all the ministries of foreign affairs in the big countries of the West we find men specially equipped in the study of Russia and East Europe. It is not easy to be the representative of a foreign country in Russia, and modern diplomacy has as one of its fundamentals the role of channeling exact understanding of the foreign country.

We must know the Soviet Union better. We think we know it, but the truth is that we know nothing, or very little of what is happening there. Generally our information is deformed.

There still must be established a Brazilian insight, built by our people prepared for the job, about the Soviet Union. We are convinced that even the criticisms of us have the wrong address.

When they talk about Fidel Castro, the Russians always use the term "liberator." They invoke the legend of Simon Bolivar, and present him as the man who is constructing Cuba's greatness. We listen and understand that this is just one more of the usual Communist heresies.

And they say this without realizing the enormity of what they are saying, but with the intention of attacking the North American social organization, about which they immediately begin to speak but which is completely unknown to them.

They do not know, because they are not permitted to know, that it is one of the most advanced and socialized societies in the world. They cannot free themselves of prejudice to perceive that the American society offers the human creature the highest rights. It is in the United States where everyone has an equal opportunity, and not in the U.S.S.R., where almost everyone is barred from any opportunity—almost all, except the career men and the bureaucrats who constitute the new class.

We were advised to take the least possible amount of clothing on our weekend visit to Leningrad.

In Moscow, all railroad destinations are distributed in nine huge stations. One of the best trains in which I have ever traveled carried us in 8½ hours to Leningrad. There was no luxury, but there is comfort on the best Soviet trains.

The conductorettes (there are no conductors) make the journey pleasant with eager solicitude, and offered us tea to compensate for the absence of a dining car.

Punctuality is held to the second with Soviet trains, and from Moscow to Leningrad, over the famous Route of the Czar, the train reached a high velocity.

We knew, through Brazilian friends who had been in Moscow previously, and by tricking the guide we visited another Moscow station where trains brought in the rural population. The spectacle was diametrically opposed, especially at night, which was the time we visited it.

The rural Russian still lives in the czarist past in his manner of dressing and his standard of living. He appears to be a page from an old romance. We saw entire families of poor countryfolk sleeping on the floor of the station huddled together to escape the night chill of a Moscow summer, piling at their sides the sacks containing the vegetables they would take to the Moscow market in the morning.

This is one of the pungent pictures of the low living standard, of misery migrating for work. Seeing this reminded me of Brazil, and there occurred to me, for some reason or other, the picture of the migrating northeasterners on the trains crossing the Brazilian backlands, and I also do not know why, but I recalled that the Soviet regime soon will celebrate half a century of existence.

What is happening in the Soviet backlands, where an agrarian reform whose high price we all know is being carried out? Looking at this station, which is the arrival and departure point for Russians of the interior, brought me the picture of a problem that I must say has not been solved.

It appears that communism seeks urgently for a revision in the farmlands, and there are those who now speak about formulas that are not entirely in accord with the principles of the revolution.

We were received at the Leningrad station by a representative of the Journalism Union of that city, going directly to the hotel, a building in ancient style. It is of the time of the czars. And in Leningrad, the pleasing capital of Russia of the czars, the visitor can see and hear one of the best symphonic orchestras of the world. He can see also, if he likes, a theatrical spectacle produced with the best technique.

The Leningrad Ballet, also world famous, has several Brazilians attending its courses.

The fascinating beauty of Leningrad, cut by the Niev River and its tributaries, was 366 bridges, leaves the visitor in a world of dreams.

The hotel, like all the other, is proletarianized, that is to say that the minimum essential services do not exist with the desired rapidity and service.

We visited the Winter Palace, today transformed into one of the largest museums in the world. An infinity of galeries hold precious exhibits, and we were surprised to encounter one of the good collections of Picasso, an excellent collection of impressionist art.

And we were surprised to learn what there is in the way of Soviet art. We could see that it obeys the rigid patterns that subordinate esthetic concepts to the political, like all the other artistic and intellectual manifestations in Russia. Communist Russian art has two themes: the suffering of the people and the popular activity in the struggle which is called liberation, or what they think it is. Abstract art is prohibited. The Marxist theories attribute to it the power of dividing the Communist society. The manifestations of the intelligence deny the power to create freely.

Through special permission, we were permitted to visit the Treasury, a marvelous collection of jewels which belonged to the imperial Romanoff family.

We also were taken to the Fortress of Peter and Paul, with its countless cells reminding one of the phase of terror which is one of the chapters of Russian history. We were told tales of episodes of horror registered during the epoch of the czar, in a sequence which well reflects the telluric evolution of a sad people who, over a long period of time and for different pretexts, saw their fundamental rights violated.

If we had lived in the epoch of the czars, we would have been just as much opposed to the oppression which smothered the Russian people then as we are today to the society which pretends to be Communist and devoted to equality, but which overthrew in the name of the people a regime of violence only to supplant it with a despotic system. What was accomplished was merely the ascension of a new class which, to maintain itself, also uses terror and violence.

While the great majority of the people live in stoic submission, the bureaucrats enjoy a sweet life. Only a Fellini is missing in the Soviet Union, but Fellini was possible only in Italy, a democracy.

The motion picture is an art, and because of this fact, is subjected in the U.S.S.R. to the control of the Communist Party. And without liberty there can be no art.

The new class lives far removed from the people, far from its problems. Any Western citizen, who retains a minimum of liberty to criticize a country where he is the guest of the government, cannot fail to feel a profound repugnance for the contrast between the life which separates the people from the directors, and for the oppression which maintains the equilibrium of social injustice.

At night—those beautiful white nights of which Dostoievski speaks—principally on Saturday nights, there is dancing in the ballrooms of the hotels. Dancing to the sound of old rhumbas, which are just becoming known in the Soviet Union in a wave of splendor. It reminded me of Garcia Lorca, who said in a marvelous verse: "Oh, Cuba, rhythm of dried seeds."

The rhumbas fill the salons of the hotel with the sound of dried seeds on Saturday night. But the rhumba is not there to honor Lorca, because the influential figure is Fidel Castro.

SCHOOL OF DICTATORS

We conversed with the director of the Tass Agency in Leningrad.

He said little about the U.S.S.R. and wanted to hear about Brazil. Then he began to talk.

From that point on, I do not know why, whenever we passed the house where Rasputin was assassinated and his body thrown into a tributary of the Niev River, I remembered always this strange director of Tass, the official news agency.

In Petergoff—the old residence of the czars—on a sunny Sunday morning I witnessed the solemn ceremony of opening the fountains which had just been restored. This is a spectacle out of the best school of dictators. We saw similar things in Santo Domingo, during the era of Trujillo. Through books and the movies, we know that it was the same in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy.

The armed forces, youth and unions, these are the basic elements for a perfect scene, with flags and militia on all sides. And the people gathered en masse. It reminded me of Charles Chaplin, in the beginning of "Modern Times"—the masses, the sheep.

The speech of the mayor, which the interpreter translated, and who said, with the greatest tranquillity, that the Communist regime had made that recreation center possible. He also said that the parks were open, but he did not add that the residences, with the exception of one, continued closed, with police dogs guarding the doors.

The police dogs made me think of that strange Russian habit, which is repeated in different places and under different circumstances: This was the third time I had seen police dogs guarding places where the public was not admitted.

Petergoff had been laid waste by the Nazi army, but now has been completely reconstructed.

We were "liberated" one night for 4 hours. The generosity was not intentional. That way, we were told, we would have time to write an article for which Izvestia has asked, and which we were constantly being pressured to complete, by the Journalists Union representative who accompanied us.

He used all kinds of arguments, at every opportunity, to induce me to write the article. He even became puerile once. To convince me he said that "Khrushchev will read it," and that this represented "an immense honor" for me.

No one can imagine the enormous interest that an article written by the director of a Brazilian newspaper about Brazilian affairs can hold for the Russian reader. We can speak freely about theatrical pieces, about political matters, in fact about anything Brazilian. We know, perhaps, about Brazilian literature which the Russian people like so much. Later, on a visit to a publisher of foreign books in Moscow, we discovered that the only Brazilian books available to the people are those of the admirable Jorge Amado, and a few others written by those of our authors with Communist leanings.

In the end, all other arguments failing to convince me I should write the article, the Journalists Union representative decided to use what appear to him decisive: "You will receive 50 rubles for the article."

I promised that I would consider his proposal. And without giving any more thought to the matter, I went to my bedroom where I could enjoy the sleep that would restore my forces. That same night I took the train to return to Moscow to complete the remaining portion of my program.

The following day in Moscow, I faced the same questions: "Where is the article?"

So I decided to end this ill-mannered joke. I said that I never would write it, and above all, I never would write it for any sum in kopeks, much less for 50 rubles which was half the minimum wage in the Soviet Union.

They still insisted: Continue thinking and who knows if inspiration would not strike me—it could be about anything Brazilian.

But now they added another note: It could be about Brazilian political personalities, such as, for example, Luis Carlos Prestes, Leonel Brizzola, Francisco Julião, and others. Passing all limits, it was an open provocation.

I asked them if it could be about Carlos Lacerda. The response was total silence.

The automobile continued to roll.

A little later, on a visit to the director of Pravda, I was questioned about the eventual political leadership of Carlos Lacerda.

MEDITATION ON THE RETURN

That Monday afternoon in Moscow they handed me the return tickets, already certified by the airline. I put them in my pocket with the sensation that they were well-needed—the very precious return to the Western World.

And this is the sensation that is being refused by the Soviet Government to more than 800 Brazilians, in their majority native-born or naturalized, who left Brazil tricked by Russian propaganda and who are regretting it there, many of them since the very day of their arrival. Many of them pleaded dramatically, in letters or knocking on the door of the Brazilian Embassy, that our Brazilian diplomatic representatives in Moscow obtain from Brazil a pardon for the terrible error they committed.

And the diplomats pound on the doors of the Russian Foreign Ministry, where functionaries, instead of treating the liberation of these Brazilians who do not want to continue living in Russia, say that the presence of "John Doe" in Moscow is illegal because the right of free travel within the country is prohibited. Or they say, as has occurred, that "Mrs. Jane Doe," native-born Brazilian, can return to Brazil but must leave her husband and children in Russia.

Up to now only 40 or 50 of the most fortunate have succeeded in returning.

They live under the greatest of difficulties, because the Russian Government knows they want to return and refuses them employment. They live on odd jobs and the hope that the Brazilian people will be capable of forcing the Government to discuss the matter with the Kremlin, to overcome the political sophisms which prison them in Soviet territory.

There is no Marxist principle of philosophy capable of justifying the brutality of this treatment. For those Brazilians it is inconceivable that any foreigner in our country could be prevented from returning to his own country, as is well known.

This is one of the points most difficult to understand, if not impossible. The principles of international law, it is alleged, are not applied to the right to travel.

We are discussing, in simple terms, Brazilians who want to return to Brazil. Brazil, through its embassy in Moscow, has already taken all the measures of bureaucratic procedure. Why cannot these men, women, and children return to their own country, and why does not the Brazilian Government act in a political manner, if that is necessary?

Why, after all, should the Brazilian Government conceal the situation from public opinion? Why not demand from the Soviet Government an action which is only a sign of respect for the elemental right of Brazilian citizens?

And nothing, none of this, can be taken to affect the Russian-Brazilian diplomatic relations.

Only for argument's sake, let us suppose that this situation existed in one of the Western countries, let us say, the United States—or any other. In all certainty we would see an hysterical chorus resounding throughout our country. What a clamor our Communists would raise, stirring up the incautious masses, if instead of the U.S.S.R. it was any democratic country which prevented the return of 800 Brazilians to Brazil.

Would the CGT have announced a general strike, the National Students Union smash streetcars, if we still had them, if our people received the information that a station wagon of the Brazilian Embassy, imported from Germany and which went to the U.S.S.R. by way of Finland, had been intercepted by the militia between Leningrad and Moscow because it was late in passing one of the highway control points due to a mechanical breakdown?

Would there not be a mob hurling stones at embassies to heal the wounded national sovereignty if instead of choosing Russia the 800 Brazilians had selected the United States, England, France or Italy?

Now is the time to remember that the principal objectives of Communist propaganda, which plays the game of Soviet interests and not Brazilian, is to separate us as much as possible from the Western countries, traditional friends and allies, through cases of friction which can easily be inflamed.

TIME TO SPEAK CLEARLY

This is the time to declare that the Brazilian economic life still has not fallen into collapse, because we have credit which is justified more by friendship than by financial motives, because we have long since passed the limits. Friendly countries and allies still believe in Brazil, and offer us ways through which we can recuperate time and delinquencies, and to pay later.

Our word still holds value because they believe in us. And they have confidence because they know that, by natural propensity and historical formation, we are a people identified with the freedoms and democracy. They give us the right to live and to decide what is best for us.

It is time, also, to explain that the Soviet Embassy in Paris has a press attaché for France and Latin America. It is not difficult to suppose that the Russian Ambassador in France is closer to Brazilian interests than the Brazilian Ambassador in France. But that is another story, one which must await a better opportunity.

We arrived at the end of our stay in the Soviet Union.

It was early on a beautiful Russian morning when we went to the airport. We saw several slums marking the socialist passage along the road. The heart aches on leaving a country inhabited by such a marvelous people.

The delightful beauties which the Russian past has left in the hands of the Soviets made us think about the strange destiny of this people, who suffered under czarist oppression and, thinking they were on the road to liberty, surrendered themselves to an even greater oppression. We were filled with emotion.

While passing time at the airport we listened to a Russian citizen who spoke reasonably good English. Looking at the planes he said: "I know what you are thinking. It is a terrible oppression." I looked at him and invited him to come to my country, if he could obtain permission to leave Soviet Russia. I told him that here one could be against the government, in favor of the government, express freely what one thought, be a Democrat, be a rightist and, if one wanted, even continue to be a Communist.

On the plane I began to perceive the unfolding of all that I had seen and heard. The isolation in which those people live assailed me. I had an overall understanding of the enormous significance of the Berlin Wall, and those 1,800 kilometers of barbed wire which separate the Soviet zone of Germany from the rest of the world. These thoughts began to assemble themselves in broad lines of reasoning while we still flew over Soviet territory.

I felt sufficiently ripened to judge the suffering of the extraordinary Russian people, after having seen them close up, having seen their greatness and felt the political misery of the Communist regime to which they are submitted.

Imagine what a castigation it would be for Brazil if one day, through emotion and the lack of information, there came about such a fatal situation as that which has fallen on the Russians.

I struck a balance: When I left Brazil I was filled with a sincere desire to identify the hopes which a flood of literature feeds in younger people, and in those in whom age has not destroyed their aspirations for a better world. I came disarmed, without preconceptions. In the 8 months preceding my visit I read extensively and prepared myself sufficiently so that I could arrive in the Soviet Union knowing that I was not going to encounter any paradise.

All the declarations, newspaper reports, documents, articles, literature and interviews which had the U.S.S.R. as their subject had prepared me to investigate profoundly in the search for answers which I could see with my own eyes. I wanted to confirm things for myself, with my own eyes.

I returned with clarified thoughts, freely clarified. The people are admirable, but the regime is condemned.

Communism, as the expression of a society which does not know freedom, is only a label; a package which still misleads but cannot continue to do so for long.

It has made the people literate, given them scientific victories, turned the Soviet Union into a first-class military power, lifted its science into space, but on the other side of the medal there is so much effort, so much sacrifice in vain.

The fruits of labor are not within the reach of the people. Peace is a camouflage for the superforce for war. The fear of the people makes the Soviet leaders invoke the peril of a foreign aggression for those who work, not to improve the life, but only to arm. The Government is against most ardent desires for liberty.

HAPPINESS RESTORED

A little while after we had passed Riga the hostess of the Soviet plane, beautiful Moyaravskaia, announced that we had just crossed the frontier. We were flying over Scandinavia. I thought about Smetanya, a beautiful child of Piridiekino, who in the innocence of her 4 or 5 years, perhaps is destined to never become anything more than that to which she is confined by the lack of liberty.

I became aware of cheerful movement behind me. I turned and saw a group of tourists who, without thinking, had become expansive and unreserved with each other. It appeared to me that every one had returned to himself.

I realized that the emotional contrast gave me an accumulation of responsibilities to the public opinion of my country. The destiny of Brazil was presented to me as a challenge to interpretation.

The moment had arrived to speak clearly about things, without omissions and without fear of telling the truth.

We are a people who have arrived at economic development, social and political progress, several decades late.

On one side we have a traditional structure submitted to a process of growth and increased value. The molds are ready for the work we must perform. The world in which we live is divided on the ideological level, and on the material level. Democracy and communism confront each other in every manner. In Brazil we discuss day and night; we divide because of others who have nothing to do with our history.

The demographic explosion of Brazil has surpassed the rhythm of development in the country. Almost 3 million persons are born annually, and there are not enough schools to guarantee all of them the minimum, which is society's obligation: access to the A, B, C's. And the greater part of every group which succeeds in learning to read and write cannot continue its studies. We have not succeeded in routing the young to a democratic political consciousness in our system of education.

The aggravation of the national crisis, multiplying the difficulties, offers opportunities for the marginals of politics. The level of debate is lowered, and is dominated by those least capable and on an emotional level. Those who are speaking are those who have nothing constructive to offer, and nothing to say about the real problems of the country. What kind of an example is this to place before the eyes of Brazilian youth?

Twenty years late, there are arriving in Brazil ideas which were old in Europe a hundred years ago. Nobody is deluded in Europe by the promises which fill the mouths of the Communists. Here even the opportunists, the unscrupulous in their ambitions, the adventurers, gather on the left to fool millions.

There are books which speak of a Soviet Union which exists only in the propaganda magazines. The proof of this is within the reach of everyone.

The life of the Soviet citizens is worse than ours, and is aggravated by the absence of rights and freedoms. I am certain that the Communist regime could not continue in Brazil, even if its implantation were possible by a coup of force. It is contrary to the very soul of the Brazilian people.

It is not with this that I am preoccupied, principally. It is the breakdown of authority, the national dispersal, slow and inexorable, which is being brought about in a calculated manner.

We are watching a political retreat. Nobody studies. Nobody worries about anything. Nobody is nobody.

There are few who are disposed to confront honestly, rationally, without passion, the task of clarifying public opinion.

The people are weary of political discussions which are sterile, seeking only personal advantages. They are fed up with hearing explanations by those interested in confusing the facts. The danger that surrounds Brazil is the imprisoning which we are watching, and which does not leave a place for the judgment of those who know how to evaluate the liberties and not accept any material price in exchange for a much more valuable patrimony.

It is necessary to not have fear to tell the truth about Soviet Russia. It is difficult, but we need to be democratic, and repudiate the dilemma in which an attempt is being made to place Brazilian society. The option that is forced on us does not correspond to any Brazilian necessity, but on the contrary, serves only the interests of those who are not legitimately national.

I have in my mind the conviction that Brazil can only be lost through the omissions of her best men. Heads of families, factory workers, public men, women, youth, the clergy, military men and the middle class—all maintain confidence in democracy.

Debates are not the evil of Brazil, because they only represent a sign that those responsible for the national life are not equal to the Brazilian reality. But having debates strengthens liberty.

Brazil, we are certain, never will be an experimental camp for a socially unhappy experience such as I have just finished observing and where an admirable people live under a sinister social order. It is necessary to explain to the Brazilian people, because only by explanation and clarification, can the Brazilian people make the desired decision.

The plane prepared to descend in a city where we all would feel like human beings. We flew in the midst of heavy clouds and fog, but we knew that it was a Western city, with the characteristics of life totally different from those we had seen in the Soviet Union, and which made the Russian citizens nothing more than human ghosts.

And suddenly there came to my mind a phrase which I had read in the autobiography of the poet Jevtuchenko:

"I know that these men have an alibi that must have been invented by one of their brothers: silence is gold. And I reply to them: This gold cannot be pure; this silence is not authentic."

IN THE UNITED STATES WE ARE STILL FREEMEN

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as the year nears its close, we might pause to reflect on the fact that we are still freemen. We should stop to consider as we hurry to purchase the last gift, as we read our newspaper, as we discuss politics, as we gather with family and friends, and as we worship, that we are exercising the right to choose. To secure this right, Americans have sacrificed their lives since 1776, from Lexington and Concord to the jungles of Vietnam.

During this long session, we have been privileged to participate in the deliberations of our national legislature; to speak and vote as freely elected Representatives on matters affecting our country. From this vantage point, I am made acutely aware of the genius of those who conceived our system of free government; a structure which has endured world and civil conflict, depression, and, most recently, grief and outrage at the deed of one who in his perverted arrogance would take the life of our President.

But I am made aware, as well, of the agonizing responsibility and burden which the preservation of these freedoms puts on each of us. As the Congress strives to find responsible and workable solutions to vast and complex domestic and international problems, I am convinced that there are no simple answers. I doubt that my generation will witness the coming of a new year when it can say, "The task of protecting freedom is done." For as the ashes of nazism still smoldered, there emerged communism; and like as not, there will appear other forces to threaten our sacred institutions.

The Declaration of Independence proclaims that the equality of men and the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are self-evident. It does not declare that they are self-enduring. As we enjoy the bounty of this holiday season, I urge that we all give special thanks for our freedom. May all of us resolve that in the coming year we will willingly undertake to pay the heavy price that this great privilege demands; that we shall not lag or despair if the way is hard; and that by our own actions, we will seek to further the causes of peace, good will among men and human dignity, which are the central themes of this season.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, December 19, I was necessarily absent. As a result I was not recorded on rollcall No. 248. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

NEW YEAR'S RESOLUTIONS FOR NEW ENGLAND

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, New England, as you well know, has contributed much to our Nation. It is not my intention to detail these many notable contributions; it is not necessary. The pages of our Nation's history have been written and tell the tale. Nor will I dwell at this time on the continuing contributions to our Nation being made by New England, for surely, all well-informed citizens are aware of them. But, Mr. Speaker, as we now approach adjournment, it seems appropriate to remind this House that New England is not being as fairly treated as it should be by the Nation for which it has done much.

Residual oil quotas impose on our heating costs an unfair burden approximating $30 million yearly which our economy can ill afford. A decree of decapitation by the CAB that will take 83 percent of its air-passenger-miles from Northeast Airlines threatens to kill off our only airline and reduce us to colonial status in the air age. Our Government's unkept promises to provide our wool industry the same protection already given to cotton jeopardize the jobs of thousands of New England workers.

I have discussed these matters before, Mr. Speaker. It should be emphasized that we are not asking for handouts or subsidies. We ask only for equal treatment and fairplay.

And now comes word of a dire threat to New England's agriculture. Due to rate differentials, feed grains are being shipped to our competitors in Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia at lower rail rates than to New England. This situation, unless corrected, will sound the death knell of our poultry industry. The threat to our dairy industry is equally grave.

Mr. Speaker, how long must New England suffer thus at the hands of its own Government. This is not a partisan matter. Both of our great political parties have proud histories for righting wrongs and treating all States and regions and sections and citizens of our great Nation with fair and equal regard. This is not a plea for subsidy or special treatment. The plea is for equality and fairness and that promises be kept.

It seems to me as we approach the new year, that among the resolutions that should be made, high on the list should be a resolve to assure to New England equal and fair treatment. Not only should the new year find New England free of crippling residual oil embargoes, it should also find the promises of the administration to the wool industry fulfilled, and the restoration to Northeast Airlines of its southern routes. And surely, New England's agriculture should be permitted to compete fairly with other parts of the country by enjoying equalized rates for grain shipments to our farms.

REQUEST OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO FUND PUBLIC LAW 874

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the distinguished majority leader and the minority leader discuss the possibility of getting out of here this afternoon.

I think the action, or perhaps I should say inaction, of the White House has raised some questions as to whether we will be able to get out of here this week or not. I refer particularly to the request of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which was made to the Bureau of the Budget to fund Public Law 874 in the amount of $216 million and $31 million to fund the National Defense Education Act student loan program. Both of these requests were placed before the Bureau of the Budget by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and were approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The White House decided that it would not submit requests for any assistance to schools in federally impacted areas or any money for the student loan program. The Senate, however, is presently acting on the supplemental appropriation bill, House Joint Resolution 875. The Senate is taking action to add the funds for schools in federally impacted areas to this supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, we here in the House of Representatives should insist that the executive branch submit requests for funding this program or we should not consider it. If, when this bill comes over from the Senate, there still is no request from the White House for this funding, this bill will be objected to and the whole bill will be in serious jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, with all the publicity and ceremonies that went on when the authorizing bill was signed, with the support of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, it must be to show some sort of false economy that the White House refuses to submit a request for funding these programs which were signed into law just a few days ago. It is either that, or the White House has reason to question the need for the amount of funds the Department requested.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of printed public record that the Department's request for these funds had been studied and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and that they were on the President's desk before he signed the authorization bill so that, if he saw fit to do so, he could sign the request for funds immediately after he signed the authorization bill. I cannot understand the attitude of the White House in rejecting the request of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There must be an error in the estimate or else the White House is trying to make a show of economy and make us look like big spenders. If it is the first, we should hold hearings and find out what is really needed before we act on this bill. If it is the second, I am not about to be an accomplice.

THE FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I might say that those of us on this side of the aisle are as anxious to complete the work of this session as anyone in this body.

I might also say that it is not unusual for the majority to feel that the appropriations for a given year should be concluded before the Congress adjourns and goes home, even if it means that some of us—and in this case it means all of us—are inconvenienced.

Mr. Speaker, my family has gone home, like the families of many of the rest of the Members. But, our obligations are here, regardless of whether some in this body and elsewhere may have been dilatory.

Let me say further, Mr. Speaker, in direct response to a statement made by my good friend, the distinguished minority leader. Mr. Speaker, there is not one penny in this bill which would finance any of the groups he mentioned. I ask the Members of the House to find it and point it out. The bill is available to any of the Members who want to see it.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, if the Members will read carefully the language as offered by the gentleman the other day in his motion to recommit, it constitutes as I understand it a limitation on the Export-Import Bank and this bill does not appropriate for the Export-Import Bank.

In addition under the continuing resolution there is no limitation whatsoever in the Export-Import Bank or any other Government agency.

This is a matter of considerable disagreement. The other body by bipartisan votes on two occasions has rejected this proposal, so it is a proper matter for the conference to work out and bring in a constructive solution.

I want to set the record straight.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with hearings scheduled for civil rights legislation at the beginning of the next session, I trust that we will also consider pending legislation for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. As free men we are morally obligated not only to improve the conditions of freedom in our own midst but also to extend the hope of such conditions to the millions in Europe, Asia, and Cuba, who are deprived of both civil rights and national freedom and independence.

THE UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Several pointed questions have been raised about the measures calling for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. They will be repeated time and time again until satisfactory answers are obtained. Why have not hearings been scheduled for the 40 resolutions submitted to create this special committee? Why has not the majority of sentiment in the Rules Committee been satisfied to see this legislation through? What could be Secretary Rusk's opposition to the formation of this committee today? That the Russian Dictator Khrushchev wouldn't like it? What has happened to the so-called captive nations' studies undertaken by a subcommittee of one of our standing committees? As was predicted, its show in 1962 was only a maneuver to discourage formation of a special committee. How much longer will we continue to ignore the popular demand for a special committee, as was so widely expressed during the fifth Captive Nations Week observance last July.

THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. Speaker, in July 1964 the American people will be observing the fifth anniversary of Captive Nations Week. The months-long preparations for this anniversary will highlight the need for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. As we prepare to pursue civil rights for our domestic scene, it is obligatory for us to also pursue the ways and means of free existence for all the captive nations.

Much has been written and said about the 1963 Captive Nations Week. Its story seems to be endless. However, supplementing the heavy evidence already given, I request that the following items be published as part of my remarks: First, additional news reports of the week; second, the Los Angeles program of the week; third, the Boston Globe editorial, "Lest We Forget", fourth, the Boston program release; and, fifth, a letter to the Standard-Times editor:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1963 IN UNITED STATES PRESS

North Carolina Catholic: article entitled, "Red Web Around the World":

"Nikita Khrushchev is succeeding in establishing an iron chain of political, economic, and industrial-interlock from the Russian oil fields to East Berlin that is making a single complex of these nations. What is even more poignant is that we need to ask ourselves if Americans have not done and are not doing much to strengthen this Soviet power. * * *

"We Americans can ask ourselves: What is our Nation actually doing to help these captive peoples? When will we throw off the indifference that has marked our course since the end of World War II, when we acquiesced in Soviet rule over these countries."

Columbia (S.C.) State Record: Editorial entitled "Free Choice": "Captive Nations Week is upon us again—aimed once more at reminding peoples behind communism's curtain that the free world has not forgotten them."

The Shreveport (La.) Times: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week":

"The great Hungarian revolution of 1956, however, was a great embarrassment to the Eisenhower administration which had openly called for revolt in the Communist captive nations.

"The Kennedy administration has moved to avoid any such 'embarrassment' by flatly making it a policy matter to discourage any freedom rebellion against Communist rule. In fact, even the U.S. broadcasts beamed into Iron Curtain countries have been sharply reduced.

"It is no wonder then that President Kennedy was willing to dismiss the captive nations with a perfunctory message devoid of even his usual flashes of spirited oratory. Washington has simply written off the Communist captive nations. Such is the spirit, sad to say, of the United States in the sixties."

Santa Monica (Calif.) Outlook: Editorial entitled "They Haven't Got the Word":

"It seems our Washington policymakers have been so anxious to get a nuclear test ban treaty, and otherwise 'exploit' (as they think) the ideological quarrel between Moscow and Red China, that they have not wanted to annoy Nikita Khrushchev by any reminder of Russia's broken promises to hold free elections in the occupied countries. When President Kennedy recently issued the annual proclamation of 'Captive Nations Week,' he left out any reference to Soviet Russia. He deliberately refrained from using the greatest propaganda we have against Soviet Russia.

"Are we going to deprive ourselves of this great propaganda and moral weapon as the price of a worthless agreement to ban nuclear testing?"

McAllen (Tex.) Valley Monitor: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "It might be well to remind Brother Kennedy in Washington that while he is thinking of freedom for the Africans, he might give a thought to freedom for the Hungarians, the Latvians, and perhaps even the Cubans."

Woonsocket (S. Dak.) Artesian Commonwealth: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week and Recognition of Red Hungary": "No one, however high in our official life, can possibly, sincerely believe in recognizing Red Hungary and at the same time believe in government by consent of the governed."

Nowata (Okla.) Star: Editorial entitled "Another Hollow Gesture":

"These oppressed peoples still live in a state of subservience and inner misery that is unmatched almost anywhere. There have been surges by these captive peoples to regain their freedom from the satanic Communists of Russia. In East Germany, in Poland, and in Hungary the desire for freedom and the rights of the individual surged up and burst into the open, momentarily.

"In each instance where were those who were free?"

Wildwood (N.J.) Leader: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "Millions have fled from the captive nations, and the attempts to escape continue in spite of obstructions of concrete walls and barbed wire fences patrolled by guards who shoot to kill. They risk death gladly in their search for liberty."

The Hartford Courant: Editorial entitled "The Captive Nations": "Captive Nations Week * * * is the time when relatives and friends living in the United States turn their thoughts to the plight of the residents of countries like Poland, Lithuania, Hungary and the rest. Millions of human beings have come under the control of the satellite governments. Congress has proclaimed the third week of each July as a time to remind the peoples of the captive nations that their plight is not forgotten. The United States will not go to war to free them. But it is interested in seeing them win their freedom, and will help them as best it can."

Morning Democrat, Davenport, Iowa: Editorial entitled "Hopeful Leaks from Moscow":

"And this is Captive Nations Week, reminding us that Mother Russia still holds ruthless control over Armenia, the Ukraine and other so-called Soviet Socialist Republics.

"Khrushchev himself, in a new letter to Britain's egregious Bertrand Russell, has once more bluntly and specifically refused to pay any part of the United Nations' peacekeeping assessments, on the specious grounds that this would serve 'the colonialists' purposes.

"The only colonies enchained since the Second World War—Hungary, Poland, the Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, East Germany—go unmentioned, but not forgotten."

Columbus (Ind.) Republican: Editorial entitled "To Be Free":

"We know who holds the captive nations. So do the peoples of these nations and so does Khrushchev. The main thing is that we understand that none of us is free until all are free. Many Americans would just as soon not face this responsibility, but it is our heritage.

"And it is our heritage, whether we want it or not, that none of us will ever be free of responsibility to one another."

San Bernardino (Calif.) Telegram: Editorial entitled "Set the Captives Free":

"Each year Americans are reminded by the observance of one special week that the captive nations of Central and Eastern Europe are yoked to the Communists' juggernaut of tyranny. Yet, why not keep their plight lucidly in our minds 365 days a year?

"Let not the American people become so drugged by questionable policies of accommodating the Soviet Union—ostensibly because of the threat of thermonuclear war—that we lose sight of the enslaved millions behind the Iron Curtain.

"Always we must remember—in this age of many voices—that Communists are not Russians, not Asians. They are world revolutionists. The are passionately determined to destroy not only the American way of life but also to remove all individual freedom and human dignity from the face of the earth. To think otherwise is to invite quick suicide."

* * * * *

Captive Nations Week was also highlighted in the Blade (Toledo, Ohio); Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News; Philadelphia (Pa.) Catholic Standard and Times; Davenport (Iowa) Times; San Rafael (Calif.) Independent Journal; Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer; Dubuque (Iowa) Telegraph-Herald; Eau Claire (Wis.) Leader; Aurora (Ill.) Beacon-News; Reno (Nev.) Gazette; Fort Dodge (Iowa) Messenger and Chronicle; Sandusky (Ohio) Register; Atlantic City (N.J.) Press; Brownsville (Tex.) Herald; Lynchburg (Va.) Advance; Duluth (Minn.) Herald; Manistee (Mich.) News-Advocate; Yakima (Wash.) Republic; Paris (Tex.) News; Indio (Calif.) News; Sea Isle City (N.J.) Cape May Times; Claremont (N.H.) Eagle; Goone (Iowa) News-Republican; Billings (Mont.) Gazette; Phoenixville (Pa.) Republican; Jefferson City (Mo.) Capital News; Norman (Okla.) Transcript.

The Providence Journal: Editorial entitled "The Kremlin Loosens the Bonds of Its Captive Nations":

"The hope symbolized by the bouquets showered by Hungarians on Mr. Nixon emphasizes the validity of this Nation's annual expression, by means of a Captive Nations Week, of its concern for the plight of the satellites and its peaceful dedication to their eventual independence.

"It is important that Americans keep this torch high in their own hearts and in the eyes of people longing to be free."

Chester (Pa.) Times: Editorial entitled "Captives":

"The slavery of Hungary today—while the reins of oppression have been loosened a little—remains in principle as basic as it was then.

"Maybe this makes Hungarians wonder a little. What do they have to do to concern other freemen with their plight?

"Will the free world remember slavery exists only when it's dramatized by men dying in the street?"

Santa Monica (Calif.) Outlook: Editorial entitled "The Captive Still Languish":

"Mr. Kennedy's proclamation, reluctantly given and couched in vague generalities, conveys the impression that the U.S. Government is seeking to play down this observance for fear of offending Nikita S. Khrushchev and his puppet slavemasters.

"Every step the Kennedy administration takes toward peaceful coexistence and recognition of the status quo is a step away from delivery of the millions enslaved by communism. The United States can risk the offended sensitivities of Khrushchev and Kadar, but it can never in conscience forsake the peoples of captive countries."

Chicago Tribune: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week Soft-Pedaled": "Now, Khrushchev would like to quiet the captives while he is trying to keep his ideological war with China within the formal confines of a fraternal party struggle. He has his hands full with China, but they could become fuller if the captives were to seize upon the split as a time for winning concessions."

Springfield (Ohio) News: Editorial entitled "Dead-Wrong Word": "People as brave as these can live for a long time on hope that is genuine even if deferred. They will lose heart only if they are betrayed once too often by false promises."

Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette: Editorial entitled "The Captive Nations' Role in Sino-Russian Strife": "We can think of a few measures that would better serve to wipe out old United States-U.S.S.R. differences than the freeing of the captive nations.

"Khrushchev may well be thinking today of the implications of the West's Captive Nations Week as he looks eastward at the growing power and increasing bellicosity of the Red Chinese leaders.

The thoughts will take time to mature, if indeed they ever do, but if they take shape at all, the world may be headed toward a new and better alinement of powers."

Rocky Mount (N.C.) Telegram: Editorial entitled "Meaningless Proclamation": "Repercussions from Kennedy's captive nations statement reverberated through American ethnic organizations. These groups also received details of the administration's backdown in the United Nations this year over recognition of the credentials of representatives of the Kadar regime in Hungary. For the first time, this Nation failed to vote against such recognition, thus tacitly expressing approval of Russia's suppression of the Hungarian uprising in 1956."

Fall River (Mass.) Herald News: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations": "In an age of nuclear war it may be no nation will wish to precipitate a planetary catastrophe in order to rescue the victims of aggression. But this should not and need not mean that those victims can be forgotten. They are human beings whose sympathies and beliefs are our own. They have a right at least to the clear-cut expression of our support that can be given this week."

Augusta (Ga.) Herald: Editorial entitled "Bitter Irony of Captive Nations Week": "There have been men in this country who did not let expediency temper their devotion to principles. Men with names such as Washington, Jefferson, and Lee. Had the middle decades of this century seen more men of that kind in the United States there might be no occasion today for a Captive Nations Week."

Redondo Beach (Calif.) Breeze: Editorial entitled "Poor Week for a Tour": "Keeping hope alive within the breasts of millions of people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain is the primary—and just about the only—basis of Captive Nations Week. * * *.

"One wonders how these captive people will interpret the visit of a party of smiling Americans to their midst, while Americans at home are dedicating a week as a memorial to their enslavement?"

Marion (Ind.) Chronicle: Editorial entitled "Are We Still for Freedom?" "The American people still stanchly stand for the freedom of all peoples and the administration's efforts to play down Captive Nations Week does not do justice to the intent for which the week was founded."

Santa Ana (Calif.) Register: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "We haven't heard much out of Washington this year about Captive Nations Week.

"Apparently the administration is unwilling to remind the Communists of the unpleasant fact that millions of people the world over are being held captive by governments that were imposed on them by outside forces."

Mishawaka (Ind.) Times: "The U.S.S.R. calculators will be watching to see whether U.S. public opinion is becoming apathetic about the captive nations * * * about the right of all people to self-determination ultimately. People in the captive nations will be watching, too, through their grapevine sources.

"Few things would strengthen Mr. Khrushchev's hand so much as for people in the Red-enslaved nations to give up hope of ever having a voice as to their form of government."

Stone Harbor (N.J.) 7-Mile Beach Reporter: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "Captive Nations Week has been proclaimed in order to impress upon the minds of all Americans that the countless numbers of oppressed people in the captive countries need our thoughts, our sympathy and our help."

Concord (N.H.) Monitor: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "At a time when Communists are attempting to expand their colonial domain throughout the world, we should not only encourage the hapless captives of their empire, but by means of a special committee, publicize their plight as a grim warning to prospective victims. Such a committee would help to expose communism for what it is neocolonialism—a modern-day version of czarist imperialism. It could also help in giving new direction to our foreign policy."

The Miami Herald: Editorial entitled "The Captive Nations": "Americans whose family trees originated in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have no monopoly on concern for the captive nations. Neither have fugitives from communism in mainland China, Tibet, North Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, and many other countries. Until all those nations are liberated, no American can rest easy."

Elyria (Ohio) Chronicle-Telegram: Editorial entitled "Not a Message of Hope":

"The Proclamation issued by President Eisenhower in 1959 and 1960 specifically called for the freedom of these peoples and condemned Communist imperialism.

"President Kennedy undoubtedly felt such a call would be embarrassing at a time when American and British representatives are in Moscow for talks about a possible nuclear test ban agreement. But the generality and evasiveness of the proclamation surely cannot inspire much hope among the people of the captive nations."

Malvern (Iowa) Leader: Editorial entitled "Communist Imperialism Now the World's Biggest Threat to Freedom of Nations and Peoples":

"Today there is a substantial sentiment in the United States to forget the captive nations of Russia, and to let the Russians hold to any new territories they can acquire. Few deny that without Russia's occupation of Cuba Castro's chaotic government would last only a brief time, yet the U.S. State Department seems more concerned about preventing resistance to Castro than in getting the Russians out of Cuba.

"There are two freedoms—the false, where a man is free to do what he likes; the true, where a man is free to do what he ought."

Columbus (Ohio) Catholic Times: Editorial entitled "Captive Nations Week": "And what can you do as an individual? You can make a contribution to Radio Free Europe which broadcasts information and inspiration daily to the Iron Curtain countries. You can be interested in aiding refugees through your own Catholic Welfare Bureau. You can follow the proceedings of the U.N. as they affect the captive nations. You can be vigilant of the legislation in Congress which can help or hinder these peoples."

Captive Nations Week was also featured in the Muncie (Ind.) Star; Hartford (Conn.) Times; Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal; Alexandria (La.) Town Talk; Quincy (Ill.) Herald Whig; Tampa (Fla.) Tribune; Fort Wayne (Ind.) News Sentinel; Mobline (Ill.) Dispatch; Pueblo (Colo.) Chieftan; Anderson (Ind.) Herald; Elkhart (Ind.) Truth; Kannapolis (N.C.) Independent; Meriden (Conn.) Journal; Sarasota (Fla.) News; Sheridan (Wyo.) Press; Malone (N.Y.) Telegram; Macon (Ga.) Telegraph; Anniston (Ala.) Star; Petersburg (Va.) Progress-Index; Salem (N.J.) Standard and Jerseyman.

COMMEMORATION OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE OF CALIFORNIA FOR FREEDOM OF ENSLAVED NATIONS

(Dr. Emil Onaca, president; Carol Blaze, secretary; Wolodymyr Siyak, treasurer)

Sunday, July 21, 1963, 3 p.m. sharp; Ukrainian Culture Center, 4315 Melrose Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

Delegations:

Armenia: Art Bacholan, Hagop Manjikian, and Michael Minasian.

Estonia: Walfried Gutman, and Bernard Nurmsen.

Hungary: Rev. Laszlo Kecskemethy, Dr. William Rethy, and Tibor Dolinszky.

Latvia: Miss Silvija Pilmanis, Arnis Tubelis, and Viktors Vaits.

Lithuania: Jonas Motiejūnas, and Stasys Paltus.

Poland: Carol M. Blaze, George Radwan, and Edward Skirmuntt.

Rumania: Dr. Emil Onaca, Mrs. Ileana Petrescu, and Ironim Petrescu.

Ukraine: Orest L. Dolyniuk, Leo Roman, and Wolodymyr Siyak.

> "I have sworn upon the Altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."
>
> —THOMAS JEFFERSON.

> "We will never surrender positions which are essential to the defense of freedom nor will we abandon people who are now behind the Iron Curtain through any formal approval of the status quo."
>
> —JOHN F. KENNEDY.

PROGRAM

Master of ceremonies	Carol Blaze.
Presentation of colors.	
Invocation	Rev. Sumbat Lapajian, pastor, Armenian Apostolic Holy Cross Church.
National anthem—"Star Spangled Banner."	Henry Czarnecki.
Opening remarks	Dr. Emil Onaca.
Address	Geo. Kramer, Ph. D., columnist, L. A. Catholic Tidings.
Adoption of resolution.	Dr. E. Onaca.

Intermission

I. Ukrainian

Ukrainian Freedom Fighter songs, by Kobzar.	Ukrainian Choir, Volodymir Bozyk, director.

II. Rumanian

Vocal solo	Mrs. S. Shishmanyan; accompanist, Mrs. Silvia Ramba.
Cavaleria Rusticana, folk songs.	

III. Polish

Vocal solo	Henry Czarnecki.

IV. Lithuanian

	Mrs. Zina Kalavaitis, soprano; accompanist, Bronius Budriūnas, composer.
My Country	by A. Kacanauskas.
Oh, Faster, Faster	by St. Simkus.
The Call	by Br. Budriūnas.

V. Hungarian

Violin solo	Master Andrew Balogh (age 8 years); accompanist, Sandor Dienes (age 16 years).
Scene de Ballet by DeBeriot.	
Helyre Kati by Hubay.	
Obertass by H. Weintawski (Polish).	

VI. Armenian

Vocal solo	Mrs. Ankine Keshishian-Mouradian, soprano.

"God Bless America."

THE VICTIMS OF SOVIET COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM

Armenia: An ancient country and victim of Communist imperialism, succumbed to Communist-Turkish collusion in 1921, after an epic struggle for independence in which 3 million lives were sacrificed. A simultaneous attack by Communist and Turkish armies crushed Armenian resistance and divided her territory between the two invaders. Five-sixths of Armenians went to Turkey and one-sixth became a Soviet Republic. The Armenian people soon became the first and only people to throw off the Communist yoke, but the precious independence—unassisted by arms or aid—lasted only 2 months. The dead cities of west Armenia—called Turkey on the world's maps—and the living cities of Communist-enslaved eastern Armenia, stand together as an accusing symbol of injustice, inhumanity, and lack of conscience among the world powers. Armenia remains Armenia forever, whether it is called Turkey or Socialist Soviet Republic on a map, and will again be free—assisted or unassisted. Armenians will never be satisfied with anything less than complete freedom and complete independence.

Estonia: With a prewar population of 1,200,000, is one of the Baltic States. Her people are akin to the Finns and Hungarians, her culture unique.

Her history has been constant struggle against invasion and foreign domination by Denmark, Germany, Sweden and from the 18th century on the Russian Empire. At the start of the Russian revolution in 1917 she won her independence for which she fought the Soviet armies for 15 months. In 1918 a Declaration of Independence was proclaimed, heralding 22 years of peaceful development in the free Republic of Estonia. All this came to an end in 1940, when this nation lost its independence to the Soviets as a result of a pact between Nazi Germany and Communist Russia. Ever since that time the systematic murders extermination of this small nation had been carried out until by now the Estonian population has, "by Russian admission" decreased by 25 percent.

Hungary: A country which has been the outpost of the freedom of the Christian world for a thousand years was ruthlessly oppressed by the barbarian terror of Soviet occupation. Yet, after 11 years of Communist indoctrination, her youth arose on October 23, 1956, and showed the indifferent Western democracies what the people of a tortured nation are willing to pay for their freedom. This nation of only 10 million was willing to tackle the mighty Red army of the Soviet Union, but with the sympathy of the West being the only aid received, their war of freedom was cruelly suppressed.

Let us hope that 40,000 Hungarian patriots—students, workers, and children—have not sacrificed their lives in vain.

Latvia: Toward the end of World War I, Latvia—one of the three Baltic states—became an independent republic after the collapse of the czarist Russian empire. It is a little country of about 2 million people and in territory not much larger than the State of Maine. For centuries it had been ground between the two giant millstones: Germany and Russia. Having gained its independence in 1918, Latvia became a prosperous and enterprising free nation of farmers and aspiring intellectuals, but for 22 years only. In 1940 it was occupied by the Soviet armies, a year later by Germany but since 1945 it has again been subjugated by the Soviet Union. The Iron Curtain came down and from behind it thousands of her best men: professors, statesmen, lawyers, farmers, etc. were deported to Siberia. Almost none returned.

Lithuania: Founded as kingdom 710 years ago, was in the 15th century a leading power in Eastern Europe, but by the beginning of the 19th century it had been absorbed by the Russian Empire and had lost its independence. In 1918, the Lithuanians regained their independence and for two full decades thereafter enjoyed their freedom. They lost it again early in the last war. After its occupation and forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union in 1940, a shockingly large segment of its population (10 to 15 percent)—and most of its intellectuals—have been deported to Siberia or simply shot to death. At no time before during the turbulent history of this country, have its people been subjected to such systematic annihilation, and the Soviet Government not only plunders the lands it occupies—it also wants to destroy the heart and mind of the people it subjugates.

Poland: Is a country of 30 million people and was founded 1,000 years ago. Between the 18th and 20th centuries the country was partitioned four times but gained full independence in 1918. It became a Republic under the leadership of Joseph Pilsudski and the world-famous Ignacy Paderewski became the Prime Minister. Between the two World Wars, their country has established a strong economy and innovated many social services. In 1939 a time of great suffering has begun for the Polish people. Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany have by agreement, divided her territory among themselves. Under their joint occupation a countless number of Poles perished in concentration camps in Germany and slave labor camps in Siberia. After the end of the war the Soviet occupation troops remained in the country and were instrumental in bringing about the existence of a communistic government. The Polish people lost their independence in 1939. They have still not regained it but they are continuing their fight in exile under the leadership of a legal Polish President and government-in-exile residing in London, England.

Rumania: A land whose history dates back to Roman times, in 1944 suffered the 11th Russian invasion, since 1711, this time by the hordes of Stalin's Red army. Worse than all previous invasions this one enslaved and transformed Rumania into a large prison, called People's Republic of Rumania. Since 1944, the 20 million Rumanians live under the cruel Soviet military occupation, some in permanent terror, some in dark and humid prison cells and some in concentration and extermination camps in Rumania and Siberia. Although, Rumania is the world's fourth producer of oil, rich in agriculture, minerals, forests and cattle, the Soviet Union takes everything by force and the Rumanians live in misery and poverty.

Ukraine: Is a country of 45 million people and was founded with the capital city of Kiev 1,000 years ago. This territory about the size of France, contains the richest farmland and concentration of mining resources in the Soviet Union. In the 17th century they were forcibly absorbed by the Russian Empire but proclaimed their independence in 1917 and created their own parliament. For 3 years the army of the Ukrainian Republic fought the Red army—without any support from the West. After their defeat the first Russian satelite state was born. Military defeat didn't break the resistence of the Ukrainian people thus in 1932 Moscow confiscated their whole harvest. The result: 7 million Ukrainians died by starvation. When World War II came the Ukrainians fought the armies of both Hitler and Stalin. In spite of the cruel suppression they endured for so long, the Ukrainians are strong in spirit and united in their desire for liberty.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, July 19, 1963]

Lest We Forget

Though the memories of men are notoriously short, it is well to remind ourselves that this is Captive Nations Week, and why. For millions in many parts of the world, tending the lamps of freedom through long years of exile or cherishing its flame in secret places of the heart under repressive regimes, this annual week of commemoration in the United States means much.

It means that their voices are not like a drowner's cry "lost on the desolate wind" of indifference; and that other men and women have not forgotten them. It is a reminder that no genuinely free elections have ever stamped with popular approval the regimes now dominating Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Cuba, or the Baltic States whose cultural leaders were subjected to genocide by the Russians. Freedom does not coexist with the sepulchre.

The American Institute and the New England Captive Nations Committee Presents New England's Captive Nations Freedom Rally

(Congressman **Edward J. Derwinski**, Boston, Mass., July 20, 1963)

Mr. **Derwinski's** speech will be preceded by a cultural program presenting Latvian, Lithuanian, Ukranian and Hungarian talent. Expansion of communism's colonialism has to be challenged by assuring our allies, the captive peoples, that our prayers and sympathies are with them. Mr. **Derwinski**, dynamic speaker and statesman, will speak on the challenging subject of the freedom for the captive people and how to stop communism's aggression.

For the past 4 years, pursuant to Public Law 86–90, the President of the United States has proclaimed the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week," inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. All Americans are asked to work and pray for the restoration of the enslaved people to their historic freedom and national independence. The Soviet Union and its satellite puppets constitute a vast colonial empire. Khrushchev knows what danger to his Communist empire constitute 17 million Americans who may contact their kin enslaved by the Soviets, urging them to continue to battle and thwart Communist designs upon their freedom.

In the captive nations lie our best hope to destroy Communist dreams for global conquest. The captive peoples of the Soviet Union continue to pose many difficulties for the Kremlin tyrants. Captive peoples demonstate an amazing stamina to resist not only communism, but continue to perpetuate their diverse racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds.

Ukranians and Byelorussians had a history of national independence of six centuries prior to 1795. Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians for centuries have enjoyed self-rule and independence. The same is true about Armenia, Georgia, and other nationalities listed as captive nations. When the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, lists any of the captive nations as "traditional parts of the Soviet Union," he seals the fate of the first victims of Soviet imperialism and seeks to wiggle himself out of a historic responsibility and the opportunity to launch an offensive for the expansion of freedom in keeping with the principles of self-determination of nations.

Captive peoples are not reconciled with their status. Their dreams and aspirations for freedom and national independence pose a major problem to their oppressors. Though hundreds of thousands of captive peoples have been executed and millions have been scattered throughout remote parts of the Soviet-Asian landmass, the faith of Christians, Moslems, and Hebrews persists to be indestructible and lives for the day of liberation and freedom.

Legitimate groups of most of the captive peoples of the Soviet Union are functioning throughout the free world. They should be provided truly effective assistance for the cause of freedom to develop and continue effective liaison and communication with their oppressed brethren behind the Iron Curtain. In many instances de jure governments-in-exile continue to operate. With a realistic foreign policy we can take the offensive and roll back communism.

We have a responsibility to the oppressed peoples to aid them in regaining their God-given rights of legitimate free national government. The doom of millions of captive peoples can be thwarted by an outpouring of indignation of the American people. Write your President, your Senators, your Congressman, your Governor; speak to your minister, priest, rabbi, demanding action to establish a progressive program to aid captive nations and to start the long-overdue crusade for the final and complete destruction of anti-God communism. A select permanent Captive Nations Committee with the U.S. Congress should be established to advocate freedom and national independence for all captive peoples.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, June 5, 1963]

Wants Committee on Captive Nations

To the Editor of the Standard-Times:

Last January 9, Congressman **Daniel J. Flood**, of Pennsylvania, introduced in the House of Representatives H.R. 14, which calls for the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. The Public Law 86–90 of 1959 enumerates 22 captive nations under communism, such as: Ukraine, Armenia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Estonia, Georgia, and others. The proposed committee will handle all the matters concerning the captive nations and recommend peaceful means by which the United States can assist these nations to regain freedom.

More than 30 Congressmen introduced similar resolutions; others indicated their support for the passage of H.R. 14, including Massachusetts Congressmen **John W. McCormack**, **Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.**, **James A. Burke**, **Silvio O. Conte**, **Philip J. Philbin**, and **F. Bradford Morse**.

Presently H.R. 14 is pending before the House Rules Committee. As with any other piece of legislation, the passage of the Flood resolution needs the widest public support.

Each of us can help the captive nations by writing letters to:

1. His Congressman, urging him to vote for the passage of H.R. 14 and,

2. Congressman **Howard W. Smith**, chairman of the House Rules Committee, urging him to spur action on the proposed legislation.

The Flood resolution injects a powerful tool into our fight with communism. The proposed committee will bring to full light the true nature of the new Soviet colonialism.

Please write a letter today to your Congressman, **Hastings Keith**, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., and to **Howard W. Smith**, chairman of the House Rules Committee, House of Representatives, Washington. Urge them to vote for the passage of H.R. 14.

O. Szczudluk,
Director of Public Relations, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Boston Branch.

Mr. Speaker, to indicate further the feelings and thoughts expressed not only in this country but also in other parts of the world, I append the following resolution on captive nations passed unanimously at the recent Conference of the Asian Peoples Anti-Communist League:

Resolution at the Conference of APACL

(Submitted by Turkey and Supported by Hong Kong, Australia, Malaysia, and Macao)

Witnessing the process of the decolonization of the world, the collapse of old empires, and the victory of the national freedom idea in all continents;

Realizing that the Russian colonial imperium threatens the freedom and independence of the peoples of the entire world above all the peoples of Africa and Asia recently liberated from colonialism;

I. This Ninth Conference of APACL reaffirms the resolution of the Eighth Conference that advocates the disintegration of the Soviet Russian colonial imperium into national, independent democratic states of all subjugated peoples;

Supports the revolutionary liberation fight of the peoples in Europe, Asia, and Cuba, subjugated by Soviet Russian colonialism and communism, for the restoration of their national independence and for the destruction of the Communist system;

Requests the United Nations to put the problem of Soviet Russian colonialism in Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, Czechia, Cossackia, Estonia, East Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Slovakia, Turkestan (Usbekistan, Tadzikistan, Kirgizistan, Turkmenistan, Karachstan), North Caucasia, and other countries subjugated by communism and Soviet Russian imperialism, on the agenda of its General Assembly, to condemn said colonialism, to exclude all Communist governments from the U.N. and in their stead to admit the authorized representatives of the peoples subjugated by Soviet Russian imperialism and communism;

Exhorts the free world to give wholehearted, active support, including military support, to the national liberation revolutions of the peoples subjugated behind the Iron Curtain, as a possible alternative to an atomic war;

Corroborates the solidarity of the APACL with the U.S. Congress resolution on Captive Nations Week, in which said Congress advocates the liberation and freedom of Hungary, Ukraine, Lithuania, Poland, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Rumania, White Ruthenia, Estonia, Bulgaria, Latvia, East Germany, Czechia, Slovakia, mainland of China, northern part of the Republic of Korea, Idel-Ural, Albania, North Vietnam, Cossackia, and others;

II. The ninth conference of APACL warns against the demobilization of the free world by means of the campaign of the so-called positive neutralism, in particular in the countries of Africa and Latin America, which is being pursued in the interests of Moscow by Yugoslavia, whose Communist regime has subjugated the Croats and other peoples who yearn for their national independence.

III. The Ninth Conference of APACL warns against the growth of Communist influences in Latin America.

It declares its solidarity with the fight for freedom of the Cuban people against a Communist despotic regime supported by Moscow, and appeals to the anti-Communist countries of the American continents to help the Cuban people to obtain its liberation from Communist slavery.

IV. The 9th Conference of APACL expresses its sincere wishes to ABN on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of its founding (in November 1943) behind the Iron Curtain for success in its fight for the liberation of the peoples subjugated by Russian imperialism and communism and for the restoration of the independent national democratic states of those peoples.

Mr. Speaker, moreover, as indications of the types of programs and pronouncements we can look forward to on the fifth anniversary of Captive Nations Week, I include the following remaining material in the RECORD:

[From Freedom Torch, published by the American Committee for Freedom of Enslaved Nations, Los Angeles, Calif., July 1962]

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Dr. Emil Onaca)

By a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the U.S. Congress has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation designating the third week of July 1960, as Captive Nations Week, and to invite the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The resolution also urged the President to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world. This proclamation—which is being issued every year—symbolizes America's interest in the freedom of all human beings; it is the proof that this great Republic shares the aspirations of all nations to become independent and free from all kinds of despotism and tyranny; it proves to the enslaved nations that Uncle Sam and Lady Liberty have not forgotten them.

At the time of the 1959 Presidential proclamation for the Captive Nations Week, 24 countries were victims of Communist tyranny, for various lengths of time. The enslavement of free nations by communism started even before the Red Russian Revolution of 1917 ended. After 1918, the Kremlin-headquartered communism enslaved the peoples of Ukraine, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Cossackia, Idel-Ural and Turkestan, and forced them into the Soviet Union. In 1940, the Red Army of Stalin invaded and then enslaved Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. In 1944, the hoardes of the same Red Army invaded and then enslaved Rumania, Poland, Hungary, White Ruthenia, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria, East Germany, and Yugoslavia. In 1947, over 600 million Chinese fell victims of communism, then North Korea, then North Vietnam, and then Tibet.

As we all know, since the Captive Nations Week proclamation of 1959, no nation has achieved freedom, but several new nations have become enslaved. Cuba, at only 90 miles from the United States border, succumbed under the cruel Communist regime of Fidel Castro. In Asia, Laos is already the 26th member of the unhappy family of captive nations; South Vietnam is unfortunately not far from falling into the Communist slavery; and in North Africa, Algeria is the target of Communist conspiracy, infiltration and takeover even before enjoying 1 day of freedom. In Central Africa, Congo is the main attraction of Communist maneuvering in preparation for chaos and Communist takeover.

But the activities of the Communists, in their drive to conquer the world, are not limited to the countries mentioned. The Communist fifth columns are busy and successful in their conspiracy in every Latin American country, and in Asia from Indonesia to Korea and from Japan to Iran.

On June 8, 1962, U.S. Senator ROMAN HRUSKA, Republican of Nebraska, introduced a resolution in the Senate urging the President to proclaim again the Captive Nations Week, to take the plight of these nations before the U.N. General Assembly and ask the withdrawal of all Communist troops, agents, and controls from every captive nation; the return of all prisoners from Siberia and all concentration and slave-labor camps, and free elections in each country, under international control.

Now that the Western powers missed the unique chance offered by the heroic Hungarian revolt of 1956 to help the enslaved nations regain their freedom, Senator HRUSKA's Senate Concurrent Resolution 77 offers the President of the United States and his people another chance to free the enslaved nations by peaceful means. Armed with this resolution, President Kennedy has the historic mission of taking the plight of 1 billion people enslaved by the Soviet Union before the General Assembly of the United Nations and forcing the Assembly to make the captive nations cause No. 1 on its agenda. There is no other problem in the world today more important, more urgent and more humanitarian, than that of the captive nations.

It is ironic and shameful that while the tribes of darkest Africa, and even the cannibals of Dutch Guinea, are gaining their freedom and independence, 1 billion people of ancient culture and history are being enslaved by the Soviet Union.

Let our President test the usefulness and good intentions of the United Nations. This organization has been founded to promote freedom and independence for all mankind, yet since its birth in 1945 in San Francisco, 800 million freemen have been enslaved by the Kremlin.

Today, let us urge our President to expose before the world body the ugliness of Communist colonialism and its worldwide conspiracy against freedom and democracy; to tell the whole world how Khrushchev calls in the same body for an end to Western colonialism, while his Communist colonialism threw behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains 1 billion people, and works day and night to enslave the rest of the free world.

Let the world see if the leaders of newly independent countries of Asia and Africa will oppose free elections under international control, in each and every country under Communist domination. Let the world see those who will oppose freedom for the enslaved countries. Let them stand up in the U.N. General Assembly and be counted as opposed to freedom for the Russian colonies. Let the world see how a Nehru, a Sukarno, a Nasser (who so vehemently condemned the Western colonialism—after swallowing over $6 billion in gifts from the United States) will stand up and say "no" to free elections in the Soviet colonies.

The heroic struggles of Poles at Poznan, of Hungarians at Budapest, of East Germans at Berlin—the forced labor and extermination camps in every enslaved country—aren't they the strongest possible proof that the spirit and the struggle for freedom of the captive nations is more alive today than ever? Then let us help them.

Let us remind the Western powers, especially the United States, that this world cannot go on living half free and half enslaved; let us remember what Khrushchev told the American people: "We'll bury you. Your nephews will live under communism." Freedom, the most blessed God-given gift, is being denied today to 1 million human beings just like us. As long as their freedom is denied, that very freedom is endangered in Paris, London and in Washington.

The issue of our time is the issue of Communist slavery versus freedom. No other nation in history has been more qualified to identify itself with the cause of freedom for those who lost it, than the United States. This country has today the historic mission of organizing and leading the struggle to free the Soviet colonies. It has the power, the prestige, and the position—both in the United Nations (which it supports with many hundreds of millions of dollars) and in the Western World—to organize with its allies this drive for freedom.

If the U.N. refuses to act immediately by forcing Khrushchev to hold free elections, under international control, in every captive nation, there is no use for its existence and even less for spending hundreds of millions of U.S. taxpayers dollars on it.

Let us all hope and pray that this time the United States will use its prestige, power and abilities toward achieving freedom for all countries victims of Communist slavery.

God bless America.

[From the Boston Record American, July 30, 1963]

BOSTON.—The otherwise timely and penetrating Record American editorial of July 23, "Crowded Summit," cannot be passed without comments.

The editorial limits itself to enumerating captive countries that fell under Communist rule after 1939. We cannot, however, forget those countries which were captured by Russian Communists after World War I. Among the latter was Ukraine, the first and the biggest victim of the new Communist colonialism. As a reminder here, Ukraine proclaimed its independence on January 22, 1918. Armenia, Georgia, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, and other non-Russian countries also gained their independence.

Certainly, Ukraine's incorporation into the Soviet Union did not result from the exercise of free will of the Ukrainian people. Let us not divide captive nations under Soviet colonialism into groups; they all are in the same boat.

Let us support the establishment of a permanent congressional Committee on Captive Nations, which was proposed by Congressmen FLOOD (H.R. 14), DERWINSKI (H.R. 15), and supported by many Massachusetts Congressmen: MCCORMACK, O'NEILL, PHILBIN, CONTE, MORSE, BURKE, DONOHUE. Since last January, the subject resolutions have been pending before the House Rules Committee. Now is the time to enact these resolutions. The proposed committee will handle all matters pertaining to the captive nations.

Furthermore, our Government should make freedom and independence to all captime nations held in Communist captivity the issue in all negotiations with the Soviet government, direct and at the United Nations.

O. SZCZUDLUK,
Director of Public Relations, Ukrainian Congress Commission of America, Inc.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Tidings, July 12, 1963]

OUR CAPTIVE BROTHERS

(NOTE.—Last Friday, President Kennedy issued a proclamation designating the week of June 14 as "Captive Nations Week." But the full text of the proclamation was given no space in the news.

(All that can be ascertained at this writing is that the President declared that "the cause of human rights and dignity remains a universal aspiration" and that "this Nation has an abiding commitment to the principles of national self-determination and human freedom.")

It may be questioned whether proclamations and protestations have great value, apart from any concrete action which might accompany them. But at least they serve as a reminder of purpose and of principle which may in some way arouse a latent fire.

Accordingly, we are somewhat cheered by the fact that our President last Friday designated this coming week as Captive Nations Week. It is true that news of this action was a bit obscured by other events crowding the recent holiday weekend, but it at last emerged.

These other events included an exchange of greetings between the Soviet Union and the United States on the occasion of our Independence Day. But the happy fact remains that, in spite of such pleasantries, the President faithfully adhered to a policy which has aroused Soviet ire in the past.

Established by joint congressional resolutions and presidential proclamation in 1959, the third week of July is a period dedicated to the renewal of concern for those peoples who languish in the grip of Communist tyranny. And the resolution adopted at that time requested that this observance continue each year "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

Obviously and sadly, that time has not yet come. The original congressional resolution listed 22 nations as being deprived of national independence and subjugated "through direct and indirect aggression" of Communist Russia. It included Poland and Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, and Latvia, Estonia and Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany and Bulgaria, Albania, and others. A doleful list, surely, and a measure of the tragedy of our times.

More doleful yet, the intervening years have seen no shrinking of that list, but rather its expansion. The name of Cuba must now be added, from which unhappy island the threat falls upon others which are marked. And among the emerging nations of Africa, pressing forward toward freedom's light, the dark shadow of Soviet influence probes its way.

In the words of this year's proclamation, "the cause of human rights and dignity remains a universal aspiration." We who have experienced the fulfillment of that aspiration may easily forget the lands where it is denied. And once we forget, then is our own fulfillment diminished and the breath of our freedom shortened and staled.

But it is not our selfish interest which should sharpen our resolve. These captive nations are people, engendered by the same Father as have we, endowed inalienably with the same rights as we possess, seeking the same destiny which we pursue in liberty. They are not alien to our race, strangers to the planet on which we live, cut off from the plan and scope of our common redemption and eternal hope.

They are people whose blood strains have flowed into our own veins to make us what we are. They are people whose history is as proud as ours, who once breathed the fresh morning air of freedom, walked upright in the open day, cherished the sunset glow. Now darkness lies upon them.

They are people who once worshipped God in simplicity of faith, raised their children in His knowledge without fear, lifted their temples to the sky. They are people who made the journey of their years with human dignity and bequeathed to their young a future of promise. Now they have no future, but only a past.

These are the captive nations. Our Congress and our President have proclaimed them such. While the high talk of coexistence and conciliation goes on about the conference tables, we might ask, with whom do these poor people coexist? And with what fate would we have them reconciled?

Our President has asked the American people "to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities." He did not specify what these might be. But we would suggest that, at the far outer circle of propriety, there are certainly two things we must do for these enslaved people. We must remember them, and we must pray.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Tidings, July 5, 1963]

NO U.N. CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK?

(By George N. Kramer, Ph. D.)

A joint resolution approved by both Houses of Congress July 17, 1959, authorized and requested the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July each year as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

The President is therefore under obligation to issue this annual proclamation, and Captive Nations Week has been officially observed since 1959.

Since our Government's formal adoption of a policy of accommodation with the Soviet Union, the tendency has been to play down the importance of the proclamation by restricting publicity of it lest Khrushchev might be offended.

Last year, it was generally known that pressure from the State Department went so far as to urge the President not to issue the proclamation at all. But this would have violated a congressional request, even though refusal to issue a proclamation might not have been illegal or even a serious breach of executive responsibility.

As it happened, Captive Nations Week was proclaimed in a much weaker version than that promulgated in 1961. It came the weekend preceding the week to be observed and was almost obscured by headline news released by the administration at the same time.

At this writing the Presidential proclamation has not yet been made and there is no information when it will be made, although there is reason to believe that last year's pattern will be repeated this year.

VICTIMS OF RED TYRANNY

Obviously, a mere proclamation not backed up by positive action or even a positive policy of dealing with the problem will not free a single captive nation.

President Kennedy's remark in Berlin June 25 that "the winds of change are blowing across the Iron Curtain as well as in the rest of the world" can scarcely be taken seriously when one contemplates the world situation where the nations enslaved by the Soviet Union are still held captive and new nations of free people are still slipping behind the Red bars.

This point was well made in an article last year by Dr. Emil Onaca, president of the American Committee of California for Freedom of Enslaved Nations. It is but a glimpse of the situation which has even worsened during the past 12 months.

"At the time of the 1959 Presidential proclamation for the Captive Nations Week, 24 countries were victims of Communist tyranny for various lengths of time," he wrote.

"After 1918, the Kremlin-headquartered Communism enslaved the peoples of Ukraine, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Cossakia, Idel-Ural and Turkestan, and forced them into the Soviet Union.

"In 1940, the Red army of Stalin invaded and then enslaved Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. In 1944, the hordes of the same Red army invaded and then enslaved Rumania, Poland, Hungary, White Ruthenia, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria, East Germany and Yugoslavia.

"In 1947, over 600 million Chinese fell victims to Communism, then North Korea, then North Vietnam, and then Tibet.

END IS NOT YET VISIBLE

"As we all know, since the Captive Nations Week proclamation of 1959, no nation has achieved freedom, but several new nations have become enslaved.

"Cuba succumbed under the cruel Communist regime of Fidel Castro. In Asia, Laos is already the 26th member of the unhappy family of 'captive nations.' South Vietnam is unfortunately not far from falling into Communist slavery, and in North Africa, Algeria is the target of Communist conspiracy. In Central Africa, the Congo is the main attraction of Communist maneuvering in preparation for chaos and takeover.

"But the activities of the Communists, in their drive to conquer the world, are not limited to the countries mentioned," Dr. Onaca observed. "The Communist fifth columns are busy and successful in their conspiracy in every Latin American country, and in Asia, from Indonesia to Korea, and from Japan to Iran."

Here are the cold facts, yet the U.S. State Department has announced and is carrying out a policy of accommodation while the Communists continue to enslave free peoples without serious protest from the rest of the free world. And the end is not in sight.

Dr. Onaca pointed out it is both ironic and shameful that while the tribes in Africa and even in Dutch New Guinea are gaining their freedom and independence, 1 billion people of ancient culture and history are being enslaved by the Communists.

Then he made this excellent suggestion:

"Let our President test the usefulness and good intentions of the United Nations. This organization was founded to promote freedom and independence for all mankind, yet since its birth in 1945 in San Francisco, 800 million free men have been enslaved by the Kremlin.

"Today, let us urge our President to expose before the world body the ugliness of Communist colonialism and its worldwide conspiracy against freedom and democracy; to tell the whole world how Khrushchev calls in that same organization for an end to Western colonialism, while his Commuinst colonialism thrust behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains 1 billion people and works day and night to enslave the rest of the free world.

LET ALL THE WORLD SEE

"Let the world see if the leaders of newly independent countries of Asia and Africa will oppose free elections under international control in each and every country under Communist domination.

"Let the world see those who will oppose freedom for the enslaved countries. Let them stand up in the U.N. General Assembly and be counted as opposed to freedom for the Soviet colonies.

"Let the world see how a Nehru, a Sukarno, a Nasser will stand up and say 'no' to free elections in the Soviet colonies. * * *

"If the U.N. refuses to act immediately by forcing Khrushchev to hold free elections, under international control, in every captive nation, there is no use for its existence and even less for spending hundreds of millions of U.S. taxpayers' dollars on it."

A more reasonable suggestion could scarcely be made in the name of freedom, and yet not the slightest gesture in this direction has been taken by our delegates in the U.N., whereas we continue to suffer the humiliation of Soviet abuse and denunciations at every session of the U.N.

And we fear it will always be thus so long as we pursue a policy of accommodation with the Soviets. Meanwhile more free men will fall under the Red yoke.—G.N.K.

Mr. Speaker, the freedom and civil rights of all peoples remain in danger as long as the international Communist conspiracy continues its aggressive actions and holds in bondage millions of people in Europe and Asia. On the international scene, self-determination of peoples is an integral part of our foreign policy, and I believe the Rules Committee must take a long, overdue step, hold hearings, and approve a rule on the original resolution—House Resolution 14—introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dan Flood, for early House consideration.

Certainly suspicion might be aroused that the Rules Committee's inactivity in this field has been dictated by the House leadership at the request of the State Department, which shows a shocking disinterest in the plight of the captive peoples of communism.

Mr. Speaker, a typical example of the continued denial of "civil rights" to the people of the capitive nations is illustrated by an article which appeared in the November edition of ELTA, published by the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania, reporting on Soviet activities to repress the nationalistic forces in the Baltic nations. The report follows:

Western Press Sees Soviet Effort To Amalgamate Baltic Nations

The Soviets are now engaged in a campaign to fuse Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into a single gray Soviet entity and thus finally to eliminate the marks of their national identity. This was the contention of an article in the September 1963 issue of the magazine Der Europäische Osten, Munich.

The magazine bases its findings on the following facts. This spring a joint issue of the three Baltic Communist Party organs (Tiesa, Cina, Rahva Haal) was published with identical texts and pictures. The occasion for the joint issue was the creation of the so-called western economic region, which encompasses the Baltic countries and the Karaliaucius (Königsberg) region. At about the same time, the so-called northeastern power region was established. Somewhat later, the railway boards of the three Republics were merged and subordinated to Moscow.

Der Europäische Osten quotes the Secretary of the Latvian Communist Party, A. Voss, who said that the merger of the Baltic Communist Parties is imperative not only because of the economic unification, but also since all Soviet Republics are gradually approaching a merger in a single body.

The predictions of the German monthly were echoed in the New York Times, on September 27, 1963:

"The Soviet Union is quietly pressing a far-reaching plan to convert the present structure of national republics into a system of regional federations that would deemphasize the distinctiveness of non-Russian ethnic groups.

" A conference in Frunze, according to the newspaper Sovetskaya Kirghiziya, condemned the 'pseudo-scientific theory' of linguistic purity, hailed the importance of the Russian language as a means of communication among the Soviet Union's ethnic groups and demanded an investigation of nationalistic ideology that might oppose the intended mergers of peoples.

"No formal changes have yet been made in the Baltic republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, where the drive for cultural, economic and political merger has been limited so far to joint conferences and cultural exchanges."

Meanwhile, the United Nations is busy with the abolition of colonialism in—Gibraltar and Malta.

I also include two articles from the December 14 edition of the Denver Post, detailing the oppression of individual citizens of Rumania and Lithuania.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Nov. 14, 1963]

A Cry for Help From Rumania

(By Nino Lo Bello)

Cluj, Rumania.—"Help us. We are being slowly exterminated."

This written message was sneaked into the palm of my hand by a member of the Hungarian minority that lives here. Later we met and talked while sitting on a park bench near the Horia Street Bridge spanning the Somes River.

So another racial tragedy can be reported, this one from the Transylvanian capital. It involves some 2 million Hungarians who believe the Soviet puppet regime of Rumania has undertaken a systematic program of "biological extermination," since the collapse of the 1956 Hungarian revolt.

As soon as the uprising was squashed in Budapest, the Rumanian People's Republic opened a drive to reduce the number of Hungarians living in Transylvania, the high plateau that lies in northwest Rumania behind the wooded mountains of the mighty Carpathian Range.

Many of the Rumanian Hungarians were rounded up in mass arrests. Those not executed were given stiff prison sentences up to 25 years. The women and children of men so condemned were deported to Rumania's dreaded marshes of the Danube Delta, where many contracted malaria.

For the Hungarians who were "lucky" enough to have been allowed to stay behind, life has been nothing short of a Dante purgatory. Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish Hungarians are forbidden under penalty of imprisonment to practice their religion.

The Magyar minorty finds it almost impossible to get work. Rumanian laborers are imported by Communist bosses into Transylyvania to make job competition even harder. And "to rub salt in the wounds," Hungarians are being turned out of their homes and forced to double and triple up in other houses to make room for these official migrants.

"We are the lost people of Europe," my informant said. He said it with a stone face—this for the benefit of the pedestrians and some secret police milling about the street—but his eyes transmitted the message's impact. "No one knows about our plight. Please tell the United Nations about us. Tell the President of America. Tell Mr. Khrushchev and the Soviet Union. But please get our message to the outside world—we are being slowly exterminated."

Migrating into Hungary is absolutely impossible for this minority group of Rumania.

Cluj's more aggressive Hungarians have banded into an underground organization known as Independent Transylvania. Anyone remotely suspected of being involved in this secret group is likely to be slapped with a 7-year solitary confinement. Not long ago, when a petition was sent to Moscow asking the Soviet Union to annex Transylvania, Rumanian police intercepted it. Every one of the signers was sent to prison for 25 years.

The region known as Transylvania, which was at one time an autonomous country, came into Rumania's hands as a result of a secret treaty with Russia, whom Transylvania helped during World War I. When Germany, Austria, and Russia lost the war, Transylvania, with its 16 million population, was taken from the old Austro-Hungarian Empire and given to Rumania.

Today one out of every three Transylvanians speaks Hungarian. The region's extensive pine forests, fertile valleys, and deep gorges have not yet been found by Western tourists.

Now everybody is welcome here—except Hungarians. And they can't even go home.

And a Tale of Misery From Lithuania

(By Eric Geiger)

Toronto, Canada.—While some Western leaders are talking about a relaxation of East-West tensions, two Lithuanian sailors in Toronto this week told a grim story of starvation, oppression, and terror in their Communist-dominated homeland.

Jurgis Vaitkevicius, 31, and his shipmate, Allinas Vibrys, 30, arrived in this Canadian industrial city a few days ago to start new lives after jumping ship from the Soviet tanker *Alytus* in Halifax and subsequently being granted political asylum in Canada.

With tears in his eyes Jurgis, who was a diesel mechanic abroad the tanker, said "Lithuania is a prison and we just couldn't go back."

He added that thousands of crewmembers of Russian vessels would jump ships in Western ports if they knew they would fine protection.

Political commissars assigned to every Russian ship, he explained, regularly hold indoctrination sessions designed to discourage sailors from escaping to non-Communist countries.

"All of us were told repeatedly that Western countries send all political refugees back to Russia," he said.

They decided to take a chance and leave the ship while it took on water in Halifax because they couldn't bear the thought of returning to the Soviet Union.

"The Lithuanians used to be a happy people," he said, "but ever since the Soviets took over, our homeland has become a sad and dreary place."

Both men, who had lived in the Baltic seaport of Klaipeda, said there is a serious shortage of just about everything in the so-called "Soviet Republic of Lithuania."

Jurgis snorted derisively when asked about Khrushchev's often-proclaimed promises to raise the standard of living of the Soviet worker.

"To earn enough money to buy a shirt, I had to work 7 days," he said. But most of his pay went toward food, he added, and there was nothing left for clothes.

Above all, he stated, the tight control imposed on the Lithuanians by the Soviet authorities has made life intolerable.

"You are being watched all the time. It's just like in prison," he said.

The two seamen then described conditions on the large, mysterious Soviet North Atlantic trawler fleet, of which their vessel was a part.

The morale of the crews is generally very low, said Jurgis.

There is no refrigeration on the ships he added, and the food consists primarily of potatoes and barley. "We saw no fresh or green foods for months and our teeth were beginning to fall out."

Crew members are rarely allowed to go ashore, he said, and the commissars watch their every move.

It would be my hope, Mr. Speaker, that we would start the new year right with very early consideration of both the civil rights measure and a captive nations resolution. Thus, the House could work its will on both matters, and the cause of freedom throughout the world would be advanced.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, MR. SPEAKER

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people I represent here—all the people of Alabama—I extend to you our best wishes on the occasion of your 72d birthday.

Your inherent kindness, your fairness as presiding officer of the U.S. House of Representatives, your great patience, your compassion for the problems and the well-being of all Americans are greatly admired by every Member of the House.

It is the wish of myself, and I am sure of everyone else here this morning, that you have many happy returns of this day and much happiness in the years ahead.

Happy birthday, Mr. Speaker McCORMACK.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m., Saturday, December 21, 1963.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 875. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 792. An act to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 250]

Abbitt
Adair
Andrews, N. Dak.
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Bass
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Blatnik
Bolling
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Curtis
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derounian
Devine
Diggs
Donohue
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Evins
Fascell
Fino
Flynt
Foreman
Forrester
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodell
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Hall
Harris
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDowell
McIntire
McLoskey
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Mass
Martin, Nebr.
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morris
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Philbin
Pilcher
Powell
Purcell
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St Germain
Scott
Shelley
Shipley
Short
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Stephens
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Tollefson
Trimble
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watts
Wharton
Whitener
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 263 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE BILL H.R. 9499

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 598, Rept. No. 1086), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the conference report are hereby waived.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 598 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 598?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the rule on the grounds that under rule 11, section XXII, of the rules of the House this rule is not laid over before the House for 24 hours.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that clause 22 of rule 11 provides, in substance, that the House may consider a resolution on the same day as reported, if by a two-thirds vote.

The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 598?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow) there were—ayes 178, noes 50.

The SPEAKER. Two-thirds having voted in favor thereof the House agrees to consider House Resolution 598.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at this late hour and after the Committee on Foreign Affairs spent weeks and weeks and months holding hearings on this legislation, and after the Committee on Appropriations held hearings and hearings for days and days, and then with the debate on the floor of the House, I do not think anything said at this late hour will change any votes here this morning. Any valuable information given to the Members here this morning will be whatever words the members of the conference committee have to say. I do, however, want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], and the members of the conference committee for the great work they have done in arriving at a determination on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, of course this is a very late hour in the morning and everybody is tired and we would like to adjourn, but by the same token this is probably the most important subject we are considering this session. We probably would not be here this late if it were not important. I do have some requests for time, and I would ask the indulgence of the Members of the House a little longer so that gentlemen can express their comments on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution waives points of order and provides for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 9499, the foreign aid appropriation bill. As I understand it, the additional language which was added and which makes necessary this resolution by the Rules Committee is as follows. In speaking about the Export-Import

Bank this language, as I understand, is added:

> Except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate.

In the short amount of testimony we heard a while ago before the Rules Committee, it was brought out that some of the Members suggested and felt that the language which the House earlier adopted when we passed the motion to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions, the so-called Findley amendment, is better than this particular amendment. In turn, some Members feel that there is no time limit in this broad statement as to the conditions precedent as to when President Johnson has to report to the two committees of the House and the two committees of the Senate or if he has to report before the Export-Import Bank makes the guarantee, that it is not specific enough on the requirement for the determination of the President. Others feel that Russia owes us money they have not paid back, and eventually, if the Export-Import Bank does this, possibly the U.S. taxpayer may have to pay the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand the rules of the House and as I also understand the assurances that were given to the members of the Rules Committee before this rule was given, the minority will have a motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of California. That is my understanding.

Mr. HALLECK. We will have that motion to recommit before we finally vote on the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of California. We may have some differences of understanding here. I might ask the Speaker about this. My understanding is that after the rule on this resolution is adopted and time is taken by the committee in explaining the conference report, when the motion for the previous question is made, at that time a motion will be in order to recommit the conference report to the committee with instructions to take the House version of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. That is my understanding of it. I want to make that clear.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, may I submit a parliamentary inquiry as to whether or not that is the understanding, so that we will all know as we proceed here?

The SPEAKER. Under the rules of the House the motion to recommit is in order after the adoption of the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of California. After the adoption?

Mr. HALLECK. After the adoption of the previous question, but not the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right. If the gentleman will yield to me further, in order that my position may be very well understood, I supported the Jensen motion to recommit when this measure was originally before us. It carried by a very decisive vote here in the House of Representatives. It was originally offered in the Committee of the Whole by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]. It lost on a tie vote. As far as I am concerned, I understand that a motion to recommit with instructions to insist on the House position will be offered. I shall support that motion. I hope it prevails.

Now otherwise I might say, that after too much delay, but having been here this long tonight and this morning, possibly we might as well go on and dispose of this matter and send it over to the other body. But again may I say I hope the motion to recommit will prevail to the end that the original recommit when we had the bill before us will be in the bill. Now as to what happens in the other body, I do not know. That is up to them. But so far as I am concerned, I am going to support that motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentlemen who are asking for a vote will have it soon and when they vote, I hope they will vote against this rule.

I recognize, gentlemen, that the hour is late but I also recognize the hour is late in the legislative history of this country in the matter of the delegation of power, and it is beginning to get us into a situation where we had better give consideration to this and if it is so important that you get home for the holidays and you are not willing to consider basic legislation that involves constitutional questions, then there is something wrong with this House of Representatives. May I say to you very briefly why I believe this rule is not in the best interest of the country. The motion failed by a vote of 133 to 133 to prevent the Export-Import Bank from making loans to sell wheat to the Communists. Then on the motion to recommit there was a prohibition against the financing of this wheat to the Communists; and it is in this bill regardless of what was said on this floor earlier today.

Now what does this amendment do? I say to you, if you vote for this rule, you are then voting against what you voted for several days ago. For what this rule does is to provide legislative authority for the President of the United States to make determinations. The rule provides that the President may determine, if he feels it is in the best interest of the Nation, then this financing can be done by the Export-Import Bank. May I point out what he does then is to notify the proper committees of both the House and Senate. There is nothing in the bill that says when he shall report and there is nothing you can do after he has reported. So you have completely wiped out the will of the House, as we passed it last week, when we voted for the motion to recommit. You now simply wipe that all out by turning this authority over to the President. It is a legislative authority that you are now delegating to the President of the United States. May I call your attention to section 1 of article I of the Constitution which provides that all legislative power shall rest in the Congress of the United States; and you are delegating that legislative power to the Chief Executive. Under the Constitution the Executive may from time to time send us a message on the state of the Union. Now we have gone down this road for some time about the delegation of constitutional powers of the rights of this House. The hour is late and you are unhappy with me for taking your time. But I say to you, and to those who want this vote, if an early vote is more important to you than the Constitution of the United States and its preservation—what are we doing here? I hope you will oppose the rule. May I say again that this bill does have money in it for Communist countries. There is money contained here that will find its way into Yugoslavia, Poland, and into Cuba and other Communist countries.

The reason this rule was necessary was because of the Export-Import Bank legislation money that might go into Communist hands. If you are against financing wheat to Communist countries, you will vote against this rule.

Thank you.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just one more request for time. I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this proposal demands our careful consideration because it goes right to the heart of our foreign policy. Monday we voted to ban subsidized credit for the Communists. The message was clear, and the people of the United States applauded.

Now what is before us? New language. What does it say? Nothing. It is a joke. It pulls all the teeth we put in Monday's amendment. It leaves nothing but a verbal vacuum. The President gets a blank check. He sets the policy, not the Congress.

Examine it. Look at the words in this new proposal: the President must determine it is in the national interest before taxpayers are forced to guarantee credit for the Communists. But do not hold your breath. The President has already made the determination. In a letter to the majority leader of the other body, dated yesterday, the President, speaking of sales to Communist countries, said, and I quote:

"In my judgment, sales of wheat and other farm commodities, on reasonable terms, are now plainly in the national interest of the United States."

He said "national interest." The very same phrase that appears in this proposed language.

The new language says that the President must report his decisions to various congressional committees. It does not say when. It can come long after the damage is done. But here again do not hold your breath. The President has already reported his determination.

Pull the Congressional Record out from under your seat. You do not have to wait 7 days to read it in the Federal Register. Turn to page 25144 of today's or, rather, yesterday's Congressional Record. There the President has already reported. You can see for yourself the full text of his letter.

The simple fact is this: the President has made his determination, and his determination is already on the public record.

What does this compromise language mean? Nothing. Words. Meaningless, empty words. The only way that we can stop subsidized credit for the Communists is to say so ourselves in plain, clear language, like the language we adopted on Monday.

Do we shrink from saying in clear language—no subsidized credit for the Communists? Is that asking too much of the elected representatives of the last, best hope for human freedom? Why are we here? What is our duty? To set policy or to shift it to the President?

Congress should make the determination and determine that forcing taxpayers to subsidize credit for the Communists is not in the national interest.

The Congress should make its own report—report to the American people—yes, report tonight to the American people and to all who love freedom that we will not finance Communist Russia out of a hole dug by its own repressive, dictatorial system.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he is insisting upon the retention in this legislation of the amendment which he originally proposed when we were in the Committee of the Whole. Is that correct?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I correctly understand, in agreement with him, that the motion to recommit will restate the position of the House of Representatives in that regard, and if we have here the votes tonight to restate that position, then this conference report will be recommitted with an affirmative determination on the part of the House of Representatives to retain the amendment that the gentleman originally proposed?

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman has stated it correctly.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Having studied your own amendment very carefully, and the language adopted by the conferees, do you consider the language to be a compromise now, or would you say it was not a compromise?

Mr. FINDLEY. It has the effect of wiping out the entire content of the amendment we adopted on Monday. Maybe that is a compromise. To me it washes out the entire effect and meaning of that amendment.

Mr. DOLE. That is the way I understand it, and I agree with the gentleman. What was the vote on Monday on your amendment? Do you remember the vote on your amendment?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes. The vote was 218 for the amendment and 169 against.

Mr. DOLE. Rather clearly the House position was not sustained then.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is correct.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. To sustain the gentleman's position on the vote earlier this week, how should one vote on the proposition before the House at this time?

Mr. FINDLEY. The correct vote would be "aye" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to bring to the attention of the House a statement by the Department of State which shows that the Communists owe the U.S. taxpayers at this very minute $10,800 million plus interest. The State Department agreed some time ago to take $300 million and settle that big account. Yet the Communists have not been willing to settle for even that amount.

Now we are asked to extend further credit to these deadbeats of half a billion more of our taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the Record this statement from the State Department which explains this matter quite in full.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

General Information on the Question of a Lend-Lease Settlement With the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The following information has been prepared in response to many inquiries received about World War II lend-lease to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the efforts the United States has taken to seek a reasonable settlement by the U.S.S.R. of its lend-lease obligation.

Lend-lease was conceived and executed "to promote the defense of the United States," as provided for in the lend-lease law. The program was inaugurated on March 11, 1941 as our peacetime contribution to nations aiding our defense by resisting Axis aggression. After the United States was attacked, lend-lease became an instrument by which we strengthened our allies according to the strategic plans of the Allied Nations as a whole. Unlike methods used in previous wars, lend-lease focused directly on the aid to be rendered rather than upon the dollar sign to be placed on the war materials and services furnished by the United States. It was not a loan of money nor was it provided for the exclusive benefit of the recipient country. We helped other peoples under lend-lease because at the time their interests coincided with our interests.

In settling the lend-lease accounts with our World War II Allies, the United States has not made it a practice to obtain payment for the value of all equipment and services furnished other nations for use during the war. No compensation has been requested for articles and services which were lost, consumed or destroyed during the war, nor for combat items such as tanks, aircraft, etc., in the custody of the Armed Forces of our allies at the end of the war. It has been the policy and practice of the United States to require payment for lend-lease goods in the possession of other countries at V–J Day which were of a civilian type useful in the peacetime economy of the recipient country and for lend-lease delivered after V–J Day.

There were two phases of lend-lease with most of our World War II Allies: (1) lend-lease requested and delivered to our allies before V–J Day, and (2) lend-lease requested before V–J Day and for which procurement contracts had been placed but which was not produced or delivered to an Ally until after V–J Day. When World War II came to an end large quantities of such lend-lease supplies and equipment were in production or storage in the United States. Our Government informed its Allies that if they wished to obtain these lend-lease materials they would either have to pay for them or undertake to make payment upon terms to be mutually agreed before the goods would be transferred.

The Soviet Government has agreed to pay for lend-lease delivered after V–J Day. In an agreement signed on October 15, 1945, the U.S.S.R. undertook to pay for undelivered lend-lease articles which were in production or in storage in the United States before V–J Day. The total amount to be paid by the U.S.S.R. for these articles is $222,494,574. This is to be paid in 22 annual installments, with interest as 2⅜ percent per annum. The Soviet Government has been making regular partial payments on this account and as of July 1, 1962, has paid a total of $100,807,451. The United States did not complete deliveries to the U.S.S.R. under this agreement. In making annual payments on account, the Soviet Government deducts certain sums which it claims as compensation or damages resulting from the failure of the United States to complete deliveries under the agreement. In view of these deductions and since the question of the Soviet claims has not been settled, the U.S. accounting records show an arrearage of $46,626,012.

The United States has been unable to reach a settlement with the Soviet Government for lend-lease assistance which was delivered before V–J Day.

The United States furnished approximately $10.8 billion worth of lend-lease assistance to the Soviet Union up to V–J Day. In seeking a settlement of this lend-lease account of the Soviet Government, the United States has followed the basic principles and policies, previously described, which governed lend-lease settlements with other governments. The Soviet Government has been asked to pay the reasonable value of civilian-type lend-lease articles on hand in the Soviet Union at V–J Day which would be useful in peacetime. Since the U.S.S.R. did not provide an inventory of such articles, the United States prepared one which showed the value as $2.6 billion. An additional problem relates to the disposition to be made of 84 lend-lease merchant ships and 49 miscellaneous army and navy watercraft still in Soviet custody, the value of which is not included in the $2.6 billion figure.

During the initial negotiations the United States in 1948 requested the U.S.S.R. to pay $1.3 billion as the first step in the negotiating process. The Soviet Government had offered to pay $170 million. During subsequent negotiations in 1951–52, the U.S. figure was reduced to $800 million. In the interest of obtaining a prompt settlement, the United States indicated its readiness to reduce this sum further, provided the Soviet Government increased its offer, which at the time was $240 million, to a sum more nearly reflecting the value of the articles in the peacetime economy of the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. increased its offer to $300 million. The United States did not consider this sum adequate and rejected the offer in 1952. The foregoing sums do not include settlement for any ships since these were to be dealt with as a separate part of the overall negotiations. No further settlement offer has been received from the U.S.S.R.

At the request of the United States, negotiations were resumed on January 11, 1960. The United States proceeded on the understanding that the negotiations were to deal solely with a lend-lease settlement. When the discussions began, however, the Soviet Government insisted that a lend-lease settlement could not be considered as a separate and independent problem. It took the position that any settlement of lend-lease would have to be accompanied by the simultaneous conclusion of a trade agreement giving most-favored-nation treatment to the Soviet Union, and the granting by the United States of long-term credits on terms acceptable to the Soviet Union.

During the negotiations the United States explained why it is not in a position to negotiate on either a bilateral trade agreement or the extension of long-term credits. It was pointed out that existing law prevents the granting of most-favored-nation treatment to the Soviet Union and that other laws and policies have an effect upon Soviet-United States trade. On the question of credits the United States took the position that legal and policy considerations made it impossible for the United States to discuss this matter in the lend-lease negotiations. The Soviet position remained unchanged.

Under these circumstances there was no agreement on the terms of reference to the negotiations and there appeared to be no common ground for continuing the discussions at that time. The last meeting was held on January 27, 1960. The United States informed the Soviet Government that it is prepared to resume negotiations for an overall lend-lease settlement at any time the Soviet Government is ready to negotiate on this as a separate and independent issue.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on the rule, but I think in view of the argument that has been made the record should be set completely straight at this time. In the first place I think the entire amendment as changed by the conferees should be read into the RECORD at this time because it clearly illustrates the intention of the gentleman from Illinois as expressed in the amendment which he offered when this bill was before the House originally, that:

> None of the funds provided herein shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereinafter incurred by any Communist country.

The only difference in the amendment which is now before the House and the amendment originally offered is that regardless of whether it was in the national interest of the United States or not, regardless of the need on the part of the President of the United States to make a determination that a guarantee of a sale was in the national interest, regardless of the necessity on the part of the President in the exercise of his leadership in the field of foreign affairs, it would be completely impossible to realize these aims if we should return to the language in the amendment as originally offered—

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I shall not yield at this time.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, attention has been directed to the letter of the President of the United States to Senator MANSFIELD. The President of the United States stated in this letter:

> I strongly urge that the Senate reject the amendment attached to the foreign aid appropriation bill which would prevent any use of the facilities of the Export-Import Bank in connection with all trade with Communist countries.
>
> The Senate has before refused to accept this proposal, and it is even less justified now than before. In one of the last letters of his life, President Kennedy pointed out plainly that the Export-Import Bank has a record of judgment which fully justifies confidence in its ability to use its powers wisely, with a net gain to the taxpayer.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.]

The Chair has already counted a quorum.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the point here it seems to me is this: First, are we going to restrict the President of the United States in the exercise of his constitutional powers to speak as the voice of this country in foreign policy? Second—and I think this is most important, and most important to the Members who voted for the motion to recommit when this bill was before the House previously—those Members had no opportunity to vote for an amendment with an escape clause that would state the policy of this country and at the same time would give the President of the United States the opportunity to exercise his constitutional powers in the interest of, and after a determination of the interest of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this fact, it seems to me that we should go along with the conferees, that we should adopt this amendment, and adopt the conference report.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman, if I have time.

Mr. MEADER. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma mean to say that the Congress does not have the authority to lay down national policy and that we must do it through the President?

Mr. ALBERT. We are doing that very thing in this amendment. We are laying down basic policy, without infringing upon the constitutional authority of the President of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have another request for time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time this year that I have taken the floor of the House. I do not want the year to end without wishing you all a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

Mr. Speaker, I just ask a simple question. Do we know what we are doing here tonight? Here we are appropriating $3 billion in foreign aid to fight, to resist, to stop communism in the world. That is the purpose of the foreign aid bill. However, in order to be sure that we have to spend that money, we are going to provide for $500 million worth of credits by the U.S. Government to supply the Russians with wheat to make them strong throughout the world and to be sure that we have to spend this $3 billion that we are providing for in this bill.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, in one breath we are saying to the world we have got to appropriate $3 billion of the taxpayers' money to fight communism and in another section of the bill we say we are going to provide the Russians with approximately $500 million worth of credit with which to buy wheat so that they can keep their army in Poland, they can keep their army in Bulgaria, in Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and to continue their armies in Cuba 90 miles from our very shores.

Mr. Speaker, I, for the life of me, cannot understand why we are appropriating money in one breath to resist communism and in another breath appropriating money and providing credit to help communism. This is par for the other body. We expect things like that from them. But this House has to defend the people against their irresponsible action.

This bill is an insult to the people of America. It takes $3 billion from the taxpayers to stop communism and then takes another $500 million of taxpayers' money to help communism. To me this is nonsense. Let us awaken to what we are doing. Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House tonight will stand firm on its position barring any Export-Import Bank credit on any trade deal with Communist nations. There is more involved here than in getting an early start on our respective journeys home for Christmas.

Let us take a look at this Russian wheat deal. It was first presented to the American people by the late President Kennedy as a private, commercial transaction—a one-shot deal—for cash presumably gold, and it was supposed to help the American wheat farmer as well as the American taxpayer, and ease our balance-of-payments problem. There was even to be a side benefit to the hard-pressed American shipping industry in that the wheat was to be transported to Russia in American bottoms.

Now—in the space of a few short weeks—nearly all of this has been changed. Our Government, through various of its agencies and officials, has been involved in the protracted negotiations with the Russians up to its bureaucratic neck. There have been ample indications that, far from being a single transaction, this wheat sale is to pave the way for a whole new concept of our hitherto restrictive trading policies with Communist countries—and all practically without any consultation with Congress.

That Russian gold has evaporated off the top of the "barrelhead," and, Russian commercial credit in this country being zero, it is now proposed that the deal be saved by the granting of a Russian credit guarantee to insure that the American grain-export dealers who are putting the deal together will not lose their money. In essence, this means that the American taxpayer will be underwriting, with his money, the good faith, the good intentions and the good credit of Mr. Khrushchev and his cronies.

How good is that Russian credit, which here will be to the tune of, perhaps, 80 percent of the total $250 million wheat deal? Well, as I have said, Khrushchev's commercial credit—through normal international banking circles—is zero, and it does not seem to me that its government-to-government credit, and that is what we are now talking about, ought to be figured very much higher.

Why? Because as of June 30, this year, the Secretary of the Treasury reported that the Russians owed us a balance of over $621 million on their World War I indebtedness to the United States, and in addition—according to my information—they received some $11 billion from us in World War II aid, of which vast sum, after the war, they agreed to repay only some $321 million, toward which we have so far received only about $110 million.

I know this is the season for "good will towards all men"—and I am moved by that spirit—but I just think it goes beyond all reason and the proper limits of enlightened charity for us to be trying to so finance both sides of the cold war at one and the same time. For this reason, this limiting amendment—as originally passed by the House—had a proper place in the foreign aid bill, a bill financing a program that is supposed to have been designed and administered so as to combat and contain the declared Communist ambition to enslave the whole world.

It is clear that the Russians have gold with which to pay for our wheat—if they really want it and need it that badly. So far this year, they have "dumped"—or sold—some $365 million worth of gold on the international market—nearly double the amount of their previous year's sales.

Already we have yielded to an undetermined degree on the American shipping requirement—to sell Khrushchev wheat at a cost of 56 cents a bushel less than the cost of the same wheat to an American buyer. What point is there in yielding any further on what was a dubious bargain to begin with?

The conferees are now suggesting to us that we give the President authority to sidestep this restriction on credit—which was carried here in this body earlier this week by a substantial margin—whenever he finds it proper to do so in the national interest. And—take special note—the language they suggest would permit of such Presidential discretion not only in connection with this wheat deal, where it would undoubtedly be applied, but with respect to any and all future similar transactions, as well.

Now, I should not wish to be a party, in any way, in any move to restrict the President's power and right to determine upon and conduct this Nation's foreign policy, subject to such constitutional duties as are imposed upon him with respect thereto. However, the Constitution clearly states that it is the Congress that has the power to—and I quote from article I, section 8, thereof—"regulate commerce with foreign nations." I do not think, in the light of the precedent we may hereby be establishing, that we should lightly or hastily lay aside our responsibility in this respect. Most assuredly we should not do so on adjournment eve, when many of our colleagues are absent, and we are, perforce, operating under abnormal legislative conditions.

In my considered judgment, we should proceed to agree to the compromise amount suggested for mutual security purposes, hold fast to the position we have already taken here in this body on the question of credit to Communist nations, and hope that the other body will finally consent to let the matter rest here until we have reconvened in January, and can go into this whole question of cold war trading policies in a thorough and responsible manner.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are debating here a very important question which I believe deserves our most careful attention.

You will recall that some time ago, our Government indicated it would take under consideration any request made by the Soviet Union to purchase some of our surplus wheat. Several weeks of intensive discussion and study of the question followed. Every responsible public opinion poll showed that an overwhelming majority of Americans favored the sale of our surplus wheat to the Soviet Union, especially since most other countries, including our neighbor to the north, Canada, are now selling wheat to the Soviet Union.

Finally, after hearing all of the evidence pro and con, our late President Kennedy suggested it would be in the national interest to sell Soviet Russia our surplus wheat under several conditions including one that the wheat would have to be shipped in American ships and that all sales would be on a cash-on-the-line basis.

President Kennedy said that since all other countries are selling wheat to the Soviet Union, we might as well get rid of our surpluses which cost us millions of dollars in storage fees, and at the same time strengthen our gold reserve position since the Soviets would have to pay for the wheat in gold.

President Kennedy's suggestion won overwhelming approval of the American people. We all understood that every grain of American wheat that goes to Russia helps demonstrate again and again the complete bankruptcy of the Communist system. Our wheat is produced by American farmers who are free; Russia's wheat shortage is being caused by Soviet farmers who are slaves of communism.

The Soviet Union has begun negotiating with our Government for the purchase of $300 million worth of our surplus wheat. At this moment we do not know if the agreement will be consummated.

We are debating here an amendment which is necessary if the sale is to be considered any further.

The amendment states as follows:

> None of the funds made available because of the provisions of this title shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committee and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination.

Mr. Speaker, you will notice that this amendment differs only slightly from the original amendment offered a few days ago in the House. This amendment adds the additional language "except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest."

What this amendment actually does is expressed in unequivocal terms that the Congress is opposed to insuring any sales to the Soviet Union by American grain dealers unless such action is proven by the President to be in the national interest.

It should be remembered that the Export-Import Bank does not issue any loans per se. This agency is nothing more than an insurance agency which protects American exporters from losses in the event a foreign government defaults in its payments to an American company.

I personally am strongly opposed to extending any credit to the Soviet Union. But the Constitution vests in our President the responsibility of determining foreign policy. I cannot conceive any circumstance under which the President would be justified in extending any credit to the Soviet Union, especially since we are well acquainted with the Soviet Union's horrible record of keeping its word on agreements. But I do not have access to all of the facts regarding international relations which the President has. Therefore, while I personally oppose any credit to the Soviets, I do not want to deny our President—Democrat or Republican—his constitutional right to determine foreign policy.

It should be remembered, however, Mr. Speaker, that the language provided in the amendment may never be needed in our proposed wheat sale to the Soviets. President **Kennedy** said all sales of wheat should be on a cash-on-the-barrel basis. This amendment in no way changes our original position. I, for one, shall insist that any sale of American surplus wheat to Soviet Russia must be on a cash-and-carry basis. What this amendment would do is that in the event some hitch occurs in the payment of funds by the Soviet Union to the American firms which handle the sale, these firms could be protected by the Export-Import Bank. But these firms have to pay the bank a premium for this protection.

The Export-Import Bank was created to encourage American firms to get into the export business without jeopardizing their investments in the event foreign countries default on payments to American firms. We have a favorable balance of trade; that is, we export more than we import. We have this favorable balance of trade because American businessmen are now willing to sell abroad because their contracts are protected by the Export-Import Bank. Exports mean jobs to American workers.

I believe the language in the amendment fully protects the American people. It requires the President to first prove to Congress and the American people that sales of wheat to the Soviet are in the national interest.

This resolution clearly states that we are opposed to any sale to the Soviets unless such sales are on a cash-and-carry basis, and credit can be extended only when it is in the national interest.

I believe we should not lose sight of the fact that this bill before us today reduces foreign aid by $1.9 billion. This is the biggest cut ever voted in the foreign aid program and I am happy to support these cuts. I have stated throughout this session that the American people will support military and economic assistance to our allies but only when the American people are certain all waste has been eliminated. I believe this $1.9 billion cut reflects our determination to phase the entire program out as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, statements have been made that this amendment would help feed Communists with American credit. I do not believe this is true. We have stated that our policy is to sell wheat to the Soviets only on a cash-and-carry basis. The Soviets are paying cash to other nations and while there has been some mention of a 25-percent cash downpayment, I can only reaffirm that my own position will be to insist all sales of wheat to Russia must be on a cash-and-carry basis.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the vast number of Americans who support this sale of surplus wheat to Russia do so because they believe such sales clearly demonstrate how thoroughly bankrupt is the Communist system. I have said before and I will say again, we Americans, as free people, have consistently been able to show how superior is our system as compared to the Soviet philosophy. I believe the very fact that we have wheat surpluses to sell to the Soviet Union demonstrates again the vigor of American free enterprise. I have not the slightest doubt that American freedom will ultimately bury Soviet Communist slavery. Those who oppose this demonstration of American superiority have little faith in the strength of America. I do not believe the Soviet Union can ever fully explain to its people how it is that America has such abundance under capitalism to be able to sell its surpluses to the Soviets.

I should like to emphasize again: President Johnson may never use this authority of the Export-Import Bank. As a matter of fact, I doubt if he will and I certainly hope he never will, but I do not believe we should tie his hands. The Constitution of the United States clearly states the President shall set foreign policy. This is a time when all Americans should join ranks to support our President in charting a course which will bring about the ultimate collapse of communism and the victory of freedom.

I have infinite trust and confidence in President Johnson. He is a dedicated American whose only goal in life is to see America and its free institutions triumph over Communist tyranny. He is our President and I can think of no more effective way to impede his dedication to America than to tie his hands at this crucial moment in history when it is becoming more and more clear that communism can be defeated without armed warfare.

I will take my stand beside my President and I am sure most Americans will support the President on this issue.

One final point, Mr. Speaker. Opponents of the amendment have tried to create the impression that this amendment somehow would pay for the wheat to the Soviets. May I emphasize that there is not a penny in the bill to buy wheat for the Russians. The amendment would in no way help the Soviets purchase the wheat, but this amendment would tie the hands of the Export-Import Bank, the very agency which was established to protect American firms which try to save the American taxpayer millions of dollars in storage costs by getting rid of our surplus wheat commodities.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the adoption of this rule. Once again the American people are being deceived, slapped in the face and insulted by the so-called foreign policy experts of this country. The State Department has once again had its way and this means that we will lose and the Communists will gain. The latter's declared purpose is to bury us and this aim will be augmented by the action of the Congress in capitulating from its position of earlier this week whereby we declared that the Communists should not get credit in their purchase of wheat from the United States. The distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] fought a great battle but in the end his position did not prevail.

How dumb can we get? We are stupid to sell wheat to the Soviet Union in the first place but this stupidity pales into insignificance when it later comes to pass that we must furnish them credit to assure the transaction. Who in the United States except the State Department appeasers would believe that the Communist credit is worth anything? We were told in the beginning that this transaction would help offset our flow of gold, that we would improve our balance-of-payments position by selling this wheat surplus to our mortal enemies. As if this were not a mirage, the next step in this sellout was indicated in the Thursday, November 21, 1963 Washington Post in a front-page story under the heading "Threat Seen to Soviet Wheat Deal." The lead paragraphs tell the story:

> Congress was told yesterday that the Russian wheat deal probably will fall through unless the Government can guarantee private financing of the transaction. The warning was given in testimony before the Senate Banking Committee by Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon.

Thus, we not only are called upon to subsidize the Communists to the tune of about 60 cents per bushel, we also must yield in the matter of ships flying the American flag, and, on top of that, provide for possible assurance of credit. Were a private citizen to propose such a deal he would be put in the insane asylum.

The Congress has shown a shocking propensity to compromise on basic principles. How can we possibly think we are protecting the interest of the American taxpayers by this weak-kneed compromise? There should be a positive prohibition in the law, not a statement of the will of Congress with a presidential exception. Bureaucrats have been calloused in their disregard of these pronouncements. We made the same error in the so-called Latta amendment whereby the positive prohibition offered by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio Representative DELBERT LATTA, was changed by this body into a statement of principle. I insert at this point a letter from Secretary of Agriculture Freeman which should answer the question whether or not this compromise is meaningful. Of course it is not and we will get the same answer when the Export-Import Bank guarantees credit to the Communists. In fact this compromise is less meaningful since the President can waive it. Note, in particular, the fourth paragraph of this letter. It is always easy to skirt around a declaration by saying it is not binding.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 24, 1963.

Hon. JOSEPH M. ASHBROOK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASHBROOK: This is in reply to your letter of March 28 regarding the transfer of certain nonfat dry milk for distribution to children and other needy persons in Cuba.

Five million pounds of nonfat dry milk have been made available to the American Red Cross, and an additional 5 million pounds are in the process of being donated.

to be distributed through noncommercial channels to children and other needy persons under the supervision of the Red Cross organization.

The American Red Cross requested and received the nonfat dry milk to which reference is made pursuant to section 1431, title 7 of the United States Code (as revised by sec. 302 of Public Law 480, 83d Cong.), which authorizes donations to approved nonprofit voluntary agencies for distribution to needy persons in foreign countries. The containers for the nonfat dry milk are marked "Donated by the people of the United States of America," and the containers also bear the symbol of the American Red Cross. Local distribution is being made through the Cuban Red Cross.

With reference to the policy statement of the Congress as set forth in section 2(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1961, it is understood that this section is a general declaration of congressional policy which the legislative history indicates was directed toward commercial transactions other than those under Public Law 480, which are involved in the expansion of trade between this and other countries. Section 2(c) neither amends nor repeals any provision of law, and does not in itself constitute a statutory prohibition on action otherwise authorized by law. In this connection, it is noted that section 104 of the act which contains section 2(c) provides that "Nothing in this act shall be deemed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under other provisions of law or to establish or consult with advisory committees."

You, of course, are aware of the huge surplus quantity of nonfat dry milk in Commodity Credit Corporation's inventory, for which we are unable to find any available outlet. It was the judgment of those concerned that the exigencies of the situation warranted this particular movement of milk, and that the best interest of the Government was served thereby.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

This is no compromise in any sense of the word. We started out with the Findley amendment which was an absolute prohibition on the guaranteeing of credit to the Communists. The so-called compromise provides legislative authority to the President to authorize this credit when he deems it in the national interest. This is meaningless because in a letter to the Senate, he has already stated that he believes sales of wheat to the Soviet Union are in the national interest. It is worse than this because the language of the conference committee substitute provides no opportunity for the Congress to block this action once taken by the President. It simply requires that he submit a report to specified committees of the Congress when he makes such a determination, not even requiring a time limit for so doing. This is a broad delegation of authority, our authority, to the President and the State Department.

It seems a little ridiculous to me, Mr. Speaker, that the bill before us would spend $3 billion of our taxpayers money for the avowed purpose of bolstering the free world against communism and in the same bill we permit the President to authorize up to $300 million in credit to these same Communists to buy our wheat. Why would they want our wheat? To strengthen themselves and be in a position to further spread their godless ideology throughout the world—the exact thing we are supposed to be fighting in this same bill. Where could this happen except in Washington? Is it any wonder that people are losing faith in their elected representatives?

Can we not open our eyes? The letter from Secretary Freeman will be duplicated in regard to guaranteeing credit for this wheat deal. We will get the same answer—the declaration the Democratic majority is forcing through here tonight "neither amends nor repeals any provision of law and does not in itself constitute a statutory prohibition on action otherwise authorized by law." In other words, a statement of congressional policy is meaningless.

As far as that goes, the 1934 Johnson Act barring credit to countries which are in default of their obligations to the United States, the Export Control Act of 1949 which placed several important controls on exports, prohibiting trade which would not serve our foreign policy objectives or national security, and the 1951 Mutual Defense Assistance Act, better known as the Battle Act, which embargoed shipment of war materials and strategic goods to Soviet-bloc nations, are still on the books and overlooked by the present administration. There is little intention to enforce these legislative enactments. Who can be so foolish as to think the State Department appeasers will abide by a mere declaration of congressional intent?

This is no compromise in any sense of the word. The Johnson administration has won and the people have lost. The Johnson administration fought for the right to guarantee credit to our enemies. A logical question is whether or not Secretary Rusk and President Johnson feel that the Communists are, in truth, our enemies? Is the cold war over? Mr. Speaker, we cannot blame the Communists. It is certainly in their interest that this compromise be passed. The blame cannot rest with this band of liars, murderers, and thieves if they proceed to take our wheat, accept our credit, and then default. The sole blame rests with the Democratic majority in this Congress and the administration. I hope the American people will call them to account for this tragic retreat from principle.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said concerning the controversial Mundt-Findley amendment to the foreign aid appropriation bill that I feel clarification is in order. I realize full well that all sorts of clarifying statements have been made, but frankly, they missed the point.

By selling wheat and other commodities at subsidized prices to the Soviet Union and other Communist countries under conditions dictated by the Soviet Union and its puppet states, we are engaging in a tragic, self-defeating operation.

What the administration is demanding the Congress do is place the stamp of approval on direct support of an international bandit, the Soviet Union. If I may rephrase the point, we are directly aiding "Mother Russia," a totalitarian nation under the czars with its visions of world domination extended and refined by Communist dictators.

At a time when the Soviet farm economy is completely collapsing, our subsidy and aid has the effect of saving them from self-destruction. Arms are twisted, pressure of all sorts is brought to bear, the leadership on the Republican side is outmaneuvered by false promises, and final approval of a completely watered-down, meaningless amendment is a victory for communism.

The Johnson administration has now completely clothed itself in the mantle of foreign policy of the last 3 years which basically is coexistence with communism and a slow surrender to Red pressure in all parts of the world.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on House Resolution 598.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 182, nays 95, answered "present" 1, not voting 156, as follows:

[Roll No. 251]

YEAS—182

Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Avery
Barry
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Broomfield
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Chelf
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Holland
Huddleston
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Karsten
Karth
Keith
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McFall
McMillan
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Mills
Minish
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Passman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Sibal
Sickles

Smith, Va.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weltner
Westland
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—95

Abele
Alger
Anderson
Ashbrook
Ayres
Baldwin
Battin
Beermann
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cameron
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Derwinski
Dole
Dowdy
Feighan
Findley
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Horan
Horton
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Knox
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
McClory
McDade
MacGregor
Martin, Calif.
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Norblad
O'Konski
Pelly
Pillion
Poff
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rich
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stinson
Taft
Thomson, Wis.
Utt
Weaver
Whalley
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Wyman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hosmer

NOT VOTING—156

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, N. Dak.
Auchincloss
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Bass
Becker
Belcher
Bolling
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Colmer
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derounian
Devine
Diggs
Donohue
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Evins
Fascell
Fino
Flynt
Foreman
Forrester
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodell
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Hall
Harris
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Lloyd
McCulloch
McDowell
McIntire
McLoskey
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, Mass.
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morris
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Philbin
Powell
Purcell
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
Scott
Shelley
Shipley
Short
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Stephens
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Tollefson
Trimble
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watts
Wharton
Whitten
Willis
Wright
Wydler
Younger

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Hosmer against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Becker against.
Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Derounian against.
Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Short against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. McCulloch against.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.
Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. Cederberg against.
Mr. Nedzi for, with Mr. Bray against.
Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Clancy against.
Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.
Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Glenn against.
Mr. Slack for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.
Mr. Burke for, with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota against.
Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Younger against.
Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Quillen against.
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.
Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. King of New York against.
Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Hoffman against.
Mr. Morris for, with Mr. Devine against.
Mr. Moss for, with Mr. McLoskey against.
Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Hoeven against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Harrison against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gray with Mr. Adair.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Hays with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Kyle.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Siler.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Taylor with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Ostertag.
Mr. Roberts of Texas with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Lankford with Mr. Fino.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Burkhalter with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. QUIE and Mr. MacGREGOR changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BELL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], who, if present, would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PASSMAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 9499), an act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1087)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 10, 13, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 7, 12, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, and 24, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$155,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$116,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$330,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$135,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$375,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert $687,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment and insert $92,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows:

"None of the funds made available because of the provisions of this Title shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate."; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 14, 22, 25, and 26.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
JOHN J. RHODES (I reserve on amendment No. 20),
GERALD R. FORD (I reserve on amendment No. 20),
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
MIKE MONRONEY,
GALE W. MCGEE,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—FOREIGN AID (MUTUAL SECURITY)

Economic assistance

Amendment No. 1—Development grants: Appropriates $155,000,000 instead of $150,000,000 as proposed by the House and $175,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. None of the reduction in the amount allowed is to be applied against the malaria control program.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3—American hospitals and schools abroad: Insert language proposed by the Senate and delete language proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4—International organizations and programs: Appropriates $116,000,000 instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House and $130,903,000 as proposed by the Senate. None of the reduction in the amount allowed is to be applied against the Children's Fund.

Amendment No. 5—Supporting assistance: Appropriates $330,000,000 instead of $300,000,000 as proposed by the House and $380,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Contingency fund: Appropriates $50,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $32,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—Inter-American social and economic cooperation program: Insert language proposed by the Senate and appropriate $135,000,000 instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House and $180,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9—Alliance for Progress, development loans: Appropriates $375,000,000 instead of $350,000,000 as proposed by the House and $425,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10—Alliance for Progress, development grants: Appropriates $80,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—Development loans: Appropriates $687,300,000 instead of $600,000,000 as proposed by the House and $800,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—Inserts language proposed by the Senate relating to the use of deobligated funds.

Amendment No. 13—Military assistance: Appropriates $1,000,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $977,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14—General provisions: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE II—FOREIGN AID (OTHER)

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16—Peace Corps: Appropriate $92,100,000 instead of $89,000,000 as proposed by the House and $98,100,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide that not to exceed $19,900,000 shall be available for administrative expenses instead of $19,500,000 as proposed by the House and $20,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17—Ryukyu Islands: Provides that not to exceed $2,300,000 shall be available for administrative and information expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18—Assistance to refugees in the United States: Appropriates $39,717,137 as proposed by the Senate instead of $56,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19—Investment in Inter-American Bank: Inserts language proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Amendment No. 20: Restores House language which was stricken by the Senate relating to the guarantee of sales amended giving discretionary authority to the President with the provision that such determinations by him be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

TITLE IV—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendment No. 21—Senate: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 23 and 24: Insert heading and appropriate $190,000 for miscellaneous items as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE V—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission

Amendment No. 27: Deletes the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $150,000 for the Commission as there is no authorization for this appropriation.

TITLE VI—CLAIMS AND JUDGEMENTS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 28–33: Insert section numbers.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
JOHN J. RHODES (I reserve on amendment No. 20),
GERALD R. FORD (I reserve on amendment No. 20),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9499), an act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see above.)

Mr. PASSMAN. Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the night or, rather, early in the morning, I shall limit my time in discussing this conference report.

I want to say that the conference agreement is the best job that it was possible for us to accomplish in the circumstances which exist.

This appropriation bill comes back to the House from the conference committee $1,525,325,000 below the budget estimates. It is $602,075,000 below the amount authorized by the legislation which the Congress passed just a week or so ago. It is only $198,300,000 above the House appropriation figure, but it is $273,203,000 below the Senate appropriation figure. The bill now before the House calls for a round figure of $3 billion, which is the lowest appropriation made for foreign aid in many years, plus, of course, the usual carryover of unobligated funds, which amounts to approximately $260 million. That figure is about $45 million higher than the estimate which we gave the House previously.

Let me say now, Mr. Speaker, that I do not like a Federal Government wheat-sale arrangement with reference to Communist countries any better than any other Member of this House does. But with privileges comes responsibilities. And, as chairman of the subcommittee charged with the responsibility of protecting the position of the House in conference on this appropriation bill to the greatest extent possible, I must face up to my responsibility and endeavor to help reach the very best agreement that is possible. I believe that all of the conferees will concur that this conference agreement was the best that we could reach.

Let us be realistic, Mr. Speaker. The so-called Mundt amendment which was agreed to by the conferees requires two things specifically: The President must determine that financing such assistance by the Export-Import Bank is necessary, and the President must report each such determination to the Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate and the Appropriations and Foreign Affairs Committees of the House.

In addition, our Government would not be subsidizing the credit to the countries who will purchase the wheat, or whatever the commodities might be, but, rather, the Export-Import Bank will make a profit from such transactions.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. First, I want to compliment the gentleman from Louisiana on the role that he played in making certain that we would have an opportunity to have a clear-cut vote on the issue.

I am grateful personally for his help and assistance in this regard.

I want to ask the gentleman whether or not in his judgment the language which is proposed in the conference report requires the President to make a report to the Congress promptly after his determination.

Mr. PASSMAN. On each such determination such a report must be made. We must take into account, also, that the provision expires entirely on June 30, 1964, under this bill.

It is my understanding that the President will make a determination that will be promptly reported to the Appropriations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. FORD. Are you saying that the determination and notification should be made simultaneously?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is, in effect, my understanding, that the actions will be virtually simultaneous. And there will be a report for each determination. If, for example, there are 20 such determinations, the President will report 20 different times to the four congressional committees specified in the bill.

Mr. FORD. The determination in each instance and the notification will be virtually simultaneous?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is my understanding.

May I add, Mr. Speaker, that it is the understanding of the managers on the part of the House that the language of the so-called Mundt amendment relating solely to sale of American products to Communist countries is designed to limit the authority to guaranteeing, or insuring, loans in connection with such sales after an appropriate finding is made by the President. I think that this is a positive definition and limitation and I want the RECORD to so state.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried to do a creditable job in conference on this bill, the very best that has been possible for us to accomplish.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not true that we are operating now under a continuing resolution and it extends until January 31 of next year?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, and at a ceiling of $3.9 billion.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand they are doing a little better under the continuing resolution than they would do under this bill, and that is certainly something we should keep in mind.

Mr. PASSMAN. They may spend at the rate of $1 billion a year better.

Mr. HALLECK. But, on the other hand, will the gentleman not agree with me that this matter of helping to finance the people we are supposed to be fighting is the sort of thing we ought to get settled right here and now?

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say again that I do not like such a financing arrangement. But, and I repeat, this is the very best agreement that we could reach in conference. It would have been impossible in the circumstances for us to bring back any better bill than we have done.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that in the interest of maintaining the position of the House that at 4:30 o'clock this afternoon we got up and walked out of the conference room without any agreement at all?

Mr. PASSMAN. We certainly did.

Mr. GARY. And we subsequently went back into the conference room upon the urging of the Senate and upon the urging of the leadership of the House and finally reached an agreement?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct. This has been the most difficult conference in which this committee has ever been engaged. We worked for hours and hours doing the very best that we could do.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Will not the gentleman agree with me that if the motion to recommit, which is to be offered here and which we voted for by a very substantial vote here in the House is to be adopted—will not the gentleman agree with me that very likely we could get the other body to recede and concur in what we are doing?

Mr. PASSMAN. The other body has taken a very positive position in two previous votes on this subject.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would like to point out to the gentleman in the House that no one questions the tremendous ability of the gentleman from Louisiana to extract the most practicable dollar adjustment. The question is the so-called Mundt-Findley amendment. I would like to point out two things, and the gentleman will please correct me if I am wrong. One is, under the language proposed in the conference report, once the President makes the determination that the guarantee will be in the national interest, that ends it. There is not any recourse that the Congress has, so it is an empty gesture.

The other point is, early in October when the public was first told we feel that the Soviet Union and its satellites should be permitted to purchase, it was clearly stated it would be a cash-on-the-line deal. What we have now is a repudiation of the administration position of 2½ months ago. I do not believe the gentlemen on that side of the aisle wish to repudiate the position of early October.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say to the gentleman that in the foreign-aid bill the presentations are illustrative. Under the legislation approved by this House the witnesses could justify 25 projects for Guatemala, for example, and could then take that same money and start projects in Indonesia. Everything is illustrative. They can spend the money wherever they want to spend it.

Why the Congress has not tightened up this legislation before this time, I do not know. However, I have not heard some of my friends who are now complaining oppose giving the executive the authority requested in the authorizing legislation, to make money available, for example upon Presidential determination, to Indonesia and Egypt and Yugoslavia.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his efforts on holding down foreign aid expenditures, but I see my colleague from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] here on the floor, and I would like to remind the gentleman of the fight that Congressman HARDY put up to use the power of the purse to get information about foreign aid expenditures and that the House backed him up. However, in conference the gentleman from Louisiana yielded to the Senate, as he is now, and permitted an escape clause where the President could make the determination on wiping out all of the teeth that the House put in the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me say to the gentleman that we did not yield to the Senate.

Mr. MEADER. The Hardy amendment had teeth. When a department of the Government refused to give information to the General Accounting Office or to committees of the Congress and 30 days expired, their funds would be shut off. But the Senate put in an amendment saying that the President could certify that that information should not be given and it was agreed to in conference. This is precisely the same type of operation that is involved in this wheat amendment. We say one thing and then we say the President can decide it.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. For the sake of clarity it is important to understand exactly what happened in both bodies. The gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the conference on the House side, had to compromise with the other body. What happened? The other body voted on this amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], a month or so ago and voted the proposition down by a substantial vote. On yesterday, by a bipartisan vote of 52 to 32, again the other body knocked out all of this language; not part of it and not an amendment thereto but all of it. So that the chairman of the conference on the House side was faced with Senate language which contained none of this. Now he has come back with a proposal which is a limitation, so that for all practical purposes he has asked the other body to subscribe to something which twice it has rejected by a bipartisan vote. That is what the issue is that is before the House.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct. We did the very best that could be done to protect the House position.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. BATTIN. I would like some clarification of the statement the gentleman made earlier.

Mr. PASSMAN. To what statement does the gentleman refer?

Mr. BATTIN. The gentleman stated that if, in fact, the Export-Import Bank guaranteed the credit it would show a profit to the bank.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BATTIN. Does not that assume that Russia will repay the loan?

Mr. PASSMAN. It is my understanding that the terms, if credit is extended, will be 25 percent cash, 25 percent payable in 6 months, 25 percent in 12 months, and 25 percent in 18 months. The bank terms provide for one-fourth of 1 percent profit for guaranteeing the loan.

Mr. BATTIN. In the event Russia did not repay the obligation who, then, would make up the loss?

Mr. PASSMAN. The same people who are making up the loss of $10 billion annually that foreign aid is costing us.

Mr. BATTIN. Are we not talking about the cash payment?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. BATTIN. Does not Russia owe use a great deal of money at the present time?

Mr. PASSMAN. So far as I know, every nation on the face of the earth owes us money. The bill before the House right now provides money for 100 nations around the world. I wish to note, in this connection, that I have never voted for the foreign aid authorization bill, but this does not mean, of course, that I am not going to face up to my responsibility as a member of the Appropriations Committee and as chairman of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I want to say right here and now that in my opinion the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman] did as effective a job in negotiating with the other body as I have seen during my 11 years in this body. Let me point out the state of the Findley amendment, when we went into conference. We had adopted the Findley amendment in the House as a motion to recommit. The Senate struck out the language completely. There was nothing in the Senate bill on this subject. Therefore we had to start from scratch and negotiate something. And, Mr. Speaker, if you think that the language which we brought back came easily let me disabuse your mind of that completely. This is the result of long and hard negotiation.

The gentleman from Louisiana has said that he is not satisfied with it. I am not satisfied with it. The gentleman from Michigan and I have reserved on this amendment and at the proper time I shall offer a motion to recommit it, because I feel the language of the Findley amendment which we adopted in the House is much better language and should be adopted. However, let me say in the next breath that there is much to be said for this amendment. In the first place, if you are going to have a foreign aid bill at all, in my opinion, this is the amendment best calculated to get it.

Now, a lot of you do not care whether we have a foreign aid bill or not. But let me remind you that the Government is now spending foreign aid money at the rate of $3.9 billion a year. This bill is some $900 million less. We could save money. I think practically all of us feel that foreign aid expenditures are too high. I am not sure that we would not be subject to some criticism if we were to delay too long in taking a bill which is as much lower than last year as this one is. This bill is $900 million lower than the amount which was appropriated in the last year. Thus, as far as the figures of the bill are concerned, I do not think there could be very much in the way of dissatisfaction on the part of the House with the bill. The bill is $3 billion, which is some $197 million higher than the House figure but $273 million lower than the Senate figure.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly believe that as far as the gentleman from Louisiana is concerned, he has done a magnificent job, and I commend the gentleman for it.

I would like now to reiterate the point which the gentleman from Michigan made in his colloquy with the chairman. If the President decided that he wanted to allow the Export-Import Bank to participate in a guarantee to a Communist country, he has to do two things: The first thing he has to do is to make a determination that it is in the national interest.

The second thing that he must do is notify the committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate. In other words, he has two things to do, and in my opinion and I think in the opinion of the other conferees, he has to do them simultaneously. So, there is nothing left hanging insofar as the time of the reporting is concerned before the President can avail himself of the authority which would be in this amendment to provide for an exception. He would have to do both.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FINDLEY. For the purpose of clarification, could the gentleman give me assurance that his interpretation of this language means that the President would have to announce his determination before making a final commitment on these transactions?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As far as I can tell that would not be the situation. As the gentleman has so well pointed out in his own statement, there is nothing in here which keeps the President from making the determination.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. There is nothing in here which keeps the President from making that determination. All he has to do is to notify the proper committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. FINDLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, there would be no opportunity for the Congress or its committees to come back and argue the merits of the determination; is that correct?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is precisely correct. However, of course, the Congress could, if it felt strongly enough about it, pass legislation which would have the effect of stopping such transactions in the future.

Mr. FINDLEY. Would the gentleman not agree that the President as of yesterday clearly went on public record to the effect that he has made a determination that sales of wheat and other farm commodities to Communist Russia are in the national interest?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Of course, the gentleman realizes that a new determination has to be made with each transaction under the terms of this amendment?

The gentleman is correct, though, as far as the present state of mind of the President is concerned, as I would interpret it from his statement. He apparently does feel that it is in the national interest to make such guaranties.

Let me say this one further thing: It was said before, and I would like to repeat it. When the first idea of any sale of wheat to Russia came about, it was to be the payment of gold for the wheat. Then, after that it became "something" for wheat. Now we know what it is. It is 25 percent cash.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I do not really know what is meant by cash. If you mean rubles then I do not think that is cash. If you mean dollars it is. But the rest of it is credit.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I certainly do intend to push my motion to recommit because, in my opinion, such transactions with Communists are not in the interest of the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman has stated that he does not know whether it will be rubles or dollars. If I understand it correctly, if the Russians buy wheat in this country, they are going to buy it from the dealers. I do not know of any dealers in the United States who would accept rubles. Would the gentleman agree that that is true?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not have any way of knowing what the deal would be. Certainly, if the dealer wanted to accept something besides dollars, he probably could.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will yield further? If he wanted to accept rubles instead of dollars, that would be his choice. But I cannot imagine any dealer in the United States accepting rubles. Most of our dealers are pretty good businessmen. They want the cold cash in American dollars. The gentleman, I think, would agree with me that that is correct?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think, certainly, that it would be a good business deal for any grain dealer if he could get the kind of guarantee that is provided in these transactions.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I think we should make it plain that this is not an amendment that only applies to wheat. This talks about any product. I think many of us have confined it to a narrow limitation and that is to wheat alone. It would guarantee, in effect, the financing and the purchase of any product. The gentleman indicated that if we reject this there will not be any foreign aid bill. Does that mean there will be no foreign aid if we reject this?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. No. Of course, there is a continuing resolution which would be good until the 31st of January. The expenditures would be at the rate of $3.9 billion instead of $3 billion, as provided in the bill. There is no reason to believe that further continuing resolutions might not be adopted after this one runs out; in fact, it would be entirely possible for an agency to operate for the whole fiscal year on a continuing resolution.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the plain facts are that if Congress adopts the language in the conference report the Congress of the United States of America is and will be abdicating our responsibility as representatives of the people and we will turn that responsibility over to the President of the United States. The American people will know that we, the Members of this House, are so afraid that we might create a feeling in the mind of the President of the United States that we do not trust him. That is not the case at all. It is our responsibility to legislate for the people of the United States. If we abdicate our responsibility we are not fit to sit in the House of Representatives.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Let me just say in closing that I agree with the gentleman from Iowa, but I think I should point out that as of now the President of the United States has the authority to enter into these agreements if he so desires. There is no inhibition as far as I know under the present interpretation of the law, against the President's entering into any of these guarantee agreements with Communists. I agree that the Findley amendment would be much better, but I would also state that the amendment which we brought back in the conference report would put us in a better situation than we have right now. At least we have here an important and vigorous statement of congressional intent. Also, we have here a provision whereby there would be at least notification to the committees of the House and Senate before such a guarantee could be made.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the plain truth is that probably the greatest job that our new President has is handling our relationship with the Soviet Union. Many would agree that probably this is his No. 1 job. Under the Constitution it is peculiarly within his jurisdiction. It is his responsibility under our system to represent our country in international matters.

As has just been pointed out so ably by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] under the existing law the President has every right to make these negotiations relating to sales of wheat to the Soviet Union.

There are certain prerogatives that are peculiarly within the purview of the Congress, such as the constitutional provision that we raise and equip armies, but our Constitution gives to the President the responsibility for handling problems with foreign countries. I realize we have some responsibility in this area, but it does seem to me that our new President should not be downgraded or appear to be downgraded in the eyes of the American people or in the eyes of the world by a vote which may be interpreted as a vote of no confidence in him in the handling of perhaps his biggest job; dealing with the Soviet Union.

The question before us is not whether we favor the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union. The question is whether in the beginning of the period of service of the new President we will give him the flexibility which he has requested in the handling of foreign affairs. I for one, here in the beginning of his administration, am willing to give him this flexibility. He is able, informed, and experienced and he is going to be answerable to the American people. The correctness of his decision on these matters can be decided at a later date even perhaps at the ballot box. We ought not to deny the President the flexibility which he has requested in an area where he has a special constitutional responsibility.

Let me say that this is, therefore, no abdication of authority by Congress. This proposal, this limitation upon our President in the handling of an international matter, is more of an encroachment in a sense upon the President than an abdictation by the Congress.

When we voted on the matter on Monday, we did not have an unequivocal statement from the President as to his position. It is true that many of us have been disturbed over this issue, but on yesterday, rather the day before, the President in unequivocal language stated to the Congress that he opposed the language which the motion to recommit seeks to enact into law, the motion should be rejected.

The President did not say he was going to use the Export-Import Bank. He asked that he not be denied the flexibility of using the Export-Import Bank. So, Mr. Speaker, I think there is room here for agreement on the part of all of us regardless of how we may have voted on Monday and regardless of how we feel on the issue of wheat sales to Russia. There is room here for us to accept the compromise represented by this conference report. I think we can get together and support these men who wrote the conference report—support the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and his committee—and I commend the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] for the statement he has made. I think we can support the conference report and support our President and give him the full opportunity to be our spokesman in this important matter involving foreign affairs.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, let me apologize to you for taking your time.

In the first place, to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle who served on this conference committee, we owe them a debt of gratitude. You do not have to apologize for what you did. If there has been any mistake that has been made, we made it in this House when we adopted the so-called Findley amendment the other day, and the other body was exactly right when they took it out.

Let us get right down to the issue now. This motion to recommit ought to be voted down. As my colleagues must surely know, I am not in the habit of giving your money away. This is the first time I have voted for this bill in about 12 or 13 years—and you reduced it by $1 million.

You gentlemen know they do not grow 1 bushel of wheat in my neck of the woods.

Gentlemen, the Constitution gives to the President the authority to conduct your foreign affairs. Why do you not, through the device of a limitation on an appropriation, come up and say that the President of the United States cannot open up an embassy in Moscow until the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate approve the amount of money that is going to be spent on that embassy in Moscow—that is exactly what you are doing here. Just think that over now. Would you also say by such a limitation on the use of funds—say to the President, "You cannot send the fleet to the Mediterranean until the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee approves the amount of money you are going to spend"?

This is a matter of the conduct of our foreign affairs and, yet, we are trying to come through here by a back-door device and say that this is a limitation on the expenditure of funds. It may be that, but certainly it is a limitation on the President's authority.

We have a new President now. Do you doubt him? He is trying to do a job. There is not one red cent appropriated here for the Export-Import Bank. And you know it and I know it.

Now we are aiming at the sale of wheat here. You are spending about $1½ billion—and let us get down to the facts—on subsidies and interest, storage charges and transportation charges. It is running out of our ears. Now let us sell that wheat. If we do not sell it, Canada is going to sell it and some of our allies are going to sell it. Who are we? Are we a little bit "holier than thou"? Oh, yes, we are—sure we are—and if we do not sell it, then they will sell it.

Of course, if you are looking into your crystal ball and we are going to fight Russia in about 6 or 7 months, then certainly we ought not to sell it under any circumstances. But does anybody think we are going to war? Let us not tie the hands of our President. He is patriotic just like we are. His job is to keep us out of war—and he is trying. Let us not here take every tool that he needs away from him.

Mr. Speaker, certainly we ought not to take this authority away from our President. May I respectfully say to you to vote down this kind of provision and let our able friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. Morgan, and his able Committee on Foreign Affairs of this body handle this matter. Do not do it through the Committee on Appropriations. Do not destroy your committee system and that is what you will be doing now if you adopt this restrictive language.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, along with 219 others, I voted for the Findley-Jensen motion to recommit. As has been mentioned here earlier, I refused to sign this part of the conference report, referring to amendment No. 20. The gentleman from Arizona did as well. On this vote I intend to vote for the motion to recommit.

Now, I would like to say without hesitation or qualification that everybody who wants to vote for the motion to recommit owes a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman]. Without his wholehearted cooperation it could not have happened, and I believe against his own personal wishes he made it possible for us to have this issue clearcut. I compliment him on it and thank him for this help and assistance.

The alternatives, parliamentarywise, without his cooperation, would have been far worse. Because of his help, because of his cooperation, we now have on the line whether the vote taken on Monday will be upheld or whether this proposal that is in the conference report will be approved. The issue will be whether the House will give to the executive branch of the Federal Government open end authority to deal with the Soviet Union and other Communist nations with the credit assistance of the Export-Import Bank. This is the issue. I feel that we, tonight, under all the circumstances, should meet it head on. As for myself, I intend to sustain what we did on Monday when 219 Members of this body voted for the motion to recommit, including 66 Members on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Every once in a while we are lectured by our friends on the other side of the aisle about political consequences. I said earlier, and I want to say it again, I am not interested in financing arrangements to help the Russians or the Communists in their effort against us, and I do not believe that the American people are interested in that sort of an endeavor.

Much has been said about supporting the President. Well, I know President Johnson possibly just about as well as any of you, and I have for him the greatest respect and the highest regard. However, what we are doing here is appropriating the money of the people of the United States. I do not think it is incumbent upon us just to appropriate the money and not say in some way at least how it shall be used. I think it is our right, not only our right but our responsibility, when we see something that is proposed that we do not like, when we have the opportunity, to do what we ought to do to see to it that the money is spent in line with what actually would serve the best interests of the people as we see it.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question for clarification on this amendment No. 20. I would like to ask if the words "in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national" means just agricultural surplus commodities such as wheat and corn, and so forth, or does it include fertilizer and fertilizer plants?

Mr. FORD. The word "product" has a very broad connotation. I would hate in the limited time available to try and define precisely what commodities or other materials are involved within the definition of this word.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD. Surely.

Mr. BEERMANN. It looks to me as though we are financing food for the Communists at the same time that they are getting ready to or they are purchasing products from us which would be fertilizer plants and getting in a position to produce that food. I think the amendment should be voted down, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FORD. I would hope that the definition intended here would be very restricted and very limited rather than a broader interpretation. From past experience, however, you can get some "Philadelphia lawyers" down in the department and they can stretch the meaning of a word rather broadly. I only would counsel them that they ought to be very careful if this modified language is approved.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that we already have on the books a law which prevents the sale of any strategic materials to Communist countries?

Mr. FORD. There is such legislation, but I do not think potash as a commodity would fall within that definition.

Mr. GARY. I do not know whether it would or not, but I just want to call the attention of the House to the fact that we already have legislation on the books which would prevent the sale of strategic materials.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And that provision can be waived by the President if he deems it to be in the national interest to sell strategic materials.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, I hope the motion to recommit prevails. I believe that when we appropriate money or when we as a legislative body deal in funds that had their origination from congressional action we have the responsibility and the duty to make certain decisions as to how it shall be spent. For that reason I support the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FORD. I yield to my Chairman.

Mr. PASSMAN. There are no appropriated dollars involved and there would be none unless there is a default; is that correct?

Mr. FORD. It is correct to a degree. But the money that we are dealing with at one point came from the American taxpayer. This being the case we have a responsibility to look at the problem and to make certain recommendations as to how such funds shall be used. So in my opinion we have a very legitimate area of responsibility. This is why I personally feel that, feeling as I do, we ought to vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee has remarked this is nothing but a guarantee of credit to American citizens who are going to sell wheat.

In 1957 the Export-Import Bank negotiated a loan to Poland for $30 million. One purpose was to buy a tinplate mill in this country. There was a 5-year grace period on that loan. Payments started to come in last year; and at 4½ percent interest. In 1958 we loaned again through the Export-Import Bank $25 million to purchase pharmaceutical products and other products in this country. In 1959 another $6 million was loaned through the Export-Import Bank. If it is wrong today it was wrong then.

Let us not forget what happened then. We did not attempt to tie President Eisenhower's hands with restrictive amendments of this kind. I do not think we ought to tie the hands of the man who is now in the White House by this type of amendment.

Poland is adhering to the schedule of repayments for these loans. This amendment is unduly restricted and should be defeated.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I shall make my remarks brief. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] very frankly stated the issue when he said that this question goes right to the point of our foreign policy. Let us pause for a moment and realize the responsibility in the field of foreign policy and where that responsibility mainly lies. Under the Constitution the President of the United States is the sole repository of that responsibility in the field of foreign affairs.

The Findley amendment simply ties the hands of the President of the United States in the matter that is involved in the issue before the House today. The compromise gives the President the right to exercise judgment, not when he desires it, but only in the national interest of the United States. That is the paramount question confronting you and me at all times, confronting all officials—the national interest of our country. The only time, under the compromise, when the President can make an exception is where the national interest of our country is involved in the foreign affairs of our Nation.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, called attention to the fact that when former President Eiesnhower was in the White House, no attempt was made to try and tie his hands or to invade completely his constitutional responsibility in the field of foreign affairs. It has never been done with reference to any President that I know of in the past.

Mr. Speaker, only a few weeks ago a very tragic event happened in this country in the assassination of our late, beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. His successor, President Johnson, has many trying problems confronting him. Uppermost in his mind is the national interest of the United States.

Are we going to deny to President Johnson what we gave to other Presidents? Are we going to deny to him the power to perform his duties under the Constitution? That is the question involved.

I hope my colleagues, without regard to party, will realize the serious question involved concerning the foreign policy of our country; that is, whether or not we are going to take away completely from the President of the United States the exercise of judgment where the national interest of our country is involved.

It is a dangerous step to take, my colleagues. I hope the motion to recommit will be defeated.

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this matter, as I am not a member of this committee. However, I think we ought to set the record straight.

The distinguished Speaker has just pointed out that this Congress has never passed any type legislation like this before, tying the President's hands. I know he would want the record to show that the 87th Congress, passed such legislation. I refer to the Agricultural Act of 1961, Public Law 87–128, August 8, 1961, which President Kennedy signed into law, and which states in its declaration of policy:

> SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to (c) expand foreign trade in agricultural commodities with friendly nations, as defined in section 107 of Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1707), and in no manner either subsidize the export, sell, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nations other than such friendly nations and thus make full use of our agricultural abundance.

This Congress did make a similar declaration and President Kennedy signed the act containing it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I say again that the Senate will not accept this bill with this amendment out. They turned it down on two occasions. They will turn it down again.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked 800 hours, and listen, if the Members will. I trust you will not recommit this bill. If you do, we are going to be here on Christmas eve.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. RHODES of Arizona moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 9499 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment No. 20.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 141, nays 136, answered "present" 3, not voting 153, as follows:

[Roll No. 252]

YEAS—141

Abele
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Avery
Ayres
Baldwin
Barry
Bates
Battin
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Derwinski
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Ford
Fountain
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
Kilgore
Knox
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
McClory
McDade
McMillan
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Moore
Morton
Mosher
Norblad
O'Konski
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Sibal
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wyman

NAYS—136

Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Aspinall
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Chelf
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Finnegan
Flood
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Holland
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Karsten
Karth
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Lankford
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McFall
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Matthews
Mills
Minish
Morgan
Morrison
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Passman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Pilcher
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rooney, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Senner
Sheppard
Sickles
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Weltner
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Mathias
Morse
Tupper

NOT VOTING—153

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, N. Dak.
Auchincloss
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Bass
Becker
Belcher
Bolling
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Colmer
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derounian
Devine
Diggs
Donohue
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Evins
Fascell
Fino
Flynt
Foreman
Forrester
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodell
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Hall
Harris
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Lloyd
McCulloch
McDowell
McIntire
McLoskey
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morris
Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Philbin
Powell
Purcell
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Riehlman
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
Scott
Shelley
Shipley
Short
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Stephens
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Tollefson
Trimble
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watts
Wharton
Whitten
Willis
Wydler
Younger

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Van Pelt for, with Mr. Tupper against.

Mr. Morse for, with Mr. Derounian against.

Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. Mathias against.

Mr. Becker for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. McLoskey for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. Glenn for, with Mr. Donohue against.

Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Nedzi against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. Multer against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Ryan of Michigan against.

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Gray against.

Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Lennon for, with Mr. Clark against.

Mr. Talcott for, with Mr. Moss against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Burke against.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Johnson of California against.

Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Wydler for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.

Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. Macdonald against.

Mr. Clancy for, with Mr. Randall against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Shipley against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.

Mr. Cederberg for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio, for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. Carey against.

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota for, with Mr. Burkhalter against.

Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Lesinski against.

Mr. Tollefson for, with Mr. McDowell against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Monagan against.

Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Montoya against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Moorhead against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Bass against.

Mr. Cahill for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Curtis for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Fascell against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee against.

Mr. Goodell for, with Mr. Harris against.

Mr. Teague of California for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Ostertag for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Martin of Nebraska for, with Mr. Reuss against.

Mr. Hoffman for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Rogers of Colorado against.

Mr. Foreman for, with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois against.

Mr. Siler for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Watts against.

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Gubser for, with Mr. Brown of California against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Hall for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Mr. Nelsen for, with Mr. Slack against.

Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Dague for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Hutchinson for, with Mrs. Kelly against.

Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Kunkel for, with Mr. Flynt against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Kastenmeier against.

Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Jones of Alabama against.

Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mrs. Kee against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Murray against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins with Mr. Forrester.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Roberts of Texas.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Grant.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Purcell.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. DEROUNIAN. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. VAN PELT. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. MCCULLOCH. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 875, making supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, after line 15, insert:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"Payments to school districts

"For an additional amount for 'payments to school districts', $216,204,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. LAIRD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of this week the House passed a supplemental appropriation bill containing some $42 million to carry on the new comprehensive program to combat mental retardation which was authorized in two acts passed by the House and agreed to by the Senate this year. This supplemental appropriation bill was limited to funding the mental retardation program so that this program could be effective immediately.

The Senate in considering this yesterday added $216 million, for schools in federally impacted areas, for which no budget request was submitted by the President of the United States. Earlier today—in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 25400—I made a statement here on the floor of the House urging the President of the United States to submit a budget request for the impacted areas program under Public Law 874, and also funds for the National Defense Education Act student loan program. I also called the White House urging that the President sign a letter transmitting these two funding requests. These programs were both signed into law by President Johnson with a great deal of fanfare and publicity. Many people gained the impression he strongly favored these programs, but no budget request has been submitted by him so that they can be carried out. This is a strange situation.

I had a conversation yesterday with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. He advised me that both of these requests had been forwarded to the White House and awaited the President's signature.

Also I was interested in reading what a Member of the other body had to say in a hearing on last Wednesday on this subject. He said:

> I thought that by all means this item should come in this particular bill and we could wait very properly for the facilities under Public Law 815 which also was extended for 2 years. I think I was stating the attitude of all four of the Senators who had discussed this matter this morning.
>
> I also stated, Mr. Chairman, that I had talked yesterday on behalf of all of us to the Budget Bureau and to the White House and found that the Budget Bureau had completed its work on this matter and that their recommendation was on the White House desk for action if the President saw fit to take action immediately upon the signing of the authorization bill which was also on his desk and scheduled for signature this morning.

As of this hour the President has not requested any funds for the National Defense Education Act student loan program, nor has he requested funding for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas.

It seems to me that in view of the fact that the Chief Executive has rejected the Bureau of the Budget proposal for funding at this time we should not agree to the Senate amendment until we at least know his reasons for not requesting funds. So far as I know he has not even indicated why he is opposed to the requests of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which have the support of the Bureau of the Budget. To me this inaction is just incomprehensible.

It seems to me that if we agree to the program for assistance to schools in impacted areas now without the funding for the student loan program, it would be months before the funding for the student loan program would be made available. The funding for the student loan program is most important because there are many thousands of students that will be awaiting and needing these funds early in January. It seems to me the White House has made a grave error in not signing the letter of transmittal requested by the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of HEW. In view of this, I must object to the request at this time in hopes that such a letter of transmittal vill be received from the President before this Congress adjourns.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speakers' table House Joint Resolution 875, making supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. LAIRD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I raise the same objection to this request. The letter of transmittal with regard to the funds for the student loan program and assistance to schools in federally impacted areas has not been received from the President. It seems to me that before we adjourn this Congress we should insist that that letter of transmittal on the student loan program be submitted by the President of the United States. The student loan program is the most pressing funding need facing educational programs. Going to conference without such a funding request would be a grave error. Therefore, I will object to going to conference until the request of the President can be presented and considered by the conference committee. This is our last chance to secure funds for the student loan program. I direct attention of the House to my remarks made earlier today—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 25400.

Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances I must object to going to conference at this time.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution—House Joint Resolution 875—making supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and disagree to the amendment of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, was a motion to reconsider the vote just taken on the motion to recommit tabled?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which action was taken on the motion to recommit the conference report on H.R. 9499 making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. WHITTEN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 6754), an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes which was ordered printed:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1088)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6754) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 32, 45, 46, and 47.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 6, 17, 25, 29, 31, 35, 40, and 44, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$45,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$91,496,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$64,449,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,931,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert $39,363,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert $41,633,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,725,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$67,295,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,272,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$98,339,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$63,607,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,622,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,912,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,290,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$45,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,699,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$106,549,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,973,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,247,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$38,925,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,080,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,505,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 7, 9, 11, 24, 27, and 38.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
WALT HORAN,
ROBERT H. MICHEL
(except as to amendment No. 37),
Managers on the Part of the House.

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6754) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service

Amendment Nos. 1 and 4.—Salaries and expenses: Eliminate House language providing for marketing research as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree that quality research could be appropriately conducted under the Agricultural Research Service as indicated by the Department.

Amendment Nos. 2 and 3.—Salaries and expenses: Authorize construction or improvement of three buildings at $45,000 each in lieu of five at $40,000 as proposed by the House and two at $50,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5.—Research: Appropriates $91,496,700 instead of $94,045,000 as proposed by the House and $91,811,700 as proposed by the Senate. The final amount is $315,000 below the Senate recommendation and is a net reduction of $2,548,300 below the House bill.

The appropriation proposed includes increases above the House bill as follows: additional pay act costs, $563,000; staffing and operating farm research laboratories already in operation where the need is greatest, $100,000; animal parasite research, $50,000; watershed hydrology research, $100,000; equipping ($400,000) and staffing ($280,000) of Fargo, N. Dak. laboratory; research on varietal decline of sugar cane, $100,000; research on harvesting sugar cane, $100,000; research on nosema disease in bees, $37,500; soybean production research, $100,000; sugarbeet production research, $125,000; research on corn, $25,000; staffing of Sydney, Mont., laboratory, $12,500; soil and water conservation research at East Franklin and Sleepers River, $25,000; research on cold hardiness ($75,000) and harvesting aids ($25,000) for citrus; bee research, Laramie, Wyo., $12,500; horticultural research, Cheyenne, Wyo., $37,500; strawberry research in Oregon, $12,500; safflower research, $12,500; research on dried peas and lentils, $6,200; improve road, Newell, S. Dak., $15,000; research on control of marshland mosquitoes, $100,000; research on cereal leaf beetle, $50,000; tobacco research, $25,000; research on harvesting aids for Kona coffee, $12,500.

These increases are more than offset by the transfer of $4,950,000 contained in the House bill for marketing research to the Agricultural Marketing Service appropriations.

The amount recommended also includes the following funds for items approved by the House and stricken by the Senate: peanut quality research at New Orleans, $200,000; research at existing facilities as follows: Flue-cured tobacco in North Carolina, $200,000; burley and dark tobacco, $200,000; wheat and wheat products, $200,000; cotton $200,000; and corn and other grains, $200,000.

Amendment No. 6.—Research: Eliminates House language providing funds for a Peanut Research Laboratory in Georgia. This item has been removed from this bill without prejudice. The managers on the part of the House agree to include an appropriation for this purpose in the amount of $600,000 in the first supplemental appropriation bill for the coming year or the next regular appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, whichever provides the first opportunity for action by Congress.

Amendment No. 7.—Research: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide $15 million for research, surveys, planning and construction of facilities as follows:

Expanded utilization research	$5, 000, 000
Additional construction, including conversion of pilot plant, at Peoria Laboratory	4, 500, 000
Construction, alteration and equipment for the New Orleans, Albany, and Wyndmoor Laboratories, $1,500,000 each	4, 500, 000
Enlarging and modernizing existing research facilities, $250,000 each for Weslaco Fruit and Vegetable Laboratory, Olustee Naval Stores Laboratory, and Stoneville Ginning Laboratory	750, 000
Survey, determination of need, and planning of additional research facilities as may be required for utilization research in the Southeast, and weed control research, not to exceed	250,000
Total	15, 000, 000

Amendment No. 8.—Plant and animal disease and pest control: Appropriates $64,449,000 instead of $59,505,000 as proposed by the House and $67,071,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes $395,000 for additional pay costs; $2,750,000 for screwworm eradication; $200,000 for plant quarantine inspection; $600,000 for eradicating hog cholera; $74,000 for pesticide regulation; and $500,000 for eradication of fire-ant.

In addition, $125,000 is provided to evaluate the efficiency of plant pest control programs and to test the effect of residues on nontarget organisms such as people and wildlife. This will enable the Department to undertake activities recommended by the President's Science Advisory Committee in its report "The Use of Pesticides." In this connection, the Department is directed to work in close cooperation with officials of other agencies in the conduct of joint programs and to take such steps as are necessary to carry out its assigned role in this very important area. The conferees recommend further that a high-level commission or board be established to evaluate and make final determinations as to the use of pesticides for pest control purposes. The Department of Agriculture should be adequately represented on such a board.

Also, $300,000 is provided for eradication of sheep scabies. This amount, to be matched from local sources, is to be used for the purposes for which appropriated. Also, the Department is to explore the feasibility of dipping sheep moved in interstate commerce as a control measure and to prevent reinfestation.

The general reduction of $750,000 is to be applied to the several programs financed under this appropriation item, including the increases discussed above.

Amendment No. 9.—Plant and animal disease and pest control: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment requiring 50 percent matching of funds used for screwworm eradication. The conferees have agreed to the Senate language with the understanding that State and local sources will be given full credit for all funds heretofore and hereafter contributed to the program.

Amendment No. 10.—Meat inspection: Appropriates $27,931,000 instead of $27,638,000 as proposed by the House and $28,126,250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11.—Salaries and expenses (Special Foreign Currency Program): Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment, the amount of the appropriation to be $1,250,000 instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Cooperative State Experiment Station Service

Amendment Nos. 12 and 13.—Payments and expenses: Appropriates $41,633,000 instead of $40,383,000 as proposed by the House and $42,883,000 as proposed by the Senate. It is the intent of the conferees to provide for the Federal share of salary increases for the balance of the fiscal year. In addition to the regular work of the land-grant colleges, the conferees recognize that research for other Federal agencies is also an important contribution of these institutions. They concur in the statements of the two Houses which request reports on research contracts and grants entered into beginning with fiscal year 1964.

Extension Service

Amendment Nos. 14 and 15.—Payments to States and Puerto Rico: Appropriate $67,295,000 instead of $64,590,000 as proposed by the House and $70,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16.—Retirement costs for extension agents: Appropriates $7,272,500 instead of $7,110,000 as proposed by the House and $7,435,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Farmer Cooperative Service

Amendment No. 17.—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,201,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,195,000 as proposed by the House.

Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 18.—Conservation operations: Appropriates $98,339,000 instead of $97,480,000 as proposed by the House and $99,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes $839,000 for additional pay increases. The conferees direct that soil survey reports be published within the amount of funds provided, exclusive of the $20,000 additional which shall be available to strengthen existing facilities.

Amendment No. 19.—Watershed protection: Appropriates $63,607,000 instead of $63,222,000 as proposed by the House and $63,992,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to includes $5,446,000 for planning of new watersheds. The conferees have agreed that States should be encouraged to contribute as much as possible for this activity, regardless of Federal appropriations.

The conferees concur in the Senate language calling on the Bureau of the Budget to give fuller review and coordination to river basin surveys. They are also concerned about the declining local share of the cost of constructing watershed projects and urge Department officials to require more adequate local contributions, more in line with the intent of the original act.

Amendment No. 20.—Great Plains Conservation Program: Appropriates $13,622,000 instead of $12,994,000 as proposed by the House and $14,640,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase, $28,000 is included for additional pay costs and $600,000 is included for cost sharing assistance.

Amendment No. 21.—Resource conservation and development: Appropriates $1,500,000 instead of $1,200,000 as proposed by the House and $2,200,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the appropriate committees of Congress should be kept advised of each proposed activity under this program in advance of commitment.

Economic Research Service

Amendment No. 22.—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $9,912,000 instead of $9,832,000 as proposed by the House and $9,965,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Statistical Reporting Service

Amendment No. 23.—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $11,290,500 instead of $11,079,000 as proposed by the House and $11,486,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes $49,000 for additional pay costs, $100,000 to extend the long-range program, and $62,500 for additional cattle-on-feed reports for the balance of the fiscal year. Additional requirements for cattle-on-feed reports will be considered in connection with the 1965 budget. Adequate funds have been provided to enable the Department to continue all reports now being furnished.

Amendment No. 24.—Marketing research and service: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $42,498,975 instead of $37,061,000 as proposed by the House and $44,514,100 as proposed by the Senate. The increase above the House bill includes $4,985,675 for marketing research; $50,000 for quality research on field packed lettuce and citrus; $333,000 for additional marketing service pay costs; $50,000 for poultry inspection; $11,800 for reimbursement to employee's compensation fund; and $7,500 for a cooperative market news service in Louisiana.

The Department is requested to make a full study of the possible use of State inspection organizations to hold down the cost as well as to prevent duplication of poultry inspection.

Amendment No. 25.—Payments to States and possessions: Appropriates $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,425,000 as proposed by the House.

School lunch program: For the first time, funds for cash payments and section 6 commodity purchases are based on a rate of 5 cents per meal on the average for the number of meals expected to be served during the school year. In addition, $2,070,000 has been included for administrative purposes.

Amendment No. 26.—Section 32: Authorizes the use of $45 million for the food stamp program instead of $40 million as proposed by the House and $51,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27.—Section 32: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide $16 million instead of $25 million as provided in the House bill. Of this amount, $11 million shall remain available for construction and equipping of research facilities determined to be needed, including $9,500,000 for a utilization research laboratory in the Southeast and $1,500,000 for a weed control research laboratory. It is agreed that any new utilization laboratory shall not be used for quality research on peanuts.

Foreign Agricultural Service

Amendment No. 28.—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $18,699,500 instead of $18,505,000 as proposed by the House and $19,039,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase includes $41,000 for additional pay costs; $58,000 for international agricultural affairs; $14,000 for export programs; and $81,500 for commodity programs. The conferees request the Department to more closely supervise the use of market development funds for travel and other purposes.

Commodity Exchange Authority

Amendment No. 29.—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,095,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,093,000 as proposed by the House.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

Amendment No. 30.—Expenses: Appropriates $106,549,500 instead of $105,737,000 as proposed by the House and $107,091,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31.—Expenses: Approves language proposed by the Senate to restrict the use of funds for employees and committeemen for certain purposes.

Amendment No. 32.—Agricultural conservation program: Restores House language restricting use of funds for drainage of wetlands. In view of the action of the conferees, they instruct the Departments of Agriculture and Interior to expedite the implementation of action on types 1 and 2 where necessary to permit desirable drainage to proceed without unnecessary delay.

Amendment No. 33.—Land-Use Adjustment Program: Appropriates $11,350,000 instead of $10 million as proposed by the House and $12,150,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that, in the absence of legislation expanding the pilot program for 1964, expenditures in fiscal year 1964 will be held to the 1963 level of operation and financed through direct appropriation.

Office of the General Counsel

Amendment No. 34.—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $3,973,500 instead of $3,953,000 as proposed by the House and $3,987,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Agricultural Library

Amendment No. 35.—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,426,140 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,420,000 as proposed by the House.

General administration

Amendment No. 36.—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $3,750,000 instead of $3,735,000 as proposed by the House and $3,760,550 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement that, beginning with fiscal 1965, separate budget requests for the Office of Inspector General and for the Office of Management Services shall be submitted to the appropriations committees and justified separately, and corresponding reductions shall be made in agencies from which transfers are made. For fiscal 1964, the expenditures of the Office of Inspector General shall not exceed $9,883,000 and for the Office of Management Services shall not exceed $2,314,000. In addition thereto, increased costs in fiscal 1964 resulting from the pay act shall be held to the same level as pay act increases for the agencies from which these offices have transferred funds in fiscal 1964.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendment No. 37.—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $11,247,000 instead of $11,162,000 as proposed by the House and $11,287,000 as proposed by the Senate. Regulations, including changes, to carry out provisions in the reports of the House and Senate Committees shall be printed in the Federal Register within 90 days of enactment of this act.

The managers on the part of the House disagree with the statements in the Senate report on pages 28 and 29 which require the Administrator (1) to certify to the Comptroller General and the Congress and (2) to give notice of applications to the committees 60 days in advance of approval. They agree that any REA cooperative which is an applicant for a generation or transmission loan shall be made a party to any subsequent negotiations between the Administrator and the power supplier on contract arrangements.

Amendment No. 38.—Rural housing loans: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $25 million for rural housing loans instead of providing it as additional borrowing authority as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39.—Rural renewal: Appropriates $1,200,000 instead of $1 million as proposed by the House and $1,350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40.—Rural housing for the elderly revolving fund: Appropriates $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2 million as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41.—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $38,925,900 instead of $38,367,000 as proposed by the House and $39,367,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provides $339,500 for additional pay costs; $205,000 for administration of loan programs; and $14,400 to reimburse employees compensation fund.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

Amendment No. 42.—Administrative and operating expenses: Appropriates $7,080,000 instead of $6,950,000 as proposed by the House and $7,210,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43.—Federal Crop Insurance Corporation fund: Provides for the use of $3,505,000 of premium income for administrative and operating expenses instead of $3,530,000 as proposed by the House and $3,480,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 44.—Reimbursement for net realized losses: Appropriates $2,699,400,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,500 million as proposed by the House.

Foreign assistance programs

Amendment Nos. 45 and 46.—Public Law 480: Appropriate $1,452 million for title I sales and $52,515,000 for title IV contracts as proposed by the House instead of $1,252 million for title I and $79 million for title IV as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47.—International Wheat Agreement: Appropriates $86,218,000 as proposed by the House instead of $92,356,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Jamie L. Whitten,
William H. Natcher,
Clarence Cannon,
Walt Horan,
Robert H. Michel
(except as to amendment No. 37),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6754) an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see above.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, this represents the agreement between the House and the Senate on the Agriculture Appropriation bill for the present fiscal year, 1964.

There are quite a number of items in this report, but we have reached an agreement as is pointed out in the statement on all items, including those that were in controversy last year. The so-called peanut laboratory item is carried over without prejudice and that matter will come up early in the next session.

At that time we can consider that matter. The conference report is about $144,384,785 below the budget estimates. As we all know, this is the bill that carries funds for meat inspection, research, school lunches, price supports, and all of the other programs of the Department of Agriculture.

A summary of amounts included in the budget estimates, the House bill, the Senate bill, and the conference report is as follows:

Agriculture Department appropriation bill, 1964

Title	Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill	Conference report	Conference report compared with—		
					Budget	House	Senate
Title I—General activities	$1,582,417,000	$1,530,934,000	$1,564,207,340	$1,548,973,315	−$33,443,685	+$18,039,315	−$15,234,025
Title II—Credit agencies	58,061,000	52,529,000	55,504,000	79,872,900	+21,811,900	+27,343,900	+24,368,900
Title III—Corporations	2,806,610,000	2,506,950,000	2,706,610,000	2,706,480,000	−100,130,000	+199,530,000	−130,000
Title IV—Foreign assistance programs	1,921,667,000	1,889,044,000	1,721,667,000	1,889,044,000	−32,623,000		+167,377,000
Total	6,368,755,000	5,979,457,000	6,047,988,340	6,224,370,215	−144,384,785	+244,913,215	+176,381,875

Mr. Speaker, unless there are some questions, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the conference report.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The conference report was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 3, line 17, after "$91,115,000" strike out the remainder of line 17 and all of lines 18 through 25 and insert: "*Provided*, That, in addition, not to exceed $35,000,000 may be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation to this appropriation, in accordance with the Act of June 29, 1948 (15 U.S.C. 714b), for utilization research and development, cost of production research, and other related research designed to reduce surplus commodities held or to be held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and such amounts as are required for the construction, alteration, and equipping of research facilities for utilization research and development shall remain available until expended: *Provided further,*".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Whitten moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted and stricken by said amendment insert: ": *Provided*, That, in addition, not to exceed $15,000,000 may be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation to this appropriation, in accordance with the Act of June 29, 1948 (5 U.S.C. 714), for utilization research and development, cost of production research, and other related research designed to reduce surplus commodities held or to be held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, including $10,000,000 for the planning, construction, alteration, and equipping of research facilities, which amount shall remain available until expended."

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 5, line 9, insert: ": *Provided further*, That no funds shall be available for carrying out the screwworm eradication program that does not require minimum matching by State or local sources of at least 50 per centum of the expenses of production, irradiation, and release of the screwworm flies: *Provided further,*".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Whitten moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. It is rather late, so excuse me if I have the wrong directions. It seems to me we have been getting wrong directions lately, and I would like to straighten them out. Do I understand that this is a second motion to recede from a position that the House has previously taken on a piece of legislation that passed this House?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is. It is a technical matter, may I say.

Mr. DENT. Well, it was a very serious technical matter awhile ago, and I heard some very patriotic speeches about the will of the House and how we ought to stand behind the position of the House, but it seems that the convenience of doing what certain groups want done can change our position as quick as we can flick a twist of the wrist.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 6, line 16, insert:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

"For purchase of foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for market development research authorized by section 104(a) and for agricultural and forestry research and other functions related thereto authorized by section 104(k) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(a)(k)), to remain available until expended, $2,500,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available, in addition to other appropriations for these purposes, for the purchase of the foregoing currencies: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be used to purchase such foreign currencies as the Department determines are needed and can be used most effectively to carry out the purposes of this paragraph, and such foreign currencies shall, pursuant to the provisions of section 104(a), be set aside for sale to the Department before foreign currencies which accrue under said title I are made available for other United States uses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $25,000 of this appropriation shall be available for purchase of foreign currencies for expenses of employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a)."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Whitten moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $2,500,000 named in said amendment insert: "$1,250,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 16, line 14, strike out lines 14 through 26 and lines 1 through 3 on page 17 and insert:

"MARKETING SERVICES

"For expenses necessary to carry on services related to agricultural marketing and distribution as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621–1627) and other laws, including the administration of marketing regulatory acts connected therewith and for administration and coordination of payments to States; and this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), and not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for employment at rates not to exceed $75 per diem under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in carrying out section 201(a) to 201(d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1291) and section 203(j) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946; $37,061,000.

"MARKETING RESEARCH AND SERVICE

"For expenses necessary to carry on research and service to improve and develop marketing and distribution relating to agriculture as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621–1627) and other laws, including the administration of marketing regulatory acts connected therewith; research and development, including related cost and efficiency evaluations, and services relating to agricultural marketing and distribution, for carrying out regulatory acts connected therewith, and for administration and coordination of payments to States; and this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), and not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for employment at rates not to exceed $75 per diem under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) in carrying out section 201(a) to 201(d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1291) and section 203(j) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, $44,514,100, of which $1,600,000 is to remain available until expended for the construction of a peanut quality research facility and the acquisition of the necessary land therefor by donation: *Provided*, That research investigations undertaken at the national peanut quality evaluation laboratory must be truly national in scope and must give equivalent treatment to the different types of peanuts produced and marketed in the major peanut producing areas: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 565a for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided, the cost of erecting any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $20,000, except for one building to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $50,000, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $7,500 or 7.5 per centum of the cost of the building, whichever is greater."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Whitten moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted and stricken by said amendment insert:

"MARKETING RESEARCH AND SERVICE

"For expenses necessary to carry on research and service to improve and develop marketing and distribution relating to agriculture as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621–1627) and other laws, including the administration of marketing regulatory acts connected therewith; research and development, including related cost and efficiency evaluations, and services relating to agricultural marketing and distribution, for carrying out regulatory acts connected therewith, and for administration and coordination of payment to States; and this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), and not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for employment at rates not to exceed $75 per diem under section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) in carrying out section 201(a) to 201(d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1291) and section 203(j) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, $42,498,975: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 565a for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided, the cost of erecting any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $20,000, except for one building to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $45,000, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed $7,500 or 7.5 per centum of the cost of the building, whichever is greater.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 20, strike out: ", and (5) not more than $25,000,000 for transfer to the Commodity Credit Corporation to be used to increase domestic consumption of any farm commodity or farm commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply and hereafter such sums as may be approved by the Congress shall be available for such purpose.".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Whitten moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted and stricken by said amendment insert: ", and (5) not more than $16,000,000 for transfer to the Commodity Credit Corporation to be used to increase domestic consumption of any farm commodity or farm commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply, and hereafter such sums (not in excess of $25,000,000 in any one year) as may be approved by the Congress shall be available for such purpose, such authorization not to restrict authority in existing law, of which amount $11,000,000 shall remain available until expended for construction and equipping of research facilities determined to be needed as a result of a special survey.".

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38, page 31, line 14, insert:

"RURAL HOUSING LOANS

"For rural housing loans, $25,000,000, to be made available in addition to and in the same manner and under the terms and conditions applicable to funds provided under section 511 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended.".

Mr. **WHITTEN.** Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"RURAL HOUSING LOANS

"For additional rural housing loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. **WHITTEN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the conference report in the RECORD and to include tables.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **MICHEL.** Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that this conference report is $244,912,215 over and above the bill passed by the House, which brings the total to $6,224,370,214, or $144,384,785 less than the budget figure.

Frankly, I wish that we could have made a more respectable showing in our reduction, but in all fairness it should be pointed out that $1,889,044,000 is for title 4, foreign assistance programs. This is one big reason why I continue to vote against even the pared down figure of the foreign operations subcommittee bill.

As the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has pointed out earlier during consideration of the foreign aid bill, there are a number of additional expenditures over and above his regular foreign aid bill, and this is one of the big ones.

I should like to point out also that $2,706,480,000 of this agriculture appropriation is for reimbursement of Commodity Credit Corporation for sustained losses in the past year—an astronomical figure.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I should just like it to be known for the record that I signed the conference report with one exception and that is amendment No. 37, having to do with the Rural Electrification Administration. Personally, I believe the language in the Senate report is stronger than that of the House and that it has several very meritorious features. I will say, however, that our House report this year was the strongest it has ever been and it would be my fervent hope that those responsible for administering the rural electrification program would take heed to what the Congress says, for we have proved conclusively in both bodies that our warnings in the past have not been ill founded.

Mr. Speaker, our subcommittee has worked long and hard to arrive at an acceptable compromise and while we cannot have everything our way, it is my feeling that the House position has been upheld in fine fashion by the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] and my own ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and in view of the lateness of the hour, urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. **WHITTEN.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on this report.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 18, 1963.
Hon. JOHN F. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please consider this my formal resignation from the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress in which I have served as the Member from California's Fifth District. This resignation is to be effective at 11:59 p.m., January 7, 1964. As you know, the reason for this resignation is that I have been honored by the people of my native city who have chosen me to be their mayor.

Taking leave of the U.S. Congress after having had the privilege to serve with you and all my other colleagues, leaves me with mixed emotions. Allow me through you to thank all those with whom I have served for their many kindnesses, for their cooperation, and above all for the privilege of knowing and working with them.

I look forward to seeking your advice and counsel in the pursuit of my new duties to the end that I may better serve the people of San Francisco.

With every best wish, I am,
Sincerely,
JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Member of Congress.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN

Mr. **STRATTON.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **STRATTON.** Mr. Speaker, one of the really great citizens of our time passed away in New York City the other day, Herbert H. Lehman, former Governor of New York and former U.S. Senator from New York.

At the time of his death Governor Lehman was 85. He had lived, to be sure, a full and distinguished life. He had earned a quiet and peaceful retirement. Yet until the day of his death, Governor Lehman never lost his interest in forward-looking and progressive government, and he remained an active leader and counselor in the political and civic life of our State, and a source of inspiration to millions of Americans everywhere.

Characteristically, Governor Lehman was engaged in preparing to travel to Washington to receive from President Johnson the Nation's highest civilian award, the Medal of Freedom, when the end came.

No one more richly deserved this recognition for distinguished service to his country and to humanity.

In many ways, Mr. Speaker, Governor Lehman was the antithesis of the popular impression of a successful politician. He was not a gladhander. He was not a spellbinder on the podium. And yet Herbert H. Lehman was one of the most successful votegetters in the history of New York State politics. What was his secret? Simply a profound sincerity and personal integrity that came across loud and clear to every man and woman in the State—here was a man who really cared, here was a man who said what he believed and believed what he said, here was a man you could truly have full and complete confidence in. Monumentally unconcerned with what we refer to these days as a political "image," Herbert H. Lehman was nonetheless the very embodiment of that rare combination of courage, strength, independence, and humanity which comprise the real leader of men par excellence.

Mr. Speaker, Herbert H. Lehman died only a few days after the tragic death of John F. Kennedy. It is most fitting that today we should be mourning them together, because together they fought for the same kind of tolerant, rational, and progressive America. And with both of them our greatest tribute would be to strive harder than ever before to carry through to completion the work for which they dedicated their lives.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF THE SPEAKER

Mr. **WICKERSHAM.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WICKERSHAM.** Mr. Speaker, I know all the Members are tired, but I take pleasure in calling attention of the Members to the fact that this is the Speaker's birthday.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

TO PRINT FOR THE USE OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS CERTAIN INFORMATION ON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. **FRIEDEL.** Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 67 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works not to exceed two thousand additional copies of the hearings on water pollution control, S. 649, and related bills, by the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution during the current session of Congress.

The resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF COMPILATIONS OF MATERIALS RELATING TO ANNUAL NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE DEBATE TOPICS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up S. 2311 to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college debate topics, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to prepare compilations of pertinent excerpts, bibliographical references, and other appropriate materials relating to (1) the subject selected annually by the National University Extension Association as the national high school debate topic and (2) the subject selected annually by the American Speech Association as the national college debate topic. In preparing such compilations the Librarian shall include materials which in his judgment are representative of, and give equal emphasis to, the opposing points of view on the respective topics.

SEC. 2. The compilations on the high school debate topics shall be printed as Senate documents and the compilations on the college debate topics shall be printed as House documents, the cost of which shall be charged to the congressional allotment for printing and binding. Additional copies of such documents may be printed in such quantities and distributed in such manner as the Joint Committee on Printing directs.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIRTHDAY OF THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, is it really true that this is your birthday? If it is, I am sure on behalf of all of us on both sides of the aisle we want to wish you many, many happy years of life and success. Now, by that I do not mean exactly that we want you to be Speaker forever. I say this because we on this side of the aisle have a few ambitions in that regard ourselves.

But let me just say that, through a long day and a long night, you have again demonstrated your fairness and your great capacity to preside over this House of Representatives with that dignity and patience we all admire.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

TRIBUTE TO THE SPEAKER ON HIS 72D BIRTHDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have been preempted for about the fourth time in the effort I had hoped to initiate which was to wish you a happy birthday. We had planned tentatively to postpone these good wishes until noon today. But in view of the very fine tribute paid you by our distinguished minority leader, I think it would be in order to continue the discussion of this subject at this time.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that on this day when you are 72 years young you are the most admired, respected legislative leader in our country.

I think this is an appropriate occasion on which to pay the great man who presides over this House a brief word of tribute.

JOHN McCORMACK has demonstrated those unique qualities of mind, heart, and character which are essential to the speakership. First of all, as the minority leader has said, the Speaker has been eminently fair at all times. I am sure every Member of the House will agree with me that he has presided with utmost impartiality and with devoted consideration for the rights not only of the majority party and the minority party, but of every individual Member of the House.

The Speaker has had long experience as a legislator. He adds to that his boundless energy, his keen mind and his deep understanding of the responsibilities of this House. This year in particular we have seen him draw daily upon his great powers throughout what has been one of the longest and most adruous peacetime sessions in the history of the House of Representatives.

In the midst of issues as controversial and as complex as any upon which this House has ever had to pass judgment, in the face of frustrations necessarily attendant to the resolution of such issues, he has manifested a degree of patience seldom seem in human beings.

He has shown that unshakable resolve to do and to complete his job, and the results will be remembered long after those impatient, uninformed, and transient critics have passed into oblivion.

Under the leadership of Speaker McCORMACK we have written a great record this year and as a result the 88th Congress will go down in history as outstanding.

JOHN McCORMACK has long been an illustrious Member of the House. He has served with unusual distinction as Member, whip, leader, and Speaker. He has met all the tests of leadership. His colleagues have seen him in action in time of war and in time of peace, in depression and in prosperity. They have seen him face up to issue after issue while under fire year in and year out. They have long known his mettle. Knowing him, they have bestowed upon him the highest tribute within their power to give.

No greater honor, indeed, Mr. Speaker, has any group of men to bestow upon a fellow man. There is no higher honor on earth than the office which our Speaker holds. There is no more important office in the legislative halls of the world than the speakership of the House. There is no man that ever occupied this office with more fairness, with greater determination, with greater understanding, and greater manifestation of the historic mission of his high position than JOHN McCORMACK.

It is, therefore, Mr. Speaker, with a sense of personal pride that I join in wishing you a happy birthday.

WHAT CONGRESS DID THIS SESSION

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I think the finest method of complimenting the Speaker on his birthday is to include the legislative record of the 1st session of the 88th Congress. I therefore include with these remarks a newspaper article from the Washington Evening Star of today entitled, "What Congress Did This Session." It reads as follows:

THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD—WHAT CONGRESS DID THIS SESSION

The 1st session of the 88th Congress took the following actions in enacting legislation, disapproving bills or leaving measures for further moves in the 2d session beginning January 9:

ENACTED INTO LAW

Higher education aid providing $1.2 billion for construction of academic facilities at public and private colleges and universities; $1.5 billion for vocational education programs, extension of National Defense Education Act and assistance to impacted areas; $175 million for expansion and improvement in medical and other health professions training.

A $3.6 billion authorization for economic and military assistance to foreign countries.

Ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty by the Senate.

Increased outlays for mental health programs.

A $527 million manpower development and training program.

Continuation and expansion of the Peace Corps.

Extension of the draft law to July 1, 1967.

Requirement for equal pay for women and men employed in essentially the same work.

Legislation to avert threatened railroad strike.

Pay raise bill for the armed services.

One-year extension of the Civil Rights Commission.

A series of increases in the temporary national debt limit to $315 billion.

Another 1-year continuation of Korean war excise taxes and corporation income tax rate to avoid $2 billion drop in Treasury revenues.

Revision of the Silver Purchase Act to permit issuance of $1 bills as Federal Reserve notes.

Coordination and development of recreation programs.

Apply Federal court jurisdiction to U.S. citizens charged with committing offenses abroad.

Honorary U.S. citizenship for Sir Winston Churchill.

Authority to mint 50-cent coins in commemoration of President Kennedy.

Permit returning travelers to bring duty-free goods up to $100, instead of $500, into this country.

Authorization for programs of housing for the elderly.

Additional funds for air pollution control programs.

Funds authorized for 11 river basin and flood control projects.

Establishment of seat belt safety standards.

Stabilization bill to help small producers of lead and zinc.

Requirement that various kinds of imported products and goods bear labels identifying country of origin.

Funds for Philippine war damage claims, with ban on payment to certain lawyers.

Increased allowances for telephone, telegram, stationery, and postage expenses for House Members.

Free mail privilege for House Members to send "occupant" mail to otherwise unnamed recipients in their congressional districts.

Provision for office staff, free mail privileges, and Secret Service protection for Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy.

PASSED ONLY BY HOUSE

Tax bill with $11 billion estimated reduction.

Fallout shelter construction bill.

Cotton subsidy bill to enable mills in this country to compete with imports from abroad.

Stricter regulation of congressional travel to foreign countries. And control over expense accounting and publication.

Tighter requirements for National Security Administration hiring and firing of employees.

Apply the sedition law to acts against the United States by American citizens abroad.

Life tenure for judges of the United States Court of Military Appeals.

Provide for 4,500 maximum enrollment at Military and Air Force Academies to conform with Naval Academy strength.

Increase in per diem pay for grand and petit jurors in Federal courts.

Authorize Medal of Honor awards for servicemen in the cold war.

Ban creation of new Government departments in connection with extension of the Reorganization Act.

Several District of Columbia bills including proposed Uniform Commercial Code, permission to use "reasonable force" corporal punishment on school pupils, suspension or dismissal of unruly pupils, and authority for Metropolitan Police to use more man-dog teams.

PASSED ONLY BY SENATE

Mass transportation bill.

Wilderness preservation bill.

Youth employment bill.

Water resources research fund increase.

Creation of a Senate-House Committee on Federal Budget.

A 15-year tenure for the FBI Director.

Additional $455 million for area redevelopment programs.

National Service Corps bill.

Public defenders for indigent defendants in Federal courts.

Ban on location of foreign chanceries in certain District neighborhoods.

Designation of the proposed National Cultural Center as the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

DEFEATED OR SHELVED

House defeated a $455 million Area Redevelopment Act extension bill; a 2-year extension of the Mexican Farm Labor Act but subsequently agreed to a 1-year extension; a Reserve Officers Training Corps reorganization measure, and bills for a District transit and subway project study and for greater power for the Alcoholic Beverages Control Board.

Senate voted against changing its rules to require a three-fifths instead of two-thirds majority to curb debate. The vote was 54 to 42 but fell 10 votes short of a necessary two-thirds majority.

Senate rejected a move for action at this time on proposed modernization of its rules and procedures.

House Rules Committee heard but tabled or took no action on bills to abolish Committee on Un-American Activities, divide the Education and Labor Committee into two committees, allow radio-TV coverage of House committee sessions, and ban the so-called back-door spending method of Treasury borrowings to finance various Federal programs.

CLEARED BY COMMITTEES

Far-reaching civil rights legislation, approved by the House Judiciary Committee and scheduled for Rules Committee hearings beginning January 9.

Public defender bill, similar to measure passed by the Senate, was approved by the House Judiciary Committee and cleared by Rules Committee for scheduled House action in January.

A bill naming the National Cultural Center the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts has been cleared by the House Rules Committee for expected House concurrence with Senate in January.

The tax reduction bill passed by the House awaits Senate Finance Committee action, perhaps by February.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, December 13, I was absent on official business and was therefore unrecorded on rollcall No. 240. Had I been present I would have voted "aye." I would like the RECORD to so state.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to what he can tell us about the program for the balance of the day, if there is any day left, and what we may expect today or tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. We expect to adjourn until 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. HALLECK. Is there any possibility of having a sine die adjournment resolution tonight?

Mr. ALBERT. It all depends on the disposition of legislative business. The gentleman realizes that we still have legislative business due to the action which the House took. We are hopeful of disposing of that business, but it will be necessary that we meet at noon on the next legislative day, which starts at 12 o'clock today. We will hope to stay in session until we have disposed of the foreign aid appropriation bill.

Mr. HALLECK. I think, then, that would mean very likely we might have a vote tomorrow, or today. I am a little confused. I do not know whether it is today or tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. I would say to the gentleman that that does not rest solely with me or with the leadership or even with the House. We hope the conferees can meet, and we hope this matter can be back for disposition in the House at the earliest possible time.

Mr. HALLECK. Could I respectfully suggest that if the foreign aid appropriation bill is all we have left, and obviously we are in some difficulty about it, why not have a sine die adjournment resolution right now and take that bill up as the first order of business under the continuing resolution when we come back in January?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the disposition of this business is a matter of important urgency which should be handled in the first session of this Congress which we hope will terminate in a few days. We believe that the disposition of the matter to which the gentleman refers would have been quite different had Members been present. It is the duty of all Members to return here and complete the business of this session.

Mr. HALLECK. I would just say, Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of all of us to stay here, but on the other hand, we are all people with some family connections and some responsibilities and, of course, everyone is ready and willing to stay here to do whatever needs to be done. But I must say that many Members have airplane reservations and train reservations and at this time of the year it will be extremely difficult for them if they forfeit their reservations to obtain reservations later to go home. As far as I am concerned, I hope all the people on our side of the aisle will stay here. I will stay here through the duration. But I must say that nothing would be better for the future conduct of the business of the Congress of the United States as far as the House of Representatives is concerned than to have a sine die adjournment and come back here as we have planned on January 7. I do not know of anything under the continuing resolution that is of such overwhelming importance as to indicate that we ought to stay here any longer.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I am mindful of everything the gentleman has said, and I am sure everybody is. I am certainly hopeful that Members will get a vacation. But I cannot imagine any personal matter of a Member of the Congress that is as important as the disposition of one of the most important bills that this

House must consider in this or any other year.

Mr. HALLECK. I would just say in response to that that for the last 6 months we have been operating on foreign aid under a continuing resolution. As I said the other day, I cannot for the life of me see why 2 weeks longer makes very much difference. As a matter of fact, it has been said that the administration could do better under the continuing resolution than they could under the appropriation bill that is presently before us.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL, for the remainder of the session, on account of official business.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) from December 20 and for the balance of the session, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. KUNKEL), for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. KUNKEL), for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. POWELL.
Mr. HANSEN.
Mr. DENT.
Mr. TUPPER.
Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.
Mr. MULTER.
Mr. AVERY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MONTOYA.
Mr. CORMAN.
Mr. ALBERT.
Mr. PUCINSKI.
Mr. PIKE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KUNKEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEITH.
Mr. PELLY.
Mr. UTT.
Mr. AYRES.
Mr. CLEVELAND in two instances.
Mr. JENSEN.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 439. An act for the relief of Jose L. Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1017. An act for the relief of Angelo Coppola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1328. An act for the relief of Woo Zee-Ching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1445. An act for the relief of Archie L. Dickson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2071. An act for the relief of Nina Carmela Pirritano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2073. An act for the relief of Roza Feuer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution designating the period from January 12, 1964, to January 18, 1964, as International Printing Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late President, John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1211. An act to admit the vessels *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Herbert R. Schaff;

H.R. 1560. An act for the relief of Constantinos A. Grigoras (Gregoras);

H.R. 2292. An act for the relief for Marvin M. Greenlee;

H.R. 2364. An act for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.;

H.R. 4099. An act for the relief of Jesse Leigh, Jr.;

H.R. 4157. An act to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 4505. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and determine a motion for a new trial on the claim of Robert Alexander;

H.R. 4759. An act for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, Frank Grove, Harry P. Nash, Jr., and Michael J. Neofitou;

H.R. 5746. An act for the relief of Robert H. Bagby;

H.R. 6181. An act for the relief of Mr. Rudolph Sanderson of Meriden, Kans.;

H.R. 6468. An act for the relief of Harold J. Burke;

H.R. 6807. An act for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co., Inc.;

H.R. 7019. An act to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land and improvements in the village of Odanah, Wis., taken by the Federal Government;

H.R. 8667. An act authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins; and

H.J. Res. 680. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate 1964 as "U.S. Customs Year."

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier and Paula Bouvier;

S. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grun (Susanne Roth);

S. 1319. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents;

S. 1838. An act for the relief of Hannah Robbins; and

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week."

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on December 19, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1289. An act for the relief of Maria Mereghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina);

H.R. 2513. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2985. An act to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to venue generally;

H.R. 4062. An act to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande;

H.R. 4276. An act to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 6756. An act to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes;

H.R. 7044. An act to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission; and

H.R. 9140. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House that our dear friend and colleague, Honorable WILLIAM GREEN, passed away at 2:40 a.m. this morning. As most of us knew, BILL GREEN had been very seriously ill for some days. Even though I knew how grave his condition had become, his passing comes as a great shock.

We shall miss him greatly for he was one of our true leaders and a warm and kindly friend of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy and condolences to his widow and his children.

Mr. Speaker, a further day will be set aside for Members to offer eulogies to our distinguished and beloved colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read H. Res. 599 as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.
>
> *Resolved,* That a committee of Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.
>
> *Resolved,* That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. Morgan, Mr. Keogh, Mr. Mills, Mr. King of California, Mr. Rooney of New York, Mr. Corbett, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Dague, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Saylor, Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania, Mr. Flood, Mr. Clark, Mr. Holland, Mr. Curtin, Mr. Dent, Mr. Nix, Mr. Milliken, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Toll, Mr. Schneebeli, Mr. Whalley, Mr. Goodling, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Kunkel, Mr. McDade, Mr. Weaver, Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania, Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved,* That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon today.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m. on Saturday, December 21, 1963), the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Saturday, December 21, 1963.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1464. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs incurred for temporary storage of household goods for military personnel, Department of Defense, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2079. An act to provide for the striking of three different medals in commemoration of the Federal Hall National Memorial, Castle Clinton National Monument, and Statue of Liberty National Monument American Museum of Immigration in New York City, N.Y. ; without amendment (Rept. No. 1081). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3500. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site; with amendment (Rept. No. 1082). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 9076. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of St. Louis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1083). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 298. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; with amendment (Rept. No. 1084). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 598. A resolution waiving points of order against the conference report on the bill, H.R. 9499; without amendment (Rept. No. 1086). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 9499. A bill making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1087). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of conference. H.R. 6754. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1088). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 67. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Public Works certain information on water pollution control; without amendment (Rept. No. 1089). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. S. 2311. An act to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college debate topics; without amendment (Rept. No. 1090). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 585. An act for the relief of Agaram K. Sreekanth; without amendment (Rept. No. 1073). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1196. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Nowakowski Chandler without amendment (Rept. No. 1074). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1524. An act for the relief of Hai Yung Jung and Johnny Jung; without amendment (Rept. No. 1075). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1295. A bill for the relief of Edith and Joseph Sharon; with amendment (Rept. No. 1076). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1723. A bill for the relief of Agnese Brienza; with amendment (Rept. No. 1077). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1725. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Werner; with amendment (Rept. No. 1078). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2948. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leung Chi King; with amendment (Rept. No. 1079). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8322. A bill for the relief of John George Kostantoyannis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1080). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7821. A bill for the relief of Wladyslawa Pytlak Jarosz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1085). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 9545. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize certain provisions of law relating to veterans' pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 9546. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid as expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9547. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the basis on which pension is payable by providing that public or private retirement payments (including social security benefits) shall not be counted as income and that the income of the spouse shall be disregarded in the determination of annual income of a veteran; to eliminate the "net worth" eligibility test; and to repeal the requirement of reduction of pension during hospitalization for veterans with dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9548. A bill to prohibit banks from performing certain nonbanking services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9549. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Knights of Pythias; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 9550. A bill relating to the rate of duty on plastic containers for clinical thermometers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 9551. A bill to designate the Racine locks and dam on the Ohio River as the Chief Cornstalk locks and dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9552. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the

100th anniversary of the founding of the Knights of Pythias; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 9557. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 9558. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 879. Joint resolution calling for continuation of the naval repair facility at San Diego, Calif., as a vital adjunct to the Pacific Fleet; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution providing for printing as a House document the publication entitled "Our Flag"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEITH:

H. Res. 597. Resolution providing for printing as a House document, President Kennedy's Thanksgiving proclamation; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 9553. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maureen Fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9554. A bill for the relief of Donatas Damijonaitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9555. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Rossi Pacifico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9556. A bill for the relief of Ricardo R. Honrado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

552. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Paul D'Ortona, City Council of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa., to continue the operation of the Philadelphia Naval Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

553. Also, petition of William E. Hughes, International Lions Club, Gloucester City, N.J., urging that President Kennedy's birthday, May 29, be established as a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

554. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to publishing certain material in the Congressional Record; to the Committee on House Administration.

555. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to make an investigation of "oil money" in U.S. politics and political campaigns, especially that part of said "oil money" attributable to the infamous 27½-percent oil-depletion subsidy given oilmen and oil interests by the U.S. internal revenue laws; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Independence of Libya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 24, Libya will celebrate the 12th anniversary of her independence. We wish to take this occasion to send warm felicitations to His Majesty, King Idris I; and His Excellency, the Libyan Chargé d'affaires ad interim to the United States, Ben Jeleil.

When Libya was first proclaimed independent on Christmas Eve 12 years ago, world opinion held small hope for the rapid development, much less the continued existence, of the state. Having a per capita income estimated at $35, Libya was described as the "poorest nation on earth," "little more than a vast empty tract of the Sahara's rock and sand." Even the illiteracy was above 90 percent, with only 14 Libyan college graduates in the entire country.

By means of generous support from the United Nations, the United States, and Great Britain, the Libyan federation began its tortuous role as an independent state in the world community. The country was comprised of three Federal states, loosely joined under a central government, headed by King Idris I. Moreover, because of intense rivalry between the populous Cyrenaean and Tripolitanian units, separate Federal capitals had to be maintained in Benghazi and Tripoli, creating much duplication, confusion, and expense.

Today, the picture has changed. Almost overnight, remote cases have become boomtowns, "where cars outnumber camels." In the major cities, apartment buildings are mushrooming, with supermarkets and highways servicing the expanding urban population. Furthermore, the per capita income now averages over $100. The reason for this sudden prosperity is the discovery of vast deposits of oil in 1959.

Guided by the experiences of the other oil producing countries of the Middle East, the Libyan Government has established a development council to supervise and coordinate economic development. To this council is allocated 70 percent of all oil revenues, which, by 1965, will total $300 million. Public utility development projects will comprise 40 percent of the council's funds; agricultural schemes will receive 30 percent; while the remaining 30 percent will be granted for education, health, housing, sanitation, and welfare.

This almost overwhelming prosperity has also created a sense of stability. Recent changes in the Constitution, agreed to by popular consent, transforms the nation from a federation to a unitary state. The province system has been abolished, with the Federal state being broken into districts. A new administrative capital is being constructed at al-Baida to eliminate both rivalry and expense. Confidence in the Government is apparent throughout Libya.

Relations with the United States since independence in 1951 have remained warm and cordial. Since 1954, when Wheelus Air Force Base was established, over 10,000 U.S. servicemen and their dependents have been stationed in Libya. The oil industry has brought several more thousand Americans to Libya, to live and enjoy the friendship of the Libyan people. Then, too, U.S. aid has specifically fostered agricultural and hydrological projects to increase the benefits for the farmers. Working with the knowledge that Libya was once the granary of the Roman Empire, American technicians have resurrected Roman irrigation plans, at times using the original systems laid out 19 centuries ago. Furthermore, model farms have shown the farmer what can be accomplished with little capital.

Work in these fields as well as in education and public health has earned for the United States the amity of a grateful people. Therefore, as the Libyans celebrate their 12th anniversary of independence this December 24, let us, too, salute their achievements and wish them continued success and rapid development as allies of the free world, as participants in and stanch supporters of the Organization of African Unity, and as friends.

Dr. Clifford Merrill Drury Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Clifford Merrill Drury retires this day as California Professor of Church History at San Francisco Theological Seminary, a position which he has held since 1938. It is a great contribution when a man gives this much of his life to the teaching of students, and Dr. Drury has been a man who was loved by his students. However, his work has extended far beyond the classroom.

Clifford Drury was born and raised on a farm in Iowa; from there he took his undergraduate degree at Buena Vista College in Iowa. He first served his country as private, U.S. Army, during World War I. In 1919 he entered San Francisco Theological Seminary, where he was later to teach, as a student.

Here he gained his B.D. and S.T.M. degrees. He then traveled to the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, taking his Ph. D. in church history.

He was ordained a minister in the Presbyterian Church in the United States in 1922, and served as the assistant pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Berkeley, Calif. From 1923 until 1927 he was pastor of the Community Church, Shanghai, China. On his return in 1928 he became the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Moscow, Idaho; moreover, he not only served that city but the students of the nearby University of Idaho, also.

It was at this time he began what was to be one of his greatest contributions—the study of Christianity in western America. It was at this time he began the series of books and articles which he still continues to produce. Dr. Drury was not a man given to historical novels; his works were scholarly efforts which were written only from original sources. Some of his books include: "Marcus Whitman, M.D."; "Pioneer and Martyr"; "Henry Harmon Spalding, Pioneer of Old Oregon"; "Mary and Elkanah Walker, Pioneers Among the Spokanes"; and "First White Women Over the Rockies"; to name a few. Clifford Merrill Drury has the distinction which few men can claim and that is that all of his books become the definitive work on the subject, the references to which the scholar turns. It has been written of him that "he rescued western American church history from oblivion."

His distinctions thus far would make a full lifetime for any man, but there is more. In the mid 1930's he became a chaplain in the Navy Reserve. He was called to active duty during World War II, and rose rapidly to the rank of captain. He served as the district chaplain of the Potomac River Command. After the war he became the official historian of the U.S. Navy Chaplain Corps. He wrote the first four volumes of that work and outlined the fifth volume; thus making another historical contribution to his country.

Dr. Drury has since retired as a chaplain, but he is recognized by some as "Mr. Chaplain Corps," and often called upon to speak when chaplains gather. He is now retiring as a professor. The country has lost a chaplain, the Church of Jesus Christ, a teacher; but we gained a man who is young in heart and mind, who now has gained the time to devote to research and writing of western American church history.

New England Agriculture Threatened by Unequal Grain Shipping Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is still vitally important to the well-being and economy of New England and particularly to my State of New Hampshire. For this reason I have written to Mr. C. S. Baxter, chairman, General Freight Traffic Committee-Eastern Railroads, New York, N.Y., demanding that feed grain rates to New England be equalized and competitive with grain rates to other parts of the country—particularly those that are in direct competition with New England and New Hampshire agricultural products. Because of mounting interest and concern in regard to this important problem, I am calling my colleagues' attention to the letter I have just written to Mr. Baxter:

DECEMBER 12, 1963.

Mr. C. S. BAXTER,
Chairman, General Freight Traffic Committee, Eastern Railroads, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. BAXTER: There is pending before your committee the matter of reduced freight rates on corn in bulk for New England destinations, and I would very much appreciate receiving a report with respect to the status of same.

In the meantime, there is a new publication for nontransit rates to apply on corn in bulk, in single carloads, from numerous origins in the State of Ohio to Maryland and Virginia published for account of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad pursuant to a notice of independent action issued by that carrier, effective on November 19, 1963.

The Pennsylvania Railroad will, it also is understood, take immediate steps to place in effect a similar basis for rates to apply on carload shipments of corn, from common points in Ohio to blanket the destination territory of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, this representing a defensive measure to meet the competition of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

It is understood that the rates published by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad approximate 60 percent of the present single carload rates on shipments of corn from origins to destinations, representing reductions ranging from 20 to 28 cents per hundredweight of corn.

This will, it is believed, place the New England poultrymen at a disadvantage averaging out to about $5 per ton of corn.

It is well recognized that the direct competition for the products of the New England poultryman in the natural markets for poultry meat and eggs comes from Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia; hence, the New England Millers & Shippers Association filed a protest and petition for suspension with the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Commission's Board of Suspension has, however, concluded not to suspend the published rates.

It is quite apparent that something positive should be done with respect to the New England proposal for reductions in bulk shipments of corn via rail. Unquestionably, New England poultrymen—as well as New England rail carriers—will suffer irreparable damage as a result of the adjusted rail rates on corn to Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, unless immediate action is taken to permit competitive rates on carload shipments of corn to New England destinations.

You are probably aware that if the railroads do not take steps to provide New Hampshire agriculture with desperately needed relief, we will have to explore alternative possibilities. It is my understanding that this would include legislation to facilitate the movement of grain via the St. Lawrence Seaway. It certainly would include consideration of the fact that railroads care so little for our economy, any request they make for help in other areas must be weighed accordingly.

Your early attention to this matter will be appreciated.

Your very truly,
JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Member of Congress.

Pay Scales in Oversea Military Schools Should Be Equalized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reference is made in the December 21, 1963, issue of the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal and Register to the fact that Secretary of Defense McNamara wants a $191 million pay raise for the armed services. The article says the effective pay adjustment will be October 1964.

Meanwhile, as far as I know, the Defense Department, which operates the oversea schools for the children of servicemen, has done little or nothing about the salary schedule of teachers in these schools.

Public Law 86-91—1959—provides that oversea teachers' salaries are to be in line with the scale of teachers' salaries here in the United States. According to a study of the National Educational Association, increases in U.S. teachers' salaries since 1960 have averaged 15 percent. Since September 1960, however, the Defense Department has not provided any salary schedule increase for oversea teachers. Yet a review was supposed to be made each year.

I understand that these oversea teachers will get a $100 increase in 1964, but compared to their counterparts in the United States, salaries will still remain far below the level of teachers' pay in comparable areas in this country. For example, an oversea teacher with 2 years' experience and a bachelor's degree receives $560 a year less than his counterparts here. At the next level above that, the difference is $678, while teachers with 6 years of college receive $1,000 a year less.

In the State of Washington, the Washington Educational Association has declared recently that conditions prevailing in schools for dependents of military personnel in foreign countries are inexcusable. There are 300 schools in 26 countries involved and 7,000 teachers for 160,000 children of our military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House Committee on Armed Services will investigate. This subject should be considered just as soon as Congress reconvenes in January. Certainly the pay scale of civilian teachers in our military establishments abroad should be adjusted and treated with the same fairness as the proposed increases in military pay scales. A National Educational Association report says Defense Department budget requests have been insufficient to allow for adequate pay increases and other educational improvements recommended by their recent survey.

Imported Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mrs. HANSEN. H.R. 2513 as amended by the Senate provides for imported lumber to be marked by country of origin. Thus, under its provisions imported lumber would have to be stamped with the name of the country from which it came.

Certainly consumers in this Nation are entitled to know from what nation they are buying their lumber products. Lumber is not presently marked and it is impossible for a domestic consumer to seek redress from the foreign manufacturer from any deviations from grade. In fact, many times when complaints are made as to grade, domestic agencies are blamed for discrepancies which actually should be blamed on the foreign shipper. This occurs because grade stamps presently being used by foreign lumber producers indicate that the rules under which the foreign lumber is graded were those of domestic grading agencies such as the West Coast Lumbermen's Association or a similar organization. If the consumer is unable to determine by inspecting the lumber from which country it came, he often unfairly blames domestic grading agencies for any imperfections when in fact he should not.

Marking lumber to make it possible for domestic consumers to determine from what country their lumber came would eliminate this confusion and any dissatisfactions with the lumber could be reported to the correct source.

All Americans are aware of the problems facing the domestic lumber industry. Today we find that on an annual basis imports of Canadian lumber average about 6 billion board feet yearly. This is about 16 percent of our Nation's annual production.

This is a fact which must be faced in many of our Nation's communities in which lumber mills formerly provided thousands of men and women and children their livelihood. Now the mills are closed, men are out of work and a great industry is in trouble.

Most of the present lumber problems in our Nation may be traced to the increasing imports of Canadian lumber. But other countries might easily move into a position that further erodes our domestic lumber industry. For instance the Soviet Union is a major exporter of lumber and now accounts for about 14 percent of the total world's lumber export market. It is not generally known throughout the world but it is a fact that Russia's forest resources are larger than those of any other nation and account for almost 20 percent of the world's total. This is a threat which must not be taken lightly.

H.R. 2513 will make it possible for our Nation's consumers to be fully knowledgeable about the source of the lumber they buy. They will be able thus to buy intelligently and with full knowledge of the type, grade and value of the lumber they buy.

Savarese Requested To Resign From Birch Society or Sever Relations With the District of Columbia Republican Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post, December 17, 1963, an item appeared that was rather significant, in my opinion.

According to this article, the chairman of the District of Columbia City Republican Committee, Hon. Carl Shipley and other top Republican leaders in the District, requested a GOP city committeeman, Dr. Melchior F. R. Savarese, to resign from the John Birch Society or sever his relations with the Republican city committee.

I believe Mr. Shipley and the Republican committee should be commended for refusing to allow membership in an extremist organization to weaken and embarrass the Republican Party in the Nation's Capital.

The John Birch Society, like all other such organizations, rightwing or leftwing, has no respect for either political party. The founder of the John Birch Society, Robert Welch, in his book "The Politician," made this very clear.

Quoting from page 268 of this book, Robert Welch, in his own words, stated:

> The Communists can now use all of the power and prestige of the Presidency of the United States to implement their plans, just as fully and openly as they dare. They have arrived at this point by three stages. In the first stage, Roosevelt thought he was using the Communists to promote his personal ambitions and grandiose schemes. Of course, instead, the Communists were using him, but without his knowledge or understanding of his place in their game. In the second stage, Truman was used by the Communists, with his knowledge and acquiescence, as the price he consciously paid for making him President. In the third stage, in my own opinion, the Communists have one of their own actually in the Presidency. For this third man, Eisenhower, there is only one possible word to describe his purposes and his actions. That word is "treason."

Again quoting another contemptible passage from the same book, Welch stated:

> This door to betrayal is known to be wide open, and nobody—in Congress, in the executive branch, in the Pentagon itself—nobody even dares to try to close it.

These words come from the head of the John Birch Society. It is completely incompatible for anyone involved in the Republican or Democratic Party organizations to work, also, in behalf of any extremist group that heaps scorn and abuse on all who do not adopt their own very narrow vision.

A Patriotic Salute to Humble Oil & Refining Co. of Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, arriving in each congressional office this week was a beautifully prepared 1964 calendar, the gift of the Humble Oil & Refining Co. of Houston, Tex.

We all receive many calendars each year about this time but I desire to commend your especial attention to this inspiring product of Humble's reminder to us of the wisdom of our Founding Fathers, and the enormous human talents that have contributed so much to our present greatness.

Mr. Speaker, I append herewith the letter to me from Carl E. Reistle, Jr., chairman of the Humble board, the quoted excerpts from the 12 calendar pages, and my response to Mr. Reistle.

HUMBLE OIL & REFINING CO.,
Houston, Tex., December 2, 1963.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: As a Member of the House of Representatives, I believe you will be interested in this unusual "Voices of Great Americans" calendar being issued for 1964 by Humble Oil & Refining Co.

This calendar, which carries portraits and profound thoughts of 12 distinguished Americans, was designed for a very special purpose. That purpose is to remind ourselves forcefully of some of those eternal truths on which this country was built and became great. These same truths will provide the strength and wisdom required for this Nation to endure.

It is my hope that during the next 12 months these excerpts from our national heritage will remind us of the vital importance to America's future of such old-fashioned virtues as loyalty, honesty, and courage.

Sincerely yours,

CARL E. REISTLE, Jr.
Chairman of the Board.

EXPRESSIONS OF 12 GREAT AMERICAN PATRIOTS ACCOMPANYING THE WILLIAM A. SMITH PORTRAYALS ON THE HUMBLE CALENDAR FOR 1964

George Washington: "If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work?"

Thomas Jefferson: "I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Ralph Waldo Emerson: "Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm."

Abraham Lincoln: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present * * * we must think anew and act anew."

Woodrow Wilson: "There must be, not a balance of power, but a community of power; not organized rivalries, but an organized common peace."

Robert E. Lee: "Abandon all animosities and make your sons Americans."

Theodore Roosevelt: "If we shrink from the hard contests * * * then the bolder and stronger countries will pass us by."

Thomas Edison: "The yearning of man's brain for new knowledge * * * never can be completely met."

Benjamin Franklin: "When truth and error have fair play, the former is always an overmatch for the latter."

Daniel Webster: "On the diffusion of education among the people rest the preservation and perpetuation of our free institutions."

Alexander Graham Bell: "All great inventions * * * are the product of many minds."

Clara Barton: "Your joy will be the joy of those you serve, and minister to; your reward the success you achieve."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., December 18, 1963.

Mr. CARL E. REISTLE, Jr.,
Chairman of the Board,
Humble Oil & Refining Co.,
Houston, Tex.

DEAR MR. REISTLE: Thank you ever so much for the gift of your exciting 1964 calendar, and for your covering letter explaining the commendable motives that inspired it.

This is precisely what I have been advocating as an additional role for some of our giant business corporations; Preach the American free enterprise system, relate our present greatness and eminence to the foresight of our earlier patriots.

It should become fashionable once again to get a thrill out of the "Star-Spangled Banner" and the "Gettysburg Address." If companies like yours can reinculcate in the citizenry the ideals of Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin; Webster and Lincoln and the others, then perhaps some of the upcoming history textbooks will emulate you and return to fundamental Americanism, rather than devoting so much space to the heralds of socialism and the new order this country has endured for three decades.

There is an old axiom—never quarrel with success; but a lot of our Central Government leadership has been doing just that for 30 years, and its detrimental effect on our economy is evidenced by our total debt in excess of $300 billion.

Thank you again for the calendar—not just for mine, but because Humble ordered its production at all. Season's greetings.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

Congressman Pike Reports on 1st Session, 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, with the bang of your gavel ending the 1963 session of Congress this week the longest peacetime Congress in the history of our Nation comes to an end, and I would like to take this opportunity to report to my constituents on its accomplishments and its failures.

While the bang of the gavel marks the official end of the session, I believe it is more accurate to say that the 1st session of the 88th Congress ended with something less than a bang. Despite the many long months of the session, Congress goes home with the bulk of its legislative business unfaced and undone. Its detractors, largely of one political party, have called this session of Congress do-nothing and disgraceful. Its supporters, largely of another political party, have called it respectable, and constructive, and even outstanding. The facts, as usual, lie somewhere in between. No one has called it the greatest Congress in history and no one is going to find it so described here.

As a generalization, it can be said that those who most loudly label it do-nothing most loudly opposed those things it tried to do. Those who call it respectable failed to push it aggressively toward a more respectable record.

Last January, addressing Congress for his state of the Union message, President Kennedy's first and strongest request was for lower taxes. This January President Johnson's message will be the same, for while the House has passed the tax bill, the Senate has not. On the other hand, the Youth Conservation Corps program, No. 2 among President Kennedy's requests of last January, has passed the Senate but not the House.

This was also the fate of such other important legislative proposals as the wilderness bill, mass transit, a National Service Corps, and the proposal to provide defense counsel for indigent criminal defendants in the Federal courts. Every one of these bills has passed one body of Congress but not the other. At the bottom of the pile may be found the medical care proposal and the civil rights bill, Nos. 3 and 4 among President Kennedy's proposals, neither of which has passed either House of Congress.

Next year, I believe a real attempt will be made to complete all of the above legislation. Any bill stays alive for the entire 2 years of a Congress, but if it is not passed during the second year it dies and the entire legislative process must start all over again with the reintroduction of the bill in the next Congress. How successful the attempt will be I do not know, but if I were rash enough to make a prediction it would be that the tax bill will pass, the civil rights bill will pass, the medical care proposal will fail, the wilderness bill will fail, the mass transit bill will pass, the Youth Conservation Corps bill will pass, the National Service Corps bill will fail, and the proposal for defense counsel for indigent defendants will pass. This fearless forecast, in common with a lot made at the beginning of the session just past, could be completely wrong.

One area in which Congress did accomplish a great deal this session was in the field of education. Four major bills were passed in this general category and signed into law by the President. One bill was designed to help provide facilities for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. A second will help construct and improve teaching facilities for doctors and dentists and provide loans for students in these professions. A third major bill provided a 3-year program of grants and loans for construction of colleges and junior colleges and the fourth bill continued the National Defense Education Act, continued aid to school districts adversely affected by large Government installations—commonly called impacted areas—and expanded vocational education programs.

Legislation of more purely local interest involved the Fire Island National Seashore, erosion control for the entire south shore of Long Island, and the stabilization of the Fire Island Inlet. Of these, by far the most noteworthy and controversial was the proposal to establish a Fire Island National Seashore.

On June 11, 1963, the Department of the Interior recommended a new national seashore proposal, embracing not only the 31 miles of Fire Island in the towns of Babylon, Islip, and Brookhaven, but stretching an additional 21 miles east along the barrier beach, past the Moriches and Shinnecock Inlets and into the village of Southampton. The cries of anguish which were heard when the Interior Department said there was not enough land on Fire Island paled into insignificance compared with the yells of outrage when they tried to get more.

On June 18, 1963, I introduced my own bill for a Fire Island National Seashore. It embraces the area from the Fire Island State Park on the west to the Moriches Inlet County Park on the east, a distance of 27 miles, and includes several islands in the South Bay and Moriches Bay. It eliminates all land east of the Moriches Inlet. The bill is detailed and specific and I was greatly aided in the preparation of these details by such groups as the committee for a Fire Island National Seashore, the League of Women Voters, the Patchogue Chamber of Commerce, many of the garden clubs and conservation organizations on Long Island and a great many interested individuals.

Four other Congressmen have since joined me in this legislation, and at the hearings held by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at Adelphi Suffolk College on September 30, 1963, it attracted fairly general support. On December 11, 1963, the Senate committee started its hearings in Washington and the Interior Department formally withdrew its request for any land in the town of Southampton. The legislation still has a long way to go, and there are many details to be worked out, but in a farsighted move, the board of supervisors acquired the entire easterly end of Fire Island. Regardless of how long the national seashore legislation may take, or even if it should fail, the land is now in public ownership for the benefit of future generations.

The Congress appropriated $2,100,000 for matching funds for an erosion control project between Moriches Inlet and Shinnecock Inlet, $600,000 for navigation and erosion control work on Fire Island Inlet and the beach west of that inlet, and started a study of erosion control problems on the north shore of Long Island.

As always, the problems of fluctuating employment in our defense industries continued to plague Long Island and occupied a great deal of the time of our office. Defense contracting is always a tricky business—when you have them it is great, when you do not have them it is disastrous. While we continue to exert all our efforts to see our district get its fair share, we also hope for the day when greater diversification of our industry will put us less at the mercy of such violent swings in employment.

On the personal level, my work on the Armed Services Committee was greatly increased this year by the fact that I was assigned to three separate subcommittees—one having jurisdiction over Reserve affairs and civil defense, one having jurisdiction over military research and development, and one having jurisdiction over all types of special investigations.

My office staff of five full-time secretaries and two part-time representatives has been kept busy answering a flood of mail on legislation and on all types of personal requests.

We have tried to keep the people of our district informed of our activities by Sunday broadcasts over eight radio stations, and by a weekly column mailed to every newspaper printed in the county.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the people of my district and to thank them for the magnificent demonstration of faith in our system of government which they displayed during the turmoil and shock which followed the assassination of President Kennedy. Republicans and Democrats, people from every walk of life, of every religion, and of all colors, joined in a moving expression of our national tragedy, and in declarations of support and confidence in our new President. A great man is dead, another great man is at the helm, and a mighty Nation carries on.

My voting record on all major issues follows: There have been 115 rollcall votes and I have been present and voting 113 times. On one of my absences I was confined to the hospital, on the other I just plain goofed. It was a vote on a motion to adjourn. Had I been present, I would have voted to adjourn.

Date (1963)	Issue	Vote
Jan. 9	Election of Speaker (McCormack 256, Halleck 175)	McC.
9	Maintain size of Rules Committee (yea 235, nay 196)	Yea.
Feb. 27	Supplemental appropriation for Department of Agriculture (yea 254, nay 154).	Nay.
27	Funds for Committee on Un-American Activities (yea 386, nay 20).	Yea.
Mar. 11	Extend draft law (yea 388, nay 3)	Yea.
12	Honorary citizenship for Sir Winston Churchill (yea 378, nay 21)	Yea.
13	Add $364,000,000 to Defense appropriation for B–70 aircraft (yea 226, nay 179).	Nay.
13	$15,800,000,000 Defense appropriation (yea 374, nay 33)	Yea.
Apr. 4	$6,000,000,000 Treasury, Post Office, and executive appropriation (yea 386, nay 17).	Yea.
10	$450,000,000 accelerated public works program (yea 228, nay 184)	Yea.
24	Program to increase opportunities for training doctors and dentists (yea 288, nay 122)	Yea.
25	Extend feed grain subsidy (yea 208, nay 195)	Nay.
29	Coordinate Federal programs for outdoor recreation (yea 292, nay 50).	Yea.
May 7	Reduce travel allowances (yea 387, nay 2)	Yea.
9	Tighten Internal Security Act (yea 340, nay 40)	Yea.
15	Recommit Temporary Debt Increase Act (yea 195, nay 222)	Yea.
15	Passage of temporary debt increase (yea 213, nay 204)	Yea.
23	Ban discrimination against women in employment (yea 362, nay 9).	Yea.
29	Continue import of Mexican farmworkers (yea 158, nay 174)	Nay.
June 6	$6,000,000,000 Agriculture Department appropriation (yea 288, nay 79).	Nay.
11	$140,000,000 legislative branch appropriation (yea 271, nay 122)	Yea.
12	$455,000,000 Area Redevelopment Agency increase (yea 204, nay 209).	Nay.
13	Extend existing excise and corporate income taxes (yea 283, nay 91).	Yea.
18	$1,800,000,000 State, Justice, and Commerce Department appropriation (yea 301, nay 93).	Yea.
June 26	$47,000,000,000 Defense appropriation (yea 410, nay 1)	Yea.
July 17	$958,000,000 Interior appropriation (yea 332, nay 50)	Yea.
24	Air Pollution Control Act (yea 272, nay 102)	Yea.
Aug. 1	Authorize $5,200,000,000 space program (yea 335, nay 57)	Yea.
6	Matching grant program for vocational education (yea 377, nay 21).	Yea.
14	5-year program for construction facilities for higher education (yea 287, nay 113).	Yea.
23	Cut $585,000,000 for foreign aid (yea 222, nay 188)	Nay.
23	Authorize $3,500,000,000 foreign aid (yea 224, nay 186)	Yea.
Sept. 10	Authorize $283,000,000 mental health program (yea 335, nay 18)	Yea.
24	$11,100,000,000 tax cut and tax reform (yea 271, nay 155)	Yea.
Oct. 1	$1,200,000,000 Armed Forces pay increase authorization (yea 333, nay 5).	Yea.
7	Extend Civil Rights Commission (yea 265, nay 80)	Yea.
10	$13,100,000,000 appropriation for 23 independent agencies and offices (yea 302, nay 32).	Yea.
23	Establish United States-Puerto Rico Commission on Status of Puerto Rico (yea 320, nay 44).	Yea.
31	Extend Mexican farm labor import program 1 year (yea 173, nay 158).	Nay.
Nov. 7	$6,000,000,000 increase in national debt (yea 187, nay 179)	Nay.
18	$1,600,000,000 military construction appropriation (yea 332, nay 5).	Yea.
19	$4,300,000,000 appropriation for public works and Atomic Energy Commission (yea 358, nay 27).	Yea.
20	$20,000,000, 2-year extension of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (yea 252, nay 133).	Yea.
Dec. 9	$400,000,000 subway system for Washington, D.C. (motion to recommit) (yea 278, nay 76).	Yea.
16	$2,800,000,000 foreign aid appropriation (yea 249, nay 135)	Yea.
16	Prohibit guarantee of credit on sales to Communist countries (yea 218, nay 169).	Yea.

Speech by James B. Utt, Orange County City Hall Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a dedicatory speech which I gave on December 9, 1963, at the new city hall in Orange, Calif.:

SPEECH BY JAMES B. UTT, OF CALIFORNIA, ORANGE CITY HALL DEDICATION, DECEMBER 9, 1963

Chairman Ronald Fairbairn, Mayor Reynolds, distinguished guests, and my fellow Americans, it is a privilege and an honor to share and to have a part in this happy occasion It is fitting to pay tribute to those who planned and built this new city hall. We admire the building, its architecture and its arrangement, but few if any of us will take the time to examine the foundation upon which this building rests.

You see a beautiful tree, you admire its symmetry, its foliage and its vivid color, and we seldom stop to consider that this tree is nourished by a system of roots far more intricate and extensive than is the tree itself. We would reject the thought of anyone cutting away its branches or its foliage, or in any way damaging what we see. We should remember, however, that it is just as destructive to tamper with the roots, or fail to nourish and to water the roots, but the tree itself would perish if this were not done.

Every city, every State, every nation, and every civilization rests upon a foundation. We here are enjoying the fruits of those who planted the tree and nourished it and made it to bring forth and bud. I beg your indulgence for a few moments to look backward, not as a sentimental journey, but rather an excursion into the past to examine the roots and the foundation of this city. Let us be mindful of the blood, sweat, tears, and prayers that went into winning the West and acknowledge the great contributions made by thousands who came before us.

I hope you will pardon an occasional personal reference, made only because my father and my grandfather and I were a tiny thread in the historical fabric of this city. We hear names which mean little to the present generation, but they were giants in the history of this county.

To the east we see Mount Pleasants, and to my mind it brings back the story of Joe Pleasants, who, when a infant, crossed the Great Plains and over the great Sierra Nevadas in a covered wagon in 1849, moving thence from the mining claims of northern California and settling at the foot of what is now called Mount Pleasants. The adjacent mountain is called Modjeska Peak, that also is but a name to the present generation, but I remember the great Polish actress Mme. Helena Modjeska, who lived for years in the community where I was born. She also established the Forest of Arden below the peak which now bears her name. There are dozens of other such monuments named after those sturdy pioneers.

The history of this community and of this country and of this State are one and inseparable. The culture, the law, and religion came to California from Spain. These were firmly established here in California when Father Serra built his first mission in 1769 at San Diego. Our culture was far advanced over anything known on the East Coast. When George Washington spent that cold and bitter winter at Valley Forge in 1775, Father Serra had just completed the beautiful mission at San Juan Capistrano. No architecture in America equaled the architecture found in those early missions at San Gabriel and Santa Barbara. The nomenclature of this State is derived from Spain and still remains in the majority. Such euphonious names as La Jolla, San Luis Rey, Santa Margarita, San Gabriel, and Nuestra Senora La Reina de Los Angeles de la Porceuncala, commonly referred to as L.A., and so on up the coast to Santa Maria, San Francisco, and other cities.

Our interest today is in the city of Orange and so we turn to the year 1810 when this was still a part of Mexico and that government granted to Antonia Yorba and Juan Pablo Peralta a large tract of land, including the area where we stand today. The first water was taken from the Santa Ana River in 1825 to irrigate a few hundred acres along the river. This is an important date to remember, because in that year, water from the Santa Ana River was first put to prior beneficial use and played a most important part in the water rights of Orange County in later court cases, which were determined under the civil law of Mexico, adopted by this State.

After the Mexican War, a Federal Land Commission determined the validity of the titles to these Spanish and Mexican grants, and the Yorba-Peralta grant was held to be valid. Between the years of 1810 and 1865, some of the land had descended to heirs, sold and traded and exchanged for debt and finally, in 1865, under a court decree, the land was partitioned and title vested separately in these new owners. Some of it was given to A. B. Chapman for legal fees and a great portion went to Abel Stearns. Chapman and Glassell formed a partnership, subdivided the land and sold much of it off to other investors. They started a ditch from the Santa Ana River to Orange in 1870, which was completed a year later. In 1873, this ditch was sold to the Semitropic Water Co., which extended its lines farther south. At that time, this community was known as Richland and a map of what is now Orange was filed at the then county seat in Los Angeles in 1871 and consisted of 40 acres. The present plaza was reserved for a park at that time. There was already a post office in California called Richland and it became necessary to change the name of this community. At that time there were orchards of oranges, lemons, olives, and almonds and, of course, a great many grape vineyards. It was difficult to settle on a proper and significant name and a poker game was played; the winner of that game was to choose the name. Prophetically, the winner was the man who wanted the name of Orange. This was in 1875.

In 1874, my father passed through here, overshot the community and landed in a mustard patch in Tustin City, which was located between Gospel Swamp and Tomato Springs. At this time the area was covered with sagebrush, wild game, snakes, lizards, and wild horses. It may amaze you to know that in 1 year, 3,000 wild horses were driven from this county to Chicago to haul the horse-drawn streetcars. In 1 year, the Travis and the Parker boys shipped 19,000 quail to the market in San Francisco and Sacramento. There were still a few condors soaring over the Santiago Canyon and there were still a number of grizzly bears. I remember very well when Ed Atkinson and Andrew Joplin trapped the last grizzly bear in Orange County. This ended a rather heathen and brutal form of entertainment, which used to be held at Irvine, between a grizzly bear and a bull and civilization is none the worse off in this demise.

Probably the greatest contribution to the development of the great Southwest was made by the Santa Ana Valley Irrigation Co., which was formed in 1877, after acquiring all of the water rights south and east of the river, with the exception of one holdout. This system extended over 17,000 acres. The company was organized by three men, none of whom was a lawyer nor an engineer and yet it became the model system for practically every irrigation district in the Southwest. They made the water pertinent to the land, so that no one could get more than his equitable share. The river water was divided between the SAVI and the Anaheim Union Water Co., which was on the north and west sides of the river. The Anaheim Union brought suit against the SAVI to acquire an additional amount of water from the river and one of the longest water suits in the State took place. This suit, which gave an equal amount of water to the SAVI, and the Anaheim Union, was based on riparian rights, and as the Yorbas had put water to prior beneficial use in 1825, the SAVI was able to protect these valuable water rights.

The first well in Orange was dug by J. D. Parker in 1876.

I was not born to the affluent life, but rather I enjoyed the pleasures of poverty and worked in the fields for my father for 25 cents a day. My first outside job, when I was 12 years old, was to be employed by V. L. Steward, a civil engineer for the SAVI. I was to be paid $2 per day. I had arrived. I was rich. Our work was to measure the water of the Santa Ana River at the dividing point between Anaheim and the SAVI, and to see that each received its equal share. We made water measurements further up the river at Prado. Even in those days, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties were encroaching on our water rights as they are today. The fame of the SAVI system spread rapidly, and around the turn of the century, President Theodore Roosevelt asked the Governor of California to send Henri Gardner, who was one of the originators of this system, to attend a reclamation conference, out of which developed the Roosevelt Dam and the great irrigation system for the Salt River Valley around Phoenix, Ariz., which was patterned after the SAVI system.

Of course, Orange had its share of Chinese laundries. It also had its bandits and its horsethieves and the vigilantes, who were formed to put an end to this thievery. The culprit generally confessed before the noose was drawn by the vigilantes and then he had a fair trial and was hung.

Dr. Hayward was the first doctor in Orange, and Dr. Medlock, whom many of you remember, came in 1876. Dr. McCoy was the first dentist.

In 1872, the first public building was built in Orange. Fittingly it was a schoolhouse, but had no teacher. Mr. Stephen McPherson was a schoolteacher who lived in Westminster and he rode horseback each day from Westminster to Orange, in order to teach in this first school. In 1873, Orange had its first post office and Dr. George Beach was the first postmaster. Land was selling at $12 an acre, although not many years before, the going price was 12 cents per acre. In 1875, the Plaza Hotel was built and 2 years later Wells Fargo came to town.

There was a group of New Yorkers who came to Orange in 1887 and built the Rochester Hotel, and named the street Palmyra. The Southern Pacific passed through West Orange in 1876, and in 1887 the Santa Fe came through Orange on its way to San Diego. Then followed the land boom as the Santa Fe would bring passengers out from the Midwest for $1 per person. That was when the great Hotel Del Coronado was built and we even had a four-story wooden hotel in Tustin. The land boom broke in 1888 and most everyone went broke with it. In 1874, the Presbyterian Church was founded and also the Methodist Church, and they both met in the schoolhouse. That was before the Supreme Court frowned upon such things. The Methodists built a church and invited the Presbyterians to use it, but the Methodist bishop decided that the Presbyterians might corrupt the Methodists and put an end to this falderal. So, the Presbyterians went back to the schoolhouse. A Santa Ana wind blew the Methodist Church off its foundation, which was probably nothing more than a mud sill, and they had a hard time getting enough money to build a new foundation. There was an atheist in town who was probably more God-fearing than many others and he offered to haul the gravel for free.

When the Presbyterians built a church they didn't have enough money to buy a bell and so this same atheist said, "Hell, I'll buy you a bell," but he didn't have any money. So, on Sunday morning he visited all the poker games in town and took up a collection and bought them a beautiful bell. The Lutheran Church was built in 1882, and Reverend Krogler was its first minister. The first newspaper was founded in 1884 and was called the Orange Tribune. Its publisher was William Ward. The Santa Ana-Orange-Tustin Railroad was built about that time and extended out as far as El Modeno. Of course, it was horse-drawn and I remember when they finally pulled up the tracks in Tustin. The Bank of Orange was founded in 1886 as a State bank and later became a national bank. In 1888, the city of Orange incoporated and held its first council meeting on April 16, 1888. The Trustees were William Blasdale, O. P. Chubb, C. Z. Culver, Henri F. Gardner, P. J. Shaffer. The first ordinance that was passed was known as the Pasadena Ordinance. No liquor. So, that ended the saloons in Orange until after prohibition.

Time does not permit me to give you the names of all of the sturdy pioneers to whom we owe so much. I will borrow the words of Lincoln when he said, "The world will little note nor long remember what we say here but it can never forget what they did here." To the memory of those pioneers, their wives, and children, I would like to dedicate this city hall. They had courage, faith, determination, and patience. They had an unfaltering belief in the omnipotence of God and that His Divine Providence would lead them to their destiny. I would like to close with the words of Tennyson, as spoken by King Arthur to the Knights of the Round Table while he was on his deathbed:

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
And God fulfills himself in many ways,
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.
Comfort thyself: What comfort is in me?
I have lived my life, and that which I have done
May He within himself make pure! but thou,
If thou shouldst never see my face again,
Pray for my soul. More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of. Wherefore, let thy voice
Rise like a fountain for me night and day.
For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain,
If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
Both for themselves and those who call them friend?
For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

Excessive Imports Threaten Cattle Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to appear before the Trade Information Committee and the U.S. Tariff Commission in behalf of the beef cattle industry of our country, and quite specifically, in behalf of that portion of the industry located in New Mexico.

I believe that because of the seriousness of the situation, much of what I stated in my testimony on those occasions should be repeated and brought to the attention of the Congress.

I recall that over a year ago, in the fall of 1962, I had the opportunity to extend my greetings to the assembled members of the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association. At that time, I offered my congratulations to the livestock producers of New Mexico and of the Nation for the outstanding contribution that they were making, not only to total farm productivity, but to the overall productivity of the United States.

At the same time, I offered them well deserved congratulations for their determination and consistent effort to solve their own problems and thereby improve conditions within their own industry. Today, I believe that New Mexico's livestock producers remain every bit as deserving of that praise as they were a year ago. However, we must look to next year.

The beef cattle industry has been and is faced with a critical situation and their problem, in turn, translates into an economic dilemma for the State of New Mexico. All New Mexicans are well aware that the cattle industry is of substantial importance to our State economy. For example, beef cattle sales are responsible for about 50 percent of our total agricultural cash receipts. Those receipts amount to about $114 million per annum. Such receipts account for the fact that agriculture ranks second, in terms of dollar sales, among our basic State industries. First, mineral resources; third, manufacturing.

It is, naturally, of major concern to us when so large a market becomes economically depressed. Obviously, sharp price drops of $3 to $4 per hundredweight—alive—is clear indication that there is something basically amiss. Figured in prices of 1960, when 553,145,000 pounds of cattle alive were marketed in New Mexico, a loss of $4 per hundredweight equals an overall loss to the State of $22,125,800. So, during a price slump, the livestock producer suffers a direct loss, the business community and, indeed, the entire State suffer indirect but quite substantial revenue losses.

It is my carefully considered conclusion, based on the record, that the primary cause for our depressed market is the rise in imports as a percentage of our domestic production of beef, veal, beef cattle, and calves, which in 1962 was 10.6 percent as compared with 3.9 percent in 1957. That is an increase of almost 7 percent in only 5 years. Relating imports to consumption, we find similarly that they currently represent almost 11 percent of our total consumption; this is compared with less than 4 percent in 1960—here an increase in excess of 7 percent in less than 3 years. In 1962 the volume of imported processing beef equaled 40 percent of our domestic production of a similar quality beef. Inasmuch as 40 percent of the consumable meat of a choice beef may be and often is ground for hamburger, our cattle industry is at a severe disadvantage in competing with the far lower quality imported processing beef. Both of these meats are known as hamburger and consumers in purchasing either make no distinction between the two or retailers do not properly advise them of the various grades of meat.

In other words, many incorrectly assume that one grade of hamburger is as good as another.

Certainly, I do not advocate excluding all beef imports; but I do unequivocally oppose a further dropping of tariff rates or quotas. When imports for the first 8 months of 1963 equal 122 percent of those of the same period of last year, when in 1962 choice slaughter steers at Chicago average $27.67 per hundredweight and fall in May of 1963 to $22.61 and when in November 1962 choice steers at Chicago sell for $30.13 per hundredweight, but by May of 1963 have fallen to $22.61 per hundredweight, there is then no logical reason to further promote foreign imports. Great alarm has set in; rectifying action is long overdue.

The fault for this situation does not rest with the American cattleman, either singularly or collectively; our livestock producers are not inefficient. The fact is that farm income has remained relatively stable since the 1940's, while simultaneously farm production expenses have increased about four times as rapidly as income. Considerably lower production expenses are one reason that Australia, New Zealand, and Argentina are able to export to the United States about 80 percent of the beef which we import annually. Moreover, relative to other Western nations, a far smaller proportion of American agricultural output enjoys the benefits of nontariff import controls. For instance, France accrues benefits of 74 percent; West Germany, 93 percent; Italy, 63 percent; Australia, 41 percent; New Zealand, 100 percent; and the United Kingdom comes closest to our humble level with 37 percent, outdoing us by 11 percent.

So, while our Nation's import and quota controls have been sharply falling, those of other nations have risen or remained stationary. As we speak of becoming more efficient and interdependent under the Trade Expansion Act for world commerce, we swiftly realize that in the area of beef trade the United States is taking all the action and seems to be furthering every other nation's beef stability but our own. In international trade, as it relates to cattle, we owe no further concessions, but rather are justly due preferred treatment to compensate for the extensive losses already incurred at the cattle market.

Our agricultural production has set an example for the world. Each year, this Nation produces a massive farm surplus. Due in great part to our agricultural prowess, we have the highest health and living standard in the world. To endanger our high standards in the name of responsible livestock efficiency is the height of inefficiency. To what efficient revenue producing use could we put all our vacant grazing lands should we henceforth abolish cattle raising; where would we employ all the livestockmen put out of work? Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz said recently that we lost approximately $40 billion in gross national product last year through unemployment. Can we afford more efficiency similar to the loss of $40 billion? Of course, we cannot.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the unfair treatment which cattlemen have been receiving in the area of foreign trade.

Now we have an opportunity to right the wrong. We have an opportunity and an obligation to afford our livestock producers with proper protection from foreign imports and cutrate prices.

I strongly urge that the virtually unlimited importation of beef be halted. It is truly vital that the present tariff and quota rates be raised to afford proper income protection to the world's best cattle producer, the American cattleman.

Thank you.

Text of President Johnson's Address to the United Nations Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the great speech of President Johnson to the United Nations General Assembly:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ADDRESS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ASSEMBLY

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, distinguished delegates to the United Nations, ladies and gentlemen:

We meet in a time of mourning, but in a moment of rededication. My Nation has lost a great leader—this organization has lost a great friend—world peace has lost a great champion.

But John Kennedy was the author of new hope for mankind—hope which was shared by a whole new generation of leaders, in every continent—and we must not let grief turn us away from that hope. He never quarreled with the past—he always looked to the future—and our task now is to work for the kind of future in which he believed.

I have come here today to make it unmistakably clear that the assassin's bullet which took his life did not alter his Nation's purpose.

We are more than ever opposed to doctrines of hate and violence—in our own land and around the world.

We are more than ever committed to the rule of law—in our own land and around the world.

We believe more than ever in the rights of man, all men of every color—in our own land and around the world.

And more than ever we support the United Nations, as the best instrument yet devised to promote the peace of the world and the well-being of mankind.

I can tell you today, as I told you in 1958 when I came as majority leader of the Senate to the first committee of this great tribunal, that the full power and partnership of the United States is committed to our joint effort to eliminate war and the threat of war, aggression and the danger of violence, and to lift from all people everywhere the blight of disease, poverty, and illiteracy.

I

Like all human institutions, the U.N. has not achieved the highest of hopes that some had held at its birth.

Our understanding of how to live with one another is still far behind our knowledge of how to destroy one another.

But as our problems have grown, this organization has grown—in numbers, authority, and prestige—and its member nations have grown with it, in responsibility and in maturity.

We have seen too much success to become obsessed with failure.

The peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations has worked, in the Congo, in the Middle East, and elsewhere.

The great transition from colonial rule to independence has been largely accomplished.

The decade of development has successfully begun.

The world arms race has been slowed.

The struggle for human rights has been gaining new force.

And a start has been made in furthering mankind's common interest in outer space—in scientific exploration, in communications, in weather forecasting, in banning the stationing of nuclear weapons, and in establishing principles of law.

I know that vast problems remain—conflicts between great powers—conflicts between small neighbors—disagreements over disarmament—persistence of ancient wrongs in the area of human rights—residual problems of colonialism—and all the rest.

But men and nations, working apart, created these problems. And men and nations, working together, can solve them.

They can solve them with the help of this organization—when all members make it a workshop for constructive action, not a forum for abuse—when all members seek its help in settling their own disputes as well as the disputes of others—when all members meet their financial obligations to it—and when all members recognize that no nation, no party, and no single system can control the future of men.

II

When I entered the Congress of the United States 27 years ago, it was my privilege to work closely with a great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. As a Member of Congress, I worked with him to bring about a profound but peaceful revolution.

That peaceful revolution brought help and hope to the third of our Nation then "ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-nourished."

We helped our working men and women obtain more jobs and better wages.

We helped our farmers to own and improve their own land, conserve their soil and water, and electrify their farms.

We harnessed the power of great rivers, as in the Tennessee Valley and lower Colorado, encouraged the growth of cooperatives and trade unions, curbed the excesses of private speculation, built homes in place of city slums, and extended the rights and freedoms of all our citizens.

Now, on the world scale, the time has come, as it came to America 30 years ago, for a new era of hope—hope and progress for that one-third of mankind still beset by hunger, poverty, and disease.

In my travels on behalf of President Kennedy, I have seen too much of misery and despair in Africa, in Asia, and in Latin America.

I have seen too often the ravages of hunger, tapeworm and tuberculosis, and the scabs and scars on too many children who have little health and no hope.

I think that you and I and our countries and this organization can, and must, do something about these conditions.

I am not speaking here of a new way of life to be imposed by any single nation.

I am speaking of a higher standard of living—to be inspired by these United Nations.

It will not be achieved through some hopeful resolution in this Assembly, but through peaceful revolution in the world, through a recommitment of all our members, rich and poor, strong and weak, whatever their location or ideology, to the basic principles of human welfare and human dignity.

In this effort, the United States will do its full share. In addition to bilateral aid, we have with great satisfaction assisted in recent years in the emergence and improvement of international development institutions, both within and without this organization.

We favor the steady improvement of collective machinery for helping the less-developed nations build modern societies.

We favor an international aid program that is international in practice as well as purpose. Every nation must do its share. All United Nations members can do better—we can act more often together—we can build a better world.

III

The greatest of human problems—and the greatest of our common tasks—is to keep the peace and save the future.

All that we have built in the wealth of nations, and all that we plan to do toward a better life for all, will be in vain if our feet should slip, our vision falter, and our hopes ended in another worldwide war.

If there is one commitment more than any other that I would leave with you today, it is my unswerving commitment to the keeping and the strengthening of peace.

We know what we want:

The United States wants to see the cold war end, once and for all.

The United States wants to prevent the dissemination of nuclear weapons to nations not now possessing them.

The United States wants to press on with arms control and reduction.

The United States wants to cooperate with all the members of this organization to conquer everywhere the ancient enemies of man—hunger, disease, and ignorance.

The United States wants sanity, security, and peace for all, and above all.

President Kennedy, I am sure, would regard as his best memorial the fact that in his 3 years as President the world became a little safer and the way ahead a little brighter. To the protection and enlargement of this new hope for peace, I pledge my country and its government.

My friends and fellow citizens of the world: Soon you will return to your homelands.

I hope you will take with you my gratitude for your generosity in hearing so late in your session.

I hope you will convey to your countrymen the gratitude of all Americans for the companionship of sorrow which you shared with us in your messages of the last few weeks.

And I hope you will tell them that the United States of America, sobered by tragedy, united in sorrow, renewed in spirit, faces the new year determined that world peace, civil rights, and human welfare become not an illusion but a reality. Man's age-old hope remains our goal—that this world, under God, can be made safe for diversity, free from hostility, and a better place for our children and all children in generations to come.

And therefore any man and any nation that seeks peace—and hates war—and is willing to fight the good fight against hunger and disease and ignorance and misery—will find the United States of America by their side, willing to walk with them every step of the way.

Legislative Accomplishments of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Education and Labor

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, this 1st session of the 88th Congress has undoubtedly been one of the longest in the history of our Nation. By the same token, from the standpoint of the two committees on which it is my privilege to serve, it has been an extremely busy session. As the ranking Republican on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the second ranking Republican on the Committee on Education and Labor, I am proud of the record of accomplishment of both of these committees. It is a record of solid legislative accomplishment in which the Republicans on the committees played a constructive part, and it is a record with which I am proud to be associated. It is a record which offers living testimony to the reasons for my pride. Permit me to share with you the highlights of our progress during 1963.

EDUCATION AND LABOR

There has been a great deal of comment in the press and other news media concerning our committee, but very little of this comment has even mentioned our legislative achievements. If the work of this Congress thus far leaves much to be desired, the fault does not lie with the House Committee on Education and Labor.

This committee operates in several of the most difficult and most controversial fields of national legislation, fields in which the Congress often hesitates to act, and in which any action requires solid bipartisan effort. Yet, in this first session, the Education and Labor Committee has reported 16 bills, 4 of which have already been enacted. These four acts, I would emphasize, are all of major significance in the fields of labor, education, and manpower development.

Before attempting a very brief review of these acts, I wish to underscore a simple truism known to all who serve in the Congress—behind every bill enacted, reported, or even considered, stands days and weeks, often months, of hard work by the Members and staff of the committee. In our case, during 1963, the committee and its 10 subcommittees conducted more than 200 days of public hearings on matters before it. In addition to the hundreds of hours of executive sessions of subcommittees, the full committee held 28 executive sessions devoted to the drafting, consideration, and reporting of legislation.

Sixteen bills have been reported to the House, most with considerable bipartisan support. The subject matter of these bills reads like a digest of national economic and social problems: fair employment practices; manpower retraining;

college academic facilities; equal pay for women; prevailing wages for work on Federal projects; migrant labor; modernization of vocational education; youth conservation; racial discrimination in education; mine safety; adult illiteracy; education of handicapped children; and library services. You will note that not one of these is an easy or noncontroversial subject in terms of the proper Federal role in achieving national goals.

The four major bills from our committee which have already been enacted in this session would represent a respectable committee score for an entire Congress.

First. Equal pay for equal work for women, H.R. 6060, Public Law 88-38: This legislation to prohibit discrimination in employment because of sex and to accord to women equal pay for equal work has been before the Congress for nearly 25 years. Final action on this is a credit to the 88th Congress.

Second. Manpower Development and Training Act amendments, H.R. 8720, awaiting President's signature: This represents a major strengthening of the manpower retraining program with particular emphasis on meeting the problems of unemployed youth and citizens who lack the basic educational skills necessary to profit from job training. It gives hope that we can strike at the hard core of unemployment in this country.

Third. Vocational Education Act of 1963, H.R. 4955, Public Law 88-210: This act, which also extends the federally impacted school aid and the National Defense Education Act, is the most significant legislation in vocational education since the beginning of Federal participation in 1917. It completely transforms and modernizes the National Vocational Education Act, with its heavy emphasis on education for employment in the economy of the sixties. The act provides generous Federal assistance to the States for this purpose.

Fourth. College Academic Facilities Act of 1963, H.R. 4163, Public Law 88-204: President Eisenhower first proposed this aid for college classroom construction, in 1959, to meet needs which were already urgent. The Federal aid made available in this act may come "in the nick of time" to meet a crisis in higher education caused by a phenomenal increase in enrollments—increases which will mount for the rest of this decade. President Johnson described this as the most important educational enactment by the Congress in the history of the Republic. I think this is somewhat exaggerated in view of other historic education acts, such as the Eisenhower-sponsored National Defense Education Act, but this is extremely important and timely legislation.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs had an extremely busy session. As of December 17, 1963, 406 bills and resolutions have been referred to the committee. Testimony in hearings conducted in 26 open sessions consists of 1,701 printed pages. There have been 14 executive sessions resulting in the reporting of 26 bills. Of this number, 11 have been enacted into law; 11 have passed the House and are pending in Senate committees; 2 passed the House, were amended and passed by the Senate and returned to the House for further consideration; and 2 bills reported by the committee await the action of the House of Representatives. A brief description of veterans' bills that have become public law in this 1st session of the 88th Congress follows:

Public Law 88-3 (H.R. 212): Permits payment of $250 burial allowance in behalf of veterans whose discharges are changed from dishonorable to other than dishonorable after their death. Claim must be filed within 2 years from date of correction or 2 years from the date of enactment, whichever is later. (Approved April 2, 1963.)

Public Law 88-18 (H.R. 4549): Authorizes a very limited exception to the bar against employing retired officers, so as to permit the appointment of such a retired officer, prior to January 1, 1964, to the position of Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration. (Approved May 8, 1963.)

Public Law 88-20 (H.R. 199): Adds "deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction," to the other types of service-connected disabilities specified in the law pertaining to veterans' disability compensation for which an additional award in the amount of $47 monthly is provided. (Approved May 15, 1963.)

Public Law 88-21 (H.R. 211): Increases, generally by 10 percent, the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to eligible parents and children of veterans dying of service-connected causes. (Approved May 15, 1963.)

Public Law 88-22 (H.R. 214): Provides for payment of a statutory award of $47 per month to those veterans who incurred a service-connected loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, resulting in constant inability to communicate by speech. (Approved May 15, 1963.)

Public Law 88-40 (H.R. 249): Extends for another 5 years the program for reimbursement of the Philippine Government covering hospitalization and outpatient care for service-connected conditions of Commonwealth Army veterans who served with the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II. Permits the furnishing of drugs under certain conditions. (Approved June 13, 1963.)

Public Law 88-126 (S. 330): Provides that after expiration of the Korean conflict veterans' education and training program (generally after January 31, 1965), approval of courses under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act shall be by State approving agencies. (Approved September 23, 1963.)

Public Law 88-134 (H.R. 5250): Under the provisions of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act (Public Law 881, 84th Congress, effective Jan. 1, 1957), dependency and indemnity compensation is payable to widows, children, and parents based on the service-connected deaths of their husbands, fathers, and children, respectively. Specific monthly rates are provided for children and parents. The widow, however, until enactment of this law, was paid at the monthly rate of $112 plus 12 percent of the basic active rate of pay of her deceased husband. This law increases the $112 factor applicable to widows to $120 per month. (Approved October 5, 1963.)

Public Law 88-148 (S. 13): Provides for conveyance of approximately 19 acres of land, which was originally donated to the Veterans' Administration by the city of Fayetteville, Ark., back to that city for use as a park and recreational area. (Approved October 17, 1963.)

Public Law 88-151 (H.R. 242): Provides for waiver of recovery from veterans of indebtedness to the United States resulting from the payment of loan guarantee claims or from default on direct loans, under circumstances in which waiver is now denied. Specifically, provides that where there has been a default and loss of the property the Administrator may waive recovery if he determines "that the default arose out of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran or that collection of the indebtedness would otherwise work a severe hardship upon the veteran." (Approved October 17, 1963.)

Public Law 88-207 (H.R. 5691): Allows the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director authority to act upon the recommendations of disciplinary boards in cases involving inaptitude, inefficiency, or misconduct of physicians, dentists, and nurses appointed in the Department of Medicine and Surgery. (Approved December 17, 1963.)

Of the bills reported by the committee that have passed the House and are now pending in the Senate, one is deserving of special mention. Each Member of the House of Representatives can take pride in the knowledge that in supporting H.R. 8009, he has made a valuable contribution to the veterans' benefit program. This bill, authorizing as it does a comprehensive program of nursing care in Veterans' Administration and State facilities, provides a most worthwhile and needed benefit for the aging World War I veteran. It is my understanding that a committee in the other body currently is holding public hearings on this bill and I am hopeful that it will become law in the immediate future.

Mr. Speaker, I have presented this review of the work of these fine committees to help set the record straight. I am also proud of the very substantial and constructive Republican contributions to shaping this legislation and presenting it to the Congress. Needless to say, the legislative record of the Committee on Education and Labor reflects particular credit upon its chairman, ADAM POWELL, and upon its ranking Republican, PETER FRELINGHUYSEN. A major share of the credit for legislative action in the field of veterans' benefits, of course, goes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, OLIN E. TEAGUE.

The Changed Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the 17th annual mid-year meeting of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks was held in New York City on December 3 of this year. My father, the Honorable Roger Keith (former chairman of the committee on banks and banking of the Massachusetts State Senate) attended this conference and heard an excellent address by our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. His speech is a thoughtful presentation of the prospects for further growth of mutual savings banks—and their contribution to our Nation's economy—particularly as it concerns the role of mortgage financing in our country's homebuilding efforts. Mr. WIDNALL also comments upon the proposed Federal Charter for Mutual Savings Banks and other matters of importance to Congress. Under unanimous consent, I included this address in the RECORD:

THE CHANGED OUTLOOK

(Address by the Honorable WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, U.S. Representative from New Jersey)

President Rauch and members of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, I appreciate the opportunity of meeting with you today.

Our Nation has suffered great shock in the assassination of President Kennedy. But one of the great virtues of our democracy is that we never are dependent on any one man no matter how much he may be loved, how able he may be, or how tragic the circumstances under which he is replaced.

The problems of transition to a new Chief Executive which we face at the present time are actually less than those frequently occasioned as a result of our elective system. There is no change in party control, there is continuity in the Cabinet, and our new President has had 3 years and not just 60 days in which to intimately acquaint himself with many responsibilities of the high office he has assumed. The composition of the Congress remains unaltered. And yet we know there will be change. History records, that is the inevitable result of change in Chief Executives of our Nation. Policies, recommendations, and actions will begin to bear the imprint of the new President.

Our new President is a strong and able individual in his own right. As majority leader of the Senate he had a distinguished career and demonstrated a unique capacity for leadership to obtain constructive accomplishments. Although traditionally the Vice President occupies a submerged role, we can be sure that as Vice President he achieved familiarity with and participated in considerations of many of the great problems that had confronted the former Chief Executive of our Nation. We are fortunate we have such a man to assume the heavy responsibilities of the Presidency which fate has forced upon him.

It is early, of course, to attempt to prognosticate legislative and economic impacts of this sudden change in the executive head of our Government. It comes at a time when our economy has experienced a 33-month upswing which already is longer in duration than our average peacetime expansions. It also comes at a time when the broad base of the expansion is impressive. The advance of our gross national product to a record $588.5 billion on a seasonally adjusted annual rate for the third quarter of the year was the best advance of the year and represented a gain of almost $9 billion from the previous quarter. Before the change in our Presidency, official estimates were that GNP would reach an annual rate of $596 billion in the current quarter, $603 billion in the first quarter of next year and $608.5 billion in the second quarter without a tax cut, and $608 billion in the first quarter and $620 billion in the second quarter with the tax cut passed effective as of January 1 next year.

In view of the turn of events it would seem now those estimates are optimistic, but I also believe the prospects for a substantial tax cut effective January 1 have improved. Prospective hesitancy and uncertainty on the economic front almost surely would enlarge and accelerate support for the tax cut as a counteracting and stimulating force for our economy. It is probably a good guess that GNP, primarily under the force of existing momentum, still will cross the $600 billion level early next year. But a new factor of uncertainty has been added which could trip this already old, 33-month upswing in business.

As the incumbent, President Johnson, falls heir to the Democratic Party nomination next year; he also has fallen heir to the Kennedy program. Doubtless, initially, he will retain that program. But he will face reelection in the light of improved prospects for the Republican candidate, whoever he may be. As he pursues reelection in his own right there will surely emerge shifts in policies and objectives reflecting his own strong personality and his own proven abilities. He will surround himself with his own advisors and gradually shifts will occur in some of the key personnel of the executive establishment. His campaign for reelection will be by his own campaign. Change will become a reality and with change comes hesitancy and uncertainty.

I think this new element of uncertainty will temper our economic picture notwithstanding the stimulative effects of the tax cut. Rarely does business assess change at an economic peak; instead, the normal tendency is that it backs away from peaks while the reassessment is being made. I think that could well be the prospect in store for us and it will be reflected by early summer of next year.

Our balance-of-payments problem will continue to be a constraining influence. Fortunately the mercurial swings in our balance-of-payments deficit so far this year were already a matter of record. The first quarter annual rate of $1.7 billion in the deficit ballooned to $5.1 billion in the second quarter and then subsided to $1.5 billion for the third quarter on a seasonally adjusted annual rate. The Department of Commerce credits "smaller capital outflows" as responsible for "a very large part of the improvement in the balance on regular types of transactions." With the uncertainty engendered by a change in Chief Executives I would think that chances have improved for early enactment of the proposed interest-equalization tax, the effect of which would be to increase the interest cost to foreigners of obtaining funds in this country by approximately 1 full percentage point and thus discourage outflow of funds abroad for portfolio investment. It is reassuring to recall the steps which have been taken to guard against speculative raids on international currencies including our dollar. These include the $6-billion increase in special resources of the International Monetary Fund as well as our standby arrangement with the Fund for drawings up to $500 million, our currency swap arrangements with other countries, and the close and understanding working consultations that have been established with foreign central banking authorities.

Our balance-of-payments position will continue to exert upward pressure on interest rates particularly in the short-term sector. However, as I have already indicated, I think moderation of the level of business activity as a result of the new uncertainties will temper upward pressure on long-term interest rates with the result they will remain approximately at current levels in the period ahead. Two weeks ago I would have leaned to the view that interest rates would move upward in 1964.

Now after having gotten myself out on a limb through attempting to prognosticate at a time when it is particularly difficult to do so I would like to offer a few words of comment about your great industry. Your institutions are enjoying another banner year after setting new highs in savings and assets last year. This year your institutions will probably top last year's record $3 billion increase in savings deposits by approximately 10 percent and boost savings totals to almost $45 billion. Your depositors will enjoy the protection of reserves over the $4 billion level. Early next year we may expect to see assets of your industry cross the $50 billion mark. That is a great achievement and I congratulate you for your fine record as specialists in handling the savings of our citizens.

I would expect that mortgage investment, which is your highest yielding investment, would continue next year to dominate your investment activity. I note that your investment in mortgage loans has moved up from 69.5 percent of assets at the close of 1962 to approximately 71.4 percent of assets as of September 30 of this year.

Residential mortgage loan investments comprise approximately 90 percent of your total mortgage loan investments, so you understandably are interested in the outlook for housing. The forward push which housing has given the economy this year has been from a boom in apartments with little change from last year in single-family housing starts. Since apartment construction represents the more volatile segment of the residential construction industry, I would expect it to respond to a more tempered outlook for the economy as a whole. Despite the sharp upturn in housing starts in September and October which will probably carry us close to 1.6 million starts for the year, I doubt that this strength will continue. I would not expect next year's level of housing starts to equal that for this year.

In view of the fact that approximately 22 percent of your mortgage loans are residential multifamily mortgage loans, I would like to call your attention to a relatively new development in this field in our financial picture.

This newcomer to multifamily structure financing is the condominium in which there is private ownership of a dwelling unit in a multifamily structure. FHA section 234 covers such mortgage insurance. A 60-unit project averaging about $18,000 per unit was started in Florida in July 1962 under the regular FHA section 207 multifamily project insurance program with intent to convert to the FHA section 234 condominium program. The project was completed in April of this year. The conversion to the condominium program will take place when 48 of the units are sold to individual owners. As of the present time I understand 22 of the units have been sold. I mention this not because of any immediate impact on the mortgage market. It is new to our country, but anyone who has traveled in the Spanish-speaking countries cannot fail to be most impressed by the very substantial amount of good housing that is financed under the condominium system of financing. FHA insured section 234 mortgages probably are eligible for investment under your existing statutes. I would suggest you acquaint yourselves with this newly emerging type of mortgage financing.

There is discussion these days of quality of credit. Every time I look at a chart of increase in home mortgage debt I am struck by the fact that truly this is a growth industry. Over the past 10 years nonfarm home mortgage debt outstanding has grown at a compound annual rate of 11.2 percent per year. Few of the glamour companies can match that compound rate of growth. However, a direct spoken rock-ribbed conservative might instead describe it as a credit binge. Home mortgage debt, of course, is the principal component of individual and noncorporate debt, all of the segments of which also have been on the increase. Related to disposable personal income there is no question that the income cover of debt is deteriorating. In 1962, individual debt (including noncorporate business and farms) rose by a record $32.2 billion or 10.4 percent, substantially outstripping the $20 billion rise in personal income after taxes of the same group. As a result, the ratio of personal debt to disposable personal income rose to another new high of 88.9 percent in 1962—up from 84.9 percent in 1961 and from approximately 60 percent in 1953. Possibly you will find this reminder of interest in considering your lending policies.

I would expect a housing bill next year although I think I should point out that the big omnibus housing bills have not come in presidential years. The big omnibus housing bills in recent years became the Housing Acts of 1949, of 1954, and of 1961. Not to be overlooked is the fact that neither the FHA nor Fanny Mae can be held as hostages to a housing bill next year. The basic FHA mortgage insurance programs do not expire until October 1965 and Fanny Mae has ample funds for its regular secondary market operations for the foreseeable future.

We can expect a substantial additional request for urban renewal grant authorization. This will be rationalized with the tax cut deficit on the basis that although additional urban renewal grant authorization is needed for project commitment, there is a very considerable lapse of time before the funds are actually disbursed and hence the additional authorization will not aggravate the tax cut deficit. I am aware of your association's support of the urban renewal program. In this connection I would like to mention a suggestion which I think has considerable merit. Urban renewal has moved away from the original concept of slum clearance. More and more it is moving in the direction of downtown rehabilitation. Central city core areas are bulldozed to make way for new multistory commercial structures surrounded by open space. Even the New York Stock Exchange is a candidate for such a project. We are assured, and some of the already completed projects have shown, that tax yield to the city is increased multifold from the same area. Yet we continue with taxpayer subsidy for such projects—a two-thirds Federal grant of net project costs. In my opinion these central core area projects should be put on a loan rather than a grant basis. When we find individual cities coming in with billion-dollar plans it is obvious to me that we should be thinking in terms of placing some parts at least of urban renewal on a revolving fund basis.

We may or may not see a big push on moderate income housing in a housing bill next year. Moderate income housing is supposed to serve families with incomes ranging between the upper brackets of low income and the lower brackets of middle income. The genesis of such a program exists in the FHA section 221(d)(3) program which was placed in the law in the 1961 Housing Act with a scheduled termination date of July 1, 1965. Only slightly over 10,000 units have come out of the program to date but this is the one to watch. Many of your savers are moderate income people and I dare say many of your home loan borrowers are moderate income people. But you can't compete with 40-year, 3⅜-percent, 3-percent equity loans which are picked up by Fannie Mae special assistance operations. Fannie Mae special assistance operations are financed directly by the Federal treasury, so broadening this program might encounter Budget Bureau difficulties as the budget deficit impact would be immediate. In particular you should concern yourselves with any attempt to broaden the category of eligible borrowers under the program.

Probably, modest additional authorization will be requested for public housing. But since even the advocates of the program are disturbed by the way it operates we may well see moves to introduce innovations, such as for instance, a rent certificate plan which would get away from institutionalizing the recipients of public housing assistance.

A new housing bill doubtless would propose changes in many of the existing programs. I will not attempt to detail them but suggest they receive your careful consideration as they become known.

Recently our committee was afforded an opportunity to become better acquainted with one of the legislative proposals which you support. About a month ago your industry sent to Washington a very able five-man team of experts to present the case of your industry for Federal charter legislation. The occasion was a hearing before the Bank Supervision Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which my good friend and your good friend Congressman MULTER of New York is chairman. Let me assure those of you who were not present at the hearing that the presentation was most interesting and effective. One of the committee members in complimenting your witnesses stated, and I quote, "In the nearly 5 years that I have served on this committee, this statement that you have made is the most scholarly and helpful statement that has ever been made to the committee." You might also be interested in knowing that notwithstanding the fact the subcommittee is a 13-member subcommittee, no less than 21 committee members, or approximately two-thirds of the full committee membership, attended the hearings at which your industry presentation was made. Sharing honors in this fine presentation to the subcommittee were your president, Stewart Rauch; your vice president, Morris Crawford; your executive vice president, Grover Ensley; your director of research, Saul Klaman; and your general counsel, James Riordan.

Your bill providing for Federal charter of mutual savings banks, as is true of many other legislative proposals, must now find its place in the program of the new President. This possibly can mean delay. In the transition period when the economy will be particularly sensitive to change from established patterns, it may well be that executive policy will be to temporarily forego financial changes of any kind. While delay is discouraging, the fact remains that you have taken an important and necessary first step in formally presenting your proposal to the committee.

I look forward to the opportunity of more actively working with the members of your industry and your national association. I count many of your members among my close personal friends. I have long been familar in my home State of New Jersey with the fine work done by my good friend, John Kress, president of the Howard Savings Institution of Newark. His accomplishments reflect credit both on your industry and on his community as well. I have known your association's executive vice president, Grover Ensley, since the days when he served as the very able staff director of that important and highly respected committee of the Congress, then known as the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and now known as the Joint Economic Committee. It is generally recognized that much of the credit for the excellent professional stature which that staff has attained belongs to Grover Ensley. You are indeed fortunate in having him as the executive vice president of your national association. Only recently the former general counsel of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Robert Poston, joined your association as director of your Washington office. Bob is well known and well liked on Capitol Hill and I am sure he will make a valuable contribution to the work of your association.

President Rauch and members of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, again I wish to express my pleasure and appreciation of this opportunity of meeting with you today and participating in this 17th annual midyear meeting of your great national association.

Residual Oil Quotas Should Be Eliminated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as you know, residual oil quotas impose an unfair burden on New England's economy amounting to approximately $30 million a year. There is increasing indignation concerning this matter which is broadly bipartisan and which is finding support not only on the entire eastern seaboard but throughout the country. Because of mounting interest in this matter, Mr. Speaker, I am calling my colleagues' attention to a letter that I have just sent to Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall:

DECEMBER 20, 1963.

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On Monday, December 9, President Johnson restored to you the responsibilities and role of being the chief agency for petroleum policy matters for the Federal Government. After your talk with the President that date, you stated "we will have a heavier responsibility than in the past on oil matters," referring especially to all import controls." As a Member of Congress who has been fighting aggressively for relief for my State, as well as all of New England, on this subject of restrictions on residual fuel oil imports, I am most happy to see that we now have one central source that we can go to. I commend President Johnson for making this decision since it will eliminate the confusion of the past that resulted in divided authority and responsibility on oil imports between the White House and your Department.

As you are well aware, in view of the statements that you and your senior aides made at the time of the announcement of the Passamaquoddy project, New England power costs are the highest in the Nation. The findings of the Federal Power Commission studies in the past have always confirmed the fact that New England power costs are the highest in the Nation and, further, that the prime factor creating these high power costs was, and is, the high cost of fuel. The restrictions on residual fuel oil imports that have been kept in effect for the past several years, have been a major source that has contributed to the burden that the New England consumer has had to shoulder in the form of high fuel costs which, in turn, have created the highest power costs in the Nation.

In spite of the facts that I and my colleagues from New England have made known to you in the past, that the coal industry's problems are caused by factors other than residual fuel oil competition, these controls have been kept in force for apparent political reasons. I want to stress again the causes of the coal industry's problems—namely, automation, which now requires only 170,000 miners to do the work of 400,000 miners 10 years ago in order to produce the same volume of coal, conversions from coal to diesel fuel oil by the railroads, and by household consumers from coal to No. 2 fuel oil. None of these products has any direct connection with residual fuel oil. Another factor that has contributed to the coal industry's problems is the fact that the coal mine owners have looked to the taxpayer to finance their research and development in both technological as well as marketing research. An example of the latter is the fact that the coal industry last year spent less than $20 million on research and development as against over $400 million by the oil industry.

Please do not misunderstand me, I am not unsympathetic to the problems of coal regions. In fact, I think it is the responsibility of both the coal mine owners as well as the Federal and State Governments to do everything in their combined power to assist in retraining programs, relocation programs, as well as efforts to attract diversified industries into the depressed areas. Another potential outlet for coal, and one virtually untapped because of the failure of the coal mine owners to aggressively develop foreign markets, is the potential for U.S. coal exports. Here again the coal industry had the taxpayer pay approximately $100,000 for a detailed study by Robert Nathan Associates, "The Foreign Market Potential for U.S. Coal."

I endorse this program 100 percent and urge its implementation to the end that U.S. coal, which, because of its automation can compete with any coal produced in the free world, gets its fair share of foreign markets. Because, in this manner, not only will we help the coal regions, but we will make a very considerable contribution to our serious balance-of-payments program.

Speaking for my own State, residual fuel oil imports have placed an undue burden on every resident of the State, as well as on our industrial machine. At the start of the century, New England was the heart of our industrial empire and now it is far down the line, and one of the main causes of this slippage has been the high cost of power and the high cost of fuel. In the case of the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, I am informed by President Schiller that his utility is paying a premium of at least $300,000 per year due to residual import controls. If we had the traditional free enterprise market economy in residual fuel oil in New Hampshire, President Schiller could effect savings to his customers in his residual fuel oil costs that would, on the basis of present price levels, result in a saving of at least $300,000 per annum.

There is no rhyme nor reason for the continuation of the present restrictions on residual fuel oil. They are not helping the coal industry; they are causing the cost of living for the 50 million odd consumers on the east coast to be higher due to increased fuel costs; they are denying the consumer his traditional right of freedom of choice of supplier; they are hurting friends and customers abroad such as Venezuela; they are compromising our position in our trade affairs because we will have to set aside $750 million of import trade when Governor Herter and his trade negotiating team meet in GATT conferences next year; and, finally, these imports are of no impact on our domestic oil industries, as witness the fact that at the annual meeting of the Industrial Petroleum Association of America in Dallas last November, this reputable and responsible organization excluded residual fuel oil imports from its resolution on the overall subject of oil imports.

Mr. Secretary, the evidence is such that you can by no stretch of the imagination justify the continuation of these import restrictions which are causing such hardship to the consumer in New England. At least, if you will not lift these controls, then reform the governing regulations so that the factor of end-use control is eliminated and freedom of choice of supplier by the consumer is returned to the marketplace.

Although I have stressed my own State of New Hampshire and the New England region in this letter, as you know, this is a matter of direct concern to all eastern seaboard States. I noticed with interest that Senator Javits and Senator Keating have joined in the battle to remove the infamous residual oil quotas, as reported on pages 25005–25007 in the Congressional Record of December 18, 1963.

Yours very truly,

James C. Cleveland, M.C.

Mr. Speaker, I am also calling my colleagues' attention to a letter from Mr. John K. Evans, executive director of the Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, Inc., Washington, D.C., addressed to the Under Secretary of Commerce, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. Mr. Evans' forthright statement should be read carefully as it meets squarely many false arguments which are being improperly advanced as the reasons for maintaining discriminatory residual oil quotas.

Independent Fuel Oil
Marketers of America, Inc.,
Washington, D.C. December 6, 1963.

Subject: Appalachian Regional Commission.

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.,
Under Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Roosevelt: I read with interest the press release dated December 1, 1963, issued by the National Coal Policy Conference regarding their letter to you on the subject. There are several pertinent points and observations I hereby make for your personal information regarding the contents of this press release.

I agree with Mr. Moody that the coal industry "is the only important indigenous industry in most of the Appalachians. The mining and transportation of coal can provide far more jobs than any other industrial activity." I disagree with the balance of his argument.

First he said, "Government-supported imports of residual oil strike at the heart of the coal industry." Imports of this product, which is in short supply in our country, are not Government-supported. He then goes on to call this product "imported waste oil." The oil industry, unlike the coal industry, finances all of its operations such as research and development out of its profits, unlike the coal mine owners who get Uncle Sam to pick up the tab most of the time. The point I make is that the oil industry cannot afford to waste anything. It has no waste product.

Mr. Moody then goes on to solicit the support of the administration of the legislation his group is sponsoring "to limit imports in the area of competition to 50 percent of residual consumption." Just so that you comprehend what Mr. Moody is asking you to endorse—it is nothing less than end use control and the enforcement by Government decree of not only the complete elimination of the traditional right of the consumer to freedom of choice of energy but to compound the felony on the consumer by forcing the majority of the utilities to convert from residual fuel oil to the consumption of coal at sizable capital expense coupled with higher energy costs. Mr. Moody stated that "the electric utility market is coal's growth market." Since when under our free enterprise system has the electric utility market been captive to coal? It seems that what Mr. Moody is suggesting is nothing less than your sponsoring the adoption of a communistic type of market economy and to hell with the interests of 65 million consumers on the east coast.

Let's look at the facts: There are approximately 160,000 coal miners against around 400,000 in the late forties. Why the drop in employment? The miner today produces over 16 tons per day against 6 tons in the forties—right here is your major reason for unemployment; namely, automation. The balance of the story lies in the conversion from coal to diesel by the railroads and from coal to No. 2 fuel oil by the household consumer—neither of which product has any connection with residual fuel oil.

Mr. Moody is asking you to disregard the interests of 65 million consumers of energy on the east coast for the selfish interests of a few coal mine owners who, incidentally, never had it so good profitwise. The issue he makes re "jobs of Appalachian workers" is 100 percent false as I prove by the above statement. By the way he says he speaks for the United Mine Workers of America—I am informed that of all the unions the latter is the only one that has not had any revision of wage scales to adjust for cost of living increases since 1958. I also understand that the United Mine Workers Welfare & Rehabilitation Fund wasted millions of dollars building 10 hospitals in the Appalachian area, 5 of which have already been taken over by the Appalachian regional hospitals and the remaining 5 are due to be released next year because of lack of need. The funds involved in the construction of these hospitals were contributed by the mine owners at the rate of 40 cents per ton, which subsidy was passed along to the long suffering consumer. The UMWRF could better use its funds for more productive efforts on behalf of its members.

The above is not to imply that something should not be done for the Appalachian area. But the answer is in positive rather than negative action. Continuation of the depressed areas program, of which West Virginia has been a leading recipient, is required. Regarding the coal industry, due to the magnificent job that has been done in the automation of mining operations coupled with the fact that the good Lord has blessed our country with the richest and most easily accessible deposits of coal in the world, U.S. coal can compete in any market in the world and that includes the domestic market. Recently the taxpayer paid for a detailed study of "The Foreign Market Potential for U.S. Coal" and the findings and recommendations of this study should be implemented. Granted the latter function, both cost of study and its implementation would have been assumed by the oil industry if oil was involved, but since the coal mine owners can get Uncle Sam to finance their research and development far be it for me to try to change the historical course. The present negative policy created and endorsed by the coal mine owners only raises the cost of living of 65 million east coast residents, penalizes and is gradually eliminating the small businessman, who markets residual fuel oil, by creating a monopoly/cartel in the marketplace by Government decree, compromises our position in the economic arena of the world, and ties the hands of our trade negotiator in the upcoming GATT Conference next year by the fact that we are maintaining a nontariff barrier against the importation of residual fuel oil that is neither justified in the light of national security nor are these imports harmful to our domestic economy as proven in the Office of Emergency Planning report on residual fuel oil imports dated February 13, 1963. On the contrary domestic production of residual fuel oil has dropped each year since the forties (now down to 8 percent of total refinery yield) and imports are needed to supplement domestic supply.

Regarding the above trade point, we are putting a gun in the hands of our free world competitors by reserving from the negotiating conference table 5 percent of our imports (residual fuel oil imports run at $750 million per year) for reasons unjustified under free world trade standards thereby enabling our friends at the conference table to do likewise—except that they have the right to hit us where it will hurt—such as the importation into their respective countries of American automobiles and manufactured goods. The coal mine owners not only want New England to pay higher energy costs but they also want to create a trade situation in the GATT whereby New England exports will be discriminated against. Further in this regard, our tariff income on this import is only 2½ percent, making it an ideal item to trade off in our bargaining program with the other GATT nations. The Western Hemisphere is of primary national security importance and Venezuela, the main source of supply of residual fuel oil, is not only one of our stanchest friends and allies but also one of our best customers. The present program of unjustified and inequitable import restrictions is not only directly harming Venezuela but also is diverting supplies from that country to the Middle East by U.S. Government decree. Already 70,000 barrels a day have been diverted and trade rumor says that more will follow.

In closing, therefore, since it is open season for giving you advice I suggest in view of the facts, not the fiction that you are receiving from other quarters, outlined in this letter that for the benefit of all our people, and especially the 65 million consumers of energy on the east coast and the manufacturers of the goods we sell and export to Venezuela, that controls on the importation of residual fuel oil either be removed or the governing regulations changed so as to return the marketplace to our traditional free enterprise economy by the adoption of a regulatory system whereby the marketer that gets the customer automatically gets the right to import that customer's requirements of this product. For the domestic coal industry I suggest you render every assistance and support to an all-out program to sell our coal in oversea markets, thereby helping both our balance-of-payments position as well as our coal mining States. For the 170,000 miners, benefits should automatically accrue to them from the increased sale of U.S. coal in world markets, particularly if their union exercises sound fiscal and operational policy and looks after the interests of the miners rather than the coal mine owners. Finally, since the coal mine owners do not have the same sense of humane and civic responsibility that the oil industry has when faced with unemployment problems created by automation—the oil industry instead of firing personnel resorts to attrition reduction by a gradual program placing men already on the payroll in job openings created by the normal attrition of retirement, etc. I urge the continuation of all aspects of our depressed area programs, particularly such rehabilitation activities as adult vocational and retraining schools.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN K. EVANS.

The 1963 Legislative Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we will soon move into the second session of the 88th Congress. Much lies before us if we are to keep faith with the American people. I have in mind the civil rights bill, the tax bill, medicare, the National Service Corps, the Youth Employment Act and other legislation advanced to us by the late President Kennedy. President Johnson will soon deliver his state of the Union message. I confidently expect that he will urge action on this unfinished business. My constituents expect enactment of this program and I suspect that millions of others do, too. I herewith place before you the results of 5,500 questionnaires returned to my office in recent weeks. I cite you first the overall percentages and then some actual returns from 4 of the 14 municipalities polled in my district.

1963 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you favor or oppose President Kennedy's civil rights proposals—

(a) To enforce the constitutional right to vote for all citizens? Favor, 88 percent; oppose, 9 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

(b) To prevent racial discrimination in places of public accommodation? Favor, 67 percent; oppose, 27 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

(c) To permit the Attorney General to institute suits to end school segregation? Favor, 62 percent; oppose, 32 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

(d) To establish an agency to help communities voluntarily solve racial problems? Favor, 63 percent; oppose, 29 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

(e) To extend by 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights? Favor, 56 percent; oppose, 23 percent; no opinion, 21 percent.

(f) To prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs? Favor, 74 percent; oppose, 18 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

(g) To establish a permanent Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity? Favor, 53 percent; oppose, 33 percent; no opinion, 14 percent.

2. Do you favor or oppose a reduction in Federal income taxes? Favor, 72 percent; oppose, 21 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

3. Do you favor or oppose an old-age hospital insurance program under social security? Favor, 67 percent; oppose, 27 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

4. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for public school education? Favor, 62 percent; oppose, 33 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

5. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for construction of college facilities? Favor, 60 percent; oppose, 32 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

6. Do you favor or oppose a National Service Corps to help the unfortunate? Favor, 58 percent; oppose, 27 percent; no opinion, 15 percent.

7. Do you favor or oppose the Youth Employment Act to establish a Youth Conservation Corps? Favor, 68 percent; oppose, 18 percent; no opinion, 14 percent.

8. Do you approve or disapprove the recently signed nuclear test ban treaty? Favor, 73 percent; oppose, 16 percent; no opinion, 11 percent.

9. Do you think our foreign-aid program should be: More, 9 percent; less, 67 percent; the same, 24 percent.

10. Do you favor or oppose Federal programs to assist States and municipalities for urban renewal, public health, and highway construction? Favor, 64 percent; oppose, 26 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

11. Do you approve or disapprove continuing our program to aid economically depressed areas in the United States? Favor, 82 percent; oppose, 12 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

12. Do you consider yourself: a Democrat, 35 percent; a Republican, 29 percent; an independent, 36 percent.

QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS FROM THE CITY OF BURLINGTON

1. Do you favor or oppose President Kennedy's civil rights proposals: (a) To enforce the constitutional right to vote for all citizens? Favor, 440; oppose, 52; no opinion, 18.

(b) To prevent racial discrimination in places of public accommodation? Favor, 331; oppose, 145; no opinion, 33.

(c) To permit the Attorney General to institute suits to end school segregation? Favor, 310; oppose, 169; no opinion, 38.

(d) To establish an agency to help communities voluntarily solve racial problems? Favor, 346; oppose, 129; no opinion, 34.

(e) To extend by 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights? Favor, 285; oppose, 120; no opinion, 110.

(f) To prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs? Favor, 351; oppose, 106; no opinion, 51.

(g) To establish a permanent Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity? Favor, 312; oppose, 134; no opinion, 64.

2. Do you favor or oppose a reduction in Federal income taxes? Favor, 411; oppose, 61; no opinion, 37.

3. Do you favor or oppose an old-age hospital insurance program under social security? Favor, 394; oppose, 88; no opinion, 27.

4. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for public school education? Favor, 367; oppose, 110; no opinion, 32.

5. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for construction of college facilities? Favor, 347; oppose, 124; no opinion, 41.

6. Do you favor or oppose a National Service Corps to help the unfortunate? Favor, 357; oppose, 93; no opinion, 58.

7. Do you favor or oppose the Youth Employment Act to establish a Youth Conservation Corps? Favor, 391; oppose, 48; no opinion, 71.

8. Do you approve or disapprove the recently signed nuclear test ban treaty? Favor, 340; oppose, 79; no opinion, 86.

9. Do you think our foreign aid program should be: More, 38; less, 310; the same, 137.

10. Do you favor or oppose Federal programs to assist States and municipalities for urban renewal, public health, and highway construction? Favor, 357; oppose, 110; no opinion, 42.

11. Do you approve or disapprove continuing our program to aid economically depressed areas in the United States? Favor, 447; oppose, 28; no opinion, 30.

12. Do you consider yourself: a Democrat, 258; a Republican, 107; an Independent, 102.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM THE BOROUGH OF PRINCETON

1. Do you favor or oppose President Kennedy's civil rights proposals: (a) To enforce the constitutional right to vote for all citizens? Favor, 339; oppose, 21; no opinion, 11. (b) To prevent racial discrimination in places of public accommodation? Favor, 304; oppose, 47; no opinion, 20. (c) To permit the Attorney General to institute suits to end school segregation? Favor, 277; oppose, 69; no opinion, 25. (d) To establish an agency to help communities voluntarily solve racial problems? Favor, 265; oppose, 75; no opinion, 29. (e) To extend by 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights? Favor, 254; oppose, 42; no opinion, 77. (f) To prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs? Favor, 312; oppose, 36; no opinion, 23. (g) To establish a permanent Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity? Favor, 228; oppose, 87; no opinion, 56.

2. Do you favor or oppose a reduction in Federal income taxes? Favor, 243; oppose, 84; no opinion, 45.

3. Do you favor or oppose an old-age hospital insurance program under Social Security? Favor, 244; oppose, 95; no opinion, 32.

4. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for public school education? Favor, 224; oppose, 119; no opinion, 29.

5. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for construction of college facilities? Favor, 220; oppose, 110; no opinion, 39.

6. Do you favor or oppose a National Service Corps to help the unfortunate? Favor, 207; oppose, 85; no opinion, 79.

7. Do you favor or oppose the Youth Employment Act to establish a Youth Conservation Corps? Favor, 246; oppose, 54; no opinion, 69.

8. Do you approve or disapprove the recently signed nuclear test ban treaty? Favor, 319; oppose, 26; no opinion, 26.

9. Do you think our foreign aid program should be: More, 60; less, 175; the same, 135.

10. Do you favor or oppose Federal programs to assist States and municipalities for urban renewal, public health, and highway construction? Favor, 243; oppose, 81; no opinion, 46.

11. Do you approve or disapprove continuing our program to aid economically depressed areas in the United States? Favor, 296; oppose, 42; no opinion, 36.

12. Do you consider yourself: A Democrat, 104; a Republican, 115; an independent, 156.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM THE CITY OF TRENTON

1. Do you favor or oppose President Kennedy's civil rights proposals: (a) To enforce the constitutional right to vote for all citizens? Favor, 530; oppose, 65; no opinion, 23.

(b) To prevent racial discrimination in places of public accommodation? Favor, 380; oppose, 189; no opinion, 50.

(c) To permit the Attorney General to institute suits to end school segregation? Favor, 362; oppose, 205; no opinion, 51.

(d) To establish an agency to help communities voluntarily solve racial problems? Favor, 400; oppose, 160; no opinion, 60.

(e) To extend by 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights? Favor, 338; oppose, 164; no opinion, 115.

(f) To prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs? Favor, 433; oppose, 118; no opinion, 67.

(g) To establish a permanent Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity? Favor, 328; oppose, 192; no opinion, 97.

2. Do you favor or oppose a reduction in Federal income taxes? Favor, 466; oppose, 108; no opinion, 43.

3. Do you favor or oppose an old-age hospital insurance program under social security? Favor, 450; oppose, 132; no opinion, 32.

4. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for public school education? Favor, 368; oppose, 190; no opinion, 55.

5. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for construction of college facilities? Favor, 372; oppose, 186; no opinion, 62.

6. Do you favor or oppose a National Service Corps to help the unfortunate? Favor, 404; oppose, 139; no opinion, 73.

7. Do you favor or oppose the Youth Employment Act to establish a Youth Conservation Corps? Favor, 426; oppose, 110; no opinion, 80.

8. Do you approve or disapprove the recently signed nuclear test ban treaty? Favor, 426; oppose, 103; no opinion, 87.

9. Do you think our foreign aid program should be: More, 61; less, 406; the same, 144.

10. Do you favor or oppose Federal programs to assist States and municipalities for urban renewal, public health, and highway construction? Favor, 406; oppose, 129; no opinion, 81.

11. Do you approve or disapprove continuing our program to aid economically depressed areas in the United States? Favor, 502; oppose, 75; no opinion, 43.

12. Do you consider yourself: A Democrat, 157; a Republican, 110; an Independent, 219.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM THE TOWNSHIP OF MAPLE SHADE

1. Do you favor or oppose President Kennedy's civil rights proposals:

(a) To enforce the constitutional right to vote for all citizens? Favor, 294; oppose, 52; no opinion, 10.

(b) To prevent racial discrimination in places of public accommodation? Favor, 189; oppose, 142; no opinion, 28.

(c) To permit the Attorney General to institute suits to end school segregation? Favor, 184; oppose, 150; no opinion, 24.

(d) To establish an agency to help communities voluntarily solve racial problems? Favor, 226; oppose, 106; no opinion, 28.

(e) To extend by 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights? Favor, 171; oppose, 105; no opinion, 78.

(f) To prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs? Favor, 231; oppose, 89; no opinion, 39.

(g) To establish a permanent Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity? Favor, 167; oppose, 142; no opinion, 46.

2. Do you favor or oppose a reduction in Federal income taxes? Favor, 252; oppose, 83; no opinion, 18.

3. Do you favor or oppose an old-age hospital insurance program under social security? Favor, 270; oppose, 65; no opinion, 21.

4. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for public school education? Favor, 231; oppose, 101; no opinion, 17.

5. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for construction of college facilities? Favor, 218; oppose, 113; no opinion, 24.

6. Do you favor or oppose a National Service Corps to help the unfortunate? Favor, 226; oppose, 81; no opinion, 50.

7. Do you favor or oppose the Youth Employment Act to establish a Youth Conservation Corps? Favor, 278; oppose, 38; no opinion, 42.

8. Do you approve or disapprove the recently signed nuclear test-ban treaty? Favor, 245; oppose, 58; no opinion, 50.

9. Do you think our foreign aid program should be: More, 20; less, 262; the same, 57.

10. Do you favor or oppose Federal programs to assist States and municipalities for urban renewal, public health, and highway construction? Favor, 223; oppose, 81; no opinion, 35.

11. Do you approve or disapprove continuing our program to aid economically depressed areas in the United States? Favor, 313; oppose, 22; no opinion, 21.

12. Do you consider yourself: A Democrat, 166; a Republican, 44; an independent, 132.

Changing Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, now that the new year has about started it is not surprising to see old faces with new looks and old songs with new tunes. I have been preaching and politicking against so-called free but unfair foreign trade so long that I am grateful for any help I can get.

The worm is turning although it is still a long way from total victory but the solid wall of the sophomoric world economists who prevailed upon Congress to pass the trade bill is beginning to show some big cracks.

Some of the cracks are serious. For instance after 5 years of sponsoring a bill to force all importers to mark every item sold in the United States with the country of origin, the Senate passed the bill finally right before recess.

The President answers retaliation against Common Market by upping tariffs to make up for the loss of chicken sales. This would have been a serious foreign relations problem a few years ago, but the old dollar sign still controls trade whether the free trade fakers like it or not.

The House passes a bill giving $270 million to textile mill stockholders because imports have hurt the textile mill profits. This can be the beginning of the end of either our trade policies or our free enterprise systems.

House passes a bill to stop dumping of stainless steel sheets by Japanese under a deliberate abuse of interest in Congress in tariff regulations.

Association of American Railroads passes resolution to support laws limiting imports of residual oil in an attempt to help the railroad and coal industry.

The National Milk Producers Association hits hard at further cuts in tariffs on dairy products; removal of dairy products from the list of commodities being considered for tariff cuts was urged November 25 by the National Milk Producers Federation of the Trade Information Committee, which is holding hearings preparatory to negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, scheduled in Geneva next year.

Lower tariffs and increased imports would put a heavy burden on the U.S. price support program and add to its cost of operation, the federation informed the committee. Imports reduce income to Americans by depriving them of more desirable markets and forcing domestic production into Commodity Credit Corporation.

> For example—

It was stated—

> imports of frozen cream displace outlets for domestic fresh cream and drive down its price. The displaced fresh cream is made into butter and nonfat dry milk, and sold to CCC for substantially less net return.
>
> The firm policy of Congress—that the foreign trade program should not be permitted to impair the domestic agricultural programs it has enacted—was restated in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962—

Emphasized E. M. Norton, federation secretary.

> Further reducing tariffs would increase the pressure of the disparity already existing between domestic support prices and the prices of dairy products in world trade.

The cheese industry has just completed hearings before the Tariff Commission begging for relief from imports. They say that more than 50 percent of all U.S. cheese consumption is imported. We don't have to look far to see why we have surplus feed grain and billions of dollars for farm relief.

Pennsylvania mushroom growers claim imports will destroy our domestic mushroom business unless we do something about imports from Formosa and Japan.

Steel mills loss of production because of imports takes 50,000 jobs from steel workers in 1963.

Former Secretary of State Christian Herter announces plans to consider tariff cuts on all U.S. products at Geneva Conference of GATT.

Our glass industries have petitioned the President, the Tariff Commission and Congress not to allow any cuts in glass tariffs.

Lead and zinc, lumber and coal producers still are fighting to save U.S. market from imports.

Elgin Watch Co. slashes 600 worker's jobs and says it is up to the Government to give them defense jobs.

Try and buy U.S. made watches. Even the Russians are getting into the "trade in United States act." They are charged by the watchmakers unions of shipping into Jamaica and then the Jamaicans under preferential trade treatment export to United States by simply putting a strap on the watch and shipping it into the United States in a box made in United States of America.

It would take a full book to cover the trade losses we have sustained, but a recent survey showing our unemployment up to 5.9 percent in November makes a joke out of the promises made to the American people and Congress by both the then Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, and Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges that the new trade bill would bring in from 4 to 6 million new American jobs.

As a Congressman, I made a prediction that industry would be hurt, mining would be hurt, and farming would be hurt, and considering our consumption and growth in population our workers would be hurt by any lowering of trade barriers. If you do not believe I was right ask the 6,000 workers at Studebaker, in Indiana.

You will note from the press and I quote:

> Studebaker cars will be imported into the United States from Canada to existing dealers, the Studebaker president said.

This means that because of cheaper labor, less taxes for foreign aid and defense, and less costs for regulated utilities, Studebaker hopes to produce cheaper in Canada while still enjoying the relative security and privileges of being an American citizen corporation. Nice if it holds up, but sooner or later the 6,000 laid off employees will not be able to buy Studebakers or any other car, then where does Studebaker move to?

Do not be too hard on Studebaker: our trade acts, our economic aid to competitors plus a policy of urging our corporations to invest overseas are to blame for Studebaker, and hundreds of other American companies that have run away from U.S. responsibilities while still enjoying the lucrative U.S. marketplace without restrictions.

It would be interesting to have a candidate for U.S. Senator or President campaign on a trade platform.

This would be especially interesting if the candidate really believes in free trade but understands our job economy enough to know the difference between free, fair, and fake trade agreements.

For instance we've sold—or have we—$250 million worth of wheat to Russia. It is reported that this makes a 100 percent increase in cash sales of wheat and yet according to the fake trade figures given out by the proponents of free trade we are supposed to be selling $2 billion worth of wheat to foreign countries.

It is not hard to see why our balance of payments is out of whack. We sold $475 million worth of wheat to Brazil. However, we take payment in cruzeiros—Brazilian dollars—under an agreement that gives the United States the use of 10 percent of $47,500,000 if we use it in Brazil, we loan to Brazil 60 percent or $380 million for economic development and give Brazil the last 10 percent or $47.5 million. This means the U.S. taxpayer paid out $47.5 million of wheat, shipped it to Brazil and received not one cent back in the United States.

The balance of payments goes out the window and in the words of the old refrain—

> That's where our money goes, selling wheat for worthless cruzeiros, that's where our money goes.

The first duty of a government is to its own people just as it is a father's duty to his family.

No American ought to be out of work in his own country if he is expected to live and raise his family in keeping with our traditions and our way of life.

I am now and have always been for the 32-, 35,- 36-hour week but I am realistic enough to know that if we increase costs on our products and lower our tariff on imports we will have a no-hour week.

I believe the two biggest blunders of our times were the passage of the so-called free trade expansion bill followed by giving industry a $3-billion-a-year tax credit to automate so it could meet foreign competition.

In the end, automation must be more harmful than beneficial to the economy since even complete automation will not stop imports because we will not hesitate to help our friends overseas become automated and, secondly, importation plus automation spells job stagnation in all production-line industries, mining, and farming.

The fact that we are preparing to pay subsidies to textile manufacturers to meet the unfair competition from foreign countries is as fantastic a proposal as ever submitted to Congress.

We came within 18 votes of defeating this measure in the House with all the weight of the leaders, both past and present, against us. In a secret ballot this bill would not have received much more than the sponsors' support.

There is always a silver lining in every cloud and this bill, if the Senate passes it, may well break the back of the international profiteers or it will give every industry a subsidy to make up differences between foreign and domestic costs of production.

One flaw in the ointment, however, is the problem of getting the money to pay the subsidies.

When the northern Democrats and Republicans joined the cotton-State Democrats and Republicans, it created a new unholy alliance against the little people who have to pay the freight.

Unemployment will not be solved by talking or by trading; it can only be cured by hard work and a dose of buy-American when we spend our American-earned dollars.

Every nation must protect itself economically the same as it does militarily.

We have laws against dumping goods by foreign producers and so do other nations. The trouble is, the only way we can sell to other countries is by dumping subsidized products or foreign aid purchases except in machinery and material the other nations do not produce or produce in short supply.

All trade should be free in noncompetitive goods and all jobs both here and in foreign countries should be protected in competition goods.

Our policy is just the opposite. We charge high imports on scotch, diamonds, and other non-U.S.-produced items and let the foreign countries flood our market with fuel oil, glass, steel, cheese, and so forth.

Funny, if it was not so tragic, a nation with unemployment, glassworkers import glass so it can give away wheat. Do not be shocked, in some cases we can be accused of doing worse.

For instance, the freetraders are now building up a case to have open trade with Russia in nonstrategic goods. It has long been the opinion of experts in defense that all things are strategics, from a grain of wheat to the H-bomb.

Remember the story of the king who for want of nail lost a shoe, for want of shoe lost a horse and for want of horse lost a war and his kingdom.

Yes, small wheels make empires move, and when a nation can buy its so-called nonstrategic needs it can devote more time to producing its strategic materials.

The same people have been screaming about our allies trading with Red China and Cuba. Who is going to stop Russia from feeding the Chinese and helping the bearded one in Cuba? Certainly not the wheat traders.

What is even worse than poor people who get the wheat will not be told we sold it on credit and took a loss of 60 cents a bushel on every bushel.

They will not be told because they will be told that the high price of bread is the fault of the American who charged so much for the wheat. You can bet the little people will pay the freight.

The True Facts Are Always a Complete Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I long ago learned that a legislator worth his salt must grow a thick skin and learn to take abuse from the ignorant as well as from the malicious. Usually, the best course is to ignore such slanderous tripe. Occasionally, one's self respect demands that we take notice and reply.

Such an item appeared about me, written by one William V. Shannon under the title "District of Columbia Subway" and published in the New York Post of December 12, 1963.

I am happy and most grateful for the fact that our distinguished majority leader, the very able gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Carl Albert, upon learning of this diatribe against me, sent off a letter to the publisher of the paper, which speaks volumes and which is as follows:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Office of the Majority Leader,
Washington, D.C., December 17, 1963.
Mrs. Dorothy Schiff,
Publisher, New York Post,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Mrs. Schiff: Permit me to draw your attention to the column of William V. Shannon in your issue of December 12, 1963, headed "District of Columbia Subway."

I believe in every columnist's right to oppose any legislation with which he disagrees even when I disagree with his conclusions. However, I certainly cannot be considered biased against the subway transit system for the District of Columbia as I voted for the bill both on a standing vote and on a rollcall vote as the Congressional Record will indicate. I favor the transit system. Nonetheless, I think it is grossly unfair to state that my colleague Representative Abraham J. Multer, who had an opposite view and who was backed overwhelmingly by Members of the House, was not honest in the presentation of his point of view, nor do I think that any of the 278 Members of the House of Representatives who supported him were acting with any ulterior motive.

Frankly, I do not think the article is fair or accurate. For instance the reference to Representative Multer as red faced and roly-poly. He is neither. If that reference was intended to paint him as dissolute, it was both unfair and untrue. He neither drinks nor smokes. He bears the reputation among his colleagues as being a man of unusual personal morality and integrity.

The item then pictures him as aggressive, self-important, and humorless, causing him to be disliked and opposed by his colleagues because of his mannerisms. This statement also is both unfair and untrue. Mr. Multer has the utmost respect and admiration from Members on both sides of the aisle, for knowledge, ability, understanding, accuracy, fairness, and kindliness—as well as good humor. His advice and guidance are constantly sought by all who know him. The prestige he enjoys among his colleagues and the members of his own delegation and in the Congress as a whole, is evidenced by the fact that he has served as Democratic whip of the State of New York for many years, in which role I can testify he has performed with outstanding ability and success.

While I was hopeful that the District transit bill would pass, I think it ought to be pointed out that organized labor supported the defeat of the bill if an amendment it favored was not adopted. Mr. Multer supported the amendment which was rejected by the House and the bill was then recommitted by a vote of 278 to 76. I must emphasize both with respect to this bill and with respect to the bill to revise the ABC Act of the District of Columbia, that regardless of the views of any Member on the merits of either of these bills, no Member questioned the integrity of Mr. Multer in expressing his point of view in strong language. No one to my knowledge had the slightest idea that he was motivated by any impulse except the public good. I have known Congressman Multer and worked with him on many pieces of legislation in the years gone by. I am personally convinced that he is one of the most conscientious Members in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Multer has long been one of those Members who has been in favor of complete autonomy for the District of Columbia. He has repeatedly offered the administration's bill for this purpose. He has remained on the Committee on the District of Columbia even though it has been a burden from which he has long sought to be relieved. He has been requested to stay because of his valuable service. He is a good soldier and has responded accordingly. In his capacity as a member of that committee he has made a record which includes not only his fight for the administration's District home rule but also among others the following important measures: the administration's tax program including increased Federal payments; improvement of educational and hospital facilities; improvement of the operation of the District juvenile court; prohibiting the unlawful practice of law; juvenile delinquency and crime deterrent bills; granting the privilege of confidentiality to clergymen; regulation of pawn shops and personal loan companies to protect those who must resort to them for borrowing; regulation of employment agencies to protect the unemployed from the unscrupulous; improvement of the workmen's compensation laws; improvement of the compulsory automobile insurance laws; urban renewal bills; parking facilities; abolition of capital punishment; municipal art council and children's theater; antisegregation; standard weights and measures; and extension of minimum wage laws.

In conclusion may I only for the sake of emphasis say that in my honest view there is no more honorable, nor more hard working Member of Congress than Congressman Abraham J. Multer.

Sincerely,

Carl Albert,
Member of Congress, Majority Leader.

Some further facts on the subject matter of Shannon's maliciously slanderous harangue are as follows:

I introduced and caused to be reported to the House from the Banking and Currency Committee the administration's mass transportation bill in the last session. A similar administration bill was reported in this session of this Congress. Both bills include provisions protecting private enterprise and labor. Those provisions, and the entire bill, were supported by labor, management, and Governors and mayors from across the country, regardless of political affiliation. It was these same provisions that I urged be written into the District of Columbia transportation bill. The committee rejected both amendments. The House adopted the private enterprise amendment but rejected the labor amendment. The District bill was overwhelmingly defeated for several reasons, the more important of which are the following:

(1) It called for an expenditure of $400 million in the District of Columbia alone, while the mass transportation bill for the entire country called for $500 million for the entire country including the District of Columbia.

(2) The labor unions, national and local, were united in their efforts to kill the bill if it did not protect labor, both in the construction and operation of the transit facilities.

My view prevailed by a vote of 278 to 76. An analysis shows the following: The District committee reported the bill by a vote of 11 to 4. At least 5 of those 11 voted against the bill on the floor. There are 25 Members on the full committee. Only 10 of them voted against me on the rollcall. There are 33 Members of the Banking and Currency Committee on which I serve. Only eight of them voted against me on the rollcall. There are 13 members on the Small Business Committee on which I serve. None of them voted against me on the rollcall. There are 41 members from New York State, 21 Republicans and 20 Democrats. Only three Republicans and one Democrat voted against me on the rollcall. I think that speaks volumes in answer to Shannon's slander.

A word about the ABC liquor bill: This bill was the first attempt to revise the ABC law of the District of Columbia since 1934. It represented the best thinking of every segment of the industry and of a Special Citizens' Committee appointed by the District Commissioners. It met all of the valid objections of the Attorney General. The language against unfair competition was that suggested by the Attorney General. The opposition to the bill was stirred up by the local newspapers who were afraid they would lose some advertising if the bill as enacted contained a provision against false advertising. Although the bill as reported to the floor did not contain a word concerning price fixing the newspapers labeled the bill as a price-fixing bill which would push the consumers' cost up by $1 a bottle. That statement was either deliberately false or made with an utter disregard for the truth. In order to make assurance doubly sure, however, on the floor of the House (unfortunately with very few Members present) specific language was written into the bill prohibiting anything in the bill being construed so as to permit price fixing.

The article concludes with a snide remark about my having organized a bank on the Island of Nassau. Of course, he doesn't say that the Island of Nassau is in the Bahamas which is British territory subject only to British laws and in no way subject to the laws of the United States or of any State thereof.

There is nothing illegal, improper, wrong, or unethical about any Member of the U.S. Congress acting as a lawyer for or being an officer, director, or stockholder of a financial institution in the United States, and many of our colleagues are lawyers for or officers, directors, or stockholders of such institutions. It is certainly more legal, more proper, and more ethical, for a legislator to engage in such activities on behalf of a financial institution that can be in no way subject to the laws, control, or regulation of our Government.

I have been a Member of this House since 1947. At no time have I done anything to bring discredit or dishonor to this Congress, to our country, or to myself. I intend to continue to so conduct myself, as long as God gives me life.

American Legion Distinguished Service Award to Senator Cooper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on July 12, the American Legion Department of Kentucky at its 45th annual convention, held in Louisville, Ky., presented to our colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr.

COOPER] one of its two 1963 distinguished awards.

The plaque presented to Senator COOPER by Commander Harry A. Greene is inscribed with the citation:

Nineteen hundred and sixty-three Kentucky Distinguished Service Award, American Legion, presented to JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, U.S. Senator, in recognition of his untiring efforts rendered in the Senate of the United States in behalf of the veteran, his widow and/or dependents and for his years of dedicated public service.

Given at Lousiville, Ky., this 12th day of July 1963.

Harry A. Greene,
Department Commander.
Ray A. Beyer
Department Adjutant.

The award was the first of its kind made by the American Legion Department of Kentucky. The second award was presented to Mrs. Callas, in honor of her husband Mike Callas, deceased, a former Commander of the Department of Kentucky, and a distinguished Legionnaire.

We are glad that the honor was bestowed on our colleague, Senator COOPER. He enlisted in 1942 in the U.S. Army as a private, and was commissioned a second lieutenant in July 1943, after completing Officers Candidate School at Fort Custer, Mich. He entered France in 1944 with the 3d U.S. Army under Gen. George Patton and served through the campaigns in France, Luxembourg, and Germany, being discharged as a captain in December 1945.

After the close of the war, he was assigned to military government, in Munich, where he served as legal adviser in the 3d Army Zone on the repatriation of displaced persons, and was later placed in charge of the reorganization of the German judicial system in Bavaria. I know that all Senators are pleased with the great honor accorded to our distinguished colleague.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Senator COOPER at the convention be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN COOPER BEFORE THE AMERICAN LEGION DEPARTMENT OF KENTUCKY, AT ITS 45TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, LOUISVILLE, KY., FRIDAY, JULY 12, 1963

I cannot tell you how greatly I appreciate your invitation to speak to the 45th annual convention of the American Legion of Kentucky and to be in the company of my fellow Legionnaires. While I have met with many posts throughout Kentucky, and have attended State conventions, this is the first occasion that I have had to speak at an opening session of this great body of veterans. I thank Commander Greene and all of you for this great honor.

This morning my thoughts go back to the early days of the American Legion. We are familiar with its history—how it was formed in Paris, France, in March 1919, and how it has grown throughout the United States, and indeed all over the world, until today its membership embraces 2,600,000 veterans and 925,000 members of the auxiliary. It is well for our people in Kentucky to remember that the American Legion, Department of Kentucky, is a strong patriotic and civic organization of over 30,000 members, and 6,500 members of the American Legion Auxiliary.

It is natural and proper that the Legion is concerned with its fellow veterans, and particularly the plight of the disabled, and the children and widows of veterans. But its broad interests and objectives are for the Nation—the promotion of patriotism, the combatting of totalitarian ideologies, and the preservation of security and freedom.

These objectives are as valid and important today as they were when the first charter was drawn.

I remember well in the twenties—in the early days of the American Legion—that it fought for the development and maintenance of a strong national defense. It was criticized and characterized as a warmongering organization. But it was right, and if the United States had been prepared as the legion advocated, World War II might have been ended more quickly, and Russia's first penetration into Germany and Eastern Europe prevented. The American Legion was the first to warn this country of the danger of penetration by Soviet espionage. Again, it was characterized as extreme and irrational. But it was right, for the record shows that the Soviet Union has acquired vital defense and security secrets of the United States, and recent news informs us again that it has never ceased its efforts to undermine the security of our Nation. The American Legion was one of the first organizations to inform and warn our people of the gulf between the American system of free government and the Communist system—a gulf which cannot be bridged unless the Communist world rejects the basic tenets of its totalitarian system.

It is difficult to know what one should talk about to an assemblage which possesses such a history. But because I am speaking to the legion which embraces men of experience—who know not only the theory of freedom, but the actuality of preserving freedom—I feel it my duty to discuss briefly and frankly some of the grave issues which face our country and which call for the consideration and action of the Congress.

The overriding issue before the Nation, as it has been since World War II and will be for many years, is the defense of our country, our people, and our free institutions. We are in danger because the Soviet Union and the Communist world maintain as their inexorable objective the communization and domination of the world, and above all of the United States. The Soviet Union's policy of coexistence does not change this objective, because the word "peace" in its lexicon includes the encouragement and support of Communist revolution throughout the world.

There are many points of danger and crisis in our world. Those most apparent are Berlin and Western Europe, and Cuba and Latin America. While these situations are in our thoughts and must guide our actions, I want to point out several facts which indicate our strength, and which indicate some weaknesses in the Communist world.

With the exception of its entrance into Cuba, which I will discuss later, I do not consider that the Soviet Union has scored any impressive successes in other parts of the world—in the Middle East, in southeast Asia, and in Africa. Communist China has not been able to produce sufficient food for its people, and food production is a basic test for any country striving to achieve strength and leadership. There are some signs of cracks in the Communist alliance. It seems unlikely that the Soviet Union and Communist China will admit an open break—because this would split the whole thrust of world communism. Yet if reports are true, extreme divisions have been opened in their Communist doctrine—divisions which cannot be healed unless Russia should abandon its policy of coexistence, accept Communist China's doctrine of continuing revolution and ultimate war against the United States and other free countries.

But interesting and hopeful as these developments may be, we cannot rely upon weaknesses in the Communist bloc for our protection. We must maintain such overwhelming military strength that the Soviet Union and Communist China will know that they will be destroyed if they should attack us. I have had the opportunity to see the records of our military strength.

I believe, as do our military leaders, and such valued leaders of our Armed Services Committees in the Congress as Congressmen VINSON and MAHON and Senators RUSSELL and SALTONSTALL, that we possess this strength.

I will not burden you with too many statistics, but some figures are important. Our total active duty military strength is 2.7 million men and women; our Reserves are 2.1 million. The Navy has 859 ships in its fleet. The Air Force has 15,500 planes, and the Navy and Marines another 8,800 aircraft.

Turning to our nuclear power, which of course is our chief deterrent, the Strategic Air Command has 650 bombers on a 15-minute alert, chiefly B–52's with approximately 75 B–58's. Nine Polaris subs with 144 missiles each are in operation; 9 more will be operational by mid-1964, with some 20 more in various stages of development. Today the Air Force has 200 intercontinental ballistic misiles in place, and 800 more are scheduled to be in place by mid-1964.

The total defense budget is $53.6 billion. All of us who have been in the service know there is waste in the military, as in other agencies of the Government; and the defense budget will be cut. But the Congress will not impair the military strength of the Nation. For we know, as you do, and as Winston Churchill said years ago, that the safeguard of freedom rests on the strength of the United States.

But strength without information and purpose is not enough. The unfortunate criticism of our military power in 1960—a power which at that time was greater than Soviet strength—created doubt in the minds of our people, our allies, and I am afraid the Soviet Union, that we had the capacity to defend ourselves.

The world must know our strength because power is a harsh reality, and is respected. I have said on the Senate floor several times that the President should on occasion and within the limits of security, spell out to the world our military capacity—and our will to use it if we should be attacked.

Now I would like to speak briefly about two of the most troubling and controversial issues before our country.

The first deals with negotiations with the Soviet Union. Our Government, under Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, has sought since World War II to develop an alternative to the arms race, and the danger of thermonuclear war, by negotiations with the Soviet Union on nuclear testing and disarmament.

At Geneva in 1955, President Eisenhower made an initiative in his open skies inspection proposal—designed to reduce the threat of surprise attack, and to create an atmosphere of confidence in which disarmament proposals could be considered. Speaking in that year, he pledged the United States "to devote its entire heart and mind to find a way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

President Eisenhower established an office in the State Department to study means of negotiations for a nuclear ban and for disarmament. President Kennedy, with the approval of the Congress, has expanded this office into the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I have been informed that the work of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is one way, and perhaps the only way, in which the United States can join together a group of scientists who can continuously detect and evaluate any testing advances made by the Soviet Union. If there were no other purpose, this work of the Agency is necessary to our defense and security.

In a few days the United States will meet again with the Soviet Union to consider a recent proposal of the Soviet Union to ban nuclear testing in the air, water, and outer space—a proposal which had been previously suggested by leaders in the United States. No one can foretell the results of these negotiations, for the proposal is hedged with conditions. We only know there is little in the record of the Soviet Union to indicate that progress can be made.

We live in a world in which two major systems, the United States and Russia, are in confrontation. Both possess nuclear weapons at least a million times more powerful than those which existed at the outset of World War II. Both are engaged in increasing the number, quality, and destructive power of these weapons in an arms race.

There are some in our country who announce that there can never be an effectively verified arms control agreement with the Soviet Union. Others urge the untenable position that an agreement must be obtained at all costs—even at the cost of effective verification—and if an agreement is not possible, they urge the unilateral disarmament of the United States.

The true issue is to determine whether it is possible to work out an effective and secure arms control agreement and nuclear ban which would better serve the interests of our national security than a continuation of the arms race. This issue can only be resolved by the painstaking process of negotiation. Only in this way can it be determined whether the interests of the United States and the U.S.S.R. against total destruction are sufficiently strong to outweigh the interests which divide the two.

The refusal to face the real issue is compounded by the use of slogans which obscure the hard decisions which we must make. Some call any disarmament negotiations a part of a no-win policy; others chant the defeatist and cowardly slogan "better red than dead."

Any treaty concerning nuclear testing or disarmament must be ratified by the Senate. I know no one in the Senate—and I include myself—who would vote for a treaty which would compromise the safety of the United States. And I must say, I do not believe the President would accept or propose a treaty which would endanger the life of our country.

It is generally believed that the Soviet Union would not risk a nuclear war and its own destruction. But as long as our issues with Russia remain unsolved we will have to live as an armed state, and under the threat of war. We have not thought much about managing our own lives, our Government, and our industrial economy during a long period of such danger, for we have never lived at the brink of a thermonuclear war.

All our efforts toward negotiation may prove futile as they have in the past. But our system is distinguished from the Soviet system, for we believe in a moral order. We will maintain our defenses; we will not surrender or risk the security of our country and its freedom. But as a people, I believe it imperative and morally right that we continue our efforts to reach honorable and just agreements with the Soviet Union, including disarmament.

Now I come to the most difficult question of all—Cuba. I know the concern of the people of our country about Cuba. The same concern is felt deeply by all of us in the Congress. Many speeches are made about Cuba, but there are few suggestions as to what ought to be done about it.

While circumstances could require it, I know of no one in the Congress in any position of responsibility or leadership who has advocated an invasion of Cuba. Last fall, when I went to Washington at the time of the Cuban crisis, it was not known what the Soviet reaction would be. There was a solemn concern that war, even a nuclear war, might develop. A situation of danger continues, though not of the same imminence, and I believe that the chief source of danger lies in the continuing presence of Soviet troops. It is the Soviet presence in Cuba which gives authority to Castro, promotes subversion, and incites Communist action in the countries of Latin America.

In a speech in the Senate on February 11, I proposed that the United States should adopt as its policy that we would not accept or tolerate the continuance of a Russian base in Cuba, or anywhere in this hemisphere. It was said by some that if we insisted on the removal of Soviet forces from Cuba the Soviet Union could as reasonably ask for the removal of American troops from Europe and the Pacific. My answer is that our troops, and even Soviet troops, are in Europe because of agreements and events which occurred during and following World War II. But the Soviet Union, by its entrance in Cuba, has extended a new threat into the Western Hemisphere, and beyond the status quo which it insists it has the right to maintain in Germany and Eastern Europe.

It is our understanding that Mr. Khrushchev agreed with President Kennedy that troops as well as missiles would be removed from Cuba—and it was upon this basis that the blockade was lifted. We are informed that the President is seeking to secure the withdrawal of Russian troops from Cuba by diplomatic means. It is my view, as it was in February, that if Mr. Khrushchev does not keep his promise to remove troops, the President should take the same firm measure that he took last fall and impose a blockade.

The imposition of the blockade would bring again the risk of war. But it would not be a confrontation, such as that of last October, which would place the Soviet Union in the position of backing down. The Soviet Union would be called upon to fulfill its promise, and I do not believe that war would result. I hold that it is important that we establish the proposition that we will not accept a Russian base in Cuba, or in the Western Hemisphere.

There are many controversial issues before the Congress and the country—among them fiscal problems, unemployment, education, and civil rights—and they must be met. Every important issue before the Congress is difficult and controversial. They cannot be solved to the entire satisfaction of any group, whether it be the business community, labor, agriculture, veterans organizations, or even the Republican and Democratic Parties. For all have, as is natural, their special positions.

Our system is one of representative government, and it is the obligation of the Congress to make decisions which we believe are in harmony with our constitutional system of government, which will protect and secure our country and lead it forward, and which represent as fully as possible the interests of the country as a whole.

This does not mean that our decisions as a group or as individuals are always right. There are many voices in our country today, and they reflect a tremendous concern and interest in the affairs of government, and in the issue our country faces. There is criticism, and sharp criticism.

The right of criticism cannot be questioned, and should be encouraged, for criticism expresses opinion and can reduce the possibility of future mistakes. But I must say that those who base their criticism on loose charges that those who serve our Government are less patriotic than they, or are engaged in some conspiracy to surrender our country and its freedom, speak untruly and breed hate. They do no service or good to our country.

No one can speak for every Member of the Congress, because all are as human as the people they serve. But I know the overwhelming majority in the Congress are informed, patriotic men whose greatest devotion is to the preservation and strengthening of our country and its freedom. And whatever our disagreements with him on policy or politics, I would not charge the President of the United States with any less patriotism or devotion to our country.

As I speak to this convention, I am conscious that all of us have had experiences in our military service which have drawn us into a deeper appreciation of our country. I have had the honor of serving in several capacities in the government—as a local official, a Member of the Senate, delegate in the United Nations in the development of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and as an ambassador. I am glad that following my service during World War II with the 3d Army in Europe, I was able to intervene with General Patton and secure his order preventing the forcible repatriation of Russians who did not want to return to the Soviet Union. I am glad that as a member of the United Nations, I represented the United States when the U.N. for the first time condemned the Soviet Union for its breach of its wartime treaties with Nationalist China. But I value above all the experiences of my life, my service in the Army during World War II because, like you, I knew that we were engaged in a service which was greater than ourselves, and for our country.

I did not serve, like many of you, continually in the front lines. But at times I saw the death of young men—far from their homes, their families, and their country. We can never forget that those who went down in the sea, the air, or who fell in some dark forest, and gave up life, and all their aspirations and dreams, for this country, its future, and its freedom.

As men who have served our country—our flag—in time of peril, who have sacrificed and have seen the sacrifice of others, we have a special responsibility to look at the problems of our country fairly and objectively, to do everything possible to meet them, and to provide leadership wherever we live.

Do Not Weaken President Johnson's Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of discussion during the past few days about the amendment to the foreign aid bill which some have described as a license to use American taxpayers' money to "finance the feeding of Communists."

I believe the time has come when we should put this entire debate in its proper perspective. I have the highest regard and respect for the distinguished minority leader who quite properly is fighting for points for his side.

I am sure that leaders of all the other nations in the world find it difficult to understand just what is going on here in the House of Representatives. As a matter of fact, I feel equally certain many Americans find it difficult to keep track of what is happening here. But having said all of this, I should like to point out that, complex as our system of legislative government is, the fact remains that it works and in its complexity, it affords the individual American the greatest degree of freedom and human dignity.

While I have the highest respect for those who argue the amendment to limit the President's freedom in dealing in foreign affairs should be adopted because "this is the only way to keep American dollars from feeding the Communists," I submit, Mr. Speaker, advocates of this amendment are wrong. They are going contrary to the American Constitution; they are not serving the best interest of the United States; there is nothing in the bill that would permit us to use taxpayers money to feed the Communists.

Let me reiterate what I said the other day here on the floor. The compromise language adopted by the conferees would make it crystal clear that we here in Congress are opposed to extending any credit to the Soviet Union for the purchase of our surplus wheat unless the President finds that such a sale would be in the national interest. The compromise provides the President must inform Congress and the American people within 30 days why he thinks such credits should be extended if indeed such credits are extended.

The compromise proposal provides such strong language that I doubt if any credits would ever be extended to the Soviet Union but the important thing to remember is that under the compromise proposal, we here in Congress have an opportunity to express our opposition to any credits to the Soviet Union without tying the President's hands in foreign affairs.

History shows that every time Congress has tried to write foreign policy on the floor of the House or the Senate, our Nation has suffered. World War II could most probably have been avoided if Congress had not written foreign policy on the floor of the Senate in rejecting the League of Nations following World War I. Thousands of American boys most probably could have been spared their lives because World War II could have been avoided had there been some mechanism for collective security such as the League of Nations. But no, those who thought they knew better, decided to write foreign policy on the floor of Congress. We have countless examples of similar experiences which have set this Nation's goals of world peace and freedom back because shortsighted politicians played Russian roulette with America's foreign policy.

There is really only one fundamental issue involved here this afternoon. This issue is whether the President of the United States shall face his Communist adversaries strong with the full support of this Nation's legislative body; namely, the Congress of the United States.

I am unalterably opposed to giving the Soviet Union any credit for the purchase of wheat or anything else from the United States. I happen to believe that the Soviet Union's credit is meaningless. But that does not mean that I have to support amendments which would tie President Johnson's hands in dealing with the Soviets.

I happen to believe as firmly as I believe in my Lord that Lyndon Johnson is a dedicated American whose only goal in life is to see the demise of Communist tyranny and the victory of American freedom and dignity. For anyone to suggest otherwise would be a monstrous assault on the truth. I stand before man and God convinced that Lyndon Johnson will give his life to see American freedom triumph over godless communism. It is a mockery of commonsense to suggest that Congress must place some sort of restrictions on President Lyndon Johnson in his dealings with the Soviets on the sale of wheat. Anyone who has had any dealings with President Johnson knows that Khrushchev has never met his equal; Lyndon Johnson can be depended on not to give the Soviets an inch unless he is convinced it will serve the long-range interest of the United States and the ultimate victory of American democracy over Communist despotism.

What a scandalous demonstration of weakness, Mr. Speaker, it would be for us here in Congress to serve notice on the entire world that we do not trust this new President who has inherited the burdens of the entire free world; that we do not believe he is capable of leading our Nation to the ultimate victory; that we believe here in Congress that only Congress itself can set down the guidelines which Mr. Johnson must follow in his dealings with the Soviets. I cannot think of a single act which we, as Members of Congress, can approve which would prove more devasting to our best interest as a nation and would be of greater comfort to the Communists who are determined to embarrass and destroy President Johnson—or any other American President—be he Democrat or Republican—than to adopt this restriction on the President's freedom to use all of the weapons of democracy at his disposal to bring about the ultimate collapse of international communism.

Mr. Speaker, I say those who urge the adoption of this restrictive amendment just have not read our Constitution.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, have they read the Export-Import Bank Act. This act clearly provides that any credits which the Bank underwrites must be secured by the party benefiting from the transaction.

Let us see for a minute what it is that we are talking about. There have been statements here that this legislation would permit the use of American dollars to subsidize the feeding of Communists. Let us put these statements to a test.

If I understand the act correctly, and I think I do, if an American grain dealer—using private capital—decides to sell American surplus wheat to Russia, he may ask the Export-Import Bank to secure the sale so that if the Soviet Union defaults on its payments, he will still recover his losses. He may also ask the Bank to guarantee or cover the sale, because he has to borrow part of the money to buy the surplus wheat from American farmers or from the Commodity Credit Corporation. The banks lending him money to purchase the wheat to sell to Russia want some sort of backing. This is understandable. So he goes to the Export-Import Bank. He must pay the Bank a premium to get the backing. And this is most important—before the American Export-Import Bank can underwrite this credit, it first will ask the Soviet Government to put up collateral which the American Export-Import Bank can redeem immediately on world markets if for some reason the Soviet Union fails to meet its payments to the American grain dealer who sold the wheat to Russia in the first place. The American Export-Import Bank actually makes a profit on the transaction. If the Soviets fail to meet their payments—and if they did they would ruin their credit on commodity purchases throughout the world—the Export-Import Bank first cashes in the collateral which the Russians have put up before it pays out any losses to the American grain exporter. This clearly indicates that should there be any losses because of the Soviets' failure to pay, those losses must be recovered from Soviet collateral and not American taxpayers. To say, then, that American taxpayers are being asked to subsidize sale of wheat to Russia and in this way "feed the Communists" is stretching the truth beyond all scope of reason; it is the most staggering torture of the truth we have seen in this session of Congress.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Soviets have not indicated in any manner that they will ask for credit if they enter into a surplus wheat deal with the United States. The reason for their hesitation is clear. The Soviets would have to pay a 5-percent additional rate on the entire transaction which is the amount that American brokers must charge the Soviets because they must borrow the money from American banks to purchase the wheat in the first instance if any credit is to be extended at a prevailing interest rate of 5 percent.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, those fighting for this restrictive amendment have not been thoroughly frank with the American people. The Soviet Union has been paying cash in gold to the Canadians because the Soviets do not want to or cannot afford the 5-percent carrying charge if they buy on credit. The Soviets have indicated they will pay us in gold also. There is nothing to indicate that our own American grain dealers could sell the surplus wheat to Russia without charging the same additional 5-percent carrying charge. Furthermore, our late President Kennedy clearly stated that any sale of wheat to Russia would have to be on a "cash on the barrelhead and commercial credit basis." Thus the sale would immediately improve our gold supply and our balance-of-payments problem.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe our Republican friends should acknowledge that the American Export-Import Bank is controlled by the most businesslike group of Republicans you will ever find. The Export-Import Bank has never lost a penny on a transaction it secured since 1934. What makes our colleagues on the other side think the Bank is about to extend the Soviets credit unless the Bank feels absolutely secure it is a sound investment? Since when have the Republican businessmen who run the Export-Import Bank shown any signs of going soft in their international relations? The Export-Import Bank has had a fantastically good record of success and I doubt if it will change now for the Soviet Union or anyone else.

It appears, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that this whole debate has turned around a struggle for power; a struggle for control of this Nation's foreign policy. Why do not our colleagues on the other side offer a constitutional amendment to take the responsibility of formulating foreign policy away from the President and vest it in Congress. But they will then also have to take the full responsibility for such a move, and the chaos that would follow.

Report on Accomplishments of 1st Session of the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice to submit a report to the residents of my district at the end of each session of Congress on the legislative action and my voting record on some of the vital issues. The following is a report of the limited legislative accomplishments of the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

It is apparent to everyone that the tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy completely overshadowed all legislative action or administrative programs. So much has already been written and spoken on this regrettable act that I do not feel any useful purpose would be served by writing a further tribute in this report. Along with other Members, I inserted a special memorial tribute in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on December 5.

It is difficult to point to any significant accomplishment of this Congress or the establishment of any new doctrine or policy by it. Perhaps the most unusual aspect of this Congress would be that it has been the only Congress in peacetime to be in session during a full calendar year. An explanation of this unprecedented session appears to divide along party lines. The majority party indicates that it is a result of unusual developments throughout the year, such as the consideration of the civil rights bill and other unavoidable controversial issues. The Republicans, on the other hand, contend that the mood of the country simply was not responsive to the expensive programs that were insisted upon by the late President Kennedy and now sought by President Johnson. No doubt there is some validity to both points of view, but the 12-month session is now a matter of record without an impressive list of legislative accomplishments.

In retrospect, it appears that a considerable amount of attention of the administration was taken up in the field of foreign affairs, although there were very few new legislative proposals in this area. At the head of the list would undoubtedly be the ratification of the test ban treaty, which has been hailed as a major accomplishment in easing the tensions between East and West. Although this ratification of the treaty was exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Senate, Members of the House had strong feelings about the wisdom of the ratification as it affected the future of our national security. It is not possible to comment at length in this report on that matter, but I would like to observe that I think the importance of the treaty itself has been greatly overestimated. It contains a provision that when one of the signatories breaks the agreement and proceeds with further atmospheric testing, all members are released from their commitment and are free to proceed in a like manner. This is little more than a voluntary suspension agreement that was negotiated under the Eisenhower administration and prevailed from 1958 to 1961.

Another observation I would make on this Congress was the gradual emergence of a more conservative attitude. Spending proposals met with little enthusiasm and this is no doubt responsible in part for the rejection of many parts of the Kennedy legislative program. I think this conclusion is supported further by the considerable amount of press releases made by the new President, Lyndon Johnson, reflecting his determination to reduce Government spending. In my opinion, the new President will have strong congressional support in this regard. I hope this is not a short-term conservative effort on the part of the new President merely to obtain passage of the tax reduction bill.

Some short mention should be made that the principle of Federal aid to colleges, first commenced under the land grant college program 100 years ago, has been broadened to apply to facilities for all colleges and universities across the Nation, both public and parochial. This is probably the most significant policy decision that was established by this Congress. An argument of considerable persuasion for approving this program was the estimate by the Office of Education that the college enrollment in 1970 would be doubled over its present level.

The unprecedented length of this session has made it difficult for Members to attend all committee meetings and conferences throughout the year. In my most responsible position, that as a member of the Rules Committee, my recorded voting percentage is 96 percent. I was highly honored to be selected as one of the five Republicans to serve on this very important committee and have conscientiously attempted to coordinate the interests of the United States, the State of Kansas, my congressional district, and the Republican Party in voting my decisions in that committee.

The function of the congressional office may be of some interest to recipients of this report. From January 1 to December 15, we received 9,826 pieces of first-class mail. During the same period, 14,734 pieces of first-class mail were sent by this office. I subscribe to all the weekly and daily newspapers of the district and make every effort to keep informed of all developments in Kansas. I also receive a substantial number of trade publications which also report matters of interest to the economy in Kansas. We were honored to receive 831 visitors in the office this year, down from the 1,285 last year.

The following is a brief summary of the appropriations for Federal projects and functions of the Second Congressional District: civil works projects—$19,105,000; military construction—$6,100,000; soil conservation and ACP work—approximately $2½ million.

Your Congressman is proud to be one of the original sponsors of a student program we have designated as "A Week in Washington." This is a nonpartisan educational project for college juniors to observe the firsthand operation of the Federal Government. This is the fourth such year for this program, and a total of 30 students have participated. The students spend a week in Washington observing Congress in session, attending committee hearings, visiting by appointment the headquarters of both major party committees as well as the many historical points of interest. Appointments are arranged with Members of the House and Senate of both political parties. The students are selected by the participating schools and, in most instances, are political science majors, although this is not a requirement. I am pleased to report that some of the students participating in this program have later been awarded Rhodes and Fulbright scholarships while others have been awarded Woodrow Wilson fellowships. A considerable number of these students have indicated their desire to continue their education with an objective of entering public service or possibly a teaching career in the future. The participating students this year were Fritz Aldrine, of Topeka, representing Washburn University; Frances Barry, Shawnee Mission, of Mount St. Scholastica College; Patricia Shafer, Wichita, Kansas State University; Charles Marvin, Lawrence, of the University of Kansas; Terry Watson, Osborne, St. Benedict's College; and Joyce Milleret, of Lawrence, representing St. Mary College.

During the past year, over 50 young men have competed for appointment to the service academies. Each was given an equal opportunity. The Academic Board at each Academy will choose the best qualified individual. This impartial process of selection is not used by all Members. The young men presently at the Academies from our district include: West Point, Peter C. Linn, Manhattan; John B. Kozak, Leavenworth; William W. Obley, Junction City; Dennis E. Coats, Topeka. Naval Academy, William T. Benson, Topeka; Elroy A. McAlexander, Mayetta. Air Force, Leroy W. Stutz, Effingham; David L. Nolting, Nortonville; Edward A. Petersen, Topeka; Lewis T. Moore, Wakarusa; Roger T. Templin, Topeka.

I make every effort to personally read all mail from Kansas and dictate the replies. Most readers of this session know that I write a weekly news report that is sent to all the newspapers of the district as well as the wire services. I am proud to report that in my 9 years of congressional service, this report has gone out each week that Congress was in session as well as at additional times as there was news to report of general interest in northeast Kansas. Also, a weekly report is taped and made available to all radio stations which serve the northeast Kansas area.

It has previously been my practice to make an extensive tour of the entire district between the first and second sessions of each Congress. This has not been possible this year because Congress has remained in session. I have returned to Kansas whenever the legislative program would permit.

I have not introduced many public bills during this session of Congress. One of the important bills is a proposal to amend the Interstate Commerce Act which would insure an adequate supply of railroad boxcars. Although the bill did not pass, it did stimulate some action on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission to induce the eastern railroads to return cars to the Middle West.

After the rejection of the Nation's wheat farmers to the bushel management wheat program, I joined 20 other midwestern Congressmen in introducing an amendment to the Feed Grain Act which would authorize a voluntary wheat program as well as an extension of the soil bank program. This bill is still before the House Committee on Agriculture.

The other bills which I introduced were of principal interest to individuals and not general in nature.

The following is a résumé of my voting position on what I consider to be some of the more important issues that have been before the House this session:

Voted against a subsidy to Russia and other Communist countries by way of permitting the Export-Import Bank to guarantee the repayment of loans for sale of U.S. commodities to them.

Voted for assistance for public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate institutions.

Voted against foreign aid.

Voted against a tax reduction for 1964–65 without a limit in Federal spending.

Voted against the expansion of the Area Redevelopment Agency.

Voted against the extension of the public debt limit.

Voted to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational opportunities in the Nation.

Voted to increase the opportunities for training physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel.

Voted to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

Voted against making supplemental appropriations for Philippine war damage claims.

Voted against additional travel privileges for the Committee on Education and Labor.

Voted to limit allowances and necessary transportation costs for travel outside the United States for Members of Congress.

Voted for assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for facilities for the mentally retarded.

Voted and spoke against a bill to pay a subsidy to domestic cotton processors.

I hope you will continue to write me your views on legislation pending before the House or on any other matter relative to the administration of the Federal Government. If you wish any further explanation in regard to the above summary, I will be glad to furnish that to you also.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Luke 1: 32: *He will be great and shall be called the Son of the Most High.*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness may we daily unite our hearts in adoration and gratitude as we contemplate the significance and splendor of that great day when Thou gavest Thine only begotten Son to be the world's Saviour.

We frankly acknowledge that during the past weeks we have spent much time in thinking about giving gifts to our loved ones and friends, and the poor and needy.

God forbid that we should ever be numbered among those who lose sight of the gospel truth that on Christmas Day Thou also dost expect a gift from us. May we plan and resolve to give unto Thee our very selves which Thou dost consider an acceptable gift.

Grant that it may be our heartfelt desire and determination to give ourselves so completely that our lives may be of greater value than they have been in the past in the adventure of establishing peace on earth and good will among men.

We thank Thee for the life and service of our beloved colleague who now dwells with Thee in heavenly blessedness. Grant unto the members of his bereaved family the consolations of Thy grace.

Now may the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with us all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn until 12 noon today.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6754) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 7, 11, 24, 27, and 38 to the above-entitled bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 253]

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Becker
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Bolling
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Burke
Burkhalter
Burton
Cannon
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Cramer
Curtis
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Flynt
Foreman
Forrester
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gathings
Gibbons
Gill
Goodell

Grant
Gray
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hall
Hansen
Harris
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Keith
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Lloyd
McIntire
McLoskey
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
May
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Montoya
Moore
Morris
Morse
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Philbin
Powell
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Riehlman
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St Germain
Scott
Shelley
Shipley
Short
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Stephens
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Van Pelt
Watts
Wharton
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 271 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

USE OF MILITARY AIRCRAFT TO RETURN DEMOCRATIC PARTY MEMBERS TO THE CAPITAL

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the House is engaged in a very important, very crucial issue. All of our Members, both Democrats and Republicans, should be present. It has come to my attention that both the Democratic and the Republican leadership are making every effort to get their Members back for this very crucial vote. I agree that this is important. But it has also come to my attention, I admit by rumor, that the administration is cooperating in bringing members of the Democratic Party of the House back by Military Air Transport or other military aircraft and in contrast the same privilege is not available to Members of the Republican Party. If that is true it cannot be justified. It can be justified only if such transportation is available to all Members of the House and Senate, both Democrats and Republicans alike.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the gentleman and if what he says is established, then we will all feel just as he does.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let us ask anybody on the other side of the aisle if this is true to their knowledge. I say not only Military Air Transport but any military aircraft. I can assure the gentleman and the other Members of the House that I intend to find out from Secretary McNamara or anybody else who has the information, where we can get the truth.

USE OF MILITARY AIRCRAFT TO TRANSPORT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think we would all agree that the gentleman has a good point.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if this has happened I have no knowledge of it. I do not think the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] should make any such statement unless he has knowledge of it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I have profound respect for the gentleman from Michigan. I do not believe the gentleman from Michigan would have made that statement unless he had heard it. I do not believe it, because I have been trying to find out; I am sure the gentleman must have some indication, but I think we should pin it down. If it has happened I think it is wrong. If they are bringing Democrats back they should bring Republicans back, too; we agree on that. I think it is a rumor. Let us do some checking and then proceed with our business.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. It is more than rumor to this effect. I have just put in a call to the Secretary of Defense to ask him the facts as he knows them, and I intend to find out as soon as I can. I have been unable to get hold of the Secretary of Defense up to this moment, even though I have tried. I have left word for him to call me. I am just saying that if there is any truth to this, the matter should be remedied promptly.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman. I certainly agree with him.

USE OF MILITARY PLANES TO RETURN MEMBERS TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of this discussion I am calling the attention of the House to the fact that there is a Member on the Republican side from New York who was campaigning in my district last night. I would urge the Secretary of Defense, if there is to be transportation provided for the purpose of returning absent Members to their duties in Washington, that they would include him. Considering the way he is conducting himself in my district, I am most anxious that he leave. If he has no other means, I would be glad to personally pay his fare back here.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that many of us have been working on this problem, that we have been since very early this morning. To my knowledge, no military aircraft has been used by anybody on either side of the aisle.

If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has any information about anyone coming by military aircraft or being refused transportation by military aircraft or requested it, we would like to know about it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. And, if it is established that they came by military aircraft, then we should send them a bill for the cost.

RETURN TO WASHINGTON, D.C., BY MILITARY AIRCRAFT

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, so that the RECORD be unmistakably clear, the Members of the House will please be advised that for the first time in 16 years, I rode in an Air Force plane from Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio, to Andrews Air Force Base, at or near Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I rode in an Air Force plane on which several officers and at least two enlisted men were passengers, and in which there were several vacant seats. The flight had been scheduled before I requested the transportation.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement made by the gentleman. I think it was a very forthright and honest statement. As far as I know no Member on this side came here, to my knowledge, that way.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I am not objecting to any Member, Democrat or Republican, coming back by military aircraft for this purpose. I am only asking that there be equity between the Democrats and the Republicans in this transportation matter.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to conclude by saying that I have no transportation back to Ohio by Defense Department plane. I have tried to make reservations for return home by commercial aircraft.

USE OF THE CRYING TOWEL

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I remember it was a few years ago when the gentleman from Michigan was a star on the Michigan University football team. Kipke was one of the great coaches at Michigan University. The day before a big game Coach Kipke would use many crying towels moaning about the misfortune to his star players. He had players with rheumatism, arthritis, bellyaches, and broken arms. They were all sick till the whistle blew at the kickoff. I think perhaps our good friend from Michigan, Congressman Ford, who was a star on the Michigan team, might be using a little of that strategy in talking about these military planes. In my opinion he is using the old Michigan smokescreen in trying to divert the minds of the Members off the true facts on this legislation.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. May I say to my very good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden], that over the years the University of Michigan has played the University of Indiana a number of times, and may I say that we have been able to sing the victor's song a great deal more times than Indiana in those contests.

Mr. MADDEN. I remember that. I also remember that the Michigan football coach could have all the players in the hospital the night before the game and the Indiana boys were suckers enough to get overconfident and were crucified the next day on the football field. The gentleman's startling blast about Democratic Congressmen using military planes to come here today is as phony as Coach Kipke's football hospital list.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. When we begin talking about Indiana University, I just do not want to get myself mixed up in this.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the event that we do not finish this bill today and I have to take a military plane to New Orleans on Monday, would that be in order? If we do not finish the bill and if there is no commercial transportation available—I must be in New Orleans at that time—would it be in order for me then to try to requisition a military plane?

The SPEAKER. The Chair regrets to inform the gentleman from Louisiana that that is not the subject of a parliamentary inquiry.

USE OF MILITARY TRANSPORTATION TO RETURN MEMBERS TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we should belabor this point. However, I have been checking with representatives of the White House and I am informed that they have no knowledge of any such operation as this. They have no knowledge that anybody at the suggestion of the administration is being sent here for this or any other purpose. I hope that if the gentleman from Michigan does not have that information he will revise his remarks based purely, as he indicated in his original statement, on rumors, because it is not fair to the administration and it is unfair to the Members of the House who might on their own have caught a ride on military planes.

Mr. FORD. I have a call in for the Secretary of Defense, and I intend to have him make a check of the situation and report to the Congress.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is well within his rights. I think he should have done that first and then advised the House afterward.

TRANSPORTATION IN MILITARY AIRCRAFT

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I consider it perfectly proper for any Member of the Congress to ask for transportation on any military aircraft that is traveling across the country. If our friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch], was able to secure it, I congratulate him for it. If any other Member of the House does the same, I would consider it perfectly proper. In addition to that, I had to cancel my reservation for today. I am unable to secure one. I am trying to meet my wife with her family in South Carolina this afternoon or Sunday. If anybody knows of a military plane going that way, I hope he will inform me sometime this afternoon.

AIRPLANE TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I canceled two reservations for Nebraska and have been unable to get another flight reservation before Christmas. My wife has been in the hospital for a couple of weeks. I have not had an opportunity to get there. I would like to make the same request from anyone anywhere that the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Tennessee made, and I would appreciate it. My extension number is 2101.

Mr. PASSMAN. It would be a lot cheaper if we were to go together.

Mr. BEERMANN. May I say to the gentleman from Louisiana that if we go together let us go by way of Nebraska and drop me off first.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader whether or not he can tell us anything about what is proposed to be done today.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. As announced earlier this morning when we adjourned, the gentleman from Louisiana will request a rule and we will bring it out. We hope to adopt it, and we hope to pass this bill and adjourn this afternoon. We are going to do everything in our power to do that, and we ask the cooperation of all Members in expediting the matter.

Mr. HALLECK. I am not going to ask the gentleman to answer the question, but I am going to propound a question, then I hope we can get some sort of answer before too long. The question is whether, if we can have a vote on the merits that are involved in what has come to be known as the Findley-Jensen amendment, which in my understanding simply means that we are not going to finance the Communists and the Russians; if we have that vote, and those of us who believe that that amendment ought to stay in this bill can win, are we going to be called back here Monday? I am not asking the gentleman to undertake to answer it now, but I want the Record to show that if there is that degree of cooperation in bringing this thing to a vote today, then what may we expect.

Mr. ALBERT. I can give the gentleman an answer. It will not be necessary to come back Monday. The matter will be disposed of this afternoon.

CHARGES OF FAVORING COMMUNISM

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am very much surprised at the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], whom I have known since I came here 15 years ago and have admired very highly. We have worked on programs together. But to correct this very important piece of legislation with a rumor indicting a whole party or a whole group on the flimsy text that something "might be" true, is a continuation of the whole indictment of guilt by association.

When the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana, said that the men who vote for this legislation are voting for communism and strengthening communism in the world, his is indicting a great segment of the American society, going into both major parties. To me, this is not a Christian attitude nor the American way of accomplishing things. I do not believe this is the way to legislate in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am against it with all of my being. I certainly do not believe in communism. I believe it is degrading to the individual and to the basic moral principles of free peoples. God forbid that there should ever be another war in this nuclear era or ever. I served in the Second World War and I am a disabled veteran. However, I say to you, if it should be necessary to defend our Nation's heritage today, I stand ready to serve.

I believe in the President of the United States. I believe in his patriotism. I believe in his judgment. He is your President and my President. I never impugned the motives or patriotism of President Eisenhower when he was President of the United States, and I do not believe it becomes a Member of the Congress to do that today, or in the future.

It behooves each of us, regardless of political affiliation to be careful of our accusations and to strengthen the President's hand against outside enemies. Politics should stop at the water's edge.

Only by working together, and not by accusing each other's motives or lack of patriotism—especially in foreign policy—can we hope to remain strong as a nation. We should present a united front to those who oppose our way of life.

Intimidation by insinuation is against our American basic philosophy of life, as expressed by the great American, Thomas Jefferson, when he said:

> I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO MR. SPEAKER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for all Members to extend their remarks in the body of the Record wishing the Speaker a happy birthday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our great Speaker is a source of pride to each of us and to the entire Nation. His dignity and distinguished manner add additional prestige to this the greatest legislative body on earth.

Speaker McCormack's integrity, fairness, and ability as a presiding officer is rapidly becoming a legend and is without superior in the history of the United States. His love for this body as a fundamental and essential American institution knows no limitation.

Mrs. Dorn, my children, and my constituents join me today in saluting you, our beloved Speaker, on your birthday and they join me in wishing for you and Mrs. McCormack very happy returns of the day. We are proud of you and we love you.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, though we are all striving now to wind up the affairs of this, the 1st session of the 88th Congress, so that we may spend a few days with our families during the Christmas season, I would not want the day to go by without having just a moment of the House's time in which to wish you a happy birthday today. The guidance and strength you have lent to this body since the 70th Congress sat is appreciated by all of us who have followed you. After the all-night session, most of us have not the voice to sing our greetings, so I hope you will accept them in this fashion. Happy birthday, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I express my many best wishes today on the happy occasion of your birthday and may you have many, many, joyous and happy birthdays in the future.

It has been a great privilege and honor to serve in the Congress of the United States with you.

As a woman, I feel particularly keenly about this, for you as our Speaker have made possible more progress and recognition for women in the legislative branch than any other leader.

Your fairness, kindness, and courtesy are treasured gifts to each and every one of us who share with you membership in the House.

I joyously salute the occasion of your birthday and look forward to saluting many more.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, your birthday is an occasion of joy to everyone in the House, for we all love you. It also is an occasion which gives us an opportunity to demonstrate our great respect for your unparalleled service to your country, first as majority leader and now as Speaker. You have brought to this service a fighting Irish heart and a universal concern for the progress and betterment of mankind, capped by a patriotism and dedication to our own country which has no peer.

We who have known you as majority leader for years have admired you as an ardent advocate of the things you stood for. Now, as Speaker, we see also in you the forbearance and sympathy, the perfect tolerance, which speaks eloquently of your Christian inspiration. Our country is more vital, more secure, and more significant because of your labors. I am glad to extend to you and your beloved wife on this occasion hearty congratulations and best wishes for many years to come.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I could not let the opportunity pass without joining with my colleagues today in extending my very best wishes and congratulations to our distinguished Speaker on the occasion of his birthday.

Our Speaker has had a long and distinguished career in the service of his State and Nation. He has had a significant role in shaping the destiny of our country. His life has been characterized by a dedication to the high ideals of public service, a devotion to his church, and a love of his fellow man. In this hour when the grave problems confronting our country demand strong leadership and great personal courage, America is indeed fortunate in having John W. McCormack as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

He was my friend long before I came to the House of Representatives. His life and work has been an inspiration to me. I congratulate him on reaching another milestone in the journey of life and wish for him many, many more years of health, happiness, and service to his fellow man.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, if each of us who serve in this House was asked to name the most beloved Member among us, I have no doubt that there would be complete unanimity in naming the gentleman from Massachusetts, John W. McCormack, not because he is the Speaker, but because he is the man that he is.

Here is a wise man, possessed of commonsense in an uncommon abundance; a man of penetrating understanding, with the patience of Job; a kind man, whose mind is devoid of evil thoughts and whose heart reaches out with genuine compassion for his fellow men. This is my estimate of the man who celebrates his 72d birthday today, after having known him for a little less than a year.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the good people of Hawaii, and for myself, I extend to you birthday greetings and congratulations upon your attainment of 72 years of useful living. You have distinguished yourself as a leader of leaders, beloved by all, as perhaps no other man in your present position has ever been. In the many years that you have devoted to public service, you have carved for yourself an indelible niche in the annals of American history, as an effective leader and a statesman. To your statesmanship and espousal of our cause, we citizens of the 50th State owe much for our present privileged status of full, first-class American citizenship.

To you, Mr. Speaker, Hawaii sends its fondest aloha with best wishes that you will continue to serve your State and your Nation for many more years to come. God bless you.

WHO IS SUPPORTING COMMUNISM?

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, in the wee hours of this morning I was very moved by the speeches of the honorable gentlemen from Texas [Mr. MAHON and Mr. THOMAS] about supporting our new President and not giving the world the impression that we want to specifically deny to President Lyndon Johnson authority that has been available to President Harry Truman, President Dwight Eisenhower, and to President John F. Kennedy in the past.

In the meantime I have heard many wild charges from the Republican side that in refusing to deny President Johnson this authority that we are supporting the Russians and communism.

Therefore I want to ask a simple question that can be answered yes or no by the minority leader:

Did the eight Republicans in the Senate, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]; and did the five Republicans in the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] who were voting against limiting President Johnson's authority to conduct the foreign affairs of this Nation and against giving the world the impression that he does not have the confidence of Congress; Did they vote to aid and abet the Russians and the Communists?

RECESS

The **SPEAKER.** On the happy note of the unanimous-consent request of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the Chair was at that time going to declare a recess, and so at this time on that happy note the Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

THE LEGISLATIVE SITUATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks?

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I must advise the Members of the House that we are not able at this time to prevent a rule making in order the consideration of the foreign aid appropriations conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I must also advise the Members that in view of this fact it will be necessary and a matter of the highest urgency for the Members of the House to return here next week on Monday when we adjourn today and to stay here until we complete the business of this session.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is in order to state that my good friend, the minority leader, came to the Speaker and stated at noon, without any qualification, that I heard anything about as to time or otherwise, that he would be able to have two members of his party available, who were members of the Rules Committee, for a meeting of the Committee on Rules, to report a rule which would make possible bringing up this matter for consideration; and indicated that there would be no effort on the part of the minority leadership to vote down the question of consideration.

The Speaker of the House, who is the Speaker, and who will be backed by the Members on this side of the aisle as Speaker of the House, went to work immediately under the terms laid down by the distinguished minority leader. He consulted the White House, which I think was proper. I think the President had the right to know what kind of plans we might have for the disposition of a matter of this importance. I think the President had the right to take a few minutes to go over the matter and to advise with the Democratic leadership and the distinguished chairman of the conference on the side of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] who has cooperated in this matter entirely. And, Mr. Speaker, by a quarter past 3 o'clock this afternoon after the Speaker had come to the conclusion that he could comply with all of the requests of the minority leader, he went back and advised the minority leader and the minority leader said: "You are too late. It cannot be done."

Mr. Speaker, we may have to handle this matter with Democrats. Six Democratic members of the Rules Committee were present for 3 hours when there were two Republican members of the Rules Committee in town. One of them is here who never appeared, so far as I have been able to find out, to make a quorum.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. No, I will not yield; I want to make my statement and then I will yield to the gentleman. I will yield to the gentleman in time, but I should like to make my statement. I am not going to yield at this time.

Mr. Speaker, if the Republican Party is going on a sitdown strike on a matter of this importance it is time the Democratic Party backed the Speaker of the House of Representatives in his efforts to promote the legislative responsibilities of this body. We accept this challenge. There will be no sine die adjournment unless you can get the majority of the votes, until we have disposed of this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon every Member on my side to be here on Monday; if necessary, on Tuesday; and, if necessary, on Wednesday. And, if the minority party is going to refuse to confer on a matter of the highest urgency, we are going to do it over here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. First, let me say that I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just wish that the minority could have seen the enthusiasm on the majority side for this program that has been languishing before the House for 6 months.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman is going to be surprised at the rising Christmastide or rising enthusiasm for this program.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman did yield to me; is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes.

Mr. AVERY. First, let me say I do not think this is the time of the season nor the time of the year to raise our voices and to become overly emotional. I can talk pretty loud, too, if you want to get into that. I did not think this would expedite the business before the House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have the floor. I will ask the gentleman, was the gentleman in Washington during the afternoon?

Mr. AVERY. If the gentleman will permit, he did yield to me, did he not?

Mr. ALBERT. He did not yield in this case, and I ask the gentleman, Was he in Washington this afternoon?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. ALBERT. Was the gentleman in Washington this afternoon? I will not yield to the gentleman unless he will answer the question.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to insist that the House not adjourn sine die, and that we meet here on Monday, that we back our beloved Speaker and our great new President, who are trying only to do a job. I ask that we support our Speaker in his tremendous effort to dispose of this matter.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Michigan whether he has obtained any information about this charge that was made earlier when we met today about the use of military planes in bringing Members back to Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan on that point.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman yields to me?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes.

Mr. FORD. About 1:30 this afternoon the Secretary of Defense called me, in returning the call which I had made earlier, and according to the information he had been able to obtain at that time—and it is my understanding he had just previously called the Speaker and related to him the same information—as of that time Secretary McNamara reported to me that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] had requested transportation and it had been granted. This was so stated on the floor of the House.

It was also indicated by the records then available that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ryan], of Detroit, a Democrat, had requested of the Air Force transportation—I believe from Detroit to Washington. It was turned down locally, I assume, in Detroit.

It was also reported by Secretary McNamara that just prior to the telephone call to me that the majority leader on the Senate side, Senator Mansfield, had just called him and requested that the Department of Defense provide transportation for Senator Johnston, of South Carolina, in order to bring him back to Washington. I have subsequently learned from other sources, that a colleague of mine on the Republican side from the State of Ohio had called this morning to Washington and wondered if there was any transportation available for his return to Washington for the purpose of ending the session. It was indicated that no flights were available for this purpose.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for whom I have the very highest regard. I think his statement now will indicate that his previous statement that the administration might have been using airplanes to transport Democratic Members and not to transport Republican Members for the purpose of voting on the foreign aid bill last night was slightly exaggerated.

SUPPORT OF THE MINORITY FOR THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a long minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the very eminent and esteemed majority leader has undertaken to make certain statements about this pending measure and my connection with it.

Let me just say, first of all, that the first time I voted for a measure like this was when I had a call from President Truman. I was the majority leader of the Republican 80th Congress. I think it was Greek-Turkish aid for which he asked my support. Subsequently, we had aid to France and Italy. After that we had the Marshall plan, and I supported all those measures.

Mr. Speaker, I continued to support them under President Truman and supported them under President Eisenhower. To this very hour, I have supported them under President Kennedy, and may I say, most recently, under President Johnson. I think it might be worthy of note that many times those actions on my part have involved a certain amount of political peril for me.

It is no secret that my Republican colleagues from Indiana and most of them from Illinois and surrounding States have voted against these foreign aid programs right along; and yes, even Members on the Democratic side of the aisle have voted against them. But I have bared my breast on a nonpartisan basis to support programs that I thought were in the best interests of my country.

Now we come on to this particular measure. When it was before the House in the authorization bill I voted for it. I voted for the cut in the authorization bill. I was castigated in some quarters because it was said that I rushed up and down the aisles to get Republican votes for the program to save the bill from defeat. I am not so sure but what if a straight motion to recommit had been made at that time the whole program would have been defeated.

Now we have come on to this year. We had the authorization bill and then we had the appropriation bill. When we met here and we acted on the appropriation bill, an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley], which I supported. It had to do with what the Export-Import Bank might do with respect to certain financing operations of Communist countries. When that amendment was offered I voted for it. It lost on a tie vote in the Committee of the Whole. Subsequently it was the motion to recommit, and I supported that motion to recommit. I make no apology for it. The motion carried by a decisive vote. Then I voted for the measure. The measure then went to the other body, and they refused to go along with the action of the House of Representatives and deleted that amendment.

Now, here is what I want the majority leader to understand real plain. When it came back and when it seemed to me that here after a long, frustrating session of the Congress we might be approaching an adjournment, the Speaker and the majority leader asked me if I would help them get a rule, and I did, yesterday sometime. It was such a long day I do not remember what time it was. But my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery], and the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith], went to the meeting of the Rules Committee to make a quorum and without their presence no action could have been taken. The Speaker and the majority leader asked me to have them attend. The rule was voted out and the measure came on to the floor of the House of Representatives. It had to have a two-thirds vote to bring it to consideration. How did the minority leader vote? He voted for it, and may I say, to the great dismay and disappointment of many Members on my side. But I thought, "Let's get it to a vote." Then we had a vote on the rule, and I voted for the rule to bring the conference report to the floor of the House of Representatives for action.

I dislike to go into all of this business at the moment, but when anybody challenges my position in respect to the affairs of the House of Representatives I have got to say something, and it cannot be denied what my position was; and again, when I voted for that rule there were many people on my side who thought it was a serious mistake. But in any event we stayed in session all night. We quit about 6 o'clock this morning. We had a motion to recommit to insist on the House position. I voted for it. It was the same thing we had voted for when we originally had the bill before us. And again we won, by a vote of 141 to 136.

Then this morning we adjourned. When I came down later this morning I had been informed there was a desire to try it for the third time. The House had sustained its position twice, but the Democrat leadership wanted to try it again. So I did go to the Speaker—he did not send for me—I went of my own volition. I said: "Mr. Speaker—" and I am not sure of the exact words I used, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to get into any controversy with you over this—but when I came down here about a quarter of 12 or about 10 minutes of 12, and looked you up—and I am not sure whether the majority leader was there or not, I said:

> Now, look, if you want to try this again, I will do what I can to get the people on my side of the aisle to go along with another rule and to give you another chance. But, what I want to know is—three strikes ought to be out—and I want to be assured that if we cooperate again to bring this matter up and you lose this time, we still have a sine die adjournment.

I waited and I waited. I called and I called. I went to see people one after the other to find out what was going to be done.

In the meantime, one of our members of the Committee on Rules had gone home. Bill Avery was here. He was up in the Rules Committee, may I say to the majority leader.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there has been any breach of faith on my part. I think I have acted in complete and perfect good faith. We sat around in recess yesterday afternoon for I do not know how long. As I say again, but for Republican cooperation, there would have been no action in the Committee on Rules. You could not have gotten that rule adopted except for Republican cooperation.

Now I want to say another thing, and I want this unmistakably clear. I cannot see the reason for the bum's rush on this measure right now. You talk about President Johnson. I have known him just about as long as anybody and I admire and respect him. I have evidenced that fact. But at the same time I have my own position to maintain. We had a continuing resolution in respect to appropriations that had not been acted upon. We have gone as far here as you are going to go right now, and we are finally enacting some of them. Others are not going to be finally concluded.

But the continuing resolution was adopted providing that the money would be available until January 31, 1964. In other words, my friends, there is no emergency about this measure—none at all. As a matter of fact, the distinguished majority whip indicated that they will do better under the continuing resolution than they will do under this appropriation bill—that they could spend more money. Moreover, if the restriction that the House has twice insisted upon proves to have an adverse effect, it should be pointed out that under the continuing resolution it would not be applicable.

So I say to you, why is it—why is it that now rather than to have a sine die adjournment, when we have been here faithfully week after week and month after month—with many weeks of doing nothing—but we have been here—why is it that all at once after you tried twice to beat down this amendment and failed, do you now insist you are going to have to try it again before we adjourn?

As for my own personal affairs, of course, I have to rearrange all of my plans. I will be here on Monday, may I say to my friends on the Democrat side. I do not know how many people on this side will be here. I know there will not be a corporal's guard in the other body, and I doubt if they will be here. Yes, the other body has gone into a 3-day recess. So you are not going to get anything done over there until the second session opens.

Now what is this all about? When I went in this morning to see the Speaker of the House—and I have talked to him and to the majority leader all afternoon until 3:30 p.m. or some such time—we called a lot of people back—you called people back. We were ready to go ahead. But in the meantime—sure, I said it looks to me like it is awfully late—I did say it is too late. It was probably too late for me to have undertaken a meeting on the Republican side to do what we did yesterday—to bail you Democrats out.

However, I am telling you right now, yesterday we did what the majority wanted. But for us you could not have gotten the bill on the floor, and you lost in a clean fight. You come back today and you want to do it all over again. We say OK, get going, but let us get this show on the road so that we can adjourn. I do not propose to sit around. My friends, there was a great appeal made to the people on the other side of the aisle for our beloved Speaker, and he has no better personal friend than I and no greater admirer than I, but I just want to say in concluding that if I was wrong in insisting that we get going and not sit around here all night tonight, I am sorry, because I am getting a little agey for this all night stuff. I do not know about the rest of you. I used to be able to do that real well, but it kind of wears me down. However, I will still do it in a good cause and in a cause that has justification. However, when you want to go the third time around and you are not ready to get going, that is something else. When we could have had our people in the Rules Committee up there, all we wanted was the assurance that this was the last vote on this amendment and that we would not have to come next Monday to do it all over again. I do not know how many times you want to try it. I just happen to believe that the American people are with us in this controversy. We will have to find out, I suppose, ultimately.

Having said this much, I just want to say that I am kind of sorry at what I must say. I interpreted it as something of a castigation of my operations today, and maybe all the way through in connection with this measure. I think that is unjustified. I shall continue to cooperate with the majority leadership in the conduct of the affairs of the House of Representatives. I certainly want to express the hope at this time that when we come back here on January 7, if we ever do finally get adjourned—and somebody said that we can see the star of Bethlehem coming up here just as well as we can at home, and maybe that is right, and it is all right with me, but, in any event, I am going to continue to cooperate when I think the best interests of my country are involved. I think I speak for every Member on this side of the aisle when I make that statement. But that does not mean that we shall just willy-nilly roll over and play dead when we think that the issue demands something else.

I could recount many, many circumstances. It was not very long ago that I really was taken apart because I had cooperated too much with the administration in getting the civil rights bill up. Maybe you still may need me. I do not know. I do not want to break the friendly ties that we have had, but I am just not going to plead guilty in any respect to any misconduct on my part in connection with this matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in order to take my colleagues into my complete confidence, might I say that earlier today the distinguished minority leader did talk to me about a rule and said two members of the Rules Committee would cooperate. Of course, it is their duty to do it, anyway, but if they did not, there would not be a quorum if they were not there while the other six Democrats who were there since about 12 o'clock, and the rule was reported out to help bring up the bill so it could be voted on. The main question was to vote it up or down and a motion to adjourn sine die would follow.

In years past under former President Eisenhower, when my friend from Indiana, as majority leader, had his problems and the late Speaker and I, the Democratic leader, had some discussions with him while he had his problems, we were very tolerant of him, sometimes giving him 2 or 3 days to work out his problems. The leadership has many headaches and I appreciated it then and I understood it then. I am aware that the leadership on both sides have many problems that confront us. So, we are always very broad and tolerant and understanding.

In our talk today there was no question of a time limit in our minds. We cooperated with my friend from Indiana without limitation or without restriction.

Now, as Speaker of the House or as majority leader, when a question of adjournment sine die comes up, I would think it would be unwise if I did not contact the President of the United States to let him know that under certain circumstances a sine die resolution would be offered. And I would do this if I were a Democratic Speaker with a Republican in the White House. I would do it with any President, whether Democrat or Republican.

During the course of the afternoon with many other things to do, it took about 3 hours to work this matter out. About a quarter past 3 o'clock, as I remember, I sent for the minority leader. I told him that if a rule came out and it was considered, and if the main question involved, which was the wheat question, was voted up or down, either way, then a motion to adjourn sine die would follow. At that time, about a quarter past 3 o'clock my distinguished friend told me that I had taken too long. The very proposition that he submitted to me about a quarter past 3 o'clock was not accepted. I went through a rather tortuous hour that I hope I will never have to undergo again. The thought entered my mind, Who is the Speaker of the House of Representatives? And if I capitulated by an adjournment sine die without an effort to bring up this conference report, I would not deserve to be the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and under no conditions would I do that.

I think the facts should be understood. If the Rules Committee reported out a rule and it was considered, and the matter brought up, we could have adjourned sine die today. I am willing to do it now if my friend from Indiana will assure us that we will have a meeting of the Rules Committee. We can dispose of this today. If he has only one Republican member of the Rules Committee in town, I will get the seventh Democratic member, in order to constitute a quorum of eight.

I do not want to get into an acrimonious discussion. I simply want the facts understood. The very proposition, the very suggestion that the gentleman from Indiana made to me about a quarter past 3 o'clock was accepted by me. The gentleman from Indiana refused. Now if he wants to go ahead and cooperate we can get the Rules Committee together, a rule can come out, and we can dispose of this matter tonight. Under the circumstances, if that is not done, there is no other honorable course I can follow than to move to have the House adjourn until Monday, try to get a quorum of eight Democrats here; then on Monday I will bring the resolution up to see if we can get the two-thirds vote for consideration, and if so, dispose of it on Monday. If not, we will then have to wait until Tuesday in order to bring the matter up under the rules of the House, where a majority vote is necessary.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished Speaker yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has spoken of how many members of the Rules Committee he can get. The record should indicate that there are 10 Democrats and 5 Republicans who are members of the Committee on Rules. So far as I know, the only Republican member of the Rules Committee in town at the moment is the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

So far as I am concerned, may I say to my very good friend, if everybody here wants to go all night again for a third try, that is all right with me.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say that this is the second attempt on a conference report, if we do not go back to the original bill.

Mr. HALLECK. All right; we had a vote when the amendment went into the bill here in the House. Then you had the conference report here yesterday and you did not win, and the very next day you say, "Let us try it all over again."

All I wanted to know this morning was, How many times do we have to go through with it? Maybe I was unreasonable in expecting that there would be some response in a reasonable time in order that we might get the matter disposed of.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me ask my dear friend a question. About a quarter past 3 o'clock this afternoon did I not state to the gentleman that if the Rules Committee reported out a rule that was considered and the wheat issue was voted up or down, a sine die resolution would follow?

Mr. HALLECK. Let me say to the gentleman, as I remember it, the time was later than 3:15.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, we spent an hour talking with the two leaders of the other body.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, as a matter of fact, I do not think I was invited to the Speaker's office. I got word that the majority and minority leaders from the other body were coming to the Speaker's office. There was a suggestion that possibly it might be well for me to go there. But I think—the Speaker will agree with me that after we had the 1-minute speeches here this morning, I went to him, as he sat in the Speaker's chair, and again urged him to give me some sort of assurance as to what we might expect, because, Mr. Speaker, I again say to you, I just do not know what the people on this side of the aisle would do. There are a great many Members who are not in favor of voting for the rule. I do not know how they will vote now.

If the gentleman is in favor of getting the Committee on Rules together, I think probably our Republican will show up. He is the only one in town.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I ask the gentleman a further question? When I told him that if the Rules Committee reported out a rule and the matter was brought up today and disposed of one way or the other, a sine die resolution would be offered, did not the gentleman tell me that I had taken too long and refused at that point to cooperate?

Mr. HALLECK. I said to the gentleman, the Speaker, that in my opinion the thing had gone along too late. Now, when I said that, I did not make any pledge about what I would do. I did not undertake to say what the people on my side would do. I have talked here for some time with different Members and I can see the difficulty building up in trying to acomplish what the Speaker wants to accomplish.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the record clearly shows that the very recommendation made by the gentleman from Indiana was acceptable to me and about a quarter past 3, the gentleman then declined to go through with it.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield to me for just one further question?

The Chairman has asked several questions of me.

Suppose the rule is voted out this evening and under the rule the gentleman does not get the necessary two-thirds majority?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman asked me that and I gave the gentleman the answer: If we do not get the two-thirds majority, we will adjourn until Monday and bring it up under the rules of the House requiring a majority vote.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Since my schedule this afternoon has been the subject of considerable talk here, I would like the record to show clearly that I did go to the Rules Committee room on three different occasions. I went there at 1:30 p.m. and only the chairman was there. I went a little after 4:00 when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] was there, and only the chairman was there. I went again after that, and there was nobody there except the staff.

I do not know whether that is of any interest to the Members this evening, but I did want to make that observation.

If the majority wishes to announce a meeting of the Committee on Rules, I shall attend such meeting on the minute that it is announced by the Chair.

So, if there is any disposition to go on from here, the gentleman can be assured that I will cooperate in every way possible.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the record is very clear that the Republican members of the Committee on Rules did not intend to attend the meeting. They have clearly proved it. They boycotted the meeting. And, furthermore, there is no mistake about it in my mind because I dislike a club hanging over my head, and that is all I have been getting all afternoon.

When we had the opportunity and when I came to the minority leadership, then he said, after my working on it for 3 hours, it was too late.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Just in order that we may have it completely clarified, there were three members of the majority party on the Rules Committee who were absent and there were three members of the minority party on the Rules Committee who were absent at that particular time of day. So, the split was 50 to 50.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman knows that all members of the committee, without regard to party, are members of a committee. It is certainly their duty to cooperate. The gentleman from Illinois knows that two Republican members of the committee were not cooperating and did not join with the six Democratic members in order to constitute a quorum.

Mr. ARENDS. I just want to make the point that there is nothing unusual for three members of the committee on each side of the aisle to be away.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1964

Mr. PASSMAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill H.R. 9499, and I further ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made about the minority members of the Rules Committee, and that possibly they were on a sitdown strike, I want to say a word for my able colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, CLARENCE BROWN, whom I have known for so long and so well.

There is no member of the Rules Committee on either side of the House, save only the chairman, who has been more faithful in attendance on Rules Committee business for more than a decade than the gentleman from Ohio, CLARENCE BROWN. Seldom, indeed, has he been absent from either the committee or from the House in this session of the Congress, which has lasted longer than any session of the Congress in the peacetime history of America.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I will in a moment.

CLARENCE BROWN's mother is 92 years old. She is blind and she is bedfast. I am afraid that CLARENCE BROWN's good wife, Ethel, who has been a friend of our family for so long, is suffering from an illness in Mercy Hospital in Urbana, Ohio, from which she will not recover. It is a medical fact, Mr. Speaker, that one of CLARENCE BROWN's lovely grandchildren, the apple of his eye, only 6 or 7 years old, is being kept alive by medical science until Christmas Day, suffering from leukemia.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Ohio, CLARENCE BROWN, were here, if he ever needed a defense, he would defend himself far better than I, but I wanted the facts on the record.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for the statement he has made about the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. I certainly intended no aspersion on my fine and beloved colleague. I know he has illness in his family. I did not personalize this statement, and had no such intention in referring to the distinguished gentleman. I was not speaking in personal terms at all, except in defense of the Speaker and his prerogatives as Speaker. I join the gentleman in the wonderful tribute he paid to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, may I have unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not yet consumed his minute.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I thank the Speaker.

I should like to give you the sequel to my story about getting to Washington, today, from Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in an Air Force plane, in which there were several officers and several enlisted men, and probably a dozen vacant seats. I want to say this because I am fearful that there may be some sanctions visited on some people who permitted me to board the plane.

This flight on which I came to Washington had been scheduled for the flight before I called for the transportation. It would have taken off whether I had arrived at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and boarded the plane or not.

Mr. Speaker, after I arrived in Washington, I renewed a request to ride back to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in an Air Force plane if one were scheduled and if there were a vacant seat in that plane. In due course, a commanding general called me and he said, "Mr. Congressman, I regret that it is improper for you to ride in an Air Force plane even though there be vacant seats in it and even though you were returning to Congress."

Mr. Speaker, I heard the statement just made that arrangements had been made to fly a Member of the other body back to Washington. I recently read in the papers, that there have been civilian rides to Portland, to Detroit, to Montreal, to Los Angeles, to Tampa, and to Palm Beach.

I shall be watching with interest the enforcement of the rule which is supposed to keep all Congressmen from riding Air Force planes on scheduled flights and when there is vacant space unless they are authorized to do so by some nebulous person for some alleged compelling reason.

SELF-HELP AND THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Judge Gavin Watson, Jr., of Red River County, Tex., which demonstrates how a partnership can be developed between government and local groups in helping people help themselves.

Judge Watson's letter was in the form of a progress report on what the Area Redevelopment Administration has been doing in his part of Texas. And it is an entirely different picture than one gets in reading some of the exposés that have been appearing in print on this subject recently.

Before reading the judge's letter, let me emphasize that what we are talking about here for the most part is a case of the Federal Government joining hands with private bankers and investors and local civic groups to help put up money to start new industries or expand old ones and create new jobs.

That is what ARA is mainly about. But in the 2 years of its existence it has also developed into a coordinating agency which has helped many other Government agencies to get in at the grassroots and do something about helping people who are caught in economic squeezes over which they, themselves, have little if any control.

But let me read Judge Watson's letter. It expresses the thought far better than I can.

CLARKSVILLE, TEX., *December 5, 1963.*

Re report on Red River County, Tex., ARA program.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Buddy and I have just completed the attached report, at the request of Pat, to send to the Office of Planning and Research, Area Redevelopment Administration. It is in the nature of a 2-year progress report, as required by the ARA. We thought you might perhaps like to have an advance copy of this.

You may recall that our overall economic development plan was submitted on September 1, 1961, and in this we set 56 goals. We recently listed these 56 goals and discussed the action taken in regard to each, and this is the subject of the report.

Somewhat to our amazement, we found very definite action has been taken on 47 projects, or, about 84 percent. We found 16 goals had been reached. Even those of us working in the program were gratified to find so many results; we frankly had not realized the total of these achievements.

In making this record, for whatever it may be worth, we used the advice and assistance and, in many cases, the resources, of many Federal groups. Prominent among these are: U.S. Department of Commerce (Area Redevelopment Administration), SBA, HHFA, CFA, PHA, Farmers' Home Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and, U.S. Department of Agriculture through the Texas A. & M. Extension Service. We also used considerable State help.

We think perhaps this is at least a partial refutation of those who criticize ARA as a giveaway. Actual grants did not figure prominently in but a few of these projects. Many Government loans and guarantees were accepted, of course, but these are repayable with interest. Most of the projects were financed by local government or through private sources.

This required a fantastic amount of work by local sources, but this we have been willing to give and are working even harder at this time.

All of these projects are important but many are preparatory only, and we are now about ready for economic progress. The 10-percent financing required by ARA still proves a major stumbling block, but we are putting in many hours now on prospective industries and on agricultural plans.

Mr. PATMAN, all of us here, after much thoughtful consideration, wonder if our county isn't really completely representative of ARA as it was meant to work. That is, these big projects make a big splash and are wonderful to have (we are working on some ourselves) and we hope everyone gets one. But, all of these little things that we have been able to do, with your help, have meant so much to this county.

ARA so enthused our people that a wave of optimism swept over this county and our citizens begin to feel that now is the time to get things done. There was a surge to accomplish things that had before looked impossible. Through your urging, many agencies gave us help where before we had been ignored. We feel if ever there was a bootstrap operation, with ARA help, of course, we are it.

So, perhaps that is what ARA is really meant to be: An idea which will encourage people to help themselves on all these things, with encouragement and assistance from the Federal agencies.

Economically, we are still not prospering as we would hope. But, we have several very fine things working. With the continued support of ARA and with your invaluable help, we think we can pull this county on up to where it should be.

We are all looking forward to seeing you.

Buddy and Pat join me in sending you our best regards.

Sincerely,

GAVIN WATSON, Jr.

URBAN RENEWAL IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA], who are members of Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Committee on the District of Columbia of which I am chairman, for their very kind and constructive remarks of yesterday concerning the House District of Columbia Subcommittee No. 4 study of urban renewal in the city of Washington.

These gentlemen have given freely of their time and efforts in the best tradition of Members of this House. I want to express my appreciation to them for their cooperation and contributions to the subcommittee and their remarks concerning the Columbia Plaza project.

Further, I want to acknowledge and express appreciation to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] for their kind remarks and contribution to the discussion yesterday.

It appears that Washington is not the only city which has its "Columbia Plaza" problem. I have received communications from Dayton, Ohio, which indicate that a very similar project is underway in that city.

It appears that the Perry Meade project in Dayton has received a Federal grant of advance funds in excess of $120,000. As in Columbia Plaza in Washington, the "chosen instrument" policy of preselecting a developer without competition, even before any project plan is prepared, is evidently being used.

The Perry Meade project in Dayton calls for the use of Federal funds to acquire approximately 50 acres of the downtown area for urban renewal purposes. I am informed that the project area contains most of the new and improved buildings in the central business district, while other areas of the business district which have shown a substantial downward trend in values over the past 10 or 15 years are not included in the renewal area. Although this seems completely contrary to the purpose and intent of the urban renewal provisions of the Housing Act, it is apparently the general practice in such cases.

It appears that the disposition of the renewal land area in the Perry Meade project is to be made to the "chosen instrument" redeveloper without any competition. Existing businesses in the renewal area indicate that they have been denied any opportunity to build their own buildings, even though they are ready, willing, and able to do so under a redevelopment plan, and without being subsidized by the American taxpayers.

In the Columbia Plaza area in Washington, existing property owners, ready and able to redevelop privately, without Federal cost or under the renewal plan, were squeezed out. Our committee found that the procedures used subverted the purposes of the law and amounted to the use of public power for a private user under the guise of qualifying the project as a public use. From the information made available to me in the following letter, which I request be incorporated in my remarks, the Perry Meade project seems closely akin to the situation in Columbia Plaza. If this is the case, there is no authority in the Housing Act to permit the use of Federal funds for such purpose, and the Administrator of Urban Renewal is under obligation to protect the funds of the taxpayers of the Nation.

DAYTON, OHIO,
December 17, 1963.

Re city of Dayton, Ohio, central business district urban renewal.

Hon. JOHN DOWDY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOWDY: The city of Dayton, Ohio, is in the process of obtaining Federal funds for assistance in purchasing for renewal purposes, approximately 50 acres of the downtown area of the city. A part of this area contains most of the new buildings and improvements made in the central business district during the past 10 or 15 years, and some of the area to be renewed has multiplied in value many times over recent years. Other areas of the downtown business district not within the renewal area have shown a substantial downward trend in values over the same period of time.

The city commission has decided to sell this entire acreage to Mr. John Galbreath of Columbus, Ohio. No other competitive bids will be made on the property. Mr. Galbreath intends to submit his renewal design at a private luncheon of the leaders of the community on December 20, 1963.

We are attorneys for an Ohio corporation, Car-Two, Inc., that owns property which is slated to be sold to Mr. Galbreath. This corporation is owned by several local businessmen and it has owned the property for approximately 10 years. Our client operates a title abstracting business on its property at the present time, and wishes to construct a modern office building that will comply with the requirements of the plan of renewal for the area. All necessary private financing has been arranged and no governmental financial assistance is required. The city refuses to allow our client to construct the building and gives as the reason, that Mr. Galbreath is unwilling to have this property excluded.

We have filed a lawsuit in the local Federal district court, which is now pending upon a motion by the city to dismiss the case on the theory that the Federal court does not have jurisdiction. Several other lawsuits have been filed in the local common pleas court by other property owners in the urban renewal area. In spite of the pendency of these suits, the city is proceeding at full speed with its plans for the acquisition and sale of the property to Mr. Galbreath.

If Federal funds can be used through urban renewal to destroy the small businessman to the advantage of the few, I believe it will do more toward encouraging such things as communism than the Communists can do for themselves. How can we criticize the complete ownership of land by the Communists if we are to encourage, through the use of Federal funds, the ownership of land by a few multimillionaires. The question can be asked, "Why should the U.S. Government concern itself with one property owner in the city of Dayton?" However, if the city of Dayton, with the use of Federal funds, can compel, under a threat of law, perhaps a hundred or more small property owners within a 50-acre area of the city of Dayton, to sell their properties to the city for resale to Mr. Galbreath, and this is happening in many other cities throughout the United States, its impact on our society is not a little matter.

If you would like to have any additional information, please let us know and we will supply it to you, either in person or otherwise.

Very truly yours,
PAUL H. GRANZOW.

KNOWLES PROJECT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of this distinguished body the following letter which I received from a constituent who is the chairman of the Flathead-Kootenai Tribe in Montana.

Due to a lack of time, I was unable to place this letter in the RECORD of our discussion on Knowles Dam Tuesday, and request your permission to have the letter printed in today's RECORD. I particularly wish to point out that this letter is only one of many letters from Indians who clearly show that the Knowles project is misrepresented to the Congress by private power interests:

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN.

DEAR SIR: As chairman of and spokesman for the Flathead-Kootenai organization, a legally franchised group of the rank and file Indians of the Flathead and Kootenai tribes which includes a potential membership of some one thousand individuals, I wish to take exception to and refute the statement made by the Honorable Mr. HARSHA, Representative of Ohio; in essence, the opinions expressed that the Flathead Indians are against Knowles Dam, and the position he has taken in regard to our treaty rights.

The Knowles proposal does in no way infringe upon our original treaty rights. On the contrary, the dam site represents a sound tribal asset which by treaty we are entitled to make the best use of.

Regarding Indian opinion, I want it known for the record that no general assessment of opinion regarding Knowles Dam has ever been taken among our people. We are aware that Mr. HARSHA may have been taken in by various reports issued by the Flathead Tribal Council, a group of 10 Indians who would like to have it thought that all of our Indians are against the Knowles proposal. It should be known that this tribal governing body, which has been in the clutches of the Montana Power Co. since the construction of Kerr Dam on the lower Flathead River, would not report the fact that there are indeed a great many Indians in favor of Knowles Dam.

I challenge this governing body and the Honorable Mr. HARSHA to place this issue before our people for a real assessment of the facts. I request that any other opinions on the Indian side of this issue be withheld from testimony pending proper foundation. We want no one to place false words in our mouths.

Yours truly,
HENRY LOZEAU,
Chairman, Flathead-Kootenai.
MISSOULA, MONT.

Further note two telegrams from outstanding leaders in the Flathead tribe:

CHARLO, MONT.,
December 17, 1963.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

No one knows how the majority of Indians feel about Knowles because the tribal council has not held a vote on this issue. It is plain to see why they have not done so; they fear too much opposition to the council's stand. In my opinion the majority favor Knowles.

Respectfully,

LUCILLE T. ROULLIER,
Member, Flathead Tribe.

RONAN, MONT.,
December 17, 1963.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Indian council does not represent all members of the Flathead Tribe on the issue of Knowles Dam. We are for it.

MRS. WEIVODA.

POWER OF TOBACCO INDUSTRY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, we have seen two demonstrations this week of the power of the tobacco industry to intimidate the American people, and in light of the overwhelming evidence linking cigarette smoking to various diseases, I believe these events warrant comment.

First, I would call the attention of my colleagues to a report carried on the market pages this week that tobacco stocks were booming in spite of the fact that the Surgeon General's Committee on Smoking and Health is about to release its report on this problem. The news stories explained that tobacco industry leaders were convinced Congress would not follow up that report with any sort of legislation. If this is the stuff on which stock prices are built, I think we may have pause to reflect on the operations of Wall Street. As one concerned Member of Congress, I want to make it clear to my colleagues and the public that I intend to follow up that Surgeon General's report with renewed efforts to enact legislation to cope with a most serious health menace in this country. I presently am awaiting Department reports on my bill to place smoking products under the Federal food and drug laws. If other recommendations ultimately are made by the Surgeon General, I will certainly give them most serious consideration. In any case, I am certain the time is at hand for the Congress of the United States to recognize the need for smoking legislation of some kind, and I want it clearly understood that the tobacco industry leaders do not speak for me when they say that Congress will continue to ignore this problem.

Mr. Speaker, the second event of interest this week was a report Sunday in the New York Times that the AFL–CIO has cancelled plans to include a drive against excessive smoking in its cancer education program next month.

It does not take too much guessing to figure out what maneuvering preceded that announcement. The tobacco industry spoke to the tobacco unions, which in turn spoke to the leadership of the AFL–CIO, and what started out as a sound program of public education has been turned into a travesty.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fantastic accumulation of facts indicting cigarette smoking with the causation of cancer, emphysema, cardiovascular and other physical disorders, it makes absolutely no sense to conduct a program on cancer prevention without talking about cigarettes.

This would be like "educating" the public about the problem of obesity without mentioning desserts.

It would also be like selling cigarettes with "extra margins," new "miracle" filters and the like, without mentioning what it is that we're being protected from.

Mr. Speaker, I do not condemn the AFL–CIO. It is a democratic organization which must seek always to tread a line between the demands of its various elements. But I deplore the high-pressure tactics which most surely can be blamed for this idiotic result.

It will be noted that the AFL–CIO gave as its reason for this action the "fact" that the health hazard in smoking is a subject of controversy among science and health authorities. This is simply a restatement of the well-known tobacco industry position that "the facts aren't all in."

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues are aware of the endless procedure envisaged by the tobacco industry in this regard. As long as they can hire some "authority" somewhere to say he isn't yet convinced, they hope to continue saying "but the facts aren't all in."

Let us imagine that as a nation we decided to conduct the most ambitious test of the effects of smoking on health that could be imagined. Suppose that we took 10 percent of the population of every State in the Union and followed every detail of the lives of these people for the next 25 years. Following that study let us suppose, which is most likely, that the facts pointed overwhelmingly to cigarette smoking as a major cause of illness and premature death. Do you imagine the tobacco industry would be satisfied?

I am sure there is no one present who assumes for a moment that the industry would be satisfied. They would contend that certain of the reports were inaccurate, that the original 10-percent sample was improperly taken, that the data failed to correspond significantly to previous data, and so on ad infinitum. In short, even such a massive accumulation as this would be questioned, disputed, minimized, and made "controversial" by the propagandists of the tobacco industry.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an unimportant or trivial problem. In a recent newsletter I pointed out to my constituents that fatalities in the next 12 months attributable to cigarette smoking would exceed the 100,000 persons killed in the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, and might actually approach the 292,000 battlefield deaths our Nation suffered in World War II. These are not scare figures. I firmly believe the evidence already assembled by leading scientists must lead to American fatalities in the range of 100,000 to 300,000 a year—all attributable to cigarette smoking. And there are those who say this problem should be ignored.

If this is peace, Mr. Speaker, what would war be like?

Without objection, I insert the New York Times article of Sunday, December 15, at this point in my remarks:

AFL–CIO DROPS DRIVE ON SMOKING—LEAVES ISSUE OF CANCER LINK TO MEDICAL EXPERTS

The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organization has canceled plans to include a drive against excessive smoking in its cancer education program next month.

The drive is part of the American Cancer Society's general effort to reduce the incidence of cancer through education aimed at prevention and early detection.

The program of the AFL–CIO will be carried on in cooperation with the society.

When the federation's community service activities section announced that the drive on excessive smoking would be included in its program, AFL–CIO spokesmen said, labor officials and interested tobacco unions were surprised.

WORKED WITH FOUNDATION

When questioned whether the issue had been discussed by the federation at its convention or in executive council sessions, inquiry showed it had not. Neither had the noncontroversial parts of the cancer education program.

However, the labor organization has supported cancer education for a long time, working in the field originally with the Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Foundation.

As a result it had been decided that no special authorization from the convention or the council was required.

Federation spokesmen said the question was not expected to be raised at the next convention or council session unless the medical profession or the Government agreed that excessive smoking was involved directly as a causative agent in cancer.

As matters stand, they said, the issue is not properly up to the federation. The rest of the program relating to prevention, early detection, and treatment involves matters on which science and health authorities are in agreement, which raises no policy issue, they explained.

THE 1ST SESSION, 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the calendar is about to put an end to the hardest working session of Congress in all history. Probably the uninformed will greet this statement with a derisive hoot. It is neither funny nor embarrassing to those of us who have struggled and wrangled through the full count of calendar months without a pause to catch our breath. If it were proper to measure the amount of work we have done by the number of complicated pieces of legislation we have put on the statute books, our record might be called into question. A better measure of our activity is the number of hours we have spent considering proposed legislation, in hearing testimony for and against proposals, and in gathering and analyzing public opinion on the subject. The fact is that a vast amount of highly controversial legislation has been considered by this session of the Congress.

Up through December 13, 9,497 bills have been introduced in the House, plus 1,464 resolutions. The Senate has contributed 2,388 bills and 374 resolutions. A larger than usual proportion of these measures belong in the controversial category. Testimony before the committees considering them has been long and heated. The various public interests affected by the proposals have been unusually antagonistic. Public opinion on many of them is difficult to ascertain. Probably immediate and short-range advantages gain more support than farsighted plans in the broad public interest. It would be the height of unwisdom to enact such measures into law before their full effect could be foreseen with clarity. It is better to delay action in some cases than to be compelled to undo action which turns out to be mischievous. This is not a time of crisis, either in foreign matters or on the domestic scene. The U.S. News observes:

> Congress is the place where diverse and often clashing interests of this vast Nation are adjusted and compromised.

That has been the perplexing and complicated task of this session of the 88th Congress. Our record cannot be compiled and evaluated until the end of the next session.

On many of the issues of the day, individual Members of the Congress have already reached a conclusion. In my own case, I have no hesitancy in taking a stand on those which I consider to be in the interest of the people I represent and of the Nation as a whole. I must credit other Members with being equally sincere. Where our views conflict, some common ground of agreement should be found—must be found. The involved, apparently cumbersome, and sometimes vexatious procedures of the legislative branch of the Government are designed for the express purpose of discovering that common ground. The matters which have provoked bitter argument in this session have too important a bearing on the future well-being of this Nation to permit of adjustment without full consideration of the probable consequences.

In the area of national defense, there has been no controversy on purpose. This Congress is unitedly committed to the strongest defense that money and advanced technology can procure. There are differences of opinion over what weapons systems or what organizational adaptations best serve that purpose. These are matters requiring the best scientific judgments available. The Congress has been busy in securing those judgments and in acting on them.

There has also been wide agreement on the desirability of relaxing tensions where national security is not endangered.

On the domestic front, this Congress is being designated as an "educational Congress." Nearly $3 billion has been authorized or appropriated in three bills designed to expand and aid education facilities. A full half of it goes to vocational education programs, and nearly a quarter billion more to the expansion of medical education facilities. An additional third of a billion has been authorized for an attack on the enormous problem of mental health.

This attention to urgent domestic needs has wide support, both in Congress and among the people. We are making a beginning on problems of health and education that have waited too long already, while we have been absorbed in providing for matters relating to defense and to international relationships. The appropriations made for the start do not, in fact, represent additions to the budget. Careful pruning of the budgetary requests by the House Appropriation Committee has made it possible to save approximately twice the cost of health and education appropriations. It is a case of putting money where it was most needed at the time. Congress is properly concerned with making necessary expenditures, and equally concerned with avoiding unnecessary expenditures.

A threatened strike which would have paralyzed the rail transportation system of the Nation and, along with it, all business activity, was averted by the creation of an independent arbitration board. It was my good fortune to have a significant role in devising this plan of settlement and in securing its acceptance.

A vigorous attack on the continuing problem of employment was made by this Congress when it placed accent upon acceleration in aid to public works projects and to construction of interstate highways. I am happy to note that my State of West Virginia showed during the year commendable initiative in developing water and sewer systems and other public facilities under this program. Long-needed highway construction is presently being speeded up. Loans and grants under ARA have helped to develop the economic resources of the State, and the program has been extended by this Congress. Further, we have provided for important research programs in many fields, ranging from development and use of natural resources to the most scientific approaches to outer space questions and those of the interior of the atom. Unemployment compensations have been increased and extended.

The armed services have been given a needed basic pay rate increase. Veterans and those suffering from service-connected disabilities have been given generous consideration.

Agriculture is one domestic problem for which no permanent and generally acceptable solution has yet been found. In the absence of such a solution, the Congress has provided temporary extension of the remedies now in use, and has endeavored to correct some of the inequities of the past.

These are just a few of the solid accomplishments of the 88th Congress to date. They should not be obscured in the shadow produced by the blazing light of publicity thrown on a relatively few highly controversial and as yet unresolved issues. In a less complex and less rapidly moving age, they would entitle the Congress to general applause.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 875) entitled "Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. COTTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. GIAMO.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 792. An act to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 848. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of February in each year as "American Heart Month."

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1175. An act to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; and

S. 2311. An act to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college debate topics.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1211. An act to admit the vessels *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Herbert R. Schaff;

H.R. 1560. An act for the relief of Constantinos A. Grigoras (Gregoras);

H.R. 2292. An act for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee;

H.R. 2364. An act for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.;

H.R. 4099. An act for the relief of Jesse Leigh, Jr.;

H.R. 4157. An act to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 4505. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and determine a motion for a new trial on the claim of Robert Alexander;

H.R. 4759. An act for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, Frank Grove, Harry P. Nash, Jr., and Michael J. Neofitou;

H.R. 5746. An act for the relief of Robert H. Bagby;

H.R. 6181. An act for the relief of Mr. Rudolph Sanderson, of Meriden, Kans.;

H.R. 6468. An act for the relief of Harold J. Burke;

H.R. 6807. An act for the relief of N. W. Robinson & Co., Inc.;

H.R. 7019. An act to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land and improvements in the village of Odanah, Wis., taken by the Federal Government;

H.R. 8667. An act authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins;

H.R. 9413. An act to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy;

H.J. Res. 680. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate 1964 as "U.S. Customs Year"; and

H.J. Res. 778. Joint resolution to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in the Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International (Rome) Institute for the Unification of Private Law, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Monday, December 23, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1465. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the final report of the U.S. Study Commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Mary's, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee and Perdido-Escambia River Basins and intervening areas (commonly known as the U.S. Study Commission—Southeast River Basins) was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee of Conference. H.R. 9499. A bill making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1091). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. HAWKINS introduced a bill (H.R. 9559) to amend section 221 of the National Housing Act to require, as a condition of mortgage insurance for cooperative housing thereunder, a finding by the Federal Housing Commissioner (after public hearing) that the proposed housing will adequately serve a useful purpose, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. EDWARDS introduced a bill (H.R. 9560) for the relief of Lim Sam Soon which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who in the gift at Bethlehem sent the supreme revelation of Thy love to all mankind: Into Thy holy keeping we commit ourselves and all that has been said and done here in sincerity of motive and purpose. Wilt Thou bless and strengthen all that within these cherished walls has been worthily weighed as these servants of the people's choice have followed flickering lights in a darkened hour.

And now as in the glow and glory of the Christmastide "The End" is about to be inscribed, closing another chapter in the record of the Nation's life.

May the Lord bless you and keep you in your going out and in your coming in. May the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you. May the Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace—peace in your own hearts and homes, peace in this dear land where still burns brightly freedom's holy light, and the Advent offer of peace throughout all the earth to men of good will, now and evermore.

In the name of the Prince of Peace we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar days of Friday, December 20, and Saturday, December 21, 1963, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that statements in the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the postmaster nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Preisdent, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With reference to the printing of committee activity reports for the session, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, I wish to remind the chairmen of all committees that the Joint Committee on Printing has very properly ruled that the printing of such reports, both as committee prints and in the Record, is duplication, the cost of which cannot be justified.

It is requested that committee chairmen decide whether they wish these reports printed as committee prints or in the Record, since the Government Printing Office will be directed not to print them both ways.

REPORT OF U.S. STUDY COMMISSION—SOUTHEAST RIVER BASINS (S. DOC. NO. 51)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the final report of the U.S. Study Commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, Saint Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee and Perdido-Escambia River Basins and intervening areas (commonly known as the U.S. Study Commission—Southeast River Basins), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

RESOLUTION OF MUNICIPAL BOARD OF ORMOC CITY, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Municipal Board of Ormoc City, Philippine Islands, expressing condolences at the death of the late President John F. Kennedy, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, from checking the Congressional Record, I find that on rollcall No. 159, in the 87th Congress, 2d session, Congressional Record, volume 108, part 12; page 16409, on the vote on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] to adjourn, I am not recorded. If present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 21, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier and Paula Bouvier;

S. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grun (Susanne Roth);

S. 1319. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents;

S. 1838. An act for the relief of Hannah Robbins; and

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week."

FOREIGN AID CUTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, an article published in the Wall Street Journal of yesterday, entitled "Administration To Try New Ways To Avert Big Cuts in Oversea Funds" is a knowledgeable presentation—by Philip Geyelin, of the Wall Street Journal staff—of various ways and means whereby the budget could be adjusted to minimize the amount of foreign aid, as such.

For example, the writer points out that military assistance funds could be placed under the regular appropriation for the Department of Defense, and that it could be done logically because of the close relationship between the military assistance part of our foreign aid program and our national defense program. Other examples are given.

In view of the current battle being waged over foreign aid, I believe this article merits the attention of the general public; therefore I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Foreign Aid Change—Administration To Try New Ways To Advert Big Cuts in Oversea Funds—Military Aid Will Be Shifted to Defense Budget; Critics May Balk at Repackaging—Girding for Next Year's Fight

(By Philip Geyelin)

Washington.—As Congress puts final touches on another severe drubbing of the U.S. foreign aid program, the scene along the aid front is strikingly familiar—but only up to a point.

Aid advocates are grimly warning that next year's congressional reception promises to be equally rough. The Johnson administration is urgently searching for new ways to put a more appealing look on oversea assistance. And veteran foreign aiders are contending that just about everything possible has already been tried.

But new approaches will be tried next year, nonetheless. While final decisions have yet to be made, talks with key planners strongly suggest a significant switch from past aid strategy. The Johnson treatment, it's already clear, calls for a combination of strategic retreat and a little sleight of hand. One result is sure to be the slimmest aid program sent to Congress in recent years. But another result will be that the program will look considerably slimmer than it really is. And whether this will bemuse the lawmakers is anybody's guess.

THIS YEAR'S CUTS

The briefest look at what happened to this year's aid program explains the urgency with which the administration is casting around for a fresh approach. Within the next day or so, House and Senate conferees are expected to agree on an appropriation of only about $3 billion for the fiscal year begun last July; the slash would be the sharpest ever made in an administration aid request.

All but forgotten is that the late President Kennedy actually asked Congress at the beginning of this year for $4.9 billion in new aid appropriations; in the wake of recommendations for a general tightening up, made by a citizens' study group headed by retired Gen. Lucius Clay, Mr. Kennedy scaled down his original request by $500 million or so; still later, the Kennedy administration reconciled itself to General Clay's own rockbottom recommendation of $4.1 billion.

The aid planners are contending that another round of fund chopping next year, going as deep as this year's, would put them almost out of business. So a wide-ranging review is underway on President Johnson's orders, and the rough outlines of next year's approach are emerging.

REDEFINING "FOREIGN AID"

The broad strategy calls for nothing less than a redefinition of "foreign aid" and a splitting of the fund request into various parts.

The theory is that much of this country's oversea help—military aid, Export-Import Bank loans, sales of surplus farm commodities, and cash handouts for political purposes—are now lumped together either in budget columns or the public's mind under the general heading of "Foreign Aid." Yet each of these, it's insisted, serves some American self-interest: Military aid in many cases supports U.S. defense activities; Eximbank loans help U.S. exporters as well as hard-pressed foreign purchasers; sales of surplus farm goods ease the U.S. farm problem besides feeding the hungry overseas; cash grants for political purposes can be considered part of every country's diplomacy.

The thinking of many top aid men is that all these items not only make the foreign aid program look bulky but bear no strict relation to the kind of aid doled out to build dams, highways, schools, or other projects aimed at economic uplift. The result, they argue, is that strictly economic aid appears to be a far bigger budget item than it actually is.

BOOKKEEPING CHANGES

One remedy involves no more than bookkeeping. Just this week, officials report, President Johnson decided to extract all or most military aid from next year's foreign aid bill. Some projects involving such things as communications networks, radar screens, or oversea air and naval bases, which serve U.S. forces as well as those of other countries, will be tucked into the defense budget and, as one official puts it, "simply disappear from view among the billions for defense." Military training programs would get the same treatment. These two changes alone would magically remove several hundred millions of dollars from foreign aid appropriations.

A separate appropriation bill may be created to cover military hardware given to friendly nations. This could slice the annual foreign aid appropriation request by almost $1 billion.

Even economic assistance may be repackaged in hope of gentler treatment on Capitol Hill. One possibility: All Latin American aid under the Alliance for Progress, accounting for a half billion or so in appropriations, may be presented separately to Congress. The thought is that this might have more appeal, especially now that Latin American responsibilities, both political and economic, have been consolidated under the newly appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Thomas Mann. Not only will he bear the additional title of Special Assistant to President Johnson, but he is thought to have special appeal to businessmen and conservative lawmakers and so might be able to push Alliance for Progress funds through Congress with less argument.

Similar legerdemain is to be applied to another aspect of foreign aid that draws heavy congressional fire—the large bureaucracy involved. Officials note that two-thirds of all aid personnel deal with technical assistance, which accounts for a relatively small part of the spending. A proposal under consideration would trim this item on Uncle Sam's payroll by simply paying countries receiving technical aid the amount necessary for them to contract out the work to universities or foundations. The costs to the U.S. taxpayer presumably wouldn't change, but the work force employed by the aid-dispensing Agency for International Development would contract dramatically.

There are, it's true, practical limits to repackaging possibilities. Already, surplus farm commodity transactions are budgeted to the Agriculture Department; the Export-Import Bank has its own borrowing authority from Congress and does not figure in foreign-aid appropriations. Yet both are regularly lumped into the foreign-aid figure when the subject is discussed by its most vocal opponents, including Democratic Representative Passman, of Louisiana, whose House Appropriations subcommittee did much of this year's aid cutting.

Mr. Passman, it's agreed, would have no trouble reassembling an impressive foreign-aid total no matter how the program may be fragmented in presentation to Congress. But repackaging and redefinition can at least, aid officials figure, have an educational impact on the U.S. public as well as the lawmakers and thus lengthen the odds somewhat against a repeat of this year's aid debacle.

Helping administration efforts will be a retreat somewhat in its aid requests. Most administration planners agree this year's deep cuts tend to set limits on what can be sought next year. The best present guess is that next year's total of aid appropriation requests comparable to the traditional aid package will be not much higher than the $3.6 billion Congress authorized this year, and possibly will be much closer to the $3 billion or so that the lawmakers may wind up appropriating. (The amount next year actually labeled as either sum.)

The disparity in outlook stems from a lively debate now underway on whether to depart drastically from the traditional padding of aid requests in anticipation of heavy congressional cuts. Some aid men are suggesting that the Johnson administration ought to propose a "hard" figure and then fight furiously for it.

Though no decision has been reached, the betting is that the administration will not take that gamble. For one thing, as aid officials see it, Congress merely took the Clay Committee's recommendations as a starting point for deep cutting. President Johnson, it's expected, will recognize the natural instinct of many lawmakers to whack away at the foreign aid bill, especially in an election year, and will accordingly add what one official calls "cut insurance," of $500 million or so, atop estimated minimum needs.

Whatever the figure proposed next year, it will almost certainly signal a sharp retrenchment from recent requests and even from recent appropriations. For last fiscal year, Mr. Kennedy requested $4.9 billion in appropriations and received $3.9 billion. At one stage in this year's struggle with Congress, the Kennedy administration was insisting it could get along with no less than that figure. Yet on Wednesday President Johnson was indicating an ability to "live with" not much above $3 billion. What accounts for this seeming complacency over massive aid cutting?

One answer is simply that the administration now sees no hope of getting more. Privately, aid officials concede, too, the squeeze is being eased partly because the delay in action on appropriations has slowed the rate of aid giving and partly because the failure of Brazil and Indonesia to put their economies in order has resulted in almost a cutoff of U.S. aid to those countries; Indonesia has also offended the United States with its hostility toward the new Federation of Malaysia.

If either of these countries suddenly became eligible through political change or a new attitude toward economic reform, says one aid man, "this could push us right back up to the $4 billion level again." Partly with this in mind the Johnson administration is reserving the right to go back to Congress for extra funds next year if convinced they're needed.

Perhaps more important, however, in the current administration attitude is the fact that Aid Administrator David Bell has been doing considerable trimming of his own, much of it in response to the Clay report's recommendations. These included a proposed clampdown on countries not willing to put their economic house in order, a wholesale tightening up of technical aid, a general deemphasis of aid to African nations that receive sizable help from European countries and speedier phasing out of aid to countries which are rapidly reaching self-sufficiency. Now a mere dozen nations account for two-thirds of U.S. economic assistance, and such relatively prosperous beneficiaries as Israel, Greece, and Nationalist China have been marked down for an early cutoff.

CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURE AND REFORM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an editorial entitled "Sail on, Noble Scow!" published yesterday in the Washington Evening Star. I believe the editorial is accurate, timely, and circumspect; and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Sail On, Noble Scow!

As Congress arrives at a recess which in other years began 3 to 5 months earlier, an anguished cry arises. The situation, we are assured, has become intolerable. Congress must be reformed. Archaic rules must be brought up to date. Obsolete procedures must be abandoned. Institutions like the Rules Committee in the House and the right to filibuster in the Senate must no longer be permitted to frustrate the will of the people as expressed in bills sent over by the administration.

Like any human agency Congress no doubt can always profit from a fresh examination of its ways and from a bit of judicious tinkering. But it is certainly true that the only body legally empowered to tinker with Congress is Congress. If Congress doesn't do it, it won't be done.

Since the Members of Congress do not appear to be exactly rushing to do the job, it may behoove the rest of us, nonmembers, to use the recess to gain a little perspective on the problem, if problem there truly is.

In the perspective of time, as Senator Dirksen recently pointed out, whatever else it is, the "problem" of Congress is not new. From the earliest days of the Republic, editors and administrators have assailed the National Legislature as leaderless and unwieldy, balky, and indolent. The Senator produced, among many examples, the congressional "crisis" in the press of 1836–37. The 24th Congress was seen as a "weak, bigoted, persecuting, and intolerant set of instruments of malice and every hateful passion." Among the instruments were Henry Clay, Thomas Hart Benton, James Buchanan, James K. Polk, John Quincy Adams, and Sam Houston.

There is also a perspective of purpose. Historically and at the moment attacks upon Congress are based on what it doesn't get done. But, contradictory as it may sound, this is one of the great values of the body.

Senator Dirksen, in an appropriately homely simile, said, "Our Government is much like an old scow. It does not move fast; it does not move very far at one time; but it does not sink."

In the political history of modern times, beginning in 1776, that last is a greater achievement than may be thought by those impatient for twin diesels on the legislative end of the scow. We call ourselves a young country and we are. But our form of representative government is the oldest continuing political system in the world. At its own steady pace the scow proceeds on the river of time, while flashier craft have gone aground or gone to the bottom.

The great stabilizer of that system is the very slow-poke quality built into the elaborate constitutional separation of powers. We are a Federal Union as well as a representative democracy. Those two characteristics create the two Houses of Congress and lead directly to the sometime maddening deliberation of the deliberative body.

It may be doubted that tinkering within the constitutional framework is going to change much. The heavily derided House Rules Committee, for instance, was created in just such a spirit of tinkering, as an antidote to the power of the Speaker early in this century. Like Aesop's frogs, Congress moved from King Stork to King Log, exchanging one set of "disadvantages" for another.

The governing disadvantage, however, remains the nature of our free society. It is not hard to devise efficient systems of government. The trick is to find a reasonable compromise between efficiency and restraint.

In time of real national crisis, Congress has proved again and again that it can move swiftly in creative collaboration with the Executive. Measures exist by which a dedicated majority can at any time make things move in either House. Finally, the electorate itself can, if it wishes, create a whole new ball game in Congress every 2 years.

When none of these things happens, it may reasonably be doubted that a national crisis exists. It may be assumed that Congress, in its fashion, reflects the will of the country to go slowly.

Speaking for a minority of the press, we extend season's greetings to a battered, noble, much maligned but still enduring, old scow. We expect it will be afloat long after the present storms are stilled.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, when a person's integrity is attacked, as mine was earlier this week, it is always gratifying to have such attack repudiated by another party—especially when such repudiation of the attack is made by a distinguished and highly respected newspaper in one's home State.

I received this kind of gratification from the Lewiston, Maine, Daily Sun, 2 days after the attack had been made on me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an editorial of December 19, 1963, published in that paper, which states that the charge that I "calculated to panic employees" is ridiculous.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Demanding Proof Is Justified

Senator Margaret Chase Smith is fully justified in wanting to know the facts concerning rumors that the Navy yard at Kittery is on the way to being closed. If an official inquiry by the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness is necessary to get at those facts, then such action should be taken.

The charge by Senator Thomas J. McIntyre, of New Hampshire, that Senator Smith's statement is "irresponsible and calculated to panic employees" is ridiculous. Such action on her part would be completely contrary to her long and outstanding career of public service. Moreover, it could serve no reasonable political purpose, particularly at this time.

Closing of Navy yard at Kittery would be a hard economic blow both to Maine and New Hampshire. But if such closing is a necessary part of the program of economy in the Defense Department, and not dictated by political expediency, then our two States must learn to live with it. We feel sure that if there are sound reasons for closing the Kittery facility, Senator Smith would not stand in opposition just because the economy move was in her home district.

There is a lot of difference between opposing economy when it hits home and demanding to know the facts when an economy move will affect one's area. The former is narrowminded politics which ignores the best interests of the country as a whole. The latter is the duty of an elected representative of the people.

The Defense Department should be the first to come forward with full information about Kittery, as well as any decisions it has reached about the future of the operation. Senator Smith's position is right.

CATTLE AND BEEF IMPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in recent weeks there has been an increasing and justified expression of concern about the importation of cattle and beef products and the effect that it is having on the domestic cattle industry. I have noted that more and more of our colleagues here in the Senate and House of Representatives are expressing their concern about the situation. The Congressional Record contains a wealth of supporting information.

The cattle market is dropping; in fact, in some areas the livestock interests are beginning to suffer economically. The increase in cattle and beef imports may not be the only cause, but in my observations they certainly are a major one. My distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], informed me that between 1956 and 1962 there was an average of 890 million pounds imported while in 1962 there were 1.9 billion pounds imported, and this year the increase is even larger. This situation cannot be handled lightly when we are presented with such information as this.

In addition to the import situation the livestock producer is confronted with customer preferences and changing marketing patterns. These matters need attention, but I feel that the most beneficial action at this time would be the establishment of a quota system on imports.

There has been quite a bit of talk about legislation. I do not think this is the quickest way; in fact it might confuse an already complex situation. I have discussed this matter with a number of officials in the administration and I feel that this can be done administratively under existing law.

Senator Burdick was successful in getting the Senate Finance Committee to adopt a resolution directing the Tariff Commission to begin an investigation of the impact of foreign beef imports on the domestic market. I hope the Commission will act expeditiously in this matter. I believe there is sufficient authority under the Trade Expansion Act and through executive action to bring about some relief.

The livestock industry is one of the most basic industries in our country; it cannot be allowed to drift. I commend this matter of increased cattle and beef imports to the attention of our President and his counselors, and ask that it be given immediate attention and action at the executive level.

PROGRAM FOR SOLVENCY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Program for Solvency," published in the Washington, D.C., Daily News of Friday, December 20, 1963, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Program for Solvency

For the last several years, the United States has been running a serious deficit in its dealings with other nations. This has been properly deplored, the longrun dangers have been specified and some dramatic, but small, steps have been taken to offset it.

But, as Senator Symington, of Missouri, says, "we have hesitated to make the necessary hard decisions." Indeed we have hesitated to the point of our own peril.

We still are spending abroad, one way or another, much more than we take in. As a result, since 1951 our gold stock has been reduced from $22.8 billion to $15.6 billion at a recent count.

Most of our excess outflow of dollars is due to Government spending—for foreign aid, for maintaining military forces abroad.

Senator Symington thinks we should put all our international dealings on a two-way street basis. To bring this about, he urges several steps:

Reduce our military forces overseas. Other nations withhold manpower from NATO on the ground they cannot afford it. Neither can we.

In next year's foreign aid program, go to a strictly lend-lease system—materials instead of money, based upon the availability of goods that we are in a position to produce and finance. The countries we aid, as the Senator said, use that aid to make up their own balance-of-payments deficits.

Use the trade program to protect our international financial position. By restricting imports. By postponing trade negotiations until the European Common Market softens its restrictions against U.S. farm products. By amending the 1962 trade expansion law to permit independent negotiations with Great Britain and other countries outside the Common Market.

The clear answer to our balance-of-payments problem, Senator Symington said, is "a more just and logical division of the costs of freedom." So long as the United States will carry the burden, so long will other nations let us. But if we make the necessary hard decisions the Senator has outlined, then perhaps the others will understand the importance of our own prosperity and stability to their own freedom and economic strength.

All else we have done has failed of substantial improvement in our international deficit. We continue to falter at increasing risk.

We hope Congress has been listening to the Senator from Missouri.

SIOUX FALLS ELKS MEMORIAL TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY—EULOGY BY JUDGE DUNN

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on Sunday, December 1, members of the Sioux Falls Elks Lodge gathered in memory of deceased members of the lodge.

At this memorial service, Circuit Court Judge Francis Dunn offered a fitting eulogy to the late President Kennedy. Judge Dunn is one of the Nation's finest citizens and public servants. He possesses a brilliant mind, a keenly developed sense of justice, and a warm heart. He was a strong supporter and friend of John Kennedy and I am sure that our beloved fallen President would have deeply appreciated what Judge Dunn said about him.

I ask unanimous consent that the eulogy by Judge Dunn be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On Friday, November 22, 1963, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, and a brother in the Benevolent Protective Order of Elks, fell before an assassin's bullets. In just a few moments this most vigorous young man, acknowledged leader of the Western World, was reduced to a lifeless bundle.

Since that fateful hour, hundreds of people have spoken millions of words in eulogy of this great man—I intend to add only a few. Each person who has spoken has touched on one common theme—the feeling of personal tragedy that this assassination has brought to them. I can understand this feeling. I touched this man's hand but once, yet his death brought deep and personal grief to me as though I had lost someone near and dear to me. And the reason is that I had, indeed, lost someone near and dear to me. I had lost the idol of youth, the image of greatness that had been placed before me since childhood by my parents, by my teachers and by my spiritual advisors.

For here was the perfect image of young American manhood; tall of stature and handsome, with a warm winning smile and a glowing personality that would melt an iceberg.

Here was a man of great intellect; blessed with a keen mind—he had cultivated that mind with formal education and voluminous reading until he was a veritable walking book of knowledge.

Here was a man of courage who in time of hot war when his PT boat was shot from under him, and with a painful injury to his back, swam for miles towing an injured shipmate to safety; and who in time of peace and cold war, has stood up to the tyrants of the world until they gave ground before him.

Here was a man born to enormous wealth, yet with the greatest compassion for the lame, the ill, the aged, and the unfortunate.

Here was the most powerful man in the Western World, yet he unashamedly and regularly fell on his knees and asked God for guidance and strength.

Here was a true family man who has publicly stated that his greatest duty on earth was being a parent, and who found some time from each of his crowded days to spend with his beloved Caroline and John-John.

And finally, here was a patriot of the highest order, who fought valiantly in time of war, fought brilliantly for peace in our times, and died serving the great America that he loved.

I do not suppose that John F. Kennedy ever had much time to attend Elks meetings in Boston or in Washington, yet I submit that

he lived and died according to the finest principles of this great order. Today we mourn the passing of a brother.

EDWIN M. MARTIN'S DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, no high official of the U.S. Government in recent years has conducted himself with greater effectiveness than Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Edwin M. Martin.

Mr. Martin has recently yielded this important post to another distinguished official, Thomas Mann. It is understood that President Johnson has been anxious to highlight the importance of Latin America as far as U.S. policy is concerned. To do that he has ordered certain changes in the authority and responsibility of the Assistant Secretary post and apparently felt it was necessary to dramatize his action with a new appointment. While I personally feel that the new Secretary, Thomas Mann, is a highly able official, his appointment should in no way detract from the magnificent record of Secretary Martin.

During the first 2 years of President Kennedy's administration, I served as Director of the food for peace program. In that capacity I came to a new appreciation of our State Department officials. No one of them impressed me more favorably than Ed Martin. He is a completely devoted, highly intelligent, progressive-minded administrator with a long and impressive record behind him. He is the kind of rare individual whose great talent calls for a constantly rising recognition of his ability.

I hope, and fully expect, that this administration and future administrations will recognize his expanding capacity for service. My own view is that there is no post in the State Department including the office of Secretary of State that is beyond Ed Martin's capacity. I have complete faith in his judgment, his genius for inspiring the confidence and cooperation of his colleagues, and his total devotion to the best interests of the United States.

Mr. President, the December 19 issue of the Washington Star carried a column by Mr. Charles Bartlett relative to the service of Mr. Martin, and the new responsibilities that face Mr. Mann. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S FIRST REPLACEMENT

(By Charles Bartlett)

An unhappy and unintended injustice will be done if the quality of Edwin M. Martin's service as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs is obscured by President Johnson's decision to replace him.

This was the new President's first venture into personnel changes but he did not intend any slight to Martin in naming Ambassador Thomas Mann to conduct his South American relations.

Many have long felt that the job should be upgraded to the level of Under Secretary of State. John Kennedy was planning to make this change and Mr. Johnson was fortunate to secure a personal friend with Mann's experience and stature to take on the expanded responsibilities.

Mr. Martin took the Assistant Secretary's job in the fall of 1961 when none of the specially qualified experts in Latin affairs would have it. The buoyant beginnings of the Alliance for Progress had disrupted the chain of command in the State Department, the morale of the career officials was low, and none of some six eminent men approached by Mr. Kennedy could see a future in the role.

The search finally turned to Martin because one of the searchers, George Ball of the State Department, knew that he had character, administrative ability, and perseverance. A Government economist since 1935, Martin spoke no Spanish and his net South American experience consisted of one vacation visit to Mexico.

NEEDED COURAGE

With these limitations Martin needed courage to step into the maze of political imponderables. Even in English, he was not one of the soft-spoken, gentle personalities with whom the Latins like to deal. He was abrupt, abstemious, and so concentrated in his energies that he could rarely be induced to participate in the social ceremonies of diplomacy.

But his long working hours and his straight talk slowly created a basis of respect for his authority. His own example restored the drive and spirit of his division. He was committed to the concept of the Alliance for Progress by his deep liberal convictions and he fell into close cooperation with the people struggling to make it work. He gained, particularly after the missile crisis, the confidence of President Kennedy.

Mr. Martin more than endured the day-to-day perils of Latin politics. He took part in developing the weapons of recognition and nonrecognition against the danger that democracy in South America might fall prey to the power of the military juntas. Six coups took place while he held office but a pattern of return to democratic processes had been set in Argentina and Peru.

"Our leverage is sometimes great, sometimes small," he wrote last October in explaining his philosophy toward the military juntas. "We must use our leverage to keep these new regimes as liberal and considerate of the welfare of the people as possible. In addition we must support and strengthen the civilian components against military influences and press for new elections as soon as possible."

POSITION SOUND

Mr. Martin correctly predicted that some would use his statement to accuse him of being an apologist for military coups. He was attacked fiercely by some of the regular kibitzers on Latin affairs but his position was sound because he had been asked to write the statement by President Kennedy, who wanted the Nation to understand that the wave of coups did not spell the decline of hopes for the Alliance.

Progress in South America, Martin has said, "will be a saw tooth rather than a smooth curve." It is an abrasive process for the policymaker who confronts running criticism from all sides. For this reason many who know the merit in Martin accept the President's strategy of replacing him now with Mann.

The fear in regard to Mann is that he is accustomed, as a veteran in Latin affairs, to dealing with the power structure and will try to tailor the programs to the criticisms of an elite group which does not wish in its heart for the success of the Alliance or the birth of a new era in South America.

Mr. Mann's appointment may ultimately mark a redirection of the policies toward South America, but it will not detract from the courage and idealism that Martin brought to his labors.

YESTERDAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an arresting article appeared recently in several newspapers. It is based on a historic statement made a hundred years ago by the parliamentary head of a leading European power which reflects the 19th-century materialistic concept of international behavior.

The author, Mr. A. N. Spanel, founder and chairman of International Latex Corp. which presented this editorial-advertisement in the public interest, analyzes the influence on today's free world in general, and the deteriorating relations between France and the United States, in particular.

It is a timely exposition. Mr. Spanel makes a powerful and patriotic appeal for reciprocity with an accommodating and responsible unity in the West in order that our freedoms may prevail and our world be saved from destruction.

It is heartening in a sad and divided world to see the cause of human freedom and the unity needed for its preservation espoused as Mr. Spanel and his company have for more than two decades with such spirit of dedication and constructiveness.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Spanel be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YESTERDAY AND TOMORROW

(By A. N. Spanel)

One hundred years ago a slow-acting chain reaction bomb was exploded when a European statesman proclaimed, "We have no perpetual allies and we have no perpetual enemies, our interests are perpetual."

The spread of communism, the failure of colonialism followed by a succession of emergency colonial amputations, and now the festering divisiveness in the free world are testimony to that explosion which is also tearing the body of Franco-American relations.

Never in the histories of France and the United States have members of their respective governments heaped such abuse on innocent and bewildered masses of people. Traditional friendships and sacred bonds were desecrated with ugly name calling, with gross sloganeering, unseemly newspaper diplomacy, quixotic political maneuvering; willfulness and suspicion—these corrosive ingredients of disunity.

Doesn't Mr. Khrushchev have reason to gloat over our divisiveness? Has he not demonstrated his mounting contempt for our alliance this fateful year? It will be recorded for future generations that while our world was in peril we bickered; we thereby encouraged the common enemy to harry and bully us at Berlin, and conspire freely in the Middle East, in Latin America, in Africa.

Indeed, we draw closer to the war we are so anxious to avoid by giving the Kremlin cause to underrate our strength which is precisely what our disunity continues to do.

Do we really expect uncommitted nations and underdeveloped states to rely with confidence upon a West in such shameful disarray? Is it surprising that so many of these people wistfully eye the Kremlin in spite of free-world teachings that theirs is a tyrannically imposed unity?

Washington, after years of monumental successes and frustrations in international affairs that continue to demand almost superhuman talents, experience and colossal treasure, now accuses France of reverting to nationalism as if it were a sin. Is the world to believe that the United States, England, Germany, Russia, China, and India, to mention only a few, are not nationalistic? Is nationalism really the problem?

France, it must be said, invited Washington's frigid attitude by giving only its most grudging support to NATO, among other things. Some even believe she minimizes the Communist threat in order to justify her position of nuclear independence. This prompts a fringe of isolationist-minded people in the United States to press for the withdrawal of American troops from Europe on the grounds that "France not only resents our presence but the costs continue to be a backbreaking burden on American taxpayers." They forget that the primary responsibility for excluding France, our oldest ally, from the nuclear club rests with Washington and that our failure to give her established nuclear technology has placed a needless and resented burden on all classes in France, even as in the United States. Moreover, the French remember with pain and apprehension Indochina, Suez, Algeria, New Guinea, Cuba.

It's an unending, engulfing spiral; yet it all appears so very, very 'logical' on both sides; as 'logical' as the predicted decline of the West and perhaps the suicidal death of freedom's cause.

We have learned nothing in 100 years if our dominant political leadership is beguiled by that 19th century rule of international conduct, "We have no perpetual allies and we have no perpetual enemies, our interests are perpetual." It is a certainty that the advertised decline of the West will become prophesy fulfilled unless we recognize that our own divisiveness is the perpetual enemy; and accept the hard fact that the free world Alliance must itself become perpetual if our interests are to have freedom on earth flourish, and this planet saved from destruction.

Let us hope that the assassination of President Kennedy, such a tragic blow for America and its allies, will draw free men together in the unity, wisdom and spirit of accommodation needed to achieve peace with dignity and strength, on earth.

PROTECTION OF WILDERNESS, SCENIC, AND OTHER RECREATIONAL AREAS IN THE WEST—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs has forwarded me copy of resolutions adopted by that group at their convention in Monterey, Calif., on Labor Day weekend with a request that it be included in the Congressional Record.

The federation is a group of western clubs with approximately 35,000 membership which has been extremely active in supporting and advancing proposals for protection of wilderness, scenic and other recreational areas in the West.

There are few, if any, organizations more dedicated and energetic in the programs they support. They are rendering a service to the Congress, and to their constituency, in the able presentations which they make.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include the resolutions adopted by the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 1

The conservation movement has faced many major crises in the past, but at present, because of the rapidity with which time is running out, the crises are reaching points of no return in at least five important areas:

1. Since whatever wilderness and scenic areas not specifically designated for preservation and given strong, enduring protection will soon deteriorate and be lost entirely to posterity, the passage of a strong wilderness law without further delay is essential to effective preservation.

2. The U.S. Forest Service is completing its long-range management plans for all national forests, and what is not classified as wilderness, wild, or canoe areas when this process is completed will soon be lost as wilderness.

3. Opportunities to add areas of sufficiently high wilderness, scenic, and scientific standards to the national park system are likewise vanishing with rapidity under a variety of industrial, military, and transportation pressures, and additions of high quality to the park system not made soon will no longer be of national park caliber.

4. The increasing encroachment of motorized vehicles on our previously roadless wild lands and on wild lakes and waterways is creating precedents which will become increasingly difficult to reverse unless a strong, farsighted policy to combat this trend is adopted promptly by the various administrative agencies and, where necessary, through legislation.

5. The cumulative pollution and poisoning of wildlife, plants, soils, and waters in wild lands through old-fashioned types of pollution and litter, wholesale use of pesticides, and atomic fallout and other poisonings can reach irreversible stages unless sufficiently strong and effective protection is programed soon.

Resolution 2—Wilderness Bill

The future of an adequate wilderness system in the United States depends upon an effective wilderness law for its enduring protection. This truth has been recognized at many previous Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs conventions: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs reaffirms its support of the wilderness bill, and urges the 88th Congress of the United States to pass without further delay legislation at least as strong as that already passed by the U.S. Senate in 1963 (S. 4).

Resolution 3—North Cascade Wilderness Area

There is evidence that timber is being sold within areas proposed for addition to the North Cascade Primitive Area in Northern Washington: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs expresses its regret that recommended additions are being committed to commercial uses before public comment on the Forest Service proposal is invited, and a final decision is made by the Secretary of Agriculture. This procedure displays a lack of respect for public opinion, and has happened with respect to other areas also, such as the Mount Jefferson Primitive areas: It is further

Resolved, That the federation urges that the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Forest Service, and the regional forester expedite the early release of their reclassification proposal for the North Cascade Wilderness Area. The federation further urges the Forest Service to establish the new boundaries of this area in accordance with the proposal of the mountaineers of Seattle.

Resolution 4—Mount Jefferson Wild Area

The recently released reclassification proposal for the Mount Jefferson Wild Area in Oregon contains some important additions to the area on the northwest, east, and south. Two recommended additions on the west side of the area were not made, however, including portions of the Pamelia and Marion Lake Valley approaches: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs expresses its conviction that the omission of the Pamelia and Marion Valley additions will seriously impair the wilderness and recreational value of the west side of this area.

Resolution 5—Kern Plateau

For some years conservation organizations have urged that the Kern Plateau in California be classified as a national forest wilderness area. Within the past year the Dome Lands Wild Area has been established in the southern portion of the plateau, and the Forest Service is considering establishing a Golden Trout Wild Area in the northern portion. However, unless other steps are taken, the intervening major part of the plateau may be assigned to other than wilderness purposes before there is a final determination of the wilderness values of the entire plateau.

It is therefore resolved that the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs urges the Forest Service to establish a Golden Trout Wilderness Area at the northern part of the Kern Plateau, with boundaries running as far south as possible; and further requests the Forest Service to continue to consider the establishment of a unified wilderness area on the plateau, in accordance with federation resolution No. 5, 1962, and to preserve the presently unclassified portions of the plateau in wilderness status pending further studies and wilderness classification.

Resolution 22—Skiing Facilities and Wilderness

The desire for more downhill ski developments with their mechanical lifts, buildings, and roads provides a recurrent threat to dedicated wilderness. New proposals for such developments within wild, wilderness, and primitive areas continue to be made. Any inclusion of this type of development in classified wilderness necessitates modification of boundaries.

It is therefore resolved that the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs strongly supports and commends the U.S. Forest Service for its steadfast opposition thus far to all proposals, and strongly encourages it to continue this opposition.

Resolution 6—Selway-Bitterroot Area

The 1,869,356 acre Selway-Bitterroot Primitive Area in Idaho and Montana was reclassified as the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area and the Salmon Breaks Primitive Area by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman on January 11, 1963, with a net loss of 418,500 acres from classified wilderness—a loss of 22 percent: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs:

1. Regards the removal of 418,500 acres from wilderness status in the reclassification as a serious undermining of the wilderness value of this area and a serious reduction of the National Forest Wilderness System.

2. Urges Secretary Freeman to reconsider the declassification and to further study this area, meanwhile maintaining the wilderness character of the area pending further decision.

Resolution 7—Sawtooth Wilderness Area

The Forest Service has made a proposal for the reclassification of the Sawtooth Primitive Area in southwestern Idaho to a Sawtooth Wilderness Area, which recognizes the wilderness value of much of the region but fails to include some desirable areas: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs strongly recommends that the U.S. Forest Service expand its proposal by the addition of a 10,000 acre unit around the Hanson Lakes and Trail Creek area, some downslope acreage along the Alpine Way Trail, more corridor approach along Pettit and Redfish Lakes, and additions, rather than deletions, in the Queens River area and along the North Fork of the Boise River, including representative stands of yellow pine.

Resolution 8—North Cascades National Park

Past federation resolutions have urged the establishment of North Cascades National Park (No. 18, 1961; No. 10, 1960; No. 12, 1959; No. 2, 1958). Study of the area, including its park potential, is now being made by a team jointly appointed by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. The federation has advocated in the past (Resolution 8, 1962) that a moratorium on timber cutting in the area be imposed while the study is underway; the Secretary of Agriculture has imposed only a very limited moratorium for 1963: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs endorses the specific proposal for a North Cascades National Park and Chelan Mountain National Recreation Area which the North Cascades Conservation Council has prepared and urges the joint departmental study team to recommend the establishment of this park and recreation area; it is further

Resolved, That the federation urges that in establishing timber sales plans of the Forest Service for 1964 that the Secretary of Agriculture exclude sales in all areas for which a moratorium has been requested previously.

Resolution 9—Oregon Cascades

The federation has requested in the past (Resolution 18, 1960) that the Federal Government use its best skills to preserve the scenic and wilderness values of the Oregon Cascades. To date, the protection of these values has not been adequate: it is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs urges that a National Park Service study be made of the protection which these values might receive under an Oregon Cascades National Park. The federation suggests that a study be made particularly of the park potential of the area running from somewhat north of the Mt. Jefferson Primitive Area to somewhat south of the Diamond Peak Wild Area, and of suitable intervening and adjacent lands, such as the former Waldo Lakes Limited Area and the Three Sisters Wilderness Tract. Recommendations emanating from this study should guarantee the continuing roadlessness of zones presently classified as wilderness and wild areas; it is further

Resolved, That pending completion of such a study, administering agencies be urged to do nothing further to compromise scenic and wilderness values in the area.

Resolution 10—Columbia River Gorge

For many decades, State and Federal agencies have attempted to protect the unique scenery of the Columbia River Gorge from despoilment. Despite the efforts of the Columbia River Gorge Commission and the establishment of the Columbia Gorge Park Division, land ownership in the gorge remains divided and threats continue, of which the most recent is the proposed construction of two unsightly tramways: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs urges that a Columbia River Gorge Scenic Parkway be established under the National Park Service. It should consist of much of the drainages of streams flowing into the gorge—most of which should be kept roadless, as well as of intervening and adjacent private holdings which should be acquired.

Resolution 11—Channel Islands

The Channel Islands south of Santa Barbara off the coast of California—comprised of Santa Barbara, Anacapa, Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa, and San Miguel Islands—are a significant national recreational resource, with special value for science because of the unusual ecological relationships found there: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs favors protection of the Channel Islands under the National Park Service, either as a national park or seashore or appropriate combination.

Resolution 12—Kings Canyon National Park

Congressman Sisk, of southern California, has introduced legislation in this Congress providing for the inclusion in Kings Canyon National Park of the area on the middle fork of the Kings River known as Tehipite Valley and the area around Cedar Grove. These additions would increase the scenic and recreational values of the park as a whole: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs urges support of Congressman Sisk's bill for passage by the 88th Congress.

Resolution 19—Redwoods

Officials of the National Park Service are now studying means of saving a substantial portion of the remaining virgin stands of coastal redwoods in northern California, most of which are currently threatened by highway construction and logging: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs advocates establishment of a Redwoods National Park or Recreation Area to preserve as many of these stands as possible, with the acquisition and inclusion of endangered stands on private as well as public lands: It is further

Resolved, That the federation calls upon all public agencies to protect redwoods on their lands from destruction, and to see that all roads, highways, and freeways be routed around rather than through redwood preserves, with special emphasis on the imminent proposed construction of freeway through Prairie Creek State Park.

Resolution 13—Kauai National Park

The central and north shores of Kauai Island, Hawaii, contain some of the most scenic areas of the Pacific Ocean: Mt. Waialeale; Alakai Swamp, comprising extensive preserves of unique and rare flora and birdlife in still untouched wilderness; spectacular Waimea Canyon; and Na Pali Cliffs. Also included are fluted cliffs, lovely valleys, rain forests, precipitous waterfalls, white beaches, coral reefs, and excellent areas suitable for campgrounds and hiking trails.

This is the site of the proposed Kauai National Park. The National Park Service currently is engaged in a feasibility study of this unusual area to inventory its assets and to decide where its boundaries might be. Ninety-eight percent of the area is owned by the State of Hawaii, and half of it is administered as a State park: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs strongly supports the establishment of a Kauai National Park and urges that a large proportion of this park be preserved as wilderness.

Resolution 14—Expansion of Haleakala National Park

The National Park Service is at present studying possible additions to Haleakala National Park on the island of Maui in Hawaii. The Hawaiian Trail and Mountain Club has recommended as additions to the Park the Kipahulu and Keanae Valleys, which extend from the crater of Haleakala to the sea in virgin rain forests and untouched wilderness: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs endorses the recommendation of the Hawaiian Trail and Mountain Club to add these valleys to Haleakala National Park.

Resolution 15—Canyonlands National Park

In southeastern Utah is a vast area of spectacular landscape. The beauty of the canyons, arches, and other erosional features is everchanging with the time of day and weather.

The Secretary of Interior is to be commended for recognizing the potential of the region in suggesting that over a million acres be set aside for scenic and recreational purposes. Legislation looking toward this end introduced by the Senators from Utah is unacceptable because the areas proposed are far too small. Also there are proposed certain commercial uses, and uses incompatible with the area's scenic and recreational potential: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs urges the establishment of a National Park and Recreation Area complex of a magnitude similar to that indicated by the Secretary of Interior, with considerable portions set aside to remain undisturbed. Uses incompatible with the scenic and recreational enjoyment of the area should be prohibited.

Resolution 16—The Grand Canyon of the Colorado

The magnificent canyons of the Colorado River, extending practically uninterrupted from above Moab, Utah, to the Grand Wash Cliffs in northwestern Arizona, have long been recognized as one of America's scenic treasures. Until recently, a wild river—their creator—has flowed through them, adding to their wilderness character and high scenic values.

The Glen Canyon Reservoir will tame that wild river, flood a large portion of this unique landscape, as well as inflict irreparable damage to the remote charm of the setting of one of the world's great natural wonders—Rainbow Bridge. The Congress of the United States promised protection, and instructed the Secretary of Interior to provide that protection to this masterpiece of nature.

Pleadings of conservationists throughout the country for adeqaute protection of Rainbow Bridge have been repeatedly rebuffed. The Secretary of Interior is to be criticized for refusing to use the powers of his office to provide protection ruled by the courts to be his duty under law. Congress is also to be criticized for not fulfilling a promise made in the Colorado River Storage Act.

There remains one last outstanding section known as the Grand Canyon. It is imperative that adequate permanent protection of the highest order be immediately undertaken to guard the largest possible amount of this natural wonderland. The Marble Gorge above Grand Canyon National Park, and the gorges between Grand Canyon National Monument and Lake Mead are geographical parts of the Grand Canyon. Proposals for flooding these are protested: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs express its disappointment with Congress and the Secretary of Interior for failure to provide protection for Rainbow Bridge; it is further

Resolved, That the federation urge that Grand Canyon National Park be extended westerly to the boundary of Grand Canyon National Monument, embracing all the Colorado River escarpment and the lower canyon of Kanab Creek. Grand Canyon National Monument should be added to and included in the national park. The natural scene within this enlarged park should be protected against flooding and any manmade works, with the exception of foot and horse trails.

It is recommended that studies be instituted to determine if additional areas deserve to be added to the enlarged park. Until such determination is made, plans to flood the gorges anywhere above or below present dedicated areas should be held in abeyance.

RESOLUTION 17—WILD RIVERS

A wild river study team has been appointed by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to investigate the Nation's need to protect recreation values of a share of its remaining rivers free flowing in their natural state. Chairman Edward C. Crafts, of the study team, has stated, "Undeveloped rivers offer unique values to all Americans. They are symbols of timelessness and continuity of history. Rivers substantially in their natural state afford a needed variety of recreation and related experience possible nowhere else." The study team has selected 64 rivers or segments of rivers for preliminary study to determine those to be protected and the best means for their protection: It is therefore

***Resolved,* That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs welcomes the wild river study, offers its cooperation to the study team, and requests that special emphasis be given to preserving those wild rivers which flow through wilderness or have outstanding scenic values; it is further**

***Resolved,* That member clubs of the federation make recommendations to the study team, both on rivers already selected for study in their areas, and on other rivers in their areas which they may feel warrant future study and possible protection.**

RESOLUTION 18—RAMPART DAM, ALASKA

The Yukon Flats in Alaska have outstanding values for wildlife, including nesting grounds for myriads of migratory birds, as well as other wilderness features. Flooding this region would irreparably damage an area larger than Lake Erie.

There are alternate sites and methods for developing power in Alaska which would not destroy major wilderness, wildlife, and the natural scene: It is therefore

***Resolved,* That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs opposes construction of Rampart Dam.**

RESOLUTION 20—INCREASED CONSIDERATION OF SCENIC AND RECREATIONAL VALUES

Technological advances have increased the frequency and magnitude of construction projects. A woeful disregard of aesthetic as well as of fish and wildlife values is increasingly evident. Under the guise of economy, construction has intruded upon parks and public-owned recreational facilities. Any such economy is illusory when the cost of replacing these lost facilities is considered: It is therefore

***Resolved,* That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs urges that the appropriate public agencies develop criteria for evaluating true loss to the public resulting from intrusions on recreation and scenic areas, as well as from alteration of other natural features, and that these criteria be applied to the evaluation of all public construction projects.**

RESOLUTION 23—INDUSTRIAL VERSUS PARK AND RECREATION VALUES

Increasing numbers of industrial and power plants are being proposed for construction along the Pacific coast in areas that are of major importance for State parks. The projected powerplant at Bodega Head is a conspicuous example: It is therefore

***Resolved,* That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs protests the construction of any industrial or power plant which might be located at any point along the coast where significant park or recreational values would be adversely affected.**

RESOLUTION 24—PESTICIDES

The people of the United States are becoming increasingly aware of the dangers arising from the use of chemical pesticides. There is growing concern over the intentional or unintentional misuse of chemicals intended to control insects and plant disease before adequate studies to determine their possible adverse effects on plants and animal populations. Forests, fish, wildlife, water, and even our soil resources may be endangered: It is therefore

***Resolved,* That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs urges that criteria and regulations for control of dangerous or potentially dangerous agricultural chemicals be adopted on a national level, and diligent enforcement on all Government levels be effected.**

RESOLUTION 21—AIRCRAFT AND WILDERNESS

The presence of motorized equipment of any type is inconsistent with a true wilderness experience. The federation position on trail vehicles and chain saws has already been formulated in resolutions 25 of 1961 and 15 of 1962: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs urges the passage of laws or regulations severely limiting airdrops, landing of aircraft, and low level flying over wild, wilderness, or primitive areas and in wilderness portions of national parks except in emergency conditions.

RESOLUTION 25—LAND EXCHANGES

With the checkerboard pattern of land ownership in the Pacific Northwest, some high mountain lands of great public value for scenic and recreational purposes, such as those on Mount St. Helena, are under private ownership.

Under existing Federal regulations, exchanges of Federal for private lands must involve property containing the same types of resources, and thus, exchanges of Federal timberlands for high mountain lands are not feasible: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs urges the revision of Federal law to provide an effective means of exchanging public and private lands of differing types of values when the objective is consolidation or expansion of public ownership of lands with wilderness or recreational values.

RESOLUTION 26—MINING LAW REVISION

Laws currently governing mining rights on public lands have not been revised significantly since 1872. Mining on these lands may proceed irrespective of damage to other resources, such as soils, watersheds, and wilderness: It is therefore

***Resolved,* That the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs urges Congress to modernize these laws so that values of other resources of the land are considered in granting mining permits. Reformation could be effected through placement of all minerals under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as Congressman SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, has recommended in H.R. 935, 88th Congress.**

RECESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business at the moment, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m. the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MORSE in the chair).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, 1964

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on House Joint Resolution 875.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution—House Joint Resolution 875—making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield briefly.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate insist upon its amendment and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. COTTON managers on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first, I wish to apologize to the entire Senate for the inconvenience which has been caused the membership of this body over the past several days. I am sure my distinguished colleague, the leader of the minority, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has sent out telegrams and has made telephone calls to alert some of the Members on his side of the aisle, just as I have done in regard to Members on this side. We did so in the hope of reaching a reasonable conclusion covering the foreign aid appropriation bill conference; but that hope has proven to be illusory.

In view of the fact that this body can do nothing on this measure until and unless the House acts, it is felt by the joint leadership and other Senators, whom we have consulted, that it would be advisable at the appropriate time to move to adjourn from today until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next, at which time there would be only a pro forma meeting; and then from Tuesday next to Friday next, again anticipating that if no decision had then been reached in the other body, that session, too, would be a pro forma meeting.

It would be the intention of the leadership, at any time that a decision on the conference report was reached by the other body, to send out telegrams and to use the telephones and other means of communication to the Members, so that they could be forewarned in plenty of time to be back here to attend to the duty of the Senate.

We feel that we should not adjourn sine die; we feel that we have business still to be done, and we feel that our place is here, while there is business to be done.

But, by the same token, we do not feel that we should inconvenience the Members of this body by keeping them waiting here and cooling their heels, waiting for events to develop.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I think the Senate should know that, at the request of the House conferees, we reassembled in conference this morning, at 10 o'clock. It was necessary to remain in session only a very, very short period of time. The suggestion for the modification of the so-called wheat agreement provision was advanced by the House conferees, and it was acceptable to the Senate conferees. As a matter of fact, it kept the revised provision pretty much intact, with the exception that when the President makes a determination, he shall notify the Congress within a period of 30 days of that determination.

There was no dispute; and we consummated that in less than 15 minutes.

That is where the matter stands; and I feel that the membership should know that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, Mr. President, let me pay tribute to the saintly and almost ascetic patience of the majority leader all day yesterday and last night and today in his efforts and his hopes to have this rather knotty issue resolved, so that we could develop a sine die adjournment.

Last night, probably at the hour of 2 o'clock, when we were discussing this in his office, he and I were quite agreed that there should have been a sine die adjournment.

It could not be consummated. So we stayed the night. When we came back, I undertook to ask the majority leader to accompany me to the other side of the Capitol this afternoon. We spent an hour and a half with the Speaker and other House leaders, in the hope that by patience, restraint, and a little sacrifice on all sides, we could yet resolve this issue and have sine die adjournment. That seemed to be impossible of accomplishment. However, it distresses me to see this sort of thing on the news ticker:

> WASHINGTON, D.C.—Adjournment plans of the 88th Congress foundered today over the administration's foreign aid money bill, and the White House charged that Republican isolationists were to blame for the stalemate.

Mr. President, that does no good. I think the majority leader himself will tell the Senate that I have stood at his side constantly and tried to be as helpful as I could. The fact that an isolationist note should be injected into the controversy, when we have bent over backward to keep the situation divested of all partisanship and all of its other ideological aspects on which events sometimes founder, distresses me no end. I believed I had to make at least this much comment on the press statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I aline myself in every way with what the distinguished minority leader has said relative to our relationship in the Senate and the way the Senate operates. He has proved himself time and time again to be one who places the interests of the country ahead of the interests of his party. He has done so, I know, at times, under extremely difficult circumstances.

I have nothing but admiration, affection, and respect for him; and so far as his bipartisanship is concerned, it is absolutely unquestioned.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to refer to the pattern the majority leader has suggested for the Senate, which will take us over, first, until Tuesday, for a pro forma session, and then until Friday. He followed that with the statement that if the House acted, arrangements would be made to bring us back. May we be assured, or may we assume, that this will not happen on Tuesday, the day before Christmas, and that Friday is probably the very first day on which we will be brought back?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I give that assurance to the distinguished Senator from Utah insofar as we are both capable of doing so, because we try to keep in mind all considerations and give Senators plenty of notice. Senators will recognize that, so far as we are concerned, we are dependent on what action, if any, is taken by the House. The Senator has that assurance so far as we can give it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to pay tribute to the leadership on both sides of the aisle. I think they have acted magnificently in this crisis which is not of their making. The question I wish to ask is this: If there is no action on the part of the House, is it proposed to continue the pro forma sessions of the Senate until the time that was set for our reconvening in the event we adjourned sine die, which would be January 7?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I came to the floor of the Senate as soon as I heard the bells ring. I did not hear the preliminary comments made by the majority leader. I should like to ask the majority leader this question: If the House should perchance act, would it be the intention of the leadership that the Senate would not meet for business on Tuesday, but that it would do so on Friday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would all depend on developments. I would, of course, discuss any procedure with the distinguished minority leader; and together, we would try to lay out a plan of action and policy which would, in our opinion, meet with the approval of the majority of the Members of the Senate and see that all of them got plenty of notice.

Mr. MILLER. So that some plans could be made, I am wondering if it would be at all possible to have the unanimous consent request indicate that there will be a pro forma session on Tuesday and also on Friday, but that if the House acted, it would be agreed that the Senate would take the matter up a week from Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The leadership would appreciate it if Senators would allow the leadership to use its discretion in this matter. I assure Senators that we will take into consideration the interests of the Senate as a whole.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the majority leader permit the Chair to appoint the following conferees on House Joint Resolution 875, whose names the clerk will read?

The legislative clerk read the names of Mr. Pastore, Mr. Holland, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Russell, Mr. Hill, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Cotton as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Senate is aware, we will very likely operate in this session on the basis of going into the second session. That is the possibility at this time. In other words, the session is not at an end. I should like before the final gavel falls to insert a last report on the status of legislation at this point in the 88th Congress. Once again, may I stress that we are at the halfway mark. We will remain and do the work which still lies before us.

In my judgment the output of essential and desirable legislation by this Congress and Senate constitutes a respectable record—a very respectable record for this session. And, a detailed analysis of this output which I am about to put into the Record will support that judgment on the basis of any reasonable standard of comparison.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the following detailed analyses at this point in the Record:

First. Presidential Recommendations: Congressional and Senate action in the 88th Congress to date.

Second. The 3-year legislative record of the Kennedy administration.

Third. Appropriations for fiscal 1964 as of December 20, 1963.

There being no objection, the analyses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS—CONGRESSIONAL AND SENATE ACTION IN THE 88TH CONGRESS TO DATE

With the new recommendations submitted by President Johnson, there have been a total of 129 legislative recommendations. There are 15 appropriations including the two supplementals for fiscal 1963. The combination makes a total of 144. There are three on which specific draft legislation has not been submitted: Narcotics control, user charges—fuel and air freight, and urban affairs department. Excluding these 3 we have a total of 141. Based on 141, the following figures apply:

		Percent
Action completed	63 or	44
Conference report filed	1 or	.70
Passed Senate	30 or	22
Total	94 or	66.70

All but 10 percent (excluding the three on which draft legislation has not been submitted) are either enacted, in conference, reports filed, on the calendars, subject of hearings or in the markup stage.

ACTION STATUS OF PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS (LEGISLATIVE: 126*—APPROPRIATIONS: 15)—SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE, 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Recapitulation: Action completed (63), conference report filed (1), passed Senate (30), Senate Calendar (2), passed House (2), House Calendar (7), Committee action (21), no action (14), rejected (1), no legislation (3).

ACTION COMPLETED (62)

1. AEC authorization, Public Law 88–72.

2. AEC supplemental authorization, Public Law 88–189.

Appropriations

3. Agriculture supplemental for 1963, Public Law 88–1.

4. Supplemental, 9163, Public Law 88–52.

Fiscal year 1964

5. Agriculture, Public Law 88– .

6. Defense, Public Law 88–149.

7. District of Columbia, Public Law 88– .

8. Foreign aid appropriations, Public Law 88– .

9. Independent offices, Public Law 88– .

10. Interior, Public Law 88–79.

11. Labor-HEW, Public Law 88–136.

12. Legislative, Public Law 88– .

13. Military construction, Public Law 88– .

14. Public works, Public Law 88– .

15. State, Justice, Commerce, judiciary, Public Law 88– .

16. Supplemental for HEW, Public Law 88– .

17. Treasury-Post Office, Public Law 88–39.

18. Civil Rights Commission extension, Public Law 88–152.

19. Clean Air Act, Public Law 88–206.

20. Corporate-excise tax extension, Public Law 88–52.

21. District of Columbia fiscal affairs, Public Law 88–104.

22. District of Columbia National Cultural Center, Public Law 88–100.

23. Disarmament Agency—increased authorization, Public Law 88–186.

24–28. Education: Exceptional children—teachers, Public Law 88–164; higher education, Public Law 88–204; Manpower Training Act Amendments, H.R. 8720, Public Law 88–214 Medical education, Public Law 88–129; vocation education—National Defense Education Act—impacted areas, Public Law 88–210.

29. Equal pay for women, Public Law 88–38.

30. Export-Import Bank extension, Public Law 88–101.

31. Feed grains, Public Law 88–26.

32. Foreign aid authorization, Public Law 88–205.

33. Foreign Service buildings, Public Law 88–94.

34. Housing for elderly—increased authorization, Public Law 88–158.

35. Kennedy 50-cent coin, H.R. 9413, Public Law 88–.

36. Mental health, Public Law 88–164.

37. Mental retardation—child health, Public Law 88–156.

38. Military construction authorization, Public Law 88–174.

39. Military pay, Public Law 88–132.

40. Military procurement authorization, Public Law 88–28.

41. Outdoor recreation, Public Law 88–29.

42. Peace Corps expansion, Public Law 88–200.

43–45. Public debt—increase ceiling; to August 30, 1963, Public Law 88–30; to November 30, 1963, Public Law 88–106; to June 29, 1964, Public Law 88–187.

46. Railroad labor dispute; Public Law 88–108.

47. Railroad retirement amendments; Public Law 88–133.

48. Reorganization plan I—Roosevelt Library; effective July 1926.

49. Silver Policy Repeal; Public Law 88–36.

50. Space authorization; Public Law 88–113.

51. Tax on air passenger transportation—extend at 5 percent; Public Law 88–52.

Treaties ratified

52. Nuclear test ban.

53. Coffee agreement.

54. Consular convention with Korea.

55. Consular convention with Japan.

56. Extradition Treaty with Brazil—amend.

57. Extradition Treaty with Israel.

58. Extradition Treaty with Sweden.

59. Protocol to International Civil Aviation Convention.

60. Chamizal Treaty.

61. UMT extension—4 years; Public Law 88–2.

62. Veterans' family benefits; Public Law 88–21.

63. World Bank, increase capital stock; Public Law 88–178.

CONFERENCE REPORT FILED (1)

1. Pacific Northwest Power, S. 1007.

PASSED SENATE (30)

1. Airport construction extension (August 26), House Calendar.

2. Area redevelopment (June 26), House Calendar; Rule hearing September 24.

3. Dairy program (October 10).

4. Equal time suspension; House Joint Resolution 247 (October 2).

5. International air rates, S. 1540 (November 26).

6. Juvenile Delinquency Act extension (September 25), House subcommittee approved October 8.

7. Land-use adjustments, S. 1588 (October 11).

8. Kennedy Art Center, Senate Joint Resolution 136 (December 18).

9. Library services and construction, S. 2267 (November 26).

10. Mass transit (April 4), House Calendar.

11–14. Migratory labor, four bills: S. 521, S. 523, S. 524, S. 525.

15. National Council on the Arts, S. 2379 (December 19).

16. National Defense Education Act, extend loan forgiveness provision, S. 569. (October 24.)

17. National Service Corps. (August 14), House Labor Subcommittee approved December 11.

18. President's Transition Act, passed Senate, amended October 17.

19. Public defenders, (August 6) House Calendar.

20. River basin planning, (December 4).

21. SEC amendments, (July 30) House hearings November 19–21, December 3–5.

22–24. Shorelines: Lake Mead—House Calendar, Canyonlands, Ozark national rivers.

25. Sleeping Bear Dunes, S. 792. (December 19.)

26. U.N. Participation Act amendments, (December 6.) House Calendar.

27. Water pollution control. (October 16) House Public Works hearings, December 4–6, 10, 11.

28. Water resources research program (April 23) House Interstate Subcommittee approved December 5.

29. Wilderness. (April 9.)

30. Youth employment. (April 10) House Calendar—Rule requested April 22.

SENATE CALENDAR (2)

1. Inter-American Development Bank, H.R. 7406; agreement to vote January 14, 1964.

2. International Development Association, S. 2214; agreement to vote January 14, 1964.

PASSED HOUSE (2)

1. Coffee agreement—implement (November 14) H.R. 8864.

2. Reorganization Act extension (amended) (June 4), Senate Government Operations Committee.

HOUSE CALENDAR (7)

1. Adult basic education, H.R. 5542.

2. Civil Rights Act of 1963, H.R. 7152.

3. Equal employment opportunity, H.R. 405. Senate Labor Committee, executive, December 12.

4. Interest equalization tax, H.R. 8000.

5. Land conservation fund, H.R. 3846.

6. Patent fee increase, H.R. 8190. Rule hearings, December 16.

7. Pay bill, H.R. 8986.

(See Passed Senate: Airport construction, rule hearings December 16; area redevelopment; Lake Mead; Library Services, rule hearings December 16; mass transit; migratory labor, contract registration; public defenders, rule hearings December 4; U.N. Participation Act; youth employment. House Calendar.)

COMMITTEE ACTION (21)

1. Airports—Dulles and National—management. House Interstate Committee executive consideration underway.

2. Bureaus of Community Health and Environmental Health in NIH—create. H.R. 2410: House Interstate Committee hearings April 23–26; May 14, 15; June 10.

3. Civil service retirement financing, S. 1562; Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee hearings concluded August 14.

4. Cotton subsidy. H.R. 6196: Passed House December 4; Senate Agriculture Committee hearings May 20, 27.

5. District of Columbia home rule. H.R. 5794; House District of Columbia Committee hearings November 18–20.

6–8. Education: Cooperative research. H.R. 8408; House Education Committee ordered reported August 27. Elementary and secondary school construction. H.R. 5344; House subcommittee hearings underway. Teacher quality, H.R. 6013; House subcommittee reported August 27.

9. Fallout shelters. H.R. 8200: Senate Armed Services Subcommittee hearings adjourned subject to call December 13.

10. Food stamp plan. S. 1387; Senate Agriculture Committee. H.R. 8107; House Agriculture Committee, executive October 30.

11. Foreign Affairs Academy. S. 865: Senate Foreign Relations Committee markup July 10. H.R. 3668: House Foreign Affairs Committee.

12. Housing for elderly—make single persons eligible for moderate income housing.

---

*Excluded from totals—awaiting submission of specific proposals.

S. 1170: Senate Banking Committee hearings October 2–4.

13. Medicare. S. 880: Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 3920: House Ways and Means Committee hearings November 18–22; suspended until next session.

14. Minimum wage coverage expansion. H.R. 5958, H.R. 6075: House Labor Subcommittee hearings underway.

15. National Forest roads and trails. S. 1147: Senate Public Works Subcommittee concluded hearings July 31; executive August 15.

16. Presidential Commission on Automation. Senate Joint Resolution 105: Senate Labor Committee hearings suspended December 5.

17. Stockpile disposal. S. 2272: Hearings March 7, 1962, January 30, 1963, December 3, 4.

18. Tax reform cut. Passed House September 25. Hearings October 15 through December 10; executive started December 12.

19, 20. Transportation policy (two bills). S. 1061, S. 1062: Senate Commerce Committee hearings concluded October 24. H.R. 4700, H.R. 4701; House Interstate Committee executive October 15–17; November 12.

21. Watershed Act amendments—multiple use. S. 566: Senate Agriculture Committee hearings June 3.

NO ACTION (14)

1. Air carriers—limit subsidy payments. S. 1884: Senate Commerce Committee.

2. Bank accounts—savings and loans—increase insurance coverage. S. 1799: Senate Banking Committee will wait for House. H.R. 7404: House Banking Committee.

3. Civil defense—foodstuff stockpile. S. 1711: Senate Armed Services Committee. H.R. 5121: House Armed Services Committee.

4. Food and Drug amendments. H.R. 6788: House Interstate Committee.

5. General university extension. H.R. 1779: House Education and Labor Committee.

6. Group practice facilities—mortgage insurance. S. 1426: Senate Labor Committee. H.R. 4534: House Interstate Committee.

7. Hill-Burton Act—extension and expansion. S. 894: Senate Labor Committee.

8. Immigration amendments. H.R. 7700: House Judiciary Committee. S. 1932: Senate Judiciary Committee.

9. Mental health—vocational rehabilitation. S. 968: Senate Labor Committee.

10. Political campaign tax incentives. H.R. 7308: House Ways and Means Committee.

11. Public welfare work-training. S. 1803: Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 7262: House Ways and Means Committee.

12, 13. Social security amendments. S. 1357, 1358: Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 5839, 5840: House Ways and Means Committee.

14. Unemployment compensation—permanent program. S. 1542: Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 6339: House Ways and Means Committee.

REJECTED (1)

1. District of Columbia rapid transit, December 9—recommitted.

NO LEGISLATION (3)[1]

1. Narcotics control. President reviewing Advisory Commission report.

2. User charges—fuels—air freight.

3. Urban Affairs Department.

Status of Appropriation Bills Fiscal Year 1964 and Supplementals for 1963 as of December 20, 1963

Enacted into law (14): Defense, District of Columbia, foreign aid, independent offices, Interior, Labor-HEW, legislative, military construction, public works, State-Justice-Commerce-judiciary, supplemental for HEW, Treasury-Post Office-Executive Office, Agriculture supplemental, 1963, supplemental, 1963.

In conference (1): Agriculture.

Subject Report of Presidential Recommendations (Legislative: 126*—Appropriations: 15) Senate Democratic Policy Committee

AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES AND STATUS

1. Feed grains program (B, SPM January 31), Public Law 88–26.

2. Cotton program (B, SPM January 31), H.R. 6196, passed House December 4. Senate Agriculture Committee hearings, May 20–27.

3. Dairy program (B, SPM January 31), S. 1915, passed Senate October 10. Additional, House hearings, September 17, 18.

4. Expand food-stamp program (B, SPM January 31), S. 1387, Senate Agriculture Committee. H.R. 8107, House Agriculture Committee, executive, October 30.

5. Amend Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit development of available sites for multipurpose use (SPM January 31), S. 566, Senate Agriculture Committee hearing, June 3.

6. Land-use adjustments—raise limitation (SPM January 31), S. 1588, passed Senate October 11. H.R. 6491, House Agriculture Committee hearings, June 24–27.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

7. Area redevelopment—increase, limitation (B), S. 1163, passed Senate June 26. House Calendar (rule hearing, September 24).

ATOMIC ENERGY

8. AEC authorization, 1964. (*) Public Law 88–72.

9. AEC supplemental authorization, 1964. (*) Public Law 88–189.

CIVIL RIGHTS (SPM FEBRUARY 28, JUNE 19)

10. Omnibus. S. 1731: Senate Judiciary hearings started July 16; recessed September 11, H.R. 7152: House Calendar (rule requested November 27). Discharge petition filed December 9. Rule hearings start January 9. S. 1732: Public accommodations—Senate Commerce ordered reported October 8. S. 1750: Omnibus minus public accommodations—Senate Judiciary hearings started July 16; recessed September 11.

11. One-year extension of Civil Rights Commission; Public Law 88–152.

12. Equal employment opportunity, S. 773, S. 1210, S. 1211; Senate Labor Subcommittee approved September 16; executive December 12. H.R. 405: House Calendar.

13. Public defenders, (SU), S. 1057: passed Senate August 6. H.R. 7457: House Calendar (rule December 4).

14. Immigration amendments. (B) S. 1932, Senate Judiciary Committee; H.R. 7700, House Judiciary Committee.

15. Equal pay for women. (*) Public Law 88–38.

16. Manpower Training Act amendments—postpone date of matching requirements and increase fiscal year 1964 authorization; illiterate training and age reduction, Public Law 88–214.

17. Public welfare work training, S. 1803, Senate Finance will wait for House. H.R. 7262, House Ways and Means Committee.

COMMERCE AND TRANSPORTATION

18. Strengthen National Transportation Policy, (B, SU, E) S. 1062, Senate Commerce hearings concluded October 24. H.R. 4701, House Interstate executive October 15–17, November 12.

19. Minimum rate transportation. (B, SU, E) S. 1061, Senate Commerce hearings concluded October 24. H.R. 4700. House Interstate executive October 15–17, November 12.

20. Urban mass transit ($500 million, 3-year program—$100 million first year) (B, E, SU), S. 6, passed Senate April 4; H.R. 3881, House Calendar (Rule hearings concluded June 13).

21. Extend airport construction program (B), S. 1153, passed Senate August 26. House Calendar.

22. Consolidate management of Dulles and Washington National Airports (B), H.R. 826. House Interstate executive underway.

23. National forest roads and trails. (*) S. 1147, Senate Public Works Subcommittee markup August 15.

24. International air fares. (E/C) S. 1540, passed Senate November 26. H.R. 6400, House Interstate.

25. Limit right of certain air carriers to receive subsidy payments. (*) S. 1884, Senate Commerce.

DEFENSE

26. Fallout shelter program. (B), H.R. 8200, passed House September 17. Senate Armed Services special subcommittee hearings adjourned subject to call December 13.

27. Military pay increase—effective October 1, 1963 (B), Public Law 88–132.

28. Military procurement authorization. (*) Public Law 88–28.

29. Extend universal military training to July 1, 1967 (B), Public Law 88–2.

30. Authorize Secretary of Agriculture to provide essential foodstuffs for civil defense needs (B), S. 1711, Senate Armed Services; H.R. 5121, House Armed Services.

31. Stockpile disposal (B), S. 2272, Senate Armed Services hearings December 3, 4.

32. Military construction. (*) Public Law 88–174.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

33. Increase existing authorizations governing appropriations to District of Columbia; authorize Federal loans (B), Public Law 88–104.

34. Home rule, S. 1650, Senate District of Columbia Committee; H.R. 5794, House District of Columbia Committee hearings, November 18–20.

35. Rapid transit system for District of Columbia (SPM May 27), S. 1647, Senate District of Columbia Committee; H.R. 8929, House recommitted December 9—278 to 76.

36. National Cultural Center extension. Public Law 88–100.

37. Vocational education—amended to include National Defense Education Act and impacted areas extension, Public Law 88–210.

38. Higher education, Public Law 88–204.

39. National Defense Education Act—extend loan forgiveness, S. 569, passed Senate October 24.

40. Library services and construction, S. 2265, passed Senate November 26; H.R. 4879, House Calendar.

41. Exceptional children—teachers, Public Law 88–164.

42. Cooperative research, H.R. 8408, ordered reported August 27.

43. Adult education, H.R. 5542, House Calendar.

44. Teacher quality, H.R. 6013, House subcommittee reported August 27.

45. Elementary and secondary education, H.R. 5344, House subcommittee hearings underway.

46. General university extension, H.R. 1779, House Education and Labor Committee.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

47. Improve financing of Civil Service retirement system (B), S. 1562, Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee concluded hearings August 14.

48. Kennedy Art Center (E/C) Senate Joint Resolution 136, passed Senate December 18.

---

[1] Not included in totals for Presidential recommendations.

* Excludes 3 which have not had specific proposals submitted.

49. Revise silver policy (E), Public Law 88-36.

50. Bank deposits—savings and loans, increase insurance coverage. (*) S. 1799, Senate Banking will wait for House; H.R. 7404, House Banking.

51. National Council on the Arts, S. 2379, passed Senate December 19.

52. Kennedy 50-cent piece, E/C December 10, H.R. 9413, Public Law 88– .

HEALTH

53. Hill-Burton Act—extension and expansion, S. 894, Senate Labor.

54. Medical school aid—doctors, dentists, nurses, Public Law 88–129.

55. Create new Bureaus of Community Health and Environmental Health, H.R. 2410. House Interstate Committee hearings, April 23–26; May 14, 15; June 10.

56. Group practice medical and dental facilities, S. 1426: Senate Labor. H.R. 4534: House Interstate.

57. Food and drug amendments—consumer protection, H.R. 6788; House Interstate Committee.

58. Air pollution control, Public Law 88–206.

59. Water pollution control, S. 649: Passed Senate October 16; H.R. 3166: House Public Works Committee hearings, December 4–6, 10, 11.

60. Narcotics control (B), Presidential reviewing Advisory Commission report; excluded from total since specific proposal has not been submitted.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

61. Urban Affairs Department, establish (B), excluded from total since specific proposal has not been submitted.

62. Increase present maximum authorizations for direct housing loans for elderly and moderate income families (B, SPM February 21); Public Law 88–158.

63. Amend 1961 Housing Act to make single elderly persons eligible for housing financed under section 221(d)(3) (SPM February 21); S. 1170; Senate Banking Committee hearings, October 2–4.

INTERNATIONAL

64. Enlarge resources of International Development Association (B), S. 2214: Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, November 15, December 4; Senate Calendar; H.R. 9022, House Banking and Currency Committee hearings, December 3.

65. Nuclear test ban treaty, ratified September 24.

66. Authorize U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for an increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock (B), Public Law 88–178.

67. Authorize $50 million payment as U.S. share of Fund for Special Operations of Inter-American Development Bank (B), H.R. 7406, Senate Calendar.

68. Extend life of Export-Import Bank to June 30, 1968, to increase its resources (B), Public Law 88–101.

69. Foreign aid authorization for fiscal 1964, Public Law 88–205.

70. Foreign Service buildings program (B), Public Law 88–94.

71. Establish National Academy of Foreign Affairs (B), S. 865, Senate Foreign Relations markup July 10; H.R. 3668, House Foreign Affairs Committee.

72. Disarmament Agency authorization increase, Public Law 88–186.

73. Coffee Agreement, International (SPM–68), ratified May 21.

74. International Coffee Agreement—implement, H.R. 8864, passed House, November 14. S. Finance.

75. Amend U.N. Participation Act to give President wider discretion in assignments. (*) S. 949, passed Senate, December 6. H.R. 6283. House Calendar (in Rules).

76. Consular convention with Korea, ratified October 22.

77. Consular convention with Japan, ratified October 22.

78. Protocol to amend International Civil Aviation Convention, ratified October 22.

79. Extradition treaty with Sweden, ratified October 22.

80. Extradition treaty with Israel, ratified October 22.

81. Amend extradition treaty with Brazil, ratified October 22.

82. Chamizal Treaty, ratified December 17.

LABOR

83. Unemployment insurance, permanent program (B, E), S. 1542, S. Finance. H.R. 6339: House Ways and Means Committee.

84. Extend minimum wage coverage (E), H.R. 5958, 6075: House Education and Labor Subcommittee hearings started November 20.

85. Railroad retirement amendments (B), Public Law 88–133.

86. Migratory agricultural workers—fair labor standards. (*) S. 523, passed Senate June 11.

87. National Advisory Council on Migratory Workers. (*) S. 525, passed Senate June 10.

88. Registration of interstate farm labor contractors. (*) S. 524, passed Senate June 11. H.R. 6242, House Calendar (in Rules).

89. Educational opportunities—migratory farmworkers. (*) S. 521, passed Senate June 10.

90. Railroad labor dispute (SPM July 22), Public Law 88–108.

91. Presidential Commission on Automation. (*) Senate Joint Resolution 105, Senate Labor Committee hearings started November 15, adjourned subject to call December 5.

MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM (SPM FEBRUARY 5)

92. Maternal and child health and mental retardation planning amendments of 1963, Public Law 88–156.

93. Mental health community centers and retardation, Public Law 88–164.

94. Expand Vocational Rehabilitation Act to include programs for mentally retarded, S. 968, Senate Labor Committee; H.R. 5194, House Education Committee.

NATURAL RESOURCES

95. Land conservation fund, including user fees (facilities and water transportation) (B), H.R. 3846, House Calendar; Senate Interior Committee hearings concluded March 8; executive, August 26.

96. Reserve necessary power supplies for Pacific Northwest (B), S. 1007, conference report filed.

97. Outdoor recreation. (B, SU), Public Law 88–29.

98. Water resources research program (B), S. 2, passed Senate April 23; House Interior Subcommittee approved December 5.

99. River basin planning (B), S. 1111, passed Senate December 4.

100. Wilderness bill (B), S. 4, passed Senate April 9, House Interior Committee.

SHORELINE AREAS (B)

101. Canyonlands, S. 27, passed Senate August 2.

102. Lake Meade National Recreational Area, Ariz., S. 653, passed Senate August 2; H.R. 4010, House Calendar.

103. Ozark National Rivers, S. 16, passed Senate October 21, House Interior Committee, executive, December 4.

104. Sleeping Bear Dunes, S. 792; passed Senate December 19.

POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

105. Political campaign tax incentives, H.R. 7308; House Ways and Means Committee.

106. Presidential Transition Act. (*) H.R. 4638; passed Senate, amended October 17.

107. Equal time suspension. (*) House Joint Resolution 247; passed Senate, amended October 2.

PUBLIC DEBT

108. Temporary $307 billion debt limit through June 30, 1963; $309 billion through August 30, 1963 (B), Public Law 88–30.

109. Temporary increase in debt limit to November 30, 1963 (E, B), Public Law 88–106.

110. Temporary $315 billion debt limit through June 29, 1964 (E, B), Public Law 88–187.

REORGANIZATION

111. Extend President's authority to transmit reorganization plans to Congress, (B) H.R. 3496: Passed Senate, amended June 4; Senate Government Operations Committee.

112. Reorganization plan I—Franklin D. Roosevelt Library (SPM May 27), plan effective July 26.

113. Amendments to SEC Act. (*) S. 1642: Passed Senate July 30. H.R. 6789: House Interstate Committee hearings, November 19–21, December 3–5.

SALARY ADJUSTMENT AND REFORM

114. Pay legislation (B, SPM April 29), H.R. 8986: House Calendar. Senate Committee hearings, September 4.

SENIOR CITIZENS (SPM FEBRUARY 21)

115. Medicare—effective January 1, 1965. Pay benefits for those not covered by social security from regular appropriations. S. 880: Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 3920: House Ways and Means Committee hearings, November 18–22. Suspended until next session.

116. Amend the Social Security Act to provide assistance in development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services for training, through research, development, or training project grants, through grants for construction or recreational activity centers, and through grants to stimulate employment opportunities. S. 1357: Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 5840: House Ways and Means Committee.

117. Improve public assistance provisions of Social Security Act relating to aged individuals. S. 1358: Senate Finance Committee, H.R. 5849: House Ways and Means Committee.

SPACE

118. NASA authorization for 1964. (*) Public Law 88–113.

TAXES

119. Tax cut and reform (B, SPM January 25), H.R. 8363: Passed House September 25; Senate Finance hearings October 15–December 10. Executives started December 12.

120. Temporary interest equalization tax (SPM July 18), H.R. 8000: House Calendar.

121. Extend excise taxes to July 1, 1964, and corporate rates to December 31, 1963 (B), Public Law 88–52.

USER CHARGES

122. Extend air passenger transportation at 5 percent, Public Law 88–52.

123. Effective January 1, 1964, enact user charges: (B) (a) 2 cents a gallon on all fuels used in commercial air transportation, including jet fuels; (b) 5 percent on air freight; (c) 3 cents a gallon on all fuels used in general aviation; (d) 2 cents a gallon on all fuels used in transportation on waterways. Excluded from total since specific legislation has not been submitted.

124. Increase patent fees (B), H.R. 8190: House Calendar.

VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES

125. Increase benefits of children and dependent parents of veterans who died as a result of military service (B), Public Law 88–21.

YOUTH (SPM FEBRUARY 14)

126. Youth Employment Act, S. 1: Passed Senate April 10. H.R. 5131: House Calendar. (Rule requested April 22.)

127. Establish National Service Corps, S. 1321: Passed Senate August 14. H.R. 5625: House Labor Subcommittee. Approved December 11.

128. Peace Corps expansion ($180 million). Public Law 88-200.

129. Juvenile Delinquency Act extension, S. 1967; Passed Senate September 25; H.R. 5866: House Labor Subcommittee. Approved October 8.

(Symbols: SU, state of Union message; B, budget message; E, economic message; SPM, special message; *in accord with the President's program; P/S, passed Senate; P/H, passed House; E/C, Executive communication.)

STATUS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS, FISCAL YEAR 1964, AND SUPPLEMENTALS FOR 1963, AS OF DECEMBER 20, 1963

Enacted into law (15): Agriculture, Defense, District of Columbia, foreign aid, independent offices, Interior, Labor-HEW, Legislative, military construction, public works, State-Justice-Commerce-judiciary, supplemental HEW, Treasury-Post Office-Executive Office, Agriculture supplemental, 1963, and supplemental, 1963.

THE 3-YEAR LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

(By Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD)

The practice of appraising the work of each session of Congress is as old as the Congress itself. Because Congress is charged with the responsibility of establishing legislative policy for all the American people, it is essential that such evaluations be made to inform the people of the work of their representatives. Because of the incomprehensible tragedy which occurred on November 22, this appraisal is based on the 3-year legislative record of the Kennedy administration. It gives a clear-cut picture of the programs established under that administration and of the work still to be done under the able leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

An analysis of the 3-year period under the leadership of our late President reveals a record of lasting achievement. No Congress can ever enact all the measures desired by all groups in our country, whether the period covered is 1, 3, or 10 years. As the late President stated in his inaugural message on January 20, 1961, after outlining his beliefs and ambitions:

"All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin."

And begin he did. The late President, from January 25 to April 27, 1961, sent 28 messages to Congress outlining his ideas of programs to halt the recession, to get the unemployed reemployed, to obtain adequate housing for all, and to create better educational facilities. These messages ranged from area redevelopment to the establishment of a permanent Peace Corps and a 5-year plan for foreign aid. In his effort to revitalize the 10-year-old foreign aid program, the late President said:

"There exists, in the 1960's, a historic opportunity for a major economic assistance effort by the free industrialized nations to move more than half the people of the less developed nations into self-sustained economic growth, while the rest move substantially closer to the day when they, too, will no longer have to depend on outside assistance."

Congress did revise the foreign aid program by replacing the existing Mutual Security Act with a new basic law and title; it authorized future separation of military and economic aid budgets; it granted long-term permission for economic aid for the first time in the form of an authorization of $7.2 billion in appropriations over 5 years to finance long-term, low-interest development loans to underdeveloped nations.

On March 1 of 1961, the late President established a Peace Corps pilot program by Executive order and, in answer to his request, Congress gave a degree of permanency to this idea of enlisting young Americans to serve as instructors and helpers in the less developed countries. This year, the program was more than doubled.

On September 26, 1961, the late President signed into law the bill enacted in response to his request for the establishment of a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to assume primary responsibility within the Government for directing and coordinating disarmament matters. The importance of this Agency was outlined in his address to the United Nations just the day before he approved the bill. He said:

"We in the United States have labored this year, with a new urgency, and with a new, now-statutory Agency fully endorsed by the Congress, to find an approach to disarmament which would be so far reaching yet realistic, so mutually balanced and beneficial, that it could be accepted by every nation."

In this same message, the late President said:

"We remain ready to seek new avenues of agreement; our new disarmament program thus includes the following proposals: First, signing the test ban treaty by all nations. This can be done now. Test ban negotiations need not and should not await general disarmament. * * * Finally, halting the unlimited testing and production of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles, and gradually destroying them as well."

On September 24 of this year, almost 2 years to the day from the time of the U.N. speech, the Senate consented to ratification by the President of the limited nuclear test ban treaty which prohibits nuclear explosion in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater. In a world standing on the brink of nuclear devastation, this was truly a dream come true.

Less dramatic than the Peace Corps or the Disarmament Agency, but equally as important, was the 1961 decision to join the 20-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development representing a long step forward in the evolution of the Atlantic Community by linking the nations of Western Europe and North America in a common economic bond.

In his first state of the Union message on January 30, 1961, the late President emphasized that "the American economy is in trouble" and immediately followed up with his message of February 2 outlining his program for economic recovery and growth. In response to this message, on March 22, the Congress sent to the President a bill extending jobless pay benefits an additional 13 weeks. We immediately followed this with a bill making dependent children, whose parents were unemployed, eligible for the same aid given to children deprived of support by reason of death, desertion, or disability. On April 26 the late President received the depressed areas bill authorizing $394 million in loans and grants for areas beset by chronic unemployment, and the Senate this year authorized an additional $455.5 million for the Area Redevelopment Administration. We improved social security retirement and survivor benefits by about $800 million a year. And by May 3, of 1961, Congress sent down to the White House a bill raising the minimum wage for 23.9 million workers from $1 an hour to $1.25, and extended coverage for the first time since 1938 to an estimated 3.6 million additional workers.

Congress responded to the President's balance-of-payments message by sending him a bill to accord uniform tax treatment to the dollar holdings of foreign central banks. It reduced the value of duty-free goods Americans might bring back from abroad and provided for a U.S. Travel Service in the Commerce Department to encourage foreign tourists to visit the United States.

In response to his community health program, the late President signed into law on July 20, 1961, a bill almost doubling the amount authorized for grants by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act—raising the authorization to $80 million in fiscal 1962, $90 million in fiscal 1963, and $100 million in each of the next 4 years. Public Health Service funds were increased by $738 million for the National Institutes of Health.

The President requested adequate housing for all. In response Congress enacted a $4.88 billion omnibus housing bill, the most far-reaching housing legislation since 1949. And this year it authorized an additional $50 million for housing aid to the low-income elderly.

An omnibus farm bill signed into law on August 8, 1961, granted President Kennedy the aids he wanted for the farmer. Acreage retirement programs and regional authority for marketing orders, for example, were extended to many new crops and $4.5 billion in new authority for Public Law 480, and expanded credit was made available to small farmers through Farmers Home Administration.

The year 1962 began as a historic year. On February 20, Marine Lt. Col. John H. Glenn returned safely from a three-orbit space flight. This was the beginning. The President decided to expand space exploration to include a landing on the moon and, to that end, the 87th Congress voted a record budget of $5.4 billion.

Throughout 1962 the President gave the highest priority to his trade and tax proposals. His trade program, as enacted into law, allowed him wide latitude in negotiating tariffs with other nations over a 5-year period and gave him more tools to ease the burdens on segments of American business and labor during the transition to freer trade patterns. As expressed by Senator COOPER, of Kentucky: "The passage of this bill is a signal achievement of the administration and the Congress during the present session." Senator MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, described it as a "forward-looking and far-reaching bill which faces up to the challenges of a rapidly changing world, a world in which yesterday's formulas are no longer adequate for today's problems."

On taxes, the Congress enacted the first omnibus tax revision bill since 1954, an accomplishment which was considered essential by both President Kennedy and Secretary of the Treasury Dillon.

It was in that year that action was completed on the $435 million 3-year manpower retraining program and $400 million was voted in special accelerated public works funds. This year we have authorized an additional $161 million for the manpower training program in fiscal 1964. At the urging of Congress, teeth were put into an international agreement to regulate trade in cotton textiles between low-wage countries, the United States, and several European countries.

Congress authorized a loan of up to $100 million to the U.N. to assist in a financial crisis caused by peace-keeping operations in the Middle East and the Congo. In the midst of the Cuban crisis, President Kennedy was given standby authority, for 1 year, to call up 150,000 members of the Ready Reserve to active duty. Congress cleared a concurrent resolution expressing U.S. determination to resist any violation of its rights in Berlin.

Congress authorized a private corporation to establish, own, and operate a commercial communications satellite system.

It increased by $466 million the Small Business Administration's revolving loan fund.

It granted a 4½-year extension to the expiring Sugar Act and, in a rider, allocated additional sugar quotas to the Western Hemisphere.

It provided Federal aid to educational television outlets.

It increased postal rates and Federal pay.

It adopted a constitutional amendment to abolish the poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections and primaries, an amendment now very close to ratification by the required number of States.

It gave Federal assistance to the States and local communities for a program of immunization of all children under 5 years of age against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, or tetanus.

It modernized the conflict-of-interest laws.

This year Congress convened on January 9 and on January 14 the biennial struggle over rule 22, the cloture rule, kept the Senate occupied until February 7, thereby delaying committee assignments until February 14. In the meantime, on February 6, the House Ways and Means Committee opened hearings on the President's tax cut and reform proposal. After many months of hearings and 80 executive sessions, the House sent the bill to the Senate on September 25. Although hearings have been completed and Executive consideration underway, it will possibly be late January before the Senate can complete action on the bill.

One of our earliest actions this year was to authorize President Kennedy to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States. It was an unusual action to give tangible form to the high esteem in which the 88-year-old former Prime Minister of Britain, the son of an American mother, is held in this Nation.

Another of the early actions of 1963 was to give statutory authority to the Interior Department's Outdoor Recreation Bureau which had been established by Executive order in 1962 to formulate a nationwide outdoor recreation plan.

In order to obtain more effective Federal performance on scientific and technological programs, the Senate, on March 8, took positive action to establish a Commission on Science and Technology. By April 10 the Senate had sent to the House a bill establishing a Youth Conservation Corps and a Home Town Youth Corps in answer to the President's special message on February 14 in which he said:

"To the extent that the Nation is called upon to promote and protect the interests of our younger citizens, it is an investment certain to bring a high return, not only in basic human values but in social and economic terms."

Prior to action on the Youth Conservation Corps, the Senate, on April 4, passed the mass transit bill, authorizing $375 million in grants based on the concept of $2 in Federal grants for every $1 in local or other non-Federal funds, to establish a long-range program of assistance to urban areas in solving their mass transportation problems. In the President's letter of February 18 to Congress, he stated:

"Urban mass transportation is one of the most urgent problems facing the Nation and the Congress. * * * Nearly three-fourths of our citizens live in urban areas, which occupy only 2 percent of our land, and if mass transit is to survive and relieve the congestion of these cities, it needs Federal stimulation and assistance."

On April 9 the Senate passed a bill establishing a national wilderness preservation system, placing 8.2 million acres of national forest, already classified as wilderness, permanently in the wilderness system and an additional 57.2 million acres of public lands conditionally in the system.

By April 23 the Senate had acted on an administration bill guaranteeing electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on hydroelectric energy generated at Federal plants in that region. On the same day the Senate completed action on another administration bill establishing water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities to stimulate a national program of water research.

Since 1946 the Congress has had before it a recommendation to require equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex. President Kennedy, in signing the bill into law on June 10, said:

"I am grateful to those Members who worked so diligently to guide the Equal Pay Act through the Congress. It is a first step. It affirms our determination that when women enter the labor force, they will find equality in their pay envelopes."

The Senate took rapid action on the President's request to ratify the International Coffee Agreement, making the United States a party to the agreement. This action was designed to stabilize coffee prices and insure exporting countries that their foreign exchange reserves would not be severely depleted by low coffee prices on the world market.

Early in the year, President Kennedy sent down his special message on "Mental Illness and Mental Retardation," calling for a bold new approach by Federal, State, and local governments to combat mental disability. The Senate, on May 27, approved part of this request by completing action on a bill expanding facilities for treatment of mental disabilities. The President in his message pointed out that there were currently 800,000 patients in mental institutions across the Nation, including 200,000 who are retarded; altogether, an estimated 5 or 6 million Americans are mentally retarded and need assistance. Facilities, in turn, are needed to provide this assistance.

Congress sent the late President a law responding to his request for amendments to the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal assistance to States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation, by providing for both new grant programs and expansion of the existing maternal and child health and crippled children's programs. In this measure we also included a program for training teachers of exceptional children.

On June 10 of this year the late President sent down his omnibus civil rights message in which he said:

"I am proposing that the Congress stay in session this year until it has enacted—preferably as a single omnibus bill—the most responsible, reasonable, and urgently needed solutions to this problem, solutions which should be acceptable to all fairminded men."

The House Judiciary Committee reported its bill a few weeks ago, and it is now before the House Rules Committee—with a discharge petition filed on December 9. Although final action will not be taken on this measure until early next year, a 1-year extension to the Civil Rights Commission was voted, together with additional funds to carry on this valuable work.

The Senate took final action on an administration request authorizing Federal judicial circuits to establish a public defender system at public expense, citing the 1963 Supreme Court ruling in *Gideon* v. *Wainwright* in which the Court stated:

"That Government hires lawyers to prosecute and defendants who have money hire lawyers to defend are the strongest indications of the widespread belief that lawyers in criminal courts are necessities, not luxuries."

The life of the Export-Import Bank was extended for 5 years, and its borrowing authority was increased to $8 billion. The limitation on outstanding loans, guarantees, and insurance was also increased to $9 billion, as well as an increase to $2 billion in the maximum amount allowable at any one time for insurance and guarantees.

After debate disclosed that during the past 10 years the U.S. fishing industry had dropped to fifth place in the total world catch and was currently facing a crisis, the Senate, this year, authorized a 5-year program of $28,250,000 in matching grants to the States to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects.

Congress succeeded in clearing a badly needed pay raise for the military, amounting to approximately $1.2 billion a year, effective on October 1, 1963, the first such raise for the military since 1958.

And on August 14 the Senate completed action on an administration bill establishing a domestic National Service Corps patterned after the Peace Corps and authorizing $15 million for the 2-year pilot program.

On July 22 President Kennedy sent to Congress a proposal that solutions to the 4-year-old work-rules dispute between railroad management and labor over the composition of traincrews be submitted to the ICC. On August 28, just 6 hours before a nationwide rail strike was to begin, President Kennedy signed into law a resolution creating an ad hoc seven-member arbitration board to resolve the two primary issues—manning the traincrews and firemen on diesel locomotives—thus averting a nationwide strike. This action marked the first time in peacetime labor relations that Congress imposed arbitration in a labor-management dispute.

In the area of education, it has been said that the 88th Congress has "the greatest record in the field of education in the history of this Nation." In response to the President's request, he was sent, on September 12, the medical training aid bill authorizing a 3-year program of matching Federal grants for construction or rehabilitation of medical, dental, and related professional schools and a 6-year loan program for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy. Similar legislation had been considered without success by every Congress since 1951. Two additional bills requested by the late President have been signed into law by President Johnson. One authorizes a 3-year $1.2 billion program of grants and loans for construction of college academic facilities at public and private higher education institutions. The other is a vocational education bill authorizing new matching grants to the States to expand vocational education programs while extending the National Defense Education Act and the impacted areas program. In addition, the Senate has completed action on a library services bill to increase Federal aid for expanding public library improvements to urban as well as rural areas and to authorize matching grants for construction of public library buildings. At the same time Congress has extended the provisions of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 relating to cancellation of loans, to teachers in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education.

Finally, there has been enacted a Clean Air Act authorizing $95 million over a 4-year period to provide a greatly expanded national effort to control air pollution through research, the establishment of pollution and control agencies, and legal action to halt existing causes of pollution.

With action hoped for next year on the tax cut proposal, the civil rights program, and aid for the aged in ill health, the most far-reaching impetus in many decades toward social and economic improvement within the Nation and toward a more stable peace in the world, will have received a sound legislative base. In cooperation with President Johnson, the Congress will strive to complete this base as a lasting testament to the life and work of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President in the service of the people of the United States.

Below is a detailed description of our 3-year review highlights, which includes Presidential recommendations and measures initiated by the Congress.

THREE-YEAR REVIEW OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES, 1961–63

Economic area

Agriculture

Year 1961

Omnibus farm bill: Enacted a major farm bill to reduce wheat and feed grain surpluses; authorized Secretary to consult with farmers, farm organizations, and other groups to develop new farm programs; extended the Agricultural Trade and Development Act to December 31, 1964; consolidated and modernized the Farmers Home Administration; extended the Wool Act for 4 years to March 31, 1965; extended Great Plains conservation program to December 31, 1971; authorized a 5-year extension of the school milk program to be paid by direct appropriations; and extended the Veterans' Administration and armed services milk program to 1964, with CCC furnishing the funds; Public Law 87–128.

Feed grains: Authorized a 1-year emergency price support for the 1961 crop of corn at $1.20 a bushel with the other feed grains to be supported at fair and reasonable levels in relation to corn, in an effort to raise the incomes of feed-grain producers and to reduce the mounting surpluses of feed grains in Government hands; Public Law 87–5.

Drought relief: Enacted a temporary 1-year program authorizing the sale of Government surplus corn and feed grains to needy farmers and ranchers in drought areas at 75 percent of Government price-support levels and permitting livestock grazing on grasslands idled by the soil bank and other conservation programs; Public Law 87–127.

Farm loans: Increased proportion of appropriated farm loan funds available for individual farms with a debt of over $10,000 from 10 percent to 25 percent to help meet the rapid and increased cost of farming; Public Law 87–8.

Mexican farm labor: Extended and revised the Mexican farm labor program for 2 years, to December 31, 1963; prohibited infringement upon the rights of domestic workers. Public Law 87–345.

Cotton farmers' relief: Authorized emergency relief to cotton farmers where floods made it impossible to plant; Public Law 87–37.

Farm credit: Liberalized farm credit laws to permit installment payments on Federal land bank loans to be scheduled more frequently than semiannually if desirable to the borrower; permit Federal land bank loans to be made to corporations set up by farming families (now restricted to persons); extends from 5 to 7 years the permissible maturity of intermediate-term loans; required in applying the earnings at the end of each fiscal year that one-half of 1 percent of the loans outstanding be held in reserve up to an accumulation of 3½ percent of the outstanding loans; Public Law 87–343.

Year 1962

Second farm bill: As enacted this bill has four major titles, which contain numerous innovations as aids to reducing farm surpluses and solving agricultural problems by providing for a new permanent supply-management wheat program, a 1-year extension of the present feed grain program and replacing the 1958 corn law with a provision effective in 1964 permitting the Secretary to set price supports for corn between 50 and 90 percent of parity and expansion of surplus disposal under Public Law 480. Includes a new land-use-adjustment program to take land out of production and divert its use to recreational and public purposes; Public Law 87–703.

Farmers Home Administration loans: Raised the annual limitation on Farmers Home Administration insured loans from $150 million to $200 million. These farm ownership loans made to families with a farm background and experience or training to help them buy, enlarge, or develop farms and to refinance debts; Public Law 87–798.

Textile imports: Authorized the President, for the purpose of carrying out any agreement under section 204 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1956, to limit imports of any agricultural commodity or product covered by such agreement from countries not participating in the agreement, if, in the President's judgment, such imports would seriously affect domestic producers; Public Law 87–488.

Migrant farmworkers' health clinics: Authorized a $3 million a year, 3-year program in Federal grants to public or nonprofit agencies and organizations for paying part of the cost of establishing and operating family health clinics and special health projects for domestic migratory farm families; Public Law 87–692.

Wheat: Enacted a measure correcting an inequity in the Agricultural Act of 1961 relating to the withdrawal of wheat stored to avoid penalty; Public Law 87–410.

Cotton disposal: Provided for disposal of all extra-long staple cotton in the strategic stockpile by transferring domestic cotton to the CCC for unrestricted use at not less than 115 percent of current support price plus reasonable carrying charges, and foreign cotton for export only at not less than the world price; Public Law 87–548.

Cotton farmers: Extended for 1 year an emergency measure enacted last year to bring relief to cotton farmers whose land has been and is unplantable because of recent floods or whose plantings have been washed out; Public Law 87–446.

Diverted acreage: Authorized production in 1962 of flax, castor beans, guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, and other annual field crops not surplus on acreage diverted from wheat and feed grains; authorized payment up to 50 percent of the amount the producer would receive if acreage were devoted to conservation uses; Public Law 87–451.

Feed grains: Liberalized requirements for participation in the 1962 feed grain program by permitting farmers to plant barley on land taken out of wheat production and made barley interchangeable with other feed grains; Public Law 87–425.

Rice acreage: Enacted a measure providing for the transfer of rice acreage history where the producer has withdrawn from rice production; Public Law 87–412.

Wet lands—Drainage: Prescribed methods and procedures for approval of agreements to furnish financial and technical assistance for agricultural drainage; Public Law 87–732.

Forest management: Doubled the authorization under the Cooperative Forest Management Act which furnishes technical assistance to small forest and woodlot owners; Public Law 87–680.

Federal Extension Service: Authorized funds appropriated in excess of the 1962 funds to be distributed on the basis of an equalized formula for the first 20 percent; Public Law 87–749.

Forestry research: Authorized matching grants for forestry research to land-grant colleges, agricultural experiment stations, other colleges and universities offering graduate training in sciences basic to forestry and having a forestry school; Public Law 87–788.

Year 1963

Feed grains: Extends through 1964 and 1965 crop years the feed grains program in effect in 1962 and 1963, providing price supports for producers who make voluntary acreage reduction. Public Law 88–26.

Dairy program: Clarifies Secretary of Agriculture's authority to provide for allotments under milk marketing orders so that producers will receive a higher return on milk covered by allotments and a lower return for milk in excess of allotments, instead of a uniform blend price. (S. 1915, passed Senate October 10.)

Mexican farm labor: Extends the Mexican farm labor program to December 31, 1964; Public Law 88–203.

Federal crop insurance coverage: Expands the Federal crop insurance to permit it to be offered in 150 additional counties. (S. 277, passed Senate August 28.)

Agricultural development in Alaska: Authorizes a $1,250,000 Alaskan farmland development program to aid in clearing, draining, shaping, and conditioning land for crop production and pastures. Limits maximum payments to $125,000 for any one year. (S. 623, passed Senate June 25.)

Tobacco allotment leasing authority: Extends for an additional 2 years the authority to transfer, by lease, tobacco acreage allotments from one farm to another within the same county for a more economical operation; Public Law 88–68.

Misuse of relief feeds: Establishes civil and criminal penalties for misuse of feed made available for relieving distress or to preserve and maintain foundation herds. (S. 400, passed Senate June 25.)

Producer livestock programs: Permits voluntary programs for promotion, research, and education relating to livestock. Public Law 88–61.

Agricultural experiment stations: Authorizes Federal assistance to States, on a matching basis, to help finance additional research facilities at State agricultural experiment stations; Public Law 88–74.

Rice acreage allotments: Permits a rice producer permanently withdrawing from rice production to transfer his history for allotment purposes without transferring his land (as required by existing law). S. 1604, passed Senate July 22, H.R. 3742, House Calendar.)

Rice acreage: Validates all 1956–62 crop rice acreage allotments properly apportioned on the basis of producer history and allocates to the farm by the county committee in good faith; applies only in States where rice allotments are made on the basis of the producer's history of rice production; Public Law 88–160.

Conservation reserve—land-use adjustment: Increases the limit on annual payments under the land-use adjustment program from $10 to $20 million; and authorizes extension of conservation reserve contracts (soil bank) through 1965 which expire in 1963 and 1964. (S. 1588, passed Senate October 11.)

General Economy

Year 1961

Federal unemployment compensation: Authorized Federal advances to permit the States to extend unemployment benefits up to an additional 13 weeks for workers who have exhausted their regular benefits during the recession, thus providing an unemployed worker with benefits up to a total of 39 weeks—in an effort to ease the unemployment problem throughout the country; Public Law 87–62.

Aid to dependent children: Authorized a 14-month program, from May 1, 1961, through June 1962, of aid to dependent children, permitting States to aid needy unemployed parents and their children who are not now eligible for aid in which the Federal Government participates; and increased by $3 the minimum amount to which the Federal Government will participate on a matching basis in State programs carrying out the special medical care provision for recipients of old-age assistance; Public Law 87–31.

Railroad unemployment compensation: Approved benefits of a similar nature for unemployed railroad workers under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; Public Law 87–7.

Railroad retirees: To bring the railroad retirees in line with the beneficiaries of social security, this amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act permits men without 30 years' service to receive reduced annuities upon reaching age 62; and reduces from 3 to 1 year the required time which must elapse after marriage before a wife or husband, otherwise qualified, may receive the annuity; Public Law 87–285.

Minimum wage: Increased minimum wage to $1.25 (from $1) and extended coverage to 3.6 million additional workers; Public Law 87–30.

Area redevelopment: Established the Area Redevelopment Administration in the Department of Commerce, and authorized a 4-year program of $300 million in loans and $94 million in grants for industrial plants and public facilities in economically distressed areas; Public Law 87–27.

Social security: Increased minimum old-age insurance benefits and benefits to widows under the Social Security Act; provided reduced benefits to men at 62; liberalized disability provisions, increased tax for workers and employers by one-eighth of 1 percent; increased (for 1 year) the amount of public assistance payments for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled; Public Law 87–64.

Housing Act of 1961: Enacted a housing program, authorizing $4.9 billion in new funds. The act provides for a new 2-year experimental plan of low-interest rate, 35-year mortgage loans for middle-income housing (except in hardship cases the mortgages may be extended to 40 years); requires a 3-percent downpayment on low-income housing, with a permissive inclusion of settlement costs; authorizes $75 million for mass transportation systems, and $50 million for "open space" grants; and includes a reauthorization of approximately 100,000 public housing units; Public Law 87–70.

FHA: Increased by $1 billion the mortgage insurance authorization of FHA; Public Law 87–38.

Federal-Aid Highway Act: Enacted the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961, revising the original estimated authorization for 41,000-mile, 13-year program of interstate highways by increasing the Federal Government's share from $25 to $37 billion; extended for 2 years the incentive bonus for States to enter into agreements for billboard controls; Public Law 87–61.

Federal Airport Act extension: Extended the Federal Airport Act for 3 years to June 30, 1964, and authorized a total appropriation of $225 million, or $75 million annually; Public Law 87–255.

Small business loans: Increased by $20 million the amount the Small Business Administration may commit for loans under their regular business loan program, which will enable SBA to continue its loan program without interruption for approximately 1 month; Public Law 87–198.

Small business amendments: Increased SBA's revolving fund by $105 million which, in addition to the $20 million approved in Public Law 87–198, increases the total SBA revolving fund to $1,125 million; Public Law 87–305.

Small Business Investment Act: Increased limit on amounts Small Business Administration may lend small business investment corporations and on latter's investments in individual enterprises; Public Law 87–341.

ICC loans: Extended for 27 months (to June 30, 1963) authority of Interstate Commerce Commission to make loans to help ease the credit difficulties of railroads; Public Law 87–16.

Debt limit: Increased the public debt limit by $13 billion to $298 billion through June 30, 1962; Public Law 87–69.

Lead-zinc subsidy: Aided the domestic lead-zinc industry by authorizing a 4-year program of stabilization payments for small mineowners—75 percent for lead and 55 percent for zinc or the difference between 14½ cents a pound and the market price whenever the market falls below 14½ cents; Public Law 87–347.

Year 1962

Manpower retraining: Authorized a 3-year, $435 million program of training of unemployed in vocational schools or on-the-job retraining to develop new skills; first 2 years' cost to be paid with Federal funds, third year 50–50 matching with the States; Public Law 87–415.

Work Hours Act: Provided for a standard workweek of 40 hours with not less than time and a half for overtime after an 8-hour day or 40-hour week; Public Law 87–581.

Accelerated public works program: Authorized the President to allocate $90 million for job-creating public works projects in areas where there is heavy unemployment, the funds to be allocated to Federal agencies for acceleration or initiation of authorized projects; Public Law 87–658.

Public debt: Enacted a $2 billion temporary increase in the public debt—from $298 billion to $300 billion (to June 30, 1962); Public Law 87–414.

Tax revision: Enacted a major revision and reform of our Federal tax system; Public Law 87–834.

Tax changes: Permitted an employer to claim tax deductions for his contributions to employee pension plans which include medical care among their retirement benefits; broadened the allowable individual tax deductions for medical expenses; permitted oil companies, for 1962 only, to deduct drilling costs on tax returns in 1 year rather than claim them as depreciation over several years; and required a State or local government operating retail liquor stores to buy only one $54 Federal liquor tax stamp a year instead of one for each store; Public Law 87–863.

Tax Rate Extension Act of 1962: Extended for 1 year the existing corporate tax rate and certain excise tax rates, while reducing or eliminating taxes on the transportation of persons; Public Law 87–508.

Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962: Authorized an additional $100 million (to $225 million) for the existing program of direct loans to provide housing for the elderly. Established a new program for rural areas and authorized $50 million for loans to private nonprofit corporations, consumer cooperatives, and public agencies to build rental housing for the elderly and related facilities such as dining halls and infirmaries. The new plan to be administered by the Farmers Home Administration includes $50 million loan fund to help elderly persons purchase an existing home or housing site; Public Law 87–723.

Foreign bank deposits: To help slow the U.S. gold outflow, removed for a period of 3 years the Federal Reserve Board's present ceiling—which ranges up to 4 percent varying with the duration of a deposit—on interest rates paid by U.S. commercial banks on time deposits of foreign governments, their central banks or other monetary authorities, and international institutions of which the United States is a member; Public Law 87–827.

Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962: Authorized a total of $2.3 billion for fiscal years 1963–65 to continue the Federal-aid highway program for the regular system; Public Law 87–866.

Public debt limit increase: Provided for a temporary debt limit of $308 billion through March 31, 1963, and $305 billion from April 1, 1963, through June 24, 1963, and $300 billion for the remainder of fiscal 1963; Public Law 87–512.

SBA amendments: Increased the Small Business Administration's revolving fund ceiling to $1,666 million. Of the $1,666 million authorized, $1,325 million will be used for regular business and disaster loans. Earmarks a separate fund of $341 million for loans to small business investment companies; Public Law 87–550.

Customs simplification: Reclassified the U.S. tariff schedule to adapt the classifications to the changes which have occurred since 1930 in the character and importance of articles produced in and imported into the United States and in the markets in which they are sold; Public Law 87–456.

Export controls: Extended for 3 years the Export Control Act of 1949 which authorizes the President to prohibit or curtail exportation from the United States of certain articles because of security reasons or because they are in short supply. Strengthened the criminal provisions and provided for a fine of five times the value of exports involved in a willful exporting of certain materials with knowledge that it will be used for benefit of any Communist-dominated nation and/or 5 years' imprisonment; Public Law 87–515.

Mobile trade fairs: Authorized the Secretary of Commerce to provide technical assistance, as well as limited financial aid, to operators of mobile trade fairs which have value in promoting sale abroad of American goods and products; Public Law 87–839.

Self-employed voluntary pension plans: Encouraged establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed professionals by permitting them to set aside up to $2,500 or 10 percent of their income, whichever is lesser, in an approved retirement program and permits them to deduct from taxable income up to a maximum of $1,250 in any one year for contributions to the fund; Public Law 87–792.

Civil service retirees: Provided a 5-percent increase, effective January 1, 1963, to all entitled annuitants on that date; Public Law 87–793.

Retirement income credit: Increased to $1,524 from $1,200 the maximum annual amount a retired person can subtract from his tax payment; Public Law 87–876.

District of Columbia police and firemen: Provided for an average salary increase of 11.6 percent for policemen and firemen; Public Law 87–882.

Missouri River Basin project: Authorized the Department of Interior to defer the collection of operation and maintenance charges due in 1962 from the Angostura Irrigation District to ease the financial problem in that area resulting from decreased crop production caused by droughts; Public Law 87–440.

Federal Reserve Banks: Extended to June 30, 1964, the present authority of the Federal Reserve Banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury—up to $5 billion outstanding at any one time; Public Law 87–506.

Metal scrap—temporary suspension of duties: Continued to June 30, 1963, the duty-free importation of certain metal scraps, including iron, steel, aluminum, magnesium, nickel, and nickel alloys; Public Law 87–514.

Alumina and bauxite—duty free: Continued to July 16, 1964, suspension of duty on alumina when imported for use in producing aluminum, crude bauxite, and calcined bauxite; Public Law 87–567.

Duty suspension—shoe lathes: Continued to August 7, 1964, existing suspension of duties on shoe lathes; Public Law 87–607.

Spun silk—suspension of duties: Continued to November 7, 1965, existing suspension of duties on spun silk or schappe silk yarn; Public Law 87–602.

Casein—duty free: Because of severe shortage in this country casein used in the manufacture of coated paper, adhesives, emulsions, plastics, paints, and fibers is transferred to the duty-free list; Public Law 87-606.

Coconut and palm oils: Suspended to June 30, 1966, the processing tax on coconut and palm oils; Public Law 87-859.

Disasters: Authorized taxpayers in any disaster area declared as such by the President of the United States to charge off their casualty losses on the preceding year's tax return when the disaster happens after January 1 and before the time prescribed by law for filing their income tax returns; Public Law 87-426.

Unpatented mining claims: Granted Secretary of Interior discretionary authority to alleviate hardships by permitting persons who reside on mining claims and were in possession at least 7 years prior to July 23, 1962, to continue to maintain this residence as a home even though the claim has been invalidated or relinquished; Public Law 87-851.

Copyright extension: Continued through December 31, 1965, the renewal term of any copyright subsisting on the date of approval of this measure where the renewal term would otherwise expire prior to December 31, 1965; Public Law 87-668.

War claims: Authorized payments to Americans who lost property abroad during World War II and permitted the Government to sell General Aniline & Film Corp., seized during the war as German owned; Public Law 87-846.

Savings and loan loans on apartment houses: Authorized federally insured savings and loan associations to invest more of their assets in apartment buildings. Existing law requires these associations to include apartment loans with certain other loans in a group which cannot exceed 20 percent of their assets. This act allows the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to authorize them to invest up to 15 percent of their assets in apartment loans; Public Law 87-779.

Year 1963

Youth employment: Authorizes a 5-year program to employ and train jobless youngsters between the ages of 16 and 22 in a youth conservation corps and a hometown service corps. (S. 1, passed Senate April 10; H.R. 5131, House Calendar.)

Manpower Training Act amendments: Waives the State matching requirement for fiscal 1965 and extends the act for 2 additional years with the requirement that States match one-third and one-half, respectively, in fiscal years 1966 and 1967; authorizes training in education at the basic level for those unable to qualify for occupational training provided evidence exists of intention to undertake training and for this group an additional 20 weeks of training allowances are authorized; provides for the expansion of the program by lowering the age limit for youth training allowances from 19 to 17, subject to a restriction of a 1-year waiting period for school dropouts, by increasing the proportion of youths receiving training allowances to 25 percent of those receiving allowances and restricts the allowances to those in special youth training projects; and authorizes $50 million in new funds for fiscal 1964 and $100 million for fiscal 1965; Public Law 88-214.

District of Columbia fiscal affairs: Authorizes a permanent annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia of $50 million. Increases the borrowing authority from a flat $75 to $175 million; Public Law 88-104.

Area redevelopment amendment: Authorizes an additional $455 million in Federal funds for loans in urban and rural areas and public facility grants. (S. 1163, passed Senate June 26; House Calendar.)

Public works planning: Authorizes an additional $10 million for Housing and Home Finance Agency's program of advances for public works planning. (S.J. Res. 129; passed Senate November 19.)

Public debt ceiling: Places a ceiling of $307 billion for the remainder of fiscal 1963 and $309 billion through August 31, 1963; Public Law 88-30.

Public debt ceiling: Extends the temporary debt limitation of $309 billion to November 30, 1963; Public Law 88-106.

Public debt ceiling: Raises the ceiling to $315 billion to June 29, 1964; Public Law 88-187.

Duty-free allowance: Extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1965, the $100 exemption from import duties allowed on foreign goods brought back from outside the United States, but continues the $200 exemption for the Virgin Islands until April 1, 1964, when it will drop to $100; Public Law 88-53.

Tax-rate extension: Continues for 1 year, to July 1, 1964, present corporate tax rate of 52 percent and the present rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, general telephone service, and transportation of persons by air; Public Law 88-52.

Unemployment tax rates: Eases Federal unemployment insurance taxes established to repay the Government for extra compensation payments made to unemployed workers between 1957 and 1960; Public Law 88-174.

Accrued vacation pay—deductible: Extends to January 1, 1965, period during which accrued vacation pay may be deducted as a business expense for income tax purposes even though liability to a specific individual has not been established; Public Law 81-153.

Unemployment tax: Reduces the 1963 tax for unemployment compensation and readjusts allotments to States for administrative expenses; Public Law 88-31.

Taxes: Permits deduction for child care by a wife who has been deserted by her husband; Public Law 88-4.

Ground rent: Provides a deduction from income taxes for payment of redeemable ground rent; Public Law 88-9.

Supreme Court Justice widows—annuities: Increases the annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices from $5,000 to $10,000 a year, payable monthly. (S. 1686, passed Senate November 5.)

Mortgage insurance authority: Extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1965, authority of FHA to insure mortgages for sale and rental housing for low and moderate income groups; Public Law 88-54.

Housing for elderly: Authorizes an additional $50 million for loans to nonprofit corporations and consumer cooperatives to provide housing for the elderly designed to meet their special needs; Public Law 88-158.

Silver purchase: Withdraws silver backing of paper currency, averts shortage of silver for coinage by repealing the tax on silver transfers and other obsolete sections of Silver Purchase Act of 1934; Public Law 88-36.

Cadmium: Authorizes disposal of 2 million pounds of surplus cadmium from the national stockpile valued at about $4 million; Public Law 88-8.

Corkboard insulation: Authorizes a temporary (3-year) suspension of import duty on corkboard insulation; Public Law 88-32.

Chicory—Duty free: Extends to June 30, 1966, existing suspension of duty on crude chicory except endive, and continues for the same period the statutory rate of duty of 2 cents a pound for chicory, ground or otherwise prepared; Public Law 88-49.

Metal scrap—Duty suspension: Extends to June 30, 1964, suspension of duties on metal scrap; Public Law 88-50.

Heptanoic acid: Continues for 3 years the existing suspension of import duty on heptanoic acid; Public Law 88-93.

Tanning extracts: Extends for 3 years the period during which tanning extracts may be imported free of duty; Public Law 88-92.

Tampico fiber: Continues to September 5, 1966, the existing suspension of duty on dressed or manufactured istle or Tampico fiber; Public Law 88-90.

Attorneys' fees—bankruptcy: Permits courts, on their own motion, to examine into the reasonableness of attorneys' fees in bankruptcy proceedings; Public Law 88-17.

Bankrupt funds: Permits the deposit of funds of bankrupts' estates in interest-bearing accounts; Public Law 88-16.

Small Business Act amendments: Increases by $34.3 million SBA's revolving fund bringing the total authorization for the fund to $1,700,300,000 and broadened the causal basis of SBA's authority to make loans from its disaster fund to cover all natural disasters. (S. 1309, passed Senate November 21.)

Small business investment amendment: Liberalizes investment provisions of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and encourages increased capitalization of SBIC's by raising the amount of capital that SBA may invest in an SBIC, on a matching basis, from $400,000 to $700,000. (S. 298, passed Senate November 21.)

Trade—Communications—Transportation Economy

Year 1961

Ship trade-ins: Liberalized the law regarding obsolete trade-ins by authorizing the Federal Maritime Commission to take trade-ins either when the owner signs the contract for construction or purchase of a new vessel or (at the owner's option) within 5 days of the delivery date of the new vessels; Public Law 87-401.

Dual-rate shipping: Permanently legalized the operation of steamship conferences and dual systems of contracts for shippers and strengthened the antimonopoly provisions; Public Law 87-34.

Steamship operators: Authorized steamship operators under subsidy contracts to use part of their required reserve for research and planning; Public Law 87-271.

Broadcasting: Liberalized antitrust laws to validate certain contracts for televising professional sports games; Public Law 87-331.

Duty-free allowance: Reduced the duty-free exemption from $500 to $100 through June 30, 1963, to counter our unfavorable balance of payments; Public Law 87-132.

AEC sales: Accelerated property sales to stimulate the economic growth of atomic energy communities; Public Law 87-174.

Metal scrap: Extended to June 30, 1962, the existing suspension of import duties on metal scrap; Public Law 87-110.

Corporate excise extension: Extended for an additional year the existing 52 percent corporate income tax rate, excise tax rates on automobiles, liquor, and tobacco, and taxes on local telephone calls and passenger transportation, to prevent a loss of revenue of some $2.5 billion; Public Law 87-72.

Income tax returns: Curbed tax evasion by assigning identifying numbers to all taxpayers; Public Law 87-397.

Unemployment tax credits: Prevented double taxation in the case of Federal and State unemployment taxes arising as a result of a technical deficiency in the Federal tax law; Public Law 87-321.

Federal savings and loan: Strengthened the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and the National Housing Act by increasing the reserves and cutting overcapitalization of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation created as a reserve credit facility for savings and home mortgage credit institutions; Public Law 87-210.

Year 1962

Trade Expansion Act of 1962: Gave the President general authority to cut all tariffs as much as 50 percent over the next 5 years; empowered him to remove tariffs as much as he believes desirable on products in which the United States and Western Europe account for most of the world trade; permitted the President to negotiate tariff reductions on entire categories of commodities instead of item by item as at present; established a new program of subsidies to serve as a substitute for tariff protection for workers and companies hurt by import competition; prohibited the United States from granting tariff concessions to Poland and Yugoslavia and eliminated present concessions to these nations; and removed the peril-point provision of present law which empowers the Tariff Commission to recommend minimum safe tariffs on specific items prior to international trade negotiations, and authorizes the Commission only to advise the President on the probable economic effect of any proposed trade agreement action; Public Law 87–794.

All-channel television receivers: Authorized Federal Communications Commission to require that all television receivers shipped in interstate commerce or imported into the United States at the time of manufacture, capable of adequately receiving all TV channels; Public Law 87–529.

Supplemental air carrier: Authorized the CAB to limit the number of supplemental carriers, to require performance books, and prescribe the minimum service which must be provided under a supplemental certificate; Public Law 87–528.

Alaska highway study: Authorized $800,000 for a study of Alaska highways with a report to Congress by May 15, 1963; Public Law 87–866.

Alaska-Hawaii through routes: Established through routes and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska or Hawaii and the other States; Public Law 87–595.

Vessel loadlines: Established new loadline regulations for oceangoing and coastwise vessels with increased penalties for violations; Public Law 87–620.

Gas rates: Granting Federal Power Commission authority to suspend changes in gas rate schedules covering sales for industrial use only; Public Law 87–454.

Patent interferences: Requires that all agreements settling patent interference proceedings be filed with the Patent Office; Public Law 87–831.

Fishermen taxation: Permits fishermen to file their declaration of estimated tax and pay the estimated tax by January 15 after the end of the year in question. This privilege will begin after tax year beginning December 31, 1962; Public Law 87–682.

Aircraft accidents: Provided express authority in the Federal Aviation Act to facilitate the investigation of aircraft accidents; Public Law 87–810.

Aircraft loan guarantees: Extended the aircraft guarantee loan program an additional 5 years to September 7, 1967, and increased the amount of the loans from $5 to $10 million except for all-cargo carriers—which amount is $15 million; Public Law 87–820.

Railway Express: Exempted the Railway Express Agency, Inc., from the long- and short-haul rate provision of the Interstate Commerce Act; Public Law 87–707.

Intrastate motor carriers: Authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to grant the right to common motor carriers operating within a single State to engage in interstate or foreign operations within the State; Public Law 87–805.

Vessel subsidy—Extension: Extended to July 7, 1964, authority to pay maximum of 55 percent subsidy for construction of vessels whose keels were laid after June 30, 1959; provided a 60-percent differential for reconstruction and reconditioning; repealed the 6-percent west coast differential for all bids opened following enactment; Public Law 87–877.

Trademarks—Registration and protection: Broadened the provisions to the Trademark Act of 1946 relating to improper use of a mark to include instances where use would cause confusion; and clarified the administrative and court procedures; Public Law 87–772.

Railroads—Tax relief: Permitted any regulated transportation company to spread its net operating loss over 7 succeeding years in computing its taxable income; Public Law 87–710.

Potomac River compact: Granted congressional approval for the States of Maryland and Virginia to enter into the Potomac River compact which created the Potomac River Fisheries Commission to regulate taking seafood and fish from the Potomac between the District line and the Chesapeake Bay; Public Law 87–783.

Washington metropolitan transit compact: Granted congressional approval to four amendments adopted by Maryland and Virginia to the Washington metropolitan area transit regulation compact between Maryland, Virginia, and District of Columbia. One amendment enlarges the metropolitan area to include Dulles International Airport; all cities incorporated within the metropolitan district subsequent to the effective date of the compact are to become part of the metropolitan district; limits the jurisdiction of the Transit Commission to the metropolitan district; and provides for the submission of the annual report on a fiscal year basis instead of calendar year; Public Law 87–767.

Year 1963

Railroad labor dispute: Creates a seven-member arbitration board, composed of two members appointed by the carriers and two by the union to arbitrate the two key issues of firemen's jobs and train crew jobs (President named three since the four could not reach an agreement); Public Law 88–108.

Railroad Retirement Act: Restores the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems to a satisfactory financial condition by reducing the actuarial deficit in the railroad retirement system by $61 million a year and improves the financial condition of the unemployment system by about $20 million a year; Public Law 88–133.

International air rates: Gives the CAB discretionary authority to prescribe rates and to suspend tariffs in international air transportation to and from the United States under the same standards now applicable to interstate transportation. (S. 1540, passed Senate November 1926.)

Lead-zinc: Amends the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961, to make certain that payments under this act will be made only to small producers whose primary products are lead and zinc. This is achieved by (1) providing that a small producer must have as his principal product or products lead and zinc; and (2) defining the term "principal product and products" to mean that more than 50 percent of the value of metal or minerals produced or sold is lead or zinc or a combination of both; Public Law 88–75.

Parcel post rates: Permits Postmaster General to continue parcel post at present rates for a 3-year period, pending congressional action on problem of deficits from fourth-class operations; Public Law 88–51.

Alien radio operators: Provides for issuance of authorizations for alien amateur radio operators to operate their stations in the United States and its possessions, with reciprocal agreements between the United States and the alien's government. (S. 920, passed Senate October 16.)

Federal Airport Act: Extends for 3 years, to June 30, 1967, the Federal airport construction program which authorizes Federal matching funds of $75 million a year for airport development. (S. 1153, passed Senate August 26; House Calendar.)

Dual rates: Extends to April 3, 1964, the provision of law which requires the Federal Maritime Commission to approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify existing dual rate contracts in use in U.S. waterborne foreign commerce. Public Law 346 enacted in 1961 authorized foreign commerce carriers to enter into "effective and fair" dual rate contracts but set up specific standards which these contracts must meet. This bill extended the Commission's time to make certain these contracts do or do not comply with the requirements; Public Law 88–5.

Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway: Authorizes a study to determine if there are means and economic justification for providing year-round navigation on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway. (S. 530, passed Senate June 25; House Calendar.)

Federal-Aid Highway Act amendment: Apportions through 1971 funds for completion of Interstate and Defense Highway System; fixes January 1965 as cost estimate deadline; raises Federal payments for construction engineering; continues billboard control program for 2 years; Public Law 88–157.

Urban construction: Authorizes 5-percent increase on the limitation on payments for construction engineering for Federal aid primary, secondary, and urban projects. (S. 626, passed Senate June 24.)

Lumber—tariff: Excludes cargo which is lumber from certain tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act of 1916; Public Law 88–103.

Emergency transportation: Exempts from ICC regulations emergency towing or transportation in interstate commerce of any wrecked or disabled motor vehicle (H.R. 2906); Public Law 88–208.

Seat belts: Provides safety standards for seat belts sold in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles; Public Law 88–201.

U.S. waters—fishing: Prohibits fishing in territorial waters or along the Continental Shelf claimed by the United States except by domestic vessels or as provided by international treaty or by the Secretary of the Treasury issuing licenses to foreign vessels where it is certified by the Secretary of Interior that permission would be in the national interest. (S. 1988, passed Senate October 1.)

Fishing subsidies: Increase from 11⅓ to 55 percent the subsidy for construction of fishing vessels; extends program for 5 years to July 1, 1968. (S. 1006, passed Senate October 2.)

Alaska Railroad: Improves and encourages collective bargaining between the management of the Alaska Railroad and representatives of its employees, and permits to the extent practicable adoption by the Alaska Railroad of the personnel policies and practices of the railroad industry. (S. 622, passed Senate, June 24; House Calendar.)

Coast Guard officers: Establishes a new officer promotion system in the Coast Guard and provides interim authority for involuntary retirement of Coast Guard officers in the grades of captain and commander to alleviate stagnation of promotion to those grades; Public Law 88–130.

Collisions at sea: Authorizes the President to accept, on behalf of United States, certain regulations formulated at the Fourth International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, and to proclaim an effective date for regulations for preventing collisions at sea; Public Law 88–131.

Professional nurses—U.S. merchant marine: Grants authority for registration of professional nurses as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine; Public Law 88–128.

Communications Act—Petitions: Requires that petitions for intervention in hearings for a broadcasting license be filed with the Federal Communications Commission within 30 days after publication of the issues in the

Federal Register. (S. 1193, passed Senate September 25.)

Communications—Nonbroadcast operations: Authorizes the Federal Communications Commission to grant special temporary authorizations for 60 days in those cases where an application for a special temporary authorization is filed pending filing an application for regular operation. (S. 1005, passed Senate, September 25.)

War risk insurance: Permits U.S. citizens who are owners of vessels built in U.S. shipyards with construction subsidies to obtain war risk insurance coverage. (S. 927, passed Senate, December 5.)

Defense and Space Exploration Areas

Year 1961

Ready Reserves: Granted authority, requested by the President, to call to active duty up to 250,000 ready reservists, authority to continue until July 1, 1962; and to grant discretionary authority to the Secretary of Defense to extend enlistments, appointments, and other service obligations up to 12 months, which would otherwise expire on July 1, 1962; Public Law 87–117.

Alien enlistment: Authorized peacetime enlistments in the Army and Air Force by persons who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence; Public Law 87–143.

Military procurement: Authorized $12.4 billion procurement program for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for fiscal 1962; Public Law 87–53.

Military: Clarified the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; Public Law 87–391.

Additional military procurement authorizations: As requested by the President, authorized additional funds to provide for additional equipment primarily to improve the nonnuclear defense capabilities of our ground forces and of the Navy and Air Force; to provide increased air and sea lift; and to expand our antisubmarine warfare program. The overall request for additional authorization for procurement of weapons, equipment, and ammunition was for $1,753 million; however, of this amount, additional authorizations are required only for $958,570,000; Public Law 87–118.

Military construction: Authorizes $831 million for construction and improvement projects at military bases at home and abroad, including missile sites and nuclear submarine bases; Public Law 87–57.

Aeronautics and Space Council: Reactivated and strengthened the usefulness of the Aeronautics and Space Council, and provided that it be administered by the Vice President; Public Law 87–26.

NASA authorization: Authorized $1,784,300,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Public Law 87–98.

Civil aviation insurance: Extended until 1966, for 5 years, title XII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, to provide that in the event of war the Nation's civil air fleet would have adequate insurance coverage for war risks; Public Law 87–89.

War hazards: Increased monthly disability and death compensation payable under the War Hazards Compensation Act; Public Law 87–380.

Military: Amended the Uniform Code of Military Justice to provide specific authority for prosecution of bad check offenses; Public Law 87–385.

Marine Corps: Improved the combat effectiveness of the Marine Corps by providing for the expanded assignment of supply-duty-only officers to unrestricted duty; Public Law 87–123.

Emergency evacuation: Provided for advances in pay to Armed Forces personnel in cases of emergency evacuation of dependents from oversea areas; Public Law 87–188.

Coast Guard—Temporary appointments: Extended to January 1, 1964, the authority of the President to make temporary appointments in the Coast Guard, or until such time as the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the number of officers holding permanent appointments on the active list of the Coast Guard is equal to 95 percent of the number authorized by law; Public Law 87–257.

AEC authorization: Authorized $270,440,000 for a total of 40 new AEC projects including the Stanford linear electron accelerator and electric generating facilities; Public Law 87–315.

AEC omnibus amendments: Enacted numerous amendments to the AEC Act designed to provide a better framework and to help us keep pace with emerging developments in atomic energy; Public Law 87–206.

Air Force promotions: Provided a temporary program through June 30, 1963, for promotion all active duty Air Force officers below the grade of colonel; Public Law 87–194.

Reserves: Provides more flexible regulations regarding terms of enlistment in the National Guard to make service in that unit more attractive; other changes include making ROTC graduate training programs run from 3 to 6 months at the discretion of the service Secretary; Public Law 87–378.

Year 1962

Ready Reserves: Gave President standby authority to call 150,000 military reservists to active duty if an international crisis should require it; Public Law 87–736.

Berlin resolution: Approved a concurrent resolution putting Congress on record for any action, including the use of military force, needed to uphold Western rights in Berlin. Adopted unanimously by both Houses.

Cuban resolution: Approved a resolution on Cuba stating the United States will use force if necessary to halt the spread of communism in this hemisphere; Public Law 87–733.

Military procurement: Authorized $12,969,300,000 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels during fiscal 1963; Public Law 87–436.

Military construction authorization: Authorized $1,455,672,500 for construction and related authority for the military departments and the Department of Defense; Public Law 87–554.

Space authorization: Authorized $3.7 billion for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1963; Public Law 87–584.

Communications satellite system: Established Communications Satellite Corporation, subject to Government regulation, to plan and operate with foreign governments and businesses a commercial communications satellite system; Public Law 87–624.

AEC authorization: Authorized appropriations of $242,695,000 for AEC construction projects; Public Law 87–701.

AEC amendments: Amended Atomic Energy Commission Act of 1954 by authorizing establishment of one or more atomic safety and licensing boards; provided Government indemnity coverage for oversea nuclear accidents involving contractors or subcontractors of AEC and limited overseas coverage to $100 million; Public Law 87–615.

Armed services procurement: Amends the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 controlling procurement of property and services by the Armed Forces and NASA—to encourage procurement by formal advertising; to obtain more competition in negotiated procurement; and to provide safeguards for the Government against inflated cost estimates in negotiated contracts; Public Law 87–653.

Quarters allowance for the military: Increased the basic quarters allowance for military career people, from corporal to general, in order to meet the increased cost of housing in the civilian market; and increased the housing allowance for dependents of temporary military personnel; Public Law 87–531.

Armed Forces travel expenses: Increased to $16 (now $12) a day the maximum per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence for members of the Armed Forces; Public Law 87–500.

Southern interstate nuclear compact: Granted congressional consent to southern interstate nuclear compact which will establish a regional agency, the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board, to develop and control peaceful uses of nuclear energy throughout the compact area; Public Law 87–563.

Army reorganization: Approved plan to reorganize the command and management structure of the Army. Effective February 17, 1962.

Public facility loans: Makes certain federally impacted areas in which there is located a research or development installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration eligible for a loan under the public facility loan program; Public Law 87–634.

Amorphous graphite: Extended to June 30, 1964, the present suspension of duties on amorphous graphite; this extension is necessary because the United States is dependent entirely upon imports of this type graphite for certain strategic items required by the Air Force; Public Law 87–497.

Defense production extension: Extended to June 30, 1964, the remaining powers of the President under the Defense Production Act of 1950, to establish priorities for defense contracts; power to allocate materials for defense purposes; Public Law 87–505.

Renegotiation Act extension: Extended to June 30, 1964, the authority of the Government to recapture excessive profits on certain Government contracts; Public Law 87–520.

Civil defense emergency authorities extended: Extended to June 30, 1966, the provision of title III of the Civil Defense Act which authorized the President to declare a national emergency for civil defense purposes and to assume emergency powers during such an emergency; Public Law 87–501.

Reserves—Lump-sum payments: Equalized the treatment between "Reserves" and "Regulars" by increasing the readjustment payments to 2 months' basic pay for each year of active duty for a Reserve member released after 5 years' active duty; and authorized maximum readjustment of 2 years' basic pay or $15,000, whichever is lesser; Public Law 87–509.

Armed Forces—Educational opportunities: Permitted qualified members of armed services and Public Health Service to accept, from nongovernmental sources, competitive fellowships, scholarships, or grants for educational purposes; Public Law 87–555.

World War I emergency officer retirement: Reopened the emergency officers' retirement program to permit a limit group of former World War I emergency officers to apply for and receive the benefits of that program; Public Law 87–875.

Retired officers: Repealed the law which imposed a lifetime ban on retired Navy and Marine Corps officers selling supplies and war materials to the Navy Department; Public Law 87–777.

Nonjudicial punishment: Amended article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to give increased authority to designated commanders in the Armed Forces to impose nonjudicial punishment; the increased authority will enable them to deal with minor disciplinary problems and offenses without resort to trial by court-martial. Public Law 87–648.

Diplomatic radio stations: Granted authority to license a foreign government to operate low-power point-to-point radio stations in the District of Columbia to transmit messages to points outside the United States whenever the President considers it to be in the interest of national security; Public Law 87-795.

Year 1963

Space authorization: Authorizes fiscal 1964 appropriations totaling $5,350,820,400 for National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Public Law 88-113.

Military pay increase: Effective October 1, 1963, authorizes pay increases averaging 14.4 percent for 1.9 million military personnel at a cost of about $1.2 billion a year; Public Law 88-132.

Military training: Permanently fixes 6 years of service for enlistees in Reserve program to fulfill their military obligations; Public Law 88-110.

Draft extension: Extends to July 1, 1967, the following provisions of law: authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces; authority to issue selective service calls for physicians and dentists; suspension of permanent limitation on the active-duty strength of the Armed Forces; authority to pay quarters allowance to all enlisted members of the Armed Forces with dependents; and the authority for special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians; Public Law 88-2.

Military procurement: Authorizes $15.3 billion procurement program for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for fiscal 1964; Public Law 88-28.

Military construction: Authorizes a total of $1,642,253,380 for military construction for fiscal 1964; Public Law 88-174.

AEC authorization: Authorizes $216,271,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission, $172,562,000 of this amount is for new construction projects; Public Law 88-72.

AEC supplemental authorization: Authorizes an additional $17 million for constructing of 12 new facilities for the nuclear weapons development program; Public Law 88-189.

Air Force personnel: Extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1965, present authority for an additional 4,000 officers in the grade of lieutenant colonel in the Air Force; Public Law 88-63.

Essential housing mortgages: Extends sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act—sales and rental housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces, NASA, and AEC—for 2 years from October 1, 1963, to October 1, 1965; Public Law 88-127.

International Area

Year 1961

Foreign assistance authorization: Authorized a total appropriation of $4,253,500,000 for fiscal 1962; a long-term (5 year) Development Loan Fund program authorizing an appropriation of $1.2 billion for fiscal 1962 and $1.5 billion for each fiscal year from 1963 to 1966; and established a new foreign aid agency; Public Law 87-195.

Latin American aid: Appropriated $600 million for Latin American aid program, which includes $100 million in disaster relief for Chile, $394 million for loans by the Inter-American Development Bank, $6 million for social and economic programs of the Organization of American States, and $100 million for loans and grants by the International Cooperation Administration; Public Law 87-41.

OECD: Ratified the creation of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development consisting of 18 European member nations, the United States, and Canada, to promote economic stability and an orderly growth of the economies of the member states.

Foreign bank tax exemption: Exempted foreign central banks from payment of taxes in this country on interest accrued from ownership of U.S. Government securities not used or held for commercial purposes; Public Law 87-27.

Peace Corps: Carried out the President's recommendation to establish a Peace Corps of American volunteers to carry America's skills and talents and idealism abroad to help other peoples to help themselves; Public Law 87-293.

Disarmament: Established a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to deal with the problem of reduction and control of armaments looking toward ultimate world disarmament; Public Law 87-297.

U.S. Travel Service: Established a U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce to promote and encourage tourist travel from abroad; Public Law 87-63.

Surplus as aid: Authorized disposal of additional $2 billion in surplus commodities under the Agricultural Development and Assistance Act; Public Law 87-27.

Sugar Act: Extended the Sugar Act of 1948 for 15 months to June 30, 1962, fixing quotas of domestic and foreign producers; and continuing the President's authority to exclude Cuban sugar imports and reallocate its quota; Public Law 87-15.

Agricultural aid: Authorized the administration to continue and expand the use of our agricultural abundance in helping needy people in the less-developed countries through development programs under title II of Public Law 480, Agricultural Trade Development Act; Public Law 87-92.

Alien Orphan Adoption Act: Made permanent and expanded the Alien Orphan Adoption Act which permits orphans adopted or to be adopted by U.S. citizens to enter the country on nonquota visas; Public Law 87-301.

Repatriation assistance: Enacted an emergency 1-year repatriation assistance program to provide temporary assistance to U.S. citizens and dependents of U.S. citizens returning from abroad without available resources. Aid can consist of money payments, medical care, temporary billeting, or other goods or services needed for the health and welfare of the recipients; Public Law 87-64.

Caribbean Organization: Authorized the President to accept on behalf of the United States the agreement establishing the Caribbean Organization; the participation of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in the Organization; made available to the Organization the privileges, exemptions, and immunities conferred by the International Organizations Immunities Act; and authorized the Secretary of State to appoint a U.S. observer to the Organization. (Organization is to concern itself with social, cultural, and economic matters of common interest to the Caribbean area); Public Law 87-73.

Fulbright Act: Authorized legally classified American nationals to qualify and receive financial assistance under the Fulbright Act for advanced education abroad; Public Law 87-153.

Cultural exchange: Consolidated all cultural and educational exchange programs in an effort to promote these programs to a more important position in our foreign relations. The exchange programs combined are the Fulbright Act, the Smith-Mundt Act, the Finnish Debt Payments Act, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956; Public Law 87-256.

U.S. food reserve: Expressed an interest in exploring with other nations the possibility of establishing an international food and raw materials reserve under the United Nations and related international organizations to acquire and store in appropriate countries raw or processed farm products and other raw materials excluding minerals (S. Res. 128); adopted June 1, 1961.

Export-Import Bank: Authorized Export-Import Bank to guarantee and insure U.S. exporters and importers against political and credit losses in foreign countries; Public Law 87-311.

Red China: Expressed as the sense of the Congress that—

1. The United States should continue to support the Government of the Republic of China as the representative of China in the United Nations;

2. The United States shall continue to oppose seating of the Chinese Communist regime in the U.N. so long as that regime persists in defying the principles of the U.N. Charter; and

3. The American people support the President in not according diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Communist regime.

International Finance Corporation amendment: Amended the charter of the IFC to allow purchase of capital stock to encourage private investment in underdeveloped countries by creating a wider flexibility of financing to meet the varying needs of private enterprise; Public Law 87-185.

Mercy fleet: Supported the establishment by the President of a White Fleet—a force of mercy ships to assist in disaster areas in any coastal region of the world, and to carry on a regular program of logistics support in the public health field and other works of technical assistance.

Inter-American Children's Institute: Continued U.S. participation in and contributions to the Inter-American Children's Institute; Public Law 87-365.

NATO: Extended through June 30, 1962, the life of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, a commission established to explore means of increasing cooperation and unity of purpose among NATO countries; Public Law 87-116.

United States-France: Provided immediate effectiveness for atomic cooperation for mutual defense purposes between the United States and France; Public Law 87-363.

Loans to friendly nations: Authorized loan of naval vessels to certain friendly nations; Public Law 87-387.

Year 1962

Foreign aid authorization: Authorized $1.2 billion in foreign aid for fiscal 1963 for development grants, investment guarantees, investment surveys, international organizations and programs, supporting assistance and the contingency fund, and $2.4 billion over a 4-year period for the Alliance for Progress, which includes $600 million for fiscal 1963; Public Law 87-565.

International Monetary Fund: Granted the Secretary of the Treasury standby authority to lend up to $2 billion to the International Monetary Fund so that 10 industrialized nations, including the United States, can participate in a special lending program; Public Law 87-490.

Peace Corps: Authorized $63,750,000 to finance the operations of the Peace Corps during fiscal 1963. (Forty million dollars was authorized last year but only $30 million appropriated); Public Law 87-442.

U.N. bonds: Authorized an appropriation of $100 million for a loan to the U.N. on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis with other nations for the purchase of U.N. bonds to ease the financial crisis caused by the Congo; Public Law 87-731.

Migration and Refugee Assistance Act: Assists in the resettlement of refugees and escapees by authorizing the President to participate in three programs: contributions to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM); contributions to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR); and the U.S. escapee program (USEP). Establishes specific authority to assist Cuban refugees who have come to the United States; Public Law 87-510.

Sugar Act extension: Extended to December 31, 1966, the Sugar Act of 1948 and set new quotas for domestic and foreign sugar producing areas; Public Law 87-535.

Sugar—Western Hemisphere: Reserved 150,000 tons of premium-priced sugar for Latin American supplies for 1963 and 1964, and 75,000 for balance of 1962; Public Law 87-539.

International Wheat Act extension: Extends International Wheat Agreement of 1949 to implement the International Wheat Agreement ratified in 1962, by authorizing the President, acting through Commodity Credit Corporation to make available wheat and wheat flour at prices necessary to exercise the rights, obtain the benefits, and fulfill obligations of United States; Public Law 87-632.

Philippine war damage claims: Authorized an appropriation of $73 million for unpaid balance of awards made to claimants under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946; payments to be made only to claimants or their successors in interest; no new claims will be allowed; Public Law 87-616.

Naval Academy: Authorized admission of two citizens of Belgium to the Naval Academy on a reimbursable basis; Public Law 87-463.

Air Force Academy: Authorized admission of a citizen of Thailand to the Air Force Academy on a reimbursable basis; Public Law 87-462.

Military academies: Authorized appointment of a person from Guam, Virgin Islands, or American Samoa to each of the three military academies; Public Law 87-663.

Inter-American Development Bank: Authorized domestic insurance companies to invest in bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness of the Inter-American Development Bank; Public Law 87-739.

Ryukyu Islands: Increased from $6 to $12 million the authorization of funds for economic development in the Ryukyu Islands; Public Law 87-746.

World Food Congress: Authorized up to $300,000 to defray the expenses of organizing and holding a World Food Congress in the United States in June of 1963, to help combat the international problem of hunger and malnutrition; Public Law 87-841.

Copyrights-trademarks-films: Copyrights and trademarks vested under Trading With the Enemy Act authorized to be returned to entitled persons subject to certain vested rights; authorized transfer of vested motion picture films to Library of Congress; Public Law 87-861.

Year 1963

Foreign aid authorization.—Authorizes $3.6 billion in foreign aid funds for fiscal 1964; Public Law 88-205.

Churchill: Proclaimed Winston Churchill an honorary American citizen; Public Law 88-6.

Export-Import Bank Act extension: Extends the life of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for 5 years to June 30, 1968, and increases the lending authority of the Bank by $2 billion (to $9 billion) and insurance coverage from $1 to $2 billion; Public Law 88-101.

Foreign chanceries: Prohibits locating foreign chanceries in the residential areas of the District of Columbia. (S. 646, passed Senate July 24.)

Marking requirements for imports: Provides that when imported articles in a container, required to be marked under section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as to the country of origin are repackaged after importation, the new package must be marked to indicate the English name of the country or origin. (H.R. 2513, Conference report agreed to, Dec. 18.)

Peace Corps expansion: Authorizes an additional $38,250,000, or a total of $102 million, for the Peace Corps for fiscal 1964; Public Law 88-200.

World Bank capital stock increase: Amends the Bretton Woods Agreement Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) to vote for a $1 billion increase in the capital stock of the Bank. Increase is required to permit new member countries of the Bank to subscribe and to enable present members to increase their subscriptions; Public Law 88-178.

Foreign Service buildings amendment: Authorizes $49,824,000 for a 2-year Foreign Service buildings program; and amends the Philippine War Claims Act of 1962 by earmarking (1) between $30 and $40 million for claimants up to $25,000, (2) between $30 and $40 million for the Government of the Philippines to use for educational purposes, and remainder to revert to the U.S. Treasury (antilobbying amendment); Public Law 88-94.

Disarmament Agency: Increases the authorization for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to $20 million for fiscal years 1964 and 1965; Public Law 88-186.

Industrial property: Increases the ceiling on the U.S. contribution to the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property from $7,270 to $15,000 a year; Public Law 88-69.

State Department: Authorizes one additional Assistant Secretary of State; and permits retired Foreign Service officers to accept employment as consultants to foreign governments, if authorized by the Secretary of State. (S. 1512, passed Senate July 16.)

Laos: Permanently authorizes appropriations for the U.S. contribution to the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos ($650,000). (S. 1627, passed Senate July 16.)

Treaties

Year 1961

Belgium treaty: Ratified a commercial treaty with Belgium to provide protection for property and interests of American citizens and companies in Belgium and to assure fair and nondiscriminatory treatment in commercial, industrial, and financial activities, in return for like assurances in the United States.

Brazil: Ratified a treaty of extradition with Brazil.

Columbia River: Ratified a treaty between the United States and Canada for cooperative development of the Columbia River.

Geneva radio regulations: Ratified the Geneva radio regulations containing a number of provisions relating to the international regulation of radio communication to assist the United States in carrying out its scientific efforts in radio astronomy and space research.

German war bonds: Ratified a second agreement with Germany for the validation of East German dollar bonds to enable owners of these bonds to establish they were acquired from legitimate sources and not through Soviet sources in Berlin at close of World War II.

International Telecommunications Convention: Ratified Executive J which continues in effect the principal provisions of the International Telecommunications Convention to maintain and extend international cooperation of the improvement and rational use of telecommunications of all kinds.

Loadline: Ratified a modification to the International Load Line Convention.

Oil pollution: Ratified the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the High Seas by Oil.

Vietnam treaty: Ratified a commercial treaty with Vietnam to provide protection for property and interests of American citizens and companies in Vietnam and to assure fair and nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to engaging in commercial, industrial, and financial activities, in return for like assurances in the United States.

Pollution of sea by oil: Implemented the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, which prohibits discharge of oil from tankers and imposes fines and penalties for violations; Public Law 87-167.

Year 1962

Ratified a 3-year extension, to July 31, 1965, of the wheat agreement: The agreement, which supersedes a pact due to expire July 31, embraces 25 wheat importing countries and 10 exporters, including the United States. (July 9, 1962.)

ICAO: Ratified an amendment to the International Civil Aviation Convention increasing the size of the ICAO Council from 21 to 27 members. (January 31, 1962.)

IAEA: Ratified amendment enlarging the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency from 23 to 25 members. (March 13, 1962.)

WMO: Ratified amendments to the World Meteorological Organization increasing the membership of the Executive Committee of the Organization and eliminating an inconsistency relative to voting on membership. (March 13, 1962.)

Tax treaty: Ratified a tax convention between the United States and Canada. (January 31, 1962.)

NAFC: Ratified a declaration of understanding to the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention. (January 31, 1962.)

SOLAS Convention: Ratified the 1960 Safety of Life at Sea Convention which was signed by our Government and 39 other governments to promote maritime safety. (April 12, 1962.)

Luxembourg: Ratified a commercial treaty between the United States and Luxembourg to provide an agreed basis for protection of property and interests of American citizens and companies in Luxembourg with reciprocal rights for Luxembourg citizens in the United States. (September 19, 1962.)

Year 1963

Nuclear test ban treaty: Ratified the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water, signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963, on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. (September 24.)

International Coffee Agreement: Ratified the International Coffee Agreement to stabilize prices in world trade by establishing quotas for exporting countries and binding importing countries to limit their purchases of coffee from countries not parties to the agreement. (May 21.)

Civil Aviation Convention: Ratified Convention on International Civil Aviation. (October 22.)

Sweden Extradition Convention: Ratified Convention on Extradition Between United States and Sweden. (October 22.)

Brazil—Protocol: Ratified additional protocol to the Treaty of Extradition Between the United States and Brazil. (October 22.)

Israel Extradition Convention: Ratified Convention on Extradition Between United States and Israel. (October 22.)

Korea Consular Convention: Ratified Consular Convention Between United States and Korea. (October 22.)

Japan Consular Convention: Ratified Consular Convention Between United States and Japan. (October 22.)

Chamizal Treaty.—Ratified the treaty settling the longstanding dispute over the Chamizal district in the El Paso-Ciudad Juárez region of the United States-Mexican boundary by providing for an exchange of land resulting in a net transfer of 437.18 acres to Mexico. (December 17, 1963.)

Civil Rights

Year 1963

Civil Rights Commission: Extends for 1 year to September 30, 1964, the life of the Civil Rights Commission; Public Law 88–152.

Equal pay for women: Amends the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide that equal work must be compensated with equal pay regardless of the sex of the workers (this measure had been before Congress for 18 years); Public Law 88–38.

Manpower Training Act amendments: Waives the State matching requirement for fiscal 1965 and extends the act for 2 additional years with the requirement that States match one-third and one-half, respectively, in fiscal years 1966 and 1967; authorizes training in education at the basic level for those unable to qualify for occupational training provided evidence exists of intention to undertake training and authorizes an additional 20 weeks of training allowances for this group; expands the program by lowering the age limit for youth training allowances from 19 to 17, subject to a restriction of a 1-year waiting period for school dropouts, by increasing the proportion of youth receiving training allowances to 25 percent of those receiving allowances and restricts the allowances to those in special youth training projects; and authorizes $50 million in new funds for fiscal 1964 and $100 million for fiscal 1965; Public Law 88–214.

Health and Social Problems

Year 1961

Community health services: Expanded and improved community health services and facilities for the health care of the aged, construction of nursing homes, and training of public health personnel; Public Law 87–395.

Mass transit: Authorized a new $75 million program to help overcome commuting problems in cities; $25 million is authorized for demonstration grants (covering up to two-thirds of project cost) for projects to explore ways of overcoming mass transit problems; $50 million is authorized for low-interest loans to public bodies for acquiring, constructing, and improving transportation facilities and equipment; Public Law 87–70.

Juvenile delinquency: Authorized a program of Federal grants to communities and nonprofit agencies of $10 million a year for 3 years to aid in financing projects to combat juvenile delinquency; Public Law 87–274.

Year 1962

Drugs: Strengthened Federal regulation under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide consumers with better, safer, and less expensive drugs; Public Law 87–781.

Vaccination Assistance Act of 1962: Authorized a 3-year program of special project grants to States and, with State approval, to local communities to pay part of the cost of intensive vaccination programs against four contagious diseases—polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus; Public Law 87–868.

Major disasters: Authorized assistance to be given by the Federal Government to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in case of a national disaster; Public Law 87–502.

Community facilities: Increased from $7.5 to $15 million the appropriation authorization for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to permit construction of needed hospitals, utility systems, and school buildings as well as the political and economic development of the area; Public Law 87–419.

Public facility loans: Provided eligibility to Indian tribes for assistance under the public facility loan program, title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955. Under present law, eligibility for loans is limited to "municipalities and other political subdivisions and instrumentalities of States." This provision has been interpreted as not including Indian tribes which resulted not only in discrimination but an inconsistency since all tribes are eligible for low-rent public housing, housing for the elderly, and assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act; Public Law 87–808.

Air pollution control study: Extends to June 30, 1966, and authorizes up to $5 million annually in appropriations for a continuation of the present study being conducted by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in conjunction with various State agencies into the causes, effects, and ways to abate air pollution with special emphasis on the effects of automobile exhaust fumes; Public Law 87–761.

National school lunch funds: Revised the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds to States in the school lunch program to base it on the number of lunches served the previous year plus the assistance-need-factor instead of the present system of number of children aged 5 to 17 plus the assistance-need-factor; Public Law 87–823.

Public health: Authorized establishment within PHS of a National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and a National Institute of General Medical Sciences; Public Law 87–838.

Migratory health services: Authorized $3 million annually in Federal grants to public or nonprofit agencies and organizations for paying part of the cost of establishing and operating family health clinics and special health projects for domestic migratory farm families; Public Law 87–692.

Anthracite coal resources: Broadened the Federal-State program to include filling or sealing abandoned anthracite coal mines as a safety and public health device; Public Law 87–818.

Nonquota immigrant status: Provided nonquota status for certain first preference quota immigrants needed urgently in the United States because of their education, training, experience, skills, and abilities and also for certain fourth preference quota immigrants such as brothers, sisters, married sons, or married daughters of citizens of the United States including spouses and children; Public Law 87–885.

Water pollution control: Authorized an additional $270 million to help communities construct sewage treatment plants to control water pollution, thus raising the annual limit on grants from $50 million yearly to $80 million for fiscal 1962, $90 million for fiscal 1963, $100 million for fiscal 1964, through and including 1967. In addition, this measure increased from $3 to $5 million the annual Federal matching grants to States to administer water pollution control programs and extended the program through June 30, 1968, and authorized $5 million a year for the Secretary to use to develop demonstration program to treat sewage, to measure pollutants, and to evaluate the effects of sewage treatment; Public Law 87–88.

Year 1963

Retardation and community centers: Authorizes an overall 10-year $320 million program of aid to the mentally ill to: (a) Construct research centers and facilities; (b) construct and establish community mental health centers; and (c) train teachers of children who are mentally retarded or mentally ill as well as other handicapped children; Public Law 88–164.

Maternal and child health and mental retardation: Authorizes 5-year $350 million program to increase aid to States for maternal and child health services and for crippled children's programs; provides grants for maternity care and research projects to prevent mental retardation; Public Law 88–156.

Water pollution control: Establishes a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration within HEW and authorizes a 4-year $80 million program of demonstration grants for research and development of better sewer systems; authorizes establishment of water quality standards; and establishes procedures to evaluate progress in developing decomposable detergents so they will not cause or contribute to pollution of surface and underground waters. (S. 649, passed Senate October 16.)

Clean Air Act: Authorizes a 4-year $95 million program of Federal aid to State and local governments to combat air pollution; Public Law 88–206.

Physically handicapped: Authorizes an additional $100,000 a year (to $400,000) for the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. (S.J. Res. 103, passed Senate November 20.)

Medical care for fishing boat owners: Restores to self-employed U.S. fishermen eligibility for medical care in hospitals, outpatient clinics, and other medical facilities of the Public Health Service in the event of illness or injury incurred while engaged in their hazardous occupation. Such eligibility existed until 1954. (S. 978, passed Senate May 28.)

Medical care for Coast and Geodetic survey: Subject to regulations of the President, this bill entitles retired ships' officers and retired crew members of Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels to medical, surgical, and dental treatment, and hospitalization at facilities of the Public Health Service if the employee was on duty on July 1, 1963, or date of enactment, whichever is later; Public Law 88–71.

Mass transit: Authorizes a $375 million grant and guarantee bond program through fiscal 1966 to assist urban areas in their planning and developing of both public and private mass transit systems. (S. 6, passed Senate April 4; House Calendar.)

Dependent children—foster care: Extends for 1 year, to June 30, 1964, authority granted under the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 which permits the responsibility for placement and foster care of dependent children under the program of aid to needy families with dependent children to be exercised by a public agency other than the agency which regularly administers this program; Public Law 88–48.

Juvenile Delinquency Act extension: Extends to June 30, 1967, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act and authorizes appropriations of $10 million a year for grants to States to help develop aids to control existing problems of juvenile delinquency. (S. 1967, passed Senate September 25.)

Educational opportunities—migratory farmworkers: Authorizes a 5-year program of aid in educating children of migratory workers. The Federal Government will pay 100 percent of the program the first 2 years, and the States and Federal Government will match costs for the next 3 years. (S. 521, passed Senate June 10.)

Agricultural workers—fair labor standards: Extends the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to certain children employed in agriculture. (S. 523, passed Senate June 11.)

National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor: Establishes a 15-member Council to advise the President and Congress on the operation of Federal law, regulations, programs, policies, and all other matters relating to migratory agricultural labor, to provide a better understanding on conditions, needs, and long-range solutions. (S. 525, passed Senate June 10.)

Interstate farm labor contractors—registration: Establishes a system of Federal registration for farm labor contractors of migrant agricultural workers. (S. 524, passed Senate June 11; House Calendar.)

Migratory health services: Authorizes a 4-year $2.5 million annual program of Federal grants to alleviate serious health problems among migratory farm families. (S. 526, passed Senate June 10.)

Criminal Laws Strengthened

Year 1961

Circuit judges: Created 73 additional U.S. district and circuit court judgeships to help ease the present workload and overcrowded court calendars; Public Law 87–36.

Tax court judges' widows and dependent children: Provided a system of annuities for the surviving widows and dependent children of judges of the U.S. Tax Court; Public Law 87–370.

Judgment and compromise settlement: Provided for the swift payment of judgments and compromise settlements against the U.S. Government won by State and foreign claimants; Public Law 87–187.

Racketeering enterprises: Prohibits the use of the mail or any transportation in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of distributing the proceeds of any unlawful activities (business enterprises involving gambling, bootlegging, narcotics, etc.); Public Law 87–228.

Transmission of bets: Forbids the use of wire communications (telephone, telegraph, or any other means of interstate wire communications) for gambling. Exempts information carried for use of the press and wireless communication; Public Law 87–216.

Wagering paraphernalia: Prohibits interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia for bookmaking, wagering pools, numbers games, or similar games carried by means other than common carrier in the usual course of its business, but allows transportation of equipment from a State where it is manufactured into a State where parimutuel betting is legal; Public Law 87–218.

Felons: Extended Fugitive Felon Act to all felonies; Public Law 87–368.

Espionage: Extended laws against espionage and censorship to acts committed anywhere in the world; Public Law 87–369.

Tax stamps: Made it a Federal crime to transport fraudulent State tax stamps in interstate commerce; Public Law 87–371.

Plane hijacking: Made airplane hijacking a Federal crime subject to a possible death penalty; Public Law 87–197.

Aircraft claims: Authorized immediate payment of up to $1,000 to anyone who might suffer injury or personal damages as a result of an accident involving military aircraft or missiles; Public Law 87–212.

Year 1962

Gambling devices: Broadened the definition of gambling devices to cover additional types of machines manufactured for gambling purposes, and requires detailed records of all such devices shipped in interstate commerce; Public Law 87–840.

Antitrust: Authorized Department of Justice to demand the records of business firms under investigation for possible use in antitrust cases; Public Law 87–664.

Smith Act amendment: Defines and clarifies the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act of 1940 to make it apply to continuing as well as original Communist activities; Public Law 87–486.

Juvenile delinquents: Requires that juveniles adjudged delinquents be committed to the custody of the Attorney General for observation and study and that a full report be submitted within 60 days by the Bureau of Prisons; Public Law 87–428.

Guam: Extended to Guam the power to enter into interstate compacts to enforce criminal laws and policies of the States; Public Law 87–406.

Vending-machine slugs: Broadened the Federal criminal law dealing with the manufacture and sale of slugs and similar devices which could be used in lieu of coins in vending machines; Public Law 87–667.

District court jurisdiction: Made it possible to bring actions against Government officials and agencies in U.S. district courts outside the District of Columbia which, because of certain limitations on jurisdiction and venue, could formerly be brought only in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia; Public Law 87–748.

Torts: Provided for the recovery by the Government of the value of hospital care furnished to an individual tortiously injured by a third party; Public Law 87–693.

Federal-State law enforcement: Authorized further cooperation with the States in administering and enforcing Federal law; Public Law 87–718.

Trafficking in phonograph records: Provided a criminal penalty for counterfeiting phonograph records and labels; Public Law 87–773.

Year 1963

Public defenders: Authorizes Federal judicial circuits to establish a public defender system at public expense. (S. 1057, passed Senate August 6; H.R. 7457, House Calendar.)

Crimes abroad: Permits prosecution in U.S. district courts of offenses against this country committeed abroad; Public Law 88–27.

Court of Claims: Authorizes five additional Commissioners for the U.S. Court of Claims (S. 102, passed Senate October 16; House Calendar.)

Judicial Council: Provides for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit. (S. 979, passed Senate October 17.)

Tort claims: Permits civil action on tort claims to be brought in the district court of the district where the act or omission occurred. (H.R. 2985; Public Law 88– .)

Courts: Clarifies the status of Federal circuit and district judges retired from regular active service; Public Law 88–176.

Sport bribes: Prohibits bribery schemes in interstate or foreign commerce from influencing the outcome of sporting contests. (S. 741, passed Senate October 30. House Calendar.)

Welfare and general Government areas

Education and Training

Year 1961

Impacted areas—National Defense Education Act extensions: Enacted bill which extends for 2 years, until June 30, 1963, Federal assistance to help build schools in districts burdened with substantial increases in their school memberships due to Federal activities, and authorizes an additional $20 million for this purpose. Also extended for 2 years, until June 30, 1964, the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, passed in 1958, to stimulate a nationwide effort to strengthen instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages; Public Law 87–344.

College housing: Increased the loan authorization by $300 million for each of the 4 years beginning July 1, 1961, through 1964; Public Law 87–70.

Freedmen's Hospital: Transfers Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University as its teaching hospital; Public Law 87–262.

Geodetic Survey: Improved and expanded the Coast and Geodetic Survey Act of 1948 to induce qualified scientists and mathematicians to join the service; Public Law 87–233.

Nurses scholarships: Extended for 4 years (to June 30, 1965), $5 million a year program for grants and scholarships for training of practical nurses under Vocational Education Act; Public Law 87–22.

Vocational teacher training: Authorized two 1-year programs of Federal grants for training teachers of the deaf, and advanced training of speech pathologists and audiologists; Public Law 87–276.

Year 1962

Educational television: Authorized a 5-year, $32-million program of grants to the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, to establish or improve the educational television broadcasting facilities in our public schools, colleges, and in adult training programs; Public Law 87–447.

Surplus personal property to schools: Clarified the provisions of existing law permitting disposal of surplus Federal property for activities providing educational or occupational training for mentally retarded children, schools for the physically handicapped, educational television stations, and public libraries; Public Law 87–786.

War orphans education aid: Raised the present ceiling age of 23 to 31 when a war orphan must have completed his education provided the suspension was due to conditions beyond his control; Public Law 87–819.

Research costs: Authorized Federal agencies, when awarding research and development contracts to educational institutions, to provide for payment of a fixed percentage of the direct research or development cost to cover the indirect overhead costs associated with the work; Public Law 87–638.

State taxation—Interstate commerce income: Extended to July 1, 1963, the reporting date of the congressional studies on all matters affecting State taxation of income derived from interstate commerce; Public Law 87–435.

Alexander Hamilton: Established the former dwelling of Alexander Hamilton as a national shrine in New York; Public Law 87–438.

Bob Hope: Authorized the President to present to Bob Hope, in the name of the people of the United States, a gold medal in recognition of his service to his country and to the cause of world peace; Public Law 87–478.

Sagamore Hill National Historic Site: Established Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace and Sagamore Hill National Historic Sites, New York; Public Law 87–547.

Religious articles—duty free: Broadened coverage of certain duty-free imports to include cemeteries, schools, hospitals, orphanages, and similar nonprofit activities staffed and controlled by corporations or associations organized and operated for religious reasons; Public Law 87–604.

MacArthur Medal: Authorized the President to award a gold medal to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur; Public Law 87–760.

Social Security Amendments of 1962: Extended an improved public assistance and child welfare service programs of the Social Security Act; Public Law 87–543.

Pension plans: Strengthened the 1958 Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act by providing additional enforcement procedures and imposing criminal sanctions; Public Law 87–420.

Depository libraries: Increased total of depository libraries from 594 to 1,174; Public Law 87–579.

Captioned films for the deaf: Strengthened and improved the existing program of providing captioned films for nonprofit purposes to groups of deaf persons, by authorizing the production and distribution of training films for the deaf, research in the use of educational and training films and training persons in the use of these films for the deaf and raised the established loan ceiling of $250,000 to $1,250,000; Public Law 87–715.

Du Pont: Enacted into law the so-called Du Pont bill providing that a distribution of stock made to an individual, or certain corporations, pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall be treated as a return of capital; and that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value; Public Law 87–403.

Payments in lieu of taxes: Extended to December 31, 1964, the period in which payments in lieu of taxes may be made to State and local taxing authorities by the Federal Government; Public Law 87–787.

National Cultural Center Week: Proclaimed the period from November 26, 1962, through December 2, 1962, as National Cultural Center Week; Public Law 87-804.

Sam Rayburn Medal: Authorized the Secretary of Treasury to strike and present to the estate of Sam Rayburn a gold medal "for services rendered to the people of the United States"; Public Law 87-702.

National Science Foundation amendment: Eliminated the non-Communist disclaimer affidavit required in the existing National Science Foundation Act; made it a crime for any member of a Communist organization to apply for or to use any scholarship or fellowship awarded under section 10 of the act; required each applicant for scholarship or fellowship to provide the NSF with a full statement of the crime of which he has been convicted and information regarding any criminal charges punishable by confinement of 30 days or more; Public Law 87-835.

Pay reform: Enacted a two-step pay-reform measure for the classified, postal, Foreign Service, and Veterans' Administration employees to lessen the discrepancies between industry and the Federal worker; Public Law 87-793.

Year 1963

Vocational education—impacted areas—NDEA: Authorizes new matching grants to the States to expand vocational education programs, extends the National Defense Education Act for 1 year to June 30, 1965, and extends the impacted areas program for 2 years to June 30, 1965; Public Law 88-210.

Higher education: Authorizes a 5-year $1.2 billion program of grants and loans for construction of college academic facilities at public and private higher education institutions. Provides for $230 million a year in grants and $120 million a year in loans. Earmarks $50,600,000 a year of the grant funds for junior colleges and technical institutes; Public Law 88-204.

National Cultural Center: Extends the National Cultural Center Act to September 1, 1966; increases the number of general trustees to 30 and provides staggered terms for the additional trustees; Public Law 88-100.

Science and Technology Commission: Establishes a 12-member Commission on Science and Technology to study the possibilities and methods of strengthening the Government's contribution in promoting national security, national progress in scientific and technical development, world peace, and in insuring maximum use of all scientific know-how and information by coordinating Federal research and development programs with those of private industry and nonprofit organizations including educational institutions. (S. 816, passed Senate March 8.)

National Service Corps: Establishes a National Service Corps of volunteers to aid communities, at their request, with people and problems of social need; limits membership to 1,000 and appropriations to $5 million for fiscal 1964 and $10 million in 1965. Limits program to 2 years. (S. 1321, passed Senate August 14.)

Medical education aid: Authorizes 3-year program of $175 million in matching grants to expand teaching and research facilities of medical, dental, and related-type colleges, and $30.7 million in student loans; Public Law 88-129.

Exceptional children—teachers: Authorizes grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing professional or advanced training for personnel engaged or preparing to engage in employment as teachers of handicapped children; Public Law 88-164.

National Defense Education Act amendment: Extends the provisions of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 relating to cancellation of loans, to teachers in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education. (S. 569, passed Senate October 24.)

Library Services Act of 1963: Increases Federal aid for expanding public library improvements to urban as well as rural areas and authorizes matching grants for construction of public library buildings. (S. 2265, passed Senate November 26; House Calendar.)

Adult Indian vocational training: Increases from $7,500,000 to $12 million a year the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Indian vocational training program. (S. 1868, Public Law 88- .)

National Council on the Arts: Establishes in the Executive Office of the President a National Council on the Arts of 25 members and, 90 days after the Council comes into being, establishes as an independent agency a National Arts Foundation. (S. 2379, passed Senate, December 20.)

John F. Kennedy Center: Renames the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. (S.J. Res. 136; passed Senate December 18.)

District of Columbia Teachers College: Authorizes establishment of a junior college division within the District of Columbia Teachers College. (S. 1406, passed Senate, November 26.)

Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation: Authorizes incorporation of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, a privately financed charitable and educational foundation; Public Law 88-11.

FBI: Authorizes the President to appoint the next Director of the FBI, subject to Senate confirmation, and sets the salary at $22,000 a year. (S. 603, passed Senate June 13.)

Student trainee travel expenses: Authorizes payment of travel expenses to student trainees on completion of college when assigned to positions where the Civil Service Commission determines there is a manpower shortage. (Present law provides for these expenses only if the trainee has been promoted to the shortage category position.) Public Law 88-146.

Coast Guard retirement: Removes the percentage (1 percent) limitation on retirement of enlisted men in the Coast Guard with 20 years' service. Discontinues the practice of paying a good conduct bonus on retirement, but excludes those presently in the service who meet the requirement; Public Law 88-114.

Alien employment: Authorizes Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity. (S. 1291, passed Senate July 9.)

Government contracts: Establishes uniformity and equality in contracting for public utility services and in purchasing natural gas, coal, and other utilities by limiting Government contracts for these services to 10 years. (S. 572, passed Senate May 27.)

Registration of pesticide chemicals: Provides for a system of labeling insecticides and pesticides. (S. 1605, passed Senate October 22.)

Coast Guard: Requires an annual legislative authorization for major capital construction and procurement programs of the Coast Guard prior to the appropriation of funds; Public Law 88-45.

Indian tribes—Expert assistance: Establishes a $900,000 revolving loan fund for the Secretary of Interior to make loans to Indian tribes for services of expert researchers and witnesses in prosecuting their cases before the Indian Claims Commission; Public Law 88-168.

Indian Leasing Act: Increases from 50 to 55 years the term of leases of individual and tribal lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, and business purposes. (S. 48, passed Senate August 28.)

Indian heirship: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to reduce the rapidly increasing number of Indian allotments in multiple ownership; and increases the Indian revolving credit loan fund from $20 to $55 million. (S. 1049, passed Senate October 11.)

Pinkerton—detective agencies: Permits Federal agencies and the District government to contract with Pinkerton and other private detective agencies for guards. (S. 1543, passed Senate October 17.)

Guam: Authorizes up to $45 million in loans and grants to help Guam finance public works and community development projects; Public Law 88-170.

Guam: Permits the government of Guam to authorize a public authority to undertake housing activities; Public Law 88-171.

Virgin Islands: Reinstates authority of the Virgin Island government to issue general obligation bonds for schools, firehouses, slum clearance, libraries, electric systems, etc.; Public Law 88-180.

Submerged lands: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain tracts of submerged lands surrounding the territories of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa when the lands are needed for a specific economic development or for a public purpose; Public Law 88-183.

Salem Maritime National Historic Site: Provides for the acquisition (purchase or donation) of the 17th-century Narbonne House in Salem, Mass., as part of the Salem Maritime National Historic Site; Public Law 88-199.

Resource Buildup

Year 1961

Saline water conversion program: Extended the saline water conversion program, enacted in 1952, from 1962 through 1967 and authorized a total appropriation of $75 million, but does not limit the annual appropriation to a pro rata share of the total amount; Public Law 87-295.

National fuels study: Approved a resolution authorizing the Senate Interior Committee to make an investigation and study of the current and prospective Government policies, to determine changes for an effective national fuels policy. Report of the findings to be submitted by January 31, 1961. (S. Res. 105.)

Cape Cod Park: Established Cape Cod National Seashore Park to preserve for public enjoyment the scenic, scientific, and historic features of the cape; Public Law 87-126.

Migratory waterfowl conservation: Authorized a 7-year migratory waterfowl conservation program permitting advances to States to purchase necessary lands; Public Law 87-383.

Year 1962

Point Reyes National Seashore: Authorized an appropriation of $14 million to acquire land to preserve, for public recreational purposes, Point Reyes National Seashore in California; Public Law 87-657.

Padre Island: Established Padre Island National Seashore as a seashore recreational area; Public Law 87-712.

Rivers and harbors and flood control: Authorized $2.3 billion for 91 rivers and harbors projects and 105 flood control projects; Public Law 97-874.

Navajo-San Juan-Chama projects: Authorized $221 million in appropriations to construct the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the San Juan-Chama project to supplement water supplies for domestic and industrial uses, and to provide recreation and fish and wildlife benefits; Public Law 87-483.

Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado: Authorized Department of Interior to spend up to $170 million to construct facilities for the diversion of water from the Colorado River Basin in western Colorado to the Arkansas River Basin. Water will be used for irrigation, flood control, power, and to meet the municipal water needs of Colorado Springs and other cities; Public Law 87-590.

Rogue River Basin project, Oregon: Authorized Federal construction of the Agate Dam and Reservoir as an addition to the irrigation works of the Rogue River Valley Irrigation District in Oregon at a total cost of $1,802,000; Public Law 87-727.

Elephant Butte-Caballo Reservoirs: Provided for establishing additional facilities at Elephant Butte Reservoir and at Caballo Reservoir—cost limited to $607,000; Public Law 87-542.

Arbuckle reclamation project, Oklahoma: Authorized Federal construction of multiple-purpose Arbuckle project in south central Oklahoma to provide municipal, domestic, industrial water supplies, and flood control at a cost of $13.3 million, of which $10.5 million is reimbursable; Public Law 87-594.

Spokane Valley project: Modified earlier legislation to enlarge the present irrigation plant at an estimated cost of $7,232,000 to furnish more water for irrigation purposes; Public Law 87-630.

Other Continental Shelf: Extends the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to permit the Geological Survey to perform certain of its work in areas outside the continental limits of the United States; Public Law 87-626.

Forest survey authorization: Increased from $1.5 to $2.5 million the authorization for keeping current a survey of the Nation's forest resources; Public Law 87-685.

World Conference on National Parks: Authorized the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the First World Conference on National Parks to be held in Seattle in July of 1962. The Conference was sponsored by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, an international body of nations and organizations concerned with conservation of the world's resources; Public Law 87-504.

Mann Creek reclamation project, Idaho: Authorized $3.4 million for Federal construction of Mann Creek Federal reclamation project in Idaho for irrigation and recreational purposes; Public Law 87-589.

Oysterbeds—Delaware Bay: Authorized $100,000 for grants to five States presently involved in rehabilitating oysterbeds in Delaware Bay—grants to be used for research and related activities necessary in developing and propagating disease-resistant strains of oysters; Public Law 87-580.

Delaware-New Jersey compact: Granted congressional consent to States of Delaware and New Jersey to enter into a compact to establish the Delaware River and Bay Authority for developing the border areas; Public Law 87-678.

Fish and wildlife: Authorized the use of national fish and wildlife conservation areas for public recreation; Public Law 87-714.

Quincy Columbia Basin contract: Approved the execution of an amended repayment contract with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District and with either or both of the other two Columbia Basin project districts. Amended contract is to increase the average construction charge from $85 to $131.60 per irrigable acre and extend the repayment period to 50 years; Public Law 87-728.

Baker reclamation project, Oregon: Authorized Federal construction of a $6,168,000 multipurpose reclamation, flood control, and recreational project in northeastern Oregon; Public Law 87-706.

National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in District of Columbia: Authorized Federal construction and operation of a $10 million National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia; Public Law 87-758.

Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington: Authorized $3,210,000 for construction of control works and a pumping plant at Palmer Lake to enlarge the facilities to irrigate an additional 1,500 acres and supply about 3,650 acre-feet of supplemental water annually to the remaining irrigable area; Public Law 87-762.

Year 1963

Wilderness bill: Authorizes setting aside 35 million of the 761 million acres of federally owned land as a wilderness unavailable for commercial use. (Government permits commercial development of a major portion of its land.) (S. 4, passed Senate April 9.)

Pacific Northwest power sales: Guarantees electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants of that region and guarantees electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. (S. 1007, in conference.)

Water resources research: Authorizes up to $20 million a year Federal aid program to land-grant colleges and universities to stimulate and expand water resources research and scientific training program. (S. 2, passed Senate April 23.)

Water resource planning: Provides for a Federal-State program of long-range comprehensive planning for conservation of the Nation's water resources. Establishes a Federal Water Council to make biennial assessments of water supplies and requirements and appraise the effect that individual river basin plans have on other regions. (S. 1111, passed Senate December 4.)

Dixie project, Utah: Authorizes Federal construction of a $44 million Dixie multipurpose project in Utah with $40 million of the original cost reimbursable. (S. 26, passed Senate October 30.)

Outdoor recreation: Authorizes development and coordination of Federal and State outdoor recreation plans through studies, research, and education programs under guidance of Secretary of Interior; Public Law 88-29.

Small reclamation projects amendments: Amends the Small Reclamation Project Act of 1956 to increase the authorizing ceiling from $100 to $200 million. (S. 283, passed Senate October 17.)

Ozark National Rivers: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to designate portions of the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in Missouri as the Ozark National Rivers for the purpose of conserving and interpreting unique scenic history. (S. 16, passed Senate October 22.)

Pecos River Basin: Authorizes continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, N. Mex. and Tex. (S.J. Res. 49, passed Senate October 22.)

Alaska mineral lands selection: Provides for an additional 5 years from January 3, 1964, within which the new State of Alaska may select lands under Federal mineral lease. (S. 1878, passed Senate November 27.)

Fisheries research: Authorizes a $28,250,000 5-year program of coordinated aid to the States to develop commercial fisheries by stimulating research and development on the local level. (S. 627, passed Senate July 22.)

Lake Mead National Recreation Area: Grants statutory authority for the official operation of Lake Mead National Recreation Area in Arizona and Nevada, established by an interbureau agreement in 1936. Authorizes additional lands to be acquired to build up this shoreline area at an estimated cost of $1,200,000. (S. 653, passed Senate August 2; H.R. 4010, House Calendar.)

Canyonlands National Park: Authorizes the establishment of Canyonlands National Park in Utah as a shoreline recreation area. (S. 27, passed Senate August 2.)

Sleeping Bear Dunes: Established the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan. (S. 792, passed Senate December 19, 1963.)

Reclamation Project Act: Provides for renewal, subject to negotiation, of long-term contracts between Secretary of Interior and municipal, industrial, and domestic users of water service under the Reclamation Project Act of 1959; Public Law 88-44.

Rivers and harbors authorization: Authorizes $816.8 million for rivers and harbors and flood control for fiscal 1964. (H.R. 8667, Public Law 88- .)

River and Harbor Act: Abolishes the Beach Erosion Board established under the River and Harbor Act of 1930, and establishes a Coastal Engineering Research Center to conduct research relating to coastal engineering and near-shore oceanography; Public Law 88-172.

Rio Grande dams: Authorizes Secretary of Interior to market electric power generated at Falcon Dam and Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande. (H.R. 4062; Public Law 88- .)

Wildlife conservation in Oregon and California: Provides a permanent basis for administration of the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refugees in Oregon and California to promote wildlife resources conservation on the Pacific flyway. (S. 793, passed Senate, July 15.)

Cochiti Reservoir: Authorizes approximately 50,000 acre-feet of water from the San Juan-Chama unit of the Colorado River storage project for filling a permanent pool for recreational purposes at Cochiti Reservoir of the Rio Grande Basin. (S. 614, passed Senate, June 19.)

Oil-gas compact: Grants congressional consent to a 4-year renewal and extension from September 1, 1963, to September 1, 1967, of the interstate gas and oil conservation compact; Public Law 88-115.

Veterans' Aid

Year 1961

Disability benefits: Increased weekly disability benefits for longshoremen and harbor workers to $70 (from $54); provided comparable increases in death cases from $81 to $105; and increased statutory maximum compensation payable for all injuries other than cases of permanent total disability or death from $17,280 to $24,000. Public Law 87-87.

Veterans' widows: Increased payments to veterans' widows; Public Law 87-268.

Veterans' home loans: Extended direct and guaranteed home loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967, and for Korean conflict veterans to February 1, 1975; authorized an additional $1.2 billion for direct loan program through fiscal 1967; Public Law 87-84.

Year 1962

Disability compensation increase: Provided for increases from 5.3 to 11.1 percent for veterans disabled 10 to 100 percent, retroactive to July 1, 1962; Public Law 87-645.

Veterans' Administration: Appropriated an additional $55 million for readjustment benefits payments to Korean war veterans attending school under the GI bill of rights; and provided for a $115,247,000 increase, by transfer, in the VA loan guarantee revolving fund to enable the Federal Government to repossess homes on which GI home mortgages have been foreclosed; Public Law 87-404.

Veterans: Extended the time during which individuals affected by Public Law 87-117 may pursue and complete a program of education or training under the Korean GI bill or the War Orphans' Education Act. The individuals affected served an additional tour of duty because of the war threats in 1961; Public Law 87-815.

VA pensions—hospitalization: Continues pensions for married veterans while hospitalized in veterans' hospitals, Public Law 87-556.

Disability compensation: Increases compensation for certain veterans disabled by blindness or kidney involvements; Public Law 87-610.

National service life insurance—assignments: Broadened assignment provisions of national service life insurance available to World War II veterans and maturing on or after date of enactment of this bill; Public Law 87-557.

War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act: Permits eligible beneficiaries under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act to attend foreign educational institutions; Public Law 87-546.

VA—Hospital and medical care: Furnished hospital and medical care, including outpatient treatment, to peacetime ex-servicemen for service-connected disabilities on same basis as care and treatment is furnished war veterans; Public Law 87-583.

Deceased veterans' benefits: Permits payment of compensation, retirement, or pension benefits withheld from deceased veterans during VA hospitalization only to spouse, children, or dependent parents; Public Law 87-544.

Prosthetic research—VA: Removed the $1 million ceiling on funds for research in the fields of prosthesis, prosthetic appliances, orthopedic appliances, and sensory devices; Public Law 87-557.

Endowment at age 96: Permits veterans holding U.S. Government life insurance to exchange for a policy providing death protection only—with reduced premiums; Public Law 87-549.

Blind veterans: Vocational rehabilitation.—Permits World War II or Korean veterans blinded by reason of a service-connected disability to obtain vocational rehabilitation training up to June 30, 1975; Public Law 87-591.

VA—Prosthetic appliances: Broadened the provisions of existing law by authorizing the Veterans' Administration to repair or replace a prosthetic or other appliance (other than dental appliances) if the appliance is damaged or destroyed in a fall or other accident caused by a compensable service-connected disability; Public Law 87-850.

Year 1963

Veterans' family benefits increase: Increases by approximately 10 percent monthly rates of dependence and indemnity compensation payable to widows, children, and parents of veterans dying of service-connected causes; Public Law 88-21.

Compensation increase—Veterans' widows: Increases from $112 to $150 the basic monthly rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans who died from service-connected disabilities; Public Law 88-134.

GI insurance: Reopens national service life insurance for World War II and Korean war veterans who let their policies lapse, and set up a new optional payment method for holders of long-term insurance. (H.R. 220, passed Senate, amended, June 20.)

Veterans—Vocal cords: Adds "complete organic aphonia with constant inability to communicate by speech" to the existing types of service-connected disabilities, and authorizes an additional $47 award for such disability; Public Law 88-22.

Deafness of both ears: Adds "deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction" to the types of service-connected disabilities for which compensation is awarded. Monthly compensation will be $47; Public Law 88-20.

Burial expenses: Extends the time during which a veteran's family may claim an allowance for burial expenses; Public Law 88-3.

War orphans: Designates State agencies to work with the Veterans' Administration in approving educational courses for war orphans; Public Law 88-126.

Grants-in-aid: Extends for 5 years the program for reimbursement of the Philippine Government covering hosiptalization for service-connected veterans who served with the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II; Public Law 88-40.

Veterans—dependents: Increases from $80 to $135 monthly rental on servicemen's dwellings which are subject to the protective provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, and prohibits eviction of dependents of military personnel where monthly rental does not exceed $135. (S. 384, passed Senate May 28.)

Autos for disabled veterans: Extends to the disabled service-connected veterans of the cold war the present policy of allowing such veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict an allowance of $1,600 toward a specially equipped auto. The disabled veteran must have suffered from the loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands or feet or permanent visual impairment to a prescribed degree. (S. 449, passed Senate May 28.)

Veterans—waiver of indebtedness: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to waive recovery on defaults on home loans in certain hardship cases, Public Law 88-151.

VA facilities: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to use private hospital facilities for the treatment of veterans with non-service-connected disablities if there is no veterans hospital located within the State or within 500 miles of the border of the State. (Bill applies only to Alaska and Hawaii since all other States have a veterans hospital.) (S. 625, passed Senate June 19.)

Educational asistance: Provides educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled as a result of a service-conected disability arising out of active military, naval, or air service during the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the induction period. (H.R. 221, passed Senate, amended December 10.)

Elections and the White House

Year 1961

District of Columbia elections: Implements the 23d amendment to the Constitution giving the residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President; retains the voting age at 21 and provides for a 1-year residency requirement. Public Law 87-389.

White House: Established the White House as a national monument, Public Law 87-286.

Year 1962

Poll taxes abolished: Congress approved a constitutional amendment barring the requirement of a poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections and primaries. The amendment, if ratified by three-fourths of the States within 7 years, will become the 24th amendment to the Constitution. There are only five States with such a requirement: Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia. (S.J. Res. 29—36 States have ratified, December 13, 1963.)

White House Police force: Created a permanent White House Police force under the supervision and control of the Secretary of the Treasury to protect the Executive Mansion and Grounds in the District, any building in which White House offices are located, and the President and members of his immediate family. Increased the force from 170 to 250; Public Law 87-481.

Year 1963

Equal time: Suspends application of equal time requirements of Federal Communications Act to nominees for President and Vice President in 1964. (H.J. Res. 247, passed Senate, amended, October 2.)

Coinage of Kennedy 50-cent piece: Authorizes the Treasury Department to mint new 50-cent pieces with the likeness of the late President John F. Kennedy. (H.R. 9413, Public Law 88-).

Mrs. Kennedy: Provides, for a 12-month period, office space, equipment, and staff for Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy's use; provides a life-time use of the franking privilege; authorizes Secret Service protection for a 2-year period for Mrs. Kennedy and her two children. Limits staff salaries to $50,000 a year and authorizes an appropritaion of $65,000 to carry out purposes of the act, of which $15,000 is for the President's burial; Public Law 88-195.

Reorganization and Government Aids

Year 1961

Government reorganization: Restored the authority of the President to submit plans for the reorganization of the Government; Public Law 87-18.

Civil Rights Commission: Extends the life of the Commission for 2 years, or until September 30, 1963; Public Law 87-264.

Labor: Authorized an additional Assistant Secretary to perform functions relating primarily to the employment and effective utilization of women in our labor force; Public Law 87-137.

FTC reorganization: Provided for the reorganization of the Federal Trade Commission to expedite the present workload (plan No. 4); effective July 9.

CAB reorganization: Authorized the reorganization of the Civil Aeronautics Board to provide greater flexibility and a more expeditious handling of CAB cases (plan No. 3); effective July 3.

Maritime reorganization: Authorized reorganization of Maritime Board (plan No. 7); effective August 12.

ICC reorganization: Authorized reorganization of Interstate Commerce Commission; Public Law 87-247.

FCC reorganization: Authorized FCC to delegate functions in adjudicatory cases to expedite and improve the administrative process; Public Law 87-192.

SEC investigation: Authorized $750,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a special investigation of the adequacy of its rules, for the protection of the investor, governing stock exchanges and over-the-counter securities trading. SEC is to report its findings to Congress by January 3, 1963; Public Law 87-196.

Internal revenue employees: Appropriated funds for an additional 4,265 Internal Revenue Service employees; Public Law 87-159.

Travel expenses: Increased the allowances of Government employees for traveling expenses when on official business. Increases include from $10 to $16 per diem allowances and from 10 to 12 cents a mile by private automobile; Public Law 87-139.

Interstate commerce—Property destruction: Strengthened existing Federal law by making it unlawful to destroy, injure, set fire to, or otherwise damage goods moving in interstate or foreign commerce, break into or enter any railroad car, vessel, aircraft, truck, or other vehicle for such purpose; Public Law 87-221.

Postal employees: Extended to employees in the postal field service the same salary retention protection in cases of reduction in grade as provided under the Classification Act since 1956; Public Law 87-270.

Scientific and supergrades: Authorized an additional 480 supergrade positions and 280 additional scientific positions for the executive branch; Public Law 87-367.

NSLI special dividend: Authorized the payment of a special insurance dividend, averaging from $100 to $150, for those veterans who have RS or W insurance. The RS insurance is entirely term insurance and the premium increases at the end of each 5-year period. The W insurance is both term and permanent, with the increased rate at the end of each 5-year period; Public Law 87-233.

Year 1962

Reorganization Plan II: Established Office of Science and Technology as a new unit within the Executive Office of the President—capable of and designed to keep the President informed and advised on national policy matters relating to science and technology. (Plan went into effect June 8, 1962.)

SEC reorganization: Permits Securities and Exchange Commission to lighten its workload by delegating certain functions to individual Commissioners or staff members; gives rulings or decisions made by a single Commissioner or staff member the same force and effect of judgment by the full Commission. The Commission, however, can review any decision and would be required to do so on the request of a single Commissioner; Public Law 87–592.

Postal-rate increase: Raised postal rates to produce an estimated $600 million in additional revenues to cut the large postal deficit. Increased first class from 4 to 5 cents an ounce, airmail from 7 to 8 cents effective next January 7; with graduated increases for second- and third-class mail; Public Law 87–793.

Federal Reserve System: Authorized the Federal Reserve System to spend an additional $30 million to build branches and other facilities; Public Law 87–622.

U.S. marshals' fees: Increases fees for U.S. marshals' services to private litigants; Public Law 87–621.

Hatch Act: Liberalized the provision requiring the Civil Service Commission to impose a minimum penalty of 90 days' suspension for violations of section 9 of the Hatch Act by reducing the suspension period to 30 days; Public Law 87–753.

Trust territory: Removed ceiling on authorization for government of Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; Public Law 87–541.

Guamanian benefits: Provided benefits under War Claims Act for Guamanians killed or captured by Japanese at Wake Island; Public Law 87–617.

Lake Ontario water level: Authorized investigation of citizens' claims resulting from artificial raising of Lake Ontario water level by Canada; Public Law 87–587.

Home loan bank directors: Extended to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico a status comparable to that of a State in the nomination and election of directors of the Federal home loan bank of the district in which Puerto Rico is located; Public Law 87–676.

Census reports—confidential status: Specifically provided that company-retained copies of reports submitted to the Census Bureau be kept confidential; Public Law 87–813.

Conflicts of interest: Enacted a measure making major revisions in Federal Government conflicts-of-interest laws to make uniform and bring up to date existing laws aimed at preventing present and former Government employees from improperly mixing private interest with their public office; Public Law 87–849.

FCC: Added a new section to the Communications Act of 1934 to grant authority to the Commission to impose monetary forfeitures for violation of the Commission's rules and regulations by radio stations operating the common carrier and safety and special radio fields; Public Law 87–448.

Commerce: Enacted into law authority for an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce to provide an effective review of the expanding scientific activities within the Department; Public Law 87–405.

FCC—American Samoa: Authorized the Federal Communications Commission to issue radio operator licenses to natives of American Samoa who are nationals of the United States and owe allegiance to it, but to whom full citizenship has not been extended; Public Law 87–445.

Music for blind: Establishes in the Library of Congress a library of musical scores and other educational materials for blind persons; Public Law 87–765.

Household and personal effects under Government orders: Extends to July 1, 1964, free-entry provisions for personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; Public Law 87–790.

Government Training Act: Restored travel authority to attend training meetings to Foreign Service employees of Department of State, Tennessee Valley Authority, and Presidential appointees; Public Law 87–566.

U.S. Park Police: Provided for the creation of trial boards for the U.S. Park Police as a means of assuring better discipline and more equitable treatment; Public Law 87–797.

Year 1963

Former Presidents: Authorizes former Presidents of the United States (unless otherwise prohibited) to be entitled to seats in the U.S. Senate as Senators at Large; with the right to speak on the floor of the Senate and to participate in committee activities. (S. Res. 78 adopted October 1.)

Bureau of Reclamation: Made nonreimbursable all costs of investigations of a general nature or investigations leading to authorization of reclamation projects or works in order to provide for uniformity throughout the Bureau of Reclamation. (S. 46 passed Senate, August 28.)

Presidential transition: Authorizes the Administrator of General Services to provide, on request, to each President-elect and each Vice-President-elect suitable office space, payment of staff salaries, travel expenses, communication services, printing and binding, and postage during the transition period between election and inauguration. Limits the authorized appropriation to $500,000 for necessary expenses. (H.R. 4638 passed Senate, amended, October 17; House requested conference, October 31.)

Treasury Department: Authorizes an additional assistant secretaryship in the Department of Treasury; Public Law 88–58.

Additional mint facilities: Authorizes a 10-year construction and building equipment program for the Bureau of the Mint operations and limits aggregate appropriations to $30 million; Public Law 88–102.

Inland waterways: Repeals the Inland Waterways Corporation Act and provides for liquidation of the affairs of the Corporation; Public Law 88–67.

SEC reforms: Extends to approximately 5,600 industrial, utility, and banking concerns whose stocks are traded over the counter, the financial disclosure, proxy and insider-training requirements that have applied since 1934 to companies listed on stock exchanges. (S. 1642 passed Senate, July 30.)

Reorganization Plan No. 1: Transfers to General Services Administration complete authority for operation of Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, N.Y., now managed jointly with Department of the Interior; effective July 27, 1963.

Administrative conference: Creates an administrative conference to study the mutual problems of Federal administrative agencies. (S. 1664 passed Senate, October 30.)

STATUS OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, 1961

Total major recommendations	53
Enacted into law	33
Rejected by one or the other House or no action taken	20
Total percentage	62

	Recommended	Approved	No action	Percent
National security	2	2	0	100.0
International affairs and finance	8	7	1	87.5
Commerce, housing, and space technology	6	4	2	67.0
Agriculture	4	4	0	100.0
Natural resources	4	2	2	50.0
Labor and welfare	20	10	10	50.0
General government	9	4	5	44.0

Major legislation approved

National Security

1. Authorize additional appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for Armed Forces.
2. Authorize the President to order units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months.

International Affairs and Finance

3. Establish a permanent Peace Corps.
4. Establish a strengthened and enlarged Disarmament Administration.
5. Authorize a new AID (Act for International Development) agency and program.
6. Authorize a 10-year social and economic plan for the Americas (Alliance for Progress).
7. Encourage travel to the United States (establish Office of International Travel).
8. Reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents.
9. Ratify United States-Canada Columbia River Development Treaty.

Commerce, Housing, and Space Technology

10. Establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas.
11. Make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program.
12. Assist in the provision of housing for moderate- and low-income families, promote orderly urban development, extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities.
13. Provide a 5-year extension of the Federa Airport Act (expired June 30, 1961).

Agriculture

14. Provide a special program for feed grains for 1961.
15. Extend the Sugar Act of 1958, as amended.
16. Authorize an additional $2 billion for this calendar year under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 83–480).
17. Enact the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961.

Natural Resources

18. Extend and expand the current saline water conversion program.
19. Cape Cod.

Labor and Welfare

20. Establish temporary program for payment of additional unemployment compensation to workers who have exhausted their benefits.
21. Provide aid to dependent children of the unemployed on a temporary basis.
22. Raise minimum wage to $1.15 immediately and to $1.25 within 2 years; extend coverage of Fair Labor Standards Act to several million workers not now covered.
23. Improve old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program.
24. Enact community health facilities legislation.
25. Provide a more effective water pollution control program.
26. Amend and expand the student loan and other provisions of the National Defense Education Act (expires June 30, 1962).
27. Anticrime legislation.
28. Juvenile delinquency.
29. Authorize additional Assistant Secretary in the Department of Labor.

General Government

30. Provide for reorganization in the Civil Aeronautics Board (Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1961).
31. Provide for reorganization in the Federal Trade Commission (Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961).
32. Provide for reorganization in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1961).

33. Provide for reorganization of maritime functions (Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961).

Major legislation disapproved or not acted upon

International Affairs and Finance

1. Authorize payment of certain Philippine war damage claims.

Commerce, Housing, and Space Technology

2. Increase postal rates, effective July 1.
3. Authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Natural Resources

4. Establish shoreline areas.
5. Enact a wilderness protection bill.

Labor and Welfare

6. Amend the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act with respect to method of enforcement and provide certain additional sanctions.
7. Enact Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961.
8. Enact Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961.
9. Enact health insurance program (free choice of doctor and hospital) for all persons aged 65 and over who are eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits.
10. Establish National Institutes of Child Health and Human Development in National Institutes of Health.
11. Authorize additional assistance to medical and dental schools.
12. Authorize additional assistance to institutions of higher learning.
13. Authorize educational TV.
14. Enact 3-year program of general Federal assistance for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries.
15. Provide effective air pollution control program.

General Government

16. Provide for reorganization in Federal Communications Commission (plan No. 2).
17. Enact essential income tax changes.
18. Provide for reorganization in the Securities and Exchange Commission (plan No. 1).
19. Provide for reorganization in National Labor Relations Board (plan No. 5).
20. Abolish poll tax, amend the Constitution.

STATUS OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS, 87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, 1962

Total major recommendations	54
Enacted into law or anticipated approval	40
Rejected by one or the other House or no action taken	2
Action not yet completed	12
Total percentage to date	74

	Recommended	Approved	Rejected	Action not completed
National security	4	3	0	1
International affairs	10	9	0	1
Commerce, housing, and technology	6	5	0	1
Agriculture	1	1	0	0
Natural resources	7	5	0	2
Labor and welfare	17	9	1	7
General government	9	8	1	0

Major legislation approved

National Security

1. U.N. bond issue.
2. Mutual security.
3. Authorizing the President to order Reserve units of the Ready Reserve.

International affairs and finance

4. Enlarging Peace Corps.
5. Customs simplification.
6. IMF loan fund.
7. Refugee resettlement.
8. International Wheat Agreement (treaty).
9. Philippine war damage.
10. International Wheat Agreement Act.
11. Reciprocal trade and trade adjustment.
12. Tax reform.

Commerce, Housing, and Space Technology

13. Additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.
14. FCC–UHF conversion.
15. Communications satellite.
16. A–B–C highways.
17. AEC authorization (Hanford reactor).

Agriculture

18. Farm bill.

Natural Resources

19. San Juan-Chama and Navajo projects.
20. Fryingpan-Arkansas project.
21. Arbuckle project, Oklahoma.
22. Point Reyes.
23. Padre Island.

Labor and Welfare

24. Manpower development and training.
25. Pension and welfare disclosure.
26. Educational TV.
27. Public welfare.
28. Drug labeling bill.
29. Increased compensation for 2 million disabled veterans.
30. Public works acceleration.
31. Mass immunization.
32. Conflict of interest.

General Government

33. Reorganization Plan No. 2 (science and technology).
34. Poll tax constitutional amendment.
35. SEC reorganization plan.
36. Postal rate modification.
37. Federal pay reform.
38. Slot Machine Act.
39. New National Institute for Child Health, etc.
40. Civil investigative demand.

Major legislative action not yet completed

National Security

1. Civil defense.

International Affairs

2. Standby tax authority.

Commerce, Housing, and Space Technology

3. Mass transportation.

Natural Resources

4. Wilderness bill.
5. Outdoor recreation, land conservation program.

Labor and Welfare

6. College aid and scholarships.
7. Federal aid to education.
8. Youth Employment Opportunities Act.
9. Aid to medical education and research.
10. Adult Basic Education Act.
11. Educational Improvement Act (teacher quality).
12. Temporary unemployment compensation.

Major legislation disapproved or not acted upon

Labor and Welfare

1. Health care for older citizens.

General Government

2. Department of Urban Affairs.

STATUS OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS, 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, 1963

Summary of legislative record—Senate activity

	82d, 1st	83d, 1st	84th, 1st	85th, 1st	86th, 1st	87th, 1st	88th, 1st
	Jan. 3 to Oct. 20	Jan. 3 to Aug. 3	Jan. 3 to Aug. 2	Jan. 3 to Aug. 30	Jan. 7 to Sept. 15	Jan. 3 to Sept. 27	Jan. 9 to Dec. 21[1]
Days in session	172	125	105	133	140	146	186
Hours in session	996:46	763:35	559:41	860:44	1,009:48	1,005:00	1,038:43
Total measures passed by Senate	1,060	848	1,325	1,210	1,052	1,133	854
Senate bills	411	342	574	612	434	459	336
House bills	429	320	566	346	375	433	296
Senate joint resolutions	14	22	22	22	21	25	20
House joint resolutions	29	21	20	54	32	27	23
Senate concurrent resolutions	23	25	25	24	34	23	26
House concurrent resolutions	19	14	21	28	24	23	19
Senate resolutions	135	104	97	124	132	143	134
Public laws	255	288	390	316	383	401	214
Confirmations	26,069	23,420	39,897	44,620	43,567	48,962	66,640

[1] Figures in this column based on Dec. 20 figures.

The annual report will be available as a Senate document in January.

Appropriations for fiscal year 1964 as of Dec. 20, 1963

Title	Budget	Enacted	Difference	Public Law
Interior and related agencies	$998,009,000	$952,456,500	$45,552,500	88-79
Treasury-Post Office-Tax Court	6,146,842,000	6,045,466,000	101,376,000	88-39
Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare	5,759,489,000	5,471,087,500	288,401,500	88-136
Defense	49,014,237,000	47,220,010,000	1,794,227,000	88-149
Independent offices	14,658,588,000	13,224,518,050	1,434,069,950	88-
Military construction	1,966,400,000	1,585,880,000	380,520,000	88-
Public works	4,561,957,000	4,406,272,700	155,684,300	88-
Legislative	182,218,450	168,293,069	13,925,381	88-
District of Columbia (Federal payment)	52,868,000	40,368,000	12,500,000	88-
State-Justice-Commerce	2,159,891,900	1,820,093,000	339,798,900	88-
Foreign aid	4,525,000,000	[1] 3,282,397,137	1,242,602,863	88-
Agriculture	6,368,755,000	6,224,370,215	144,384,375	
Total	96,484,255,300		[2] 5,953,042,769	

[1] Titles I and II.
[2] Total reduction below administration budget requests.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK NOON, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 24, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate has caught up with its work. There is no business pending. If no other Senator desires to speak, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next. Before the question is put, I repeat: There will be a pro forma session, with no business conducted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has heard the motion. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, December 24, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 20 (legislative day of December 20), 1963:

POSTMASTERS

MISSISSIPPI

Robert D. Heslep, Boyle.

WISCONSIN

James C. Anderson, Dallas.
Philip A. Panetti, Juneau.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

In Memoriam: Justice Charles E. Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, December 21, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it is my sorrowful duty to report this day an irreparable loss to the bar of the State of Connecticut and the Nation. Justice Charles E. Clark of the second circuit court of appeals succeeded in his lifetime in achieving an eminence on the bench, behind the lecturn, and with the pen, sufficient to make him a respected authority in each of these fields; respected to a degree in each that would have satisfied a lesser man in any one. For this reason it is difficult to categorize Judge Clark. When we praise a man we like to refer to that accomplishment which made most famous, but with Judge Clark there are so many achievements to which we can point that we feel inadequate in trying to single out any one.

The newspapers identified Judge Clark in their headlines as the former dean of the Yale Law School, certainly abundant recognition for any man. I prefer to remember him, however, for his scholarly and tireless work in the movement for judicial reform. In Connecticut it is to him to a great degree that we owe our progressive circuit court system, a model system of which our State is justly proud. On the national scale his was the chief influence in the construction of the rules of civil procedure now followed by our Federal courts. That his influence at both State and national levels was so great is mute testimony to his deep understanding of the letter of the law, and his heartfelt concern for its spirit. "Due process" to him called forth visions not of the volumes on his library shelf, but of his fellow men, standing before the bar of justice.

Judge Clark served in his later years as chief justice of the circuit court of appeals, a post which he filled in a manner earning him the boundless respect of his colleagues and the attorneys who pleaded before him, successful and unsuccessful litigants alike. Approaching 70 he voluntarily stepped aside as chief justice to yield his place to a younger man, but he retained his position on the court bench, and maintained always that vigorous activity which characterized his whole life.

It was my privilege to know him personally, a privilege accorded many men because that was the judge's way. Still it was a valuable privilege, because he was the sort of inspiration to his fellow men that was not to be found elsewhere. Like others who knew Judge Clark, I shall miss him. But in his passing Judge Clark left a challenge to those of of us who mourn; a challenge to each to make of himself a bigger man, that together we may fill the tremendous gap in our ranks caused by his untimely loss.

CHARLES EDWARD CLARK, A GREAT LEGAL MIND

Memorial services will be held tomorrow at Yale Battell Chapel for Charles Edward Clark, one of the great legal minds of this generation. In 74 productive years he wrote his own memorial to his chosen law profession and to himself in office, college classroom, and on the bench.

Judge Clark knew his law as did few other men. Without law, fairly administered, there can be no justice. Without justice there can be no equality of man. Judge Clark made lasting contributions to equality for his fellow men.

This equality was assured in his decisions as a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. He labored to perpetuate it as a professor and later as dean of the Yale University Law School. He pledged it as a young attorney in private practice. He put his philosophy in printed form so other attorneys could benefit from his knowledge. Books written by Judge Clark are in the libraries of every law school and most law offices.

Judge Clark knew the frailties of man and his tendency to err. He could detect innocent mistakes, quickly segregate them from premeditated and deliberate violations. He was a student of man as well as the law.

Judge Clark's face was normally wrapped in smiles. This smile was never more pronounced than on a sunny June morning last year when Yale honored him with an honorary doctor of laws degree. Also honored that day with an honorary degree was another outstanding American, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Judge Clark was a great jurist because he was a fine human being. This was acknowledged by all who knew him. No more noble tribute can be paid to a man who dedicated his life to justice and decency.

Pupils of Winton School, Hayward, Calif., Honor John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, December 21, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I recently was privileged to visit Winton School, Hayward, Calif. My visit was 2 weeks after the death of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy, and I was touched to observe the beautiful manner in which the pupils at Winton School were sharing in the national mourning and honoring his memory.

Amongst the thoughtful things done by the pupils in memory of President Kennedy was to dedicate to him the entire first page of their fine student newspaper, "Green and White." A most excellent picture of our late President, with the White House in the background, its flag at half-staff, by Student Artist Roy Ostyn was featured, together with a sensitive eulogy.

Mr. Speaker, I am immensely proud of the young people of America, those to whom we will turn to for national and international leadership in the coming decades. My visit to Winton School has refreshed my confidence in the American adults of tomorrow.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 145. 18: *The Lord is nigh unto all who call upon Him in truth.*

O Thou who art the supreme source of all wisdom and strength may we never be afraid to enter upon any new day, however freighted it may be with heavy burdens and difficult decisions.

Enable us by Thy grace to accept the overtures of Thy divine counsel and companionship and give us a clearer vision and a more vivid sense of the high and helpful things which we are privileged to do together as a Congress for the building of a nobler civilization.

Grant that we may leave this Chamber, when the hour of adjournment comes, commending and committing one another to Thy divine care and guidance.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 21, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2379. An act to provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 254]

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Alger
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Becker
Belcher
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Bray
Brock
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Burkhalter
Cannon
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Collier
Corbett
Cramer
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Ellsworth
Evins
Farbstein
Fascell
Finnegan
Fino
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Goodell
Grabowski
Grover
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Halpern
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Joelson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
Knox
Kunkel
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Long, La.
McCulloch
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Milliken
Montoya
Moore
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
Osmers
Ostertag
Philbin
Powell
Quillen
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Riehlman
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Schenck
Schwengel
Scott
Shelley
Shipley
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Springer
Staggers
Shephens
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Waggonner
Weltner
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Williams
Wydler
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 286 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules this morning reported out a rule on the matter that has kept us here up to now.

As you all know, under the rules, this is supposed to lay over for 24 hours. If the question of consideration is raised, I expect to report the rule in a few minutes and ask for its present consideration. I hope in view of the situation, as long as we have been here, that it will be in order to do that and that the question of consideration will not be raised. Then we may consider this matter again today and dispose of it. We have considered it twice. The only reason for requiring us to have the two-thirds vote would simply be to delay the action to tomorrow. It would be in order tomorrow, and you will do the same thing tomorrow that I am asking you to do today. You would consider the rule. I very much hope that there will be no objection to our going on and proceeding with the business today which I am sure has become very embarrassing to all of us through this delay.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman if I have the time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, my telephone has been ringing all morning. Many of our Members, by reason of the weather, are stranded and cannot get back. I think the quorum call showed that there are 286 Members present. As a matter of fact, one of the conferees on our side is now stranded. He had an airplane reservation, but all you need to do is look around a bit and you will see the airplanes are not flying.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am personally concerned, while I did not get any credit for it, I want to point out we provided on this side the quorum for the reporting of the rule last week. I went along then with consideration. I voted for the rule. I must say to the gentleman from Virginia that as far as I am concerned I do not know how the Members on this side are going to vote. We have made no effort to undertake to persuade them. Obviously, there are Members who are here who would like to get home for Christmas tomorrow. There are many Members who are here and, as I say, they would like to do that. There are others who are away and would like to get back for the vote tomorrow, if it goes over until tomorrow, who cannot get here today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make another observation. I thought from the discussions here late Saturday evening that there was a strong likelihood of a meeting of the Rules Committee at that time. It was indicated, as I understood it from the Democratic side of the aisle, that they could get seven votes in the Rules Committee. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] was the only Republican Member in town at that time, and he stayed here and said he was ready to go up and vote out a rule, but instead of voting out a rule, which would have been in order today, the House was adjourned by the majority leader.

I just want to make this one further observation. I have been castigated in too many quarters—not that I am going to be thinskinned about it, because I have learned in my time here that if you cannot take the heat, you had better get out of the kitchen, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this December a continuing resolution was adopted by the Congress of the United States continuing the appropriations that would finally be acted upon, not to December 31 but to January 31, 1964. I wish somebody would write that in their paper or talk about it on the radio or television. In other words, it is not just a matter of the funds for the foreign aid program running out. They are available and will be available until January 31.

I want to be careful about my language, although some people have not been very careful in their language about me. But I must say in view of that continuing resolution and in view of the fact that we have operated under that continuing resolution for 6 months, since last June 30, and the fact that the foreign aid program is going right on, just as it can go on until January 31, 1964, then I must ask why all of the heroics and why are they having us here right up to Christmastime with Members coming back at the risk of their lives and limbs in a snowstorm, going away from their families, and having it interfere with their Christmas recess? All right. There will be a lot of people who will not be home for Christmas, and perhaps I am one of them. In any event, if it were a necessary thing, then I would say "OK. I will stay here as long as anybody." But it is not necessary and it has never been necessary. If we come back January 7, this matter could be disposed of in an orderly fashion and without all of what I think is a cruel treatment of Members who cannot be here and Members who made their plans for the holidays far in advance. I cannot do my arithmetic quickly enough to figure it out exactly, but out of 433 Members of the House we have left here 286. That means well over 100 Members are not here who would probably like to vote on this measure.

In any event, those are my feelings about this, may I say to my very good friend from Virginia. I share with him the desire to get this matter back of us. I thought we had it back of us twice. The other day 26 Democrats voted to recommit the conference report and 66 Democrats from all over the country voted to recommit it when we had the bill originally before us. I do not know who is right or wrong and what the people think about this wheat deal and the amendment which is involved here, but up to the time I came over here a little while ago I had 209 telegrams from all over the country commending me for the stand which I have taken and only 6 criticizing me.

I have been accused of playing politics. It is said that I am leading a Midwest isolationist coalition to take over the foreign affairs of the country.

Apparently, it is very easy for people to forget that I have voted for this foreign aid program right straight along. I started in 1947 under Mr. Truman. I voted for it under Mr. Truman, under Mr. Eisenhower, and under Mr. Kennedy. I voted for it under President Johnson. But I must say that it does not seem to make much difference what you do around here; some of us cannot win for losing.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana has taken up most of my minute. But if I may say one further word, the gentleman from Indiana is always very eloquent, always very persuasive. It so happens that I entertain the same view that he does with respect to extending credit to Russia. That is not the question this morning. The question this morning is whether we shall do this today or whether we shall do it tomorrow at the inconvenience of a great many people. And when the eyes of the country are upon the Congress I do not think we can justify further delay on this matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9499

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 600) from the Committee on Rules and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and that during the consideration of the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to the bill, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, a motion by the Chairman of the Managers on the part of the House to recede and concur in said Senate amendment numbered 20 with an amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the rule has just been granted and there are no other copies available, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report the resolution.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object. Section 22 of rule 11 provides that the rule shall lie on the Speaker's desk for 24 hours.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise the gentleman that he passed upon this question the other day and a two-thirds vote would make the resolution in order.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FINDLEY) there were—ayes 171, noes 83.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 202, nays 105, not voting 125, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

YEAS—202

Albert
Andrews, Ala.
Ashley
Ashmore
Baring
Barrett
Bass
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burke
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Fraser
Friedel
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grant
Gray
Green
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Hemphill
Holland
Huddleston
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pike
Pilcher
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staebler
Stafford
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Watson
Watts
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—105

Alger
Anderson
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barry
Bates
Battin
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Cunningham
Dole
Dwyer
Findley
Foreman
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Hall
Halleck
Harsha
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
MacGregor
Martin, Calif.
May
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Mosher
Norblad
O'Konski
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Robison
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Short
Shriver
Skubitz
Stinson
Teague, Calif.
Thomson. Wis.
Utt
Van Pelt
Wallhauser
Weaver
Westland
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Wyman

NOT VOTING—125

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Becker
Belcher
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Bray
Brock
Brown, Ohio
Burkhalter
Cannon
Cederberg
Celler
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Collier
Corbett
Cramer
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Ellsworth
Evins
Fascell
Finnegan
Fino
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodell
Grabowski
Gubser
Haley
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Joelson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kilburn
Kilgore
Knox
Kunkel
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
McCulloch
Mailliard
Martin. Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Milliken
Montoya
Moore
Morgan
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
Osmers
Ostertag
Philbin
Powell
Quillen
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Riehlman
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, Pa.
Roudebush
Ryan, Mich.
Schenck
Schwengel
Scott
Shipley
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Springer
Staggers
Stephens
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Tollefson
Tupper
Waggonner
Weltner
Whalley
Wharton
Williams
Younger

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the House refused to consider House Resolution 600.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert and Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Collier against.

Mr. Rodino and Mr. Joelson for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mr. Murphy of New York and Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Addabbo and Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Snyder against.

Mr. Burkhalter and Mr. Celler for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Daniels and Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Ford against.

Mr. Fountain and Mr. Henderson for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Shipley and Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Philbin and Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Derounian against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York and Mr. Fascell for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee and Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania, for, with Mr. Glenn against.

Mr. Grabowski and Mr. Healey for, with Mr. Moore against.

Mr. Ryan of Michigan and Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Mr. Karth and Mr. Lennon for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Lesinski and Mr. Montoya for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Nedzi and Mr. Reuss for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts and Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Schenck against.

Mr. Blatnik and Mr. Davis of Georgia for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Diggs and Mr. Finnegan for, with Mr. Brock against.

Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania and Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Nelsen against.

Mr Herlong and Mr. O'Brien of Illinois for, with Mr. Belcher against.

Mr. Jones of Alabama and Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Morton against.

Mr. Weltner and Mr. Rogers of Colorado for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Abele.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Kilgore with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Murray with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Ostertag.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Devine.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FUNERAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock there will be held the funeral services for our late colleague, the Honorable William Green, Jr., of Philadelphia.

Those Members who want to attend that funeral will not be able to get back here until about 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am asking that the House recess until we have an opportunity to come back to cast our vote tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we be men and politicians. But it is also important that we be human with all the elements which go into making us human beings, whether we are Members of Congress or just plain, ordinary citizens.

INVITATION TO COFFEE AT THE WHITE HOUSE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President and Mrs. Johnson have asked me to advise all Members of the House and all elective officials of the House that they would like to invite them to the White House for a coffee hour from 5 to 6 o'clock p.m. today. It is their hope that all Members may be with them.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, does it require unanimous consent to adjourn over Christmas?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

THE DECLINE OF CONGRESS

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial in the Washington Post for December 21, 1963, should make every Member of Congress think and then act to bring about reform of the rules and procedures of Congress. In the 87th Congress and in this Congress I have sponsored legislation—House Concurrent Resolution 24—to set up a Joint Committee To Study Congressional Organization. We must come to grips with this issue. Otherwise, the Congress will suffer a further erosion of public confidence, and the urgent needs of our society will remain unmet.

I include at this point in the RECORD the following constructive and well-balanced editorial which discusses the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 21, 1963]

THE DECLINE OF CONGRESS

No Congress in recent years has matched the 1963 session in delays, disappointments, and wasted effort. Its performance has satisfied no one. Even some of its Members are filled with gloom over the outlook for representative government in the hands of a legislature that operates so ineffectively. The general sagging of confidence in Congress has created a profound interest in probing into the reasons for this sorry record.

It cannot be said, of course, that the session was devoid of achievements. Out of the general stalling and confusion came some significant enactments. The Senate consented to ratification of the test-ban treaty. Both Houses approved constructive bills for the aid of higher education and the expansion of medical schooling. The new attack on mental illness sponsored by the late President Kennedy and accepted by both Houses may prove to be one of the most significant events of this era.

Congress demonstrated that it could act promptly under pressure when it passed a compulsory arbitration law to avert a threatening nationwide railstrike. But aside from these measures the harvest from a year-long session consists largely of program extensions and relatively minor bills. The mountain labored and brought forth an unimpressive litter of trivia.

No explanation for this shabby performance is to be found in derogatory labels: "Do-nothing Congress," "Stand-still Congress," and so forth. Not many of the men on Capitol Hill have been idle. Some have worked furiously. What ought to concern the country most of all is the alarming frequency with which good intentions and conscientious efforts have been detoured into thorny byways or inescapable dead ends.

The 1963 record thus clearly illuminates the defects in the system. Congress did not succeed in bringing the civil rights bill to a vote in either House. In an entire year the tax bill completed only about half of its legislative journey. Medicare and general school aid did not get out of committee. Unemployment compensation reform and minimum wage expansion were never considered at all. Congress frittered away an enormous amount of time passing three separate debt-limit bills. The wrangle over foreign aid, which should by now be relatively settled policy, was entirely out of proportion. Indeed, Congress has created so many annual chores for itself—extending foreign aid, corporate and excise taxes, the Export-Import Bank, the Civil Rights Commission and a vast number of other routine extensions—that it hasn't time to meet its major legislative responsibilities.

An enormous part of the legislative process consists of assigning priorities to public and private demands. But the Congress of the United States has no systematic means of making these decisions. It allows the trivial to get in the way of the vital because it has no means of putting first things first.

Each session of Congress begins with mountainous piles of bills and resolutions before it. Only a small fraction of them can possibly be enacted. Yet neither House makes a practice of following an agenda or of requiring its committees to comply with a time schedule. Nor is there any requirement that any committee give first attention to major bills. Each committee chairman is a law unto himself. Under such a haphazard system, the scheduling of bills for final action depends upon the whims of many individuals who may be disinterested or even hostile to the central program that the administration is trying to get enacted.

Much of the stalling in the 1963 session appears to have been deliberate with the intention of preventing action on the civil rights bill. Both Houses are vulnerable to this kind of footdragging because the central leadership has no means of taking key bills to the floor against the wishes of reluctant committee chairmen. Here lies the most critical weakness of Congress. Little bills, petty politicking and routine chores are often put ahead of the Nation's major business because no leader or group of leaders has authority to outline a program and hold Congress to it.

The 1963 session has demonstrated that Congress now is the real problem child of our Federal system. It has not kept pace with either the executive branch or the Supreme Court in its adjustment to the demands of modern government. Its rules and procedures are outmoded and unequal to the legislative requirements of a great world power. Its meager achievements in the last year stand as a warning to the country of serious troubles ahead unless Congress can be made an instrument of popular government instead of an obstruction to it.

WHEAT LOANS TO RUSSIA BEWILDERING AND INCONSISTENT

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, on one hand we have State Department pressure on Spain, and rightly so, to cease trade in strategic materials with Red Cuba. We are seeking to step up the war against the Communists in South Vietnam. Then on the other hand and at the same time, we see extreme pressure on the membership of this House to permit loans to Red Russia so she can buy our wheat and continue her trade with Red Cuba and other Communist countries.

This policy is bewildering and inconsistent. It could be disastrous. We are becoming a joke to the whole world and we are confusing the American people. We have sent billions in foreign aid around the world to stop communism—we have voted many more billions to strengthen our defense and that of the free world against communism. Now in this bill we are voting more money, supposedly to fight communism, yet in the same bill we have money for them which will strengthen the Communist world.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to give my enemy my own money to buy my own pocketknife with which he will stab me in the back.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience vote for this aid to Russia who in turn is helping the economy of Castro-Cuba and supporting Communist's infiltration and espionage throughout the world.

WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, all of us who knew and respected him are saddened by the untimely death of Representative William J. Green, Jr. He was an able and valuable Member of the Congress and a diligent and hardworking member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Bill Green was also a friend of the late President John F. Kennedy. President Kennedy had said that Bill Green's efforts in Philadelphia contributed much to the success of the Democratic Party in carrying Pennsylvania for the President.

I have known Representative Green as a good friend since coming to the Congress in 1949. My wife and I join in sending our commiserations to Mrs. Green and her four sons and two daughters.

WEST VIRGINIA'S CHRISTMAS GIFT TO THE NATION

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, it was a tall, red spruce tree, 71 feet in height.

From a great center of lumbering operations, from West Virginia's Randolph County, this giant spruce grew up near the town of Pickens. The tree was donated as the Nation's Christmas Tree by Miss Mary Winkler of Pickens, W. Va., wso sat on the platform last evening as President Lyndon B. Johnson pressed the button to light the 8,000 bulbs on the Christmas tree.

What does he plant who plants a tree?
  He plants the friend of sun and sky;
He plants the flag of breezes free;
  The shaft of beauty towering high.

SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH HONORED

It is entirely fitting that West Virginia's senior U.S. Senator, the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, was accorded a place of honor on the platform close to President and Mrs. Johnson. Senator RANDOLPH escorted the First Lady of the Land and the President, and Mrs. Johnson's youngest daughter, Lucy Baines Johnson, to the platform for the colorful and impressive ceremonies.

Last October, it was an honor for me to fly to Elkins, Randolph County, W. Va., with Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and Senator RANDOLPH. On that occasion, Secretary Udall addressed a banquet opening the annual Mountain State Forest Festival, and he remarked to Senator RANDOLPH at the time that surely West Virginia could be well termed the "Christmas Tree State."

OTHER WEST VIRGINIANS HONORED

Also on the platform at the Ellipse last evening was Dr. Walter Fix, Martinsburg, W. Va., civic leader, who was one of those instrumental in arranging for the 71-foot red spruce to be donated as West Virginia's Christmas gift to the Nation. The tree was delivered and placed at the Ellipse on December 5, 1963, and Senator RANDOLPH wrote Dr. Fix on December 6:

> We can all be happy as West Virginians that a tall spruce tree from our mountains can stand near the White House this Christmas season.

Warden Lane, West Virginia's director of natural resources, was also on the platform for the ceremonies last evening. A large group of West Virginians braved the cold to attend the ceremonies at the Ellipse. Following their annual meeting and Christmas party, the members of the West Virginia State Society of the District of Columbia, led by their outgoing president, Richard Ward, and their president-elect, James Kee, attended the ceremonies as a group.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, it was estimated that 8,000 people—1 for every bulb on the tree—attended the ceremonies. Thousands of the visitors were the young people who had been so inspired by the late President Kennedy, and who now look forward to the promise of a great tomorrow under the leadership of President Johnson.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of President Johnson's remarks at the lighting of the Nation's Christmas tree last evening:

> Mr. Secretary [of the Interior Stewart L. Udall]: Tonight we come to the end of the season of great national sorrow, and to the beginning of the season of great, eternal joy. We mourn our great President, John F. Kennedy, but he would have us go on. While our spirits cannot be light, our hearts need not be heavy.
>
> We were taught by Him whose birth we commemorate that after death there is life. We can believe, and we do believe, that from the death of our national leader will come a rebirth of the finest qualities of our national life. On this same occasion 30 years ago, at the close of another troubled year in our Nation's history, a great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, said to his countrymen, "To more and more of us the words 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself' have taken on a meaning that is showing itself and proving itself in our purposes and in our daily lives."
>
> I believe that this is no less true for all of us in all of our regions of our land today. There is a turning away from things which are false, and things which are small, and things which are shallow. There is a turning toward those things which are true, those things which are profound, and those things which are eternal.
>
> We can, we do, live tonight in new hope and new confidence and new faith in ourselves and in what we can do together through the future. Our need for such faith was never greater, for we are the heirs of a great trust. In these last 200 years we have guided the building of our Nation and our society by those principles and precepts brought to earth nearly 2000 years ago on that first Christmas.
>
> We have our faults and we have our failings, as any mortal society must. But when sorrow befell us, we learned anew how great is the trust and how close is the kinship that mankind feels for us, and most of all, that we feel for each other.
>
> We must remember, and we must never forget, that the hopes and the fears of all the years rest with us, as with no other people in all history. We shall keep that trust working, as always we have worked, for peace on earth and good will among men.
>
> On this occasion 1 year ago, our beloved President John F. Kennedy reminded us that Christmas is the day when all of us dedicate our thoughts to others, when we are all reminded that mercy and compassion are the really enduring virtues, when all of us show, by small deeds and by large, that it is more blessed to give than to receive.
>
> So in that spirit tonight, let me express to you as your President the one wish that I have as we gather here. It is a wish that we not lose the closeness and the sense of sharing, and the spirit of mercy and compassion which these last few days have brought for us all.
>
> Between tonight and Christmas Eve, let each American family, whatever their station, whatever their religion, whatever their race or their region—let each American family devote time to sharing with others something of themselves; yes, something of their very own. Let us, if we can do no more, lend a hand and share an hour, say a prayer, and find some way with which to make this Christmas a prouder memory for what we gave instead of what we receive.
>
> And now here, as we have done so many years, we turn on, in your Capital City, the lights of our national Christmas tree, and we say that we hope that the world will not narrow into a neighborhood before it has broadened into a brotherhood.

LOWERING VOTING AGE TO 18

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, there is rising sentiment in many States for lowering the voting age to 18. A number of proposals have been advanced for an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would provide a uniform voting age of 18 throughout the Nation. I would strongly favor such an amendment, but believe it is also the prerogative of the people of the several States to make their own decisions on this important question. Therefore, I hope that each State legislature will seriously consider this issue at their forthcoming legislative sessions.

On Friday, December 20, the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation presented its report to President Johnson at the White House. I am proud that one of the recommendations of this blue ribbon, bipartisan Commission, headed by the Director of the Census, Dr. Richard M. Scammon, was that each State consider reducing the voting age to 18.

I include a list of the members of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation and their backgrounds, as well as the members of the staff:

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Richard M. Scammon, Commission Chairman, Director of the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce since 1961. Following 5 years in the Army during World War II, served on Gen. Lucius Clay's military government staff in Germany. Chief, division of research for Western Europe, U.S. Department of State, 1948–55. Director of elections research for the private, nonprofit Governmental Affairs Institute, 1955–61. Editor of the four-volume series "America Votes."

Bert L. Bennett, immediate past chairman, North Carolina Democratic Executive Committee. General partner in Quality Oil Co., Winston-Salem, N.C. Director of 14 corporations. Active in civic and religious life of the community. Navy veteran with service in both Atlantic and Pacific theaters during World War II. Was president of the student body at University of North Carolina.

Brendan Byrne, executive director, the American Heritage Foundation. Directed nationwide "Register, Vote on an Informed Basis and Contribute to Your Political Party" program, 1958, 1960, and 1962. Has conducted, since 1957, a continuing educational program on the need to modernize archaic election laws. Author of "Let's Modernize Our Horse and Buggy Election Laws." Former public affairs and philanthropic consultant, magazine editor and educator. Commissioner, New York City Board of Education, 1961–63.

Robert A. Forsythe, State chairman, Minnesota Republican Party. Attorney. Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1959–60. Administrative assistant to U.S. Senator Edward J. Thye, 1955–59. Chief counsel, U.S. Senate Small Business Committee, 1953–55. Faculty member, speech department, College of St. Catherine, 1946–53. B.A., St. Olaf College. LL.B., University of Minnesota, 1949. World War II veteran, 1942–46.

Evron M. Kirkpatrick, executive director, American Political Science Association. Former professor of political science; chairman, social science division, University of Minnesota. Former chief, psychological intelligence and research staff, U.S. Department of State. Author of political science textbooks and board member of numerous educational institutions and foundations.

Bradshaw Mintener, attorney. General counsel, United States Chocolate Manufacturers Association and American Cocoa Research Institute. Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1954–56. Vice president and general counsel, Pillsbury Mills, 1946–54. Chairman, department of social welfare, National Council of Churches. Member of numerous civic and governmental advisory committees.

John A. Perkins, president, University of Delaware. Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1957–58. Has been professor of political science, University of Michigan; president, American Society for Public Administration; vice president, American Political Science Association; editor, "Public Administration Review." Author of several books and numerous professional articles.

Ruth Schertz Phillips, president, League of Women Voters of the United States. Elected in 1958, reelected in 1960 and 1962. League member since 1926. Officer of League of Women Voters of Illinois 1947–57, including presidency, 1953–57. Has two married children and six grandchildren. Widow of the late Robert J. Phillips.

Roy L. Reuther, director, citizenship-legislative department and administrative assistant to the president, United Automobile Workers Union (AFL–CIO). Deputy director, National Voters' Registration Committee, 1960, and national director, AFL–CIO voter registration campaign, 1962. Chief, Labor Morale Division, War Production Board. Service with Army Engineers, World War II.

Victoria Schuck, professor of political science, Mount Holyoke College. Former president, New England Regional Political Science Association and secretary, American Political Science Association; member, Massachusetts Commission on Interstate Relations, 1957–60; member, Board of Trustees of the University of Massachusetts since 1958; chairman, Planning Board of the Town of South Hadley; member Massachusetts Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission; advisory editor, Encyclopedia Britannica; author numerous articles on Federal-State relations and State government.

Leon H. Washington, Jr., editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Sentinel. Born in Kansas City, Kans., the son of Leon H. and Blanche Washington. Attended Washburn College, Topeka, Kans. Went to Los Angeles in 1928, and in 1934 founded the Los Angeles Sentinel, which, under his leadership, has grown to be the largest Negro newspaper west of Chicago with a circulation of more than 35,000. Crusader for human rights for all Americans. Initiated a dramatic campaign through his newspaper entitled "Don't Spend Your Money Where You Can't Work."

Staff: Donald G. Herzberg, staff director; Robert J. Sickels, assistant staff director; Thomas G. McHale, counsel; Allen Hoffard, Michael McClister, Frances D. Hull, and Earlene Owens.

CONCLUSIONS ON 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

Mr. Speaker, the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation covered a wide area of subjects in addition to the 18-year-old vote, and their report is well worth study and action to implement their recommendations. I particularly wish to call attention to further comments by the President's Commission on the subject of the 18-year-old vote:

> The Commission is concerned over the low-voter participation of the age group from 21 to 30. We believe a major reason for this low turnout is that, by the time they have turned 21 (the minimum voting age in 46 of the 50 States) many young people are so far removed from the stimulation of the educational process that their interest in public affairs has waned. Some may be lost as voters for the rest of their lives.
>
> Despite the growing enrollment in institutions of higher education, it is a fact that only a minority of Americans are still in school when they near or reach their 21st birthdays. We believe that each State should carefully consider reducing the voting age to 18.
>
> If 18 is adopted as a minimum age, we also recommend programs under which registration of students could be facilitated, perhaps through voter registration days at high schools themselves.

ADDITIONAL REASONS FOR THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

Mr. Speaker, there are many other arguments which can be advanced for lowering the voting age to 18. These arguments have been well stated from time to time, and at this point I will summarize some of the additional arguments which have validity:

First. When the voting age was set at 21, nearly 200 years ago, the school system was certainly inferior to what it is today. Those who reach 18 today are far better educated than they were at 21 in the old days.

Second. There is far more illiteracy among people over 60 than there is among people between 18 and 21.

Third. If 18-year-old boys can be drafted and exposed to enemy fire in Vietnam and other trouble spots, they ought to be able to exercise the responsibility of voting for the kind of government they are called upon to defend.

Fourth. Under the law, if 18-year-olds can make wills, get married, undertake the great human and civic responsibility of raising a family, obtain licenses to operate automobiles, and be sued, they ought to be considered competent to vote.

Fifth. In the State of Georgia since 1943, 18-year-olds have been allowed to vote. Likewise in the State of Kentucky since 1955, 18-year-olds have been allowed to vote. Alaska allows voting at age 19, and Hawaii at age 20. Officials in Georgia and Kentucky, including school officials, have uniformly praised their State laws allowing voting at age 18.

Sixth. The medical science has lengthened the lifespan, and the average age of the electorate is rising; the 18-year-old vote would help balance this trend.

Seventh. To work for the Federal Government, the minimum age under the civil service laws is 18. People considered capable and responsible enough to work for the Federal Government at age 18 ought to be old enough to vote.

Eighth. The idealism and enthusiasm of young people will help raise the moral tone of government and politics.

HOUR OF MEETING OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'NEILL. Would it be in order to move that the House meet forthwith when we adjourn today?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman advise the Chair what he means by "forthwith"?

Mr. O'NEILL. When we adjourn we will have a new legislative day. Can we then meet at the call of the Chair?

The **SPEAKER**. It would require unanimous consent to meet at any hour other than 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, of course any meeting of the House at any hour for the consideration of this matter other than at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow would require unanimous consent, as I understand it. May I inquire of the Speaker, so as to have the matter official, would not any meeting of the House other than at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow require unanimous consent?

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman has made a correct statement.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Many Members want to meet early, but I do not feel that I can request that the House come in at 9 o'clock, when there will be a funeral of a distinguished friend and colleague at 10 o'clock in the morning. It would require unanimous consent, anyway. Members who have reservations in the early afternoon tomorrow would like to come in at 12 o'clock rather than 2 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the House to adjourn, to reconvene to consider this matter at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. **HALLECK**. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to object, will the gentleman amend that request to come in tomorrow morning at 6 o'clock, to give Members who are out of town an opportunity to get here?

Mr. **ALBERT**. I will be glad to amend the request. I will let the gentleman set the hour.

Mr. **HALLECK**. Seven o'clock.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 7 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. **ALGER**. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection?

Mr. **GROSS**. I object, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas does not. This is 7 o'clock in the morning.

The **SPEAKER**. Objection is heard. The Chair would like to state that since there is to be tomorrow the funeral of one of our dedicated Members, this is a matter that had better be given serious consideration by the leadership and the Members before this afternoon is over.

Mr. **HALLECK**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HALLECK**. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that Bill Green had no better personal friend than I in this House of Representatives. I said earlier that in my opinion there is absolutely no necessity for this rush to try to pass this matter before we adjourn sine die. That has been my position right along. Obviously I have had no cooperation—practically none—in that regard from the other side of the aisle. I made a suggestion that we come in at 7 o'clock. I understood that the funeral was to be at 11 o'clock. If you talk about a later hour this evening, the weather is still bad, as I understand it. I have had word that several Members on this side that want very much to vote on this matter, which I think is basic, are marooned because they cannot get here. I want to do everything I can to cooperate with respect to the people who want to go to this funeral.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **HALLECK**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **ALBERT**. We have a number of Members also who are on board airplanes and who now are unable to land in Washington. Some of them have been turned back to Philadelphia and to other places as well. I think on that score we are both exactly in the same boat because, obviously, both sides are the victims of the inclement weather.

Mr. **HALLECK**. If the gentleman will permit me to say, in making this suggestion, as I made it earlier, I did not have in mind—in spite of what anyone may write or say—that there would be any particular advantage to one side or the other. Because I have no doubt but what many Members on your side of the aisle are marooned because of the inclement weather and they would like to be here. I think it is rather important that we give them that fair chance to be here to vote on this issue. And I want to do that as early as we can tomorrow so that the people who want to go to the funeral will have that opportunity.

This rule can be adopted tomorrow, and expeditiously. So far as I am concerned, I am not so sure but that just about everything has been said on this matter that can be said and I will do everything I can to bring the matter to a vote as quickly as possible.

Mr. **DENT**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **HALLECK**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **DENT**. The rules of the House allow an hour's debate on the rule and an hour's debate on the issue. With all respect to the gentleman and I do have a great deal of respect for him, and I believe he is sincere in his desire to accommodate those of us who would like to pay our respects to a late colleague and friend, I still maintain that none of us have control over all of the membership.

I can almost name you, sir, at least three Members who will eat up the better part of both hours.

Mr. **HALLECK**. The gentleman can do much better than I can, then. I just cannot quite believe that is true. I do not know just how many Members will be going to the funeral, and I do not know how many would vote one way or the other, and that applies to Members on both sides of the aisle. I think this matter should be disposed of, since, apparently, we are going to have to dispose of it quite soon.

With that thought in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the distinguished majority leader that he renew his request that we come in at 7 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Might I suggest 6 a.m.?

Mr. **HALLECK**. That is all right with me.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 6 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker, before the Chair puts that request, I am getting so much advice that it is difficult to proceed. Many Members are pleading with me to ask the distinguished minority leader if he will not agree that when the House adjourn, it adjourn to meet again this afternoon at 4 o'clock or 5 o'clock or, perhaps, 6 o'clock p.m.

Mr. **HALLECK**. Objection has been made to that. Let me just say to the gentleman that I was informed that if that effort was made, there would be objection, and that is why I made the suggestion I did to the majority leader.

Mr. **ALBERT**. I think it is quite obvious that there will be objection made.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 6 o'clock this afternoon for the purpose of considering this matter.

Mr. **HALLECK**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I think I shall object—but pending that, because as I said to the majority leader, there have been many Members on this side of the aisle who have said to me that they are going to object, I would respectfully request that the distinguished majority leader withdraw his request and that the Speaker declare a recess for perhaps an hour or a half an hour.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request in view of this very unusual situation so that we may have a chance to see what might be worked out.

RECESS

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair declares a recess until 2:15 p.m. this afternoon.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2:15 p.m. this afternoon.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I renew my unanimous-consent request that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet at 7 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. **HALLECK**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I would like the RECORD to show that this suggestion was originally made by me. I have also discussed with the Speaker and the majority leader the matter of a sine die adjournment, provided we do come in at 7 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker, I might say in connection with the arrangement for 7 o'clock it is my understanding that very little time would be used in connection with the adoption of the rule. I do not know how much time there would be in debate on the motion to recede and concur on the conference report. I would assume that there would not need to be too much debate because I think pretty much everything has been said. So I think we could move to a vote very quickly, which would make it possible for Members to attend the funeral of our late departed colleague, Mr. Bill Green.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, based upon what has been said it is not implicit that debate on the rule or on the conference report would be unduly circumscribed?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield—and I do not want to try to put words in the mouth of the minority leader—I think what he said was that he did not expect there would be much debate. I would like to join in the hope that there would not be much, but nobody would be cut off from the normal procedures of the House.

Mr. HALLECK. Could we have an assurance from the majority leader as to the sine die adjournment?

Mr. ALBERT. It would be my hope that immediately after the disposition of this matter we could adopt the sine die resolution.

Mr. HALLECK. I would say that would be without regard to how the matter comes out?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we have already heard one Member say that he will not sit idly by and watch the debate cut short. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we adjourn today. Those of us who want to pay our respects could go up this evening and pay our respects to the family and come back tomorrow and be here at 12 o'clock, like a normal day of the Congress. That will be the only way that you can guarantee it. I do not believe that this Congress can in this season of the year completely forget the little decencies that we ought to observe.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would say we tried to work that out so both things could be accomplished.

Is there objection?

Mr. DENT. I have not given up my reservation of the right to object yet, because, as we all know, good intentions pave the road to hell, and I understand some Members might be considered contractors in that pavement contract. I have no way of knowing whether there will be an airplane flying tomorrow when they are not flying today.

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we have been checking the Weather Bureau and the airlines. Our information is that the weather will be clearing at 10 or 11 o'clock tonight. Again, may I say that many, many Members on our side and on the other side have spent their money trying to get here. I think they have a right to be here and be recorded on this vote. I think the funeral services up there are at 11 o'clock.

Mr. DENT. I understand that.

Mr. HALLECK. I am not a member of the official party. Were it not for plans that have been made for a long period, I would go under my own power to pay my respects. I think that with airplane transportation clearing up by tomorrow we can conclude this matter in time for our colleagues to get to the funeral.

Mr. DENT. I will accept that we are trying. I never saw any virtue in delinquency, and there is delinquency on the part of those who are holding this House in session when their duty is to be here the same as those who are here. I owe nothing to any Member of the House who has left and left the Members of this House to hold us here on the eve of Christmas, to come back.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been a very frustrating and exhausting experience for those of us who have remained during this Christmas week in order to conduct the affairs of Congress. We do not complain when the cause is just and urgent, but the events of the past several days have convinced me of the futility of this extraordinary session.

My sole reason for canceling five speaking engagements in my district during the past 2 weeks and denying myself of the joys of being with my family at this advent season is because of the importance of this foreign aid bill and my desire to see it trimmed to the bone and, also, block the sale of wheat to Russia.

While I appreciate the importance of this measure it is difficult to comprehend the insistence that action must be taken on this bill prior to adjournment especially when there already exists legislation to continue the current foreign aid appropriation until January 31, 1964, which is far more advantageous to the administration.

Let me appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to forget party considerations, to forget political consequences and to forget personal contentions so that this issue may be decided today.

Mr. Speaker, as important as foreign aid is, the fate of our Nation is not at stake on this vote, but very well the maturity and responsibility of the Congress could be.

A FRUITFUL CAREER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, as your birthdays tumble down upon you through the calendar years, you have become more and more cognizant of the fragile existence of life itself, and how frugal is our span of time.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, on this your birthday we can say that your life has been one of richness in your contributions to the spiritual, economic, and cultural advancement of our people. There is no man who came within your sphere of activity that has not felt the warmth of your friendship, or the influence of your persuasive powers always pleading to serve and help.

Your high sense of religious acceptance has given many a new chance to rededicate themselves to their true purposes in life.

Through the years of abuse and vituperation which every public servant falls heir to, you have overcome your protagonists by disregarding the snide averments, and with a slight smile and gentle gesture pointing to the unanswerable record.

Mr. Speaker, you have grown with the years, both intellectually and philosophically. Your realistic approach to the responsibilities of your position and its problems, mark you as a great leader and superlative statesman.

You hold the admiration and respect of not only those who serve the Government, but the citizens of the Nation who have closely watched your great career.

We who work with you are proud to serve under your tutelage and guidance. May God's blessings guide and keep you in the Nation's cause forever.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in these days of stress and strain many things have been said that perhaps in calmer moments might not have been uttered. Yet, some of the things that were said and hotly advanced during the past 3 to 4 days concerning foreign aid have caused me to recall and remember a most informative and inspired address that the great and distinguished American affairs made at the University onetime Ambassador to India and special adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American, the Honorable Chester Bowles,

of Texas earlier this year. His words and thoughts have special pertinency and I include them at this point in the RECORD:

WHY FOREIGN AID?

(Address by the Honorable Chester Bowles, President's special representative and advisor on African, Asian, and Latin American Affairs, at the University of Texas, Austin, Tex., April 24, 1963)

It is a pleasure to be here in Texas: A State where people are accustomed to speaking their minds frankly and with commonsense.

Perhaps it is fitting that my subject tonight is one on which we Americans have lately expended all too little commonsense. I refer to foreign aid—the program of U.S. assistance to less developed nations.

This spring the foreign aid program is once again undergoing its annual drubbing on Capitol Hill and in certain elements of the Nation's press.

As has become their custom, many frustrated legislators and editorial writers are once again attacking the program on every possible score while many others who have been among its most loyal friends appear to be on the defensive.

Yet there is a paradox in this situation. On the basis of recent Gallup polls, the program's popularity in the country as a whole is at the highest level since its inception. According to Mr. Gallup, 58 percent of the American people are in favor of it, with only 30 percent opposed.

What is more, most of those who remain opposed to foreign aid grossly overestimated its cost, with the majority of guesses ranging anywhere from 10 to 50 percent of our budget.

In fact, of course, foreign assistance amounts to less than one twenty-fifth of our annual Federal expenditures, and even this percentage may be reduced further as our national wealth increases and our loans are repaid.

Now how are we to explain this paradox: the clear contradiction between apparent public approval and vocal political opposition?

I believe that the answer lies largely in our inadequate efforts in the last 10 years to explain the real objectives of our aid program to the American people and to their Congress.

The official reasons offered in support of the program during the 1950's were often contradictory, inaccurate, or irrelevant. The upshot has been widespread public confusion on the program's real objectives and widespread disillusionment when it fails to achieve the false goals so often proposed.

For instance, the program has been most widely presented in terms of simple anticommunism. Since a major U.S. objective is to stop communism, this implies that if communism did not exist, there would be little or no reason for the program itself.

For many years this negative perspective was actually written into the preamble of the enabling foreign aid legislation through language suggesting that the program would be necessary only as long as the Communist conspiracy threatened U.S. interests.

For developing countries seeking aid, such a view also ironically turned communism into a valuable natural resource, such as oil or uranium.

By the logic of the argument, any developing nation devoid of a powerful Communist neighbor or a noisy Communist minority becomes per se a poor candidate for U.S. economic assistance. It has been suggested sardonically that a developing nation which lacked a Communist minority should plant and nourish a small but vocal Communist movement—and then implore the United States to provide the funds to squelch it.

Since even Communists are sometimes blessed with a sense of humor, it is not surprising that Soviet spokesmen talking to the people of Asia and Africa have said: "The Soviet Union offers you loans and technicians to speed your development. For this you are grateful. But you should be equally grateful to Moscow for whatever aid the Americans give you. They are quite frank in saying that if they were not so frightened of us Communists, they would give you nothing."

In 1959, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I introduced an amendment to the preamble of the foreign aid bill which outlined the purposes of the aid program in the affirmative terms of our traditional dedication to freedom and opportunity. Although my amendment was approved overwhelmingly, our thinking on aid is still bound in major degree by the same narrow, self-limiting anti-Communist obsession.

A second fallacy in our past presentation of foreign aid is that claim that the program will bring us military allies, win us votes in the United Nations, or gain us support against Cuba and the Red Chinese. In other words, it is assumed that the program's primary objective is to make friends and buy votes.

This argument is equally hollow and futile. It is no more possible to buy the long-term loyalty of a nation than it is to buy the enduring loyalty of a friend. To attempt to do so can lead only to frustration and antagonism.

Suppose a wealthy resident of the Texas town in which you live should offer to build a swimming pool for your children, a new library, and an extension to your town hall—provided only that you and your neighbors agree to support his political views on public questions.

What would you do? You would invite him to take his money and go live elsewhere.

Unfortunately, in the past we Americans have inadvertently placed ourselves often in the position of the richest man in the world community, naively trying to buy friends and supporters for our views. Yet commonsense and a knowledge of human nature should tell us that foreign aid will not make us love our neighbors, make our neighbors love us, or win international popularity laurels for us—and we should not expect it to do so.

Finally, it has often been wrongly assumed that the success or failure of the aid program should be judged by purely and simply the rate of economic growth in the recipient country.

Obviously increased agricultural and industrial production is of the utmost importance. Yet the record shows that when the added production is badly distributed, it only widens the gap between rich and poor—and, in the process, inevitably erodes the political stability which we are striving to create.

There are many examples. Some of the most productive countries of Latin America, for instance, already have per capita incomes greater than several European countries. Yet because the privileged minority at the top may be getting rapidly richer while the impoverished embittered masses at the bottom of the ladder are making little or no progress, these nations can be as politically explosive as the poorest African or Asian country whose per capita income may be no greater than $100 a year.

In view of our past failure adequately to explain the program, it is a tribute to our national commonsense that so many Americans have continued to give tacit support to foreign assistance for basically humanitarian reasons.

This leads us back to the basic question: If the purpose of our aid program is not simply to combat communism, and if it cannot be expected to buy friends or votes, and if faster economic growth alone is no sure cure-all, what exactly is foreign aid good for? What will it do?

The answer to this question is deceptively simple to state: A wisely administered U.S. aid program can help build nations that are increasingly prepared to defend their independence against totalitarian enemies—external or internal, overt or covert—and increasingly willing to work with us as partners on common projects which may lead the world a little closer to peace.

In other words, the purpose of our aid program is to develop independent nations able and willing to stand on their own feet—and thereby to share with us a dedication to peace and freedom.

To put the question more sharply, we have a critical choice: We can help to guide the economic and social upheaval now sweeping Asia, Africa, and Latin America into constructive, peaceful channels; or we can sit back nervously and ineffectually, while the revolution of rising expectations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America slips into the hands of reckless extremists who despise everything we stand for—and a succession of Red Chinas and Red Cubas comes into being.

Within this more realistic framework of achievable objectives, let us now consider to what extent our aid program has thus far succeeded—and to what extent it has failed.

In the years since 1946, the most dramatic success of the foreign aid program has come, of course, in Western Europe.

Following World War II a political and economic vacuum existed in Europe. Bombed out industries lay in ruins, and each nation's economy was scarred by inflation, vast unemployment and utter hopelessness.

In the United States, meanwhile, shortsighted political leaders of both parties led a mad scramble to disband our victorious armies and draw back into our isolationist shell.

With most of Eastern Europe already overrun by the Red armies, with large and well organized Communist parties in France, Italy, and elsewhere, and with nearly 200 battle-tested Soviet divisions still under arms, Stalin was confident that communism could quickly fill the entire European vacuum.

Yet his efforts failed. Soviet pressures toward the Mediterranean through Greece and Turkey were forestalled by the prompt counteraction of a massive military and economic assistance program under the Truman doctrine.

Within months, Marshall plan aid was provided to rebuild the war-torn economies of Western Europe, followed by the creation of NATO as an effective military shield between our allies and the Communist world.

Although the Communist danger was obviously on our minds, Secretary of State Marshall was careful to present our aid effort within an affirmative framework. Its objective, he stressed, was not negatively to oppose some other ideology or ism, or to win subservient satellites but positively to create prosperous, independent European nations capable of standing on their own feet and making their own decisions.

It is noteworthy that in the 15 years since the Marshall plan got underway, and quite contrary to Stalin's confident expectations, there have been no Communist territorial gains anywhere on the European Continent. Indeed, Western Europe has achieved a measure of political stability and economic prosperity unparalleled in its history.

There were many of our fellow citizens who charged at the time that the $13 billion we invested in the Marshall plan was a giveaway, just as there are many today who describe our present aid program in Asia, Africa, and Latin America as a giveaway.

Yet the wisdom of this investment becomes all the more apparent when one compares the dismal Soviet record in Eastern Europe with the booming economic and political conditions of Western Europe today.

While the Kremlin is still forced to bolster many of its East European satellites with economic loans, U.S. economic aid to Western Europe has ceased, and we are now selling over $6 billion worth of American goods each year to former recipients of Marshall plan aid. Even the diehards must admit that that is a remarkably good return on our postwar investment in Europe's recovery.

What we have witnessed in Europe, what our foreign assistance program has helped to create there, is nothing less than a new economic and political renaissance.

To be sure, for the moment, some of the symptoms of Europe's new vitality can be irritating to us. Nevertheless, our aid program to Europe brilliantly accomplished what it set out to do, and today we are dealing with prosperous, independent allies. Would any thoughtful man prefer that we deal instead with the chaotic Europe of 1947?

In many other parts of the world foreign aid has also been a major success.

Let us consider, for example, what has happened in less than a generation in India, an underdeveloped country of 450 million people, equaling the combined population of Africa and Latin America—a country which I know well.

Since I left India as U.S. Ambassador in 1953 Indian national income has increased by 42 percent, with food-grain production up by 56 percent. In 1947 it was estimated that 100 million cases of malaria developed annually; now this debilitating disease has nearly disappeared. Life expectancy in India in 1947 was 27 years; it is now 42.

In a country that was only 10 percent literate 15 years ago, 60 percent of all Indian children under 12 now go to school. Indian industrial production is expanding by 10 percent annually, one of the highest rates in the world.

In its first years of independence India developed a constitution that combined features of both the United States and British experience. Since then India has held three national elections—each the largest exercise of the democratic privilege in the world—in which a higher percentage of people voted than in the United States.

India has freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and a private enterprise sector that has been chalking up sizable gains.

India's success has been in large measure due to its own efforts. The Indian people have worked hard, developed able leadership, learned by hard experience, and maintained a sound civil service based on solid British training.

But the Indians would be the first to agree that the outlook for the success of Indian democracy would not be so bright today had it not been for generous assistance from the United States.

In the last 15 years we have granted or loaned India $3.9 billion in economic aid. Approximately 55 percent of this assistance was in the form of surplus commodities—wheat, cotton, corn, etc. Another 42 percent was in dollars for the purchase of materials—steel, railroad transportation equipment and machinery, manufactured mostly in the United States and produced by American workers. The remainder went for technical advice and instruction.

India's record of achievement is of great significance to that nation's future and security. Yet this record is also profoundly important to our own security.

Only through a free India, with growing strength and confidence, can we expect to see the development of a political and military balance to Communist China in Asia. What is more, a successful, expanding India demonstrates to all of the doubters and the fainthearted in Asia, Africa and Latin America that democracy is more than an impractical Western political luxury; it is a realistic political and economic system that actually works in practice, that produces results.

The Indian third 5-year plan proposes that within the next 10 years the need for foreign assistance will begin to be reduced; and it foresees its eventual end as India's takeoff point of self-sustaining growth is finally reached.

But India is by no means the only dramatic example of successful aid use outside Western Europe. In the same subcontinent, Pakistan is taking equally impressive strides toward national development with U.S. assistance. Together, these two nations hold the key to the future security of south Asia against pressures from Communist China.

These south Asian examples, moreover, are matched in other parts of the world. In Japan, Greece, Formosa, and Israel, our aid program has either accomplished its purpose and been terminated, or is in the process of being phased out. Indeed, Japan and Israel are already extending such assistance to others. In Nigeria, Colombia, Tunisia, and many other countries steady progress is being made.

Therefore, the records shows that foreign aid, when handled wisely, can succeed in doing what it sets out to do—it can help to create viable independent nations.

On the other hand, where the program has not been handled wisely, the results have naturally not been so good. Similarly, where our expectations have been unrealistic and grandiose, we have inevitably met disappointment.

In regard to the wise handling of economic assistance, we have learned some hard lessons from our Latin American experience in recent years; and today we are now attempting to apply these lessons through tightened standards for aid distribution through the Alliance for Progress.

The primary lesson that we must learn from Cuba is that the United States cannot afford to support, or even to tolerate, corrupt, oppressive regimes, of whatever ideological base, which deny the basic aspirations of their own people for human dignity and a better life. As President Kennedy has himself pointed out on more than one occasion, we wouldn't have Castro if it had not been for Batista.

Reactionary rightwing governments constitute the weakest defense against totalitarianism of the left. They are sitting ducks for the Castro-Communists because they deny the dignity and rights of the majority of people—and their eventual overthrow through violence is inevitable as the economic and political pressures intensify.

What is the nature of these pressures? Consider these facts:

In Latin America today 1½ percent of the people—those with 15,000 or more acres each—are said to own half of all agricultural land. Only a handful of countries have an effective income tax. In several countries local capital is being accumulated in Swiss banks for safekeeping at the same time that U.S. aid is requested, while scarce foreign exchange goes for perfume and Cadillacs instead of for machinery, tools, and fertilizer plants.

In many Latin American countries the reforms needed to produce prosperity and stability are dangerously overdue. Yet because the essential economic and social revolution in many cases has not yet taken place, great wealth continues to exist explosively side by side with abject poverty.

What is important about the new AID program is the fact that its administrators now have the will to use it as a lever to induce reform and not, as so frequently happened in the past, as a backstop for the doomed status quo. In the broadest political and human sense, we intend to use this program to prevent situations getting so far out of hand that we are forced to make the impossible choice between the Castros and the Batistas of this world.

Those countries that are unable or unwilling to curb luxury spending, to stop the flight of capital, and to undertake far-reaching social and economic reforms should be dropped as aid recipients; or, in some cases, I believe our assistance should be limited to a modest U.S. presence through the Peace Corps and technical assistance programs.

There will, of course, be inevitable exceptions in those situations where overwhelming strategic or political considerations make continuance of a dole necessary for our own security.

In such exceptional instances, however, let us at least frankly admit that our purposes are political, and not confuse these exceptions with the constructive development policies, operations and standards of the rest of the program.

So much for the lessons of our 15-year aid program. What must we Americans do here and now, as the annual aid debate begins to rage again?

What we need to do now, as citizens and as a Government, is to strengthen the program, to support it and explain it, and to recognize it as a basic arm of American foreign policy without which we would be sorely, perhaps fatally, handicapped.

In this regard, I believe that we should keep in mind five clear sets of objectives:

First, we have an overriding responsibility to explain to ourselves and to others what the program can and cannot do. We should never fall prey to the tired old fallacies that have previously distorted our views of aid's possibilities.

Properly administered foreign assistance can do one thing, and one thing only: It can help to build independent nations capable of standing on their own feet and making their own free choices. And if we can do that we can help create a rational world in which communism is steadily declining in influence—a world that holds some prospect of peace.

Second, we are now establishing and publicizing clear working criteria for the distribution of economic aid. The need for such criteria has been strongly implied in the Act for International Development as passed by Congress and the recent Clay report has reemphasized this need.

Let us remember that the Congress has directed us to do precisely what experience has taught us must be done if our oversea assistance effort is to succeed. For instance, the act says:

"Assistance will be based upon sound plans and programs, be directed toward the social as well as economic aspects of economic development; be responsive to the efforts of the recipient countries to mobilize their own resources and help themselves; be cognizant of the external and internal pressures which hamper their growth and should emphasize long-range development assistance as the primary instrument of such growth."

In the spirit of the congressional legislation, we are now posing for ourselves some searching questions in regard to all requests for assistance from abroad.

These questions relate to the applicant's present per capita income and its distribution: The competence of the government, and its sensitivity to the needs of the population; the existence of well-conceived, long-range national economic development plan; the adequate distribution and collection of the nation's tax burden; the priority given to the vast majority of citizens who live in the rural areas; the development of equitable land distribution and the creation of an integrated approach to community development; the existence of a favorable climate and adequate incentives for foreign and domestic private investment; and the maintenance of effective controls over the expenditure of foreign exchange for luxury imports.

Most important of all, we are asking ourselves whether a government which seeks our assistance exists with at least the general consent of its own population: in other words, is it sufficiently rooted in public support to assure the broad backing of its people necessary for a bold program of economic and social development?

Although obviously no nation could respond affirmatively on all these counts, these are objectives that we must stress in developing priorities and standards for distribution of assistance.

Now let us consider a third general objective—the need for improvement in the planning and integration of the foreign aid program, not only within our own Government, but in connection with the wide and complex variety of international agencies and other countries that also operate in this field.

The U.S. Government provides unilateral aid through the Export-Import Bank, which helps the underdeveloped nations finance the purchase of industrial goods in the United States; the Development Loan Fund, which provides long-term loans on easy terms payable in both dollars and soft currencies; U.S. technical assistance, which offers a wide range of specialists in planning and technology; the Peace Corps, which provides several thousand volunteers trained in teaching, nursing, rural development, and the like; and food for peace, which distributes U.S. surplus farm products, including wheat, rice, powdered milk, and cotton.

But economic assistance for the developing nations is not solely an American enterprise. Loans and technical assistance are available from many international agencies. These include the World Bank, which provides loans payable in hard currencies; the International Development Association, which provides soft loans; the International Monetary Fund, which helps stabilize currencies; and the so-called specialized agencies of the U.N.—the World Health Organization, Food and Agricultural Organization, and UNESCO.

Finally, West Germany, France, Britain, Canada, Australia, Japan, Switzerland and Israel also provide unilateral economic assistance on a generally similar basis.

The staggering number of sources to which the developing nations can turn for assistance inevitably creates confusion and some overlapping of effort. This suggests the need for careful planning to make sure that the right kind of aid is made available and that its use is effectively coordinated with the resources of the developing country itself.

Now let me emphasize a fourth basic consideration of particular importance: orderly political growth in the developing nations is dependent in large measure upon what happens in the rural areas where 80 percent of the people live.

When the rural areas are oppressed with poverty, exploitation and injustice, they are easy targets for Communist infiltration. Moreover, it is impossible for any developing nation to increase its industrial output rapidly if four-fifths of its people lack the purchasing power to buy its factory-produced goods.

Our aid program therefore should be more and more closely related to the improvement of agriculture, the encouragement of land reform, the creation of rural extension services, and the building of rural schools, roads and clinics.

Fifth and last, let us take an imaginative approach to questions of public and private ownership, developing new mixed forms to meet management problems.

This question is one of practicality, not morality. We Americans are wedded to a system of private ownership which has done so much for us. However, as a matter of pure realism the overburdened governments of the developing nations have enough to do without taking on the multiplicity of economic problems inherent in government management of production.

Twenty years of government service have made me increasingly aware of the limits of government. As long as they are getting results, it is not our prime responsibility to impose our ideas on the recipients of our aid. To do so would be to open a Pandora's box of imperialistic charges and to contribute to a less effective utilization of our own aid.

In summing up, there is no question but that our foreign aid program is an absolutely vital instrument of American foreign policy, and that it has already made an enormous contribution to our national security.

The frustration that so many Americans seem to feel with this program has resulted partly from inevitable mistakes in new areas of effort, partly from the complexities of the cold war, but more than anything else from the unbalanced presentation in recent years of what the aid program can and cannot do.

Yet it would be folly to allow our frustrations to thwart our capacity to deal with the present-day world. The fact is the program, in spite of many errors, has on the whole been a brilliant success and its continuance is essential if we are to develop the kind of peaceful world community in which we ourselves can prosper.

We Americans have one peculiar national habit: We tend to act much better than we sound. Why this is so I shall leave to the psychologists.

However, the fact of the matter is that we are likely to give the worst reasons for some of our most noble acts.

Thus we argue that the time has come to grant our Negro citizens first-class citizenship not because they have been waiting 180 years since the Declaration of Independence asserted that "all men are created equal" but because the colored majority of mankind in Asia and Africa is said to be breathing down our necks.

In order to win public support for urgently needed scholarships to our universities, we call the legislation the National Defense Education Act and we fit it out with reassuring anti-Communist disclaimers.

Through our fears and frustrations of this disorderly new world, we have come to act as though our chief national purpose is not to maintain and extend our basic American commitment to human dignity, but to thwart the Russians and Chinese in whatever they decide to do.

And while we strive to outfox the Communists abroad, we concentrate on keeping up with the Joneses at home. Politicians, journalists, businessmen—even college professors—increasingly give the most cynical reasons for their most high-minded activities.

We smile with a knowing self-assurance as we explain that scandals in high places and the misuse of positions of national trust simply go to prove that politics is politics.

Northern officeseekers assure their southern colleagues that they vote for Negro rights only because of the political pressures back home.

Businessmen contributing to boys' summer camp funds and hospital-building drives rush to cover up their decent motivations by pointing out that it is good publicity for their business—and after all, isn't it tax deductible?

In regard to foreign aid we indulge ourselves in the same labored, cynical rationalizations instead of proudly presenting this crucially important program for what it is—an earnest unprecedented effort to help new nations ease poverty, illiteracy, and disease so that they can remain free within their own cultures—we explain that our real purpose is to buy friends and supporters in the United Nations, or to keep restless peasants and workers from asking hard questions, or to fill empty bellies on the mistaken assumption that well-fed peasants will more easily tolerate the injustices and harassments of the feudal societies in which they live, and thus joyfully join us in support of the status quo.

The constructive leadership of America is now challenged, not simply to stand up to the Russians, but to understand the nature of our revolutionary world, to explore the forces at work in Communist societies and to put itself in touch with the aspirations of the people in between—the men, women, and children of Asia, Africa, and Latin America who see our planet as something more than an area for Soviet-American conflict.

As we move to meet this challenge, we may be reminded of the words of Woodrow Wilson, who once told a graduating class at Annapolis:

"There have been other nations as rich as we; there have been other nations as powerful; there have been other nations as spirited; but I hope we shall never forget that we created this Nation, not to serve ourselves, but to serve mankind. * * * No other nation was ever born into the world with the purpose of serving the rest of the world just as much as it served itself."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I returned to Washington this morning, arriving at about 5 o'clock a.m., in order to attend the session today. Unfortunately, the heavy snowfall so delayed travel from my residence to the Capitol that, although I left my home at 11 this morning, I missed today's quorum call and the rollcall on the motion. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

FAIR WEATHER CAUSES MEMBERSHIP ABSENCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussion concerning the delaying of action on the foreign aid conference report I feel obligated to make a progress report to the minority leader concerning the Republican Member from New York who is campaigning in my district.

Since we last discussed this matter, other Congressmen have returned from the area but there is no evidence of a desire on the part of the gentleman I first mentioned to return. I have checked the weather in my district, and I am pleased to tell you it is clear, sunny, and in the low seventies. I suggest this is the impelling reason for his absence, rather than inability to obtain transportation and would suggest that further delay for his benefit is hardly called for.

FINANCING WHEAT FOR RUSSIA

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the distinguished majority leader accused the Republicans of going on a sitdown strike. I protest. This is crybaby talk and it is not true. More Democrats were absent than Republicans on the crucial vote early last Saturday when the House again for the second time reaffirmed its opposition to financing wheat for Russia with the U.S. taxpayer's dollar. If the Democratic Party wants a Christmas present for Khrushchev by financing wheat for Russia as a campaign issue, I, for one, accept the challenge. This will set the stage for a Republican campaign issue which will be congressional reform—reform by the voters and return of this body to control by the Republican Party and commonsense.

Sitdown strike, Mr. Speaker, indeed. This is strange talk from the architects of a yearlong slowdown strike which has unfairly created public disrespect for this House, still the world's greatest bastion of freedom and democracy.

SALES TO COMMUNIST NATIONS

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, certain accusations concerning the Republican position in opposition to guaranteeing credits to the Soviet Union through an instrumentality of the U.S. Government have been stated, both on the floor of the House and in statements issuing from the executive branch. As I understand it, the administration is opposed to a congressional ban on credit guarantees by the Export-Import Bank on sales to Communist nations because it would "tie the hands of the President." It has further been argued that should the Congress insist on a provision of this type in a foreign aid bill that it will strike a disastrous blow to the prestige of the President of the United States and amount to a declaration of no confidence in his efforts to deal with the problem of the Soviet Union.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, as I have listened to the arguments on the floor of the House the last few days, it almost seemed as if by some strange alchemy our constitutional Republic had become a parliamentary democracy where an adverse vote in this body would topple the Government. Mr. Speaker, when the day arrives that mere prestige, even of so important and exalted a person as the President of the United States, becomes more important to the Members of this body, be they Democrat or Republican, than fundamental and basic principles and beliefs, then I fear for the future of our country.

The argument that a congressional declaration against facilitating the financing of sales to Communist nations deprives the President of his constitutional powers to direct the foreign policies of this Nation is the familiar "strawman" that is always erected when no other convincing argument is available. It has already been pointed out that there is nothing new or novel in Congress asserting its will with respect to matters of this kind. In the Agriculture Act of 1961, Congress expressly stated that funds authorized pursuant to that act were not to be used to finance the sale of subsidized farm commodities to Communist nations. Surely, the elected representatives of the people have a broader responsibility than that of a mere dollars-and-cents appraisal of what form our foreign aid program should take. As was pointed out earlier on the floor of this House, it scarcely makes sense to appropriate billions of dollars annually to keep back the tide of communism if we in the same legislation approve actions which can only serve to strengthen the Communists in the battle which they are making against our whole way of life.

Members from the other side of the aisle have vehemently claimed that the efforts of the Republican Party to point this out amounts to an indictment of the Democratic Party for being pro-Communist. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are not charging the opposition with being soft on communism. We are charging them with responsibility for misdirecting and misapplying those policies which can and should be used to frustrate the ambitions of the Communists for a world takeover. We believe that the vast majority of American people are with us in this battle and that, like the Republican Members of the House of Representatives, they do not approve of the course of action on which this administration has apparently embarked. There is certainly nothing disloyal in suggesting that the President of the United States is capable of making a mistake, and that he and his advisers are committing an egregious error by this sudden revamping of our trade policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

It has been suggested, and I think correctly so, that the Soviet Union may not even be interested in American wheat, as such. What they are interested in is establishing an open line of credit with this country so that future deals for fertilizer, fertilizer plants, and other types of machinery and equipment, which are in critical short supply can possibly be made on advantageous credit terms.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost incredible when to stop and think that only 14 months ago this Nation stood poised on the brink of a nuclear holocaust, all because Mr. Khrushchev, in his effort to alter the strategic balance of power in the world, placed missiles on the island of Cuba. Today that same Mr. Khrushchev is still the dictator of Communist Russia. Today the same Communist Party rules supreme with the same avowed aim of eventually subverting and destroying the Western capitalist system. Yet, the Johnson administration, little more than a year later, is waging a desperate battle to try to convince this Congress and the American people that it is in the national interest to subsidize the financing of grain sales to the U.S.S.R. No one in the administration or in this House has undertaken to explain just how the national interest will be served by strengthening the sinews of the Russian Government.

Mr. Speaker, if the Democratic leadership in this body had worked as hard to enact a farm bill which would be in the best interests of the wheat farmers and the feed grain farmers of America as they have worked in recent days to facilitate the sale of grain to Soviet Russia, we perhaps would not have to be looking for an outlet for our surplus grain behind the Iron Curtain. This Congress is coming to a close on a sorry note indeed because in my opinion the Democratic leadership has fought more fiercely and put forth a greater effort to facilitate the financing of trade with Communist countries than they have fought for civil rights, or for any other single program recommended by the late President.

In conclusion, the spectacle which we are witnessing now here in the Congress and within the administration reminds me of the quotation attributed to Lenin that "when the time comes to hang the last two capitalists, you will find them bidding against each other for the sale of the rope."

GRANTING CREDIT TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, with all of the debate, charges, and countercharges as to the position of Members and political parties on the conference committee report before the House of Representatives, concerning the foreign aid appropriation bill (H.R. 9499), it is clear to me that two primary issues are involved.

First, there is the issue of granting credit to the Soviet Union through the Export-Import Bank to facilitate the purchase of wheat and other agricultural products by the Soviets. To the extent that these funds are contributed by American taxpayers—and our Nation's contribution to the Export-Import Bank is substantial—those who oppose the Findley amendment are enabling the Soviet Union to enhance its position with its own citizens and with various others of the Soviet bloc nations.

This does not mean that any Member who opposes the Findley amendment is disloyal or unpatriotic. However, it is perfectly appropriate to question the judgment of those who oppose such an amendment. It is my feeling and that of a great many Americans—both Republican and Democratic—that a failure to support this amendment is detrimental to the free world's contest with the Soviet bloc.

The second clear issue involved in the Findley amendment—in contrast to the substitute recommended in the conference committee report—involves the constitutional division of powers under our republican form of government. If the Congress wishes to deny use of American funds to finance the purchase of wheat by the Soviet Union, the Congress must make that decision. The Findley amendment does just that. The substitute recommended by the conference committee delegates this authority to the executive branch of Government. Those Members of Congress who are jealous of the legislative prerogatives will not hesitate to support the Findley amendment and oppose the conference committee substitute.

There must be an awareness on the part of all Members of Congress that a constant diminution of legislative authority is taking place—and that the executive branch is expanding constantly, both in size and in authority. The opportunity to restrict that growth and that influence is presented to this House of Representatives today.

These issues are neither partisan nor temporary. They are basic to our entire political system.

HOW RIDICULOUS CAN WE BECOME?

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I have had a little experience in the credit insurance policies of the Export-Import Bank. This past August, I helped to form a compromise agreement in conference that kept the Export-Import Bank and its credit insurance program in operation. At no time, during the months of negotiations over the extension of the Bank's charter, was there ever a hint that its credit insurance policies toward Communist countries would change. I cannot believe that this Congress would have been willing to accept a charter extension had it known of any effort to insure 100 percent the credit risk of the Soviet Union. Nor do I think there would have been any cries of protest against what some now call an attempt to invade the domain of the executive in foreign affairs.

When the export credit was proposed for the wheat deal this fall, I submitted H.R. 9144, a companion measure to the Mundt bill in the Senate, containing the language of the Findley amendment to the foreign aid appropriations bill. At the time, we were being told that the wheat deal, on an 18-month insured credit basis, was necessary to relieve our wheat surplus and to help our balance-of-payments deficit. The dire predictions by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman last spring that rejection of his compulsory wheat plan would raise surpluses have been proven false. Our balance-of-payments position has improved to the point that a leading European economist last week suggested it was now under control.

No one can deny that the wheat deal with Russia will make even further improvement on the grain surplus problem or the balance-of-payments deficit. No one can deny, however, that this could be accomplished by requiring a cash payment instead of credit terms guaranteed 100 percent by the American taxpayer. Russia has been buying foreign exchange with her gold at a rate almost twice that of a year ago, and I doubt if she plans to use it to play Santa Claus either to her own people or for any other country. That money has been accumulated just in case the United States finds enough backbone to demand it for a deal the Soviets need much more than we do.

For the past month I have been warning that the real reason for the credit guarantee and the wheat deal was to use this deal as an opening wedge for further trade with the Communists based on further credit concessions. Today the press finally admitted this was a fact. This week it will be 18 months worth of credit; next week it will be 36 months; the week after that, 60 months. Congress has outlawed loans to Communist countries and I have not heard of anyone from the executive branch complaining that this should be repealed because Congress has no right to legislate in this area. What the difference would be between a 60-month credit and a 5-year loan, I do not know, yet Congress is now being condemned for trying to close a wide open loophole in the policy it has previously set forth.

I do not understand how anyone with any knowledge of the history of the cold war can question the possibility that in 36 months or even 18 months changes could occur in the world situation which would jeopardize the taxpayer's interest in credit guarantees. Was there no change from the end of the war to the Berlin blockade, no change from that settlement to the Korean war in 1949? Was there no change from the spirit of Geneva to the Communist takeover in Cuba? Was there no change from the Khrushchev visit in 1959 to the Paris summit? No change from the meeting in Vienna between President Kennedy and the Soviet Premier to the building of the Berlin wall? Can anyone here guarantee no change for 18 months in the future? If so, let him take the credit risk, not the American people.

We have been told that the failure of Soviet agriculture is a great propaganda blow against the Communist system. Must we now relieve this burden the Soviets bear? We have been told that pressures from consumers at home have forced Khrushchev to be more moderate, and less belligerent. Must we now relieve that pressure so that belligerency can again be the Soviet motto? I say the answers to these questions as well as to the question of eliminating the credit ban must be an emphatic "No." The American people will stand for nothing less.

COMMUNISM

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, since the evil, cruel, and calculating mind of Lee Harvey Oswald struck down the President of the United States, I have observed a complete moratorium on partisan political matters, in accordance with the original suggestion made by Senator GOLDWATER on that fateful day. I can no longer enjoy the luxury of silence, nor can this Nation enjoy the luxury of silence.

Much has been written on the subject of the assassination, and many lessons are to be learned. The initial, hysterical reaction of the leftwing was, of course, to immediately blame the so-called rightwing extremists, and I received some editorial comment as well as individual letters to the effect that I was somehow responsible for this horrible crime. This line of twisted thinking no doubt had its fountainhead in the first report, broadcast throughout the world by the Voice of America, to the effect that Dallas was the hotbed of rightwingers and therefore it had to be the work of some rightwing individual. This set the pattern, which is still followed by all of the Communist countries throughout the world. This broadcast was followed by a television appearance of one of the Democratic leaders of the House, making the same statement.

First impressions are often lasting, and this one certainly was. Incidentally, I immediately requested a transcript of the Voice of America broadcast, together with the first reciprocating broadcast from Moscow. Naturally, Voice of America has conveniently ignored the request. The broken record goes on and on to a point where the foreign image of America is not one of a great Republic, which has survived many crises, but rather an image of a country so divided by isms, hatred, and self-abuse, that complete destruction must naturally follow.

Following the assassination, there were 4 solid days of attempted brainwashing of the American people and the world into believing that all America must share the guilt. That is hokum and hogwash. The assassination was the work of a cool and calculating mind, steeped in communism and dedicated to Castroism, to the point where he shared the convictions of his boss, Fidel Castro, that President Kennedy was an enemy of Cuba and must be destroyed before he succeeded in overthrowing the Castro government.

The Fair Play for Cuba Committee is one of the best financed and most extensive Communist fronts and espionage agencies in the country, having more than 6,000 members with 27 chapters in the United States, and student councils in more than 40 universities in the United States and Canada. This was revealed in volume 6 of the Senate Judiciary Committee document entitled "Castro's Network in the United States."

During the past 3 years, little if anything has been done by the Justice Department to make the Communist organizations register. Contrariwise, there has been a general denial by the Justice Department that communism was an internal threat. I have been saying for years that no one need fear the thunder on the right, as it was simply a response to the lightning on the left, and that thunder had never been known to kill anybody, but that lightning is a deadly element.

President Johnson addressed a joint session of Congress, which, for the most part, was reassuring to an anxious public. Portions of it I felt were unsound, when he urged the hasty passage of complex and far-reaching legislation as a memorial to the martyred President. This Republic is too great to pass this type of legislation as a memorial to any man. If the proposition was bad before the assassination, it would still be bad, and, if it were good legislation, it would still be good and would be passed under a calmer atmosphere of consideration and debate.

I was shocked to hear the President make the following statement, which became the theme song of the Chief Justice of the United States and the leftwing commentators:

> Let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream.

Who, may I ask, is teaching and preaching hate and evil and violence? The only teachers of hate and evil and violence are the Communists.

The subtle purpose of this statement was one of semantics. It triggered a massive attempt to convert the word "criticism" into the words "hate and evil," so that anyone who dared to criticize would be guilty of hate, and the voice of criticism would then be stilled. I criticize my children, but I do not hate them; I love them. So let us not be trapped by that line of argument. Let us remember—a free and open society demands that the great business of this Nation be thrashed out in healthy discussion, is spirited debate, and in the great dialog of criticism.

It is amazing to note how many far-reaching resolutions were immediately introduced with respect to the sale, transportation, keeping and bearing of arms. I am in complete agreement that mail-order shipment of guns should be restricted. As opposed to this trend of firearm control legislation, there has not been one new resolution introduced to tighten up on Communist propaganda or Communist activities. The spoken word and the pen are still mightier than the sword, and millions of Americans are subjected to rapid-fire Communist propaganda which can destroy more people than all other lethal weapons combined.

The Communist leaders in America are not only being welcomed but invited to speak on our college campuses, and they appear on television as heroes of the downtrodden masses. This is the real venom which is flowing into the Nation's bloodstream.

It is important that all Americans dedicate themselves to the survival of constitutional government, and eternally guard against a government of men rather than a government of law.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S DECISION TO ESTABLISH NINE-MAN COMMITTEE TO SURVEY METHODS BY WHICH DEFENSE SPENDING AND ESTABLISHMENT MAY BE CURTAILED WITH MINIMUM HARM TO UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS IS HAILED

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read in the press over the weekend that President Johnson, who has frequently stated his concern with the problems of poverty and economic distress, has now acted promptly and decisively to insure that when the Defense Department takes actions which could aggravate unemployment problems in local areas, they will no more plead that unemployment is none of their concern.

Over the weekend the President created a high-level, nine-man committee, headed by Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, to survey the impact of Defense Department decisions on local economies and on existing unemployment areas. In taking this step the President has acted to plug a grave loophole in the Defense Department's current policy with regard to such matters as base closings and other shifts in its spending pattern which I pointed out at some length last Thursday on the floor of this House. The President is to be warmly congratulated on his action.

If some such committee as this had been in existence a couple of weeks ago, and if it had worked out an overall Government policy to manage Defense cutbacks and closings in such a way that their impact on local unemployment problems would indeed be held to an absolute minimum, then I am confident the Department would never have closed two key defense installations in New York State, both of them in serious unemployment areas, when the alternative establishments which it had decided not to close were not located in unemployment areas—the Rome Air Materiel Area and the Schenectady Army Depot.

In view of the President's wise action, and in view of the fact that some such coordinated policy is obviously necessary for this Government and should indeed have been in the mind of the Defense Department, without the President even being required to set up a committee, I have today wired the President asking him to direct Secretary McNamara not to undertake any personnel reductions at either Schenectady or Rome until the new committee can have a full opportunity to survey the situation at both locations, and determine whether the action the Defense Department took the other day in the case of these two installations was indeed in conformity with the kind of policy the President has now made clear he expects the Defense Department to follow.

My wire, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows:

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartiest congratulations your decision create special Government committee to mesh possible defense cutbacks with Government's overall policy of combating unemployment. This action now plugs a serious loophole in Defense Department current attitude toward base cutbacks which I discussed in detail on House floor last Thursday. Because both major closings in New York at Rome and Schenectady located in serious unemployment areas and were selected over alternative sites not located in unemployment areas, strongly urge you direct Secretary McNamara delay all personnel reductions at Rome and Schenectady until your committee has had opportunity determine whether Department's action on these two bases conforms with soundest possible Government policy to insure that defense reductions have minimum impact on local unemployment.

SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
Member of Congress.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the quorum call earlier today I was unavoidably detained due to inclement weather in returning to the floor of the House from an appointment with one of the Government agencies downtown. Had the streets not been so difficult to negotiate I would have been here to respond to the quorum call.

I request that the Record for today report this statement of my personal situation.

FUNDS FOR STUDENT LOANS AND SCHOOLS IN IMPACTED AREAS ARE NEEDED

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, we have been fully advised as to how the President feels on the foreign aid appropriation bill which is presently before the Congress.

I would like to call the attention of the House to another appropriation bill which is presently before the Congress as to which the President has not advised the House regarding his position. I refer particularly to the funds which most people think are necessary, starting in January, for the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act. In my opinion, these funds are urgently needed. Thousands of students will not have sufficient money for the record semester of this school year if we do not appropriate these funds.

On Saturday I reminded the House that a conference committee could insert these funds in the supplemental appropriation bill, House Joint Resolution 875, if the request was forthcoming from the Chief Executive. I have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that a letter requesting funds under the program to assist schools in federally impacted areas and also under the student loan program was on the President's desk several days ago but still awaits his signature. I feel these two domestic programs for the education of our children and youth should be given at least as high a priority as financing food purchases for the Soviet Union and other Communist countries.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President has sufficient interest in the education of our young people that a letter of transmittal requesting funds for the schools in impacted areas, and also for the student loan program will be forthcoming soon so that we can consider it in connection with House Joint Resolution 875. I have been discussing, with Members on both sides of the aisle, the possibility of taking the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's request, that has the Bureau of the Budget's approval, but which the President so far has not seen fit to approve, and try to get unanimous consent to agree to include them both in the joint resolution. However, it looks like that cannot be done if we lack Presidential support.

IN MEMORIAM—J.F.K.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ryan] may extend his remarks at this point and include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to place into the Record a poem composed by the Honorable Wade McCree, judge of the district court for eastern Michigan.

Judge Wade McCree presided at the memorial service on November 25, 1963, for our late President, John F. Kennedy, on the site of the old city hall at Detroit, Mich., which is now appropriately called Kennedy Plaza.

After the following very pertinent observation of Judge McCree, who said:

> Regardless of any opinion we may entertain about Lee Harvey Oswald and Jack Ruby, we should include their griefstricken families within the ambit of our compassion.

Judge McCree closed his remarks with the following poem which he composed for the occasion, and which I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of this honorable body as a further tribute to our beloved President, whose life was snuffed out at the height of his career.

The poem follows:

In Memoriam—J.F.K.

What can we do, surviving him who died
  In selfless service to transform a world
From one of hate and war and vaunted pride
  To one of love with freedom's flag unfurled?

What can we do, surviving, to assure
  That his last gift shall not have been in vain?
What did his noble sacrifice procure
  Or must this tragic loss be void of gain?

To bow our heads in grief as we stand here
  To shed our tears and count ourselves bereft
Profanes this noble hero's flag-draped bier
  Unless we learn the lesson he has left.

If we would honor him we mourn today
We must forsake forever hatred's way.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Dorn and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Laird and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Schadeberg) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Conte.

Mrs. May.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2379. An act to provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 24, 1963, at 7 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1466. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the erroneous reporting of taxable income and taxes withheld from the pay of military personnel in the Department of the Air Force was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 600. A resolution waiving points of order against the conference report on H.R. 9499 and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1092). Referred to the House Calendar.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 9561. A bill for the relief of Moni Parvanoff Floroff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 9562. A bill for the relief of Rocco Laballarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

556. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to inserting certain material in the Congressional Record relating to the tax bill; to the Committee on House Administration.

557. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to calling States by their correct names when being mentioned in public documents; to the Committee on House Administration.

558. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to correcting the last paragraph, column 2, page 24657, of the Congressional Record of December 16, 1963; to the Committee on House Administration.

559. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to epileptics and their terms in State hospitals and institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Christmas Message From the Silvio O. Conte Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to share with my colleagues the message of my December 1963 newsletter, which I plan to circulate in the First Congressional District of Massachusetts.

The letter includes a Christmas message which calls attention to the great era of communications in our time and contrasts that with the humble and holy message of "Peace on earth, good will toward men" which was delivered to just a few people in the period of the birth of Christ some 1,963 years ago in the hills of Bethlehem.

It also includes material, in case any Members missed the recent rollcall, which indicates that a great deal of work was actually done during this session of Congress. It will remain for the 2d session of the 88th Congress to continue making strides from the groundwork which has already been accomplished.

Let us hope that the new year will find even more and greater successes.

The message follows:

A JOYOUS YULETIDE AND A HAPPY NEW YEAR FROM THE SILVIO O. CONTE FAMILY

DEAR FRIEND: My report will reach you before the new session of the 88th Congress opens in early January. Everybody at our house extends to you our best wishes for a joyous Christmas, with fond hopes that the New Year will bring you an abundance of happiness.

How few mortals were privileged to share the initial joy at the Nativity of the Son of God. The Herald Angels sang their glad tidings to but a handful of poor shepherds in the hills of Bethlehem. The Christmas star guides only three weary travelers to the foot of His manger.

In our day, man's voice reaches out to every corner of the world at the touch of a switch. Manmade stars carry messages across oceans and far into space.

This Christmas may the perennial joy of the spirit of Bethlehem reach into the hearts of all men to form a bond far stronger than we have created with wire or electronic waves.

May the hope of "peace on earth" be made attainable by the acceptance of our present sorrows and labors.

May the promise of "good will to all men" be our goal for now and throughout the coming year.

To the disappointment of many, the 88th Congress has not completed action on two major pieces of legislation—the civil rights bill and the tax bill. However, it has been one of the longest sessions in American history and one of the most productive.

Through November 30, the session enacted 190 new public laws in 164 legislative days for the House and 171 days for the Senate.

For both Houses the production schedule has averaged better than one new public law completed each legislative day.

In addition there are now 11 major enactments in conference; and 13 more are through conference but still awaiting final approval of the conference agreements.

During the same months the session placed on the books a total of 107 private laws, adjusting claims and grievances of citizens.

The Senate, in the same period, approved a total of 66,294 Presidential nominations for civil and military places.

The Senate had 205 calls of yeas and nays, and the House 95. In addition the Senate ordered 54 quorum calls, and the House 114.

A total of 13,717 measures were introduced in both Houses. All have been acted upon, or now have active status on the committee calendars of the House and Senate.

Only one veto came to Congress during the entire session, and that on a minor private bill which President Kennedy rejected because he feared it might establish a costly and dangerous precedent. (S. 1201.)

During the first 11 months of the session—one of the longest and most difficult in our constitutional history—the proceedings made 21,858 pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These pages were divided 13,921 for the Senate and 7,937 for the House.

As the 12th month of the session opened December 2, there were 92 additional measures reported in both Houses awaiting final legislative clearance. Total measures passed through November 30 were: Senate 699; House 812.

As soon as the Congress recesses for the Christmas and New Year's holidays, my family and I plan to immediately motor to our home in Pittsfield to spend Christmas with our families. We will all return to Washington on New Year's Day.

My wife, Corinne, and the children join me in sending this Christmas letter to you. We are grateful for your kindness to us over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the following extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 5, 1963:

JOHN F. KENNEDY, 1917–63

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as we meet here today to pay tribute to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, we pay tribute to a continuing force among us. For the finest thing that we can say about the late President is that, in a very genuine sense, he is with us here today on the floor of the House where his admirable career had its beginning and where he gave his state of the Union addresses.

These addresses, Mr. Speaker, were model surveys of plans, programs, and policies of a vigorous young man who lived actively the life of the mind and one who attempted to fuse the ideal with the real into programs that were part and parcel of the great American tradition. Few people agreed with all of his ideas, but many people were to agree with most of them.

It will be the place of history to record how successful his brief tenure as Chief Executive of our land was and how meaningful many of his programs will become with the passage of time.

We can already say with certainty, for example, that the dream of the Peace Corps has become a reality. We do not know, on the other hand, whether the Alliance for Progress will develop into the kind of a program and demonstrate the great potential that it has. And on and on—these and other judgments will be made by the ultimately objective hand of history.

We can remember him now as one who believed in the career of politics and equated the word "politics" with good government.

This was true of the young John Kennedy at Choate and later at Harvard, and during his graduate work at the London School of Economics. Soon after his commendable career in the U.S. Navy, he was to go into the rough and tumble politics of the Boston area, an area that had been called an advanced school of political science.

The young man obviously was a man of destiny, and his election to this body from the 11th Congressional District in Massachusetts was the beginning of one of the distinguished careers in the history of American public life.

Few of us would have thought that such an amazing career would have been possible, but John Kennedy demonstrated that it was. And we can remember him with a great deal of pride for innumerable things and incidents.

It seems incredible to me that just a short while ago I had a wide-ranging discussion with him during the ground-breaking ceremonies for the Robert Frost Library at Amherst College in Massachusetts. He had come there to pay tribute to the poet whom he loved, and after the ceremony, we talked about legislation and he expressed intimate detail of issues which confronted the Nation, issues which were, in a real sense, his own plans for the extension of American social progress and progress around the world—the free world in which he had become the undisputed leader.

All of us have our own private prayer for the late President and for the surviving members of his family.

As a recent issue of Commonweal magazine so profoundly stated: "The loss of a President is more than the loss of its most important officeholder and the symbol of its law and order, as stunning as that is in itself. It is also the loss of a man—in this case—with a peculiarly apt set of talents and convictions for our time."

The editorial goes on to state, quite basically, that he was a man of our time, who understood the problems of our time. While we may have had different interpretations of how certain policies could have been executed, he stood squarely in line with those whose view of the world was broad, and not narrow.

It was one of peace, and not hate. It was also one of hope, and in summing up, I would like to quote from a statement made by Mark Van Doren, in Cornwall, Conn., just over the borders of the Berkshires where John Kennedy loved to visit.

Mark Van Doren, the distinguished poet and writer said, at the conclusion of his public statement:

"The oneness of the world is what we are now feeling; and fearing, if we doubt that it can soon enough be good, at least within the limits of mankind's capacity.

"But there are fears and fears, noble and ignoble; and the noblest fear is that which each of us can have lest he himself fall short of being as sensible, as reasonable, as steadfast, and as loving as he can. It is not for others to be these things to the limit of possibility. It is for ourselves, each one of us, whoever, whatever, and wherever he may be.

"Goodness," Van Doren said, and we all must agree, "begins at home. If it is not there, it may be nowhere. The clearest sign that it is there, the unmistakable sign, is our fear that we ourselves have not been all that we could be. This is a noble fear, another name for which, when hope and faith come with it, is humility. Hope and faith, and not despair, upon which fear can feed until it fills the world. Hope and faith, the final cure of fear; along with knowledge—all of which we can possess—and charity: the rarest, the most difficult, and still therefore the greatest of these."

My deepest sympathies go out to the wife and family of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The Strategy of Deception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House a most significant book on Communist worldwide tactics.

This book is entitled "The Strategy of Deception." It is a collection of essays edited by Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, recently published by Farrar, Straus & Co. This remarkable book in 16 short, easy-to-read chapters details the full deception of Communists and their activities throughout the world.

This is an ideal book for layman and expert alike. It discusses how the Communists operate in India, Africa, Spain, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Great Britain, and elsewhere.

Many of the contributors are well-known figures. One—Julian Gorkin—was actually the founder of the Communist movement in Levant, Spain.

"The Strategy of Deception" shows how the Communists continually deviate and zigzag and vary their basic principles and their very ideologies to follow the line put forth by Moscow or now, in many cases, the line put forth by Peiping.

It is interesting to note that there is no worldwide Communist tactical pattern. In each case the Communists merely choose the most expedient path to gain the most credit and recognition possible.

This book amply demonstrates in each of the 16 essays and in the excellent introduction written by Mrs. Kirkpatrick the complete unreliability and irrationality of the Communist movement and the Communist leaders.

This book is recommended to those among us who would like to gain a working knowledge of communism in action.

I hope all my colleagues will find the time to examine "The Strategy of Deception" for I feel there is no one so sophisticated or so knowledgeable who cannot benefit from it.

It Could Happen Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following poem written by my colleague, the Honorable Robert Dole, of Kansas:

It Could Happen Here

'Tis 2 days till Christmas; we're still in the "House."
Not many are stirring, not even my spouse.
Most Members await in the cloakroom with care
In hopes that our Speaker may soon take his chair.

The pressmen were restless and ready for bed
But visions of headlines ran through their head.
The ladies were quiet, but the men could still yap;
So for some it was hard to catch much of a nap.

Then throughout the "Hill" bells rang with a clatter,
And I rushed from my room to help settle the matter.
Away down the tunnel Members rushed with a flash;
They sped up the stairways in a final mad dash.

The galleries were 'most empty when we reached the door,
But this didn't matter to those on the floor.
Then, what to our wondering eyes did appear
But, H. R. Gross and nine foreign reindeer,
With such a driver, so witty and quick
Most knew in a moment it must be a trick.
More rapid than pages, his chargers they came.
He arose and objected, and called for the names:
"Now Charlie, now Carl, Les, and Hale; let's not tarry;
And the same goes for you—Passman and Natcher, Rhodes, Ford and Gary."
To the top of his voice (it filled the big hall)
"Now, let's get this settled, once and for all."

"We've been here a year, through thick and through thin
And this final obstacle gets under my skin."
So up to the mike with a statement he flew
With a full 5 minutes, and an amendment, too.

And then in a twinkling we heard with alarm
A voice that we knew had acquired new charm.
As I lifted my head and was turning around
To the well came the Speaker, without making a sound.
As he walked he was smiling, from his head to his toes;
And his colleagues were hopeful he'd hold down the "noes."

A bundle of papers he took from the stack
And stood ready and waiting to answer back.
His eyes sort of sparked as he looked at H. R.
And his patience would be tried if H. R. went too far.
But to those in their seats, this could be the end;
And back to our districts, our fences to mend.
The finale was set and H. R. was in form.
He fumed and he fussed and kicked up a storm.
H. R. had a knack for this sort of fight
And some say he'd skip Christmas if he thought he was right.

He was ranting and raving (was his usual self)
And not many laughed when he moved to place "aid" on the shelf.
A wink of his eye and a twist of his head
Soon gave many to know this bill could be dead.

He spoke his words, then looked to his right
And saw his friend, John, itching to fight.
And dropping his hands, he paused with a smile
And then strode to his seat near the center aisle.

As the battle raged, we prayed for a "whistle"
But alas, came the words that fell like a missile.
I heard the Speaker, as he pounded the gavel
"We'll adjourn till tomorrow; so don't plan to travel."

Let Us Reject Aid to Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to stay here through Christmas Day to prevent aid to our enemies. My five children are willing for me to stay here. It would be a very appropriate celebration of the birth of Christ if by staying here we could prevent aid to the anti-Christ force of the world. On the other hand, it would be a blow to American prestige and the Christian world for this Congress to approve officially loans, wheat, grants, or any aid directly or indirectly, to Communist Russia which is that sinister force in the world seeking to destroy everything Christmas represents.

We have been told over and over again that the purpose of foreign aid is to stop communism, which is atheism. It would be utterly inconceivable for this Congress to go home for Christmas having voted for a foreign aid bill to help destroy communism and at the same time vote in the same bill for money to help communism—to feed them and to strengthen them. When we were faced with our enemies this time of the year in 1944 in the Battle of the Bulge, we did not shoot at them on one hand and then with the other feed and strengthen them so that they could continue to fight against us.

Mr. Speaker, a basic principle is involved here today. We are the direct Representatives of the people. They are against communism, overwhelmingly. We cannot hold on to "God and mammon" at the same time. Let us stand up, be counted, and reject this aid to our enemies.

Tribute to a Great Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I noted with sorrow in the Washington papers recently that Rear Adm. Morton L. Ring—SC, U.S. Navy, retired—had passed away. He leaves behind a great record as public servant of the highest type.

Those of us who had business with the Munitions Board and prior to that the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of the Navy remember Mort Ring as a courteous, cooperative, and highly trained and qualified public servant. In testifying before the various committees on complicated subjects, he displayed not only charm but the ability to see the overall picture of national defense and fiscal responsibility, though he wore the uniform of one of the partisan services.

Admiral Ring's contribution to the progress that is now being made in the Defense Department is great, and his passing is a cause for grief to those of us who knew him so intimately.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 24, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore, Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Thou hast taught us to love truth and beauty and goodness. May Thy truth make us free—free from pride and prejudice and from all the ugly sins of disposition that so easily beset us. Lift us, we pray, above the mud and scum of mere things to the holiness of Thy beauty, so that even the common task and the trivial round may be edged with crimson and gold.

Lead us into paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake. Enrich us, we pray, with the durable satisfactions of life, so that the multiplying years may not find us bankrupt in the things that matter most—the golden currency of faith and hope and love.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 880) establishing that the 2d regular session of the 88th Congress convene at noon on Tuesday, January 7, 1964.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions:

H. Con. Res. 248. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the two Houses of Congress adjourn on Monday, December 30, 1963, they stand adjourned sine die; and

H. Con. Res. 249. Concurrent resolution establishing that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The message further announced that a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 22, 25, and 26 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14 and 20 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 5338. An act to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6754. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6868. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7063. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7431. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair state that the leadership has notified the Chair that after appropriate consultation with Members on both sides, and in order to keep expressed or implied commitments, it has recommended that the foreign aid appropriations conference report would best be considered on Monday, December 30, at 10 a.m., by the Senate. The Chair is informed that all Members will be personally notified of this time by their respective leadership, and it is the hope and expectation that all will be on hand for this highly important vote.

CONVENING ON JANUARY 7 OF 2D SESSION OF 88TH CONGRESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution, which will be read by title.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 880) establishing that the 2d session of the 88th Congress convene at noon on Tuesday, January 7, 1964, was read twice by its title.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the acting majority leader whether agreement has been reached between the majority leader and the minority leader for the present consideration of the sine die adjournment resolution?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the distinguished acting minority leader that it is my understanding that it has been reached between the two leaders.

Mr. KUCHEL. If I correctly understand, this is the House-passed joint resolution fixing January 7 as the date for the convening of the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does it also provide for adjournment sine die of this session on any particular date?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. That will be taken care of as a part of the announcement on Monday, December 30, at the session commencing at 10 a.m., when business will be transacted.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the acting majority leader whether it is a fact that the House of Representatives adopted the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill at its session this morning?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; it is my understanding that that was accomplished.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is there any reason the acting majority leader can give Senators as to why the Senate cannot adopt the conference report now, rather than to have a session on December 30?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I cannot give such a reason, and I, myself, would be anxious to have the Senate adopt the conference report at this time or on Thursday morning or on Friday morning. But this arrangement has been made by the leadership, and I think we are bound by it.

So I can see nothing to do but proceed accordingly—in other words, to have a pro forma session on Friday, and to convene on Monday, and at that time to act on the conference report on the foreign aid bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Am I correctly informed that the measure as acted on finally by the House of Representatives is acceptable to the administration; and does the Senator from Wisconsin know of any reason why the Senate should not adopt the conference report today—other than the arrangement to which he has referred?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Arkansas will recall that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had indicated that he desired to have a live quorum call, and also that he wanted a yea-and-nay vote taken on this question. Of course, in order to have a live quorum call and a yea-and-nay vote on the question of agreeing to the conference report on the appropriation bill, it will be necessary to have the physical presence in this room of at least 51 Senators.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But a Senator cannot in absentia make a demand for a yea-and-nay vote, can he? Is that permissible under the rules of the Senate? After all, the Senator from Oregon is not now present.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator from Arkansas will bear with the present occupant of the chair, let the Chair state that he has a commitment to the Senator from Oregon that there be a live quorum call if the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill is to be called; and the acting minority leader had a similar commitment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. However, I do not believe that a Senator who is occupying the chair can make such a point of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A Senator who is occupying the chair certainly can suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At any rate, I am not going to be here on Monday. I have been here all this year; and I state now for the record that I am not going to be here on Monday. I think this arrangement is perfectly ridiculous. The House has agreed to the conference report on this important appropriation bill, and the Senate has twice passed on this issue. So I see no sense in our holding such a session on December 30, and I shall not be here at that time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree entirely with the Senator from Arkansas. This situation is most difficult for me, and I am sure it is for many other Senators.

However, the leadership has made a commitment, and intends to keep it; and since I have made a commitment to the leadership, I have no alternative but to proceed in the way indicated. Therefore, if the Senator who now occupies the chair and is presiding over the Senate does not suggest the absence of a quorum, I am bound to do so; and if the absence of a quorum is suggested, we would then have to remain in session until the presence of a live quorum was developed, and it is obvious that a live quorum could not be obtained today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator from Wisconsin state with whom the agreement was reached?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that the agreement as to the procedure was reached between the majority leadership and the minority leadership; namely, to have a pro forma session on Friday, and to convene on Monday at 10 a.m., and at that time to take final action on the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am in the same position the Senator from Arkansas is in. I have waited here all week, and have received telegrams—at various hours of the day and night—as to what would happen.

It will be very difficult for me to be here on Monday.

It is most difficult to understand why the Senate cannot act now on the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill, if the conference report has now been agreed to by the House of Representatives, and if there is no objection in the Senate to the report.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with the Senator from Missouri; but the commitment has been made by the leadership, and we must work with the leadership.

On the other hand, if the absence of a quorum were suggested and if a live quorum were demanded, we would be likely to remain here until Monday, anyway.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I was notified to be here today, and I am here. We are now notified to be in the Senate next Monday, and I will be here then. But it was understood that the House might take action today on the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill; since last Saturday it has been known to everyone that the House was being urged to act on the conference report.

I should like to know whether any notice was given to any Senator not to be here today. Was any Senator now present so notified?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Not to my knowledge; and it seems to me that the information which was given out was that there would be a pro forma session today. But the only information I had was that there would be a pro forma session today.

Mr. COOPER. I realize that the Senator could not be aware of all the facts or circumstances which led to the decision which he has announced. But was the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] consulted?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was not consulted.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have been informed by the secretary for the majority that the announcement made on Saturday was that this session would be strictly a pro forma session, and that no business would be transacted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the situation was not clear then. I have read carefully what was purported to be the agreement. Obviously the Senate could not act until the House acted on the conference report; but—unexpectedly, perhaps—the House acted on the report this morning. I know of no reason, after the Senate has twice acted affirmatively, by a margin of almost 2 to 1—why there should be further delay. After all, the House has acted on the conference report, and there is nothing to prevent the Senate from acting on it.

Mr. COOPER. I agree. If it was important to have the House act today on the conference report, it is equally important to have the Senate act today on it. I regret that the Senate is not going to act on it today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to read—for the benefit of Senators—precisely the colloquy which occurred last Saturday between the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the majority leader. I read now from page 25473:

> Mr. BENNETT. I should like to refer to the pattern the majority leader has suggested for the Senate, which will take us over, first, until Tuesday, for a pro forma session, and then until Friday. He followed that with the statement that if the House acted, arrangements would be made to bring us back. May we be assured, or may we assume, that this will not happen on Tuesday, the day before Christmas, and that Friday is probably the very first day on which we will be brought back?
>
> Mr. MANSFIELD. I give that assurance to the distinguished Senator from Utah insofar as we are both capable of doing so, because we try to keep in mind all considerations and give Senators plenty of notice.

Mr. President, speaking for myself, I am rather surprised to see any of my brethren present today, because I assumed this session would be a pro forma session and that no business would be transacted, and that, automatically, the Senate would go over to Friday.

I have great respect and fondness and friendship for the distinguished Senator from Arkansas; but he did make one inaccuracy in his earlier comments: He suggested that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] cannot act in absentia. But apparently the Senator from Arkansas was not correct in making that comment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will defer for a few moments, I think we can all make one thing absolutely clear without question: That is, that much as I would like, and other Senators would like, to have the Senate act by Friday, we cannot do so, and that Friday's session will definitely be a pro forma session, with no business to be transacted, and that the Senate will convene at 9 o'clock on Friday morning and adjourn shortly thereafter to reconvene on Monday.

The Senator from Wisconsin has eight speeches scheduled next Monday in Wisconsin. This is the only time in the whole year when I thought surely the Senate would be out of session. I have had to cancel all eight speeches, because I am going to be here. I have not previously missed rollcalls, and I do not want to start to do so now.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand from the Senator from California that one can act in absentia. I ask the Chair, if it is in order for me to ask unanimous consent that I be considered to be present on Monday and voting "yea," and that I be included as present in the live quorum.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I regret, with all my heart, that I find myself constrained to object to the request of my able brother.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was addressing a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

Why would the Senator from California object? If the Senator from Oregon can act in absentia, why cannot I?

Mr. KUCHEL. I did not know the Senator from Oregon had made a unanimous-consent request. Apparently he had. I mention what occurred to make the understanding perfectly clear; that is, with one or two of our colleagues being present to suggest the absence of a quorum, the Senate would not be given an opportunity to transact business today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as I understand, the able Senator from California voted for the bill. Why is he opposed to the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Missouri being included as being present Friday when the bill comes up?

Mr. KUCHEL. Because I never heard, in the history of the country, how a Senator in absentia can be deemed to be present.

My thought in presenting the situation with respect to the Senator from Oregon is that apparently he had arranged to have friends or colleagues see to it that no business could be transacted today. I am ready to transact business, but apparently—there should be no mistake—what the Senator's leadership had in mind was quite clear; namely, that this would be a pro forma session.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California be allowed to cast my vote next Monday.

Mr. KUCHEL. I would be glad to cast the vote of the Senator from Arkansas, because he and I would vote precisely in the same fashion. However, again, I feel constrained to object.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am told that the Senate can do anything by unanimous consent. Why can I not ask unanimous consent to have the Senator from California vote for me next Monday?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator can, but he will not get me to do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from California should realize——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has the Chair ruled on my request?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the Senator from California objected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California objected to the Senator from Arkansas making a unanimous-consent request in this case. However, if the Senator from Arkansas wishes to make a unanimous-consent request that some other Senator cast his vote on Monday, the Chair will then rule. But the Chair will not rule in advance as to what the ruling on the unanimous-consent request will be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I move that the junior Senator from Arkansas be allowed to cast his vote on Monday through the Senator from California.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That would be a violation of rule XII.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then I ask unanimous consent. What rule would that violate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California has objected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, he has not objected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] be allowed to vote on Monday.

Mr. KUCHEL. In absentia?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In absentia; and that the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] will be allowed to cast our votes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Think what a historic occasion it would be if Senators could, by unanimous consent, vote in absentia. That would be a historic, unique occasion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will not object, we can make history.

Mr. KUCHEL. I regret that I must object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. KUCHEL. I object.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why does the Senator object?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I think we are in a preposterous situation. In the first place, the House having acted, I cannot see a single reason why it makes any difference whether we act on Monday or a week from Monday or the following Tuesday. Funds already have been provided in the Foreign Aid Act at a higher rate than they are being allowed in this bill, until the end of next January. I cannot understand the necessity for immediate action.

Furthermore, if we are to act, I agree entirely with Senators who have spoken that we should act today. Like the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] I was advised to be here today. That is true. I want to be fair. I called in and was told that no business would be transacted today. However, I call attention to a specific inquiry on that point which was made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], of the majority leader, when the Senator from Iowa asked, to pin down the point:

> If the House should perchance act, would it be the intention of the leadership that the Senate would not meet for business on Tuesday, but that it would do so on Friday?

The majority leader replied:

> It would all depend on developments. I would, of course, discuss any procedure with the distinguished minority leader; and together, we would try to lay out a plan of action and policy which would, in our opinion, meet with the approval of the majority of the Members of the Senate and see that all of them got plenty of notice.

In my judgment—and I may be in error—the procedure that we are following, or that is proposed to be followed, today does not meet with the approval of the majority of the Members of the Senate. I do not think there is any reason to believe that it does. Personally, I would prefer to have a live quorum and stay here until we got one, than to have to leave and come back next Monday. I had plans to be away. This is the only time I have available to be away. I shall not go. I shall be here next Monday, whatever happens. However, I think this is an imposition on the Members of the Senate. I personally would prefer that this matter be brought to a head today and voted on Friday, rather than next Monday.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion for a moment and let me ask him a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I think we will be informed by the Chair that if the Senator suggests the absence of a quorum, and if a quorum is not available, the Senate will automatically go over until Christmas Day. I do not think the Senator from Arkansas would want to do that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator from California sure that a live quorum is not available?

Mr. KUCHEL. Pretty sure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will inform the Senator from Arkansas that he made a commitment with the Senator from Oregon, and he will keep it, just as he would with the Senator from Arkansas. If a quorum is called, it will be a live quorum.

Mr. KUCHEL. If a quorum is not available, in the event the absense of a quorum is really suggested, to what day would the Senate go over?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Until the following day.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That would suit me better than Monday. I do not understand these prior commitments. The circumstances have changed, I submit to the leadership. There is no reflection on the leadership. The leadership did not know when the House would act.

I can only ask, as the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] has said so clearly, what in the world is the necessity of returning for a pro forma session on Friday and a vote on Monday when the issue has been fought out in the Senate over the course of weeks? There is not the slightest chance of any doubt about what the position of the Senate is on the bill and on the particular issue that has caused the delay. Now that the House has agreed to the conference report, we are advised that there is a commitment. What is the purpose of the commitment to have a pro forma session today and not vote until Monday? It makes no sense to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator from Arkansas press the suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would like to withdraw it. If the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] will not object to my unanimous-consent request, I will not suggest the absence of a quorum.

Is the Senator from California agreeable to withdrawing his objection to my unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not think the Senator from Arkansas or any other Senator wants the U.S. Senate to meet on Christmas Day.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want to dispose of the matter now. It seems to me that every Senator would like to dispose of it now. Personally, I think we are quite capable of doing so. I do not understand how it would scuttle the agreement to go over until Monday, when Senators did not know of the circumstances that have arisen this morning.

I, myself, was surprised by what took place.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin would suggest the absence of a quorum, so that we might have a short quorum call, in order that in that period I may speak with him informally.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is with commendable restraint that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] has refrained from speaking; and there has been a partial restraint also shown by the Senators who have spoken and the Senator who is now speaking—10 Senators, plus the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF] have been heard. Perhaps Senator YOUNG will make it unanimous.

But I wish to say seriously that the approximately 2½ million civilian employees of the Federal Government are working today, either in Washington, D.C., or in the various States; and, therefore, following the affirmative action in the House earlier today, it seems incongruous that the Senate cannot affirm its will at this time of our Christmas eve meeting. I do realize the validity of the agreement not to finally vote on the foreign aid legislation at this hour.

I have written Christmas greetings to all Senators; and again I wish in the spirit of harmony and comity each of my colleagues present in the Chamber a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Arkansas press his point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder whether it would be possible to take a recess for 10 or 20 minutes, so that we can consider this matter.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is there objection?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. Lest there be some protracted delay during the recess, I hope all 10 Senators now present will have their attendance recorded, so that the RECORD will show that they were present at this session—lest there be surprise that some Senators attended.

The recess taken the other day—a recess subject to the call of the Chair—lasted a considerable length of time; therefore, I hope the RECORD will show the presence of each of the Senators now in the Chamber at this time, the day before Christmas. Perhaps the clerk will take notice of the Senators who are now present and have come to the Senate today in the interest of doing the work at hand.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in today's issue of the New York Times is a very fine editorial—and a similar one was published today in the Washington Post—urging that the Senate act today on the conference report on the foreign aid bill. I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial, which is entitled "Shackle on Foreign Aid," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHACKLE ON FOREIGN AID

The sorriest episode in a dismal year on Capitol Hill is the partisan controversy over financing the projected Soviet wheat deal that is holding up adjournment in the House. Even if President Johnson emerges with the permissive power he wants—and should have—for Government underwriting of credit for the so-called private commercial transactions with Communist countries, the squabble is bound to damage international respect for the American decisionmaking process in world affairs.

The House already has contributed substantially to undermining national prestige by its meat ax treatment of all aspects of foreign aid. But the current excursion into congressional obstructionism has nothing to do with the merits of foreign aid. Its represents an effort mainly by the Republicans, under Minority Leader HALLECK's direction, to deny the President the discretion he needs to explore another possible bridge to improved East-West relations. The worst aspect of this assault on Executive flexibility in administering American foreign policy is its focus on what is essentially a side issue. It is ridiculous to paralyze the legislative process over a question that so clearly should be answered in the affirmative: Whether short-term credits should be made available to finance the sale of grain to Russia and other Communist nations when the President finds it in the national interest.

Conferees representing the Senate and House already have undone some of the restrictions the House had sought to impose on the President's freedom to guide U.S. policy on Government loans and other forms of aid to certain countries, including Poland and Yugoslavia. In this period, when both our allies and our adversaries abroad are seeking to evaluate the effects of our foreign policy of the change in White House leadership, putting new curbs on the exercise of Presidential authority could inflict lasting harm to our position in a world of fast-changing power balances.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

RESOLUTION OF FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION MEMORIALIZING THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I have been asked by the District of Columbia chapter of the Federal Bar Association to insert in the RECORD a resolution that was passed on December 4, 1963, by the board of directors of that chapter memorializing the late President Kennedy.

It is most fitting that a bar association of Government attorneys pass such a resolution because among his many other great qualities the late President Kennedy stood for thorough and ethical legal procedures within the forces of the Government, and he stood for the rule of law rather than the rule of individuals. His assassination was an unspeakable crime against the Nation. His passing is justly mourned by the legal profession.

I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, since it has been stated that I have been sitting here in silence, perhaps the Chair will aid me in obtaining unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY: "A WRIT FOR FREEDOM"

Resolved, The District of Columbia chapter of the Federal Bar Association on behalf of its members join the Nation and the world in expressing sympathy in the tragic loss of the President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Being a man of great intellect, he has raised the sights of our people in innumerable ways. In his inaugural address he renewed our pledge to enlarge the area in which the writ of the United Nations must run for the freedom of man and, through his distinctive vision, gave strong recognition that man is about to embark into a new world of law where the strong are just, the weak secure and the peace preserved.

Our Nation and the universe will move on, being a better place because of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The legal profession is now more cognizant of its heritage and will earnestly seek to accomplish his most noble desire—a world of peace and freedom under law. To this end, we shall urge that the International Court of Justice be given greater jurisdiction over the disputes among nations and among men as well as greater power to enforce more meaningfully its writs and judgments.

Subscribed this 4th day of December 1963, at Washington, D.C.

CYRIL F. BRICKFIELD,
President.

A BILLION DOLLARS OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY DOWN DRAIN, ECONOMIC EXPERT SHOWS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Prof. Robert Haveman of Grinnell College in Iowa has written a devastating analysis of Federal waste in our huge water resource projects.

Professor Haveman uses evaluation techniques developed by some of the most brilliant economists in the Nation to show that an immense amount of these appropriations represent a wasteful misallocation of national resources.

Professor Haveman has selected 10 States which enjoyed some 147 projects between 1947 and 1962 involving some $2,644 million. He found that applying the evaluation techniques of highly competent economists that 63 of these 147 projects representing $1,169 million of Federal funds or 44.2 percent of the total should never have been undertaken. He charges that these projects have led to a misallocation of national resources and economic waste.

Think of that, Mr. President, a shocking 45 percent of the billions of dollars we spend on these projects, spent wastefully on the basis of competent, objective, scholarly study. Those who scoff at charges of pork barrel and waste in the Congress should consider this Haveman study very carefully.

Professor Haveman's estimate is conservative. It assumes that the additional land brought into the production of surplus farm crops by these projects represents the full value to the Nation of the price the taxpayer has to pay to take these crops off the market so that they will not depress farm income even further.

If Professor Haveman had valued this crop production as worthless, which it certainly is, the overwhelming majority of these projects would have to be classified as wasted.

Mr. President, I do hope those who champion these huge expenditures—and this constitutes a big majority of this body will try to answer the telling indictment by Professor Haveman.

I have had pending for many months in the Interior committee a bill to provide for a revision of the present benefit-cost ratio that has been used by Congress to justify this gross misallocation of our resources.

I have written the committee pleading for action of this bill. The taxpayers of this Nation deserve it. Until we get action, the taxpayer can be sure that literally billions of dollars of his hard earned tax money will be squandered on these unjustifiable, wasteful, pork-barrel projects.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Professor Haveman be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POSTWAR CORPS OF ENGINEERS PROGRAM IN 10 SOUTHERN STATES—AN EVALUATION OF ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY

(By Robert Haveman)

In recent years, the existing investment criterion used by the Federal Government has undergone substantial scrutiny in the work of professional economists.[1] These studies had as their goal the development of an objective efficiency criterion to be used by those Federal agencies concerned with the evaluation of proposed investment opportunities.[2] Consequently, the proposed criteria built upon, modified and, in one case, abandoned completely the embryonic form of the existing criterion. Because of the indisputable superiority of the proposed criteria, this study will apply them to the postwar Corps of Engineers water resource projects in 10 Southern States in an attempt to estimate the misallocation of Federal funds and national resources in this area caused by the application of the existing agency criterion. The analysis will be presented in the five following stages: (1) A discussion of the primary deficiencies present in the existing criterion, (2) a brief analysis of the proposals suggested in the studies cited, (3) a discussion of the methods and assumptions necessary in applying these proposals to the projects, (4) the presentation of the evidence concerning the effect of the application of the proposed criteria on the projects and finally, (5) an estimation of the misallocation of national resources resulting from the construction of economically unjustified projects as determined by the proposed criteria.

DEFICIENCIES IN PRESENT BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS

Criticism concerning the efficacy of the present benefit-cost ratio technique has arisen primarily on three fronts. The most serious criticism questions the very concept of the benefit-cost ratio while the other two raise doubts concerning the variables used in the evaluation of future benefit and cost streams; namely, the rate of interest presently used to discount future streams of benefits and costs and the present treatment of risk and uncertainty.

THE BENEFIT-COST RATIO

As it is presently applied by the Corps of Engineers, the benefit-cost ratio takes the following form:

$$Z=\frac{\Sigma\frac{B}{(1+i)}t}{K+\Sigma\frac{0}{(1+i)}t}$$

in which B is the expected annual benefit from the project, i is the rate of interest used to discount the future streams of benefits and costs, it is the estimated life of the project, K is the fixed investment cost, and O is the estimated annual operation, maintenance, and repair cost. If, for any given project the ratio is greater than 1, the project becomes eligible for appropriations. In the law, no mention is made of the possible existence of a budget which is unable to cover all projects bearing a ratio greater than 1.

This form of investment criterion has undergone its most trying criticism at the hands of Roland McKean.[3] The source of error in this criterion, he feels, stems from an erroneous definition of the relevant budget constraint. By the very form of the ratio, it is assumed that the relevant budget, i.e., the rationed commodity, is the "total expenditure of money," a concept that includes not only present expenditure but also the future expenditure devoted by a decision made in the present. This constraint, McKean states, centers its attention upon the wrong budget and consequently a criterion is developed which, when applied so as to maximize the return on the rationed commodity, leads to the choice of a "wrong" set of projects—a set of projects different from those which would be chosen under a criterion which isolated the proper rationed element and adapted the budget constraint to it. In his own words, his criticism takes this form:

"Should we turn to a total-cost budget embracing operating expenses for future periods? No, the problem, for either a Government agency or a businessman, is not really the allocation of such a budget."[4]

A somewhat different tack, but one which also strikes directly at the efficacy of the existing criterion, has been presented more recently by Stephen Marglin.[5] His criticism is based on the proposition that national welfare is a function not of one but of several variables. Because the populace is interested not only in the absolute size of the national income but also with its division and composition, he feels that a criterion which embodies only this concept of absolute size (even though it may be the most important of the community's desires) will lead to a choice of projects which again is not optimum from the standpoint of national welfare. Consequently, rather than making use of a criterion with but a single objective (such as the maximization of national income) Marglin suggests a criterion which embodies dual or multiple objectives.

THE DISCONTINUING OF FUTURE STREAMS: THE INTEREST RATE PROBLEM

A second broad area of criticism leveled against the present benefit-cost technique concerns the rate of interest used in discounting future streams of benefits and costs. Current Corps of Engineers manuals stipulate that "average long-term interest rates that will prevail over the life of a project are considered the proper basis for discounting future benefits and costs."[6] This rate, identified as the long-term Government bond rate, is also suggested by "the Green Book,"[7] the Bureau of the Budget,[8] and the 1955 Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy.[9] Since 1946, this rate has fluctuated between 2.5 and 3 percent and present evaluations are made using a rate of 2⅝ percent.

Rationalization of this rate is made on two grounds. First, because the Federal Government can raise money at the present rate it is claimed that this rate depicts the social cost of capital. Second, it is stated that this rate approximates "the risk-free return expected to be realized on capital invested in alternative uses."[10] Both of these arguments have been demonstrated as fallacious by the word of Eckstein. Relying on the oft-stated truth concerning the difference between lenders' and borrowers' risk, he points out the necessary divergence of the rate on long-term Government issues from the social cost of capital.[11] In a separate statistical study, he demonstrates that this bond rate falls far short of the opportunity cost of capital as determined by its value in an alternative use.[12]

---

[1] Primarily Otto Eckstein, "Water Resources Development: The Economics of Project Evaluation" (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), Roland McKean, "Efficiency in Government Through Systems Analysis, With Emphasis on Water Resources Development" (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958) and John V. Krutilla and Otto Eckstein, "Multiple Purpose River Development, Studies in Applied Economics" (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1958) to mention only the main contributors.

[2] Because the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation were the primary agencies concerned with such evaluation, these studies centered about water resources investment decisions. Evaluation in these agencies was and is effected through a criterion called the benefit-cost ratio, which, if the ratio is greater than 1 for a given project, certifies that project to be eligible for authorization by the Congress. See Subcommittee on Evaluation Standards, "Proposed Practices for Economic Analysis of River Basin Projects," Report to the Inter-Agency Committee on Water Resources, 1958, and Bureau of the Budget, Circular A-47, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C., 1958.

[3] McKean, op. cit., pp. 74–96 and 103–134.

[4] Ibid., p. 114.

[5] Stephen A. Marglin, "Objectives of Water-Resource Development: A General Statement," "Design of Water Resource Systems," Arthur Maass, Maynard Hufschmidt et al. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), pp. 18 ff. and Bureau of the Budget, "Standards and Criteria for Formulating and Evaluating Federal Water Resources Development, Report of Panel of Consultants to the Bureau of the Budget, Washington, 1961, pp. 68–70.

[6] U.S., Army, Corps of Engineers, "Survey Investigations and Reports," Em 1120-2-118.

[7] Subcommittee on Evaluation Standards, op. cit., p. 23.

[8] Bureau of the Budget, Circular A-47, p. 14.

[9] The President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, "Water Resources Policy, 1955," p. 27.

[10] Subcommittee on Evaluation Standards, op. cit., p. 24.

Attacks on present Federal interest rate policy have been leveled on two other grounds. Rather than objecting solely to the numerical value of the rate of interest these criticisms are based upon the conviction that the conceptual meaning attached to the rate of interest by the Federal Government is incorrect. According to McKean, the proper rate of interest should not necessarily portray the social cost of capital as the Government claims, but rather that rate of interest should be chosen which will assure "* * * the maximum yield over the planning period, i.e., maximum growth of asset values through the period." [13] Yet another view of the proper purpose of the interest rate is presented by Eckstein and Bain. Rather than a rate reflecting either the social cost of capital or the rate suggested by McKean, they propose the use of an interest rate which "* * * reflects the relative evaluation by the populace of current or earlier income forgone and future or later income gained." [14]

THE TREATMENT OF RISK AND UNCERTAINTY

Finally, criticism has been leveled at the present corps treatment of existing risk and uncertainty components in future streams of costs and benefits. Critics point out that the procedure possesses no rigorous or consistent treatment of either risk or uncertainty but rather applies a variety of techniques such as "conservative estimates of benefits," contingency allowances in the estimation of investment costs and arbitrary limits on the period of analysis, none of which are specifically capable of isolation and evaluation by the decision-maker.[15] Because of the built-in tendency toward the overestimation of future benefits,[16] the well-recognized underestimation of construction costs in spite of the contingency allowances,[17] and the general lack of a well-defined approach toward the problem, it appears likely that any real adjustment for risk and uncertainty is nonexistent or negligible.

PROPOSALS FOR REVISION OF EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Concurrent with the above-mentioned criticisms came a spate of proposals intended to correct the inadequacies of the present approach. These proposals ranged over the entire field, modifying the form of the criteria, the interest rate used in evaluating future streams, and the treatment of risk and uncertainty.

THE CONCEPT OF THE APPROPRIATE CRITERION

Within the span of a single year, two proposals appeared concerning the nature of an appropriate criterion.[18] Both the McKean and Eckstein proposals are based on the existing body of welfare economics, both deal with a situation in which a limited budget serves as a constraint and both agree that the goal in selecting water resource projects is the maximization of national present value. It is concerning the definition of the constraint and the meaning of "maximum national present value" that the two proposals diverge.

By assuming that the future national water resources budget available for construction of projects is invariant with regard to the volume of necessary operating expenses arising from already constructed projects, McKean views the relevant constraint to be only the capital budget.[19] Moreover, he interprets the concept "maximum national present value" to mean the maximum growth of asset values throughout the period.[20] With this definition of the proper goal of water resource development and the relevant constraint under which such a program must operate, McKean argues that the necessary criterion is one which will choose that set of projects which will maximize "present worth for a given investment budget, when the streams are discounted by the marginal internal rate of return." [21] By ranking the projects by their internal rate of return and choosing those which just exhaust the budget, the correct set will be approximated.[22]

The approach taken by Eckstein is substantially different. Rather than postulating only capital expenditure to be the rationed element, Eckstein views the entire expenditure of money, a concept embracing both capital expenditure and necessary operation, maintenance, and repair costs to be the most reasonable budget constraint.[23] Consequently, the return which he wishes to maximize is the present value of the future income stream which can be created by the expenditure of this bundle of "cost." The criterion proposed, therefore, closely follows the format of the traditional benefit-cost ratio as applied by the Corps of Engineers.

THE APPROPRIATE EVALUATION OF TIME

With this emphasis on the development of a proper criterion for project choice, came a simultaneous set of proposals concerning the proper conceptual and empirical evaluation of the time factor in future streams of benefits and costs. Essentially, defense of each of these was based upon a particular view of the goal of the program, the choice of a budget constraint and, consequently, the nature of the criterion into which the rate was to be incorporated. The main alternative proposals are: (1) The marginal internal rate of return; (2) the social (or opportunity) cost of capital; and (3) the social rate of time preference.

The first of these concepts has been closely associated with the work of McKean. Accepting his assumption concerning the need to maximize the growth of asset values throughout the period, the internal rate of return of the marginal project included in the limited budget is the rate which must be applied.[24] Because the rate is itself a function of the size of the budget, an empirical estimation of it becomes impossible. Likewise, this rate may be greater than, equal to, or (in the case of a very large budget) less than the social (or opportunity) cost of capital and the social rate of time preference.

The social cost of capital is, likewise, a logical candidate for the role. Although not associated with any one name, the concept has been widely recommended and many empirical studies have been concerned with its estimation.[25] The argument in support of this rate can be briefly stated as follows: because the budget to be committed to water resource development is raised through the taxation of private citizens, any particular public project is constructed and maintained at the expense of its private alternative and, consequently, national income can only be maximized if funds committed to public projects earn at least as high a return as their value in the private sector.[26] By tracing the budget provision back to its source in the private sector, this social or opportunity cost of capital can be determined.

---

[11] Eckstein, op. cit., p. 94.

[12] Krutilla and Eckstein, op. cit., pp. 78–127.

[13] McKean, op. cit., p. 84. This conclusion is based upon the assumption, considered by McKean to be appropriate in this context, that net receipts are completely reinvested rather than consumed.

[14] Joe S. Bain, "Criteria for Undertaking Water-Resource Developments," American Economic Review, L (May 1960), pp. 315–316. See also Eckstein, op. cit., pp. 99–101. In a report by a Panel of Consultants to the Bureau of the Budget, a synthesis of the "opportunity cost" of capital and the interest rate concept suggested by Bain and Eckstein is proposed. Their analysis is based on the necessary assumption that "the benefit streams of all Federal water resource projects are constant over a uniform life." See Bureau of the Budget, "Standards and Criteria for Formulating and Evaluating Federal Water Resources Development," pp. 11–16.

[15] Eckstein, op. cit., pp. 81–91 and pp. 149–160.

[16] One of the most significant sources of bias in the estimation of the expected benefit stream enters because of the excessive inclusion of secondary or indirect benefits. Examples of such benefits include reduction of losses of wage payments because of the control of flooding and the increase of property values because of the increased activity caused by navigation improvements. Bias is also introduced by the use of rail rates instead of out-of-pocket rail costs in the estimation of navigation benefits. Elucidation of these and description of many more, less significant but also important defects in the measurement procedure can be found in the following sources: Eckstein, op. cit., pp. 110–258. Otto Eckstein, "Evaluation of Federal Expenditures for Water Resource Projects," in United States, Congress, Joint Economic Committee, "Federal Expenditure Policy for Economic Growth and Stability," Washington, November 5, 1957, pp. 657–667, Task Force on Water Resources and Power, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, "Report on Water Resources and Power" (Washington: 1955) vol. 1, pp. 126–145, vol. 2, pp. 294–299, pp. 789–821, pp. 935–953, vol. 3, pp. 1275–1299, pp. 1317–1395.

[17] Vivid evidence is available concerning the deviation of actual construction cost from the estimated construction cost at the time the decision was made to construct the project, i.e., from the time that it was included as a "new start." See United States, Congress, Committee on Public Works, "Report of the Subcommittee To Study Civil Works, Part 1, the Civil Functions Program of the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army," House Committee Print No. 21, 82d Cong., 2d sess. In recent years, this deviation has been substantially reduced, but even today average actual construction cost exceeds the average estimated construction cost including the contingency allowance.

[18] Eckstein, op. cit., and McKean, op. cit.

[19] It should be noted here that McKean's argument for such a constraint is based on the judgment that both marketable (e.g., irrigation and power) and nonmarketable (e.g., flood control) project benefits are, in some sense, current receipts available for reinvestment by the Government. (Ibid., p. 116.) This judgment has been open to severe criticism. See Julius Margolis, "The Economic Evaluation of Federal Water Resource Development," American Economic Review, XLIX (March 1959), p. 105, and John V. Krutilla, "Some Recent Developments in River Basin Planning and Evaluation," Journal of Farm Economics, XL (December 1958), p. 1676.

[20] This judgment is likewise doubtful. Is it true that the maximum growth of a water resource program is the desired goal of such a program?

[21] McKean, op. cit., p. 117.

[22] This is true, he points out, if the projects to be ranked are neither inter-related nor interdependent. If they are so related this device can lead to gross errors unless many extensive and complicated side calculations are performed to choose, for example, the proper one of two mutually exclusive projects.

[23] Eckstein, op. cit., pp. 61–65.

[24] Implicit in this statement is the assumption that the budget limitation is constant and that each year a similar set of projects exists, each of which are supramarginal.

[25] Krutilla and Eckstein, op. cit., pp. 78–130. The opportunity cost of Federal investment was estimated by Eckstein for the year 1955 to be in the range of 5 or 6 percent. Harberger, following a somewhat different tack, suggests the use of a rate of interest in this same range. "It therefore seems reasonable to expect that Federal investments * * * should pay off at least 6 percent,

The final concept which has been proposed is the above-mentioned social rate of time preference.[27] It is argued that, because the program under consideration will provide its benefits to future generations, it is not at all certain that the cost of capital to the present generation is the correct evaluation. If we (as a nation) "* * * prefer rejection of present intertemporal preferences in favor of a redistribution of income toward future generations," a rate of interest should be chosen which will encourage the development of projects with a long life and will maintain the "long-term perspective" of the Federal program. Consequently, that rate of interest, which a majority of the populace would choose as a guide to long term investment projects whose income streams will go to large masses of population at a later date, is the appropriate one in this context.[28]

RISK AND UNCERTAINTY: A PROPER ALLOWANCE

As with proposals concerning the criterion and the interest rate, the diversity of the various approaches to the treatment of risk and uncertainty is great. Broadly speaking, one can distinguish some five different approaches. These are (1) a limit on the period of analysis suggested by the Green Books[29] and Circular A–47[30] and disposed by Eckstein,[31] (2) the inclusion of direct and specific safety allowances proposed by the Green Books and concurred in by Eckstein (in the case of risks which are not a function of time), (3) the inclusion of a risk premium in the interest rate recommended by Eckstein (to allow for uncertainties related to time),[32] (4) a general case-by-case evaluation involving a description of contingencies, a schedule showing a possible range of outcomes and an analysis of the public attitude toward the disutility (utility) of uncertainty bearing as recommended by McKean[33] and the Panel of Consultants to the Bureau of the Budget[34] and (5) an approach which makes allowance for the fundamental differences in the nature of expectations concerning costs and benefits through a dual rate of interest.[35]

METHOD AND ASSUMPTIONS

The method

At its most basic level, the study involves the application of the proposed criteria cited above to the data of the projects already constructed or under construction in 10 Southern States since 1946.[36] All of the data are based upon substantial economic base studies as outlined in the corps manual[37] and was obtained from the 11 district offices of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers which are concerned with project evaluation in these States. Through these studies, estimates of future annual flows of benefits and of operation, maintenance, and repair costs as well as estimates of total investment cost were secured for each project considered for construction. It is this raw material which was obtained from the corps for each project involved[38] and to which the proposed efficiency criteria are applied in appraising the corps program.

Taking then these corps estimates of annual benefits, annual costs and total investment cost, the following tests were run.

A. The Eckstein test, in which a 2.5-percent interest rate is accepted as an estimate of the social rate of time preference and is applied in the evaluation of future streams, a 50-year length of project life is assumed accurate and a cutoff benefit-cost ratio of 1.4 is used to insure that the entire corps program would earn a return at least equal to the opportunity cost of the funds invested (estimated by Eckstein to be about the 6-percent level).[39]

B. The traditional benefit-cost ratio criterion with an interest rate of 4.5 percent as suggested by Miller and the panel of consultants to the Bureau of the Budget and an estimated length of economic life of 50 years.[40]

C. The test suggested in the work by Eckstein and Krutilla which proposes the use of the traditional benefit-cost formulation with an estimated economic length of project life of 100 years and a rate of interest equal to the social cost of the capital committed. The rate they suggest, and which is used in this study, is 5.5 percent.[41]

D. The test which makes a specific allowance for risk and uncertainty as suggested in the appendix. Working from a base interest rate of 4.5 percent taken to be the social cost of capital, a premium of 1 percent was added to the rate in the discounting of future benefits and a premium of 0.5 percent was subtracted from the base in the discounting of future costs.[42]

E. The rate of return on investment as suggested by McKean.[43]

The assumptions

In attempting to set forth the necessary assumptions involved in such a reevaluation, the minimum number essential to a precise analysis is very elusive. Nevertheless, while recognizing the risk involved in concealing certain necessary factors, only those assump-

---

which, as we have seen, appears to be somewhat below the average return on investments in the private sector of the economy." See Arnold C. Harberger, "The Interest Rate in Cost-Benefit Analysis," in U.S. Congress, Joint Economics Committee, op. cit., pp. 239–241. Miller, using the same technique as Eckstein, estimated the social cost of capital to be between 4 and 4.5 percent, somewhat lower than either Harberger's or Eckstein's suggestion. See William L. Miller, "The Magnitude of the Discount Rate for Government Projects," Southern Economic Review (April 1962), pp. 348–356.

[26] It should be noted that, if this concept is incorporated into the benefit-cost ratio criterion, the rate of return on all of the projects with a benefit-cost ratio greater than 1 will be larger than the measure of the social cost of capital which is used. Moreover, if the budget is sufficiently restricted, the "social marginal productivity" of water resource investment will be greater than the social cost of capital.

[27] This rate is suggested by both Eckstein and Bain. Eckstein, op. cit., pp. 99–104, and Bain, op. cit., pp. 315–316.

[28] Again in this case, as with the marginal internal rate of return, an empirical evaluation becomes impossible. Eckstein, rather arbitrarily, estimates that this rate is approximately 2.5 percent and recommends the evaluation of projects through a benefit-cost ratio making use of this rate. In order to assure that the entire Federal program earns a rate of return which is equal to the opportunity cost of the funds committed, he recommends the use of a cutoff benefit-cost ratio which will assure such a rate of return. Bain, also realizing the impossibility of empirical evaluation, suggests a reliance "on the social cost of governmental funds as a conservative approximation." Ibid., p. 316.)

[29] Subcommittee on Evaluation Standards, op. cit., pp. 22–25.

[30] Bureau of the Budget, Circular A–47, p. 13.

[31] Eckstein, op. cit., pp. 81–86.

[32] Ibid., pp. 86–90.

[33] McKean, op. cit., pp. 58–103.

[34] Bureau of the Budget, "Standards and Criteria for Formulating and Evaluating Federal Water Resources Development," pp. 34–41.

[35] This approach is discussed in the appendix.

[36] Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

[37] U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers, Survey Investigations and Reports, EM 1120–2–101.

[38] For some of the projects, precise information was not available for two primary reasons: (1) the records of the Charleston, S.C., office were destroyed by fire and (2) information on older projects was unavailable from one or two of the district offices because of a more rigid adherence to the policy concerning the destroying of old records. In nearly all of these cases, however, acceptable data was secured from the project document or House or Senate hearings on authorization or appropriation.

[39] Where B represents the estimated annual stream of benefits, O the estimated annual stream of operation, maintenance and repair costs and K the investment costs the traditional form of the benefit-cost ratio expressed earlier can be redefined as

$$Z=\frac{B}{O+ait\,K}$$

in which ait is the annual capital charge of both interest and amortization per dollar of investment cost. Given the rate of interest (i) and the length of project life (t), the numerical value of ait can be secured from a table "Annuity whose present value is 1." The numerical value of ait used in the Eckstein test is .0325806.

[40] The numerical value for ait in this case is 0.05060215.

[41] The numerical value for ait in this case is .05526132.

[42] Because of the use of the dual rate of interest, the simpler formulation as presented in note 39 cannot be applied. In this case, the traditional form of the ratio must be used in which B, O, and K are defined as above but where i is the rate of interest used to evaluate the stream of costs and i′ is the rate used to evaluate the stream of benefits

$$Z=\frac{\Sigma\frac{B}{(1+i')}t}{K+\Sigma\frac{0}{(1+i)}t}$$

Given i and i′ and the length of project life, the factors by which B and O must be multiplied to yield their present value can be secured from a table, "Present value of an Annuity." The value of the B factor is 16.931518 and the value of the O factor is 21.4821864. It should be noted that, in all of these tests, the interest rate(s) is assumed constant for the entire 17-year period. In defense of this assumption see Eckstein and Krutilla, op. cit. pp. 119–120.

[43] The formulation for this test is

$$ait=\frac{B\text{–}O}{K}$$

Taking t to be 50 years, the value of the rate of return can be determined from a table "Annuity Whose Present Value Is 1."

tions essential to the results of the study will be explicitly mentioned. These assumptions, it appears, fall into two categories: (1) those covering the project data secured from the corps and used in the evaluation and (2) assumptions concerning the form and content of each of the criteria which will be applied.

Assumptions concerning project data

Use of the project data obtained from the Corps necessitates several assumptions. First of all, because of the inability of economic science to measure the worth of certain phenomena, these "intangibles" are not included in the estimates of annual benefits or costs. Lives saved through flood control, the "costs" of increasing the size of the Federal Government and contributions of a project to the national defense effort are examples of such indirect benefits (costs) which cannot be measured in dollar terms. It is, therefore, assumed that these "intangibles" are non-existent. Second, it is assumed that the configuration of benefits and operating costs through time is as posited by the corps; i.e., that the stream of values is constant and continuous and stops abruptly at the end of the estimated project life. Also, it is assumed that the projects are mutually exclusive and independent; i.e., that side calculations have already been made to determine the best combination of projects to be included in an entire river basin program.[44] Finally, it is assumed that the corps estimates of benefits and costs are accurate; that there is neither over- nor under-estimation of the values involved.[45]

Assumptions necessary in applying the proposed criteria

Because a varied set of criteria is to be applied to the same project data, the assumptions necessary for the analysis vary with the application of each particular criterion. For example, in applying the Eckstein criterion, it must be assumed that the budget constraint accepted by Eckstein (total Federal cost) is, in fact, the correct one, that his estimate of the social rate of time preference (2.5 percent) is correct, that the goal of his criteria (maximization of national income) is an acceptable one and, finally, that his statement concerning the social cost of capital (6 percent) is an accurate estimate. Suffice it to say that for each criterion the goal chosen is assumed to be the correct one and the variables contained in the criterion are assumed to be accurate estimates of reality.

The results of the study

During the 17-year period from 1946 to 1962, 163 projects in the 10-State area received Federal appropriation.[46] Of these 163 projects, 35 were still under construction at the close of fiscal year 1962. The total amount of Federal funds committed to these projects amounts to approximately $2,687,942,000.[47] For 9 of the 163 projects, no benefit-cost computations were performed by the Corps of Engineers as project justification was based on noneconomic grounds. The committed Federal funds accounted for by these nine projects is $9,339,000. On seven additional projects, benefit-cost records were neither available from the corps offices nor could they be secured from the documents or hearings. The Federal funds committed by these projects totals $34,602,000. On the remaining 147 projects, the benefit-cost data was secured and it is this data to which the strict efficiency criteria described and discussed above have been applied. The Federal funds committed by this group of projects totals $2,644,001,000 or 98.4 percent of the total. The results of the application of these criteria are summarized, together with the original corps evaluation, in tables 1 through 6.

Table 1 presents the benefit-cost ratios which faced the Congress at the time that the initial appropriation was made on each of the projects, that is, at the time that each project was a new start. It should be noted that even under the corps own concept of efficiency, three projects were constructed in which the national outlay exceeded the expected return. Also, it is significant that by far the largest concentration of projects, both in absolute number and in Federal funds committed, is located at the very bottom end of the distribution—the range which, even under the most liberal interpretation, is marginal. The weighted average benefit-cost ratio of the projects as evaluated by the corps is 1.67.[48]

Table 1.—*Distribution of 147 water resource projects constructed in 10 Southern States from 1946 to 1962 by benefit-cost ratio presented by the Corps of Engineers to the Congress at the time of initial appropriation* [1]

Benefit-cost ratio	Number of projects	Federal funds committed	Percent of total Federal funds committed
		Thousands	
0.60 to 0.79	0		
0.80 to 0.99	3	$95,970	3.62
1.00 to 1.19	36	786,339	29.74
1.20 to 1.39	26	361,375	13.67
1.40 to 1.59	24	317,093	11.99
1.60 to 1.79	16	326,066	12.34
1.80 to 1.99	7	50,492	1.91
2.00 to 2.49	16	527,768	19.96
2.50 to 2.99	5	17,890	.68
3.00 to 4.99	11	147,885	5.59
5.00 or more	3	13,123	.50
Total	147	2,644,001	100.0

[1] The length of project life is assumed to be 50 years unless specifically stipulated to be less by the corps.

Table 2 presents the results necessary for the application of the criteria suggested by Eckstein (approach A). In applying this test, a low rate of interest (2.5 percent) was used to evaluate future streams of benefits and costs. In order to assure an adequate rate of return of 6 percent, Eckstein posits a cutoff benefit-cost ratio of 1.4. From the table then, it can be seen that 57 of the 147 projects representing about 43 percent of total funds committed, fail to satisfy the standard posited by Eckstein.

Table 2.—*Distribution of 147 water resource projects constructed in 10 Southern States from 1946 to 1962 by benefit-cost ratio when future streams are evaluated by a 2.5-percent rate of interest* [1]

Benefit-cost ratio	Number of projects	Federal funds committed	Percent of total Federal funds committed
		Thousands	
0.60 to 0.79	0		
0.80 to 0.99	1	$94,600	3.58
1.00 to 1.19	25	477,694	18.07
1.20 to 1.39	31	568,757	21.51
1.40 to 1.59	22	187,082	7.07
1.60 to 1.79	21	514,953	19.47
1.80 to 1.99	7	91,123	3.45
2.00 to 2.49	17	450,032	17.02
2.50 to 2.99	7	97,866	3.70
3.00 to 4.99	12	148,751	5.63
5.00 or more	4	13,123	.50
Total	147	2,644,001	100.0

[1] See note 1, table 1.

In table 3 these same 147 projects are evaluated by a 4.5-percent rate of interest as suggested by Miller and the Panel of Consultants to the Bureau of the Budget (approach B). The effect of this reevaluation is to shift the entire schedule of benefit-cost ratios downward substantially. Whereas the modal class is 1.00–1.19 in the corps distribution and 1.20–1.39 when a 2.5-percent rate is applied, the modal class in this distribution decreases to the 0.89–0.99 range. This is likewise reflected in the weighted average benefit-cost ratio which, for this distribution is a meager 1.30. As with the Eckstein test, some 40 percent of committed Federal funds are devoted to projects which fail to pass the test; i.e., projects with ratios less than 1.

Table 3.—*Distribution of 147 water resource projects constructed in 10 Southern States from 1946 to 1962 by benefit-cost ratio when future streams are evaluated by a 4.5-percent rate of interest* [1]

Benefit-cost ratio	Number of projects	Federal funds committed	Percent of total Federal funds committed
		Thousands	
0.60 to 0.79	9	$295,527	11.18
0.80 to 0.99	38	822,616	31.11
1.00 to 1.19	33	277,009	10.48
1.20 to 1.39	23	520,679	19.69
1.40 to 1.59	9	151,749	5.74
1.60 to 1.79	10	314,496	11.89
1.80 to 1.99	2	3,346	.13
2.00 to 2.49	10	185,271	6.25
2.50 to 2.99	3	74,216	2.81
3.00 to 4.99	8	9,644	.36
5.00 or more	2	9,448	.36
Total	147	2,644,001	100.0

[1] See note 1, table 1.

---

[44] When a project is started which is but an integral part of an entire river basin program, the data for the entire program at the time the project is started is used to evaluate the project rather than the data of the project alone.

[45] The doubtful quality of this assumption is well known and recognized. See Eckstein, op. cit. chapter 5–8. To simply assume that these estimates are accurate, covers up a host of necessary assumptions made in calculating the estimated values; assumptions concerning price projections, population growth, future land use and value, future river tonnage and future demand for power, to mention but a few.

[46] This figure excludes projects under the Mississippi River Commission which bears responsibility for flood control expenditures along the Mississippi. However, two large river basin complexes were broken down into their component parts and each part included as a separate project. The Appalachicola, Flint, and Chatahoochie project was divided into five segments and the Arkansas River Basin project into two.

[47] The concept of Federal funds committed is a rather hybrid quantity. It consists of the funds already appropriated to the 163 projects plus the latest estimate of the necessary appropriations needed to complete the projects yet under construction.

[48] The formula used to compute the average is the following:

$$\overline{X}w = \frac{\Sigma Xw}{\Sigma w}$$

in which $\overline{X}w$ is the weighted arithmetic mean, X is the benefit-cost ratio and w is the amount of Federal funds committed by a project.

TABLE 4.—*Distribution of 147 water resource projects constructed in 10 Southern States from 1946 to 1962 by benefit-cost ratio when future streams are evaluated by a 5.5-percent rate of interest* [1]

Benefit-cost ratio	Number of projects	Federal funds committed	Percent of total Federal funds committed
		Thousands	
0.60 to 0.79	18	$399, 153	15. 10
0.80 to 0.99	42	761, 017	28. 77
1.00 to 1.19	35	642, 210	24. 29
1.20 to 1.39	12	179, 245	6. 78
1.40 to 1.59	9	110, 322	4. 17
1.60 to 1.79	8	293, 475	11. 10
1.80 to 1.99	6	93, 813	3. 55
2.00 to 2.49	6	143, 583	5. 43
2.50 to 2.99	3	7, 549	. 29
3.00 to 4.99	6	4, 186	. 16
5.00 or more	2	9, 448	. 36
Total	147	2, 644, 001	100. 0

[1] The length of project life is assumed to be 100 years unless assumed less by the corps.

Table 4 presents the distribution of projects when the length of project life is assumed to be 100 years to insure the long-range nature of the program and the social cost of capital raised through taxes is accepted as the appropriate rate of interest and is estimated to be 5.5 percent by Eckstein-Krutilla (approach C). The effect of this test is more severe than either of the previous two. Of the 147 projects accepted for construction, 60 fail to pass the efficiency requirement posed by Eckstein-Krutilla. Nearly 45 percent of the committed Federal funds belong in this category. This severity is also reflected in the weighted average benefit-cost ratio which has declined to 1.20.

TABLE 5.—*Distribution of 147 water resource projects constructed in 10 Southern States from 1946 to 1962 by benefit-cost ratio when allowance for risk is made in the criterion* [1]

Benefit-cost ratio	Number of projects	Federal funds committed	Percent of total Federal funds committed
		Thousands	
0.60 to 0.79	33	$806, 581	30. 51
0.80 to 0.99	46	631, 118	20. 09
1.00 to 1.19	24	577, 792	21. 85
1.20 to 1.39	12	160, 812	6. 08
1.40 to 1.59	8	305, 952	11. 57
1.60 to 1.79	7	96, 980	3. 67
1.80 to 1.99	2	18, 792	. 71
2.00 to 2.49	6	130, 900	4. 95
2.50 to 2.99	4	1, 918	. 07
3.00 to 4.99	3	3, 708	. 14
5.00 or more	2	9, 448	. 36
Total	147	2, 644, 001	100. 0

[1] See note 1, table 1.

When risk and uncertainty are treated as disutility to the community and when allowance is made for this disutility in the rate of interest, the resulting benefit-cost configuration is as presented in table 5 (approach D). The effect of the risk premium (discount) is clearly seen in the resulting distribution. Over one-half of both the number of projects and the Federal funds committed are excluded by this test. The weighted average benefit-cost ratio in this case falls to a minute 1.11.

TABLE 6.—*Distribution of 147 water resource projects constructed in 10 Southern States from 1946 to 1962 by average rate of return* [1]

Rate of return	Number of projects	Federal funds committed	Percent of total Federal funds committed
		Thousands	
0.0200 to 0.0299	8	$142, 786	5. 40
0.0300 to 0.0399	24	565, 658	21. 39
0.0400 to 0.0499	27	451, 244	17. 07
0.0500 to 0.0599	25	373, 030	14. 11
0.0600 to 0.0699	14	377, 531	14. 38
0.0700 to 0.0799	7	69, 783	2. 64
0.0800 to 0.0899	8	105, 099	3. 97
0.0900 to 0.0999	4	283, 728	10. 75
0.1000 to 0.1499	18	246, 059	9. 31
0.1500 to 0.1999	3	11, 431	. 43
0.2000 to 0.2999	3	4, 371	. 17
0.3000 or more	6	13, 281	. 50
Total	147	2, 644, 001	100. 0

[1] See note 1, table 1.

In table 6, the results of the final reevaluation are presented. Working from the suggestion presented by McKean (approach E), this distribution displays the 147 projects by the average rate of return. Again, the bulk of projects are seen to cluster at the lower end of the scale. The weighted average rate of return for the 147 projects is 0.0644. Applying the recommendation by Harberger, that no project should be constructed which did not return at least 6 percent, 84 of the 147 projects should have been rejected implying that nearly 60 percent of the total committed Federal funds have been allocated to projects failing to pass this test.

In the reevaluation process then, each of the alternative efficiency criteria, all of which have as their objective the maximization of national income, rejected a significant proportion of the projects. When measured by Federal funds committed, the proportion varies from 42 percent in the case of the 4.5-percent test to 58 percent in the rate of return—Harberger proposal. For any given project, however, the results may be quite varied; i.e., any given project may be accepted by some of the tests and rejected by the others in any combination. Table 7 portrays in a crude way the degree of such inconsistency in the results of the tests.

TABLE 7.—*Distribution of number of rejections out of 5 tests for each of 147 water resource projects constructed in 10 Southern States from 1946 to 1962*

Number of rejections	Number of projects	Federal funds committed	Percent of total Federal funds committed
		Thousands	
0	62	$1, 109, 944	41. 98
1	6	196, 299	7. 42
2	16	168, 830	6. 39
3	10	36, 612	1. 38
4	8	23, 971	. 91
5	45	1, 108, 345	41. 92
Total	147	2, 644, 001	100.0

In 107 of the 147 projects, complete consistency was achieved. Of these projects, 62 were accepted by all of the criteria and 45 were rejected by all. In the remaining 40, the answer given by the proposed criteria is not as neat, as individual projects are accepted by some and rejected by others. By percent of Federal funds committed, however, the degree of consistency is somewhat more clear; 84 percent of the Federal funds committed were allocated to projects accepted or rejected by all of the criteria and only 16 percent were allocated to projects in which the answer was inconsistent.

The inconsistency present among the criteria is not limited, however, to the type pointed out above in which those projects on the margin can be placed on different sides of the acceptance-rejection line by different criteria. This type of inconsistency can occur simply because of the higher standard of justification required by some criteria as compared to others, i.e., some criteria may simply be willing to move further down the list of monotonically ranked projects than others. Such a situation is obviously present but an inconsistency of a higher order is also worthy of note. When some projects accepted by criteria Z are rejected by criteria Y while some projects accepted by criteria Y are rejected by criteria Z, such higher level inconsistency is present. This inconsistency appears as a disparity in the actual ranking of the projects and its extent is expressed in table 8.

TABLE 8.—*Degree of inconsistency among the 6 criteria caused by nonunique ranking of projects as expressed in the acceptance-rejection decisions*

	Number rejected by A	Number rejected by B	Number rejected by C	Number rejected by D	Number rejected by E ′	Number rejected by E
Number accepted by Eckstein (A)	----------	1	6	21	17	25
Number accepted by 4.5 percent (B)	11	----------	12	31	26	35
Number accepted by Eckstein-Krutilla (C)	4	0	----------	19	13	24
Number accepted by risk test (D)	0	0	0	----------	0	8
Number with rate of return of 5.5 or more (E′)	1	0	0	5	----------	10
Number with rate of return of 6 or more (E)	1	0	0	1	0	----------

Thus, for example, in comparing the results of the Eckstein test with the results of the proposal by Krutilla-Eckstein, it is seen that a substantial overlap exists. Of the 57 projects rejected by the Eckstein test, 4 were accepted by the Krutilla-Eckstein formulation. Conversely, of the 60 projects rejected by the Krutilla-Eckstein test, 6 possessed benefit-cost ratios greater than 1.4 when evaluated at a 2.5 percent rate of interest and were, therefore, acceptable under the Eckstein test.

Table 8 yields yet another insight. In setting up his test, Eckstein realized that, because the ratio of operating costs to investment costs directly influenced the size of the benefit-cost ratio, the choice of a single value as a cutoff benefit-cost ratio would lead to the acceptance of some projects, namely those of low capital intensity, with a rate of return significantly below the desired rate and the rejection of some, namely those of high capital intensity, with a rate of return above the desired rate. In defense of his method, however, he makes the following assertions:

"The marginal projects which would be undertaken under the proposed test would not represent a misallocation of capital into a use in which it is incapable of earning a satisfactory rate of return."[49]

* * * * *

"An interest rate of 2½ percent coupled with a ratio of 1.4 are combinations which will produce an average rate of return for the entire Federal program of about 6 percent."[50]

Both of these statements appear rather untenable. The evidence in table 8, rather effectively illustrates the costs involved in choosing a single benefit-cost ratio as a cutoff. Although the ratio chosen by Eckstein (1.4) aimed at yielding a rate of return of 6 percent, it, in fact, accepted 25 projects with a rate of return less than 6 percent, accepted 17 projects with a rate of return less than 5.5 percent and rejected 1 project with a rate greater than 6 percent. Consequently, in opposition to the first statement, it appears that marginal projects may well be accepted even if they do not yield a satisfactory rate of return. Of the projects accepted by the Eckstein test, for example, 2 had rates of return less than 4.5 percent.

As regards the second statement, there is no more reason for claiming that such a combination of interest rate and cutoff benefit-cost ratio will yield an average rate of return of 6 percent than claiming that the average return will be 7, 8, 9, or any other percent. The adoption of such a single benefit-cost ratio only assures that some projects bearing rates of return equal to or greater than the desired rate (6 percent in this case) will be rejected by the test while other projects bearing rates of return less than the desired rate will be accepted. The average rate of return of the entire Federal program depends, then, upon the ability of the average rate of return of those accepted projects with a rate of return greater than 6 percent to outweigh the average rate of return of those accepted projects with a rate of return less than 6 percent. Consequently, the two statements in defense of the Eckstein test appear quite unwarranted.

CONCLUSION

From the evidence presented, one can hardly doubt that a great number of projects have been constructed which, if efficiency or the maximization of national income had been the sole objective, should not, in fact, have been constructed. Although each of the above criteria have presented somewhat varied estimates of this misallocation of national resources (see tables 2–6), it seems plausible that some acceptable estimate of the size of this misallocation is possible. Consequently, it will be assumed that any project that is rejected by 3 or more of the 5 tests should not have been constructed; that any project which is accepted by 3 or more of the 5 tests should have been constructed. For those projects in the latter category, it is presumed that national resources have been allocated efficiently and the consequent change in national income is the greatest possible per dollar devoted to rivers and harbors development. For project in the former category, the reverse is presumed true. Under this approach, then, it appears that 63 of the 147 projects representing $1,169 million of committed Federal funds or 44.2 percent of the total are devoted to projects which should not have been undertaken; projects, the construction of which, has led to a misallocation of national resources and economic waste. Given the present desire for a rapid development of the South and given the willingness of the Federal Government to aid in the fulfillment of this desire through water resource investment, it becomes essential that such misallocation be brought to a minimum.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I wish to make several observations.

First, let me say that I think it was just as important for the Senate to act on the conference report as it was for the House to act on it. All of us were here during the long sessions held on Friday night and Saturday and we are acquainted with the efforts made in the House to obtain a favorable vote on the conference report. Regardless of whatever may have been the agreement about a pro forma session, most of us thought a vote would be taken today in the Senate on this issue.

On the other hand, as the Senator from New York has stated, if it was not important to have the conference report adopted today by the Senate, the action of the Senate on the report could just as well go over until Monday or when the Senate commences January 7, because in the interim the necessary appropriations continue.

Further, I believe it would have been fair and just to notify Senators who have great responsibility for this measure. It is evident that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] was not notified. Although he did not handle the appropriation bill, he conducted the hearings on the authorization bill, and he has participated in the battle for weeks and months.

I do not know whether the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] was notified. But it is obvious that those of us who are here were not notified.

Second, there is considerable talk about the delays in the Senate's procedure. I do not wish to become too involved in a discussion of this subject today, but I think the sort of procedure we have witnessed today is rather typical and endemic of what happens in the Senate during a great deal of the year, and particularly during the first 3 or 4 months of the session when arrangements for postponed meetings which satisfy some Senators are made, and the work of the Senate is delayed. We waste and fritter away much time especially in the early months of the session, because of such agreements.

I hope that when we return in January our committees will meet steadily, for at least 3 or 4 days each week, during the first 3 or 4 months of the session to speed up their work. I also hope that during the early part of the session the Senate will meet when there is work to be done, and stay in session until decisions by vote are made. If this is done we will conclude our work earlier in the year and make decisions, and not experience the long delays of this year. Agreements such as the one under consideration today should not be made unless there is the greatest necessity therefor.

It is, in my opinion, the delays of the early months of the session, and agreements to satisfy a few Members, which contribute most to delay.

Having said that, Mr. President, I wish all Senators a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. When the Senator and I left the Chamber Saturday evening, was it not the understanding that the Senate would meet today to act on the conference report if by this time the House had acted on it?

Mr. COOPER. Oh, yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess——

Mr. McCARTHY. First, Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield, so that I may request that certain items be printed in the daily Record?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I feel certain—and if there is any question about it, I think it would be well to consult with the President of the United States, who has been strongly urging this action—and I agree with that—as to whether he would prefer to have the Senate act today on this measure, rather than to drag out our proceedings until some time next week. I believe it would be well to consult him and to learn his views.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in deference to Senators on both sides of the aisle who argued most persuasively that we should consult the leadership, I move that the Senate take a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

It was suggested that the Senate take a recess until 1 p.m. However, I understand there may be a little difficulty in getting in touch with the leadership. Therefore, if there is no strong disagreement on this point, I hope the Senate will take a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If there is no hurry about having the Senate act on this measure—and some of us have made plans to be here at this time to act on the conference report, and it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for us to be here on December 30—let me suggest that the leadership be asked, if there is no hurry about having the Senate act on the conference report, if instead of calling all Senators back on December 30, the Senate act on the conference report on January 7.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me that action on January 7 would be much more logical.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure that question will be discussed with the leadership before we reconvene at 1 p.m. or thereabouts.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

---

[49] Eckstein, op. cit., p. 101.

[50] Ibid., p. 104.

RECESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now take a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is agreed to; and the Chair announces that he will be available, and that as soon as possible after 1 p.m., the Senate will reconvene.

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL rose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California desire to address the Senate?

Mr. KUCHEL. I do, Mr. President.

After consulting with my colleague the distinguished acting majority leader [Mr. PROXMIRE], and by telephone with both the majority leader and the minority leader, it is the plan of the leadership in the Senate for the Senate to adjourn from today until Friday and from Friday until Monday next, by which time all Senators will have been placed on notice that the conference report on the foreign aid bill then will be considered, and presumably passed.

Under those circumstances, I say to my friend the Senator from Wisconsin, if there is no objection among those faithful colleagues who are present today to consider the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 880, at the desk, I suggest that we proceed with that business and then adjourn until Friday.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I agree.

DATE FOR CONVENING OF 2D SESSION OF 88TH CONGRESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 880), establishing that the 2d regular session of the 88th Congress convene at noon on Tuesday, January 7, 1964?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 880) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 23, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1175. An act to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; and

S. 2311. An act to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college topics.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address on automation in industry, delivered by the Secretary of Labor on December 19, 1963.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, DECEMBER 27, AT 9 A.M.; AND FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY UNTIL MONDAY, DECEMBER 30, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today it adjourn to reconvene on Friday, December 27, at 9 a.m., and that when it adjourns on Friday it adjourn to reconvene at 10 a.m. on Monday, December 30, and that the business to be laid before the Senate at that time be the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill, H.R. 9499.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to inquire whether it is the intention of the acting majority leader that the Senate not transact any business on Friday?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is certainly the intention of the acting majority leader. That was certainly the intention of the majority leader and of the minority leader when this request was agreed to.

The session of the Senate on Friday will be merely a pro forma session. The Senate will come in at 9 o'clock a.m. and go out shortly after that, and no business will be transacted.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in view of the statement just made by our able friend from Wisconsin, I wonder if the Senator is willing to revise the unanimous-consent request so that the consent agreement will include the fact that there will be no business transacted on Friday.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Surely.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that will be included in the unanimous-consent request.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the orders are entered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That at the conclusion of its business today the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock a.m. Friday, December 27, 1963; that immediately after convening on that day the Presiding Officer shall, without the transaction of any business or debate, declare the Senate adjourned until 10 o'clock a.m. Monday, December 30, 1963, at which time the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 9499, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. (December 24, 1963.)

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. FRIDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1963

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate will now adjourn.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Friday, December 27, 1963, at 9 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 24, 1963

The House met at 7 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 72: 11: *Yea, all kings shall fall down before Him, and all nations shall serve Him.*

Almighty God, our Father, in Thy divine keeping and control are the coming in and the going out of all our days and years.

Grant that these words of Thy servant, whom Thou hast richly endowed with insight and inspiration, may be completely realized by all the members of the human family:

"Many merry Christmases. Many happy New Years. Unbroken friendships. Great accumulation of cheerful recollections. Affection on earth. And heaven at last for all of us."

Hear us through the merits and mediation of our blessed Lord whom the ancient prophet proclaimed that His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WAIVING OF POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 9499

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 600 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and that during the consideration of the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to the bill, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, a motion by the chairman of the managers on the part of the House to recede and concur in said Senate amendment numbered 20 with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] 30 minutes, and I would like to inquire if the gentlewoman from New York would wish to use some of the time?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I will use some of the time, yes, sir. Do you want me to use it now?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that we all understand what this is about. In the interests of proceeding more rapidly, I wish the gentlewoman would go first.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have very little to say on this resolution. I quite agree with the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I believe everybody knows what we are going to talk about today, and I hope we will talk about it very briefly. Certainly everybody knows what has been going on here for the last couple of weeks. We deplore it, and it probably is the greatest argument for changes in certain rules of the House. I must, however, call the attention of the House to one thing: Some of us have been told that the Committee on Rules was rather a useless appendage; that it was quite useless and that nobody really thought very much of it. I note, however, Mr. Speaker, that it has been necessary to have recourse to the Committee on Rules to get this bill on the floor, so maybe there is some use to it after all—not that I am for the bill.

We all have the privilege of revising and extending our remarks.

For that reason it is to be hoped we will all do that this morning. Then our words will go down to posterity. Everyone will be able to read them. Future generations yet unborn will be able to see them. But those of us who are here on this Christmas Eve need not listen to them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take 5 minutes. I think we should be certain about the procedure, especially on our side of the aisle. You will recall the last time—I will not say the first or the second time, but the last time we voted on this issue the conference report itself was in disagreement and therefore the principal vote on this side occurred on a motion to recommit the conference report. This morning the circumstance is, as I understand the procedure, that the conference report is not in disagreement. The language in disagreement is to a Senate amendment, No. 20, to the conference report. So, said another way, I assume that the conference report will be approved when it comes before the House.

There is one technical amendment, amendment No. 14, which I understand is not in dispute. The next Senate amendment, No. 20, is in dispute and I presume the gentleman from Louisiana will move to recede from the House position and concur in that amendment with an amendment. It is at that point, may I say to my colleagues on our side of the aisle, that the principal vote will occur this morning.

I might add further, if we prevail on this side of the aisle, and in justice certainly we should, it is assumed that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized to move that the House conferees insist on the House position.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not use 5 minutes, but as one of you who has been disturbed in these last days at the reputation we have made for ourselves in the country and in the world, it seems a very great pity that at this time of year particularly we should have been fighting each other and doing things for which, as the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] has said, future generations will not be proud.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Members who are here this morning—and I congratulate those who came back under such very difficult conditions—will do their voting this morning in the spirit of Christmas, not in the spirit of battle. This is so important to the whole world. Unless we can demonstrate peace within our own frontiers how can we expect to be of any moment at all in the decisions of the world?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, day after day the Soviet Union spends $1 million a day in Cuba to defy us and destroy liberty and freedom to the Cuban people. Today we are asked to open the door that American taxpayers finance sale of products to the Soviet Union.

Shall we endorse the Soviet Union's note at the expense of the American taxpayer? Shall we extend further credit to a nation that now is in default to us over $10 billion?

Shall we now begin to finance both sides of the cold war?

TO SELL OR NOT SELL WHEAT IS NOT THE QUESTION

Mr. Speaker, there have been some who have tried to lead us down the primrose path into confusion from the real issue. It is not shall we or shall we not sell wheat to the Soviets. When this issue was first discussed with the American people we were told the wheat sale would be for dollars or gold. That it would help our balance of payments. This is not the issue today.

This is not a proposal which involves the question whether we should trade wheat, corn, cotton, or tobacco. The amendment deals with all products and for all countries. It involves the question whether we want to do business with Communist dictators helping them to import the things they need to shore up the staggering economy in Communist countries by means of the credit extended by the American taxpayers.

What has happened to the wheat deal for dollars or gold?

Again I point out this amendment is not for wheat but for products.

Webster's dictionary defines "product" as: "Product—anything produced as by generation, growth, labor, or thought."

Shall we delegate this great power, shall we grant this unlimited authority? I hope not.

We have spoken twice. Twice before this issue has been settled by a majority vote of this House.

It is an open secret, of course, that the President wants this power. He has used his influence, prestige, and skill to overturn the will of this House.

Are we in the future to expect the power of the Executive to dictate and overturn the action of Congress except through his constitutional veto?

I would hope not.

Less than 1 month ago, on November 27, 1963, in an address by the President before a joint session of Congress he said—

> As one who has long served in both Houses of the Congress, I firmly believe in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch. I promise you that I shall always respect this. It is deep in the marrow of my bones. With equal firmness, I believe in the capacity and the ability of the Congress, despite the divisions of opinion which characterize our Nation, to act—to act wisely, vigorously, and speedily when the need arises.

Mr. Speaker, I too have served here some years. I believe in the independence and integrity of this House. In the past few days and nights I have fought to protect that integrity and independence. The opposition has been great and not all of it has come from within the House.

THE ROLE OF THE PRESIDENT AND OF THE HOUSE IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker, there are those who say that under the Constitution the sole power in foreign affairs rests with the President. I challenge anyone in this House or elsewhere to find any such language in the Constitution. But the authority of the Congress in appropriations is well settled. Let us look at history.

HOW THE FOUNDING FATHERS FELT

It is clear that many of the men who assembled in Philadelphia in 1787 to frame a constitution for the newly independent colonies favored an Executive with limited powers. Madison notes in his journal of Friday, June 1, 1787, that one of the delegates, Mr. Sherman, echoed the feelings of others present when he said that he considered the Executive office as nothing more than an institution for carrying into effect the will of the legislature. Sherman went so far as to say that the Executive ought to be appointed by the legislature and accountable to that body since Congress would be the depository of the supreme will of the society. Sherman considered the legislators as the best judges of the business which ought to be done by the executive department. Madison notes that another delegate, Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania, considered the execution of the laws and the appointing of officers the only strictly Executive functions.

These comments proved typical of the sentiment evoked by Charles Pinckney's preliminary plan for Executive powers introduced before the delegates only 3 days before, on Tuesday, May 29:

> He shall receive public ministers from foreign nations, and may correspond with the executives of the different States. He shall have power to grant pardons and reprieves except in impeachments. He shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States.

Opinion was so divided and strong over the powers of the executive branch that the Convention resolved on July 23, 1787, to refer to a committee the drafting of a report of the powers of the Executive conformable to the major resolutions already passed by the Convention. The committee, composed of Nathaniel Gorham, of Massachusetts; James Wilson, of Pennsylvania; Edmund Randolph, of Virginia; John Rutledge, of South Carolina; and Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, was thus justified to enumerate a more complete definition of the powers of the future President. The only powers thus far conferred by the Convention had been the veto, appointment—but not of judges—and the execution of laws. Madison's original idea had been to leave the unenumerated powers to the will of the legislature as expressed through legislative enactments. Now the committee faced a question of enormous importance: Shall control of the military and foreign relations be left with one Executive? Should the powers be enumerated?

Of the 12 listed powers of the Executive only the 10th in the draft of the proposal which Randolph drew up was connected with foreign relations: "receiving ambassadors." Up to this point, the Convention, as far as the records show, gave the subject of international affairs no attention. The only recorded reference to this area of potential Executive action had been in the provisions of a sketch Alexander Hamilton had drawn up whereby treaties would be made and ambassadors named by the Executive with the advice and consent of the Senate.

One member of the committee, Ellsworth, was decidedly for a strong, independent head of government. Rutledge and Randolph favored a weak Chief of State. Randolph regarded foreign affairs essentially as a matter to be decided by the Legislature as a body or by the Senate alone.

Randolph's original proposals were amended so that the committee later gave the power "to be Commander in Chief of the land and naval power of the Union and of the Militia of the Several States." Changes were also made in the direction of making the Senate the sole organ of foreign affairs. Finally, Wilson drew on Randolph's amended draft, Charles Pinckney's plan of May 29, and certain provisions of the New York constitution to draft a final plan of Executive powers. No other powers relating to foreign affairs were added. The chief feature of the Wilson plan was the independent possession by the executive department of its powers by direct grant of the people. Unfortunately, there is no indication or evidence in the records whether Wilson intended the enumerated powers to be an exhaustive description of that general Executive power which the President held as the executor of the Nation's laws. The construction of many State constitutions of the time already realized the importance of unenumerated Executive power for more responsive, flexible leadership.

On August 20, 1787, Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, and Charles Pinckney submitted a plan before the delegates for the complete constitutional organization of the executive department of the National Government. There were to be five departments of the executive branch, each headed by a secretary. Together with the Chief Justice they were to be a council of state to assist the President in conducting public affairs. This plan confirms the fact that the delegates generally regarded the President as a sort of chief administrator. This belief is reinforced by the fact that the duties of these heads of department were enumerated, the secretary of each department responsible to the President. The Secretary of Foreign Affairs had for his functions: "to correspond with all foreign ministers, prepare plans for treaties, and consider such as may be transmitted from abroad, and generally to attend to the interests of the United States in their connection with foreign powers."

Those duties for which the subordinate secretaries became responsible became an integral part of the Presidential power. The recognition that the President, although granted little real power—except as Commander in Chief—in the Constitution in the field of foreign affairs, was generally taken by the Founding Fathers as the single constitutional representative of the people in this area can be seen in the terms of the Foreign Department bill; the sole purpose of the Foreign Department was to carry out the will of the President. Only the Treasury Department was created solely to carry out the acts of Congress. As one political scientist has put it:

> Where by the terms of the Constitution, the National Government is vested with control over a certain sphere of action, that portion of the field's is the President's which is executive in character. Thus the Constitution makes the National Government the sole organ in foreign affairs. Since many powers are not enumerated, they are the President's as of constitutional right, being of an executive character (Charles Thatch, "The Creation of the Presidency, 1775–89," Baltimore, 1922).

Today the President undoubtedly acts more arbitrarily and independently than the framers of the Constitution ever intended him to act. Custom, law, court decisions, and the practice of foreign nations have placed the President in a prominent position in the formation and execution of foreign policy. Certainly secrecy, unity of operation, continuity, and access to information are characteristics of his office. These necessary elements are peculiar to the President. Congress, by nature, possess none of them. It was felt by one of the most articulate delegates at the Convention that even the Senate could not properly deal with international relations:

> To have entrusted the power of making treaties to the Senate alone, would have been to relinquish the benefits of the constitutional agency of the President in the conduct of foreign relations (Alexander Hamilton, "The Federalist," LXXV).

This same intellectual forcefully explained the few enumerated powers directly granted to the President in the Constitution by describing the important implications of a broad interpretation of Executive power:

> The enumeration (of Executive powers in the Constitution) ought therefore to be considered as intended merely to specify the principal articles in the definition of Executive power, having the rest to flow from the general grant of that power, interpreted in conformity with other parts of the Constitution, and with the principles of free government.
>
> The general doctrine of our Constitution, then, is that the Executive power of the Nation is rested in the President, subject only to the exceptions and qualifications which are expressed in the instrument. (Alexander Hamilton in the Philadelphia Gazette, June 29, 1793.)

Jefferson himself referred to the transaction of business with foreign nations as "executive altogether" and John Marshall declared in the House of Representatives on March 7, 1800, that "the President is the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations." The Senate itself early enough recognized that all powers claimed by the President in the field of foreign affairs not specifically named in the Constitution must nevertheless be considered as emanating from the Constitution:

> The President is the constitutional representative of the United States with regard to foreign nations. For his conduct he is responsible to the Constitution. (S. Doc. 231, 56th Cong., 2d sess.)

Thus, aside from the chief provisions of the Constitution relating to foreign affairs—

> The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States * * *. He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur * * * appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls * * * receive ambassadors and other public ministers—

Presidential power in this area has grown chiefly from necessity and the demands of executive leadership in a field requiring secrecy and unity of command.

But the nature of foreign affairs and the characteristics of the Executive Office which fit the President to the task are merely one side of the coin. On the other side is the rightful role of Congress in foreign relations, and in a rather ironic sense, the part played by the Appropriations Committee. Congress and the President were bound to cross swords early over the financial support of foreign policy flowing from the Executive Office, and interestingly, even though Congress historically has followed Presidential recommendations for appropriations for crucial policies, the House of

Representatives has made clear its rightful, constitutional position with reference to money matters. When a bill was introduced into the House for appropriations for the Jay Treaty during Washington's administration, opposition developed and the view was quickly advanced that the House really was free to grant or withhold the required funds on its own view of the merits of the treaty. A majority of the House sanctioned this position, even though the appropriations were finally granted. But to the authorization was attached the following resolution:

> When a treaty stipulates regulations on any of the subjects submitted by the Constitution to the power of Congress, it must depend, for its execution, as to such stipulations, on a law or laws to be passed by Congress. And it is the constitutional right and duty of the House of Representatives, in all such cases, to deliberate on the expediency or inexpediency of carrying such treaty into effect, and to determine and act thereon, as, in their judgment, may be most conducive to the public good.

In the matter of the Jay Treaty, the House was not constitutionally bound to appropriate the necessary funds. In voting the money to carry out the treaty, however, the House certainly was exercising its part of the "whole legislative power" and had, accordingly, its right to exercise its full constitutional discretion in the matter.—Noted by Edward S. Corbin in "The President's Control of Foreign Relations," Cambridge, 1917.

If the Jay Treaty established congressional opinion regarding the appropriation of money, it also fixed the Presidential prerogative of wide discretion in foreign affairs. When the House of Representatives asked George Washington to lay before it the instructions, correspondence, and documents relating to the treaty he said:

> The nature of foreign negotiations requires caution, and their success must often depend on secrecy, and even when brought to a conclusion, a full disclosure of all the measures, demands, or eventual concessions which may have been proposed or contemplated would be extremely impolitic, for this might have a pernicious influence on future negotiations or produce immediate inconveniences, perhaps danger and mischief, in relation to other powers.

Thus, at the same time both congressional rights with respect to appropriations and the Presidential power of single command in foreign affairs was fixed. Even the modern notion of foreign policy decisions in the vital interests of U.S. security find precedent in the first important foreign policy legislation in this country: the Embargo Act of 1794 authorized the President to lay the embargo "whenever, in his opinion, the public safety shall so require," and "to continue or revoke the same whenever he shall think proper." By the more recent lend-lease proposal, action could have been taken when the President deemed it "in the interest of national defense," and the benefits of the statute were extended to "the government of any country whose defense the President—deemed—vital to the defense of the United States."

We now see that the volatile question of wide discretionary powers available to the President is one founded on precedents set by the first Executive of the United States, agreed to by both Houses of the National Legislature, and followed up by later Presidents and Congresses. Perhaps the wording of an 1860 court decision defines even today the peculiar position which the President occupies:

> As the Executive head of the Nation, the President is made the only legitimate organ of the General Government to open or carry on correspondence or negotiations with foreign nations in matters concerning the interests of the country or of its citizens (*Durand* v. *Holland*, 8 Fed. Cas. No. 4186).

The Supreme Court in 1936 officially awarded to the President legal claim in the exercising of discretionary powers as sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of foreign affairs. In the important Curtiss-Wright case, the Court recognized this power as exclusive and plenary—a power in international relations which "does not require as a basis for its exercise an act of Congress."

The decision in the Curtiss-Wright case sustained the constitutionality of a joint resolution of Congress of 1934 authorizing the President to forbid the sale of arms to the participants in the Chaco dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay "if the President finds that the prohibition may contribute to the reestablishment of peace between those countries."

The Curtiss-Wright Export Co. was charged with having violated the resolution by selling machineguns to Bolivia. A demurrer to indictment was filed on the ground that the resolution was unconstitutional, as it amounted to an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power to the President. The demurrer was sustained in a district court but was reversed in the Supreme Court.

Justice Sutherland in his opinion for the Court seemed in effect to withdraw virtually all constitutional limitation upon the scope of congressional delegation of power to the President to act in the field of international relations. Sutherland's reasoning in the case rested on what he named as the difference between the powers of the Federal Government with respect to foreign and external affairs and those having to do with internal or domestic affairs. The difference, according to Sutherland related both to origin and nature. He wrote as follows:

> The very delicate, plenary, and exclusive power of the President as the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations—a power which does not require as a basis for its exercise an act of Congress, but which, of course, like every other governmental power, must be exercised in subordination to the applicable provisions of the Constitution. It is quite apparent that if, in the maintenance of our international relations embarrassment is to be avoided and success for our aims achieved, congressional legislation which is to be made effective through negotiation and inquiry within the international field must often accord to the President a degree of discretion and freedom from statutory restriction which would not be admissible were domestic affairs alone involved * * * he, not Congress, has the better opportunity of knowing the conditions which prevail in foreign countries. He has the confidential sources of information. He has his agents in the form of diplomatic, consular, and other officials. Secrecy in respect of information gathered by them may be highly necessary and the premature disclosure of it productive of harmful results. * * * Powers of external sovereignty of the Federal Government, including the power to declare war and conclude peace, to make treaties and maintain diplomatic relations, are not dependent on affirmative grants of the Constitution.

APPROPRIATIONS

It has long been recognized by Presidents, Members of Congress, and political scientists that the appropriating of public money often has a far greater impact on the formation of foreign policy than the substantive decisions coming from the White House. The House is at liberty to insert provisos or instructions in appropriations bills which have the effect of determining or modifying policy. Of course, Congress may withhold funds altogether and thus completely cancel an executive policy. To the extent that funds are withheld or the terms and conditions set for the expenditure of Treasury money, Congress may prescribe its own policy. But this is as it should be. According to the Constitution, article I, section 9, clause 7:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditure of public money shall be published from time to time.

That Congress may check the desire of the President to give Communists further financial assistance is clearly drawn from the provisions of the Constitution. Indeed, perhaps the President should possess wide discretion in the matter of deciding what is in the vital interest of national security. The wisdom of possessing such power apparently goes unchallenged. But in the matter of spending public money Congress alone may declare for what purpose the funds may be used, the terms of expenditure, and the conditions under which the taxpayers' dollars may be sent overseas. The Constitution grants this power directly. An important court decision of 1945 confirms Congress unique position. During the Second World War certain subcontractors sought action in the courts for a declaratory judgment that the Renegotiation Act (50 U.S.C.A. App. 1191) was unconstitutional and therefore did not authorize the War Department to recapture alleged excessive profits. The court said the action presented no justiciable controversy because Congress, in making an appropriation, has the power not only to designate the purpose of an appropriation, but also the conditions under which an executive department of the Government could expend the appropriation.

> The purpose of appropriations and terms and conditions under which they are made is a matter solely in the hands of Congress, and it is the explicit duty of the executive branch to comply therewith, and any attempt by the judicial branch to interfere therewith would be a plain invasion of the constitutional powers of Congress. (*Spaulding* v. *Douglas Aircraft Co.*, D.C. Cal., 60 F. Supp. 985.)

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, every one of us would prefer to be elsewhere at this moment. This is Christmas eve.

Christmas is in your mind—a personal Christmas, a family Christmas. Many of you were already at home—a thousand, 2,000 or more miles from here—when summoned back to Capitol Hill.

And rightly you probably feel sorry for yourself at having to be here. With airlines clogged this holiday week, you may have trouble getting back home in time for Christmas, even if the issue before us is resolved quickly.

Let us give a little thought to how other American citizens will spend Christmas.

What kind of a Christmas will it be for the families of the men who died last week fighting communism in South Vietnam?

What kind of a Christmas will it be for the families of the thousands and thousands of American men who died fighting communism in South Korea just a decade ago?

Eight American divisions are in Europe. Thousands of American men who will not be home for Christmas. Other thousands of American men in uniform will be away from home on Christmas because they are in South Vietnam, on the high seas, in South Korea—in a thousand military duty stations overseas.

What kind of a Christmas will they have? It will not be a family Christmas. They will be away from home, away from family, away from the joy of a family Christmas. Why? Because they are a part of the military might of this Nation, a military machine created because of communism and arrayed against communism.

Were it not for the existence of powerful Communist governments—principally the Soviet Union—these thousands of American men could safely be released from official duty to spend Christmas at home with their families.

But the Soviet Union does exist. It is a powerful Communist government, allied with other powerful Communist governments. Because of this fact thousands and thousands of American men will not be home for Christmas.

They will be scattered all over the world manning the ramparts against communism.

It is entirely fitting and proper that we, too, as their elected representatives, be willing to be on duty this Christmas and do our bit against communism.

Were it not for the existence of powerful Communist governments, in Russia, and elsewhere, the House of Representatives would not be in session today. We could all be home this very moment.

We were called back to duty to resolve one question and one alone, an amendment that goes to the heart of our efforts against communism. Only one item in the foreign aid appropriation bill is in dispute—the amendment to prohibit financing the Communists. It would keep American tax dollars from giving aid and comfort to Communist governments. It is as simple as that.

On this vote, you cannot hide behind President Johnson's coattails. The President is already on record—yes, even on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—as plain as day in favor of subsidized credit for the Communists through the Export-Import Bank. So for all practical purposes, if you vote to give the President discretion, you vote to help finance the Communists. The President has announced how he will go, so you cannot get by trying to pass the buck to him.

Yes, it is Christmas week, and we all want to be home. And it may seem that the easy way to get there is to reject the motion to recommit the conference report—and thus OK financing the Communists.

But, is it really the easy way out?

How will you explain your vote—a vote to aid Communist governments—to your constituents who are in American uniform in Europe, in South Vietnam, or any of a thousand other foreign places—American men who are away from home on Christmas in order to meet the threat posed by these same Communist governments?

How will you explain voting to finance the Communists to your constituents who lost sons, brothers, and fathers fighting communism in Korea and South Vietnam?

How will you explain your vote to any constituent for that matter? Every constituent is digging deep in his pocketbook to help finance our billion-a-week outlay for defense against communism.

Yes, it seems easy to cave in on this issue. Let the Senate have its way. Let the President go ahead with his announced determination to help finance the Communists. That way, we can all hurry home to the Christmas tree.

But how will you explain it to yourself when, in the glow of the Christmas tree lights, you look into the eyes of your own trusting family?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic leadership by making the prestige of President Johnson the issue may finally in a third effort defeat the provision banning Government guarantees of credit on grain sales, and sales of other products to Russia and other Communist countries.

The basic issue of whether it is morally or legally right to guarantee Communist countries credit has been glossed over. Statements that indicate adoption of the "anti-Red credit ban" would prevent sale of wheat, or other commodities, to Communist countries are erroneous for in fact the provision would firm up what our late President, John F. Kennedy, stated on October 9 in approving sales to Russia and other countries for cash or gold. The "Red credit ban" is referred to as the "wheat amendment," but in fact Russia wants to buy industrial alcohol, fertilizer plants and many other products. The "credit ban" provision requires cash or gold in payment instead of credit and has no bearing on the sales of wheat, otherwise. It may still be sold for cash or gold. The following facts are completely ignored in frantic Yuletide efforts to "bail out" the administration.

First. Present Russian obligation from World War I—with interest totals over $620 million.

Second. So-called pipeline lend-lease in World War II—that is material ordered by Russia and delivered at end of war. The amount agreed to was over $222 million—but nearly $206 million remains unpaid.

Third. The $11 billion lend-lease shipped to Russia during World War II—we agreed to settle for $800 million—Russia offered $300 million in full settlement.

Fourth. Russia now owes the United Nations nearly $43 million for unpaid special assessments.

Fifth. That just 2 weeks ago J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director said—

> We are at war with communism and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this the safer we will be.

Sixth. That in the same bill containing the "Red credit ban," American taxpayers are asked to "shell out" nearly $3 billion for foreign aid for what? Why, to protect us from communism.

Seventh. That guarantee of Russian credit is a new departure for the Export-Import Bank, in fact since its inception in 1934 the Bank has never insured a credit risk or extended credit to Russia, Hungary, Red China, or any Communist country except Yugoslavia which has been treated "specially," for some reason.

Eighth. That defense appropriations this year exceeded $51 billion—all—we are told—to protect us from communism.

These are but a few indisputable facts. Most significant is the fact some 14,000 Americans are now in Vietnam fighting communism and that 158 Americans have made the supreme sacrifice—all—we are told—to protect the free world from communism.

No doubt President Johnson and the Democratic leadership will win when the vote is taken but do not forget what were to be cash or gold may now become credit transactions. Commercial bankers and grain exporters are relieved from any financial risk as this will be assumed by the Export-Import Bank in the event of default by any Communist country. As usual the only possible loser will be the American taxpayer as the Export-Import Bank is a Government-chartered institution and every dollar it has, or loses, belongs to the taxpayers.

If we yield to political pressures today are we not strengthening the hand of the enemy? Is there any real indication "relaxing of tensions" will become a bilateral undertaking?

If Russia, or some other Communist country can buy on credit of 18 months, which I trust will be the minimum, they can strengthen themselves in some other area of their economy or increase the pressures in other spots in the world, such as Cuba or Berlin.

I doubt my banker, or any banker, would lend or guarantee a nickel's worth of Russian credit—not even on the eve of Christmas—something, incidentally and unfortunately not recognized in Communist Russia. To go down fighting for principle is certainly honorable so when you vote "remember the Alamo."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I find it extremely strange that we are engaged here in debate again today on a feature of the foreign aid appropriation, the end result of which can only harm more segments of the American economy. And I also find it strange to reconcile the concern the executive branch of the Government has for furthering the world Communist movement, that has sworn to bury us, and at the same time exhibit so little concern toward a segment of our domestic economy.

I have reference to the livestock industry of the United States that at the present time is in an extremely precarious position as a result of imports. And although this effect of imports on the livestock industry has been brought to the attention of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, the Tariff Commission, and President Johnson, nothing has been done, although the corrective measures are seemingly contained in section 301 of the 1962 Trade Expansion Act. I also find it difficult to account for the concern for Communist nations and the seeming unconcern for sections of the U.S. economy other than livestock. For instance, the administration has said that grain farmers will stand to lose $600 million this year unless some type of a wheat program is put into effect; yet this administration has shown a distinct reluctance to come to the aid of the grain farmer unless he was willing to put his neck in a yoke and submit to farming under full Government control. At the same time we are asked to grant the President carte blanche as far as the Communist nations are concerned, and are not nearly so concerned with qualifying that need.

Now let us take a good hard close look at what many of you and President Johnson are asking us to do today. The administration has forecast a $600 million loss to just one segment of agriculture and since many Members have said right on this floor that $1 in agriculture is multiplied seven times, by simple arithmetic you are hurting our national economy in the national interest—some $4,200 million worth to say nothing of the millions of dollars being lost daily in the livestock industry and the textile industry.

To summarize: What we are being asked to do today is to pass a $3 billion foreign aid appropriation bill carrying an amendment authorizing the Export-Import Bank to guarantee payment for the sale of products to Communist countries, while at the same time the administration is ignoring domestic situations costing many times more, although the suffering industries are being forced to pay their share of foreign aid.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is no question as to the Christmas present the President of the United States wants from this House.

What he wants is as absolute and total freedom and flexibility for the executive branch in the field of foreign policy as he is able to wring from elected representatives of the American people who have twice recorded on a bipartisan basis their opposition to such a grant of power.

What he wants is a rubberstamp giftwrapped in a blank check.

The issue is no longer merely wheat for Russia. The issue is no longer merely the right of Congress to forbid financing credit for the wheat transaction.

The issue is simply and inescapably whether the House of Representatives is to retain any meaningful controls on the tax-supported fiscal policy aspects of our foreign relations.

It may well be some time before the full significance of the issue now before this House dawns upon the American people.

But that realization will come—and with it will come a day of reckoning for the leadership which, at this moment, is employing every pressure tactic in the book to force a reversal of the twice-declared will of this House.

I noted over the weekend a statement in the press attributed to an unidentified White House source to the effect that the resistance to the administration in this matter is an attempt by "midwestern isolationists" to gain power over foreign policy.

The administration must be desperate indeed if it feels compelled to resurrect this "bogyman."

Back in 1949, a proposal was made in connection with a foreign aid appropriation bill to grant the executive branch a completely free hand in the allocation of appropriated foreign aid funds among recipient nations.

It was no midwestern isolationist, but a convert to internationalism and a stanch supporter of foreign aid—the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg of my own State of Michigan—who rose in the other body to denounce the suggestion as "a proposal for the virtual creation of a total, worldwide, war-lord power for the White House."

And that was the end of the matter—for then.

We have gone a long way down the road of legislative abdication since that courageous outburst by Senator Vandenberg.

It was in connection with the 1957 foreign aid authorization bill that Chairman Richards of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs declared:

> Here you find the greatest flexibility power ever given to any President of the United States. He can move funds all over the place from one side of the world to the other.

During the debate on this bill in June 1956, I said on the floor of this House:

> I do not detract one iota from my very great respect for the present President of the United States when I say that I am unwilling to bestow this power upon any President.

I was not accused of partisan politics when I made that statement. I could not be so accused. I am a Republican and the occupant of the White House when I made that statement was Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I am no more partisan when I say today that I am unwilling to bestow total freedom and flexibility of action of the type demanded upon the present occupant of the White House.

There can be no more justification for the Congress or this House to abdicate its right to impose restrictions on fiscal policy when that policy relates to foreign affairs than when it relates to domestic affairs. In either instance, it is abdication.

And when that abdication grants to any President complete discretionary authority to extend credit or financial assistance to Communist governments, it is a doubly repugnant and intolerable abdication.

It is an abdication to which I will never knowingly be a party.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we should not be considering this resolution today. Twice before the House has gone on record as opposed to extending credit to the Communists.

Now it seems the debate centers around whether or not credit will be extended through the Export-Import Bank. I want the record to show that at least one Member, this Member, although certainly there must be many more who do not believe we should do any business with the Communists, not in food, not in any product. This resolution would permit the President to do business with Russians in any product.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the debate on this issue has made much of the position of the President in the field of foreign policy.

Some Members have contended that the President is uniquely and exclusively responsible in our dealings with foreign nations. But, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution vests in the Congress very clear-cut responsibilities.

It is true that the President makes treaties by and with the advice of the Senate. The Constitution also directs that he receive ambassadors and other public ministers.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution also vests in Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and the issue now before us lies four-square within that congressional responsibility.

The Constitution also vests in the Congress the determination of the expenditure of public money in the area of foreign relations.

The Congress should be as jealous to exercise its constitutional responsibilities as it is willing to implement the constitutional responsibilities of the other two branches of Government.

Senate Amendment No. 20, as revised by the conferees, delegates to the President the determination of what is in the national interest. The Congress should not abdicate its responsibilities here.

We, as the representatives of the American people, should ourselves determine the national interest, and, for myself, I believe it would be against our national interest to guarantee the credit of the Soviet Union or any other Communist country.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body who votes to authorize the President to give credit to Communist countries to buy goods is voting to aid communism. The only possible effect of such credit is a net plus for communism and a net minus for Americans, whether the goods the Communist nations buy are wheat or corn or ball bearings.

Such a vote is, in truth, a Christmas credit card for Khrushchev to be paid for by the American taxpayer. It is a credit card that will make the Communist bloc stronger. It is something the House has no business doing—no business yielding on to the other body—no business substituting for what we were once told by the Democrat administration was to be a hard cash transaction for gold to help our balance-of-payments deficit.

Every pressure in the book has been brought to bear upon the membership on the other side of the aisle to vote for this credit card to communism. And thanks to the voters of America there are a sufficient number of Democrats in this body to assure that when we vote today in all probability the vote will be to charge more Christmas gifts for Communist nations to the already overburdened American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that every Member of the House who votes "no" today will take the message of the full significance of an unwise vote of "Yes" to the people of his district again and again from now until our people can express their will at the polls next November.

Never has there been a more clear-cut abdication of congressional responsibility to the American people. Never will there be presented a more glaring example of political pressure for sheer power at the expense of the national security. Never will there be shown a more crass and blatant steamroller in disregard of fiscal responsibility by an organized and determined Democrat leadership both in this House and from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. It is said by some of the more experienced among the opposition that this is just another vote and that it will soon be forgotten. The suggestion is made that it is not the vote but the personality of incumbents that determines their reelection. Well, it is time the American voter paid some real attention to how the incumbent candidate has voted. Today's vote to aid communism to the tune of hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars in a bill appropriating $3 billion to fight communism is something no candidate should ever be allowed to forget, nor should the voters when he seeks reelection. It cannot be explained away against any competent opponent. Such a vote is a monument to infamy.

What are a few simple unvarnished facts in the situation we face today?

First. Any financial aid we give to Communist nations frees an equal amount to these nations to devote to other purposes in the cold war, be they propaganda leaflets, military salaries or the manufacture of bombs.

Second. Without the extension of Export-Import Bank credit to back up Communist promises to pay American exporters, there is little likelihood that any exporter would sell to Communist buyers without having dollars on the line in advance.

Third. Communist nations already owe us hundreds of millions of dollars that they have promised to pay but have not paid, ranging from U.N. assessments to lend-lease. This is no time for Christmas presents. We should stand firm and collect what is due us before there is even talk of credit.

Fourth. Agricultural products that may be purchased with such Eximbank credit are already subsidized for export in an amount of roughly 60 cents per bushel. This subsidy should never be paid by the American taxpayer for shipments to Communist nations, let alone giving a credit card to Communists to purchase such products, adding insult to injury.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member to stand firm for America and the free world today and to vote against this credit to the enemy. This is not only a matter of fundamental principle—it is commonsense as well. The American people do not want tax money collected from them to be given away to friendly foreign nations unless it is urgently in the national interest. Under no circumstances do they want their taxes used to help unfriendly Communist nations.

A vote to give a credit card to Khrushchev is just that. The good people who sent us here know better than to do this. So should we.

I urge you to vote against allowing any U.S. agency to be a guarantor of loans to any Communist nation. It is morally and practically wrong.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished majority leader.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JAMES JARRELL PICKLE, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I just wanted to observe that I have checked with our Texas people on this side and they tell me there is no contest about the gentleman's election.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how he is going to vote today. I rather assume he will vote against us. But I hope, with the indulgence of the Members on our side, if he has come up here from Texas to be here the day before Christmas, I think we ought to let him vote.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I observe that the charity of our beloved minority leader becomes not only himself but the season.

Mr. PICKLE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

WAIVING OF POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE BILL H.R. 9499

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] stated, you really are not interested in listening to speeches. But there has been the inference on the floor of this House and in the press that anyone who opposes the administration is showing a distrust of President Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I want this House and I want everyone to know that I will take great issue with anyone who distrusts Lyndon B. Johnson. I would also take great issue with anyone who challenges his ability to fill this high office that he now holds.

But, Members of the House, I want to refresh your memory to this effect: This proposal that we will vote on today is tied in with an amendment which was placed in the authorization bill last year, section 620(f) of the authorization bill which I happened to initiate and which you saw fit to adopt, after amending it. It was amended, if you will recall, to require some reporting to the Congress.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was naive enough to think that the report would be in such form that I would know about it, also being a Member of Congress. The report was made, as required by law, but I had no knowledge of it, and I am sure most of you did not either, until the report of the hearings of the subcommittee of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] were released on the 1st of October. They were marked "secret" when they were reported. They were marked "secret" with a class 4, I believe it is—group 4, downgraded at 3-year intervals, declassified after 12 years.

I do not blame President Kennedy for that. I doubt if he knew that someone got happy with a rubber stamp and stamped this thing.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have faith in this Congress and in this House, and I take issue with anyone who says that this Congress and this House does not have a right to say something about how our money is going to be spent.

If you will recall, one of our ambassadors retired a while back and called us "provincial" and stated that we had no business meddling with the country's foreign affairs, that domestic affairs and activities were getting superior to our State Department affairs. He proposed a Secretary of State similar to a prime minister.

You recall I took issue with him on the floor of this House on that.

Do not vote today on a distrust of Lyndon B. Johnson, because if this House sees fit to give him that authority I think he will carry it out better than anyone has ever fulfilled the obligations of that office. But I want it clearly understood that my vote today is cast on my conviction, my conscience of the duty of the office I have been elected to uphold. I do not agree with the delaying tactics that have been going on on this side of the aisle one bit. We are going to have to face the issue. I would rather have faced it 2 or 3 days ago than have gone through what I have been going through, being torn up about having to oppose my beloved President. Vote your conscience, but by all means bear in mind that the man who holds the office of President will fulfill that duty better than anyone, in my opinion, has ever fulfilled it before.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this situation that has prevailed here the last few days will be written into the history of the country and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of what has happened this morning will probably be used as a precedent for this sort of issue. I do not think we ought to vote on this resolution until there is at least some statement here of what the real issue is on the part of those who are voting to sustain the House conferees; that is, voting for the amendment put on by the House and voted on twice and successfully carried twice.

There is a lot of politics hanging around all this. I do not think politics ought to be considered. The issue is too basic. I think we ought to be voting on what our consciences dictate on the particular issue, and the particular issue with some of us is this, and I will have to be right plain spoken about it—we do not want to extend credit to the Soviet Union.

Why do we not want to do that? I doubt that there is a Member of the House that, notwithstanding all the past history of our relations with that country and our present situation of relationship to it, I doubt if there is a man or woman in this House who, if the Russian people were starving and did not have any money or resources, would refuse to give them the wheat. That is the history of this country. But the Russians are buying wheat all over the world, and we are told that they are selling their gold and paying for it. But they apparently do not want to pay cash to us—we are still "Uncle Sap."

When this situation first arose I was one that announced that I was willing to sell Russia some wheat if they needed it, but I wanted it "cash on the barrelhead," and I still want it cash on the barrel. Why should not some of us be hardhearted and businesslike and demand cash on the barrel? History again. What is the status of the obligations of the Russians to this country? We loaned them $11 billion worth of goods and services in World War II under the lend-lease policy—$11 billion. Have they paid it? Not one plugged nickel.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will yield to the gentleman in just a minute.

These Members on the left who are yelling "Vote!" "Vote!" are carrying out their usual conduct; they do not want anybody else to do any talking when they do not agree with what is being said.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Now, you on the left can yell "Vote" some more. As I was saying when interrupted, they still owe $11 billion that we advanced to them when they were with their backs to the wall. Subsequent to that we advanced them in goods and services $230-odd more millions. Have they showed any disposition to pay that? No.

I wonder if they have paid their dues to the United Nations which have been in default for years. Now let us just be frank about this thing and let us not be afraid to lay the cards on the table. We have been running from potential enemies for the last 15 years and I am getting tired of running away.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Will not the gentleman agree with me, it is most basic that if we advance credit to the Russians and Communists, we improve their capacity to cause trouble all around the world and that includes trouble in Cuba. But if we make them pay cash on the barrelhead for whatever they need whether it be wheat or anything else then that diminishes their capacity for causing trouble.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, I think it is a good policy to make them pay anyway.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say one word about this matter. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Virginia has been so helpful in bringing this matter to a final disposition. But when the issue is put solely on the basis which he mentions I think some refutation must be in order.

The real issue here is the image and authority of our new President around the world. Are we going to give Communist and free nations alike the impression that he does not have, in the performance of his responsibilities as the repository of American foreign policy, the complete confidence of the Congress and the American people? President Johnson succeeded to office by succession after a base assassination, and the question in all nations is, do the American people have a leader? Would the Congress want to convey the impression that we would want to tie the President's hands or to limit his authority when we did not do this to either of his predecessors, President Eisenhower or President Kennedy? Any such action would weaken the President's authority in dealing with other nations and in consequence would weaken the United States.

The issue never has been whether or not we are going to help the Communists. This Congress is united as always in its fight to strengthen the free world as against the Communist world.

The issue never has been the extension of credits to Communist nations. The Export-Import Bank is only going to extend credit in the usual way to private shippers who are selling nonstrategic materials. We are helping Americans sell surplus American commodities to buyers of their own choice, and this is certainly in the national interest.

We cannot tie the hands of our new President in his first battle on foreign affairs. World reaction to this would be lasting and detrimental to the interests of all Americans and of all the people of the free world.

I would like to insert into the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, a paper which I received today from the Department of State. It outlines the thinking of administration officials on the central issues involved in the argument over authorization of Export-Import Bank guarantee credits. I believe it does much to clarify the issues.

1. We accept the conference report which requires a Presidential decision before any Export-Import Bank guarantee of payment could be made on transactions with the Soviet Union or Eastern European countries.

2. We do not know whether a wheat sale will be concluded by the Soviet traders and American wheat dealers. If agreement is reached, we do not know whether the Soviets will ask for a deferred payment rather than a cash transaction. If the issue does arise, the President would make a decision as to the national interest on the recommendation of the Secretaries of State, Defense, and Treasury.

3. On its wheat purchases from Canada the Soviet Union is paying cash and it may do so here. However, the Soviet Union will refuse to deal with the United States if it is the object of discrimination by law with respect to credit terms.

4. The wheat sale to the Soviet Union, if it materializes, will be in the national interest, bringing in needed gold and foreign exchange, reducing our expensive surpluses, saving storage charges and interest for the U.S. taxpayer and benefiting farmers and traders.

5. Such sales are consistent with longstanding U.S. policy. The United States has never had a policy of refusing to sell nonstrategic goods to Soviet bloc countries. As a corollary of this policy, normal financing facilities should be available to U.S. exporters. Such facilities are available to American competitors abroad.

6. The extension of guarantees of payment on commodity sales and other export transactions is a normal Export-Import Bank function. Such guarantees are ordinarily used in connection with sales of commodities and other products to foreign countries

where deferred payment terms are extended. The Export-Import Bank has had this authority since its creation in 1934, including authority to guarantee payment on commercial exports to Communist bloc countries.

7. Sales like the wheat sale will use up scarce Soviet and Communist bloc gold reserves on consumption expenditures so that they cannot be used for military purposes or investment in heavy industry.

8. The Soviet Union is in the process of making important decisions concerning the allocation of its resources and the handling of its quarrel with Communist China. Soviet officials will be watching carefully any moves by the U.S. Government to see whether, under the new President, the United States is going to change its policy of seeking to reduce the dangers of war and to strengthen peace. The Soviet Government will doubtless consider the proposed amendment to the aid bill as such a change.

9. The Soviet people would regard this action as an attempt to exploit their difficulties and as an indication of the implacable hostility of the American people. This would also be a blow to our efforts toward peace.

10. Americans should not be fooled into believing that by depriving the Russian people of better quality bread we are reducing the threat of communism. The present Russian regime will be able to survive even without our wheat, and it will be able to divert the blame for short bread rations in the Soviet Union to us.

11. This bill would affect not only the Soviet Union, but other Eastern European countries as well. Some of the Communist countries of Eastern Europe are showing signs of wanting to reduce their economic dependence on the Soviet Union. They would like to use their foreign exchange to purchase products of the free world. By trading with these countries on commercial terms and in nonstrategic items, we can encourage this growing tendency toward independence.

12. The Export-Import Bank guarantees do not provide aid to the Soviet Union. They afford financial facilities to United States exporters to enable them to engage in ordinary commercial competition with other Western exporters. Valiant and successful efforts have been made by the Export-Import Bank to place our exporters in a position of equality with their competitors abroad. It is essential that this position be maintained when it is in our own country's interest to do so.

13. The bill does not provide funds for Export-Import Bank loans or guarantees. These are derived from Treasury borrowing authority under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945. Thus, the rider in the aid appropriation bill is wholly inappropriate. It is unacceptable for the House to extort this elimination of longstanding Presidential discretion as a condition for achieving an aid appropriation.

14. The Senate has twice rejected the proposal after full hearings before the appropriate committee and after extensive debate.

15. The argument has unfortunately become highly partisan. If the sales now contemplated are made, all Americans will benefit. Democrats and Republicans alike. Partisanship is especially inappropriate where, as here, there has not been the fullest exploration in the House of Representatives of the underlying United States national interest. The House Republican leadership is playing partisan politics with the national interest.

16. The rider affects not only wheat sales but all other potential commercial sales of agricultural or other products to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

17. It is of utmost and urgent importance that the House accept the conference report, to which the President has agreed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I hope we may adopt this resolution unanimously and get through with this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the resolution just adopted, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1091)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 10, 13, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 7, 12, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, and 24, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$155,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$116,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$330,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$375,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$375,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$687,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$92,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 14, 20, 22, 25, and 26.

Otto E. Passman,
J. Vaughan Gary,
William H. Natcher,
John J. Rhodes (I reserve on amendment No. 20),
Gerald R. Ford (I reserve on amendment No. 20),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Carl Hayden,
Allen J. Ellender,
Spessard L. Holland,
John O. Pastore,
Mike Monroney,
Gale W. McGee,
Leverett Saltonstall,
Milton R. Young,
Margaret Chase Smith,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—FOREIGN AID (MUTUAL SECURITY)

Economic Assistance

Amendment No. 1, Development grants: Appropriates $155,000,000 instead of $150,000,000 as proposed by the House and $175,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. None of the reduction in the amount allowed is to be applied against the malaria control program.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3, American hospitals and schools abroad: Insert language proposed by the Senate and delete language proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4, International organizations and programs: Appropriates $116,000000 instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House and $130,903,000 as proposed by the Senate. None of the reduction in the amount allowed is to be applied against the Children's Fund.

Amendment No. 5, Supporting assistance: Appropriates $330,000,000 instead of $300,000,000 as proposed by the House and $380,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6, Contingency fund: Appropriates $50,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $32,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8, Inter-American social and economic cooperation program: Insert language proposed by the Senate and appropriate $135,000,000 instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House and $180,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9, Alliance for Progress, development loans: Appropriates $375,000,000 instead of $350,000,000 as proposed by the House and $425,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10, Alliance for Progress, development grants: Appropriates $80,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11, Development loans: Appropriates $687,300,000 instead of $600,000,000 as proposed by the House and $800,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12, Inserts language proposed by the Senate relating to the use of deobligated funds.

Amendment No. 13, Military assistance: Appropriates $1,000,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $977,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14, General provisions: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE II—FOREIGN AID (OTHER)

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16, Peace Corps: Appropriate $92,100,000 instead of $89,000,000 as proposed by the House and $98,100,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide that not to exceed $19,900,000 shall be available for administrative expenses instead of $19,500,000 as proposed by the House and $20,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17, Ryukyu Islands: Provides that not to exceed $2,300,000 shall be available for administrative and information expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18, Assistance to refugees in the United States: Appropriates $39,717,137 as proposed by the Senate instead of $56,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19, Investment in Inter-American Bank: Inserts language proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Amendment No. 20, reported in disagreement.

TITLE IV—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendment No. 21, Senate: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22, reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 23 and 24: Insert heading and appropriate $190,000 for miscellaneous items as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26, reported in disagreement.

TITLE V—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission

Amendment No. 27, deletes the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $150,000 for the Commission as there is no authorization for this appropriation.

TITLE VI—CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 28–33: Insert section numbers.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
JOHN J. RHODES (I reserve on amendment No. 20),
GERALD R. FORD (I reserve on amendment No. 20),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I would like to make a comment about an article which appeared in the Sunday morning papers to the effect that the opposition to the administration on this issue was headed by so-called midwestern isolationists. I have been here 15 years, and from the very outset I have supported the foreign aid program. There is ample evidence to that effect in the recorded votes every year in this Congress. I have supported the late Preisdent, John F. Kennedy, when the going was fairly tough, against my chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], and I supported former President Eisenhower and, as a relatively new Member, I supported Mr. Truman when this program was virtually started. So any comment to the effect that people who oppose it are "midwestern isolationists" is clearly inaccurate.

Now let us get down to the nub of the issue. The problem is whether or not we will authorize the Export-Import Bank, an agency of the Federal Government, to guarantee credit for Communist countries. Those Communist countries are those that would qualify under section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Now, who are they? They are the Peoples Republic of Albania, the Peoples Republic of Bulgaria, the Peoples Republic of China, the Czechoslovakian Socialist Republic, the German Democrat Republic—East Germany, Estonia, the Hungarian Peoples Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, the North Korean Peoples Republic, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia-Mongolian Peoples Republic, the Polish Peoples Republic, the Rumanian Peoples Republic, Tibet, the Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia, Cuba, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is a total of 18 countries who would be authorized to receive credit from an agency of the Federal Government.

Let us get down to just how this might work. I am going to oversimplify it, but here is, to be frank, the guts of the issue. This is a typical banking transaction. I have borrowed money. I suspect there have been others in the House of Representatives who have likewise taken advantage of that opportunity to borrow money from one of the local Washington banks. What happens on such a transaction is similar, to a degree, to what will transpire on these deals with Communist countries.

As I understand the proposed transaction, there will be certain exporters in the United States who will buy grain from the Commodity Credit Corporation. They will buy grain on the basis that they have a commitment from the Soviet Union or from any one of the other 17 listed Communist countries who qualify under 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. You will find on this note the name of the exporter. The person who signs the note will be the Soviet Union or any one of the 17 other Communist countries.

But then on the back of the note, when our credit—yours or mine—is not too good, you always have an endorser. That endorser, by placing his name on the back of the note, helps your credit. I have had that experience. I have used the Federal Government under the GI bill to buy a house. In fact, I am still paying on the mortgage. But I got a better rate of interest, did I not? I got 4 percent because the Federal Government guaranteed it.

Now, this is exactly why under this legislation the Soviet Union and 17 other countries can get a better rate of interest in paying for the grain they buy from an exporter who previously had bought it from the Commodity Credit Corporation. You will have the exporter's name as the payee, you will have the Soviet Union as the payor, and on the back, if this legislation goes through, you will have the Export-Import Bank of the U.S. Government. Now, I seriously question whether the taxpayers of this country want an agency of the Federal Government to be a guarantor for a loan to a Communist country. I just do not believe my constituents want me to authorize an amendment that will tell the Export-Import Bank, a bank which has been funded by their tax money, that they should guarantee a loan for 18 Communist-dominated countries.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I certainly will.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that this amendment, instead of authorizing the bank to make these loans, prevents the bank from making the loans?

Mr. FORD. The gentleman is correct as far as the first five or six lines of the amendment are concerned. It does ban those loans to Communist-dominated countries. Those first five or six lines were the lines that were in the House bill under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] and in the motion to recommit by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. However the conference, over my objection, has added four or five other lines. Those lines are the lines which would permit the President to make a determination that if in his judgment it is in the best interest of our country, then, on this note, 18 countries will be the beneficiaries of a guarantee by the U.S. taxpayers' banking agency of the Government.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has confined his remarks to wheat. Is it not true that the amendment deals with the sale of any product to the Communists?

Mr. FORD. Of course it does. It can deal with any product. The language of the amendment so provides.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is it not also true that the President already has publicly made his determination on this issue? In a letter published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last week he made it clear that he believes that these sales to Communist countries are in the public interest, are in the national interest. So the determination is already made and what we are voting on is squarely the issue whether we are going to help the Communists. We cannot cling to President Johnson's coattails on this issue. We cannot pass the buck to him. He has already said how he would act.

Mr. FORD. He has indicated in a tentative way that he would take such action.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague from Michigan for putting this issue in proper focus. It seems clear to me that to extend credit and guarantee loans is to extend aid. It is inconceivable to me that within the four corners of one bill we could request our taxpayers, our constituents, to finance both sides of the cold war. It seems to me that we ought to get on one side or the other. Therefore, I commend my colleague, and I urge that we insist on the House position in this regard.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the comments about the charge that this was an effort by the isolationist Midwest to take over the policy of the Nation. As a member of the Committee on NATO Unity, a committee of which the gentleman in the well is also a member, I think I can state with some pride that the Republican side of this House has taken strong initiative in behalf of the international institutions to strengthen the free world. The only thing we are trying to isolate is Communists from the American tax dollars.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 3½ minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, under section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 there are 18 countries that qualify or would qualify for credit under this provision if you adopt it. I have 18 blank notes in my hand.

There is a possibility that the Soviet Union would have an Export-Import Bank endorsement on the back of its note. Cuba also qualifies under this section of the authorization act.

There is a possibility that they would have the Export-Import Bank endorsement. Also, the Rumanian People's Republic could qualify for a note. The Outer Mongolian People's Republic could qualify, North Vietnam could qualify, the Hungarian People's Republic could qualify, and you can go right down the list, 18 in all.

Mr. Speaker, as for myself, I do not intend to support an amendment that would permit the Export-Import Bank to endorse and guarantee such loans where the beneficiary will be a Communist country, in the form of lower interest rates.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. This in no way prohibits the sale of wheat to any country, does it?

Mr. FORD. It does not.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. If the gentleman will yield further, it only prohibits the giving of our credit to Communist and pro-Communist countries.

Mr. FORD. Any one of these countries, if the administration wants to make a deal, can pay cash on the barrelhead and the sale can be made.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join in commending our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] for his excellent statement this morning.

Mr. Speaker, do we want the Export-Import Bank, financed by our Federal funds, to insure payment by the Soviet Union of any surplus wheat it purchases in the United States?

That, in essence, is the choice we have before us today in this amendment.

There are a number of reasons why I oppose this amendment and why I will vote against it. Strangely enough, most of the reasons for my position were presented by the majority in its arguments in favor of this amendment.

The first was the statement that the President might not need to ever invoke the provisions of this bill. If this amendment is not considered absolutely necessary, if it is not an integral part of the agreement for the sale of surplus grain to the Soviet Union, then what are we doing here?

I, for one, cannot buy this argument that the right of the President to determine foreign policy and to implement such policy is on the line with this amendment.

This issue is primarily a question of foreign trade, clearly under the Constitution a jurisdiction of this Congress. Its foreign policy impact is secondary.

The Congress is being asked to give away another portion of its power and to turn over this power to the executive branch, a path we have followed on far too many occasions in the past.

If there were good and sufficient reasons why this amendment should be made law, if they were presented to Congress, then, in an emergency situation, the Congress might see fit to grant such discretionary powers for a limited period of time.

But, as far as I have been able to determine from the debate on these issues over the past few days, there is no such real emergency, although there appear to be attempts to manufacture one.

Further, there is no time limit on this discretionary power. It would remain a permanent additional power of the executive branch.

Next, there is nothing in the wording of the amendment we are considering which would limit these additional powers simply to this one deal with Russia for surplus grain.

It could be used in similar deals with Red China or Albania, or any other Communist bloc country, and they need not be limited to wheat.

The second argument is that, through some peculiar alchemy known only to Madison Avenue public relations experts, the President will suffer a loss in something called prestige if this amendment is defeated.

I do not think so. The President is far too capable, far too efficient a man to suffer a loss of stature because of this one vote on an amendment to a foreign aid appropriation bill.

His integrity and his position of respect in the eyes of the American people and the world are too high to be threatened, much less damaged, by what happens here today on this amendment.

However, I have my doubts about the amount of respect the Congress will be able to command if it slices off another large hunk of its responsibility and hands it over to the executive branch with the comment: "Here, this is too hot for me to handle."

We have done little enough these past 11½ months which could be called constructive. A great many of us here in the House realize that. Let us not end this seemingly endless session by throwing away another piece of our duty.

As I understand from the debate, a tentative deal has been made with the Russians for a downpayment of one-fourth, and the payment of an additional one-fourth every 6 months until the balance is paid.

My question is: Why?

Has the Soviet Union pleaded poverty? Has the Government of the U.S.S.R. stated that it does not have the money to pay for its purchases and needs credit terms? If so, that fact most certainly has not been brought out in the thousands of words which have been spoken and written on this topic during the past few weeks.

In fact, we have every reason to believe that the Soviet Union has the means to pay cash on the barrelhead for our wheat if its government so desires.

Before we start guaranteeing the loans of those who have vowed to bury us, either literally or figuratively depending upon your interpretation of Premier Khrushchev's words, we ought to take a look at what sort of credit risk is offered.

I am afraid the record is rather dismal. The Soviet has not paid us for World War I debts, much less World War II debts, and only partial payment has been made for those goods received after V–J Day.

As many of my colleagues know, I have been a constant supporter of a sound, firm foreign policy. I have been an advocate of an efficient, economical foreign aid program.

Because I believe in both of these, I cannot vote for this amendment. It would be a divorce by Congress of its constitutional responsibility and another example where dollars might be substituted for brains in carrying out those actions necessary to the security of the United States.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I think it should be pointed out that the Russians deal with private exporters in this country. That is the way we do business in this country. If there is wheat for sale, Cuba can buy it in that way. We do not have government-to-government transactions. In order to prohibit it, we should also be opposed to the granting of credit. We look at this as aid to the Russians, but in this country you have to deal with private exporters and not the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse the statement of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from Michigan for the stand which he has taken on this issue. I want the record to show that on this day before Christmas that I as one Member of Congress do not intend to participate in any Christmas present to Mr. Khrushchev.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. It has been said by some that this is only normal relations between the countries. Would this be the first time in history that our Government has given a credit guarantee to a Communist country?

Mr. FORD. I am not certain about that, but I am certain of this: We have never granted credit to a debtor who owed the United States almost $11 billion.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to every question. We have heard one side so far this morning that we are either voting for communism or against communism. The United States today is committed to other countries around this world. We are voting more than $50 billion yearly, to wage the cold war. Our boys are stationed at bases ranging from Germany down into India, and South Korea and in South Vietnam. Some of our boys are being killed. We are waging a total war. The Communists have said they would bury us, and we as a Nation and a people are committed to the destruction and obliteration of the Communist ideology.

Now, this question in my opinion boils down to this: We are either going to trust the Commander in Chief of the greatest and the best equipped military force in the world to wage total war against communism, or we are not going to trust him. I am against communism and every American in this House is against it. Anyone who suggests that is not true and impugns the motives of any man on either side of the aisle is not speaking the truth. That is just how plain it is, because communism is repulsive, it is repugnant, it is revolting to any freethinking American citizen, or any free citizen around the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing is this: We will be saying to the world we do not trust the President of the United States to do his sworn duty. We are hitting at him. Why do we not question and attack some of his larger responsibilities? He is the Commander in Chief of the greatest army in the world. He has the power to push the button to determine life or death for civilization. Why do we not say: We do not trust you in anything?

The amendment says he cannot extend this credit unless it is in the national interest. Then, we say: "No, we are not going to let him determine what is the national interest." But we say we do not trust him. This amendment is simple. The way it is written it says he cannot extend credit unless it is in the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I say any man who votes against the compromise conference report is not voting to uphold the arm of the President of the United States to wage all-out total war against communism.

President Johnson, on the day after Pearl Harbor, left this body and enlisted in the Armed Forces of the United States. How many other Members of Congress did that? How many today, if we went to war, would enlist? But he did just that. Yet there are others who get up and say we do not impugn his motives, we just do not trust him.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Will the gentleman explain to me how you wage total war against communism by giving them aid?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is your theory. That is what you say, not me. You are just evading the issue. This amendment says he cannot extend credit—unless it is in the national interest.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If the gentleman will yield further, How is it in the national interest to give your potential enemy credit?

Mr. STAGGERS. You are still evading the issue, I am against helping the Communist cause in any and every way. They are dedicated to the overthrow of our Government and we are just as dedicated to the destruction of the Communist ideology.

This is a war being waged on social, economic, and religious fronts while the instruments of death stand waiting or are being used infrequently. In fact at this stage it is a battle for the minds of men.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thought World War II was also a battle of the minds.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, World War II was a battle of the minds, but it also was a war waged with the most destructive weapons known to man. Millions lost their lives.

Mr. CEDERBERG. You explain the theory.

Mr. STAGGERS. I cannot explain the theory of communism. I do know it is anti-God and against everything you and I stand for. This war will be engaged to the bitter end. The United States and her allies will win, if we stay prepared physically, mentally, and morally for we are religious people. Almighty God will be on our side as long as we stay prepared and do right—in His eyes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan deserves a factual reply.

It is a fact that this amendment establishes no precedent. Under President Eisenhower nonmilitary loans were made to Communist countries, including Poland, because it was felt they were in the national interest. It obviously was not then and is not now in the national interest to establish a policy of never having anything to do with a Communist country. The nuclear test ban treaty amply proves this point.

It is a fact that our national policy is to reduce, if possible, cold war tensions, and prove to nonalined countries the sincerity of our humanitarian principles. This is doubly important now that there is a rift within the Communist camp. The President, not the Congress, must have the tools to use every opportunity to help our interest. This amendment tells the President that the Congress believes wheat and other commodity sales should not be aided or permitted unless he finds and reports that our interest will be advanced. This responsibility constitutionally, historically, and rightly belongs to the President. And that is all this amendment does.

It is a fact that the gentleman from Michigan admits that the guarantees permitted by the amendment through the Export-Import Bank are financially sound. The private American businessman or exporter takes the primary risk and if there should be nonpayment it is primarily the private American who would get hurt. The Export-Import Bank only gives him some insurance. This does not advance him, any country, or anybody else one red American cent. And the Export-Import Bank collects, properly, a premium for their insurance policy. All of our allies, England, France, Germany, Japan, Canada, Australia all do just this today. Do they want to advance or help communism? Of course not. They think in the long run this shows and proves the failure of communism to the world and to its own people and forces Communists to help the capitalists make a profit. We would be a little daft to let our Republican friends, for the sake of politics, lead us up such a blind alley.

Lastly, it is a fact that the Russians do owe us billions on World War II aid. So does England and others. But Russia has not defaulted on any commercial obligations and will not because she cannot afford to. This is a commercial not a Government transaction.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment should be adopted if our United States is not made to look foolish to the outside world. The only persons who get a Christmas present from our action today are the American people. They deserve a merry Christmas. May we help them and ourselves to have it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the anonymous spokesmen referred to earlier today who say that this is some sort of a plot by Midwest isolationists to make our American foreign policy. I believe that the difference in this issue is an honest disagreement among honest men. I think we have a fundamental difference in views on this matter and it is unfair to assail those who disagree with us. One understands it one way, another understands it another way. This divergence is the essence of our democracy. But to suggest that anybody who votes for this amendment, or votes to sustain the conferees, is voting for communism is equally wrong.

I do not trust the Communists any more than I could throw this building. However, I also believe the Export-Import Bank does not trust them any more than I do.

My colleague knows that before the Export-Import Bank could guarantee any credit on loans for sale of wheat to Russia, it must first get a premium from the American grain dealer who wants to sell this wheat. Then, Mr. Speaker, and this is the key we must consider in making a final judgment, before the Export-Import Bank can guarantee one penny of credit to anyone, it must first obtain collateral redeemable in gold from the nation which would benefit from the credit. Therefore, those who say we are using taxpayers' money to feed the Communists are making strangers of the truth. The Export-Import Bank follows normal practices of international business relationships established as early as 1934. There is not an iota of evidence before this Congress that the Soviet Union has indicated it wants any credit. Our late President Kennedy said this is going to be a cash-on-the-barrel deal. As far as we know, the Soviet Union is paying cash to Canada today. It is paying cash simply because it does not want to pay the additional 5-percent premium which it would have to pay if it bought this wheat on any kind of credit from American grain dealers. We have no reason to believe that the Soviet Union, if this wheat deal is consummated between this country and the Soviet Union, is going to pay anything but cash on delivery either in dollars or gold. The Soviet Union apparently has sufficient gold to back up these cash payments.

We have been following this procedure in international commerce since 1934.

We have given the Export-Import Bank this authority. This is nothing more than a guarantee to American grain dealers, who are a segment of our free enterprise, private enterprise, that get into the stream of private international commerce instead of foreign aid. This program has been established for many years. It was conducted under previous administrations. The Export-Import Bank is one of the most conservative institutions in the world. As a matter of fact, the directors of that Bank are good, solid Republicans. I doubt very much whether this Export-Import Bank would guarantee or underwrite any kind of credit unless they knew very well that every single penny will be paid back, because that is the record of the Export-Import Bank.

So for anyone here today to suggest that we are using taxpayers money to feed the Communists is an assault on the truth. There just is no substance to a charge like that. What we are doing here is helping American businessmen, by underwriting their credit, get into the stream of international commerce. This whole Export-Import Bank was created to encourage Americans to seek foreign business without jeopardizing their investment in foreign nations.

Let us take an example. This sale of wheat to Russia will be a cash-on-the-barrel deal, but there may be 30 or 60 days involved in the payment of the money to the American grain dealer. Such a delay in payment is a normal delay in all transactions. Incidentally, I want you to remember that this amendment cuts across the board. This is not just a matter involving the wheat sale to Russia. This will affect the economy of the agricultural community of our Nation across the board. I think you gentlemen from the rural areas ought to think about this, too.

Let us assume an American businessman enters into a deal to sell wheat to the Soviet Union on a cash-and-carry basis. It is going to take 60 days or more to consumate that transaction. He needs money to purchase the wheat from American farmers of the Commodity Credit Corporation for resale to the Soviet Union. He goes to the Export-Import Bank and gets a guarantee on his contract with the Soviet Union for 60 days, and he must pay a premium for the guarantee. He does not get it for nothing. With the guarantee from the Export-Import Bank, he can borrow from his own bank to purchase the wheat for resale to Russia. The Export-Import Bank has been a model institution. It has operated at a profit, and as far as I know it has not lost a penny. So for anyone here to argue that we are underwriting or subsidizing or using American taxpayers' money to feed the Communists is just torturing the truth.

Mr. Speaker, my record here in Congress of fighting communism is crystal clear; I need never apologize for my contributions to expose the full ugliness of communism. But I would not be fair with myself and my constituents if I failed to point out there are many ways to fight communism. One way is to sell them our surplus wheat which is rotting in our bins. I said previously, every grain of wheat we send to Russia carries with it a message of the total failure of Communist despotism and the ultimate triumph of American capitalism. How does Mr. Khrushchev explain to his people that Russia must send millions of dollars worth of its gold to America to buy our surplus stocks of wheat?

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I hope the amendment will be adopted because in its present form, we clearly state we are opposed to any credit to the Soviets unless and until the President informs Congress such sales are in the public interest. I, for one, have sufficient trust in my President to let him make that final determination.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to propound a parliamentary inquiry, if I may.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the first vote which will occur will be on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. And amendment No. 20 which is the so-called wheat amendment is not part of the conference report?

The SPEAKER. That is correct. That will be considered by the House separately.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If I may inquire further, Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 20 will be brought up in disagreement and on proper motion by the gentleman from Louisiana, a separate vote will occur at that time on amendment No. 20.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that a motion will be made with respect to that amendment which is in disagreement.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have to disagree with my friend, the gentleman from Illinois. After all, if we guarantee payment of a loan, there is a presupposition that perhaps somebody will not pay the loan and if the loan is not paid, then the guarantee will be made good. And who will make it good? The American taxpayer will make it good. There is not any doubt about that. This is a contingent liability. We hope it will not become necessary for the taxpayers to pick it up, but the mere fact that there is so much agitation for this type of legislation, it certainly indicates at least that the commerical bankers of this country would not have made this loan, if they did not feel the guarantee was necessary. These are prudent people. They certainly would not be asking for the guarantee if they did not feel they needed it. So do not let anybody have any doubt in their minds but what possibly this will be a real liability which will be brought up and which will be collected from the American taxpayers.

It has not been said either that the wheat which will be sold to the Communist nations—credit given—guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank—will be sold for less than the American Government paid for it.

I have heard this deal called several things. I have heard it called bushels for Bolsheviks and I imagine there will be some other names attached to it from time to time. But let me say this. I think the gentleman from Virginia was absolutely right when he said that this issue is really an issue whether or not we think it is a good thing for the United States of America to make this kind of a sale.

Now we have heard the charge of partisanship made. You know, to me there is a difference between partisanship and honest conviction. I would agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI]; I think there are very definite honest convictions on both sides of this aisle. I certainly defy anyone to say that when the Republican side voted—all but three votes—for their position the other night that this was partisanship. You do not get that kind of consensus from partisanship. You get it from conviction. And the people on this side of the aisle are convinced that this is not a good thing for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the majority leader saw fit to try to define the standards under which Lyndon Johnson will be declared to be either a strong President or a weak President. In my opinion, whatever he may be called by history will be decided by what he does, and not by what the House of Representatives does. In my opinion, he has the capacity to be a strong President and he will be a strong President, but he does not get to be a strong President because the legislative body rolls over and plays dead for him. He does not get to be a strong President because the legislative branch votes against its own convictions and refuses to stand up to tell him that in this instance we think he is wrong. This is all that we are trying to do, and so help me if I thought that my vote today would blacken the escutcheon of Lyndon Johnson as a strong President of the United States, then I would not vote the way I am going to vote. I do not believe it—I think he is a much stronger man, perhaps, than those who have set what I think is a false standard for presidential strength.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I like what the gentleman has just said. It is in line with what the gentleman from Texas said. There are those who seek to make disagreement the equivalent of distrust. If we must agree with everything that the President says or else be disloyal or weaken our country, I think that is a very dangerous doctrine.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned the President. Does the gentleman have any knowledge as to whether President Johnson, having cracked his whip over the House, is going to stay in Washington until final action has been taken on this bill by the Senate?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have no such knowledge.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to delay the vote that I know we are all eagerly waiting for, but I do think something should be said to put this discussion into a slightly different perspective. It is true that we are waging a cold war against communism, and this bill is a major weapon of that war. But on the eve of the birthday of the Prince of Peace, it does seem to me we ought also to remember that both President Kennedy and President Eisenhower before him were making a very valiant effort to try to ease this cold war and to restore a condition of more stable peace in this world.

President Kennedy as part of that effort, got through the nuclear test ban treaty by an overwhelming vote in the other body. And some weeks before his tragic assassination President Kennedy also decided that this wheat transaction we are discussing here today might be another major weapon in trying to bring about eased relations in this long-standing cold war. President Johnson has now made the very same determination. It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that what we are being asked to vote on here this morning is simply whether we, on Christmas Eve, also support the view that this country ought to make an earnest effort to ease the cold war and to restore real peace.

I think when we vote on this measure in a few minutes we ought to keep in mind the eloquent words of President Johnson as he addressed us yesterday informally at the White House when, despite the bitterness of the past few days, he invited every one of us down there and reminded us, each one, that after all our basic and overriding duty in these difficult days is still to promote "peace on earth, good will among men."

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on questions of foreign policy of major significance it is impossible to determine foreign policy on the floor of the House of Representatives. The President of the United States, under the U.S. Constitution, has rightly affirmed this strategic and security power. I respect the Office of the President of the United States and believe that we should give full faith and credit to President Lyndon Johnson at this time in our history. We Members of Congress must rise above partisanship and the next election for the good of our country, and the standing of our Nation among the nations of the world.

This Nation of ours in foreign affairs must, when the decisions are made, speak with one voice, and that voice at this time is the voice of the new President of the United States, our friend who formerly served with us in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, the competent Lyndon Johnson.

It is unthinkable that the President of the United States should adopt one foreign policy among the major power nations, and the U.S. House of Representatives by a disputed vote, should adopt another and different policy antagonistic and in opposition to the President. We must agree among ourselves as to the method of implementing policies, but the determination of the policy itself must be left to the President of the United States, often with necessary instructions or recommendations from the Congress of the United States as to their views on the exercise of the fundamental powers. But the power itself must and should be exercised by the President in his judgment and discretion, based upon the broad background and necessary information to which the House of Representatives has neither access nor opportunity for evaluation.

We, in Congress, must choose somebody to trust and I place my trust on this currently hotly disputed question of foreign policy as to the sale of U.S. surplus wheat and grains to foreign countries upon a strategic basis, a business basis, and a basis of existence itself of U.S. farmers through sale of surplus agricultural products that now depress our markets at home and cost millions of dollars a year to store.

I, therefore, have placed my full faith and confidence in the decision of the President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, with the policy stated by Congress that he make the decision when he finds in his judgment this to be in the best interests of the United States.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, we are in great danger today of losing sight of the issue which has deadlocked the Congress. Politics, emotion, frustration, the imminence of Christmas, personal misunderstandings, even the weather, have all conspired to introduce a host of irrelevant considerations which have obscured the limit and well-defined issue before us. Members of both parties must share the responsibility for the impasse and for the destructive heat which the impasse has generated.

The issue, as I see it, is this: Should Congress, which created the Export-Import Bank for specific public policy purposes, now consent to the use of this device to facilitate other purposes, that is, the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union, which have never been considered part of the Bank's responsibility?

The issue is not whether the Government shall permit the commercial sale of wheat to Soviet Russia. Whether we agree with the decision or not, this issue has already been settled by the President acting under the authority of his office.

The issue is not isolationism or the fate of the foreign aid appropriation bill. Despite serious questions about certain aspects of our foreign-aid program, Congress has once again approved the program, and conferees from the House and Senate have agreed on the amount of money needed to finance the program during the current fiscal year.

The issue is not obstructionism or an attempt to tie the President's hands in the conduct of American foreign policy. The Export-Import Bank is a creature of the Congress. Congress has endowed it with its authority, defined its purposes, and provided it with the funds necessary to accomplish those purposes. Congress, therefore, has every right to clarify the Bank's authority or to supplement the definition of its purposes in the face of changing circumstances.

In the statement of purposes, approved by the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, which appears in the current issue of the U.S. Government Organization Manual, congressional policy is clearly indicated to be the controlling factor in the Bank's operations. The President has no authority to set the policy of the Export-Import Bank as he does, for example, that of the State Department. The two agencies occupy significantly different positions with respect to the President's general authority to conduct the foreign relations of the United States.

In carrying out its responsibility to establish policy governing the Export-Import Bank, Congress is very much aware, and properly so, of several important factors bearing on the issue of guaranteeing the credit of Soviet Russia.

First. The Soviet Union and other Communist bloc countries are engaged in massive economic competition with the United States and its free world allies. Under his own definition of peaceful coexistence, Premier Khrushchev has publicly committed his nation to this competition between economic systems. We have welcomed this competition—as a safer form of conflict than the arms race, as a way of reducing the kind of tensions that could lead to nuclear war, and as a means of demonstrating the superiority of our own economic system. We mean to win this competition, or at least to stay ahead.

Second. The Soviet Union has no credit standing in the United States. Commercial bankers do not consider the Soviet Government a reasonable risk nor, on the record, can our own Government accept their credit as good. According to the State Department, the Soviet Union has continued to refuse even to negotiate the question of the debt it owes the United States—a debt we have several times reduced in a spirit of compromise, a debt incurred not for materials used to fight World War II but for articles and equipment used by Soviet Russia after the war for peacetime purposes.

Third. The authority of the Export-Import Bank has been increased and broadened by Congress to enable it to play a major role in our postwar policy of expanding international trade among free world countries so as to strengthen the economies of those countries, as well as our own, and enable the free world cooperatively to resist the economic pressures of Communist governments and to extend the influence of freedom throughout the uncommitted world.

Each of these three factors, Mr. Speaker, militates strongly against the use of Export-Import Bank facilities to guarantee American exporters against possible Soviet default in paying for the wheat it presumably wishes to purchase. Under existing congressional policy—which has assigned an important role to the Bank in the East-West economic struggle and which requires the Bank to limit its assistance to acceptable risks—there is no justification for bringing the Bank into this Soviet wheat deal. Conversely, there is every justification for Congress to spell out once again its policy in this regard in unmistakable terms—the more so since on a number of occasions the administration has chosen to interpret related congressional declarations as not binding. There would be no question about the binding character of the provision now in dispute in the foreign aid appropriation bill.

Those of us who wish to impose this policy restriction on the Export-Import Bank are seeking to accomplish this objective is a completely valid way. The present bill is the logical vehicle—because it is the only one that could be effective—to carry this prohibition. The means we are using are entirely consistent with the rules and procedures of the House. We are not blocking foreign aid, since the program is already being financed through the end of next month under a continuing resolution appropriating the necessary funds. We are not getting tough with Russia since we are simply denying our opponents in this economic competition a special advantage we have hitherto always reserved for our friends. We are not interfering with the President's constitutional prerogatives—unless it has become unconstitutional for Congress to differ with the President on a matter of policy—since Export-Import Bank policy is and always has been a question for Congress to decide.

So long as a majority of the Members of the House agree with this position, Mr. Speaker, then we have no alternative but to abide by our convictions. They are bipartisan convictions, shared by Democrats and Republicans alike, in and out of Congress, and in my judgment these convictions are in complete harmony with the national interest which we are sworn to uphold and defend.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today's action on the foreign aid appropriations bill clears the way for us to get on with the vital work of foreign aid. The amount finally appropriated is, I believe, disappointingly small in relation to the magnitude of the task and the needs of U.S. foreign policy.

I have long stated—and fought for—my belief in the importance of an adequate foreign aid program. Clearly foreign aid is not perfect—but equally clear is the fact that foreign aid is the best instrument we have to serve our foreign policy needs in the underdeveloped world—and to live up to the humanitarian principles that have made America great.

Foreign aid's bitterest critics have been unable to offer any sensible alternative to this program. Mr. Speaker, there is none. I trust that in the coming session of Congress, we will give careful consideration to, and provide adequate resources for, a sound foreign aid effort.

Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have been absorbed in arduous, acrimonious debate on the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union and satellites. I would like to set out the background and facts concerning the sale, since they may not be clear from the rhetoric of the past few days.

The Soviet Union and various Eastern European countries have expressed a willingness to buy from our private grain dealers at the regular world price several million tons of surplus American wheat or wheat flour for shipment during the next several months. They may also wish to purchase from us surplus feed grains and other agricultural commodities.

After consultation in the National Security Council, the administration informed appropriate leaders of the Congress, and concluded that such sales by private dealers for American dollars or gold, either cash on delivery or normal commercial terms, should not be prohibited by the Government. The Commodity Credit Corporation in the Department of Agriculture will sell to our private grain traders the amount necessary to replace the grain used to fulfill these requirements, and the Department of Commerce will grant export licenses for their delivery to and use in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe only.

An added feature is the provision that the wheat we sell to the Soviet Union will be carried in available American ships, supplemented by ships of other countries as required. Arrangements will also be made by the Department of Commerce to prevent any single American dealer from receiving an excessive share of these sales.

Basically, the Soviet Union will be treated like any other cash customer in the world market who is willing and able to strike a bargain with private American merchants. While this wheat, like all wheat sold abroad, will be sold at the world price, which is the only way it could be sold, there is in such transactions no subsidy to the foreign purchaser; only a savings to the American taxpayer on wheat the Government has already purchased and stored at the higher domestic price which is maintained to assist our farmers.

Today's action by the House in accepting conference agreement on the foreign aid bill will permit American grain dealers to bid succesfully with grain suppliers of other free world nations for this business. It is clear that if our dealers are to obtain this business, they must be competitive and one of the most important competition factors involves terms of financing.

It should be noted in this connection that the Soviet Union and its wheat have generally received from Canada, for example, terms which provide for cash payment of 25 percent prior to shipment of commodities, with the balance payable in equal semiannual installments over an 18-month period. These are now the customary commercial terms for sales of wheat to bloc countries.

Eighteen-month terms are sound and justified. In sales to non-Communist countries, we have offered Government credit of up to 3 years on tobacco, cotton and feed grains, and up to 2 years on wheat. American grain dealers will probably find it necessary to offer reasonably equivalent commercial credit in order to compete successfully for the Soviet trade. However, it is clear that U.S. commercial banks are not prepared by themselves to grant commercial credits to the bloc for agricultural commodities in the quantity and time required. Therefore, if advantageous U.S. sales to the bloc are to be made, with the consequent boon to our balance of payments, our financial institutions will probably need assistance from our own export credit institution, the Export-Import

Bank of Washington. The Export-Import Bank could guarantee commercial credits extended to cover purchase of American grain by the Soviet bloc. Credit would probably carry an interest rate of 5 percent per year with a small part going to the Export-Import Bank as a fee. In terms of the risk involved, two points should be made:

First. Soviet Union has consistently met all commercial credit obligations it has undertaken fully and promptly.

Second. The loss record of the Export-Import Bank is extraordinarily good.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House has retained for the President the necessary flexibility to successfully conclude the wheat sale.

This transaction has obvious benefit for the United States. The sale of 4 million metric tons of wheat, for example, for an estimated $250 million, and additional sums from the use of American shipping, will benefit our balance of payments and gold reserves by that amount and substantially strengthen the economic outlook for those employed in producing, transporting, handling, and loading farm products.

Wheat, moreover, is our No. 1 farm surplus today, to the extent of about 1 billion unsold bushels. The sale of around 150 million bushels of wheat would be worth over $200 million to the American taxpayer in reduced budget expenditures. Our country has always responded to requests for food from governments of people who needed it, so long as we were certain that the people would actually get it and know where it came from.

The Russian people will know they are receiving American wheat. The United States has never had a policy against selling consumer goods, including agricultural commodities, to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. On the contrary, we have been doing exactly that for a number of years, and to the extent that their limited supplies of gold, dollars, and foreign exchange must be used for food, they cannot be used to purchase military or other equipment.

Our allies have long been engaged in extensive sales of wheat and other farm products to the Communist bloc, and in fact, it would be foolish to halt the sales of wheat when other countries can buy wheat from us today and then sell this flour to the Communists. Recently, Australia and NATO Allies have agreed to sell 10 to 15 million tons of wheat and wheat flour to the Communist bloc.

This transaction advertises to the world as nothing else could the success of free American agriculture. It demonstrates our willingness to relieve food shortages, to reduce tensions, and to improve relations with all countries, and it shows that peaceful agreements with the United States which serve the interests of both sides are a far more worthwhile course than a course of isolation and hostility.

For this Government to tell our grain traders that they cannot accept these offers, on the other hand, would accomplish little or nothing. The Soviets would continue to buy wheat and flour elsewhere, including wheat flour, from those nations which buy our wheat. Moreover, having for many years sold them farm products which are not in surplus, it would make no sense to refuse to sell those products on which we must otherwise pay the cost of storage. In short, this particular decision with respect to sales to the Soviet Union, which is not inconsistent with many smaller transactions over a long period of time, does not represent a new Soviet-American trade policy. That must await the settlement of many matters. But it does represent one more hopeful sign that a more peaceful world is both possible and beneficial to us all.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would not wish the record of this session to be written without expressing once again, as I did on yesterday, my profound distress at the course on which the Johnson administration has so determinedly embarked. I repeat what I said then. It is incredible that only 14 months after Khrushchev brought the world to the brink of war we want to aid him in solving the problems of his failing economy—to resuscitate him so that he can renew his assault on us at a more convenient hour.

No one during all the debate on this issue has been able to even come close to demonstrating how guaranteeing credit to the Soviet Union by an instrumentality of the U.S. Government is in the interest of the American people. It is the height of folly to pretend that a $300 million loan to the U.S.S.R. when piled on top of billions in defaulted obligations dating back as far as the old czarist regime can strengthen our own country eocnomically, politically, or militarily.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party has been accused of partisanship in taking the negative side of this issue. Yet it is the Democratic leadership in this House with its specious and empty arguments that "we must in any event uphold the wishes of the President" would have made this a matter of party loyalty rather than principle as it should be. We do not live under a monarchy. The cry of former ages that "the king can do no wrong" is no part of our vocabulary. President Johnson deserves our wholehearted support when he is right; when he is wrong we owe a higher loyalty to our own conscience and the will of the people who sent us to sit here in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of West Germany of which mention has been made during this debate does not guarantee the commercial loans that are attendant upon transactions between West German businessmen and the Soviet Government. Neither does the Government of France. Why then should the proponents of this wheat deal with Russia seek to cite either of these countries as examples for us to follow?

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States and the Democratic majority in this Congress apparently will succeed on this Christmas Eve in their efforts to dispatch a Christmas present to Chairman Khrushchev or as one member has said: "a credit card for the Kremlin." I think this gift will come back to haunt them because out of some misbegotten desire to assert Presidential authority in the field of foreign affairs they are making a deal that is bad for the American people. Oh they are not doing this out of any conscious desire to aid and abet communism as such. However, I think that historians of the future will wonder at their naivete and their inability to apprehend the constancy of our foe. The record of Soviet treachery and perfidy and callous disregard of past promises is there for all to see. The philosopher put it very well indeed in these words:

> Those who fail to learn the lessons that history teaches are condemned to relive them.

I hope that this administration still young in office may yet see fit to ponder that admonition and alter the course that it presently seems determined to pursue because it has become obsessed with prestige and lost sight of principle.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate the Members of this honorable body for recognizing the importance of the foreign aid bill and their concern over trade with Communist countries. Many Congressmen remained in Washington and others returned for a Christmas Eve debate on these questions. I think it is a fine commentary on their devotion to duty.

With the indulgence of the House, Mr. Speaker, may I say at the outset that the decision we make here today is most crucial to the future of the world. We are in a major conflict between Christianity and godlessness. I pointed this out recently in San Jose, Costa Rica, at a recent prayer breakfast of the International Christian Leadership Conference honoring the President of Costa Rica. If we lose, the world would go through another "Dark Ages" of conflict and suspicion, without faith or brotherhood. If we win, Christian faith, charity and the Golden Rule will prevail. We must not lose this conflict.

The question before us now is whether we should use every tool at our disposal to win. Should we use the great economic strength we have built under Christian democracy to force the failure of godless communism and win a bloodless victory? Or should we give away or bargain away our economic advantage, which shows the success of our system, for the benefit of the Communists, whose economic plight shows the failure of their system?

To give away our economic advantage, Mr. Speaker, is to dispose of the strongest weapons we have to win a bloodless victory. And what would it leave? The obvious answer is either final surrender or a hot war. Since we all want peace, our economic advantage should be used toward easing the cold war, not just as a means to dispose of some of our farm surplus and make a small and inadequate adjustment in our gold outflow situation.

The question of U.S. trade in farm commodities with Russia and other Communist countries is a major case in point. To the Communists, any advancement in this field is a major political gain. Despite this, we have agreed to sell farm commodities to Communist countries without commensurate political gains for us. We did not ask that Russia remove her troops from Cuba or tear down the Berlin wall or stop harassing Allied convoys on their way to West Berlin.

Second, in the wheat deal, we have agreed to sell wheat to Russia at the world price. The U.S. Government, with taxpayers' money, will pay the rest. Again, this concession was without any gain for us in return.

Third, the administration decided to relax the requirement that U.S. ships be used to carry the wheat to Russia. This will further increase the gold outflow to foreign shipowners. Meanwhile, our west coast lumbermen still are subsidizing the U.S. shipping industry under the Jones Act. They must use U.S. ships in trade with the east coast, and they are losing markets there because of the higher cost of U.S. shipping. Again, we ask no commensurate concession from Russia.

Now, as a final blow, we are being asked in this foreign aid bill to guarantee Russia's credit so that banks will lend her the money to buy the wheat. We are providing our wheat at a cutrate price. We are permitting the use of cheaper foreign shipping, and now we are asked to provide the credit.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for a foreign aid bill that provides $2.8 billion of taxpayer money to help needy foreign countries. This bill would have restricted the President from guaranteeing Russia's credit. Now we are asked to approve a compromise providing two things: One is $3 billion in foreign aid. I would agree to compromise and vote for this amount since it represents a major reduction from the $4.9 billion originally requested. The other is that we underwrite Russia's credit so that she can buy U.S. wheat on time payments after she largely has paid cash for Canadian wheat.

Soviet Russia still owes us nearly $11 billion for World War II lend-lease which she steadfastly has refused to pay. She still owes the United Nations millions in unpaid obligations. Under these conditions, I can have no faith in guaranteeing Russia's credit. It could result in the United States paying for its own wheat to send to Russia.

Another factor has been largely ignored in the weeks of debate over the wheat sale. The U.S. public has been permitted to develop the impression that, somehow, the sale of wheat to Russia is a great humanitarian gesture. Because we are a nation of great compassion, many of our citizens have endorsed the wheat sale under the mistaken impression that Russians are starving. Nothing is further from the truth. Russians are not starving. This is not a humanitarian gesture. It is purely for the economic and political gain of Soviet Russia. And it is draining us of one of our most powerful weapons in the cold war.

With the indulgence of the House, Mr. Chairman, may I quote briefly from a paper written by Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski, director of the research institute on Communist affairs and professor of public law and government at Columbia University. May I preface it by saying that this expert on Russia favors the wheat sale in its proper context.

Professor Brzezinski said, regarding the wheat deal:

> The humanitarian argument can be dismissed quickly. First of all, there is no famine in Russia. The Soviet people are not starving, and the Government has not lost all of its ability to meet a food crisis. It could certainly divert some of its resources from heavy industry to better agricultural management, and it is still capable of providing the basic staples to meet Russian needs.
>
> To the Soviet leaders, the wheat deal is political because two very vital Soviet political interests are involved:
>
> The first is the stability of the collective agricultural system itself. Over many years, that system has failed to deliver the goods, at least in so far as the Soviet consumer is concerned. Yet to the political leadership, the collective system is essential. Collectivism was abandoned in Poland and Yugoslavia because the leaderships had no way out. By importing wheat the Soviet leadership sees a way out, and hence the wheat deal is necessary to Moscow, in order to maintain its domestic system of collectivization.
>
> Secondly, the importation of wheat is necessary to the Soviet Union in order for it to meet its grain export commitments. These commitments are important to the Soviet leadership primarily for political reasons. Last year the Soviet Union exported approximately 7.8 million tons of grain, of which wheat constituted 4.7 million tons. The list of clients shows clearly the political importance of the exports: the largest consumer was East Germany, followed successively by Czechoslovakia, Poland, Brazil and Cuba.
>
> The above comments should not be construed as an argument against an American-Soviet wheat deal. They are meant to suggest, however, that this wheat deal ought to be viewed in political perspective and that United States negotiators ought to seek political concessions from the Soviets in return.
>
> For example, it would seem ironical for the United States to be helping the Soviet Union to maintain its collectivized agriculture and its politically motivated grain exports and at the same time for this country to endure continued Soviet harassment in its access to Berlin. At the very least, our negotiators could insist on a clear reciprocal understanding of the technical arrangements involved in Western access.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, many of us who have remained here in the Chambers have done so because of strong convictions. These convictions relate to a concern over the type of negotiations we will encourage by permitting the indiscriminate use of American credit to underwrite the sale of wheat to Communist countries.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the Soviet Union is shifting to the economic battleground in the conduct of their cold war against our free enterprise system. If the opportunity presents itself, they will just as quickly shift to the use of military hardware to advance their cause. Our history of dealing with the Soviets and all advocates of the Communist doctrine is very clear—they will use deceit, deception, treachery, and trickery to win in their announced objective to "bury us."

Now with the emphasis placed on smooth talk and an unwarranted appeal to the humanitarian instinct to Americans, they have hoodwinked us into accepting another deal—again on terms satisfactory to their cause. In dealing with the Communist countries, the prudent bankers associated with the Export-Import Bank recognize the tremendous collateral risks involved. The risks are so great that commercial banks do not choose to participate at the rates of interest to be charged.

But here again, Uncle Sam, who is rapidly being recognized in hard business circles as "Uncle Sap," has intervened to set the stage for providing credit, I repeat, credit—not cash on the barrelhead—for the benefit of our political enemies, the Communists.

In this type of warfare, be it hot or cold, be it military or economic, we must keep our guard up. We must retain every available weapon in our arsenal. The chief weapon we have available to us is the economic strength of this Nation—whether it be for the support of our military effort or for the development of our own, long-overdue, ideological offensive.

The issue is clearly in focus by the vote we cast today. If we vote to support credit for Communist countries, we are voting to undercut the economic foundation of this country—the economic foundation upon which the leadership of the free world is dependent for its strength. With the history of unmet treaty obligations, as well as financial obligations with the Soviet Union, how can any thinking American expect a turnabout in present and future negotiations with our Government?

If they want the wheat on a cash basis, I say OK. But when the deal is considered on a credit basis, I say "Nyet." When is Uncle Sam going to wake up to the reality of the Communists announced objectives? They want to dominate the world, they want to substitute their system for ours, with the total loss of freedom that is inevitable. They want to guide our destinies and control our opportunities. In this, I refuse to participate. This is why I have chosen to stay here this Christmas Eve to vote against this proposal.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, three times we have been called upon to vote on this question. For the third time I intend to vote in support of the foreign aid conference report, in support of the bill, in support of congressional expedition, and in support of the constitutional powers of the Executive in the conduct of foreign policy. Others may consider this a party matter. I do not. This is a part of foreign policy and Congress must give the President sufficient flexibility in which to work. If he is wrong in his use of these powers he will answer for it to the country.

The issue has been pushed out of proportion. The Export-Import Bank may or may not extend credit in the course of commercial transactions involving the sale of wheat for dollars. That is a decision that will be made by the President, reporting to Congress, and by the Bank exercising business judgment. It is important to remember that when President Eisenhower was in the White House the Export-Import Bank in 1957 guaranteed a $30 million loan to Poland to buy a tinplate mill. Payments started to come in last year at 4½ percent interest. Again in 1958 the Bank guaranteed a $25 million purchase of pharmaceutical products by Poland. In 1959 there was a $6 million transaction. The losses of the Export-Import Bank have been infinitesimal. From a business point of view there should be no objection. From a policy point of view this country has everything to gain by not putting roadblocks in the way of the proposed wheat sale. We have more wheat on our hands than any other country. Our taxpayers pay $400 million in storage charges alone. Direct subsidies are many hundreds of millions of dollars added to this. Canada, Australia, and now even West Germany are in the business of selling or proposing to sell wheat to Russia. The terms of all of these transactions are the usual business ones. So much is paid down—the U.S. proposal is 25 percent of the cost—and the balance is financed by bank loans. There is nothing unusual about it. I for one, too, am of the view that there is no better way to demonstrate the failures of the Soviet economy than by these wheat shipments. And in the course of it we unload some of our surplus and stand to gain upward of $2 billion in gold.

I can see no objection to the language of the conference report. It states very clearly that the Export-Import Bank is not to guarantee any payment incurred by any communistic country in connection with the purchase of any product except when the President of the United States makes a determination that it is in the national interest to permit the Bank to extend credit, and a report must be made to the Congress within 30 days to that effect. That puts the onus squarely on the President.

Finally, this is an appropriations bill backing up a foreign policy decision. This is the wrong bill for a substantive policy issue of this kind. It is not germane to our task. But beyond this, let us remember that Congress and parties must act with restraint in the area of foreign policy. The founders of the country understood this when they wrote the Constitution. Let us not forget it.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the day before Christmas and all through the House my colleagues are handing out credit cards drawable upon and secured by the American taxpayer. This folly will bring us not one inch closer to peace on earth nor promote much good will among all men. As a member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, I protest against the United States underwriting its own loans to the Soviet Union and some 18 of its satellites.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the so-called "sale" of grain to Communist nations from its inception because I felt that it was ridiculous to be spending billions of dollars in foreign aid to contain communism and then turn around with the other hand and bail them out, nurture their suffering economy, with subsidized grain.

Furthermore, I felt it a great injustice to those American soldiers who were called upon to risk their lives to combat communism for this Government to enhance the Red economy by supplying it much-needed food products.

Mr. Speaker, there were many other reasons why I opposed this deal even under its original terms, but, Mr. Speaker, originally it was promised the American people that this deal would be for cash only and that it was a one-shot transaction that would be shipped in American vessels. Then, Americans were told only 50 percent of the shipments would be carried in American vessels; now, it is to be shipped American only if there are American ships available and instead of cash, it is to be for credit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, even those people who supported the idea originally did so only on the basis that the sale would be for cash.

Russia has paid cash for all the grain she has purchased from Canada.

This year alone, Russia has placed on the market some 325 tons of gold worth $365 million to raise cash to pay for wheat purchases. Yet, Russia wants to purchase American wheat on credit. Is it because she knows that ultimately she won't have to pay us?

According to the State Department, Russia owes the United States $10.8 billion, yet Russia has the largest gold reserve in the world except for the United States. Congress certainly is playing Santa Claus to Khrushchev by extending further credit to Russia.

Now, it is obvious that the sale will be made on credit; otherwise there is no reason for the fight against the restriction prohibiting the Export-Import Bank from extending credit to Russia.

The American taxpayer has again been bamboozled.

The action of Congress in refusing to restrict credit to Communist countries is tantamount to issuing a credit card for communism.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the views of so many expressed on the floor of the House during debate on this matter, I believe a great majority of the American people would join with me in disagreement to doing any business with the Communists. As I pointed out earlier, it seems the debate centers around whether or not credit will be extended through the Export-Import Bank. I want the RECORD to show that at least one Member, this Member, although certainly there must be many more who do not believe we should do any business with the Communists—not in food, not in any product. This resolution would permit the President to do business with Russians in any product.

There are several other matters that should be mentioned at this point.

First. This legislation or any legislation should not be considered on any basis but merit. As I see it, the majority leader was utterly wrong in saying that rejection of this resolution would be a "slap at the President." We must not, as the legislative branch, abdicate our responsibility. We represent the American people and I am convinced a majority of the American people are opposed to doing business with the Russians. However, whether I am right or wrong is not so important as the fact that each Member should vote his convictions in representing his district on the merits of the bill rather than whether this supports or rejects the President. President Johnson, himself, in his first address to Congress said that he did recognize and respect the "integrity and independence" of the legislative branch. Obviously his present conduct belies this statement. However, that was what he said.

Second. The best evidence that this administration may be soft on communism and, therefore, the House must reject this resolution can be found in Secretary of State Rusk's recent appeal to our friendly neighbors in the world that we must help Russia because Russia was having Communist ideological differences with China. Such a course, as I see it, for us would be suicidal since we will be aiding an enemy determined to enslave us by any means, fair or foul.

Third. We are by this resolution helping further to make Russia respectable in the world today. True, this conforms to the pattern we have followed since we recognized Russia in 1933 but is no less wrong. In fact, it is even more wrong today because Russia has shown us how dishonest and untrustworthy they are and is the Communist philosophy.

Fourth. There is no assurance of repayment as was pointed out in debate when the collateral was used. Of course, there will be no collateral except the Communist word and we know how little that means.

Fifth. Russia if needing financial help can arrange her own credit.

Sixth. We have no assurance that this legislation will be limited to food and will not be extended to any or all other products.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, before I move the previous question on the conference report, I want to mention to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] that the wheat amendment is not in the conference report. That will come subsequent to the passage of the conference report. Is that correct?

Mr. AVERY. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 11, line 14, insert:

"SEC. 118. None of the funds made available by this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used for the financing, in whole or in part, of any construction contract in any foreign country where persons other than nationals of such country or citizens of the United States will be employed to perform any work in connection with such contract, except when such nationals or citizens of the United States are not available and qualified to perform such work, or when the President finds that application of this provision would be contrary to the national interest."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"None of the funds made available by this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be obligated on or after April 30, 1964, for financing, in whole or in part, the direct costs of any contract for the construction of facilities and installations in any underdeveloped country, unless the President shall, on or before such date, have promulgated regulations designed to assure, to the maximum extent consistent with the national interest and the avoidance of excessive costs to the United States, that none of the funds made available by this Act and thereafter obligated shall be used to finance the direct costs under such contracts for construction work performed by persons other than qualified nationals of the recipient country or qualified citizens of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the President may waive the application of this amendment if it is important to the national interest."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 17, line 17, strike out: "None of the funds provided herein shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows:

"None of the funds made available because of the provisions of this title shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national, except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate within 30 days after such determination."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of the House know my record for trying to save money in the foreign aid bill. The record speaks for itself.

I believe there are certain facts about this so-called wheat amendment that should be explained. It is my understanding that when you do business nation to nation under Public Law 480, it is customary either to make a grant or a sale in local currency on a long-term basis.

It is my further understanding that we have in excess of $8.5 billion in surplus agricultural commodities. Those commodities are now being shipped into over 50 nations of the world either on a grant basis or for sale on a local currency basis. In some nations we are accumulating so much local currency that, in all probability, we will never be able to spend it. After checking into this matter I find that many other nations are doing business with the Soviet Union on the same basis as is proposed here. In October, West Germany shipped to the Soviet Union 450,000 tons of flour. It is also my understanding that when you do business on a government-to-government basis you may eventually negotiate or compromise and may not expect to get all your money, but the basis on which we are proposing here to do business with Russia is considered a cash basis; 25 percent cash, 25 percent in 6 months, 25 percent in 12 months, and 25 percent in 18 months. The only part that the Export-Import Bank plays is to guarantee the credit and for guaranteeing that credit the American taxpayer could receive a profit of over $10 million. The agreement that is proposed here prevails in the case of other nations who are also extending credits to the Soviet Union. It is also my understanding that in many instances where the American businessman is doing export business with Soviet Russia, such terms are also extended.

While our allies are waxing fat, shipping commodities to the Soviet Union, we are continuing to build up our agricultural surpluses here in America. There is not one dime of cash involved in this transaction. It is only a guarantee by the Export-Import Bank for a period of 6 to 18 months.

Mr. Speaker, it is most difficult to defend anything when you mention the Soviets. I am getting telegrams from my district, just as you are getting telegrams from your district. But, remember that the President must make a determination that it is in the interest of our country before he may permit the transaction to proceed. Under existing law, he does not have to make such a determination before proceeding. I am not afraid to say that in this one instance it is considered a cash deal. I am thoroughly convinced that we are going to get approximately $2 billion in gold if we go through with this proposal. On the other hand, if we do not go through with this proposal, in all probability we are going to give, not sell, the same wheat to 54 other nations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman refers only to wheat and other agricultural surpluses.

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. This amendment is not confined to wheat or to agricultural surpluses. It provides for the sale of any product to the Communists. It can be roller bearings, or anything.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is true. It could be used on such a basis, but the gentleman knows as well as I do——

Mr. GROSS. I do not know that.

Mr. PASSMAN. That the intent is to allow the sale of $2 billion of surplus wheat to the Soviet Union.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. I think it also ought to be clear that if the Soviet Union paid enough interest to secure credit from commercial firms in this country, they could secure the credit. But the United States is actually putting up their collateral to enable the Soviet Union to secure credit at a lower interest rate in order to make the loan. That is the important thing here.

Mr. PASSMAN. This is a standard proposal of the kind that is entered into by any nation shipping products to other nations.

If the gentleman would check on the contracts with West Germany and the other countries who are selling to the Soviet Union you will find out that this is considered a cash transaction. I do not like it any better than you do. However, I think we have played politics with this amendment long enough. I do know this: I know that we may get rid of $2 billion worth of surplus commodities and if we do, we will get in return $2 billion in gold, as well as the Export-Import Bank earning approximately $10 million in interest for its guarantee of the transaction.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Members of the House that as chairman of this subcommittee I have faced up to my responsibility. I do not like foreign aid. But as far as I am concerned this is a cash transaction. We may get rid of $2 billion of surplus commodities and, if we do, we will get in return $2 billion in gold. The Export-Import Bank, representing the United States, will make approximately $10 million as profit.

That is it, gentlemen. You can talk here until Santa comes at 12 o'clock tonight and you cannot change the facts.

We have brought this conference report back to you. All of the conferees agreed that this proposal was the very best thing that could be worked out.

I repeat that in my candid opinion you will get rid of $2 billion worth of commodity surpluses, the same as many other countries are doing. We may get up to $2 billion in gold and we will make $10 million for guaranteeing the transaction.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. As a matter of fact, was it not the gentleman from Iowa, my good friend [Mr. GROSS], who in the debate the other day, pointed out that under existing law, with or without this amendment, the President of the United States has the power and has had the power for many years to make a finding that the national interest requires a transaction under which roller bearings or any other strategic materials could be sold to the Soviet Union? As a matter of fact are we not by this amendment simply enabling the President to use the credit of the Export-Import Bank, and in the exercise of the same discretion under which he can today approve the sale of strategic materials behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; this is a normal procedure, the same procedure that all other nations use when they are doing business with other countries. Make no mistake about that. This is nothing new. You have had similar arrangements with Yugoslavia and Poland. You have given the President the same right as far as aid to Indonesia is concerned, and, as far as I am concerned, Indonesia is a Communist nation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we have carried this debate a little bit too far. I am willing to take a position and I know the Members of the House agree that I am against excessive foreign aid spending. I have worked untiringly to put some commonsense into this program. We have cut it to the extent of $8 billion in the past 9 years. But so far as I am concerned I am not going to play politics with this proposal any longer. I am going to face up to my responsibility. I want to see the $2 billion of gold coming into this country if it is possible and I want to see $35 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities go out of this country. Further, I want to see my Government make $10 million for guaranteeing the loan. This is a one-time proposition. It is considered a cash proposition. You will not get the cash except under these terms. Those are the terms for getting the cash. If you want to go home for Christmas let us approve this conference report and amendment No. 20.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Is not this a fact, that this is strictly a business loan?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, not only that but they pay an insurance premium, the exporters do?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; that is right, and we make a $10 million profit.

Mr. PATMAN. In order to guarantee these loans they pay an insurance premium and the loans will not be made unless the security is adequate?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, this is normal procedure used by this country and all other countries. We all know that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the 5 minutes. However, Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit at a loss to know exactly how to talk about this deal because I do not know what the deal is. I have heard a lot of things said about it but I do not understand the explanation.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will yield, that is why I tried to explain the deal for the benefit of the entire House. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not think the gentleman from Louisiana knows anything more about it than I do. All we know about it is what we read in the papers. I do know this: I have heard it rumored that this is to be 25 percent down. I do not know in what it is down, whether it is rubles down or dollars down, or peanuts down.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is dollars.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. But I do know this, that the rest of it is supposed to be on some sort of credit terms and is supposed to be guaranteed. I do not think this is the usual deal. I do not think every time grain is sold to France or Western Germany or any of the other nations of the West the Export-Import Bank is called on for a guarantee. The reason they are called on for a guarantee is because the sale is to be made to a nation which does not have credit. We are going to make that respectable. Why are we going to make that respectable? Are we going to make it respectable because their Premier says they would bury us? Is this why we should make them respectable? I do not think the people of the United States want to do anything like that.

What are the terms? People on this side of the aisle have said there is to be collateral, there is to be security. What security? What collateral? There is no such thing as this in dealings between nations.

The facts are these. We own some wheat. We were told that that wheat would be sold for gold. It is not going to be sold for gold. It is going to be sold for credit. We do not know what. The credit is so bad that the American taxpayer not only has to buy the wheat and sell it for less than he pays for it, but now he has to guarantee a loan for it. I ask you if this is any kind of deal that anybody should enter into. The answer is "No."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman from Louisiana is making quite a point that we stand to make a considerable gain on our gold problem by providing this authority to the President. I would like to point out that to the extent that we lend credit to the Communist countries, to that very same extent we fail to make any gain on our balance-of-payments problem or our gold outflow problem. The best way to make sure we are going to have a gain on our gold problem is to insist on cash on the barrelhead.

I call the attention of the gentleman to an article which appeared in the Evening Star last month quoting diplomatic sources as follows:

> Senate defeat earlier this week of a bill by Senator MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, to prohibit the Export-Import Bank finance the wheat deal left the Soviets unimpressed, diplomatic informants declared. They said Moscow was prepared to pay for the wheat in gold or hard currency anyway.

They were unconcerned about the Export-Import Bank issue.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I think it also ought to be pointed out for the information of the gentleman from Louisiana that this could not be $2 billion for wheat. This is talked of as being only $300 million. That is the most anybody suggested. There will not be any wheat going into Soviet Russia in that amount. When Germany buys wheat from us it is because she has sufficient credit. If the Soviet Union had sufficient credit, she would be able to buy from commercial firms, but she does not. So we are asked for the United States to put up a guarantee for them, and it will not help our balance-of-payments stand until they pay for it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Oklahoma spoke of the statement I made in debate on this bill a few days ago. It is true that unconscionable authority has been delegated to the President. That is what I am protesting here today and protested then. I protested when the Agency for International Development was created. This is another demonstration on the part of the House of Representatives in giving to the President unwarranted and unholy delegated power. I refuse today to compound that felony.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. This is no attempt to belittle anybody, certainly not the President of the United States. This is an honest disagreement. I would remind you that the President of the United States has spent most of his life on Capitol Hill. He knows what this sort of disagreement is. He knows nobody who opposes him on this is opposing him or the administration.

Mr. Speaker, may I thank the Members of the House, particularly my good colleague from Louisiana, for the type of cooperation, the type of good fellowship, really, which we have had through a very trying period, and to give to the Members of the House and particularly the Speaker my very best wishes for a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, my votes on this piece of legislation over the past few days does not reflect my confirmed feeling that it is bad for the United States to continue to try to support 100 of the 110 duly recognized nations of the world. As I have previously stated in the debate on the authorization bill and during the debate on this appropriation bill—the U.S. Treasury and the American taxpayers cannot solve all of the economic problems of the world. Our gold supply has diminished to the point where we now have an insufficient amount to back the American dollar. As I have stated before—I hereby repeat—our Nation owes over $300 billion in debts not including all those public debts that we as a nation have guaranteed.

The reason that I voted against recommital of this bill, and for the rule, is due to the fact that I wanted to help uphold the hand of our great new President. Knowing something of the thinking of the European mind—I know that had President Johnson lost this fight on this bill it would have created in the minds of our oversea friends the idea that the Congress had repudiated our new President. They would have interpreted it as "a no confidence vote." Therefore, while basically I am opposed to this appropriation bill, I felt it my duty to my President, my country, and my party, to support them, especially since President Johnson has only been in office as our President for just about 30 days.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I wish all Members a very Merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table showing a breakdown of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, on this day before Christmas we come face to face with the issue of an amendment that would permit the extension of some short-term credit to the Export-Import Bank to Russia for purchase of wheat. The issue has been fully debated, but now that the conference report provides that the final determination is left to the President as to whether the extension of credit is in the national interest, the real nub of the issue is whether or not the Congress has trust and confidence in the President. Under the Constitution, the Congress must trust the Chief Executive as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. He has the decision as to whether or not the terrible power of the mightiest military machine on earth shall be unleashed. This has been reposed in the Chief Executive by the Constitution. Surely, no one can say he should not be trusted with a matter of a few months credit for the sale of wheat. No money is involved, no cash is involved, only credit and even with this extension of credit some $5 million will accrue to the United States from exporter premiums.

Aside from all emotional, economic and political implications the other free world nations will go on trading with the Communists. If the United States forgoes such benefits it will do so without any appreciable injury to the Communist system. There is precious little the United States can do to prevent trade with Russia by the rest of the world.

On last Monday, December 16, an amendment to the foreign aid appropriations bill, worded in rather legalistic and somewhat misleading language caught some of our Members by surprise. Although it is now clear that it was aimed at prohibiting the sale of wheat upon which we are now paying annual storage costs, the amendment did not even mention the word "wheat." There was and is the attempt to claim that it was a blow at communism. A look at the facts shows it may be just the opposite. Any gold they use to pay for wheat to eat cannot be used to pay for guns or war materials. Money we receive from the wheat can be used to help support our bases overseas and reduce our balance-of-payments deficit.

During the debate the gentleman from Iowa, Neal Smith, was one Member of the House of Representatives who immediately recognized the implications and spoke against the restrictive amendment. Since that time, President Johnson has vigorously opposed the amendment and it has been the subject of several skirmishes in both the Senate and the House.

The amendment would limit our sales of wheat on the world market, will give assurance to Canada and West Germany that they can go ahead to continue to make sales that we could have made, and provide the further assurance that our wheat will instead be left in storage at Government expense. In the month of October alone, West Germany sold 450,000 tons of flour to Russia. We have unemployed people who would like to have milled, packaged and transported that flour. If the restrictive amendment stands, everyone in the United States loses except perhaps the storage people who cannot be blamed if they prefer the Government to continue to pay them millions of dollars indefinitely to store the wheat and corn that we could have sold.

The gentleman from Iowa has called my attention to an editorial in the Des Moines Register of December 18 which in my opinion is very informative and enlightening on the issues underlying the amendment. I want to commend our colleague, Neal Smith, for his alertness and to commend him for calling our attention to the editorial from the Des Moines Register, as follows:

Wheat for Russia

Strong opposition to the proposed sale of wheat to the Soviet Union continues in Congress. The House of Representatives voted 218 to 169 against permitting the U.S. Export-Import Bank to underwrite insurance on the deal, although the Senate had approved it by 57 to 35.

All Iowa Republicans in both House and Senate voted to stop the wheat sale. Only Representative Neal Smith, Democrat, voted for it and spoke in its support.

Most opponents of sale of wheat to Russia recognize that the sale would benefit U.S. agriculture. It would reduce the wheat surplus and make the choices in wheat policy much simpler next year. The American Farm Bureau Federation approved the sale as a good business proposition. The sale would reduce the cost of Government wheat support programs. Also, it would help the U.S. balance of payments.

The opponents declare that they are willing to permit private traders to sell wheat to Russia for cash. What they object to, they say, is (1) Government guarantee of the transaction, (2) special concessions or "subsidies" to the Russians, (3) changed terms for the bargain from those laid down by President Kennedy.

The conditions made by Mr. Kennedy are not sacrosanct just because of his tragic death. But the fact is that no violation of those conditions is involved. Mr. Kennedy said that private dealers could go ahead with negotiations on a sale for cash, gold or normal commercial credit.

The Russians accepted the same terms from the American export firms as they did from Canada—25 percent cash, the remainder to be paid in 18 months. The Russians actually paid 80 percent cash down to Canada, apparently because they didn't want to pay so much interest to the capitalists. Whether they would pay more than 25 percent in cash on a U.S. sale cannot be told in advance, but the face-saving-conscious Russians insisted on the same credit terms as they got from Canada.

Mr. Kennedy also said the wheat should be shipped in U.S. vessels as much as possible. This leaves room for negotiation and adjustment, which is necessary because U.S. ship rates are far above world levels. Whether an agreement can be reached on this is still uncertain. But the Russians appeared to be willing to pay a moderate differential on the U.S. ships used, which does not sound as though they were driving a cruel bargain and upping the terms.

The U.S. Government pays the U.S. exporters a subsidy to make it possible for them to buy wheat at the support level in this country and export it at the world price. The Soviet bargainers, of course, insisted on paying the going world price.

The proposed Export-Import Bank insurance of the wheat sale to Russia is not Government credit. It is coverage of political risk on the private bank loans, and is considered to be part of normal commercial financing of such large sales in foreign trade. At least 19 countries, including such big trading nations as Japan and Britain, have such insurance programs.

It was brought out in the Senate hearings that the record of the Communist bloc countries on payment of commercial debts is very good, and the Export-Import Bank considers the proposed Soviet deal a very safe risk. Similar insurance is extended on more liberal terms to many countries—for example, on a sale of cotton to Japan last summer.

Objections to the terms of the Russian sale obviously are window dressing for opposition to the whole idea of selling wheat to Communists. Those who believe wheat should not be sold logically should oppose trade in any commodity with Russia. They also should oppose the trade of U.S. allies with Russia and the Communist bloc—including the large volume of trade between West Germany and Communist East Germany.

This would be futile, because the United States cannot dictate the policies of other free world countries. It would only tend to isolate America as an implacable foe of any attempt to establish normal relations with the Russians. It would deny American farmers a nice piece of export business and would earn this country ridicule for allowing hate of Communist ideology to overrule sound business judgment.

Worst of all, such an Iron Curtain policy would be missing the chance to dramatize America's superiority in farming in a way no propaganda by words can ever do. And all because of an irrational fear that we might be helping communism.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, this issue is a disturbing one for all of us and in the heat of debate the issue is distorted and as a result we see some fancy footwork on the part of the members of the Republican Party. Within the past few years we have seen the Republican leadership agree to give to the President of the United States the authority to determine whether it is in the national interest to sell guns, and planes, and other strategic materials to certain Communist countries. Now we see them resisting the proposal that the President have the authority to authorize the extension of credit for the sale of—not arms—but food to Communist countries. The amendment prohibits the Export-Import Bank to guarantee credit to Communist countries wanting to buy wheat from us. But if the President believes it in the best interest of the United States to extend such credit he may authorize it.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote "aye." I have always contended that we do nothing to further the cause of communism. If Russia is to use our wheat to further its political cause then we should not sell it to them. If by its sale we further our own cause by feeding the hungry people of the world then we should sell it. I have confidence in my President and am sure that he will serve the best interests of the United States.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said concerning the controversial Mundt-Findley amendment to the foreign aid appropriation bill that I feel clarification is in order. I realize full well that all sorts of clarifying statements have been made, but frankly, they missed the point.

By selling wheat and other commodities at subsidized prices to the Soviet Union and other Communist countries under conditions dictated by the Soviet Union and its puppet states, we are engaging in a tragic, self-defeating operation.

What the administration is demanding the Congress to do is to place the stamp of approval on direct support of an international bandit, the Soviet Union. We are directly aiding "Mother Russia," a totalitarian nation under czars with its vision of world domination extended and refined by Communist dictators.

At a time when the Soviet farm economy is completely collapsing, our subsidy and aid have the effect of saving them from self-destruction. Arms are being twisted, pressure of all sorts is brought to bear, the leadership on the Republican side is outmaneuvered by false promises and final approval of a completely watered-down, meaningless amendment is a victory for communism.

Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration has now completely clothed itself in the mantle of foreign policy of the last 3 years, which basically is coexistence with communism and a slow surrender to Red pressure in all parts of the world.

It is especially shocking that on the eve of Christmas the key issue before the Congress is a demand by President Johnson and his leaders in the House and Senate that the tax dollars of American citizens be used to subsidize communism. What more disgraceful performance could be displayed before the public at a time of the birth of the Savior when we, as a Christian nation, rededicate ourselves to the virtues of Christianity, while the administration rededicates itself to the subsidy of the forces which aim at world domination.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the issues herein are so obviously apparent that it is amazing that the Democratic leadership and President Johnson would choose to make a fight for a position that is not supported by the American people, let alone commonsense.

The providing of credit guarantees through the Export-Import Bank to Russia, and some 19 other Communist nations, not only for wheat but for any other product, makes no sense and is against our best interests for the following reasons:

First. To provide credit guarantees for products sold to the Communist nations is to help the enemy.

Second. To provide such taxpayer supported guarantees in a $3 billion foreign aid appropriation bill designed to strengthen our hand against the Communists in the cold war is to repudiate one laudable purpose with a directly opposed purpose—and all in the same bill.

Third. Russia should be the last country to whom we should extend taxpayer guaranteed credit, not only because Khrushchev has announced the intentions of the international Communist conspiracy, to bury us, but also because Russia has already defaulted on $11.8 billion of credit through lend-lease heretofore issued by Uncle Sam at the expense of the taxpayers.

Fourth. Russia is in trouble in its agriculture program, clear proof that Communist subjugation of the farmer—and the people—will not work and this wheat deal will bail that Communist government out of one of its major weaknesses and failures.

Fifth. By extending guaranteed credit, the United States is aggravating, not improving the flow of gold problem, and is undercutting the chief argument used by the proponents of the wheat deal to Russia.

Sixth. The amendment as amended by the conferees gives the President discretion to extend such credit if he determines it is in the national interests and he has already made such a determination, so to vote such discretion is to vote for the extension of such credit.

Seventh. Congress is not tying the hands of the President but is stating policy of no credit to Russia consistent with the American people's beliefs and is following precedents established previously by Congress such as on the Latta amendment restricting Public Law 480 wheat surpluses from going to Communist countries.

Eighth. To argue that the Findley amendment would affect the image of President Johnson before the world is to argue that Congress must rubberstamp all presidential proposals, especially in the field of foreign affairs, even though Congress disagrees with them and thus to abdicate the constitutional duty of Congress.

Ninth. To issue credit guarantee authority to Communist countries for trade of products is to make a sham and a farce of our announced trade ban on Cuba, threatening withdrawal of foreign aid to countries trading with Cuba and closing of U.S. ports to shipping companies trading with Cuba.

Tenth. To placate Russia and the Communist countries to this extent, realizing that some of this wheat and other products will undoubtedly end up even in Cuba, is to make a mockery of our entire anti-Communist position in the Western Hemisphere and makes such a policy the laughing stock of the Latin Nations.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, as one of five Members of the House who conferred with the Senate for many hours in search of a compromise on this appropriations bill, I urge the adoption of the conference report as the best agreement possible under the legislative circumstances that exist today. In my judgment your House conferees drove as hard a bargain as could be driven, and I feel our efforts deserve the support of this body.

We conferred over a period of 12 hours last Friday, beginning at 11 a.m. and ending in the vicinity of 11 p.m. At one point we walked out of the conference because of the adamant position of the Senate conferees. Finally, thanks in large part to a giving of ground on the part of the Senate, we were able to reach an agreement that has been a subject of controversy in this House since. As one who helped work out that agreement, I intend to support it.

Let me make myself clear. I have always maintained that any sale of wheat to Communist countries should be a cash-on-the-line transaction. We have a surplus of wheat that is costing us millions of dollars just to handle and we need gold. I therefore have considered a cash deal to be in our best interest.

I question the advisability of extending credit, however, and I voted last week against the guarantee of such credit by the Export-Import Bank when the question was before the House in connection with this bill. And I felt the position of the House in opposing the guarantee of such credit was sound.

It was my responsibility, on the other hand, to represent the House in conference with the Senate, which has voted twice against placing any restrictions whatsoever on the Export-Import Bank in the event that agency is called on to guarantee credit in a transaction with the Soviet Union.

It became the job of the House conferees, therefore, to work out with the Senate conferees an agreement acceptable to both Houses. And I must confess that I do not think the debate we have engaged in since does justice to the job we were able to do in conference under the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The House had approved a $2.8 billion foreign aid appropriation. The Senate increased this to $3.3 billion but we got it back to an even $3 billion in conference—a reduction of $1½ billion in the budget request and $600 million in the amount previously authorized by the Congress.

What is more, we were able to get into the bill a statement of congressional policy on the guarantee of credit in trade with Communist countries where no policy now exists. We were successful in retaining the prohibition against guaranteeing credit with an exception—to satisfy the Senate—where the President certifies to the Congress that the transaction is in the national interest. Such certification by the President to the appropriate committees will give the Congress an opportunity to take action on the question of credit in each instance if it is so inclined.

This was not exactly what I wanted—but what agreement in the Congress satisfies everyone to every degree? It was, I feel, the best agreement the Senate would accept and I do not think the compromise was unreasonable.

We are achieving a $900 million reduction in the foreign aid program and we are getting a prohibition against the guarantee of credit to Communist countries where no prohibition now exists.

I do not believe we will strengthen the House position by refusing to accept the conference report. Therefore, I urge its adoption.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the wheat sale amendment is a much misunderstood and highly controversial item which will demand explanation for months to come. It is at this time unpopular with the people and a vote against it would be far the simplest way to meet the issue.

Unfortunately for me the problem cannot be resolved that simply. Many factors are to be weighed. This is foreign policy. Foreign policy is by law the responsibility of the President. Congress can set guidelines but in this first major issue affecting the new administration, Congress could endanger foreign policy by tying the President's hands; by saying we do not trust him.

Few people will realize the real issue before the House is not a prohibition against credit on sales of wheat to Communist nations. The House voted such a prohibition—and my vote was cast for it. However, that amendment was dropped in conference. What is before us now is a restriction on the way credit is used. If the wheat amendment is voted down, the President can, under existing law, extend loans and credit. The amendment before us would require a certification that credit is in the national interest and require that Congress be notified of each transaction. It tightens existing law.

This is only a beginning in the tangled skein of the wheat amendment. We are talking about short-term credit in which the Export-Import Bank would endorse the Russian's promise to pay in gold. Actual terms would be 25 percent cash, 25 percent in 6 months, 25 percent in 12 months, and 25 percent in 18 months. A similar system is followed by other Western nations when sales are made to the Russians.

Significantly we have for years been making loans and grants to Communist nations without the furore which accompanies today's action. Billions have gone—my vote to the contrary—notably to Poland and Yugoslavia. There is no assurance any of it will come back.

By contrast, in the present deal, the United States proposes to cut down on the $8½ billion tied up in agricultural surplus, to cut down on the million-dollar-a-day storage costs, to move more U.S. products onto the world market, to move them at world prices instead of cut rate, and to realize money instead of promises from the transaction. This is not a giveaway.

Other Western Nations trade with the Communists. They are using our money, our methods, even our machinery to get business we admittedly can use. There is nothing in this which smacks of appeasement or soft dealing. It is a business transaction with reasonable safeguards.

We still are committed to the winning of the cold war; to the defeat of communism. We are not financing communism through this transaction. We tried building a wall around the free world but the free world would not be so contained. Now we seek areas where a thaw can be achieved with benefit to us. Turning surplus wheat into gold is to me a transaction more advantageous to the United States than to Russia.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, in listening to debate on the amendment made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] it appears to me that a significant matter should be added to this record. This is testimony of Hon. Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, made before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on February 25, 1963. I call the attention of the House to a record of these hearings on the matter of the Export-Import Bank Act extension.

The testimony is significant to this debate because Mr. Linder cites the fact that three entities in Cuba, after that country was overrun by Castro, have failed to make payment to American exporters. These defaults exceed $36 million and have been guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank.

I call attention of the House to page 14 of the hearings, wherein Mr. Linder states the following:

> In addition to this $3.7 million [in losses] we have loans in default which have not been written off because we are still hopeful of ultimate collection or at least some settlement thereon. These comprise three loans to entities in Cuba aggregating $36.3 million.

I further call attention of the House to page 28 of the hearings, and the following question and answer:

> Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Linder, in the three loans to entities in Cuba aggregating $36.3 million, do you really have some reasonable expectation of salvaging something from those loans?
>
> Mr. LINDER. Well, we have the same reasonable expectation I would think, Mr. MOORHEAD, that the United States in general has of not expecting the Castro regime to last forever. Except in the case of a Communist takeover, successor governments have invariably honored the obligations of their predecessors and to that extent we have some reason to hope. I will leave it to you.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has reported to this House that the intended Russian payment for wheat purchased from this country would be 25 percent in cash, 25 percent in 6 months, 25 percent in 12 months, and 25 percent in 18 months.

If defaults were made in the case of Cuba due to Communist takeover, it seems perfectly clear that in the event we should have an increasingly hostile relation with Russia, the Communists would default as they have done in Cuba, in which case the money of American taxpayers through the Export-Import Bank would be used to guarantee the Russian payment, and we would thus be in the position of paying Russia to use our wheat.

It is inconceivable to me, Mr. Speaker, that we should support this kind of financing. On the basis of the proven record in Cuba alone, I urge that we continue our refusal to concur with Senate amendment No. 20.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 189, nays 158, answered "present" 6, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

YEAS—189

Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Barrett
Bass
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burke
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Carey
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Fraser
Friedel
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Holland
Ichord
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper

Perkins
Pike
Pilcher
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Pickle
Rains
Randall
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Trimble
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Watts
Weltner
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—158

Abele
Alger
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bates
Battin
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burleson
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Dwyer
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Gibbons
Goodling
Grant
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
May
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Mosher
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Konski
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Skubitz
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6

Downing
Frelinghuysen
Mathias
Matthews
Morse
Rivers, S.C.

NOT VOTING—80

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Aspinall
Becker
Belcher
Bolling
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Burkhalter
Cahill
Cannon
Celler
Clawson, Del
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Derounian
Diggs
Ellsworth
Evins
Finnegan
Fino
Forrester
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Glenn
Goodell
Gubser
Haley
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Hosmer
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kilburn
Kilgore
Knox
Kunkel
Lennon
McCulloch
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Milliken
Montoya
Moore
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Ostertag
Philbin
Powell
Reuss
Riehlman
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, Pa.
Scott
Shipley
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Stephens
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Tollefson
Tupper
Waggonner
Wharton
Williams
Younger

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Karth for, with Mr. Downing against.

Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.

Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Haley against.

Mr. Mathias for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Knox against.

Mr. Morse for, with Mr. Derounian against.

Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Burkhalter for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Finnegan for, with Mr. Lennon against.

Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Tupper for, with Mr. Waggonner against.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. Abbitt against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Montoya for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Reuss for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado for, with Mr. Cahill against.

Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Gubser against.

Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Harrison against.

Mr.Taylor for, with Mr. Becker against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Hosmer against.

Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Belcher against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Kilgore with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Murray with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Forrester with Mr. Moore.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Karth]. Due to transportation difficulties he could not be here. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Philbin]. Because of the very, very heavy snow it was physically impossible for him to be here today. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Haley], who is ill and could not be here today. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] who finds it impossible to be here today. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Knox]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Derounian]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 18, line 22, insert:

"For payment to Nancy P. Kefauver, widow of Estes Kefauver, late a Senator from the State of Tennessee, $22,500."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Passman moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 18, line 10, insert the following:

"MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

"For an additional amount for 'Miscellaneous items', $215,000: *Provided*, That effective January 1, 1964, the paragraph relating to official long-distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, under the heading 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' in Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress (2 U.S.C. 46c), as amended, is amended by striking out the words 'one hundred and twenty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'one hundred and sixty' and by striking out the words 'six hundred' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eight hundred'."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Passman moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 18, line 21, insert the following:

"STATIONERY (REVOLVING FUND)

"For an additional amount for stationery, $60,600: *Provided*, That commencing with the fiscal year 1964 and thereafter the allowance for stationery for each Senator and the

President of the Senate shall be at the rate of $2,400 per annum."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Passman moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 601) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck] to wait on the President.

STATEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to express his thanks to all Members of the House, all of my colleagues, for the many courtesies and kindnesses you have extended to me during the past year.

I realize the sacrifices that each and everyone of you has made and I know that a grateful constituency and the country as a whole will appreciate it.

I extend to each and every one of you and your loved ones the greetings of the holy season and my very best wishes for happiness and joy for you and your loved ones at Christmas and during the coming new year and that God will bestow on each and every one of you and your loved ones an abundance of His choicest blessings.

SUPPORT FOR THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, since the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation recommended that each State consider reducing the voting age to 18, there have been a great many expressions of support for this proposal.

At Huntington East High School, Huntington, W. Va., and at Marshall University in Huntington, the West Virginia Youth Suffrage Committee has been organized. Among the leaders in the movement at Huntington East High School are Ann Cyrus, June Hunt, David Webb, and Richard Jackson. All of these high school seniors are extremely busy with responsible extracurricular activities—for example, Jackson, first-string halfback on the football team is also vice president of the student body at Huntington East—yet they regard it an obligation and a responsibility to devote a vast amount of time to this civic activity. At Marshall University, among those who have played a leading role in this drive are Kenneth Gainer, president of the student body; Francis Fabi, Michael Carroll, Dean Thompson, and John L. Jones.

In the current December 1963 issue of the Huntington East High School newspaper the Babpipes, Miss June Hunt, Huntington East senior, has penned a cogent editorial entitled "Time To Move" which, under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks:

TIME TO MOVE

This, the 100th anniversary of the founding of our State, is the year in which to move forward.

Since the beginning of 1963, certain young citizens, including five seniors at Huntington East, interested in the progress of the State of West Virginia, have become aware of the need for exercising their opinions in government both on a local and State level. These opinions can best be expressed by giving young people the right to vote at the age of 18.

During the past summer, I had the opportunity to work in Congressman Ken Hechler's office for a week. This experience—the excitement of seeing our Government in action and getting to meet governmental leaders—greatly increased my awareness and interest in governmental and civic affairs. By the time students reach 18, many are very much interested in current affairs; if denied the right to vote, they frequently lose interest by the time they are 21 and are allowed to vote.

The minimum age for employment under Federal civil service laws is 18. The minimum draft age is 18. Federal relief for dependent children is suspended upon reaching the age of 18. Under the penal code, an 18-year-old can be committed to the Federal prison at the discretion of the Attorney General.

In four States this lowered voting age has been successfully tried—Georgia (18), Kentucky (18), Alaska (19), and Hawaii (20). According to John A. Burns, Governor of Hawaii, "It is difficult to give reasons why the voting age should be 20 or any other specific age, older or younger, for as you know, the necessary maturity can come to exist in some people while still very young and perhaps never develop in others. I cannot believe, however, that 18 would be too young, as young people today are becoming more politically conscious at an earlier age."

In 1961, U.S. Senator Jennings Randolph proposed an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to set the voting age in all 50 States at 18. At the same time Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia introduced a companion bill. Many State officials, including Governor Barron, Representative Ken Hechler, Senators Jennings Randolph and Robert Byrd, Lyle Smith and C. H. "Jackie" McKown, State Auditor Denzil Gainer, State Fire Commissioner Dick Kyle and others, are personally in favor of this move.

Many young West Virginians are leaving the State. But the right to vote will give 18-year-olds a voice in the kind of future they would like for West Virginia and give them a stake in building the State.

I, personally, am proud to be associated with such a movement. I'm happy that this campaign began at Huntington East, and is spreading throughout the State from here. This can really raise our school's prestige in the eyes of both the student and adult world. I feel that we, as students, should back this campaign and continue spurring it on to the hilt.

June Hunt.

Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the rising tide of support for the 18-year-old vote, I also ask to be printed an editorial in the December 23, 1963, issue of the Huntington, W. Va., Herald-Dispatch:

IF THEY'RE OLD ENOUGH TO FIGHT, THEY'RE OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE

With the recommendation of a Presidential Commission that 18-year-olds should be allowed to vote in all States, we are heartily in accord and have previously said so on several occasions.

There are no really valid arguments against this needed reform in State and National election laws. Such arguments as there are do not amount to much alongside the blunt fact that an 18-year-old can be inducted into the armed services and required to fight for his country.

A nation which—in 48 of the 50 States—disfranchises its uniformed fighting men until they attain the age of 21 is following a policy that is both illogical and embittering. Young people cannot understand why such a paradoxical system exists. It is indefensible.

The Commission did not, however, base its recommendation for voting age on military service age. The members expressed the belief that the lower voting age would stimulate the interest of young people in politics and government and raise voter participation in the age group from 21 to 30.

By the time these young people reach 21, the Commission said, they are "so far removed from the stimulation of the education process that their interest in public affairs has waned."

Only two States—Kentucky and Georgia—currently extend the vote to 18-year-olds. Pending a more extensive study of voting trends in the last Kentucky statewide election, State officials are reasonably certain that young voters went to the polls in encouragingly large numbers.

As we pointed out here recently in urging West Virginia's Legislature to submit the question of a lower voting age to the people, our Constitution does not specify 21 as the legal voting age. It simply says that "no person who is a minor" shall vote—and by common law that term is used to describe a person who is not yet 21.

The Presidential Commission made several other recommendations, including abolition of the poll tax and abolition of all literacy tests—but not on the grounds that they are being abused. The Commission conceded the abuses, but said that "no American should be denied the right to vote because his formal education is limited."

This would imply that literacy tests—in those States which have them and enforce them—are being used to deny the vote to people who can at least read and write.

The dictionary definition of illiteracy is the inability to read and write, and if this is the only test being used to establish literacy, there are excellent reasons why it is justifiable. It seems doubtful that a voter in this day and age can inform himself intelligently on the qualifications of candidates—or even on their availability—if he cannot read.

Again, West Virginia's constitution is silent on this matter of literacy. It does deny the vote to paupers, but the stricture is seldom invoked.

In several other recommendations the Commission seeks to "make voting easier" by simplifying registration practices and residential requirements. By and large, these proposals would be ineffective, even if there were any prospect that the States could agree on standards for registrations and residencies.

Making it easier to vote does not necessarily increase the desire to vote. It does not expand the citizen's sense of obligation to go to the polls and participate in the affairs of government.

Until we find the stimulants which will awaken voters to their responsibilities as well as their privileges, the American record of nonvoting will continue to be one of shameful indifference toward a heritage which was so dearly acquired and which was once so proudly preserved.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FIRST MONTH

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, as the flags of the Nation go up to the top of the mast, we pause on this eve of Christmas to express the firm confidence of the people of America in our President.

One of the crowning achievements of President Lyndon B. Johnson is that he has so keenly sensed the mood of the American people. Millions of Americans walked with him, stunned with grief, on that Sunday afternoon in late November when he strode up to place the wreath by the casket of our martyred President. We were proud of the warmth and dignity with which President and Mrs. Johnson greeted the great heads of state who had come from all corners of the earth to pay their last homage to our fallen leader.

President Johnson expressed the personal emptiness which each of us felt at the loss of President Kennedy, because he felt it so deeply himself. Yet he also sensed that out of this tragedy, tears had washed away some of the malice and hate and laid bare the Nation's conscience. Just as President Kennedy had articulated the burning desire of the people for a fresh idealism in programs like the Peace Corps, now President Johnson successfully lifted the Nation from its despair and gave voice to its determination to move forward toward higher goals.

In his first hundred days in 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt electrified the Nation with his program which rescued the ship of state from the slough of despond. Nothing comparable to that happened until the man who so much admires F.D.R. took the helm a month ago.

As the President and his gracious First Lady are winging their way homeward for Christmas, our hopes and our prayers go with them. They have forged a new unity and strength of spirit in the American people. In President Johnson's first month in office he has displayed that touch of greatness which gives new meaning to the American dream.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of December 22, 1963:

THE FIRST MONTH

This day, by the calendar, marks the first month of the Presidency of Lyndon B. Johnson; but the calendar is inadequate to measure days so packed with events. It must seem an epoch or an era to the man who assumed great office in the wake of great tragedy just 31 days ago.

Such was the dreadful impact of the events of November 22 that much that happened thereafter is seen as though dimly remembered from a distant dream. But what happened after November 22 also will have its place in history. These events are at once a tribute to the man who became President and to the country of which he became President.

President Johnson took up the burdens of great office with confidence and assurance and he has met the challenge of the crisis without false step or faltering. It has been a flawless performance. The Government plainly is in the hands of a professional politician whose virtuosity, if it continues, promises to make that sometime pejorative term more synonymous with statesman.

The great Federal Establishment has moved on with the business of state without a single disorder or convulsion, steadying, in the wake of calamity, to all the demands that crisis has made upon it. Those in the most sensitive governmental posts contributed to the uninterrupted and ongoing conduct of affairs by continuing in office at the invitation of a President who instantly sensed the especial contribution they could make to governmental stability.

The new President skillfully met the challenges of transition; and so did the Federal organization and the country governed by it. In these 4 eventful weeks surely the world has had a revealing glimpse of our institutions and of our people, operating in the midst of great emergency. If doubts there were, the glimpse must have been reassuring.

A people, shattered, stunned and dismayed by the assassination of a President who was greatly loved and admired, have a right to feel proud of themselves, of their governmental institutions and of the new President at their head, as they survey the eventful weeks through which they have just passed.

NEVER SHUN A CONTROVERSY, LET THE CHIPS FALL WHERE THEY MAY, LET'S BE FORTHRIGHT ON FEDERAL SPENDING, ETC.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in these last trying days we have been concerned in this body with one of the more controversial categories of Federal spending—the foreign aid program. In the course of this debate I have received many letters from my constituents asking, not only how I stand on foreign aid, which I support, but how I stand on public spending in general.

Mr. Speaker, this is always an exciting challenge, for like all Members I am anxious to make my views eminently clear on every question that comes up.

Now, in regard to Federal spending, I find in some parts of my State a clear consensus that we should have lower taxes but more defense, fewer Federal aid programs but more Federal money spent in Arizona, less bureaucracy but more jobs for deserving constituents. I am not at all sure that my State is unique in this respect.

In recent days I received a letter from one constituent asking my views on Federal spending, and I drafted a reply. I was about to mail it when I decided to give the matter just a little further thought. However, I put so much work into the letter that I thought it might be of some value to those of my colleagues who find themselves similarly hard pressed on the Federal spending issue.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, without objection I shall insert my unmailed constituent reply at this point in the RECORD:

DEAR FRIEND: You have expressed alarm at the rate of Federal spending, and asked me as your Congressman where I stand. I had not intended to discuss this controversial question at this particular time. However, I want you to know that I do not shun a controversy. On the contrary I will take a stand on any issue at any time no matter how fraught with controversy it may be. Here is exactly how I stand.

If, when you say "Federal spending" you mean the billions of dollars wasted on outmoded naval shipyards and surplus airbases in Georgia, Texas, and New York; if you mean the billions of dollars lavished at Cape Kennedy and Houston on a "moondoggle" our Nation cannot afford; if, sir, you mean the $2 billion wasted each year in wheat and corn price supports which rob midwestern farmers of their freedoms and saddle taxpayers with outrageous costs of storage in already bulging warehouses; if you mean the $4 billion spent every year to operate veterans hospitals in other States in order to provide 20 million able-bodied veterans with care for civilian illness; if you mean such socialistic and pork-barrel projects as urban renewal, public housing, and TVA which cynically seek votes while robbing our taxpayers and weakening the moral fiber of millions of citizens in our Eastern States; if you mean the bloated Federal aid to education schemes calculated to press Federal educational controls down upon every student in this Nation; if you mean the $2 billion misused annually by our Public Health Service and National Institutes of Health on activities designed to prostitute the medical profession and foist socialized medicine on every American; if, sir, you mean all these ill-advised, unnecessary Federal activities which have destroyed States rights, created a vast, ever-growing, empire-building bureaucracy regimenting a once-free people by the illusory bait of cradle-to-grave security, and which indeed have taken us so far down the road to socialism that it may be, even at this hour, too late to retreat—then I am unyielding, bitter, and four square in my opposition, regardless of the personal or political consequences.

But, on the other hand, if when you say "Federal spending" you mean those funds which maintain Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Fort Huachuca, and other Arizona defense installations so vital to our Nation's security, and which every year pour hundreds of millions of dollars into our State's economy; if you mean the Truman-Eisenhower-Kennedy-Johnson mutual security program which bolsters our allies along the periphery of the Iron Curtain enabling them to resist the diabolical onslaught of a godless communism and maintain their independence; if you mean those funds to send our brave astronauts voyaging, even as Columbus, into the unknown, in order to guarantee that no aggressor will ever threaten these great United States by nuclear blackmail from outer space; if you mean those sound farm programs which insure our hardy Arizona cotton farmers a fair price for their fiber, protect the sanctity of the family farm, insure reasonable prices for consumers, and put to work for all the people of the world the miracle of American agricultural abundance; if you mean those VA programs which pay pensions to our brave soldiers crippled in mortal combat and discharge our debt of honor to their widows and orphans and which provide employment for thousands of Arizonans in our fine VA hospitals in Tucson, Phoenix, and Prescott; if, sir, you refer to such Federal programs as the central Arizona reclamation project which will, while repaying 95 percent of its cost with interest, provide our resourceful people with water to insure the growth and prosperity of our State; if you mean the Federal educational funds which build desperately needed college classrooms and dormitories for our local universities, provide little children in our Arizona schools with hot lunches (often their only decent meal of the day), furnish vocational training for our high school youth, and pay $10 million in impact funds to relieve the hard-pressed Arizona school property taxpayers from the impossible demands created by the presence of large Federal installations; if you mean the Federal medical and health programs which have eradicated the curse of malaria, smallpox, scarlet fever, and polio from our country and which even now enable dedicated teams of scientists to close in mercilessly on man's age-old enemies of cancer, heart disease, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, and mental retardation that afflict our little children, senior citizens, and men and women in the prime years of life; if you mean all these Federal activities by which a free people in the spirit of Jefferson, Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, Wilson, and F.D.R., through a fair and progressive income tax, preserve domestic tranquillity and promote the general welfare while preserving all our cherished freedoms and our self-reliant national character, then I shall support them with all the vigor at my command.

This is my stand and I will not compromise.

Sincerely,

MORRIS K. UDALL,
Member of Congress.

OUR CONTRIBUTIONS FOR THE U.N. VOLUNTARY PROGRAMS

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in the history of the Foreign Assistance Act Congress has reduced the U.S. support for the U.N. voluntary programs. In an attempt to restore House cuts in the U.N. allocation I submitted an amendment restoring the full amount to these programs on Monday, December 16, the day the House passed the aid appropriations bill.

In the course of debate on the amendment, several points were raised criticizing our efforts under the U.N. Time did not allow extensive rebuttal, so I wish now to submit my replies to what I consider to be the 10 most salient arguments against our contributions for the U.N. voluntary programs.

I have listed the criticisms point by point and my reply follows each specific charge:

1. Increasing U.S. bilateral technical assistance aid doesn't warrant increasing the U.S. dollar contributions for U.N. technical assistance aid.

Comment: The needs of the less developed countries for assistance in improving their techniques of production, for building up their educational systems, for training of officials to provide essential governmental services, and for preparing sound and well-based plans for economic development far exceed the technical assistance now being provided by the United States on a bilateral basis, by the U.N. agencies, and by other bilateral programs.

The U.N. programs, with major support from the United States, complement the U.S. bilateral programs by tapping the substantial pool of technical and linguistic skills and familiarity with the less developed areas which are available in other developed countries such as those of Western Europe. The multilateral programs also permit the sharing of developmental experience of the underdeveloped countries with each other, through the exchange of experts and students.

The Clay Committee noted other advantages. "A multilateral organization, having no political or commercial interests of its own to serve, is able to concentrate on obtaining the greatest possible return, in terms of economic and social development, for each dollar of aid funds invested. It is also better able to limit its assistance to projects which are soundly conceived and executed and to condition the financing of such projects under appropriate economic performance by the recipient country. Moreover, conditions imposed by an international cooperative organizations are not so susceptible to the charge that they infringe on the sovereignty of the recipient country; even if they offend national sensitivities, they do less damage to the fragile fabric of comity among nations than when such resentment is directed against a single country."

Finally, it should be noted that the U.S. pledge to match contributions of other governments to the U.N. expanded program of technical assistance and Special Fund at a 40–60 ratio, has been an important factor in the steady increase of financial support by other countries.

2. The Clay Committee recommended 32 percent contributions instead of the present 40 percent for U.N. voluntary programs.

Comment: The executive branch keeps under continuing review the rate of U.S. voluntary contributions to international programs, with the objective of assuring that the programs are carried forward at the minimum level consistent with U.S. national interests and at the minimum cost to the United States.

Over the past several years the United States has urged, where appropriate, the incorporation of voluntary programs into the regular assessed budgets of international organizations, and have achieved this with respect to the NATO science program and the World Health Organization's program for malaria eradication. This incorporation has meant that the U.S. contribution to the former program, initially at 50 percent, was reduced to 25 percent and that the U.S. contribution to malaria eradication was reduced from virtually 100 percent to less than 32 percent.

In recent years the U.S. contributions to the U.N. expanded program of technical assistance, the U.N. Special Fund, and the world food program have been a level of 40 percent. Our contribution to the U.N. Children's Fund has been higher, but is proposed at 40 percent in 1964. This is, in the opinion of the executive branch, an appropriate level, as it is a fair proportion taking into consideration the relative per capita income of the contributing countries; it exerts pressures on other donor governments who we believe are able to contribute more; and it is considered an appropriate proportion for the United States to contribute as the leader of the development efforts of the free world.

There is another type of U.N. program, primarily of a peacekeeping nature, such as the U.N. military operation in the Congo and the U.N. Emergency Force in the Middle East, toward which the United States has in the past contributed up to 48 percent. Our national security interests were of course significantly involved. The United States recently undertook an initiative at the United Nations to develop a better system of financing these activities. The formula for 1964 worked out at the U.N. brings down the U.S. contribution to about 37 percent on the basis of combined assessed and voluntary contributions.

The UNRWA program on relief to Palestine refugees is one which again relates directly to U.S. security interests and it would be difficult to reduce our percentage share of support below our current 70 percent without affecting many of our vital interests in this sensitive area of the Middle East. We are, nevertheless, seeking to reduce the dollar outflow to this program through a number of devices, and we have achieved a remarkable degree of success in this direction through the use of Public Law 480 foodstuffs, U.S.-owned local currencies, etc.

3. State Department asked for reduced funds—from $136 million down to $127 million.

Comment: In late September, after the formal hearings on the foreign aid appropriation bill before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, consulted informally with the chairman of the subcommittee. At that time, the Secretary stated that the estimate made in the fall of 1962 of the U.S. contribution to the Indus Waters Development Fund during fiscal year 1964 appeared too high. Indications from the managers of the fund suggested that their call would be roughly $9 million less than the earlier estimate.

On the other hand, the Secretary indicated that negotiations at U.N. headquarters on the financing formula for U.N. peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and the Congo suggested a new requirement of approximately $3.8 million as a voluntary contribution for the latter half of 1963 and the first half of 1964. These changes taken together suggested a reduction to $127,090,000 of the amount required for contributions to international organizations in fiscal year 1964.

In November 1963, the annual pledging sessions for the U.N. Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and Special Fund for 1964 were held at U.N. headquarters. The pledges made by other governments were substantially higher than the U.S. estimate made a year ago. On the 40-percent matching formula, the U.S. contribution to the two U.N. programs would be higher than the $55 million contained in the original fiscal year 1964 estimate.

In his testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee, on December 12, the Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs formally stated that the estimate for voluntary contributions to international organizations had been reduced from $136,050,000 to $130,903,000. The original estimate as compared with the revision follows:

Voluntary contributions to international organizations

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year 1964 program	Presentation volume	Current request	Change
1. UNTA and Special Fund	55.000	59.000	+4.000
2. U.N. economic assistance to the Congo	5.000	5.000	
3. U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees	17.200	17.200	
4. U.N. Children's Fund	12.000	12.000	
5. U.N.-FAO world food program	2.000	2.000	
6. IAEA operational program	1.250	1.250	
7. WHO medical research	.500	.500	
8. Indus Waters	43.100	30.300	−12.800
9. U.N. peacekeeping		3.653	+3.653
UNOC		(2.473)	
UNEF		(1.180)	
	136.050	130.903	−5.147

4. The President may transfer money out of the contingency fund into other funds of the U.N.

5. The committee took out the provision limiting the transfer of funds by the President to $10 million. Therefore, the President can fund U.N. programs completely if he desires.

Comment: The applicable legislation (sec. 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended) provides that the contingency fund may be used in accordance with other provisions in the act governing economic assistance, when the President "determines such use to be important to the national interest."

The use of contingency funds to supplement the funds appropriated for voluntary contributions to international organizations and programs will therefore require a determination by the President.

6. There is "fat" in the U.N. appropriations that can be eliminated.

Comment: In order to seek congressional approval of the level of U.S. voluntary contributions to international organizations, the executive branch submits its proposals in advance of pledges to the organizations. As the U.S. pledges are normally made a percentage of total contributions, the executive branch must estimate the contributions which will be forthcoming at a future date.

In some years, the executive branch has underestimated the amount of funds required in a given fiscal year to meet proposed pledges. Such shortfalls have been met by transfers within the foreign assistance funds or by appropriation in a following year. In other years, the executive branch has overestimated the amounts which will be drawn down by other contributions. Only in this sense is there "fat" in the request for fiscal year 1964. If the funds requested prove to be in excess of the amount needed, they will not of course be obligated.

7. The World Health Organization sent two boatloads of jeeps to Cuba, and Cuba and other Communist countries are being assisted by U.S. contributions to the U.N.

Comment: The reference to 2 boatloads of jeeps may relate to the voluntary contribution by the U.S.S.R. of 19 jeeps and 16 trucks to the World Health Organization in 1961, which were shipped to Cuba for use in the malaria eradication campaign.

The campaign in Cuba is part of a worldwide effort, undertaken by both the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), and the World Health Organization (WHO), pursuant to resolutions of the governing bodies of both organizations in 1954 and 1955, respectfully, which complements U.S. extensive bilateral activities in this field.

The United States has strongly supported the campaign for the eradication of malaria and has been the chief contributor to the malaria eradiction special accounts of the WHO and PAHO since their establishment. The U.S. Congress, in making provision for such contributions has declared it to be our policy to assist other governments in eradicating the scourge of malaria in order to raise the economic and social conditions of the people of these countries.

All countries in the Americas having malaria have participated in and benefited from this program, including Cuba, which first requested assistance from PAHO in 1957. An agreement was signed between the Cuban Government and PAHO in 1959 and technical assistance has been rendered the Cuban Government since that date. This assistance has taken the form of assignment of malaria consultants, and supplies and equipment as in the case of other countries engaged in the campaign. For the current year, all such assistance to Cuba is financed by WHO from its regular budget. WHO is providing the salaries and allowance of one medical officer, one sanitary engineer, one entomologist, and two sanitarians, estimated to cost $83,375, and $10,000, is being expended for supplies and equipment, and $4,300 for fellowships. Estimates of the Cuban Government contribution for this activity in 1963 are approximately $1 million.

The malaria program in Cuba has now entered the major operational stage of DDT spraying of houses. Spraying was initiated in January 1962 and a first cycle was completed in one portion of the country in June. The program of spraying is planned for continuation throughout the current year. Nonetheless, the incidence of malaria in Cuba has been on the increase and has risen from 1,600 cases in 1960 to 3,000 plus in 1962.

There has been a heavy breakdown in both automotive and spraying equipment and the absence of spare parts for replacement has impeded the progress of the program. Since the importation of the 35 Russian vehicles donated to the WHO by the Soviet Union, no new vehicles have been made available to the Cuban Government by WHO.

It should be noted that as long as malaria is present in Cuba there is a risk of reinfestation of neighboring countries including the United States, from which malaria has been eradicated. Continuation of WHO assistance to Cuba under its regular program is therefore considered desirable.

With respect to the statement that Cuba and other Communist countries are being assisted by U.S. contributions to the U.N., it is pertinent to note that Communist countries contribute considerably more to the U.N. Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund than they receive from these programs in project assistance. In the years 1950–63, the Communist countries contributed $20.4 million to the expanded program and received $10.1 million in assistance. From the inauguration of the Special Fund in 1959 to June 1963, the Communist countries gave $8.2 million and received Special Fund projects totaling $5.6 million.

In other words, Communist contributions to the two programs, in addition to financing U.N. Technical Assistance projects in Communist countries, also contributes to the financing of $13.5 million worth of projects in non-Communist countries.

8. UNICEF is more than adequately supported. It recently had enough reserve funds to provide a $10 million loan to finance the operating expenses of the U.N.

Comment: Normally, payment of U.S. funds pursuant to voluntary pledges made to international organizations are made at periodic intervals after notification by the respective Secretariats that matching contributions have been received from other governments. This procedure has been adopted as a matter of administrative policy.

In the spring of 1961 the U.N. was facing a major deficit in the financing of the U.N. military operations in the Congo. While the operation was authorized in July 1960, first assessments were not actually voted until December 1960. Payments by governments in response to the peacekeeping assessment were not, of course, immediately forthcoming.

In May, the United States made a payment of $10 million as part of its contribution of $12 million appropriated by the Congress and pledged to UNICEF for the latter's 1961 program. While UNICEF had not received sufficient matching contributions in May to draw down the entire $10 million, it should be noted that contributors to UNICEF had in the past faithfully fulfilled their pledges to that program. As authorized by the U.N. financial regulations the Secretary-General then borrowed the $10 million to help pay urgent bills; the $10 million was repaid to UNICEF on December 27, 1961.

In 1961 and earlier years, UNICEF pursued a policy of setting aside sufficient funds to carry projects through to completion, even though they might be planned to run for several years. Therefore the temporary unavailability of the $10 million did not disrupt ongoing projects. And since UNICEF could plan on the basis of a later return of the $10 million, it continued during 1961 to develop new projects.

9. The U.N. TAP and Special Fund are funded for $55 million this year and they also receive aid from other accounts, some of which will go to Cuba.

Comment: As noted in the comment on point 7 above, the ratio of input into the U.N. Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund as compared with output is running substantially in favor of the free world and against the Communist bloc. Over 98 percent of U.N. projects go to countries on our side of the Iron Curtain.

This result has not been achieved by the introduction of political considerations into the distribution of U.N. funds, but on the basis of technical and economic criteria applied by the U.N. secretariats. This nonpolitical character of U.N. programs has made it possible to have projects approved for Nationalist China over the objections of the Soviet Union and of a project in Israel over the objections of an Arab country.

The United States has consistently advocated and supported the position that decisions on U.N. programs and projects for development of the less-developed countries be made objectively on economic and technical grounds. An about-face by the United States could encourage other countries to attach similar political strings to their contributions, thus transforming the U.N. assistance programs into a complicated set of bilateral aid channels designed to reap political advantage for one side or the other in the cold war. It should be noted that after a review of the U.N. technical cooperation programs, an advisory committee on eminent American citizens recently recommended "that the cold war can and should be kept out of the technical cooperation operations of the U.N."

10. It is impossible to audit the U.N. voluntary programs nor can there be any American control over use of these funds even though we pay the major share.

Comment: The accounts and other financial records of the United Nations are audited annually by a Board of Auditors, presently consisting of the Auditors General of Colombia, the Netherlands, and Pakistan. These professional auditors are assisted by a staff. Their reports are distributed to all member governments and are reviewed by a committee of the General Assembly.

Since the U.N. voluntary programs are carried out by international organizations, it is obvious that no one country can impose unilateral control over the use of funds contributed from many sources. However, the United States is a member of the governing board of each of these programs and, as a major contributor, can and does exert much influence over decisions on the use of program funds.

GOLD OUTFLOW AND FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago we debated the appropriation for foreign aid. The House had previously authorized a figure of approximately $3.6 billion after the adoption of the conference report. The Appropriations Committee, in making a case for a drastic reduction in the appropriation below the amount authorized, advanced as one of the key arguments the problem of gold flow to foreign aid recipients.

The committee presented the following table, showing sales of gold to 52 countries which were foreign aid recipients:

Net sales of U.S. gold to foreign aid program recipients

[In millions of dollars—Negative figures represent net sales by the United States; positive figures represent net purchases]

Country	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	Jan. 1-June 30, 1963	Total
Austria	−84.2	−82.7	−1.1		−142.5	−50.0	−360.5
Belgium	−329.4	−38.5	−140.9	−144.4	−63.0		−716.2
Burma			−3.8		−20.9		−24.7
Cambodia			−12.0	−3.1	−1.7	−2.3	−19.1
Cameroon Republic						−1.9	−1.9
Central African Republic						−.7	−.7
Ceylon		−7.5					−7.5
Chad						−.7	−.7
Chile	+3.0	−1.3	−2.0	−6.6			−6.9
Costa Rica				−2.3	−.5		−2.8
Cyprus				−2.0			−2.0
Dahomey						−.8	−.8
Denmark	−17.0	−15.0	−15.0	−35.0	+15.0		−67.0
Dominican Republic				−3.0			−3.0
Ecuador					−3.2	−2.3	−5.5
Egypt			−7.5	−7.8	−1.2	−.9	−17.4
Country A		−4.7	−3.0				−7.7
France		−265.7	−173.0		−459.1	−202.6	−1,100.4
Gabon						−.7	−.7
Germany (West)			−33.8	−22.5			−56.3
Ghana			−5.6				−5.6
Greece		−15.0	−47.0	−10.2	−19.1		−91.3
Honduras			−.8				−.8
Indonesia		−11.0	−24.9				−35.9
Iran	−2.3		−.4	−16.1		−5.9	−24.7
Iraq			−29.8				−29.8
Israel		−4.4			−10.0		−14.4
Italy	−348.8			+100.0			−248.8
Ivory Coast					−1.5		−1.5
Japan	−30.1	−157.4	−15.2				−202.7
Korea		−1.6					−1.6
Laos				−1.9			−1.9
Lebanon				−21.0	−32.1		−53.1
Mexico		−30.0	−20.0				−50.0
Morocco			−21.0				−21.0
Netherlands	−260.9	−29.9	−249.4	−24.9			−565.1
Niger						−.8	−.8
Nigeria				−20.0			−20.0
Pakistan			−12.5				−12.5
Peru			−15.0	−5.0	−.6		−20.6
Portugal	−20.0	−10.0					−30.0
Saudi Arabia			−11.3	−47.5	−12.6		−71.4
Senegal						−1.7	−1.7
Somalia					−1.9		−1.9
Spain	+31.7		−113.7	−156.2	−146.1	−130.0	−514.3
Surinam	−2.5		−2.5		+2.5		−2.5
Syria			−2.1		−1.3	−.2	−3.6
Tunisia			−.5		−.5	−.5	−1.5
Turkey			−6.1	−2.5	−1.1	+6.0	−3.7
United Kingdom	−900.0	−350.0	−550.0	−305.7	−387.0	+124.5	−2,368.2
Upper Volta						−.8	−.8
Yugoslavia		−1.5	−15.9		−1.5	−.8	−19.7
Net sales of gold	−1,960.5	−1,026.2	−1,535.8	−737.7	−1,289.9	−273.1	−6,823.2

Utilizing the table, the committee report went on to reach this conclusion:

> While there may be good and valid reasons why foreign nations have been able to purchase our gold, in the opinion of the committee one of the primary reasons is that the United States, through the foreign aid program for the same period of January 1, 1958, to June 30, 1963, extended $11,947,400,000 in economic and military assistance to these same 52 foreign nations. This financial assistance by the United States in turn released the revenues of these 52 nations to be used in any way they saw fit and obviously one of the ways was to buy $6.8 billion of gold from the U.S. Treasury.

It is regrettable that the decision of the House in reducing the appropriation reflected this conclusion because it is erroneous and misleading.

A closer examination of the figures will demonstrate that it is not true that the "financial assistance by the United States released the revenues of these 52 nations to buy $6.8 billion of gold from the U.S. Treasury."

Twelve of the countries, listed on the following charts, accounted for $6.3 billion of the total gold purchases.

The amount of military and economic assistance which these 12 countries received is shown on the chart. Note that the total economic assistance for the 12 countries aggregated only $253.8 million. The total military assistance, delivered very largely in the form of weapons and materials from this country's stock and not in cash, aggregated $3.09 billion.

The largest purchaser of gold, the United Kingdom, purchased $2.3 billion during this period, received no economic assistance and only a modest amount of military assistance. In the case of France, the second largest purchaser, which obtained $1.1 billion gold, the economic assistance amounted to $200,000 during the period, and the military assistance was modest. In the case of the third largest gold purchaser, Belgium, there was no economic assistance and a small amount of military assistance.

Gold outflow and foreign assistance to 12 major purchasers of U.S. gold, 1958–63

[In millions of dollars]

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	Jan. 1 to June 30, 1963	Total
Austria:							
Gold outflow	−84.2	−83.0	−1.0	--------	−142.0	−50.0	−360.0
Economic assistance	−.1	.1	0	0	0	0	.2
Military assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belgium:							
Gold outflow	−329.4	−38.5	−140.9	−144.4	−63.0	--------	−716.2
Economic assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military assistance	66.0	13.3	22.4	9.8	18.8	28.1	158.4
Denmark:							
Gold outflow	−17.0	−15.0	−15.0	−35.0	+15.0	−8.0	−67.0
Economic assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military assistance	23.6	27.2	36.5	33.4	15.0	24.0	159.7
France:							
Gold outflow	--------	−265.7	−173.0	--------	−459.1	−202.6	−1,100.4
Economic assistance	.1	.1	0	0	0	0	.2
Military assistance	133.8	110.5	74.3	25.9	40.9	30.5	395.9
West Germany:							
Gold outflow	--------	--------	−33.8	−22.5	--------	--------	−56.3
Economic assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military assistance	165.7	49.6	134.4	16.0	1.5	.3	367.5
Italy:							
Gold outflow	−348.8	--------	--------	+100.0	--------	--------	−248.8
Economic assistance	.3	.3	0	0	0	0	.6
Military assistance	102.5	96.6	105.6	135.0	83.7	72.4	595.8
Japan:							
Gold outflow	−30.1	−157.4	−15.2	--------	--------	--------	−202.7
Economic assistance	2.5	2.5	1.7	.9	.1	0	7.7
Japan—Continued							
Military assistance	130.9	146.9	85.8	66.9	74.0	49.1	553.6
Lebanon.							
Gold outflow	--------	--------	--------	−21.0	−32.1	--------	−53.1
Economic assistance	2.5	19.1	1.3	.5	0	0	23.4
Military assistance	1.3	3.6	.2	.9	.2	.2	6.4
Netherlands:							
Gold outflow	−260.9	−29.9	−249.4	−24.9	--------	--------	−565.1
Economic assistance	3.0	0	0	0	0	0	3.0
Military assistance	72.5	22.8	49.9	30.5	14.7	16.3	206.3
Portugal:							
Gold outflow	−20.0	−10.0	--------	--------	--------	--------	−30.0
Economic assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military assistance	18.9	16.7	10.1	3.4	5.0	11.2	65.3
Spain:							
Gold outflow	+31.7	--------	−113.7	−156.2	−146.1	−130.0	−514.3
Economic assistance	55.1	74.9	49.0	25.2	14.5	0	218.7
Military assistance	48.2	51.6	60.7	51.8	20.7	31.8	264.8
United Kingdom:							
Gold outflow	−900.0	−350.0	−550.0	−305.7	−387.0	+124.5	−2,368.2
Economic assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military assistance	22.6	133.8	116.5	14.0	27.5	11.2	325.6
Total gold outflow (12 countries)							6,300.0
Total economic assistance (12 countries)							253.8
Total military assistance (12 countries)							3,099.3

A further figure which confirms the point that gold-purchasing nations are not aid recipients is demonstrated by the transactions for 1962. In that year, only eight nations receiving economic aid had gold transactions with the United States and from these transactions there was a net gold inflow into the United States of $123.6 million in 1962. The countries that did not receive aid accounted for a net gold outflow of $833 million.

I hope that when the question of foreign aid comes up again in the House, we may take the occasion to recognize the facts about foreign aid and the great contribution which it makes to our foreign policy and to the preservation of the free world.

After all, it is foreign aid which gives foreign policy, and the President in conducting it, his leverage in dealing with many situations. Our great military strength, on which the peace of the world and freedom depend, is a basic background for our policy. The active component of it depends upon the availability of military and economic aid.

A PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on November 19 the House considered a public works appropriation bill, H.R. 9140. Being home and ill, I was not recorded as voting on the measure on final passage. Had I been present for roll No. 207, I would have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. Speaker, further, on Saturday, December 21, in a continuation of the previous legislative day, the House considered the conference report on foreign aid appropriations. Earlier in the evening of December 20 and during the recess, I had given my home telephone number to the Democratic cloakroom for the purpose of being notified in the event of any further votes on the preceding matter. I was not notified as to the quorum call or either of the two rollcalls and did not learn that I had missed these proceedings until later the following morning.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present on roll No. 251, relating to the rule on the foreign aid conference report, I would have voted in the affirmative, and on roll No. 252, relating to recommitting the conference report on H.R. 9499, I would have voted in the negative.

STARVING ILLITERATES

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in three instances and include some editorials.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, much is being said and written today about the severe economic plight of the Appalachian region of the United States. Certainly, there are parts of the large region which are suffering great problems resulting from the loss of industries and the closing of mines that once supported thriving economies. However, the picture of hopeless gloom that is being broadly painted of this whole area is a distortion of fact which is a disservice to the proud people in many Appalachian counties who have done much to develop their many resources and improve the conditions under which they live.

I have spent a good part of my life in the mountain countries of the congressional district I have the honor to represent here. I resent, as I know the fine people of these areas do, the allegations that apathy and ignorance abound and that the economic salvation of people without imagination or initiative awaits a kindly handout. It is time that when the rest of the country looks at Appalachia, it sees problems where they exist and the facts of progress where they are so clearly apparent.

The Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co. of Charlotte in an editorial of December 19 makes this point well—particularly as it discusses economic development in Watauga County, N.C. I commend the good advice in this excellent editorial to the Congress and those beyond Capitol Hill to whom it is addressed:

STARVING ILLITERATES

If we know the southern mountain people, the members of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission are going to find themselves extremely unpopular if they don't tone down their more lurid statements. And when you get unpopular with Carolina mountain people, you might as well have leprosy.

One member said the commission had to deal with what he called tragic starvation in the mountains.

A northern newspaper correspondent attending a meeting at Asheville twisted Governor Sanford's statement on the North Carolina fund so that it seemed to represent typical rather than exceptional conditions. He said the fund aims to "break the listless dependency of thousands of mountain families on relief handouts."

There certainly are depressed areas in the Appalachian region. They need help and need it badly. To deny this would be to turn one's back on reality, but statements such as those we have just quoted give the impression that the whole mountain region is one vast poorhouse of starving illiterates.

The northern correspondent described Watauga County as an example of extreme poverty and unemployment, where 60 percent of the boys drop out of school before reaching the eighth grade.

We have been all over Watauga County and have seen some pockets of depression. But to describe them as typical of the whole county betrays either ignorance or dishonest journalism.

We'd like to take this correspondent to Boone, as modern a small town as we know of. We'd show him Appalachian State College, give him a room in one of the excellent motels, and feed him a mountain dinner he would never forget. We'd take him to the Daniel Boone Amphitheater, which the people of the town built with their own resources for one of the country's finest outdoor historical dramas, "Horn in the West." He should see the new industrial plants employing hundreds of people. He should also see Blowing Rock with its State park and its Cone Museum of mountain artifacts and crafts.

"Well," he would say, "there are sophisticated towns. How about the back country?"

All right. Go over to Cove Creek and see some "starving illiterates" attending one of the finest school plants in the State. Keep going to Avery County, also on the backward list, and have a look at Lees-McRae College and its fine hospital. Drop down to Yancey County, another on the list, and have a look at Burnsville's community theater and art center. And there a dinner of plain mountain food at Nu-Wray Inn will revise some ideas about starving mountain people.

We don't object to helping those who need help. We are all for it. But we do wish that these people with the missionary urge would watch their language. If they don't, they've got a lot to learn, and the Carolina mountain people are just the ones who can teach them.

HOUSE PROCEDURES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, December 15, 1963, raises a question of why I have not stated whether I had signed the petition which seeks to discharge the Rules Committee from considering a rule under which the civil rights bill would be debated on the floor of the House.

Actually, as any enterprising reporter could find out, my position in this matter is rather well known, particularly among my colleagues. I am opposed to discharge petitions except as a measure of last resort and then only under very strict guidelines. I have signed only one discharge petition since I have been in Congress. It was to discharge the District of Columbia Committee from further considering legislation for home rule for the District of Columbia. I pointed out to the sponsors, who asked me to assist them, that before such a discharge petition would lie, a case had to be made against the District of Columbia Committee of misfeasance and/or nonfeasance in considering the matter. It became quite apparent in our discussion that the sponsors had not done their homework. However, I told them I was interested enough in both the subject matter and the procedure so that I would undertake to do the necessary homework. And, if objective research revealed that a case could be made, I would take the floor of the House to make the case, but only after notifying the members of the District of Columbia Committee of my intentions and the general nature of the charges.

I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to make a study of the actions and inactions of the District of Columbia Committee over a period of the past few years in respect to the issue of home rule. This study took several months and revealed what I thought was a serious violation of responsibility on the part of the District of Columbia Committee. Accordingly, I notified the members of the District of Columbia Committee that I would take the floor of the House on a certain day to air these charges and to give the chairman and the members of the District of Columbia Committee the opportunity to reply. The day came. I took the floor: The chairman and several members of the District of Columbia Committee made a point of being present and, as I rose to speak, to march out of the House Chamber in protest. I set forth the charges. They remained unanswered. I felt a case had been made against this committee and, accordingly, I signed the discharge petition—see Congressional Record, volume 106, part 9, pages 10774–10779.

To my amazement, the sponsors of the legislation seemed unimpressed with this procedure and the reporting media gave it only a passing comment. This is the last I have heard of a petition to discharge the District of Columbia Committee on the subject of home rule. Did the sponsors want legislation or simply an issue?

There has been no effort on the part of the sponsors of the petition to discharge the Rules Committee from considering a rule for the civil rights bill to charge the Rules Committee with either misfeasance or nonfeasance in handling this matter. Quite the contrary; the discharge petition was conceived before the Rules Committee had any opportunity to act one way or the other and was filed just as soon as the minimum time required, which was accelerated by the unusual procedure of holding a Saturday session, had elapsed. The basis for the discharge petition was not that the Rules Committee had acted improperly—or failed to act—although it was suggested that it would act improperly—but rather the sponsors stated it was to bypass the procedures in order to bring the civil rights bill to the House forthwith.

The fact that there are proper procedures available to bring a measure to the floor forthwith without doing violence to the theory of the discharge petition, which in effect is an accusation of impropriety against a committee has been pushed under the rug. One such procedure is Calendar Wednesday. It should be obvious to any objective observer after the parliamentary maneuvering of the House Democratic leadership to adjourn the House to avoid Calendar Wednesday on Wednesday, December 11, if it was not before, that the arguments that Calendar Wednesday is a cumbersome and ineffective procedure are unfounded. Indeed, this was a strange argument to be advanced by sponsors of a discharge petition which in truth is cumbersome and time consuming. It is clear that the House by majority vote can prevent any committee from abusing Calendar Wednesday by preempting a committee which sincerely wishes to use Calendar Wednesday. Any Member can raise the "question of consideration." The question is privileged and not subject to debate. The majority can vote "nay" on all questions of consideration until the committee which has a bill waiting for floor action is reached in the alphabet.

Congressman Bolling, after consulting with the Parliamentarian, has now agreed with me that Calendar Wednesday continues until the business before the House is finished and does not terminate in any set number of hours, or days for that matter. The same legislative day continues until by majority vote the House agrees to adjourn. All of us in the House know that no minority group can delay the debate against the will of the majority. Routinely debate is shut off in the House by majority vote. Incidentally, Calendar Wednesday provides the rule which is most frequently employed when the House debates a matter in the Committee of the Whole, the open, or 5-minute rule.

I have been anxious to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress, as well as of the general public, the purpose and availability of Calendar Wednesday. Once one understands the Calendar Wednesday procedure, one realizes that a great hoax is being played upon the American people in leading them to believe that the House Rules Committee can successfully thwart the will of the majority of the House in keeping matters voted out of a legislative committee from reaching the floor of the House for orderly debate.

Of course, those who see political advantage to be gained from perpetrating the myth of the power of the Rules Committee have resisted this effort to clarify the House rules. These people come from all shades of political ideology and from both the two major political parties; however, their motives are different. The so-called liberal Democrat has found the mythical power of the Rules Committee a successful target, helpful in perpetrating another myth, the so-called southern Democrat-Republican coalition. The southern Democrat and many Republican conservatives have been willing to play the game because it means that legislation they oppose is kept bottled up. The general run of Congressmen find the myth very advantageous in keeping pressure groups off their backs. The House leadership of both political parties, of course, seeks to keep Calendar Wednesday submerged because it is a major gap in their power to control the legislative process. In other words, the Rules Committee serves as a very convenient whipping boy for many groups for varied reasons.

There was an interesting Associated Press story appearing on page 3–H of the same Sunday edition of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch as the editorial under comment, discussing the Rules Committee as a "whipping boy" to avoid the embarrassment some Congressmen might experience in voting against the quality stabilization bill. I am placing this article in the Record at the end of this statement. If the retail druggists realized that Calendar Wednesday was an effective way of getting the quality stabilization bill on the floor of the House they would immediately direct their lobbyists to pursue this course and this would end this particular shell game which has been going on ever since I have been in the Congress. I might state, incidentally, I am opposed to the quality stabilization bill.

In one sense I think the myth of the Rules Committee serves a very valuable function. It keeps overzealous pressure groups from effectively pressuring their measures to a vote against the better judgment of the majority of the House. However, the damage to the representative process caused by this myth is much greater than this little bit of potential good. The best way to get rid of undue pressure from pressure groups is to make known the merits and demerits of the legislation to the general public. The failure to get the message to the people is the evil to representative government, not the pressure, even if it is what some would call undue pressure. With good reporting from Washington, the Congress would have no fear of being unduly pressured into voting for something its studies and debates revealed was not in the best interests of the country.

All Congressmen are familiar with the main purpose to which the discharge petition has been put in recent years. Many petitions are filed, but few are ever intended to get anywhere. Essentially, they are public relations gimmicks for lobby groups. Discharge petitions have an element of drama about them, just like a community chest drive where the objective is to go over the top. Daily or weekly reporting on how many signatures have been added and how many now are needed serve as the grist for the publicity campaign.

The House, in the past, realizing the explosive aspects of discharge petitions being pushed by zealous lobby groups, placed in the rules one great deterrent. The House rules require that the signatures on a discharge petition be kept confidential. Actually, the number signing the petition is also supposed to be confidential. The lobby groups, of course, have developed many techniques for getting around this rule. One is to get a friendly Congressman to violate the rule and tell them who has signed. Another, and the most effective if it can be done, is to get some reporter or newspaper or other public relations media to utilize its prestige and its power to undertake the chore, by calling all the Congressmen, one by one, and asking them about their own individual action which, of course, any Congressman is entitled to give out. So, by a process of cumulative inclusion, those not signing are pinpointed.

It became apparent to me that the New York Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, or perhaps individual newspapermen working on the staffs of these newspapers, had undertaken to do this work, which I regard as highly improper, for the group sponsoring the discharge petition on the civil rights bill.

A member of the Washington bureau of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch left word with my office on Thursday, December 12, that he wanted to talk to me "only 30 seconds" about civil rights. The whole week preceding I had been trying to bring about the utilization of Calendar Wednesday for immediate consideration of the civil rights bill, or to make the Democratic leadership openly confess that they had no intention of bringing about early consideration of this measure.

This had culminated in a most unusual maneuver on the part of the Democratic leadership, supported by the sponsors of the discharge petition, to adjourn the House forthwith. This motion to adjourn was put to a record vote and by this vote the Democratic Party clearly demonstrated that it, or large elements in its ranks which the leaders were powerless to control, had been engaging in an effort to gain an issue rather than legislation in the field of civil rights.

No one from the Washington Bureau of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, or any other newspaper for that matter, called me to find out what this was all about, although it was quite clear from the Congressional Record that I was a primary moving force. There was not even a followup by the news media on the press releases I had issued on the subject. No news media reported the ejection of a Republican staff member sent as a representative at the request of Congressman McCulloch, the ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee and other interested Representatives, including myself, to attend the conference called by the sponsors of the discharge petition chaired by Roy Wilkins, the president of the NAACP, on Monday, December 2, at the Mayflower Hotel, although this ejection became the subject of rather heated debate in the conference. In fact, the leaders who decided to sponsor the discharge petition route made it clear in many ways that they did not want any Republican participation in the strategy to be evolved. No Republican had been invited to attend, and it was only by the fairness of some Members of the participating groups we even learned about the conference. It is clear to me that a very narrow and selfish partisan move was afoot.

This strategy on the part of the self-styled liberal Democrats and their allies to keep Republicans out of the civil rights battle lest they gain political credit has been in existence for a number of years. It was revealed this year most vividly by the sparse reporting and comment by the news media and by civil rights groups on the civil rights bill prepared and introduced by 26 Republicans, including those on the crucial House Judiciary Committee in January this year. This civil rights bill received the approval of the House Republican Policy Committee and the endorsement of the Republican House Leader, Charles Halleck, who appeared at the press conference called at the time the measure was introduced.

Attorney General Kennedy, when he finally testified before the House Judiciary Committee in June, 1963, on civil rights legislation, stated that he was unaware of the Republican proposals.

National columnist and Post-Dispatch reporter, Marquis Childs, wrote a column appearing May 29, 1963, stating in effect that the Republicans Party was one without a policy on civil rights. I wrote to Marquis Childs immediately, calling his attention to the Republican proposals and the statement I made in the House that he and other reporters writing along similar lines could never have written articles with any readership acceptability if the Republican proposals had been adequately reported in the first place. I received a letter from Mr. Childs' secretary stating he was abroad and my letter would be called to his attention upon his return. This is the last I have heard of this matter. I am setting out a copy of my letter to Mr. Childs. The reference to the Congressional Record for the statement to which I refer is on page 9798, May 29, 1963.

To get back to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch Washington Bureau call. I thought maybe at last the St. Louis Post-Dispatch was going to do a news story on Calendar Wednesday. Regrettably, I was wrong. The reporter said he was doing a story on which Missouri Congressmen had signed or not signed the discharge petition.

An article did appear subsequently in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on this subject. This article set forth some, but not all, of what I had said to the reporter on the subject. I not only said that it was against the rules of the House to disclose the names of those who had and who had not signed a discharge petition, but also that it was against the rules of the House for a newspaper to undertake the task of revealing this information by the process of cumulative inclusion. I said I would not be a party to this endeavor. I also said that it appeared to me that he or the Washington bureau of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch was accommodating the sponsors of the discharge petition and so indulging in what I would call partisan politics.

The reporter said I was attacking his integrity and he thought he should terminate the conversation. I told him my attack was directed to the specific incident and that I was drawing no general conclusions from it, but only the particular conclusion I stated. I, too, felt the conversation should terminate.

An allegation had been made to me previous to this conversation that Congressman Bolling had been preparing to release all the names on the discharge petition to a New York Times reporter but was dissuaded from this course by one of his own colleagues. It seemed to me that what Congressman BOLLING was dissuaded from allegedly doing directly, he or someone else was trying to do indirectly with the help of certain newsmen and newspapers. Perhaps a statement by Congressman BOLLING on this allegation and statements by any newsman or newspaper involved in disclosing the names of those who had signed the discharge petition would resolve this question.

It also has been alleged that various civil rights groups which are sponsoring the political maneuvers of the discharge petition are also working closely with Congressman BOLLING and the so-called Democratic study group of the House to further the efforts of this Democratic liberal group to finance its plans to elect more liberals like themselves in the next Congress.

An interesting article about the plans and aspirations of this liberal group appeared on the front page of the New York Times, Thursday, December 12, and a similar article appeared on the front page of the Sunday, December 15, St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Nothing is said in these articles about financing, but it would be appropriate to have a public disclosure of who is financing the lobbying activities in behalf of the discharge petition and who is financing the electioneering activities of the Democratic study group.

I find no fault with the endeavors of any political group to be politically effective, but its concept of proper procedures is always a proper subject of consideration. Any group appropriating for itself the label "liberal" should be especially careful about the methods it employs. Certainly, if public debate is to move forward, the news reporters must report the debate objectively. If they should participate in the debate personally the least they can or should do is disclose their participation. Such participation is important news which must be reported if the public is to objectively weigh the arguments pro and con.

The letter and articles follow:

MAY 29, 1963.

Mr. MARQUIS CHILDS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MARQUIS: For your information I am enclosing a copy of statements which I made in the House of Representatives on editorial column of yours which appeared in the May 29 issue of the Washington Post. As a convenience, I am also enclosing a copy of the statement of Congressman WILLIAM MCCULLOCH in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 31 to which I make reference in my remarks.

There are a few people in the reporting profession who picked up this Republican effort in the field of civil rights. One of them was Roscoe Drummond, and I am enclosing copies of his column as it appeared in the Post and in the Lima (Ohio) Citizen. This general subject came up again at the end of February when Mr. MCCULLOCH took a special order to point up the differences between the President's civil rights message and the Republican bill. A tear sheet of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with this is enclosed as is the report of it in the Baltimore Sun. In addition, I am enclosing Congressman MCCULLOCH's statement to the Judiciary Committee at the time this and other civil rights legislation was under study, and I am enclosing my remarks for that hearing.

Finally, I am enclosing an analysis of the bill which I cosponsored with MCCULLOCH and other House Republicans.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Dec. 15, 1963]

HOUSE PANEL'S DELAY TACTICS CUT BOTH WAYS

WASHINGTON, December 14.—H.R. 3669 is a bill that has nothing at all to do with civil rights, but it is a key to understanding why the House Rules Committee has the power to bottle up the civil rights bill.

Many of the people complaining about the Rules Committee holding up the civil rights bill are overjoyed that the committee is holding up H.R. 3669. The administration, in fact, opposes the bill just as much as it supports the civil rights bill.

H.R. 3669 is the quality stabilization bill and it is designed to allow manufacturers to set prices for their brand goods. Its sponsors say it would help the small businessman, who has been hurt by the competition of large discount houses. Its opponents say it would increase the cost of living and hurt the consumer.

PRESSURE ON LAWMAKERS

Many Congressmen are caught in the crossfire of controversy over the bill.

Representatives of pharmacists and big manufacturers have put pressure on them to vote for the bill. Congressmen do not want to offend potential campaign contributors. At the same time, Congressmen do not want to be known back home as the man who voted for a bill that increased the costs of some goods in the store. Rather than vote "yes" or "no," many Congressmen would rather not vote at all.

That is where the House Rules Committee comes in. In the 86th, 87th, and present 88th Congress, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, the chairman, and other members of the committee have successfully kept the bill from coming to a vote on the floor of the House. Unless the committee gives the bill a rule, which sends it to the floor and sets the limits on debate and amendments, the bill has little chance of coming to a House vote.

OK'D BY COMMERCE COMMITTEE

In the 88th Congress, the bill was approved by the House Commerce Committee but never received a rule from the Rules Committee. Supporters tried to release it with a discharge petition just as civil rights supporters are trying to release their bill now. But the bill's supporters never got the required 218 signatures.

In the 87th Congress, the bill was approved by the House Commerce Committee and this time received a rule from the Rules Committee. But the rule was granted in the last few days of the final session, and there wasn't enough time for the House to consider it.

In this year's 1st session of the 88th Congress, the House Commerce Committee approved the bill last July 22 and asked the Rules Committee for a rule.

ONE HEARING HELD

On September 25, Representative SMITH called a meeting of the Rules Committee to hear testimony from Representative OREN D. HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Commerce Committee. After an hour of testimony, SMITH gaveled the session to a close and told HARRIS he would schedule another session soon.

SMITH still has not called HARRIS back.

No one is sure that SMITH and the Rules Committee will be successful in holding back the quality stabilization bill. But, at the moment, he and the Rules Committee are standing in the way of the quality stabilization bill and taking the pressure away from the other Members of Congress.

This is the kind of job that the Rules Committee often does on bills that hardly anyone wants, but almost everyone is afraid to vote against.

And this is the reason that although many Congressmen cry out against the Rules Committee for holding up the Civil Rights bill, few of them cry out against the power of the committee to hold up a bill.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Dec. 15, 1963]

ODD EXCUSES

Missouri Representatives who have signed the civil rights discharge petition deserve credit for leadership on an urgent issue. We admit of being somewhat baffled by the reasons given by other Congressmen for not signing the petition.

The signers include Representatives KARSTEN and SULLIVAN of St. Louis, BOLLING and RANDALL of outstate Missouri, and PRICE of East St. Louis. The two St. Louisans agree on using every means to facilitate early House consideration of the issue. That is the real purpose of the petition. Even if it does not acquire enough signatures to force the rights bill from the Rules Committee to the House floor, it offers leverage against the committee.

Representatives CANNON and ICHORD contend they did not sign because the discharge petition would delay consideration. The evidence is the other way around. Chairman SMITH of Virginia did not even promise early Rules Committee hearings until the petition was proposed.

It is left to Representative CURTIS alone to refuse to say whether he has or has not signed the petition, and his reasoning is the most peculiar of all. The Webster Groves Republican argues that it is against House rules to disclose names on a discharge petition. So it is, and so what? There is no rule against a House Member making his own position clear, as the other Missourians have done.

This is no time for timidity and needless parliamentarianism. The discharge petition offers a reasonable test of conviction and of leadership for civil rights—on the part of Republicans as well as Democrats. Every Congressman ought to stand up and be counted.

HILL AND REILLY STATEMENTS ON OTEPKA "BUGGING" REPUDIATING OWN TESTIMONY AND CONTAINING FURTHER FALSE INFORMATION CLEARED BY RUSK

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, statements enclosed with letters sent to Senator EASTLAND by former State Department employees Elmer Dewey Hill and John F. Reilly, intended to supplement and clarify their testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in July and August of this year, still contained false information concerning the tapping of the office of ousted State Department security officer, Otto Otepka, and according to reliable information Otepka's office was tapped and certain information was recorded.

These false statements, along with a letter sent to Senator Eastland by State Department employee, David I. Belisle, were placed in the hands of Secretary of State Dean Rusk before being transmitted to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee chairman.

I repeat my earlier statement, made last week, that Rusk was the man behind the move to have Otepka ousted from the State Department before for furnishing information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and thus could hardly be impartial upon review of the Otepka case:

> The State Department's partial denial was as expected as Santa Claus at Christmas. Still, they confirmed enough of the memorandum I released to satisfy me as to its substantial accuracy and to justify a thorough investigation by the Congress of the entire matter.

The State Department in its reply to my charge admitted that the meeting of security officers with William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, took place as described in his memorandum:

> They admitted that the Otepka case was discussed and they admitted the validity of that part of the memorandum which reported that security officers with policy problems should go to Crockett if they could not get immediate satisfaction from their immediate superiors and that even meetings with Rusk would be arranged to solve such policy problems.
>
> Attesting to the accuracy of this much of the memorandum makes wholecloth of the State Department charge that the entire memorandum is inaccurate.
>
> Certainly enough of the memorandum has been confirmed to justify a thorough investigation of the entire matter by the Congress.

I make a part of the Record the testimony of Mr. Reilly, Mr. Hill and Mr. Belisle before the Senate committee together with their later repudiating letters, which were cleared by Rusk and still contain false information:

EXCERPT FROM TESTIMONY OF ELMER DEWEY HILL, JULY 9, 1963 (PP. 1105, 1106, 1107, AND 1108 OF THE TRANSCRIPT)

Mr. Sourwine. Do you know of any single instance in which the Department has ever listened in on the telephone of an employee? I am talking about his office telephone—the telephone that does not belong to him; it belongs to the State Department. Do you know of any instance where that has been done?

Mr. Hill. I cannot recall such an instance.

Mr. Sourwine. Do you know of any instance where a listening device has been placed in an employee's office?

Mr. Hill. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Sourwine. Are these not normal security measures which in proper circumstances would be indicated and would be taken?

Mr. Hill. I have never engaged in this—in that type of security measure.

Mr. Sourwine. I see.

You do not know whether the Office of Security has authority to do this?

Mr. Hill. I personally have not ever been requested to do such a thing.

Mr. Sourwine. Would not your division be the one to do this, if the Office of Security wanted to do it?

Mr. Hill. I do not know.

Mr. Sourwine. Who else would do it? Who else would be competent to do it in the Office of Security?

Mr. Hill. This falls under the category of personnel security, and, as such, is out of my bailiwick.

Mr. Sourwine. Well, do you know of any other office or division or branch in the Office of Security that would be competent to place a listening device in an employee's office, or compromise his telephone?

Mr. Hill. I do not know of anyone who would be competent.

Mr. Sourwine. But you say your division has never done it, has never been called upon?

Mr. Hill. We have never been called upon; no, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Specifically, did you ever have anything to do with tapping the telephone of Mr. Otepka, the Chief of the Division of Evaluations in the Office of Security?

Mr. Hill. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. You had no knowledge of it, if it was done?

Mr. Hill. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Did you ever have anything to do with placing a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office?

Mr. Hill. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Did you have any knowledge of it, if it was done?

Mr. Hill. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Did you ever have anything to do with the searching of Mr. Otepka's desk or his safe or any of his files at night?

Mr. Hill. No, I had nothing to do with it.

Mr. Sourwine. Did you have any knowledge if this was done, if it was done?

Mr. Hill. I now have knowledge of it.

Mr. Sourwine. How did you acquire that knowledge?

Mr. Hill. It was discussed with me by Mr. Belisle.

Mr. Sourwine. After it had been done?

Mr. Hill. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Was that after this committee had started asking questions about it?

Mr. Hill. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. I see.

Did Mr. Belisle discuss it with you in the context of your testimony here?

Mr. Hill. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. What did he tell you about it?

Mr. Hill. He told me that questions were asked regarding this.

Mr. Sourwine. He told you it had been done?

Mr. Hill. No, sir; he did not tell me it had been done. He told me that this committee was concerned with that.

Mr. Sourwine. And that is all?

Mr. Hill. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. He did not indicate anything about what your own testimony should be?

Mr. Hill. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Did he not tell you that this committee was concerned over the question of the tapping of Mr. Otepka's telephone?

Mr. Hill. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. And why did you make the distinction in the way you answered with respect to the tapping, that you had no knowledge of it, and with respect to the search that you had acquired knowledge of it?

Mr. Hill. It was an accidental distinction.

Mr. Sourwine. Do you want us to understand that you had no knowledge of either until Mr. Belisle told you about this committee's interest?

Mr. Hill. Yes, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. And that, in the telling, he did not indicate to you, that there had been a tapping or a search?

Mr. Hill. That is right. Yes, sir.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 6, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Internal Security, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: A copy of my testimony before the Subcommittee on Internal Security on July 9, 1963, has recently been made available to me. Upon review of this testimony I have concluded that mention of an incident which occurred last March would serve to clarify my responses to Mr. Sourwine's questions concerning interception of conversations in Mr. Otepka's office. I believe that my answers to these questions were correct. I would like, however, to have the attached statement inserted in the record of my testimony in order that there be no misunderstanding.

If you approve my request, I suggest that the statement and this letter be inserted at page 1107 of my testimony.

I enclose the copy of my testimony which was made available to me.

Sincerely,

ELMER DEWEY HILL.

On Monday, March 18, 1963, Mr. John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, asked me to explore the possibility of arranging some way to eavesdrop on conversations taking place in Mr. Otepka's office. Mr. Reilly explained to me that he would only consider such a technique if other investigative methods failed.

Later that day, I discussed the technical aspects of this matter with Mr. Clarence J. Schneider who, at that time, was serving as Chief of the Technical Operations Branch of the Division of Technical Services. We agreed on the approach to be used—modifying the wiring of Mr. Otepka's telephone instrument—and decided to return that evening to try the approach.

That evening Mr. Schneider and I altered the existing wiring in the telephone in Mr. Otepka's office. We then established a circuit from Mr. Otepka's office to the Division of Technical Services laboratory by making additional connections in the existing telephone system wiring.

Mr. Schneider and I tested the system and found we would be unable to overhear conversations in Mr. Otepka's office, except actual telephone conversations, because electrical interference produced a loud buzzing sound. (It was never contemplated that an attempt would be made just to monitor Mr. Otepka's telephone line in order to overhear conversations on it.)

I reported our unsuccessful effort to Mr. Reilly the following morning. Mr. Schneider has told me that during that day he asked an officer in the Division of Domestic Operations of the Office of Security whether he had, or knew where to acquire, equipment which would eliminate such a buzzing sound. Mr. Schneider assured me that he did not discuss with the officer the specific application for which the equipment was needed. I also attempted during that day to obtain such equipment, but was unsuccessful.

On the following day, March 20, Mr. Reilly informed me that I should not pursue the matter further because he had found the type of information he was looking for from an examination of Mr. Otepka's classified trash. Mr. Reilly directed me to disconnect the wiring connections which Mr. Schneider and I had made. That evening, Mr. Reilly, Mr. Schneider, and I met in the Office of Security. In the space of a few minutes, I removed the extra connections which Mr. Schneider and I had made in Mr. Otepka's telephone while Mr. Reilly and Mr. Schneider stayed in the hall outside Mr. Otepka's office.

To summarize, for a 2-day period it might have been possible to intercept conversations taking place in Mr. Otepka's office if certain technical problems could have been resolved. These problems never were resolved and the wiring connections which were made were removed without any conversations having been intercepted.

Excerpt From Testimony of David I. Belisle, July 29, 1963 (Pp. 1213 and 1214 of the Transcript)

Mr. Sourwine. Do you know, Mr. Belisle, what the respective rights are of a State Department employee on the one hand and the Office of Security of the Department on the other with respect to the tapping of the employee's telephone, or are there any rights involved there?

Mr. Belisle. I don't know.

Mr. Sourwine. How about the placing of listening devices in the offices of employees? Does the Office of Security have the right to do this?

Mr. Belisle. Well, that would be a legal question, I guess, and inasmuch as I am not a lawyer, I don't know whether he has any rights or not.

Mr. Sourwine. You have never had occasion to look into this question?

Mr. Belisle. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Would that mean that you have never been involved in an authorization for either the tapping of an employee's telephone or the placing of listening devices in his office?

Mr. Belisle. No, it wouldn't mean that; no, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Have you been so involved?

Mr. Belisle. Yes, I have.

Mr. Sourwine. While you have been at the Department of State?

Mr. Belisle. No.

Mr. Sourwine. The question concerned the rights of the Department of State, so I guess I wasn't precise enough in asking.

Can you tell us what the policy is in the Office of Security in the Department of State? If the Office or head of the Office thought the employee might be a security risk, would he have the right to tap his telephone or put a listening device in his office?

Mr. Belisle. I really don't know, and in the Department of State it hasn't come up since I have been there.

Mr. Sourwine. Do you have any information with respect to the tapping of the telephone of Mr. Otto Otepka, the Chief of the Division of Evaluations of the Department of State?

Mr. Belisle. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Do you know whether this was done?

Mr. Belisle. No, I do not.

Mr. Sourwine. Did you have anything to do with the placing of a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office?

Mr. Belisle. I did not, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Do you know if this was done?

Mr. Belisle. I do not.

Department of State,
Washington, November 6, 1963.

Hon. James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Internal Security, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, U. S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In the course of my July 29, 1963, testimony before the Subcommittee on Internal Security, I was asked by Mr. Sourwine whether I had any information concerning the interception of conversations in Mr. Otto F. Otepka's office. I replied that I did not.

After review of my testimony, I would like to amplify my responses to Mr. Sourwine's questions by stating that Mr. Reilly mentioned to me the events which I understand he has described to you in a separate letter, and accompanying enclosure. He mentioned these events to me, however, only after the events occurred. At the time the events took place, I was in Costa Rica in connection with the visit of the President and the Secretary to that country. I had, therefore, no firsthand information concerning these events, and it was for this reason that I answered Mr. Sourwine's questions as I did.

I would appreciate it if this letter could be inserted in the record of my testimony. If this is done, I suggest that it be included on page 1214 of my testimony.

I am enclosing the copy of my testimony which was provided to me.

Sincerely,

David I. Belisle.

Excerpt From Testimony of John F. Reilly on August 6, 1963 (Pp. 1322–1326, of Transcript)

Mr. Sourwine. Do you remember giving any previous testimony here on a question of bugging or tapping a telephone in the State Department?

Mr. Reilly. I don't recall any questions along those lines.

Mr. Sourwine. Then let me start fresh. Have you ever engaged in or ordered the bugging or tapping or otherwise compromising telephones or private conversations in the office of an employee of the State Department?

Mr. Reilly. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. You never did?

Mr. Reilly. That is right, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Specifically in the case of Mr. Otepka you did not do so?

Mr. Reilly. That is correct, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Did you tell Jerome Schneider to install an electrical device to compromise Mr. Otepka's telephone?

Mr. Reilly. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. So that audible conversations in his office could be heard whether or not that phone was on the hook?

Mr. Reilly. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Did you know this had been done?

Mr. Reilly. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Can you say it was not done?

Mr. Reilly. That I cannot say, sir.

Senator Hruska. Is that within the order from Mr. Crockett?

Mr. Reilly. No, no. His questions have already made it clear that I cannot—I don't know.

Senator Hruska. It is on your own?

Mr. Reilly. Yes.

Senator Hruska. Your own lack of information?

Mr. Sourwine. When I say "tell Jerome Schneider" I would like to have that include tell somebody to tell him. Did you give an order to have this done?

Mr. Reilly. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Has any device for clandestine listening or an aid of physical surveillance been placed on the automobile of any individual employed by the Office of Security?

Mr. Reilly. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Not while you have been——

Mr. Reilly. Not while I have been there; no, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Doesn't the Office of Security make use of any clandestine listening devices at all in dealing with its employees?

Mr. Reilly. Not while I have been there, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Does it make use of them in dealing with prospective employees or with security cases from other parts of the Department?

Mr. Reilly. Not while I have been there, we have not.

Mr. Sourwine. Don't you have concealed microphones in your interviewing rooms?

Mr. Reilly. We tape interviews. That is not a clandestine listening device in the sense——

Mr. Sourwine. Do you do this with the knowledge and consent of the person being interviewed?

Mr. Reilly. No, we do not.

Mr. Sourwine. It is not clandestine?

Mr. Reilly. It is not a clandestine listening device in that there are State Department people conducting the interview, Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. Sourwine. Yes.

Mr. Reilly. Yes.

Mr. Sourwine. The listening device, is that a microphone standing up in the center of the table?

Mr. Reilly. Oh, no.

Mr. Sourwine. It is hidden?

Mr. Reilly. Yes.

Mr. Sourwine. But it is not clandestine?

Mr. Reilly. No, of course we do that, but I wanted you to understand the sense in which I understood your question to me.

Mr. Sourwine. I thought you would understand it in the commonly accepted sense of the word. Apparently, I was wrong. Now let's see if we can get back to Mr. Otepka's case. Have any listening devices been installed in his office?

Mr. Reilly. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Have any devices or contrivances been installed in or connected with his telephone wires or with a box outside his office so as to activate his telephone so as to make it in a sense a permanent receiving microphone?

Mr. Reilly. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. You are familiar with this technique. You know what I am talking about?

Mr. Reilly. Yes, I do, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. And it has not been used in Mr. Otepka's case?

Mr. Reilly. No, sir.

Mr. Sourwine. Mr. Chairman, you have a clear issue here on which we will have to take the testimony of other State Department employees. I have no more questions of Mr. Reilly at this time, sir. It is 3 minutes of 12.

Senator Hruska. Very well, sir.

Department of State,
Washington, November 6, 1963.

Hon. James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Internal Security, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In the course of my testimony before the Subcommittee on Internal Security on August 6, I was asked a series of questions by Mr. Sourwine concerning the compromise of conversations in Mr. Otto F. Otepka's office and over his telephone. My responses to these questions were, I believe, accurate. I have concluded from a review of my testimony, however, that mention of one incident might serve to avoid a misleading impression.

I would like, therefore, to amplify my testimony by the inclusion in the record of the attached statement and this letter. If this request is granted, I suggest that the statement and this letter be inserted at page 1326 of my testimony.

I am enclosing the copy of my testimony which was provided to me.

Sincerely,

John F. Reilly.

In the course of the year following my present appointment I began to suspect that Mr. Otepka might be privately furnishing information to Mr. Jay Sourwine, chief counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, without authority and possibly in violation of applicable laws and regulations.

On March 13, 1963, I discussed with Mr. David I. Belisle, my special assistant, a variety of investigative techniques which might be used to determine whether my suspicions were accurate. As a result of these discussions, I concluded that the best technique would be to recover and examine Mr. Otepka's classified trash from his burn bag. On March 14, Mr. Otepka's burn bag was recovered, but an examination of its contents revealed nothing of significance.

On March 18, while Mr. Belisle was in Costa Rica in connection with the visit to that country by the President and the Secretary, I asked Mr. Elmer D. Hill, Chief of the Division of Technical Services, to undertake a survey of the feasibility of intercepting conversations in Mr. Otepka's office. I made it clear to Mr. Hill that I was not authorizing the actual interception of any conversations. Rather, I desired to know whether this technique could be used without undue risk of detection in the event that subsequent examination of Mr. Otepka's burn bags continued to reveal nothing of significance.

On March 19, Mr. Hill told me that he and Mr. Clarence J. Schneider had discussed the means by which conversations in Mr. Otepka's office might be intercepted and had conducted a feasibility survey by connecting spare telephone wires from the telephone in Mr. Otepka's office to the Division of Technical Services laboratory. Mr. Hill told me that the system attempted had not proven successful when he and Mr. Schneider had tested it and that they were uncertain whether it could be made to work. I made it clear to Mr. Hill that I did not wish any conversations to be intercepted at that time.

Later during the same day, March 19, a second bag of Mr. Otepka's classified trash was recovered and examined. Its contents revealed that Mr. Otepka had furnished certain material to Mr. Sourwine. As a result, I then determined that I would not at any time authorize the interception of conversations taking place in Mr. Otepka's office.

Shortly after the close of business on March 20, I directed Mr. Hill and Mr. Schneider to disconnect the telephone wires which they had connected. Later that evening Mr. Hill complied with my directions while Mr. Schneider and I remained in the corridor outside Mr. Otepka's office.

No conversations were intercepted as a result of the events described above. Other than these events, I know of nothing which could have given rise to the belief that Mr. Otepka's office was being "bugged" or that his telephone was being "tapped." I understand, however, that about the same time that the events described above took place, Mr. Otepka asked Mr. Stanley Holden, of the Division of Domestic Operations to examine his telephone system. I also understand that Mr. Holden did examine Mr. Otepka's telephone system but found no evidence that Mr. Otepka's office was "bugged" or that his telephone was "tapped." In this connection, I might point out that Mr. Belisle and I have both noticed unusual sound phenomena on our telephones and have had our telephone systems checked. These checks have not produced any evidence that our telephone systems had been interfered with.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO INFORM PRESIDENT CONGRESS IS READY TO ADJOURN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress.

SECOND SESSION EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 880 fixing the beginning of the 2d regular session of the 88th Congress and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 880

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second regular session of the Eighty-eighth Congress shall begin at noon on Tuesday, January 7, 1964.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVISION FOR SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up for immediate consideration House Concurrent Resolution 248.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Con. Res. 248

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Monday, December 30, 1963, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 249 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 249

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED BY THE TWO HOUSES AND FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any recesses, adjournments, or the sine die adjournment of the House, the clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been sitting here listening to these adjournment resolutions going through. What transpires, if I may ask the majority leader, if the other body refuses to concur on December 30 or refuses to adopt the conference report?

Mr. ALBERT. I would say to the gentleman that I could not imagine that happening as a practical matter, but I will state that the Members will be protected. We cannot adjourn although we have adopted the sine die adjournment, until the resolution has been agreed to by the other body, but we can adjourn from day to day, and there will be no business on those days except what I am requesting on behalf of the Speaker. There will be no unanimous consent agreements, no 1-minute speeches, nor any legislative business or other kind of business except ringing of the bells at adjournment. If worst should come to worst and we did not get a sine die adjournment adopted, we would have no business until January 7 under any circumstances except the business required by the statute which would be to get a quorum on January 3.

Mr. GROSS. Then, there would be no attempt to bring up the supplemental appropriation bill that is pending?

Mr. ALBERT. There will be no attempt to bring up any legislation. None whatever.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations, and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF REPORTS FILED BY INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the sine die adjournment by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the 88th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF MEMBERS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege, until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the Congressional Record on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extensions of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred, or to any speech delivered, subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS TO CHAIRMEN OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBERS THEREOF

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chairmen of all the standing committees and subcommittees of the House may extend their remarks up to and including the publication of the last Record and to include a summary of the work of their committees; also that the ranking minority member of such standing committee or any subcommittee may have the same permission to extend their remarks and to include a summary, if they desire, from their point of view, separately from that of the chairman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROGRAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. When will the distinguished majority leader announce a program for January 7?

Mr. ALBERT. I will be prepared to announce that before we adjourn.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

PRESS RELEASE BY SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK ON DECEMBER 21, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to discuss the 1st session of the 88th Congress—indeed, the history of this century—without immediately confronting the tragic impact on our time, on our hearts, and on our souls, of the assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Few episodes that I can recall, in a lifetime at the center of action in a world shaken to its foundations by world wars, world revolutions, and world depressions, match the dramatic incomprehensibility of this most dreadful single event of these history-laden decades.

It is a tribute of the first magnitude to the wisdom of the governmental structure of our country, to the ruggedness of its underpinnings designated by the Founding Fathers, that we were able to make the remarkable transition from President Kennedy to President Johnson, so smoothly and so competently under the pall of this awful crime. It is a tribute to the strength and unity of our people. I believe it demonstrates a profound religious and a deeply spiritual quality in us all. Also, in the tragic death of President Kennedy, we are fortunate in having as his successor President Johnson, with his great qualities of leadership. Thus, there was reassurance and relief for the whole free world, under the ruthlessness of this disruption, in the decisive acceptance, at once and fully, by President Johnson, of the monumental responsibilities that suddenly and within a moment fell to his lot. This Congress, like President Johnson, is fully cognizant of its responsibilities to the Nation in these trying times, and it has moved to meet these responsibilities.

The weepers and the criers who are raising great lamentations over the Congress that they say is dragging its feet are purblind to the great basic truth of the life of this Congress so far: This truth is that the 1st session of the 88th Congress has met the needs of the times in accordance with the aims, the desires, and what I call the mood of the country at this hour.

The legislative problems of our times are characteristic of an era that must be considered in long-range terms, not in terms of brief, urgent, dramatic crises, demanding great risks and speculative legislative adventure.

This is not a Congress dealing with the hundred days.

This is not a Congress dealing with a state of war.

This is not a Congress dealing with the spreading poverty of depression.

Up to the instant of the tragedy in Dallas, our country on the whole—and with some spots that marred the general picture—did feel in the home, in the economy, in the general health, in the pervading sense of well-being, the effectiveness of the Kennedy program of peace and prosperity. The 1st session of the 88th Congress reflects the national appreciation that our genius for finding the ways of peace, through the skills, the boldness, the diplomacy of our brilliant young President, had settled definitely upon the whole world the conviction that the United States is indeed in the posture of plain and obvious world leadership.

All this produced a spirit of caution, as distinguished from complacency, in the 88th Congress. It removed from the Capitol of the United States the driving sense of immediacy, and the pressure of crisis. It filled the individual Member of Congress with an attitude of study as differentiated from an attitude of precipitate action. And while there was action to a considerable degree, as the record clearly indicates, it was calculated action. It was action that hesitated to do violence to the mood of the country, which demanded a period of relief and surcease from the spectacular. This is far from being a lethargic Congress, as some critics would have it, it is a thorough, studious, and a careful Congress. In several areas it has established a record of accomplishment that is unequaled by any Congress of recent times.

Indeed, it is only necessary to examine the record of the 1st session of the 88th Congress in the field of education to realize that this is a landmark Congress for American education. This Congress under Public Law 88–129 authorized a 3-year program of $175 million in matching grants to expand the teaching and research facilities of medical, dental, and related-type colleges, and $30.7 million in student loans to increase health personnel. Public Law 88–210, the vocational educational bill, provides for vocational education grants, extension of the aid program to Federal installations, and extends the National Defense Education Act. Of even greater importance is Public Law 88–204, which establishes a comprehensive program for the construction and improvement of institutions of higher learning. The magnitude of the contributions that this legislation will make to the national strength and character are impossible to predict, but this Congress is certain to be long remembered for its action in this vital field.

Likewise, the mental health program which this Congress has passed stands as a monument to the dedication, vision, and cooperative spirit of the 88th Congress. This legislation, which was close to the heart of President Kennedy, authorizes $329 million to assist the fight against mental illness and promotes with meaning the cause of mental health.

The 88th Congress in this 1st session is to be commended, not criticized, for having met its obligations in accordance with the mood and the spirit of the times, and the will of the people. Sensationally bold experimentation and precipitate legislation compelled as in other Congresses, by acute and pressing need, were not in the cards. But thoughtful and profound legislation on such major problems as civil rights and tax reduction was, indeed, called for, and will be well and ably disposed of in the forthcoming session.

In sum the 88th Congress will find itself evaluated not alone upon what it did in terms of a score card on its enactments in this first session, but even more on the careful preparations it made for wise and considered legislation for the forthcoming session. With the passage of the civil rights bill and the tax bill, both of which will pass in the next session, the 88th Congress will, with the other important bills it has already passed, be recognized as a historic Congress.

LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we all have reason to be proud of the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 88th Congress. It has been a long and difficult session—one of the most exacting in all our history—and one deeply stricken only recently by a tragedy which grieved the heart of the world.

All men of good will are stunned. No rational being can explain or understand the evil impulse which took the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy at the zenith of his mission. All the world mourns with us. And all the world takes new courage and new confidence in the dignified and orderly presidential succession, which we have witnessed and which once more demonstrated for history the majestic authority and power of freedom under law.

Our work in Congress has been directed toward peace, progress, and prosperity, not only for our own country, but for the entire world; and we have beckoned all who strive for order and tranquillity to join with us in our search for the methods and instruments of peace on earth—that noble quest which has lighted the world these many centuries. We shall never drop the torch.

As we adjourn for the festive days of the Christmas season, we would do well to pause for a moment of tribute to our own distinguished leader, the Honorable John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, our Speaker, guide, mentor, friend, and noble counselor. His fairness, wisdom, patience, and gentle spirit truly reflects the genius of America. The House and the country are indebted to him for the determination and devotion he has brought to his tasks here during these many years as Member, leader, and Speaker. May he be with us for many, many years to come.

Our record at the halfway mark of the 88th Congress speaks for itself as an example of the constructive functioning of a legislative body in a nation of free men deliberating under conditions of extraordinary stress both at home and abroad. Yet we have approached our work in confident spirit, determined that there shall be no retreat.

The Congress of the United States will be 175 years old next year. And I daresay that in the century and three-quarters since the leaders of the American Revolution launched the infant Republic, few other Congresses until our own ever faced problems of such magnitude, complexity, and challenge.

First and foremost, we have maintained and strengthened the national defense and security. We have in no direction faltered or quibbled on the great issue of national survival as a free nation.

Peace has been maintained, and the first timorous step taken by international agreement to defuse the time bomb of holocaust. At the same time, we have increased our conventional Armed Forces, strengthened our nuclear deterrent power, and authorized the funds necessary to resume nuclear tests should the Soviet Union violate the test ban treaty.

We have written the greatest record in the field of education of any Congress since the founding of the Republic. The 1st session of the 88th Congress would go down in history as truly magnificent for this reason alone—and there are many other reasons.

It has been a long session, Mr. Speaker, but who can say a session is not a landmark session when it pushes through to enactment the long-awaited Higher Education Facilities Act, a $1.2 billion measure?

Who can say this session has not distinguished itself when we have crossed all horizons in vocational educational opportunities through enactment of the better than $1 billion Vocational Education Act and when we have extended and greatly expanded the National Defense Education Act as well as the federally affected areas education program?

Who can say we have not broken vital new ground in the twin areas of education and health by passage first of the $236 million Medical Professions Educational Assistance Act and then passage of two great measures plus the implementing appropriations in the field of mental health and mental illness?

Our energies have been largely devoted to the forthcoming enactment of the Revenue Act, a far-reaching tax reduction and reform measure to take up the slack in the national economy, and the Civil Rights Act, which will hasten the fulfillment of many promises uttered a hundred years ago. These measures of such great dimensions have commanded the unwavering attention of the entire Nation. This House has already passed the Revenue Act and sent it to the Senate. The Civil Rights Act is ready for floor consideration next month. The final passage next year of both these acts will rest upon the grueling but sustained efforts of this year.

We have extended the emergency corporate and excise taxes. We have adjusted the debt limit to the new demands of the budget.

Throughout the session this House has cast a frugal and prudent eye on every item in the departmental appropriations bills, as it came along. The net result was combined reductions of some $7.1 billion under the original departmental estimates. President Johnson has admonished that every agency of Government must get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar spent for the public weal. On this score the present session has been truly responsive.

Our balance of international payments is a problem of genuine concern, to which we have given earnest attention in all our fiscal decisions.

Another historic forward step in 1963 was the enactment of a new national program to reduce or eliminate air pollution. This energetic and forward-looking health program provides $95 million for a 3-year effort to fight a health menace which now touches every community in the Nation. No one community can do this job by itself. A national effort promises the only solution; that effort is now underway.

Our new authorizations in military preparedness were the largest in our peacetime history, making a total of more than $15.3 billion for new weapons systems designed to insure the peace of the world. We extended the Draft Act; we authorized vast new projects in military construction; we adjusted military pay in all ranks and grades, and in all branches of the service; we enacted new laws regulating the military reserves; we gave final clearance to the Philippine war claims, a problem which has been hanging over the Nation for 17 years.

For the first time in history we enacted laws to provide equal pay for women in industrial occupations.

We broadened the program for housing assistance to the elderly. We have a new program for the development of outdoor recreation areas from coast to coast.

We extended the life of the Export-Import Bank for 5 years, to give new emphasis to our policy of "trade, not aid."

In all areas of legislation we have sought earnestly to keep abreast of the 20th century and to plot a future of sound and practical national development. America is changing, its population is burgeoning, the national economy is becoming more challenging. The sustained attention of this Congress to the tasks at hand will be broken by a pause of only 2 weeks at year's end. Every Member well may be proud of our record of devoted effort and solid accomplishment.

PRELIMINARY APPROPRIATIONS RÉSUMÉ, 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted and in accord with practice, I include for information of Members and others a preliminary résumé of the appropriations work of the 1st session of the 88th Congress. The House has completed its work. Only the foreign aid bill, cleared by the House today, is pending; and the expectation is that it will clear the other body by next Monday.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, and because other actions of the session outside the annual appropriation bills affect final budget and Treasury results in any particular year, including this year, we will include a more comprehensive summary of the situation in the Record next week.

A comprehensive executive updating of the financial situation for the current fiscal year 1964 will also be reflected in the new budget from the President next month. That will include:

First. Revised estimates of budget revenues for fiscal 1964 in light of current conditions and outlook. The original budget projection of $86,900,000,000 has since been informally revised by the Treasury to $88,800,000,000; it will, probably, be further updated in connection with the next budget.

Second. Revised estimates of fiscal 1964 budget expenditures from all sources, including the effect of appropriation reductions made in the bills of the session as disclosed in the tabulations

I am including. And in this connection, it is to be noted that roughly 35 to 40 percent of annual budget expenditures—disbursements—are from prior year appropriations, and some from permanent appropriations, and are therefore not directly affected by congressional actions in the appropriation bills of the current session.

Third. The effect of congressional action, or inaction, on new legislation urged in the original 1964 budget or subsequently submitted or amended—the original appropriation budget request for the first year, fiscal 1964 cost of such new legislation was $2,727,468,000 of which it was indicated some $1,202,000,000 would, if enacted, be disbursed during fiscal 1964. Some legislation has not been enacted and some was adopted at variance with the budget provisions.

All these factors will join—and they are characteristic of every annual budget—to influence the final results and the budget deficit originally projected at $11,902,000,000 for the fiscal year 1964 which began last July 1, and more recently informally projected by the Treasury at $9,000,000,000. Whatever the final deficit, fiscal 1964 represents the 28th year of budget deficits in the last 34 years.

Mr. Speaker, the original budget for fiscal 1964, submitted last January, proposed total new obligational authority—annual appropriations, permanent appropriations, Treasury borrowing, contract authority, and reappropriations—everything which, if enacted, would authorize an obligation against the Treasury—of $107,927,000,000, the second peacetime year in history the total request has exceeded $100,000,000,000. The executive branch has revised that figure from time to time by an amount not yet precisely determinable, but not by much; it remains roughly close to that sum. And since not a dollar can be removed from the Treasury for any purpose at any time unless the Congress has first appropriated or otherwise enacted authority to obligate the Government, the obligational authority request, not the more widely used $98.8 billion expenditure budget total, is the more significant long-run figure and the more accurate barometer to future spending levels urged in the budget. Congress acts on the obligational authority budget, not directly on the expenditure budget.

The principal portion of the obligational authority budget is disposed of in the bills processed through the Committee on Appropriations. In this session, there were 2 supplementals having to do with fiscal 1963 and 12 regular bills for fiscal 1964 plus a small joint resolution for limited last-minute supplements. As noted, everything has cleared the House and only the foreign aid bill awaits final approval in the other body. The last-minute supplemental passed both Houses but was not enacted.

SUMMARY OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

Budget estimates of appropriations submitted to the House for action this session in bills from the Committee on Appropriations total $98,883,372,581, as shown by the tabulations included. This divides $2,149,679,106 as supplements for fiscal 1963 earlier in the session and $96,733,693,475 for fiscal 1964 bills. And as noted, this does not include permanent appropriations recurring automatically under permanent law, estimated in the January budget at about $11,500,000,000; in view of subsequent indications of rising interest costs on the recordbreaking national debt, that total will, probably, go to $12,000,000,000 or more.

The appropriation bills, 88th

[Does not include back-door appropriations[1] or permanent appropriations under previous

Bill No.	Title	House							
		Budget estimates to House	Date and report number	Amount as reported	Amount reported compared with budget estimates	Date passed	Amount as passed	House action compared with—	
								Budget estimates	Amount reported
	1963 SUPPLEMENTALS								
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, agriculture	[2] $508,172,000	Feb. 26 (No. 35)	$508,172,000		Feb. 27	$508,172,000		
H.R. 5517	Supplemental	1,641,507,106	Apr. 5 (No. 198)	988,756,506	−$652,750,600	Apr. 10	1,438,691,506	−$202,815,600	+$449,935,000
	Public works acceleration	(500,000,000)			(−500,000,000)		(450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)	(+450,000,000)
	All other	(1,141,507,106)		(988,756,506)	(−152,750,600)		(988,691,506)	(−152,815,600)	(−65,000)
	Total, 1963 supplementals	2,149,679,106		1,496,928,506	−652,750,600		1,946,863,506	−202,815,600	+449,935,000
	1964 APPROPRIATIONS								
H.R. 5279	Interior	998,009,000	Mar. 28 (No. 177)	929,690,200	−68,318,800	Apr. 2	922,625,200	−75,383,800	−7,065,000
	Loan authorization	(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)	
	Contract authority	(17,500,000)			(−17,500,000)			(−17,500,000)	
H.R. 5366	Treasury—Post Office	6,146,842,000	Apr. 1 (No. 179)	5,997,026,000	−149,816,000	Apr. 4	5,997,026,000	−149,816,000	
H.R. 5888	Labor—HEW	5,759,489,000	Apr. 25 (No. 246)	5,449,988,000	−309,501,000	Apr. 30	5,449,981,000	−309,508,000	−7,000
H.R. 6754	Agriculture	6,368,755,000	June 3 (No. 355)	5,979,457,000	−389,298,000	June 6	5,979,457,000	−389,298,000	
	Loan authorizations	[3] (855,000,000)		[3] (855,000,000)			[3] (855,000,000)		
H.R. 6868	Legislative	[4] 148,580,245	June 6 (No. 369)	[4] 140,038,919	−8,541,326	June 11	[4] 140,038,919	−8,541,326	
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	2,159,891,900	June 14 (No. 388)	1,851,269,900	−308,622,000	June 18	1,851,269,900	−308,622,000	
H.R. 7179	Defense	49,014,237,000	June 21 (No. 439)	47,092,209,000	−1,922,028,000	June 26	47,082,009,000	−1,932,228,000	−10,200,000
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia	(289,581,800)	July 8 (No. 499)	(284,286,800)	(−5,295,000)	July 11	(284,286,800)	(−5,295,000)	
	Federal payment	34,868,000		32,868,000	−2,000,000		32,868,000	−2,000,000	
	Loan authorizations	(8,000,000)		(8,000,000)			(8,000,000)		
H.R. 8747	Independent offices	14,658,588,000	Oct. 7 (No. 824)	13,102,818,700	−1,555,769,300	Oct. 10	13,102,718,700	−1,555,869,300	−100,000
H.R. 9139	Military construction	1,966,400,000	Nov. 14 (No. 901)	1,562,964,000	−403,436,000	Nov. 18	1,562,964,000	−403,436,000	
H.R. 9140	Public works	4,561,747,000	Nov. 15 (No. 902)	4,276,116,400	−285,630,600	Nov. 19	4,276,116,400	−285,630,600	
H.R. 9499	Foreign aid	4,874,400,330	Dec. 14 (No. 1040)	3,113,100,370	−1,761,299,960	Dec. 16	3,113,100,370	−1,761,299,960	
H.J. Res. 875	Supplemental, mental retardation	41,886,000	Dec. 14 (No. 1041)	41,886,000		Dec. 19	41,886,000		
	Total, 1964 appropriations	[7] 96,723,693,475		89,569,432,489	−7,164,260,986		89,552,060,489	−7,181,632,986	−17,372,000
	Total, all appropriations	[7] 98,883,372,581		91,066,360,995	−7,817,011,586		91,498,923,995	−7,384,448,586	+432,563,000
	Total, loan authorizations	(876,000,000)		(869,000,000)	(−7,000,000)		(869,000,000)	(−7,000,000)	
	Total, contract authority	(17,500,000)			(−17,500,000)			(−17,500,000)	

---

[1] Tentatively estimated in January budget at about $11,500,000,000 for fiscal year 1964, (probably low).

[2] Shifted from budget for 1964, which was reduced accordingly.

[3] Includes $330,000,000 for Farmers Home Administration loans currently made from loan repayments in lieu of former practice of public debt borrowings from Treasury.

[4] Excludes Senate items.

As sent to the House floor, the committee bills for the session totaled $91,066,360,995 in appropriations, or $7,817,011,586 below the corresponding budget requests—the largest such aggregate reduction in several years. Every regular bill was below the budget. There were, of course, as in most every session, three or four reductions somewhat in the nature of funding adjustments or of uncertain durability because of limited discretionary control in the appropriations process.

The House made only minor changes in the regular 1964 bills but did insist on restoring the accelerated public works appropriation to the supplemental last spring. As sent to the other body, the bills aggregated $91,498,923,995 in appropriations, a total cut of $7,384,448,586 from the requests considered in the House.

In virtually every session the President sends supplemental budget items to the other body after the House has acted on the bills. This year was no exception but the added amounts were nominal; they totaled only $62,791,555, so that the Senate considered $98,946,164,136 of appropriation budget estimates. As passed by the other body, the bills totaled $93,221,837,607, a reduction of $5,724,326,529 below the corresponding estimates but $1,722,913,612 above the House totals. I am certain the House and the country will be glad to note that both Houses have, this year, held every regular bill total below the related budget requests. But, of course, the other body, somewhat characteristically, also raised every regular bill, except one, above the House allowance.

The bills finally adopted, including the foreign aid bill cleared by the House and pending final disposition, aggregate $92,433,123,132 in appropriations, a cut of $6,513,041,004 below the budget requests.

And to repeat, because it is important in the total situation, these amounts exclude something like $12,000,000,000, plus, of permanent appropriations for fiscal 1964 under previous law.

And significantly, Mr. Speaker, while the bills adopted for fiscal 1964 are substantially below the budget requests, they are are also for the first time in several years, below appropriations for the preceding fiscal year—for the fiscal year 1963. The bills enacted are $3,317,416,885 below last year, in contrast to the upward trend of recent years. I should say that the reduction includes the $2,000,000,000 nonrecurring IFM item, but the residue, nonetheless, leaves a significant cut below last year. Comparison with the previous year is the more accurate and informative measurement, because while the House needs to know what disposition has been made of the budget requests, you never really retrench when you cut a budget level that has never before been appropriated and conclude with appropriations higher than the previous year.

Of course, as is always the case, not every dollar cut from appropriation budget requests for a given year results in an equivalent reduction in expenditure estimated for that same year; the rough rule of thumb, for the budget as a whole, is that 35 to 40 percent of total appropriations are not expended in the first year. However, that is essentially immaterial here. A dollar not appropriated is a dollar not taken from the Treasury.

This significant step, this departure from the general trend, is summarized in the following tables. The first table supplies more details on bills of the session at each stage of consideration:

Cong., 1st sess., as of Dec. 24, 1963

legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Senate							Conference			Public Law	
Budget estimates to Senate	Date and report number	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with— Budget estimates	Senate action compared with— House action	Date filed and report number	Amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date	Number	Date approved
[2] $508,172,000	Feb. 28 (No. 9)	$508,172,000	Mar. 4	$508,172,000				$508,172,000		88-1	Mar. 6
1,652,300,456	Apr. 24 (No. 155)	1,486,096,841	May 1	1,488,683,841	−$163,616,615	+$49,992,335	May 6 (No. 275)	1,467,430,491	−$184,869,965	88-25	May 17
(500,000,000)		(450,000,000)		(450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)		May 31 (No. 290)	(450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)		
(1,152,300,456)		(1,036,096,841)		(1,038,683,841)	(−113,616,615)	(+49,992,335)		(1,017,430,491)	(−134,869,965)		
2,160,472,456		1,994,268,841		1,996,855,841	−163,616,615	+49,992,335		1,975,602,491	−184,869,965		
998,009,000	May 22 (No. 181)	979,093,400	May 28	979,693,400	−18,315,600	+57,068,200	July 11 (No. 551)	952,456,500	−45,552,500	88-79	July 26
(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)			(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)		
(17,500,000)					(−17,500,000)				(−17,500,000)		
6,146,842,000	May 3 (No. 168)	6,074,216,250	May 8	6,069,466,250	−77,375,750	+72,440,250	May 28 (No. 353)	6,045,466,000	−101,376,000	88-39	June 13
5,759,489,000	Aug. 1 (No. 383)	5,494,627,250	Aug. 7	5,495,827,250	−263,661,750	+45,846,250	Sept. 25 (No. 774)	5,471,087,500	−288,401,500	88-136	Oct. 11
6,368,755,000	Sept. 12 (No. 497)	6,046,738,340	Sept. 30	6,047,988,340	−320,766,660	+68,531,340	Dec. 21 (No. 1088)	6,224,370,215	−144,384,785		
(855,000,000)		[3] (880,000,000)		[3] (880,000,000)	(+25,000,000)	(+25,000,000)		[3] (855,000,000)			
182,218,450	June 25 (No. 313)	168,273,069	June 26	168,273,069	−13,945,381	+28,234,150	Nov. 12 (No. 806)	[5] 168,293,069	−13,925,381		
2,159,891,900	Dec. 5 (No. 747)	1,821,283,000	Dec. 12	1,821,343,000	−338,548,900	−29,926,900	Dec. 17 (No. 1056)	1,820,093,000	−339,798,900		
49,014,237,000	Sept. 17 (No. 502)	47,371,407,000	Sept. 24	47,339,707,000	−1,674,530,000	+257,698,000	Oct. 7 (No 812)	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000	88-149	Oct. 17
(328,724,000)	Nov. 6 (No. 632)	(319,582,825)	Nov. 18	(319,587,785)	(−9,136,215)	(+35,300,985)	Dec. 17 (No. 1055)	(313,093,424)	(−15,630,576)		
52,868,000		47,868,000		47,868,000	−5,000,000	+15,000,000		40,368,000	−12,500,000		
(20,800,000)		(20,800,000)		(20,800,000)		(+12,800,000)		(19,300,000)	(−1,500,000)		
14,658,588,000	Nov. 13 (No. 641)	13,390,214,650	Nov. 20	13,300,214,650	−1,358,373,350	+197,495,950	Dec. 5 (No. 1004)	13,224,518,050	−1,434,069,950	88-215	Dec. 19
1,966,400,000	Dec. 5 (No. 750)	1,617,489,000	Dec. 9	1,617,489,000	−348,911,000	+54,525,000	Dec. 12 (No. 1036)	1,585,880,000	−380,520,000	88-220	Dec. 21
4,561,957,000	Dec. 5 (No. 746)	4,500,988,200	Dec. 9	4,500,963,200	−60,993,800	+224,846,800	Dec. 11 (No. 1027)	4,406,272,700	−155,684,300		
4,874,550,330	Dec. 17 (No. 785)	3,604,364,667	Dec. 19	3,578,058,607	−1,296,491,723	+464,958,237	[6] Dec. 21 (No. 1091)	3,298,705,607	−1,575,844,723		
41,886,000	Dec. 20 (No. 814)	258,090,000	Dec. 20	258,090,000	+216,204,000	+216,204,000			−41,886,000		
[7] 96,785,691,680		91,374,652,826		91,224,981,766	−5,560,709,914	+1,672,921,277		90,457,520,641	−6,328,171,039		
[8] 98,946,164,136		93,368,921,667		93,221,837,607	−5,724,326,529	+1,722,913,612		92,433,123,132	−6,513,041,004		
(888,800,000)		(906,800,000)		(906,800,000)	(+18,000,000)	(+37,800,000)		(880,300,000)	(−8,500,000)		
(17,500,000)					(−17,500,000)				(17,500,000)		

---

[5] Report rejected by Senate on Nov. 27, 1963. Amendments adopted separately on House floor on Dec. 17, 1963, and on Senate floor on Dec. 18, 1963.

[6] Report No. 1087 of Dec. 20 rejected previously.

[7] Does not include $32,427,000 included in H. Doc. 174 but not considered.

[8] Does not include $32,277,000 included in H. Doc. 174 but not considered.

Source: Prepared by Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess.—A summary as of Dec. 24, 1963

Bill	Appropriations	The appropriations—	
		Below (−) the budget requests	Above (+) or below (−) fiscal 1963 appropriations
1. Supplemental bills for fiscal 1963	$1,975,602,491	−$184,869,965	
2. Bills for fiscal 1964:			
Interior and related	952,456,500	−45,552,500	+$22,762,400
Loan authorization	(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)	
Contract authority		(−17,500,000)	
Treasury-Post Office	6,045,466,000	−101,376,000	+383,951,830
Labor-HEW	5,471,087,500	−288,401,500	−100,885,100
Defense	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000	[1]−1,130,072,500
Independent offices	13,224,518,050	−1,434,069,950	+1,354,866,750
Public works	4,406,272,700	−155,684,300	−1,128,429,910
Military construction	1,585,880,000	−380,520,000	[1]+266,765,500
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	1,820,093,000	−339,798,900	−323,333,841
District of Columbia (Federal payment)	40,368,000	−12,500,000	+7,169,000
Loan authorizations	(19,300,000)	(−1,500,000)	(−6,742,000)
Legislative	168,293,069	−13,925,381	+17,880,224
Agriculture	6,224,370,215	−144,384,785	+216,770,305
Loan authorizations	(855,000,000)	(..........)	(+35,000,000)
Foreign aid (pending Senate approval)	3,298,705,607	−1,575,844,723	−2,904,861,543
Supplemental, mental retardation		−41,886,000	
Total for fiscal 1964 bills	90,457,520,641	−6,328,171,039	−3,317,416,885
Loan authorizations and contract authority	(880,300,000)	(−26,000,000)	(+28,258,000)

[1] The 1st figure, $1,130,072,500 is, on a comparable basis, overstated by $484,300,000, and the 2d figure, $266,765,500, is understated, (thus converting a real decrease to an apparent increase) by approximately the same amount due to the shift, in 1964, of financing of operation and maintenance and debt payments in connection with family housing from the regular defense bill to the military construction bill.

AS THE HOUSE PREPARES TO ADJOURN SINE DIE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 88th Congress is now in its waning moments. It has been an extraordinary session in many respects—its extended length, the scope and impact of the measures we have had to consider, its record of solid accomplishment in many areas, both domestic and foreign, and the loss of our great President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and our transition to immediate cooperation with our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

As we prepare to adjourn sine die, we can lay down our legislative burdens until January secure in the knowledge that we have risen to many challenges which have confronted us. We have written a record in which every Member can take pride.

I know that I speak for the House as a whole when I say that not only we, but the entire Nation, owes a special tribute to our beloved Speaker, whose inspiring leadership was indispensable to the many successes of this session.

It was Speaker McCormack who, more than any other person, provided the patience and the bedrock determination that carried us through to the end of this lengthy session.

It was the pool of energy of Speaker McCormack which provided the fuel to ignite the legislative fires which have burned so long and produced so much in the way of solid accomplishment—accomplishment in which every Member of the House can take pride.

I know I speak the sense of this House when I say that the Speaker has executed his duties with a fairness, a judiciousness, and a devotion that is unsurpassed in the history of this great body.

He is our leader, our tutor, our friend and advisor, and one of the most honorable and remarkable men ever to grace the position of Speaker. He has our love and respect forever.

I am personally indebted to the Democratic whip, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] and his assistant whips, for their tireless efforts and magnificent work. The accuracy of their polls on legislative matters could not be easily matched.

I am at a loss for adequate words to express my gratitude for the many kindnesses shown me by all the Members of the House, both Democratic and Republican. Members of my own party have given me daily support and help to an extent that I could never have hoped to receive.

I owe a special tribute to my good friend, the distinguished minority leader and gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck], and the very able minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends]. They have given the best of their great abilities to this House and this country, and their statesmanship and fairplay have been indispensable to the efficient operation of this House. They are great Americans and have my eternal admiration and gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, all the Members of this House have given unstintingly of their time, efforts, and abilities. It is difficult for persons, not intimate with the legislative process in this country, to understand how this body operates, being composed of Members having many different and sometimes conflicting opinions and views on all the great issues. We function, Mr. Speaker, because this Chamber is filled with great Americans, devoted first and foremost to the concept of government by consent of the governed through orderly procedures and respect for the rights of the majority and minority alike. I salute my colleagues, each and every one, for their great contributions to the record of this session.

We also must recognize the magnificent part played by the officers and employees of the House, all of whom have given tirelessly of their devoted efforts to the work of this session.

We will be back together in a short while. I hope we all enjoy our brief rest, which is so well deserved. Again I thank you for your friendship and your help. I wish for each and every-one of you good health and good fortune, and a happy Christmas holiday.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, due to the unnecessarily long session of this House, much is being said concerning congressional reform. Much of the comment is unduly harsh on Congress and some reveals a lack of knowledge of the true function and role of this House.

Because such comment is beginning to feed upon itself and is helping to create unfair disrespect for this House which, despite imperfections, is still the mainspring of democracy, it is important that perspective be kept. For this reason, it is refreshing to read a comment by the noted columnist, Max Freedman, which honestly attempts to place this matter of mounting criticism into proper perspective. Because of increasing interest in this general question, Mr. Freedman's column, which appeared in the Evening Star on December 23, follows:

IN DEFENSE OF OUR CONGRESS—KENNEDY'S VISION OF AMERICA'S NEEDS POSSIBLY AHEAD OF MAJORITY IN UNITED STATES

(By Max Freedman)

Few Americans will regret the end of this year's session of Congress. It has talked too much and done too little to earn respect or gratitude. But the criticism of Congress has now reached such a pitch of bitterness that it is necessary to speak up in its defense if only to guard it from undeserved and exaggerated abuse.

We can never know what the final tally of legislative achievement would have been if President Kennedy had been spared. He himself thought that the most important parts of his program, including civil rights, would all pass by June of next year. He always spoke of his proposals as forming a 2-year program which would be endorsed by Congress as public opinion slowly prevailed. Perhaps President Kennedy could have mobilized those pressures in a way that would have brought action from Congress. He was certainly not despondent about the prospect at the time of his death.

In short, President Kennedy used a larger timespan in judging Congress and therefore he refused to join the angry critics. As a matter of practical politics he had very little choice. It was possible for Mr. Truman in 1948 to campaign against Congress because that Congress was under Republican control. In 1964 it would not have been easy for Mr. Kennedy to denounce a Congress dominated by his own party.

Yet there is a deeper reason than party loyalty for President Kennedy's troubles with Congress. It may be one of his best titles to greatness that his vision of America's needs was ahead of majority opinion in Congress and maybe even in the country. As a prophetic voice as well as a national leader he raised issues that could only be settled after long debate. He was less critical of Congress than many people wanted him to be, not only because he was much wiser than these critics, but also because he knew so much more about the legislative process.

In retrospect, his friends in Congress have only one criticism of his technique of leadership. They believe he made a mistake in sending so many proposals to Congress instead of bending its energies to action on a few major measures. It should be observed that this criticism reduces to complete futility all arguments which measure the success of Congress by the volume of legislation which it has endorsed.

Those arguments assume that the proposals sent to Congress are always wise and necessary; and that any opposition to them must be an offense against the national interest. The men in both parties who direct the work of Congress will never accept this wretched formulation of the legislative role. All criticism based on the inherent wisdom of presidential action will merely widen the breach between Congress and the executive branch, and delay rather than facilitate the passage of useful legislation.

It is, for example, no real contribution to legislative reform to suggest that Congress should be compelled to vote on certain measures within a period specified by the White House. Congress will not do it; nor should it.

When President Kennedy's trade program passed the House of Representatives, Mr. Wilbur Mills was the hero. When the tax program got stuck in the House this year, he suddenly became a devil. Isn't this rather silly? Nor can all the abuse of Senator Byrd obscure the two essential facts that the Senate Finance Committee under his chairmanship is making progress with the tax bill and the Senate will be able to pass this legislation, despite his personal views, early next year.

All this trivial chatter about personalities cheapens Congress by degrading the debate into a scuffle for personal vindication. In the TFX controversy, for instance, this particular kind of attack dwells on the motives of Senator McClellan or Senator Jackson instead of recognizing the genuine and widespread resentment that prevails in the Senate over the Defense Department's role in awarding this contract.

No wonder experienced and responsible Members of Congress have refused to be persuaded by the kind of criticisms they have been forced to endure in the last few months. Those criticisms will find no champion in President Johnson, who has pledged himself to respect the integrity and independence of Congress. He knows that the best way to get good results is to treat Congress not as a destructive critic but as a useful partner in the necessary compromises of national leadership.

EXTENSION OF CREDIT TO RUSSIA

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Foreman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I must take issue today with those who urge that we cast our votes in the Christmas spirit. The folks of West Texas elected me to carefully consider each issue on its merits, to be diligent, thrifty, and frugal in the expenditure of their hard-earned tax dollars and to do what best my conscience dictates—not because of emotion, but because of reason.

I do not believe my folks want me to play Santa Claus to Khrushchev by issuing him an international meal ticket or a credit card for communism. The Russians are faulty now, some $10 billion plus, in their payments to the United States of America for goods previously purchased. By granting credit to Russia, we will, in effect, be subsidizing the expansion of communism around the world.

Our foreign aid program is unrealistic and wasteful enough as it is, but it is repulsively unconscionable to make it even worse by extending credit to the avowed enemy of freedom and all that America stands for.

We are now shelling out American foreign aid dollars to 104 nations of the 112 in the world. The Agency for International Development now has 64,508 employees carrying on this program. I cannot and will not be a party to adding to this by an extension of credit to those not now covered in our foreign aid largess. In my opinion, it is not American.

NEW GOP TASK FORCE ON LATIN AMERICA APPOINTED

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the special projects subcommittee of the House Republican policy committee, today I am proud to announce the formation of a new GOP Task Force on Latin America.

Representative William C. Cramer, Republican of Florida, who is one of the most knowledgeable Members of the House on Latin America is named chairman of the task force. Representative James F. Battin, Republican, of Montana, is named as vice chairman.

The purpose of this special task force is to probe deeper into United States-Latin American relationships. This will be done with the idea of trying to establish a foreign policy which will first, work toward real friendship with our Latin American neighbors based on mutual respect and understanding; second, abate the anti-American feeling which is now prevalent in Latin America; third, destroy the Communist movement in that area and deny it to the Communist bloc; and fourth, make the Alliance for Progress program a workable one.

The task force will confer with experts in all areas of Latin American relations, develop long- and short-range programs to meet the challenges America faces in this area, and make reports to the Congress.

We are hopeful that the work of the task force will prove beneficial to the new administration as well as to the Congress.

Other Members appointed to the task force are Republican Representatives H. R. Gross, of Iowa; James D. Weaver, of Pennsylvania; Don H. Clausen, of California; James T. Broyhill, of North Carolina; Durward Hall, of Missouri; Elford A. Cederberg, of Michigan, and John M. Ashbrook, of Ohio.

BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on December 9 of this year I addressed the House on the accomplishments of the economy drive undertaken at the beginning of this session of Congress. At that time I estimated that we might make savings in the House of Representatives of approximately $7,500 million. Even as of this date it is impossible to determine the exact cuts that were made, but they were substantial. More could and should have been done, and the task force will continue its operations during the next session of the Congress, and we shall continue to make every effort to make reductions where they are feasible and do not affect the national interest. It is our opinion we can accomplish a balanced budget and with a balanced budget that we may have a meaningful tax bill which will reduce the heavy burden of taxes upon the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well to submit on this closing day of the session a comparative budget comparing the budget requests from 1960 to 1964. I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that this is not complete insofar as the action taken by the Congress this session is concerned, but it does give the picture on budget requests.

Mr. Speaker, there has never been published, to my knowledge, a comparative budget. By this I mean a budget allowing a complete comparison of appropriations from the general fund in the past several years. Every year, it is true the budget message contains some historical perspective on Federal expenditures, but never a detailed analysis. The Budget of the United States does print data for the previous 2 years, but often with estimates or possible revisions—due to supplemental requests. The fact is that there simply is no long-range view of the budget.

Not that there is not a need for such a view. Members of Congress must ask questions before they vote on appropriations, or even authorizations, questions about trends in Government spending, total outlays in certain areas over the past few years, and the extent of Government involvement in the economy. Such questions cannot be answered by mere reference to the past 2 years. Yet, without much effort and a good chance for error, the Members of Congress cannot find more information.

"Much effort and a good chance for error" is a real picture of the situation, too. Every year the structure of the budget is altered; a commission is created; an agency abolished; a service transferred from one department to another; two offices merged; and so on. The final product is never final; yet, one must set up some base for comparison and work around it. This requires "much effort and a good chance for error."

This summer I attempted to make a "Comparative Budget." Based on the budget documents of 1962–64, the supplemental appropriations of this session, and the Appropriations Committee reports printed thus far, this budget is as accurate and up to date as possible. Yet this budget is quite limited: It covers only the last 4 fiscal years; it deals only with new obligational authority, not expenditures; it contains only estimates for indefinite appropriations, which could now be corrected; and, in several specific areas, it lacks the necessary material for making an accurate comparison.

These limitations could all be overcome by a comprehensive document from the Bureau of the Budget. I believe that a full presentation along the lines of my "comparative budget," but covering all of the fiscal years from possibly World War II on, such a budget would be invaluable to the Members of Congress.

The "comparative budget" I have made is put in the structure of the present executive budget.

[NOTE.—All figures are in thousands of dollars. Figures in parentheses are not counted in the totals. Asterisks indicate budget requests to be transmitted at a later date. The final column represents action taken by the House Appropriations Committee only and does not reflect changes occurring either on the floor of the House or in final action by the Congress]

Department of Defense—Military functions

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Military personnel:						
Military personnel:						
Army	3,204,188	3,254,548	3,697,000	3,662,900	3,885,000	3,785,000
Navy	2,476,700	2,503,244	2,652,536	2,747,400	2,676,000	2,614,000
Marine Corps	608,600	606,74	632,000	667,900	678,600	676,600
Air Force	3,918,000	3,964,843	4,175,820	4,167,690	4,418,000	3,943,000
Reserve personnel:						
Army	227,700	220,598	205,530	239,200	210,100	210,100
Navy	85,000	85,584	83,000	85,600	92,300	92,300
Marine Corps	24,300	24,831	26,400	28,100	28,500	28,500
Air Force	54,000	52,250	52,080	50,100	55,100	55,100
National Guard personnel:						
Army	234,961	230,277	218,550	261,800	240,300	240,300
Air Force	48,000	46,000	47,000	53,000	58,300	58,300
Retired pay, Defense	715,000	789,500	920,000	1,029,000	1,163,000	1,143,000
Pay increase	0	0	0	0	*900,000	
Total	11,596,449	11,778,421	12,709,916	12,992,690	13,235,200 *+900,000	12,848,200
					14,135,200	
Operation and maintenance:						
Operation and maintenance:						
Army	3,075,596	3,209,772	3,770,726	3,452,552	3,395,200	3,361,000
Navy	2,610,610	2,597,626	2,986,282	2,864,414	2,934,000	2,905,000
Marine Corps	175,850	176,725	187,271	194,000	192,300	191,000
Air Force	4,202,303	4,306,617	4,493,543	4,412,877	4,385,000	4,341,000
Defense agencies	0	0	0	358,987	451,400	446,000
(Office of Secretary now included in above)	20,500	19,850	21,500	0	0	0
Army National Guard	151,700	166,316	165,485	174,400	176,600	176,600
Air National Guard	169,000	189,481	189,100	194,400	222,700	222,700
National Rifle Promotion Board	300	501	500	622	528	528
Claims, Defense	16,500	19,575	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
Contingencies, Defense	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Court of Military Appeals	425	425	445	472	509	509
Adjustment figure	−120,074	0	0	0	0	0
Total	10,316,510	10,701,888	11,758,852	11,688,724	11,792,237	11,678,337
Procurement:						
Equipment and missiles, Army	1,407,300	1,495,352	2,532,102	2,520,000	3,202,000	2,969,094
Aircraft and missiles, Navy	1,961,644	2,141,760	2,680,888	3,034,660	3,066,000	2,877,445
Shipbuilding, Navy	1,330,700	2,245,590	2,966,860	2,919,200	2,310,000	2,080,089
Other, Navy	583,219	424,480	852,012	903,600	1,208,000	1,175,231
Marine Corps	133,850	91,180	264,600	256,000	207,700	201,960
Aircraft, Air Force	4,284,600	3,562,237	3,657,852	3,562,400	3,559,000	3,328,900
Missiles, Air Force	2,465,550	2,615,120	2,729,784	2,459,000	2,177,000	2,129,490
Other, Air Force	1,109,650	877,171	1,096,182	956,250	951,500	871,299
Defense agencies	0	0	0	36,000	43,600	43,164
Adjustment figure	−171,418	−1,737,100	−1,034,744	0	0	0
Total	13,105,095	11,715,790	15,745,536	16,647,110	16,724,800	15,676,672
Research, development, test, and evaluation:						
Army	1,074,128	1,147,417	1,337,175	1,319,500	1,469,900	1,363,141
Navy	1,066,524	1,366,509	1,308,905	1,475,958	1,572,900	1,525,713
Air Force	1,448,850	1,583,858	2,529,857	3,632,100	3,621,800	3,416,146
Defense agencies	329,620	194,000	191,650	444,000	447,400	434,000
Emergency fund, Defense	5,288	4,159	14	150,000	150,000	150,000
Adjustment figure	291,492	1,737,100	1,034,744	0	0	0
Total	4,215,902	6,033,043	6,402,345	7,021,558	7,262,000	6,889,000

Department of Defense—Military functions—Continued

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Military construction:						
Army	263, 632	148, 407	171, 284	151, 407	249, 500	------
Navy	204, 112	162, 519	198, 618	161, 354	269, 900	------
Air Force	783, 832	676, 084	522, 746	780, 068	628, 200	------
Defense agencies	16, 545	0	350	35, 677	29, 900	------
Army Reserve	20, 000	16, 038	14, 381	8, 000	4, 500	------
Naval Reserve	8, 980	4, 000	7, 000	7, 000	6, 000	------
Air Force Reserve	4, 000	4, 000	4, 608	5, 000	4, 000	------
Army National Guard	23, 219	17, 540	21, 869	7, 000	3, 500	------
Air National Guard	16, 440	13, 850	20, 775	14, 000	16, 000	------
Loran stations, Defense	23, 200	19, 000	10, 000	20, 000	20, 500	------
Arizona Memorial	0	0	150	0	0	------
Total	1, 363, 961	1, 061, 438	971, 781	1, 189, 506	1, 232, 000	------
Family housing	0	0	0	596, 879	734, 400	------
Civil defense:						
Operation and maintenance	0	0	0	72, 848	82, 200	------
Research, development, and construction	0	0	0	53, 000	217, 800	------
Civil defense and construction	0	0	257, 206	0	0	------
Total	0	0	257, 206	125, 848	300, 000	------
Revolving and management funds:						
Permanent appropriation	30, 000	30, 000	0	0	0	------
Permanent, indefinite, contract authorization	0	0	324, 639	0	0	------
Total	30, 000	30, 000	324, 639	0	0	------
Grand total, Defense, military	40, 627, 918	41, 320, 580	48, 170, 275	50, 262, 315	51, 280, 637 *900, 000	------ ------
Total	------	------	------	------	52, 180, 637	------

Legislative branch

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Senate	------	------	------	------	------	------
House of Representatives:						
Compensation of members	10, 638	10, 673	10, 672	10, 672	10, 622	10, 622
Mileage and expense allowance	200	390	200	200	200	200
Salaries, employees	7, 123	7, 648	7, 661	8, 149	8, 458	8, 384
Members' clerk hire	16, 300	18, 122	20, 400	21, 348	21, 800	21, 300
Contingent expenses of the House:						
Furniture	232	243	243	270	283	270
Miscellaneous items	2, 443	2, 544	2, 549	2, 689	2, 825	2, 800
Reporting hearings	150	150	150	175	175	175
Special and select committees	2, 450	2, 634	2, 900	3, 059	3, 325	3, 300
Joint Committee on Taxation	295	322	322	338	344	344
Joint Committee on Immigration	20	20	20	20	20	20
Joint Committee on Defense Production	0	0	0	68	70	70
Office of Information	99	108	108	120	122	122
Telephone and telegraph	1, 300	1, 275	1, 300	1, 500	1, 670	1, 670
Stationery	1, 056	794	745	788	785	785
Physician's office	15	17	17	17	17	17
Postage stamps	184	184	184	184	183	183
Folding documents	220	250	236	251	257	251
Revision of laws	18	20	20	20	21	21
Special autos	38	30	30	30	31	31
Portrait of Speaker	0	0	0	3	0	0
New edition, United States Code	150	0	100	0	0	0
Payments to widows and heirs	135	112	102	45	0	0
Capitol Police:						
General expenses	37	37	37	37	37	37
Capitol Police Board	106	113	125	136	144	144
Education of pages	62	68	68	73	77	77
Penalty mail costs	2, 691	3, 269	3, 836	3, 986	4, 867	4, 867
Statements of appropriations	8	8	8	8	8	13
North Atlantic Treaty Conference	80	0	0	0	0	0
Preparation of Clerk's report	0	8	0	0	0	0
Total	46, 049	46, 038	52, 023	54, 186	56, 340	55, 702
Architect of the Capitol:						
Office of the Architect:						
Salaries	278	316	338	363	496	480
Expenses	50	50	50	50	50	50
Capitol Building and Grounds:						
Capitol buildings	1, 020	1, 152	1, 630	1, 633	1, 437	1, 428
Extension of Capitol:						
Contract authorization	0	3, 000	0	0	0	0
Liquidation of authorization	0	0	(1, 500)	(800)	(1, 000)	(700)
Capitol Grounds	357	388	446	435	496	476
Senate office buildings	1, 832	2, 363	2, 320	2, 252	2, 945	(2, 945)
Legislative garage	116	112	79	63	50	50
House office buildings	1, 460	1, 703	1, 639	1, 722	1, 928	1, 778

See footnotes at end of table.

Legislative branch—Continued

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Architect of the Capitol—Continued						
Capitol Building and Grounds—Continued						
Acquisition of property:						
Contract authorization	5, 000	5, 000	0	0	0	0
Liquidation of authorization	(16, 500)	(18, 000)	(6, 000)	(8, 500)	(20, 000)	(20, 000)
Capitol Power Plant:						
Current	1, 902	2, 029	2, 052	2, 052	2, 230	2, 313
Liquidation of authorization	(2, 500)	(3, 230)	0	0	0	0
Extension of Senate Office Building site	200	140	0	0	0	0
Subway transportation	6	6	0	0	0	0
Library of Congress buildings:						
Structural and mechanical care	1, 085	967	3, 748	1, 116	3, 522	3, 388
Furniture	140	123	99	225	189	180
Contract authorization	75	0	0	0	0	0
Liquidation of authorization	0	(75)	0	0	0	0
Total, Architect of Capitol	13, 520	17, 350	12, 401	9, 912	13, 344	10, 044 [1]+2, 945
Total						12, 989
Botanic Garden	328	352	489	514	483	462
Library of Congress:						
Salaries and expenses	7, 160	8, 123	8, 455	10, 141	10, 405	9, 726
Copyright Office	1, 450	1, 589	1, 600	1, 674	1, 794	1, 781
Legislative Reference Service	1, 455	1, 780	1, 809	1, 961	2, 143	2, 138
Distribution of card catalogs	1, 981	2, 173	2, 347	2, 754	3, 077	3, 042
Books for general collection	350	400	470	570	670	650
Books for law library	90	90	90	110	110	110
Books for the blind	1, 619	1, 723	1, 786	1, 894	1, 902	1, 900
Presidential papers	107	113	113	113	113	113
Motion picture preservation	60	61	61	61	61	50
Collection and distribution of materials (foreign currency program)	0	0	400	680	978	978
Alaskan church records	0	0	0	15	0	0
Revision, annotated Constitution	0	0	25	0	0	0
Oliver Holmes Fund (permanent, indefinite (special fund))	26	17	26	18	20	20
Total	14, 299	16, 068	17, 182	19, 992	21, 273	20, 508
Government Printing Office:						
Printing and binding	11, 500	11, 900	13, 400	15, 200	18, 200	18, 200
Office of Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses	3, 520	4, 044	4, 724	4, 760	5, 418	5, 242
Acquisition of annex site	0	0	0	6, 450	3, 758	0
GPO fund, contribution	0	0	0	0	11, 000	8, 500
Total	15, 020	15, 944	18, 124	26, 410	38, 376	31, 942
Grand total, legislative branch	116, 656	124, 665	129, 086		161, 136	119, 358

[1] Senate office buildings appropriations are not handled by the House Appropriations Committee.

NOTE.—Revisions in budget from original requests of January 1963: House of Representatives, salaries of officers and employees, raised by 8. Penalty mail costs, raised by 881 Architect, liquidation of contract authority, acquisition of property, raised by 3,500. Library of Congress, distribution of card catalogs, raised by 100. Government Printing Office, GPO fund contribution, raised by 11,000. Total, raised by 11,988, plus (3,500).

The Judiciary

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests. 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
The Supreme Court:						
Salaries	1, 336	1, 440	1, 479	1, 503	1, 588	1, 588
Printing and binding reports	90	90	105	138	141	138
Miscellaneous expenses	79	70	83	79	87	85
Care of buildings and grounds	347	287	284	323	354	348
Auto for Chief Justice	6	7	7	7	7	7
Books for Court	30	35	38	35	35	35
Total	1, 888	1, 929	1, 996	2, 085	2, 212	2, 201
Court of Customs and Patents Appeals	332	357	359	370	390	388
Customs Court	788	840	895	931	989	989
Court of Claims	884	924	964	1, 044	1, 124	1, 110
Court of Appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:						
Salaries of judges	9, 185	9, 200	10, 100	11, 048	11, 200	11, 200
Salaries, other personnel	21, 501	23, 751	25, 654	27, 988	31, 480	30, 650
Fees	4, 820	4, 635	4, 800	5, 800	5, 500	5, 500
Travel and miscellaneous expenses	3, 500	3, 835	5, 438	4, 670	4, 550	4, 500
Administrative office	1, 200	1, 368	1, 442	1, 530	1, 640	1, 590
Referees' salaries (special)	2, 006	2, 125	2, 370	2, 552	2, 600	2, 550
Referees' expenses (special)	3, 050	3, 651	4, 310	4, 897	5, 456	5, 250
Total	45, 262	48, 565	54, 104	58, 486	62, 426	61, 240
Grand total, Judiciary	49, 154	52, 615	58, 319	62, 916	67, 141	65, 927
Plus Grants to Alaska from Court receipts (permanent, indefinite, special fund)	749	0	0	0	0	0
Transfers from GSA	0	0	934	2, 354	1, 587	0
Total	49, 903	52, 615	59, 253	65, 270	68, 728	

Department of Agriculture

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Agricultural Research Service:						
Salaries and expenses	138,848	151,520	159,558	173,595 (178,457)	184,204 (190,814)	---- (181,588)
Salaries and expenses (foreign currency)	18,193	15,131	5,265	5,265	2,500	0
Construction of facilities	0	7,750	800	0	0	0
Permanent appropriation	30	400	0	0	0	0
Total	158,071	175,801	166,623	178,860 (183,722)	186,704 (193,314)	---- (181,588)
Cooperative State Experiment Station Service	31,804	32,803	35,803	38,263	40,383	40,383
Extension Service	64,123	67,431	70,804	75,344	77,328	77,313
Farmer Cooperative Service	616	657	657	1,156	1,280	1,195
Soil Conservation Service:						
Conservation operations	82,322	89,204	86,646	93,976	99,453	97,480
Watershed protection	22,750	36,800	53,752	61,376	63,992	63,222
Flood prevention	18,000	19,570	24,994	25,326	25,576	25,465
Great Plains conservation program	10,000	10,168	10,166	12,354	14,640	12,994
Water conservation and utilities program	75	0	0	0	0	0
Resource conservation and development	0	0	0	0	6,275	1,200
Total	133,147	155,742	178,558	193,031	209,936	200,361
Economic Research Service	0	0	9,360	9,511	10,301	9,832
Statistical Reporting Service	0	0	8,761	10,022	11,552	11,079
Agricultural Marketing Service:						
Research and service	41,417	47,221	37,961	40,897 (36,034)	42,905 (37,895)	---- (37,061)
Research and service (permanent)	0	0	285	0	0	0
Construction of facilities	0	0	0	0	1,600 (0)	---- ----
Payments to States	1,195	1,195	1,325	1,425	1,425	1,425
Special milk program	66,731	74,668	171,181	100,000	102,000	100,000
School lunch program	110,000	110,000	125,000	125,000	137,000	137,000
School lunch program (permanent)	43,657	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
Perishable Commodities Act fund (permanent-indefinite)	679	693	665	729	913	913
Food stamp program	0	0	0	0	*25,000	----
Total	463,981	545,600	654,085	577,904 (573,041)	639,026 (632,416) *+25,000	---- (629,582) ----
Foreign Agricultural Service:						
Salaries and expenses	15,071	19,031	15,901	21,129	19,039	18,505
Salaries and expenses (permanent)	2,493	2,817	3,117	3,117	3,117	3,117
Total	17,564	21,848	19,018	24,246	22,156	21,622
Commodity Exchange Authority	910	990	1,007	1,061	1,095	1,093
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:						
Expenses	40,535	43,598	62,598	95,423	114,944	105,737
Sugar Act program	71,500	74,500	78,000	77,650	80,000	78,000
Agricultural conservation program	241,702	242,000	243,000	212,900	220,000	215,000
Land-use adjustment program	0	0	0	2,000	19,000	10,000
Conservation reserve program	335,000	351,825	312,000	304,000	294,000	294,000
Total	688,737	711,923	695,598	691,973	727,944	702,737
Foreign assistance programs:						
Public Law 480:						
Sales of commodities	968,016	881,000	1,250,451	1,588,804	1,452,000	1,452,000
Famine relief grants	104,508	115,000	140,868	250,000	215,451	215,451
Losses on contracts	0	0	13,000	40,000	79,000	52,515
Total, Public Law 480	1,072,524	996,000	1,404,319	1,878,804	1,746,451	1,719,966
International wheat agreement	63,875	52,042	70,681	81,218	92,356	86,218
Materials for stockpile	129,000	422,950	125,000	125,000	82,860	82,860
Total	1,265,399	1,020,592	1,600,000	2,085,022	1,921,667	1,889,044
Commodity Credit Corporation:						
Price support programs	2,043,693	1,151,832	936,429	2,370,698	2,799,400	2,500,000
Other programs	2,664	1,018	1,861,915	0	0	0
National Wool Act (permanent-indefinite)	50,050	67,190	75,278	69,165	69,000	69,000
Total	2,096,407	1,264,095	1,011,707	2,439,863	2,868,400	2,569,000
Federal crop insurance program	6,377	6,561	6,550	6,779	7,210	6,950
Rural Electric Administration:						
Salaries and expenses	9,632	10,024	10,024	10,442	11,344	11,162
Loans (from debt receipts)	265,000	310,000	407,500	480,000	495,000 *−151,000	495,000
Total	274,632	320,024	417,524	490,442	506,344 *−151,000	506,162
Farmers' Home Administration:						
Salaries and expenses	30,745	33,017	34,501	35,779	39,367 *+5,350	38,367
Housing grants and loans	0	0	10,000	0	0	0
Housing for elderly fund	0	0	0	1,000	5,000	2,000
Rural renewal	0	0	0	0	2,350	1,000
Loan authorizations	226,000	467,000	326,000	340,000	0	0
Farm tenant mortgage fund	6,245	0	0	0	0	0
Housing credit fund	0	0	0	0	*100,000	
Total	262,990	500,017	370,501	376,779	46,717 *+105,350	41,367
Office of Rural Areas Development	0	0	0	88	134	120
Office of General Counsel	3,162	3,550	3,649	3,855	3,967	3,953
Office of Information	1,432	1,548	1,591	1,662	1,684	1,684
Agriculture centennial	0	0	100	0	0	0

Department of Agriculture—Continued

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
National Agricultural Library	900	951	1,029	1,185	2,145	1,870
General administration	2,881	3,080	3,096	3,397	3,975	3,735
Defense food stockpiling	0	0	0	0	*30,000	
Forest Service:						
Protection and utilization	129,120	159,676	204,380	183,865	190,397	183,500
Cooperative range improvement	700	700	700	700	700	700
Roads and trails (contract authority)	0	0	0	80,000	0	0
(Permanent contract authorization)	30,000	35,000	40,000	0	85,000	85,000
(Liquidation of authorization)	(28,000)	(30,000)	(35,000)	(37,500)	(66,400)	(60,000)
Access roads	1,000	1,000	2,000	2,000	0	0
Acquisition of lands:						
Superior National Forest	0	750	250	2,000	0	0
Special Acts (indefinite)	10	10	10	30	70	70
Cache National Forest	50	0	0	0	0	0
Wasatch National Forest	0	0	0	0	20	20
Klamath Indians lands	0	68,717	0	0	0	0
State tree-planting assistance	0	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Permanent, indefinite, special funds:						
Expenses, brush disposal	7,222	6,762	7,699	9,000	9,000	9,000
State roads and trails	11,870	14,166	10,024	10,900	12,000	12,000
Fire prevention	14	22	20	20	20	20
Land restoration	6	5	10	196	100	100
Minnesota, payments to	121	123	324	125	128	128
Counties, payments to	453	392	421	425	438	438
School funds, payments to	114	140	99	80	100	100
States, payments to	29,669	35,409	25,056	27,235	30,000	30,000
Construction, Salt Lake City	25	0	0	0	0	0
Total (permanent, indefinite, funds)	49,494	57,019	43,453	47,971	51,786	51,786
Total, Forest Service	210,374	322,872	291,082	317,566	328,973	322,076
Grand total, Agriculture	5,683,507	5,559,430	7,409,736	7,528,908	7,618,941 *+9,350	7,222,746
Total					7,628,291	

NOTE.—Revisions in budget from original requests of January 1963: Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, land-use adjustment program, cut 8,000. Foreign assistance programs, Public Law 480, sales of commodities, cut 508,172 (by supplemental, 1963). Total, original requests cut by 516,172.

Department of Commerce

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
General administration	2,673	2,831	3,638	3,952	4,520	4,000
Special projects:						
New York World's Fair	0	0	17,000	0	0	0
Century 21 Exposition	9,000	0	900	0	0	0
West Virginia Centennial	0	10	0	0	0	0
Great Lakes pilotage administration	0	60	0	0	0	0
Total	9,000	70	17,900	0	0	0
Area Redevelopment Administration:						
Operations	0	0	8,148	12,416	14,800	13,500
Grants for public facilities	0	0	40,000	35,000	35,000	0
Area redevelopment fund	0	0	122,500	115,500	190,000	132,000
(Authorization from debt receipts)	0	300,000	0	0	0	0
Total	0	300,000	170,648	162,466	239,800	145,500
Business and Defense Services	6,175	4,553	4,212	5,059	6,250	4,600
Office of Business Economics	1,400	1,508	1,600	1,869	2,350	2,000
Bureau of the Census	100,999	38,182	16,483	21,689	33,100	29,435
Office of Field Services	0	2,868	3,148	3,445	5,000	3,725
International Activities	5,187	6,490	8,402	11,029	19,500	13,600
Office of Trade Adjustment	0	0	0	25	1,700	100
U.S. Travel Service	0	0	2,500	3,350	4,200	2,600
Civilian Industrial Technology	0	0	0	625	7,400	1,000
Coast and Geodetic Survey	14,084	23,161	33,106	37,388	40,900	38,000
Patent Office	22,000	23,882	24,816	27,545	32,300	29,000
Bureau of National Standards	19,390	45,253	69,500	60,665	57,540	39,288
Office of Technical Services	0	0	0	48	1,700	1,020
Weather Bureau	51,355	60,497	118,400	116,179	109,500	95,550
Maritime Administration:						
Ship construction	130,250	126,200	98,000	64,200	112,500	112,500
Research and development	0	0	6,500	3,550	8,250	7,000
Salaries and expenses	14,014	15,148	14,334	15,249	15,752	15,500
Maritime training	2,900	3,216	3,218	3,319	3,495	3,495
War shipping claims, payment	0	0	18	0	0	0
State marine schools	165	250	250	250	250	250
Permanent contract authority	2,489	1,642)	1,407	1,125	1,155	1,155
Liquidation of authority	(960)	(1,020	(1,020)	(1,125)	(1,155)	(1,155)
Operating-differential subsidies:						
Permanent contract authority (indefinite)	153,232	176,861	193,332	200,000	210,000	210,000
Liquidation of authority	(152,750)	(150,000)	(202,000)	(220,400)	(225,000)	(225,000)
Total, Maritime Administration	303,050	300,527	317,050	287,693	351,402	349,900

Department of Commerce—Continued

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Bureau of Public Roads:						
Forest highways:						
Contract authorization:						
Permanent	33,000	0	33,000	0	33,000	33,000
Current	0	33,000	0	33,000	0	0
Liquidation of authority	(30,000)	(27,000)	(27,400)	(36,900)	(33,000)	(33,000)
Public lands highways:						
Contract authorization:						
Permanent	3,000	0	3,000	0	9,000	9,000
Current	0	3,500	0	15,000	0	0
Liquidation of authorization	(4,000)	(2,700)	(3,000)	(2,500)	(4,000)	(4,000)
Control of outdoor ads	0	0	0	2,000	3,000	2,000
Inter-American Highway:						
Current	0	0	0	0	16,000	13,000
Contract authorization	0	0	0	12,000	0	0
Liquidation of authority	0	0	0	0	(6,000)	(6,000)
Study of Alaska highways	0	0	0	400	0	0
Total	36,000	36,500	36,000	62,400	61,000	57,000
Transportation research	0	0	0	625	2,500	1,500
Grand total, Commerce	571,313	869,112	827,412	806,052	980,572	817,818

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Food and Drug Administration:						
Salaries and expenses	13,800	18,848	22,929	29,065	35,805	35,805
Reappropriation	0	0	0	0	718	0
Buildings and facilities	0	0	0	0	13,300	4,347
Laboratory building	0	100	1,750	0	0	0
Certification, inspection, and other services (indefinite, special fund)	1,712	1,506	1,737	1,931	0	0
Total	15,512	20,454	26,416	30,996	49,823	40,152
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	33,702	33,672	33,672	34,716	34,756	34,756
Endowment, colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts	2,502	2,502	8,194	11,950	11,950	11,950
Library service grants	6,131	8,800	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500
Payments to school districts	186,300	217,300	247,000	282,322	104,466 *+216,204	104,466
					320,670	
Assistance for school construction	61,135	63,392	61,942	63,686	23,800 *+37,984	23,740
Total					61,784	
Defense educational activities	159,700	187,480	211,627	229,450	229,620	229,620
Education of mentally retarded	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Education of deaf	0	0	1,575	1,500	0	0
Cooperative research	0	3,357	5,000	6,985	17,000	11,500
Educational research	0	0	0	400	800	500
Land-grant college aid	0	2,225	3,775	0	0	0
Foreign language training	0	0	0	0	2,500	1,500
Salaries and expenses, Office of Education	12,800	10,549	11,594	12,645	16,261	14,761
New education program	0	0	0	0	*1,215,170	----------
Colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts (permanent)	2,550	2,550	2,550	2,550	2,550	2,550
Promotion o: vocational education (permanent indefinite)	7,161	7,170	7,161	7,161	7,161	7,161
Total	472,981	539,997	602,590	661,465	459,364 *+1,479,358	451,004
					1,928,722	
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation	75,438	74,519	88,397	102,926	131,435	125,415
Public Health Service:						
Buildings and facilities	300	3,776	18,230	33,200	19,072	13,811
Community health:						
Accident prevention	0	0	3,616	3,668	4,857	4,163
Chronic diseases	0	0	12,955	22,942	55,907	53,377
Communicable diseases	8,158	15,393	9,988	15,492	30,429	25,405
Community health practice	24,497	27,135	22,231	26,276	31,648	28,608
Control of TB	6,452	6,493	6,493	6,993	6,828	6,828
Control of VD	5,400	0	6,000	8,000	9,588	9,588
Dental services	0	0	2,400	3,006	6,227	6,218
Nursing services	0	0	7,641	8,438	11,245	11,217
Hospital construction	187,850	187,936	221,500	226,220	179,514 *+35,000	177,914
Total					214,514	
Mental health research facilities	0	12,139	0	0	0	0
George Washington University Hospital	0	0	0	0	2,500	2,500
Aid to medical education	0	0	0	0	*34,352	
Total	232,357	249,096	292,924	321,035	338,743 *+69,352	325,818
					408,095	
Environmental health:						
Environmental health activities	15,720	27,768	0	0	0	0
Environmental health sciences	0	0	0	0	4,246	4,224
Air pollution	0	0	8,590	11,069	12,998	12,954
Milk, food, interstate, and community sanitation	0	0	7,422	8,536	9,079	9,009
Occupational health	0	0	3,970	4,122	4,621	4,590
Radiological health	0	0	10,482	15,875	18,776	18,745
Water supply and pollution control	0	0	20,270	24,707	29,980	27,921
Waste treatment works construction	46,816	46,101	80,645	90,000	100,000	90,000
Total	62,536	73,869	131,379	154,309	179,700	177,443

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Public Health Service—Continued						
Medical services:						
Hospital and medical services	51,600	56,023	50,009	48,820	50,038	49,962
Foreign quarantine activities	4,686	5,110	6,082	5,910	7,116	6,456
Indian health activities:						
Current	45,245	49,742	52,549	56,597	58,985	58,750
Contract authorization (permanent)	529	435	435	0	0	0
Liquidation of authorization	(455)	(529)	(432)	(432)	0	0
Indian health facilities	4,946	9,714	8,285	9,335	6,096	5,000
Total	107,006	121,024	117,357	120,662	122,235	120,168
National Institutes of Health	430,000	577,861	773,000	930,800	980,454	962,454
Other services:						
Scientific activities overseas	0	3,707	9,000	2,800	6,647	4,000
National health statistics	0	0	4,642	5,150	5,949	5,949
National Library of Medicine	1,566	1,738	2,066	3,335	4,074	4,074
Pay of retired officers (indefinite)	1,682	1,927	2,360	5,784	6,436	6,436
Office of Surgeon General	5,816	7,368	5,560	5,850	6,091	6,091
Emergency health activities	0	0	35,433	7,000	41,361	----------
Total	9,064	14,740	59,061	29,919	70,558	----------
Total, Public Health Service	841,263	1,040,366	1,391,952	1,589,925	1,780,114	----------
St. Elizabeths Hospital:						
Salaries and expenses (definite)	3,805	4,572	5,105	6,332	0	0
Salaries and expenses (indefinite)	0	0	0	0	9,716	7,354
Buildings and facilities	330	5,445	645	8,095	627	627
Total	4,135	10,017	5,750	14,427	10,343	7,981
Social Security Administration:						
Payments for military service credits	0	0	0	0	63,400	----------
Grants to States for public assistance	2,037,500	2,177,000	2,401,200	2,738,300	2,900,000	2,725,000
Personnel training	0	0	0	0	2,000	0
Aid for repatriated U.S. nationals	0	0	764	467	500	467
Bureau of Family Services	2,345	2,727	3,442	3,874	5,400	4,756
Maternal and child health service	0	0	0	0	*17,250	
Maternal and child welfare	46,500	51,833	69,100	79,295	87,000	86,943
Children's Bureau	2,300	2,493	2,668	2,956	3,401	3,401
Cooperative research	0	350	700	1,100	2,000	1,455
International social security meeting	0	0	0	0	95	95
Research and training	0	0	1,607	0	1,200	0
Refugee assistance	0	0	0	70,110	70,000	
White House Conference on Youth	200	150	0	0	0	0
Office of Commissioner	337	373	590	736	1,025	1,025
Total	2,089,182	2,234,926	2,480,071	2,896,838	3,072,621 *+80,650 3,153,271	
American Printing House for Blind	400	400	670	739	775	775
Freedmen's Hospital	3,190	3,498	3,736	3,909	3,880	3,880
Gallaudet College	1,285	3,600	1,857	2,544	4,616	4,616
Howard University	4,646	7,166	11,915	13,552	15,064	15,064
Office of the Secretary	6,541	7,372	15,550	15,210	29,502	20,737
Grand total, Health, Education, and Welfare	3,514,572	3,942,315	4,628,904	5,332,930	5,488,185 *+1,619,360 7,107,545	----------

NOTE.—Revisions in requests from original budget, January 1963: Social Security Administration, grants to States for public assistance, cut by 50,000. Total cut by 50,000.

Department of Justice

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Legal activities and general administration:						
Salaries and expenses (administration)	3,695	4,036	4,165	4,428	4,778	4,600
Salaries and expenses (legal activities)	12,665	14,265	15,785	17,096	19,173	18,573
Salaries and expenses (Antitrust Division)	4,500	5,074	5,873	6,219	6,600	6,600
Salaries and expenses (attorneys and marshals)	22,825	24,583	25,185	28,167	29,580	29,230
Fees and expenses, witnesses	1,775	1,835	2,235	2,500	2,500	2,300
Salaries and expenses, Administrative Conference	0	0	150	100	0	0
Total	45,460	49,793	53,394	58,509	62,531	61,363
Federal Bureau of Investigation	114,600	125,550	127,177	135,925	146,900	146,900
Immigration and Naturalization Service	55,750	62,890	63,450	66,272	70,000	69,011
Federal prison system:						
Salaries and expenses	42,350	45,195	46,785	50,242	54,100	53,000
Buildings and facilities	5,625	9,875	2,350	3,454	17,775	9,425
Prisoners' support	3,300	3,705	4,000	4,100	4,200	4,100
Total	51,275	58,775	53,135	57,887	76,075	66,525
Grand total, Justice	267,085	297,008	297,156	318,593	355,506	343,799

NOTE.—Revisions in budget from original requests in January 1963: Legal activities and general administration, salaries and expenses, attorneys and marshals, raised by 200. Total, original requests raised by 200.

Department of Labor

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Bureau of Labor statistics	10,749	12,440	14,767	15,955	19,905	17,805
Bureau of International Labor Affairs	0	0	500	809	935	882
Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training	0	0	14,000	82,018	176,093	149,000
Office of Welfare and Pensions	0	0	0	0	1,720	1,565
Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training	4,047	4,329	4,962	5,212	5,460	5,460
Bureau of Employment Security	454,954	965,093	508,140	150,387	119,870	110,870
Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights	592	632	633	652	790	790
Bureau of Labor Standards	2,488	2,522	3,257	4,686	3,470	3,470
Bureau of Labor-Management Reports	3,025	5,550	5,767	5,924	5,900	5,900
Bureau of Employees' Compensation	63,011	66,432	67,798	69,053	58,123	58,123
Women's Bureau	509	554	668	930	785	785
Wage and Hour Division	11,489	12,261	17,250	18,274	19,300	19,300
Office of Solicitor	2,695	2,878	4,107	4,362	4,570	4,570
Office of Secretary	1,611	1,870	1,796	2,093	2,664	2,364
Youth employment opportunities	0	0	0	0	*100,000	----------
Trade adjustment activities	0	0	0	100	7,635	4,000
Grand total, Labor	555,170	1,074,561	643,645	360,454	427,220 *+100,000	384,884
Total	----------	----------	----------	----------	527,220	

Post Office Department

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee. 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Payment for public services	37,400	49,000	62,700	0	0	0
Contribution to postal fund (indefinite)	608,821	845,580	811,460	808,400	564,964	564,964
Authorizations and limitations on use of the postal fund: [1]						
Administration and operation	71,575	79,911	82,000	79,471	85,700	83,500
Research and development	0	0	0	12,000	13,700	11,500
Operations	3,008,200	3,365,841	3,440,500	3,701,863	3,959,814	3,890,000
Transportation	536,500	563,000	582,000	594,500	611,750	611,000
Facilities	187,835	137,780	159,000	167,000	195,000	185,000
Plant and equipment	81,200	131,107	105,000	102,267	111,000	104,000
Total	3,885,310	4,268,639	4,368,500	4,657,461	4,976,964	4,885,000
Grand total, Post Office	646,221	894,580	874,160	808,400	564,964	564,964

[1] The postal fund is not included as an item in the general fund and, therefore, is not included as expenditures in the executive budget. On the other hand, the House Appropriations Committee controls the expenditures from both funds and must act on requests of the postal fund.

Department of State

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Administration of foreign affairs:						
Salaries and expenses	112,300	125,265	136,868	147,548	162,800	153,000
Representation allowances	825	872	925	950	996	973
Acquisition of buildings abroad	17,372	10,723	10,000	10,000	27,000	0
Acquisition of buildings abroad (foreign currency)	0	4,500	4,650	2,205	3,900	2,750
Emergencies	1,500	2,300	1,500	1,800	1,600	1,500
Extension, State Department	3,000	500	0	0	0	0
Payment, Foreign Service retirement	2,360	2,540	0	0	0	0
Replacement of autos sold abroad (permanent, indefinite, special fund)	256	255	264	284	343	343
Total	137,613	146,955	154,208	162,788	196,639	158,566
International organizations and conferences:						
Contributions to organizations	54,533	80,905	87,192	69,227	81,821	81,305
Missions to organizations	1,950	1,953	2,115	2,322	2,745	2,500
Conferences and contingencies	2,100	1,943	1,943	3,117	2,170	1,943
Tariff negotiations	0	650	171	0	495	450
U.N. loan	0	0	0	100,000	0	0
Citizens Committee on NATO	0	150	250	0	0	0
Total	58,583	85,601	91,671	174,666	87,231	86,198
International commissions:						
Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:						
Salaries and expenses	573	616	604	692	729	715
Operation	2,610	2,021	1,950	1,972	2,043	2,015
Construction	1,400	9,225	13,168	11,000	8,354	8,000
Total	4,583	11,862	15,722	13,664	11,126	10,730
American sections, international commission	1,725	382	415	415	500	430
International Fish Commission	0	1,896	1,910	1,910	2,053	1,910
Total	6,653	14,140	18,047	15,989	13,679	13,070
Educational exchange:						
Mutual exchange activities	64,137	32,616	34,399	41,950	55,975	42,250
East-West Exchange Center	0	10,000	3,300	8,340	5,690	4,460
Preservation, Nubian monuments	0	0	4,000	0	0	0
Fund payments by Finland (permanent, indefinite, special)	397	396	396	396	396	396
Total	64,534	43,012	42,095	50,290	62,061	47,106

Department of State—Continued

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Other:						
Rama Road, Nicaragua:						
Current	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,500	0	0
Contract authorization	0	0	0	850	0	0
Liquidation of authorization	0	0	0	0	850	850
Migration and refugee assistance	0	0	0	14,947	11,800	--------------
Payment of foreign claims	20	0	0	0	0	0
1-time items	0	6,018	217	0	0	0
Payment to Republic of Panama (permanent)	1,930	1,930	1,930	1,930	1,930	1,930
Total	2,950	9,823	3,147	18,377	13,730	--------------
Grand total, State	270,333	299,532	309,168	422,110	373,340	--------------

NOTE.—Revisions in budget from original requests, January 1963: Educational exchange, mutual exchange activities, cut by 445. Total, cut by 445.

Treasury Department

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Office of the Secretary:						
Salaries and expenses	3,337	3,576	4,268	4,695	5,050	5,000
Expenses, War Claims Act (permanent, indefinite, special fund)	18	18	6	12	10	10
Total	3,355	3,594	4,274	4,707	5,090	5,010
Bureau of Accounts:						
Salaries and expenses	3,489	3,708	3,716	3,886	4,100	4,050
Division of Disbursement	22,000	24,066	25,700	26,500	31,500	30,750
Claims, relief acts	7,229	23,866	39,147	970	0	0
Permanent, definite and indefinite	3,890	5,085	4,804	5,972	5,002	5,002
Interest, uninvested funds (permanent, indefinite)	9,792	10,070	10,357	11,207	12,456	12,456
Payment to unemployment trust fund (permanent, indefinite)	2,553	1,216	0	0	0	0
Fund for payment of Government losses in shipment	0	100	0	525	1,250	550
Total	48,952	68,111	83,724	49,160	54,308	52,808
Bureau of the Public Debt	48,500	47,943	47,984	48,325	48,600	48,000
Office of the Treasurer	17,463	16,960	16,925	16,450	16,800	16,700
Check forgery insurance fund	0	0	0	0	50	50
Bureau of Customs	54,245	59,815	63,281	67,510	76,100	72,000
Internal Revenue Service:						
Salaries and expenses	364,250	413,900	450,912	504,000	578,300	546,000
Refunding collections, interest (permanent, indefinite)	76,438	82,798	67,868	70,694	70,665	70,665
Collections for Puerto Rico (permanent, indefinite, special)	22,698	26,348	33,328	34,000	34,000	34,000
Total	463,386	523,046	552,109	608,694	682,965	650,665
Bureau of Narcotics	4,080	4,320	4,462	4,777	5,450	5,250
U.S. Secret Service:						
Salaries and expenses	5,859	6,098	6,306	7,358	9,400	8,860
Contribution for annuity benefits (permanent, indefinite)	239	256	269	360	380	380
Total	6,098	6,354	6,575	7,718	9,780	9,240
Bureau of the Mint:						
Salaries and expenses	4,600	5,825	6,138	6,582	7,720	7,300
Coinage profits fund (permanent, indefinite)	371	440	324	462	552	552
Silver profits fund (permanent, indefinite, special)	412	615	306	618	737	737
Total	5,383	6,880	6,768	7,662	9,009	8,589
Bureau of Engraving and Printing	0	1,250	0	300	5,380	0
Coast Guard	258,050	281,000	298,228	302,580	363,500	351,400
Interest on the public debt (permanent, indefinite)	9,179,589	8,957,242	9,119,760	9,700,000	10,020,000	10,020,000
Grant total, Treasury	10,369,100	9,976,889	10,204,088	10,817,784	11,297,032	11,239,712

Atomic Energy Commission

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Operating expenses	2,539,672	2,577,104	2,351,978	2,871,993	2,472,800	--------------
Plant and equipment	262,500	204,250	195,360	262,745	420,200	--------------
Grand total, Atomic Energy Commission	2,802,172	2,781,354	2,547,338	3,134,738	2,893,000	--------------

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Agency or service	Actual appropriations				Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964
	1960	1961	1962	1963		
Research, development, and operation (now includes "salaries and expenses")	423,950	838,773	1,499,178	2,935,888	4,912,000	--------------
Construction	99,625	125,227	325,752	737,425	800,000	--------------
Grand total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration	523,575	964,000	1,824,930	3,673,313	5,712,000	--------------

Mr. Speaker, I also think it would be well to submit a growth budget from 1960 to 1964.

THE GROWTH BUDGET

The growth budget is an attempt to discover trends in Government spending. Every agency or service of every department is represented, with the actual appropriation made to it in 1960 and 1963. The change between those appropriations and the request for fiscal year 1964 is shown both in absolute terms and in percentages. Finally, a study of action taken by the House Appropriations Committee follows, in order to determine the real effect of "budget cutters."

[NOTE.—The structure is that of the executive budget. All references to "1964" are to the requests made in the budget message of the President, and not to action taken by Congress. The references to the House Appropriations Committee are to action taken by the committee alone, not to any happening on the floor of the House or by the Congress as a whole. The "Total, Appropriations Committee" is to demonstrate the amount of any appropriation that comes under the jurisdiction of the committee, which is often far different from the amount that is actually contained in the budget. Asterisk (*) indicates the effect of including the future requests with those already sent to Congress. The dagger (†) indicates that there was no appropriation in the base year, thus allowing no "Percent change" to be made]

Growth budget

Agency or department	Actual appropriations		Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964	Change, 1960-64	Percent change, 1960-64	Change, 1963-64	Percent change, 1963-64	Change, Budget-House	Percent change, Budget-House
	1960	1963								
Legislative branch:										
Senate										
House of Representatives	46,049	54,186	56,340	55,702	10,291	22.3	2,154	3.9	−638	−1.1
Architect of the Capitol	13,520		13,344		−176	1.3				
Botanic Garden	328	514	483	462	155	47.3	−31	−6.0	−21	−4.3
Library of Congress	14,299	19,992	21,273	20,508	6,974	48.7	1,281	6.4	−785	−3.6
Government Printing Office	15,020	26,410	38,376	31,942	23,356	155.4	11,966	45.3	−6,434	−16.7
Total	116,656		161,136		44,480	38.1				
(Total, Appropriations Committee)	(87,975)	(109,459)	(127,585)	(119,338)	(39,610)	(45.0)	(18,126)	(16.6)	(−8,247)	(−6.5)
The Judiciary;										
Supreme Court of the United States	1,888	2,085	2,212	2,201	324	17.1	127	6.0	−11	−.4
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	332	370	390	388	58	17.4	20	5.4	−2	−.5
Customs Court	788	931	989	989	201	25.5	58	6.2	0	0
Court of Claims	884	1,044	1,124	1,110	240	37.9	3,940	6.7	−1,186	−1.8
Court of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services	45,262	58,486	62,426	61,240	17,164	27.1	80	7.6	−14	−1.2
Permanent appropriations	749	0	0	0	−479	−100.0	0	0	0	0
Total (excluding GSA transfer)	49,903	62,916	67,141	65,927	17,238	34.5	4,225	6.7	−1,213	−1.8
(Total, Appropriations Committee)	(49,154)	(62,916)	(67,141)	(65,927)	(17,987)	(36.6)	(4,225)	(6.7)	(−1,213)	(−1.8)
Executive Office of the President										
Department of Agriculture:										
Agricultural Research Service [1]	157,071	183,722	193,314	181,588	29,633	18.8	9,592	5.2	−11,726	−6.2
Cooperative Experiment Station Service	31,804	38,263	40,383	40,383	8,579	26.9	2,120	5.5	0	0
Extension Service	64,123	75,344	77,328	77,313	13,205	20.5	1,984	2.6	−15	0
Farmer Cooperative Service	616	1,156	1,280	1,195	664	107.7	124	10.7	−85	−6.6
Soil Conservation Service	133,147	193,031	209,936	200,361	76,789	57.6	16,905	8.7	−9,575	−4.5
Economic Research Service	0	9,511	10,301	9,832	10,301	(†)	790	8.3	−469	−4.5
Statistical Reporting Service	0	10,022	11,552	11,079	11,552	(†)	1,530	15.2	−473	−4.0
Agricultural Marketing Service [1]	463,981	573,041	632,416	629,582	168,435	36.3	59,375	10.3	−2,834	−.4
	463,981	573,041	*657,416		*193,435	*41.7	*84,375	*14.7		
Foreign Agricultural Service	17,564	24,246	22,156	21,622	4,592	26.1	−2,090	−8.6	−534	−2.4
Commodity Exchange Authority	910	1,061	1,095	1,093	185	20.3	34	3.2	−2	0
Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service	688,737	691,973	727,944	702,737	39,207	5.6	35,971	5.1	−25,207	−3.4
Foreign assistance programs	1,265,399	2,085,022	1,921,667	1,889,044	656,268	51.8	−163,355	−7.8	−32,623	−1.6
Commodity Credit Corporation	2,096,407	2,439,863	2,868,400	2,569,000	771,993	36.8	428,537	17.5	−299,400	−10.4
Federal crop insurance program	6,377	6,779	7,210	6,950	833	13.0	431	6.3	−260	−3.6
Rural Electrification Administration	274,632	400,442	506,344	506,162	231,712	84.3	15,902	3.2	−182	0
	274,632	400,442	*355,344		*80,712	*29.3	*−135,098	*−27.5		
Farmers' Home Administration	262,990	376,779	46,717	41,367	−216,273	−82.2	−330,062	−87.6	−5,350	−11.4
	262,990	376,779	*152,072		*−110,923	*−42.1	*−224,712	*−59.6		
Office of Rural Areas Development	0	88	134	120	134	(†)	46	52.2	−14	−10.4
Office of the General Counsel	3,162	3,855	3,987	3,953	825	26.0	132	3.4	−34	−.8
Office of Information	1,432	1,662	1,684	1,684	252	17.5	22	1.3	0	0
National Agricultural Library	900	1,185	2,145	1,870	1,245	138.3	960	81.0	−275	−12.8
General Administration	2,881	3,397	3,975	3,735	1,094	37.9	578	17.0	−240	−6.0
Defense food stockpiling	0	0	*30,000		*30,000	(†)	*30,000	(1)		
Forest Service	210,374	317,566	328,973	322,076	118,599	56.3	11,407	3.5	−6,897	−2.0
Total	5,682,507	7,528,008	7,618,941	7,222,746	1,936,434	39.8	90,933	1.2	−396,195	−5.2
	5,682,507	7,528,008	*7,628,291		*1,945,784	*34.2	*75,283	*1.0		
(Total, Appropriations Committee)	(5,040,092)	(6,590,443)	(6,560,172)	(6,163,977)	(1,520,080)	(30.1)	(−30,271)	(−.4)	(−396,195)	(−6.0)
Department of Commerce:										
General administration	2,673	3,952	4,520	4,000	1,847	69.0	568	14.3	−520	−11.5
Special projects	9,000	0	0	0	−9,000	−100.0	0	0	0	0
Area Redevelopment Administration	0	162,466	239,800	145,500	239,800	(†)	77,334	47.6	−94,300	−39.3
Business and Defense Services Administration	6,175	5,059	6,250	4,600	75	1.2	1,191	23.5	−1,650	−26.4
Office of Business Economics	1,400	1,869	2,350	2,000	950	67.8	481	25.7	−350	−14.8
Bureau of the Census	100,999	21,689	33,100	29,435	−67,899	−67.2	11,411	52.6	−3,665	−11.0
Office of Field Services	0	3,445	5,000	3,725	5,000	(†)	1,555	45.1	−1,275	−25.5
International Activities	5,187	11,029	19,500	13,600	14,313	275.9	8,471	76.8	−5,900	−30.2
Office of Trade Adjustment	0	25	1,700	100	1,700	(†)	1,675	6,700.0	−1,600	−94.1
U.S. Travel Service	0	3,350	4,200	2,600	4,200	(†)	850	25.3	−1,600	−38.0
Civilian Industrial Technology	0	625	7,400	1,000	7,400	(†)	6,775	1,084.0	−6,400	−86.4
Coast and Geodetic Survey	14,084	37,388	40,900	38,000	26,816	190.4	3,512	9.3	−2,900	−7.0
Patent Office	22,000	27,545	32,300	29,000	10,300	46.8	4,755	17.2	−3,300	−10.2
Bureau of Standards	19,390	60,665	57,450	39,288	38,060	196.8	−3,215	−5.2	−18,162	−31.6
Office of Technical Services	0	48	1,700	1,020	1,700	(†)	1,652	3,441.6	−680	−40.0
Weather Bureau	51,355	116,179	109,500	95,550	58,145	113.2	−6,679	−5.7	−13,950	−12.7
Maritime Administration	303,050	287,693	351,402	349,900	48,352	15.9	63,709	22.1	−1,502	−.4
Bureau of Public Roads	36,000	62,400	61,000	57,000	25,000	69.4	−1,400	−2.2	−4,000	−6.5
Transportation Research	0	625	2,500	1,500	2,500	(†)	1,875	300.0	−1,000	−40.0
Total	571,313	806,052	980,572	817,818	409,259	71.6	174,520	21.6	−162,754	−16.5
(Total, Appropriations Committee)	(382,081)	(511,927)	(728,572)	(566,818)	(346,491)	(90.6)	(195,130)	(38.2)	(−162,754)	(−22.3)

See footnotes at end of table.

Growth budget—Continued

Agency or department	Actual appropriations		Budget requests, 1964	House committee, 1964	Change, 1960-64	Percent change, 1960-64	Change, 1963-64	Percent change, 1963-64	Change, Budget-House	Percent change, Budget-House
	1960	1963								
Department of Defense, military functions:										
Military personnel	11,596,449	12,992,690	13,235,200	12,848,200	1,638,751	14.1	242,510	1.8	−387,000	−2.9
	11,596,449	12,992,690	*14,135,200		2,538,751	*21.8	*1,142,510	*8.7		
Operation and maintenance	10,316,510	11,688,724	11,792,237	11,678,337	1,475,727	14.3	103,513	.8	−113,900	−.9
Procurement	13,105,095	16,647,110	16,724,800	15,676,672	3,619,705	27.5	77,690	.4	−1,048,128	−6.2
Research, development, test, and evaluation	4,215,902	7,021,558	7,262,000	6,889,000	3,046,098	72.2	240,442	3.4	−373,000	−5.1
Military construction	1,363,961	1,189,506	1,232,000		−131,961	−9.6				
Family housing	0	596,879	734,400		734,400	(†)				
Civil defense	0	125,848	300,000		300,000	(†)				
Revolving funds (permanent)	30,000	0	0		−30,000	−100.0				
Total	40,627,918	50,262,315	51,280,637		10,652,519	26.2				
(Total, Appropriations Committee)	(40,597,918)	50,262,315	51,280,637		(10,682,519)	(26.3)				
Total*	40,627,918	50,262,315	52,180,637		11,552,519	*28.4				
Department of Defense, civil functions										
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:										
Food and Drug Administration	15,512	30,996	49,823	40,152	34,311	221.1	18,827	60.7	−9,671	−19.4
Office of Education	472,981	661,865	459,364	451,004	−13,617	−2.8	−202,101	−30.5	−8,360	−1.8
	472,981	661,865	*1,928,722		*1,455,741	*307.7	*1,267,257	*191.5		
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation	75,438	102,926	131,435	125,415	55,997	74.2	28,509	27.6	−6,020	−4.5
Public Health Service:										
Buildings and facilities	300	33,200	19,072	13,811	18,772	6,257.3	−14,128	−42.5	−5,261	−27.5
Community health	232,357	321,035	338,743	325,818	106,386	45.7	44,338	15.0	−12,925	−3.8
	232,357	321,035	*408,095		*175,738	*75.6	*113,690	*38.6		
Environmental health	62,536	154,309	179,700	177,443	117,164	187.3	25,391	16.4	−2,257	−1.2
Medical services	107,006	120,662	122,235	120,168	15,229	14.2	1,573	1.3	−2,067	−1.6
National Institutes of Health	430,000	930,800	980,454	962,454	550,454	128.0	49,654	5.3	−18,000	−1.8
Other	9,064	29,919	70,558		61,494	678.4	40,639	135.8		
Total	841,263	1,589,925	1,710,762		869,499	103.3	120,837	7.6		
	841,263	1,589,925	*1,780,114		938,851	*111.6	*190,189	*12.0		
St. Elizabeths Hospital	4,135	14,427	10,343	7,981	6,208	150.1	−4,084	−28.3	1,773	−17.1
Social Security Administration	2,089,182	2,826,727	3,002,621	2,823,142	913,439	43.7	175,894	6.2	−179,479	−5.9
	2,089,182	2,826,727	*3,083,271		*994,089	(†)	−110	−.2		
Refugee assistance	0	70,110	70,000		70,000	93.7	36	4.8	0	0
American Printing House for the Blind	400	739	775	775	375	21.6	−29	−.7	0	0
Freedmen's Hospital	3,190	3,909	3,880	3,880	690	259.2	2,072	81.4	0	0
Gallaudet College	1,285	2,544	4,616	4,616	3,331	222.3	1,512	11.1	0	0
Howard University	4,646	13,552	15,064	15,064	10,418	351.0	14,292	93.9	−8,765	−29.7
Office of the Secretary	6,541	15,210	29,502	[2] 20,737	22,961	62.5	31,051	2.9		
Total	3,514,572	5,332,939	5,488,185	5,165,259	1,973,612	*102.2	*354,923	33.3		
	3,514,572	5,332,939	*7,107,545		*3,592,972	(55.9)	(144,877)	(2.7)		
(Total, Appropriations Committee)	(3,502,651)	(5,317,435)	(5,462,322)	(5,138,396)	(1,959,671)	*47.5	*256,544	*9.0		

[1] Figures for 1963 and 1964 are adjusted for comparability; comparisons between 1960 and 1964 are made with unadjusted figures.

[2] Incomplete or inaccurate.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to call attention to House Joint Resolution 129 which I introduced on January 17, of this year, which provides that not earlier than May 1 nor later than May 20 of each year, the President shall transmit to Congress, in such form and detail as he may determine, such revisions of estimates and summary data contained in the last annual budget and subsequent amendments. It is difficult indeed for the Congress to rely upon the early estimates and it would be advantageous to us to have this updated budget submitted during the month of May.

Again, Mr. Speaker, may I say that some progress has been made toward fiscal responsibility and it is to be hoped that in the second session of this Congress, our accomplishments will be much greater.

PROGRAM FOR THE 1ST WEEK OF THE 2D SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to inquire of the majority leader concerning the program, if he can enlighten us at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the program for the first week of the next session, which is the week of January 6—of course, we will not convene until the 7th if the resolution previously adopted is concurred in by the other body—is as follows:

On Tuesday and Wednesday we will first call the bills on the Private Calendar.

Then we will consider House Joint Resolution 871—John F. Kennedy Center Act. This provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

We also will take up S. 1153—Amendments to Federal Airport Act. This has an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

On Wednesday, the state of the Union message.

On Thursday, H.R. 6041—Amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act. This has an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

This, of course, is subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program may be announced later.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Corman and to include his voting record.

Mr. Alger.

Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Mathias.

Mrs. Kelly.

Mr. Ford.

Mr. Harris.

Mr. Widnall.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Bruce) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. Jensen.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5338. An act to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6754. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6868. An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7063. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7431. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 12 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, December 27, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1467. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a copy of the report of the proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States held at Washington, D.C., September 17–18, 1963, pursuant to the provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 331 (H. Doc. No. 184), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9563. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 9564. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be paid compensation at the rate of $1.50 per day for each day spent in hiding during World War II to evade capture by the enemy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.J. Res. 881. Joint resolution to establish a commission to be known as the John F. Kennedy Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

560. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to appropriations in the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Automation in Industry—Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz Sets Forth Facts—The Charleston Gazette Calls for Public Works Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, at this Christmas season, and as we approach the new year 1964, it is important that we keep before us the fact that we have problems as well as blessings and reasons to be grateful. We must be determined that we shall not brush aside the conditions of change induced by technological advancements but, rather, that we will be resourceful and aggressive in seeking solutions.

As was stated so ably by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz recently:

> The most dangerous myth in immediate times is that machines produce as many jobs for men as they destroy and therefore represents no threat to workers.

I agree with Secretary Wirtz that—

> This is a half-truth, and, therefore, a half-lie. The truth is that machines permit the extension of men's work activities. The implied lie is that this will happen automatically or without the exercise of full human responsibility.

In the distinguished Labor Secretary's speech from which I quote—an address prepared for a midyear commencement at the University of Michigan—Mr. Wirtz declared that—

> Any philosophy or policy about automation must necessarily start from clear recognition that unrestrained technological advance is not only inexorable, but essential to the maintenance and elevation of the standard of living. Full employment in this country is completely dependent on our being more efficient producers than our competitors in a world where the competition is tougher every day. The alternative to automation would be economic stagnation. * * *
>
> Machines now have, in general, a high school education, in the sense that they can do most jobs that a high school education qualifies people to do. So machines will get the unskilled jobs, because they work for less than living wages. Machines are, in the most real sense, responsible for putting uneducated people out of work.
>
> The answers are not to smash the machines. They are to recognize that the individual versus the machine is as unfair a match today as the individual versus the corporation was in the last century, and the advancing technology requires the exercise of collective—public and private—responsibility for its effects and collective measures to carry out this responsibility.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Labor has provided us with a cogent statement of why people today are haunted by the "specter of becoming robots," and he is forthright in admonishing us to "recognize that the individual versus the machine is an unfair match."

The human factors behind the problems of advancing technology as expressed especially by progress in automation are part and parcel of the unemployment figures of our Nation. This is brought to our attention forcefully and clearly by an editorial, "Only Crash Programs Can Help Unemployed," in the December 21, 1963, issue of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette, in which it points out:

> The unemployment figure for November is in, and it is by no means reassuring—almost 6 percent—in round totals 4,292,000 workers or 115,000 more unemployed than in January of this year.

The Gazette editorial asserts further:

> The paradox is the unprecedented prosperity for approximately 80 percent of the population, while 20 percent or more than 30 million Americans, according to Federal statisticians, are living in poverty.

I agree with the Gazette that—

> The quickest, surest, and admittedly the most expedient way to assist these forgotten and forsaken is to trigger a huge public works program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the thought-provoking editorial to which I have made reference and from which I have quoted briefly.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY CRASH PROGRAMS CAN HELP UNEMPLOYED

"The foreign front," writes James Reston in a recent column, "was Kennedy's major problem but the home front is likely to be Johnson's, and the need for some effective way to convert from the cold war to the 'slum war' is likely to be more urgent with every passing month."

The unemployment figure for November is in, and it is by no means reassuring. Almost 6 percent (5.9 percent to be exact) of the Nation's work force is idle. In round totals the figure is 4,292,000 workers or 115,000 more unemployed than in January of this year.

The paradox is the unprecedented prosperity for approximately 80 percent of the population, while 20 percent or more than 30 million Americans, according to Federal statisticians, are living in poverty.

How to bring this 20 percent into the mainstream of American life, thus guaranteeing to this helpless minority a meaningful stake in the economy, is the dilemma confronting the Johnson administration.

Allocating defense reductions to alleviate their plight—and surely substantial slashes in defense expenditures can be achieved without impairing in the least the national capacity to wage total war—is undoubtedly part of the answer.

But, as Reston notes, simply transferring funds from one account to another isn't the solution it appears to be at first acquaintance. Cutbacks in defense will mean job losses among the employed, and the long-term interest isn't accommodated by elevating unemployed at the expense of those already employed. Therefore, cutbacks must be softened by reconversion efforts.

Conversion of defense projects, however, will take time and the dreadful status of the Nation's neglected calls for immediate action. Their humiliating condition—an awful blotch upon the character of a nation which boasts of its constant concern for all its citizens—will hardly wait for reconversion to have been proved successful, so that the Government can then take up the next priority. Their needs are now, and they shriek for attention.

Obviously, the quickest, surest, and admittedly the most expedient way to assist these forgotten and forsaken is to trigger a huge public works program in the Nation's cities, where the greatest needs exist. The United States is no longer an agrarian nation. It is urban, and no city of any size lacks a significant slum area with despairing, ghettoized inhabitants and appalling problems of housing, education, diet, crime, and disease.

Reconversion can assist the employed, but only crash programs and revolutionary measures can help today's unemployed.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I would like to include my newsletter to my constituents for December 20, 1963:

Foreign Aid Study a Tremendous Task—(Supplement to Foreign Aid Newsletter of August 24, 1963)

The House this week took its most determined stand to date against big foreign aid spending. In approving the foreign aid appropriation it cut $1,700 million from the original budget request. The appropriation of $2,801,700,000 as finally passed was reduced from the $3,599,050,000 which was authorized just a few days earlier. The slash was due largely to the masterful report of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid led by Congressman Otto Passman, of Louisiana. This study and report is one of the best prepared I have seen in my 9 years in Congress, and represents the finest type of constructive legislative work.

The Foreign Operations Subcommittee in its consideration of this bill conducted more than 800 hours of research and hearings. Testimony by officials of the executive branch and others resulted in over 11,000 pages of transcript. The 4 volumes of printed hearings contain 3,849 pages of testimony and related data and represent a most thorough examination of the budget estimates of the foreign aid program. (These statements give some idea of the effort that goes into committee work, the part of a Congressman's job which demands most of his time and attention. It is testimony to the care and thoroughness which is given to important legislation before it can be presented to the House for action.)

The hearings brought out many little known facts concerning foreign aid. Testimony showed that our aid program is being continued in countries where one of the following illegal action has occurred:

1. A dictator has taken over control of the country.

2. A military junta has overthrown a friendly government.

3. A president or premier has been assassinated.

4. A newly elected president has been prevented from taking office.

5. A monarch has been dispossessed by a rebel force.

6. Twenty-nine aid-recipient countries have experienced an illegal change of government during the period 1948–63.

7. Of these 29, Cuba is the only country which is not now receiving direct U.S. aid, although she does receive assistance from the United Nations.

Of concern to many is the attitude of some officials of our Government on foreign aid. This attitude is exemplified by the statement of William Kling, Special Assistant for Economic Affairs, African Affairs, Department of State: "I do not think that our aid program has to be necessarily directed toward rather unrealistic policies of only helping our friends."

How on earth can Mr. Kling or the State Department justify using the hard-earned money of American taxpayers to help our enemies? Yet, this is exactly what we are doing in too many instances.

1. Of the 112 countries in the world, the administration contemplates granting of assistance during fiscal year 1964 to a minimum of 100 countries, territories, or possessions.

2. The proposed military assistance program alone envisages grant aid to 65 countries and credit assistance to 3 additional countries.

3. Aid is given to countries which first tried Communist-bloc assistance and after becoming disenchanted turn to the United States for help.

4. Aid is given to countries where the attitude of the official and semiofficial press and radio is anti-American.

5. Aid is given to countries indulging in unwise fiscal policies, deficit spending, and lack of self-help.

6. We continue our aid to five countries in Latin America which still maintain trade and diplomatic relations with Cuba.

7. Foreign aid funds in the pipeline (already appropriated and unexpended) amount to $7.6 billion projected into fiscal 1964.

THE ISSUE: AID TO COMMUNISM

The issue which tied up the adjournment of Congress in bitter debate was the House passed amendment (218 to 169) to prohibit the U.S. Government from underwriting credit to Communist countries buying American goods, including the sale of wheat to Soviet Russia. After three attempts and by the Democratic leadership exerting every possible pressure on its members, the House approved the final report by 30 votes (189 to 159). With no regard to the political moratorium the Democratic leadership and the President charged the Republicans with "delaying tactics and sitdown strikes against the bill." The fact is, the conference report had been voted down twice and many Members had left Washington to be at home with their families on Christmas. In an all-night session Friday, a long Saturday session, and a session on Monday, it was the Democrats who could not muster the votes, most of the Republicans had remained on the job or returned to Washington at the first call.

Now, what was the basis of our opposition to the bill?

1. We do not believe we should be doing business with Russia on any basis. Certainly we should not finance their ability to do business with us.

2. This bill, as all legislation, should have been decided on its merits. It was not, as charged by the majority leader, "a slap at President Johnson" to vote against the bill.

3. The bill makes it possible for the United States to extend credit to Russia with no collateral except the word of the Government of the Soviet Union and it has never honored its word or its agreements.

I could list many other reasons and will have more to say on our dealings with the Communists in the coming year. This will be the last newsletter until Congress reconvenes January 7. To all our friends, "Season's greetings."

Navy Yards and Naval Strength Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent authoritative British publication, Jane's Fighting Ships, touching upon comparative naval strength in the world, declared that "the United States still has the greatest navy the world has ever seen," but "the Soviet Navy has a new look which must have a profound effect on naval thinking and planning on both sides of the Atlantic."

I think it can be said that this observation by a great naval authority like Jane should be carefully heeded and taken to heart by those in the Congress and administration having to do with the defense of this Nation, particularly our naval strength.

According to Jane's the world has more navies than ever before, 96 in number. While some of these are considered to be no mere infants-in-arms, but quite considerable fleets, notably those of Germany, Italy, Japan, and Indonesia, it seems that we should lose no time in carefully reappraising our own position in terms of naval strength.

It is the opinion of Jane's that the United States, as the senior partner of the victorious Allies, is in danger of becoming topheavy with the weight of its outdated, war-built hulls, although, of course, the United States has built in recent years the biggest and most sophisticated warships in every major category, while the navies of the so-called defeated nations are rising on a pinnacle of new steel, unfettered by the deadwood of a generation gone.

In brief, our Navy, while strong, has more older ships than the newer navies, and this is especially true of the Russian Navy which is being built up at a very rapid rate.

Jane's made reference to the oft-reiterated and reiterated and proven maxim exemplified by Nelson, Churchill, and Mahan: "Who rules the sea rules the world."

While this maxim is now subject to some revision, it is pointed out that if the United States can turn out nuclear-powered submarines at the rate of 10 to 12 per year, so also can the Soviet Union.

It is said that the Soviet naval watchword seems to be intelligence, infiltration, and interception. To these ends, the Soviet Union has built and is building a strong and modern navy second only to that of the United States. It has rapidly built and is increasing alarmingly an enormous merchant fleet while our own American merchant marine has been permitted to fall back in comparative strength with other great powers. The Soviet Union has also accumulated the world's largest, most modern, and unusually versatile fishing fleet of trawlers which, as we know, are being widely used for gathering information, sometimes close to our shores and in this Western Hemisphere.

In addition, it has created a large fleet of survey ships in a massive and worldwide oceanographic research effort, according to such a distinguished authority as Jane's.

The Soviet has made sufficient progress with the building of a new spearhead in the shape of new warships, including guided missile ships and nuclear submarines, that she has been able to discard her long streaming tail of older warships, although this Nation has not had such notable success along these lines.

It is also Jane's informed view that the Soviet Navy has the most powerful submarine fleet the world has ever known. Even excluding training and obsolescent units, there are believed to be over 400 effective submarines, including 25 nuclear powered, and over 40 armed with guided missiles.

According to the commander in chief of the Soviet Navy, submarines constitute the Soviet Union's main striking force at sea and this is something that has been known to our own, as well as other, naval experts in the world.

The information furnished by Jane's, much of which has been and is available to our own experts, and the pertinent observations made as a corollary to this information, should certainly be sobering upon our own thinking and acting in the planning and construction of naval craft for our own Navy and national defense.

Short of cutting down key critical construction of new naval craft in modern categories, this Nation should be now building at a greater rate than it is in these categories to match the Soviet and other navies of the world, so that we will not be left behind as long as it is necessary in this troubled world to provide for our security and that of our associates of the free world.

We can hope and work for peace, to be sure, and we must devote ourselves energetically to that end in the name of humanity, freedom and justice. But we must never negate our naval strength or allow it to fall below that of our competitors in overall naval potential.

Above all, we cannot allow important arms and agencies of that strength, like the Boston Naval Shipyard, and other repair and modernizing installations to deteriorate, run down, to be curtailed or, as some propose, entirely eliminated.

Till the time comes that an effective, permanent, lasting peace is established—let us hope and pray that will be soon—our course is obvious and imperative. It must be to keep our Navy and all other vital defense arms in a state of adequacy, readiness and modernity to meet every test, every challenge.

Instead of laying plans to dismantle the Boston Naval Shipyard and similar installations in the country, it would seem far more appropriate for us, indeed vital and compelling for us, to build up, streamline and modernize these establishments so that they can serve us and our great Navy with more efficiency, skill and readiness to meet every need in a sensible, economical manner.

We must under no circumstances allow our understandable zest and quest for sensible economy to jeopardize our defense forces and leave the Nation more susceptible to military attack.

I think that we must meet those challenges of the Soviet Union and other nations in naval strength and we must do it without further delay or equivocation.

I am forwarding a copy of these remarks to our great President, the distinguished Secretary of Defense, the distinguished Secretary of the Navy, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I hope that the subject matter will be carefully pondered, examined, appraised, and acted upon before our great American Navy becomes less than the greatest and most effective in the world and unable adequately to perform its proper role in defending the country.

Navy yards, naval strength, and a powerful, balanced striking force are vital to the safety and security of this Nation, and I most respectfully urge upon the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Joint Chiefs their most energetic efforts, not only to hold the line for the Navy, but to build and develop this great defense arm and keep it as the greatest and the best Navy in the world.

I Refuse To Hand the Communists a Spade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee on whose shoulders rest to a very great degree along with the other 49 members of that committee, the credit of these United States which has been greatly weakened over the past three decades. Now we are being asked in this bill to further weaken our credit by guaranteeing the payment of about half a billion dollars worth of wheat and other commodities, the Communists wish to obtain from us simply on their promise to pay, which is no good. They owe us billions of dollars this minute which they refuse to pay while we are spending $50 billion annually of our taxpayers' dollars mainly to keep the commies from burying us, as Khrushchev promised he will do; and as bread is yet one of the most important military commodities, I will not hand the ungodly Communists a spade with which to bury us.

Report to the People of the 22d District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 88th Congress has been a long and fruitful one. We can be proud of our accomplishments. I will presently set forth my voting record and comments on the legislation we have acted upon, but first I want to make some remarks concerning the session we have just completed.

Congress has been criticized for the length of the past session, but these critics fail to recognize that the long session was due to the extraordinary number of complex and controversial matters which confronted us. Foremost among these were the civil rights, tax, and education bills. Had we chosen to turn our backs on these problems or been content with only token legislation in these fields, we could have adjourned earlier and given ourselves more time to spend in our districts. But a Congressman does not fulfill his obligation to his constituents or to the Nation by such action. It is the duty of a Congressman to seek genuinely constructive solutions to these and the other pressing problems we face. This cannot be done quickly. It demands time, energy, and thought.

This year our efforts have been crowned with success. During the session, the Members reached general agreement on the need for a broad civil rights bill and on the basic structure of the tax bill and passed three major education bills. This is an excellent record. It shows the vitality of our legislative process. Of course, it is not perfect. Improvements can and should be made, but our achievements demonstrate that our system of representative democracy continues to work well and is the best yet devised by man.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

The long, arduous task of Congress this year was made even more difficult by one of the most brutal, tragic events in our Nation's history—the assassination of President Kennedy. The loss has been a painful one for us all, and the burden of guilt we share because this senseless act was permitted to occur in a law-abiding society is a heavy one. President Kennedy was truly a man of courage and vision, with a deep sense of the past and a deeper commitment to the future. He brought new energy and purpose to our Government, and his death has left a void in American life.

Nevertheless, I am confident that President Johnson will carry on President Kennedy's work and noble dedication to a better America and a better world. President Johnson shares the same ideals and goals to which President Kennedy so eloquently committed his administration, and I am sure there will be no change in President Johnson's legislative program. The succession of Lyndon B. Johnson to the Presidency demonstrates the strength and continuity of our form of government. President Kennedy is gone, but our democratic nation and our debt of gratitude to this great American live on.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

In the past session, Congress appropriated almost $50 billion for the continuing buildup of our nuclear and conventional Armed Forces. I supported every request made by Defense Secretary McNamara, including a long-overdue pay increase for military personnel, to assure that our defenses and the morale of our troops will be the strongest in the world.

At present and for the foreseeable future, our military might will be superior to that of any nation. We possess 500 long-range ballistic missiles and have an equal number of intercontinental bombers on the alert at all times. Our Polaris weapons system is "at the ready." Such deterrent power could destroy any aggressor. In 1963, our special forces units in Vietnam showed how well they can carry out conventional and counterinsurgency action. Every American can feel secure in the knowledge that our Armed Forces are prepared to meet any challenge.

Secretary McNamara recently indicated that in view of our great strength the defense budget can be expected to level off and perhaps decline a little in the years ahead. I hope the world situation continues to improve, as it did this year with the signing of the test ban treaty, and meaningful economies can be made in the huge defense budget in the future.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

I am deeply distressed by the drastic cuts made in foreign aid. This program is the cornerstone of our foreign policy in those areas of the world where the outcome of the struggle between freedom and tyranny is still in doubt. In the past, this program has been markedly successful. It is largely responsible for the strong economy and independence of Western Europe, Japan, and the Philippines. The reductions made in 1963 were wholly unjustified and impaired our own security and our position as the leader of the free world.

As a result of the cuts, we cannot make development loans to the new Asian and African nations. We will also be forced to curtail supporting assistance to Laos, Vietnam, and the Congo. These are crucial times in the history of many such areas. We cannot abandon them and expect them to survive in freedom. We have a vital interest in that survival, for ultimately our own security depends on it.

Most disturbing to me was the reduction in funds for the Alliance for Progress. This action virtually repudiated the pledges of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy to assist the nations of Latin America in a peaceful revolution of modernization. I cannot understand how some Members of Congress can be content to provide less aid for all of Latin America than the Soviet Union gives to Cuba alone. This is no way to fight communism!

I concur in the judgment of every President since World War II that a substantial foreign aid program is essential to our foreign policy. The expenditures for this program constitute only a small fraction of our own budget for defense, and the contribution to the protection of our interests and the interests of freedom around the world far exceeds the cost.

A pleasant contrast to the treatment given foreign aid was approval of a 50-percent increase in the size of the Peace Corps. Wherever the Corps has been invited, it has been a notable success. This program should certainly be expanded to give more Americans an opportunity to serve their country.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The most important legislation affecting the national economy was President Kennedy's proposal to stimulate economic growth by tax reduction and reform. I will have more to say on this later.

Another important bill will broaden and strengthen the Manpower Development and Training Act. It is the aim of this program to supply the skilled labor increasingly needed by our economy. It is anticipated that by 1965, 400,000 workers will have been retrained under this program and placed in productive employment. The legislation enacted this year will extend the training period for certain classes of workers, establish additional courses of instruction and open up new opportunities to youth.

There is a constant need for a wide variety of public works. If California is to continue to prosper, there must be an adequate and controlled supply of water. This year we passed two bills providing funds for more than 30 projects in California, including $15 million for flood control to protect life and property in Los Angeles County. These projects will help us meet the demands that will be made in the years ahead by California's burgeoning population and expanding industry.

Also essential for economic progress is a first-class highway system. Congress recognizes this and enacted amendments to the Highway Act which will insure that our national road networks will be the best and most modern in the world.

SPACE PROGRAM

During the past few years, we have proudly watched the expansion of our frontiers to outer space. We have seen American initiative and research and development push us into a leading position in space technology. Now that we have moved to the forefront in this field, we cannot abandon the role of leadership but must continue to move forward, pursuing our national interest by exploring the unknown.

In light of the importance of the space program, I feel particularly privileged to represent the State of California and the 22d District, where so much of our Nation's space work is being carried out. For the past 3 fiscal years, California has received nearly half of all the major contracts awarded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and 6 of the 10 largest NASA contractors are California aerospace firms. On June 30, 1963, the 22d District was the place of performance of $377.5 million worth of research and development contracts—15 percent of the total for the entire State. Firms in the 22d District received more than 25 research and development contracts during the year.

EDUCATION

The 1st session of the 88th Congress can look with pride upon the legislative landmarks it has established in the field of education, passing some of the most significant education measures in our history. Passage of three major phases of the administration's education program led President Johnson to predict that this session will "go down in history as the Education Congress of 1963." This legislation will give us new weapons in our never-ending battle against illiteracy and poverty.

Congress approved a bill to provide teaching facilities and loans to prospective physicians, dentists, and those in related medical professions. This will boost the number of medical school graduates and relieve the growing shortage of health personnel.

The "brick and mortar" bill—the first major new Federal program of assistance to education since 1958—sets up a $1.2 billion plan to help finance the building of classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and other academic facilities in colleges and universities across the Nation. This 3-year program will help us accommodate the hundreds of thousands of students who will nearly double college enrollment in this decade and will enable us to offer them the physical facilities necessary for the pursuit of knowledge.

The $1.5 billion vocational education bill expands and modernizes our existing vocational educational training program, designed to develop our most important resource—manpower—by teaching basic skills, curbing school dropouts, and working with illiterate adults. The bill substantially increases the amount of Government loans to college students under the National Defense Education Act. Unfortunately, no improvement was made in the impacted areas aid.

Large school districts, such as Los Angeles, are discriminated against, and I will continue my opposition to this program until its deficiencies are corrected.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Congress made significant gains in the area of health and welfare during the first session, approving several bills which will be of direct benefit not only to those afflicted by poverty and disease but to all our citizens.

Congress authorized $50 million for the next 5 years to increase aid to States for maternal and child-health services and for crippled children's programs. Another bill authorizes $238 million during the next 3 years to aid States in providing mental retardation facilities and constructing community health centers. Congress authorized a $50 million increase in the Government program of direct loans to nonprofit corporations and cooperatives for construction of housing for the elderly, as well as allowing the Federal Housing Authority another 2 years in which to insure mortgages for low- and moderate-income groups.

Los Angeles area residents can be encouraged in their long, relentless fight against smog by the passage of the clean air bill. The research and pollution control programs to be jointly undertaken by the local, State, and Federal Governments give promise of eventually eradicating this menace to our health and well-being.

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Despite the passage of several agricultural bills this year, we are still faced with the basic problem of excess farm production. The farm bloc in Congress demands reduced spending in other sectors of the economy, but it continues to clamor for higher price supports for its own products while refusing to cut down production and eliminate surplus goods.

For the most part, farm legislation this year solved only a few superficial problems. I reluctantly supported the cotton bill because it will eliminate the two-price system which puts our American mill operators at a competitive disadvantage with foreign manufacturers. I strongly opposed the extension of our Mexican farm labor program because I see no reason for American farmers to continue their exploitation of foreign labor. Furthermore, there is an adequate supply of domestic workers available at reasonable wages. The passage of the feed grain bill did offer an encouraging note in this dreary area, for the bill provides price supports only for producers who make voluntary acreage reductions.

However, farm subsidies continue as the most indefensible of all Federal spending. They deserve the attention of Congress in the next session.

BILLS I HAVE SPONSORED

It was my privilege this year to introduce a companion medicare bill to provide hospitalization insurance to the aged under social security. The heavy costs of hospital and related health care have long posed a grave threat to the security of our senior citizens who have contributed so much to make this Nation great. Most of these elderly people are unable to qualify for or afford private insurance to adequately protect them against the high cost of hospitalization. Consequently, many of them are forced to seek private or public aid and become public welfare burdens. Hearings on this bill have been completed, and I hope that this measure will become law.

I am pleased to report that work on the Federal building in the Valley Administrative Center in Van Nuys will begin shortly. After many months of effort, my colleague, the gentleman from California, EVERETT BURKHALTER, and I were able to secure the final approval and financing for this much-needed facility.

I have also introduced a bill to allow voting registrars, upon proper application, to dispense with the requirement of a Federal law that they retain ballots for 22 months following an election. The purpose of the present law is to preserve records which would be necessary in a suit to enforce voting rights. Such a suit would never be needed in Los Angeles where our officials are among the best and fairest in the Nation. Enactment of my bill as part of the omnibus civil rights bill will greatly reduce the large storage costs which the county must bear.

While I am concerned with the welfare of this Nation as a whole and the welfare of my State and district in particular, I have not ignored the needs of individual constituents. For this reason, where circumstances warranted, I introduced private bills for the relief of deserving individuals.

THE SECOND SESSION—CIVIL RIGHTS

While I am highly pleased with the accomplishments of the first session of Congress, there are several important items which remain to be acted upon during the coming year.

Highest priority must be given to the civil rights bill. The late President Kennedy gave his wholehearted support to this long-needed bill, and President Johnson is strongly urging its early passage. During the past year, civil rights has become the Nation's No. 1 problem. The protests and demonstrations by our Negro citizens have made it unmistakably clear that they will no longer accept second-class citizenship.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I helped draft the civil rights bill which outlaws racial discrimination in voting rights, public accommodations, employment opportunities and federally assisted programs. It also permits the Attorney General of the United States to bring suit to prevent certain violations of the Constitution, particularly in the area of school segregation.

Discrimination and prejudice, whether they be subtle or blatant, are injurious to our national welfare. They contradict principles upon which this Nation was founded and impair our economic, social and cultural life. The sooner we remove this cancer, the sooner all of us will be able to realize our fullest potential as free Americans.

The leadership given the Judiciary Committee by Chairman EMANUEL CELLER and ranking Republican WILLIAM MCCULLOCH, working with the late President, produced an excellent bill, one worthy of support by Republicans and Democrats. This House and this Nation are truly served by these two great Americans. It is hoped that the Rules Committee will realize that it is in the national interest to expedite this bill. It is imperative that Congress act swiftly on this urgent matter, gaining the bipartisan support necessary to secure a strong bill and make the American ideals of liberty and justice for all a reality.

TAX BILL

The second most important issue facing Congress in 1964 is the tax reduction and reform bill now awaiting action by the Senate. Last January, President Kennedy proposed a broad program to reduce Federal income tax for individuals and businesses and to make our tax law more equitable.

Virtually every taxpayer in the country would pay lower taxes under this program, and everyone would benefit from the increased economic activity brought about by the release of tax savings to the private economy. Most of the individual tax reduction savings would be spent and respent, circulating throughout the economy and bringing it new life. This would generate new jobs and greater output, taking up much of the slack in our economy. Together with business tax savings, it would stimulate the kind of investment that results in faster economic growth and full employment and would bring the average American a greater level of prosperity and job security.

Initially, the tax cut would increase our Federal deficit by only a small degree. Our current deficit is the direct result of the inadequate growth of our economy. However, as our economic activity picks up, unhampered by the straitjacket of high taxes, the national deficit will be reduced, making it possible to balance the budget within the next few years. Our economy is fully capable of reducing unemployment to a reasonable level and producing enough tax revenues to meet our essential expenditures.

Regrettably, there seems little possibility that the tax bill will contain the reforms originally expected. Some taxpayers will retain their position of unfair privilege, shifting their responsibilities to others.

OTHER LEGISLATION

The assassination of President Kennedy has focused our attention on the inadequacies of Federal laws governing the sale of firearms. The Constitution guarantees Americans the right to bear arms, but some reasonable regulation over the traffic and shipment of weapons is needed if we are to keep firearms out of the hands of criminals and lunatics.

Several provisions of the National Housing Act, which have made low-cost financing available to so many homeowners, will come up for renewal during the second session of Congress. The FHA and urban redevelopment programs should be continued. I have introduced a bill to amend the act to permit loans for construction of sidewalks, gutters and other public improvements to be insured under that law. These improvements are especially needed in my district, and I am hopeful my amendment will be included in the omnibus bill.

Other matters which should receive favorable consideration include revisions in our immigration laws, legal counsel for indigent defendants in criminal cases in the Federal courts and royalties for composers for the jukebox performance of their work.

VOTING RECORD

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table which lists major legislative decisions made in the 1st session of the 88th Congress and my position on each of them:

My vote	Issue	Outcome
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SPACE	
Supported	Extension of the military draft	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $47,200,000,000 for defense [1]	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $1,600,000,000 for military construction projects	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $5,100,000,000 for NASA research and development.[2]	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $2,300,000,000 for Atomic Energy Commission	Enacted.
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Supported	Appropriate $3,000,000,000 for foreign aid	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $7,500,000 for operations of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	Enacted.
Supported	Extend Export-Import Bank for 5 years and increase its lending authority	Enacted.
Supported	Increase size of the Peace Corps	Enacted.
Supported	Limited nuclear test ban treaty [3]	Ratified.
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Supported	Tax reduction and reform bill	Passed House.
Supported	Extend and strengthen Manpower Development and Training Act	Enacted.
Supported	Continuation of the Interstate and Defense Highway System	Enacted.
Supported	Extend corporate and certain excise taxes	Enacted.
Supported	Reduce unemployment compensation tax rate	Enacted.
	GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION	
Supported	Permanently increase House Rules Committee to 15 members	Approved.
Supported	Extend Civil Rights Commission	Enacted.
Supported	Provide for orderly transition between election and inauguration of a new President	In conference.
Supported	Extend President's authority to submit reorganization plans to Congress	Passed House.
Supported	Establish Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation	Enacted.
Supported	Extend period for raising contributions for construction of the National Cultural Center	Enacted.
Supported	Suspension of "equal time" rule of FCC for presidential and vice presidential election of 1964	In conference.
	HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE	
Supported	Health professions education bill	Enacted.
Supported	Higher education facilities bill	Enacted.
Supported	Vocational education bill	Enacted.
Supported	Establish safety standards for seat belts for autos	Enacted.
Supported	Establish air-pollution-control program	Enacted.
Supported	Increase aid to States for maternal and child health services and for research projects to prevent mental retardation	Enacted.
Supported	Provide for construction of community mental health centers	Enacted.
Supported	Increase funds for construction of housing for the elderly	Enacted.
Supported	Extend FHA program for mortgage insurance for low- and moderate-income groups	Enacted.
Supported	Tax relief for child care expense for deserted wives	Enacted.
Supported	Equal pay for person performing the same work regardless of sex	Enacted.
	SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS	
Supported	Increase pay and subsistence allowances for military personnel	Enacted.
Supported	Increase payments to widows, parents, and children of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities	Enacted.
Supported	Permit conversion or exchange of national life insurance policies to new plans	In conference.
Supported	Permit VA to waive recovery on default on home loans in certain hardship cases	Enacted.
Supported	Assist States in providing nursing home facilities for veterans	Passed House.
Supported	Provide educational assistance to children of disabled veterans	In conference.
Supported	Raise enrollment of Military and Air Force Academies	Passed House.
	AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES	
Supported	Feed grain bill	Enacted.
Supported	Cotton bill	Passed House.
Opposed	Continue importation of Mexican farmworkers	Enacted.
Supported	Extend exemption of peanuts for boiling from marketing quotas	Enacted.
Supported	Develop outdoor recreational plans	Enacted.
Supported	Public works bills	In conference.
Supported	Abolish Beach Erosion Control Board; transfer its functions to Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors; establish Coastal Engineering Research Center.	Enacted.
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
Supported	Federal contribution to District government	Enacted.
Opposed	Amendments to the Criminal Code	Passed House.
Opposed	Increase number of police dogs	Passed House.
Opposed	Permit teachers to use corporal punishment in public schools	Passed House.
Supported	Strengthen enforcement procedures against unsafe structures	Passed House.

Bill No.	Bills I have sponsored	Status
H.R. 5264	To provide hospital and related services under social security to the elderly	Hearings completed.
H.R. 5544	To provide insurance under the National Housing Act for loans made to homeowners for the construction of public improvements.	Pending in committee.
H.R. 8882	Authorize reduction of the period under which certain voting records are required to be retained	Pending in committee.
H.R. 7557	To repeal the "cooly trade" laws	Pending in committee.
H.R. 3596	To strike a medal commemorating the 250th anniversary of the birth of Padre Junipero Serra	Enacted.
H.J. Res. 543	To establish a U.S. World Film Festival Commission	Pending in committee.
H.R. 5289	For the relief of Mrs. Zara Schreiber	Enacted.

---

[1] I opposed the expenditure of an additional $363,000,000 for 2 more RS-70 aircraft. In so doing I supported the judgment of Secretary of Defense McNamara that the cost and effectiveness of these planes do not justify such large expenditures.

[2] I opposed every effort to reduce the funds for the manned space flight program.

[3] Although treaties are considered only by the Senate, I made my position known to both our California Senators. They each supported the treaty.

Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit my voting record for the 88th Congress, 1st session, as compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

VOTING RECORD OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

(Citations are to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD)

JANUARY 9, 1963

Election of Speaker, page 10 (256–175); vote HALLECK.

House Resolution 5. Provides that the rules of the House of Representatives for the 88th Congress shall be the same as those of the 87th Congress with the exception of the Committee on Rules, whose membership shall be increased from 13 to 15 members permanently. On ordering the previous question, page 21 (249–183); vote nay; on agreeing to resolution, page 21 (235–196); vote yea.

FEBRUARY 27, 1963

House Joint Resolution 284. Supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for 1963.

On passage, page 3050 (254–154;) vote, general pair.

House Resolution 249. Provides $360,000 for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. On agreeing to resolution, page 3077 (386–20); vote yea.

MARCH 11, 1963

H.R. 2438. Extends the induction provision of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. On passage, page 3937 (388–3); vote yea.

MARCH 12, 1963

H.R. 4374. Proclaims Sir Winston Churchill as honorary citizen of the United States of America. On passage, page 4001 (378–21); vote yea.

MARCH 13, 1963

H.R. 2440. Authorizes appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. On committee amendment increasing the funds provided for research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft for the Army by $363,700,000 and earmarking the amount for development of the RS–70 weapons system, page 4090 (226–179); vote yea. On motion to recommit with instructions designed to reduce by 5 percent the procurement funds and by 12½ percent the research and development funds, page 4091 (149–258); vote yea. On passage, page 4091 (374–33); vote yea.

APRIL 4, 1963

H.R. 5366. Treasury-Post Office appropriations, 1964. On passage, page 5803 (386–17); vote yea.

APRIL 10, 1963

H.R. 5517. Supplemental appropriations, 1963. On Boland amendment to restore $450 million for public works acceleration program, page 6161 (228–184); vote yea.

H.R. 5389. Repeals certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver. On passage, page 6179 (252–122); vote yea.

APRIL 24, 1963

H.R. 12. Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963. On motion to recommit, designed to delete the student-loan provisions, page 6899 (171–239); vote nay. On passage, page 6899 (288–122); vote yea.

APRIL 25, 1963

H.R. 4997. Feed Grain Act of 1963. On motion to recommit, page 7142 (196–205); vote yea. On passage, page 7143 (208–195); vote nay.

APRIL 29, 1963

H.R. 1762. Promotes the coordination and development of effective programs relating to outdoor recreation. On Griffin amendment to require the Secretary of the Interior to file annual reports itemizing the source, value, purpose, and use of each donation accepted or used in connection with this program, page 7246 (292–50) vote general pair.

MAY 6, 1963

H.R. 40. To assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations. On suspending the rules and passing the bill, page 7820 (275–30); vote yea.

MAY 7, 1963

House Joint Resolution 245. Provides that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States. On passage, page 7883 (386–2); vote yea.

MAY 8, 1963

H.R. 5517. Supplemental Appropriations, 1963. On recommitting the conference report with instructions to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment No. 47, providing funds for World Food Congress and a contribution of $65,000 to the International Peace Corps Secretariat, page 8043 (207–190); vote yea.

MAY 9, 1963

H.R. 950. Amends the Internal Security Act of 1950, to provide for maximum personnel security in the National Security Agency. On passage, page 8156 (340–40); vote present (paired against).

MAY 13, 1963

H.R. 4274. Amends District of Columbia Code to permit principals and teachers in District of Columbia schools to use reasonable force in maintaining order in schools. On passage, page 8338 (278–53); vote general pair.

MAY 14, 1963

H.R. 5517. Supplemental Appropriations, 1963. On agreeing to conference report, page 8504 (242–129); vote yea. On ordering the previous question on motion to concur in Senate amendment 76 with an amendment, page 8509 (168–207); vote nay.

House Resolution 340. Authorizes travel outside U.S. continental limits by members of the House Committee on Education and Labor. On agreeing to resolution, page 8520 (153–217); vote yea.

MAY 15, 1963

H.R. 6009. To provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit. On motion to recommit, designed to continue temporarily the present $305 billion public debt limit, page 8596 (195–222); vote yea. On passage, page 8596 (213–204); vote nay.

MAY 23, 1963

H.R. 6060. Prohibits discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. On agreeing to House Resolution 362, the rule under which the legislation was considered, page 9194 (362–9); vote yea.

MAY 29, 1963

House Resolution 368. Authorizes the Speaker to appoint delegates and alternates to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva. On agreeing to resolution, page 9802 (278–52); vote yea.

H.R. 5497. Amends title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the Mexican farm labor program for 2 years. On passage, page 9833 (158–174); vote nay.

JUNE 4, 1963

H.R. 3496. Reorganization Act Extension. On Brown (Ohio) amendment to prohibit creating any new executive department, or abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof, or consolidating any two or more executive departments or all the functions thereof, page 10077 (226–175); vote yea. On motion to adjourn, page 10155 (53–276); vote nay.

JUNE 6, 1963

H.R. 6754. Agriculture Department and related agencies appropriations, 1964. On passage, page 10413 (288–79); vote yea.

JUNE 11, 1963

H.R. 6868. Legislative appropriations, 1964 On passage, page 10649 (271–122); vote yea.

JUNE 12, 1963

H.R. 4996. Amends certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act. On passage, page 10723 (204–209); vote nay.

JUNE 13, 1963

H.R. 6755. Tax Rate Extension Act of 1963. On passage, page 10870 (283–91); vote yea.

JUNE 18, 1963

H.R. 7063. Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriations, 1964. On passage, page 11036 (301–93); vote yea.

JUNE 19, 1963

House Joint Resolution 247. Equal-Time Rule Suspension Act. On passage, page 11195 (263–126); vote yea.

JUNE 24, 1963

H.R. 6177. Relates to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States. On motion to recommit, designed to increase the Federal contribution from $45 million to $53 million, page 11404 (99–237); vote yea.

JUNE 26, 1963

H.R. 7179. Defense Department Appropriations, 1964. On passage, page 11772 (410–1); vote yea.

JULY 9, 1963

H.R. 3179. Provides that judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior, and for other purposes. On passage, page 12308 (313–83); vote yea.

JULY 16, 1963

H.R. 4897. Repeals subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code, to extend geographical application of laws relating to seditious activities affecting the Armed Forces. On motion to recommit, page 12707 (40–339); vote yea.

JULY 17, 1963

H.R. 5279. Department of Interior and related agencies appropriations, 1964. Conference report—On motion to recommit providing for insistence of House disagreement to Senate amendment No. 52 providing for planning for construction of a National Air Museum, page 12769 (144–245); vote yea. On agreeing to conference report, page 12770 (333–50); vote yea.

JULY 18, 1963

H.R. 5171. Authorizes the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal agencies and departments. On motion to recommit, page 12968 (96–258); vote not voting.

JULY 24, 1936

H.R. 6518. To improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution. On passage, page 13293 (273–102); vote yea.

JULY 25, 1963

H.R. 4638. Promotes the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President. On motion to recommit, designed to eliminate the authorization of appropriations, page 13352 (29–343); vote nay.

JULY 30, 1963

H.R. 3872. Export-Import Bank Act Extension. Conference report—On motion that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and ask for further conference with Senate, page 13635 (379–11); vote yea.

JULY 31, 1963

H.R. 5207. Amends the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926 to authorize additional appropriations (also to pay balance of payment for Philippine war damage). On agreeing to House Resolution 453, the rule waiving points of order against and providing for the consideration of the conference report, page 13822 (234–166); vote yea.

AUGUST 1, 1963

H.R. 7500. Authorizes appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. On agreeing to House Resolution 467, the open rule providing for consideration of the bill, page 13861 (387–1); vote yea. On passage, page 13911 (335–57); vote yea.

AUGUST 5, 1963

S. 1652. Amends the National Cultural Center Act. On suspending the rules and passing the bill, page 14078 (293–33); vote yea.

AUGUST 6, 1963

H.R. 4955. Vocational Education Act of 1963. On motion to recommit, designed to insert language requiring all vocational education programs to be conducted on a racially nondiscriminatory basis by July 1, 1965, page 14296 (181–217); vote yea. On passage, page 14297 (378–21); vote yea.

AUGUST 7, 1963

H.R. 7824. Continues for the period ending November 30, 1963, the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit. On agreeing to House Resolution 477, the closed rule waiving points of order against and providing for 4 hours of debate on the bill, page 14337 (303–72); vote yea.

AUGUST 8, 1963

H.R. 7824. Public debt limit. On motion to recommit, designed to limit the extension to October 31, and to fix the increase at $307 billion in lieu of $309 billion, page 14611 (164–229); vote yea. On passage, page 14612 (221–175); vote nay.

AUGUST 12, 1963

H.R. 7525. Relates to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. On motion to recommit, page 14758 (114–222); vote yea.

AUGUST 14, 1963

H.R. 6143. Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. On passage, page 14998 (287–113); vote yea.

AUGUST 23, 1963

H.R. 7885. Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. On motion to recommit, designed to reduce certain authorizations, page 15676 (222–138); vote nay. On passage, page 15677 (224–186); vote yea.

AUGUST 28, 1963

H.R. 7500. Authorizes appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Conference report—on motion to recommit with instructions to limit the aggregate amount of authorizations to $5,203,719,000, page 16153 (176–200); vote general pair. On agreeing to conference report, page 16154 (249–125); vote paired for.

SEPTEMBER 10, 1963

S. 1576. Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. On passage, page 16696 (335–18); vote general pair.

SEPTEMBER 11, 1963

House Resolution 504. Creates a select committee to investigate research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government. On agreeing to resolution, page 16753 (336–0); vote yea.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1963

H.R. 8363. Amends Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes and to make certain structural changes with respect to income tax. On agreeing to House Resolution 527, the closed rule providing for the consideration of and 8 hours of debate on H.R. 8363, page 17905 (324–65); vote yea.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1963

H.R. 8363. Amends Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes and to make certain structural changes with respect to income tax. On motion to recommit, designed to limit Federal expenditures for fiscal year 1964 to $97 billion and for fiscal year 1965 to $98 billion, page 18118 (199–226); vote yea. On passage, page 18119 (271–155); vote nay.

OCTOBER 1, 1963

H.R. 5555. Military pay increase. On agreeing to conference report, page 18408 (333–5); vote yea.

H.R. 7044. Authorizes $1.5 million for construction of Corregidor-Bataan Memorial. On agreeing to House Resolution 539, the open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 7044, page 18411 (314–12); vote general pair.

OCTOBER 7, 1963

H.R. 3369. For the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason. On suspending the rules and adopting House Resolution 541, providing for the House agreement to a Senate amendment, extending for 1 year the life of the Civil Rights Commission, page 18863 (265–80); vote general pair.

OCTOBER 8, 1963

H.R. 7179. Department of Defense appropriations, 1964. On agreeing to conference report, page 18913 (336–3); vote yea.

OCTOBER 10, 1963

H.R. 8747. Independent offices appropriations, 1964. On motion to recommit, designed to reduce by $200 million the research and development funds for National Aeronautics and Space Administration, page 19270 (145–192); vote yea. On passage, page 19271 (302–32); vote yea.

OCTOBER 14, 1963

H.R. 5871. Amends District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act. On passage, page 19430 (150–89); vote yea.

OCTOBER 15, 1963

H.R. 6237. Amends act to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States. On passage, page 19565 (158–154); vote nay.

OCTOBER 21, 1963

S. 1576. Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. On agreeing to conference report, page 19965 (299–13); vote yea.

OCTOBER 22, 1963

H.R. 8821. Relates to restoration of Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act amounts. On passage, page 19993 (350–1); vote yea.

OCTOBER 23, 1963

H.R. 5945. Relates to political status of Puerto Rico. On passage page 20130 (320–44); vote yea.

OCTOBER 28, 1963

House Joint Resolution 782. Continuing appropriations through November 30, for fiscal year 1964. On agreeing to resolution, page 20367 (279–11); vote yea.

House Resolution 314. Grants additional travel authority to the Committee on Education and Labor. On agreeing to resolution, page 20371 (119–164); vote yea.

OCTOBER 31, 1963

H.R. 6500. Military construction authorization, 1964. On agreeing to conference report, page 20690 (356–1); vote yea.

H.R. 8195. Provides a 1-year extension of the Mexican farm labor program. On passage, page 20731 (173–160); vote nay.

NOVEMBER 6, 1963

H.R. 6143. Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. On agreeing to conference report, page 21135 (258–92); vote yea.

H.R. 8920. Revises the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act. On motion to recommit, page 21161 (258–98); vote yea.

NOVEMBER 7, 1963

H.R. 8969. To temporarily increase the public debt limit for the balance of fiscal year 1964. On agreeing to House Resolution 564, the closed rule providing for consideration of the bill, pages 21383–21384 (212–149); vote yea. On motion to recommit, page 21405 (172–197); vote yea. On passage, page 21406 (187–179); vote nay.

NOVEMBER 14, 1963

H.R. 8864. International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963. On passage, page 21810 (181–145); vote nay.

NOVEMBER 18, 1963

H.R. 2988. Relates to Armed Forces participation in international sports. On suspending the rules and passing the bill, page 22027 (284–30); vote general pair.

H.R. 8135. Provides for establishment and administration of public recreational facilities at Sanford Reservoir area, Canadian River project, Texas. On suspending the rules and passing the bill, page 22029 (284–30); vote general pair.

H.R. 9139. Military construction appropriations, 1964. On passage, page 22043 (332–5); vote yea.

NOVEMBER 19, 1963

H.R. 9140. Public works appropriations, 1964. On passage, page 22278 (358–27); vote yea.

NOVEMBER 20, 1963

S. 277. Amends the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. On passage, page 22538 (251–133); vote yea.

DECEMBER 2, 1963

H.R. 9124. Amends title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the ROTC programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. On suspending the rules and passing the bill (failed); page 22994 (176–154); vote nay.

H.R. 10. Extends the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of 1883 to temporary summer employment. On suspending the rules and passing the bill, page 23007 (301–18); vote nay.

DECEMBER 4, 1963

H.R. 6196. Revitalizes the American cotton industry. On motion to recommit, page 23324 (179–224); vote yea. On passage, page 23325 (216–182); vote nay.

DECEMBER 9, 1963

H.R. 7885. Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. On agreeing to conference report, page 23850 (195–164); vote yea.

H.R. 8929. Authorizes the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region. On motion to recommit, page 23872 (278–76); vote nay.

DECEMBER 10, 1963

H.R. 8747. Independent offices appropriations, 1964. On agreeing to conference report, page 23949 (356–22); vote yea.

Conference report—on preferential motion to recede and concur in amendment No. 92, which provides funds for site and planning expenses involved in construction of a VA hospital at Bay Pines, Fla., page 23952 (171–204); vote yea.

H.R. 6518. Improves, strengthens, and accelerates programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution. On agreeing to conference report, page 23966 (273–109); vote yea.

H.R. 7457. Provides legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts. On agreeing to House Resolution 579, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, page 23970 (345–12); vote yea.

DECEMBER 11, 1963

On motion to adjourn until December 12, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon, page 24217 (214–166); vote nay.

DECEMBER 12, 1963

H.R. 9140. Public Works Appropriations, 1964. On agreeing to conference report, page 24241 (330–47); vote yea.

H.R. 4955. Vocation Education Act of 1963. On motion to recommit, page 24290 (180–192), vote nay. On agreeing to conference report, page 24291 (301–65); vote yea.

DECEMBER 13, 1963

H.R. 9139. Appropriations for military construction, Department of Defense. On ordering the previous question, page 24561 (301–4); vote yea.

DECEMBER 16, 1963

H.R. 9499. Foreign aid appropriations and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. On the motion to recommit, page 24758 (218–169); vote nay. On passage, page 24759 (250–135); vote yea.

DECEMBER 17, 1963

H.R. 8667. Authorize additional appropriations in regard to river basins flood control projects. On the preferential motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, page 24822 (329–41); vote yea.

H.R. 9413. The President John F. Kennedy memorial 50-cent piece. On the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, page 24828 (352–6); vote yea.

DECEMBER 19, 1963

House Joint Resolution 875. Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for combating mental retardation. On passage, page 25216 (324–4); vote yea.

DECEMBER 23, 1963

House Resolution 600. Privileged resolution from the Rules Committee to consider without any point of order H.R. 9499 (foreign aid appropriations, supra). Question is on the House considering the resolution, page 25495 (202–105); vote yea.

DECEMBER 24, 1963

H.R. 9499. The foreign aid appropriations bill. Question is on waiving the conference report, pages 25543–25544 (189–158); vote live pair with Mr. HALEY (Florida). Mr. MATHIAS withdrew yea vote and voted present. Mr. HALEY voted nay.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Summary of Major Legislative Activity, 1st Session, 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, and House Resolution 17, 88th Congress, I submit herewith a summary of the major legislative accomplishments of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

During the first session, 662 House bills and resolutions and 13 Senate bills and resolutions were referred to the committee. Twenty bills were reported to the House, of which 10 were enacted into public law, 4 were approved by the House but not acted upon in the Senate, and 5 remained on the House Calendar on the adjournment of the first session. One House joint resolution passed the House and was amended in the Senate. The House has yet to concur in the Senate amendments.

The following bills reported from the committee became public law:

H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act—House Report No. 109; Public Law 88–129.

H.R. 6518, to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution—Clean Air Act—House Reports Nos. 508 and 1003; Public Law 88–206.

S. 1576, Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963—House Report Nos. 694 and 862; Public Law 88–164.

House Joint Resolution 665, providing for the settlement of the railroad labor dispute—House Report No. 713; Senate Joint Resolution 102 became Public Law 88–108.

H.R. 8100, a bill designed to restore the railroad retirement system to a satisfactory financial condition—House Report No. 748; Public Law 88–133.

H.R. 2876, repealing the Inland Waterways Corporation Act—House Report No. 347; S. 1031 became Public Law 88–67.

H.R. 134, requiring safety standards for automobile seat belts—House Report No. 378; Public Law 88–201.

House Joint Resolution 220, granting consent for an extension of 4 years of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas—House Report No. 681; Senate Joint Resolution 33 became Public Law 88–115.

H.R. 2906, providing for the emergency transportation of any motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing—House Report No. 483; Public Law 88–208.

H.R. 4646, declaring a portion of the Benton Harbor Canal, Benton Harbor, Mich., a nonnavigable stream—House Report No. 482; Public Law 88–88.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE WHICH PASSED THE HOUSE NOW AWAITING SENATE ACTION

H.R. 6199, granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact of agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission. House Report No. 909.

H.R. 8462, authorizing the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes—House Report No. 908.

H.R. 8344, amending the Railway Labor Act to provide that the terms of office of members of the National Mediation Board shall expire on July 1—House Report No. 1032.

H.R. 8673, amends the Federal Aviation Act to provide that the validity of an instrument, the recording of which is provided for by such act, shall be governed by the laws of the place in which such instrument is delivered—House Report No. 1033.

BILLS REPORTED TO THE HOUSE ON WHICH NO ACTION WAS TAKEN

H.R. 5445, amends the Interstate Commerce Act to permit freight forwarders to acquire other carriers subject to such act—House Report No. 421.

H.R. 1341, requires passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards—House Report No. 491.

H.R. 3669, the Quality Stabilization Act—House Report No. 566.

S. 1153, airport construction—House Report No. 1002.

H.R. 8316, length and frequency of broadcast commercials—House Report No. 1054.

JOINT RESOLUTION WHICH HAS PASSED BOTH HOUSE AND SENATE

House Joint Resolution 247 suspends the equal opportunity requirement of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for the 1964 presidential and vice-presidential campaigns. The joint resolution passed the House and was amended in the Senate. The House has not yet concurred in the Senate amendments; House Report No. 359.

In addition to the bills which the committee reported to the House during the first session of the present Congress, public hearings were held on the National Capital Airports Corporation; use of Dulles and Friendship Airports; development of a commercial supersonic aircraft; Transportation Act of 1963; National Accident Prevention Center; reorganization of Public Health Service; animal drugs; medical care for fishing boat owners; operation of motor vehicles by disabled persons; automobile spaceometers; judicial review of biological orders; safety latches on refrigerators; labeling—wood, steel containers, and labels—Securities and Exchange legislation; review of administrative process in regulatory agencies; and broadcast editorializing and broadcast rating services.

A detailed explanation of the reported bills is contained in the committee reports which accompanied them, and in the activity report of the committee for the 1st session of the 88th Congress which will be filed in the House next month.

Report to the People of the 12th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, this, my 14th annual report to my constituents, is intended to cover some phases of important world and national events which occurred during 1963. It briefly details the passage of our Ship of State through at times calm but, more frequently, rough and turbulent seas of events.

The year 1963 will go down in history, above all, as the year of the great tragedy which befell our Nation. The assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, that monstrous deed, shocked every American. In the lonely reaches of their hearts, in the privacy of their homes, and in public observances held throughout the Nation, the people of the United States mourned the passing of a leader who, in a brief span of less than 3 years, had left his indelible imprint upon the course of our national history.

President Kennedy belonged not only to us and to the present, but to the world and the future as well. In his person, he combined some of the best characteristics of the many nationality strains which comprise our great Nation. He was conscious of the spiritual, cultural, economic and political values of countries whose births predate that of the United States. He was even more deeply steeped in that rare blending of different cultural heritages achieved here which we know as the American tradition. In addressing himself to the problems of our day, in shaping the goals and the policies of the Government which he headed, he drew on both. He embraced the highest ideals of the Western, Judeo-Christian civilization. And he was loyal to the institutions and traditions which our unique experiment in human freedom and democracy produced upon the American soil. Thus, while serving his country, he served mankind.

President John F. Kennedy worked for, and died for, the implementation of the principles of human dignity, justice, and freedom. He fought against the denial of basic human rights to people everywhere. His death left on our shoulders the responsibility to continue that task. We must rededicate ourselves to the realization of the promise which is America, so that he will not have died in vain.

At the moment of its great loss, our Nation was fortunate to have a man of the caliber of President Lyndon B. Johnson assume the responsibilities of the Presidency. His many years of public service, his congressional experience, and his dedication to the programs and the high goals of the Kennedy administration, generated public confidence and the belief that he would strive to continue the work begun in 1960. He has, I am sure, the prayers of all thoughtful and fairminded Americans in the discharge of his grave duties.

The year 1963 was a year of turbulent change in many other parts of the world. To the south, continuing economic instability, political disorders, and military coup d'etats in several of our sister republics, hampered the advance of the Alliance for Progress and cast dark shadows on the future of that momentous undertaking. Communist subversion, generated by the Castro regime in Cuba, was not helping the cause of hemispheric security and progress. In Africa, Arab forces clashed in the north, the situation in the Congo remained perilous, and the apartheid policy of the Republic of South Africa was giving rise to mounting resentment throughout the continent which threatened to erupt in violence.

In the Middle East, fighting flared in Yemen, and governments fell in Iraq and Syria while the smoldering Arab-Israel conflict continued to resist a peaceful solution. In southeast Asia, the aftermath of the 1962 invasion of India by Red China continued to present problems. Indian-Pakistani relations took a turn for the worse, the infant Federation of Malaysia was, and is now, battered on all sides, and valiant President Diem of South Vietnam, having led his new nation through the years of bitter, bloody struggle against the deeply entrenched Communist guerrillas, was brutally murdered. Many Western news media and governments appeared to nod with approval at the change in the Government of South Vietnam, a change which to date has enhanced the takeover of the Orient by the Communists. And in Western Europe, three of the four major powers required new governments.

Not all of the changes occurring in 1963 were disruptive, of course. There were many hopeful developments. The peaceful, orderly elections leading to the transfer of executive power in Venezuela and Mexico are an instance in point. The restoration of civilian, democratic government in Argentina is another. The encouraging outcome of the United States-Soviet negotiations in the United Nations on outer space and disarmament must also be noted. The complete list of encouraging changes in 1963 would be very long. For this reason, I would like to mention only two more which I have watched with particular interest as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

In Western Europe, there were some signs that President de Gaulle's opposition to Britain's entry into the Common Market, and United States-led North Atlantic community defense force, was possibly softening. In spite of General de Gaulle's speech on New Year's Eve, in which he appeared to reaffirm French opposition to the admission of Great Britain to the Common Market, some observers predicted that before 12 months pass by, there may be a noticeable shift in the French position. And in Eastern Europe, the ferment of change appeared to have some effect on the solid voting pattern of the Communist bloc in the United Nations.

As a member of the U.S. delegation to the 18th General Assembly of the United Nations this fall, I had a front-row view of these developments. For the first time, conflicts developed in the positions of the Communist and Communist-dominated countries. Yugolsavia was first to create a major breach by making a payment on its arrearages for United Nations peacemaking operations. Rumania and Albania parted from the other Communist countries in voting on a resolution dealing with the denuclearization of Latin America. Several other breaches were noted. What their developments mean, no one can tell precisely at this time. They will bear constant close watching.

I personally believe that this atmosphere of relaxation of the U.S.S.R. is but a pattern of the Soviet Communist "peace" offensive. All must agree that it is in no way substantive. It is my fear that the people of the free world including many Americans and persons within our own Government will succumb to accepting this change as the real thing. This, and the unfortunate "going left" movement in governments around the world must be stopped or there will be more great tragedies in the years ahead. This new atmosphere of the U.S.S.R. was undertaken, in my viewpoint, because the Communists were made to realize by the stand of President Kennedy in Cuba that America would fight to maintain our way of life, even in a nuclear age.

The first session of the 88th Congress is being labeled with many unfavorable terms. This is unfortunate. All, including the news media, should weigh the density of the issues under consideration; the thorough review needed by the committees of Congress before congressional action is taken; the crises of the day; the change of governments; the shattering of traditions. These force Congress to act with patience and care. Congress has made a significant beginning in the consideration of the complexities faced by enacting legislation of benefit to all of us. So, as Al Smith said, "Let us look at the record."

The debt limit was extended to meet the demands of the national budget and the total national debt as of June 30, 1963, was $305.8 billion. Interest on the debt for fiscal year 1963 was $10.1 billion. In the same fiscal year, expenditures totaled $119.1 billion, revenues were $114.0 billion, leaving a deficit of $5.1 billion.

Defense spending continues to be the largest single budgetary item, and $47 billion was appropriated to maintain our military posture. Of this amount, $15.3 billion was for procurement and construction of planes, missiles, and ships; $5.3 billion was for research, development, construction of facilities, and administration of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and $216.2 million was for the operation of the Atomic Energy Commission, including new construction projects.

To insure sufficient manpower to operate our defense systems, it was necessary to extend the draft to July 1, 1967. However, since sufficient unmarried men were available, the drafting of married men was suspended.

Many men with important technical skills were leaving the armed services because of the low pay schedules. In order to restore morale, military pay was increased for the first time since 1958, based on grade and length of service. The raises vary from $12 to $120 per month for enlisted men and from $56 to $95 per month for officers.

A treaty was ratified by the U.S. Senate which bans nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water. This treaty was signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963, by the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This was the first step taken by international agreement which culminated in the signing of a limited nuclear test ban treaty.

After substantial cuts in committee and on the floor, the $3 billion Foreign Assistance Act was approved by Congress. This is another item for national defense. It represents the United States share of our mutual defense with our allies. While I have consistently supported foreign aid, I have long favored a complete review of this program. Some of my amendments to tighten the administration of the program were incorporated in the bill as passed by Congress. Others, such as my amendment which conditions the granting of aid to any country by requiring the recipient to agree to reviews, inspections, and audits by the United States, were deleted by the conference committee. I will continue my efforts to have these incorporated in the foreign aid program.

The completion of a 2-year study on the needs of the Foreign Service buildings culminated in the authorization of nearly $50 million for the purchase, construction, major alteration, long-term leasing, maintenance and repair of buildings overseas required by the Department of State for the next 2 years. After long controversy, the Philippines war claims bill, which terminated World War II obligations to that nation, was enacted.

The year 1963 has been the greatest in the history of our country for legislation in the field of education. Congress enacted the long-awaited Higher Education Facilities Act, a $1.2 billion measure, and the more than $1 billion Vocational Education Act. A 3-year, $238 million program was authorized to aid States in providing mental retardation research facilities and construction of community mental health centers. Another program provides $350 million over a 5-year period to increase aid to States for maternal and child health services and for crippled children's programs. This same program provides grants for maternity care and research projects to prevent mental retardation. Congress extended and expanded the National Defense Education Act and the federally affected areas education program.

My efforts, along with many of my colleagues, to obtain equal pay for equal work by women culminated in the enactment of an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act covering women. I was at President Kennedy's desk when he signed the bill and was honored when he presented me with one of the pens with which he affixed his signature.

Legislation for the benefit of veterans and their families was enacted. A bill to increase the payments to parents and children of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities, as well as one to increase payments to widows of veterans whose deaths were due to service-connected disabilities, were passed. Also, the law to provide educational assistance to children of deceased veterans was amended to include children of veterans with total and permanent service-connected disability. Congress also enacted laws to permit the Veterans' Administration to waive recovery on default on home loans in certain hardship cases; to provide additional compensation for service-incurred loss of hearing in both ears; and to increase compensation for veterans suffering complete loss of speech.

In one area the program for housing assistance to the elderly was broadened; while, in another area, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was extended for 2 years. Quick passage of the Peace Corps bill showed the success of this agency. Funds were increased to $102 million, while the number of volunteers was increased to 11,000.

A new program to reduce air pollution in cities authorized $187 million for Federal grants and confers additional powers on the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct research and cooperate with State officials in solving the problem. The manpower training program will relieve the States of matching Federal funds for the fiscal year beginning next July and lowers the age limit for youth training allowance from 19 to 17, to help more young people who are school dropouts.

A $4.4 billion public works bill was passed which provides funds to finance flood control, harbor improvement and reclamation projects. A large amount of the appropriated funds is for the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The threatened railroad strike forced Congress to lay aside other business to enact legislation to prevent a disastrous strike. The law provides for arbitration of the two main disputed issues and collective bargaining on all others. The arbitration award will remain in force for 2 years; thereafter, the parties are free to take such action as they desire.

Tax legislation passed in the 1st session of the 88th Congress continued for 1 year existing excise taxes, as well as the income tax rate of 52 percent on corporate profits. Special tax deductions for child care were granted working mothers, deserted by their husbands. The Export-Import Bank, which renders invaluable services to American exporters and which has always operated at a profit, was extended to 1968.

During 1963, the New York City office of the Internal Revenue Service was retained in New York, due to the joint efforts of the New York congressional delegation, which acted to prevent transfer of the office to Boston.

Early in 1964, Congress will take action on three bills of major importance which are our hope and which were the recommendations of the late President Kennedy. These bills—tax revision, civil rights, and medical care for the aged—include some new concepts and social changes which the Kennedy administration attempted to achieve and which President Johnson had pledged to enact. He has marked them urgent.

Tax revision legislation, which would reduce taxes by $11 billion over the next 2 years, has passed the House of Representatives, and is due to be acted upon by the Senate early in January. The bill does not repeal the extra $600 personal exemption for each taxpayer aged 65 or over. It provides a minimum standard deduction of $300 in addition to the $600 exemption provisions.

This provision will be particularly beneficial to many lower income taxpayers. The bill also repeals the existing "floor" on the deductibility of medicine and drugs to persons aged 65 and over or to dependent parents aged 65 or over. The bill doubles the existing $50 dividend exclusion, making $100 per taxpayer. The bill does repeal, in two stages, the 4-percent dividend credit. The effect of the combination of the doubling of the exclusion and the gradual repeal of the credit will be to reduce taxes for 2 million taxpayers who receive dividend income. The bill does not repeal the retirement income credit.

In the field of civil rights, far-reaching legislation was approved by the House Judiciary Committee and is scheduled for action early in January. The civil rights bill, which will restore to all Americans their inherent rights, provides for enforcement of voting rights; injunctions against discrimination in public accommodations; protection of rights to education and extension of the Civil Rights Commission for 4 years; establishment of a Community Relations Service and a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity; and nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs.

The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives began public hearings on the subject of medical care for the aged in mid-November. The hearings have been suspended, but will resume sometime in January.

We are a nation which has weathered many crises. Our national security cloaks our rights and provides for freedom and human dignity. These qualities we enjoy because we are strong and unified. I know that all Americans pledge their cooperation to President

Johnson in the days ahead. He has earned the confidence of the American people. His leadership among men—as we his former colleagues can so surely attest—will be a source of strength in preserving our way of life.

It has been an honor and privilege to serve the people of Brooklyn. My Washington office is open year round, and letters sent there receive immediate attention. The address is EDNA F. KELLY, Member of Congress, Washington 25, D.C. When Congress is not in session, I meet with my constituents at the Madison Club, 739 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, on Monday and Thursday evenings after 8 o'clock.

Everyone, Regardless of Economic Circumstances, or Cultural Interests, Can Enjoy the Free and Simple Magnificence of the Lincoln Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, because of my deep interest in legislation in behalf of the arts, I have studied the various bills relating to the National Cultural Center very closely during the past 6 years. Despite defects in all of these bills, I have voted favorably on all of them because it seemed to me that, with the assurance that further Federal funds would not be invested, the possible gain to the general public outweighed the obvious risks.

However, when the project is changed in a way that calls for an immediate investment of some $35 million in Federal funds and an uncertain financial future, and when all of this is proposed as a memorial to a beloved and mourned American President, then I believe that Members of Congress owe their constituents careful study and analysis of the plan, House Joint Resolution 871, to provide it. For this reason I shall go into this matter at some length at this time in order to bring to your attention a number of questions, some of them alarming, for which Congress must seek satisfactory answers before it can properly pass legislation, such as House Joint Resolution 871, dedicated to a deceased President and calling for an unprecedented large sum of Federal money.

I urge you to prepare yourself for the House consideration of this matter to begin January 7, 1964. Perhaps the presentation I submit at this time will stimulate you to do your own research on this proposal.

Here are some of the troublesome problems that raise inevitable doubts, and demontrate the need for legislative caution:

First. Is the memorial concept a "face-saver" for an otherwise faltering project?

Second. Why are Federal funds needed now when Congress has been repeatedly told, again as recently as last August 5 that the project could be realized through public contributions?

Third. How can a building designed for a 13-acre tract be fitted into the 9 acres authorized by Congress?

Fourth. How can Congress, in good conscience, authorize a $15.4 million loan on a parking garage to applicants who candidly admit that they do not anticipate enough revenue to pay the annual interest, let alone the operating costs and reduction of principal?

Fifth. Should a Presidential memorial be built with borrowed money—in effect, should it be subject to a first mortgage?

Sixth. Is there a proven need for the project in its present form, aside from the memorial aspects, that justifies such major Federal participation?

Seventh. Should the administration of a Presidential memorial be governed largely outside the control of Congress by a largely self-perpetuating board of lay citizens appointed by the President without review by Congress?

Eighth. What happens to congressional responsibility, the taxpayers of the future, and the memory of President Kennedy, if the Center is a financial failure?

Ninth. Is the site a desirable one for the intended use in spite of severe criticism by leading architects and other qualified experts?

Tenth. Is this "sole" memorial in fact the most suitable one for the mourned President it would commemorate? Should Congress ignore other worthy memorial proposals that have been submitted to it? The Senate-passed companion measure drops the word "sole." Should we insist on its retention.

I do not pretend to have the answers to all of these questions, but I am certain that they should be developed by a suitable commission of Congress. I hope that my colleagues, Democratic and Republican, will join me in this appeal to reason and dignity. Certainly a memorial based on culture, of all memorials, should arise from a thoughtful approach, calling on all the skills of our vast Nation before the position of Congress is irrevocably decided.

Yesterday's plan for a national theater, no matter how attractive, should not be hastily improvised into a monument for the ages. To do so is not worthy of Congress, of the people of the United States nor of President Kennedy.

The National Cultural Center has been before Congress as a legislative matter three times; once in the summer of 1958, when the original bill was passed, again in 1960, when the act was amended in certain technical respects, and again during the summer of 1963, when the act was extended for 3 years due to the failure of the fundraising campaign to make its goal within the 5-year limitation originally set by Congress. Each time that this legislation has been before Congress, it has been brought to the floor with a severe limit on debate. Thus, Congress has never had a chance to consider as thoroughly as it should the defects as well as the virtues of the act and the project.

The act, as well as its first amendment, were passed during the Eisenhower administration with the backing of President Eisenhower. It was made clear to Congress in 1958 and in 1960 that the President favored the project only on the basis that the obligation of the Federal Government was to provide a site of about 9 acres and that all other capital and operating funds would be raised by public subscription. The extension of the act was passed in the Kennedy administration with the backing of the White House, and the same clear representations as to funding through public contributions only were made by the proponents of the extension. The record is crystal clear on this point.

House Joint Resolution 871, which proposes to change the name of the National Cultural Center to the John F. Kennedy Center of the Performing Arts, and to provide up to $15.5 million of Federal funds as capital, and to lend another $15.4 million in Federal funds for construction of a parking garage, and to designate the proposed Center as the sole national memorial to the late President in the National Capital area, evolved from a very simple amendment which was sent to Congress with the recommendation of President Johnson. House Joint Resolution 871, with its concept of borrowing authority and other unique provisions, is substantially different from the amendment first recommended by the White House. It is of some significance that House Joint Resolution 871 was prepared within 24 hours after penetrating questions were asked during committee hearings by Representative CRAMER of Florida and this joint resolution appears to be have been drawn in an attempt to answer most of the questions he raised.

Even so, it appears to be full of defects, and it certainly raises many questions which Congress should face and resolve before taking final action on the present problems. For the first time, there is an opportunity for extended debate which is more important than ever in view of the suddenness and brevity of the recent committee hearings and the fact that the only public witness who appeared during these hearings, the president of the District of Columbia Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO, expressed grave concern about many aspects of House Joint Resolution 871, and the project as it is currently organized.

In order for Congress to deliberate and legislate intelligently in the public interest, it is necessary to consider the theater and art concepts of this memorial to President Kennedy. These components of the legislation are especially important, because of the fact that the project has been in existence for more than 5 years and therefore the proposed memorial, like a business corporation, becomes subject to the liabilities as well as the assets that have been acquired during its 5-year, nonmemorial, history. Congress must consider a point that has been raised by a number of thoughtful Members, including Senator ELLENDER of Louisiana, Representative BROWN of Ohio, and Representative CRAMER of Florida. This is that the trustees of the National

Cultural Center see the conversion of the Center to a memorial as a means of rescuing a project that might not otherwise have succeeded.

FIRST. THE QUESTION OF MAGNITUDE AND NEED

Other than in the matter of acreage, the original legislation set no limit on the nature of the building or buildings to be erected nor their cost. The hearings produced testimony from the American Institute of Architects under which it recognized the national importance of the project and recommended that the design be chosen through a nationwide competition which the institute agreed to administer free of charge as a public service. The trustees never availed themselves of this generous offer, and appointed as sole architect, Edward D. Stone. The first plan he developed called for three theaters and two small auditoriums under one roof with underground parking facilities at an estimated cost of $75 million.

Many proponents of the original legislation were surprised and shocked, since they had believed that the project should be started with a single theater suitable for opera and ballet and, perhaps, symphony concerts. Based on figures from other cities, it was assumed that this could be accomplished for about $10 million. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], one of the authors of the original bill, had this to say as late as 1961:

> When I backed the proposal I had in mind the construction of a comparatively modest multipurpose auditorium here in Washington which could serve as a showplace for the performing arts, related traveling painting and sculpture exhibitions, and so on. The Center, under present plans, is far larger than the population of the metropolitan area of the Nation's Capital can reasonably or realistically be expected to use. The Congress gave the Center a site almost as large as that of the Lincoln Center in New York City on which six major buildings will be located. I do not believe the additional land called for in two bills before the Congress is needed, or that the powers of the Congress should be exerted to obtain it.

During 1962 the project was redesigned, retaining the concept of three theaters under one roof, but eliminating working space which would have made the project a true cultural center equivalent to cultural centers in other big cities in this country and in other nations. The cost of the revised structure was announced as $30 million. It now appears that the trustees also eliminated the parking facilities from their cost estimates. It was not made publicly clear until the present hearings that the parking facilities (to be discussed below) were not included in the $30 million estimate. Indeed, publicity material issued by the trustees states that the parking garage is an integral part of the project and the $30 million cost estimate. The information developed at the hearings, therefore, came as a surprise to the Congress, the public and, doubtless, to most donors.

There appear to have been no adequate studies that would indicate a need at present or in the immediate future, for the three theaters that are presently proposed. Roger L. Stevens, the chairman of the board of trustees, stated at the recent hearings grave doubts that there is enough audience available at present for the structure that is being planned. He said that it was the hope of himself and his colleagues that the existence of the three new theaters would encourage the growth of audiences.

Washington is already graced by Constitution Hall in which symphony concerts by the resident National Symphony Orchestra and by visiting orchestras from the United States and abroad have flourished for many years. It has been made available by its owners, the Daughters of the American Revolution, at very low rentals so that it appears that there is no urgent need for another symphony hall in Washington. In respect to an opera house, it is widely acknowledged that there is no suitable auditorium in Washington for grand opera, and great ballet groups. It follows, that a genuine need does exist in this field, but there appears to have been no adequate market study as to the number of days in each year that such an opera house would be economically useful. In respect to the proposed theater, judging by the rest of the country, the so-called legitimate theater appears to be diminishing in holding the interest of audiences. The National Theater in downtown Washington is not occupied in each of the 52 weeks of the year and, with rare exceptions, it does not attract audiences to the limit of its seating capacity. Could the National Theater survive as the legitimate business enterprise of its owners if it were faced with the competition of a tax-exempt theater on Federal property? One of the corporations owned in part by Roger L. Stevens is lessee of the National Theater.

Related to the question of need is the attitude of the potentially largest users of a cultural center. The two most active performing arts organizations in Washington, the National Symphony, which has been operating for 32 years, and the Washington Opera Society, which is now in its 7th year, have both been quoted in the press as expressing concern that vigorous fundraising for the National Cultural Center was creating difficulties for them in their own essential fundraising activities. In this connection I call your attention to an article in the Wall Street Journal of September 6, 1963. This same concern has been voiced by the managements of America's major symphony orchestras, who presumably would be the most frequent users of the Center after the Washington organizations. At a conference of the 25 major orchestra managers in San Francisco on June 23, the National Cultural Center was discussed and the consensus was that active fundraising for the Center was in "direct conflict" with the fundraising needs of the orchestras in their own communities. This would indicate that the national efforts to raise contributions would be at least privately resisted, if not publicly opposed, by the very performing arts organizations who the Center's trustees count on to be the core of support for the National Cultural Center. Since these existing cultural organizations are widely scattered among the constituencies of Congress, it follows that Congres should take time to inform itself thoroughly regarding the impact of the proposed legislation on existing cultural activities throughout the United States.

SECOND. THE QUESTION OF SITE

During the hearings leading to the original legislation, the proponents were virtually unanimous in recommending a site on the Mall close to downtown. They lost out to the Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution and the present site along the river was hurriedly designated as a substitute in the closing days of the 85th Congress. Most thoughtful critics continue to be opposed to the present site despite its acknowledged scenic splendor. It has been widely characterized as "an island in the midst of a spaghetti-maze of arterial highways." It was pointed out during the hearings that successful theaters are almost invariably located in downtown areas and that those that have been located off the beaten track are often doomed to be failures. The Washington Auditorium, which is now being demolished, and which was out of the downtown area in its day, was cited as an example. Officials close to President Kennedy who were active on the Planning Commission for Pennsylvania Avenue had recommended to him that the Cultural Center project be broken up into its three components and that these be built one at a time as part of the rehabilitation of Pennsylvania Avenue between the White House and the Capitol.

The Advisory Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue was critical of the present plans and site on these grounds: First, the site is so far from the center of the Nation's Capital that it could do little to enrich the city's cultural life; second, the present location is not served by major public transportation facilities; third, housing all performing arts stages in a single building might result in a structure so large as to be out of proportion to the rest of the city.

The New York Times on December 11, 1963, said that the National Cultural Center "seems doomed to be a well-landscaped traffic island in the midst of freeways; culture over a giant car park. Pedestrians will undoubtedly be able to burrow over or under the automotive obstacle race, but this is peculiarly bad planning. As it stands now, the National Cultural Center is a well-intentioned gesture, dubiously sited, promising prettiness but shortchanging the possibility of architectural greatness—a backhanded tribute to culture and Mr. Kennedy."

The most experienced, independent, concert manager in Washington, Patrick Hayes, has been frequently critical of the large size of the Cultural Center project and of the site. After the memorial legislation was introduced, Mr. Hayes in two broadcasts—December 1 and 15, 1963—urged caution and deliberation by Congress and continued to raise serious questions regarding the site.

Congress should certainly have a chance to review the question of site, especially if the Cultural Center is to be a memorial to President Kennedy, since no American would want a Presidential memorial to risk failure as a business enterprise, a risk which now must be considered by the Congress because of the unique nature of this proposal as developed in House Joint Resolution 871.

Another serious question relating to the site is its size. The original act authorized only 9 acres. The plan for the National Cultural Center developed by Edward D. Stone, architect, as well as publicity issued by the trustees of the Center, calls for 13 acres. When this discrepancy was brought up by me on the floor of this House on August 5, 1963, I was assured by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] that no additional land involving Federal funds would be acquired for the National Cultural Center. In spite of these assurances, officials of the National Cultural Center testified at the hearings on this legislation on December 12, 1963, that 4 additional acres would have to be acquired by the Federal Government through the National Capital Planning Commission at a cost of some $3.3 million to be appropriated by Congress. Congress has not authorized this extension of the acreage for the National Cultural Center, nor has it authorized such an appropriation, but it appears that the presently planned building cannot be erected on the present 9 acres according to the trustees of the Center, who say it is the "obligation" of the Federal Government to buy the additional land.

THIRD. THE QUESTION OF PARKING

The business risks of the memorial come into sharp focus in relation to recently uncovered facts about the parking garage which is essential to the operation of the Center. In order to justify the omission of the cost of the parking garage from the publicized cost of the Center, Mr. Stevens, the Center's chairman, testified that he considered parking to be noncultural and therefore that it would be improper to ask for public contributions to pay for the construction of it. Presumably the same standard has not been applied to the funds needed for construction of restaurants, checkrooms, and other noncultural activities within the Center. It was at the time of that testimony on December 12, 1963, that Congress first heard of the proposal to borrow funds to construct the parking garage. It is noteworthy that the originally proposed memorial bill did not include such borrowing authority so that it is certain that Congress would have been faced with this request later on if it had passed the bill as originally proposed.

At the time of his testimony, Center Chairman Roger Stevens stated that construction costs of the garage would be $10,800,000. In House Joint Resolution 871, which emerged a day later, borrowing authority is asked for $15.4 million. Three days later Mr. Stevens testified that the additional $4.2 million was needed because of architects' fees, engineers' fees, and allowance for increases in construction costs.

This astounding proposal would put a first mortgage on a presidential memorial for the first time in our history. Moreover, according to the testimony of its own proponents, this mortgage is certain to default. The proposed parking garage with spaces for about 1,600 cars is to be built at the unprecedented high cost of $10,000 per parking space. According to the testimony of Mr. Stevens, the best anticipated revenues from the use of this parking will not be enough to pay the annual interest charges, let alone the annual operating costs, and any reduction whatsoever of the principal of the 30-year loan that is sought. It is clear that the end result will not be a loan, but a further $15.4 million contribution from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Stevens testified that it was proposed to operate the parking garage at a dollar a car on an in-and-out basis regardless of time. Because of its isolated position, most tourists would be able to approach the proposed Kennedy memorial conveniently only by private automobile. Those tourists who merely want to view the building—and it is unclear whether they may ever enter free—rather than attend one of the spectacles to be presented there, would thus have to pay $1 for the privilege of parking. The other presidential memorials provide free parking conveniently near and, of course, free admission. Might not this affect the attitude of tourists toward the memory of President Kennedy?

It is also to be questioned whether enough parking and adequate entrance and exit facilities have been planned. The present seating capacities of all of the Center's facilities add up to more than 12,000. For this, 1,600 parking places underground, and no surface parking, are being planned. By comparison, the Federal Government's Carter Barron Amphitheater has a seating capacity of 4,000 and adjacent parking lots for more than 1,100 cars. The Carter Barron Amphitheater is also served by regularly scheduled D.C. Transit routes. Yet, at the times when it plays to large audiences, the Carter Barron parking lots are quickly filled and the parking spills over to adjacent streets for many blocks around. According to the architect, Mr. Stone, there will be only one access road from the surrounding highways to the Cultural Center. This would tend to raise a serious problem, both in entrance and exit, for 1,600 cars at a time when there is intensive activity in the theaters, especially when audiences are leaving at one time.

Here it shall be noted that the parking problem appears to be greatly aggravated by the difficult site that has been chosen. If the Cultural Center project were to be located in downtown Washington, existing and future commercial parking facilities could take care of all of the needs at no expense to the Federal Government.

FOURTH. THE QUESTION OF MATCHING FUNDS

President Eisenhower and President Kennedy both laid great emphasis on the fact that no Federal money would go into the construction of the Center. Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, spoke on this subject just this past December 18, saying:

> President Kennedy was aware that if the Cultural Center could be constructed entirely through private contributions, it would have much more meaning for the people all over the country. * * * President Kennedy realized this, and attached great significance to the raising of private funds. * * * He made it the subject of White House messages.

Chairman Stevens of the Center has himself laid great emphasis on this aspect of the plan for the Center. Writing in the American Music Teacher for September–October 1962, he stated:

> When Congress sets aside a 13-acre tract [sic] on the Potomac for the National Cultural Center it also stipulated—in conformity with the American tradition—that the funds for erecting the Center should be raised by popular subscription. In other words, Congress hoped that the people of our country would indicate their enthusiasm for this program by a kind of referendum, in which their votes would be cast in the form of voluntary contributions, both large and small.

Yet, it is now proposed that a memorial to President Kennedy be erected in a way that is not in conformity with a long-established and successful American tradition. This tradition and precedent have not been violated in the case of the congressionally authorized memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt which is yet to be built and which, when it is built, is to be constructed from funds made available entirely by public subscription.

FIFTH. THE QUESTION OF ADMINISTRATION

All existing Presidential memorials in Washington (including those authorized but not yet constructed) have been developed under the direct control of Congress through congressional commissions. Congress is now being asked to consider a Presidential memorial of unprecedented magnitude and of unprecedented usage and cost with unprecedented haste—and also is being asked to waive the commission approach which has resulted in the great memorials to Washington, Lincoln and Jefferson. Congress is being asked to surrender fiscal control and administrative control to a board dominated by lay citizens appointed by the President without the advice and consent of Congress. It is being asked to do this in the face of a proposal for a Presidential memorial which is simultaneously being presented to Congress as a "business proposition" which is supposed to pay its own way. It would appear that because of the grave risks in the uncharted course set for the proposed project that the thoughtful commission approach is more necessary than ever before.

SIXTH. THE QUESTION OF FINANCIAL RISK

For the first time in our history, Congress is being asked to authorize and pay the major cost of a Presidential memorial which, once it is built, must be maintained as a business. This injects the problem of calculated risk into a memorial monument, something which Congress has never had to deal with before. During various committee hearings, Congress has relied on the testimony of one witness, Mr. Stevens, for assurances, unsupported by figures, that the project would pay for itself once it is built and would not be a future burden to the taxpayers. Although the statements of Mr. Stevens, whose investments are primarily in the theater and in real estate, should be carefully considered, his opinion runs counter to all actual experience in this field. Comparable cultural centers erected, or being erected in other big American cities, have assumed that they would need annual operating funds in addition to those coming from operating revenues. Lincoln Center in New York found that its construction costs just about doubled in the course of construction, and it still has not raised all of the capital that it needs. Lincoln Center has also found that its annual operating costs are greater than those assumed in the planning estimates. In the other nations of the world, opera houses and cultural centers all receive large annual subsidies from their governments. They cannot and do not exist from operating revenues alone.

It thus becomes virtually certain that Congress will have to provide annual operating funds to keep such a gigantic enterprise solvent. Comparison has been made with the National Gallery of Art, which was constructed entirely through private means and given to the Government. Yet, the National Gallery requires and receives from Congress an appropriation of more than $2 million a year which it needs in order to operate. A complex cultural center of the performing arts will undoubtedly require even more in annual subsidies in order to operate.

Congress has been given rosy predictions in regard to other so-called self-liquidating projects, the most recent and notable of which is the District of Columbia Stadium. Congress now knows that even the most careful business predictions by experts cannot be considered negotiable. This is an especial problem for enterprises which depend upon paying audiences in order to remain solvent. For example, far from paying for itself, the District of Columbia Stadium cannot pay the interest on its Government-guaranteed bonds and the Government has had to step in in order to make the interest payments.

It is true that Congress has already authorized the undertaking of such necessary financial risks in connection with the construction of the theaters of the National Cultural Center. However, the circumstances under which Congress approved the plan were much different from those that are now being proposed. The original plan called for a project which, except for the grant of land, would be capitalized and supported entirely through private contributions. The project at that time was not a memorial project and therefore there was no implied obligation to rescue it, if it should fail. Now Congress is confronted with a plan under which a major Federal investment of at least $35 million is to be made immediately. This plan for a presidential memorial can hardly be allowed to fail, once it has been built, regardless of the future cost to the Federal Treasury.

A presidential memorial that, in the future, found itself in financial trouble would not be a graceful tribute to the man to whom it is dedicated.

Congress is also being asked to pass in House Joint Resolution 871 a measure which would supersede more than 40 conflicting memorial proposals on which hearings have never been held, and whose virtues will never be known if, for the first time in our Nation's history, a presidential memorial is authorized under emergency conditions. Precedent and prudence appear to require the commission approach. Congress, for example, should have a completely detailed fiscal report of the Center's operations to date including a complete listing of all donations made, the names of the donors and the conditions attached to the gifts. Congress should have this information because it is the Congress and, also, because it is being asked to authorize Federal funds that must match, among other items, substantially more than $1 million which have been spent already on purely administrative and promotional activities. The commission approach would also give Congress the needed opportunity to consider, in less chaotic circumstances, whether or not the Cultural Center, attractive as the idea may sound at the moment, is in fact the most suitable memorial to President Kennedy. Representative SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, has appropriately pointed out that although the late President's interest in the performing arts was a matter of record, it was not the dominant interest in his life.

It would be wise to consider whether a Cultural Center memorial is the type of memorial that would appeal to most Americans in connection with their late President. It is apparent that the greatest value of the Cultural Center memorial will be to those who are able to afford the admission prices to the attractions that it will present. It follows that the Center will be of more value to the residents of Washington than to its visitors. Many millions of Americans who visit Washington will be excluded from the fullest enjoyment of a memorial such as House Joint Resolution 871 will provide. Everyone, regardless of economic circumstances or cultural interests, can enjoy the free and simple magnificence of the Lincoln Memorial.

Voting and Attendance Record of Representative Gerald R. Ford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

The report is as follows:

Voting record of Representative GERALD R. FORD, *5th District of Michigan*

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 9	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 9	Election of the Speaker. (McCormack, 256; Halleck, 175.)	Halleck.
3	Jan. 9	H. Res. 5, on a motion calling for a vote on the resolution concerning rules of the House. (Passed 249 to 183.)	No.
4	Jan. 9	H. Res. 5, to adopt for the 88th Cong. the House rules of the 87th Cong. except that membership on Committee on Rules shall be increased permanently from 12 to 15 members. (Passed 235 to 196.)	No.
5	Feb. 27	H.J. Res. 284, to approve a supplemental appropriation of $508,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture. (Passed 254 to 154.)	No.
6	Feb. 27	H. Res. 249, to authorize an amount not to exceed $360,000 for use by the Committee on Un-American Activities in carrying on its work. (Passed 385 to 20.)	Yes.
7	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
8	Mar. 11	H.R. 2438, to extend for 4 years the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (selective service). (Passed 387 to 3.)	Yes.
9	Mar. 12	H.R. 4374, to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States. (Passed 377 to 21.)	Yes.
10	Mar. 12	Quorum call	Present.
11	Mar. 13	Quorum call	Present.
12	Mar. 13	H.R. 2440, to increase the authorization for military procurement by $363,700,000 to develop the RS-70 weapons system. (Passed 226 to 179.)	Yes.
13	Mar. 13	H.R. 2440, to recommit to committee the bill authorizing appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in order to reduce by 5 percent the procurement funds and by 12¼ percent the research and development funds. (Defeated 149 to 258.)	Yes.
14	Mar. 13	H.R.2440, on final passage of the bill to authorize $15,856,391,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. (Passed 374 to 33.)	No.
15	Apr. 4	Quorum call	Present.
16	Apr. 4	H.R. 5366, to approve the $5,900,000,000 appropriation bill for the Department of Treasury and Post Office and for the Executive Office. (Passed 385 to 17.)	Yes.
17	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
18	Apr. 10	Quorum call	Present.
19	Apr. 10	H.R. 5517, to add $450,000,000 for the public works acceleration program to the supplemental appropriation bill, 1963. (Passed 228 to 184.)	No.
20	Apr. 10	H.R. 5389, to repeal certain legislation relating to silver including authorization to issue $1 Federal Reserve notes in place of $1 silver certificates. (Passed 251 to 122.)	Yes.
21	Apr. 23	Quorum call	Present.
22	Apr. 24	Quorum call	Present.
23	Apr. 24	H.R. 12, to recommit to committee the Health Professions Education Assistance Act in order to delete the provision for student loans. (Defeated 171 to 239.)	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record of Representative GERALD R. FORD, *5th District of Michigan*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
24	Apr. 24	H.R. 12 on final passage of the Health Professions Education Assistance Act. (Passed 288 to 122.)	No.
25	Apr. 25	Quorum call	Present.
26	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present.
27	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present.
28	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present.
29	Apr. 26	H.R. 4997, to recommit to the Committee on Agriculture the Feed Grains Act of 1963. (Defeated 196 to 205.)	Yes.
30	Apr. 26	H.R. 4997, on final passage of the Feed Grains Act of 1963. (Passed 208 to 196.)	No.
31	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
32	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
33	Apr. 29	H.R. 1762 (S. 20), to amend the bill establishing a bureau in the Department of the Interior to coordinate outdoor recreational programs by requiring it to file annual reports itemizing the source, value, purpose, and use of each donation accepted in connection with this act. (Passed 292 to 50.)	Yes.
34	Apr. 30	Quorum call	Present.
35	May 1	Quorum call	Present.
36	May 1	Quorum call	Present.
37	May 6	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
38	May 6	H.R. 40, to provide Federal matching funds to assist in the construction and remodeling of facilities for research in State agricultural experiment stations. (Passed 274 to 30.)	Absent.[2]
39	May 7	Quorum call	Present.
40	May 7	H.J. Res. 245, to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States. (Passed 384 to 2.)	Yes.
41	May 8	H.R. 5517, to recommit to conference the supplemental appropriations bill, 1963, in order to insist upon the elimination of funds added by the Senate for the World Food Congress and $65,000 to the International Peace Corps Secretariat. (Passed 207 to 190.)	Yes.
42	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
43	May 9	H.R. 950, to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 to provide for maximum personnel security in the National Security Agency. (Passed 340 to 40.)	Yes.
44	May 13	H.R. 4274, to amend the District of Columbia Code to permit principals and teachers in District of Columbia schools to use reasonable force in maintaining order in schools. (Passed 277 to 53.)	Absent.[2]
45	May 14	H.R. 5517, to accept the conference on the supplemental appropriation bill, 1963, which includes among others a provision for $450,000,000 for the accelerated public works program. (Passed 241 to 130.)	No.
46	May 14	H.R. 5517, to order the previous question in order to vote on a provision in the bill relative to the Philippine war damage claims payment. (Defeated 168 to 207 with the provision later ordered recommitted to conference for further consideration.)	No.
47	May 14	Quorum call	Present.
48	May 14	H. Res. 340, to authorize travel outside the United States by members of the House Committee on Education and Labor. (Defeated 153 to 217.)	No.
49	May 15	Quorum call	Present.
50	May 15	Quorum call	Present.
51	May 15	H.R. 6009, to recommit to committee the bill to increase the national debt limit in order to amend the bill by providing for a continuation of the debt limitation at $305,000,000,000. (Defeated 195 to 222.)	Yes.
52	May 15	H.R. 6009, on final passage of the bill to increase the national debt limit to $309,000,000,000 for July and August 1963. (Passed 213 to 204.)	No.
53	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
54	May 23	H. Res. 362, to adopt the resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 6060 (S. 1409), the bill relative to equal pay for equal work by women. (Passed 362 to 9.)	Yes.
55	May 28	Quorum call	Present.
56	May 28	Quorum call	Present.
57	May 29	Quorum call	Present.
58	May 29	H. Res. 368, to authorize the Speaker to appoint official delegates from the House of Representatives to the meeting of the International Labor Organization in Geneva. (Passed 277 to 52.)	Yes.
59	May 29	H.R. 5497, to continue for 2 years the program under Public Law 78 of 1951 by which Mexican nationals are temporarily admitted to the United States as agricultural laborers. (Defeated 158 to 174.)	Yes.
60	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
61	June 4	H.R. 3496, to amend the bill providing for certain exemptions of the Reorganization Act by prohibiting the creation by the President of any new executive departments under the authority of the Reorganization Act. (Passed 227 to 174.)	Yes.
62	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
63	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
64	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
65	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
66	June 4	On a motion to adjourn the meeting of the House. (Defeated 53 to 277.)	No.
67	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
68	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
69	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
70	June 5	Quorum call	Present.
71	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
72	June 6	H.R. 6754, to approve the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture in the amount of $5,900,000,000. (Passed 288 to 79.)	No.
73	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
74	June 11	H.R. 6868, to approve the legislative appropriation bill in the amount of $140,000,000. (Passed 271 to 122.)	Yes.
75	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
76	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
77	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
78	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
79	June 12	H.R. 4996, to adopt the Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963, increasing the authorized funds for the program by $455,500,000. (Defeated 204 to 209.)	No.
80	June 13	Quorum call	Present.
81	June 13	H.R. 6755, to adopt the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1963, continuing for 1 year the corporate tax rates and the rates on certain excise taxes scheduled to change or expire on June 30. (Passed 283 to 91.)	Yes.
82	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
83	June 18	H.R. 7063, to adopt the 1964 appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce in the amount of $1,800,000,000. (Passed 301 to 93.)	Yes
84	June 19	Quorum call	Present.
85	June 19	H.J. Res. 247, to suspend the equal time provisions of the Communications Act to enable radio and TV facilities to grant equal time to 1964 presidential and vice presidential candidates for major parties without extending same privilege to minor candidates. (Passed 263 to 126.)	Yes.
86	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
87	June 24	H.R. 6177, to recommit to committee the bill relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia in order to increase the contribution from $45,000,000 to $53,000,000. (Defeated 99 to 237.)	No.
88	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
89	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
90	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
91	June 26	H.R. 7179, to adopt the 1964 appropriation bill for the Department of Defense in the amount of $47,000,000,000. (Passed 410 to 1.)	Yes.
92	July 9	Quorum call	Present.
93	July 9	H.R. 3179, to provide that judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior. (Passed 314 to 82.)	Yes.
94	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
95	July 16	H.R. 4897, to recommit to committee the bill extending the provisions of the sedition law to include acts of sedition committed against the United States in foreign countries by U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens. (Defeated 40 to 338.)	No.
96	July 17	H.R. 5279, to recommit to the conference committee the appropriation bill for the Department of Interior in order to eliminate $511,000 for initiating plans for a National Air Museum Bldg. (Defeated 144 to 245.)	No.
97	July 17	H.R. 5279, to approve the conference report making appropriations in the amount of $958,456,500 for the Department of the Interior in fiscal 1964. (Passed 331 to 50.)	Yes.
98	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
99	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
100	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
101	July 18	H.R 5171, to recommit to committee the bill authorizing General Services Administration to handle purchase, lease, operation of automatic data processing equipment by Federal agencies and departments. (Defeated 96 to 258.)	No.
102	July 24	H.R. 6518, to adopt the Clear Air Act which authorized $90,000,000 previously for research, investigation, and training in the area of air pollution. (Passed 272 to 102.)	No.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record of Representative GERALD R. FORD, *5th District of Michigan*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
103	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
104	July 25	H.R. 4638, to recommit to committee the Presidential Transition Act in order to eliminate the authorization of appropriations. (Defeated 29 to 343.)	No.
105	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
106	July 30	H.R. 3872, to insist on the House position that the Export-Import Bank should be financed by appropriations rather than through back-door spending. (Passed 379 to 11.)	Yes.
107	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
108	July 31	H. Res. 453, to adopt a rule waiving points of order and providing for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 5207, to amend the Foreign Service Building Act as amended to pay balance of payment for Philippine war damage. (Passed 234 to 166.)	No.
109	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
110	Aug. 1	H. Res. 467, to adopt a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 7500, a bill authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Passed 387 to 1.)	Yes.
111	Aug. 1	H.R. 7500, to approve the bill authorizing $5,200,000,000 in appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Passed 334 to 57.)	Yes.
112	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
113	Aug. 5	S. 1652, to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend the termination date for fund raising for 3 years and to enlarge the board of trustees. (Passed 293 to 33.)	Yes.
114	Aug. 6	Quorum call	Present.
115	Aug. 6	H.R. 4955, to recommit to committee the Vocational Educational Act of 1963 to amend the act to provide that by July 1, 1965, all vocational educational programs conducted under the act should be on a racially nondiscriminatory basis. (Defeated 181 to 217.)	Yes.
116	Aug. 6	H.R. 4955, to pass the Vocational Education Act of 1963. (Passed 377 to 21.)	Yes.
117	Aug. 7	Quorum call	Present.
118	Aug. 7	H. Res. 477, to adopt the rule permitting consideration of H.R. 7824, the bill to extend the $309,000,000,000 debt limit until Nov. 30. (Passed 303 to 72.)	Yes.
119	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
120	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
121	Aug. 8	H.R. 7824, to recommit to committee the bill on public debt limit to set the temporary limit at $307,000,000,000 until Oct. 31, 1963. (Defeated 164 to 229.)	Yes.
122	Aug. 8	H.R. 7824, to pass the bill extending the $309,000,000,000 public debt limit until Nov. 30, 1963. (Passed 221 to 175.)	No.
123	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
124	Aug. 12	H.R. 7525, to recommit to committee the bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. (Defeated 114 to 222.)	Paired against.
125	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
126	Aug. 14	H.R. 6143, to pass the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. (Passed 287 to 113.)	Yes.
127	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
128	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
129	Aug. 21	Quorum call	Present.
130	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
131	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
132	Aug. 23	H.R. 7885, to recommit to committee the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 in order to reduce the authorization for foreign aid by $585,000,000. (Passed 222 to 188.)	Yes.
133	Aug. 23	H.R. 7885, on final passage of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 authorizing $3,500,000,000 for fiscal year 1964. (Passed 224 to 186)	Yes.
134	Aug. 27	Quorum call	Present.
135	Aug. 27	Quorum call	Present.
136	Aug. 28	Quorum call	Present.
137	Aug. 28	Quorum call	Present.
138	Aug. 28	H.R. 7500, to recommit to conference committee the authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in order to reduce the dollar amount to $5,200,000,000 as originally approved by the House. (Defeated 176 to 200.)	Yes.
139	Aug. 28	H.R. 7500, on final passage of the NASA authorization bill for $5,350,000,000. (Passed 249 to 125.)	Yes.
140	Sept. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
141	Sept. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
142	Sept. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
143	Sept. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
144	Sept. 10	S. 1576, to approve the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Centers Construction Act of 1963 as amended by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. (Passed 335 to 18.)	Absent.[3]
145	Sept. 11	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
146	Sept. 11	H. Res. 504, to establish a select committee of the House to investigate research programs conducted or sponsored by the Federal Government. (Passed 336 to 0.)	Absent.[3]
147	Sept. 17	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
148	Sept. 17	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
149	Sept. 17	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
150	Sept. 24	Quorum call	Present.
151	Sept. 24	H. Res. 527, to adopt a closed (gag) rule providing for 8 hours of debate on the Revenue Act of 1963. (Passed 320 to 66.)	No.
152	Sept. 24	Quorum call	Present.
153	Sept. 25	Quorum call	Present.
154	Sept. 25	Quorum call	Present.
155	Sept. 25	Quorum call	Present.
156	Sept. 25	H.R. 8363, to recommit to committee the Revenue Act of 1963 to provide that tax reduction should become effective only if expenditures in fiscal year 1964 are estimated by the President to not exceed $97,000,000,000 and for the year 1965 not to exceed $98,000,000,000. (Defeated 199 to 226.)	Yes.
157	Sept. 25	H.R. 8363, to approve the Revenue Act of 1963 as recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means. (Passed 271 to 155.)	No.
158	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Present.
159	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
160	Oct. 1	H.R. 5555, to adopt the conference report on the military pay raise bill. (Passed 333 to 5.)	Yes.
161	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
162	Oct. 1	H. Res. 539, to adopt an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 7044, a bill to authorize $1,500,000 for construction of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial. (Passed 314 to 12.)	Yes.
163	Oct. 2	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
164	Oct. 7	Quorum call	Present.
165	Oct. 7	H.R. 541, to agree to a Senate amendment to H.R. 3369 (a private bill) extending for 1 year the life of the Civil Rights Commission. (Passed 265 to 80.)	Yes.
166	Oct. 8	Quorum call	Present.
167	Oct. 8	H.R. 7179, to approve the conference report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense in the amount of $47,200,000,000. (Passed 335 to 3.)	Yes.
168	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
169	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
170	Oct. 10	H.R. 8747, to recommit to committee the independent office appropriation bill in order to reduce by $200,000,000 the research and development funds for NASA. (Defeated 145 to 192.)	Absent.[2]
171	Oct. 11	H.R. 8747, to adopt the independent offices appropriation bill in the amount of $13,000,000,000. (Passed 302 to 32.)	Absent.[3]
172	Oct. 14	H.R. 5871, to modify the retirement benefits of judges of local District of Columbia courts. (Passed 149 to 86.)	Absent.[4]
173	Oct. 15	Quorum call	Present.
174	Oct. 15	H.R. 6237, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material of American history. (Passed 157 to 154.)	No.
175	Oct. 21	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
176	Oct. 21	S. 1576, to adopt the conference report on the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Centers Construction Act of 1963. (Passed 296 to 14.)	Absent.[3]
177	Oct. 22	Quorum call	Absent.
178	Oct. 22	H. R. 8821, to revise the methods for repayment to the Treasury of funds advanced by the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act. (Passed 350 to 1.)	Absent.[2]
179	Oct. 23	Quorum call	Present.
180	Oct. 23	H.R. 5945, to establish a United States-Puerto Rico commission to study relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico. (Passed 320 to 44.)	Yes.
181	Oct. 24	Quorum call	Present.
182	Oct. 28	Quorum call	Absent.[3]

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record of Representative GERALD R. FORD, *5th District of Michigan*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
183	Oct. 28	H.J. Res 782, to extend the continuing resolution for appropriations for fiscal year 1964 through Nov. 30, 1963. (Passed 279 to 11.)	Absent.[2]
184	Oct. 28	H. Res. 314, to authorize a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor to visit Russia and other European countries for the purpose of inspecting scientific data processing arrangements. (Defeated 119 to 164.)	Absent.[5]
185	Oct. 29	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
186	Oct. 30	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
187	Oct. 31	Quorum call	Present.
188	Oct. 31	H.R. 6500, to adopt the conference report on the military construction authorization bill. (Passed 356 to 1.)	Yes.
189	Oct. 31	H.R. 8195, to approve the bill extending for 1 year (to Dec. 31, 1964) the provisions of Public Law 78 relating to the use of Mexican nationals as agricultural laborers in United States. (Passed 173 to 158.)	Yes.
190	Nov. 6	Quorum call	Present.
191	Nov.	H.R. 6143, to adopt the conference report on the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. (Passed 258 to 92.)	Yes.
192	Nov. 6	H.R. 8920, to recommit to the Committee on the District of Columbia a bill to revise the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act for the District. (Passed 258 to 98.)	Yes.
193	Nov. 7	Quorum call	Present.
194	Nov. 7	H. Res. 564, on the adoption of a closed rule to take up for consideration H.R. 8969, a bill to raise the public debt limit. (Passed 212 to 149.)	No.
195	Nov. 7	H.R. 8969, to recommit to committee the bill to increase the public debt limit from $309,000,000,000 to $315,000,000,000 until June 29, 1964. (Defeated 172 to 197.)	Yes.
196	Nov. 8	H.R. 8969, to approve the bill to increase the public debt ceiling to $315,000,000,000 until June 29, 1964. (Passed 187 to 179.)	No.
197	Nov. 13	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
198	Nov. 14	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
199	Nov. 14	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
200	Nov. 14	H.R. 8864, on final passage of the bill to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962. (Passed 182 to 144.)	Absent.[5]
201	Nov. 18	Quorum call	Present.
202	Nov. 18	H.R. 2988, to provide for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities. (Passed 282 to 30.)	Yes.
203	Nov. 18	H.R. 8135, to provide for the establishment and administration of public recreational facilities at the Sanford Reservoir area, Canadian River project, Texas. (Passed 283 to 30.)	No.
204	Nov. 18	Quorum call	Present.
205	Nov. 18	H.R. 9139; to approve the military construction appropriation bill for 1964 in the amount of $1.500,000,000. (Passed 332 to 5)	Yes.
206	Nov. 19	Quorum call	Present.
207	Nov. 19	H.R. 9140, to approve the public works appropriation bill for 1964 in the amount of $4,200,000,000. (Passed 358 to 27.)	Yes.
208	Nov. 20	Quorum call	Present.
209	Nov. 20	S. 777, to amend and approve the bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization and modify personnel security procedures for contractor employees. (Passed 252 to 133.)	Yes.
210	Dec. 2	Quorum call	Present.
211	Dec. 2	H.R. 9124, to suspend the rules and pass the bill relative to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps including expansion of junior ROTC and other changes. (Defeated 176 to 154; ⅔ vote required for passage.)	Yes.
212	Dec. 2	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
213	Dec. 2	H.R. 10, to extend the apportionment requirement relative to State residence and open competitive examinations to temporary summer positions with the Federal Government in Washington. (Passed 301 to 18.)	Absent.[2]
214	Dec. 3	Quorum call	Present.
215	Dec. 3	Quorum call	Present.
216	Dec. 3	Quorum call	Present.
217	Dec. 4	Quorum call	Present.
218	Dec. 4	Quorum call	Present.
219	Dec. 4	H.R. 6196, to recommit to committee the bill entitled "A bill to revitalize the American cotton industry." (Defeated 179 to 224.)	Yes.
220	Dec. 4	H.R. 6196, on final passage of cotton bill. (Passed 216 to 182.)	No.
221	Dec. 5	Quorum call	Absent.[6]
222	Dec. 6	Quorum call	Present.
223	Dec. 9	Quorum call	Present.
224	Dec. 9	H.R. 7885, to adopt the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, authorizing $3,600,000,000 for the mutual security program in fiscal 1964. (Passed 195 to 164.)	Yes.
225	Dec. 9	Quorum call	Present.
226	Dec. 9	H.R. 8929, to recommit to committee a bill authorizing construction of a 23-mile rapid transit system including a subway in Washington, D.C. (Passed 278 to 76.)	Yes.
227	Dec. 10	H.R. 8747, to approve the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill of $13,200,000,000. (Passed 356 to 22.)	Absent.[2]
228	Dec. 10	H.R. 8747, to adopt the amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill providing funds for site and planning expenses involved in construction of a VA hospital at Bay Pines, Fla. (Defeated 170 to 204.)	Absent.[2]
229	Dec. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
230	Dec. 10	H.R. 6518, to approve the conference report on the Clean Air Act, a bill relative to the prevention and abatement of air pollution. (Passed 273 to 109.)	Absent.[5]
231	Dec. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
232	Dec. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
233	Dec. 10	H.R. 7457, to adopt the rule for consideration of the bill to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts. (Passed 345 to 12.)	Absent.[2]
234	Dec. 11	On a motion to adjourn the House of Representatives at about 1 p.m. (Passed 214 to 166.)	No.
235	Dec. 12	H.R. 9140, to adopt the conference report on the public works appropriation bill in the amount of $4,400,000,000. (Passed 328 to 47.)	No.
236	Dec. 12	Quorum call	Present.
237	Dec. 12	H.R. 4955, to recommit to committee the conference report on the Vocational Education Act of 1963. (Defeated 180 to 192.)	Yes.
238	Dec. 12	H.R. 4955, to approve the conference report on the Vocational Education Act of 1963. (Passed 300 to 63.)	No.
239	Dec. 13	Quorum call	Present.
240	Dec. 13	H.R. 9139, to adopt the conference report on the military construction appropriation bill in the amount of $1,500,000,000. (Passed 300 to 4.)	Yes.
241	Dec. 16	Quorum call	Present.
242	Dec. 16	H.R. 9499, to recommit to committee the foreign operations appropriation bill with orders to report forthwith the bill amended to bar use of funds of Export-Import Bank to guarantee credit of Communist governments. (Passed 218 to 169.)	Yes.
243	Dec. 16	H.R. 9499, on final passage of the foreign operations appropriation bill in the amount of $3,100,000,000. (Passed 249 to 133.)	Yes.
244	Dec. 17	Quorum call	Present.
245	Dec. 17	H.R. 8667, to insist on the disagreement of the House with the Senate amendment authorizing $50,000,000 for construction of the Knowles Dam and Reservoir at Flathead, Mont. (Passed 329 to 41.)	Yes.
246	Dec. 17	H.R. 9413, to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John F. Kennedy. (Passed 352 to 6.)	Yes.
247	Dec. 19	Quorum call	Present.
248	Dec. 19	H.J. Res. 875, to pass a supplemental appropriation bill of $41,800,000 for mental health activities in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Passed 324 to 4.)	Yes.
249	Dec. 20	Quorum call	Present.
250	Dec. 21	Quorum call	Present.
251	Dec. 21	H. Res. 598, to adopt the rule waiving all points of order for consideration by the House of the foreign aid appropriation bill. (Passed 182 to 95.)	Yes.
252	Dec. 21	H.R. 9499, to recommit to the conference committee the foreign aid appropriation bill in order to strengthen the limitation on the Export-Import Bank relative to guarantee of credit to Communist governments. (Passed 141 to 136.)	Yes.
253	Dec. 21	Quorum call	Present.
254	Dec. 23	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
255	Dec. 23	H. Res. 600, to suspend the rules and adopt the rule waiving points of order, etc., on the foreign aid appropriation bill. (Defeated 202 to 105; ⅔ vote required.)	Absent.[5]
256	Dec. 24	H.R. 9499, to adopt an amendment to foreign aid appropriation bill barring use of funds of Export-Import Bank for guaranteeing credit to Communist governments unless President determines that such guarantees are in the national interest and reports each such determination to the House and Senate. (Passed 189 to 158.)	No.

---

[1] Speaking engagement away from Washington.
[2] If present, would have voted "yes."
[3] In Michigan.
[4] Attending session of Interparliamentary Union as official delegate of the House of Representatives.
[5] If present, would have voted "no."
[6] Attending meeting of Presidential Commission on Assassination of Mr. Kennedy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
December 27, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 4: 1: *I beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called.*

Eternal God, our Father, whose blessings cannot be numbered and whose treasury of goodness is inexhaustible, may our minds and hearts always go out to Thee with feelings of adoration and gratitude.

Grant that when we come to the last day of this 1st session of the 88th Congress, our President, our Speaker, and every Member of this legislative body, and all the officers, clerks, reporters, secretaries, pages, and employees serving in whatever capacity, may be grateful for having had the privilege of walking and working together in the service of our God, our country, and humanity.

May we have the testimony and joy of feeling that we have sought to discharge our duties and responsibilities with a pure and steadfast devotion and have aspired to prove worthy of receiving the benediction which Thou art always seeking to bestow upon the faithful.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 24, 1963, was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

DECEMBER 26, 1963.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on December 24, 1963, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate passed House Joint Resolution 880 entitled "Joint resolution establishing that the second regular session of the 88th Congress convene at noon on Tuesday, January 7, 1964."

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker on December 24, the Speaker did, on December 26, 1963, sign the following enrolled House joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 880. Joint resolution establishing that the 2d regular session of the 88th Congress convene at noon on Tuesday, January 7, 1964.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, DECEMBER, 30, 1963

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I make this reservation to merely inquire if the Chair will accept any unanimous-consent requests today for insertion in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] that, under the agreement reached at the last session of the House, no unanimous-consent request will be in order today.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the Chair. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 880. Joint resolution establishing that the 2d regular session of the 88th Congress convene at noon on Tuesday, January 7, 1964.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On December 23, 1963:

H.J. Res. 848. Providing for the designation of the month of February in each year as "American Heart Month."

On December 24, 1963:

H.R. 5338. An act to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6754. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6868. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7063. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7431. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenue of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

On December 26, 1963:

H.J. Res. 880. Establishing that the 2d regular session of the 88th Congress convene at noon on Tuesday, January 7, 1964.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 30, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1468. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a joint resolution, entitled, "Joint resolution to suspend during the calendar year 1964, restrictions on marketing of domestically produced sugar under the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1469. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certification that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Spokane Valley project, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1470. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive cost of leasing compared with buying certain electronic data processing equipment at Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex., Department of the Air Force, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1471. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting further comments on desirability of establishing more equitable arrangement between the Federal Government and commercial banks maintaining Treasury Department tax and loan accounts, pursuant to the Treasury Department report dated November 7, 1962, commenting on the General Accounting Office report (B-114302, May 21, 1962; H. Doc. No. 421, 87th Cong.); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1472. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the annual report on the activities of the U.S. General Accounting Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, pursuant to section 312(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1473. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which have been approved pursuant to the provisions of section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1474. A letter from the national secretary-treasurer, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and the certified public accountant's audit of the books for the same period, pursuant to Public Law 605, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

561. By the **SPEAKER**: Petition of Steven D. Hughes, Salem, Oreg., relative to the Congress enacting legislation covering members of the Armed Forces of the United States in the Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

562. Also, petition of the Council of the City of New York, relative to its feeling of deepest sorrow at the passing of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

563. Also, petition of Rensselaer County Board of Supervisors, Troy, N.Y., relative to making November 22 a national holiday in memory of the late President, John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

564. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to establishing a list showing next in line for President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

565. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to regulating the time, places, and manner of congressional elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

566. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., with reference to a clarification of the phrase "privileges and immunities"; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1963

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under previous order, the Senate will now adjourn to 10 a.m. Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1963

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 2 seconds a.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order of Tuesday, December 24, 1963, until Monday, December 30, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

DECEMBER 30, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 65: 17: *Thou crownest the year with Thy goodness.*

O Thou who art the same yesterday, today, and forever, and unchanging in Thy love and goodness, hitherto Thou hast blessed us and daily we have been the beneficiaries of Thy bountiful providence.

May we now render unto Thee the tribute of our heartfelt praise for throughout the past year Thou hast been our ever-present guide and companion and hast not withheld from us anything that was needful for our journey.

Grant that the vision of peace on earth and good will among men may never fade and may our determination and desire to make it a blessed reality never fail.

May the Lord bless us and keep us; may the Lord make His face to shine upon us and be gracious unto us; may the Lord lift upon us the light of His countenance and give us peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 27, 1963, was read and approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9499) entitled "An act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 14 and 20 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution as follows:

S. RES. 241

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 248. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the two Houses of Congress adjourn on Monday, December 30, 1963, they stand adjourned sine die.

H. Con. Res. 249. Concurrent resolution establishing that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

APPROPRIATIONS AND BUDGET RÉSUMÉ, 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include for information of Members and others a résumé of the appropriations work of the 1st session of the 88th Congress together with pertinent data on the budget and fiscal situation. The appropriations work of the session is concluded but because other actions outside the annual appropriations process affect final budget and Treasury results in any particular year, including the current year, this résumé is in some respects necessarily subject to later revision and updating.

A comprehensive executive summary for the current fiscal year 1964 will be reflected in the new budget from the President next month. That will include:

First. Revised estimates of budget revenues for fiscal 1964 in light of current conditions and outlook. The original budget projection of $86,900,000,000 has since been informally revised by the Treasury to $88,800,000,000; it will, probably, be further updated in connection with the next budget.

Second. Revised estimates of fiscal 1964 budget expenditures from all sources, including the effect of appropriation reductions made in the bills of the session as disclosed in the tabulations below. And in this connection, it is to be noted that roughly 35 to 40 percent of annual budget expenditures—disbursements—are from prior year appropriations, and some from permanent appropriations, and are therefore not directly affected by congressional actions in the appropriation bills of the current session.

Third. The effect of congressional action, or inaction, on new legislation urged in the original 1964 budget or subsequently submitted or amended—the original appropriation budget projection for the first year, fiscal 1964 cost of such new legislation was $2,727,468,000 of which it was indicated some $1,202,000,000 would, if enacted, be disbursed during fiscal 1964. Some legislation has not been enacted and some was adopted at variance with the budget provisions.

All these factors will join—and they are characteristic of every annual budget—to influence the final results and the budget deficit originally projected at $11,902,000,000 for the fiscal year 1964 which began last July 1, and more recently informally projected by the Treasury at $9,000,000,000. Whatever the final deficit, fiscal 1964 represents the 28th year of budget deficits in the last 34 years.

Mr. Speaker, the original budget for fiscal 1964, submitted last January, proposed total new obligational authority—annual appropriations, permanent appropriations, Treasury borrowing, contract authority, and reappropriations—everything which, if enacted, would permit an obligation against the Treasury—of $107,927,000,000, the second peacetime year in history the asking price

has exceeded $100,000,000,000. The executive branch has revised that figure from time to time by an amount not yet precisely determinable, but not by much; it remains roughly close to that astronomical sum. And since not a dollar can be removed from the Treasury for any purpose at any time unless the Congress has first appropriated or otherwise enacted authority to obligate the Government, the obligational authority request, not the more widely used $98.8 billion expenditure budget total, is the more significant long-run figure and the more accurate barometer to future spending levels urged in the budget. Congress acts on the obligational authority budget, not directly on the expenditure budget.

The principal portion of the obligational authority budget is disposed of in the bills processed through the Committee on Appropriations. In this session, there were 2 supplementals having to do with fiscal 1963 and 12 regular bills for fiscal 1964 plus a small joint resolution for limited last-minute supplements. As noted, all regular bills have cleared both Houses and conference; the last-minute supplemental was not enacted.

SUMMARY OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

Budget estimates of appropriations submitted to the House for action this session in bills from the Committee on Appropriations total $98,883,372,581, as shown by the appending tabulations. This divides $2,149,679,106 as supplements for fiscal 1963 earlier in the session and $96,733,693,475 for fiscal 1964 bills. As noted, this does not include permanent appropriations recurring automatically under permanent law, estimated in the January budget at about $11,500,000,000; in view of subsequent indications of rising interest costs on the recordbreaking national debt, that total will, probably, go to $12,000,000,000 or more.

As sent to the House floor, the committee bills for the session totaled $91,066,360,995 in appropriations, or $7,817,011,586 below the corresponding budget requests—the largest aggregate reduction in several years. Every regular bill was below the budget. There were, of course, as is most sessions, a handful of reductions somewhat in the nature of funding adjustments or of uncertain durability because of limited discretionary control in the appropriations process.

The Committee on Appropriations has been in operation for nearly 99 years. Its jurisdiction and its activities have changed with time and circumstance, but its charter has never changed. The original mandate is intact—and more urgent than ever. The necessities of the times demand more fiscal restraint. The pending high priority tax cut bill, with its accompanying loss of Treasury revenue at least temporarily, embodies the declared policy of fiscal restraint. The President has declared his accord with that policy. And the people want the senseless spiral of ever-increasing national debt stopped, especially in time of peace and record income.

Here on the floor, when the committee was created in 1865, it was said:

> The tendency of the time is to extravagance in private and in public. We require of this new committee their whole labor in the restraint of extravagant and illegal appropriations.

The House made only minor changes in the regular 1964 bills but did insist on restoring the accelerated public works appropriation to the supplemental last spring. As sent to the other body, the bills aggregated $91,498,923,995 in appropriations, a total cut of $7,384,448,586 from the requests considered in the House.

In virtually every session the President sends supplemental budget items to the other body after the House has acted on the bills. This year was no exception but the added amounts were nominal; they totaled only $62,791,555. Thus the Senate considered $98,946,164,136 of appropriation budget estimates. As passed by the other body, the bills totaled $93,221,837,607, a reduction of $5,724,326,529 below the corresponding estimates but $1,722,913,612 above the House totals. I am certain the House and the country will be glad to note that both Houses have, this year, held every regular bill total below the related budget requests. But of course the other body, characteristically, also raised every regular bill, except one, above the House allowance. It would be a consummation devoutly to be wished if the other body would cooperate more closely in this respect by resisting the importunities of the departments. The decisions of the House are by no means perfect in these matters but, to be certain, neither are they so imperfect as to justify raising virtually every bill total. They could even, as on rare occasion has happened, constructively reduce the House totals. There are many places where this would be possible without adverse effect on essential functions of Government. The Founding Fathers envisioned extravagant allowances in the House and armed the Senate with the amendment power to diminish it. How astonished they would be to note today how drastically the process has been reversed.

The bills finally adopted aggregate $92,433,123,132 in appropriations, a cut of $6,513,041,004 below the budget requests.

And to repeat, because it is important in the total situation, these amounts exclude something like $12,000,000,000-plus of permanent appropriations for fiscal 1964 under previous law.

Significantly, Mr. Speaker, while the bills adopted for fiscal 1964 are substantially below the budget requests, for the first time in several years, they are also, in total, below appropriations for the preceding fiscal year—for the fiscal year 1963. The bills enacted are $3,317,416,885 below last year, in contrast with the upward trend of recent years. The reduction includes the $2,000,000,000 IMF item, but the residue is, nonetheless, a significant cut from last year's total. Comparison with the previous year is the more accurate and informative measurement, because while the House needs to know what disposition has been made of budget requests, you never really retrench when you cut a budget level that has never before been appropriated and conclude with appropriations higher than the previous year.

Of course, as is always the case, not every dollar cut from appropriation requests for a given year results in an equivalent reduction in expenditure estimated for that same year; the rough rule of thumb, for the budget as a whole, is that 35 to 40 percent of total appropriations are not expended in the first year. However, that is essentially immaterial here. A dollar not appropriated is a dollar not taken from the Treasury.

This significant step, this departure from the general trend, is summarized in the first table. The one following that supplies more details on bills of the session at each stage of consideration:

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess.—A summary

Bill	Appropriations	The appropriations—	
		Below (−) the budget requests	Above (+) or below (−) fiscal 1963 appropriations
1. Supplemental bills for fiscal 1963	$1, 975, 602, 491	−$184, 869, 965	
2. Bills for fiscal 1964:			
Interior and related	952, 456, 500	−45, 552, 500	+$22, 762, 400
Loan authorization	(6, 000, 000)	(−7, 000, 000)	
Contract authority		(−17, 500, 000)	
Treasury-Post Office	6, 045, 466, 000	−101, 376, 000	+383, 951, 830
Labor-HEW	5, 471, 087, 500	−288, 401, 500	−100. 885, 100
Defense	47, 220, 010, 000	−1, 794, 227, 000	[1]−1, 130, 072, 500
Independent offices	13, 224, 518, 050	−1, 434, 069, 950	+1, 354, 866, 750
Public works	4, 406, 272, 700	−155, 684, 300	−1, 128, 429, 910
Military construction	1, 585, 880, 000	−380, 520, 000	[1]+266, 765, 500
State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary	1, 820, 093, 000	−339, 798, 900	−323, 333, 841
District of Columbia (Federal payment)	40, 368, 000	−12, 500, 000	+7, 169, 000
Loan authorizations	(19, 300, 000)	(−1, 500, 000)	(−6, 742, 000)
Legislative	168, 293, 069	−13, 925, 381	+17, 880, 224
Agriculture	6, 224, 370, 215	−144, 384, 785	+216, 770, 305
Loan authorizations	(855, 000, 000)	(..........)	(+35, 000, 000)
Foreign aid	3, 298, 705, 607	−1, 575, 844, 723	−2, 904, 861, 543
Supplemental, mental retardation		−41, 886, 000	
Total for fiscal 1964 bills	90, 457, 520, 641	−6, 328, 171, 039	−3, 317, 416, 885
Loan authorizations and contract authority	(880, 300, 000)	(−26, 000, 000)	(+28, 258, 000)

---

[1] The first figure, $1,130,072,500 is, on a comparable basis, overstated by $484,300,000, and the 2d figure, $266,765,500, is understated, (thus converting a real decrease to an apparent increase), by approximately the same amount due to the shift, in 1964, of financing of operation and maintenance and debt payments in connection with family housing from the regular defense bill to the military construction bill.

The appropriation bills, 88th

[Does not include back-door appropriations, or [1] permanent appropriations under previous

Bill No.	Title	House							
		Budget estimates to House	Date and report number	Amount as reported	Amount reported compared with budget estimates	Date passed	Amount as passed	House action compared with—	
								Budget estimates	Amount reported
	1963 SUPPLEMENTALS								
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, agriculture	[2] $508,172,000	Feb. 26 (No. 35)	$508,172,000		Feb. 27	$508,172,000		
H.R. 5517	Supplemental	1,641,507,106	Apr. 5 (No. 198)	988,756,506	−$652,750,600	Apr. 10	1,438,691,506	−$202,815,600	+$449,935,000
	Public works acceleration	(500,000,000)			(−500,000,000)		(450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)	(+450,000,000)
	All other	(1,141,507,106)		(988,756,506)	(−152,750,600)		(988,691,506)	(−152,815,600)	(−65,000)
	Total, 1963 supplementals	2,149,679,106		1,496,928,506	−652,750,600		1,946,863,506	−202,815,600	+449,935,000
	1964 APPROPRIATIONS								
H.R .5279	Interior	998,009,000	Mar. 28 (No. 177)	929,690,200	−68,318,800	Apr. 2	922,625,200	−75,383,800	−7,065,000
	Loan authorization	(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)	
	Contract authority	(17,500,000)			(−17,500,000)			(−17,500,000)	
H.R. 5366	Treasury—Post Office	6,146,842,000	Apr. 1 (No. 179)	5,997,026,000	−149,816,000	Apr. 4	5,997,026,000	−149,816,000	
H.R. 5888	Labor—HEW	5,759,489,000	Apr. 25 (No. 246)	5,449,988,000	−309,501,000	Apr. 30	5,449,981,000	−309,508,000	−7,000
H.R. 6754	Agriculture	6,368,755,000	June 3 (No. 355)	5,979,457,000	−389,298,000	June 6	5,979,457,000	−389,298,000	
	Loan authorizations	[3] (855,000,000)		[3] (855,000,000)			[3] (855,000,000)		
H.R. 6868	Legislative	148,580,245	June 6 (No. 369)	[4] 140,038,919	−8,541,326	June 11	[4] 140,038,919	−8,541,326	
H.R. 7063	State, Justice ,Commerce, judiciary	2,159,891,900	June 14 (No. 388)	1,851,269,900	−308,622,000	June 18	1,851,269,900	−308,622,000	
H.R. 7179	Defense	49,014,237,000	June 21 (No. 439)	47,092,209,000	−1,922,028,000	June 26	47,082,009,000	−1,932,228,000	−10,200,000
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia	(289,581,800)	July 8 (No. 499)	(284,286,800)	(−5,295,000)	July 11	(284,286,800)	(−5,295,000)	
	Federal payment	34,868,000		32,686,000	−2,000,000		32,868,000	−2,000,000	
	Loan authorizations	(8,000,000)		(8,000,000)			(8,000,000)		
H.R. 8747	Independent offices	14,658,588,000	Oct. 7 (No. 824)	13,102,818,700	−1,555,769,300	Oct. 10	13,102,718,700	−1,555,869,300	−100,000
H.R. 9139	Military construction	1,966,400,000	Nov. 14 (No. 901)	1,562,964,000	−403,436,000	Nov. 18	1,562,964,000	−403,436,000	
H.R. 9140	Public works	4,561,747,000	Nov. 15 (No. 902)	4,276,116,400	−285,630,600	Nov. 19	4,276,116,400	−285,630,600	
H.R. 9499	Foreign aid	4,874,400,330	Dec. 14 (No. 1040)	3,113,100,370	−1,761,299,960	Dec. 16	3,113,100,370	−1,761,299,960	
H.J. Res. 875	Supplemental, mental retardation	41,886,000	Dec. 14 (No. 1041)	41,886,000		Dec. 19	41,886,000		
	Total, 1964 appropriations	[7] 96,733,693,475		89,569,432,489	−7,164,260,986		89,552,060,489	−7,181,632,986	−17,372,000
	Total, all appropriations	[7] 98,883,372,581		91,066,360,995	−7,817,011,586		91,498,923,995	−7,384,448,586	+432,563,000
	Total, loan authorizations	(876,000,000)		(869,000,000)	(−7,000,000)		(869,000,000)	(7,000,000)	
	Total, contract authority	(17,500,000)			(−17,500,000)			(−17,500,000)	

[1] Tentatively estimated in January budget at about $11,500,000,000 for fiscal year 1964, (probably low).

[2] Shifted from budget for 1964, which was reduced accordingly.

[3] Includes $360,000,000 for Farmers Home Administration loans currently made from loan repayments in lieu of former practice of public debt borrowings from Treasury.

[4] Excludes Senate items.

BACKDOOR APPROPRIATIONS

In passing, Mr. Speaker, may I note that the House prevailed against the insistence of the other body that we supply $2,000,000,000 for the Export-Import Bank through the Treasury's backdoor. That was the only significant backdoor appropriation bill advanced during the session, although one or two smaller ones are pending. It was proposed as a supplemental fiscal 1963 addition to the Bank's general capital structure. The request has not been resubmitted in fiscal 1964—unassailable proof that it was not needed in the first instance; nothing further has been heard about it. The Bank continues to function. It exemplifies a characteristic of the indefensible backdoor procedure.

LATE ENACTMENT OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. Speaker, when the new fiscal year opened on July 1 last, only four major regular 1964 bills remained to be reported to the House. Committee hearings on them had either been completed or were well along. All hinged, in whole or in significant part, on annual authorization bills not then enacted—in two instances not even reported from the legislative committees. Every Member is aware of the rule of the House forbidding the Committee on Appropriations from bringing in a bill unless the appropriations have been authorized by legislation previously enacted. Thus the rule left us no choice but to mark time. One of the four major appropriation bills then pending—independent offices—was awaiting the multibillion-dollar space agency authorization bill which finally became law on September 6. We reported the appropriation October 7.

Another bill pending on July 1 was for military construction. The underlying authorization was signed on November 7 and the appropriation was reported a week later—November 14.

The authorization bill for the Atomic Energy Commission was not signed until July 22, and further contributions to delay in reporting the public works appropriation bill, in which the AEC budget is carried, were the revisions occasioned by the test ban treaty and the outcome of pending legislation affecting the budget for the Northwest power agencies, also in the public works bill. It was finally reported November 15 and thereafter moved with dispatch.

The committee finally reported the foreign aid appropriation on December 14, but could not call it up on the floor until the two related authorization bills were signed the morning of December 16. And even here, another authorization bill supporting the budget item for one of the banking agencies in the bill is yet not enacted.

The House cannot expect to receive the appropriation bills earlier if it continues to delay the processing and continues to extend the coverage of annual reprocessing of legislative authorizations for going Federal programs. In the present session they involved over $26,000,000,000 of the budget. Already the system has been extended, effective with the next session—first, to a part of the Coast Guard, which will affect the Treasury appropriation bill; second, to include the entire AEC budget; and third, to embrace the entire military research and development budget.

The following statistical information is pertinent.

Cong., 1st sess.

legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Senate							Conference			Public Law	
Budget estimates to Senate	Date and report number	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with—		Date filed and report number	Amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date	Number	Date approved
					Budget estimates	House action					
[2] $508,172,000	Feb. 28 (No. 9)	$508,172,000	Mar. 4	$508,172,000	----------	----------	----------	$508,172,000	----------	88-1	Mar. 6
1,652,300,456	Apr. 24 (No. 155)	1,486,096,841	May 1	1,488,683,841	−$163,616,615	+$49,992,335	May 6 (No. 275)	1,467,430,491	−$184,869,965	88-25	May 17
(500,000,000)	----------	(450,000,000)	----------	(450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)	----------	May 31 (No. 290)	(450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)	----------	----------
(1,152,300,456)	----------	(1,036,096,841)	----------	(1,038,683,841)	(−113,616,615)	(+49,992,335)	----------	(1,017,430,491)	(−134,869,965)	----------	----------
2,160,472,456	----------	1,994,268,841	----------	1,996,855,841	−163,616,615	+49,992,335	----------	1,975,602,491	−184,869,965	----------	----------
998,009,000	May 22 (No. 181)	979,093,400	May 28	979,693,400	−18,315,600	+57,068,200	July 11 (No. 551)	952,456,500	−45,552,500	88-79	July 26
(13,000,000)	----------	(6,000,000)	----------	(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)	----------	----------	(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)	----------	----------
(17,500,000)	----------	----------	----------	----------	(−17,500,000)	----------	----------	----------	(−17,500,000)	----------	----------
6,146,842,000	May 3 (No. 168)	6,074,216,250	May 8	6,069,466,250	−77,375,750	+72,440,250	May 28 (No. 353)	6,045,466,000	−101,376,000	88-39	June 13
5,759,489,000	Aug. 1 (No. 383)	5,494,627,250	Aug. 7	5,495,827,250	−263,661,750	+45,846,250	Sept. 25 (No. 774)	5,471,087,500	−288,401,500	88-136	Oct. 11
6,368,755,000	Sept. 12 (No. 497)	6,046,738,340	Sept. 30	6,047,988,340	−320,766,660	+68,531,340	Dec. 21 (No. 1088)	6,224,370,215	−144,384,785	----------	----------
[3] (855,000,000)	----------	[3] (880,000,000)	----------	[3] (880,000,000)	(+25,000,000)	(+25,000,000)	----------	[3] (855,000,000)	----------	----------	----------
182,218,450	June 25 (No. 313)	168,273,069	June 26	168,273,069	−13,945,381	+28,234,150	Nov. 12 (No. 806)	[5] 168,293,069	−13,925,381	----------	----------
2,159,891,900	Dec. 5 (No. 747)	1,821,283,000	Dec. 12	1,821,343,000	−338,548,900	−29,926,900	Dec. 17 (No. 1056)	1,820,093,000	−339,798,900	----------	----------
49,014,237,000	Sept. 17 (No. 502)	47,371,407,000	Sept. 24	47,339,707,000	−1,674,530,000	+257,698,000	Oct. 7 (No. 812)	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000	88-149	Oct. 17
(328,724,000)	Nov. 6 (No. 632)	(319,582,825)	Nov. 18	(319,587,785)	(−9,136,215)	(+35,300,985)	Dec. 17 (No. 1055)	(313,093,424)	(−15,630,576)	----------	----------
52,868,000	----------	47,868,000	----------	47,868,000	−5,000,000	+15,000,000	----------	40,368,000	−12,500,000	----------	----------
(20,800,000)	----------	(20,800,000)	----------	(20,800,000)	----------	(+12,800,000)	----------	(19,300,000)	−1,500,000)	----------	----------
14,658,588,000	Nov. 13 (No. 641)	13,390,214,650	Nov. 20	13,300,214,650	−1,358,373,350	+197,495,950	Dec. 5 (No. 1004)	13,224,518,050	−1,434,069,950	88-215	Dec. 19
1,966,400,000	Dec. 5 (No. 750)	1,617,489,000	Dec. 9	1,617,489,000	−348,911,000	+54,525,000	Dec. 12 (No. 1036)	1,585,880,000	−380,520,000	88-220	Dec. 21
4,561,957,000	Dec. 5 (No. 746)	4,500,988,200	Dec. 9	4,500,963,200	−60,993,800	+224,846,800	Dec. 11 (No. 1027)	4,406,272,700	−155,684,300	----------	----------
4,874,550,330	Dec. 17 (No. 785)	3,604,364,667	Dec. 19	3,578,058,607	−1,296,491,723	+464,958,237	[6] Dec. 21 (No. 1091)	3,298,705,607	−1,575,844,723	----------	----------
41,886,000	Dec. 20 (No. 814)	258,090,000	Dec. 20	258,090,000	+216,204,000	+216,204,000	----------	----------	−41,886,000	----------	----------
[7] 96,785,691,680	----------	91,374,652,826	----------	91,224,981,766	−5,560,709,914	+1,672,921,277	----------	90,457,520,641	−6,328,171,039	----------	
[8] 98,946,164,136	----------	93,368,921,667	----------	93,221,837,607	−5,724,326,529	+1,722,913,612	----------	92,433,123,132	−6,513,041,004	----------	----------
(888,800,000)	----------	(906,800,000)	----------	(906,800,000)	(+18,000,000)	(+37,800,000)	----------	(880,300,000)	(−8,500,000)	----------	----------
(17,500,000)	----------	----------	----------	----------	(−17,500,000)	----------	----------	----------	(17,500,000)	----------	----------

---

[5] Report rejected by Senate on Nov. 27, 1963. Amendments adopted separately on House floor on Dec. 17, 1963, and on Senate floor on Dec. 18, 1963.

[6] Rept. No. 1087 of Dec. 20 rejected previously.

[7] Does not include $32,427,000 included in H. Doc. No. 174 but not considered.

[8] Does not include $32,277,000 included in H. Doc. No. 174 but not considered.

Source: Prepared by Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

Annually recurring legislative authorization bills for fiscal 1964 (which, under the rules, must precede the related appropriation bills)

Bill (88th Cong., 1st sess.)	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference report finally adopted	Signed into law					Corresponding appropriation bill reported to House, 88th Cong., 1st sess.
				86th Cong., 1st sess.	86th Cong., 2d sess.	87th Cong., 1st sess.	87th Cong., 2d sess.	88th Cong., 1st sess.	
Major military procurement and associated research and development, H.R. 2440.	Mar. 13	Apr. 11	May 14	No annual authorization procedure.	No annual authorization procedure.	June 21, 1961, Public Law 87-53.	Apr. 27, 1962, Public Law 87-436.	May 23, 1963, Public Law 88-28.	Defense; June 21, 1963.
Military construction, H.R. 6500	June 5	Oct. 22	Oct. 31	Aug. 10, 1959, Public Law 86-149.	June 8, 1960, Public Law 86-500.	June 27, 1961, Public Law 87-57.	July 27, 1962, Public Law 87-554.	Nov. 7, 1963, Public Law 88-174.	Military construction; Nov. 14, 1963.
Foreign aid, H.R. 7885	Aug. 23	Nov. 15	Dec. 13	July 24, 1959, Public Law 86-108.	May 14, 1960, Public Law 86-472.	Sept. 4, 1961, Public Law 87-195.	Aug. 1, 1962, Public Law 87-565.	Dec. 16, 1963, Public Law 88-205.	Foreign aid; Dec. 14, 1963.
National Aeronautics and Space Administration, H.R. 7500.	Aug. 1	Aug. 9	Aug. 28	June 15, 1959, Public Law 86-45.	June 1, 1960, Public Law 86-481.	July 21, 1961, Public Law 87-98.	Aug. 14, 1962, Public Law 87-584.	Sept. 6, 1963, Public Law 88-113.	Independent offices; Oct. 7, 1963.
Atomic Energy Commission (construction) (S. 1745).	July 8	June 25	----------	June 11, 1959, Public Law 86-44.	May 13, 1960, Public Law 86-457.	Sept. 26, 1961, Public Law 87-315.	Sept. 26, 1962, Public Law 87-701.	July 22, 1963, Public Law 88-72.	Public works; Nov. 15, 1963.
Peace Corps [1] H.R. 9009	Nov. 13	Dec. 12 [2]	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	Dec. 16, 1963, Public Law 88-200.	Foreign aid; Dec. 14, 1963.

---

[1] Formerly carried in foreign aid authorization.

[2] Unamended.

Informational note with respect to fiscal 1965 budgets: AEC, Public Law 88-72, requires future budgets for operating expenses to be also annually authorized (thus the entire AEC budget will have to be annually authorized). Major military procurement, etc., Public Law 88-174, requires future annual authorization of all research, development, test, and evaluation—not just that associated with aircraft, missiles, and ships as heretofore. Coast Guard, Public Law 88-45, requires, for 1st time, annual authorization for construction of establishments or for procurement of vessels or aircraft (this would relate to Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill).

NOTE.—Not listed above is H.R. 8200, civil defense shelter construction, in partial support of civil defense budget for 1964, passed House, Sept. 17; pending in Senate.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. Speaker, as we have so frequently documented—and the fiscal situation is so serious it cannot too often be emphasized—the genesis of much of our tenuous Treasury condition with its staggering, and constantly mounting, national debt is the insistence on repeatedly spending beyond our revenues, year after year, for nondefense purposes. This continues in years of peace and record national income and record Treasury revenues. We have not been willing to exercise the self-restraint to pay as we go along or defer some expenditures until we were in a position to do so. It is incredible that we have refused to marshal the courage to face the situation and stop loading more and more debt on future generations. I quote:

> Nothing is more certain than that the days of that government are numbered whose expenditures exceed its income. The servitude of debt, whether individual or national, is the quintessence of slavery; one is a calamity which affects but a few, but the other spreads its ruinous power not only over a whole community, but upon coming generations.

We are today, Mr. Speaker, under such a heavy debt that the annual cost of merely carrying the interest on it is about $10,500,000,000. That takes 10 cents of every budget dollar. It figures out to the incredible sum of $20,000 every minute the clock ticks, every day and night of the year. Much of the national debt was unavoidably accumulated during war but we keep adding to it for nondefense spending in years of peace and record national prosperity—borrowing from the future to pay for current luxuries. No serious program—so far, no program of any kind—has been recommended or suggested for a systematic reduction of the debt—only further deficit spending.

At a time when we have accumulated the highest national debt since 1789.

At a time when the cost-of-living index is at an alltime high.

At a time when the value of the dollar is at an alltime low.

At a time when our gold supply has drained away overseas and is at a tenuously low level.

At a time when we have crossed the mark of $100 billion budgets.

At a time when we are, this year, apparently incurring the second highest peacetime budget deficit.

At a time when we are considering lightening the tax burden on American families—and, incidentally, increasing the debt burden on future generations.

At this especially critical time, Mr. Speaker, certainly we should retrench every dollar we properly can in every phase of spending—both in defense and in nondefense. Certainly that is the minimum.

Briefly articulating the figures as to defense and nondefense spending, Mr. Speaker, the original fiscal 1964 budget projected administrative budget expenditures in these striking dimensions.

	Administrative budget spending	
	Over fiscal 1961	Over fiscal 1954 (1st post-Korea war year)
Fiscal 1964, original January budget estimate:		
National defense	[1] +$7,939,000,000	+$8,447,000,000
Other than national defense	[2] +9,348,000,000	[3] +22,818,000,000
Total, 1964 original budget estimate over	+17,287,000,000	+31,265,000,000

[1] Subject to some revision (Treasury informally estimated, last month, that total expenditures might be a billion less ($97,800,000,000 rather than $98,800,000,000 in January budget). But the dimensions illustrated here would not be distorted).

[2] 27-percent increase in 2 years.

[3] 111-percent increase since end of the Korean war.

The more detailed figures in support, taken from the budget, are in the following table:

National defense and nondefense net budget expenditures—In more detail

In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	National defense functions		Other than national defense	Total net budget expenditures
	Defense military	Total		
Fiscal 1953 (Korean war year)	$43,610	$50,442	$23,678	$74,120
Fiscal 1954	40,326	46,986	20,551	67,537
Fiscal 1955	35,531	40,695	23,694	64,389
Fiscal 1956	35,792	40,723	25,501	66,224
Fiscal 1957	38,436	43,360	25,606	68,966
Fiscal 1958	39,070	44,234	27,135	71,369
Fiscal 1959	41,223	46,491	33,851	80,342
Fiscal 1960	41,215	45,691	30,848	76,539
Fiscal 1961	43,227	47,494	34,021	81,515
Increase in level during the 8 years, 1954–61	+2,891	+508	[1] +13,470	+13,978
Fiscal 1962	46,815	51,103	36,684	87,787
Fiscal 1963	48,252	52,755	39,887	92,642
Fiscal 1964 (January 1963 budget estimate, resting, as is generally the case, on certain specific assumptions and contingencies)	51,200	55,433	43,369	[2] 98,802
Increase in level during 3 years, 1962–64, on tentative basis shown	+7,773	+7,939	+9,348	+17,287
Comparisons, fiscal 1964 (original January 1963, budget estimate) over—				
1963 actual	+2,748	+2,678	+3,482	[3]+6,160
1961 actual	+7,773	+7,939	[4]+9,348	[3]+17,287
1954 actual	+10,674	+8,447	[5]+22,181	[3]+31,265

[1] A 65-percent increase, 1961 over 1954.

[2] This original January 1963 budget projection is, according to later informal Treasury estimates, $1,000,000,000 too high and, accordingly, its division between defense and nondefense, and the comparisons shown herein, would be affected. (See H. Rept. 885, pt. 4, Nov. 4, 1963.)

[3] See footnote 2.

[4] A 27-percent increase, 1964 (tentative) over 1961. (See footnote 2.)

[5] A 111-percent increase, 1964 (tentative) over 1954. (See footnote 2.)

NOTE.—"National defense" functions follows the budget classification.

Source: Budget documents.

EXPENDITURES FOR DEFENSE, SPACE, AND INTEREST

On this general question, Mr. Speaker, during the current fiscal year the budget is being administered under executive restrictions calling for aggregate budget expenditures to be held below the corresponding preceding year's level for all purposes of Government other than national defense, space, and interest. This broad segregation does not comport with the official budget classification as between defense and nondefense, but nonetheless that is the plan being followed. Measuring the progress of the current budget on this basis in comparison with last year, Treasury figures for the first 5 months through November 30 reflect net budget expenditures in amounts as follows:

	1st 5 months (in millions)			Original budget estimate for all of fiscal 1964
	Fiscal 1963	Fiscal 1964	Plus or minus	
National defense	$21,609	$21,639	+$30	$55,433
Space	837	1,485	+648	4,200
Interest	4,093	4,370	+277	10,103
All other	13,175	13,050	−125	29,066
Total	39,714	40,544	+830	98,802

RISING REVENUES—HIGHER RISING EXPENDITURES

Mr. Speaker, the pattern of the 10 years since the end of the Korean war has been an ever-increasing expenditure budget—mostly nondefense increases—and Treasury revenues, even at record levels and assisted by extension of war taxes in time of peace, insufficient to pay the bills. Additional spending demands continue to consume the flood tide of Treasury revenues and the gap has to be covered by issuing more Government bonds at higher and higher interest rates. For the 11 fiscal years since that war ended, the Treasury's budget books were thrown out of balance by some $43,600 million—almost $4 billion on the average each year.

Budget deficit in the 8 fiscal years following the Korean war	$21,953,000,000
Budget deficit during the 3 years since (including $9,000,000,000 latest informal Treasury estimate for fiscal 1964)	21,644,000,000
Total probable deficit, 11 fiscal years, 1954-64, on basis shown	43,597,000,000

Net budget receipts and net budget expenditures, 11 years, 1954–64

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Net budget receipts	Net budget expenditures	Budget surplus (+) or deficit (−)
1953 (Korean war year)	64,671	74,120	−9,449
1954 (from July 1953)	64,420	67,537	−3,117
1955	60,209	64,389	−4,180
1956	67,850	66,224	+1,626
1957	70,562	68,966	+1,596
1958	68,550	71,369	−2,819
1959	67,915	80,342	−12,427
1960	77,763	76,539	+1,224
1961 (to July 1961)	77,659	81,515	−3,856
8 years, 1954-61	554,928	576,881	−21,953
1962 (from July 1961)	81,409	87,787	−6,378
1963	86,376	92,642	−6,266
1964 (latest published informal Treasury estimate)	[1] 88,800	[1] 97,800	−9,000
3 years of 1962-64, on basis shown	256,585	278,229	−21,644
11 years of 1954-64, on basis shown	811,513	855,110	−43,597

[1] See p. 4, H. Rept. 885, Nov. 4, 1963, on the 3d debt ceiling bill of the year. Figures contrast with original January budget projections of $86,900,000,000 for receipts and $98,802,000,000 of expenditures, with consequent deficit of $11,902,000,000, on basis of economic assumptions and tax reduction and revision recomendations in 1964 budget (a GNP of $578,000,000,000 in calendar 1963; personal income of $459,000,000,000; corporation profits of $53,000,000,000; proposed tax changes and revisions, offset in part by proposed speedup of corporation tax payments and initial stimulus to economy from tax program, a net estimated loss in fiscal 1964 of $2,700,000,000; new transportation user tax proposals, $100,000,000 additional; and assumed extension of then present excise taxes due to decline or expire in June 1963.)

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, when we continue to spend as though the Treasury were a bottomless source of a boundless supply of dollars, and continue living beyond our revenues, the national debt mounts steadily as does the cost of interest—now at $20,000 every minute. So we necessarily must reenact the annual debt ceiling ritual. We have had to do that 12 years in a row—and this year we raised it three times, until it is now at $315 billion, a large part of which is labeled "temporary." But unless we show some national interest in restraining expenditures within the national income and continue that policy, it becomes absurd to cling to such a delusion. As was once said about agencies of the Government: "Nothing is so permanent as a temporary agency of Government."

With the evident certainty of at least 1 or 2 more years of deficits, the House will, in the next session and in the year following, again adjust the ceiling. Under the circumstances it will have to go even higher.

I include an illuminating summary of significant data on the public debt. It now stands at an alltime "high water" mark:

Federal debt on significant dates

Date	Classification	Total direct and guaranteed debt	Per capita [1]	Computed annual interest rate on interest-bearing debt		
				Direct debt	Guaranteed debt	Total direct and guaranteed debt
	WORLD WAR I					
				Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Mar. 31, 1917	Prewar debt	$1,282,044,346.28	$12.36	2.395		2.395
Aug. 31, 1919	Highest war debt	26,596,701,648.01	250.18	4.196		4.196
Dec. 31, 1930	Lowest postwar debt	16,026,087,087.07	129.66	3.750		3.750
	WORLD WAR II					
June 30, 1940	Debt preceding defense program	[2] 48,496,601,692.96	367.08	2.583	1.978	2.514
Nov. 30, 1941	Pre-Pearl Harbor debt	61,363,867,932.26	458.47	2.429	1.885	2.373
Feb. 28, 1946	Highest war debt	279,764,369,348.29	1,989.75	1.972	1.349	1.971
June 30, 1946	Debt at end of year in which hostilities ceased	269,898,484,032.56	1,908.79	2.096	1.410	1.995
Apr. 30, 1949	Lowest postwar debt [3]	251,553,319,739.98	1,690.29	2.235	2.356	2.235
	SINCE KOREA					
June 30, 1950	Debt at time of opening of hostilities in Korea (hostilities began June 24, 1950)	257,376,855,385.01	1,696.74	2.200	2.684	2.200
Dec. 31, 1952		267,445,125,544.96	1,687.90	2.353	2.565	2.353
Nov. 30, 1963	Highest debt [4]	308,932,504,993.29	[5] 1,621.84	3.476	3.728	3.476
Nov. 30, 1962	Debt a year ago	305,892,963,927.29	[2] 1,628.44	3.288	3.569	3.288
Oct. 31, 1963	Debt last month	307,147,152,239.03	[5] 1,614.22	3.460	3.718	3.460
Nov. 30, 1963	Debt this month	308,932,504,993.29	[5] 1,621.84	3.476	3.728	3.476

[1] Based upon estimates of the Bureau of the Census.

[2] Revised.

[3] Represents the lowest point of the debt at the end of any month following World War II. The lowest point of the debt on any day following that war was on June 27, 1949, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross) $251,245,889,059.02
Guaranteed debt (not including obligations owned by the Treasury) 23,876,001.12

Total direct and guaranteed debt 251,269,765,060.14

[4] Represents the highest point of the debt at the end of any month. The highest point of the debt on any day was on Nov. 29, 1963, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross) $308,214,711,868.29
Guaranteed debt (not including obligations owned by the Treasury) 717,793,125.00

Total direct and guaranteed debt (includes $365,486,236.30 not subject to statutory limitation) 308,932,504,993.29

[5] Subject to revision.

It is of course understood, Mr. Speaker, that there are illusory statistical methods of minimizing the monstrous size of the debt and making it appear less burdensome in comparison. They seem to mitigate the harshness and the seriousness of the situation. And that is the last thing we ought to do—the situation is far too serious. Deficits are by historical fact becoming almost a way of life. And as they pile up, the national debt piles up—on future generations not here to call us to account.

After failure to adhere to the so-called compensatory fiscal policy under which deficit borrowings during recessions were to be repaid with surpluses when prosperity returned, it became popular to justify ever-increasing budgets in statistical relationship to the gross national product—growth of the product means a growing population and therefore justifies some growth in the volume of public services. Obviously so, but it cannot justify living beyond our means or our unwillingness to tax ourselves to pay the cost. It may be claimed that the Federal debt is less, on a per capita basis, than it was 15 years ago. True, because the population has grown faster than the Federal debt. Simple arithmetic. But in the final analysis, the question is, "Do we owe more or do we owe less?" And on that question, the answer is clear, as I have just shown from the Treasury report. Furthermore, such a deluding statistical comparison ignores the fact we have only one population; the same population also owes the State and local government debt; the same population has only one pocket, one paycheck from which to support all levels of government expense and all levels of public debt. And, according to available figures, on a per person basis, and despite a rapidly rising population, the American people owed four times more total public debt in 1962 than they did in 1940; more in 1962 than in 1950; more in 1962 than in 1953. The per person total debt has risen in each of the last 3 years.

Some may be willingly deluded, but we cannot escape the truth of the situation—and it is serious.

Federal, State, and local tax receipts, expenditures, and debt, on a per capita basis, selected fiscal years

Year	Per capita				Percentage distribution			
	Total	Federal	State	Local	Total	Federal	State	Local
1. Tax receipts:								
1940	$109	$43	$32	$34	100	39.2	29.2	31.6
1946	370	286	45	39	100	77.3	12.2	10.5
1950	369	255	60	54	100	69.1	16.3	14.6
1953	576	433	77	67	100	75.2	13.3	11.5
1960	718	501	114	102	100	69.8	15.9	14.3
1961	735	507	119	109	100	69.0	16.2	14.8
1962	766	526	126	115	100	68.6	16.4	15.0
2. Expenditures:								
1940	156	77	35	44	100	49.3	22.3	28.5
1946	602	502	47	53	100	83.5	7.7	8.8
1950	473	301	86	86	100	63.7	18.2	18.1
1953	707	514	90	103	100	72.7	12.8	14.5
1960	854	549	140	164	100	64.3	16.4	19.2
1961	912	583	155	174	100	63.9	17.0	19.1
1962	953	613	160	180	100	64.3	16.7	18.9
3. Gross debt:								
1940	483	328	27	128	100	67.9	5.7	26.4
1946	2,154	2,034	18	102	100	94.4	.8	4.8
1950	1,893	1,731	36	127	100	91.4	1.9	6.7
1953	1,925	1,708	50	167	100	88.7	2.6	8.7
1960	2,018	1,622	105	291	100	80.4	5.2	14.4
1961	2,025	1,606	111	308	100	79.3	5.5	15.2
1962	2,073	1,630	118	325	100	78.6	5.7	15.7

Source: Tax Foundation, "Facts and Figures," 12th ed.

GOLD SUPPLY AND THE CLAIMS AGAINST IT

Mr. Speaker, we may continue to ignore warning signs a while longer but we do not delude foreign bankers who hold our dollars as claims against our depleted gold supply, callable on demand. They watch these significant indicators more closely than many of us; they cannot afford to do otherwise. They know that the average American, today, owes more public debt, on a per-person basis, than at any time since World War II.

The gold supply situation is not making the front pages as it did during the precipitate outflow in the years between 1958 and 1962 when $6,802,000,000 was handed over on demand. But that does not dismiss the tenuous nature of the situation. We have about $15,600,000,000 in supply. Possible claims against it approximate $22,900,000,000, and that does not count the amount committed as a 25-percent backing of our money supply. As one official so well put it, foreign holders of claims on our gold would much prefer a ceiling on Federal spending to a ceiling on the Federal debt.

Here are some arresting official data in substantiation of the seriousness of the situation:

Our tenuous gold position

[Rounded figures used]

Date	U.S. gold stocks	Gold stock (above required 25-percent backing for currency and deposits)	Possible foreign claims	Potential shortage of gold with present 25-percent backing provision
1957 (Dec. 31)	$22,900,000,000	$10,800,000,000	$14,900,000,000	$4,100,000,000
1958 (Dec. 31)	20,600,000,000	8,500,000,000	15,600,000,000	7,100,000,000
1959 (Dec. 31)	19,500,000,000	7,300,000,000	17,700,000,000	10,400,000,000
1960 (Dec. 31)	17,800,000,000	6,100,000,000	18,800,000,000	12,700,000,000
1961 (Dec. 31)	16,900,000,000	4,900,000,000	20,400,000,000	15,500,000,000
1962 (Dec. 31)	16,100,000,000	3,700,000,000	21,400,000,000	17,700,000,000
1963 (September)	15,600,000,000	3,300,000,000	22,900,000,000	19,600,000,000
Change, January 1958 through September 1963	−7,300,000,000	−7,500,000,000	+8,000,000,000	+15,500,000,000

Source: Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics (but with their figures rounded as noted).

Decline in gold assets of the United States, 6 years, 1958–63

Date or period	Gold assets	Change
Dec. 31, 1957	$22,780,675,342	
Dec. 31, 1958	20,534,104,913	$2,246,570,429
Dec. 31, 1959	19,456,135,794	−1,077,969,119
Dec. 31, 1960	17,766,797,708	−1,689,338,086
Dec. 31, 1961	16,888,905,838	−877,891,870
Dec. 31, 1962	15,978,190,463	−910,715,375
Decline in gold holdings, 5 years, 1958–62		−6,802,484,879
Jan. 31, 1963	15,928,176,307	−50,014,156
Feb. 28, 1963	15,878,348,103	−49,828,204
Mar. 29, 1963	15,878,025,379	−322,724
Apr. 30, 1963	15,877,734,571	−290,808
May 31, 1963	15,798,086,166	−79,648,405
June 28, 1963	15,733,222,382	−64,863,784

Decline in gold assets of the United States, 6 years, 1958–63—Continued

Date or period	Gold assets	Change
July 31, 1963	$15,633,079,085	−$100,143,297
Aug. 30, 1963	15,582,474,216	−50,604,869
Sept. 30, 1963	15,582,492,392	+18,176
Oct. 31, 1963	15,583,229,249	+736,857
Nov. 29, 1963	15,582,922,508	−306,741
Decline in gold holding during calendar year 1963		−395,267,955
Total decline, December 1957 to November 1963		−7,197,752,834

Source: Daily Treasury Statements.

COST OF LIVING—VALUE OF THE DOLLAR

Mr. Speaker, one of the most illuminating statistics, reflecting the inevitable result—arising in substantial measure from spending beyond income in 28 of the last 34 years—is the index to the ever-increasing cost of living. It pinches every family budget. It shows what every family knows—that the 1939 dollar is now worth only 45 cents.

What about the future if we keep on spending more than we take in—tempting the fires of further inflation and further erosion of the dollar's worth?

Consumer price index and purchasing power of the dollar

	Consumer price index (1947–49=100)		Purchasing power of the dollar [1] (calendar year 1939=100 cents)
	All items	Foods	
Years:			
1939	59.4	47.1	100.0
1940	59.9	47.8	99.2
1941	62.9	52.2	94.4
1942	69.7	61.3	85.2
1943	74.0	68.3	80.3
1944	75.2	67.4	79.0
1945	76.9	68.9	77.2
1946	83.4	79.0	71.2
1947	95.5	95.9	62.2
1948	102.8	104.1	57.8
1949	101.8	100.0	58.3
1950	102.8	101.2	57.8
1951	111.0	112.6	53.5
1952	113.5	114.6	52.3
1953	114.4	112.8	51.9
1954	114.8	112.6	51.7
1955	114.5	110.9	51.9
1956	116.2	111.7	51.1
1957	120.2	115.4	49.4
1958	123.5	120.3	48.1
1959	124.6	118.3	47.7
1960	126.5	119.7	47.0
1961	127.8	121.0	46.5
1962	129.3	122.3	45.9
Selected months:			
1946—June	79.8	72.1	74.4
1950—June	101.8	100.5	58.3
1952—December	114.1	113.8	52.1
1958—December	123.7	118.7	48.0
1959—December	125.5	117.8	47.3
1960—December	[2] 127.5	121.4	46.6
1961—June	[2] 127.6	120.9	46.6
1962—January	128.2	121.0	46.3
June	[2] 129.2	122.1	46.0
1963—January	130.1	123.5	45.7
February	130.2	123.9	45.6
March	[2] 130.3	123.4	45.6
April	130.3	123.1	45.6
May	130.3	123.0	45.6
June	[2] 130.8	123.9	45.4
July	[2] 131.4	125.3	45.2
August	131.4	125.1	45.2
September	131.4	124.4	45.2
October	[2] 131.5	123.8	45.2
November	[2] 131.8	124.0	45.1

[1] As measured by the BLS Consumer Price Index.
[2] New record high.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Financial Analysis, Dec. 17, 1963.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, as we have noted, for the first time in several years the regular appropriation bills for 1964, where not all but in any event most of the new spending authority is annually provided, aggregate less than appropriations for last year. That in itself is important. It represents, at least for this year, a change in direction, although many individual appropriations are above last year, not below. But in the aggregate they are lower, affording some basis for hope that the President, in future budgets, will follow, in the budget next month, by reversing the direction in every possible instance. In his message of November 27 to the joint session, the President especially pledged:

> The expenditures of the Government will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality. I will insist that the Government get a dollar's value for a dollar spent. The Government will set an example of prudence and economy.

The President underscored the meaning when he reported:

> Men in the Government are going to be recognized by not how much they spend but by how much they save.
>
> * * * * *
>
> So we are combing with a fine-toothed comb in every department and every individual agency.

And with respect to the size of the Federal payroll, with which public men have contended since the beginning of the Government, the directive in preparing the forthcoming 1965 executive budget seems to lay a heavy hand against further growth:

> The 1965 budget total for yearend civilian employment must be held below the levels in the 1964 and 1963 budgets.
>
> This means that I, will grant increases only when they are absolutely necessary to meet fixed commitments, to properly carry out new legislation, and to do work of the highest national priority.

Federal employment has sharply increased in the last 2 years or so—at the urging of the executive branch and in response to excessive appropriations. Twice—in October of 1961 and of 1962—after Congress had passed the appropriations and gone home, the departments were directed to get the work done with fewer employees than they could employ with the money in hand—incontrovertible proof that Congress had made excessive appropriations. Congress not infrequently shows a disposition to yield to the importunities of the departments. These recent increases in personnel would not—could not—have come about if the appropriations had not been too high.

Only 3 months ago the House when it adopted the tax cut bill pledged itself to restraint of spending and a balanced budget. In section 1:

> It is the sense of Congress that the tax reduction provided by this act through stimulation of the economy, will, after a brief transitional period, raise (rather than lower) revenues and that such revenue increases should first be used to eliminate the deficits in the administrative budgets and then to reduce the public debt. To further the objective of obtaining balanced budgets in the near future, Congress by this action, recognizes the importance of taking all reasonable means to restrain Government spending and urges the President to declare his accord with this objective.

Summary of civilian employment—Executive branch

	Department of Defense	All other	Total
Date:			
As of Jan. 31, 1961	1,032,835	1,308,250	2,341,085
As of June 30, 1961	1,042,407	1,364,622	2,407,029
As of June 30, 1962	1,069,543	1,415,111	2,484,654
As of June 30, 1963	1,050,007	1,447,028	[1]2,497,035
As of Oct. 30, 1963	1,045,298	1,437,212	[2]2,482,510
Changes—			
During last 5 months of fiscal 1961	+9,572	+56,372	+65,944
During 2 fiscal years of 1962 and 1963	+7,600	+82,406	+90,006
During period January 1961 through October 1963	+12,463	+128,962	+141,425

[1] In contrast to the 1964 budget projection (in January 1963) of 2,534,041 at the same date, namely, June 30, 1963 (which incidentally, excluded project employees under "Public works acceleration" program; the 2,497,035 figure includes 7,411 such employees).

[2] Includes 10,396 project employees under "Public works acceleration" program.

Source: Civil Service Commission data.

If the Executive and the Congress would collaborate in a program to this end, and adhere to it, we would reinforce and enhance the stability of the dollar and reassure foreign claimants on our gold supply; and we could begin a systematic reduction of the debt. In time of peace and record revenues that is the only sane, the only sensible way to write the budgets and the appropriations. But to make good on it, the Executive will have to request lower appropriations. Congress will have to cooperate fully, and continuously, by appropriating less. We will have to stop hacking at the branches and start hacking at the roots. Stop initiating new and expanding old nondefense projects. Cut down or drop some of the old, outmoded things and keep at the job of cutting waste in the defense program. The machinery is at hand. It needs no reform. All we need is the will, the disposition to do it. It is not always painless. And it is seldom popular. But it is the only way. Every gimmick the mind of man can contrive to reduce spending without cutting has probably been tried at one time or another to make a seeming, but unreal, savings. Some people call them phony or bookkeeping cuts. The only way to restrain spending is to stop authorizing more, stop asking for more, stop appropriating more. There is no other way.

And may I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the departments are well aware of the antideficiency law under which the appropriations for the year are to be so allocated as to meet the service for the full 12 months. We do not intend to let the law be relaxed. We do not want piecemeal, partial budgets. We expect complete budgets. The departments are on notice against deficiencies and supplementals.

As documented in detail here on the floor last April 11, the House let the closing supplemental bill of the preceding session die on the Speaker's table and some $251 million from it was not resubmitted in the next session for the fiscal year. The requests were excessive and certainly of no urgency. The Government was in no way discommoded. We saved that much in 1963 appropriations.

And we have declined to consider several other supplementals recently submitted for this session. Such of them as may be meritorious can wait. And we intend to examine critically all submitted in the next session.

The Treasury is in serious condition; it is depleted. Something like 9 or 10 cents of every budget dollar spent this year will have to be borrowed. The time is past due to cut more deeply, to apply more restraint to demands. That is what the House said when it voted on the tax bill. That is implicit in the President's statements. And that is what the times and an empty Treasury urgently demand.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 248, the Chair declares the 1st session of the 88th Congress adjourned sine die.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), Monday, December 30, 1963, the House adjourned sine die.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

HOUSE BILL ENROLLED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that on December 30, 1963, that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

> H.R. 9499. An act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 249, 88th Congress, he did on December 31, 1963, sign an enrolled bill of the House of the following title:

> H.R. 9499. An act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on December 31, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

> H.R. 9499. An act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1475. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements concluded during November 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1476. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report showing data by grade and age of all officers on flying status above the grade of major, pursuant to section 301(g) title 37, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1477. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting the July–October 1963 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1478. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report on the Status of the Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects, pursuant to 70 Stat. 105; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1479. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed amendment to the concession contract with Evelyn Hill, Inc., No. 14–10–0100–70, Statue of Liberty National Monument, extending contract through December 13, 1964, and including financial summary, 1958 through 1962, pursuant to act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271), as amended by the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1480. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a report on permits and licenses for hydroelectric projects issued during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, and names and compensation of persons employed by the Commission during the same period, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1481. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382, 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1482. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overestimated costs included in prices negotiated for modification of aircraft engine test stands under fixed-price contracts with Space Corp., Dallas, Tex., Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. ROONEY of New York introduced a bill (H.R. 9565) for the relief of Jozef Wal, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1963

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore, Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

We give praise to Thee, O God of all nations, that there is this moment at the beginning of this session of the U.S. Senate to invoke Thy guidance and blessing.

We are grateful for the faith that is within us, given to us by Thee through our forefathers. We stand today because of their faith in Thee and in mankind. We stand in this moment of prayer thanking Thee for that faith we have in Thee and in Thy children throughout the world. That faith gives us the joy of living. That sometimes flickering faith gives us peace within, so that peace can be possible among all men of good will. Give these men and women a blessing of new faith.

We stand in the light of the hope we share today. Dark days have been ours in the past month; but we thank Thee for the sunshine of a new day, a new year, a new man that each of us desires to become. Our hope standeth sure. As we look to the brighter day when men shall find a surer peace, we know that it will come because we have not lost hope.

The year 1963 will go down in history, Heavenly Father, as a time when the people of these United States found their only hope at the altar of God. We pray Thy blessing of hope for these men and women who for 1964 shoulder such heavy responsibilities and make such far-reaching decisions. Quicken them with Thy presence and a never dying hope.

While we are mindful of the great, we are also aware of the greatest. We have been taught that the greatest is love—love for God and for our fellow men. Bless these leaders with this kind of love. Their concern and sincerity have caused them sleepless nights. May they be rewarded in this daylight with an answer found from those moments of darkness. Help them never to become falsely professional or impersonal. Instead, enable their decisions to be molded and balanced by the greatest force—love. We pray for faith, hope, and—the greatest of all—love.

Send Thy blessing upon the President of the United States, the leaders of all nations, the citizens of this land, and those of all other lands.

> Under the shadow of Thy throne
> Still may we dwell secure;
> Sufficient is Thine arm alone,
> And our defense is sure.
> O God, our help in ages past,
> Our hope for years to come,
> Our shelter from the stormy blast,
> And our eternal home.

Amen.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Chair laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its agreement to the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under its order of the 24th instant, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the conference report on House bill 9499, the Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act of 1964, which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] will now submit.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 24, 1963 (pages 25528–25529.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield briefly?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I desire to make two statements. There will be some overlapping, but I believe I should make them at this time.

Mr. President, during the course of the meeting of the Senate on Tuesday last, it was indicated, or at least implied, that the reason why the Senate did not act on the conference report, which had been agreed to that morning by the House, was that a promise had been made by the leadership to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. Nothing could be farther from the truth. No promise was made to the Senator from Oregon, nor was any pledge requested by him.

The fact of the matter is that, as the leadership stated to the Senate on last Friday, December 20, and on Saturday, December 21, the Senate was notified that there would be a request for a live quorum and a request for a rollcall vote on the question of adoption of the conference report. That announcement was made publicly, in response to a question raised by a Member of the Senate; also, it was stated to the leadership on both sides by Members of both parties that a rollcall vote would be requested on the question of adoption of the report. Because there was no definite assurance that the House would act on any given date last week, it was felt by the leadership that it would be advisable to allow the Senate to remain out of session for the remainder of last week, in the hope that, in the meantime, the House would solve its differences and would dispose of the conference report one way or another.

It was stated specifically to the membership, and it is in the RECORD, that there would be a pro forma meeting only on Tuesday last, and that following that session the leadership would use its best judgment, taking into consideration what it considered the best interest of the Senate, as to when a final vote would be taken.

The leadership did not consult with every Senator on this decision, but it did seek the advice and counsel of a cross-section of the membership, after the House had made its decision. The result was that a decision was arrived at to call the Senate back into session today, for the purpose of facing up to a decision on the conference report.

My purpose in making this statement at this time is to clear the air, as regards the making of any demand, threat, or promise by the leadership to any individual Senator on either side of the aisle. Such was not the case. The responsibility lies with the leadership. The leadership assumed that responsibility, and made its decision known in good time to all the Senators. No blame or credit is to be attached to any Member of this body for the course of action we are taking today. My only purpose in rising at this time is to make very clear that we are meeting today, not because of what one Senator did or did not want, but because in the view of the leadership, all things considered, this was thought to be the best time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this time will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the comments of the majority leader. His neverfailing fairness and his insistence upon stating the facts for the RECORD make him beloved by all other Senators. I appreciate very much the statement he has made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon. One of the reasons—perhaps the main one—why I made the statement was that false allegations were directed against the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I did not like them. They were untrue. Therefore, I felt they had to be answered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I fully endorse and concur in every statement made by the majority leader. Not a single day went by that we did not confer and consult, either in person or by local or long-distance telephone. So we were advised, every step of the way, of what was being contemplated with respect to the pro forma sessions of the Senate, and of the fact that we would return today in the hope we could conclude our work on the conference report on the foreign assistance bill, and then consummate a sine die adjournment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois is correct; and I appreciate his statement at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. From my limited observation, I can confirm everything the distinguished Senator from Montana has said. I wish to say, further, that I happen to know from my personal contacts with both the majority leader and the minority leader that they had to leave the balmy skies of south Florida, to come back for this meeting. That was quite a sacrifice, I am sure. Their wives were there and they were there. The sunburn on the face of each of them attests to the fact that they found some sunshine down there.

I assure the Senate that I thought it was a real sacrifice in the interest of getting done something which has to be done, and which should be done before the new session begins. I was glad to return with them, although I am sure it was a source of regret to them to come back, as it was for others.

Any unkind comment is unjustified. This is an effort to do necessary work which should be done.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Florida. If he would come to Montana, to enjoy some of the skiing we have there at this time of the year, I believe I could make a similar speech.

Mr. President, all Members of the Senate ought to have had 2 weeks or more of unbroken vacation at the end of one of the longest, most grueling, and most productive Senate sessions in the last two decades. I wish it might have been possible to arrange it that way. The majority and minority leaders, along with every other Member of the Senate, would have been delighted if it could have been so.

But this was the situation which confronted the leadership a week ago, Saturday, December 21. The President had urged the Congress to act on the aid appropriation during the present session. The House, for a number of understandable reasons, was not able to approve the conference report on the appropriation either on Friday or Saturday. Meanwhile, the Senate, with a quorum on hand, waited for the House to act. It waited all day Friday and into the early morning hours of Saturday. It recessed for 3 or 4 hours and came back to wait some more. The patience of Senators understandably began to grow thin as hour after hour went by on Saturday and there was no sign that we would be able to take up the matter on that day. Moreover, there was no assurance that the House would act on Sunday, Monday, or Tuesday. And Wednesday was Christmas Day. Senators are human beings. They have families and friends. They have children and grandchildren.

The majority and minority leaders consulted each other on the problem. The leaders discussed the possibility of continuing to wait and were confronted with the likelihood of a dwindling quorum as Members were exhausted by the uncertainty of an indefinite wait for House action. They discussed the possibility of a sine die adjournment until January 7 and a vote at that time. But that would have flown in the face of the President's wishes in a nonpartisan matter of foreign policy. The leadership consulted with the whips on both sides. They consulted with Members responsible for steering the conference report. They consulted with any Member who wished to consult. The question was always the same: When can we wind this up? And that was the one question which no one in the Senate could possibly have answered.

In the circumstances—with the uncertainty as to when the House would act, with the desire to comply with the President's wish that the matter should be handled this session and with the thought that a few days' well-earned rest would be better than none for all Members—the leadership decided to adjourn, pro forma, at 3-day intervals. The intention was to permit Senators to go home to rest for 4 or 5 days or for however long it might take for the situation to clarify in the House. It was our belief that this would be better than keeping the Members in their offices for an uncertain number of days on end. It was our belief that the Senate would respond, if given fully adequate notice, with its usual sense of responsibility to a call to reconvene, after the House had acted.

The Senate was informed of these plans on the floor on Saturday, December 21. Assurances were also given that insofar as the leadership was concerned, the earliest likely date of reconvening would be Friday, December 27. There were no objections from any Member. So far as I can recall there was only general agreement that, in the light of the existing circumstances, the procedure was both sensible and desirable. And there was a general sense of relief that it had been adopted.

Now, as for the date which was chosen for this meeting I want to say that it is conceivable that a quorum might have been reassembled in Washington last Thursday or Friday. The leadership considered both days—after the House had acted. But the leadership also considered that it had previously promised very ample notice to all Members as to the date for reconvening. Members were understandably scattered far and wide and some had just about got their shoes off at home for the first time in days.

In terms of substance, it meant little whether the Senate reconvened on Thursday or Friday or Monday. But in view of the President's request, it was most urgent that it reconvene in the present session to dispose of this measure. So, the date of Monday, December 30, was agreed upon by the leadership on both sides and notices sent out on both sides.

Of course, some Senators are especially inconvenienced by this date. The majority leader is among them. He has had a long-standing engagement in California—perhaps the most important non-Senate engagement which he has had in a year or more—which has had to be rescheduled. But any date selected would have troubled some Senators or other.

Yet, our obligations in the Senate must prevail. So I am here. The minority leader is here. And other Senators are here. May I say that it means a great deal to the Nation, to the President and to the Senate as an institution that we are. And that, in itself, ought to be recompense for the inconvenience which any of us may suffer.

I can only express my personal respect for the high sense of responsibility which has been shown by the Senate in this instance. It is my hope that today's meeting will be brief, that the business at hand will be disposed of promptly, that we will adjourn sine die until January 7 and that the few days remaining before the next session will be as untroubled as the conscience of the Senate has a right to be.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should not like the declarations that were made prior to the second statement by the majority leader to convey the impression or to record the idea that there was not some resentment and some inconvenience beyond the very gentle statements made by gentlemen like the Senator from Florida and the reference to skiing in Montana. There is considerable question as to the necessity for the session today. The Congress has adopted a continuing resolution that will finance foreign aid to January 31. An amount totaling $7.5 billion is in the pipeline. There was supposed to have been—and I suppose there was—consultation with Senators who wished to be consulted. But it is a little difficult to consult at a distance of 1,400 or 1,500 miles. I presume that fact would have some bearing on the situation and perhaps put a good deal of burden on the leadership. We expect the leadership to make decisions when we are not here.

Nevertheless, I am among the group of Senators who are somewhat displeased. I thought the session today was unnecessary, and that the Congress would meet on January 7. We could have met on January 6 and not have consumed a great deal of time in traveling to Washington and then returning to our respective schedules.

Apparently the basis for the scheduling, as very clearly expressed, was not any special consideration for the wishes or desires of the senior Senator from Oregon, but rather the Presidential wish.

I have every good wish for our new President, President Johnson. We should accommodate him in every feasible way. But I respectfully suggest that perhaps we had better operate this end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

As a Senator, I cannot quite see the necessity for a session today in the middle of the only 2 weeks of uninterrupted vacation that we could conceivably have had since last January 3 for the purpose of gratifying the Chief Executive's wish. I make that statement in all due respect to him and in all due respect to the leadership, both the minority and the majority.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. He need have no fears that, so far as the Senate is concerned, it will look after its own business in its own way. But I point out that any President is entitled to a modicum of courtesy. When the President makes an urgent request, the least we can do is to endeavor to comply with it. We do not have to, but a spirit of comity should be observed. I do not believe that the request indicates in any way, that the Senate will lose its independence; nor will we cross the line that divides the executive branch from the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island has the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HRUSKA. I would be the last to object to any expression of preference on the part of the Chief Executive if it were on a necessary point, if there were some sense or some need for the action we are about to take today—presumably—but I do not see that there is any necessity for it.

The continuing resolution will be in effect until January 31.

There is the stupendous sum of $7½ billion in the foreign aid pipeline. The foreign aid program would not miss a single beat if instead of meeting today we did convene on January 6, and were to adjourn sine die after action on this conference report and then resume in the second session on January 7.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Before I yield—and I shall yield in a moment—I think the record should be set straight. There is an absolute necessity and there is an absolute need for the Senate to meet today to consummate this business before the beginning of the new year.

I hope that Senators will read the exhaustive record of the hearings that took place in connection with the foreign aid bill.

The continuing resolution is predicated upon an authorization of $3.9 billion for last year. This year the appropriation is to be $3 billion, with $259 million of unobligated funds to be reappropriated for use. That is money which was not used previously.

The $7 billion in the pipeline is committed money. That money is all obligated. Assignments and commitments of it have been made in the past.

We are now dealing with commitments to be made in the future.

I raised this question with the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk. I raised this question with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The remarkable thing is that every day that elapses without enactment of the bill is a day wasted, with more expense for the taxpayers. First, the administrative officers do not know to what extent they can commit money. Second, all the military procurement is made in conjunction with the procurement by the Department of Defense. So the longer we wait the more expensive the process becomes.

That is the reason why this action is absolutely essential. That is the reason why this action is absolutely necessary. We must do our work now and not wait another day or another week or another month under any continuing resolution. Already this process has cost the taxpayers many more millions of dollars than it would have been necessary to pay had the foreign aid bill been passed several months ago.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Now I yield to my friend the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I disagree for the most part with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. Waiting another week to pass the bill would not cost the country any money. The reason why this process has cost the country money has been the interminable delay occasioned by the other body in reporting appropriation bills to the Senate.

Because I have seen the distinguished majority leader criticized for the way he has operated the Senate, I wish to say that in my opinion he is one of the finest majority leaders the Senate could have. He has great integrity. He is always courteous, even under the greatest stress and in the most trying times. He endeavors, so far as he can, to accommodate himself to the individual needs of Senators. This is not always possible, and I have found that out, as has every other Senator. One cannot hold 100 Senators still to suit the convenience of only 1.

So the real trouble does not lie with the leadership of the Senate. It does not lie with the rules of the Senate. The real trouble seems to lie mostly with the other body, which cannot move.

I shall speak now of action on the appropriation bills.

The Senate received the Interior Department appropriation bill on April 3. It was reported to the Senate on May 22.

The Senate received the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill on April 8, and it was reported to the Senate on May 3.

The Labor-HEW appropriation bill was received by the Senate on May 1, and was reported on August 1. Perhaps that is not the speediest of action, but certainly it is reasonably speedy.

The Agriculture appropriation bill was received on June 10 and reported in the Senate on September 12.

The legislative appropriation bill was received on June 13, and was reported on June 25.

The State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill required the longest time for action. This was primarily because the distinguished chairman of that subcommittee was involved in other obligations which the Senate had heaped upon him. That bill was received June 19 and was reported December 5.

The Defense Department appropriation bill was not received until June 27, 3 days before the end of the fiscal year. The bill was reported, despite that, on September 17.

The District of Columbia appropriation bill was not received until 15 days after the beginning of the fiscal year. It was reported on November 6.

The Independent Offices appropriation bill, which involves the second largest single appropriation made, was not received by this body until October 11. That was 2½ months after the beginning of the fiscal year. That bill was reported to this body 1 month later.

The military construction appropriation bill was not received until November 19. It was reported on December 6.

The civil functions appropriation bill was received on November 20 and was reported on December 5.

The foreign aid appropriation bill—a bill on which the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] has worked so hard, and has done an excellent piece of work—was not received until December 17, and the bill was reported in the Senate on December 17.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat that statement? The bill was reported to the Senate on the very same day it was received from the House?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is entirely correct. I shall finish my thought. That was possible only because the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, had proceeded to hold its hearings and was able to report the bill, after marking it up, soon after it was received from the House.

Now I should like to say a word in conclusion, if the Senator will indulge me further.

The trouble, if there is any, is not in the leadership. It is not in the rules. It lies in the desire and the will of Congress to act.

I should like to leave Senators with one thought. It is not necessary that Congress spend the entire fall in this city. Contrary to what the general public may believe, the time in the fall is not used by Senators as a vacation time. Most Senators I know work harder during the 3 months they may be at home than they work in this place, if that is possible. At least, they work without the facilities and the staff available here.

The most dangerous thing which could happen to this country would be to continue the policies of the past 2 years, and to keep Congress in session most of the year, to keep Members of Congress insulated from their constituents and to keep their constituents insulated from them.

I confess gladly that I feel I need, and want, the advice of my constituents, when I go home in the fall and have an opportunity to travel over the entire State. If we continue the practice which seems to be an accepted policy in the Senate, of remaining in session the year-round, we shall go farther along the road toward destroying real representative government than by anything else we could possibly do.

I hope that, as we face the new year, we shall try to speed up the processes and get to work in order that Congress may adjourn at a reasonable time, so that Members of Congress will have an opportunity to reestablish their contacts with the people at home.

It is not a question of building political fences; it is a question of knowing how to represent the thoughts and thinking of the people whom we individually represent.

So I disagree with my friend from Rhode Island only in one respect—that is, I think this meeting today—and I agree with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska—is entirely unnecessary. Nothing would have been lost. We have satisfied the demand of the President. We are here, each and every one of us; let us act on the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: I have prepared a very simple tabulation of various items in the foreign aid report showing the action of the House, the Senate, and the conference. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my former remarks.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

H.R. 9499—Conference report recapitulation

Item	Conference report	Senate	House
Development grants	$155,000,000	$175,000,000	$150,000,000
International organizations	116,000,000	130,903,000	100,000,000
Supporting assistance	330,000,000	380,000,000	300,000,000
Contingency fund	50,000,000	32,900,000	50,000,000
Inter-American social and economic cooperation	135,000,000	180,000,000	100,000,000
Alliance for Progress (loans)	375,000,000	425,000,000	350,000,000
Alliance for Progress (grants)	80,000,000	100,000,000	80,000,000
Development loans	687,300,000	800,000,000	600,000,000
Military assistance	1,000,000,000	977,700,000	1,000,000,000
Peace Corps	92,100,000	98,100,000	89,000,000
Administration expense	(19,900,000)	(20,300,000)	(19,500,000)
Ryukyu Islands—administrative information expense	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,000,000
Assistance to refugees in the United States	39,717,137	39,717,137	56,000,000

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. PASTORE. In just a moment.

I am referring now to page 388 of the hearings. The title of that subsection is "Effect of Postponement and of Action." It reads:

> Senator Pastore. The House has not reported out its bill yet? If this thing goes over until January, what will be the situation? Can you give us your reaction to that?
>
> Mr. Bundy. I can say it is not exactly administratively easy at this point because we are losing time and we are going to have more unexpended balances and other problems because we can't obligate funds for the major programs until we are sure where we stand.
>
> Senator Pastore. Would you venture an opinion how important it is to pass this bill before January?
>
> Mr. Bundy. I think it would be of the greatest possible help to us, sir. You can imagine the position we are in at this point, trying to develop a fiscal year 1965 budget, trying to plan procurement, and above all trying to get this money to work. We are careful about spending and should be.
>
> Senator Pastore. How about the difference between these December and January?
>
> Mr. Bundy. It would still make a very considerable difference.
>
> Senator Pastore. It would?
>
> Mr. Bundy. It really would.

That is the answer that was given to the committee at that time. It was followed up by that of Secretary Rusk, and it was followed up further by the statement of General Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They made it abundantly clear that a delay would be expensive, because they would not know where they stood. The continuing resolution was based on a $3,900 million amount and the bill that is being acted on is to be in the amount of $3¼ billion. Therefore, these people did not know how far they could go in committing and obligating moneys over and above that amount. I call attention to the fact that under the military assistance program, procurement is made together with military procurement for the Army, Navy, and Air Corps, and a better price is obtained in buying what is needed at one time.

That was the reason why the Senator from Rhode Island made it his business to hold hearings on the bill before it was reported out of the committee of the House.

The mere fact that the House was late is no excuse why the Senate should be dilatory. The bill was passed in the House on December 16, and was reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee on December 17, on the same day it was referred. That is unusual. It was done because the Senator from Rhode Island thought it was necessary to have expedited action on it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Let me say that Senators have cooperated, not only by attending the committee sessions, but when it was called up in the Senate on the following day for consideration, no Senator objected to its immediate consideration. Had a Senator done so, it would have been necessary for a 3-day layover under the rules and the Senate could not have proceeded to consideration of the bill until Saturday. So we also cooperated.

This is the 183d day after July 1, the beginning of this fiscal year. There are 8 days until January 6, 4 of which are not working days. If that number of days makes such a difference to the administration of foreign aid, it must be in far worse condition than those who have criticized and talked against it have said.

Mr. PASTORE. I appreciate that the Senator, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, has cooperated. All I am asking him to do is to cooperate today, to get our business done, because it is absolutely necessary. I want to read one paragraph from page 391 of the hearings. It was General Wood talking:

> PURCHASING PROBLEM
>
> General Wood. It is a little more than a nuisance, sir. For example, the military departments make all of our purchases. We don't have a purchasing agency. They try to tie in large purchases, trucks, personnel carriers, tanks, airplanes, with their own purchases and thereby get the benefit of a better cost.

That was the testimony before the committee. That is the testimony that calls for the action we are taking here today.

I commend both the majority and minority leaders for the way they have conducted the business of the Senate, particularly on the foreign aid bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I happen to be one of those Senators who, a week ago last Saturday, expressed the opinion that there was no need to pass the foreign aid appropriation bill now. I used words such as "whimsy" and "fancy" in referring to the idea that it had to be done now.

The Senator from Rhode Island has read certain statements from the hearings on the bill, and from them he has concluded that it is absolutely necessary to pass the bill today; and that if we do not do it, it will cost more money. I did not make the statement I did a week ago last Saturday without taking into account the possible cost. With all deference to the Senator from Rhode Island, who has done much hard work on the bill and has expedited action on it, I disagree with his reasoning as to why we would lose money if the bill were not acted on today.

The AID administration knew, on December 20, that they were not going to get more than $3 billion plus the $250 million carryover. I find it inconceivable, if action on the bill were delayed from December 20 or 30, to January 6, that anybody in AID would spend more money than at the rate of $3,250 million. They knew the amount was fixed. The only question was when Congress would act on the bill. I cannot believe any effective administrator would go ahead and spend money at a greater rate in the face of that fact. So if action were delayed until January 6, as the Senator from Nebraska has suggested, it would not cost more money at all.

What we have been doing, however, has cost money, not only to individual Members of the Senate and the House, but to staff members. There has been a great deal of unnecessary expense in forcing action on this bill now.

If it had been necessary, I do not know of any Member of the Senate or of the House who would not have been happy to work on Christmas Day. I do not think it is necessary to act on this bill now. I do not want the RECORD to indicate that if action were delayed until January 6, it would cost the Government any more money.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is entitled to his opinion. I disagree with him. He disagrees with me. It is not the first time. It will not be the last time. I repeat, every day of delay means additional cost. I do not care who states otherwise—it will cost more money. That is the statement I make. That is the statement that has been corroborated by witnesses from the Agency whose duty it is to carry out the program.

Mr. MILLER. The statements at the hearing were made before the amount was agreed upon by the conference committee. I would not have quarreled with those statements under the circumstances in which they were made, but once the amount of money was settled on by the conference committee, anyone in AID who would spend more money than at the approved rate would not have used very good judgment.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator has been in the Senate long enough to know that not a single Government agency can know for certain what the Congress is going to do. The mere fact that we were talking about $3 billion is no authority for any agency to begin spending money until Congress passes the bill. I never heard of a more ridiculous argument.

Mr. MILLER. I suggest that if this matter were settled by the conference committee, anyone in the AID administration would be foolish to make any commitments beyond the $3 billion figure.

Mr. PASTORE. But no one in the AID administration would have legal authority to do that. He would have no right to take any figure until the bill had been passed.

Mr. MILLER. He certainly should have the good sense to not exceed the $3-billion figure. That is the point I am making.

Mr. PASTORE. The only right he has is contained in the continuing resolution, which gives him the authority to spend money according to the appropriation of last year.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct. However, he does not have to use that authority. It would be foolish indeed for him to go over the $3 billion figure.

Mr. PASTORE. That is entirely apart from the point I make. He would have no legal authority to do so. The Senator from Iowa knows that the AID administrators cannot exceed that authority.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to supplement what was stated a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], about the unnecessary delays which have occurred in the other body.

The conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill was adopted in the Senate at 6:30 a.m. on December 21. That bill carries an appropriation of approximately six and a quarter billion dollars. I want the RECORD to show the fact that on September 30 the Senate passed the agricultural appropriation bill and appointed conferees. The other body allowed that bill to languish on the desk for 6 weeks without appointing conferees. It appointed conferees on November 14. This is another example of long delays in the other body that we have experienced in the handling of appropriation bills.

I want the RECORD to show that fact, because, as the Senator from Colorado has correctly stated, inaction in the other body has accounted for long delays in the handling of appropriation bills.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I made some remarks on December 24th which I believe I should repeat. I believe the conference report should be adopted today—before the first of the new year, because—to use a word which we use in Kentucky—it would be "trifling" to wait until 1964 to pass a bill which is scheduled to pass in 1963. It would have been better if the Senate had worked on the conference report on the 23d when we were called into session. Everyone knew that the House would be called back on the 23d and that it would act upon the conference report and we could have completed our work on the same day.

It would have been more reasonable to have stayed here through the 23d or 24th and acted on the conference report.

I believe it is somewhat negligent on our part if we do not pass the appropriation bills earlier and in the session they are supposed to be passed.

The important thing now is to prevent this situation from occurring again. There are some practical measures that could be taken early in the next session. First, we could adopt a rule which the Senator from Rhode Island is sponsoring, with other Senators, including myself: the rule of germaneness in debate.

The Senator's resolution provides that, for at least 3 hours after a bill or resolution becomes the pending business of the Senate, debate shall be germane. The adoption of such a rule would speed up the work of the Senate and create greater interest in the debate. I hope the proposed rule will be adopted in January 1964.

Mr. PASTORE. I am in complete agreement with what the Senator has said. It is regrettable that the House took as long as it did. However, there is nothing we can do about it. Certainly we have no jurisdiction over the House. They chose to act in that way. However, that situation does not excuse any delay on our part. We should be diligent.

The point has been made that we should have come back on the 26th of December. I suppose the leadership did not want Senators to leave their warm turkey on the table and start jumping into planes to get here. To have come back here then would have been all right with the Senator from Rhode Island. He was ready to act on the 23d, or 24th, or 25th, or 26th. However, that was the decision made by the leadership, and the leadership has been trying to do the best it can, not merely to accommodate every Senator. It is their decision that the Senate meets today.

Mr. COOPER. I believe the conference report should be adopted today. That is my first suggestion. It would have been better if we had remained here on the 23d and the 24th and acted upon it. However, I wish to address my remarks for a minute to an important point—that this situation should not recur. Congress is under criticism for delaying action upon legislative matters. I have said that I believe we should adopt a rule of germaneness in debate. The adoption of such a rule would bring about a great deal more interest in debate, and would speed up our work on the Senate floor.

I also suggest to the leadership that in the coming session something should be done about scheduling consideration of matters by the Senate, in the first month of the session. We need not every day, when there are no bills to be debated. I would suggest that 3 days out of every week be given over to the work of the committees. If this were done, committee sessions would not be limited to 2-hour meetings, from 10 a.m. to 12 m. in the morning, and they could sit from 10 to 5 on every one of the 3 days. Bills could be considered and acted upon by committees, and the Senate could proceed with its work on the floor. A great deal of delay occurs in the first 3 or 4 months of the session of the Senate, and I hope something can be done about this situation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have come back from as far away, I believe, as anyone could come back to the Senate. I have come back from the west coast of Mexico. I am glad that I did, because the Senate as an institution is very dear to me, as it is dear to the Nation.

I have a very deep feeling, based upon contact with many New Yorkers and Americans in other States during the year, that there is a great need to keep this institution high in the public esteem, because Congress' standing has suffered seriously in the eyes of the American people, and that feeling of respect of the people for the Congress is perhaps as important as what is set out in the Constitution itself for the Congress to do. The least any of us can do, therefore, is to do our very best to maintain the distinction and honor we have by doing our business promptly and with expedition.

I agree with what the Senator from Kentucky has said about the resolution on germaneness of debate for some hours in each day of the Senator from Rhode Island. I hope that also a resolution providing for a commission to make a review of the procedures of Congress will be adopted, and without limitations as to the area of its inquiry, so that Congress may be able to act and proceed in the way in which the people of the country want our business to be transacted.

Finally, I am glad to have come back, because if this situation signalizes the importance which foreign aid continues to have in the eyes of the Senate and of a majority of the people of the Nation, it is a good thing. It is the only real offensive—as distinguished from the defensive—we have against communism in the world. Until someone proposes something better—and I am trying to do that myself through efforts in connection with the private enterprise system, under provisions now incorporated in the bill—to carry on this program we must carry it on with vitality and conviction. One of the ways of showing conviction is by coming back, when necessary, and in so difficult a way for many of us, in order to conclude action on the bill before the year ends. So I commend the Senators in the conference. I am glad that I have returned to be a party to completing the task in the way in which it ought to be done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wonder if we can now "get the show on the road" and complete the work that brought us back.

Mr. PASTORE. No greater mark of respect and admiration could be shown to our leadership, both majority and minority, than to say we transacted our business expeditiously.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. This discussion is very interesting and probably will contribute much to the thinking of many Senators. But perhaps we are missing the point. So far as I am concerned, I shall not beat my breast and say what great sacrifices I have made. I have been available practically all the time. I took 2 days off at Christmas because Congress was not meeting. Unfortunately, I did not spend Christmas with my grandchildren. Otherwise, I have not been greatly inconvenienced by this situation. I have been ready to act at any time. That is a part of the job. That is what I am paid for. I have been willing to be here. It was not necessary for a Presidential plane to go around over the country to pick me up somewhere or to take me home. So that part of the situation is completely extraneous, so far as I am concerned. We are beating our breasts, dressing ourselves in sackcloth, and throwing ashes over ourselves as a Congress when we should not be required to do so.

Congress is a great institution. It is composed of representatives of the people. The delays which have occurred at this session have not been solely the responsibility of Congress or the leadership. The delays have occurred because programs have been suggested and some influential efforts have been made by sources other than Government to compel Congress to accept programs it does not want to accept. That is what has caused the delays, in many instances, in Congress this year. It is not that Congress is impotent or cannot act; it is that Congress has been, in effect, albeit quietly, exerting its own resistance to programs which, in many cases, Congress and the people of the United States do not want to take up under compulsion, if you please, and political pressure. If one wishes to analyze the delays that have occurred this year, let him not blame Congress entirely.

The newspapers have been full of stories about the terrible roadblocks thrown up by the great ogre of the Republican membership of Congress. Heaven bless them. The Republicans must be mighty mites, indeed, if they can block the two-to-one majority that the Democrats and the administration have in Congress. But, oh, how the columnists and newspaper reporters bleed because the awful Republicans are standing, apparently like Horatius at the bridge, to block the progress which is being demanded. I wish the Republicans were so powerful.

I have one suggestion. I hope the report can be agreed to today. We talk about the dangers of communism in one breath, and in the next breath we help the Communists by providing them with the credit of the Federal Government. That has been the principal trouble with the report. We help the Communists, in one breath, and we criticize them in the next.

But let us "get the show on the road" and get the bill out of the way. I am ready to vote.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That calls for 15 minutes more of speaking on my part. I am sorry I have taken so much of the time of the Senate this year in lengthy debate. I apologize for that.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island has yielded to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have but one further comment to make. As I have said, I want to "get the show on the road." However, one thing should be apparent—and this is my personal view: Congress and the people are unhappy, concerned, and confused about foreign aid. It is not necessary to argue that point.

The President has proposed to establish a self-purging or self-investigating body in the Department of State to examine the foreign aid structure and to report back by January 15. Does the speed with which this administration is acting—or with which any other administration could act—indicate that such a body could possibly report back any kind of intelligent opinion and result by January 15? Of course it could not. It will be a self-policing group of estimable gentlemen in the State Department. How much will they be able to criticize themselves concerning the things that need to be criticized in respect to foreign aid?

While we did not agree fully on all the verbiage, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] proposed a most proper and helpful series of amendments designed to investigate the foreign aid program. I suggest that in addition to any consideration which we gave to the amendments offered by the Senator from Kentucky, we now consider the establishment of a committee—probably a joint committee—to consider the verbiage, because this suggestion at the moment is off the top of my head, and probably sounds that way. Nevertheless, I suggest that we consider the establishment of a committee of Congress—a small committee—to examine into the feelings and the attitudes of Members of Congress concerning the foreign aid program. As a result we should have a better picture of the program next year, together with the feelings of Members of Congress. Then it will not be necessary to become involved in emotionalism in debate on the floor of the Senate or in committees. By avoiding emotionalism, next year we can consider the soundness of the program and its details.

If something like that is not done—if Congress itself does not create a self-examining group—that is what I am suggesting, and I hope the verbiage can be prepared a little later—there will be a repetition next year of the situation we have had this year. It is in this way that I believe Congress can help itself to expedite action in the field of foreign aid.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Iowa has proposed an excellent idea. I do not know why the proposal that he makes could not be handled by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is the responsibility of that committee to deal with the foreign aid authorization. There ought to be an investigation, and the Committee on Foreign Relations ought to undertake it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I suggest this proposal in full awareness of the fact that foreign aid is the primary responsibility of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PASTORE. The investigation could be a joint venture.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Conducted by the two committees of the Senate and the two committees of the House. Perhaps it would be helpful if, in searching for the attitudes, opinions, and orientation of Senators, the investigation were enlarged a little, so that it would not be confined exclusively to those committees for the purpose of sensing opinions and sensing attitudes.

Perhaps there is nothing to the idea. Perhaps it is too unworkable or impracticable, but I am giving it some thought; and in the future I should be delighted to talk to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the chairman of the committee, and other Senators. I believe we can save a great deal by a little preliminary work, at the beginning of the new session, on the attitude as to how far we should go and what we should do, because certainly I do not wish a repetition of the confusion which has obtained this year in the minds of Senators as to how far we should go and what we should do on the subject of foreign aid, whether it is good, bad, or indifferent.

Perhaps we can answer many of the questions prior to the time of emotional debate on the floor of the Senate or the House.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] has referred to a proposal which I have made for 2 years, and I appreciate his reference to it. I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, but I have supported foreign aid. I support it because I believe it is a necessary arm of our foreign policy, when used effectively.

But for 3 years, I have insisted that an independent evaluation must be made of our aid program if it is to survive. In my view, the cuts were inevitable; and I voted for them because I did not believe the Congress or the country had information upon which to make a correct evaluation of our foreign aid program.

Last year, I proposed that the foreign aid program be evaluated by independent groups drawn from the public as well as from the Government. That proposal was adopted by the Senate, but it was stricken by the House.

This year, I again proposed the same amendment, and it was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 79 to 1. Although the amendment was somewhat eviscerated in the conference, the report does authorize the President to appoint committees, from the public, to evaluate the foreign aid program either in specific areas or in specific countries.

I believe that unless this evaluation is made, the foreign aid program will be ended. I do not believe it would be right for it to be ended totally because in certain countries and areas of the world our aid is needed.

I have stated that I believe the President of the United States has made a good start by appointing an interdepartmental committee to examine the foreign aid program, but I noted that its examination was directed chiefly to the structure of the foreign aid agency. There have been 5 of these agencies since the Marshall plan, and 11 administrators. I still contend that the work of the Clay Committee, which had broad scope, must be extended. It should be extended to specific areas and to the 15 or 16 countries which receive one-half of our total foreign aid appropriations.

I had a rather unusual experience this year: After I had submitted my amendment, representatives of the foreign aid agency came to see me. They wished to have me explain the purposes of my amendment.

I told them frankly that I did not believe it is sufficient to have only the foreign aid agency report on the aid program. It may not be a just and fair response, but it is evident that neither Congress nor the people are very much convinced by the reports which the foreign aid agency makes. I further stated that unless there is an independent evaluation extending the work of the Clay Committee, I believe the foreign aid program would die. One of the representatives of the foreign aid program then, and I make it clear it was not Mr. Bell, said to me: "We do not want some one looking over our shoulder."

I said that it is not their program, but is the program of Congress and the country, and is designed to give strength to the President's arm in the conduct of our foreign policy.

I repeat what I said: "I think that the aid program is going to die, although it should not die in the countries where it is doing good and can continue to do good. But it is going to die unless an independent evaluation, along the lines of the Clay Committee report, is made of its operations in specific areas and countries."

In the long debate on this subject—the first thorough debate on it, which I have heard since the Marshall plan was adopted—the Senator from Oregon who is chiefly responsible for the debate, stressed this necessity. I believe the new President of the United States has a great opportunity. If he will obtain an independent evaluation of our aid program, it can be made more effective and it will gain the respect and the cooperation of the countries we aid.

From his experiences in the Senate, and from the informed reports he made to Members of the Senate after returning from trips, as Vice President, President Johnson has great knowledge of the practical working of our aid programs; and I believe he will insist that it be effective.

If independent assessments are made, and basic information provided, Congress and the people will know whether our program is valuable, and in what countries it is valuable.

In this connection with my remarks, and with this debate, I ask unanimous consent that three articles, one from the Washington Sunday Star of yesterday, and two from the Washington Post of yesterday and today, be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Dec. 29, 1963]

COOPER SPURS ADDED STUDIES OF FOREIGN AID

Senator Cooper, Republican, of Kentucky, told the administration last night that, unless it provides an independent appraisal of foreign aid, the program will be abolished by Congress.

Senator Cooper, in a statement setting forth his views for President Johnson, commended the President for setting up an interdepartmental committee to seek ways to bring new efficiency and economy to the program.

But he insisted its work should be supplemented by country-by-country foreign aid studies by businessmen and others from outside government.

GREAT IMPACT

Senator Cooper said that a Presidential Commission headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay made a "great impact on the country in its evaluation of the total foreign aid program" early this year.

He added that its work should be followed by the President's appointment of small committees of three to five members, a majority drawn from private life, to provide Congress and the country "full and objective information concerning the effective use of aid funds in individual areas." He said such committees could work under the direction of the Clay group.

Senator Cooper's views were supported in separate interviews by Senators Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin; Morse, Democrat, of Oregon; and Hickenlooper, Republican, of Iowa; the latter the senior Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

SENATORS RECALLED

Senators have been called back from their Christmas holiday vacation to a 10 a.m. session tomorrow to complete congressional action on a $3 billion foreign aid money bill, slashed $1.5 billion below the $4.5 billion requested by the late President Kennedy.

Passage of the bill, which includes a controversial amendment giving President Johnson authority to approve credit guarantees on wheat and other sales to the Soviet bloc, will clear the way for Congress to adjourn. It will reconvene January 7 in a new session.

Mr. Johnson has set up a review of the objectives and organization of the foreign aid program by a Government committee headed by George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State.

Senator Cooper said he is glad Mr. Johnson has asked the Ball Committee to consider structural changes in the Agency for International Development. However, he added:

"But the important issue before Congress and the country is not so much the structure of aid but whether foreign aid appropriations are effectively used in the countries we aid."

REVIEWS STRESSED

Senator Cooper feels that reviews should be made on a country-by-country basis in the 15 to 20 countries that receive half of the total economic aid to determine whether (1) American assistance is meeting development needs, (2) beneficiary countries are providing maximum self-help, and (3) programs which do not further these objectives are being eliminated.

The Senate has twice adopted Cooper amendments aimed at this purpose.

This year's amendment provides authority for the President to appoint such committees.

Senator Proxmire said the appointment of the Ball Committee is wonderful but that he hopes its work will be supplemented by "a more profound and objective appraisal" by outstanding private businessmen, university people and other experts.

VESTED INTEREST

"After all, governmental people have something of a vested interest in the program," he told a reporter.

Senator Hickenlooper said an investigation by outsiders is important and could provide a real benefit. He added that, under the governmental setup, "the State Department and the AID agency will be looking into themselves."

Senator Morse, a supporter of the Cooper proposal, said he fears any move to make "the executive supreme."

"Congress has a duty to take a long, hard look at any program the executive submits," he added.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 29, 1963]

Full-Scale Aid Probe Demanded—Senator Cooper Asks Independent Look Into Use of Funds

(By Ernest B. Vaccaro)

Senator John Sherman Cooper, Republican, of Kentucky, told the administration last night that unless it provides an independent appraisal of foreign aid, the program will be abolished by Congress.

Cooper, in a statement setting forth his views for President Johnson, commended the President for setting up an interdepartment committee to seek ways to bring new efficiency and economy to the program.

But he insisted its work should be supplemented by country-by-country foreign aid studies by businessmen and others from outside Government.

Cooper said that a Presidential Commission headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay made a "great impact on the country in its evaluation of the total foreign aid program" early this year.

URGES SMALL COMMITTEES

He added that its work should be followed by the President's appointment of small committees of three to five members, a majority drawn from private life, to provide Congress and the country "full and objective information concerning the effective use of aid funds in individual areas." He said such committees could work under the direction of the Clay group.

Mr. Johnson has set up a review of the objectives and organization of the foreign aid program by a Government committee headed by George W. Ball, Undersecretary of State, to consider revamping assistance criteria.

Cooper said he is glad the President has asked the Ball committee to consider structural changes in the Agency for International Development (AID). However, he added:

"But the important issue before Congress and the country is not so much the structure of aid but whether foreign aid appropriations are effectively used in the countries we aid."

His views were supported in separate interviews by Senators William Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, and Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Republican, of Iowa, the latter the senior Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Senators have been called back from their Christmas holiday vacation to a 10 a.m. session Monday to complete congressional action on a $3 billion foreign aid money bill, slashed $1.5 billion below the $4.5 billion requested by President Kennedy.

ADJOURNMENT IN SIGHT

Passage of the bill, which includes a controversial amendment giving Mr. Johnson authority to approve credit guarantees on wheat and other sales to the Soviet bloc, will clear the way for Congress to adjourn. It will reconvene January 7 in a new session.

Cooper feels that reviews should be made on a country-by-country basis in 15 to 20 countries which receive half of the total economic aid to determine whether (1) American assistance is meeting development needs, (2) beneficiary countries are providing maximum self-help, and (3) programs which do not further these objectives are being eliminated.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 30, 1963]

Johnson Gained Aid-Bill Support After Asia Trip

(By Helen Fuller)

The enthusiasm would not last until the votes were taken on the Kennedy foreign aid bill for 1962, but Lyndon B. Johnson did his part to stir up the opinion makers who influence Congress.

The week President Kennedy returned from his talks with Khrushchev in Vienna with an aching back, United Press International editors from all over the country were assembled in Washington for their annual meeting, and the National Conference of Mayors was gathered in the Capital to discuss plans for civil defense. The President was scheduled to address both groups.

Kennedy made his speech to the editors, and the announcement the following day of the seriousness of his back ailment explained why it had been pallid. Johnson appeared before the editors on the following day, as scheduled, and subsequently he substituted for the ailing President before the Conference of Mayors. At both appearances, he stirred his audience with unaccustomed eloquence.

His journey, he said, had convinced him that "never has it been more important that the Congress and the American public support the efforts of free Asians to banish the curse of poverty, illness, and illiteracy. I know that, given something for which to fight, the people of Asia will man the ramparts of freedom with valor. But you know, as they know, that people do not fight in the steaming jungles to preserve hunger, squalor, and oppression."

He told that most provincial group of men, the mayors of the United States, that America must lead the world or "shrivel up." And when he had delivered a ringing call for foreign aid, citing as a model his own backing of Eisenhower's foreign policy in the 8 preceding years, "The mayors and their wives," a Scripps-Howard correspondent reported, "gave him a ringing, standing ovation, almost as fervently as if he had come out solidly for turning all income tax revenue over to the cities."

MRS. JOHNSON HELPS

Mrs. Johnson helped bring the story to the editors' wives. Instead of entertaining them at an ordinary tea, she enlisted 50 of the best known and most glamorous women in Washington, including embassy ladies and the wives of Cabinet members, and introduced them to the women whose husbands had been meeting every major male celebrity in town during the week, and rounded out the party with a little speech about where she and the Vice President had gone in Asia and what they had learned.

The Johnsons had turned their Asian trip into good public relations for the Kennedy foreign policy. Dick and Pat Nixon had done the same for Eisenhower; but in the new Kennedy scheme, Johnson had, as Nixon did not, authority to move from advice to action.

The Vice President naturally had paid special attention to his relations with the new civilian chiefs in the Pentagon. He and the new Secretary of Defense liked each other from the start; then Secretary of the Navy John Connally had been Johnson's manager in his senatorial campaigns; and after his years of specializing in military affairs the Vice President found the labyrinthine Pentagon no mystery.

When he returned from Asia, therefore, the Vice President, without announcement, sat down in Secretary Robert S. McNamara's office with the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to talk about improvements that could be made in our military missions and in their relations with ambassadorial staffs.

The Pentagon bought some of Johnson's ideas. The President listened to his recommendation that budget watchdogs be sent into the field to keep track of the actual expenditure of foreign-aid funds from the point of appropriation to the point of actual spending. The U.S. Information Agency and the International Cooperation Administration also had the benefit of his not very new advice: Better people are needed overseas.

Ambassador John Kenneth Galbraith, reckoning on the Vice President's desire for effectiveness, managed to squeeze another dividend from Johnson's Asian visit. Trampling through an Indian village with Galbraith, Johnson had been reminded of his first memory of electric lights in Johnson City, Tex. The electricity had been produced by a kerosene generator.

Talking to the Vice President in Washington several weeks later, the Ambassador asked Johnson if he could remember who made that generator. If it was still in production, perhaps the United States could help light some villages in India without waiting for large-scale electrical development.

The Vice President, who recalled seeing the name "Fairbanks" on the generator, made personal inquiries and learned that the remarkably simple and rugged machine was still in small-scale production by Fairbanks-Morse & Co.

After a survey of the generator's potential usefulness in India, some alterations were made to adapt it to deep-well pumping and units were ordered for a pilot project of pumping water and lighting homes in small Indian villages.

ROLE WAS STRATEGIC

All of this was pleasant and satisfying to Johnson's ego. But where the President really needed help was at the Capitol. Here Johnson wanted to be careful to avoid any accusation that he was interfering in the affairs of the Senate. He sized up the situation and the individuals concerned—as he had always done as Democratic leader. But then, instead of taking direct action, he went to the President or to members of his staff with advice and counsel on how to proceed to get the votes.

In some cases, to be sure, the suasion was direct, but for the most part Johnson's role in the drive for a new kind of long-term aid to nations overseas was strategic rather than operational. He was there to be consulted when the majority leader wanted to consult

> him, but he was, so to speak, no longer the oil driller but the prospector who points out where to drill.
>
> And the reality of his shift from legislative manipulator No. 1 to No. 2 man in the executive branch was made clear when, in the midst of the congressional battle over foreign aid, the President dispatched the Vice President to Berlin.
>
> Khrushchev had confounded U.S. policymakers by making a move for which they had planned no countering action. We had concentrated on how to deal with another Berlin blockade if the Communists sought to cut off West Berlin again, as they had in 1948. But when, instead, the Communists sealed the border between East and West Berlin early on Sunday morning, August 13, Washington, as Walter Lippmann wryly observed, "had no policy to deal with what actually happened——unless sending the Vice President and General Clay to West Berlin can be called a policy."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while so many Senators are in Chamber I should like to ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the conference report. We are trying to work out a unanimous-consent agreement in that connection. Therefore, I request the yeas and nays.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I join in the request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] was very accurate in his estimate of the situation—namely, that no agency of Government which is under criticism or no combination of agencies of Government which are under criticism can successfully investigate itself or themselves and have the results of that investigation accepted by Congress or by the public.

The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, which provided for an independent evaluation of foreign aid, was lost in the conference, after the Senate had adopted it. I understand that the State Department did not approve it and did not like the idea at all; and the House sustained the view of the State Department. So we had to lose that amendment.

However, I believe that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] need have no fear but that the Commission appointed by the President to make the study will make its report by the 15th of January. Although I have not received any leak from the Commission, I can predict what the report will be. The Commission under the leadership of George Ball will find that the members of the Commission under his leadership have done an excellent job and will continue to do so in the future if Congress does not interfere, but complies with its request.

So far as I am concerned, the report of the Commission appointed by the President may have some value to the President, but I cannot conceive that it would have any value to Congress.

I still hope that a commission that is independent in fact will make a study of foreign aid, so that thus we can receive, for our guidance, a report in which we can have full confidence, and which we can follow, and thus improve the foreign aid program, which all of us know can stand improvement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana, for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed the unanimous-consent request which I am about to make with the distinguished minority leader and with the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee on appropriations which has been considering foreign aid, and with other Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that, beginning immediately, 1 hour be allotted for each amendment to be considered, and 2 hours be allotted for debate on the conference report.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa reserve the right to object?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to have perhaps 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator will be assured of the availability of that time.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall give the Senator from Iowa that amount of time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Chair restate to the Senate the content of the unanimous-consent agreement?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the agreement, time for debate on the conference report will be limited to 2 hours, and 1 hour on each of the amendments in disagreement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the event of a quorum call, I ask unanimous consent that the time necessary for the quorum call be not charged to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What is the question now before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the conference report. Thereafter there will be debate upon amendments 14 and 20.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is now available 2 hours of debate on the question of agreeing to the conference report?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With the understanding that the time necessary for the quorum call will not be charged to the time allotted for the debate on the conference report or the amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. With that understanding, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon is recognized. Does the Senator yield himself unlimited time?

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself such time as I may need.

The vote soon to be taken on the conference report marks the climax of the first thoroughgoing congressional review of foreign aid since the program began in 1947. The changes made by Congress have been relatively minor, compared to the changes that still need to be made. But the cut in funds has served notice upon those who administer the various parts of the foreign aid program that further cuts will be made next year unless there are substantial and basic changes made by the administration, itself, in the foreign aid program.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has said that Congress will abolish foreign aid if there is not a review made by men independent from the administration which will determine not whether its procedural and structural setup needs change, but determine the value of our aid programs themselves in each country now participating in them.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] repeated that warning only a few minutes ago on the floor of the Senate. I shall have more to say later in regard to the nature of the review that ought to be conducted. But I heartily endorse his warning that Congress and the American people will not be satisfied with another shuffling around of functions and programs. We have had so many shufflings and structural changes in aid that they are lost in the haze of paperwork. But they have not improved the program in its basic elements.

I find myself heartily in disagreement with the proposal of the President of the United States that an investigation or study of foreign aid shall be conducted within the executive branch of the Government within the next few days and a report given to the Congress and to the American people by January 15.

Mr. President, that is a pure matter of form and not of substance. The investigation of foreign aid that needs to be conducted cannot possibly be conducted and the reforms that should be adopted agreed to in any such period of time.

Mr. President, the investigation should not be done by special pleaders. By and large, the Commission the President of the United States has appointed consists of a group of special pleaders. That is not the way to investigate and study foreign aid.

Although I support the objective of the Senator from Kentucky, the responsibility for investigating foreign aid rests with the Congress of the United States, and it cannot evade the responsibility. The taxpayers have the right to ask the Congress to carry out its duty to "watchdog" the expenditures of taxpayers' money. That is not the function of the executive branch of Government. It is not the function of AID.

It is the function of the Senate and the House of Representatives. We have not been doing our duty in that field. We have had languishing before us for many months report after report from the Comptroller General, who is the agent of the Congress of the United States, revealing his findings, on spot checks that he has made around the world that there has been waste of hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

What has the Congress done about those reports? Practically nothing. I shall go along with the Senator from Kentucky for the type of country-by-country investigation that he is calling for. I am perfectly willing to have outstanding laymen in this country associate themselves with such an investigation. But that investigation should be conducted under the auspices of the Congress, and Congress should be duly represented on the boards conducting such investigations. The Senator from Kentucky has that in mind. But the report should be to the Congress, for that happens to be the function of the Congress.

I shall have more to say about the subject later, not only in my present speech, but also next year, for, so far as I am concerned, this is only one battle in the war on the whole subject—if one would desire to use that figure of speech, as it involves foreign aid. I shall lose that battle today, for I am well aware of the fact that the votes are not present to reject the conference report. It ought to be rejected. In my judgment, it is not a sound report.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator have the feeling that someone in the executive branch might paraphrase Pyrrhus and say "One more such victory over the Morses and we are undone."

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe that anyone has such delusions. Congress has a clear duty under the Constitution to check the expenditure of taxpayers' funds.

Much has been said on the subject in the press. I speak now for the edification of the editors of the New York Times and the Washington Post particularly, although they are not the only editors that need a refresher course on the check-and-balance system of our Constitution. The editors of the Washington Post, the New York Times, and many other publications apparently are on a binge to downgrade the Congress. They are on a binge to becloud the issue before the American people as to the duty and responsibility of the Congress. I say to the various schools of journalism, "You ought to establish a national refresher course for all editors on the Constitution and invite them to come and refresh their recollections—if they ever had any understanding of the Constitution in the first place."

Mr. President, this is a coordinate and coequal three-branch system of government. Such editors as the editors of the Washington Post and the New York Times apparently are at work to subordinate the Congress of the United States to the White House and the executive branch of the Government. I will constantly speak out against that subversive attack on our constitutional system, because whether or not these editors know it, they are engaging in dangerous subversion. We shall have to watch out for the liberties and freedom of the American people if we ever subordinate the Congress under our constitutional system to the executive branch of Government.

I will fight just as hard as anyone in the executive branch of Government to protect the constitutional rights, under this system of checks and balances, of the White House; but I am greatly concerned about a tendency on the part of the press. Of course, the press has an impact on public opinion. It is a terrific force in molding public opinion in this Republic. I am much concerned about the growing evidence of a belief on the part of some members of the public that we ought to set up an all-powerful executive branch of Government and have the Congress function as its rubber-stamp.

That issue is basic in the debate on foreign aid. As the Senator from Kentucky said a few minutes ago, a member of AID told him in his office that they did not want someone from the public "breathing down their necks." That has been the attitude of AID for a long time. It is the present attitude of AID.

We were unable this year to induce AID and the executive branch of the Government to come forth with a reformed foreign aid program. The Foreign Relations Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, filed with the Senate a sound report on the need for policy changes in the administration of foreign aid.

When I read the report, having been one of those who led the fight within the committee for a reform of foreign aid, I felt like the lawyer who said, after a decision went against him, "I got the language of the court, but the opposing side got the decision." I got the language of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for the committee's report verified criticism after criticism I had made of foreign aid, but the committee did not give me the decision. It "passed the buck" to the executive branch of Government and said, "If you do not do something about it between now and fiscal year 1965, some dire consequences may result."

Members of Congress have the constitutional responsibility of checking the expenditures of taxpayers' money. So when editors of such newspapers as the Washington Post and the New York Times and other newspaper editors attack Congress on the basis of the false allegation that we are seeking to interfere with the administration of foreign policy by the Chief Executive, they do not know the Constitution, for the Constitution makes it as clear as the English language can make it that no money can be spent by the executive branch of the Government except in accordance with an act of law passed by the Congress. When we come to cast the value judgment as to whether the money should be appropriated, we necessarily must cast a value judgment upon the purposes for which the money is to be used. That is the coordinate power of the Congress of the United States in the field of foreign policy, Mr. President, and we cannot pass the buck to the Chief Executive, as the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate did this year in the report it filed.

I say to you, Mr. President (Mr. WALTERS in the chair), that no one is going to be able to understand the basic premise I have presented unless he understands my constitutional premise.

My charge is that the Congress has not been "watchdogging" the expenditure of the taxpayers' money, not only in the foreign aid program, but also in respect to many other activities.

We speak about foreign aid only today. We have voted, over the years, billions of dollars for foreign aid. Great portions of that money have been wasted. Much of it has led to corruption in various countries of the world, to the detriment of the prestige of the United States. Furthermore, inefficiency and waste characterize too much of the foreign aid program.

Since there no longer is any need for a Marshall plan in Europe, we have spent money in Europe in recent years that we cannot possibly justify. There is no excuse for sending millions of dollars more into the NATO countries. The NATO countries are self-sufficient. We have made them self-sufficient because of the largess of the U.S. Government.

I happened to be one of the leaders in this body at the time of NATO and the Marshall plan. Senators have heard me say this before, but I shall have to keep the record straight. I was one of the assistant floor leaders of the NATO Treaty, appointed by Arthur Vandenberg at the time, along with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the late Senator Tobey, of New Hampshire. I took article V—the one-for-all and all-for-one article—through the Senate at the time of the NATO Treaty ratification.

I would do it again.

But, Mr. President, 1963 is not 1949. The time has come for our European allies not only to pay their own way, but also to help the United States defend freedom elsewhere in the world, by making substantial contributions to the protection of freedom in South Vietnam, if we are to stay there at all. I happen to believe we never should have gone in unilaterally and should not stay there unilaterally.

That is a good example of how our allies have never assumed their full share of responsibility in the defense of freedom. They are perfectly willing to defend it in Europe, on their own soil, but they are not contributing their full share to the defense of freedom, and they are contributing only a pittance in connection with foreign aid to underdeveloped areas.

By and large what they contribute is not at the rate of three-quarters of 1 percent interest, with a 10-year grace period, and 40- to 50-year loans at an interest rate which does not even begin to pay for the cost of the use of the money.

Does anyone call that a loan program? The AID officials need to be made to understand that we do not like the kind of verbal subterfuge of which they are guilty. The AID propaganda across this country has given the American people the false impression that much of the economic aid program is now a loan program. I do not call a three-quarters of 1 percent interest rate, with a 10-year grace period, and a 40- to 50-year period to pay—if they decide to pay—a loan program, except in quotation marks.

The American taxpayers have reached the point where they are entitled to get back at least the cost of the use of their money, in the way of interest rates. Do not tell me that in some of the underdeveloped areas of the world they cannot afford to pay it. If there is a hydroelectric dam to be built in any underdeveloped area of the world, it should be built only if it is economically and engineeringly feasible. And if it is economically and engineeringly feasible, it will return, in the wealth that it produces, adequate economic income to pay the cost of the use of the money, or the interest charge on the money of the American taxpayers with which it was built.

The second major premise I want to lay down, because to understand my position on foreign aid it is necessary to understand this, is that we cannot buy friends. And we have not bought friends. If Senators think we have, let them take a look at Cambodia today. Cambodia is raising havoc with U.S. foreign policy in Asia. Cambodia has brought to an end a policy based on a theory which has always been fallacious and against which I have spoken many times in the past—the so-called domino theory. Cambodia certainly has crashed the dominoes, if there still linger those who accept that theory. It has been demonstrated that it was never sound. Cambodia illustrates that we cannot buy friends.

No; what we must do to protect the American taxpayers is to make sure the money is spent on sound economic projects in the underdeveloped areas of the world that will help create the wealth which brings about economic benefits that will help those people become economically free. What American policy ought to be, in the main, in connection with our foreign aid, is the exportation of economic freedom; for until people are first, economically free, they cannot be politically free.

I have been heard to say before, and I say it again, that we have been trying to export a political ideology we call democracy. It cannot be done, because people in the underdeveloped areas of the world could not care less about political ideologies. But even though millions of them are illiterate and ignorant, they understand economic freedom, and they understand that they are being deprived of economic freedom.

I urge that American policy in the field of economic aid be reoriented, project by project, to economic projects that will bring, or help bring, economic freedom to these millions of people. It is a concept, I am sorry to say as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, about which the AID people downtown and the military people downtown never have had any understanding or comprehension.

The elements to which I have referred involve the question whether the money spent by the American people on foreign aid is producing a foreign policy return commensurate with the expenditure. This can only be determined country by country, as the Senator from Kentucky proposes. It can only be determined by examining the entire history of U.S. aid in each country. And it can only be determined by examining the entire history of all U.S. aid in each country.

MILITARY AND ECONOMIC AID CANNOT BE SEPARATED

The statement issued a few days ago by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], which embodied his attack upon the President, reveals that our colleague suffers from a gross ignorance of these basic issues involved in foreign aid. Had we enjoyed the pleasure of the Senator's company during the debate of late October and early November, and throughout the voting on the many amendments to the authorization bill, it would have become evident to him as it has to so many of us that economic aid cannot be separated from military aid. Yet the Senator from Arizona sought to do that by protesting economic aid as being too high, while ignoring military aid altogether.

One of the key points which I sought to bring out in my daily speeches here in the Senate last summer was that our heavy consignment of military aid to certain countries requires us to furnish disproportionate amounts of economic aid to the same countries. This point was also repeated by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] during the debate on the appropriation bill. In many ways this is the key problem of the foreign aid program; it most certainly is one of the problems which the committees called for in the Cooper amendment would have gone into, and it is a problem which no true review of foreign aid can ignore.

The recipients of our military aid cannot maintain large military establishments out of their own economic resources. If they could, they would not need the military aid from us. In that sense, we are leaning on weak reeds wherever we send military aid, because a country that is militarily dependent upon others in time of peace is hopelessly dependent upon others in time of war.

Take Iran. There is a country on the border of the Soviet Union to which we have sent $633 million in military aid between 1946 and 1963. We sent Iran $789 million in economic aid in the same period. In fiscal year 1963 alone, the military and economic aid was just about equal—military aid slightly over $58 million and economic aid slightly under $58 million. But suppose some Soviet aggression occurred against Iran, or against some neighbor that would involve a treaty commitment of Iran's. Ignoring for the moment the purely military value—if any—of the Iranian forces, the United States would have to provide their complete support, and we would have to pour still more American wealth into Iran itself to keep it going under war conditions.

Exactly the same is true of Turkey, Taiwan, Pakistan, Greece, Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, and South Vietnam, all of which account for the great bulk of foreign aid outside the Alliance for Progress.

The aid figures show absolutely and beyond question that even in time of peace, we send most of our economic aid to the same nations that receive the bulk of our military aid. There are a handful of exceptions. Israel and the United Arab Republic have received economic aid, but not military aid; India has received a huge amount of economic aid, and only now are we beginning a large-scale military aid program to India. There are, in other words, a few nations receiving considerable economic aid and no military aid. But there are no countries receiving substantial military aid that do not also receive substantial economic aid.

It is a concept that romanticists like our friend from Arizona do not like to face, but military aid generates a need for economic aid. The entire $380 million for supporting assistance—a category of economic aid—goes to nations that need direct financing from outside to support their armed forces, in addition to the military equipment itself.

Beyond that, the bulk of development grants and loans also goes to countries that would have less need of outside aid for development were they not channeling so much of their scarce resources into military purposes.

The great tragedy in this is that the real protection for all these nations is in the overwhelming power of the American military forces, which we maintain in all the places in the world where we believe U.S. interests are at stake. These forces will have to protect each and every one of the nations around the Communist bloc if they are to be protected at all from Communist attack.

We have heard repeated over and over again in this debate the assertion that it is cheaper to maintain in uniform a South Korean, a Formosan, a Pakistani, a Turk, or some other soldier of another foreign country, when the fact is that we maintain them and our own forces as well; and it is our own forces, and not their military defenses, that give them the security. It is the 7th Fleet in the Pacific, not Chiang Kai-shek's army, not South Korea's Army; it is the U.S. air armada, and it is the thousands of American boys stationed in the Pacific, who give protection to American interests in the Pacific.

We need to take a long, hard look at the waste of money, by the billions; to take a long hard look at the wasteful billions of dollars that we have been pouring into military aid around the world so far as the protection of either the United States or the government involved is concerned.

There is the ugly fact, which the world needs to face, that if war were to break out with Russia, it would not be a conventional war. All the billions of dollars of military aid that we have poured into these countries would be recognized as having been wasted. It would be a nuclear war of short duration, and the probabilities are that both of the major combatants would destroy themselves.

The time has come for a hard, long look at military aid.

I warn the American people on what the next move will be. The next move will be a move of partial concealment, by taking military aid out of the general aid bill, taking it away from the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and having it considered in connection with the U.S. defense budget. It does not belong there. This is a foreign policy issue.

I am at a loss to understand why the Secretary of State has not already risen in righteous indignation against the move that is on foot to separate military aid from economic aid and to place it under the jurisdiction of an entirely different committee in the Senate and under an entirely different department of the U.S. Government.

"Watch out," I say to the American people on this move, because it is a further attempt to weaken the State Department.

AID REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION MAY MAKE SAME MISTAKE

It would appear from press reports that the administration committee set up to examine itself is about to fall into the same pit with the Senator from Arizona.

Plans to separate economic aid from military aid will, if carried out, lead to increases in both. I do not doubt that this is exactly what is in the minds of some of the advocates of the separation. It has been commonly said for many years that Congress would approve just about any amount of military aid if it were hidden away in the budget of the Defense Department. There is a wide body of opinion within the administration that economic aid should be sacrificed, if need be, to the objections made to foreign aid in general, but that military aid should be put in the Defense Department budget where it will be rubber-stamped by Congress.

But even if it is carried out, its proponents will find out eventually that the nations favored for even more military aid cannot make use of it without large sums of economic aid. This interrelation of economic and military aid, and the basic military protection afforded by our American Defense Establishment which makes so much of that aid unnecessary, is at the heart of our foreign aid problem. Perhaps it can be disguised and concealed for a while by separation of the two programs, and by a razzle-dazzle reorganization and dismemberment of existing aid structures. But it cannot be disguised or concealed for long, no matter what organizational changes are made in the presentation and administration of aid.

I am opposed to such a separation for another reason: It would make the State Department and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee nothing but appendages to the Pentagon in the formulation of American foreign policy. The commitments and obligations entered into with other countries by the United States must never be entered into on the sole word of the American military. We already have too many obligations and commitments that were entered into because purely military considerations prevailed. Putting military aid into the Defense Department budget in an effort to remove it from true congressional scrutiny and congressional guidelines would be a final step in the direction of military diplomacy.

Military aid is in fact one of the most important of all foreign policy considerations. It must, therefore, remain under the jurisdiction of the administrators and the congressional committees that have the responsibility over foreign policy itself.

MISTAKE CAME IN APPLYING EUROPEAN FORMULA TO LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

The point is, however, that no amount of procedural juggling can separate military from economic aid because the first invariably produced the second. No administrative review, and no congressional review that ignore this problem can really be considered a basic review of foreign aid.

It is one of the problems that I shall take up myself for each country next year, as the Senate Foreign Relations Committee examines the foreign aid program.

The problem itself has developed because of the very success of earlier aid programs in building bulwarks against communism, both internal and external. Massive aid to western Europe and Japan restored their economies; in western Europe it also enabled them to build their own military forces, though the continued presence of U.S. forces in Europe relieves our allies of doing what they can and should be doing in their own defense. Similarly, Japan could produce an independent military force, if she chose to do so.

But as so often happens, a bureaucracy that carried out a successful program in one area thought only of extending the same program to other areas. Congress, in its excessive zeal to give the executive branch a free hand refrained from exercising the control and direction over foreign aid that it should have exercised between 1950 and 1960. Because Congress failed to exercise control and jurisdiction over the foreign aid program in that decade, we find ourselves in 1963 with a program that seems endless and bottomless and in which the American people have lost confidence.

Where we went wrong was in trying to do in nonindustrial parts of the world what we did in the industrial areas of Europe and Japan. We have made—and are making—an infinitely costly mistake in applying the same combination of massive economic and military aid to nations that are entirely lacking in the components of industrialism that existed in Europe and Japan.

Take the countries on the Communist periphery where we concentrate our aid, both military and economic. Greece, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, India, South Vietnam, Taiwan, and South Korea. There is not one among them that will, in our lifetime and probably not ever, have the internal capacity to support a military establishment that will be meaningful in terms of the military power of China, Russia, and the United States.

So long as we maintain large aid programs in those countries with the objective of building their indigenous military forces, we will never see the day when they will be self-supporting. They will be "on our backs" forever. And if the time comes when Red China or Russia launches an attack against one of them, it will have to be defended by U.S. forces if it is to be defended at all.

How many Korean wars, and South Vietnam wars, do we have to fight in to learn that? Only Americans can and will protect American interests.

Our massive aid programs to them, far from enabling them to defend themselves, has two bad consequences. The first is that it discourages real and needed growth of all kinds. Many of these countries are run by factions that live off the American aid program. Korea, Taiwan, South Vietnam, and probably Pakistan are such countries. Their economic and political growth has been stunted by the military orientation of U.S. aid, including economic aid.

Secondly, our aid to many of them has the bad effect of setting the recipients against each other. Congress tried to come to grips this year with this effect of much of our aid by adopting the Gruening amendment. I am not at all certain that the Gruening amendment will produce the desired effect. But at least it was an honest attempt by Congress to deal with a problem of foreign aid that its administrators have refused to deal with. The operation of this new policy guideline will be closely watched by those of us who are attempting to produce a meaningful and effective foreign aid program.

As I have said, the issue of the interrelation of military and economic aid is a key foreign aid problem. I have outlined it and detailed it with respect to country after country in my speeches on the Senate floor. But there are other problems of foreign aid, too.

PROBLEM OF SELF-HELP BY RECIPIENT NATIONS

One such problem is the issue of self-help on the part of recipients. It is closely related to the question of aid for military purposes. From a great many of the countries I have been talking about, we do not ask or expect much self-help, because we expect them to concentrate their own resources on supporting military establishments. Or we do not ask them to make needed reforms because to do so might cause a particular ruling clique to tumble from power. So Uncle Sam picks up the bill for their failure or unwillingness to use their own resources most effectively.

But the issue of self-help also has great application in Latin America. The military urgency is not so pronounced there; yet we still hear it said both in Latin America and in the United States that if we expect these countries to move too fast and do very much to help themselves, they will become unsettled politically, and that might lead to unsettled military consequences. This is why the apologies are made for the juntas in Latin America. The apology makes the case that reform upsets the ruling classes and causes them to seize the government. But if the same old system is to remain entrenched in Latin America, then I see no reason at all for the Alliance for Progress. If the juntas take over to prevent reform, and if the juntas are desirable because they keep the Communists down, then there is really no reason for any further American investment in the nations to the south.

If time permits later, I shall apply this principle to the Dominican Republic, for I warned, when this administration a short time ago recognized the junta government of the Dominican Republic, that it was not helping the cause of stability either in the Dominican Republic or throughout Latin America. The material I shall later place in the RECORD bears out my warning given on the day I issued my press release in opposition to the recognition of the military junta of the Dominican Republic.

So long as we continue the expenditure of large sums under the Alliance in the name of raising their living standards, then we must demand that the recipients do the things that must be done by them to make our aid effective.

I believe the same is essentially true for every country that receives American aid.

MANAGEMENT OF AID MUST BE IMPROVED

Still another area to which I devoted much time during this year and will devote more time next year is that of the specific wastes and delays that turn up everywhere in foreign aid.

The reports of the Comptroller General, as I have said, are a complete rebuttal to anyone who parrots the argument that there is bound to be waste in a program so large as this one. If that is true, then someone had better get busy and start correcting them, because the reports of the Comptroller General do not relate to pennies and nickels of waste, but to hundreds of millions of dollars of waste.

Not long ago, there was brought to my attention just one small example of what I mean. It seems that 2 years ago, the United States entered into an agreement with the Government of the Cameroons that AID would sponsor an English language institute in that country to train teachers of English. I am further advised that for 2 years AID maintained in the Cameroons one man under contract at around $12,000 a year, a second man at around $10,000 a year, and a third man at around $8,000, not one of whom ever did one thing under the program.

It is my understanding that there was no building provided, and there were no students provided for this English language institute. Yet these Americans were paid their salaries, their families were sent to the Cameroons with them, an estimated $200,000 worth of teaching equipment, including television and acoustical tile, was purchased, sent and piled on the docks, where I understand it still sits, waiting for the Cameroons Government to designate some building where the program can be carried out.

That is the money of the American taxpayers. It is an example of why there is the fight for reform. It is not a singular instance. It exists with a resulting loss of hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

From what I have heard about this ill-fated English-language venture by AID, it was largely the idea of the United States that we should seek to create an English-speaking facility among the people of a formerly French colony. Yet the Government of the Cameroons was not sufficiently interested in the program to do more than acquiesce in it. A suggestion was made to me that the Cameroons Government wanted help from AID for a railroad it had planned, and that it was unwilling to go along with the English language program until AID agreed to help finance the railroad.

The information I have related about this particular project was given to me by responsible persons. I have not investigated it personally. But I would appreciate a report from the Agency as to the status of this particular project, including the sums spent on it and its progress to date.

CONFERENCE REPORT FAILS TO DEAL WITH FOREIGN AID PROBLEMS

There is nothing in this conference report that gives any hope that the problems I have outlined will be corrected. The sum made available is much more than the $3 billion generally reported in the press.

In addition to the $3 billion in new money there is also a reappropriation of funds that brings the total up to $3.26 billion.

But that is not all. There is in the law itself a section which permits the expenditure of up to $300 million in military aid out of Defense Department stocks, to be reimbursed out of the regular Defense Department budget. This means that instead of only $1 billion available for military aid, there is really $1.3 billion available. That is one reason why I said during the debate on the appropriation bill itself that new money for military aid should more appropriately be reduced to half a billion.

The $380 million figure for supporting assistance is also too high. It will permit a continuation of many of the worst foreign aid practices and failures. This item should be eliminated entirely from the foreign aid program.

One of my basic objections to this conference report is the flimsy and inadequate language relating to the Export-Import Bank guarantees for commercial transactions with Communist countries.

I was strong in my support of the Russian wheat deal when it was announced by President Kennedy as being an exclusively private deal between the Soviet Union and American businessmen. But the Export-Import Bank guarantee removed all the risk for American businessmen. Their risk is now guaranteed by an institution of the U.S. Government. I do not believe we should begin commercial transactions with the Soviet Union on that basis. Let us gain some experience and let the Soviet Union establish some kind of record with American businessmen before the Federal Government involves itself.

I am also strongly opposed to the principle of giving the discretion in this matter to the President. That is what the conference report in effect does. If anything, that is worse than saying nothing about it at all, or endorsing the plan outright.

Giving to the President the discretion to decide a matter that the Constitution places in the hands of Congress is exactly what is wrong with Congress. All the complaints about the inadequacies of Congress fail to recognize our real failure: It is our failure to decide the things the Constitution meant us to decide.

Article I of the Constitution places in Congress the authority to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations. Each time Congress abandons its authority because it fears to take the consequences of its actions and decisions, it weakens itself. It is such delegations of congressional authority to the executive branch as this one that have reduced Congress to wrangling over issues instead of deciding issues.

This language in the conference report alone is enough to justify my vote against it.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AID MUST CONTINUE

On February 14 of this year, nearly 1 year ago, I told the Senate:

> But there has to be an end to the pouring out of the largess of this Republic for the assistance of allies which are now as capable as we are of bearing their share of the burden, for there is not a NATO country which is not in a better economic condition now than it was at any time in modern history. Yet so long as Uncle Sam is willing to pay it out, apparently the European nations are willing to take it.
>
> That is why I indicate today that at this session of Congress, both within the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I am a member, and on the floor of the Senate, there will be a historic debate on the question of foreign policy, reviewing our foreign aid program and our alliances, including our south Asian alliances.

On June 13, when it became apparent that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was holding "quickie" hearings on foreign aid, I told the Senate:

> So I notified the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday that I reserved the right to speak each day, starting next week, on foreign aid issues, from the floor of the Senate, supplementing the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee. I did so because the procedure being followed in Senate committees makes it almost certain that Senators will not be able to use the time in committee to call the attention of the American people to what I consider to be some of the very unsound parts of the testimony already heard before the committee. * * *
>
> I do not know how the American people can be made to understand the foreign aid bill unless Senators discuss it, as I propose to discuss it, and answer here on the floor of the Senate, as the administration's case for foreign aid is developed in committee, the positions taken by the administration in respect to certain parts of the bill which I think are completely unsound.

On June 17, when the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] expressed some dissatisfaction with certain aspects of foreign aid, I told the Senate:

> I hope the administration is taking note of the increase in the number of voices speaking out against its foreign aid bill this year. I speak as a Democrat in opposition to the foreign aid bill.
>
> If the administration took a nosecount in this country it would find that a substantial majority of the taxpayers want a drastic reduction in the foreign aid bill and some major changes in the policy inherent in the foreign aid bill.

On July 2, I told the Senate:

> The time has come when the administration had better take another look at this foreign aid bill and stop talking of ramming it through Congress by whipping politicians into line. It should start talking to Congress on the basis of the merits we can agree are involved in the bill, even if the administration finds it necessary to modify its position.
>
> Reluctantly or not, it ought to modify its position, because the administration is not going to end the criticisms of this giveaway to nations which no longer deserve the giveaway, while we have the rising threat to the soundness of our own economy and enlarging pockets of economic underdevelopment in our own Nation.

I think it is fair to say that this year there was a historic debate and review of foreign policy and foreign aid. It is also fair to say that not only the House but also the Senate reflected, in their debates and in their votes on the bill, the general dissatisfaction of the American people with foreign aid. I think it is also fair to say that the administration was unable to ram its foreign aid bill down the throats of Congress. How much better it would have been if a modification had been made in foreign aid by the administration itself, instead of leaving it to Congress to do the job.

Now we are hearing that a high-level administration review of the program is underway. But I am disappointed that it seems to be concerned primarily with the procedures of foreign aid, rather than with its substance. I share entirely the opinion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] that Congress and the American people are demanding more than mere procedural changes.

When the AID authorization bill comes to Congress next year, I am going to undertake my own review of how AID has operated, and to what purpose, in each country. I do not expect to do anything like the job the Cooper amendment sought to have done; but the questions are going to be asked, even if the answers cannot always be ascertained independently from AID sources themselves.

OBJECTIONS TO HAVING CONGRESS DO ITS DUTY

Of course those of us who seek this kind of review, to find out what, if anything, U.S. aid is accomplishing, must expect to hear more of the constant attack upon Congress for doing its duty.

The press not only is attuned primarily to the executive branch; it is also largely ignorant of the American system of government and the role of Congress in that system, as its writings proved day by day. These days, most of the editorial attacks upon Congress come from writers who do not care what Congress does, so long as it does just what the administration tells it to do, and nothing more.

The editorial article in yesterday's Washington Post, describing a "Sick, Sick Congress" was such an attack. It is nothing more than a diatribe against Members who dare to fulfill their responsibilities under the Constitution.

It saddens me to read such editorials, and to find that journalists today who are parrots of the "line" from the executive branch, whatever it may be at a given time, care nothing of the merits of the case made in Congress. Ridicule and misrepresentation—not truth—are their only weapons. Many of these newspapers, and especially the Washington Post—have not dared to print in their pages the specific charges, facts, criticisms, and proposed reforms that have been made from this floor. They do not dare do so, because then they would embarrass the administrators in their own hometowns.

Fortunately, the American people understand our form of government better than do the journalists who cover the news from Washington. The voters know that it is up to Congress to decide, not only how much money is to be spent for any program, foreign or domestic, but also how it shall be spent, and for what purposes. We in Congress know we cannot evade our responsibility for the foreign aid program, even if we wanted to, because the American people hold us to the accounting.

The average voter is not interested in the parliamentary form of government which so enamours many editorial writers, and even some politicians. The average voter knows instinctively that the American form of government does not contemplate rule by executive decree, nor does it even contemplate a Congress that either supports the President or goes back to the people for a new election.

I know that many semisophisticates in American journalism do favor the British system of parliamentary government over our own. They try to superimpose the parliamentary system upon our own, by insisting that it is the President's program that is voted on every 4 years, and that it is voted up or down along with the man who is elected, and that every Member of Congress of the President's party is elected only to rubberstamp the President's program and vote it into law.

Unfortunately, not many of them realize that ours is not a parliamentary system. Ours is a system of checks and balances and a system of prescribed and delegated powers. Under our system the power to spend money lies with the Congress, not with the President or with the State Department or with the Defense Department, or even with the aid Agency.

The emotional attraction of the executive branch as the action branch is so overpowering to these journalists that, for them, Congress exists only insofar as it carries out the will of the Executive.

I do not expect that any of them will give so much as a flashing thought to the possibility that Congress might be right, or that the American people as reflected by Congress might be right in its opposition to the current aid program. As I have already pointed out, there have been 5 Presidents, 6 Secretaries of State, and upward of 12 administrators of foreign aid since the beginning of my service in the Senate. Many of us in Congress have been considering foreign aid legislation ever since foreign aid began after World War II. The duty of giving our foreign aid purpose and direction lies with us, not with the executive branch. The tradition and the tendency of the executive branch is to perpetuate, and, if possible, to enlarge upon, any program, not to guide it in any direction that might lead to its curtailment or termination.

If there is alarm in the executive branch and among the press that Congress has finally taken a hand in the foreign aid program, it is only because we have neglected to do so for so long. In 1963 Congress only began a task that it should have done every year since 1947. We still have a very long way to go. We must not be deterred by the vitriol of the ignorant press. If Congress does not continue in 1964 the review and revision of foreign aid which it began in 1963, it will be brought to account by a far more terrifying and final judge than an editorial writer; it will be brought to account by the American voters.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]—with whom I disagree in regard to the desirability of adoption of the conference report—deserves the sincere thanks of those of us who are in opposition to the report for his objectivity, his hard work, and his devotion to duty as the chairman of the Senate conferees.

I wish the record to show that he has my sincere thanks for the performance of his trust. I hope that next year he and I will find ourselves in closer agreement than we found ourselves this year in regard to the basic policy questions involved in foreign aid.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I understand that the Senator from Iowa desires some time.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has 1 hour remaining; the Senator from Oregon has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to reserve the 5 minutes still available to him?

Mr. MORSE. I reserve the time. I sought to find whether any other Senator wished to speak, but no Senator has asked me for time.

Mr. PASTORE. I am prepared to give the Senator from Iowa some of the time available to me. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. MILLER. I should like 10 or 15 minutes. The Senator from Iowa does not see that it is necessary for the Senator from Rhode Island to take away from his time. I appreciate his deference. unless it is necessary——

Mr. PASTORE. It is not necessary at all. The Senator from Rhode Island will not take more than 2 minutes to submit some charts, and then he will be ready to vote. The Senator from Iowa may have 15 minutes of the time available to me—not that I intend to be generous, but the Senator is welcome to it.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Rhode Island is always generous, whether he intends to be that way or not, and I thank him.

Mr. President, I am now finishing my first 3 years in the Senate. Since I came to the Senate six major votes have been taken on questions related to foreign aid—three on authorization bills and three on appropriation bills. I have voted for five of them. I voted for both the authorization and the appropriation bills in 1961 and in 1962, and I voted for the authorization bill this year. I like to think that the Record makes it quite clear that I am reflecting the attitude of the people of the State of Iowa, which has been favorable toward foreign aid programs.

But there comes a time when one feels that he must vote in protest against certain things that are taking place. I believe that the action of the House and the Senate this year in substantially cutting back on the authorization, and particularly on the appropriation amount, is responsive to the attitude of the people back home.

Almost a year ago the President of the United States asked the Congress for $4.9 billion for foreign aid. The request was contained in the President's budget message of last January. I find it a little difficult to understand why some authors and columnists talk about a $3.5 billion request. The original request was $4.9 billion, and it was contained in the budget message of the President of the United States last January.

Following that request, the Clay Committee report was issued. The Clay Committee was appointed by the President a year ago last November or possibly a year ago this month. On the basis of the Clay Committee's report, the President then revised his request downward from $4.9 billion to $4.5 billion. Since that time there have been further cutbacks. We are now dealing with a foreign aid appropriations bill of $3 billion, plus an authorization to continue $250 million of unspent funds previously appropriated. So if the bill passes, the foreign aid program will be $3,250 million, which is a very substantial difference from the $4.9 billion contained in the original budget request of the President of the United States.

Those figures must be considered in connection with the fact that approximately $7 billion of previously appropriated and obligated money is in the pipeline, so that if the Congress did not pass any foreign aid bill this year, there would still be a very large amount of the taxpayers' money going into the various foreign aid programs.

The action of Congress this year is responsive to a stepped-up feeling of unrest on the part of the people who are paying for the programs. I do not believe that it reflects in my State any more than in any other State the desire of the people to take a meat ax and cut off all foreign aid. But it does reflect growing impatience with reports that we see from the Comptroller General and elsewhere indicating that there have been inexcusable abuses of discretion on the part of some foreign aid administrators.

The only issue that I can see that is now before the Senate relates to the failure of the conference report to include a prohibition against the taxpayers of the United States having to underwrite the credit of the Soviet Union in connection with sales by our private exporters of wheat and other agricultural commodities, and other commodities, to Communist bloc nations. Most of us are in agreement as to the amount of money. Some think that the amount is low; some think it is high; but we are pretty well together on that question.

I recognize that the President of the United States, by and large, should have control over our foreign policy. That is his constitutional prerogative. But at the same time, it is not a blank check, because the people through their elected representatives in the legislative branch of the Government are putting up the money, and if they do not think that discretion is being used properly, they have no place to go except to the Congress to ask that safeguards and restrictions be written into the appropriation bill.

I have just returned from my State after spending a few days talking with my people. I have not found a one with whom I have talked—and I have talked with Democrats, Republicans, and independents alike—who thinks that the President of the United States ought to be given discretion to commit the taxpayers of my State to underwriting the credit of the Soviet Union. Some have very violent objections, but most are in favor of a wheat sale for gold or for hard currency. I was in favor of that method of handling the transaction from the very beginning. I am not impressed by suggestions being made that if the Export-Import Bank of the United States, which is supported by the American taxpayers, does not underwrite Soviet credit, the wheat deal is off.

I have already put into the Record on two previous occasions an article published in the Washington Evening Star following the defeat of the Mundt bill, which quoted Soviet spokesmen as saying that the defeat of the Mundt bill did not make any particular difference to them, because when and if they decide to buy our surplus wheat, they would probably buy for gold or hard dollars anyway. They probably will. Generally speaking, their attitude is that they are not interested in fattening the purses of our bankers—capitalists—by paying interest.

Then the answer comes back, "Perhaps that is the way they feel about it, and perhaps that is the way they will actually operate." But someone in the State Department has the idea that if the Congress writes in a prohibition singling out Communist-bloc nations for special treatment and saying, "You will not have our taxpayers underwriting your credit," this might cause some tensions between the United States and the Communist-bloc nations, and that the Soviet Union wants to be treated like other nations. Therefore, they would resent the writing in of a prohibition by the Congress of the United States such as the Mundt amendment and the Mundt bill sought to do, and such as the House itself wrote into the foreign aid appropriation bill originally.

I shall be the first to treat the Soviet Union like any other nation, when and if it deserves it, but I do not believe the people of the State of Iowa or the majority of the people of the United States have a feeling that the biggest deadbeat in the world ought to be treated like all the other nations of the world. I say "the biggest deadbeat in the world" because the record shows that. With more than $104 million of delinquencies in the accounts of the United Nations listed in the last report by the Comptroller General of the United Nations, over half of that amount comes under the Soviet Union.

For the American taxpayer to underwrite the credit and the good faith of the Soviet Union to pay up bills in connection with our export business, in the face of this, is unthinkable.

I regret very much that the President of the United States, whom I will support to the maximum permitted by my conscience, sent to the majority leader of the Senate a letter in which he indicated that he thought it would be in the national interest for the American taxpayers to do this. I believe it would be in the national interest for us not to do it.

Do we not have a little backbone? What will some of the other nations of the world, who pay their obligations to the United Nations, think if they see that we treat the Soviet Union's credit as being as good as theirs?

In connection with the idea of easing tensions, a revealing article entitled "Blank Check for Secretary Rusk," written by the distinguished columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, appeared in the Sioux City, Iowa, Journal for December 24, 1963. It sets forth informally some of the thinking going on with respect to the future course of our policy in dealing with Communist nations. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BLANK CHECK FOR SECRETARY RUSK

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

That blank check President Johnson gave Secretary Rusk to determine the course of foreign policy is going to be used to the hilt.

The State Department high command, making the most of this opportunity, is busily preparing a series of speeches and pronouncements designed, in effect, to commit the new President to far-reaching policies in virtually every key trouble spot in the world.

These policies include explosive portions of the late President Kennedy's "grand design" in foreign policy—which have never been spelled out in public. There have been guarded references to them, but that's all.

Last week's significant address by Roger Hilsman, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs, enunciating a so-called open door attitude toward Red China if it discards venomous hatreds against the United States was the first move in this State Department plan.

Along the same line as Hilsman's revealing declaration, other top State Department officials will proclaim equally important stands regarding Russia, its eastern European satellites, Asia, the Middle East, Africa and France.

The next of these tentatively slated momentous speeches will be made by Under Secretary Averill Harriman on a crucial shift in policy toward the Soviet bloc.

The new course Harriman will launch will be summed up as follows: "The ultimate U.S. aim is to see that these nations of Eastern Europe eventually become members of the free community of nations by a process of peaceful evolution."

Harriman has become Rusk's closest adviser on European affairs. The principal progenitor of the above concept, in which Harriman heartily concurs, is Dr. Walt Rostow, head of the State Department policy planning council and author of a series of "position papers" approved by the National Security Council in the Kennedy administration.

These closely guarded foreign policy blueprints continue unchanged and in full force in the new Johnson administration.

Like Assistant Secretary Hilsman's open door statement regarding Red China, Under Secretary Harriman's address next month on policy toward the Iron Curtain satellites will vigorously advocate a realistic view.

Presumably such a view will include East Germany which the United States does not recognize.

The key highlights of this realistic view are:

"The United States will refrain from encouraging or supporting uprisings or strikes that exert pressure against Communist regimes."

"Widening of diplomatic, cultural and trade relations and contacts with Eastern European countries."

The controlling position paper, on which the forthcoming speech will be based, lays down a cautious policy for coping with the sensitive problem of possible eruptions behind the Iron Curtain. The proposed course is similar to that followed by the Eisenhower administration during the Hungarian revolt.

"If revolt breaks out in East Germany or any other satellite," states the position paper, "we should bear in mind that our grand design is to build a community of free nations which will expand by their inner strength and attractive power when combined with the assertion of increasingly nationalistic trends within the Communist bloc. We do not wish to jeopardize this design by allowing Eastern Europe to become a battleground between ourselves and the U.S.S.R., unless we are attacked.

"Accordingly: If turbulence erupts in the area, we should maintain this posture, and urge our allies to do the same, meanwhile exerting all the influence we can muster during such crisis to yield less repressive and more nationalistic regimes as the outcome.

"We should refrain from encouraging or supporting armed uprisings, or strikes that exert pressure against Communist regimes. Should a national Communist regime be established in any of these countries, we should make a maximum effort short of military activity to permit its survival."

Concerning widening ties and contacts of every kind with the Soviet bloc, the "position paper" declares:

"Such contacts will bring home in some way, however muted, the message that history does not inevitably decree that Moscow will forever dominate their lives. That message may encourage these people to press their governments, insofar as they safely can, for gradual internal liberation and for steps toward greater national independence.

"While we cannot be expected to publicly indorse or applaud these Communist governments, there may be occasions when it will be in our longrun interest to mute our criticism and to refrain from official attacks. This balance of interest is a delicate one, but it must be made.

"We should encourage and assist Western European nations to exploit tendencies toward closer relations with the West as they appear among the Eastern Europeans, and should, so far as practicable, endeavor or develop mutually supporting programs of increasing diplomatic, cultural and trade relations with these Communist regimes."

The position paper not only flatly advises expanded trade and other relations between West and East Germany, but also between the United States and East Germany.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the sum and substance of the views presented by Mr. Allen and Mr. Scott is that some of the thinking about our future operations and policy with respect to the Soviet Union and other Communist nations is that we are to continue an accommodation policy of dealing with them; that we are not going to act, but react; that we are going to probe for peace; that we are not going to do anything, such as to stand up for our rights or evidence our firmness, which might cause any tensions with the Soviet Union.

I do not deny the good faith and conscientiousness of those who favor this policy, but I believe it is shortsighted. I believe it is wrong. I believe it will not be effective. The experts with whom I have consulted, whose views I have read about Communist philosophy and Communist tactics and strategy, cause me to be convinced that Communist reaction to this type of policy will not be to welcome the warm clasp of friendship. They will look upon it as an indication of weakness and decay on the part of the United States and its people.

While Mr. Khrushchev may smile today, instead of thumping the table at the United Nations with his shoe, let us be sure that we remember what happened a little more than a year ago in Cuba, when stealthily and secretly—accompanied by a lie by Mr. Gromyko to the face of the President of the United States—intermediate range ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads were moved into Cuba. They were not moved there for any purpose other than to get at the United States.

The leopard does not change his spots in a year. It may be that his spots will change some day. I hope and pray that this will happen. But I do not believe that our attitude of easing tensions to the extent of treating the Soviet Union the same as other nations, which are peace loving and freedom loving, which pay their debts before the United Nations, is the way to achieve this result.

For this reason, with reluctance I shall cast a protest vote against the foreign aid appropriation bill conference report today.

I recognize that the Senate has been pretty much of a rubber stamp for the executive branch of the Government. I have had much to say on that subject on previous occasions. It is all well to assert, "We are an independent branch of Government," but I do not judge by words. I judge by action; and the actions and the record show that the Senate has been a rubber stamp for the executive branch of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me another 2 minutes?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Since President Johnson has indicated he does not want this prohibition in the bill, and since he believes it will be in the national interest for the Export-Import Bank to treat the Soviet Union like all other countries, that is exactly what the Senate is going to deliver to him. I hope the President will not use this discretion, although he has indicated he will.

I hope that I am mistaken. I hope that the policy will work, but I do not believe it will. The only policy which has worked so far has been a policy of firmness.

When President Kennedy used a firm policy for a short time in respect to Cuba, and put a blockade on Cuba, it worked. When President Kennedy sent troops into Berlin, it worked.

Every other time, when we have failed to use a policy of firmness, it has not worked.

I believe this will be a significant action on the part of the Congress—failing to write in a prohibition to prevent the American taxpayers from having to underwrite the credit of the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, I suggest that refusing to write in such prohibition will be a gesture in futility in any event, because I believe when the record is written the Soviet Union probably will pay hard dollars or gold for surplus commodities, and so the credit of the Export-Import Bank will not be used anyhow.

I hope that there will not be a repetition of this situation. It is too bad that the executive branch of the Government has seen fit to put pressure on the legislative branch to grant this discretionary authority, because I believe the majority of the people of the United States do not want to treat the Soviet Union the same as other countries.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his gracious yielding to me of his time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, following my remarks, an article from the New York Times of December 19 entitled "United States To Challenge Soviet Over Dues."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UNITED STATES TO CHALLENGE SOVIET OVER DUES—WILL INSIST U.N. SUSPEND RIGHT TO VOTE UNLESS THEY ARE PAID, STEVENSON SAYS

(By Thomas J. Hamilton)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., December 18.—Adlai E. Stevenson indicated today that the United States would insist upon suspending the Soviet Union's right to vote in the General Assembly if Moscow did not pay its overdue assessments to the United Nations.

The U.S. representative said he hoped the Soviet Union, which has refused to pay its assessments for the United Nations Congo and Middle Eastern forces, would pay.

Mr. Stevenson declared that the future of the United Nations as an action agency was threatened by the refusal of the Soviet Union and other members to pay their assessments for the two forces.

The Soviet Union now owes $36,984,971 on the Congo force and $15,638,166 on the Middle Eastern force. It confirmed yesterday its refusal to pay its share of certain other United Nations activities, which it terms illegal.

LIABILITY TO ARISE SOON

On January 1, therefore, the Soviet Union will become liable to action under article 19 of the Charter, which provides that a member owing the equivalent of 2 years' contributions "shall have no vote in the General Assembly."

"Rigid adherence to the law, to the Charter, is essential to the Charter's preservation," Mr. Stevenson said. "Once you begin to contaminate or erode or interpret the Charter too flexibly, you very soon will have no sustaining body of legal structure to support the United Nations."

A British source commented today that enforcement of article 19 should be automatic, but said "We hope it will never have to be used."

France, Nationalist China, and a number of other members are in arrears on assessments for either the Congo or the Middle Eastern force or both. Most of them, including France, will not become liable to the 2-year rule before 1965.

Dr. Carlos Sosa Rodriguez, President of the 18th General Assembly, declared at a news conference that the decision whether to enforce the delinquency provision involved political as well as legal issues.

Unless a special session is held, the Soviet Union's liability to the 2-year rule cannot become a practical issue until the 1964 session of the Assembly begins next September. Dr. Sosa declined to say how he would rule if he were elected President of a special session.

RULING AVOIDED EARLIER

Dr. Sosa added that there were no precedents in the matter, since Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, President of the special session held last spring, did not make a ruling on the right to vote of Haiti, which had come under the 2-year rule.

Mr. Zafrulla Khan announced that he would enforce the rule under certain circumstances, but Haiti paid up before he did so.

Both Dr. Sosa and Mr. Stevenson expressed satisfaction with the reduction of tension that became evident during the 1963 session of the Assembly, which ended last night.

The Assembly President said the session had retained the "spirit of understanding and compromise" produced by the treaty prohibiting all except underground nuclear tests.

In this connection, he called attention to the unanimous votes on resolutions regarding disarmament and outer space.

SMALL POWERS IN REVOLT

Dr. Sosa said the small powers had revolted against the great powers by adopting resolutions calling for the expansion of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

The great powers either voted against or abstained on the resolutions, which will result in amendments to the charter if the great powers give their consent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has been a hard worker, in his usual way, in this field. I know there are some things he would like to have cleared up for the sake of the legislative history.

I wish to join the Senator in asking this question: I note that the conference committee has made available to the Agency for International Development a total of $177 million in the contingency fund, $50 million in new authority and $127 million in carryover.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. This is actually $17 million more than the $160 million contained in the authorization bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So the additional amount is actually only $17 million?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct; over and above the original amount.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it the intention of the conferees that this contingency fund shall be available to meet unforeseen or unascertained needs and other deficiencies in the present fiscal year?

Mr. PASTORE. The answer is in the affirmative. We felt that the President and the Administrator of AID should have this needed flexibility.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because, of course, we have gone for several months.

Also, to make legislative history, is it the intention of the conferees that this fund shall be available to meet vital U.S. commitments and requirements, should this be necessary in connection with the program?

Mr. PASTORE. Certainly. Under the authority of the Foreign Assistance Act, the contingency fund may be used to meet the needs of the program—through any of the categories—such as supporting assistance, development grants, and development loans—whenever necessary and important to the national interest.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall vote in favor of the conference report. I came here for this purpose. I shall vote to accept the agreement which has been made as a substitute for amendment No. 20, the so-called Export-Import Bank guarantee. The fundamental reason for bipartisanship in foreign policy is that when we make a national or international agreement, after full and fair debate, the dignity of the United States is at stake. I think it is shortchanging our country and derogating our own dignity, importance, and strength in the world to cut off a little piece of the authority to negotiate, especially when it is an established commercial type of guaranteed loan, 18 months in this case, such as that proposed by the amendment which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] sponsored.

I think this is a fair settlement. We all understand that the national interest of the United States is at stake. It is for that very reason, in my judgment, that the settlement should be approved and we should support what the conference committee has done.

To my mind, it is essential that we close our ranks after full debate, reserving every right to criticize, initiate new ideas, and fight for what one thinks should be done; but when we finally close ranks, we should stop niggling about details and vote for the conference report.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a comparative statement of appropriations for 1963, estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1964, and the conference amounts agreed to on the foreign aid and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1964.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1963, and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1964

TITLE I—FOREIGN AID (MUTUAL SECURITY)

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
Development grants	$225,000,000	[1] $257,000,000	$150,000,000	$175,000,000	$155,000,000
American schools and hospitals abroad	----------	[2] 20,000,000	14,300,000	14,300,000	14,300,000
American hospitals abroad (special foreign currency program)	2,800,000	[2] 2,000,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
Investment guarantees	30,000,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
International organizations and programs	148,900,000	[3] 136,050,000	100,000,000	130,903,000	116,000,000
Supporting assistance	395,000,000	[4] 435,000,000	300,000,000	380,000,000	330,000,000
Contingency fund	250,000,000	[5] 300,000,000	50,000,000	32,900,000	50,000,000
Inter-American social and economic cooperation program	----------	[2] 200,000,000	100,000,000	180,000,000	135,000,000
Alliance for Progress, development loans	425,000,000	----------	350,000,000	425,000,000	375,000,000
Alliance for Progress, development grants	100,000,000	----------	80,000,000	100,000,000	80,000,000
Alliance for Progress	----------	[6] 650,000,000	----------	----------	----------
Development loans	975,000,000	[7] 1,060,000,000	600,000,000	800,000,000	687,300,000
Administrative expenses, AID	[8] 49,500,000	57,250,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
Administrative expenses, State	[8] 2,700,000	3,025,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
Subtotal, economic assistance	2,603,900,000	3,120,325,000	1,801,700,000	2,295,503,000	2,000,000,000
MILITARY ASSISTANCE					
Military assistance	1,325,000,000	[9] 1,405,000,000	1,000,000,000	977,700,000	1,000,000,000
Limitation on administrative expenses	[8] *(24,500,000)*	*(25,000,000)*	*(24,000,000)*	*(24,000,000)*	*(24,000,000)*
Total, title I, foreign aid (mutual security)	3,928,900,000	[10] 4,525,325,000	[10] 2,801,700,000	[10] 3,299,503,000	[11] 3,000,000,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1963, and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1964—Continued

TITLE II—FOREIGN AID (OTHER)

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Peace Corps	$59,000,000	$108,000,000	$89,000,000	$98,100,000	$92,100,000
Reappropriation		*(3,900,000)*	*(3,900,000)*	*(3,900,000)*	*(3,900,000)*
Limitation on administrative expense	[12] *(16,500,000)*	*(20,500,000)*	*(19,500,000)*	*(20,300,000)*	*(19,900,000)*
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS					
Ryukyu Islands, Army, administration	8,954,150	14,366,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
Assistance to refugees in the United States	70,110,000	70,000,000	56,000,000	39,717,137	39,717,137
Reappropriation			*(14,082,863)*	*(14,082,863)*	*(14,082,863)*
DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
Contributions to International Organizations		[13] 18,374,000	18,374.000	18,374,000	18,374,000
Migration and refuge assistance	14,947,000	[14] 10,683,000	10,550,000	10,550,000	10,550,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Investment in Inter-American Development Bank	60,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
Subscription to the International Development Association	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000
Loans to the International Monetary Fund	2,000,000,000				
Total, title II, foreign aid (other)	2,274,667,150	333,079,000	295,580,000	288,397,137	282,397,137

TITLE III—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
Limitation on operating expenses	*($1,295,000,000)*	[15] *($1,314,366,000)*	*($1,314,366,000)*	*($1,314,366,000)*	*($1,314,366,000)*
Limitation on administrative expenses	*(3,122,550)*	*(3,500,000)*	*(3,500,000)*	*(3,500,000)*	*(3,500,000)*
Total, title III, Export-Import Bank	*(1,298,122,550)*	*(1,317,866,000)*	*(1,317,866,000)*	*(1,317,866,000)*	*(1,317,866,000)*

TITLE IV—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
Senate:					
Payment to widow of deceased Senator				$22,500	$22,500
Contingent expenses of the Senate:					
Miscellaneous items, 1963				190,000	190,000
Miscellaneous items, 1964				215,000	215,000
Stationery (revolving fund)				60,600	60,600
Total, Senate				488,100	488,100
House of Representatives:					
Payments to widows of deceased Members			$67,500	67,500	67,500
Contingent expenses of the House:					
Miscellaneous items		[16] $925,000	925,000	925,000	925,000
Reporting hearings		[16] 48,000	48,000	48,000	48,000
Special and select committees		[16] 768,500	665,500	665,500	665,500
Telegraph and telephone		[16] 515,000	515,000	515,000	515,000
Stationery (revolving fund)		[16] 523,200	523,200	523,200	523,200
Postage stamps		[16] 91,420	91,420	91,420	91,420
JOINT ITEMS					
Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy		[16] 140,460			
Education of pages		[16] 2,655	2,655	2,655	2,655
Total, House of Representatives		3,014,235	2,838,275	2,838,275	2,838,275
Total, title IV, legislative branch		3,014,235	2,838,275	3,326,375	3,326,375

TITLE V—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSIONS					
New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission		$150,000		$150,000	

TITLE VI—CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS					
Federal		[16] $12,982,095	$12,982,095	$12,982,095	$12,982,095
District of Columbia		[16] *(22,238)*	*(22,238)*	*(22,238)*	*(22,238)*
Grand total, all titles of the bill	$6,203,567,150	4,874,550,330	3,113,100,370	3,578,058,607	3,298,705,607

[1] Reflects reduction of $18,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 101.
[2] Contained in H. Doc. 101.
[3] Reflects reduction of $45,200,000 contained in H. Doc. 101.
[4] Contains increase of $38,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 101.
[5] Reflects reduction of $100,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 101.
[6] Reflects reduction of $50,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 101.
[7] Reflects reduction of $188,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 101.
[8] Excludes Pay Act costs, derived by transfer from "Economic assistance" and "Military assistance" appropriations.
[9] Reflects reduction of $75,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 101.
[10] In addition, $209,000,000 in unobligated balances.
[11] In addition, unobligated balances now estimated at $250,000,000.
[12] Excludes Pay Act costs derived by transfer from "Peace Corps" appropriation.
[13] Contained in H. Doc. 174.
[14] Reflects reduction of $1,117,000 contained in H. Doc. 83.
[15] No specific limitation proposed, amount shown is proposed program.
[16] Contained in H. Doc. 182.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for half a minute?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that there is being put in the Record action not only on this bill, but action of the Congress on other appropriation bills, in relation to the amounts recommended by the budget.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; we intend to do so at the conclusion of action on the foreign aid bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How much did this Congress, which has been so criticized about spending, appropriate under the budget recommended by the President of the United States?

Mr. PASTORE. More than $6 billion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. More than $6 billion under the budget recommendation?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know that all members of the various subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee feel that, even though we were pressed for time because the House did not act as quickly as we thought it should have acted on appropriation bills, we probably have ended up with as good a fiscal year as any.

Mr. PASTORE. That is a significant observation by the Senator from Washington. The Senator from Washington is chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, which had before it a budget estimate of over $14 billion. His committee ended with a cut of $1,434,069,950. That was a Herculean task.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. From this side of the aisle, I support the conference report. It was arrived at with a great deal of thought and care. The compromise, while not as good as we would like to see from the Senate side, on the whole is as satisfactory as we can get. I congratulate the Senator from Rhode Island, who conducted the negotiations on the part of the Senate. I hope that we on this side helped to arrive at a bill that was satisfactory.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank my neighbor from the great State of Massachusetts. It is always a pleasure and privilege to work with him. While we did not attain all of our goals, I think the result is reasonably satisfactory.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand the problem with respect to the contingency fund has been satisfactorily worked out in the conference report.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as long as encomiums are being uttered in the Chamber, I want to add my own. I want to congratulate the Senator from Rhode Island. It is true that he had bipartisan support in the exertions which have occupied most of the past several weeks on the floor and in the long series of conferences. The Senator from Rhode Island rendered a great service. He acted not as a partisan, but as an American. I was with him on a number of occasions. I say, to him, "Well done."

SPEECH BY SENATOR JAVITS BEFORE SENATE OF THE REPUBLIC OF MEXICO

Mr. KUCHEL. On another subject, a few days ago, one of our colleagues, the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], had the unique privilege of speaking to the Members of the Senate of the Republic of Mexico. The Senator from New York spoke to that Senate, in the public service, both in Spanish and in English.

Senators know that over the years, as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Conference of Parliamentarians, our able colleague has been most assiduous in endeavoring to develop a new base by which countries in the Western Hemisphere might be given assistance from the private sector of the Nation's economies as well as from the Alliance for Progress. Our colleague discussed some of the thoughts that have been developing from labors in the NATO Conference.

I ask unanimous consent that portions of the speech which he delivered be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts From Remarks of U.S. Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, New York, Before the Senate of the Republic of Mexico, December 26, 1963

Me da mucho gusto el hacer uso de la palabra ante este honorable Senado de una Republica hermana. [It gives me much pleasure to address this Honorable Senate of a sister Republic.]

Traigo para todos ustedes los mas cordiales saludos de mis colegas del Senado de los Estados Unidos. [I bring to all of you the most cordial salutations of my colleagues of the U.S. Senate.]

Puesto que es necesario que mis palabras sean muy exactas, les pido permiso de hablarles en mi propia lengua. [Since it is necessary that my words be very exact, I ask your permission to speak in my native tongue.]

Two points stand out as the scene of Mexican-United States relations is surveyed. Both are based on an unparalleled era of good feeling and mutual confidence in the stability and good will of each country to the other. I feel it just to say that the good neighbor policy between the United States and Latin America is now to be succeeded by the good partner policy.

First, that Mexico is among the first of the Latin American Republics to look outward to the other American Republics and to be ready to help them with technical assistance, financial investment and similar leadership joining with the United States in association to give greater assurance of success to the Alliance for Progress.

Second, that Mexico has discovered the secret of stable democratic government to be in the economic enfranchisement of the people which through the freedom of choice of training, occupation, and location made possible by private enterprise system can realize all the practical advantages which socialism has promised while retaining free institutions for the people.

There are sharp challenges ahead and coming days may be darker than those we have already seen in the threats to the freedom of the individual republics of the Americas from the extreme left and extreme right, but we can also discern the mountaintop in the sun of peace, stability, and well-being in freedom and the road which leads to it—that road is the enhanced spirit of self-help and mutual cooperation outside the North American Continent which, under the leadership of Mexico and other similarly minded American States, will give a new meaning to the Pan American and Inter-American systems and much more auspicious hope for the success of the Americas. An extraordinary beginning is being made in the North American Free Trade Association and in the Central American common market. In company with Senator Hubert Humphrey of the United States and with associates of the leaders of private enterprise in the United States and Europe, and under the auspices of the NATO Parliamentarian Conference, I am preparing a new private enterprise investment company initiative known as ADELA (Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America) to work in selected Latin American countries in association with its private enterprises, and in association with the Inter-American Development Bank to finance and render technical assistance to middle level manufacturing, distributing and service enterprises both industrial and agricultural but not in the extractive industries. This investment company is to be established in Paris on January 10 and 11 next, with the interested consultations of high officials of the OECD and the OAS. I expect Mexican private enterprise to be an important investor in this project.

It is these initiatives which will enable the Latin American Republics to recognize the mutual economic and social interdependence of each other and mark a new high point in the expectations for success of the Americas.

As we hail this auspicious outlook for Mexican-United States relations, we are deeply gratified by the conclusion of the Chamizal Treaty—for the ratification of which I had the honor to vote in the U.S. Senate only last week—an outstanding tribute to the high ideals and diplomatic achievements of President Lopez Mateos and his Ministers and the Congress of the Republic, as it is to our beloved and tragically deceased President Kennedy, to President Johnson, and to our gifted Ambassador Thomas Mann, who has just been called home for such important duties in Latin American affairs.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from California for his complimentary remarks. It is always a pleasure and a privilege to work with him.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] is in his State and could not be present for today's session. He had prepared a statement on the conference report, as a member of the House-Senate conference committee on the foreign aid appropriations bill.

I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Mundt

As the author of the original proposal (S. 2310) to forbid the extension of credit guarantees to Russia and the Communist bloc countries and as one of the members of the Senate conferees, I want to commend the entire conference committee on the effective compromise provisions which we were able to develop to discourage the granting of public American credit to the Communist dictators.

Special credit is, of course, due the House Members of the conference committee and the House itself in stubbornly refusing for a long time to yield from the position taken by the House in voting to attach the original language of S. 2310, which was known in the other proposal as the Mundt-Findley amendment to the foreign aid appropriation bill.

On a series of separate rollcalls the Members of the House voted to insist upon the straight-out prohibition carried in the language of S. 2310 and the tenacity of the House conferees, supported by the House membership, finally made it clear to the White House and the Democratic leadership of both Houses that if the foreign aid appropriations bill were to be enacted at all it would have to contain some form of prohibition disapproving the proposal to grant "credit card privileges" to the Communists under arrangements whereby our American taxpayers have to make good the bad debts and pay the bad bills of the Communists after they have received the products purchased with dollars made available to them through the American Export-Import Bank.

While I, of course, continue to prefer the original language of S. 2310 which constituted an outright congressional prohibition against the use of American public credit to initiate a new program of economic assistance for Communist countries I must say I am pleased with the final outcome of the congressional proposal to discourage—if we could not entirely deny—the proposed policy of extending American economic assistance to both sides of the cold war at the same time. Such a self-defeating American foreign aid program, in my opinion, can benefit nobody but the Communists and can ultimately destroy whatever benefits the free side of the cold war has derived from the more than $100 billion which our American taxpayers have already expended to support our friends, our allies, and the neutral nations overseas. The compromise language which we finally developed in the conference report and which has been adopted by the House is a significant and important policy recommendation by Congress and a firm expression of congressional intent. It contains the same specific prohibition against extension and guarantees of credit to the Communist nations contained in S. 2310 but it provides an escape clause to be used by the President of the United States only—and I repeat only—when he himself finds in the case of each proposed credit transaction that he believes it to be in the national interest of the United States to guarantee the good credit, the good faith, and the good intentions of the Communist dictators whose menace to peace and threats to freedom are considered by the President and the Congress so great that in this session half of the money we have appropriated is for the purpose of protecting the free world against further Communist encroachments and the expansion and development of Communist military and economic imperialism. In view of the determined opposition of the White House to have this heavy and direct responsibility fastened upon the President under the report terms written by the conference committee I think it has vast significance that the opposition to extending public credit to Communist dictators was so strong that in the House during its long series of votes on the subject the Democratic leadership did not even dare make an attempt to delete entirely this significant prohibition which is now included in the conference report presently before the Senate.

In view of the foregoing factors and facts I dare to hope that President Johnson will seldom if ever find it in our national interest to jeopardize the money of the American taxpayers for the purpose of strengthening the muscle and increasing and expanding the capacity of our Communist offensive adversaries and so certify such findings from both Houses of Congress as provided by the compromise version of the so-called Mundt-Findley amendment in the legislation now before us.

I am confident there are many in Congress and throughout the country—and I include myself among them—who will want to scrutinize each such transaction most intently and carefully if it should actually eventuate and be authorized. I am also confident that if this administration ventures very far or very often into the self-defeating policy of using American credit to support and sustain global communism it will find it will be increasingly difficult if not impossible to induce the Congress ever again to appropriate large scale funds for foreign aid and assistance to countries whose very need for such assistance will have been created and increased by our short-sighted policy of strengthening the power of Communists to imperil and undermine our friends in foreign lands who live outside the Communist complex.

Thus, I am well satisfied with the policy declaration and the specific prohibition in this matter contained in the conference report and by the work accomplished by the House-Senate conference committee in writing into this foreign aid appropriations bill a clear-cut statement of public policy and a prohibition which can be voided only by specific Presidential action to be publicly reported in each case within 30 days to both Houses of Congress.

While it has taken nearly 30 days and a total of seven separate rollcalls—three in the Senate and four in the House—to accomplish the result, I feel that Congress has now established a policy which I believe the administration will find much more productive and constructive to follow as compared with the results of utilizing its hard won and closely confined escape clause to flaunt and violate the intent and purpose of Congress. In fact, I very much hope that in view of the expressed opposition of Congress as clearly recorded in the compromise version of the original language of S. 310, that this ill-fated "Operation Communist Credit Card" will seldom if ever take place.

Thus, as a member of the conference committee which developed this so-called compromise amendment, I wish to be recorded as favoring the approval of this conference report. Since this prohibition was lacking in the foreign aid appropriations bill at the time it passed the Senate I then voted against the foreign aid appropriations bill. Since we have now added this important protection, I would vote "yes" on the final rollcall if I were able to be present for that vote and I am hopeful that a pair can be arranged showing my position as voting in favor of final passage of the foreign aid appropriations bill of 1963 as now amended by the language of the conference committee report.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Oregon has 5 minutes remaining. I am ready to yield back my time, if he is ready to do so.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall yield back my time, except for the time required to place various items in the Record.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following items be inserted in the Record immediately following my speech earlier today. It has been necessary, because of the danger under which the correspondents who wrote these letters live in the areas involved, that the letters be placed in the Record without their names being printed.

First is a letter from an American in the Dominican Republic calling attention to the shocking conditions that exist under the regime of the Dominican Republic that the United States so unfortunately recognized.

Mr. President, one need only read letters such as these, which I ask to have printed in the Record, to realize how important it is that there be a thorough review of the American military and economic aid so far as the Dominican Republic is concerned. So long as the conditions portrayed in these letters prevail in the Dominican Republic under the dictatorship now controlling that unfortunate land, which the U.S. Government has recognized, no military or economic aid from the United States to the Dominican Republic can possibly be justified on moral grounds, or in keeping with our professings about our desire to establish freedom in Latin America, rather than dictatorships.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

December 12, 1963.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington.

Dear Senator Morse: I had the pleasure to write you about 2 months ago from the Dominican Republic, where I lived 2 years. You may remember I routed the letter to you inside another letter, so that the envelope wouldn't be seen. This is because you are very unpopular with the new dictatorship there, but let me assure you, with the people, because of your strong stand, you are a savior, the representation of an America at long last decided against dictatorship for the "lesser breeds"—your constituents, so far off, have in their wisdom, also given a great hope to a most unfortunate nation of three and a half million: as an American citizen who also loves the Dominican Republic, I can only ask, that you will continue in your good work.

If you are going through with your plan to visit the Inter-American University in San German, Puerto Rico, I urge you Senator, to set aside a little time to speak privately to some of the Dominican students there. Should that great Abraham Lincoln of the Caribbean, Juan Bosch, be present, I don't think the boys will be inhibited. Bosch is an old shoe, his majesty being a purely natural thing with him.

Senator Morse, in the almost 2 months I spent in the Dominican Republic after the new dictatorship took over from Juan Bosch, I have seen with my own eyes thousands of people, on many occasions, tear- and nausea-gassed by the police. Students kicked and beaten, for trying to march or demonstrate, and in one case I watched a night high school student die, with a bullet hole through his abdomen. The police let him bleed for an hour and three-quarters before taking him to a hospital. A girl of 22 with three children, with her arms both broken and teeth knocked out by police. Among my own personal circle, I can count beatings, many jailings, exiles, two broken arms, an official stabbing, and so on. The "civilian junta" or triumvirate, as it is called in the now controlled news, is a military dictatorship, trying to impose control through terror.

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter I have written to President Johnson.

If my 2 years of study of the Dominican Republic can be of any service to you, Senator, then I would like the opportunity to speak to you, whether for a year or 5 minutes. Please let me know any time, any place—long or short duration.

With all best wishes,

——— ———.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter which the writer of the previous letter sent to the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 12, 1963.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last month I returned to the United States after 2 years in the Dominican Republic. In the course of beginning a business there, and teaching in my own school, I learned the Dominican Republic from one end to the other. I know well enough hundreds or perhaps thousands of people, from little workers and little farmers, to President Bosch, one of the members of the new triumvirate dictatorship (Manuel Enrique Tavares Espaillat) also students, great rich—all of them.

I should like to make to you, five points. Because I love the Dominican Republic, and of course our country: I don't want to see either of them go wrong.

1. Under the government of Juan Bosch, there was complete freedom of movement, opinion, publication, expression. Law was enforced, and there was no cause for, nor interest in, rebellion.

2. The leftover Trujillo military, in combination with the great hereditary rich, seized power on September 25, 1963, and have enforced a new dictatorship by expulsion, imprisonment, death, torture, terror.

3. Pacific resistance (petitions, demonstrations, etc.) by the people has failed. Approximately in the middle of November, violence began, and it appears that now on about 11 fronts in the country there is fighting in the mountains and countryside. The triumvirate claims this is a Communist movement. Naturally, they must, to excuse their suppression of it. One of the leaders on one of the fronts is "Manolo" Tavarez, leader of leftist "14th of June" party. It is to be noted that the new government did not outlaw "14th of June" until after the conflict began.

4. But the resistance is in truth universal, and is being joined by upper and middle class and urban youth of the lower class, none of whom are Communist, but, it is fairer to say, represent all shades of political opinion. The extremes of the fighters might be expressed as follows:

(a) Right: We want democracy. Since it has been taken away from us, and kept away from us by force and violence, we must fight to get it back.

(b) Left: We want social justice. Since the oligarchic and military classes have again prevented us from reaching social justice, as they have, ever since Columbus, we must, at long last, destroy these classes by violence, since they will not submit to legal reform.

5. What should the United States do? Reaffirm, strongly, present policy, but declare unequivocally, which it has not yet done, that we will not ever recognize or help the present dictatorial regime. Then hope that as it collapses, as it must, democracy will be reinstated by some formula, which, though weak, can be swiftly aided by us, if only by recognition.

We have, for the first time there, now, a great reservoir of good will, among the people, for not recognizing the new dictatorship, and we should not lose it.

It should be noted that news from the Dominican Republic is at a virtual standstill. I know that when the new dictatorship began, I became correspondent there for UPI, and Rafael Herrera, director of the newspaper Listin Diario became correspondent of Associated Press. We both sent out the news in abundance, and both got into disgrace with both the triumvirate and also El Caribe the government newspaper now, which is AP's and UPI's biggest customer there. We were both silenced, and while I read little or nothing of the Republic in our papers here, I know that a great deal is going on in that unhappy country now.

I should like to express my extreme willingness to come to Washington and talk with anyone who feels that I might contribute some useful information, at any time.

And at this sad time * * * etc.

——— ———.

Mr. MORSE. I ask that the names of all the writers of the letters be deleted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that another letter, which I have received from a Peace Corps student from my State, who is spending some time in the Dominican Republic, be printed in the RECORD at this point, with the writer's name deleted.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Subcommittee on Latin America, Washington, D.C., United States of America.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Both as a Peace Corps volunteer in Latin America, and as an Oregonian (Portland), I have a personal stake in your actions and opinions. Although because of my present situation, it must be off the record, I want to tell you that I cheer your stand on nonrecognition of the de facto government here in the Dominican Republic.

This toboggan run of takeovers must cease sometime, and now is an opportune time to make our stand. The Alliance for Progress is a long way off from achieving its objectives in Latin America, and these objectives or any other significant improvement will never be realized as long as the masses do not have hope.

Last December hope had a beginning—for the first time in their lives, the campesinos' voice had some meaning, and their votes put a man in office. But the recent "golpe de estado" not only made a mockery of that democratic election, it also proved once again that the campesino does not count, that the wealth and power groups will run the country the way they want to.

We Peace Corps volunteers are sick at heart with this turn of events, and are solidly behind your stand. I sincerely hope that we never recognize this current regime or any stooge that they substitute. Representative and responsible government must succeed, or we must resign ourselves to handout aid programs and forget our democratic ideals.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the next letter written to me comes from a young man from Oregon, who has spent 2 years with the Peace Corps stationed in Colombia, South America. The writer indicates some of the problems which confront us in the Alliance for Progress program, and shows the need for a thorough review of the foreign aid program.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 16, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As I near completion of my 2-year service in the Peace Corps I am taking the liberty of sharing with you a few of my experiences which, as chairman of the Senate Latin Affairs Committee I hope you will find to be of some interest.

For the past year and a half I have been involved in a job termed community development. This may best be defined as a process whereby unorganized communities recognize, examine, and resolve their problems through unified action. My job has been that of "promoter" or "community organizer" which has involved not only work with the people at the village level, but also as a mediator between the various government and private supporting agencies and the campesino. Community development as you know is a relatively new field, and of course there have been failures as well as successes. As in any learning process however, they have combined to restructure, animate, and enforce our approach. This program has come a long way in 2 short years, and I am proud to have been part of it. The experience I have gained is invaluable, not only in terms of learning a new language, but more important in the understanding of a people and the confidence which comes from such an understanding.

You are well aware of the immense problems which face Latin America and the various approaches our aid missions have used in trying to help. I have only been here for less than 2 years and could not possibly claim to be an expert on Latin American affairs. In these 2 years, however, I have gotten to know the people and their problems, and I have seen where the U.S. aid mission has helped—and where it has failed. You have undoubtedly heard the same old song of how our aid seems to always get tied up in government bureaucracy and fails to reach the common people, the very ones we are all sincere in trying to help. This is, Senator MORSE, tragically true. The fault does not just lie with our own people; many of the problems come from these countries' own bureaucratic systems. What is true is that it does exist and must be corrected. But how? In what ways can aid be made really helpful and meaningful?

Here in Colombia we see a few rays of light, a few changes are coming about. We have been in on the first steps of these changes and what we have seen and experienced has been encouraging. Where there have been Peace Corps volunteers working on a local level with the people, examining their problems together and working democratically to better their lot, there has been progress. Where communities are awakened and begin to work together the material improvements not only appear, but much more important, pride and community responsibility appear; this, Senator MORSE, is what our aid mission should try to seek and where our aid should be directed.

The basis of the problems stem from the lack of individual civic responsibility on the part of the citizen due to a parental social system which has been maintaining him at a subsistence level for over 40 generations. It is this individual civil responsibility which we are endeavoring to instill and it is only on this basis that a community, large or small, may progress. Our insistence on this approach to the aid problem has led to the development of a community development government agency (here called Acción Comunal) which in adopting our methods is emphasizing the "individual factor" in community development. Social workers are being trained not to encourage the "what can you do for me" idea that permeates all the social strata, but rather "what can I do for myself and my community."

In many areas this idea is taking hold, and where it has, the progress is encouraging. We have seen work teams formed to raise a school; communities unite to carve a road out of a mountain to get their crops to market; fiestas and bazaars presented to raise money to build an aqueduct where there had never been fresh water before. These were the material projects, but underneath all of this there has sprung from a previously apathetic people a revolutionary change, community pride and responsibility.

Of course these schools, roads, etc., are needed, but we are not able to supply them all, and even if we could it would not end the social problems that are their cause, and in my opinion much more serious. We cannot force governments to change their policies, even though we may be convinced these changes are basic; many are. If we are really sincere, and I am sure we are, we can direct our aid to programs such as the one I previously described, and from these the changes will come about. They will not come about because the United States said they had to or because we used our aid to pressure them, but rather because newly awakened communities will demand them. Through this system our aid can be meaningful, through this system an alliance can truly be an alliance, not just another gift.

I have written with the hope that my experiences and opinions from 2 years of service in the Peace Corps may be of some interest to you. I will be returning to the United States with my Colombian bride in early March and will be in Washington, D.C., for several days on my way to Oregon. I would feel it a great honor to meet you and if possible discuss these matters further.

Thank you for your kind attention.

—— ——.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the next letter I have received comes from an American newspaperman. He includes a quotation which is explained in the letter.

I ask unanimous consent that the name of the writer of the letter be deleted. This letter bears out the criticisms I have been making of the Dominican regime since the overthrow of that country's constitutional government.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 21, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is written in the Dominican Republic although it will be mailed from the United States.

I am a correspondent here for UPI and want to assure you that your policy toward this unhappy country is completely correct.

The so-called triumvirate is a plain and simple rapacious dictatorship which is causing much suffering, not to mention economic desolation.

The United States must not recognize or aid this government. To do so would be inhuman to the Dominican people and will unleash a flood of hate, torture, suffering and blood. I refer to hate toward the United States. So far we (U.S.A.) are doing fine.

We are going to see ever increasing repression and resistance on the part of the Dominicans. It is hogwash to say, as two triumvirate-paid prominent reporters say, that the resistance to the triumvirate is leftist. The resistence is universal, from left to right.

Attached to this letter please find a quote which is typical which a student gave me last night while in a newspaper office seeking aid for his imprisoned friends.

It appears that the secret election of Dr. Juan Casasnovas presents an acceptable and constitutional solution—the mayors and city councils of cities of Bani and San Pedro have recognized him as President officially, and majority of people unofficially.

"We, the young Dominicans, did not look with sympathy on the politics international of the Government of the United States because of its aid to the regimen of Trujillo in the past, but we see today with much hope the posture of President Kennedy and other statesmen of the United States, especially that of Senator MORSE, in light of coup d'état and we have hope that this position will maintain itself always, not only for Dominicans but also for all Latin Americans."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two letters, bearing upon the shocking situation which exists in Honduras, be printed in the RECORD at this point. The recognition of the military dictatorship in Honduras is as inexcusable and as unjustified as was the recognition of the military dictatorship in the Dominican Republic. I ask unanimous consent that these two letters may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 26, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I received the enclosed letter with instructions to mail it to you immediately.

I do not think people outside of Honduras realize what is going on under cover in that country. My husband and I were operating a dental clinic of our own back in the jungle near the Guatemalan border and having been in the country 3 years have learned something of conditions there.

My husband flew out of the country last week after the coup took place and can give an on-the-spot account of conditions there. The true report is not being given the public. On the surface reports are that the army has taken over the country peaceably, but purging is going on with loss of life and suffering.

You may wish to answer Mr. ——— letter personally and we suggest you send your letter to us to mail to him because a letter officially from Washington may arouse suspicion and cause trouble to Mr. ———. Men are being seized in that country on little or no evidence and placed in jail. Graves are dug beforehand for the executions.

"DEAR SIR: In San Pedro Sula the army dug the holes to bury their victims the day before the takeover.

"This information came direct to me from the office of the American consulate's office.

"In Cortez the holes were dug 2 days before and there were at least 57 killed there.

"This information came to me direct from the main office of the Fruit Co.

"Respectfully yours,

—— ——."

OCTOBER 15, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, the defrauded people of Honduras, have been greatly cheered by your bold stand for the cause of democracy in Latin America. I feel that you should have a better picture of the situation so as to be able to more effectively defend the democratic interests.

In regard to the bloody coup that overthrew our Government on the 3d of this month: It should be understood that that was merely the overthrow of the Liberal Party (that has at least 73 percent of the population) by the National Party that controls the arms. A little bit of history to explain this condition: In 1932 Nationalist Tibureio Carias Andino became President of Honduras. Instead of giving elections at the end of 4 years, as was then the term of office, he stayed on by force of arms for the 16 years referred to bitterly as the years of the "blessed peace." During this time the Liberal Party was almost annihilated by murder, prison, torture, and exile for those who were so fortunate as to escape. The press was censored. There was no chance of the outside getting a picture of the atrocities that were going on within. During this period the army was built up of the sons of his trusty National Party until today there is just a sprinkling of Liberals in the army. In 1948 Carias, to impress the outside world announced elections. We had a mockery of an election with only one candidate, his handpicked Minister of War, Juan Manuel Galvez. Galvez tried to give elections in 1954 but his Vice President, erratic old Julio Lozano Diaz, grabbed power and set up a reign of terror. He was overthrown in 1956 by a truly bloodless revolution and elections free and ample were given in 1957.

As we neared another election the National Party read the handwriting on the wall and saw that 25 years of slaughter and mismanagement had eradicated their right to rule.

They chose the only road to power, their men that comprised the army. We are again driven before a gun. The first sweep took many of the leaders, and daily their arrests are justified by their righteous announcements that the "Democratic" army has captured a few more Communists. They know from 25 years of experience that if they can destroy the leaders the masses can be led by the nose.

Now, Senator MORSE, here is the danger: During the 25 years the local press impressed on the minds of the people that the United States was keeping them in power. Every favor from the United States was used as proof. One could often hear the statement, "We will stay in power as long as the United States says so." Now when this bloody slaughter started they said that a military government best serves the purposes of the United States and that the United States had engineered the coup. Then when we hear otherwise from the United States they smile knowingly and say that the U.S. politics are that way but that within a short time she will find a way of both saving face and recognizing the Government. Already the perplexed masses are casting about for a solution. You know better than I do that the Communists are expert on riding this kind of a swell. We anti-Communists argue that they are not the answer to our problem. But the masses driven by the desire for freedom and the exercise of their rights will listen to anything that sounds like a chance. And communism sounds good to an illiterate, defrauded people.

I want to express my gratefulness to the United States for her attitude in this crisis, but if we are going to save Honduras from communism I fear that you have not done enough.

Honduras is cursed with this white elephant, the army, that only serves to stab the Government in the back when we are making some progress. A police force would be all that we need to keep order.

Why spend 10 percent of our budget to maintain an army we do not need? If there is an international problem the American nations step in and order solution by arbitration instead of by force of arms. This renders the army obsolete except to the purpose of the power thirsty national party.

If the United States, as the older sister, would come in and dissolve the army we would be over the hump. I know that you will say that there is no policy for this. But we are going to have to build some bold, new policies or risk being swallowed by the Communist threat. The danger, as I see it, is that we will build them when it is already too late. Cuba is a fair example of this.

Again I thank you for what you have done, but there is more to be done. This little Republic can easily go over the brink unless something is done, and that right early. "So much to do, so little done, so little time."

I feel that the United States has not done all that she could in our situation. A nation that is strong enough to make Russia "mind" surely could have influenced this little "bush army," especially when they were using arms provided by the United States.

Very respectfully yours for a freer and safer world to live in.

——— ———.

(Note.—If this is intercepted I will cease to exist.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, lastly, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record a letter sent to me by an American in Chile. In my judgment this letter is further evidence of the need of a thoroughgoing review by Congress—not by the President and not by any independent body, but by Congress—of our whole foreign aid program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Santiago, *October 28, 1963.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: It will probably surprise but encourage you to learn that one of the most influential newspapers in Santiago, Chile—El Mercurio—recently published excerpts of your timely recommendations to the U.S. Senate. It referred to your proposal to withhold foreign aid to Chile until they correct the abuses and discriminatory taxation imposed upon U.S. investments in this country.

Kindly allow me to compliment and commend you for putting some commonsense into our foreign policy for Latin America. May I also suggest that you diligently pursue your knowledgeable and forthright proposals by translating them into an effective course of action.

Having lived in South America since 1951 I have observed the futility of the United States assuming the role of a philanthropist to buy friendship. We are neither admired nor respected in this regard. Until we insist on fair play and honest dealings the Alliance for Progress is doomed to failure; and, furthermore, our national integrity could be seriously questioned.

The very fact that your views were published here implies an acknowledgment of Chile's unfair tax legislation which singles out and takes advantage of U.S. private investments.

Ironically, Chile, during this past fiscal year has been the recipient of some of the largest Government grants to South America. To allow these grants-in-aid from U.S. taxpayers to continue unabated will not only destroy the incentive of private enterprise to invest abroad but encourage eventual confiscation of American investments in Chile and elsewhere.

I understand that no new legislation is required, merely the enforcement of existing legislation to carry out your plans. Such enforcement through normal diplomatic channels would quietly but effectively bring about corrective measures that would doubtless eliminate the unfair tax differential now imposed. In the process we will also regain our own self-respect as American citizens knowing that we have the wholehearted support and backing of the U.S. Government.

Respectfully yours,

——— ———.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd].

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this session of Congress has gone on far too long and in many ways it has been a very frustrating year for us. And I do not intend to prolong needlessly this final debate for the year 1963 on the foreign aid program.

But I do want to take just a few minutes to discuss my reasons for voting in support of this foreign aid appropriations bill.

I will vote for this expenditure of slightly over $3 billion because I think foreign aid is an essential, indeed an indispensable, part of our foreign policy.

President Lyndon B. Johnson is absolutely right, in my view, when he says that to make too deep a cut in the foreign aid program is to undermine our basic foreign policy and to make the achievement of our worldwide objectives even more difficult than they already are.

Without military and supporting assistance, some of our stanchest cold war allies would be unable to maintain sufficient military and economic strength to help us contain further Communist encroachments into the free world.

Without economic assistance, many of the newly developing nations would be unable to sustain their efforts to provide a better life for their people.

Should these development loans and grants and American technical assistance be cut off, the Communists would be in a good position to take advantage of the resulting despair and lack of hope among the underprivileged throughout the world.

It is to a great extent American capital and technical know-how, coupled with a generous and a practical foreign aid program, which gives hope to these developing countries and their people that economic and social progress will come soon.

To cut off or even greatly diminish American foreign aid would be to strike a cruel blow to them, and I think it would detract from our prestige and position in the non-Communist world, as well as render ineffective the implementation of our basic foreign policy.

So I intend to vote in favor of this foreign aid appropriations bill because I feel it is important to us and to the rest of the free world.

And I will do so even though I am deeply disappointed that the House prohibition against the Export-Import Bank guarantee of credit arrangements for the proposed wheat deal has been weakened to the point that there is no longer any prohibition.

If the various wheat sales were to be consummated as originally announced by the late President Kennedy, and my colleagues will recall that this was supposed to be strictly a cash-on-the-barrelhead proposition, a prohibition against a credit guarantee would not have any effect at all.

The Communists were originally supposed to pay the going price for this wheat in either cash or gold and it was to be carried in American ships.

Well, what has happened to the wheat deal since then? First, despite the announcement that this was to be a cash deal, we now find that, most likely we are going to loan the Communists the money they need to pay for our wheat. And since no banker in his right mind would trust them to honor their debts, our Government must guarantee the loan. In other words, the American taxpayer is quite likely to be left holding the bag, from beginning to end.

It may be that we will get no money at all, aside from a downpayment perhaps, for in effect we will be loaning the purchase price to nations which have already defaulted on hundreds of millions of dollars worth of obligations to us, just as they have betrayed their other agreements.

On two occasions in the Senate I have voted in support of a prohibition against the Export-Import Bank guarantee of credit terms.

I cannot help but continue to question the wisdom of this wheat deal as it has evolved from the initial announcement.

I have every confidence in our President and I hope he will reappraise this situation and drive a really hard bargain with the Communists before the negotiations for a wheat sale are completed. If he is not tough, and on the basis of my knowledge of the President I am sure he will be, I am afraid the Communists will take us on this as they have on other occasions.

But the wheat deal is only one aspect of the bill before us today and the fact that my views on this wheat sale have not prevailed is not sufficient reason for me to vote against the whole foreign aid program.

It is very seldom that we have a chance to vote for exactly what we want. And I believe the good in this foreign aid appropriations bill far outweighs the bad.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton].

WHEAT DEAL: AN INCREDIBLE OUTRAGE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in the Union Leader, of Manchester, N.H., appeared a statement made by me regarding the vote we are about to take. To save the time of the Senate I ask unanimous consent to have this brief article appear in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COTTON TO CAST VOTE AGAINST AID MEASURE

LEBANON.—U.S. Senator NORRIS COTTON will not boycott Monday's showdown Senate session on foreign aid—as some Senators are planning to do—to prevent a quorum.

Contacted at his home here on Christmas, New Hampshire's senior Senator was asked if he would return to Washington for Monday's final vote on foreign aid—or stay away.

He told the Manchester Union Leader that he would return to Washington because it was his duty.

However, he revealed he would cast his vote against foreign aid—even though he knows full well that it is a lost cause trying to prevent passage of the administration bill.

PLANS "NO" VOTE

Senator COTTON emphasized that he is compelled to vote against the whole foreign aid bill because of a provision in it that is an incredible outrage having taxpayers guarantee payment in the event the Communists default on payment for wheat.

The Cotton statement on his position in Monday's foreign aid voting:

"Of course I shall return to Washington for Monday's final vote on foreign aid. No Senator should stay away to prevent a quorum. The President, as well as the people we represent, are entitled to have every Senator present and voting.

"But I shall not vote for the foreign aid bill nor shall I ever vote for any bill that permits the sale of American wheat to the Communists on credit, with the U.S. taxpayer guaranteeing the payment if the Communists default—and they have a long history of defaulting.

"To sell our surplus wheat to the Soviets for cash is bad enough. I would prefer to give it free to the hungry people behind the Iron Curtain, distributed by the American Red Cross. That, of course, the dictators would not permit. They want our wheat to help them quiet any unrest among their own people.

"If American bankers want to lend their money to permit the Communists to buy our wheat, run their own risk, and take their profit or loss, perhaps they should be allowed to do so though even that I would not approve.

"But for the Congress to deliberately put its hand into the pockets of our taxpayers to provide credit to the Communist dictators is an incredible outrage.

"Spell it any way you like, the plain fact is that our Government lets them have wheat on credit so they can continue to use their ready cash to build more missiles with which to destroy us.

"The bill will pass the Senate, for they have the votes, but I predict that those who vote for it will regret that vote more than any they have ever cast. I happen to know that many Senators are voting for it unhappily and under duress.

"I honor Congressmen WYMAN and CLEVELAND who stood with a solid phalanx of nearly every Republican and many Democrats in the House of Representatives and opposed the unthinkable wheat deal to the very end.

"I shall vote against it Monday as I have twice before even though it compels me to vote against the whole foreign aid bill."

Mr. PASTORE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE].

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, we are hearing again much talk about reorganization and evaluation of foreign aid. It seems to me that our memories tend to be a little short. Let us think back just a little. The Congress in 1961 laid the groundwork for a new and significantly more effective concentrated foreign aid program. It consolidated the many agencies and functions of U.S. foreign assistance activities into a single agency. The legislation enacted just 2 years ago took full account of the congressional concern over the past foreign aid program. The new act reflected the congressional consensus about the policy direction and established congressional guidelines for administration of this complex program.

Mr. President, over the past 5 years I have had the opportunity to make a carefully calculated sequence of inspections to the trouble spots of the world that figure so heavily in all our foreign aid activities. These missions were conducted for the Committee on Appropriations. The most recent was a study mission in the last 2 months of 1962 to southeast Asia. As a result of this long-range survey I have had an excellent opportunity to observe our oversea assistance programs, both in countries conducting "hot wars" against Communist activities and those fighting battles against equally insidious cold war subversion attempts.

In the report following that study mission I suggested that our AID programs could be tightened up in several ways, including the more careful selection of priorities, firmer controls on the types and direction of aid, and selective cuts in personnel in AID missions.

As a result of our findings on this study mission, I delved further into the problems of AID's operations and staffing in special hearings conducted in May and June together with numerous interviews and conversations with persons concerned with many different aspects of these programs. At the conclusion of these hearings and my investigation of these problems, I made a special report to the Committee on Appropriations outlining both my findings and suggestions for future improvements. This report is available to the Members of the Senate. I might add that even during the hearings and investigations many of the problems we had encountered in southeast Asia were being corrected.

Among the suggestions made in my report were the following:

First. That the Agency take steps to equip itself with a field evaluation and survey group to provide objective evaluations of projects underway or under consideration.

Second. That a country-by-country review of existing programs be undertaken so that we will be better able to understand and evaluate our position at any given time.

Third. That recipient countries make meaningful contributions to any program instituted by AID.

These are just a few of a sizable number of suggestions and recommendations contained in this report.

As this report testifies it was a massive job to turn this aid program around. It took a longer time than many of us expected, but the fact is that the foreign aid program is now making long strides toward effectiveness.

I had an opportunity, during the hearings we conducted, to observe the new AID Administrator, David Bell. He is intelligent, tough-minded, responsible, and responsive. The Agency for International Development has indicated to me the progress made on each of the points and recommendations contained in our report.

For example, the number of aid officials on acting status has been reduced sharply; "selection out" panels, for eliminating marginal employees, have got underway; several key posts have been filled with new, competent men.

It is still true, of course, that much needs to be done, in personnel and elsewhere—but much has been done already, and much is being worked on right now.

In addition to the response being given to our report a number of other basic improvements have been made and are continuing under the direction of the Administrator:

First. Steps have been taken to reduce further the already small negative effect of AID on the current U.S. balance of payments. As a result, about 85 percent of the dollars appropriated for fiscal year 1964 will be spent for purchases in the United States. By next fiscal year—fiscal year 1965—it is estimated that the negative effect of AID assistance on the balance of payments will be reduced to $500 million.

Second. Loans have become the major instrument of foreign assistance. In fiscal year 1964, 60 percent of total economic assistance will be in loans, compared to 30 percent in 1961.

Third. Special efforts have been introduced and expanded to increase the role of private enterprise, both in the developing countries and in the United States in the development effort. Since September 1962, 16 completely new investment guarantee agreements have been signed with developing countries. In 11 other countries, coverage has been expanded. During this fiscal year, the total of investment guarantees of all types will cross the $1 billion mark. Local currency loans to private investors under Public Law 480 have increased rapidly. AID has loaned more than $150 million in development loans to private enterprise since AID was established. AID has mounted a new program to help U.S. private enterprise to survey investment opportunities around the world.

Fourth. AID has met with increasing success in its efforts to get other industrialized nations to provide more assistance on more liberal terms. The British recently issued a white paper outlining their intention to substantially liberalize the terms on which they provide assistance. The Canadians have just announced a major step-up in their assistance effort.

Fifth. AID is hardening its loan terms as the capacity to repay of recipient countries improves. Greece, Israel, Taiwan, and Thailand provide examples of countries in which loan terms have been progressively hardened from fiscal 1962 to 1963.

Sixth. AID has completed termination of economic assistance programs to 15 countries which have achieved sufficient self-sustaining growth.

Seventh. More effective methods of administration of the program overseas have been developed. Already AID has created 10 "delegated posts" in which the ambassador performs AID functions, thus eliminating the need for a separate AID mission and director. In other countries, steps are being taken to consolidate management functions of AID, USIA, and embassies.

Eighth. Concentration and selectivity both among AID recipient countries and within individual country aid programs have been increased. Now, 20 countries receive 80 percent of economic assistance; 10 countries receive 80 percent of military assistance.

Ninth. Task forces were established to review all procedures for carrying out assistance programs. The first procedures generated by this review have already been established. These procedures are designed to focus responsibilities more sharply, reduce paper flow, expedite action, and shift more responsibility to those charged with implementing the program in the field.

Tenth. To improve performance and minimize the need for full time permanent employees, AID is making increasing use of the vast talents of the entire American community in its assistance efforts. These include business and industry, colleges and universities, private service organizations, and other Federal Government agencies and State governments.

Eleventh. AID has exercised tighter control over personnel levels and functions. Major personnel functions have been decentralized to the four regions, thus improving efficiency and reducing duplication. Many missions have been reduced in size; others, notably in Latin America have been increased. Sharp reductions in personnel have been effected in Greece, Israel, Korea, Libya, Ethiopia, and Free China. Loan officers and public safety advisers have been added—with increase offset by reduction in other technical specialties.

Mr. President, it is ironic that at the very time when our foreign assistance program is getting the best direction and guidance it has had in the last decade that we should hear demands that it be dismantled. It is ironic that just at the time when the Agency for International Development is beginning to accomplish the goals that the Congress set for it that we now hear in these halls demands for its abolition. It is ironic that at a time when the AID has changed and reformed its procedures and personnel practices that we hear demands for changes and reforms already being accomplished.

Certainly changes needed to be made; they have already been made. Certainly reforms need to be instituted; they are already being instituted. The reorganization of 1961 was in itself a major and total reorganization of our foreign assistance program designed to accomplish the very tasks its critics now claim it should be doing. It is true that the executive branch did not move with the speed and dispatch in carrying out that reorganization that some of us would have liked. But it is equally true that this is now being carried out and that it would be a grave error to interrupt that process. Indeed, demands for reorganization, overhauling, reorientation may very well be the greatest danger to achieving the efficient, effective, coherent, sensible foreign aid program that we all desire and that this country needs.

What we are seeing washed up on the beach is the wreckage resulting from a storm at sea 4 years ago. We must remember that most of the examples of waste and inefficiency being cited in this body occurred prior to the reorganization of 1961 and prior to the present direction of the Agency.

I find it hard to understand how we can achieve continuity in the sensible planning demanded by critics of foreign aid if we are to tear it up every year, leave it in a state of uncertainty, toss it back and forth in the debates in this Congress, wait for 6 months before we appropriate its money, and then expect it to be coherent, organized, crisp, and lean in its presentation to us and in its operations abroad.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt that this is a point on which there is unanimous agreement—that foreign aid is an essential instrument and tool of foreign policy. It can, must, and will be continued in one form or another. Nearly all of the opponents of this legislation have paid that concept lipservice by saying they are not opposed to foreign aid but only the way it is being carried out. If effective administration and organization is their goal, then let them study more closely, as my colleagues and I have done, its administration and operating procedures. They will find them much improved. They will find the quality of management decisions and economic judgments better now than they have been in recent memory. Areas that need to be improved are being improved. Changes that needed to be made have been or are in the process of being made.

The proper role for Congress is to establish and write policy, not to administer the executive branch. Let us confine ourselves to that more important and significant role, policymaking, not administering difficulties particularly applicable to the foreign assistance program which now has one of the best top management teams of any Federal agency. It would be ironic indeed, perhaps tragic, if this Agency were to be gutted, destroyed, or seriously crippled precisely at the time when it is meeting the criteria for effectiveness and efficiency set for it by the Congress.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of debate has been yielded back and has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from

North Dakota [Mr. Young] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent on official business to attend the Presidential inauguration in Korea.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is absent because of illness in his family.

On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater]. If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 14, as follows:

[No. 284 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Engle
Gore
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Javits
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Walters
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—14

Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Cotton
Ervin
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Jordan, N.C.
Lausche
Long, La.
Miller
Morse
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—30

Bible
Case
Curtis
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Jackson
Johnston
McClellan
Mechem
Monroney
Mundt
Robertson
Russell
Scott
Simpson
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I arrived in the Chamber shortly after the yea-and-nay vote was taken. I was paired with the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], but I want the Record to show that I was opposed to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 9499, which was read, as follows:

In the House of Representatives, U.S.,
December 24, 1963.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 22, 25, and 26 to the bill (H.R. 9499) entitled "An Act making appropriations for Foreign Aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"None of the funds made available by this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be obligated on or after April 30, 1964, for financing, in whole or in part, the direct costs of any contract for the construction of facilities and installations in any underdeveloped country, unless the President shall, on or before such date, have promulgated regulations designed to assure, to the maximum extent consistent with the national interest and the avoidance of excessive costs to the United States, that none of the funds made available by this Act and thereafter obligated shall be used to finance the direct costs under such contracts for construction work performed by persons other than qualified nationals of the recipient country or qualified citizens of the United States, provided, however, that the President may waive the application of this amendment if it is important to the national interest."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that if Senators will remain in the Chamber, we can easily conclude our work on this measure by 1:30 p.m.

This is a very simple amendment. It was amended in the conference. Originally, it was suggested to the committee by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], who was rightfully disturbed over the engagement of third-nation nationals to do work in the second country where our foreign aid was being given. This provision has now been perfected. A further modification was included in the conference—namely, that the President may waive the application of this provision if it is important to do so in the national interest—for sometimes it does become necessary to engage nationals of a third country, in order to keep down costs, and if they have the particular skill that is required and if they are available. I understand that that is satisfactory to the Senator from California. I believe that the proposal ought to be approved without a record vote.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I merely wish to confirm what my able friend has said. In my judgment, the amendment is in order and would be helpful. The intention of the amendment nevertheless is plain. I ask that the amendment be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14?

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the message from the House receding from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and concurring therein with an amendment, which will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. *Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows:

"None of the funds made available because of the provisions of this title shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist county (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended) or any agency or national thereof, or in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national, except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate within 30 days after such determination."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I do not believe that we need labor the amendment. It was clearly stated by the clerk. The language is customary. There is precedent for the language. There would be a prohibition or limitation on the use of the funds unless the President should determine that such guarantees would be in the national interest, and he would make a report of that determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate. He must do so within 30 days.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. How much money is provided in the bill for the use of the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. PASTORE. I know of no funds provided, excepting that there would be some limitations.

Mr. AIKEN. Other than an expression of opinion, what would be the effect of the amendment, or the amendment for which the present proposal was substituted?

Mr. PASTORE. It would merely be a statement of policy.

Mr. AIKEN. Would it be binding upon the President?

Mr. PASTORE. It would be binding upon the President in the event the funds are to be used for that purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. But could the funds provided in the proposed legislation be used for that purpose anyway?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. Originally it was subject to a point of order in the House, but the point of order was never made.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct in my understanding that all that would be permitted, even though the President should make the finding required, is for the Export-Import Bank to guarantee the deferred payments for materials sold by us, and that the proposal would by no means allow the Export-Import Bank to make loans?

Mr. PASTORE. Not to make loans, but they could extend credit. The purchase must be made in America.

Mr. HOLLAND. And the proposal would apply to guarantees, and not to direct loans.

Mr. PASTORE. It would not be a loan, but an extension of credit.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that there is involved a question of limitation of policy on the part of the Export-Import Bank. No funds would be involved by way of an appropriation, but there would be a certain limitation on the use of Export-Import Bank funds as an expression of policy on the part of Congress.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, as the Senator from Vermont brought out, no funds would be appropriated under the title.

Mr. AIKEN. Not a nickel would be available under the bill to the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is absolutely correct. In the House the provision was subject to a point of order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is it not a little misleading to suggest that no funds would be available for that purpose, inasmuch as a guarantee of credit means that incipiently there must be funds available in case the credit is not honored?

Mr. PASTORE. No. If the Senator will read the language of the amendment, he will see that none of the funds made available would be available because of the provisions of that title. There may be funds made available under some other title, but that is not the issue before the Senate. The point made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont is well taken. The language is as follows:

> Under the provisions of this title—

Which is title III of the foreign aid bill.

Mr. HRUSKA. Can we agree—

Mr. PASTORE. But it is a statement of policy. I believe the President of the United States will take cognizance of it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Can we agree on the statement that the effect of the amendment is to negate totally the original provision of the House bill?

Mr. PASTORE. No; the Mundt amendment was written in the same way. The proposal is a copy of the Mundt amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am talking about the House provision as it was found in the foreign aid bill.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct. That part of the bill has not been changed.

Mr. HRUSKA. In effect, that would negate it.

Mr. PASTORE. Negate what, and in what way?

Mr. HRUSKA. Why does the President object to the provision which the House inserted, and why is he now willing to accept the proposed provision? If it makes no difference, why should we adopt the proposal?

Mr. PASTORE. The President of the United States would rather not have the provision in the conference report at all. The Senate would rather not have it in at all. We voted it out. But the House was adamant in its desire to have it in its original form. We have modified the House version by providing that when the President determines it is in the national interest to do so he may take certain action. The action can be taken only if he makes such determination.

Mr. HRUSKA. So it is binding upon the President. He may use his own discretion, and when he uses his own discretion, the thing that the House desired——

Mr. PASTORE. The President of the United States—the Commander in Chief of the United States—has that power within his discretion, and he may use it.

Mr. HRUSKA. As the person in charge of the foreign affairs of our Nation.

Mr. PASTORE. Under the Constitution.

Mr. HRUSKA. However, the Export-Import Bank is not a creature of the Presidency. It is a creature of the Senate and the House, as a part of our national legislative policy, and that is not a part of the responsibilities of the President, even though his position in leading the Nation in its foreign policy be exalted.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; but the Congress can refuse to appropriate funds.

Mr. HRUSKA. It can.

Mr. PASTORE. That is the remedy of the Congress.

Mr. HRUSKA. Very well.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know what is disturbing the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. What disturbs the Senator from Nebraska is the fact that the House action has negated the action of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the Senator from Nebraska knows that I supported the original Mundt amendment on the floor of the Senate as warmly as he did. I voted all three times that the issue came up in the Senate in the same way that he did. I still feel that way about it. At the time when we were in conference—and I believe that this point should show in the RECORD—we were advised by the White House that the President was willing to assume the responsibility in this matter and that if the House amendment, which was written in the same way as the Mundt amendment, were so amended as to allow him to assume that full responsibility, he would accept that action. It was for that reason, if I may say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Rhode Island—I am sure he can bear this out—that this final agreement was made after many hours of controversy in the conference. As an original supporter of the Mundt amendment, I do not believe that my distinguished friend from Nebraska is correct in saying that the action completely negates the original Mundt amendment or the version of that amendment, which was almost word perfect, that was adopted by the House, and merely makes it a question on which the President must make a declaration. He must make a finding and communicate that finding as a justification for any extension of a guarantee on the part of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this is not the first time we have taken the action proposed. We took similar action for President Eisenhower and for President Kennedy. In this critical time President Johnson has said, "Why do you not do it for me?" He would prefer not to have the provision in the report at all. The position of the President of the United States is that the provision does not belong in the bill, but if we insist on putting anything in there, he has said, "At least give me the authority as President of the United States to say when in the national interest it would be proper to extend credit." That is all it amounts to.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is exactly correct. That is the basis upon which the conference compromise was reached.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that I oppose having the Export-Import Bank or any other creature of the Congress or any agency of the Federal Government guarantee for any person or corporation any loan which in effect extends credit to Communist nations to buy wheat or any other agricultural commodity. The stated aim of the Communists is to communize and enslave all the peoples of the world and I want to have no part in any action which I fear will help them in the attainment of this goal.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank my colleague, the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. CURTIS addressed the Chair.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there seems to be a general public belief that this provision would apply only to the export of wheat to Russia. It is correct to say, is it not, that not only would it apply to the export of wheat to Russia, but also it would apply to the export of wheat to a great many other countries, as well as to the export of anything whatsoever to any of the countries to which the proponents would have exports prohibited except on a cash-in-advance basis?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct. Before one can buy at all, one must have a license.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Then, if one wishes credit, as prescribed in the discussion which has been held, one must have a determination by the President. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It is also correct to say, is it not, that it is now costing the United States about $400 million a year to store surplus grain in this country, and that most of the grain is stored in about seven or eight States?

Mr. PASTORE. All I know is that none of it is stored in Rhode Island.

Mr. AIKEN. Nor in Vermont.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. In view of the fact that probably there will not be a yea-and-nay vote on this question, I appreciate this opportunity to go on record and to say that no matter how much sugar coating has been put on the provision and no matter how adroit have been the arguments to beat the devil around the bush, it means nothing, it means something to me. I want the RECORD to show I shall vote against it.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the floor in my own right.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to the position of the Senate conferees, approving giving discretionary authority to the President of the United States. As I said earlier today in my speech on the conference report, article I of the Constitution places in Congress the authority to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations. It does not place that authority with the President of the United States.

I am greatly concerned about the growing tendency in the Congress to delegate away its functions to the Presidency. I speak about the Presidency and not about the holder of the office.

There are strong forces at work in this country to downgrade the Congress and to treat it almost as a cumbersome nuisance in our governmental processes. Unless the Members of Congress themselves fight to preserve congressional constitutional authority, I fear that in our time we shall not have the constitutional system of government that our Founding Fathers designed. We may have it in form, but in fact the White House will be in control of the country, with the Congress of the United States serving in large extent as its rubberstamp.

Every once in a while there break out, in American life, proposals for a parliamentary system. In 1946 a distinguished Member of Congress suggested that the President of the United States should resign because the people returned to Washington a Republican Congress. In his pronouncement at the time, he pointed out what would happen in Great Britain. I said then, as I repeat now, if that is the kind of system he likes he ought to go to Great Britain and run for the House of Commons. But he was elected to the Congress of the United States. Under the Constitution we have a three-branch system of government, coordinate and coequal.

I will continue to vote against attempts to weaken the constitutional authority of the Congress and to pass over to the Chief Executive more and more functions that Congress itself should perform. I say that, Mr. President, as a general political theory which causes me to oppose the conference report in respect to the so-called wheat amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Do I correctly understand the position of the Senator from Oregon, succinctly stated, to be that the Export-Import Bank is the creature of the Congress, created by an act of Congress, and that it should have such powers and such responsibilities—and only those—as are conferred upon it by the Congress?

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly my position.

Mr. ERVIN. The proposed amendment would constitute an abdication of the legislative functions to the President, would it not?

Mr. MORSE. It would be a delegation to the President of a function Congress ought to retain for itself. This is the basis for my objection so far as the political theory of our Government is concerned.

I oppose this proposal for the other reasons I have heretofore expressed in the debate, which I shall recapitulate quickly.

I do not care how it is clothed, and I do not care how it is colored with legislative brushes, the fact remains that under this proposal the Export-Import Bank could guarantee grain dealers in this country against any loss in their trading with Russia. That is the essence of the fight.

To say that we have granted similar discretionary authority to other Presidents begs the question, because this issue is new.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself another 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. This proposal is novel so far as the Export-Import Bank relations with Russia are concerned, and also so far as congressional relations with Russia are concerned.

There is no precedent of underwriting a guarantee to American grain dealers or to other American concerns in their dealings with Russia. I speak as one who not only is in favor of the sale of wheat to Russia, but also is in favor of giving food to the people behind the Iron Curtain everywhere, because if we are to break down, or to give those people an opportunity to break down, the growing threat of communism in the world, we must reach their stomachs. This shocking failure of the economy of Russia is one of the best weapons we have for demonstrating to them over and over again the superiority of economic freedom to economic enslavement.

But, Mr. President, there is a question of public policy, as to whether or not this Government should guarantee to American banks, grain dealers, or American brokers in connection with any other commodity, that they can trade with Russia without having to worry about being paid for their trade, because if they are not paid, the American taxpayers will pay them.

The fact is that every dollar in the coffers of the Export-Import Bank belongs to the American taxpayers. What is being proposed is that in dealing with Communist countries we guarantee a subsidy to the grain brokers, and brokers of other commodities, and assure them that they do not deal with Russia at any risk, but with guaranteed payments, if that becomes necessary.

There is no proposal in the report requiring a check on behalf of the American taxpayer of every ton of wheat that goes into every bottom that transports wheat to Russia. I know something about the tactics of the Russians. For many years I was west coast arbitrator for maritime disputes on the Pacific coast. We could not even get on a Russian ship, even when we thought she was an ally in the midst of a war, for inspection of that ship of lend-lease supplies, and later of war supplies that we were giving her. Some very serious problems arose.

When we are dealing with the Russians in the matter of shipment of goods, we are dealing with a country that has been noted for its subterfuges, evasions, and failure to keep its word. We have not heard a word in this debate about the hundreds of millions of dollars that Russia still owes the American taxpayers out of the obligations she assumed in World War II. I would be more interested in an approach such as this if Russia had paid up what she already owes the American taxpayers through the Government.

Nothing stops the grain dealers and the banks from trading with Russia, if they want to deal with her. They can sell her the wheat. But I do not think we ought to put the American taxpayer in such a position that if there is a change of heart on the part of Russia—and she can change extremely fast—she can come up with a typical Communist alibi as to why she will not pay for the wheat, or the part which had not been paid for. She could make the excuse that the wheat, or a part of it, was wormy, or spoiled, or there was debris in it, or it was mispresented as to quality. That is a typical Communist excuse. Therefore, I do not think we ought to put this subsidy burden on the American taxpayers and have the American taxpayers help the American grain speculators and brokers by way of a guarantee.

Russia has been buying much grain around the world without requirement of a guarantee. She has been buying much grain for cash. Why should we be the one government to provide a guarantee? I think the time has come to ascertain whether or not there can be good faith dealing on the part of Russia with American private enterprise, on the basis of commercial credits, without Export-Import Bank guarantees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself another 5 minutes.

So I am opposed to it from the standpoint of policy involved in the argument I have just made.

Lastly, I am opposed to it because I do not think that the language that has come back from the conference means anything more or less than empty language. Every Senator voting for this proposal today knows that the language that was brought back to us from the conference gives us no automatic authority. Of course, Congress can always pass legislation repealing laws already passed by Congress, if the laws have not executed themselves. But this is a proposal that, if the President thinks, in the national interest, the credit should be extended, he in effect can extend it. All he has to do is send a report to the Congress. It does not provide that Congress must accept the report. It does not provide for a concurrent resolution. Nor does it call for the so-called negative approach that has been adopted in other situations in the past, whereby if the Congress does not act within 30 days, the President can go ahead and consummate the transaction. All this language requires is that the President, if he thinks it is in the national interest, may extend the credit.

I close by saying that it is unsound public policy. It is a great mistake to give credit guarantees to grain brokers and other industrialists who may trade with Russia. The time has come for the Congress to zealously and jealously hold the constitutional power already given to it. Under article I of the Constitution, it is the Congress, and not the President, that is authorized by the Constitution to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign countries. I do not believe the power should be given to the President.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I voted for the Mundt amendment. I oppose the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union. I am very much opposed to the amendment being offered. If given the opportunity to vote on it by a yea-and-nay vote, I would vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on concurring in the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 20.

The amendment to the amendment was concurred in.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a table which shows the budget estimates, the amounts in the House and Senate versions of the bills, and the final amounts agreed to in conference for every appropriation bill approved during the 88th Congress, 1st session.

The total amount is $6,513,041,004 under the budget estimates.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table of appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess.

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Bill No.	Title	Budget estimates to House	Amount as passed House	Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as passed Senate	Final action: Amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates
	1963 SUPPLEMENTALS						
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, Agriculture	[1] $508,172,000	$508,172,000	[1] $508,172,000	$508,172,000	$508,172,000	
H.R. 5517	Supplemental	1,641,507,106	1,438,691,506	1,652,300,456	1,488,683,841	1,467,430,491	−$184,869,965
	Public works acceleration	(500,000,000)	(450,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(450,000,000)	450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)
	All other	(1,141,507,106)	(988,691,506)	(1,152,300,456)	(1,038,683,841)	(1,017,430,491)	(−134,869,965)
	Total, 1963 supplementals	2,149,679,106	1,946,863,506	2,160,472,456	1,996,855,841	1,975,602,491	−184,869,965
	1964 APPROPRIATIONS						
H.R. 5279	Interior	998,009,000	922,625,200	998,009,000	979,693,400	952,456,500	45,552,500
	Loan authorization	(13,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)
	Contract authority	(17,500,000)		(17,500,000)			(−17,500,000)
H.R. 5366	Treasury-Post Office	6,146,842,000	5,997,026,000	6,146,842,000	6,069,466,250	6,045,466,000	−101,376,000
H.R. 5888	Labor-HEW	5,759,489,000	5,449,981,000	5,759,489,000	5,495,827,250	5,471,087,500	−288,401,500
H.R. 6754	Agriculture	6,368,755,000	5,979,457,000	6,368,755,000	6,047,988,340	6,224,370,215	−144,384,785
	Loan authorizations	[2] (855,000,000)	[2] (855,000,000)	[2] (855,000,000)	[2] (880,000,000)	[2] (855,000,000)	
H.R. 6868	Legislative	[3] 148,580,245	[3] 140,038,919	182,218,450	168,273,069	168,293,069	−13,925,381
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, judiciary	2,159,891,900	1,851,259,900	2,159,891,900	1,821,343,000	1,820,093,000	−339,798,900
H.R. 7179	Defense	49,014,237,000	47,082,009,000	49,014,237,000	47,339,707,000	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia	(289,581,800)	(284,286,800)	(328,724,000)	(319,587,785)	(313,093,424)	−(15,630,576)
	Federal payment	34,868,000	32,868,000	52,868,000	47,868,000	40,368,000	−12,500,000
	Loan authorizations	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(20,800,000)	(20,800,000)	(19,300,000)	−(1,500,000)
H.R. 8747	Independent offices	14,658,588,000	13,102,718,700	14,658,588,000	13,300,214,650	13,224,518,050	−1,434,069,950
H.R. 9139	Military construction	1,966,400,000	1,562,964,000	1,966,400,000	1,617,489,000	1,585,880,000	−380,520,000
H.R. 9140	Public works	4,561,747,000	4,276,116,400	4,561,957,000	4,500,963,200	4,406,272,700	−155,684,300
H.R. 9499	Foreign aid	4,874,400,330	3,113,100,370	4,874,550,330	3,578,058,607	3,298,705,607	−1,575,844,723
H.J.Res 875	Supplemental, mental retardation	41,886,000	41,886,000	41,886,000	258,090,000		−41,886,000
	Total, 1964 appropriations	[4] 96,733,693,475	89,552,060,489	[5] 96,785,691,680	91,224,981,766	90,457,520,641	−6,328,171,039
	Total, all appropriations	[4] 98,883,372,581	91,498,923,995	[5] 98,946,164,136	93,221,837,607	92,433,123,132	−6,513,041,004
	Total, loan authorizations	(876,000,000)	(869,000,000)	(888,800,000)	(906,800,000)	(880,300,000)	(−8,500,000)
	Total, contract authority	(17,500,000)		(17,500,000)			(−17,500,000)

---

[1] Shifted from budget for 1964, which was reduced accordingly.

[2] Includes $360,000,000 for Farmers Home Administration loans currently made from loan repayments in lieu of former practice of public debt borrowings from Treasury.

[3] Excludes Senate items.

[4] Does not include $32,427,000 included in H. Doc. No. 174 but not considered.

[5] Does not include $32,277,000 included in H. Doc. No. 174 but not considered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of December 12, 1963, the Acting President pro tempore, on the dates indicated, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

On December 23, 1963:

S. 1175. An act to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

S. 2311. An act to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college debate topics; and

H.J. Res. 848. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of February in each year as "American Heart Month."

On December 26, 1963:

H.J. Res. 880. Joint resolution establishing that the 2d regular session of the 88th Congress convene at noon on Tuesday, January 7, 1964.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on December 23, 1963, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 212. An act for the relief of Yoo Sei Chun;

S. 697. An act for the relief of Misako Moriya;

S. 966. An act for the relief of Yukio Iseri;

S. 1097. An act for the relief of Despina J. Sanios;

S. 1129. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Bollers and Earlene Bollers;

S. 1172. An act to amend Public Law 86–518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86–518;

S. 1269. An act for the relief of the Arizona Milling Co., of Phoenix, Ariz.;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Dr. Demetrios Flessas and Dr. Eugenia Flessas;

S. 1516. An act for the relief of Ana Murgelj;

S. 1570. An act for the relief of Dulcie Ann Steinhardt Sherlock;

S. 1698. An act to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds;

S. 1756. An act to amend the Alaska Public Works Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect, compromise, or release certain claims held by him under that act;

S. 1767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain parcel of land to the State of Delaware, and for other purposes;

S. 1868. An act to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), as amended, relating to adult Indian vocational training;

S. 2139. An act to provide for the disposition of the judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho;

S. 2228. An act to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks;

S. 2275. An act to revise the procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act, Public Law 86–3, for the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; and

S. 2364. An act to provide that the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island shall have 6 months after its formation in which to make its report to Congress.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Construction of Ground Test Facilities at Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of ground test facilities at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on Title I Agreements Under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, for the month of November 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Flight Pay, U.S. Air Force

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on flight pay, for the 6-month period ended August 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Defense Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July–October 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Permits and Licenses for Hydroelectric Projects Issued by Federal Power Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the permits and licenses for hydroelectric projects issued by that Commission, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Reports and Recommendations of NATO Parliamentarians Conference

A letter from the President, NATO Parliamentarians Conference, Paris, France, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, reports and recommendations adopted by that Conference at its ninth annual session, November 4–9, 1963 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of Comptroller General of the United States

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the U.S. General Accounting Office, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Excessive Cost of Leasing Compared With Buying Certain Electronic Data Processing Equipment

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the excessive cost of leasing compared with buying certain electronic data processing equipment at Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex., Department of the Air Force, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Erroneous Reporting of Taxable Income and Taxes Withheld From Pay of Military Personnel

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on erroneous reporting of taxable income and taxes withheld from pay of military personnel, Department of the Air Force, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Desirability of Establishing More Equitable Arrangements Between Federal Government and Certain Commercial Banks

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on further comments on the desirability of establishing more equitable arrangement between the Federal Government and commercial banks maintaining Treasury Department tax and loan accounts, dated December 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Certification of Adequate Soil Survey and Land Classification, Spokane Valley Project, Washington

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Spokane Valley project, Washington, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Proposed Amendment to Concession Contract at Statue of Liberty National Monument, New York, N.Y.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed amendment to the concession contract with Evelyn Hill, Inc., at the Statue of Liberty National Monument, New York, N.Y. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Proceedings of Judicial Conference of the United States

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., September 17–18, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOHN A. PERALTA

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of John A. Peralta (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON VISA PETITIONS ACCORDING FIRST PREFERENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning visa petitions according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Board of County Commissioners of Spokane County, Wash., favoring the establishment of a U.S. mint in Spokane; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the mayor and council of the city of Tucson, Ariz., relating to the renaming in that city of a park to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Plaza; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Rev. Felician Fritzler, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to a carol written by him entitled "Peace Memorial"; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY—RESOLUTION OF FEDERAL HOUSE OF DEPUTIES OF BRAZIL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the members of the Federal House of Deputies of Brazil passed a resolution in connection with the assassination of President Kennedy which they asked me to bring to the attention of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the English translation forwarded to me by the deputies be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

[Unofficial translation]

Senator EDWARD KENNEDY,
Senate of the United States of America,
Washington, D.C.:

The undersigned, Members of the Federal House of Deputies of Brasil, address to the United States Congress, through your good offices, the expression of their earnest wishes for the thorough identification of the true motives and authors of the brutal act which took the life of the democratic leader John F. Kennedy, outraged the free conscience of the peoples of the world as it did that of the generous American people and gravely jeopardized hopes for peace and peaceful coexistence among all races, classes, religious faiths, and political ideologies throughout the world.

NAMES OF SIGNERS

João Doria, Breno da Silveira, Rolando Corbisier, Getúlio Moura, Bento Gonçalves, Antonio Bresolin, Ary Alcântara, Ruben Alves, Clay Araújo, Campos Vergal, Geremias Fontes, Manoel Almeida, Francisco Macedo, Geraldo de Pina, Theódulo de Albuquerque, Chagas Rodrigues, Ivan Luz, Sergio Magalhães, Doutel de Andrade, Clemens Sampaio, Mario Maia, Fernando Gama, Epitácio Cafeteira, Rogê Ferreira, Helio Ramos, Valério Magalhães, Benedito Vaz, Josaphat Azevedo, Plínio Sampaio, Clovis Pestana, Ortiz Borges, Francisco Julião, Janduhy Carneiro, José Esteves, Paulo Coelho, Hélcio Maghenzani, Benjamin Farah, Paulo Mansur, Lírio Bertoli, José Maria Ribeiro, Miguel Buffara, Antônio Anibelli, João Herculano, Antonio Feliciano, Guilhermino de Oliveira, Abrahão Sabbah, Almino Afonso, Carlos Murilo, Palhano Saboia, Audizio Pinheiro, Floriceno Paixão, Castro Costa, Pereira Lúcio, Antonio de Barros, João Veiga, Padre Nobre, Nogueira de Rezende, Silvio Braga, Pedro Marão, Marcelo Sanford, Machado Rollemberg, Olavo Costa, Zacarias Seleme, Leão Sampaio, Padre Vidigal, Renato Azeredo, Medeiros Neto, Nelson Carneiro, Mario Lima, Orlando Bertoli, José Carlos, Adrião Bernardes, Geraldo Freire Geraldo Mesquita, Wanderley Dantas, Daso Coimbra, Max da Costa Santos, Floriano Rubim, Leopoldo Peres, Henrique Lima, Manso Cabral, Tufy Nassif, Gil Veloso, Clodomir Millet, Arruda Câmara, Taboas de Almeida, Celestino Filho, José Freire, João Alves, Lamartine Távora, Artur Lima, Viera de Melo, Djalma Passos, Josaphat Borges, Braga Ramos, José Carlos Teixeira, Costa Lima, Zaire Nunes, Estelio Maroja, Ramon de Oliveira, Batista Ramos, Emmanoel Waissmann, Cesar Prieto, Lister Caldas, Rui Lino, Paulo de Tarso, Jales Machado, Ari Pitombo, Arnaldo Garcez, Levy Tavares, Segismundo Andrade, Nicolau Tuma, Américo Silva, Heitor Cavalcanti, Benedito Cerqueira, Temperani Pereira, Osmar Grafulha, Wilson Roriz, Cândido Sampaio, Moisés Pimentel, Garcia Filho, José Sarney, Sussumu Hirata, Mario Covas, Raphael Rezende, Paulo Freire, Magalhães Melo, Regis Pacheco, Dinar Mendes, Emílio Gomes, Alceu Carvalho, Derville Alegretti, Armando Carvalho, Alberto Aboud, Wilson Chedid, Oscar Cardoso, Mello Mourão, Tourinho Dantas, Elias Carmo, Celso Passos, Cardoso de Menezes, Aderbal Jurema, Aloísio Nonô, Lourival Batista, Anísio Rocha, Miguel Marcondes, Fernando Santana, Jaeder Albergaria, Horácio Betônico, Wilson Falcão, Celso Amaral, Edgard Pereira, Unirio Machado, Afonso Celso, Heraclio do Rêgo, Manoel Novaes, Necy Novais, Luna Freire, Wilson Martins, Pedro Braga, Aécio Costa, Moreira da Rocha, Océlio de Medeiros, Oziris Pontes, Neiva Moreira, Guerreiro Ramos, Renato Medeiros, Armando Leite, Haroldo Durate, Raimundo de Andrade, Ivan Saldanha, Milvernes Lima, Oséas Cardoso, Simão da Cunha, Marcial Terra, Perachi Barcelos, Marco Antonio, Roberto Saturnino, Raymundo Brito, Waldemar Guimarães, Burnett Paiva Muniz, Ferro Costa, Cid Carvalho, Esmerino Arruda, Pereira Nunes, Mendes de Moraes, Milton Brandão, Bivar Olinto, José Menck, Paulo Maranini, João Ribeiro, Maia Neto, Gadhil Barreto, Athié Coury, Lino Morganti, Amintas de Barros, Ozana M. Coelho, Chagas Freitas, Gabriel Hermes Amaral Furlan, Osmar Dutra, Eurico Ribeiro.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of October 1963. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, OCTOBER 1963

INTRODUCTION

This is the 47th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories. It is for the month of October 1963.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior, and the General Services Administration.

The cost value of materials in inventories covered in this report, as of October 1, 1963, totaled $14,537,174,286, and as of October 31, 1963, they totaled $14,417,885,378, a net decrease of $119,288,908 during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, but the cost value figures are summarized by major category, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories by major category

Major category	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile [1]	$5,791,239,900	$5,779,344,300	−$11,895,600
Defense Production Act	1,491,620,400	1,489,638,200	−1,982,200
Supplemental—barter	1,347,267,417	1,350,137,038	+2,869,621
Total, strategic and critical materials [1]	8,630,127,717	8,619,119,538	−11,008,179
Agricultural commodities:			
Price support inventory	5,472,127,710	5,361,257,559	−110,870,151
Inventory transferred from national stockpile [1]	126,232,170	125,763,492	−468,678
Total, agricultural commodities [1]	5,598,359,880	5,487,021,051	−111,338,829
Civil defense supplies and equipment:			
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense	11,818,287	11,899,807	+81,520
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	191,466,181	192,421,458	+955,277
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	203,284,468	204,321,265	+1,036,797
Machine tools:			
Defense Production Act	2,208,600	2,208,600	----------
National Industrial Reserve Act	89,797,300	89,745,000	−52,300
Total, machine tools	92,005,900	91,953,600	−52,300
Helium	13,396,321	15,469,924	+2,073,603
Total, all inventories	14,537,174,286	14,417,885,378	−119,288,908

[1] Cotton inventory valued at $128,409,100 withdrawn from the national stockpile and transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal, pursuant to Public Law 87-548, during August 1962.

Detailed tables in this report show each commodity, by the major categories summarized above, in terms of quantity and cost value as of the beginning and end of the month. Net change figures reflect acquisitions, disposals, and accounting and other adjustments during the month.

The cost value figures represent generally the original acquisition cost of the commodities delivered to permanent storage locations, together with certain packaging, processing, upgrading, et cetera, costs as carried in agency inventory accounts. Quantities are stated in the designated stockpile unit of measure.

Appendix A to this report includes program descriptions and statutory citations pertinent to each stockpile inventory within the major categories.

The stockpile inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), October 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month).

Table 2: Agricultural commodities inventories, October 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 3: Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, October 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 4: Machine tools inventories, October 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 5: Helium inventories, October 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

New stockpile objectives

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new objectives for strategic and critical materials. Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives for 12 materials.

Appendix B contains excerpts from the Office of Emergency Planning statement setting forth the new policy with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), October 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Aluminum, metal:									
National stockpile	$487,680,600	$487,680,600		Short ton	1,128,989	1,128,989			
Defense Production Act	433,096,700	432,395,600	−$701,100	do	858,124	857,323	−801		
Total	920,777,300	920,076,200	−701,100		1,987,113	1,986,312	−801	[2] 450,000	1,536,312
Aluminum oxide, abrasive grain:									
Supplemental—barter	14,827,844	15,145,323	+317,479	Short dry ton	48,757	48,974	+217	(3)	48,974
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude:									
National stockpile	21,735,100	21,735,100		do	200,093	200,093			
Supplemental—barter	22,747,400	22,747,400		do	178,266	178,266			
Total	44,482,500	44,482,500			378,359	378,359		200,000	178,359
Antimony:									
National stockpile	20,488,000	20,488,000		Short ton	30,301	30,301			
Supplemental—barter	12,635,191	12,739,199	+104,008	do	21,673	21,772	+99		
Total	33,123,191	33,227,199	+104,008	do	51,974	52,073	+99	70,000	(4)
Asbestos, amosite:									
National stockpile	2,637,600	2,637,600		do	11,705	11,705			
Supplemental—barter	6,847,459	6,877,475	+30,016	do	27,619	27,630	+11		
Total	9,485,259	9,515,075	+30,016	do	39,324	39,335	+11	45,000	(4)
Asbestos, chrysotile:									
National stockpile	3,356,200	3,356,200		Short dry ton	6,224	6,224			
Defense Production Act	2,102,600	2,102,600		do	2,348	2,348			
Supplemental—barter	3,934,500	3,934,500		do	5,532	5,532			
Total	9,393,300	9,393,300		do	14,104	14,104		11,000	3,104
Asbestos, crocidolite:									
National stockpile	702,100	702,100		Short ton	1,567	1,567			
Supplemental—barter	7,278,290	7,253,690	−24,600	do	27,437	27,437			
Total	7,980,390	7,955,790	−24,600	do	29,004	29,004		(3)	29,004
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type:									
National stockpile	13,925,000	13,925,000		Long dry ton	879,740	879,740			
Defense Production Act	18,168,000	18,168,000		do	1,370,077	1,370,077			
Supplemental—barter	89,398,758	89,403,358	+4,600	do	5,780,590	5,780,590			
Total	121,491,758	121,496,358	+4,600	do	8,030,407	8,030,407		2,600,000	5,430,407
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type:									
National stockpile	78,552,500	78,552,500		Long dry ton	4,962,706	4,962,706			
Supplemental—barter	45,294,200	45,280,400	−13,800	do	2,927,260	2,927,260			
Total	123,846,700	123,832,900	−13,800	do	7,889,966	7,889,966		6,400,000	1,489,966
Bauxite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	11,347,800	11,347,800		Long calcined ton	299,279	299,279		137,000	162,279
Beryl:									
National stockpile	9,768,400	9,768,400		Short ton	23,230	23,230			
Defense Production Act	1,425,800	1,425,800		do	2,543	2,543			
Supplemental—barter	22,739,500	22,739,500		do	11,321	11,321			
Total	33,933,700	33,933,700		do	37,094	37,094		23,100	13,994
Beryllium metal:									
Supplemental—barter	15,363,012	16,167,037	+804,025	do	132	136	+4	(3)	136
Bismuth:									
National stockpile	2,674,300	2,674,300		Pound	1,342,402	1,342,402			
Defense Production Act	52,400	52,400		do	22,901	22,901			
Supplemental—barter	5,540,200	5,540,200		do	2,506,493	2,506,493			
Total	8,266,900	8,266,900		do	3,871,796	3,871,796		3,000,000	871,796
Cadmium:									
National stockpile	18,631,000	18,037,400	−593,600	do	9,490,475	9,188,064	−302,411		
Supplemental—barter	12,327,600	12,327,600		do	7,448,989	7,448,989			
Total	30,958,600	30,365,000	−593,600	do	16,939,464	16,637,053	−302.411	6,500,000	10,137,053

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), October 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Castor oil:									
National stockpile	$50,433,500	$50,181,400	−$252,100	do	192,119,777	189,932,037	2,187,740	[2] 22,000,000	167,932,037
Celestite:									
National stockpile	1,412,300	1,412,300		Short dry ton	28,816	28,816			
Supplemental—barter	225,646	225,646		do	5,416	5,416			
Total	1,637,946	1,637,946		do	34,232	34,232		22,000	12,232
Chromite, chemical grade:									
National stockpile	12,288,000	12,288,000		do	559,452	559,452			
Supplemental—barter	21,836,449	21,880,449	+44,000	do	699,647	699,647			
Total	34,124,449	34,168,449	+44,000	do	1,259,099	1,259,099		475,000	784,099
Chromite, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	264,565,500	264,565,500		do	3,795,292	3,795,292			
Defense Production Act	35,879,900	35,879,900		do	985,646	985,646			
Supplemental—barter	224,757,400	224,198,100	−559,300	do	1,543,110	1,543,110			
Total	525,202,800	524,643,500	−559,300	do	6,324,048	6,324,048		[2] 2,970,000	3,354,048
Chromite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	25,149,300	25,149,300		do	1,047,159	1,047,159			
Supplemental—barter	5,039,000	5,039,000		do	179,775	179,775			
Total	30,188,300	30,188,300		do	1,226,934	1,226,934		1,300,000	(4)
Cobalt:									
National stockpile	169,205,200	169,205,200		Pound	76,664,297	76,664,297			
Defense Production Act	52,075,300	52,075,300		do	25,194,122	25,194,122			
Supplemental—barter	2,169,000	2,169,000		do	1,077,018	1,077,018			
Total	223,449,500	223,449,500			102,935,437	102,934,437		19,000,000	83,935,437
Coconut oil:									
National stockpile	10,408,700	9,019,400	−1,389,300	do	68,679,523	59,511,851	−9,167,672	(3)	59,511,851
Comelanite:									
Supplemental—barter	2,636,400	2,636,400		Long dry ton	67,636	67,636		(3)	67,636
Columbium:									
National stockpile	23,919,200	23,919,200		Pound	7,507,959	7,507,959			
Defense Production Act	50,238,900	50,238,900		do	8,222,684	8,222,684			
Supplemental—barter	799,100	799,100		do	388,877	388,877			
Total	74,957,200	74,957,200		do	16,119,520	16,119,520		1,900,000	14,219,520
Copper:									
National stockpile	522,800,300	522,969,400	+169,100	Short ton	1,008,266	1,008,266			
Defense Production Act	58,763,600	58,093,900	−669,700	do	104,765	103,708	−1,057		
Supplemental—barter	8,218,500	8,255,300	+36,800	do	12,382	12,382			
Total	589,782,400	589,318,600	−463,800	do	1,125,413	1,124,356	−1,057	[2] 775,000	349,356
Cordage fibers, abaca:									
National stockpile	37,739,800	37,739,800		Pound	149,732,545	149,732,545		150,000,000	(4)
Cordage fibers, sisal:									
National stockpile	42,809,700	42,809,700		do	316,366,880	316,366,880		320,000,000	(4)
Corundum:									
National stockpile	393,100	393,100		Short ton	2,008	2,008		2,000	8
Cryolite:									
Defense Production Act	6,956,700	6,890,200	−66,500	do	25,193	24,952	−241	(3)	24,952
Diamond dies:									
National stockpile	496,800	497,400	+600	Piece	16,487	16,696	+209	25,000	(4)
Diamond, industrial, crushing bort:									
National stockpile	61,609,500	61,609,500		Carat	31,113,411	31,113,411			
Supplemental—barter	15,800,500	15,800,500		do	5,550,579	5,550,579			
Total	77,410,000	77,410,000		do	36,663,990	36,663,990		30,000,000	6,663,990
Diamond, industrial, stones:									
National stockpile	100,501,500	100,501,500		do	9,315,183	9,315,183			
Supplemental—barter	186,324,500	186,324,500		do	15,425,827	15,425,827			
Total	286,826,000	286,826,000		do	24,741,010	24,741,010		18,000,000	6,741,010
Diamond tools:									
National stockpile	1,015,400	1,015,400		Piece	64,178	64,178		(3)	64,178
Feathers and down:									
National stockpile	37,083,300	36,853,100	−230,200	Pound	8,951,101	8,881,351	−69,750	[2] 3,000,000	5,881,351
Fluorspar, acid grade:									
National stockpile	26,167,500	26,167,500		Short dry ton	463,049	463,049			
Defense Production Act	1,394,400	1,394,400		do	19,700	19,700			
Supplemental—barter	33,530,700	33,530,700		do	673,232	673,232			
Total	61,092,600	61,092,600		do	1,155,981	1,155,981		280,000	875,981
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	17,332,400	17,332,400		do	369,443	369,443			
Supplemental—barter	1,508,100	1,508,100		do	42,800	42,800			
Total	18,840,500	18,840,500		do	412,243	412,243		375,000	37,243

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), October 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump:									
National stockpile	$937,900	$937,900		do	4,455	4,455			
Supplemental—barter	341,200	341,200		do	1,428	1,428			
Total	1,279,100	1,279,100		do	5,883	5,883		3,600	2,283
Graphite, natural, Madagascar, crystalline:									
National stockpile	7,056,200	7,052,100	−$4,100	do	34,233	34,213	−20		
Supplemental—barter	230,343	237,043	+6,700	do	1,907	1,908	+1		
Total	7,286,543	7,289,143	+2,600	do	36,140	36,121	−19	17,200	18,921
Graphite, natural, other, crystalline:									
National stockpile	1,896,300	1,896,300		do	5,487	5,487		2,100	3,387
Hyoscine:									
National stockpile	30,600	30,600		Ounce	2,100	2,100		2,100	(4)
Iodine:									
National stockpile	4,08 ,000	4,082,000		Pound	2,977,648	2,977,648			
Supplemental—barter	1,066,000	1,066,000		do	994,920	994,920			
Total	5,148,000	5,148,000		do	3,972,568	3,972,568		4,300,000	(4)
Iridium:									
National stockpile	2,525,800	2,525,800		Troy ounce	13,937	13,937		4,000	9,937
Jewel bearings:									
National stockpile	4,129,600	4,129,600		Piece	51,626,565	51,626,565		57,500,000	(4)
Kyanite-mullite:									
National stockpile	794,500	786,000	−8,500	Short dry ton	9,190	9,091	−99	4,800	4,291
Lead:									
National stockpile	319,298,100	319,298,100		Short ton	1,050,370	1,050,370			
Defense Production Act	1,221,600	1,221,600		do	3,225	3,225			
Supplemental—barter	78,398,600	78,398,600		do	327,998	327,998			
Total	398,918,300	398,918,300		do	1,381,593	1,381,593		[3] 0	1,381,593
Magnesium:									
National stockpile	129,803,800	129,351,800	−452,000	do	178,801	178,178	−623	107,000	71,178
Manganese, battery grade, natural ore:									
National stockpile	21,025,500	21,025,500		do	144,485	144,485			
Supplemental—barter	13,621,900	13,621,900		do	137,700	137,700			
Total	34,647,400	34,647,400		do	282,185	282,185		50,000	232,185
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide:									
National stockpile	3,095,500	3,095,500		Short dry ton	21,272	21,272			
Defense Production Act	2,524,700	2,524,700		do	3,779	3,779			
Total	5,620,200	5,620,200		do	25,051	25,051		20,000	5,051
Manganese, chemical grade, type A:									
National stockpile	2,133,300	2,133,300		do	29,307	29,307			
Supplemental—barter	7,917,200	7,922,100	+4,900	do	117,607	117,607			
Total	10,050,500	10,055,400	+4,900	do	146,914	146,914		30,000	16,914
Manganese, chemical grade, type B:									
National stockpile	132,600	132,600		do	1,822	1,822			
Supplemental—barter	6,665,700	6,669,800	+4,100	do	88,016	99,016			
Total	6,798,300	6,8 2,400	+4,100	do	100,838	100,828		53,000	47,838
Manganese, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	248,240,300	248,240,300		Short dry ton	5,851,264	5,851,264			
Defense Production Act	176,474,400	176,474,400		do	3,056,691	3,056,691			
Supplemental—barter	239,729,058	241,202,862	+1,473,804	do	3,606,987	3,654,959	+47,972		
Total	664,443,758	665,917,562	+1,473,804	do	12,514,942	12,562,914	+47,972	6,800,000	5,762,914
Mercury:									
National stockpile	20,039,500	20,039,500		Flask	129,525	129,525			
Supplemental—barter	3,446,200	3,446,200		do	16,000	16,000			
Total	23,485,700	23,485,700		do	145,525	145,525		[3] 200,000	(4)
Mica, muscovite block:									
National stockpile	27,631,200	27,602,200	−29,000	Pound	11,609,000	11,617,756	+8,756		
Defense Production Act	40,746,400	40,746,400		do	6,446,722	6,446,722			
Supplemental—barter	5,287,250	5,395,162	+107,912	do	1,594,635	1,617,772	+23,137		
Total	73,664,850	73,743,762	+78,912	do	19,650,357	19,682,250	+31,893	8,300,000	11,382,250
Mica, muscovite film:									
National stockpile	9,058,100	9,058,100		do	1,733,083	1,724,327	−8,756		
Defense Production Act	633,300	633,300		do	102,681	102,681			
Supplemental—barter	1,053,033	1,064,500	+11,467	do	107,687	108,765	+1,078		
Total	10,744,433	10,755,900	+11,467	do	1,943,451	1,935,773	−7,678	1,300,000	635,773

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), October 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Mica, muscovite splittings:									
National stockpile	$40,598,300	$40,598,300		do	40,159,938	40,159,938			
Supplemental—barter	6,225,800	6,225,800		do	4,826,257	4,826,257			
Total	46,824,100	46,824,100		do	44,986,195	44,986,195		21,200,000	23,786,195
Mica, phlogopite block:									
National stockpile	303,600	303,600		do	223,239	223,239		17,000	206,239
Mica, phlogopite splittings:									
National stockpile	2,580,500	2,580,500		do	3,079,063	3,079,063			
Supplemental—barter	2,400,115	2,400,115		do	1,986,907	1,986,907			
Total	4,980,615	4,980,615		do	5,065,970	5,065,970		1,700,000	3,365,970
Molybdenum:									
National stockpile	83,679,000	83,679,000		do	79,038,361	79,043,336	+4,975	59,000,000	20,043,336
Nickel:									
National stockpile	181,974,500	181,960,400	−$14,100	Short ton	167,131	167,109	−22		
Defense Production Act	101,536,400	101,072,100	−464,300	do	53,133	52,767	−366		
Total	283,510,900	283,032,500	−478,400	do	220,264	219,876	−388	[2] 50,000	169,876
Opium:									
National stockpile	13,661,700	13,661,700		Pound	195,757	195,757		[2] 141,280	54,477
Palladium:									
National stockpile	2,079,000	2,079,000		Troy ounce	89,811	89,811			
Defense Production Act	177,300	177,300		do	7,884	7,884			
Supplemental—barter	12,170,200	12,170,200		do	648,124	648,124			
Total	14,426,500	14,426,500		do	745,819	745,819		340,000	405,810
Palm oil:									
National stockpile	3,962,700	3,841,200	−121,500	Pound	22,016,098	21,340,692	−675,406	(3)	21,340,692
Platinum:									
National stockpile	56,879,900	56,879,900		Troy ounce	716,343	716,343			
Supplemental—barter	4,024,500	4,024,500		do	49,999	49,999			
Total	60,904,400	60,904,400		do	766,342	766,342		165,000	601,342
Pyrethrum:									
National stockpile	415,100	451,100		Pound	67,065	67,065		66,000	1,065
Quartz crystals:									
National stockpile	68,587,800	68,560,900	−26,900	do	5,560,319	5,558,138	−2,181		
Supplemental—barter	3,200,900	3,519,200	+318,300	do	232,352	232,352			
Total	71,788,700	72,080,100	+291,400	do	5,792,671	5,790,490	−2,181	650,000	5,140,490
Quinidine:									
National stockpile	1,912,800	1,901,400	−11,400	Ounce	1,658,377	1,648,428	−9,949	1,600,000	48,428
Quinine:									
National stockpile	3,622,600	3,622,600		do	5,727,732	5,727,732		(3)	5,727,732
Rare earths:									
National stockpile	7,134,900	7,134,900		Short dry ton	10,042	10,042			
Supplemental—barter	5,787,811	5,803,211	+15,400	do	6,355	6,091	−264		
Total	12,922,711	12,938,111	+15,400	do	16,397	16,133	−264	5,700	10,433
Rare earths residue:									
Defense Production Act	657,800	657,800		Pound	6,085,327	6,085,311	−16	(3)	6,085,311
Rhodium:									
National stockpile	78,200	78,200		Troy ounce	618	618		(3)	618
Rubber:									
National stockpile	755,759,700	749,148,000	−6,611,700	Long ton	977,521	968,649	−8,872	750,000	218,649
Ruthenium:									
Supplemental—barter	559,500	559,500		Troy ounce	15,001	15,001		(3)	15,001
Rutile:									
National stockpile	2,070,100	2,070,100		Short dry ton	18,599	18,599			
Defense Production Act	2,725,100	2,725,100		do	17,410	17,410			
Supplemental—barter	1,061,300	1,061,300		do	11,632	11,632			
Total	5,856,500	5,856,500		do	47,641	47,641		65,000	(4)
Rutile chlorinator charge:									
Defense Production Act				do	1,877	1,859	−18	(3)	1,859
Sapphire and ruby:									
National stockpile	190,000	190,000		Carat	16,187,500	16,187,500		18,000,000	(4)
Selenium:									
National stockpile	757,100	757,100		Pound	97,100	97,100			
Supplemental—barter	1,070,500	1,070,500		do	156,518	156,518			
Total	1,827,600	1,827,600		do	253,618	253,618		400,000	(4)

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), October 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective [1]	Excess over maximum objective
Shellac:									
National stockpile	$8,535,700	$8,519,300	−$16,400	do	17,025,913	16,993,123	−32,800	7,400,000	9,593,123
Silicon carbide, crude:									
National stockpile	11,394,500	11,394,500		Short ton	64,697	64,697			
Supplemental—barter	26,802,700	26,802,700		do	131,805	131,805			
Total	38,197,200	38,197,200		do	196,502	196,502		100,000	96,502
Silk noils and waste:									
National stockpile	1,410,000	1,377,800	−23,200	Pound	1,087,321	1,072,583	−14,738	970,000	102,583
Silk, raw:									
National stockpile	486,600	486,600		do	113,515	113,515		120,000	(4)
Sperm oil:									
National stockpile	4,775,400	4,775,400		do	23,442,158	23,442,158		[2] 23,400,000	42,158
Talc, steatite block and lump:									
National stockpile	496,800	496,800		Short ton	1,274	1,274		300	974
Talc, steatite ground:									
National stockpile	231,200	231,200		do	3,901	3,901		(3)	3,901
Tantalum:									
National stockpile	10,992,700	10,992,700		Pound	3,445,169	3,445,169			
Defense Production Act	9,734,400	9,734,400		do	1,531,366	1,531,366			
Supplemental—barter	21,100	21,100		do	8,036	8,036			
Total	20,748,200	20,748,200		do	4,984,571	4,984,571		2,420,000	2,564,571
Thorium:									
Defense Production Act	42,000	42,000		do	848,354	848,354			
Supplemental—barter	17,665,758	17,849,568	+183,810	do	8,521,525	8,561,950	+40,425		
Total	17,707,758	17,891,568	+183,810	do	9,369,879	9,410,304	+40,425	(3)	9,410,304
Tin:									
National stockpile	811,098,300	808,830,500	−2,267,800	Long ton	333,536	332,585	−951		
Supplemental—barter	16,404,000	16,404,000		do	7,505	7,505			
Total	827,502,300	825,234,500	−2,267,800	do	341,041	340,090	−951	[2] 200,000	140,090
Titanium:									
Defense Production Act	176,178,800	176,098,200	−80,600	Short ton	22,381	22,371	−10		
Supplemental—barter	32,097,700	32,097,700		do	9,021	9,021			
Total	208,276,500	208,195,900	−80,600	do	31,402	31,392	−10	(3)	31,392
Tungsten:									
National stockpile	369,127,300	369,127,300		Pound	120,071,339	120,071,339			
Defense Production Act	318,813,900	318,813,900		do	78,186,563	78,186,563			
Supplemental—barter	18,651,400	18,651,400		do	5,774,827	5,774,827			
Total	706,592,600	706,592,600		do	204,032,729	204,032,729		50,000,000	154,032,729
Vanadium:									
National stockpile	31,567,900	31,567,900		do	15,730,893	15,730,893		2,000,000	13,730,893
Vegetable tannin extract, chestnut:									
National stockpile	11,932,800	11,932,800		Long ton	42,770	42,770		30,000	12,770
Vegetable tannin extract, quebracho:									
National stockpile	49,169,700	49,169,700		do	198,728	198,728		180,000	18,728
Vegetable tannin extract, wattle:									
National stockpile	9,826,900	9,826,900		do	38,962	38,962		39,000	(4)
Zinc:									
National stockpile	364,345,400	364,345,400		Short ton	1,256,845	1,256,845			
Supplemental—barter	79,588,400	79,588,400		do	323,896	323,896			
Total	443,933,800	443,933,800		do	1,580,741	1,580,741		[3] 0	1,580,741
Zirconium ore, baddeleyite:									
National stockpile	710,600	710,600		Short dry ton	16,533	16,533		(3)	16,533
Zirconium ore, zircon:									
National stockpile	159,200	145,700	−13,500	Short dry ton do	2,690	2,375	−315	(3)	2,375
Total:									
National stockpile	5,791,239,900	5,779,344,300	−11,895,600						
Defense Production Act	1,491,620,400	1,489,638,200	−1,982,200						
Supplemental—barter	1,347,267,417	1,350,137,038	+2,869,621						
Total, strategic and critical materials	8,630,127,717	8,619,119,538	−11,008,179						

---

[1] Maximum objectives for strategic and critical materials are determined pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h). The Office of Emergency Planning is currently in the process of revising stockpile objectives. (See app. B, p. 24417.)

[2] New objective. (See app. B, p. 24417.)

[3] No present objective.

[4] Not in excess of maximum objective.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, October 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month
Price-support inventory:							
Basic commodities:							
Corn	$986, 849, 082	$1, 062, 905, 007	+$76, 055, 925	Bushel	802, 646, 840	864, 198, 219	+61, 551, 379
Cotton, extra-long staple	9, 813, 121	9, 812, 982	−139	Bale	37, 073	37, 072	−1
Cotton, upland	1, 192, 057, 169	1, 114, 926, 515	−77, 130, 654	do	7, 216, 630	6, 748, 869	−467, 761
Peanuts, shelled	10, 447, 249	9, 145, 462	−1, 301, 787	Pound	60, 801, 536	52, 999, 073	−7, 802, 463
Rice, milled	389, 704	213	−389, 491	Hundredweight	39, 877	22	−39, 855
Rice, rough	9, 534, 842	9, 208, 545	−326, 297	do	1, 789, 772	1, 728, 757	−61, 015
Wheat	2, 098, 338, 617	2, 046, 189, 033	−52, 149, 584	Bushel	1, 046, 971, 226	1, 020, 522, 857	−26, 448, 369
Wheat, rolled	1, 792	1, 792		Pound	27, 144	27, 144	
Bulgur	216, 075	331, 576	+115, 502	do	3, 983, 612	6, 219, 330	+2, 235, 718
Total, basic commodities	4, 307, 647, 651	4, 252, 521, 125	−55, 126, 526				
Designated nonbasic commodities:							
Barley	43, 064, 761	40, 036, 811	−3, 027, 950	Bushel	49, 724, 492	45, 704, 692	−4, 019, 800
Grain sorghum	675, 136, 619	669, 262, 401	−5, 874, 218	do	612, 122, 821	606, 065, 089	−6, 057, 732
Milk and butterfat:							
Butter	187, 751, 083	156, 600, 699	−31, 150, 384	Pound	323, 043, 857	269, 701, 959	−53, 341, 898
Butter oil	77, 239, 345	84, 951, 969	−2, 287, 376	do	110, 729, 453	107, 966, 204	−2, 763, 249
Cheese	24, 661, 343	22, 244, 169	−2, 417, 174	do	65, 283, 365	58, 877, 267	−6, 406, 098
Ghee	1, 187, 530	1, 082, 494	−105, 036	do	1, 471, 240	1, 342, 100	−129, 140
Milk, dried	106, 354, 165	100, 556, 427	−5, 797, 738	do	722, 289, 144	683, 146, 150	−39, 142, 994
Oats	11, 516, 120	11, 438, 911	−77, 209	Bushel	19, 192, 160	19, 057, 806	−134, 354
Rye	1, 517, 824	1, 223, 150	−294, 674	do	1, 475, 730	1, 188, 843	−286, 887
Total, designated nonbasic commodities	1, 138, 428, 790	1, 087, 397, 031	−51, 031, 759				
Other nonbasic commodities:							
Beans, dry, edible	5, 208, 564	3, 316, 130	−1, 892, 434	Hundredweight	688, 397	430, 755	−257, 642
Cottonseed oil, refined	828, 060	623, 665	−204, 395	Pound	4, 821, 678	3, 631, 769	−1, 189, 909
Flaxseed	14, 736, 713	14, 664, 603	−72, 110	Bushel	4, 974, 977	4, 973, 828	−1, 149
Soybeans	3, 847, 853	1, 721, 124	−2, 126, 729	do	1, 653, 717	747, 324	−906, 393
Vegetable oil products	1, 430, 079	1, 013, 881	−416, 198	Pound	8, 926, 685	6, 351, 220	−2, 575, 465
Total, other nonbasic commodities	26, 051, 269	21, 339, 403	−4, 711, 866				
Total, price support inventory	5, 472, 127, 710	5, 361, 257, 559	−110, 870, 151				
Inventory transferred from national stockpile: [1]							
Cotton, Egyptian	102, 528, 200	102, 084, 670	−443, 530	Bale	121, 361	120, 836	−525
Cotton, American-Egyptian	23, 703, 970	23, 678, 822	−25, 148	do	47, 128	47, 078	−50
Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile.	126, 232, 170	125, 763, 492	−468, 678	do	168, 589	167, 914	−575
Total, agricultural commodities	5, 598, 359, 880	5, 487, 021, 051	−111, 338, 829				

[1] Transferred from General Services Administration pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548. (See app. A, p. 24416.)

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, October 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cos value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense:							
Engineering equipment (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings).	$10, 019, 104	$10, 100, 049	+$80, 945	10-mile units	45	45	
Chemical and biological equipment	1, 799, 183	1, 799, 758	+575	(1)			
Total	11, 818, 287	11, 899, 807	+81, 520				
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:							
Medical bulk stocks, and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses.	137, 835, 586	138, 544, 462	+708, 876	(1)			
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations	5, 326, 895	5, 327, 314	+419	(1)			
Civil defense emergency hospitals	37, 255, 680	37, 181, 646	−74, 034	Each	1, 930	1, 930	
Replenishment units (functional assemblies other than hospitals).	469, 716	443, 620	−26, 096	(1)			
Supply additions (for civil defense emergency hospitals).	10, 578, 304	10, 924, 416	+346, 112	(1)			
Total	191, 466, 181	192, 421, 458	+955, 277				
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	203, 284, 468	204, 321, 265	+1, 036, 797				

[1] Composite group of many different items.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—*Machine tools inventories, October 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month
Defense Production Act:							
In storage	$21, 400	$21, 400		Tool	7	7	
On lease	2, 144, 300	2, 144, 300		do	103	103	
On loan	42, 900	42, 900		do	7	7	
Total	2, 208, 600	2, 208, 600		do	117	117	
National Industrial Reserve Act:							
In storage	79, 645, 200	78, 241, 300	−$1, 403, 900	do	7, 238	6, 993	−245
On lease	27, 500	27, 500		do	1	1	
On loan to other agencies	2, 150, 200	2, 617, 000	+466, 800	do	225	279	+54
On loan to school programs	7, 974, 400	8, 859, 200	+884, 800	do	1, 917	2, 099	+182
Total	89, 797, 300	89, 745, 000	−52, 300	do	9, 381	9, 372	−9
Total, machine tools	92, 005, 900	91, 953, 600	−52, 300	do	9, 498	9, 489	−9

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration.

TABLE 5.—*Helium inventories, October 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Oct. 1, 1963	End of month, Oct. 31, 1963	Net change during month
Helium:							
Stored aboveground	$318, 139	$247, 979	−$70, 160	Cubic foot	28, 000, 000	21, 300, 000	−6, 700, 000
Stored underground	13, 078, 182	15, 221, 945	+2, 143, 763	do	1, 399, 000, 000	1, 598, 900, 000	+199, 900, 000
Total, helium	13, 396, 321	15, 469, 924	+2, 073, 603	do	1, 427, 000, 000	1, 620, 200, 000	+193, 200, 000

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of the Interior.

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS AND STATUTORY CITATIONS

Strategic and critical materials

National Stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The General Services Administration is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, the General Services Administration is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Supplemental—Barter

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) the General Services Administration is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

Agricultural commodities

The Price-Support Program

Price-support operations are carried out under the charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1966. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producers' commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgaged collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program results from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loans, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Inventory Transferred From National Stockpile

This inventory, all cotton, was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation at no cost from the national stockpile pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548. The proceeds from sales, less costs incurred by CCC, are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; therefore, such proceeds and costs are not recorded in the operating accounts. The cost value as shown for this cotton has been computed on the basis of average per bale cost of each type of cotton when purchased by CCC for the national stockpile.

Civil defense supplies and equipment

Civil Defense Stockpile

The Department of Defense conducts this stockpiling program pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended. The program is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

Civil Defense Medical Stockpile

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducts the stockpiling program for medical supplies and equipment pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as delegated by the President following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare plans and directs the procurement, storage, maintenance, inspection, survey, distribution, and utilization of essential supplies and equipment for emergency health services. The medical stockpile includes a program designed to pre-position assembled emergency hospitals and other medical supplies and equipment into communities throughout the Nation.

Machine tools

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration has acquired machine tools in furtherance of expansion of productive capacity, in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

National Industrial Equipment Reserve

Under general policies established and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense, the General Services Administration is responsible for care, maintenance, utilization, transfer, leasing, lending to nonprofit schools, disposal, transportation, repair, restoration, and renovation of national industrial reserve equipment transferred to GSA under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462).

Helium

The helium conservation program is conducted by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Helium Act, approved September 13, 1960 (Public Law 86-777; 74 Stat. 918; 50 U.S.C. 167), and subsequent appropriations acts which have established fiscal limitations and provided borrowing authority for the program. Among other things, the Helium Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to produce helium in Government plants, to acquire helium from private plants, to sell helium to meet current demands, and to store for future use helium that is so produced or acquired in excess of that required to meet current demands.

Sales of helium by the Secretary of the Interior shall be at prices established by him which shall be adequate to liquidate the costs of the program within 25 years, except that this period may be extended by the Secretary for not more than 10 years for funds borrowed for purposes other than the acquisition and construction of helium plants and facilities.

This report covers helium that is produced in Government plants and acquired from private plants. Helium in excess of current demands is stored in the Cliffside gasfield near Amarillo, Tex. The unit of measure is cubic foot at 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute pressure and 70° F.

APPENDIX B

NEW STOCKPILE OBJECTIVES

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new objectives for strategic and critical materials. Table I of this report reflects the new objectives for 12 materials: aluminum, castor oil, chromite (metallurgical grade), copper, feathers and down, lead, mercury, nickel, opium, sperm oil, tin, and zinc.

The following excerpts from OEP statements dated July 11 and 19, 1963, set forth the new policy with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials:

"The Office of Emergency Planning is now conducting supply-requirements studies for all stockpile materials which will reflect current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. On the basis of recently completed supply-requirements studies for the foregoing materials, the new stockpile objectives were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by the Office of Emergency Planning and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy to establish a single objective for each stockpile material. They have been determined on the basis of criteria heretofore used in establishing maximum objectives, and reflect the approximate calculated emergency deficits for the materials for conventional war and do not have any arbitrary adjustments for possible increased requirements for other types of emergency.

"Heretofore, there was a 'basic objective' and a 'maximum objective' for each material. The basic objectives assumed some continued reliance on foreign sources of supply in an emergency. The former maximum objectives completely discounted foreign sources of supply beyond North America and comparable accessible areas.

"Previously, maximum objectives could not be less than 6 months' normal usage of the material by industry in the United States in periods of active demand. The 6-month rule has been eliminated in establishing the new calculated conventional war objectives.

"The Office of Emergency Planning also announced that the present Defense Mobilization Order V-7, dealing with general policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling, was now being revised to reflect these new policies. When finally prepared and approved, the new order will be published in the Federal Register.

"New conventional war objectives for the remaining stockpile materials are being developed as rapidly as new supply-requirements data become available. They will be released as they are approved.

"The Office of Emergency Planning is also making studies to determine stockpile needs to meet the requirements of general nuclear war and reconstruction. Stockpile objectives for nuclear war have not previously been developed. Some commodity objectives may be higher and others may be lower than the objectives established for conventional war.

"After the nuclear war supply-requirements studies are completed, stockpile objectives will be based upon calculated deficits for either conventional war or nuclear war, whichever need is larger.

"The Office of Emergency Planning stressed that any long-range disposal programs undertaken prior to the development of objectives based on nuclear war assumptions would provide against disposing of quantities which might be needed to meet essential requirements in the event of nuclear attack. While the disposal of surplus materials can produce many problems which have not heretofore arisen, every effort will be made to see that the interests of producers, processors, and consumers, and the international interests of the United States are carefully considered, both in the development and carrying out of disposal programs. Before decisions are made regarding the adoption of a long-range disposal program for a particular item in the stockpile, there will be appropriate consultations with industry in order to obtain the advice of interested parties."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of Federal stockpile inventories as of October 31, 1963, totaled $14,417,885,378. This was a net decrease of $119,288,908 as compared with the October 1 total of $14,537,174,286.

Net changes during the month are summarized by major category as follows:

Major category	Cost value, October 1963	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Strategic and critical materials	−$11,006,179	$8,619,119,538
Agricultural commodities	−111,338,829	5,487,021,051
Civil defense supplies and equipment	+1,036,797	204,321,265
Machine tools	−52,300	91,953,600
Helium	+2,073,603	15,469,924
Total	−119,288,908	14,417,885,378

These figures are from the October 1963 report on Federal stockpile inventories compiled from official agency data by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, showing detail with respect to quantity and cost value of each commodity in the inventories covered.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

So-called strategic and critical materials are stored by the Government in (1) the national stockpile, (2) the Defense Production Act inventory and (3) the supplemental barter stockpile.

Overall, there are now 94 materials stockpiled in the strategic and critical inventories. Maximum objectives—in terms of volume—are presently fixed for 76 of these 94 materials. Of the 76 materials having maximum objectives, 61 were stockpiled in excess of their objectives as of October 31, 1963.

Increases in cost value were reported in 16 of the materials stockpiled in all strategic and critical inventories, decreases were reported in 21 materials, and 57 materials remained unchanged during October.

National stockpile

The cost value of materials in the national stockpile as of October 31, 1963, totaled $5,779,344,300. This was a net decrease of $11,895,600 during the month. The largest decreases were $6,611,700 in rubber, $2,267,800 in tin, and $1,389,300 in coconut oil.

Defense Production Act inventory

The cost value of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory as of October 31, 1963, totaled $1,489,638,200. This was a net decrease of $1,982,200. The larger decreases were in aluminum, copper, and nickel.

Supplemental barter

The cost value of materials in the supplemental barter stockpile as of October 31, 1963, totaled $1,350,137,038. This was a net increase of $2,869,621. The largest increases were in manganese and beryllium metal.

OTHER STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Among the other categories of stockpiled materials covered by the report, the largest is $5.5 billion in agricultural commodities. Major decreases in agricultural commodities during October were reported for cotton, wheat, and milk and butterfat, partially offset by an increase in corn.

Inventories of civil defense supplies and equipment showed increases in medical stocks; the machine tools inventories showed a net decrease; and the helium inventories showed an increase during October.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of November 1963. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, NOVEMBER 1963 AND OCTOBER 1963, AND PAY, OCTOBER 1963 AND SEPTEMBER 1963

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for November 1963 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In November numbered—	In October numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In October was—	In September was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,493,168	2,494,175	−1,007	$1,393,377	$1,276,294	+$117,083
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,449,137	1,448,768	+369	806,444	735,074	+71,370
Department of Defense	1,044,031	1,045,407	−1,376	586,933	541,220	+45,713
Inside the United States	2,324,442	2,325,412	−970			
Outside the United States	168,726	168,763	−37			
Industrial employment	558,706	559,633	−927			
Foreign nationals	159,639	159,942	−303	28,143	28,371	−228

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1963, and comparison with October 1963, and pay for October 1963, and comparison with September 1963*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	November	October	Increase	Decrease	October	September	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	104,356	107,453		3,097	$57,316	$53,199	$4,117	
Commerce	31,066	31,069		3	20,758	19,279	1,479	
Health, Education, and Welfare	81,945	81,682	263		45,574	43,874	1,700	
Interior	69,029	69,613		584	40,212	37,108	3,104	
Justice	31,866	31,886		20	22,479	20,631	1,848	
Labor	9,177	9,471		294	6,285	5,697	588	
Post Office	594,805	590,042	4,763		307,040	271,459	35,581	
State [1] [2]	42,526	[3] 42,520	6		23,309	21,843	1,466	
Treasury	85,127	85,415		288	53,964	48,942	5,022	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	365	371		6	272	258	14	
Bureau of the Budget	485	485			462	421	41	
Council of Economic Advisers	44	56		12	42	39	3	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	74	73	1		36	44		$8
National Aeronautics and Space Council	29	29			28	26	2	
National Security Council	44	43	1		38	34	4	
Office of Emergency Planning	440	440			397	370	27	
Office of Science and Technology	58	87		29	41	45		4
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	28	28			27	23	4	
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation	7	15		8	8	5	3	
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	5	4	1		4	4		
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	25	25			23	21	2	
American Battle Monuments Commission	418	421		3	97	80	17	
Atomic Energy Commission	7,241	7,249		8	5,843	5,347	496	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	621	622		1	438	398	40	
Civil Aeronautics Board	855	860		5	700	641	59	
Civil Service Commission	4,035	4,041		6	2,657	2,474	183	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			6	5	1	
Commission on Civil Rights	58	64		6	47	49		2
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			3	2	1	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	294	294			200	209		9
Farm Credit Administration	243	241	2		190	171	19	
Federal Aviation Agency	45,667	45,820		153	34,141	32,084	2,057	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			5	4	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,462	1,459	3		1,105	1,002	103	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,253	1,266		13	892	844	48	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,252	1,232	20		906	832	74	
Federal Maritime Commission	243	242	1		189	179	10	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	402	405		3	377	338	39	
Federal Power Commission	1,143	1,149		6	870	800	70	
Federal Radiation Council	4	4			4	(4)	4	
Federal Trade Commission	1,144	1,150		6	877	800	77	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	153	149	4		87	78	9	
General Accounting Office	4,454	4,480		26	3,174	2,920	254	
General Services Administration	33,206	33,270		64	17,504	16,091	1,413	
Government Printing Office	7,314	7,291	23		4,704	4,247	457	

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1963, and comparison with October 1963, and pay for October 1963, and comparison with September 1963*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	November	October	Increase	Decrease	October	September	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
Housing and Home Finance Agency	14,055	14,107		52	$9,337	$8,604	$733	
Indian Claims Commission	21	21			21	21		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,408	2,408			1,792	1,638	154	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	30,033	29,971	62		24,139	22,924	1,215	
National Capital Housing Authority	449	443	6		219	199	20	
National Capital Planning Commission	59	60		1	51	44	7	
National Capital Transportation Agency	64	63	1		53	52	1	
National Gallery of Art	314	313	1		148	138	10	
National Labor Relations Board	1,972	1,980		8	1,504	1,377	127	
National Mediation Board	139	143		4	124	102	22	
National Science Foundation	1,074	1,026	48		730	660	70	
Panama Canal	15,085	15,123		38	5,345	5,313	32	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	56	57		1	38	38		
Railroad Retirement Board	1,912	1,928		16	1,165	1,059	106	
Renegotiation Board	215	217		2	194	175	19	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	160	164		4	108	103	5	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,365	1,366		1	1,010	920	90	
Selective Service System	6,944	6,910	34		2,366	2,154	212	
Small Business Administration	3,381	3,410		29	2,361	2,152	209	
Smithsonian Institution	1,522	1,507	15		828	765	63	
Soldiers' Home	1,082	1,083		1	378	356	22	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	10	10			3	6		$3
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	25	1		21	20	1	
Tariff Commission	275	276		1	208	197	11	
Tax Court of the United States	154	154			139	132	7	
Tennessee Valley Authority	16,998	17,266		268	11,420	10,599	821	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	163	165		2	151	116	35	
U.S. Information Agency	12,018	12,005	13		5,740	5,343	397	
Veterans' Administration	173,688	173,518	170		83,366	76,779	6,587	
Virgin Islands Corporation	512	513		1	150	167		17
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,449,137	1,448,768	5,439	5,070	806,444	735,074	71,413	43
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			369				71,370	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,083	2,152		69	1,855	2,010		155
Department of the Army	373,019	374,252		1,233	202,085	187,744	14,371	
Department of the Navy	338,863	339,996		1,133	201,077	184,638	16,439	
Department of the Air Force	298,254	297,579	675		164,440	150,870	13,570	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	1,974	1,983		9	1,074	979	95	
Defense Communications Agency	674	652	22		450	380	70	
Defense Supply Agency	25,864	25,518	346		13,713	12,589	1,124	
Office of Civil Defense	1,057	1,057			929	861	68	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	39	1		36	33	3	
Interdepartmental activities	12	13		1	8	7	1	
International military activities	62	61	1		46	41	5	
Armed Forces Information and Education activities	427	427			225	205	20	
Classified activities	1,702	1,678	24		995	893	102	
Total, Department of Defense	1,044,031	1,045,407	1,069	2,445	586,933	541,220	45,868	155
Net change, Department of Defense			1,376				45,713	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [5] [6]	2,493,168	2,494,175	6,508	7,515	1,393,377	1,276,294	117,281	198
Net change, including Department of Defense			1,007				117,083	

---

[1] November figure includes 17,007 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 17,012 in October and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The November figure includes 4,654 of these trust fund employees and the October figure includes 4,674.

[2] November figure includes 1,034 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,034 in October and their pay.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

[4] Less than $500.

[5] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[6] Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658) as follows:

Agency	November	October	Change
Agriculture Department	4,546	4,843	−297
Interior Department	6,107	5,553	+554
Tennessee Valley Authority	43	52	−9
Total	10,696	10,448	+248

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1963, and comparison with October 1963*

Department or agency	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	103,003	106,103		3,100
Commerce	30,402	30,408		6
Health, Education, and Welfare	81,300	81,030	270	
Interior	68,420	69,018		598
Justice	31,506	31,528		22
Labor	9,093	9,353		260
Post Office	593,281	588,534	4,747	
State [1] [2]	10,695	10,677	18	
Treasury	84,503	84,796		293
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	365	371		6
Bureau of the Budget	485	485		
Council of Economic Advisers	44	56		12
Executive Mansion and Grounds	74	73	1	
Executive Office of the President—Con.				
National Aeronautics and Space Council	29	29		
National Security Council	44	43	1	
Office of Emergency Planning	440	440		
Office of Science and Technology	58	87		29
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	28	28		
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation	7	15		8
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	5	4	1	
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	25	25		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1963, and comparison with October 1963*—Continued

Department or agency	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued				
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7		
Atomic Energy Commission	7,209	7,217		8
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	621	622		1
Civil Aeronautics Board	855	859		4
Civil Service Commission	4,031	4,037		6
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	58	64		6
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	294	294		
Farm Credit Administration	243	241	2	
Federal Aviation Agency	44,607	44,761		154
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,460	1,457	3	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,251	1,264		13
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,252	1,232	20	
Federal Maritime Commission	243	242	1	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	402	405		3
Federal Power Commission	1,143	1,149		6
Federal Radiation Council	4	4		
Federal Trade Commission	1,144	1,150		6
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	114	109	5	
General Accounting Office	4,371	4,393		22
General Services Administration	33,181	33,246		65
Government Printing Office	7,314	7,291	23	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,861	13,914		53
Indian Claims Commission	21	21		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,408	2,408		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	30,019	[3] 29,956	63	
National Capital Housing Authority	449	443	6	
National Capital Planning Commission	59	60		1
National Capital Transportation Agency	64	63	1	
National Gallery of Art	314	313	1	
National Labor Relations Board	1,939	1,947		8
National Mediation Board	139	143		4
National Science Foundation	1,061	1,013	48	
Panama Canal	158	167		9
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	56	57		1
Railroad Retirement Board	1,912	1,928		16
Independent agencies—Continued				
Renegotiation Board	215	217		2
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	160	164		4
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,365	1,366		1
Selective Service System	6,794	6,761	33	
Small Business Administration	3,324	3,351		27
Smithsonian Institution	1,505	1,490	15	
Soldiers' Home	1,082	1,083		1
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	10	10		
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	25	1	
Tariff Commission	275	276		1
Tax Court of the United States	154	154		
Tennessee Valley Authority	16,997	17,265		268
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	163	165		2
U.S. Information Agency	3,409	3,396	13	
Veterans' Administration	172,683	172,513	170	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,384,253	1,383,836	5,443	5,026
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			417	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,032	2,101		69
Department of the Army	321,545	322,843		1,298
Department of the Navy	314,287	315,299		1,012
Department of the Air Force	270,570	269,962	608	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	1,974	1,983		9
Defense Communications Agency	641	619	22	
Defense Supply Agency	25,864	25,518	346	
Office of Civil Defense	1,057	1,057		
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	39	1	
Interdepartmental activities	12	13		1
International military activities	38	37	1	
Armed Forces information and education activities	427	427		
Classified activities	1,702	1,678	24	
Total, Department of Defense	940,189	941,576	1,002	2,389
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,387	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,324,442	2,325,412	6,445	7,415
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			970	

[1] November figure includes 2,879 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,837 in October.

[2] November figure includes 662 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 660 in October.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1963, and comparison with October 1963*

Department or agency	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,353	1,350	3	
Commerce	664	661	3	
Health, Education, and Welfare	645	652		7
Interior	609	595	14	
Justice	360	358	2	
Labor	84	118		34
Post Office	1,524	1,508	16	
State [1] [2]	31,831	[3] 31,843		12
Treasury	624	619	5	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	411	414		3
Atomic Energy Commission	32	32		
Civil Aeronautics Board		1		1
Civil Service Commission	4	4		
Federal Aviation Agency	1,060	1,059	1	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	39	40		1
General Accounting Office	83	87		4
General Services Administration	25	24	1	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	194	193	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	14	[3] 15		1
National Labor Relations Board	33	33		
National Science Foundation	13	13		
Independent agencies—Continued				
Panama Canal	14,927	14,956		29
Selective Service System	150	149	1	
Small Business Administration	57	59		2
Smithsonian Institution	17	17		
Tennessee Valley Authority	1	1		
U.S. Information Agency	8,609	8,609		
Veterans' Administration	1,005	1,005		
Virgin Islands Corporation	512	513		1
Total, excluding Department of Defense	64,884	64,932	47	95
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			48	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	51	51		
Department of the Army	51,474	51,409	65	
Department of the Navy	24,576	24,697		121
Department of the Air Force	27,684	27,617	67	
Defense Communications Agency	33	33		
International military activities	24	24		
Total, Department of Defense	103,842	103,831	132	121
Net increase, Department of Defense			11	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	168,726	168,763	179	216
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			37	

[1] November figure includes 14,128 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 14,175 in October. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The November figure includes 4,654 of these trust fund employees and the October figure includes 4,674.

[2] November figure includes 372 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 374 in October.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1963, and comparison with October 1963*

Department or agency	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,890	3,850	40	----------
Commerce	5,565	5,613	----------	48
Interior	7,737	8,800	----------	63
Post Office	263	260	3	----------
Treasury	5,279	5,327	----------	48
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	263	261	2	----------
Federal Aviation Agency	2,923	2,940	----------	17
General Services Administration	1,794	1,733	61	----------
Government Printing Office	7,314	7,291	23	----------
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	30,033	29,971	62	----------
Panama Canal	7,517	7,554	----------	37
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	159	162	----------	3
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,794	14,075	----------	281
Virgin Islands Corporation	512	513	----------	1
Total, excluding Department of Defense	88,043	88,350	191	498
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense	----------	----------	307	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 138,450	[2] 139,009	----------	559
Outside the United States	[1] 4,609	[2] 4,604	5	----------
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	194,176	194,758	----------	582
Outside the United States	1,275	1,277	----------	2
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	129,392	128,815	577	----------
Outside the United States	1,026	1,065	----------	39
Defense Supply Agency: Inside the United States	1,735	1,755	----------	20
Total, Department of Defense	470,663	471,283	582	1,202
Net decrease, Department of Defense	----------	----------	620	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	558,706	559,633	773	1,700
Net decrease, including Department of Defense	----------	----------	927	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of November 1963 and comparison with October 1963*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	November	October	November	October	November	October	November	October
Canada	11	24	----------	----------	----------	----------	11	24
Crete	82	82	----------	----------	----------	----------	82	82
England	2,878	2,883	----------	----------	121	120	2,757	2,763
France	20,651	20,843	16,889	17,061	11	11	3,751	3,771
Germany	78,021	77,691	65,897	65,707	83	84	12,041	11,900
Greece	259	259	----------	----------	----------	----------	259	259
Japan	49,722	50,036	17,247	17,481	14,311	[1] 14,367	18,164	18,188
Korea	6,203	6,210	6,203	6,210	----------	----------	----------	----------
Morocco	1,205	1,309	----------	----------	730	732	475	577
Netherlands	54	56	----------	----------	----------	----------	54	56
Trinidad	553	549	----------	----------	553	549	----------	----------
Total	159,639	159,942	106,236	106,459	15,809	15,863	37,594	37,620

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of November totaling 2,493,168, compared with 2,494,175 in October. This was a net decrease of 1,007, including a net increase of 248 in temporary employment under the public works acceleration program authorized by Public Law 87–658.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1964, which began July 1, 1963, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July	2,518,858	9,149	----------
August	2,515,033	----------	3,824
September	2,492.170	----------	22,863
October	2,494,175	2,005	----------
November	2,493,168	----------	1,007

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of November was 1,449,137, an increase of 369 as compared with the October total of 1,448,768. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in November was 1,044,031, a decrease of 1,376 as compared with 1,045,407 in October.

The civilian agency reporting the largest increase was Post Office Department with 4,763. The larger decreases were in Agriculture Department with 3,097 and Interior Department with 584.

In the Department of Defense the largest decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Army with 1,233 and the Department of the Navy with 1,133. The Department of the Air Force reported the largest increase with 675.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 970 and outside the United States employment decreased 37. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in November totaled 558,706, a decrease of 927.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,493,168 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 159,639 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during November who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in October was 159,942. A breakdown of this employment for November follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Canada	11	----------	----------	11
Crete	82	----------	----------	82
England	2,878	----------	121	2,757
France	20,651	16,889	11	3,751
Germany	78,021	65,897	83	12,041
Greece	259	----------	----------	259
Japan	49,722	17,247	14,311	18,164
Korea	6,203	6,203	----------	----------
Morocco	1,205	----------	730	475
Netherlands	54	----------	----------	54
Trinidad	553	----------	553	----------
Total	159,639	106,236	15,809	37,594

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2415. A bill for the relief of Manuel J. Vicent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 2416. A bill to amend section 703 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide criminal penalties for manufacturing, selling, offering to sell, or advertising for sale, certain official decorations, medals, or badges of a friendly nation with knowledge, or reasonable grounds for believing, that the same will be used in the United States with intent to deceive or mislead, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MILLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE SECOND ANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS ON THE "IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HUMPHREY AMENDMENT"

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 240); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document the Second Annual Report

to the Congress on the "Implementation of the Humphrey Amendment," prepared by the Agency for International Development, Fiscal Year 1963, and that an additional five-thousand copies be printed for use by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT CONCERNING THE PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT OF THE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 241) appointing a committee to notify the President concerning the proposed adjournment of the session, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 242) tendering the thanks of the Senate to the President pro tempore for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 243) tendering the thanks of the Senate to the Acting President pro tempore for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 244) authorizing the President pro tempore to make certain appointments after the sine die adjournment of the present session, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO ILLEGAL WEARING OF CERTAIN MEDALS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, several weeks ago, I received a letter from one of my constituents voicing a justified complaint. The writer's husband, while serving in the U.S. Air Force, had been awarded the French Croix de Guerre. Naturally, this woman was proud of her husband for having earned such a distinguished award. However, to their dismay they learned that anyone, even a draft dodger, could obtain an identical medal by simply sending $1 to a company in New York. I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to have printed in the Record a letter from Mrs. R. C. Groom.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ireton, Iowa,
October 14, 1963.

Hon. Jack Miller,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I have a complaint to make which will probably seem very small when compared to the many important affairs of our country. However, if you receive any other letters along similar lines such as this, I would like to have you add this as a "protest."

In last Sunday's Des Moines Register there appeared an advertisement by Alexander Sales, Department 36, 140 Marbledale Road, Tuckahoe, N.Y. It was urging people to start a collection of famous military medals "authentic reproductions."

My husband, Robert C. Groom, was in the Air Force for 6 years and was the 14th person in the United States to be awarded the French Croix de Guerre. (About 6 years ago in the This Week magazine section of the Des Moines Register there appeared an article stating that only 21 had received the award here in the United States at that time.)

My husband cut out the clipping, handed it to me and said, "You know what my Croix de Guerre is worth? One dollar." He very much resents "authentic reproductions" of such medals being sold for a dollar apiece. And so do I.

There are no U.S. service medals being offered (I understand that is against the law), but all of the world famous medals other than that are being offered.

Perhaps one should find satisfaction in the fact that a medal one has been earned and not purchased; but if there is anything that can be done about this, or if only to add a protest—I protest.

Along with this, as a letter of complaint, I should like to add a more positive thought. We find ourselves very much in accord with your reaction to our sale of wheat to Russia—that it should have been a decision made through Congress, and not by the executive branch of Government alone.

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. R. C. Groom.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, upon checking the United States Code, I learned that it is against the law to wear with intent to deceive or mislead, any uniform or decoration of a friendly foreign country. It is also unlawful to knowingly wear, manufacture, or sell any decoration or medal authorized by Congress for the Armed Forces of the United States except when authorized by regulation. Though there is a prohibition against knowingly manufacturing and selling imitations of emblems of veterans' organizations incorporated by act of Congress, or unauthorized wearing or displaying the sign of the Red Cross, and the 4-H Club, as well as the Swiss Confederation coat of arms, the Justice Department informs me there is nothing to prohibit manufacture or sale of a distinguished medal of a friendly foreign nation such as the French Croix de Guerre.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter dated December 9, 1963, from Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Deputy Attorney General.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of Justice,
Office of the Deputy Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. Jack Miller,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Miller: This will acknowledge your letter of November 8, 1963, pertaining to the manufacture and sale of reproductions of foreign military medals, particularly the French Croix de Guerre. There is no existing Federal statute prohibiting such activity. As indicated in your letter to Mrs. Groom, section 704, title 18, U.S. Code, prohibits the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale, of any military decoration or medal of the United States but does not extend protection to similar decorations of foreign countries.

With respect to special legislation to cover this situation, I might point out that there have been very few complaints of this nature referred to the Department of Justice. However, this does not necessarily reflect the true scope of the problem, since most complaints regarding military decorations are generally filed by servicemen or veterans with the Department of Defense. Accordingly, you may wish to contact the Department of Defense to determine if it has any information which may be relevant to your consideration of the need and desirability of legislation in this area.

Sincerely,
Nicholas deB. Katzenbach,
Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. MILLER. Accordingly, Mr. President, I introduce and send to the desk a bill and ask that it be printed in the Record and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2416) to amend section 703 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide criminal penalties for manufacturing, selling, offering to sell, or advertising for sale, certain official decorations, medals, or badges of a friendly nation with knowledge, or reasonable grounds for believing, that the same will be used in the United States with intent to deceive or mislead, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Miller, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 703 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 703. Uniform, decoration, or regalia of friendly nation

"Whoever, within the jurisdiction of the United States, with intent to deceive or mislead, wears any naval, military, police, or other official uniform, decoration, or regalia of any foreign state, nation, or government with which the United States is at peace, or anything so nearly resembling the same as to be calculated to deceive; or

"Whoever, within the jurisdiction of the United States, knowingly manufactures, sells, offers for sale, or advertises that he or it has for sale, any naval, military, police, or other official decoration, medal, or badge of any foreign state, nation, or government with which the United States is at peace, or the ribbon, button, or rosette of any such decoration, medal, or badge, or any colorable imitation thereof, with knowledge, or reasonable grounds for believing, that the same will be used in the United States with intent to deceive or mislead—

"Shall be fined not more than $250 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both."

SEC. 2. The section analysis of chapter 33 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the following item:

"§ 703. Uniform of friendly nation."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following item:

"§ 703. Uniform, decoration, or regalia of friendly nation."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, this bill would amend section 703 of title 18 of the United States Code to include among the prohibitions the manufacture, sale, offer for sale, or advertisement for sale, any naval, military, police, or other official decoration, medal, or badge of any foreign state, nation, or government with which the United States is at peace, or the ribbon, button, or rosette of any such decoration, medal, or badge, or any colorable imitation thereof, with knowledge, or reasonable grounds for believing, that the same will be used in the United States with intent to deceive or mislead.

Mr. President, I should point out that my amendment is not designed to punish newspapers and magazines which carry the advertisements of the manufacturers of the so-called "authentic reproductions" of distinguished medals but rather it is aimed at the industry which manufactures them and advertises that it has them for sale with a knowledge or reasonable grounds to believe that they will be purchased by imposters.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE:

His report of activities of the Committee on the District of Columbia, 1st session, 88th Congress.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

Statement by him, relating to honors awarded to Democratic Party photographer at the Capitol by the Finnish Government.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON ESTABLISHES A NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONVERSION COMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Saturday, December 21, President Lyndon Johnson ordered the establishment of a nine-member, high-level Committee of Defense and Economic Agencies in the executive branch, to study the problems arising out of shifts in defense spending, reduction of defense outlays, or possible disarmament, and to assure that they are accomplished with as little economic dislocation as possible.

I call the President's order to the attention of the Senate because there is pending in the Commerce Committee a bill to accomplish this same purpose. It is S. 2274, introduced October 31 by Senators MCGOVERN, BAYH, CLARK, GRUENING, HUMPHREY, LONG of Missouri, MORSE, NELSON, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YOUNG of Ohio.

On December 13, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] advised the Senate that he was seeking speedy reports from the executive departments on his proposed National Economic Conversion Act and that he would counsel with the administration to determine if the purposes of the act might be accomplished by Executive order. This has now been done by the President's establishment of a Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament, as it is officially designated.

I congratulate the Senator from South Dakota, the coauthors of the bill, and President Johnson on the very prompt action which has been taken.

We are obviously approaching a period of considerable adjustment in our defense outlays. The President's action assures that changes will be made carefully and thoughtfully to assure the speediest possible return of released manpower and productive facilities to civilian activity.

The recent announcement of plans to close 26 military installations was extremely disturbing to the areas involved. The New York Times described the response as an "uproar."

In his memorandum announcing establishment of the new committee, President Johnson stated:

> It is * * * important that we improve our knowledge of the economic impacts of such (defense) spending so that appropriate actions can be taken—in cooperation with State and local governments, private industry and labor—to minimize potential disturbance which may arise from changes in level and pattern of defense outlays.
>
> The Committee's work will contribute to the process of smooth and speedy changeover when such changes occur.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD President Johnson's announcement of the new Committee, the memorandum, and two New York Times articles of December 22 bearing on the President's action.

There being no objection, the announcement, memorandum, and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENT OF DECEMBER 21, 1963

The President today announced the formation of a high-level Government Committee to coordinate the work of Federal agencies in appraising the economic impacts of disarmament and changes in defense spending. It will be chaired by a member of the Council of Economic Advisers and will replace an informal group that began work on this problem last spring. The President noted that changes in the composition or total level of defense spending can significantly affect jobs and incomes in particular communities or in the Nation as a whole.

He stated: "I am confident that our economy can adjust to changes in defense spending or arms reduction that may occur. Our experiences after World War II and the Korean Conflict prove that. But the Nation as a whole and the communities with heavy concentrations of defense industry deserve assurance that any changes will be made with as little dislocation as possible. This Committee's work will contribute to the process of smooth and speedy changeover when such changes occur."

The President asked to be kept personally informed of the results of the Committee's work.

MEMORANDUM

To Hon. Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; Hon. Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce; Hon. W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor; Hon. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission; Hon. James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Hon. William C. Foster, Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; Hon. Edward McDermott, Director, Office of Emergency Planning; Hon. Kermit Gordon, Director, Bureau of the Budget; Hon. Walter W. Heller, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.

Subject: Formation of a Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament.

As you are aware, on July 10, Chairman Heller organized an informal committee to review and coordinate the work of Federal agencies relating to the economic impact of defense and disarmament. Based on the preliminary work of this informal committee, it seems desirable that it be given a more formal and permanent status.

I am therefore requesting you to designate a senior official in your department or agency to serve on this committee on a continuing basis. A member of the Council of Economic Advisers will serve as Chairman of this Committee.

The Committee will be responsible for the review and coordination of activities in the various departments and agencies designed to improve our understanding of the economic impact of defense expenditures and of changes either in the composition or in the total level of such expenditures.

Federal outlays for defense are of such magnitude that they inevitably have major economic significance. In certain regions of the Nation and in certain communities they provide a significant share of total employment and income. It is therefore important that we improve our knowledge of the economic impacts of such spending, so that appropriate actions can be taken—in cooperation with State and local governments, private industry and labor—to minimize potential disturbances which may arise from changes in the level and pattern of defense outlays.

I know that your agencies have already initiated a number of activities which will improve our ability to assess the economic consequences of the defense program. I do not expect this Committee to undertake studies of its own, but rather to evaluate and to coordinate these existing efforts, and if it seems desirable, to recommend additional studies—subject, of course, to appropriate review and authorization through established channels.

The Committee may wish to add representatives from other Federal agencies, and it is hereby authorized to do so.

As work in this area produces results of interest to the Congress and the general public, they should be made available in appropriate form.

This is an important subject and I wish to be kept personally informed as your work progresses.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 22, 1963]

Defense Study Favors Cut in Atomic Weapon Output

(By John W. Finney)

Washington, December 21.—The Defense Department has drafted long-term requirements for its nuclear arsenal that would call for a substantial cutback in the production of atomic weapons in the coming decade.

The Pentagon requirements, presented to the White House, are being studied by the Atomic Energy Commission, which has the legal and fiscal responsibility for building and paying for the weapons.

Some differences of opinion have developed between the Defense Department and the Commission over the future requirements and how to scale down the production of fissionable materials for weapons. But on all sides there is now general agreement that, with an arsenal filled with tens of thousands of warheads, the time is approaching when weapons production must be curtailed.

The only basic questions that remain to be resolved are how and when to begin the cutback. The answers to these questions involve economic and political considerations that in many ways are more complex than the military requirements.

The planned cutback would represent the first significant reversal in the upward trend of weapons production that has prevailed ever since World War II. The dramatic increases have come in the last decade as the Commission expanded its production capability and the Pentagon developed warhead requirements for every weapon from a bazooka to an intercontinental missile.

A decade ago, for example, the Commission spent $758 million for mining uranium, processing weapons materials, and developing and producing atomic weapons. By 1962 the expenditures had risen to $1.9 billion, including funds for an extensive test series.

The first steps to reverse this trend came in 1962 when President Kennedy directed the military to cut back its requirements. The Kennedy move, in turn, set in motion the long-range studies that resulted in the current recommendations for far more substantial reductions in weapons production.

Within the Commission there has been a growing realization in recent years that its capacity to produce fissionable materials was beginning to outstrip the military demand for weapons.

In 1960–61, the Commission belatedly realized that a huge surplus of uranium was accumulating and began stretching out the deliveries of ore and scaling down its refinement.

This stretchout, however, was not reflected in any sizable cutback in the production of weapons. Rather, the pressure from both the military and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy was for increasing production, particularly of smaller weapons.

PATTERN CHANGED

Now this pattern of gearing requirements to production capacity has been broken. In place of an annual determination, the Defense Department has outlined its long-term requirements until 1973. These requirements, particularly in the later years, fall far short of the Commission's production capacity.

Translating these reduced requirements into production cutbacks, however, is not proving to be a simple, straightforward matter for the Commission or the administration.

Part of the difficulty is in establishing now what kind of weapons and warheads the Pentagon will be needing a decade hence. For example, a decision to develop an antimissile-missile system would greatly increase the demand for weapons materials.

Further complicating the projections are economic considerations, such as how soon an atomic power industry will need the uranium that is now largely going into weapons.

There also are political complications, for any cutbacks will fall heavily on regions, some already economically depressed, that are highly dependent upon the atomic business and powerfully represented on Capitol Hill.

In 1959–60, for example, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, under prodding from the congressional committee, drafted long-term requirements that called for production of large numbers of small weapons. These requirements were used as the initial justification for the large plutonium-producing reactor now being completed at Hanford, Wash.

In the last year, two interrelated developments, one policy, the other administrative, have served to check the upward trend in weapons production.

OVERKILL QUESTIONED

At the White House level there has been a growing concern over the proliferation of small atomic weapons throughout military commands. Questions have also been raised as to whether the military was not acquiring an overkill capacity in its nuclear arsenal.

This changing attitude at the White House level was reflected in a significant change in the method of determining military requirements for atomic weapons.

Until now it has been the practice of the Pentagon to submit an annual "build order" for atomic weapons. This order, in turn, was based largely on the capacity of the Commission to produce the weapons.

The disagreement between the Pentagon and the Commission spring in part from differing approaches in projecting possible future requirements for weapons material. In its calculations, for example, the Defense Department makes little allowance for the materials that might be needed for such future weapons as the antimissile missile or the medium-range ballistic missile.

Furthermore, the Defense Department projections are based largely on existing weapons technology and make little allowance for the fact that by using more plutonium, better warheads could be developed for existing weapons.

Even within the Commission, however, it is acknowledged that in the reasonably near future, probably sometime after 1965, the production of weapons materials will exceed military requirements.

SOURCES OF MATERIALS

There are now two sources of fissionable material: the plutonium that is turned out by eight reactors at Hanford, Wash., and the five reactors at Savannah River, S.C., and the enriched uranium that is produced by gaseous diffusion plants at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Paducah, Ky.; and Portsmouth, Ohio.

From a strictly technical standpoint, any cutback probably would fall most heavily on enriched uranium production.

While enriched uranium is cheaper pound for pound, plutonium has technical advantages for fabricating weapons, particularly in the smaller sizes. For example, it takes roughly three times as much enriched uranium as plutonium to make a critical or explosive mass.

Furthermore, plutonium is still in relatively tight supply. In contrast, a large surplus—some commission officials have estimated it will amount to about $1 billion by 1966—is building up of enriched uranium.

It is at this point, however, that the problem of how and where to cut back the production of weapons materials gets involved in economic and political considerations.

Enriched uranium can be used as a fuel for atomic powerplants; the potentiality of plutonium as a fuel has not yet been developed.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

A cutback in uranium production also could be expected to have a broader economic impact than a reduction in plutonium production.

About 5,200 persons are employed at the three gaseous diffusion plants—less than half the number employed at the Hanford and Savannah River plutonium centers.

But more important is the indirect employment provided by the gaseous diffusion plants through their tremendous consumption of electricity. About 6 percent of the Nation's total electrical capacity goes to run the plants, and the energy for this electricity comes largely from coal mined in West Virginia, Ohio, Tennessee, Illinois, and Kentucky.

Because of this combination of military, economic, and political complications, it now appears unlikely that any substantial reduction in weapons production will be reflected in the budget that the administration will present to Congress in January.

It is a decision, however, that the Johnson administration will have to make by the time another year and another budgetmaking period rolls around.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 22, 1963]

President Orders Survey on Disarmament Outlook—Sets Up Nine-Member Committee To Help Him Cope With Economic Effects of Arms Cuts and Spending Shifts

(By Jack Raymond)

Washington, December 21.—President Johnson ordered today the formation of a high-level Government committee to help him cope with the impact of possible arms reductions and shifts in defense spending.

An explanatory statement by the President made clear the administration's concern that military spending changes could weaken the economy. He asked the heads of nine Government departments to name senior officials to the new panel.

At present, military spending at the rate of $1 billion a week accounts for more than half the total Federal budget of $98 billion in the current fiscal year ending next June 30.

Mr. Johnson expressed confidence that the economy could adjust to change. He cited the experience of the periods following both World War II and the Korean war.

"But," he declared, "the Nation as a whole and the communities with heavy concentrations of defense industry deserve assurance that any changes will be made with as little dislocation as possible."

The President named Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, as Chairman of the new nine-man Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament.

The other members will represent Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara; Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges; Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz; Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; William C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, and Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

In a memorandum to members of the Committee, Mr. Johnson said:

"This is an important subject and I wish to be kept personally informed as your work progresses."

Although the objectives of the Committee embrace the problems that might arise from disarmament, administration sources said there was nothing on the international scene indicating any substantial disarmament agreement soon with the Soviet Union.

NO SETTLEMENT IN SIGHT

Secretary of State Dean Rusk pointed out yesterday that the unilateral arms cuts announced by the Soviet Union a few days ago and previously announced U.S. reductions in military operations had "no effect" on the current search for agreements on disarmament or any other subject.

Mr. Rusk said he did not know what the Soviet troop reduction really meant. Reductions by the United States, he declared, have not curtailed our combat effectiveness.

Mr. Foster, the Director of the Arms Control Agency, nevertheless was given a key place in the new Committee. This was done, it was reported, in view of past studies of the subject by his Agency and the similarity of the economic problems arising from disarmament or shutdowns for technical reasons.

Government officials said it was recognized that if the present apparent detente with the Soviet Union continued, significant reductions in military spending might occur, even without a formal disarmament agreement, so long as basic national security needs were not endangered.

Although arms control measures remain problematical the officials said shifts in types of weapons development and production had already created service difficulties.

The uproar over the announced closing of 26 military bases in this country and pending reductions in naval shipyards underscores one of the problems faced by the Committee.

"Federal outlays of defense are of such magnitude that they inevitably have major economic significance," President Johnson observed in his memorandum. "In certain regions of the Nation and in certain communities they provide a significant share of total employment and income."

"It is therefore important," he continued, "that we improve our knowledge of the economic impacts of such spending, so that appropriate actions can be taken—in cooperation with State and local governments, private industry and labor—to minimize potential disturbance which may arise from changes in the level and pattern of defense outlays."

Studies of the economic impact of disarmament and defense spending shifts are not new in Government.

The President, in his memorandum, called attention to the informal committee Mr. Heller formed last July to review and coordinate the work of Federal agencies in this field.

"Based on the preliminary work of this informal committee, it seems desirable that it be given a more formal and permanent status," Mr. Johnson said.

The new Committee is not expected to undertake new studies of its own and go over some familiar ground, the President pointed out. Instead, he said, he is seeking an evaluation and coordinating effort.

"This Committee's work will contribute to the process of smooth and speedy changeover when such changes occur," Mr. Johnson said.

One of the major pending changeovers in the defense economy is dependent upon the work of a Pentagon committee studying the Navy's shipyard requirements. The United States now supports 11 naval shipyards. Defense Secretary McNamara has said they are not all needed.

DEFENSE CONVERSION WITHOUT FEAR

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the majority leader in regard to the President's new Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament. I thank him sincerely, and I want to thank each of the Senators who joined me in sponsoring the conversion planning bill, S. 2274—Senator BAYH; Senator CLARK; Senator GRUENING; the majority whip, Senator HUMPHREY; Senator LONG of Missouri; Senator MORSE; Senator NELSON; Senator RANDOLPH; Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Senator YOUNG of Ohio.

The Nation is indebted to President Johnson for initiating conversion planning so expeditiously. The Committee which he has established follows closely the pattern proposed in the legislation which my colleagues and I introduced on October 31 and which I recently discussed with the President's White House aids.

The establishment of the Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament is another evidence that that President is a man of action, capable of making decisions and implementing them promptly. One of the remarkable aspects of the assumption of the Presidency by Mr. Johnson is the manner in which he has not only kept the work of the late President John F. Kennedy moving forward but has already initiated programs and actions of his own. There has been no lag, no pause, no suspension of initiative.

The assurance with which President Johnson has assumed the Nation's highest office and moved forward is reminiscent of President Kennedy's confident initiative.

The need for advance planning for conversion is daily becoming more apparent. The New York Times, December 21 issue, revealed that the Defense Department has completed drafting its 10-year requirements for nuclear weapons and that a substantial cutback in production is in order. I suggested in a speech on the Senate floor on August 2 that the atomic weapons acquisition program could be reduced by as much as a billion dollars. It now appears more hopeful that this may be accomplished.

I am pleased that the Senator from Montana has placed in the RECORD the New York Times article on proposed cuts in the atomic weapons program.

Mr. President, on the same day, the Washington Sunday Star revealed the intended closing of several Federal naval factories. I ask unanimous consent that the Star article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURPLUS SHIPYARDS' CLOSING COULD NET $100 MILLION YEARLY

(By Richard Fryklund)

Defense officials estimate that almost $100 million a year can be saved by closing shipyards which the Navy and Defense Department agree are not needed.

In addition, Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas D. Morris is studying many more military installations which could someday be declared surplus. There is no specific surplus list today, he says, but several installations, in addition to shipyards, are coming under close scrutiny.

Some Defense officials believe the ultimate savings from base closing could go to $250 million a year. Secretary of Defense McNamara has mentioned potential future savings of $125 to $150 million a year.

Some of the installations under study by Mr. Morris are still wanted by the services, but the major objections to any sudden, sweeping closings are said by some officials to be coming from Congressmen and local officials.

PRESSURE TACTICS USED

These people bring pressure to bear on the White House and Pentagon to retain installations that even overwhelming evidence shows are surplus.

A major problem for Mr. McNamara is that the evidence seldom is overwhelming. While studies will show that particular kinds of installations are surplus, the studies will not always show clearly which particular base should get the ax.

Mr. McNamara's own inclination is to make swift decisions and ignore the political uproar. Money saved is worth more to him than tranquillity on Capitol Hill.

During his 3 years in office more than 400 installations in the United States and overseas have been closed. Some 6,700 still exist.

Most closings were revealed one at a time. The outcry was minimal. Twice, however, early in the Kennedy administration and about 2 weeks ago, closings were lumped into long lists, apparently to give the public an image of vigorous economizing.

PROTESTS STILL ECHO

The protests from the last list are still being heard in Congress and the Pentagon.

It is now clear that Mr. McNamara wanted to announce even more closings on December 12, specifically three or four major shipyards. (One of the 12 yards, a small repair facility, was ordered inactivated.)

He was stymied, however, when the Navy was unable to produce convincing studies specifying which particular yards should go.

The Navy agrees with Mr. McNamara that about 30 percent of its shipyard capacity is not needed. Existing Navy studies analyze ship construction needs, but they bear little on other major considerations—overhaul, the location of shipyards in relation to strategic objectives, mobilization requirements, and the effect on morale of changed yards and home ports.

Frantic efforts were made at the last minute to pick more excess bases, but the backup facts just did not prove to the satisfaction of Mr. McNamara, the Navy or Congressmen which shipyards were the least useful.

Mr. McNamara last week appointed a board to study the problem further. He said it would report "in the next 12 months."

The Navy will recommend closings based on purely military considerations. Civilian officials on the board will study the economic and political impact of shutdowns.

Here are some of the complexities involved in closing a major shipyard.

The study group could measure the savings from closing the facility and dropping, for example, 10,000 civilian employees. It would also have to consider the problems created by sending a task force based near the shipyard to some other yard for repairs.

A major overhaul takes 4 months. The crews would be away from their home base 4 months on top of the normal 12 to 18 month cruises. Hundreds of sailors would leave the Navy. New men would have to be recruited and trained at considerable expense.

If the home port is changed along with the repair yard, the Navy will find in several instances that the ships are based far away from established training installations.

When the studies do single out specific bases, Mr. McNamara's list will have to clear the White House before it can be presented to Congressmen. Pentagon officials believe the study will continue at least until after the November election.

Mr. McGOVERN. In commenting editorially on the President's action in establishing the new, high level conversion planning committee, the New York Times reviewed impending defense cutbacks, or shifts, and said:

Such dislocations will become much more general when and if dependable arrangements can be made for a worldwide reduction in the staggering burden of armaments. The U.S. military budget alone comes to more than $50 billion a year, or one-twelfth of our gross national product. Certainly, nothing could be more welcome than the fruition of our long quest for a world orderly enough to permit a substantial lightening of that load—provided we have adequate plans in readiness for using constructively the released men and resources.

The President has now taken steps to assure that such plans are in readiness, and I have every confidence that we can, if we will, make either relatively minor or major adjustments from military to civilian activity with little dislocation.

During World War II, 40 percent of our gross national product was military, or five times the present proportion of military expenditures. We made the adjustment in the 1945–48 period to a peacetime economy while holding unemployment below 4 percent. We have a great backlog of civilian needs to be met now, as we did then.

Today we need schools, housing, health facilities, modern urban transportation, electronic traffic control systems, water resources developments, pollution control, modernization of industries which have been long neglected, civilian air transport and many other things—enough to absorb all of our excess defense production capacities in civilian work.

As the effort to establish world peace succeeds—and it must succeed—the necessity for conversion will increase. A dread of conversion must not be allowed to thwart adjustments as they become possible.

Until disarmament does become a reality, resistance to changes can prevent economies, budget reductions and the transfer of our productive resources to meeting real needs.

Conversion planning, either for shifts in defense emphasis or for disarmament, is a national necessity for which President Johnson has now wisely and promptly made provision. He deserves great credit for it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the New York Times editorial of December 23, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 23, 1963]

Planning for Disarmament

The high-level Committee President Johnson has appointed to help cushion the impact of possible cuts and shifts in arms spending is a needed addition to the Nation's economic defenses. The desirability of advance planning to prevent disarmament from causing widespread unemployment and community hardship has already been demonstrated, on a microscopic scale, by the dismay with which Secretary McNamara's orders for closing a handful of military installations have been greeted in the localities directly affected.

More layoffs in defense establishments are likely to result from the Pentagon's discovery that its arsenal of atomic weapons is getting over full. If cutbacks are made in the production of fissionable material and of warheads, communities that have grown up around the plants of the Atomic Energy Commission will be hard hit. So will the electric generating plants and coal mines that depend on the AEC activities for their economic life.

Such dislocations will become much more general when and if dependable arrangements can be made for a world-wide reduction in the staggering burden of armaments. The U.S. military budget alone comes to more than $50 billion a year, or one-twelfth of our gross national product. Certainly, nothing could be more welcome than the fruition of our long quest for a world orderly enough to permit a substantial lightening of that load—provided we have adequate plans in readiness for using constructively the released men and resources.

The dangers implicit in an unplanned transition are underscored by the difficulties the country is experiencing in adjusting to automation. The blessings it should bring in greater abundance and lessened drudgery have been obscured by the lack of useful work for those thrown on the human slag pile. President Johnson is expected soon to create another advisory committee to deal with this problem. Still another Presidential committee is developing plans for the economic reclamation of Appalachia, the most distressed of America's areas of social neglect.

The multiplicity of such problems and their interrelatedness suggest the wisdom of a coordinated White House approach—the creation of an Economic Policy Board, which would perform in the economic field much the same functions as the National Security Council does in defense. Such a plan was put forward last year by Dr. Arthur F. Burns, who headed President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers. With the problems of automation, disarmament and the alleviation of poverty added to the perennial problems of taxes, budgetmaking tariffs and international payments, the need for an economic general staff grows in urgency.

THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANY PROGRAM

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Congress can be gratified by recent developments affecting the small business investment company program. Early in this session of Congress, other members of the Senate Small Business Committee joined me in introducing two bills designed to make this program more workable. One of these bills, S. 298, was passed by the Senate and has been favorably reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House. The House committee recommended some amendments to our bill, but I am confident that any differences between the bill passed in the Senate and that which is passed by the House can be worked out in conference.

The other bill that I introduced, S. 297, would amend the Internal Revenue Code as it affects small business investment companies. I understand that steps are now being taken to clear the way for early consideration by the House Committee on Ways and Means of a companion bill introduced by Congressman Patman. In the meantime, I have been highly gratified, by the actions taken by the Internal Revenue Service to put into effect administratively some of the proposals made in our bill.

My tax bill, S. 297, would provide an exemption for small business investment companies from the accumulated earnings surtax. Such an exemption would allow small business investment companies to retain their earnings for reinvestment in small businesses without incurring the additional tax imposed on accumulated earnings. The Internal Revenue Service agreed with us on the need for this, and this relief has now been provided administratively.

Of greatest significance, however, was the action taken just last week by the Internal Revenue Service having to do with the establishment by small business investment companies of tax deductible bad debt reserves. The Small Business Committee has long recognized how desperately such reserves are needed if the small business investment company program is to be a successful one. This program was established to provide a source of risk capital to small and independent concerns. It is implicit in any program requiring risk taking that there will be losses. When the program was established, those of us who sponsored and worked for it recognized that there would be such losses. In addition, new programs of this kind lack a loss experience which would serve as a guide for individual companies. It is for these reasons that the Senate Small Business Committee has consistently recommended a fixed percentage statutory reserve for small business investment company losses. Last week, the Internal Revenue Service manifested its recognition of this need by announcing that during the next 5 years, small business investment companies will be permitted to establish bad debt reserves of 10 percent of outstanding loans. In my opinion, this action is a significant contribution to the success of this small business venture capital program. The Internal Revenue Service is to be commended for the sympathetic consideration that it has given to the needs of small business in this respect. I heartily applaud the action that has been taken, and I know that it will enhance the stability of this program and its chance for success.

I am sure that the attention of many Senators has been called to unfavorable comments in the financial press on the SBIC program. Many writers have expressed doubt concerning the long-range prospects for success of the small business investment companies. In most instances this doubt has been built upon doubt of the continuing congressional and executive support for the program. Certainly, I believe that the action of the Senate in passing S. 298, and the action of the House committee in favorably reporting this bill, give clear indications of the support which the Congress gives to this program. The actions taken by the Internal Revenue Service affecting this program indicate equally strong support by the executive branch.

In addition, Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to recall that President Johnson was one of the chief architects of the legislation which created this program—the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. He was one of that small group of Senators who, for 10 years prior to 1958, struggled to establish a source of venture capital for small business. In 1958, a study by the Federal Reserve Board, made at the insistence of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, confirmed the longstanding position of that committee and the Senate Small Business Committee that small firms did not have adequate access to equity capital. The then Senator Johnson was instrumental in guiding the necessary legislation through the Congress. I am confident that he continues to support the program established by this legislation.

Mr. President, I believe that all of these factors should serve to dispel once and for all any notion within the financial community of this country that the small business investment company program has anything less than the full support of Government. I truly feel that the day will come when small business investment companies will be considered as much a part of the financial life of America as national banks and savings and loan associations.

THE LATE ROSWELL MAGILL

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as the 1st session of the 88th Congress comes to a close, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an expression of deep distress in the Senate of the United States at the untimely passing earlier this month of a distinguished American, Mr. Roswell Magill.

No one in the Senate could be more distressed than I. It is my wish to be numbered among his many friends and associates who extend sincere sympathy to members of his family.

Mr. Magill was one of the soundest students of American taxation I have ever known, and he dedicated his life to constructive work in this field, as a teacher, as a practitioner, and in the service of his country.

He was a native of Illinois and a graduate of Dartmouth College and the University of Chicago. He taught at Columbia and the University of Chicago. He was an attorney for the U.S. Treasury in 1933 and 1934, and he was Under Secretary of the Treasury in 1937 and 1938. He was an outstanding member of the bar, practicing law in New York.

In addition, he served as chairman of a special tax study committee for the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in 1947 and as chairman of the Connecticut Tax Survey Commission in 1948.

For more than 20 years he has been associated with Tax Foundation, Inc., one of the Nation's most reliable independent organizations for research in public affairs.

He served the Tax Foundation as trustee, president, and as chairman. He had just been reelected to the latter position on December 3. During the past decade he had also headed the foundation's committee on Federal tax policy.

It was my privilege to know Roswell Magill since my early days on the Finance Committee. I always looked forward to his testimony before the committee and treasured his constructive advice which invariably was the product of sound thinking.

He last appeared before the committee on October 23, this year, testifying on the pending tax bill. Strictly in character, despite recent illness, and a heavy schedule of professional commitments, he voluntarily took the time and made the effort to render this patriotic service, as he had so many times before. I talked to him at some length that day, and as usual his keen intellect and clear judgment were evident.

We shall always be grateful for his fine service to the Finance Committee and his constructive contributions to his country.

FANCY VERSUS FACTS IN THE REA PROGRAM

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, it is no secret that the private power companies are currently engaged in a massive advertising program to rid themselves of the competition of the rural electric cooperatives and other public power operations. In this regard, the December issue of the Reader's Digest carried one of the most biased, absolutely vicious articles attacking this Nation's rural electric co-op movement which I have ever read.

The printing of this article was not enough. A further example of the activities of the private utilities is evidenced by a letter and enclosure of this Reader's Digest article to the shareholders of the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. from its president, Donald S. Kennedy. In his letter, Mr. Kennedy commends the article calling it a "case against further encroachment by the REA." He calls the REA "unfair competition" and concludes by stating that he hopes the article will impel the shareholder to write his Congressman and Senators "a note or card" protesting what he calls further subsidy, tax freedom, and absence of regulation for REA cooperatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter—and the company's October 15 quarterly report—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter from Mr. Donald S. Kennedy to the shareholders of the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. and report were ordered to be printed as follows:

OKLAHOMA GAS & ELECTRIC CO.,
Oklahoma City, December 11, 1963.

DEAR SHAREOWNER: The attached reprint from so reputable a publication as the Reader's Digest states so forcefully the case against further encroachment by the REA that I feel it should be placed in the hands of every investor in the United States. Without expense to the company, I am making sure that each shareowner in Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. residing in Oklahama has the opportunity of reading this.

You have, no doubt, already read much about the REA subsidized operation sponsored by bureaucratic forces in our Government to further expand this federally financed competition with the taxpaying companies which help support our National Government.

As an investor in Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., you are interested in knowing that a part of your company's profits, as well as part of your own Federal income taxes, are being used by the Federal Government to support this most unfair competition with the electric industry today.

It is my hope that, after you have read this, you will feel impelled to write your Congressman and Senators a note or card protesting further subsidy, tax freedom, and absence of regulation for REA co-ops. These co-ops are now acting as public utilities, and as such they should be bound by the same rules of the game as the company in which you have your investment. I should also be most interested personally in any reaction you may have to this article.

Most sincerely,

D. S. KENNEDY,
President.

Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co.—Comparative statement of income

	8 months ended Aug. 31		12 months ended Aug. 31	
	1963	1962	1963	1962
Electric revenues	$54,562,545	$48,662,724	$80,175,323	$71,608,596
Operating expenses:				
Operation	17,418,083	14,956,708	25,566,241	22,157,918
Maintenance	3,346,869	3,308,768	5,040,457	4,857,041
Depreciation	6,080,411	5,722,612	9,022,069	8,538,351
Federal income tax	7,800,000	7,171,000	11,137,000	9,989,000
Federal income tax deferred, net	632,000	837,000	1,069,000	1,233,000
Other Federal, State, and local taxes	5,024,413	4,731,325	7,288,356	6,897,152
Total operating expenses	40,301,776	36,727,413	59,123,123	53,672,462
Operating income	14,260,769	11,935,311	21,052,200	17,936,134
Interest income	100,597	66,806	154,442	66,806
Gross income	14,361,366	12,002,117	21,206,642	18,002,940
Income deductions:				
Interest on long-term debt	3,046,459	2,759,584	4,426,250	4,139,375
Interest charged construction (credit)	(320,952)	(212,032)	(467,379)	(294,333)
Miscellaneous	249,624	202,747	356,981	353,524
Investment tax credit	632,000		932,000	
Amortization-debt discount and expense	141,473		141,473	
Total income deductions	3,748,604	2,750,299	5,389,325	4,198,566
Net income	10,612,762	9,251,818	15,817,317	13,804,374
Preferred stock dividends			1,716,600	1,716,600
Balance available for common dividends and surplus			14,100,717	12,087,774
Common shares outstanding at end of period			13,814,272	[1] 13,814,272
Earnings per share of common stock			$1.02	$0.88

[1] 1962 adjusted for 2-for-1 split which was effective Mar. 7, 1963.

DIVIDENDS

Quarterly dividends declared by the board of directors, payable in October 1963, are as follows:

Class of stock	Payable	
	Per share	Date
4.00 percent preferred, $20 par	$0.20	Oct. 15
4.20 percent preferred, $100 par	1.05	Oct. 18
4.24 percent preferred, $100 par	1.06	Do.
4.44 percent preferred, $100 par	1.11	Do.
4.80 percent preferred, $100 par	1.20	Do.
Common, $2.50 par	.18	Oct. 30

The record date of the preferred stocks was September 30, 1963, and the common October 10, 1963.

SALES

Total revenues for the year ended August 31, 1963, amounted to $80,175,000, which was an increase of $8,567,000 or 12 percent over the previous year. It is estimated that approximately $2,100,000 or one-fourth of this increase was due to the abnormally warm weather which began in April and extended into September. Temperatures were 14 percent above normal and it was the hottest summer since 1936. Sales to residential and commercial customers increased considerably because of greater usage of air-conditioning equipment.

Average residential usage for the year ended August 31, 1963, was 3,792 kilowatts. This was a gain of 517 kilowatts or 15.8 percent and the largest gain in the company's history.

The company served 374,064 customers at the end of August, which was an increase of 11,842 or 3.3 percent over the previous year. This rate of customer growth is substantially above the average for our industry.

Earnings on common stock for the 12 months ended August 31, 1963, were $1.02 per share compared with 88 cents for the previous year.

DEDICATION OF NEW POWERPLANT

Oklahoma's Gov. Henry Bellmon and General Electric President Ralph J. Cordiner were among the featured speakers at the dedication of the world's largest combined cycle steam turbine-gas turbine generating unit at the company's Horseshoe Lake Station at Harrah, Okla., 20 miles east of Oklahoma City on September 27. This new combined cycle unit has a capability of 250,000 kilowatts, bringing the total capability of this station to 520,000 kilowatts. Top business and political leaders from throughout the State of Oklahoma were on hand for the dedication, along with leaders of the electric industry and the industry press from throughout the United States. Public open house was held Sunday afternoon, September 29, with several thousand visitors touring the plant. The project was completed at an approximate cost of $23 million and is another of many pioneering ventures in the electric industry by your company.

COMPETITION FROM REA COOPERATIVES

The rural electric cooperatives in Oklahoma continue to compete aggressively with the company in some cities and towns, while still resisting their fair share of taxes and regulations and continuing to operate with Federal subsidy.

REA cooperatives in Oklahoma and Arkansas continue to exploit, as do other REA cooperatives in the Nation, the unfair advantages of subsidized interest rates and relative freedom from taxation. The cooperatives pay only 2 percent interest on the funds which they borrow from the Federal Government. This money costs the Federal Government approximately 4 percent.

In Oklahoma, the cooperatives pay only slightly more than 2 percent of their gross revenue in taxes, whereas investor-owned utilities, such as the company, pay approximately 25 percent in taxes. In Arkansas, the cooperatives pay approximately 5 percent in taxes.

With these unfair subsidies, and the additional advantage that they are not subject to regulation as are investor-owned utilities, the cooperatives in the company's service area have extended their operations in recent years. The electric loans to the cooperatives in Oklahoma now exceed $181 million. Their revenue exceeds $24 million from more than 145,000 customers.

Although the farms in Oklahoma are 96 percent served, those in Arkansas 98 percent, and in the United States 98 percent, the REA and the federally financed cooperatives continue to grow and expand. One new aspect of this use of taxpayers' money is the lending of funds by the cooperatives for industrial development. This is money borrowed from the Federal Treasury at 2 percent and loaned to the industrial or commercial concerns at higher rates of interest, usually 4 percent. This further illustrates the extent to which the REA cooperatives have deviated from their original purpose of taking service to farmers.

The rural electric cooperatives in Oklahoma have to a great degree grown away from being farm cooperatives as have many other rural electric cooperatives in the United States. This is evidenced by the fact that 48 percent of all the kilowatt-hour sales of the Oklahoma cooperatives in 1961 were made to commercial and industrial customers. Of the 26 local REA cooperatives in Oklahoma, 7 had sales of over 50 percent commercial and industrial business and 2 of these had sales of over 80 percent commercial and industrial business. The cooperatives should assume their responsibilities of paying their fair share of taxes and of operating without interest subsidies.

D. S. KENNEDY,
President.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Rural Electric Minuteman of December 6 carried an answer to the nefarious journalism of the Reader's Digest, and I ask unanimous consent that this article entitled "Fancy Versus Fact—Fiction in the Reader's Digest," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point so that my colleagues may have a ready answer when the note or card inspired by the private power companies arrives.

There being no objection, the article entitled "Fancy Versus Fact—Fiction in the Reader's Digest" was ordered to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

FANCY VERSUS FACTS—FICTION IN THE READER'S DIGEST

The December issue of the Reader's Digest carries one of the most vicious attacks ever made against the Nation's rural electric cooperative program.

Titled "The REA—A Case Study of Bureaucracy Run Wild," it is another chapter in the multimillion-dollar propaganda war being waged nationally against the co-ops by the power companies and their allies.

The authors of the article—yellow journalism at its worst—are listed as Kenneth Gilmore and Eugene Methvin, otherwise unidentified. The Digest also is offering dirt cheap reprints of the mudslinging article. to show how anxious it is to dig the graves of co-ops.

Although the Digest periodically castigates REA as being Government subsidized (which it is not), the magazine never mentions its own lush Government subsidy: a second-class mailing privilege that the Post Office estimated in 1958 saved the Digest some $5 million a year. It must be considerably more now. This is money that is taken directly from the pockets of U.S. taxpayers and isn't paid back. REA loans are repaid, of course, with interest.

It is also significant that the Digest takes thousands of dollars of advertising each year from the electric companies advertising program (ECAP) that rips into the rural electrics at every opportunity. Our late President, John F. Kennedy, described this advertising program as "particularly ugly."

Here are some of the many misrepresentations that appear in the current Digest article. The facts follow the quotes:

Quote: "The REA—A Case Study of Bureaucracy Run Wild."

Fact: This is not a case study but sheer propaganda put out by private power companies as part of their drive to destroy consumer-owned electric systems. The U.S. Congress—not REA—after hearings and committee investigations voted the largest appropriations in REA's history to meet the growing capital needs of the program. Congress even voted more administrative funds than REA asked for to take care of the growing demands. The only thing running wild is the imagination of the two authors and the Reader's Digest.

Quote: "To bring electricity to farm areas."

Fact: The REA Act clearly specifies "rural areas." Use of "farm areas" is a calculated power company propaganda ruse, carefully planned over the years to distort the true objectives of REA and put artificial limits on the program's operations.

Quote: "REA is a 'monster eating into the entire electric power industry.'"

Fact: REA-financed systems make up only 1 percent of the entire electric business—and this small percentage was created in areas private power companies refused or could not serve. Power company profits are at an alltime high and their flagrant overcharges have been verified by the Federal Power Commission. Will the real monsters please stand up?

Quote: "Eating * * * into the taxpayer's pocketbook as well."

Fact: Tax-producing wealth created by REA-financed electric systems adds over a billion and a quarter dollars annually to the gross national product by creating markets for electric appliances, wiring, and equipment. Grade A milk, universal in the United States, could not be produced economically in quantities but for electric service. Rural homes and farms justify higher evaluations with electric service available, resulting in greater local tax income. Industry is attracted and greater economic activity results. Health standards are raised and modern hospitals are possible. Defense and transcontinental communication needs are met. For taxpayers outside the rural electric service areas, their tax burdens are lessened by the billions.

Quote: "Regarding Florida Eglin Air Force Base, 'the Federal subsidy allowed the tax-free co-op to grab business from a long-established taxpaying private utility' and 'the Gulf Power Co. offered to furnish the electricity from its nearby power system.'"

Fact: The Comptroller General of the United States (no admirer of REA) reviewed the REA loan, and said "it is clear that Gulf Power would have to extend its lines approximately 15 miles to serve the radar site." The co-op line is 4 miles away. Regarding taxes, he said, "the Air Force states that taxes paid by private companies are dependent upon profits and may vary from time to time because of numerous factors. Interest paid by the Government also varies

* * * To try and isolate these factors and give them a numerical value would be quite difficult and would involve considerable speculation."

Quote: "Such senseless spending and ruthless squashing of private enterprise are not all that is involved."

Fact: The REA loan is part of a long-range development plan to bring power to areas Gulf Power will not serve under any conditions. The airbase radar load helps the co-op develop its marginal territory and its limited number of consumers into a better system more able to serve future demands.

Gulf's profits and stock ratings along with other power companies are regarded by investors as the growth stocks of the financial world. They give the lie to any "ruthless squashing" asserted by Reader's Digest writers.

Quote: "By diverting the contract from the privately owned Gulf Power Co., the REA has deprived the Government of $43,500 a year in corporation taxes."

Fact: Even the Comptroller General disagreed with this. What Reader's Digest neglected to say is that the Government would be paying this $43,500 to the power company, in the first place, plus additional tax liability to cover all the company tax subsidies, investment credits and their share of gross profits.

Quote: "Such cases are cropping up across the Nation. In Indiana, tax-fed co-ops are pirating away millions of dollars worth of business from private enterprise."

Fact: This is sheer fantasy. Co-ops are private enterprise, incorporated under State laws. Their loans are restricted by Federal law so as not to compete with power companies. It is the power companies who invade co-op service areas and pirate away business planned to complete area coverage standards. The Government restrictions confine loans to developing areas the power companies would not or could not serve. It is not—and never was—business the power companies wanted. Now that development has grown where power companies want to merge rural systems into their own business and become sole electric suppliers in the country, they scream that the little co-ops hurt their business. Actually they get $100 million in additional power sales to the co-ops.

Quote: "With the job now virtually completed, REA continued to expand."

Fact: Another line right out of the utility propaganda book. Does Reader's Digest advocate that power companies stop investing $4 billion a year to expand service to customers already receiving service? Rural customers' needs grow the same as urban customers.

Quote: "REA co-ops with their 2-percent subsidy and tax-free advantages are competing unfairly with private business."

Fact: The power business is a monopoly and not private competitive enterprise as the term is used in the business world. Reasonable profits are guaranteed by State regulation. Usual business risks are ruled out. REA interest loan rate and nonprofit operations are not factors in a utility's ability to carry on its business in its own service areas. There is no competition between electric systems. It is outlawed by State regulations. The interest rate and nonprofit State statutes are equalizers for the co-op to help overcome the lack of density in serving marginal territories no one else wanted. Power companies have the same "tax advantages" if they would forgo profits.

Quote: "REA has barged into the industrial loan business, an activity far removed from its original design."

Fact: More utility propaganda. Reader's Digest writers carefully omit the fact that REA does not make loans as described. The House Oversight Committee held hearings on power company claims, such as Reader's Digest voices, and concluded there was nothing to substantiate the criticisms of funds loaned to develop ski resort equipment and the like.

Quote: "REA-subsidized co-ops use their tax-free earnings for a variety of private, profitmaking ventures."

Fact: This utility propaganda line was investigated by the Congress several years ago and found to be completely untrue.

Quote: "Regarding the Indiana generating loan, 'it was a pure giveaway, for private enterprise with adequate power facilities was able and willing to supply energy to these co-ops at reasonable rates.' "

Fact: This loan has met every test invoked by power companies and been proved sound and in the public interest.

Quote: "Description of Colorado-Ute G–T development."

Fact: The account is taken from power company propaganda sheets and is lacking in credulity and authenticity. Reader's Digest fails to mention the loan was approved by the Colorado regulatory agency.

METHODIST BISHOPS SPEAK ON MEANING OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S DEATH

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, some of the most thoughtful statements made on the death of President Kennedy were offered by three bishops of the Methodist Church.

The December 19, 1963, newsletter of the Mitchell, S. Dak., Rotary Club carries a statement by Bishop Edwin R. Garrison, of the Dakota area of the Methodist Church. The January 1964 issue of the Methodist magazine, Together, includes a tribute to the late President Kennedy by Bishop John Wesley Lord of the Washington area. The December 1963 issue of the New England Methodist publication, Zion's Herald, carries the address by Bishop James K. Matthews of the Boston area which he delivered at the Washington Cathedral on November 24.

Mr. President, I am proud of the leaders of my church as represented by the moving statements of these three great bishops. I ask unanimous consent that the three statements be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rotary Whistle, Mitchell (S. Dak.), Dec. 19, 1963]

Our first word must concern our bereavement in the death of President Kennedy. Every person of religious faith will pray for the Kennedy family. We will likewise pray for President Johnson. May God have mercy on this land of ours, forgive each one of us for our trespasses and set our feet upon the path of righteousness, justice, and mercy.

These tragic days are a byproduct of a serious flaw in our American behavior. We call ourselves a civilized people. Our material standard of living is the highest in the world. In comparison with other nations we lack nothing which our money can buy. We are a nation of churchgoers in a sense no other nation can claim. Why, then, do our leaders fall before gunfire as in no other country where the political and economic stability approaches our own? The truth is that we are a people of irresponsible thought and unbridled language. We think in irrational extremes. Whoever disagrees with a fellowcitizen stands the risk of being tagged as subversive. All too often we accept the idea that the end justifies the means even if it means disregarding somebody's constitutional rights. In political campaigns we make charges and counter charges. One man is said to be "soft on communism." Someone else is called a Fascist. Campaigners imply that if the opposition wins the election, the country will be lost—so go the diatribes.

Most of this loose talk is sheer rhetoric—intended to jolt voters out of their lethargy. It is proven on the day after election when the loser shakes hands with the winner and pledges his support. But the damage has been done. In every community there are emotionally disturbed persons who may be triggered to violence by irresponsible language.

This goes on all the time in our public life situations which should call for sensible discussions—race and international relations, management and labor controversies. Public speaking platforms and mail boxes are deluged with appallingly bitter language.

Now add to this our peculiar insistence upon the right of every citizen to carry a gun, combined with a love of shooting scenes in movies and TV, and you have the making of explosive disaster.

For some time there has been the most irresponsible kind of talk in our country. Sometimes from Governors of States, now and then also from so-called ministers of the gospel there has been a continual stream of words which beget violence. Some people sit by their radios and television sets and mutter approval and seethe in malice. Then some psychotic soul takes it seriously enough to pick up a gun and, put words into action. It is time we Americans grew up. When they are crossed, little children blaze out in violent words and action. But when we grow up, we are to put away childish things.

It is time to practice our Christianity and to remember that in His Sermon on the Mount, Jesus declared that a person sins in thought and word as well as in deed: "You have heard that it was said to the men of old, you shall not kill, and whosoever kills shall be liable to judgment, but I say to you that every one who is angry with his brother shall be liable to judgment; and whoever insults his brother shall be liable to the council, and whosoever says, 'You fool' shall be liable to hell fire."

Message of Bishop EDWIN R. GARRISON.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By John Wesley Lord, bishop, Washington D.C., area, the Methodist Church)

By invitation of his brother, the Attorney General, I attended the funeral service of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy at St. Matthew's Cathedral in Washington, D.C. The universal sadness that had cast its pall over the entire world seemed focused there as members of his family, heads of state, Government officials, and friends bowed in unutterable grief. President Kennedy had lived to serve this age; now he was being given to the ages.

Methodists around the world mourn the death of a great and good President. Though it came suddenly and tragically by the hand of an assassin, his death places upon all of us the burden of achieving the suffrage of the free human spirit to which President Kennedy was committed. He will be remembered as a man of deep religious faith, articulate intelligence, and redoubtable courage. A kindly, peace-loving man, he nevertheless dared to risk a nuclear war when his conscience clearly dictated this to be the only way of meeting a threat to our national security.

With his well-trained, disciplined mind and an inner security born of deep spiritual resources, President Kennedy never lost faith in the ultimate integrity of humanity. He believed that, in a world filled with malice, there could be a meeting of minds among people of differing ideologies; that there was no gulf that could not be spanned, given time, patience, and intelligence; that men not under the stress of fear still can control events; and that right will triumph.

On June 10, 1963, the President delivered a historic commencement address at Methodist-related American University in Washington. He spoke on strategy of peace, directing his message to those who say it is useless to speak of peace or world law or world disarmament until the leaders of the Soviet Union adopt a more enlightened attitude. It was his conviction that we could show the way for the Soviet Union to adopt that attitude.

The President urged also that we rethink our attitudes toward peace itself. To believe that peace is impossible or unreal is dangerous and defeatist. This leads to the conclusion that we are gripped by forces we cannot control. But we need not accept that view. Man's reason and spirit often have solved the seemingly insolvable, and they can do it again.

These are the thoughts and this is the faith of a man who had not lost his belief in the essential goodness and reasonableness of humanity. He was a lover of peace, which he defined as a process, a way of solving problems, requiring only that men live together in mutual respect. Against a heritage of hate, the late President bequeathed his country and the world a new heritage of mutual toleration, in which may be found peace with justice.

The President concluded his American University address with a verse from the 16th chapter of the Book of Proverbs: "When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." On occasion he would call to the White House the religious leaders of the Capital Area. Implied and often expressed in these briefings was the truism that the real problems the Nation faced were not so much political or military as they were spiritual. It was the task of religion, he indicated, to create the climate in which real solutions could be found.

It will be the verdict of history, I expect, that President Kennedy was a champion of the unprotected. No occupant of the White House felt more deeply the burden of the dispossessed. He knew that indifference to suffering is the explosive factor in history; and against tremendous odds and apathy, he championed the cause of civil rights for all men everywhere.

In the slow task of building a world community, he was ever on guard that our country's rightful concern to preserve national security and national values did not betray our international responsibilities. He sensed so clearly the terrible travesty of our times: that there may be more substance in our animosities than in our love, and that we have learned to hate better than we have learned to love. As he said in a late 1961 speech, "Let our patriotism be reflected in the creation of confidence rather than in crusades of suspicion."

Some 200 years ago, John Wesley wrote: "He who governed the world before I was born shall take care of it, likewise, when I am dead * * *. My part is to improve the present moment." Man of peace, guardian of the unprotected, lover of mankind, John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be remembered as a man who indeed did improve the present moment.

THE GIFT OF A MAN—A PROTESTANT INTERPRETATION OF THE LIFE AND DEATH OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Bishop James K. Mathews)

(NOTE.—An address presented at the interdenominational service at the Washington Cathedral on November 24 in memory of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States.)

Today, Americans can have but one thought; for we have been present at a new crucifixion. A people who could endure the villainous murder of Medgar Evers without undue remorse, who could observe the slaughter of the innocents by a bomb in a Birmingham church and not really cry out for justice, have called for a yet more costly sacrifice—that of the President of their country. Truly, then, Americans are weeping not only for him but for themselves.

We react, indeed, in anger and sorrow; but do we react sufficiently in repentance? To fail to miss the message of God in this tragic hour would be to allow yet another martyr to have died in vain.

For martyr he was, as surely as those who have died for their vision in earlier ages: a martyr at the hands of extremists of every kind, as well as at the hands of the comfortable captives of the status quo which most of us have become; a martyr to those who enjoy prejudices a century out of date, and those who refuse to live in the day which God has given to us.

To take seriously the death of a martyr is to take the meaning of that death upon ourselves. For in his mortal wound is our own hurt and the hurt of all mankind.

We are a proud, and even arrogant, people who have told ourselves that this sort of thing could not happen here. In more primitive periods of our history, yes. Among more primitive peoples even today. But not here. What could not happen has happened and it has happened to us all.

More than this, all of us have had a part in the slaying of our President. It was good people who crucified our Lord, and not merely those who acted as His executioners. By our silence, by our inaction, by our willingness that heavy burdens be borne by one man alone, by our readiness to allow evil to be called good and good evil, by our continued toleration of ancient injustices, by our failure to address ourselves to this day—by these means we all have had a part in the assassination.

In particular measure, we of the church must bear a heavy share of responsibility. For we are those who speak for God. We are His people and the sheep of His pasture. We are the Body of Christ, which bears His wounds. We are sentinels of civilization, but we have failed to sound the alarm. We have been conformed to the social order we were supposed to have informed. Alas, the garments of the slayer are at our feet. Therefore, "the time has come for judgment to begin with the household of God."

Our Lord says: "Every one to whom much is given, of him will much be required." This word of God is a summons to accountability, just as the events of these days are a summons to accountability. For all too long now we have not been called to account: either to one another; or to the world; or to God. We have been ready to receive abundantly of God's grace, but it is when the demands of that grace are upon us that we fail to measure up.

We call this Thanksgiving Sunday, when we are supposed to acknowledge the mercy of God. It is not really a question of whether or not it is proper for us to celebrate Thanksgiving at such a tragic hour as this. The fact is that we as a people have allowed Thanksgiving, as a significant day, to be lost long ago. It has been reduced to feasting and football. It has become "a pleasant interlude between leaf-raking and snow-shoveling." This holiday, far from being a holy day, has become a hollow day. Having eaten our fill, and that in the midst of a hungry world, we are left with an empty feeling.

Fundamentally, we have been seized by a forgetfulness of nationwide proportions. Abraham Lincoln told a war-torn Nation in his Thanksgiving Proclamation in November 1863: "We have forgotten the gracious Hand which has preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us, and have vainly imagined in the deceitfulness of our hearts that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving Grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us."

If this was true then, how much more is it true today, exactly 100 years later? So it was that in President Kennedy's Thanksgiving Proclamation of November 1963, he said: "* * * as we express our gratitude, we must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words but to live by them. Let us therefore proclaim our gratitude to Providence for manifold blessings—let us be humbly thankful for inherited ideals—and let us resolve to share those blessings and those ideals with our fellow human beings throughout the world."

Yes, we have been seized by forgetfulness. No wonder we debate about our national purpose. No wonder we worry about what other nations shall think of us as a people. Is it not here that we have lost our way? We have forgotten who we are. We have forgotten whose we are. We have forgotten whence we have come. Therefore we do not know where we are going.

"Much has been given to us," yet we have been a thoughtless and thankless people. I do not mean merely that we have been given abundant harvests and a proud heritage. These, we have come to take for granted. Rather, we have been given a man. And this man has been, in an astonishing way, a symbol of the changing world in which we live, a constant flowing river of change which has not left any part of earth untouched.

For John Fitzgerald Kennedy represented and embodied a brandnew world. Indeed, he grasped for it by means of the image of the New Frontier, not merely as a political implement, but as a present reality. So radically has the whole climate of mankind changed that one could almost say that a person living at the beginning of this century would have been more at home in Julius Caesar's time than in our own. This cultural revolution in which we find ourselves was that for which our late President stood.

Again, he made valiant efforts to give a new sense of mission to us as a Nation. This does not mean that he solved all our problems for us but that he was, by virtue of office and by deliberate intent, in the very middle of the dramatic struggles that characterize our age. This sense of mission, involving the welfare of all civilization, has scarcely ever been as well articulated as it was in his inaugural address. Nor has a more imaginative token of it been created than the Peace Corps. So it was that one Peace Corps volunteer said last Friday, "I myself am a part of the legacy he left to the world." Young Americans, in particular, seemed to catch what this man symbolized.

Moreover, he invited and encouraged a new human dignity—a freedom for man now. If this was to have meaning, through Americans, throughout the world, it had to have substance now within our own borders. Therefore, the Negro citizens, patient for a hundred years, were encouraged by President Kennedy to become a new people. That is to say, they have decided to be the free people our Constitution and the Gospel of Jesus Christ say they are. When men determine to be free, there is an unanswerable quality about their determination.

From the Hebrew-Christian perspective, all of this is the work of God. For God is a God who acts in history; indeed, who makes history and gives meaning to human events. The President saw precisely this when he declared, "Here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

We have assuredly been given much in our day, but some factors in our national life have said "No" to it all. They have said

"No" to a brandnew world; "No" to national involvement in the whole process of civilization; "No" to the fulfillment now of human dignity. For all this, the high price of martyrdom has been paid. A martyr is, literally, a witness, and this is the witness we have been given.

Great gifts demand great responsibility. For "every one to whom much is given, of him will much be required." What, in the light of this sacrifice, does the Lord require of us? All human kind will be watching what we do in response, for when a people takes its own history seriously, every man's history is involved.

First of all, we, who have been forgetful are called to recollection and return. We have come to take God for granted, have tried to encase Him in the past and to capture Him in our creeds. Meanwhile, He is at work, as always, in the present orders of society.

Let us recall that we are a people by heritage dedicated to law and order and to equality under law. This was by specific intent. For 343 years ago this very week, the Pilgrims landed on Cape Cod. Their navigation had been faulty, and they had missed the territory for which they had been granted authority. Some of the colonists considered that they were, therefore, under no law. Then, by deliberate act, they made themselves equal under law, by creating the Mayflower Compact. In this they promised to "covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politic, for our better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof to enact, constitute and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony, unto which we promise all due submission and obedience."

They were, therefore, a covenanted community: in acknowledging God, they acknowledged one another. By self-conscious promises, each held himself before God as responsible to his neighbor in a common endeavor. We are summoned by the martyrdom of our President to renew such a covenant of equity, under law, which is basic to any true community.

Secondly, in the light of this sacrifice, we are called to receive the very realities which it symbolizes. Therefore, we must embrace this new world of radical change and possibility. For it is offered to us as the gift of God.

Moreover, if this is to be a meaningful sacrifice, we are called as a people deliberately to involve ourselves in the whole enterprise of humanity. For, in a degree unparalleled in earlier centuries, we owe ourselves to the world. Merely to preserve ourselves as a nation is to lose our identity. But to give our lives in the service of total civilization is to find ourselves. For it is only in our mission together that we are a nation.

Again, in view of this martyrdom, we are called to a deepened fulfillment of the dignity of every person. There can no longer be any second-class people of any kind, anywhere. Only through acknowledging this dignity for all—without any exception—can any one of us possess dignity himself. So it is that integrity may return to us and we can be the nation we have pretended to be.

What I have said is that we have been present at a new crucifixion and that we all have, in fact, contributed to it. Our crucified Lord enables us to understand the cruciform nature of all human existence, and He endows even the most senseless event with cosmic meaning. But the Christian is not allowed to speak of crucifixion without speaking also of resurrection. This can only be realized by our embodying, as living secrifices, that which was embodied by the one who was slain. That is to say, we are to confront life and the world with a new openness, a new awareness of our true identity and responsibility as a nation, and a new readiness to acknowledge the validity of every human being.

Finally, let us receive the torch that has been "passed" to a new generation of Americans. "For this generation," as John Fitzgerald Kennedy himself so clearly expressed it, "would not exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world." That never-dying torch has now been lighted by a martyr for his people. For this man not only uttered words but lived by them. "Every one to whom much is given, of him will much be required." Amen.

TAX REDUCTION AND BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, last Saturday Robert M. McKinney, former Ambassador to Switzerland, editor and publisher of the Santa Fe New Mexican, and now executive officer of the Presidential Task Force on International Investments, addressed a joint meeting of the New Mexico Press Women's Association and Sigma Delta Chi at Albuquerque, N. Mex. In his talk Ambassador McKinney discussed the effect that tax reduction could have upon our balance of payments by the stimulation of our own economy. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS: A 1963 YEAREND BALANCE SHEET

(By Robert M. McKinney)

We have been reading a great deal about the U.S. balance of payments recently and we are likely to encounter it even more often in the months and years ahead. Balance-of-payments considerations have played an increasingly important role in foreign policy decisions and in domestic decisions as well. For that reason I think it might be helpful if I took a close look at what our balance of payments is, why it is important, what is being done about it, and what the outlook is for the future.

WHAT THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS IS

Our balance of payments is a running account of our international economic relationships with other countries. It is a summary of all our international transactions with foreigners—imports, exports, investments, defense and foreign aid payments, tourist travel, and other payments and receipts.

A balance-of-payments account reflects the flow of money payments to and from any particular country over a particular period of time—usually one quarter or 1 year. It is frequently summarized as a single figure, either deficit or surplus. When the U.S. balance of payments is in deficit it means that we are paying out more money to foreigners—either in private and Government transactions or both—than they are spending here.

These U.S. deficits are settled either by foreign purchases of U.S. gold or by foreign retention of dollar assets. In other words, the net U.S. dollar payments abroad can be held entirely in the form of dollars by foreigners, or, alternatively, foreign monetary authorities can exchange some or all of those dollars for gold. The United States, of course, buys or sells gold freely to foreign central banks and other institutions for legitimate monetary purposes at the fixed price of $35 an ounce.

That standing pledge to exchange dollars freely for gold has made the dollar as good as gold in international markets; partially this accounts for the popularity of the dollar as a reserve currency. So popular, in fact, is the American dollar, that the nations of the free world own far more of their reserves in dollars than they do in any other currency. That, of course, is an impressive vote of confidence in the dollar. It has to do not merely with the fact that the dollar is freely exchangeable for gold, but chiefly with the confidence foreigners place in the soundness of the U.S. economy. For when foreigners voluntarily hold dollars they are, in effect, extending to the United States loans in the form of bank deposits or short-term securities; in either form, they represent potential claims on our gold stock.

I think it is important to make one thing crystal clear: a balance-of-payments deficit does not necessarily mean that our international net worth is declining. The United States, in fact, almost consistently lends more abroad than our entire balance-of-payments deficit, and it is for this reason that our net worth as a nation has continued to rise, not fall.

But, over the years, we have been lending extensively on private and public account on a long-term basis and borrowing largely at short term so that our balance of payments, as measured by changes in our gold stock and in our liquid liabilities abroad has been in deficit.

Quite literally, our accounts at some point will have to be restored to balance. While there is no time to waste in moving toward balance, neither is there any cause for panic. Our position is still strong, we still hold almost 40 percent of free world gold stocks and we have time to make an orderly adjustment.

WHY THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM IS IMPORTANT

Some people feel that the balance of payments is merely a technical problem for Treasury and Federal Reserve officials to deal with in a vacuum, and that there is no need to take account of it when considering other domestic or international issues. But this is not the case. To understand why the balance of payments is a vital part of American policy it might be helpful to take a quick look at some recent history.

Immediately following World War II we heard a great deal about the so-called dollar shortage. This referred to the fact that the United States had been exporting more than it had been importing and as a result foreigners would not have enough dollars to purchase U.S. goods. However, with the startling economic recovery of Western Europe early in the last decade, the picture began to change. In addition, as the cold war required increased U.S. Government spending abroad to help our security at home the United States developed a significant deficit in its balance of payments.

Actually, since 1950, the U.S. balance of payments was in surplus in only 1 year, 1957, and that was largely the result of the sudden and temporary increase in exports because of the closing of the Suez Canal.

For the 7 years before 1957, there had been a steady string of payments deficits averaging $1.5 billion a year. Factors contributing to these deficits included the Korean war, U.S. aid to Europe under the Marshall plan during part of that period, steadily rising military expenditures overseas, and rising long-term U.S. private investment abroad.

In the 3 years following 1957, the deficits rose steeply, averaging $3.7 billion. The 1958 and 1959 deficits reflected a sharp drop in U.S. merchandise exports with the passing of the Suez crisis and, in 1959, a spurt in imports as Europe regained its competitive position. The record deficit of $3.9 billion in 1960 was associated with the emergence, in addition, of a large outflow of U.S. short-term capital abroad.

Also, of course, during that 3-year period there was a sizable gold outflow from the United States, as foreign governments preferred to exchange many of the new dollars coming their way to build up the gold reserves of their own central banks.

Our basic balance-of-payments position has been improved since then, but it still remains a serious problem and the subject of a broad and vigorous program to reduce and eventually eliminate it.

WHAT IS BEING DONE ABOUT OUR BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Granted that our continuing balance-of-payments deficits and the gold loss which has resulted from them represents a problem which cannot be overlooked. The question is, what are we doing about it?

Is there a quick way to end the deficits?

Is there a shortcut to stopping the gold drain?

All of us hear pronouncements or opinions that a dramatic solution to the problem lies readily at hand, if only we had the sense—or as some would put it the courage—to grasp it. If only we were to cut out foreign aid, or bring back our troops from abroad, or restrict American tourist travel abroad, or shut out imports by restrictions or high tariffs, or clamp controls on foreign investment, or raise interest rates sharply, or even refuse to sell gold—then all would be well—so we are often asked to believe. But, in fact, most, if not all, such measures would prove illusory. Much of our foreign aid, for instance, is in the form of U.S. exports and does not add to our deficit. I do not doubt for a moment, however, that some of those actions, alone or in combination would, at least temporarily, stop the gold drain in its tracks. But, they would do so by evading, rather than curing, the real problem.

Our task is not simply to stop the gold drain, regardless of consequences for ourselves and our allies and trading partners. Instead, we have a much harder, longer, and more complicated task of seeking balance in ways, consistent with prosperity and expanding trade among nations and our national security.

Quite simply, we cannot take refuge in measures that will add to unemployment and waste resources at home. We cannot simply increase tariffs or put direct controls on trade and investment. Such measures would not only invite retaliation from abroad and worsen our position; they would undermine the very objectives we have sought throughout the postwar period—an expansion of trade among nations and the elimination of barriers to the free flow of funds. Nor can we afford to undermine the effectiveness of programs so vital to our own national security and to that of our friends as are our foreign aid and defense programs.

These are the kinds of limitations within which we must work to achieve what would deserve to be called a real solution—any other approach would, in a real sense, represent not success but failure.

Before looking at some of the things we are doing, I would like to look at the three main parts of our balance of payments.

By far the most important in terms of the total dollars and cents involved are our current transactions in trade and services with other countries. The United States, almost throughout the whole postwar period, has had a sizable surplus of exports of merchandise over imports. We also have a surplus in so-called service transactions—including particularly our large and growing return flow of earnings (dividends and interest) from our $60 billion of private investments abroad. That figure alone has climbed to a rate of about $4 billion a year. Overall, our surplus on all our current commercial transactions has been running between $4 and $5 billion—even without counting any of the exports generated directly by our aid program.

But, while we still have a large surplus on these accounts, it is clear that our position is quite different from what it was during the postwar years. Then our sales abroad were limited only by the money available to other nations desperately trying to rebuild their economies. In a sense, the United States in those days—as virtually the only supplier in the world of many goods—could not have a real balance of payments problem: whatever dollars we paid out would quickly turn right around and come back to us in payment for purchases of U.S. goods by foreigners.

Today the situation is very different. Almost all the goods we have for sale are actually or potentially available elsewhere; other nations are able to compete vigorously not only in foreign countries, but even right here in our home market. We are having to learn again the hard lesson that, in order to sell abroad, we must be able to compete effectively in terms of both price and quality. That our position is far from weak in this respect, our persistent trade surplus shows. Nevertheless, this surplus has not been large enough to offset the drains in the two other main areas of our balance of payments.

The first of these reflects our heavy Government expenditures abroad, primarily for defense and economic aid. Today, however, over three-quarters of all our aid is being provided in the form of goods and services rather than dollars; to that extent it is directly reflected in our exports and places no burden on our balance of payments.

The drains from defense have been large. On a gross basis we spend about $3 billion abroad for defense each year. These expenditures are now offset to the extent of over $1 billion by purchases of military equipment in this country by some of our European allies who are now in a strong financial position—notably West Germany. But in 1962, this still left us with a net defense drain approaching $2 billion. In total, Government expenditures abroad have been absorbing over $3 billion of our current surplus.

The remaining major item in our balance of payments—investment flows—have also presented a special problem. On the average in recent years, American business has been lending over $2 billion a year abroad in the form of purchases of new securities or in the form of direct investments in foreign manufacturing concerns—until this year mostly the latter. In addition, from 1960 to 1962, another $2 billion a year or so was flowing out in the form of short-term investment abroad.

It is this sector of our accounts that was responsible for the deterioration in our balance of payments during the first half of this year. For example, in the second quarter of 1963, the balance-of-payments deficit ran at about $5 billion at an annual rate. In particular, purchases of new foreign securities accelerated sharply to a rate of roughly $2 billion a year. Meanwhile, foreign long-term investment in the United States has recently been running at a rate of only about $350 million per year.

This, then, is the rough overall dimension of our problem. Our current commercial surplus of $4 to $5 billion, half on trade, half on services, is more than offset by net Government expenditures abroad of about $3 billion and over $4 billion in recent years, over $5 billion at an annual rate during the first half of the year.

Our efforts to eliminate the deficit—and thus remove the basic cause of the gold drain—have been directed toward improvement in all three of these areas. We have adopted a combination of long- and short-term measures to do the job.

WHAT IS BEING DONE TO EXPAND EXPORTS

We have neither the desire nor the intent to limit imports to the United States by erecting artificial barriers to the products of other nations. Our goal instead has been to increase our export capability—and this means stable prices, knowledge of potential markets abroad and their special needs, and well designed products that meet those needs. And behind this must be an efficient industry—an industry able to keep at the very forefront of the latest technology, to produce efficiently and to pour out the kinds of new products the world wants.

This is one reason why we have placed so much emphasis on tax reduction to stimulate business investment in modern and more efficient equipment—for if we fail to maintain our leadership here, we cannot expect to compete effectively. The tax depreciation reforms and the investment tax credit undertaken last year were needed steps in that direction, and this year's program of tax reduction is another.

In the process of achieving faster growth and a more efficient industry, the need for stable prices cannot be forgotten. We have been doing relatively well in this respect—since 1958 our wholesale price index has not budged at all. But we must make sure that we maintain that record as our domestic economy expands. It is to assist in this process of maintaining price stability as we move ahead that the administration has placed so much emphasis on price and wage guideposts—not to dictate decisions, but to suggest how the public interest in patterns setting price and wage decisions can be gaged. In essence, wage increases within the bounds of the average trend of rising productivity will permit a rise in income for both labor and capital. But, only as those increases are earned by greater efficiency can we move forward without jeopardizing overall price stability.

Meanwhile, many more specific actions have been undertaken to improve our export performance. Over the past 2 years, export credit facilities have been developed and expanded to the point that American exporters are, in that respect, on a comparable footing with their foreign competitors. A major effort is underway in the Department of Commerce to step up marketing information to businessmen, and to expose foreigners to American products. Many American firms are for the first time being made aware of the vast potentialities of foreign markets, and are being given the kind of information they need if these markets are to be penetrated successfully. A White House Conference on Export Expansion was held in Washington last September, as the Government enlisted enthusiastic support and advice of the leaders of American business. All these measures, however, will take time to be fully effective, and we can't forget that our foreign competitors—who have long been schooled in the philosophy of "export or die"—are working equally hard.

But signs of progress are appearing—certainly our price performance compares favorably with the countries of Europe. And in time, an expansion in exports can go a long ways toward curing our problem in the best manner.

WHAT IS BEING DONE TO HOLD DOWN GOVERNMENT SPENDING ABROAD

Meanwhile, action is being taken to achieve early reduction in the net outflow of Government funds. Through our own economies, and by means of the arrangements with some of our allies to purchase additional military equipment and supplies from the United States, the dollar drain from the mutual defense effort has been substantially reduced since 1960. Further savings are in store; administration measures are expected to achieve reductions of a further $500 to $600 million by January 1, 1965.

Roughly, 80 percent of our foreign aid during fiscal 1963 was committed in the form of American goods and services, rather than in the form of dollars. That percentage is being stepped up, so a reduction of around $300 million can also be achieved in this area. All other Government expenditures abroad are receiving the sort of close, tough scrutiny that is needed. Thus the rate of all types of Government spending abroad will thus be reduced by $1 billion by the end of next year.

WHAT IS BEING DONE ABOUT FOREIGN INVESTMENT

The third broad area—investment flows—is in some ways the most difficult to deal with effectively. First of all, as many have pointed out, foreign investment in the long run is not a source of weakness but of strength. It returns important benefits to this country. And it is also vitally important to other countries short of capital, and dependent on access to the U.S. market to get it. Clearly, it is not in our interest, or in the interests of the world at large, for the richest and most powerful nation in the world simply to cut off the flow of capital to others.

At the same time, it is clear that to have these flows continue at a rate that would ultimately weaken the dollar itself serves the interest of no one—certainly not the United States, and not those other countries with a stake in a stable international payments system, which in turn rests so heavily on a stable dollar. And, when capital flows increased so sharply and abruptly this year, without any clear signs of a decline to the already large levels of previous years, action was clearly needed.

Basically, of course, money flows from free international capital markets to areas of the world where the returns to investors appear most promising—whether those returns are expressed as interest rates, or, as in the case of direct investments, as profits. In recent years, the investment opportunities in the rapidly growing Common Market, in Europe generally, and in Japan have been particularly attractive. At the same time, our own growth in the United States has been relatively slow, profits have been less buoyant, and investment opportunities more limited. In the face of our huge flow of savings, and with unemployment a problem, our domestic U.S. interest rate structure has been relatively low. Thus, it is quite natural that capital has flowed abroad in volume. In the end, a large part of any solution must be found in a more dynamic, rapidly growing domestic economy, more attractive to domestic and foreign capital alike.

This is the essential reason why we believe the current tax bill is so important, not only for domestic reasons, but also for the balance of payments.

Tax reduction, however, offers an opportunity for meeting our domestic goal of fuller employment at the same time we make this country a more attractive place to invest in. And, as American industry returns closer to full capacity operations, rising interest rates will be a quite normal and healthy response to natural market forces, that is, a rising demand by consumers for goods, and by business for additional plant equipment and capital. At the same time, tax reduction will give our monetary authorities the leeway they need to conduct monetary policy in a manner best calculated to benefit our balance of payments without damaging our domestic economy made more dynamic and growth oriented through the improved tax structure.

But we cannot expect this process to work miracles overnight. And, as I pointed out a moment ago, the problems in this area became particularly critical over the first 6 months of this year.

There was a sharp improvement in the third quarter, but in the fourth quarter this improvement is slackening. Moreover, there is one important aspect of this matter that is beyond our control. With rare exceptions, capital markets abroad have simply not been developed to the stage that they are able to serve fully their domestic needs, much less those of other nations—even when large balance-of-payments surpluses provide the capacity for foreign lending. Many foreign capital markets are still subject to controls; their rate structures are high and rigid. The result is that even an increase in the profitability of American industry, or a rise in interest rates within the range of our past experience will not alone prevent from converging on our market demands for investment capital from all the world—although these factors are of course essential preconditions to a fully effective and lasting solution.

It is to meet this situation that an interest equalization tax has been proposed. This tax is equivalent to 1 percent of the interest return on a foreign bond purchased from a foreigner, or to 15 percent of value in the case of stock. The purpose is quite simple: to increase the cost of foreign borrowing in our market in a manner similar to a rise in our domestic long-term interest rates—an interest increase of such a magnitude that it would simply not be practicable today. The tax would bring the cost of foreign borrowing in our market into rough alinement with those in other leading countries, thus encouraging borrowers in those countries whenever possible to seek more of their funds at home. The tax would achieve the purpose of sharply reducing the outward flow of capital in a way that would not intrude into individual negotiations between borrowers and lenders, and without in any way restricting the free use of dollars.

As you can imagine, this step to use the taxing power to reduce investment flows was taken with the greatest reluctance, but the need was clear. The tax will be abandoned as soon as the two basic problems that led to the need are concerned—that is, just as soon as the capital markets of other countries are able to operate more effectively and at lower rates and/or as soon as increased growth in the United States is reflected in greater relative attractiveness of investment here.

The interest equalization tax passed the House Ways and Means Committee by voice vote—a fact that indicated the broad support the measure had in the committee. It is expected to pass the House soon after Congress convenes next month, and it will then go to the Senate Finance Committee. That committee is expected to take it up shortly after completing work on the domestic tax program.

Our task force on promoting foreign investment in U.S. corporate securities—the creation of which was announced at the same time as this tax—will, we all hope, contribute to shortening the life of the tax.

This task force on which I serve has three objectives:

(1) To identify and appraise the restrictions remaining in the capital markets of other industrial nations of the free world which prevent the purchase of American securities and which hamper U.S. companies in financing their operations abroad from non-U.S. sources; (2) to review U.S. Government and private activities which adversely affect foreign purchase of the securities of U.S. private companies; and (3) to plan a broad and intensive effort by the U.S. financial community to market securities of U.S. private companies to foreign investors, and to increase the availability of foreign financing for U.S. business operating abroad.

The increased freedom of capital movement and increased participation by foreign citizens and financial institutions in the ownership and financing of American business, towards which these efforts are directed, will serve to strengthen the economic and political ties of the free world as well as its monetary system. Securities of U.S. private firms could be and should be one of our best selling exports. An increasing foreign investment in these securities will encourage a more balanced two-way capital traffic between the United States and other capital marks and minimize the impact of net long-term capital outflows from the United States on our balance of payments.

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

I am happy to be able to report that as a result of the proposed interest equalization tax, together with the increase in the rediscount rate by the Federal Reserve Board last July, as well as several other factors, our balance-of-payments deficit for the third quarter of this year was the lowest on record since 1957. Preliminary indications are, however, that the fourth quarter of 1963 will see the U.S. balance of payments of deficit beginning to climb back up again—particularly in the area of short-term capital movements.

As I mentioned earlier, the sale of new foreign securities—before the interest equalization tax was proposed—played an increasingly important part in the U.S. balance-of-payments picture. The increase in our deficit on regular transactions both in 1962 and the first half of 1963 was due almost entirely to this swelling outflow of capital into new foreign securities. While our deficit on regular transactions increased by $530 million in 1962 compared to the previous year U.S. purchases of new foreign issues grew by $550 million. During the first 6 months of 1963 the increase of about $850 million, at an annual rate, in new foreign issues purchased by Americans was also roughly equal to the increase in our deficit on regular transactions.

After the President's announcement of the interest equalization tax this outflow was sharply curtailed. In the third quarter of this year, U.S. purchases of new foreign securities fell to a seasonally adjusted level of about $200 million compared with almost $500 million in each of the previous quarters. Moreover, virtually all of these purchases reflected transactions which had been completed or firmly committed before the proposed July 18 effective date for the tax. In September and October this flow has been very much smaller and well below the levels of 1959–61. So far as we know, no sizable new commitments have been undertaken since July 18.

There was also a substantial improvement in our short-term capital account in the third quarter, with the net outflow on account of short-term bank credits falling from a seasonally adjusted level of almost $500 million in the second quarter to zero. Short-term capital movements are, of course, notorious for making large swings in either direction in a short period of time and it is always difficult to attribute a cause for these swings. However, the increase in the Federal Reserve discount rate in July was undoubtedly an important factor. In addition, it seems probable that this improvement also reflected generally increased confidence in the dollar as a result of the vigorous further measures to correct our balance-of-payments deficit which were announced in the President's July message.

I cannot promise you that this improvement will continue or that you will not be reading about the gold problem and the balance of payments for some time to come. Quite the contrary, for this is a stubborn problem, and will require our best efforts before it is finally overcome. Certainly we are on the mend and the situation has improved remarkedly in recent months, but a lot of hard work remains to be done before we reach a lasting solution.

The thought I would like to leave with you is that of all the measures to improve our balance of payments perhaps the most decisive, the most important is not an international measure at all but a domestic measure. I refer to the pending income tax reduction program. This measure, of course, was designed primarily to benefit the domestic economy. One of its most important effects, however, will be to foster a higher level of productive investment in the United States.

Thus, by enabling our producers to more effectively meet foreign competition, it will make a direct contribution to increasing our export trade and to reducing the deficit in our balance of payments. Secondly, as our economy expands more rapidly, the United States will become a more attractive and a more profitable haven both for domestic and foreign private capital.

It is no exaggeration to say that the tax program, which is principally aimed at assisting the domestic economy, may well have just as beneficial an effect upon the international economic position of the United States as it does upon the domestic position. The longrun benefits from the tax program, together with the results of all the other programs designed to reduce and eventually eliminate the deficit in our balance of payments, hold an excellent promise for eventually providing a lasting solution for this delicate and difficult problem.

FEDERAL ECONOMY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Federal Government performs many useful functions. It also fulfills another role which is completely undeserved, that of whipping boy for those who seek simple solutions to complex problems.

It is certainly much easier, in an argument, to lean on false statistics and unfair comparisons that it is to admit that the civil servant is indeed serving the needs of our Nation with dispatch and efficiency. The problem is that the continued stream of nonsense about our Federal Government can erode not only the concepts of public service that are vital to a democracy but can lead to unfair and unequitable treatment of the people upon whom we depend for the continuation of our Government.

An excellent appraisal of the difficulties facing the civil servant appeared in yesterday's Sunday Star. This article was written by one of the most perceptive and articulate men ever to serve this Nation, former Postmaster General J. Edward Day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL ECONOMY, YES; PENNY PINCHING, NO

(By J. Edward Day)

(NOTE.—Mr. Day, who has been Postmaster General of the United States, insurance commissioner of Illinois, and a top life insurance executive, is now practicing law in Washington.)

Professor Parkinson's law cites the alleged tendency of paperwork organizations to keep growing needlessly and to manufacture more paperwork to keep the enlarged organizations busy.

Editorial writers and chamber of commerce speakers love to cite this to deride and scoff at the Federal Government establishment. According to them, the size of the Federal payroll is increasing by leaps and bounds. These speeches and editorials claiming that the total number of Federal employees is getting completely out of hand have been repeated so many times they have been accepted as gospel. With the charges about supposedly inflated payrolls go companion charges that a huge number of Federal employees are unnecessarry, that Federal employees do not work very hard, and that the level of competence, dedication, and performance among Federal personnel is lower than in the private sphere.

These are unfair and untrue charges which undermine the proud status of the Federal professional career.

While total Federal employment has had minor ups and downs in the last 20 years, the fact is that it has remained amazingly stable despite huge growth in population and economic activity and despite a resulting incredible increase in workload.

There are, in fact, fewer Federal civilian employees today than there were in 1953—or even than there was in 1946, after World War II had been over for a year. Not only has Federal civilian employment actually gone down in total numbers as compared with 1953 and 1946, but the relation to total population has gone down in an even more startling way.

FEDERAL FIGURES

In 1946, 19 people out of every 1,000 were civilian employees of the Federal Government. In 1953 the figure was 17 out of 1,000. Today the figure is only 13 out of 1,000.

Many of those who talk, quite inaccurately, about a big increase in Federal employment like to say that the trouble is that not enough Government functions are turned over to the States and to local governments. But let us see what has been happening to these other levels of government.

Between 1946 and 1963, when Federal employment went down, employment by State and local governments went up by 3.5 million people. Population and economic growth has forced immense increases in State and local government employment. But for some reason, there is an irrational belief in many quarters that any increase in Federal Government staffing comes from sinister causes.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, if Federal civilian employment had increased at the same rate as employment by State and local governments it would have gone up by 100,000. In fact, it grew by only 5,600.

And yet people who have responsibility for making the Federal Government function must face up to the fact that steady increases in workload cannot be absorbed without staffing adjustments.

AUTOMATIC INCREASES

As President Eisenhower said in his 1960 budget message to Congress: "We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities."

Here are some examples of what President Eisenhower was talking about: Between the fiscal years 1962 and 1964, the number of veterans or survivors receiving pensions will rise by 11 percent; the volume of mail will grow 6.4 percent; aircraft landings and takeoffs at airports with Federal towers will go up by 12 percent; beneficiaries under the social security program will increase by 15 percent; the number of patents granted will rise by 17 percent; and passports issued will increase by 27 percent.

Of the 2.5 million Federal civilian employees, 1 million are employed by the Defense Department, about 600,000 by the Post Office (there were 150,000 postal employees in 1890 to handle one-sixteenth as much mail as now) and about 175,000 by the Veterans' Administration. Everything else that the Federal Government does is accomplished by 700,000 employees, fewer than are employeed in the telephone industry.

Hand in hand with the unjustified charges about staffing the Federal Government go equally untrue charges that Government personnel are just easygoing bureaucrats who don't work as hard or as well as people in private industry or private professional life.

That attitude is just 1,000 percent wrong.

BUREAUCRACY CHARGE

W. H. Ferry, director of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, has said:

"A cherished corporate legend is that governmental bureaucracy is inefficient, full of featherbedding dullards, and tends toward venality; while the bureaucracy of the large company comprises high-minded and overworked gentlemen, whose eyes are on a brighter star.

"This line is one of the main strands of the political irresponsibility of corporations. Though it might at first glance seem merely an engaging self-deception, it in fact tears away at respect for law and government, the joint creations of people for their own good, and aggrandizes the private company as somehow superior both in aim and practice."

I was a senior officer for 8 years of a giant life insurance company which is the third largest corporation in the world—a fine, well-run, progressive company.

And yet, I can state unequivocally that I have never been surrounded with such talent as I was while serving in the Federal Government. Every day I worked with Federal executives who demonstrated superb imagination, energy, good judgment, and practical idealism.

And they had a further advantage over management and professional personnel in many other large organizations: a sense of humor.

With few exceptions, the Federal executive sees himself in context with the great complicated world we line in; he has a lively interest in new ideas and in wider horizons—and he does not take himself too seriously.

LAW OF TRIVIALITY

There is a second Parkinson law which has an important bearing on the problems of the Federal Government. It is the law of triviality. It might also be called the law of pennywise and pound foolish. It is illustrated by the unwillingness of Congress, while appropriating billions for certain glamorous and highly publicized Government programs, to allow sufficient money for carrying out vital but conventional and unglamorous responsibilities of Government, particularly in the law enforcement and regulatory field.

In Federal spending, billions are authorized for defense, space, foreign aid, and for new highly publicized programs. In September 1963, the House even voted $190 million for a fallout shelter construction program. But when the established, traditional functions of Government come up for their budget hearings, the pennypinching sets in with a vengeance.

Here is an illustration:

Everyone obviously is against drug addiction. Nearly everyone says why don't we do more about it. No one denies that almost all of the illicit narcotics used in this country are smuggled in from foreign countries. Prevention of smuggling, including narcotics smuggling, is the function of the Bureau of Customs and of that Bureau alone. No other Government agency shares the responsibility for controlling smuggling.

For 14 of the last 15 years the Bureau of Customs has requested additional enforcement personnel citing, among other reasons, the specific problem of narcotic smuggling. What happened to these requests? With the exception of one token increase of 37 officers, the Bureau's requests have been denied every year and, instead, reductions have been made.

As a result, comparing the Bureau's manpower today with the volume of export and import transactions it is required to handle, it doesn't have one-fourth of the manpower it had 15 years ago.

This means that Customs, with the full responsibility for preventing smuggling of narcotics, is like a man with a short blanket. To keep the head warm it must expose the feet.

EXPANDED WORKLOAD

World trade and travel has expanded almost four times in the last 20 years without any corresponding increase in customs enforcement personnel. The Bureau of Customs and every group which has inquired into this problem has consistently urged an increase in Customs enforcement and investigative personnel.

For an incredible example of trivality or pennypinching in action, I refer you to the printed report of the 1963 House appropriation hearings for the civil division of the Justice Department. Twenty-nine additional positions were requested. There is a whole series of questions from committee members about whether the salary for a GS–12 is $9,475 or $9,485. It must have cost many times more than this $10 difference just to print up this part of the testimony.

WORKERS AND SPACE

New duties are piled on Government enforcement and regulatory agencies without new workers being authorized and without adequate space being authorized.

The Food and Drug Administration has jurisdiction over products which account for 30 cents out of every dollar spent by the American consumer. Any one food (tuna, for example) or any one drug (thalidomide, for example) produced by any one manufacturer may call into action FDA's total resources. Yet much of their most important laboratory research is performed in the subbasement of a converted garage here.

My point is that we are pennypinching on vital but unglamorous functions of Government. We are all for economy. I, myself, am a firm believer in a balanced budget in times of peace and prosperity, such as the present. But with the enormous commitments for defense, space, grant-in-aid programs, foreign aid, interest on the national debt and the like, there is an unhealthy squeeze on the budgets of conventional Government activities which must have funds for keeping up with increased population and increased workload.

The Defense Department spends about $150 million a day. We all want a defense position second to none. But we should not let normal civilian functions of the Federal Government be strangled in the process.

Nondefense Federal expenditures are now 7 percent lower, in relation to gross national product, than they were 25 years ago.

VICTORY FOR VIRTUE

Too many people seem to think it a kind of victory for the forces of virtue if the funds that the Federal Government needs to do its work are cut.

Too often, moreover, the cuts are made in the everyday, undramatic, but enormously vital, domestic program.

Another example of Federal pennypinching is the low level of pay for top appointive officials. Cabinet members get $25,000, Assistant Secretaries, often heading huge bureaus, and members of key regulatory commissions, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, get $20,000. In contrast, over 900 State Governors, mayors, city managers, and administrators, State court judges and officials of public "authorities," receive salaries exceeding $25,000.

The difficulty of recruiting and keeping topflight talent for key Federal regulatory posts is highlighted by this example: Of the 22 Civil Aeronautics Board members who served prior to the present incumbents, fewer than one-third served to the end of their appointed 6-year terms.

Rather ironically, top airline executives, who receive salaries several times the size of those of these Federal regulatory officials, have testified before congressional committees that the Federal Government should pay for developing a supersonic commercial transport plane because the Federal Government can afford it and the airlines can't. There are many other examples of this attitude that the Federal Government can afford anything new or exciting, particularly if it is a proposal that has political appeal, but that it can't afford to do its existing, nonglamorous tasks with adequate budgets or adequate pay scales for those in charge.

We should cut the suit to fit the cloth when we decide on total Federal spending, but we should not kid ourselves into thinking we can have the services and the programs without paying for them.

Instead we should limit our Federal commitments to what we can afford to pay for and then provide the money to see that those programs are carried out, with adequate space, adequate personnel and a level of compensation reasonably comparable with private industry.

In the squeeze that now takes place the Federal executive is often called on to perform a Herculean task. But he has the satisfaction of being part of a dedicated, highly professional group that can take justifiable pride in its public service.

TWO TRIBUTES FROM TEXAS; A SAGE AND A POET HONOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Dr. Jenny Lind Porter, who has been selected as poet laureate of Texas for 1964, author of several volumes of poetry and of many separate poems printed in magazines and journals all over the world, now associate professor of English at Southwest Texas State College, has written a beautiful tribute to our martyred President, the late John F. Kennedy.

Dr. Porter has compared the spirit and dreams and hopes for a land and a people held by the Poet Robert Frost and John F. Kennedy. Her comparison, under the title, "The Poet and the President," was printed, with photographs, as the lead story on the front page of the feature section of the Austin American-Statesman on Sunday, December 15, 1963.

J. Frank Dobie, writer, philosopher, folkorist, author of many books, pamphlets, articles, sage of the southwest, historian of the cowboy and his environment, now a consultant to the Library of Congress in the field of American culture, an admirer of the late John F. Kennedy, has written feeling of the effect of the sudden loss of Kennedy—"a citizen of the world." Mr. Dobie's tribute was printed under the title "Summing Up" in the book section of the Austin American-Statesman for Sunday, December 29, 1963.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that Dr. Jenny Lind Porter's article "The Poet and the President" and J. Frank Dobie's article "Summing Up" both be printed in full at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American-Statesman, Dec. 15, 1963]

The Poet and the President

(By Jenny Lind Porter)

(Note.—Dr. Jenny Lind Porter, Poet Laureate of Texas for 1964, is assistant professor of English at Southwest Texas State College. Her biography appears this winter in the new issue of the Dictionary of International Biography, just published in London. She appears regularly on KLRN–TV with a program called "The Poet Laureate and the Poets.")

This could be called a tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy through the lines of the poet who read at his inauguration—Robert Frost. Who of us would have thought that day, watching the octogenarian poet and the boyish, handsome, 43-year-old President, that each was soon to complete his "gift outright" to the Nation? And they were magnificent gifts. In this month, December, when we talk of the gifts of the Magi laid at the feet of the Christ child, we can remember that we may follow Kennedy and Frost on a trial of the modern Magi, through a land that realizes westward because we have laid our dreams at the master's feet and are fully aware that a princely star looks down on Cape Kennedy and that frankincense and myrrh have come in great mailbags to a Dallas police station for the widow of Officer Tippit. Our country, such as she is, such as she will become, is perhaps more prayerful this week than it has ever been, more soul searching, and more humble.

Frost and Kennedy had much in common. Each was a visionary, a dreamer. Naturally, for the poet; not so naturally, with a President. Out of our 36, those Presidents possessed of great dreams and similarly endowed with courage and social conscience and eloquence number only 4 or 5: one thinks of a Jefferson, a Lincoln, an F.D.R., a Kennedy.

"We are the music makers
And we are the dreamers of dreams,
Wandering by lone sea breakers
And sitting by desolate streams.
One man, with a dream, at pleasure,
Shall go forth and conquer a crown;
And three with a new song's measure
Can trample an empire down."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a millionaire's son, might have chosen the easy route of champagne and yachts and silk suits. Instead that readheaded Irishman chose to fight for his country in war and in peace. Frost has a poem about how a great man surveys life as if it were a road that forks; in his spiritual calm, this man faces the struggles which the little-traveled road presents, and he sets forth upon it rather than upon the broad highway. So Kennedy set forth to war, to foreign countries, and even to Dallas, for one must commit himself, and he must not live in fear. Had he taken the other road, he might not lie with a flame over his grave at Arlington Cemetery—but recollect that the flame is over his grave, and over our lives, and over our Nation—indeed, over the earth, because of a safe road not taken. Total commitment to an ideal is a beautiful, awesome thing.

"Two roads diverged in a yellow wood,
And sorry I could not travel both
And be one traveler, long I stood
And looked down one as far as I could
To where it bent in the undergrowth;

"Then took the other, as just as fair,
And having perhaps the better claim
Because it was grassy and wanted wear;
Though as for that the passing there
Had worn them really about the same,

"And both that morning equally lay
In leaves no step had trodden black.
O, I kept the first for another day,
Yet knowing how way leads on to way,
I doubted if I should ever come back.

"I shall be telling this with a sigh
Somewhere ages and ages hence:
Two roads diverged in a wood and I—
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a great humanitarian. He loved people, and he was shining with that love when translated to another sphere. This is true of Frost, too: "Earth's the place for love. I don't know where it's likely to go better." Of his students, he said, "I'm very thick with 'em." You and I recall President Kennedy's concern that artificial barriers erected by race and creed should be obliterated for national harmony. Thomas Browne used to say that he was in England everywhere. President Kennedy won hearts when he sympathized with the people of Berlin, saying in fellow feeling, "Ich bin ein Berliner." One thinks of Frost's kindred understanding in "Mending Wall."

Something there is that doesn't love a wall. Frost tells us that he and his Yankee neighbor would go along the stone wall which divided their properties (and which nature kept tumbling down) and repair the gaps—senselessly, it seemed to him, for after all—

"He is all pine and I am apple orchard.
My apple trees will never get across
And eat the cones under his pines, I tell him.
He only says, 'Good fences make good neighbors.'
Spring is the mischief in me, and I wonder
If I could put a notion in his head:
Why do they make good neighbors? Isn't it
Where there are cows? But here there are no cows.
Before I built a wall I'd ask to know
What I was walling in or walling out
And to whom I was like to give offense.
Something there is that doesn't love a wall,
That wants it down."

To Frost it was as if the Yankee farmer were out of place in his stonelaying as a Druid priest in New England. When Kennedy looked at the wall, he saw its dark blot on progress and civilization. The same compassion he applied to the race question in America.

We had in Kennedy a man who loved his work. Frost said that he wanted to "lodge a few poems where they'll be hard to get rid of, like pebbles." They both were men of ideas, philosophical, thoughtful men, who wanted to communicate. "Triumph in poetry," Frost warned, "comes in facing up to darkness. You had better decide what is worth failing with as well as what is worth succeeding in." Both Frost and Kennedy wanted knowledge put to work. "Piling up knowledge," according to Frost, "is as bad as piling up money indefinitely. You have to begin sometime to kick around what you know." "And don't dry up," he admonished an audience of teachers. "A prune can never become a juicy plum by any amount of soaking. Better not to dry up in the first place." Everyone knows the story of how Frost employed seamstresses to convert the varicolored silk and satin hoods from his 33 honorary doctorates into a pair of stunning patch-work quilts. Kennedy was a Harvard graduate, with many honorary degrees, but he kept going—reading, traveling, talking with people. I find his spirit in Robert Frost's "Two Tramps in Mud Time," where the poet reminds us that we must come to work with a spirit of love as well as with a thought of our daily bread. Kennedy didn't need the salary he made at the White House to feed Jacqueline and Caroline and John-John; Frost didn't need to earn his living chopping wood, as the lumberjacks did who wanted to do his work for pay and take the ax from him. Love and spiritual hunger have their claims.

"Only where love and need are one
And the work is play for moral stakes.
Is the deed ever really done
For heaven and the future's sake."

When Frost was young, he knew great suffering. He was born March 26, 1874, in San Francisco, but his father was from Massachusetts—another Kennedy tie—and after the father died in 1885, Mrs. Frost and the two children came back to New England to live with Grandfather Frost. In 1895, Frost and Elinor White were married (she died in 1938), and Grandfather Frost bought a farm in Derry and told the young man he must not sell it for 10 years. "Nobody can make a living from writing poetry," said Grandfather to Robert. "I'll give you a year to try." "Give me 20," was the quick reply. In 1912 Frost sold the farm and went to England on a shoestring, taking his family along—and with the publication of "A Boy's Will" and "North of Boston," at last, at age 39, his career was launched. So both Frost and Kennedy—the latter with his earnest pursuit of career, his family sorrows, and his back ailment—grew through sorrows perhaps unknown to the public which sees only their fame and not their heartaches. Each man came into his real soul stride in his thirties. Each lost several children. Each had family griefs and times when it looked as if the shadows would engulf him.

"I have been one acquainted with the night.
I have walked out in rain—and back in rain.
I have outwalked the furthest city light.
I have looked down the saddest city lane."

Spiritual to the core, each survived hatred and jealousy; for these come to one who is a distinct individual.

"Some say the world will end in fire,
Some say in ice.
For what I've tasted of desire
I hold with those who favor fire.
But if it had to perish twice,
I think I know enough of hate
To say that for destruction ice
Is also great
And would suffice."

But the eternal flame conquers the ice of hatred. Kennedy was not afraid that harmony wouldn't prevail. He faced our friends and foes with that firmness and sweet, shining look born of a man who gets down on his knees. With the same optimism, Frost answered reporters who feared atomic destruction. "If we all went up in an atomic explosion," he said, "when we came out the other side and brushed ourselves off, somebody would say, 'Wasn't that something?'" "You can't exterminate us," he continued, "we're like lice or bedbugs." The President was just as hopeful, just as witty.

Each man was a friend of wind and sea and trees and stars. "This must be the most beautiful place in the world," President Kennedy told a friend of the vista in Arlington Cemetery where he was later buried. The river and the trees spoke to him, even as the tree in Frost's poem:

"Tree at my window, window tree,
My sash is lowered when night comes on;
But let there never be curtain drawn
Between you and me.

"Vague dream head lifted out of the ground,
And thing next most diffuse to cloud,
Not all your light tongues talking aloud
Could be profound.

"But tree, I have seen you taken and tossed,
And if you have seen me when I slept,
You have seen me when I was taken and swept
And all but lost.

"That day she put our heads together,
Fate had her imagination about her,
Your head so much concerned with outer,
Mine, with inner, weather."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a hero, fittingly given a hero's last tribute. Frost wrote a poem called, "A Soldier," which describes the hero as a fallen lance that lies pointed as it plowed the dust, and ends:

"But this we know, the obstacle that checked
And tripped the body, shot the spirit on
Further than target ever showed or shone."

Somehow, as I wrote this, I felt the presence of Robert Frost, and I knew that the poet would want me to close this tribute to President Kennedy with the reminder that he has given us the torch for a new generation and that we can look at his example and shut our eyes and think of the lady in the harbor, with the inscription beside her torch—"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to be free * * * I lift my lamp beside the golden door * * *" and admit that the responsible Americans have—

"* * * Promises to keep
And miles to go before (they) sleep."

[From the Austin (Tex.) American-Statesman, Dec. 29, 1963]

SUMMING UP

(By J. Frank Dobie)

The last long night of a long year has almost passed. As I look back, I seem to myself increasingly unimportant. I went to California and worked for a month with nothing else on my mind but a book that I have at last finished—to be published away along in 1964. During the year I have seen cherished friends, gone hunting, read some fine things, read things that incensed me, watched the pageant of life pass by.

Nothing experienced went into so deeply or will remain so deeply impressed on my mind and in my nature as the sudden vanishing of our President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, at Dallas, Tex., a little past high noon on November 22, 1963. During the weeks that have passed since he was killed, contemplation of his noble nature has made me feel "a richer woe." I never met him or saw his face except through the mediums of television and photography, but to me, as to millions of others, he personified hope, growth, humanity, superb intelligence, wonderful understanding of nations and peoples.

Like Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, he was a citizen of the world. It is true that he came out of Massachusetts, but who thinks of him as belonging to Massachusetts? While the Republic was still young, Alexander Hamilton said that for President a man was needed who could "think continentally." Times have so changed and spaces have so shrunken that now the President must think globally. John F. Kennedy's thinking compassed the world and looked far into space.

He never spoke to Buncombe County. When he spoke to the United States of America, he spoke also to nations of the world, as in his inaugural address: "My fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country. My fellow citizens of the world: ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man."

For him freedom was—is—a state of life far beyond the bare differences between being and not being a slave—the difference that Lincoln's Proclamation of Emancipation achieved 100 years ago. In June 1963, President Kennedy said: "If an American, because his skin is dark, cannot eat in a restaurant open to the public; if he cannot send his children to the best public school available; if he cannot vote for the public officials who represent him; if, in short, he cannot enjoy the full and free life which all of us want, then who among us would be content to have the color of his skin changed and stand in his place? Who among us would then be content with the counsels of patience and delay?"

Compassion was a word familiar to John Kennedy. I dreamed a dream in which a lad from the sticks, unfamiliar with travel, was inducted into the army and given a ticket that would carry him from a place in southern Texas a thousand miles north. He appeared to be about 18 years old. In the strange ways of dreams, his color was indeterminate; now white, now brown, now black. He was shy, bashful, ignorant of travel procedure. He sat alone in the train all day. Night came. He had not a bite to eat. He was hungry. A man walked down the aisle by the lad and stopped. The man smiled, not at all patronizingly, and spoke. The lad stood up. The man was plainly President Kennedy. "You look lost and hungry," he said. "I am going to the diner to eat. Come with me."

His words were not in an accent the lad was used to, but they expressed a concern for fellow human beings that he understood and that went into him. All this was just a dream. Presidents do not walk alone down the aisles of railroad cars. They are transported in special airplanes. The act and the words in the dream would, nevertheless, have been in character for John F. Kennedy.

Compassion was not—is not—enough. Kennedy laid strong emphasis on knowledge and thought; on cultivated intellect. The good hearted who are ignorant can no more govern than a ditchdigger can pilot a jet-propelled airplane. Some Frenchman spoke of the "intellectual and spiritual aura" that Kennedy moved in. He did not make the White House a "prison" occupied by a man holding "the loneliest job in the world." He was at home there. He and Jacqueline Kennedy made it so bright that its brightness lighted the land. They brought a new style to Washington, even if obstructing chairmen of legislative committees—brought to power by an outmoded seniority system—never felt it. They seem barricaded against the brightness of intelligent vitality.

Under President Lyndon Johnson they have continued to block government. The blocking powers have been set against the Kennedy-Johnson policy of treating openly nations that discard "venomous hatreds." No country is the czar of the whole world. In the words of Kennedy, "If we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity." The New Frontier has proved itself something beyond a political tag. It has changed many minds holding the stubborn opinion that any approach on America's part with communist powers is no better than carrying the Munich umbrella of appeasement.

John F. Kennedy, in my judgment, revealed himself in no higher form than in choosing—always with excellence in mind—individuals to go with him. Two chosen ones stand out; the woman of marked dignity, brightness and judgment who became his wife and the man of extraordinary competence, fidelity, and understanding who became his Vice President and then our President.

President Lyndon Johnson will not fail in bringing freedom of life to more individuals and in forwarding peace to our own and other nations of the world. In the words of a prayer I heard my father decades ago say over and over, "Bless those in authority over us."

VFW SUPPORTS PLANS FOR U.S. FLEET IN INDIAN OCEAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for good reasons the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is widely recognized for its understanding and leadership in matters pertaining to the security of the United States.

I call to the attention of the Senate a recent telegram sent by the national commander of the VFW, Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, to President Lyndon B. Johnson on December 13, 1963. In this telegram, Commander Lombardo informed the President of the "wholehearted support" of the VFW for the recently reported plans to establish a U.S. naval force in the Indian Ocean area.

The need, Mr. President, for U.S. naval forces in the Indian Ocean area, has been a matter of growing concern to many Members of the Senate. This potentially dangerous power vacuum between Singapore and Suez is certainly related to Communist aggression against southeast Asia, the northern approaches to India, and the eastern approaches to the Middle East and Africa.

I recommend Commander Lombardo's telegram to President Johnson as worthwhile reading by Members of the Senate. Commander Lombardo has analyzed the strategic situation of this area in brief and very understanable terms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the VFW press release, with the full text of the telegram to President Johnson, be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

VFW Supports Plans To Establish U.S. Naval Force in the Indian Ocean Area

Washington, D.C., December 13.—President Lyndon B. Johnson today was notified by telegram from Joseph J. Lombardo, Brooklyn, N.Y., national comander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of the VFW's "wholehearted support" of the administration's reported plans to establish a U.S. naval force in the Indian Ocean area.

Commander in Chief Lombardo in his telegram to the President pointed out that the VFW has advocated such action for several years. "Such an Indian Ocean fleet," Commander Lombardo said in explaining VFW views and background of the telegram, "has long been needed in the interest of the security of the United States and the free world. Since the virtual disappearance of British sea power from the Indian Ocean area following World War II, an extremely dangerous vacuum has existed in that vast area from Singapore to Suez. This has encouraged, and facilitated, Communist expansion into southeast Asia, the northern approaches to India and Pakistan, and the eastern approaches to the Middle East."

A copy of the telegram to the President follows:

"The President,
"The White House,
"Washington, D.C.

"Dear Mr. President: The purpose of this telegram is to inform you of the wholehearted support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, for your plans, as reported in the press today, to establish a U.S. naval force in the Indian Ocean area. On behalf of the 1,300,000 combat oversea veterans of the VFW, I pledge our full support of your efforts to strengthen our national security against Communist aggression in this vital, and largely unprotected, area extending from Singapore to Suez.

"The VFW firmly believes that the establishment of U.S. naval forces in the Indian Ocean is one of the most important and necessary steps our Nation can take in resisting Communist expansion. The oversea combat veterans of the VFW are deeply reassured by your reported plans in view of the fact that the establishment of an Indian Ocean Fleet has long been a primary national security goal of the VFW, and has been urged by unanimously adopted resolutions of our national conventions for the past several years.

"Such a U.S. naval force,, capable of demonstrating U.S. interest and power, from the showing of our flag to the delivery of nuclear weapons, will be a stabilizing influence in this critical Afro-Asian area.

"Our Nation and the free world are encouraged and reassured by the strategic soundness of your reported plans to extend U.S. naval forces into the dangerous power vacuum now existing in the Indian Ocean area. The VFW will support whatever action you believe necessary to increase U.S. naval strength in order to permit the creation of an Indian Ocean Fleet."

Commander Lombardo also sent copies of this telegram to Secretary of Defense McNamara and Secretary of the Navy Nitze.

THE NETHERLANDS CARILLON SHOULD BE PLAYED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in yesterday's edition of the Washington Post the distinguished music critic, Paul Hume, pointed out that the magnificent Netherlands Carillon which stands near Arlington National Cemetery and the Iwo Jima Monument is seldom played.

These beautiful bells were the gift of the people of the Netherlands to the people of America. Mr. Hume notes that bells have no life except as they are played. To permit these bells to remain silent and unused is a mark of ingratitude toward the wonderful people of the Netherlands and a shameful failure to make use of a magnificent musical instrument. To quote Mr. Hume:

> To allow a beautiful carillon to go unheard from nearly one end of a year to the next is to show a singular callousness to the purpose and power of these glorious bells. To pass up the opportunity of adding the sound of a carillon to the sights and memories of Arlington Cemetery is to slight a rich opportunity. To give such a poor show of appreciation of a princely gift is petty beyond belief.

There is, of course, the additional fact that hundreds of thousands of Americans have traveled to Arlington National Cemetery to pay homage to our great President, John F. Kennedy. In the coming years millions will make this sad journey. Surely the reactivation of the Netherlands Carillon would be most fitting and proper under these circumstances.

Mr. Hume notes that the Department of the Interior has jurisdiction over the carillon and expresses the hope that the Department could provide funds for weekly concerts by the outstanding carillonneur of the Washington Cathedral, Mr. Ronald Barnes. In the past the Department apparently has said it had no funds for such a purpose.

The Senator from Minnesota will write today to the Department for an estimate of the costs involved in providing such weekly concerts. I sincerely hope the Department will be able to discover some way to meet this small budget. If the Department is unable to do so, perhaps some public spirited citizen of the Washington community would contribute the amount necessary for weekly concerts. If neither of these alternatives is feasible, I intend to offer a small amendment to the first supplementary appropriation bill so that such concerts will be possible. This is an opportunity which should not be carelessly overlooked or ignored.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Paul Hume from the December 29 Washington Post be inserted into the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 29, 1963]

WHAT GOOD ARE BELLS IF THEY AREN'T JINGLED?

(By Paul Hume)

Washington possesses three beautiful carillons. All should be heard regularly and ought to be played by excellent carillonneurs skilled in performing the finest music available for this unique and venerable instrument.

At present, the carillon in the tower of the Washington Cathedral is heard regularly. Under the musicianly persuasion of Ronald Barnes, a truly great carillonneur, the Cathedral's bells play a superb repertory ranging from works that are classics to new compositions and transcriptions of the finest literature.

The carillon in the tower of the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception on the campus of Catholic University is heard regularly through recording devices. While it is not possible to obtain the complete range of nuances from the bells through this device, it is nevertheless possible for them to be played well on the recordings.

It is, however, of the third carillon in Washington that I want to speak particularly today. It is by some years the oldest in the city, and occupies a superb location for sound. Furthermore, the bells and tower were a gift to the people of the United States. The bells themselves, each one beautifully engraved, came to us from the people of the Netherlands, a magnificient gift of gratitude and appreciation. The tower was given by Americans of Dutch descent. Together, tower and bells stand on a slope near Arlington Cemetery and the Iwo Jima monument.

For the most part, they stand silent—a reproach to the people to whom they were given, an ungrateful symbol of our ingratitude for such a handsome gift.

Bells have no life except when they are played. They call a people, as we well know from our recent experiences, to national sorrow. They also call people to great celebration and joy.

No one who was in London during the war will forget the incredible sound the day Winston Churchill ordered all the bells in the city and throughout the country to be rung as a signal of the victory he knew was near. The bells had been silent through the long days and months of attack and defense. Their outpouring peals said, more dramatically than words could, that a time of peace was near.

To allow a beautiful carillon to go unheard from nearly one end of a year to the next is to show a singular callousness to the purpose and power of these glorious bells. To pass up the opportunity of adding the sound of a carillon to the sights and memories of Arlington Cemetery is to slight a rich opportunity. To give such poor show of appreciation of a princely gift is petty beyond belief.

I have a suggestion: that the Department of Interior, under whose jurisdiction the Netherlands Carillon stands, provide funds for weekly concerts to be played at a time determined jointly between it and the officials of Arlington when the largest number of people could enjoy them; and that for these concerts, they engage Ronald Barnes, who has no superior in the realm of carillon playing and whose schedule at Washington Cathedral could surely be arranged to include a weekly concert on the Netherlands bells.

The Interior Department has, in the past, when approached about this matter, said they had no funds for such a purpose. This is rather like the Department of Defense saying no marker could be placed at the tomb of Paderewski in Arlington. All it took was a Presidential order. Perhaps we will not need so strong a measure in order to show proper appreciation of a generous gift at the same time we add another sound of music to our city.

CONSTITUTIONAL QUACKERY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on December 10 our colleague from Hawaii, Senator INOUYE, addressed members of Phi Delta Phi, a legal fraternity, at the Lawyers Club in Washington. Portions of his remarks were devoted to the subject of "Constitutional Quackery," the practice by some persons of preaching hate while cloaking themselves, as Senator INOUYE put it, "in the hallowed raiment of the American Constitution."

This is an ever increasing problem, Mr. President, and I share the view of Senator INOUYE that "it is high time that we give serious thought to curbing some of the excesses perpetrated in the name of the Constitution of the United States." I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD that portion of Senator INOUYE's speech that deals with this subject.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUYE BEFORE PHI DELTA PHI LEGAL FRATERNITY

I have noticed that the medical profession will immediately close ranks whenever the slightest semblance of medical quackery appears to have invaded a community. The doctors' record of solidarity in this regard is most commendable, and the benefactors have often been the community at large.

The inclination to band together in the face of interlopers who would defile the profession is not limited to members of the medical profession. We find that men of other professions have similarly banded together when they felt that those without proper credentials or qualifications were invading their ranks and foisting their services on the community. Those of us who follow the practice of law, however, seem at times to be unmindful of others who choose to degrade the profession by indulging in constitutional quackery. The practitioners of constitutional quackery always cloak themselves in the hallowed raiment of the American Constitution. They usually call themselves patriotic American constitutionalists, quoting freely from the American Constitution. These individuals and organizations spew forth hatred and venom against the Negro, the Jew, the Federal Government, the United Nations, the Chief Justice of the United States, the President of the United States, and all others who fail to fit their mold. This is a malignancy which affects America today—a malignancy of hate which has some relationship to the kind of constitutional quackery pursued by these patriotic Americans.

I submit that there is precious little difference between those who seek to impeach the Chief Justice of the United States because of disagreement with certain of his decisions and the Communists who work toward the destruction of our form of government. Both of these groups have one thing in common—they wish to destroy our way of life from within. The assassination of the President, the unthinking and cruel cheers in certain American schoolrooms at the announcement of the assassination, the successful vigilante action of Jack Ruby, the unbelievable suggestion that Ruby be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for his action, are all interrelated parts of the massive psychosis induced in those who have been subjected to such constitutional quackery.

If anything, the American Constitution was devised to protect against man's inhumanity to man, but this is not what some see in this great and glorious document forged in the heat of battle to gain liberty and freedom.

I think it is high time that we give serious thought to curbing some of the excesses perpetrated in the name of the Constitution of the United States.

POPE PAUL'S CHRISTMAS MESSAGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on December 23, Pope Paul delivered to the world an inspiring Chirstmas message. He more than continued the theme of the season and of his predecessor, John XXIII, who already has become known as the Pope of Peace. Pope Paul gave his message the same urgency of treatment, and made equally unmistakable his inclusion of all men of good will.

The Pope noted realistically the great problems of the world which are obstacles to peace and human welfare. He reminded us that the number one problem is hunger. More than half of the people of the world are in this deplorable state. They want, not prosperity, but mere sufficiency; and unless something is done about it soon, the situation will get worse.

Pope Paul stressed with open favor the great projects of international aid which offer generously to entire masses of unknown people the spontaneous and well-organized gift of indispensable food. We can be proud of our food-for-peace program.

The papal congratulation and blessing were given also to the new nations of the world in Asia and Africa. Their underdeveloped nature in many cases was frankly recognized; but their wish to be sovereign, free, and independent was found to be right and just. Their need for scientific and technical aid was stressed. Most important, the Pope stressed the spirit in which that aid was to be given—a spirit of brotherhood, not paternalism.

Peace—

Said Pope Paul—

is the product of the well-ordered movement of component parts, rather than being something static and fixed—peace in well-balanced motion.

His message was as thoughtful as it was inspirational. It was meant for all; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF POPE PAUL'S CHRISTMAS BROADCAST TO THE WORLD

(Following is a translation, supplied by the Vatican press office, of Pope Paul VI's Christmas message, broadcast in Italian tonight.)

ROME, December 23.—Beloved brethren and children, we extend to all of you best wishes for a blessed Christmas. We wish this blessing to enter into the heart of each one of you and to implant there that sense of happiness, of peace, of serenity, of trust that is born, in such a special manner, of this holy feast and that forms one of the most consoling experiences of life.

May each one of you who receives our affectionate greeting experience internally the sweetness, the comfort and the happiness that we wish you. Today people who possess so many objects of so-called exterior happiness often stand in need of interior happiness, the only kind that is genuine, personal, profound, and sincere. And it is this kind of happiness that we desire each of you to enjoy.

FOR THE SICK AND SUFFERING

We send our blessing above all to you who are suffering, because you stand in greater need of it, to you who are sick, to you who are aged, to you who are sad, to you who are weeping, to you who hunger and thirst for justice. We would like to stand beside each one of you to bring you the sweet, sincere, consoling words of Christ.

Next, we send our blessing to our dear little children. You see in Christmas your special feast, the feast of new life, the feast of wholesome affections, the feast of the joy of living.

In the years that lie ahead for you, may the Lord preserve and increase your happiness and teach you its secret, which is contained in your innocence. We extend our greetings to your families who are reunited around your table, around your gifts, around your crib filled with homespun and life-giving beauty.

We extend our best wishes to you, the members of social groups, who on this annual occasion balance the accounts of your capabilities and your needs, in order that your sense of justice may be accompanied by that of orderliness and of love.

We send our blessings to those of you who are exiles and fugitives, whose anxieties and sufferings are well known to us, to those of you faithful children, who are deprived of the freedom that is due to you, to those of you who are suffering for Christ and for His church and who today more than ever are close to our heart.

We send our greetings to all the peoples and nations on this earth, to which the message of peace descends today from heaven and fills the world with trust and good will.

VIEW OF THE WHOLE WORLD

A blessed Christmas to all. We can communicate our best wishes because Christmas is a religious and Christian feast, and we know very well the honored place it holds amidst the varying conditions of human life.

But then another consideration comes to mind. In our desire to extend to all our brotherly and fatherly best wishes, our eyes try to perceive the view of the whole world as seen from what we might call the watchtower over the world, the lofty position on which our responsibility has placed us.

And then we are reminded that our good wishes ought to be related, not only to the humble longings that are so common on a happy popular feast, as Christmas ordinarily is, but particularly too the real and pressing needs of people.

Our affection cannot ignore the great sufferings, the deep longings, the painful necessities that concern great sections of society or even entire peoples.

In our intention of realistic observation of the human scene, our mood changes from joyous to pensive because we are pointedly asked this question: What are the great needs of the world today to which our desires must be related, if they are to be helpful and wise?

The needs of the world. The very question makes one dizzy because these needs are so vast, so manifold, so immeasurable. But some of them are so evident and impelling that all of us understand them, at least to some degree.

FIRST PROBLEM IS HUNGER

The first is hunger. We knew that it existed, but today it has been recognized. It has now been scientifically proved to us that more than half the human race has not enough food. Entire generations of children even today are dying or suffering because of indescribable poverty.

Hunger produces sickness and wretchedness. These in turn increase hunger. It is not merely prosperity that is wanting to vast numbers of people, it is mere sufficiency.

And unless this heart-rending situation is relieved by opportune remedies, we must foresee that it will grow worse, not better.

The demographic increase of starving areas has not yet been balanced by the economic increase of the means of sustenance, although it has been accompanied by the spread of such means of information and such types of development as impart an uneasy and rebellious consciousness to such a state of suffering. Hunger can become a subversive force with incalculable results.

One who studies this unforgettable and threatening problem is sometimes tempted to have recourse to remedies that must be regarded as worse than the problem itself, if they consist in attacking the very fecundity of life by means that human and Christian ethics must condemn as illicit.

Instead of increasing the supply of bread on the dining table of this hunger-ridden world, as modern techniques of production can do today, some are thinking in terms of diminishing, by illicit means, the number of those who eat with them. This is unworthy of civilization.

We know that the problem of demographic growth, when unaccompanied by sufficient means of sustenance, is very grave and complex. But it cannot be admitted that the solution to this problem consists in the use of methods contrary to divine law and to the sacred respect that is due both to marriage and to newborn life.

This gives us added motivation to look with profound sympathy at the multitudes of men who suffer hunger and to observe with anxious attention the manner in which men study and handle the enormous problems connected with this tragic situation.

Even though we are not given Christ's miraculous power of materially multiplying bread for the world's hunger, still we can take to heart the plea that rises from the masses, still oppressed and languishing with misery, and to feel it vibrate in us with the very pity which was felt by the heart of Christ, which is both divine and completely human: Miseror Super Turbam * * * "I have compassion on the multitude * * *. They have nothing to eat" (Mark 8: 2).

ENKINDLING OF NEW LOVE

We make our own the sufferings of the poor and we hope that this our sympathy may itself become capable of enkindling that new love, which by means of a specially planned economy will multiply the bread needed to feed the world.

We are therefore openly in favor of everything that is being done today to help those who are devoid of the goods required for the elementary needs of life.

We see with admiration that, in the years following the destruction of war, great projects of international aid have been launched to give witness to a fresh flowering of human nobility, and to offer generously to entire masses of unknown peoples the spontaneous and well organized gift of indispensable food.

We should like to encourage and bless this magnificent endeavor, at once manifold and providential. We are happy to note that Christian principles give rise to, pervade and promote these praiseworthy and beneficial undertakings.

It is also gratifying to observe that some of these initiatives come from Catholics owing to the merits of persons endowed with Christian genius, of worthy pastors who sustain these noble undertakings, and of so many of the laity who give heart and money to the cause.

Praise must also be given to the able directors who organize these works and to the courageous executives who render admirable service. We pay a special tribute to these valiant men.

This then is our first Christmas wish: That charity may reign in the world, that the love brought by Christ, born as a child in this world, and kindled by Him among men may blaze forth ever more widely until it can wipe away from our civilization the dishonor of misery weighing upon men like ourselves and our brothers in Christ.

This greeting reminds us of another, not unlike it in its humanitarian scope, but different in the methods by which it is to be realized. It is the greeting for nations on their way to development.

Our universal mission as shepherd of the world makes us look with great sympathy and with loving interest on those new nations that are now reaching that sense of identity, that dignity, that ability to function, that are peculiar to free civil states.

ESPECIALLY AFRICA AND ASIA

We look especially to those of Africa and Asia, and it pleases us to salute, on this birthday of Christ, their own birth to independence and to the harmony of international life.

We wish to recall with them the high origin of their vocation to liberty and to human receptivity to the Christian message, and we pray that they may always know where to discover the sources of true humanism and where to find that reserve of moral energy with which a people acquires the exact concept of human life and finds the wisdom and the strength to express in its laws and in its customs both the great principles of civilization and the peculiar forms of their native genius.

We know that these new nations are justly proud of their sovereign liberty and that they can no longer admit the domination of another state over them. But we know also that these nations have not yet reached that degree of self-sufficiency that is required to enjoy all the cultural and economic benefits of a complete modern state.

It is clear then that our charity this Christmas, in its search to discover the great needs of the world, recognizes the necessity of helping these emerging nations, not with humiliations and self-seeking beneficence, but with scientific and technical assistance and friendly solidarity of the international world, brotherhood in place of paternalism.

THE FAMILY OF NATIONS

This is what we desire for these new nations—that they may enter as brothers into the family of nations, bringing with them their own original civilization as well as their recent cultural and social progress, in the spirit of solidarity, harmony, and peace.

May they find in the same family of nations the respect due to them and the help of which they are still in need.

We cannot pass over the fact that the Catholic Church herself, by means of the missions among these peoples, has always striven, without thought of temporal gain, to develop them to their utmost capacity, always holding in honor all their human and upright qualities, while proclaiming to them their vocation to the true and supreme destiny of redeemed man, and offering them, at great sacrifice and out of pure love, the benefits of education, of health services, and of social formation.

In all of these activities the aim is not to establish a relationship between superior and inferior or between strangers, but to educate them to attain Christian brotherhood and civil autonomy.

We therefore wish that Catholic missions may always find a friendly welcome among the new nations, and may always know how to render devoted and loyal service to promote their spiritual, moral, and material development.

THE PROBLEM OF PEACE

While we view the entire panorama of nations, we cannot but mention again another pressing need of mankind—peace.

This is suggested by Christmas itself since, as we all know, this feast is presented to us as a message of peace bestowed from heaven upon all men of good will.

This is treated in the great encyclical of our venerated predecessor, John XXIII, who addressed himself to the fundamental question of peace in our modern world. The developments and controversies of our time force us continually to consider the nature of peace, its forms and weaknesses, its needs and progress.

This encyclical has shown us, if we may so put it, the new problems of peace and the dynamism of the elements from which peace must result.

St. Augustine's classic definition of peace as the "tranquillity of order" seems to be applicable today in the sense that the tranquillity and security of peace are the product of the well-ordered movement of component parts, rather than being something static and fixed—peace in well-balanced motion.

There are other reasons for mentioning peace in our Christmas message. First, it is necessary to heed the yearning of the new generation. Youth desires peace. Secondly, we see that peace is still weak, fragile, threatened, and that in not a few, fortunately limited regions of the earth, peace is violated.

PEACE NOW BASED ON FEAR

We observe with some apprehension other obvious facts. Peace in the present time is based more on fear than on friendship. It is maintained more by terror of deadly weapons than by mutual harmony and faith among peoples. And if tomorrow peace were to be broken—which God forbid—all humanity could be destroyed.

How can we celebrate Christmas with serenity when such a threat hangs over the world? And therefore we urgently beseech all men of good will, yes, all men who hold responsible positions in the field of culture and politics, to consider as fundamental the problem of peace.

True peace is not that hypocritical propaganda aimed at lulling the adversary to sleep and concealing one's own preparation for war. Peace does not consist in pacifist rhetoric that refuses the indispensable, patient, and which tiresome negotiations, are the only efficacious means.

It is not based merely on the precarious balance of opposing economic interests, nor on the dream of proud supremacy. But true peace is based on the abolition, or at least on the mitigation, of the causes that endanger its security, as nationalistic or ideological pride, the arms race, lack of confidence in the methods or in the organizations that have been constituted to render the relations among nations orderly and friendly.

MEN'S MINDS NOT UNITED

Peace in truth, in justice, in freedom, in love—this is the peace we pray for.

At this point our Christmas wishes touch upon another need related to that of peace. And it is the answer to this elementary question: Why are men not at peace with each other? Because their minds are not united.

Union of minds is the great need of contemporary man. Culture, which awakens and in great part fills this want, in the end does not satisfy it. On the contrary, culture exacerbates the minds of men by putting into circulation an indiscriminate pluralism of ideas.

Men lack unity in their principles, in their ideas and in their view of life and of the world. As long as they are divided they will continue to be ignorant of one another, to hate and to fight against one another.

From this it is easy to see the importance of the doctrinal element in the fate of humanity. We clearly see how blessed we are by the coming of Jesus Christ into the world. He came to forge a unique link between all mankind and God the Heavenly Father.

This religious link, respecting and ennobling each man's person as it does, is the most solid and hopeful basis for unity between men. The true sociology of human peace takes its rise from Christian religious unity. It is this unity, introduced by Christ into human thought and history, that we earnestly desire for the peace, concord, mutual understanding and happiness of all men of good will.

THAT ALL MAY BE UNITED

This is the greeting we send out with the pealing of the Christmas bells.

We direct it especially to those whom we believe to be most ready to receive it: to Christians still separated from us and to Catholics happily united. Ut unum sint, that all may be united: That was Christ's sublime and final prayer before His passion. We make it our own on this day, which commemorated His coming.

Sons and brothers and all men of good will, these are the desires with which Christmas fills our heart. They have been so profound and so insistent during these first days of our pontificate and during the Second Vatican Council that we have decided, as you know, to go very soon to Palestine, the land in which Christ, the Son of God, came down from Heaven, lived, taught, suffered, died, rose from the dead and from which He ascended again into Heaven.

We have been moved to do this because we wish to express anew our faith and love for Him and also because we feel that by uniting ourselves with Him in the Gospel setting we shall be able to carry out with greater perfection and success the mission entrusted to us for the world's salvation.

Once again we declare clearly that the nature and purposes of our pilgrimage are solely religious.

Our journey will be that of Peter's witness. We wish to include in our own faith that of the whole church, and with Peter at Caesarea Philippi, say to Jesus: Yes, Lord, You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.

It will be a journey of offering. As the Magi from the East, the symbols and precursors of all peoples of the earth, so we from the West wish to bring to Jesus the offering of His church and to acknowledge in Him the Founder and its Master, its Lord and its Saviour.

A JOURNEY OF HOPE

It will also be a journey of search and of hope: Search for all those who are for us sons and brothers in Christ in the atmosphere of the Gospels, evoked by this land of benediction. How can we not ask ourselves: Where is the full flock of Christ? Where are the lambs and the sheep of His fold? Are they all here? Which ones are missing? And so we cannot but implore Jesus the Good Shepherd, using His own words: May there be one fold and one shepherd.

And our heart will reach out also to those outside the fold of Christ, and our good intentions will embrace all the peoples of the earth, those far and near, with sentiments of respect and of love, wishing them happiness and peace.

We shall greet respectfully and cordially all, whatever be their origin, whom we shall meet on our way, especially those in authority, the people, the pilgrims, and the tourists, but without stopping in our hurried pilgrim's journey, and without allowing ourselves to be distracted from the sole religious purpose of our trip.

It will thus be a journey of prayer, made with humility and with love. In our heart will be present the whole world. No one will be forgotten.

In asking pardon from our Lord, the merciful One, for all our faults, for all our weakness, we will not hesitate to beg for all men mercy and peace and salvation.

And the wishes which on this holy Christmas Day we have expressed in behalf of the church and of all men of good will, in the Holy Land will be more intense and more efficacious.

But even now we look to their realization, as we invoke the intercession of the Blessed Virgin and of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and as we impart to you our apostolic benediction.

EULOGY OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a moving and beautiful eulogy of President Kennedy delivered by Prof. Joseph F. Smith on November 25, 1963, at a memorial service at the Mormon Tabernacle in Honolulu, Hawaii.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DIGEST OF REMARKS MADE BY JOSEPH F. SMITH AT A MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY BEFORE A CONGREGATION OF MORE THAN 2,000 AT THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS TABERNACLE, HONOLULU, HAWAII, NOVEMBER 25, 1963

Fewer than 80 hours ago, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was alive and was the President of the United States. At this hour, his body, torn by an assassin's bullets, lies in Arlington, the national cemetery dedicated as the burial ground for American heroes who have given their lives in their country's service.

At this moment here in Honolulu, geographically remote from Dallas, and even further removed from Washington, you and I are met in memorial service. I would ask, "To what purpose?"

A memorial service affords opportunity to pay tribute to the deceased, but if this service does no more than that, if a man elected to the Presidency of the United States be robbed of his life by a heinous deed, and you and I in memorial service do no more than pay him memorial tribute—even with sincere mourning—our tribute will be no more than gesture.

The Nation, during the past 3 days, has lain under a pall of gloom and of grief: gloom, that, in this country dedicated to freedom, assassinations can be; grief for a President of the United States cut down in his prime, and for a family bereft.

In contemplation of the events of the past few days, can anyone of us here wholly absolve himself from responsibility? Let us grant for the moment, that the assassination was the sole deed of a young man confused to the point of madness, will this wholly absolve you and me from responsibility? Are not the violence and the vandalism, the robbery and the rape, the industrial hatreds in Honolulu, this town of yours and of mine, a part of a national sickness of which the murder of John Fitzgerald Kennedy is another part?

This hour is fittingly a time of tribute and a time of mourning, but it must be more than that. It must be an hour of sober reckoning and of solemn resolution. Tragically, it cannot be an hour of restitution. The sin is a national sin; a nation is affected. May I note here, in passing, that I do not specifically condemn Lee Harvey Oswald for the crime. Whatever his action, he has been deprived of his right for trial by law. The man who shot him is equally guilty with him who fired the fatal bullets at the President. Twice in the space of 3 days, the international spotlight has illumined the abrogation of law in a country supposedly committed to government by law. Have you and I no responsibility in the matter? Indeed, this is a time of reckoning for you and me.

Last Friday on the floor of the Senate, the first words to be spoken in announcing the death of the President came from Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon. He said, "If there was ever an hour that every American should pray, this is the hour." And I would repeat that if there was ever an hour that every Latter-day Saint should pray, this is the hour, because we have a particular responsibility, a very especial responsibility, for the preservation of law and order in this country. We know—thanks to divine revelation—that this is a land choice above all other lands. It is a land designed for the rebuilding of Zion. This is our responsibility.

The Savior, when asked what was the greatest commandment, replied, "Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart, might, mind, and strength. This is the first and great commandment and the second is like unto it: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Brethren and sisters, are we adequately abiding the second of these commandments? Until we do, we are not keeping faith with our responsibility. Until every one of us within the area of his particular influence is so abiding, he cannot abide the first. This we must set about more diligently to do.

It is fitting that in this time of resolution we paraphrase another great and martyred President: That you and I, that we here highly resolve that the 35th President of the United States shall not have died in vain; that we here dedicate ourselves to the preservation of the land through righteousness. The Hawaiian words come to mind: Ua mau ke ea o ka aina i ka pono—the life of the land is preserved in righteousness.

Righteousness is never passive. Lassitude, lethargy, indifference, neglect, unconcern—these are insidiously potent allies of unrighteousness. What boots our present grief if it moves us not to more dedicated effort to bring greater order to our immediate house?

If the land shall be perserved in righteousness, it will require your loyalty and mine, your love and mine, your unremitting labor and mine.

That we make irrevocable resolution toward this end is my prayer in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE PRESIDENTIAL LINE OF SUCCESSION—TWO VICE PRESIDENTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on December 20, I introduced a joint resolution setting forth my suggestion for a constitutional amendment strengthening the line of succession to the Presidency. This proposal is that a second Vice President, elected by all the American people, be interposed in the line of succession between the existing Vice President and the Speaker of the House. In the event that the Nation should tragically lose both its Chief Executive and his successor during the same term, a man chosen by the people of the whole Nation would then become President.

In a WTOP radio editorial on December 27, Commentator Jack Jurey spoke in support of this proposal. I was gratified both by his thoughtful comments and by an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on December 23. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of both these editorials be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Editorial Broadcast on December 27, 1963, Over WTOP Television and WTOP Radio

We haven't been at all sympathetic to the clamor for changes in the presidential line of succession as a direct result of President Kennedy's assassination. The fact that House Speaker John McCormack is next in line for the White House does not seem to us to be a matter of grave concern, prompting precipitate action to designate some other person to be second in line for the Presidency.

But as a long-range reform, there's much to recommend the proposal put forward by Senator Kenneth Keating, of New York, to create two Vice Presidents. One—a so-called executive Vice President—would be No. 2 man in the executive branch. He would be, in effect, a presidential understudy, with no duties that would prevent him from being fully informed on the tremendously wide scope of executive responsibilities.

The second Vice President—a so-called legislative Vice President—would perform many of the present duties now assigned to the vice presidential office, including presiding over the Senate and casting a deciding vote when Senators are deadlocked. This legislative Vice President would be third in line for the White House. He would be followed, as now, by the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, then members of the Cabinet, beginning with the Secretary of State.

If the Keating constitutional amendment were to be adopted, each party would nominate a President and two Vice Presidents, one executive, the other legislative. In other words, the country would elect three national executives rather than two.

This is one of at least three proposals relating to presidential succession which will be considered by the Senate Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee early next year. Its purpose is to meet the clear need to protect the Nation against a serious lapse in executive leadership. In our view, Senator Keating has made the best contribution so far toward a solution. His suggestion ought to get very serious consideration.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 23, 1963]

Executive Vice President

Senator Keating's suggestion that the country elect two Vice Presidents instead of one turns out to be somewhat more attractive than its advance billing. It would give the United States for the first time an executive Vice President who would become a high-level functionary in the administration. Being wholly within the executive branch, he would be an understudy to the President in all affairs and would be ready to take over the reins at any time in case of necessity.

There would be substantial advantages in having a Vice President giving his full time to executive duties, and this official under the Keating plan would be first in the line of succession. Even when there is only one Vice President, we have long thought that he should be freed from presiding over the Senate so that he could be more fully prepared for any emergency.

The serious problem under the proposed Keating amendment would be to find a man of presidential stature who would be willing to occupy the third spot with nothing more to do than preside over the Senate. There would be a strong tendency to use the third place on the presidential ticket to placate an ethnic or minority faction without much regard for presidential qualifications. If this plan should get serious consideration, however, it would doubtless be possible to build up the proposed legislative vice presidency. That official could be made the chief liaison between the President and Congress and he could be selected with that special and important function in mind.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while Senators are still in the Chamber, I believe it is in order to ask the distinguished majority leader about the schedule when the Senate returns on the 7th of January. In the session on Friday last, a joint resolution was adopted under which Congress will reconvene on Tuesday, January 7. Perhaps the majority leader has some announcement as to the state of the Union message and any other business that may immediately engage the attention of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the agenda as outlined by the distinguished minority leader is correct. The Senate will return, after a sine die adjournment, on Tuesday, January 7, at which time the calendar will be carefully studied to see what particular measures can be brought up.

On Wednesday, the 8th of January, there will be a joint session in the Hall of the House of Representatives, to be addressed by the President of the United States.

After that, I shall consult with the distinguished minority leader as to the remainder of the agenda.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 241) as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to; and the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] to serve as the committee of two Senators to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 242), which was considered by unanimous consent and unanimously agreed to.

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable Carl Hayden, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the first session of the Eighty-eighth Congress.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I am personally privileged to offer at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 243) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Acting President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the first session of the Eighty-eighth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? Without objection, the resolution is unanimously agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 248, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Monday, December 30, 1963, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 249, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution is considered and agreed to.

CLOSING STATEMENT BY THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am extremely proud of the Senate because of the number of Senators who have come from very long distances, some of them as far as 5,000 miles, to be present for the last session of the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

We are at the final act of the longest continuous session of the Congress in many years. One may criticize or praise this Congress for what it has done or failed to do this session. That is understandable. But what is beyond comprehension is criticism of this Congress for staying on the job in 1963 for 12 months. Members who have been faithful to their responsibilities during these long months may properly bewail a fate which denies them a couple of weeks of vacation with their families. They may properly note—as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] has—that they need adequate time to consult in their constituencies if they are to do their work of representation effectively. But it is rubbing salt in the wounds for those who should know better to criticize them for staying here month after month to do as much of the work of the Nation as it has been possible to do.

And what has been done represents an achievement for which no Member of this body need apologize. In the legislation on education we have laid the groundwork for a most significant advance for all of the people of this Nation. Of course, much remains to be done but we have begun. As in education so, too, in mental health which is, as it has been for a long time, the Nation's No. 1 health problem, but we have begun.

And with the achievement of a nuclear test ban treaty we have kindled a flicker of light which may yet illuminate the way to a reasoned peace, a peace which the world must find if there is to be a civilized world at all and we have begun.

These three profound achievements reached in our own fashion, inadequate though some find it, will nevertheless stand as a monument to the work of the 1st session of the 88th Congress in the administration of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. And these achievements are bulwarked and undergirded by other measures concerning air and water pollution, park and wilderness facilities, and other social ends in the 1st session of the 88th Congress and by the work of the 87th Congress. Taken together this work represents the most significant advance in essential legislation of adjustment to changes in our Nation in many years.

It is not important how the Senate looks, whether it appears to hobble or to flow smoothly, whether it appears to run or walk, whether it breezes through in 6 months or struggles through in 12. What counts, in the end, is what it does in terms of legislation. And no Member of this body need apologize for the Senate in terms of durable benefit to the Nation during the 3 years of the Kennedy administration. What has been done to promote a more satisfactory life at home for all citizens and a reasoned peace in the world will stand comparison with any Congress in the memory of most of us. And for those who may be skeptical, I would refer to the detailed report and comparison in the Congressional Record of November 27, 1963, which I made when the Kennedy administration closed in the tragedy of the death of the President. I would refer to the record of the 68 percent of the Presidential legislative proposals during this year which have cleared the Senate in these 12 months. And that record, too, will stand comparison with any other.

But, as has been said many times, we have made a beginning but it is just a beginning. Ahead of us during the second session lies some of the most difficult decisions which this or any Congress is likely to be required to reach.

We face the issue of tax revision which involves not merely a tax cut but, even more, basic revenue policy and such grave questions as the growth of the U.S. economy, inflation, recession, and automation.

We face the issue of civil rights which goes to the heart of our consciences as a free people—to the meaning of the United States to all of its citizens and the meaning of this Nation in the history of the world.

We face the issue of adequate health care for the aged, an issue whose outcome will reveal much as to our compassion and understanding and sense of responsibility and our capacity to act as a nation on their dictates.

We face the issue of helping the President to refine and adjust the role of this Nation in the world in the light of the great changes which have occurred in the past few years and, particularly, as our national role is expressed in the foreign aid program.

These are some of the great issues which will confront us when we reassemble after a few days' respite. Much preliminary work has been done on them. Much remains to be done. But there is every reason to expect that the Senate will face these issues and do its best to act with independence and with wisdom on them. In doing so we will be paying the finest of all possible tributes to the late President Kennedy by carrying on what was initiated in his administration. In doing so, we will be working with President Johnson in the interest of all the people of the Nation and in the interest of the Nation in the world.

CONCLUDING REMARKS BY THE MINORITY LEADER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long. The majority leader and I will presently telephone to the President of the United States to ascertain whether he has any more business to lay before the Senate.

I shall make these concluding remarks, and insert the remainder of my observations in the Record.

The 1st session of the 88th Congress is about to become history.

It is a far cry from John Adams, the first Vice President John Adams, to Carl Hayden, the President pro tempore of the

Senate; from the temporary Capital in New York to the gleaming city on the Potomac; from a civilian payroll of 169 persons to the 2,570,533 who now serve in the executive branch; from a population of 3½ million to a teeming country with more than 190 million; from a land which spent but $1⅕ billion in the first 60 years of its existence to one that now sports a budget of nearly $100 billion in a single year. In that time, Congress has remained a durable institution which kept abreast of the needs and growth of the Nation. It has met without interruption from the first session on April 6, 1789, to this very hour. It has lived through four Presidential assassinations. It has survived six major depressions. It has come through seven wars. It has faced up to the emergencies of every generation. It has retained its identity as the exclusive lawmaking branch cf Government under our Constitution. It has not quailed or retreated from its responsibilities.

At this point I wish to say that I fully concur in the concluding sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] as the 1st session of the 88th Congress comes to an end. Whenever, through rebuke or castigation or scorn, the parliamentary body of any country is weakened or impaired, at that point the people had better be vigilant, because that is the beginning of the end of free government. Show me any parliamentary body in any civilized country that has been scorned and castigated, and whose parliamentary members have also been brought into disdain. On the day that that occurred, freedom stopped. That was the day when the complete extinction of freedom and liberty got under way.

To my friends who are sitting in the press gallery, and who have been so generous to me, I wish to say that much castigation has been directed at this Congress. It matches, of course, the adjectives that I have dug out of editorials going back more than 125 years.

But there has been a singular development in this country that follows a pattern that can be seen behind the Iron Curtain. A rather interesting booklet has now come to hand from Czechoslovakia to show the exact pattern of how free government is liquidated. First, it is necessary to get some kind of authority within the government itself. I could name a dozen this afternoon.

Next, get a little on the law books, no matter how little it might be; and then get a matching authority in the form of a pressure group outside Government. Those twin forces will bring the change about exactly as was done in other civilized countries.

It was no wonder that Khrushchev stood before the 20th anniversary Congress of the Soviet Union and said, in effect, "You can create a condition where even through a parliamentary body socialism can be brought about in a country, and socialism is the first step toward communism." If that means anything, we had better heed the signs.

The Congresses of the last 125 years were characterized as "indolent, partisan, weak, bigoted, hateful, malicious, spineless, dense, stupid, cowardly, time-killing, of low morals, intolerant." What else could be said without exhausting the thesaurus. Today, one can find similar comment.

The achievements are so often carried in lowercase type. The alleged failures command a boldface recital. Where is the civil rights bill? Where is the tax bill? What has been done about medicare? Where are the wheat bill and the cotton bill? What about the foreign assistance mess? Where is the Puritan ethic?

These questions blandly assume that Congress should legislate in accord with the pattern of administration demand. It could just be that Congress does not concur in administration demands. It could just be that Congress has other ideas. It could just be that the Congress is of the opinion that the Constitution makes it the exclusive law-making body in our Government and that while it will gladly receive and entertain the recommendations of the Chief Executive, it has no duty or obligation to concur in those recommendations. For Congress to fail in carefully deliberating every proposal which is submitted to it and exercise its will would constitute a failure of its constitutional duty.

In the strident walls which rise from the wailing wall of sharp and unrestrained criticism, one can detect a musical pattern which is not exactly melodic. It is a bit plaintive and dismal. It is more lamentation than song. It carries a note of frustration and disconcert of spirit. It is as if hope has been baffled and high expection has been disappointed. Nor is that hard to understand.

Congress is always under pressure from a great variety of economic groups. They are not shy in advancing their demands, nor are they reticent in making plain their knowledge of the political art and the extent of their political power. It is a commonplace today in assessing the chances of a candidate for office how he stands with this group or that, and how vocal and effective these groups can be at the repository of human hope and ambition known as the ballot box. As one group or another is disappointed by the fact that Congress has failed to meet their demands, it can be expected that their appraisal will not always be charitable.

But Congress has a duty to the whole country, to all of the people and to the economy generally. In that respect, the 88th Congress has measured up to its duty. It has not been panicked or stampeded. It has refused to be rushed headlong into an unwise course of action. It has assessed the needs of the times and responded accordingly.

It seems to me that those who so freely castigate Congress for its alleged sins of omission and commission might well take account of the experience of other lands where their parliamentary bodies were weakened or impaired by a concert of criticism which seems to have a common thread. Be it Spain or France, be it Italy or China, be it prewar Germany or the Soviet Union, the organized efforts to demean their parliamentary bodies saw a concentration of power in a few hands and the erosion of liberty. This is the sure road to autocratic government.

I must make one comment on the item which appeared on the press ticker on Saturday, December 21, and which stated in substance that the stalemate on the foreign assistance appropriation bill was the work of Republican isolationists. Truly, this was an unkind cut.

When the late President Kennedy came to office, the Senate-House Joint Republican Leadership Conference which was established under President Eisenhower made the position of the Republican minority quite clear, and there has been no departure from the principle laid down in 1961.

We stated then, and we reaffirm it now, that on domestic matters we would carefully examine administration programs in the light of our own principles. If they exceeded or fell short of our purposes and principles, we would try to amend, modify, change, or offer substitutes. If we deemed them not in the Nation's interest, we felt free to reject them.

In matters of foreign policy, we expected to be heard and to have a fair chance to present our views. When the decision was made, we would abide and support it, even though we did not agree. In foreign assistance, as on other matters in the foreign policy field, I believe we have pursued a consistent course and that the statement by an unnamed White House spokesman which sought to place an isolationist tag on the Republican course was unkind, unworthy, and unjustified.

As we bid farewell to 1963 and salute 1964, I thank my Republican colleagues for their generosity. I thank them for having selected me to carry the torch of leadership for them on the floor of the Senate. I have done the best I could. I am grateful for their tolerance and their forbearance.

To Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle, I express my appreciation for their sense of humor and their tolerance as, from time to time, we have had little spats that are a part of a parliamentary body.

Finally, I pay an affectionate salute to my great and good friend from Montana, the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I thank him for every courtesy and every kindness he has registered throughout the whole year of the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

To all the Senate officers and employees, I express appreciation for your unfailing consideration and devotion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to express what I hope might be an appropriate senatorial benediction following the fine remarks of the majority leader and the minority leader.

As one on this side of the aisle who has been privileged to be associated with the very fine, distinguished, able, dedicated public servant, Senator MANSFIELD, the majority leader, I am grateful for and appreciative of the outstanding public service and dedication to public duty of the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], who has placed his country above his party when great national interests have been before us and who, as the majority leader has said so many times, has been cooperative in a manner that has made it possible for the Senate to perform its public business. I know that I echo the sentiments and feelings of the members of the Democratic majority, as I am confident I do of the members of the Republican minority.

The task of conducting the business of the Senate is not one of dictation or of dictum. It is one of persuasion, one of engendering respect for a point of view as well as for a person. It is surely the art and the skill of being able to reconcile many points of view.

To be sure, there are ways of getting things done in other societies that seem to be more efficient, if that be the goal. But I submit that efficiency must take second place to justice, to fairplay, and to the procedures of representative government.

The U.S. Senate and the U.S. Congress play a vital and significant role, not only in passing legislation but also in keeping kindled the fires of understanding and information that make possible a sound public opinion and a sound public policy.

Our task is not merely to legislate. Our task is to discuss. Our task is to debate. Our privilege is to review every policy that is placed before us. Sometimes this can be done quickly; occasionally considerable time is required. When I think of such great issues as those relating to taxes, monetary policy, fiscal policy, and foreign policy, I do not think results can be achieved overnight.

I join with other Senators in saying that while we have a responsibility to the Chief Executive—and I, for one, feel that responsibility keenly—we also have a responsibility to our own consciences; we have a responsibility to our duties under the Constitution. I would remind every Senator and every citizen of the United States that Congress—and indeed the Senate—fails the American people when it refuses to do the hard job of thinking through the issues that are before it.

The policies and programs presented to us by any President are worthy of our respect, our careful attention, and our deep study. That does not mean that we must respond by an automatic "yes." It does mean that we should give them our careful consideration. As one of the majority, one who has been privileged to work with the late President Kennedy and now with President Johnson—one of the lieutenants, so to speak—I always try to give the benefit of the doubt to the leader of the party, to the leader of the country. But I did not come to the Senate to be a rubberstamp either for party or President. As Edmund Burke said in his great message to the electors of Bristol, I came here to exercise my reasoned judgment upon every issue before us. We have different points of view. Our differences need to be expressed.

I say to Senators who occasionally are pictured or categorized in the pattern of mavericks that we need them, too. We need Senators who will stand up and defend their position, even when it is unpopular. We need Senators who are willing to venture into new thought, and not merely to accept the thought of others.

I pay my respects to my friend the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the minority whip, with whom I have had a wonderful personal relationship and for whom I have the highest regard as a gentleman, as a citizen, and as a leader in Congress. I hope that our working together has been of mutual benefit, not only to us as individuals, but to the parties, to Congress, and to our country, as well.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, while every Member of the legislative branch of the American Government eagerly looks forward to the approval of the concurrent resolution for adjournment sine die on this day, I believe I speak for every Member of both the Senate and House of Representatives, Republican and Democratic, as well, when I say that as we leave, we do so as a group of intimate friends who look forward to meeting again early in 1964.

A few moments ago the Republican leader spoke. I have no doubt that I speak for all Senators when I say that we are glad to salute the leader of the minority party in the Senate. His has been a difficult chore. I have seen him discharge his responsibilities; and—as has been evident in the last few moments—he has done so first as an American. He takes with him—for the few days rest he now will be able to enjoy before the Senate convenes again—the fond respect of his Republican colleagues whom he has led and the approbation of the entire membership of the Senate for the courage and the devotion to duty which he has shown, for the sweet personality which is his, and for his never-ending attempts to accommodate the personal concerns of all of us.

I should also like to pay my respects once more to the leader of the majority party in the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], and also to the majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], who likewise have worked long, patiently, and valiantly in order that Congress might have some constructive milestones in the public interest, for which Democrats and Republicans together have tried to put strength into America and have tried to help our Nation go forward so that our exertions in the year that lies ahead may, with the blessing of the Supreme Being, be fruitful and may find the people and the Government of the United States strong and free, and may permit all of us, working together, to carry forward the torch of freedom, and of peace with justice for all good peoples around the globe.

THE PROS AND CONS OF FOREIGN AID LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, following on the debate on foreign aid appropriations, an excellent article, entitled "The Pros and Cons of Foreign Aid Legislation," was published under date of November 4, 1963, in the American Institute for Economic Research.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Pros and Cons of Foreign Aid Legislation

The foreign aid question was brought into the limelight once again with the opening of debate on the proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 on the floor of the Senate last week. Contrasting opinions as to the general desirability of the foreign aid program were epitomized in remarks made by Senator Fulbright, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which reported the bill to the Senate, and Senator Morse, who vigorously attacked it.

Even Senator Fulbright, who often has been a spokesman for the administration, admitted that the foreign aid program was obsolescing. He cautioned, however, that "any large scale departure from our present foreign aid arrangements at this time would pose unacceptable risks to our entire foreign policy position." Senator Morse said of the proposed $4.2 billion authorization that it was "the same old snow job," "a hodgepodge of meaningless compromises that will produce another year of bloated, wasteful, uneconomic and in many ways dangerous American foreign aid." One Senator who had listened to the opening speeches said that he could not decide whether Senator Fulbright's remarks about the bill were "damning with faint praise or praising with faint damns."[1]

The foreign aid bill now before the Senate differs substantially from the bill passed by the House of Representatives late in August. It authorizes a larger expenditure and it lacks many of the policy requirements initiated by the House. The following summary account of the measure passed by the House of Representatives appeared in a recently published study entitled "The Proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1963."[2]

"The proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 (H.R. 7885) is an authorization bill. It would authorize the enactment of appropriations not in excess of specified ceilings. The amounts actually appropriated, up to such ceilings, will be determined in separate annual appropriation bills. H.R. 7885 would also amend the policy statutes which authorize the President to operate the foreign aid program.

"The President's budget submitted last January for fiscal 1964 recommended foreign aid appropriations totaling $4.9 billion. Following the Clay Committee report in March, the President reduced the budget request by $420 million. H.R. 7885, as reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, reduced the amount which may be appropriated by another $438 million. The House amended the bill so as to reduce the authorization by an additional $585 million bringing the total for fiscal year 1964 down to $3.5 billion—about $400 million below appropriations for fiscal 1963."

According to the legislative analysis referred to above:

"Some (critics of the program) would go further than the policy directives and ceilings on appropriations adopted by the House. Some would put an end to all foreign aid grants and limit the program to loans, at reasonable rates of interest. Others would sharply curtail all government-to-government aid, in any form, and concentrate on people-to-people loans and on private investment in the private enterprises of recipient countries. And still others oppose any additional authorization because they are convinced that the announced goals of the program are, in practice, impossible to attain.

---

[1] The quotations appear in "Aid Bill Scored in Senate Debate," the New York Times, Oct. 29, 1963, pp. 1 and 15.

[2] A legislative analysis published by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1012 14th St. NW., Washington, D.C.

"By and large, however, the debate involves what many regard as the gap between principle and performance—which suggests, some argue, that advocates of the program built expectations too high at the outset.

"It has been pointed out that when foreign aid can be related directly and specifically to denying Communist aspirations in the cold war, there is little occasion for disagreement and debate. According to critics of the program, a gap between principle and performance emerges when the announced goals and claims of foreign aid advocates are examined side by side with specific projects and programs."

The proponents of the foreign aid program, while admitting that it can be improved, ascribe to it large accomplishments in the past and are optimistic about what it will achieve in the future. President Kennedy, in his special message to Congress last April, said of the current program:

"Today our technical assistance and development loans are giving hope where hope was lacking, sparking action where life was static, and stimulating progress around the earth—simultaneously supporting the military security of the free world, helping to erect barriers against the growth of communism where those barriers count the most, helping to build the kind of world community of independent, self-supporting nations in which we want to live, and helping to serve the deep American urge to extend a generous hand to those working toward a better life for themselves and their children."

According to the American Enterprise Institute's legislative analysis: "Proponents of the foreign aid program state that its basic purpose is to protect 'our vital security interests' and that although it is justifiable as 'the right thing to do,' it is 'clearly in our national self-interest.' The relief and welfare aspects of the program and economic development of the less developed countries, proponents argue, help deter the growth of communism and subversion and are, therefore, in our national self-interest."

The report of the Clay Committee (headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay), which was released on March 22, 1963, has been cited by some who oppose the vast scale and the methods of administering foreign aid. Early in the report the point was made that unless underdeveloped countries receiving aid are determined to use the aid effectively it can be largely wasted. "Many of the countries which have received our aid have not fully performed their part of the assistance bargain with their own resources. Moreover, we have not adequately conditioned our aid in many cases on the achievement of such performance. Indeed, we may find ourselves, in effect, granting a number of continuing subsidies because it is argued that their denial would create instability and lose us good will." The report commented on the Committee's feeling that we are trying to do too much for too many too soon and that we are overextended in resources and undercompensated in results.

General Clay, in testifying before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, said, "I think that if we adopt a philosophy that we can keep communism out of all the countries of the world by extending money and grants to those countries, we are just deluding ourselves." He also said: "We do not believe that U.S. aid can be given to all the countries of the world in sufficient quantities to be so effective that it alone brings about the political and economic strengthening of these countries. Therefore, it is our view that we should reduce the number of nations to which we give aid and that we should concentrate our aid on those nations that are willing to perform, that have the inherent ability and the self-discipline to do those measures which will make aid effective."

The legislative analysis cites the fact that since July 1, 1945, the United States "has made available nearly $100 billion to more than 100 countries" (about $66.5 billion for economic assistance and about $30.7 billion for military aid). It quotes from the minority views expressed in a congressional report, as follows: "It is obviously impossible for any country, no matter how rich or strong it may be at the start, to continue assistance indefinitely to most of the countries of the world. The growing size of our national debt and our dwindling gold reserves attest to the drain of our resources resulting from our heavy foreign and domestic commitments."

Limitations of space prevent us from reporting in greater detail on the impartial legislative analysis of "The Proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1963" prepared by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. It is a valuable contribution to thought on a highly important subject.

LATIN GIANT BEMOANS "EXPLOITATION," BUT PUTS SQUEEZE ON U.S. FIRMS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the November 5 issue of the Wall Street Journal there was published an excellent article entitled "Latin Giant Bemoans 'Exploitation' but Puts Squeeze on U.S. Firms." This article shows the usual reporting depth and ability of the Wall Street Journal staff; and I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLEEDING IN BRAZIL—LATIN GIANT BEMOANS "EXPLOITATION" BUT PUTS SQUEEZE ON U.S. FIRMS—LAND DELAYS $100 MILLION OIL IMPORT PAYMENT BUT INSISTS FIRMS PAY BIG TAX PRONTO—AID DILEMMA FOR WASHINGTON

(By Henry Gemmill)

RIO DE JANEIRO.—Who is draining the lifeblood out of whom here?

Foreign trusts—U.S. exploiters worst of all—are bleeding this country, answer many Brazilians. But to many Americans, it looks as if Brazil is bleeding the companies, and the U.S. Government, too.

The Brazilian opinion is widespread. "The country cannot bear the heavy onus on its development entailed by enrichment of privileged groups who unduly appropriate the fruits of Brazilians' labor," says a memo splashed on the front pages of Rio newspapers and signed by President Goulart. Other politicians agree that Brazil is despoiled by Yankee investors, traders, and even foreign aiders. Communists say the same thing, and so do nationalist tycoons.

Yet Americans in rebuttal can cite these facts:

The Brazilian Government, delinquent on around $100 million of crude oil import bills piled up over the past year, is demanding international oil companies wrap the debt in a pay-later package and stick it in a dark closet. Simultaneously the Government is insisting the same companies' distributing subsidiaries inside Brazil pay pronto a tax far exceeding their resources. Any company resisting either demand faces the threat of being tossed out of the Brazilian oil business.

FOREIGN AID FRUSTRATION

U.S. foreign aiders have been doublecrossed on some Brazilian Government commitments. Sample: Trying to use for good works the local currency from huge gift "sales" of wheat to Brazil, they've had as much as 22 billion cruzeiros blocked in the Development Bank—while a blast of inflation melts the value of this money as if it were butter in an oven. So far the Government bank has let them finance exactly one project, helping a private concern produce synthetic rubber.

Brazil, having gained a host of modern factories by Government lures to foreign corporations during the 1950's, enacted in 1962 a law limiting annual profit remittances abroad to 10 percent of investment. Fair enough in theory, perhaps, and seemingly of little significance since U.S. and European owners have plowed most earnings back into their businesses.

But in practice, Government paper shufflers have never gotten around to handling the required registrations. For more than a year, remittances—not just profits but interest on loans and even patent license payments—have been held near zero. This tourniquet has cut off a normal outward flow of roughly $100 million annually.

U.S. POLICY DILEMMA

American policymakers, whether they sit in Washington offices or corporate board rooms, thus face a dilemma. Should they refuse to be bled any longer, and flatly decline to throw good money after bad? Or should they figure they're so badly hooked already that, to protect their investment, they must play along—calculating that Brazil's current course reflects neither the true interests nor the popular will of this great nation, hoping things will change for the better, and fearful of touching off a change for the worse? They find it a tough decision.

To appreciate how tough, look more closely at oil. It's Brazil biggest import necessity. To ultranationalists here, it symbolizes the nation's struggle with giant foreign "trusts." To the companies concerned, that struggle displays the slashing skill of some of the Brazilian Government's most powerful and radical institutions.

These Government arms include:

Petrobras. This Government oil company monopolizes domestic exploration and production, but fills only a third of the nation's crude oil needs. It does the bulk of all refining. Under Mr. Goulart, executives who knew petroleum have vanished; the outfit is headed by a political general and run by leftists in key posts. Its costs are swollen by inefficiency, payroll padding, and apparently the financing of such unrelated things as youth movements. The Reds would like to switch crude imports over to the Soviet, already a secondary supplier.

Conselho Nacional de Petroleo: It rules over the private sector of the oil industry, regulating retail prices and myriad other matters. This council too is infiltrated by Reds who would like to stamp out capitalism at the filling-station level.

Banco do Brasil: This bank is part of the Government financial apparatus which constantly claims to fight inflation while flooding the country with paper money to cover fantastic budget deficits. It also constantly claims to be bringing foreign payments into balance, while rigging exchange rates to subsidize imports and stifle exports.

As for the foreign companies, they play a double role. First there are the Brazilian subsidiaries of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), Texaco, Inc., Atlantic Refining Co., and Shell Oil Co. (Gulf Oil Corp. got out). They buy gasoline and other refined products, mainly from Petrobras. They pay the Government within a required 30 days, and then manage to distribute to the remotest village under tight price ceilings fixed by the Petroleum

Council. But now, suddenly, they're not obeying another Government edict.

The council, which has just permitted a price rise of about 30 percent, demands the companies give Banco do Brasil a sum equal to their "windfall" profit on inventories. In effect the companies, which have already paid the Government once for enormous stocks, are told they must pay for about a third of these all over again. The cash they're asked to hand over comes to roughly 12 billion cruzeiros—more than $10 million and probably close to $20 million, depending on which of the variously rigged Brazilian exchange rates is used to translate the cruzeiro figure.

The distributing companies plead that the level of their stocks has been dictated by a council which will not permit sensible inventory trimming, and that a 30-percent price boost is no "windfall" but a belated catchup with inflation, which now has Brazilian labor demanding 100-percent wage boosts. Finally, after years of omitted dividends they say they don't have the money and can't find a banker who will lend it. Having paid similar cash levies in the past the companies don't say they are unwilling to pay, but contend they're unable.

The companies say some high government officials understand the facts and express sympathy, but they have received no assurances they are being believed. In fact government regulators, perhaps figuring parent companies can be pressured into bringing down fresh dollars to ransom these Brazilian subsidiaries, or perhaps with a more political purpose, make this threat: Any company failing to fork over will lose its marketing quota. No quota means the company is out of business.

BUYING TACTICS

The crude oil Brazil imports from Venezuela and the Mideast is supplied mainly by producing or trading affiliates of the same four companies. In buying from them the Government which is so insistent a collector inside Brazil, becomes an elusive debtor.

The chief purchaser is Petrobras. Though Petrobras demands payment in 30 days when selling, it does not consider a bill due until 4 months have passed when it's buying. Then it does pay.

There's one hitch, though. Payment is made by giving cruzeiros to Banco do Brazil which is supposed then to transmit dollars. The bank has been pocketing the cruzeiros and blandly telling oil suppliers it has no dollars.

Now, oil companies are confronted not merely with the prospect of carrying $100 million of unpaid bills on the cuff, but with a government request that this embarrassing commercial delinquency be made to vanish for a while by sticking a not-due-till-later label on it and tossing it into storage. The companies have entered negotiations. Any oil executive tempted to stalk out must consider whether he's really ready to give up this market, occupying half a continent.

A TALK WITH THE BOSS

These oil troubles illustrate the sort of battering most businesses experience if they have dealings with Brazil. Variations are innumerable. But inside Brazil the officers of many a U.S.-owned factory say they have had a "helluva" time with bosses back home, and by now the wrangling frequently evolves around whether more dollars should be brought down. Here's the outline one subsidiary officer gives of a typical conversation with his superior in the United States:

"Why should we send more money in when you fellows can't send profits out?"

"Well, this inflation has doubled the working capital we need, and we can only borrow here at more than 40-percent interest, if we can get it at all."

"You're giving everything away to your Commie union. And even that 70-percent boost 4 months ago isn't keeping them from screaming for more."

"I know, but my guys here are OK, and you should try to understand that the way things are going they really do need more money. Anyhow, we have to give it or be shut down."

"How's that nationalization bill stand in Congress?"

"Still talking about it, but it looks like we'll squeak by with just price ceilings."

"You call this a case for investing stockholders' money?"

"This is still a great country with a chance for a great future, and anybody who chickens out now may be making a great mistake. But give the word and I'll have a padlock on the gate tomorrow."

"Not so fast * * *"

A General Motors or a General Electric is physically anchored to Brazil by its plants. An American exporter may not be, but if he has a valuable traditional share in the Brazilian market for chemicals or curtain rods to balance against a batch of unpaid bills, he can't escape the problem of whether and when to take his licking and cut his losses.

Even with coffee export prices riding high, one economist says Brazil is like the fellow who overspends and keeps out of bankruptcy by running around paying the mortgage but stalling the butcher, and fending off repossession of his new car by borrowing an installment payment from a neighbor. The trouble with this comparison is that by 1964 Brazil's balance-of-payments gap is probably going to reach $800 million. So a horde of creditors will find themselves not just in the same boat but in the same ocean liner.

The Kennedy administration will be in it with them. It too has a heavy commitment through the Alliance for Progress plan for uplifting the hemisphere with U.S. aid and Latin self-help. Brazil is crucial to the project. So, Washington policymakers grant some aid, hold back on some, strive to get what they give to more useful destinations such as Brazilian state governments, and wonder whether and when more drastic decisions must be made.

MANSFIELD FOR BLOCKADE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the December 5 issue of the Washington Daily News there was published an article written by Mr. Richard H. Boyce entitled "Mansfield for Blockade."

In view of the current troublesome situation in Cuba and the present conference of the Organization of American States on the Cuban problem, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Dec. 5, 1963]

Urges Cuba Summit Parley—Mansfield for Blockade

(By Richard H. Boyce)

Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield, of Montana, today urged the Organization of American States to support Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt's demand for an air-sea blockade of Cuba.

Senator Mansfield, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, also criticized the OAS for delay in calling a hemisphere summit parley on the Cuba problem.

"I see no reason," he said, "why the OAS could not act immediately. The OAS should be an organization of all the governments in this hemisphere facing this problem.

AUTHORITY

"It has plenty of authority under its charter to act, if it would only do so."

The OAS Tuesday heard Venezuela's Ambassador call for a meeting of foreign ministers of hemisphere nations to deal with the aggression against Venezuela and other Latin nations from Communist Cuba. The OAS voted to send an investigating committee to Venezuela, but put off indefinitely a foreign ministers conference.

Senator Mansfield charged the OAS "has much more power than it exercised in this matter." The Montanan said:

"Castro is a problem and a danger to all the nations, and they should act in concert. The United States will serve in the ranks with them, doing its share, but we should expect all the others to do their part, too."

Of the proposed sea blockade, Senator Mansfield said: "If it is decided by the OAS I would support it, but not as a unilateral move. The United States nor any one country should not be the one to step in front; it should be a joint matter, the nations acting in concert."

Senator Mansfield conceded there is a long-range possibility such a blockade might escalate into war. The blockade would use U.S. and other hemisphere nations naval and air units to end the flow of Communist arms and ammunition into other Latin American countries. But Senator Mansfield added:

"Besides the end of gunrunning, the value of a blockade is that it would squeeze Cuba even more, economically, and thus would be strongly inimical to Castro's interests."

Maritime Administration figures showed free world ships still arriving in Cuba at the rate of one a day.

Despite Senator Mansfield's sharp words, there was little expectation among diplomatic observers that the United States would support immediate moves for a Caribbean quarantine.

Informed quarters indicated the Johnson administration would go slow on moves which it feels might precipitate another Soviet confrontation over Cuba like that of October 1962.

WHAT EVER HAPPENED TO SATURDAY NIGHT?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, what ever happened to Saturday night? This intriguing question, complete with warnings and reminders, is raised in the July 8 issue of Newsweek. Written to mark the observance of the 187th Independence Day, it tells the story of Keosauqua, Iowa, and the Keosauquas of other names across the Nation. Newsweek General Editor Leslie Hanscom, himself a product of a small town, has captured the essence of the small hamlet, in addition to painting a bleak picture of what is to come. He warns that the small town, the backbone of America, is fast disappearing in this age of high-speed automobiles and high-speed superhighways. In the article, sociologist Philip Hauser is quoted as declaring that "if the small town is passing, we cannot bemoan it." I think he is wrong—for while television, movies, and travel opportunities may have opened up new vistas and new wants, the small town symbolizes, as Hanscom puts it, "the attraction, in the family-like pattern of its human relationships." Again, he points to "the sociologically unprovable but instinctively American feeling that the little town and the countryside are the source of civic energy for the Nation." A return to the smalltown atmosphere, the Saturday nights of converging upon the downtown to exchange hellos and news, should be renewed, if only to become aware again of the need to reexamine our sense of values—the importance of knowing and trusting your neighbor. If this can be regained, then the mistrust which pervades this modern age will also be a thing of the past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL TOWN, U.S.A.

(A boy, a river, a flag-decked secret fort that guards the 1,023 souls of Keosauqua, Iowa, U.S.A. The scene recalls another day, before the country moved to town, before cities marched ever closer together. This Fourth of July, there are still some secret places for a boy to leap. But the Keosauquas are disappearing, and with them a way of life so long and loudly extolled from Fourth of July platforms across the land. To see what Small Town, U.S.A., is like as the Nation marks its 187th Independence Day, Newsweek's General Editor Leslie Hanscom visited Keosauqua. His story follows:)

In Keosauqua, Iowa, a town that is tucked in a lazy bend of the Des Moines River, the midmorning coffee break arrives at an early hour. Main Street business follows the work rhythms of the surrounding farms, and by 9:30 the refugees from toil have begun to gather in the dining room of the Hotel Manning, a pleasantly ramshackle pile which looks like a beached side-wheeler. Here, where the talking is easy, the used copy of the Des Moines Register passes from booth to booth, piercing the quiet morning with the jangle of its headlines. Last week a medley of discord clanged from the Register's big type: "Blunt Challenge to De Gaulle by Kennedy—Bias Protest by 100,000 in Detroit—Claim Call Girls Operate in and Out of the U.N.—Mr. K.: World War Would Kill Hundreds of Millions."

In Keosauqua, as in Kennebunkport, Kitty Hawk, and Klamath Falls, this was news that shook the nerves and the psychic certainties which smalltown life supposedly protects. Viewed through the red, white, and blue vapors of one American pipedream, the little town is still the enduring social rock, safe from the tides of distant calamity that only touch it when the waves are spent. But in Keosauqua, they know different. The American small town is no longer distant, nor, alas, is it a rock.

It is a place where the speaker on Peruvian agriculture, putting away his slides at the 4-H Club meeting, is buttonholed by the lady who knows Peru through a sister in the Peace Corps. For the latest doings in Paris, Keosauqua need not consult a columnist; the nurse-receptionist who serves the town's two doctors has a son in the Air Force who regularly reports. Keosauqua can hardly avoid belonging to the great world, but the cost of membership may be far too high. By an irony of history, the world it belongs to seems to have no place for the American small town.

Fifty years ago, the Fourth of July in Keosauqua was a blowout that would put a Sioux uprising in the shade. Before sunup, sleepers were jolted awake by dynamite blasts along the river. Along the main street, fairground performers exerted art and muscle on wooden platforms. Bands of bogus Indians and scouts, troops of horribles clothed from local ragbags, patriotic floats blooming with the maidenhood of Keosauqua, passed in grand review. And all day long, there were detonations of firecrackers and inspirational oratory. The spielers on the bandstand reminded the hometowners of a pleasant truth; here, near the breast of the land, they were living the kind of life the Founding Fathers had in mind. In small towns everywhere, it was a day of community self-congratulation. Half a century later, it is a day consecrated to the itch to be elsewhere. In Keosauqua this week, most folks will go along.

At the edge of Keosauqua (an Indian name thought to mean Big Bend or half a dozen other things) a welcoming sign calls the town historic. The description is premature. Actually, the only thing that ever happened in Keosauqua was the honey war, a bloodless boundary dispute between Iowa and Missouri in which the prize at issue was a stand of bee trees. But the town is becoming historic. It is a living illustration of an unglamorously attractive way of life that is fading from the landscape.

On its outskirts, Keosauqua has a leafy likeness to a hammered-down Vermont, but the town is there because of the cornland out where the fields are flat. This puts it in an economic class where mortality is high. All across the U.S. map, the agricultural town is dying, and Keosauquans are haunted by statistics.

Everybody from the banker to the barber pulls population figures from his hat to deplore in exact terms the loss of 78 people between the census of 1950 and 1960. In Keosauqua, the question of survival has nothing to do with missiles and mushroom clouds. More immediately chilling are the ghosts of towns that surround it on every side. Down the river is Bentonsport, once a rival river town, now a hamlet of 60 people where the last business, a general store, closed 4 years ago. Pull the bell rope in the lovely old brick Presbyterian Church, deserted on its hilltop among soaring trees, and there is not enough life in Bentonsport to be startled by the sound. A flaking back number of the Keosauqua Republican, a weekly now gone, lists no fewer than 56 vanished towns in Van Buren County.

It takes little grounding in sociology to understand the erasure of so many small-print names from the American map. Autos and high-speed roads have put the bigtown bargain racks alluringly within reach. Small farms are extinct. Television, magazines, and movies have whipped up hungers smalltown life cannot pacify. Then, too, the small town has been on the defensive ever since the withering attacks of writers like Sinclair Lewis and H. L. Mencken at a time when the United States had rural attitudes and votes to thank for the historic idiocy of prohibition. In a smalltown portrait etched with their brand of acid, George Ade once wrote: "Down in the Ague Belt there was a town called Miasma. It needed paint, sidewalks, toothbrushes, and Bibles. Everybody in Miasma believed that the sun rose just in the edge of Widow Clevison's hog lot and set over on yon side of the sand ridge."

Today's small town has left Miasma behind. If a visitor to Keosauqua—gazing through the heat waves at its dusty main street—should remark that this looks like the rump of the universe, nobody will shoot him down. More likely, the townsman at his elbow—knowing that most American main streets look no more sightly—will laugh and agree. The town does have its beauty—in the encircling river and in the cluster of old brick buildings which crown its capitol hill, the administrative center of Van Bureau County. But the attraction of the place, for those who live there, lies in the family-like pattern of its human relationships. Here is the thing that makes the demise of the small town tragic and the heart of the city dweller ache with nostalgia. This is a place so small that nobody is one too many; where the pillars of government all have faces and first names.

"We're proud of Gene Hannan," somebody says. "Ten years ago, he used to be an alcoholic." Hannan, it so happens, is the town mayor, plumber by trade, a gray-haired man in glasses with a quietly self-contained air that lends dignity to a suit of striped overalls. There is no Roman Catholic Church in the town, but Keosauqua's homogeneous Protestants pay respect to the way Hannan's Catholic faith helped put him back together. In his fifth year as mayor, he handles an annual budget of $65,000 for an annual salary of $200. In the afternoon, the coffee drinkers at the Hotel Manning can watch the mayor of the town at work on top of a ladder as he mends a leak in the dining-room ceiling. On a Saturday night, he sits by himself on a store-front doorstep, gazing at Main Street and sadly noting that nothing shouts out the dying condition of the American small town like the absence of thronging humanity on the one big night of the week.

Whatever happened to Saturday night? In Graham's Department Store, a one-room jumble of drygoods, suitcases, and shoes, manager Don (Bud) Campbell sings a sour swan song for an American folkway. "In the old days," he grumbles, "I've fitted shoes in here until 1 o'clock in the morning and the street would still be full of farmers, leaning on the fenders of cars and chewing the fat. Then came the time when they'd say, 'Hurry up and get them socks in the sack; tonight we watch television.' There you have it, Paladin won out."

Next door at the Goodie Garden, home base for the town's teenagers, booths, and counterstools are empty; there is a drag race in Kahoka, Mo., just over the State line. Across the street at the filling station, a farm boy in dungarees—bare torso sunburned with the outline of a sleeveless undershirt—tries to hug a girl who fakes resistance. Two youths Indian wrestle. These are the last teenage stragglers in town this evening; and soon they too are off, caught up in the adolescent whirl which centers on the automobile. For the evening's finale, there is the lure of a motorized tag game through the streets of the sleeping town.

In a town with a clouded future, the young are important. The Little League is a religion, and when a Keosauquan speaks of "my favorite baseball player," his thoughts are probably no further away than the diamond out behind the high school. At the school, 50 percent of every graduating class, says district superintendent Kenneth Goodwin, go on to college or further training, and few of them will ever come back. For those who stay, there is an awkward time of restlessness just before the girls marry and the boys tie their lives to the land. Keosauqua is free of minority problems (it has two elderly Negroes) and the town clucks its tongue over Southern racial intolerance. But it does have a problem with lawless juveniles.

Of the six prisoners lodged in the county jail, one is the 17-year-old whose tousled blond hair and woebegone face is visible most of the day behind the bars of a second-floor window. Shirtless in the heat, he awaits hearing on a charge of breaking into the Brass Rail—one of the two local beer taverns—and scooping out the cashbox. To make the time pass, he has been reading the battered jailhouse Bible, and he is up to the Book of Judges. Astoundingly, this country kid in dungarees—the kind female contemporaries call "cute"—suffers from mal de Madison Avenue—bleeding stomach ulcers. His exasperated mother—with six others to look out for—has refused to visit him. He wishes somebody occupied the other bare bunk on which Deputy Herschel Dickey is now sitting. "Well, son," says the deputy, sympathy in his slow voice, "the next time your father tells you to do something, just before you tell him to go to hell, you think of this place, will you?" It is the tone that officialdom takes in this town. Most of the prisoners in the county lockup call the sheriff by his first name.

Lacking a philosophical vocabulary, the typical small towner will declare that the values of his way of life come down to one thing—he knows and trusts his neighbors. The small town deserves to be kept alive says Jo. S. Stong, much respected Keosauqua lawyer, if only as a museum of decent human relations. Stong is the brother of Keosauqua's greatest celebrity—the late Phil Stong, author of the thrice-filmed novel "State Fair"—and a national official of the Boy Scouts who must make frequent trips to New York. One day on the sidewalk outside New York's Biltmore Hotel, Stong tried the experiment of walking a straight, unswerving course to find out if the onrushing horde would run him down. In the space of one block, seven people rammed into him, head down. "Here," he says, "we keep our heads up to speak to the people we know."

In a town that traffics in first names, the freedom from social rivalries is part of the pervading serenity. By any standard applicable in this country, John A. Manning—the quietly likable teller of the local bank—is the town aristocrat. It was his great-grandfather Edwin Manning—the commanding face in the hotel lobby portrait—who founded the town in 1835 by migrating from Connecticut to open a riverfront general store. From this grew the hotel, more stores, a chain of banks and a white pillared house still the grandest in town. The younger Manning lives behind the pillared portico—with wife and seven children—but the rest of the empire is gone with the wind, and he wears no patrician aura. Driving out among the cornfields to needle a farmer politely about an unpaid note on a truck, he makes classic confrontation of enemies—farmer versus banker—sound like a back country social call.

To the outsider, the tribal warmth of the place overpowers the drab physical aspect. Keosauqua is a town typified by the dust of the tin feed and grain signs, the tractor cultivators parked along Main Street, the sad little ramp at the back of a brick business block where animals come in to be butchered and stored in the meat lockers rented out to individual families.

But this is the world away from the lonely crowd. In illustration, Margaret Gray—reporter-bookkeeper-ad salesman for the weekly Van Buren County Register—tells of the time when her husband, Lloyd, lay hospitalized with rheumatic fever. Who sneaked the groceries into her parked car at night? Who sent her the $40 check in the mail? Who left the baseball shoes on her desk for her son in the Little League? She never knew. This is the dwelling place—in the view of Fred Ovrom, who owns the town bank—of "the most contented men in the world." They are the small farmers who manufacture milk bottle carrying cases at the Barker Equipment Co.—the town's one industry—and work their farms after hours ("They do it the way you would play golf"). This is the small town that all hands vow is here to stay. "We've had meetings," says Bert Leck, the editor of the Register; "it's decided—we're not leaving."

On the broad map of the States, Keosauqua is only a speck, but there is a sweep of such specks from ocean to ocean, and in many of these, the mood is low. Sometimes the cause is a temporary setback only. For example, Sandwich, Ill. (population: 3,842)—a fairly lively town—was disappointed, after raising $100,000 for a high school agricultural workshop in 1954, to find only 11 students using it this year. In Hamlet, N.C., a town of roughly the same size, the troubles of the railroad are the local headache. According to Arnold Kirk, a local newspaperman, "It seems like the town has lost interest in everything. I believe it's on the verge of disintegration. We have even quit the Miss Hamlet contest." And, as an example of all-out despair, there is Deepstep, Ga. (population: 200), where Mayor Joseph Hilliard Veal reports: "We've lost our post office, we haven't had a baseball team in 30 years, all our young people are leaving. If we're growing, we're growing downhill, and even that's so slow that you can't hardly notice it."

Doggedly committed to hope, Keosauqua looks forward to a Federal recreation dam in the Des Moines River which will improve the boating and attract tourists. There is a lush State park across the river, and the town itself—with all its earthy homeliness—might appeal to the city folks who dream nostalgically of the origins they never knew. Just down the river in Bentonsport, an intrepid couple, the Herbert K. Redheads, are working on a shoestring, trying to restore the old river port as another attraction. Turning an old riverboat inn into a museum, they live in rooms at the back, like oldtime delicatessen owners; they are curators of chamber mugs and headboards 10 feet high.

As the small town totters on the edge of darkness, such efforts count, and once in a while, there is help from outside. Since 1960, the University of Chicago (which normally is associated with nuclear chain reaction) has offered special scholarships to smalltown students, hoping that the kids will go back and become what the prospectus calls "the moral and civic leaders of their communities." Behind this is the sociologically unprovable but instinctively American feeling that the little town and the countryside are the source of civic energy for the Nation.

Or is this all moonshine and nostalgia? According to Sociologist Philip Hauser, "What the small town may have contributed in the past is one side of the coin; the other side is urbanism and the greatest opportunity in the history of man for him to reach his full potential. Where the small town kept him prisoner, urbanism gives him freedom of choice—choice of education, choice of profession, choice of marriage. If the small town is passing, we can't bemoan it."

In Keosauqua, however, at the hour when night is on the river and the cultivators have stopped rumbling across the old iron bridge at the edge of town, sociological cool reasoning is hard doctrine to take in. There are reasons why people stay here. Somewhere on the river bank, the Caruso of all whippoorwills is making sounds that stand the hair on end. Looking from the bridge, past the old steamboat Gothic hotel—veteran of four floods—there are the lights of the quiet town—"all three of them," to quote a local wag. Sociologist, go home. This is the happy place, the blessed land.

PRAYER FOR THE UNITED STATES, WRITTEN BY PETER MARSHALL, FORMER CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the late Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate, composed a prayer which I believe is particularly timely to bring to the attention of Senators and readers of the Congressional Record. I ask unanimous consent that the prayer may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PRAYER FOR THE UNITED STATES

(By Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate)

O God, our Father, we pray that the people of America, who have made such progress in material things, may now seek to grow in spiritual understanding.

For we have improved means, but not improved ends. We have better ways of getting there, but we have no better places to go. We can save more time, but are not making any better use of the time we save.

We need Thy help to do something about the world's true problems—the problem of lying, which is called propaganda; the problem of selfishness, which is called self-interest; the problem of greed, which is often called profit; the problem of license, disguising itself as liberty; the problem of lust, masquerading as love; the problem of materialism, the hook which is baited with security.

Hear our prayers, O Lord, for the spiritual understanding which is better than political wisdom, that we may see our problems for what they are. This we ask in Jesus' name Amen.

BUT WILL IT WORK?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, an editorial was published in the Wall Street Journal last April 10 entitled "But Will It Work?" This editorial discusses the planned deficit program which a tax cut without a cutback in spending would entail.

With the imminent consideration by the Senate of a tax bill, I believe it is timely for this article to be appraised. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BUT WILL IT WORK?

A number of instances of overextended credit and other abuses have been in the news lately. Some are being corrected the hard way. Altogether they cast an interesting light on the theory, currently favored on high, that we can spend and lend ourselves into much greater prosperity.

Among other cases are the discounters who have gone bankrupt; the involvement of a couple of banks with a vending machine company charged with nonpayment of withholding taxes; a once-substantial manufacturer losing heavily under a management with numerous other financial interests and associations, not all of them sweet smelling.

But perhaps the most revealing is the waning of the great real estate boom. After World War II there was indeed a tremendous demand for construction of all kinds, and the Federal Government did everything possible to fuel it. It got so the officials couldn't stand it if housing starts, for example, threatened not to surpass the previous year's level.

The fueling was done generally by inflation in the earlier part of the period and easy money through most of it. Specifically it was done through ridiculously liberal down-payment and mortgage requirements and through tax inducements.

Taxes were rigged in such a way as to provide particularly warm shelter for syndicators—groups set up to buy office and apartment buildings. Some were overoptimistic about a constantly growing demand for space; others just got too smart for their own good. Anyway, syndication is in trouble, and real estate generally is not as strong as it has been.

So here, as in the cases of corporate pyramiding and bankruptcy, some cardhouses are beginning to fall. Stern and inexorable economic reality is catching up with overexuberance or worse. To that extent it is a salutary development; timely correction of abuses can help avert big trouble later.

But from the standpoint of Government theory, it should not be happening. All these booms with their myriad opportunities for loose practice should be getting headier and headier, for that is what the Government preached with its fiscal and monetary policies throughout most of the post-war years.

Now, despite the failure of the theory, the Government offers a huge new dose of the same old stuff. We are promised large tax cuts mainly designed (but by no means guaranteed) to spur consumption when what is needed is a new growth of savings and investment.

With or without tax cuts we are to have deliberately planned Federal deficits for any foreseeable future; a $12.5 billion deficit did not send the Nation roaring off into the wild blue yonder in fiscal 1959 but a $12 billion one will surely do so in 1964. And apart from any small and temporary tightening, we are to have more easy money.

If ever there was a program for inflation, this is it. Only, in fact, as a program for inflation does it make any sense. For it is quite true that inflation can produce a boom, just as it is true that the merrier the inflationary binge the more depressing the hangover.

Unfortunately for politicians, inflation is not even that simple. It is an exceedingly mercurial quantity which will not necessarily come when wanted or do what it is supposed to do. There are signs that the big war and post-war inflation is about played out. Certainly the currently sinking real-estate and corporate ships could not be kept afloat even on the veritable flood of easy money the Nation has had.

Not being in the predicting business, we do not know whether the new economic policy will work. But it might just be that the most it will do will be to store up the fuel for an inflationary explosion not in 1963 or 1964 but in some inconvenient future years.

So perhaps the political economists ought to be asking not only if it is right to set out to defraud the people with inflation. They might also ask the pragmatic question of workability in the light of the post-war experience. If inflation is so sure to bring a perpetually expanding boom, then where is that miracle?

RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCAST EDITORIALIZING

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the WOC Broadcasting Co., of Davenport, Iowa, recently produced an editorial which I believe is timely.

Much has been said and will be said on the subject of broadcast editorializing. I believe that most radio and television stations know the meaning of editorial responsibility and any editorial comment made falls well within the definition of fair play. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial presented on the WOC stations of Davenport, Iowa, on August 1 and 2, be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If certain Members of our Congress have their way, radio and television stations who editorialize will be driven back to bland remarks about motherhood, milk, and the flag. Currently, signs point toward adoption by the House of an amendment to the Communications Act, an amendment that would deprive broadcasters of a considerable measure of editorial freedom. It seems to us that the prevailing mood of the House Commerce Subcommittee is quite apparent. These Congressmen want, at very least, a guarantee of immediate access to cameras and microphones if any station dares to criticize them. Some of these Congressmen would forbid broadcast editorials completely. This makes us wonder whether a few of our lawmakers believe their job security depends on public ignorance and immunity from criticism.

The fight of broadcasters to retain editorial freedom has been supported on the editorial pages of several newspapers. These papers, which do not face Government control of what they print, at least at this time, are asking Congress to protect the privileges of broadcasters, for fear newspapers themselves will some day feel the same editorial clampdown now being threatened against the broadcast industry.

The New York Daily News calls proposed restriction of broadcasting editorials nothing short of censorship. To quote the New York Daily News exactly, that newspaper says it is in favor of radio and television editorials. The New York Daily News also cautions broadcasters to guarantee equivalent rebuttal from any dissenters. This, of course, we have done here at channel 6 and on WOC radio by soliciting and inviting contrary opinions to any editorial remarks we make.

To quote another newspaper, the much respected Wall Street Journal, the Journal editor recently said: "Now and then the viewpoints of some Congressmen and other Government officials affront our sense of justice and fair play. In fact, we may feel they don't know what they are talking about, and, sadly, we can't shut them off by just turning the page or flipping the dial."

Another highly pertinent and threatening note is sounded by the Washington News, which lately said that political power over broadcasters through ability to revoke licenses is already oppressive and inducive to timidity. The Washington News continued by saying that if Congress takes any action on airwave editorials it should guarantee them protection from the bureaucrats, rather than put them under some restraint.

We believe we have an answer as to whether broadcasters should editorialize. It came directly from Newton Minow when he was chairman of the FCC, and it has been lately restated by the new Commission Chairman, Mr. Henry. Mr. Henry believes that, according to his own statement, broadcasters now editorializing are conducting themselves fairly and with an eye toward the public service.

The New York Times itself has one brief comment on broadcasters editorializing. The New York Times simply says, "This is as it should be."

We here at the WOC stations believe that regulation of broadcast editorials would be an even more difficult job than enforcing the law which requires us to give equal time to political candidates. We don't believe, as a practical matter, that a station can give equal minutes to candidates any more than a newspaper can give equal column inches. That is to say, 10 o'clock today will be unlike 10 o'clock tomorrow, and page 1 today will be unlike page 1 tomorrow.

If you believe, as we do, that broadcasters have a right and responsibility to bring to you news interpretation as well as the news somebody may simply want you to hear—and the way he wants you to hear it—we then urge you to write your Congressman and your Senator and tell him that you believe there should be no restriction on the editorial privileges and rights of the radio and television stations that serve you.

This is our firm opinion. As always, you are welcome to utilize our facilities to contradict what we think. All it takes is a letter to the management.

HEALTH CARE FOR ELDERLY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, two recent editorials in Iowa newspapers on the subject of health care for the elderly merit the attention of Senators and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I do not know whether hospitalization or other medical care financed by social security will be pressed in the next session of Congress. I hope that it will not. I believe these editorials, one published in the Des Moines Register for November 30, 1963, and entitled "Health Care for Elderly," and the other published in the Sioux City Journal for December 6, 1963, entitled "Medical Care for Iowa Aged," point out the potentialities of a properly funded Kerr-Mills program to operate, because on December 1 this program went into full operation in my State.

I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register, Nov. 30, 1963]

HEALTH CARE FOR ELDERLY

The Iowa program of medical care for the aged under the Kerr-Mills Act begins December 1, and Iowans can be proud of the comprehensive nature of the plan developed for this State.

The State-Federal program is intended to meet the health needs of persons 65 and over whose income and resources make them ineligible for the old-age assistance program but who need financial help because of illness. States participating in the program have broad latitude to determine the kind and extent of care provided their elderly citizens.

Many of the States have set up programs that fall far short of providing comprehensive health protection. Some sharply limit hospital care. (Kentucky allows just 10 days of care in a hospital.) Others fail to pay for drug charges or dental care. One State makes no provision for paying for physician services, and several will pay for this only when care is provided in outpatient clinics.

The Iowa plan ranks along with the plans of Hawaii, Massachusetts, New York, and North Dakota as among the most comprehensive in the country. All services provided by the licensed health professions are available to elderly Iowans under the program.

An Iowan needing hospitalization can be admitted to the hospital of his choice and receive care for an unlimited period of time. The program covers special nursing care in the hospital or at home. Eyeglasses, dental care, drug charges, and physician services in the hospital or office are among the many items included.

The major restriction is on nursing home care, which is limited to 180 days after hospitalization. The restriction is intended to prevent the transfer of old age assistance recipients receiving nursing home care under that program from being transferred to Kerr-Mills in order to take advantage of more favorable Federal matching formulas under Kerr-Mills.

The 180-day limitation should not deprive Iowans needing care beyond 180 days from receiving it. After using private resources to the point where they are eligible for old-age assistance these patients can continue to receive nursing home care under that program.

No one can know with certainty how much this comprehensive program will cost or how many Iowans will take advantage of it. Eligibility requirements are fairly stringent; annual income of less than $1,500 if single, less than $2,000 if married; resources with a net market value of less than $2,000 if single; less than $3,000 if married—excluding the family home, furnishings, car, tools, and cash surrender value of insurance.

Investigations will be made by county welfare workers to verify financial status and contacts will be made with responsible relatives to determine their ability to help pay. No one can be considered eligible until he has first incurred medical expense of at least $50 on his own in the preceding 12 months.

Many elderly Iowans can well afford to pay their own medical bills and will get no help from the Kerr-Mills program. But in a State that has the country's highest proportion of elderly persons, the program can help fill an important gap in health care. The broad coverage of the program will mean peace of mind to many elderly Iowans who now know that, no matter how severe or prolonged the illness, help is available in the institutions and by the physicians of their choice.

[From the Sioux City Journal, Dec. 6, 1963]

Medical Care for Iowa Aged

Iowa, leading State in the proportion of aged in its population with nearly 12 percent past 65 years of age, has embarked on a medical aid to the aged program which, happily under these circumstances at least, is considered among the most comprehensive in the Nation.

States participating in this program—a matching plan which for Iowa will mean an outlay of about $2 million and a Federal portion under the Kerr-Mills Act of slightly more than that figure—are given broad latitude in determining the extent and form of a medical aid program.

Such discretion correctly should be left to the State, for those shaping the machinery designed to meet the medical needs of older persons are at the grassroots, where those needs can best be assessed.

Those receiving old-age assistance are not eligible for medical aid to the aged. Recipients will not receive money. Payment will be to hospitals, doctors, and agencies participating in bringing medical assistance to the elderly. Income limitations are severe, less than $1,500 annually if single and less than $2,000 if married.

Thus, Iowa's aged residents who qualify for aid through the medical aid to the aged program will be those who need and deserve the medical care and the security such assistance will afford.

A $50 deductible clause is not expected to provide much of an obstacle since most older persons will have incurred that much in health services in the year preceding application.

Welfare officials hesitate to estimate the numbers who will apply for health services but suggest the figure could grow considerably when applicants become aware of the program's scope.

With the stringent checks and balances built into the program, Iowans who must help pay for medical services to the aged should feel their tax dollar well spent, for they should be aware that those senior citizens who avail themselves of the service are deserving of it.

Medical aid to the aged will fill an important gap in health care. It also will eliminate much fear and uncertainty among those Iowans who cannot qualify for old-age assistance but still are unable to pay their way along the broad avenue of medical needs which are bound to crop up after age 65.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY MUST BE REEXAMINED

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the necessity for a new and thorough reexamination of our foreign policy—as well as our foreign aid program—is sharply pointed up in articles which appeared today in Washington and New York newspapers. I believe that the United States, in drawing up its objectives, has too long overlooked one area—the identity of the future leaders of the nations involved. The State Department, the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency spend millions and millions of dollars on intelligence gathering. But seemingly they neglect to obtain adequate dossiers on the men who will shape the events in various countries. It seems to me that if such dossiers were obtained, the State Department could more accurately forecast which way these leaders will go and how they will react under certain circumstances. In having this knowledge, we could very well avoid pouring millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money into nations which now spurn us.

One example is Cambodia. From fiscal year 1946 through fiscal year 1963, we channeled $367 million into that nation—$97 million in military aid and $270 million in economic assistance. In fiscal year 1963 we handed it $29.2 million of which $10.4 million was in military aid. And now, Cambodia's chief of state not only tells us to keep our aid—which we should welcome—but is attempting to blackmail us in addition. The Washington Post today carried an Associated Press story which notes that Prince Norodom Sihanouk has threatened to sign an alliance with Communist China unless the West guarantees Cambodian neutrality. But what kind of neutrality can be anticipated if the Prince accepts, as he has indicated, armaments from Red China? It is no wonder that South Vietnam and Thailand, Cambodia's neighbors, view this action with alarm. One can only guess how different events would be if we had maintained a background file on this Cambodian leader?

Another case in point appears in an article in today's New York Times. After accepting $95 million—$79.6 million in fiscal year 1963 alone—in aid from the United States, Algeria has turned to the Soviet Union for assistance, apparently in the amount of $100 million. At the same time, Algier radio denounces us for actions in Cuba, based on allegations stemming from the Castro government.

It is now becoming apparent that our foreign aid and foreign nations policies are backfiring. When this happens, Congress has the duty to investigate the programs and, in the absence of clear assurances of change by the executive branch of the Government, Congress has the duty to write safeguards and limitations into the authorization and appropriations bills. The President does not have a constitutional right of the unlimited discretion in the spending of the taxpayers' money on foreign aid.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles, entitled "Cambodia's Sihanouk Threatens To Form Alliance With Red China" and "Soviet Assures Algeria of Help" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 30, 1963]

Cambodia's Sihanouk Threatens To Form Alliance With Red China

(By Antoine Yared)

Phnom Penh, Cambodia, December 29.—Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodia's Chief of State, threatened today to sign an alliance with Communist China unless the West guarantees Cambodian neutrality.

If the West refuses, Sihanouk said, "We will be obliged to renounce our neutrality and negotiate a formal alliance with China."

Sihanouk charged the United States with opposing his plans for Cambodian neutrality and declared, "The American imperialists consider that we will not be independent unless we accept U.S. control of our national life."

In a policy speech opening a 3-day national congress, the Prince told 10,000 persons jammed into an open-air stadium: "We owe our survival only to the determined support and the firm promise of intervention in our favor by the People's Republic of China."

Sihanouk also made public today a speech he delivered Thursday in which he disclosed that China had offered to give Cambodia "a large quantity of armaments," but he gave no details.

"Cambodia has no material means to prove its gratitude to China," he declared. "Therefore, we shall continue to raise our voice to defend the rights of this great power."

He described China as peace loving and defended it against charges of expansionist aims.

In threatening today to negotiate a formal alliance with Peking, Sihanouk also held out hope that the West will agree to his demands for an international conference to guarantee Cambodian sovereignty.

"We only aspire to live in peace and in good friendship with all countries," he added.

Sihanouk has demanded a neutrality conference similar to the 14-nation Geneva Conference that guaranteed the neutrality of neighboring Laos.

His proposal was greeted with alarm by two other neighbors, wartorn South Vietnam and pro-Western Thailand. They denounced his bid as playing into Communist hands.

Sihanouk stopped just short of severing relations with the United States November 19 when he announced he would accept no more American aid and ordered U.S. economic and military personnel to leave Cambodia.

Washington has said it would study Sihanouk's demands for formal neutrality guarantees. Britain has endorsed the proposal.

In Saigon, South Vietnam's Foreign Ministry issued a communique today saying it would not participate in any international conference on Cambodian neutrality. It said the conference would be exploited by Communist propaganda and do Cambodia no good.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 30, 1963]

Soviet Assures Algeria of Help—Promise of Aid in Achieving an Independent Economy Follows Moscow Talks

Moscow, December 29.—The Soviet Union promised today to help Algeria realize plans for an independent national economy.

The pledge was made in a joint Soviet-Algerian communique published tonight by Tass, the Soviet press agency, 24 hours after an Algerian delegation had left for a brief visit to Belgrade, Yugoslavia, before returning home.

No aid figure was mentioned but informed sources indicated that a credit of 90 million rubles, or about $100 million, was assured the country last fall. This is substantially less than the assistance granted by France.

The Algerian delegation received extremely cordial treatment during its 10-day stay in the Soviet Union. The trip included receptions, excursions through the country and visits with Premier Khrushchev.

ALGERIANS RETURN HOME

ALGIERS, December 29.—The 50-man Algerian delegation returned last night from the Soviet Union.

The group published a communique saying that Algeria and the Soviet Union would continue to fight colonialism and imperialism, work toward general nuclear disarmament, and cooperate in economic affairs.

Meanwhile, the Algiers radio had harsh words for Britain and the United States. The Government-run station charged in a broadcast that the British had deliberately provoked the present crisis in Cyprus.

The radio also charged that "the government of President Johnson has made its first attack on Cuba by sending anti-Castro pirates to destroy a Cuban ship."

Yesterday Cuba charged in a statement that U.S. Central Intelligence Agency saboteurs blew up a Soviet-built PT boat December 22 in Siquanea Bay of the Isle of Pines. The statement called this the Johnson administration's first act of aggression against Cuba.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the direction which our foreign aid program should take is recommended in an article which appeared in the Fort Dodge, Iowa, Messenger, on December 23. Two words aptly sum up this direction: "self-help." If we can provide the impetus to self-help for those in the underdeveloped nations by providing them the tools to improvement of their lot, they will have a future of freedom and hope. The article reports on the activities of an African student at Wartburg College in Iowa. This young student believes self-help is the key to improving methods of production of farmers in his country of Kenya. He hopes to furnish farmers with rebuilt machinery obtained through Self-Help, Inc., a Waverly, Iowa, organization designed to provide low-cost equipment to farmers in developing nations.

With such an attitude, I believe that Ernest Abajah will succeed in his goal. It is refreshing to see that this future leader of Kenya does not feel that all his nation's problems can be solved through grants from the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "He Takes 'Self-Help' Seriously" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE TAKES SELF-HELP SERIOUSLY

WAVERLY.—A young African student at Wartburg College is taking the term "self-help" seriously by trying to aid some fellow Kenyan farmers to improve their methods of production.

He is Ernest Abajah, a senior business administration and economics student who came to Wartburg from the Nyajouk Primary School in Kenya.

Abajah says he hopes to start a cooperative for the farmers and supply the cooperative with agricultural equipment.

The first step in his project is seeking funds to buy renovated machinery from Waverly's Self-Help, Inc., an organization dedicated to rebuilding equipment for low-cost sale to farmers in developing nations.

Thus far, the young Kenyan said, he has received $4,000 from the Maytag Foundation. He has letters out to 24 other foundations and philanthropic organizations.

Abajah said he plans to continue his letterwriting until he has the $20,000 he believes is needed to start and supply four cooperative farm units of 200 acres each.

A NEW YEAR MESSAGE—ARTICLE "ALL THE WAY ACROSS" PROVIDES FAITH FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the lengthy 1st session of the 88th Congress closes today. It has been a year of effort, of excitement, of partial failure, and of extreme sadness. The latter is understandable with the death of President John Kennedy.

On the eve of a new year we weigh the results of 1963, with its joys, its sorrows, and its challenges.

We examine and evaluate events which have occurred and the lessons we may have learned because of the truism that "hindsight is better than foresight."

There is a promise in the tomorrows—a new and strengthend spirit—a sense of service. These are elements that I sense as we depart from this Senate Chamber for a few days of rest and recreation and reflection.

Yesterday, in reading "Signs of the Times," a monthly magazine, I was sustained and given a mental and spiritual lift. The article, in the January 1964 issue, is by Sanford T. Whitman. I commend its message, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"ALL THE WAY ACROSS"—A NEW YEAR MESSAGE

(By Sanford T. Whitman)

It was a happy occasion, that evening hour on the vine-hung porch. Four friends of many years relaxed in the fatly cushioned rocking chairs, watching the day die, living again the times that used to be. The old man of the mountain, acknowledged patriarch of the butte country. His wife. Their two guests—former neighbors, now in retirement and visiting again the scenes and renewing the friendships of other years.

There were so many things to talk about: Children, grandchildren, young people grown up and gone away, old people gone to their final rest, aprons and flowers and bees, jellies and jams, gardens and picnics, summer droughts and winter sou'westers. After the limited horizons of apartment living, the visitors were overjoyed at the immensity of the panorama spread out below. And city lights offer no comparison to the star-studded splendor of a mountain night.

As the afterglow began to fade beyond the lofty domes and pitched-up ridges of the mountains to the west, the conversation turned to current events and the days ahead. The friends from the city were not hesitant to express an inner fear of what the future might hold for them.

Not for nought had this man of the high country lived his years on the humpbacked butte that dominated the central plain of the valley. His observant eye, his teachable mind, his meditative heart, and his unhurried pace of life had made him wise beyond his station. This matter of strength for the days ahead was a problem he himself had met and solved many years ago.

"No need to be anxious about the future," he said with quiet humility.

His guests were incredulous, yet eager to discover the source of such confidence.

"The days before us are like yonder mountains in the gathering night," he said. "High, dark, mysterious, formidable. Visible only in silhouette. Apparently impassable."

His guests did not immediately grasp his meaning, and he went on to explain.

"Men have built a modern highway across those mountains. And God has provided a way through the years to come. We cannot see the road that men have constructed—it's too far away, too dark. Because we can't see the road doesn't prove it isn't there. So with the road that God has made.

"The secret of getting to the other side is not that we can see the end from the beginning. The important thing is that we keep jogging along—a mile, a day at a time. No road will ever get us anywhere unless we use it."

How very true. To human vision the heights before us are untracked and untrackable. To human wisdom the difficulties are insurmountable, the high walls impassable. To human strength a crossing is out of the question. From the dangers, perils, and terrors which confront us on every side, there is no human escape, no passage around, over, under, or across.

And yet, hidden from mortal view, known only to God and, to us, visible only by faith, there is a way across. Long ago it was blueprinted and prepared. Today it is waiting. It begins right where we are and continues unbrokenly to the other side. It is the way of personal surrender to God and obedience to His will.

No road that man builds crosses a range of mountains in a straight line. Neither does the road that God has built. It turns and twists. It goes up and down. It bridges wild canyons. At times it seems narrow and steep. Sometimes it goes around, sometimes it goes over the precipitous walls. But at last it threads through the ultimate pass and leads down to the eternal plains beyond.

It goes all the way across.

It is not necessary that we see all the curves and ascents and dangers today. Indeed, it is better that we do not. It is enough, and it is best, that we see only 1 day—1 mile—at a time; that we rest in God's love as we walk by faith.

"Jesus saith, * * * I am the way, the truth, and the life," John 14: 6.

"Let not your heart be troubled," verse 1.

The important point is that we keep jogging along. For no road, not even God's road to Heaven and home, will get us anywhere unless we use it.

"THE KENNEDY STAR"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a poem written on the occasion of the death of President Kennedy be printed in the RECORD. It is titled: "The Kennedy Star," and was written by Rex Trowbridge of Sisters, Oreg.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KENNEDY STAR

There's a new star in heaven tonight,
An orb in outer space—silvery bright:
Symboled for all the world to see,
A martyr's mark, the light of liberty.

There's a new star in heaven tonight,
Triumph of right o'er the devil's might:
The roll of muffled drums, flags unfurled;
"Ring Freedom's Bell!" heartbeat of the
world.

Bells for our martyr—ring,
Marking mankind's travail:
"Oh death, where is thy sting?"
God's mercy will prevail.

"Flame of freedom," in heaven tonight,
Beacon of hope, and celestial light:
Let your heart be thrilled anew—
"The Kennedy Star" is shining for you.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY MR. ALEX RADIN TO THE WASHINGTON PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICTS' ASSOCIATION OF SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech given on December 12, 1963, to the Washington Public Utility Districts' Association in Seattle, Wash., by Mr. Alex Radin, general manager of the American Public Power Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY ALEX RADIN, GENERAL MANAGER, AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., BEFORE ANNUAL MEETING OF WASHINGTON PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICTS' ASSOCIATION, SEATTLE, WASH., DECEMBER 12, 1963

Many things of great importance to your organization and to the Northwest have happened since your last annual meeting. Construction was begun on the Hanford atomic powerplant, and our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy, who played such an important part in the authorization of this project, was on hand to make the principal address at the ground-breaking ceremonies. The Bonneville marketing area bill has been approved by both the Senate and the House, with only one major difference—the Westland amendment—separating the conferees and preventing final agreement on the bill. Improvements were made in the Bonneville payout procedure, and the Bonneville marketing area was extended into southern Idaho. Oral argument was held by the Federal Power Commission on the Washington Public Power Supply System's application to build the Nez Perce project, and it is likely that the Commission will issue its decision shortly—perhaps before the end of the year. Great progress was made in securing Federal appropriations for interties between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest, tying together three great Federal power systems—those of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Central Valley project in California, and the Colorado River storage project.

But the event of overriding importance for the entire country if not for the world was the tragic assassination of President Kennedy. Thus, many things have changed in Washington just within the period since November 22. President Kennedy is dead. Lyndon Johnson is our new Chief Executive. While major principles undoubtedly will remain the same, it seems inevitable that there will be some changes in policies, practices and personalities in the Federal Government, for no two men could be expected to conduct the office of the Presidency in precisely the same manner.

Despite conjecture about people and programs, there is a strong sense of continuity in the transition of leadership. The distance between Boston and Austin may be great in terms of geography, but not necessarily in terms of philosophy. President Kennedy took pride in the fact that his administration had not permitted "another Hells Canyon blunder." President Johnson actively supported the high Hells Canyon Dam during his tenure in the Senate, and he had an excellent voting record on public power and rural electrification issues during his long service both in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

He cast a number of votes in favor of appropriations for Bonneville transmission lines, including those of a controversial nature. Twice he voted for authorization of a high Hells Canyon Dam as a Federal project. He voted in favor of TVA steamplants and TVA revenue bond legislation, and in opposition to the Dixon-Yates contract. He voted to authorize the Colorado River storage project. He indicated his support for local as well as Federal public power by voting for Senator MAGNUSON's amendment to authorize construction of Priest Rapids Dam by local public agencies, and for development of the Niagara project by the Power Authority of the State of New York. He voted in favor of the Gore-Holifield bill authorizing $400 million and directing AEC to construct full-scale reactors. He has a strong record in support of REA appropriations, and many times has spoken out in favor of the rural electrification program.

Thus, President Johnson has a well-established voting record on issues of concern to this group. It is not 100 percent as we would see it, but it is certainly strongly sympathetic to the programs we have espoused for full development of the Nation's water and power resources.

The unity of purpose which has been exhibited by President Johnson in assuming his high office reemphasizes in clear, compelling fashion a lesson which we in the public power movement have learned on dozens of different battlefields: If we continue to push forward objectives prepared in the past and tested by time, we can ultimately secure the solid support which is essential to success in any endeavor.

Our goal has been, and still is, more power at lower cost for all Americans. This is one reason we support Federal multiple-purpose water projects including hydroelectric features. This is why we advance the idea of common carrier transmission facilities tying together great river basin systems. This is why we fight for the right of citizens' groups to form their own utility and supply themselves with electricity, if they desire to do so.

These programs for which many of you have struggled and won were implemented not simply because they happened to be good politics, but because they were good public policy. Every taxpayer and every ratepayer has a stake in insuring that the power potential of falling water at a damsite is not wasted or given away for exploitation. The 8,600-mile regional grid maintained by the Bonneville Power Administration and the postage stamp rate it permits are benefits to jobholders in every corner of the Northwest. Each homeowner and parent in the State of Washington is aided by the work of your public utility districts and other local public agencies in reducing residential and school rates by action and example.

Because these programs are good public policy, they have won backing from all across the country. The vote of a Congressman from New York City may be essential for the building of a dam on the Columbia River, nearly 3,000 miles from his home, just as TVA was a concept fostered by a Senator from Nebraska. The economic leverage of inexpensive electricity is an idea supported by businessmen and scholars who may never see or hear of Bonneville Dam. Support for the principles of PUD's comes from union members in States throughout the Union.

And because these plans and projects furthered a common cause, representatives of consumer-owned electric systems from Florida to Maine, from Massachusetts to Texas and California, have contributed a portion of their time, effort, and prestige to help insure their implementation. Among the stanchest defenders of the preference clause are men who do not expect to ever buy or sell a kilowatt-hour of Federal power.

One of the major power issues before the current Congress is the proposed interconnection of the Northwest and the Southwest.

All parties to the controversy agree that such a tie is not only technically feasible and desirable, but also that it possesses enormous economic potential. Studies show that extra-high-voltage transmission facilities could pay for themselves in 10 short years. Estimated benefit-cost ratios run as high as 4 to 1. A hydroelectric project which could show this kind of values would be considered a rare find. The lucrative nature of this interconnection is indicated by the fact that no less than seven separate non-Federal proposals have been submitted for construction of all or part of the needed facilities.

All parties interested in the intertie agree that it will be built. Its possibilities for beneficial use are extensive. It would permit sale in California and the Southwest of energy surplus to the needs of the Northwest; last year, Federal dams on the Columbia River and its tributaries spilled water that could have produced $33 million worth of power at standard BPA rates—a sum almost twice the BPA deficit for that year. It would allow sale of the Northwest's excess peaking capacity. It would provide a means of obtaining Southwest off-peak steam to firm up substantial quantities of Northwest secondary power. It would encourage exchanges of power to take advantage of diversity in peak loads between regions.

All parties involved in the intertie proposals agree that the Northwest should be assured protection against the draining of one of the region's richest resources—its hydroelectric potential—developed and undeveloped.

What all parties do not agree upon is who should build these intertie facilities.

Our association has supported Federal construction of this regional connection. No other individual entity or combination can provide the same financial advantages—either to the Federal Government or non-Federal users. Three major Federal power systems—BPA, the Central Valley project in California, and Federal dams in the Colorado River Basin—could be linked for mutual benefit of all affected areas, and the greatest possible return on taxpayer investment in existing projects. Bulk of the exportable surplus power in the Northwest is at Federal dams. Federal facilities would be common carrier, available to all at cost. Prevention of monopoly could be assured.

While I believe that Federal interties offer the greatest advantages to electric consumers and to the national welfare, we are realistic enough to know that there are obstacles yet in the way of securing final approval and appropriations for Federal lines. For this reason I am pleased that consideration is being given by local public agencies and rural electric co-ops to alternative proposals for construction of interties by consumer-owned groups, in the event that we do not achieve complete success for the Federal lines. The study and consideration of these alternatives by consumer-owned utilities should not, however, diminish in any way our continued support for the Federal lines, which still offer the best alternative.

During the last few weeks there have been encouraging actions in the Congress which have advanced the prospects for efficient, effective, and equitable interconnection. But many obstacles remain. The House of Representatives adopted an amendment to the regional preference bill which requires new authorization for any Federal intertie.

To my knowledge this amendment was not requested by the people of the Northwest, although it was sponsored by Congressman WESTLAND of your State. I have seen no public statement to indicate that either private or public power spokesmen in this region asked for this block to construction of these lines. To my knowledge it was not sought by consumer or producer interests of the area; in fact, I see no way by which this provision would be of benefit to the Northwest. It is apparently an appendage added to a bill upon which you had previously secured agreement throughout the Northwest. The only interests that it serves are those of the private power companies of California. I believe that you should vigorously oppose this amendment.

Why is the amendment objectionable?

This amendment is not germane to S. 1007, which would define the primary marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration and establish ground rules for the transfers of power between the Northwest and other areas.

No hearings were ever held on the amendment so that opponents might have an opportunity to present their side of the case.

The amendment is prejudicial to Federal construction of an intertie but favors non-Federal construction.

It weakens the bargaining position of the Secretary of the Interior in trying to obtain the best possible arrangements for the Federal Government and preference customers.

The amendment constitutes a deauthorization act. It takes away existing authority of the Department of the Interior to build feasible and desirable transmission lines.

It is a block to the most effective marketing of northwest surplus power, and can only delay realization of maximum revenues needed to reduce and eliminate the BPA deficit.

Full congressional review of intertie proposals has been carried out by the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate. These committees recommended appropriation of $8.5 million to initiate construction, subject to approval of S. 1007. But retention of this amendment will kill Congress beneficial action.

The effect of the amendment is simple to grasp. What would happen if every transmission line proposed by the Bonneville Power Administration were subject to individual legislative review—in addition to passing through the normal appropriations process? What if each transmission proposal had to gain approval by the House and Senate twice? The opportunity for killing off an advantageous program is automatically doubled.

Furthermore, is it not possible that the Westland amendment could be a double-edged sword? If it is logical for Congress to specifically authorize as well as appropriate funds for lines outside of the Bonneville area, could it not be argued later by opponents of your program that Congress also should be required to authorize transmission lines within the Bonneville area? These are the types of issues that arise when this Pandora's box is opened.

There are many outside your region who wish to work with you in creating an intertie which will aid all parties. I do not believe they seek to steal Northwest power; they want to buy your surplus and have agreed to accept the protections which you believe are needed. They look forward to exchanges of power which will be of help to every participant—and this is undoubtedly the long-range future of such a tie.

I urge that you continue to strengthen your contacts with your friends in these other areas and work together for a program which will prove of value to everyone. This is the kind of thing which public power has stood for in the past, and for which your own organization has worked so diligently.

It is a cliche, but worth repeating, even so: In unity there is strength. Unless all can benefit, then everyone may suffer.

Net benefits to the Northwest for this interconnection could run as high as $872 million over the next 50 years. The Southwest could realize net benefits of up to $883 million over the same period.

It is estimated that revenues to Bonneville Power Administration in the first 10 years would average $24.5 million annually. In a region facing the first boost in Federal power rates since 1937, this is a meaningful figure, and represents a goal which I believe is worthy of your wholehearted support.

Reflecting now upon the intertie issue, my thoughts go back to a dramatic talk given by Glenn Lee, publisher of the Tri-City Herald, at a dinner after the groundbreaking ceremonies for the Hanford project. With his typical enthusiasm Glenn painted a vivid word picture of his dreams of a western empire stretching from Alaska to Mexico—a prosperous empire that could be the Ruhr of the West. It seemed to me, as Glenn spoke, that the Pacific Northwest, with its vast hydroelectric resources, its coal deposits and its great potential for atomic power, could be the hub of this western empire. But it could become this hub only if its great power resources are interconnected with those to the north, the east, and the south. Thus, in my opinion, the interties are a key to your area's future development. The kind of dream pictured for you by Glenn Lee has been transformed into reality in the past by the great leaders of your area and of your own organization. I am confident that you will have the insight, the tenacity, and the dedication to the public good that will make this new dream a reality, too.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 244), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committee authorized by law, by concurrent action, of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 21; Tuesday, December 24; and Friday, December 27, 1963; was dispensed with.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, your committee just appointed to join a similar committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the Congress is ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them, anticipating this situation, has heretofore so notified the President, and he informed us that he had no further communication to make to the Congress at this session.

The President seemed to be in good spirits, good health, and full of vim, vigor, and vitality.

STATEMENT OF APPRECIATION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns, I wish to take this occasion to pay a personal compliment to my distinguished colleague the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. When I speak of the record of this Congress, I do not speak of a Democratic record, nor do I speak of a Republican record. I speak of a record made by the entire Senate. No one could have been more cooperative, more understanding, and more tolerant than the distinguished minority leader. To name only two of the occasions which come to my mind, one was the nuclear test ban treaty, and the other the bill providing financial participation in the United Nations. No one could have been more understanding, more cooperative, and more patriotic in his outlook than my distinguished colleague.

I consider myself extremely fortunate to have the privilege to sit opposite him and to work with him in behalf of the Nation. I take this occasion publicly to thank him for all that he has done to make this task more tolerable and easier than it has been in years gone by.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand adjourned sine die.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), Monday, December 30, 1963, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 248, the Senate adjourned sine die.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of House Concurrent Resolution 249, the Acting President pro tempore, on December 31, 1963, signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment,

notified the Secretary of the Senate that on December 30, 1963, he had approved and signed the following Senate bills and joint resolution:

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier and Paula Bouvier;

S. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grun (Susanne Roth);

S. 1175. An act to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

S. 1319. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents;

S. 1838. An act for the relief of Hannah Robbins;

S. 2311. An act to provide for the preparation and printing of compilations of materials relating to annual national high school and college debate topics; and

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week."

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 30, 1963:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Tyler Abell, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice Sidney W. Bishop, elevated.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Sheldon S. Cohen, of Maryland, to be an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

What Is Wrong With the John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, the John Birch Society is in the midst of an all-out campaign to recruit new converts in Idaho. They are stepping up their public meetings, newspaper advertising, and other efforts to attract Idahoans into the society.

Inasmuch as Idahoans are writing to me inquiring just what is wrong with the John Birch Society since it is supposedly anti-Communist, I include at this point in the RECORD an open letter to me published on November 11 in the Blackfoot News and my answering letter on this subject:

[From the Blackfoot News, Nov. 11, 1963]

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESSMAN HARDING

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The press has devoted a lot of energy toward denunciation of the John Birch Society during the past 2 years. So have you and many of your colleagues. There must be a lot of information about the Birchers that the average newspaper reader has not had an opportunity to glean.

My point is this: If the Birch Society is as despicable as the news media would have us believe, we are entitled to know what the aims of the society are. I am assuming that your outspoken criticism of the John Birch Society comes from a precise knowledge of their aims and desires.

Would you please explain the creed of this society so that the "intelligent" people of southern Idaho can become as well informed as yourself and possibly join you in their denunciation.

MAX COVINGTON.

BLACKFOOT, IDAHO.

Mr. MAX COVINGTON,
Blackfoot, Idaho.

DEAR MAX: When I returned from Idaho to Washington after the assassination of President Kennedy, I found your open letter to me published in the Blackfoot News on November 11 on my desk. I have purposely delayed answering until after the official mourning period for our beloved President had expired.

In a speech I delivered in the House of Representatives on September 25, I included a brief of Mr. Welch's book, "The Politician," which had been prepared by an outstanding young Republican attorney who is a member of the same 70's Quorum that I am a member of in the Potomac Stake. I believe that his brief exposes what is wrong with the first of the John Birch standard works, "The Politician." In this book Mr. Welch has made radical accusations. Not only has he accused many loyal Americans of being Communists, but he has also charged that the Congress, the executive branch, and the Pentagon itself are in the control of the Communists.

I quote directly from Welch's book, "The Politician":

"This door to betrayal is known to be wide open; and nobody—in Congress, in the executive branch, in the Pentagon itself—nobody even dared to try to close it. Those who want it kept open are too completely in charge. And this is just one more indication of how powerful the Communist influence has now become in almost all of our Federal agencies" (p. 285).

Even more radically stated, Mr. Welch accused President Roosevelt of being used by the Communists without his knowledge, President Truman of being used by the Communists with his knowledge, and President Eisenhower of being a Communist. Again I quote from "The Politician":

"The Communists can now use all the power and prestige of the Presidency of the United States to implement their plans, just as fully and even openly as they dare. They have arrived at this point by three stages. In the first stage, Roosevelt thought he was using the Communists, to promote his personal ambitions and grandiose schemes. Of course, instead, the Communists were using him; but without his knowledge or understanding of his place in their game. In the second stage, Truman was used by the Communists, with his knowledge and acquiescence, as the price he consciously paid for their making him President. In the third stage, in my own firm opinion, the Communists have one of their own actually in the Presidency. For this third man, Eisenhower, there is only one possible word to describe his purposes and his actions. That word is treason" (p. 268).

Max, I want to point out that even though I feel it necessary to call to the attention of the people in my district these harsh, extreme, un-American statements of Mr. Welch and the John Birch Society, I feel no hatred in my heart toward them. Rather, the feeling that I have for the leaders of this society is one of pity. I realize that they hate me for I have received many letters telling me so. But I do not hate them; I pity them.

The above two quotations are directly from Mr. Welch's book, "The Politician." This book and "The Blue Book" comprise the primary standard works of the Birch Society.

An outstanding eastern Idaho radio executive has carefully read and reviewed "The Blue Book" for his listeners. Gene Shumate, the owner-manager of station KRXK at Rexburg, Idaho, is a courageous, loyal American. Our political philosophies are often in disagreement, and we have taken turns attacking the views of each other over his radio station, yet I have the highest regard for Mr. Shumate and for the fine service that he is rendering to his listeners. Mr. Shumate is well aware of the fact that an informed people will remain a free people. That is why he attempted to inform his listeners of the contents of the John Birch Society's "The Blue Book."

I would like to refer you to those portions of Mr. Shumate's broadcasts on November 10, and November 17, referring to "The Blue Book."

"KRXK EDITORIAL—NOVEMBER 10, 1963

"Let me tell you something about the John Birch Society. And most of what I tell you will be from 'The Blue Book,' the primer of the society. I secured a copy on loan from the library of the Idaho State University in Pocatello. The copies are hard to come by.

"John Birch, himself, died several years before the founding of the society that carries—as far as I am concerned, 'besmirches'—his name. He was an American, a Baptist missionary, in China, and he was killed by the Chinese Communists. He was a martyr for Christianity.

"A book was written about him by Robert Welch. Welch was an unsuccessful political aspirant in Massachusetts, but a successful businessman.

"On December 9, 1958, he called a meeting of 11 men in Indianapolis. It was at this meeting the John Birch Society was formed. The 11 men are not named in 'The Blue Book.' The books itself is a compilation of lectures he gave during the 2 days with the 11 men.

"In his introductory remarks, he made such statements as, 'To anybody who has watched the way the administration moved heaven and earth to keep McCarthy from getting at the Army Loyalty Board * * * it was clear that treason * * * is widespread and rampant in our high army circles.'

"I am not going to attempt to quote all the statements in their entirety, because they are too long for listening. You could charge me with quoting out of context, but I don't think I am missing the essentials of Welch's remarks.

"His rather lengthy introduction deals with the danger of communism in this country. He says at one place, 'This octopus (meaning communism) is so large that its tentacles now reach into all of the legislative halls, all of the union labor meetings, a majority of the religious gatherings, and most of the schools of the whole world.'

"Welch deals with religion to a great extent and has one entire chapter on his religious philosophy. It is obvious that anyone who is not a Fundamentalist is suspect to him. Also in the introduction, to prove his point about how communism has taken over this country, he said, 'Fully one-third of the services in at least the Protestant churches of America are * * * watering down the faith of our fathers * * * converting Christianity into a so-called social gospel * * * an advocacy of the welfare state by Socialist politicians. Some actually use their pulpits to preach outright communism.'

"I will interrupt here to explain that apparently a Communist is anyone whom Welch calls a Communist.

"I will also interrupt to say that much of what Welch says about communism and about government can be agreed with. It's when he comes to how evils should be coped with that the John Birch Society becomes frightening. As I said last week, 'I am reading the "Blue Book" because 40 years ago I missed "Mein Kampf" and I don't want to make the same mistake again.'

"Section 4 of the 'Blue Book' is entitled, 'So, Let's Act.' In this section he for the first time outlines what the John Birch Society should do. He has 10 points. Again, I will abbreviate in the interest of time.

"Point 1. Establish reading rooms; provide 100 books of anti-Communist nature. He said, 'How many books each of these reading rooms would have, especially which books, and under what arrangements, would of course have to be tightly controlled from headquarters.'

"You will notice throughout the 10 points how 'headquarters' is to make the decisions.

"Point 2. 'We would see that the circulation of the conservative periodicals was expanded as rapidly as it could be done without too much waste.' The periodicals he mentions are: American Opinion, published by Welch, National Review, Dan Smoot Report, and Human Events. The society would see to it that these periodicals are placed in doctors' and dentists' offices, fraternities, and barbershops, but the barbershop proprietors would have to sign a pledge they would display the magazines.

"Point 3. Support, maintain, and increase the number of stations using such radio programs as Fulton Lewis, Clarence Manion, and dozens of more localized broadcasters throughout the country. 'This would take the form of encouraging sponsors by both patronage of their products and letters of approval; of praising stations and networks for carrying such programs; of getting together groups to hear such broadcasts; by helping to raise money when absolutely necessary to keep such programs or present stations and get them on more.'

"Point 4. 'We would institute the organized planning and control to make full and effectively, coordinate use of the powerful letterwriting weapon that lies so ready at hand. The letterwriting of subgroups should not be left to the haphazard or halfhearted following by the members of hopeful pleas or suggestions. It should be definitely planned, directed, and the amount and promptness of participation constantly checked and evaluated by a central headquarters or director.'

"Point 5. 'We should organize fronts—little fronts, big fronts, temporary fronts, permanent fronts, all kinds of fronts.' Welch gives some examples: 'Committee for Withdrawal of Recognition.' 'Committee To Protest the Firing of Medford Evans,' Evans was a professor of Northwestern State College in Louisiana, 'A Petition To Impeach Earl Warren,' 'A Committee To Investigate Communist Influences at Vassar College,' 'Women Against Labor Union Hoodlumism,' 'A Petition to the Airplane Pilots Association To Grow Up,' and 'Please, Mr. President, Don't Go.' The last was in reference to a summit conference.

"Point 6. Start shocking the American people into a realization of what is happening. Welch gave an example of what he would do. He said, 'There is the head of one of the great educational institutions in the East whom at least some of us believe to be a Communist. Even with $100,000 to hire sleuths to keep him and his present contacts under constant surveillance for awhile, and to retrace every detail of his past history, I doubt if we could prove it on him. But, with just $5,000 to pay for careful research, I believe we could get all the material needed for quite a shock. Of course we would have to satisfy ourselves completely as to whether our guess had been correct, from the preliminary research, before going ahead with the project and spending that much money. But if we are right, and with the research job done, we would run in the magazine an article consisting entirely of questions to this man, which would be devastating in their implications. The question technique, when skillfully used in this way, is mean and dirty. But the Communists we are after are meaner and dirtier, and too slippery for you to put your fingers on them in the ordinary way.'

"Even if I agreed with the rightfulness of the other 10 points—and I don't agree with any of them—I would recoil from such a society as could accept point 6. It is the most un-American of them all.

"Point 7. 'Send observers to lectures by those opposing militant anticommunism and have observers confound the speakers.'

"Apparently the same tactic of unanswerable questions would be used here. It should work well in our churches.

"Point 8. 'Organize a lecture bureau made up of prominent people who speak on specific subjects, but which could still carry a strong anti-Communist message. This, like everything else we are talking about, is a matter of planning, supervision, and control.'

"Point 9. Welch was a little vague in this one, I thought, but from what I got out of it the point was to 'extend our body into other countries.'

"Point 10. 'Put our weight into the political scales in this country as fast and as far as we could.'

"Those are the 10 points of action of the John Birch Society. Welch has some ideas on what the ideal government would be. I will get to those next week.

"But let me sign off today with the point again that throughout the 10 steps, the control from headquarters is essential. There must be one guiding genius. Who is this paragon? Welch answered that question to his 11 listeners, too. He said, later in the book, 'Because I know in my own mind, beyond all doubt or question, that without dynamic personal leadership around which the split and frustrated and confused forces on our side can be rallied, rapidly and firmly, we do not have a chance of stopping the Communists before they have taken over our country. It is not that you would choose me, or that I would even choose me, against other possibilities. It is simply that under the pressure of time and the exigencies of our need you have no other choice, and neither do I.'

"That's what he said. That is why I have compared Robert Welch's 'The Blue Book' of the John Birch Society with Adolph Hitler's 'Mein Kampf.'

"KRXK EDITORIAL, NOVEMBER 17, 1963

"Today we continue with the 'Blue Book' of the John Birch Society. Last Sunday I went over the 10 organizational points laid down by Robert Welch in his outline for the 11 men in Indianapolis on December 9, 1958.

"Again, I will devote myself to his book without getting into the strange acts and words of some of his followers; the spitting on Adlai Stevenson, the calling of President Eisenhower and General Marshall Communists, the vitriolic letterwriting to Congressmen and Senators. In 'The Blue Book' Welch does not deal with Eisenhower. He does devote considerable time to the advisability of impeaching Supreme Court Justice Earl Warren. And he does designate himself as the only effective leader of a society that will ultimately rule the country. I will repeat his quote on that subject, 'Because I know in my own mind, beyond all doubt or question, that without dynamic personal leadership around which the split and frustrated and confused forces on our side can be rallied, rapidly and firmly, we do not have a chance of stopping the Communists before they have taken over our country. It is not that you would choose me, or that I would even choose me, against other possibilities. It is simply that under the pressure of time and the exigencies of our need you have no other choice, and neither do I.'

"Mr. Welch spoke well of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER in 1958. First he selected him and then rejected him as the savior of the United States * * * again leaving only himself.

"I am going to quote extensively now. In his chapter on 'Under Positive Leadership' he said, 'BARRY GOLDWATER has political know-how and the painstaking genius to use that know-how with regard to infinite details. He is a superb political organizer, and inspires deep and lasting loyalty. He is absolutely sound in his Americanism, has the political and moral courage to stand by his Americanist principles, and in my opinion can be trusted to stand by them until hell freezes over. I'd love to see him President of the United States, and maybe some day we shall. But does anybody in this room think there is any slightest chance of BARRY GOLDWATER supplying the dynamic overall leadership needed to save this country for anybody to be President of? If so, I think he is still not fully aware of the nature and totality of the forces at work. For GOLDWATER, by the very circumstances of his political success, present prestige, and the expectations of his supporters, will inevitably think and move in terms of political warfare. Even if he personally should reach the point and the understanding of wanting to consider political action as just a part, no matter how important, of much broader overall action, how much chance do you think there is that his friends and supporters would let him step out of the strictly political role in which he has been so successful? How much chance is there that they would let him build and utilize forceful leadership on all of the other fronts where we must fight the Communists? How many of the steps which we discussed yesterday afternoon, and which I am sure must be taken if we are to have any chance at all, do you think you could count on BARRY GOLDWATER's leadership to bring about, no matter how much he was beseeched, and no matter how much he himself came to feel inclined, to do so?'

"Robert Welch in his 'Blue Book' later says, 'As you look more and more carefully into the hopes that have been bred, and the disappointments that have followed, throughout the political performances of these 20 years, you come increasingly to realize the wisdom of the old advice: 'Put not your faith in politicians.' We shall have to use politicians, support politicians, create politicians, and help the best ones we can find to get elected. I am thoroughly convinced, however, that we cannot count on politicians, political leadership, or even political action except as a part of something much deeper and broader, to save us.'

"It seems obvious to me that Robert Welch has no faith in a representative form of government. He has just said as much. But he says more. He says, 'The John Birch Society is to be a monolithic body. A republican form of government or organization has many attractions and advantages, under certain favorable conditions. But under less happy circumstances it lends itself too readily to infiltration, distortion, and disruption. And democracy, of course, in government or organization, as the Greeks and Romans both found out, and as I believe every man in this room clearly recognizes—democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud.

" 'For withstanding the stresses and strains of internal differences and external animosities, throughout changing political climates over long periods of time; for the building of morale and loyalty and a feeling of unified purpose and closely knit strength; for effective functioning in periods of crisis and a permanence of high dedication throughout more peaceful decades; for these and many other reasons, the John Birch Society will operate under completely authoritative control at all levels. The fear of tyrannical oppression of individuals, and other arguments against the authoritarian structure in the form of governments, have little bearing on the case of a voluntary association, where the authoritative power can be exercised and enforced only by persuasion. And what little validity they do have is outweighed by the advantages of firm and positive direction of the Society's energies. Especially for the near future, and for the fight against communism which is the first great task of the Society, it is imperative that all the strength we can muster be subject to smoothly functioning direction from the top. As I have said before, no collection of debating societies is ever going to stop Communist conspiracy from taking us over, and I have no intention of adding another frustrated group to their number. We mean business every step of the way.

"A page later, elaborating on this, Welch said, 'Those members who cease to feel the necessary degree of loyalty can either resign or will be put out before they build up any splintering following of their own inside the Society. As I have said, we mean business every step of the way. We can allow for differences of opinion. We shall need and welcome advice. And we expect to use the normal measure of diplomacy always called for in dealing with human beings. But whenever differences of opinion become translated into a lack of loyal support, we shall have short cuts for eliminating both without going through any congress of so-called democratic processes.'

"And with this, I will end the quotations of Robert Welch in 'The Blue Book' of the John Birch Society.

"I wish that this book was in popular distribution. I don't know of many of them available to the public. I borrowed a copy from the Idaho State University Library and must now return it.

"I wish that everyone could and would read it, but I realize that's wishing much too much.

"If I were to review the basic tenets of the John Birch Society, as outlined in 'The Blue Book,' I think I would do it briefly, like this: Communism is evil. A Communist is one whom Robert Welch says is a Communist. The representative form of government is ineffective. Robert Welch is effective. Therefore, Robert Welch should head the Government and the John Birch Society should be the Government. The public is not to be trusted. Therefore, don't trust them. Robert Welch believes in God. And so can you, so long as your God is the same as Robert Welch's.

"So let's all join the storm troopers and live happily ever after."

I recently told a group of high school students to be interested in our government, to investigate the political philosophies of the two parties in order to find which party most nearly matched their own thinking and to become active in it. I counseled them that this was the advice I would give my own son. I would be most proud if, after reading American history and American political thought, he made a decision on his own to be an active worker in the Republican Party. However, naturally I added that I would be even more proud if he decided to become active in the Democratic Party. Both of our two political parties are composed of dedicated Americans working for a better America.

Since the death of our beloved President Kennedy, we have seen the unity that has existed between leaders and elected officials of both the Democrat and Republican Parties.

However, I counseled these students to avoid extremists. The Communist Party U.S.A., the Socialists, the Fair Play for Cuba organization and other extreme left-wing groups have done nothing to build America. In many instances they make their programs appealing to young people, following the Devil's technique of telling 99 truths to get a person to believe 1 lie. But I know that anyone who becomes affiliated with one of these groups, either through deceit, misinformation, or bitterness, will live to regret it.

The same is true of the extremists on the right. We have seen George Lincoln Rockwell and his American Nazi Party, Elijah Muhammad and the Black Muslims, Robert Welch and his John Birch Society, and other extremists who again will use the vicious technique of telling 99 truths to get a person to believe 1 lie that will ruin his life should he accept it.

We have no need of extremism on either end of the political spectrum. It is for this reason, Max, that I have felt it my duty as an elected Representative to speak out against political extremists. After reading "The Politician" and "The Blue Book" which are the standard works of the John Birch Society, I have made the speeches in opposition to the views of the society.

Sincerely yours,

Ralph Harding,
Member of Congress.

Finnish Government Honors Photographer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently a man who has earned the respect of all the Members of the Senate and who is held in deep affection by all of us was signally honored by a nation that has endured centuries of national tragedies but which has always been a nation of indomitable courage.

His Excellency, R. R. Seppala, Ambassador of Finland, presented the Order of the Lion of Finland, Officer First Class, to Mr. Frank Muto, photographer of the Democratic Party at the Capitol, in a ceremony at the Finnish Embassy.

In appreciation for the humanitarian work done by Mr. Muto during the winter war 1939–40, the Finnish Government expressed its gratitude by presenting him with this decoration. Mr. Muto has old ties with Finland. He first arrived there in 1939 at the time of the winter war and stayed there acting as a war correspondent and photographer. Traveling all over the country, he reported about the war and life in Finland during those crucial times. In his efforts to help the Finnish people, Mr. Muto joined the Hoover Finnish Relief Center and gave a helping hand to refugees and others during his travels in the war zones.

Mr. Muto accompanied the then Vice President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson on their successful visit to Finland last September.

Mr. President, we here in the Capitol see every day evidence of Frank Muto's humanity. We rejoice that the people of Finland have taken this opportunity to pay tribute to him for these same qualities.

Congressman Harding Answers Idaho Power Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, the Idaho Power Co. has been conducting an expensive campaign to misinform the people of Idaho about the Bonneville Power Administration.

Idaho Power has spent thousands and thousands of dollars in newspaper advertisements, door-to-door campaigning, and brochures attacking the Bonneville Power Administration. One of their latest little brochures is the following little gem entitled, "Facts You Should Know About the Plan To Bring Bonneville Power to Southern Idaho":

Facts You Should Know About the Plan To Bring Bonneville Power to Southern Idaho

1. Bonneville does not serve homes, farms, stores, offices, schools, shops, or most industries.

2. Bonneville delivers electric power below cost to a few preference customers who profit by tax avoidance.

3. Bonneville is subsidized by taxpayers. It pays no taxes. It has operated at a deficit of about $60 million during the past 5 years.

4. Bonneville will have to ask Congress for an expenditure of about $100 million for

transmission facilities to deliver power to eastern Idaho.

5. There is a surplus of firm power in southern Idaho. Bonneville cannot justify squandering tax money to build duplicating power facilities.

6. Southern Idaho has a better record of industrial development—lower taxes—and far less unemployment than the Northwest areas which have been served by Bonneville for many years.

7. Bonneville power rates are artificial. They produce deficits in spite of taxpayer subsidy, tax avoidance, and access to the Federal Treasury for capital funds.

8. Bonneville power supplants the facilities of taxpaying companies to the detriment of taxing districts such as schools, cities and counties, State and Federal Governments.

9. Bonneville is now taking over reclamation project power, and will sell it below cost to preference customers. This will deprive Idaho reclamation projects of millions in legitimate revenues by subterfuge—the glib assurance that somehow Bonneville will replace these funds from its deficit-ridden operations.

10. There's no magic about Bonneville power. It is an example of the Federal Government in business—replacing taxpaying, investor-owned enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, in order to inform my colleagues and the people of Idaho of the misinformation, innuendoes, and false charges that the Idaho Power Co. is using to propagandize the people of Idaho on this matter, I present the following comments pertaining to each one of their 10 so-called facts:

Answer to Facts You Should Know

1. Bonneville does not serve homes, farms, stores, offices, schools, shops, or most industries.

The Idaho Power Co. seems to be trying to make the point here that as individual users Idahoans will not receive BPA power directly, and hence will not benefit from lower-cost power. The thing to point out is that BPA does, indirectly, serve homes, farms, stores, offices, schools, shops, and all industries, and that its contracts require that the benefits of its low, uniform rates are passed on to the ultimate consumer.

It also should be noted that any time a widely used resource can be made available to an area at a lower cost, the standard of living in the area rises.

The extension of the marketing area introduces an element of competition in southern Idaho. The private utilities there—out of concern that communities may break away and form their own public utilities in the years ahead—will improve their services and maintain the lowest possible rates. This pattern of improved efficiency is especially evident in Washington State, where competition from public utility districts is a beneficial influence. Hundreds of thousands of homeowners, small business proprietors, and other customers save millions of dollars through lower electric rates, and these dollars find their way into local trade channels through the purchase of capital and consumer goods. (This element of competition is very real. Indeed, one utility has one rate in Washington and another higher rate in Oregon where public utility laws are less favorable.)

"2. Bonneville delivers electric power below cost to a few 'preference customers' who profit by tax avoidance."

Bonneville does not sell power below costs. The Bonneville Project Act requires rates which will cover costs. Nor does BPA sell only to a few "preference customers." Besides the customers in southern Idaho presently served through the Bureau of Reclamation, BPA has 119 customers. They include the largest private and public utilities in the Pacific Northwest. Idaho Power is one of these.

It is true that public utilities do not pay income taxes, but this is because they are nonprofit organizations. Their net is plowed back into system improvements or returned to customers through lower rates. There is no profit to tax. But they do pay other taxes, which vary according to the law of the States.

Thus, although taxes paid by public distributors are lower than those of private utilities on an individual comparative basis, public utilities do pay taxes. And although they are nonprofit utilities their tax contribution, such as in the State of Washington, runs into millions of dollars.

One should remember too, that, strictly speaking, no utility—private, public, or cooperative—pays taxes. Only consumers pay taxes. The utility merely serves as tax collector or pipeline for tax collection. Idaho Power Co. doesn't pay its tax bill. Its customers do.

"3. Bonneville is subsidized by taxpayers. It pays no taxes. It has operated at a deficit of about $60 million during the past 5 years."

BPA, of course, pays its own way, with interest, and repays about 80 percent of the cost of the dams in the U.S. Columbia River power system, including substantial assistance to irrigation. During the past 5 years, BPA has used about $60 million of a $79 million surplus, but is still about $20 million ahead of its repayment schedule. These facts are presented in greater detail in BPA's last annual report. This surplus came about because BPA rates were higher than necessary to cover costs. It can be argued with considerable force that the use of this surplus now is a means of returning the overpayments to BPA customers.

"4. Bonneville will have to ask Congress for an expenditure of about $100 million for transmission facilities to deliver power to eastern Idaho."

The feasibility report estimated the cost of an extra-high voltage transmission line from Lewiston to Soda Springs at (1) $81,170,000 for a direct-current line and (2) $77,880,000 for an alternating-current line. The direct-current line would have a capacity of 940,000 kilowatts and the alternating-current line a capacity of 900,000 kilowatts.

The report also shows that annual revenues would repay the cost of these lines. In addition, the two areas would be able to combine their generating facilities to take advantage of diversity in peak loads and save an investment greater than the cost of the line; Idaho has its peak demands for power in the summer and the rest of the BPA marketing area has its peak in winter. Thus the cost of the line would be deferred twice over, first by annual revenues and secondly by a savings in investment.

"5. There is a surplus of firm power in southern Idaho. Bonneville cannot justify squandering tax money to build duplicating power facilities."

The demand for power will exceed the supply in southern Idaho in the next 10 years unless power is imported to the area or steamplants are built. Without a BPA line southern Idaho may expect a seasonal power shortage after 1967 and a year-around shortage after 1972; this statement takes cognizance of all existing and proposed projects of the Federal Government and Idaho Power Co. The needs of 20 electric distributors which now buy power from the Bureau will surpass the available supply from the Bureau in 1964, and it was these customers who first requested Bonneville service to be assured of their future supply. Fourteen of these customers are municipalities or rural electric cooperatives. By 1972 the area's feasible hydroprojects will be built or under construction. In 1972 power from steamplants will be less expensive than power from remaining, less feasible hydrosites, but more expensive than power from existing hydroplants.

In chapter VI under transmission requirements the feasibility report points out that the interchange capacity between southern Idaho and the rest of the Northwest is rather small—250,000 kilowatts. By the summer of 1968, which is the earliest the line could be built, some 400,000 kilowatts of transmission capacity will be needed to coordinate Idaho resources and meet load growth.

"6. Southern Idaho has a better record of industrial development—lower taxes—and far less unemployment than the Northwest areas which have been served by Bonneville for many years."

This bland assertion of industrial growth is false. Tom Roach, president of the Idaho Power Co., in a talk to the Pocatello Chamber of Commerce August 15, 1962, said, "In the 7-year period 1955–61 the new industries locating in southern Idaho and eastern Oregon totaled 116. They furnish employment to approximately 5,500 people."

Roach went on to say that from 1955–61 BPA added three industries and lost one for a net of two. He compared BPA industrial customers, which have electroprocess loads of over 10,000 kilowatts, with the Idaho Power Co.'s industrial customers which except for FMC do not fall in this class. They are mostly small industries. Roach's comparison is not valid, for BPA is primarily a power wholesaler. His statistics, if comparable, should include industrial customers added by distributors in BPA's western area.

The three customers BPA added in this period consumed 3.1 billion kilowatt-hours in 1961. Idaho Power's sales to all of its industrial customers in 1961 totaled 1.3 billion kilowatt-hours.

The industrial growth in Oregon, and especially in Washington, is much greater than that of Idaho Power Co.'s service area. But it is very difficult to make accurate comparisons because of the paucity of figures available. For example, the Washington Department of Commerce and Economic Development hesitates to publish any figures in this regard because of the unreliability of estimates.

Idaho does not have lower taxes. The only fair way to compare taxes is on the basis of the percentage which each person pays from his income to both State and local coffers. The U.S. Bureau of Census publishes these figures on a per capita per $1,000 of income basis. The latest figures are for 1961 when Idaho was ranked 13th among the States. Washington was 19th, Oregon 23d, and Montana 2d.

No competent comparison with regard to unemployment is possible, for Idaho lacks any industrial centers which can compare with Spokane, Seattle, Portland, or Tacoma. Besides, Idaho has had an outmigration and there are no records to show what percentage of these emigrants left to seek jobs in other States.

"7. Bonneville power rates are artificial. They produce deficits in spite of taxpayer subsidy, tax avoidance, and access to the Federal Treasury for capital funds."

BPA rates, of course, must meet repayment obligations and are reviewed by the Federal Power Commission. This point is nothing more than a play on such words as "artificial," "taxpayer subsidy," "tax avoidance," and "access to the Federal Treasury." It is a glittering generality built on fluff. As stated earlier, BPA is still $20 million ahead of its repayment schedule and further it has proposed a program for remaining fiscally sound. A major part of that program is to market surplus power in California, providing legislation is first passed to protect the region's power supply.

"8. Bonneville power supplants the facilities of taxpaying companies to the detriment of taxing districts such as schools, cities and counties, State, and Federal Governments."

BPA does not supplant the facilities of taxpaying companies. It supplements them by broadening and lowering the cost of a vital resource.

In Oregon and Washington the development of the economy that has come about because of low-cost power from the U.S. Columbia River power system has created taxable wealth many times greater than would have existed without the system. The dams were built by the Federal Government at a time when private capital was unwilling and unable to do the job on the scale necessary to assure such priceless added benefits as irrigation and navigation, which by themselves contributed greatly to the growth of the region. It is fortunate the Government built the dams when it did, for the region's supply of electric power played an important role in creating the industrial might that helped to win World War II.

Idaho Power Co. often repeats that 60 percent of the property taxes which it pays goes for school support. Tax payments to schools by electric utilities are important. However, they are only part of the story. The other part has to do with electric rates charged such tax-supported schools. A dollar saved by a school on its electric bill is as valuable for school support as a dollar paid to such a school by the electric utility which serves it.

Recently a lot of emphasis was placed by private power companies in Washington State on taxes paid by them for school support. To keep the record straight the PUD's made an analysis in which they recomputed their power bills to schools using the rates of neighboring private power companies. These recomputed bills were then compared to the actual bills which the schools paid. In most cases the schools received greater benefit from the PUD's savings and tax payments than if they had received a property tax from private power and had been charged private power rates. Idaho Power Co. would suffer by such a comparison, for its rates are substantially higher than the rates of private power companies in the State of Washington.

"9. Bonneville is now taking over reclamation project power, and will sell it below cost to preference customers. This will deprive Idaho reclamation projects of millions in legitimate revenues by subterfuge—the glib assurance that somehow Bonneville will replace these funds from its deficit-ridden operations."

The extension of BPA's marketing area to southern Idaho is compatible with the area's irrigation program. It will not affect the water supply for irrigation, nor will it affect the irrigators' present repayment arrangements. The effect, if any, on their pumping power supplies or rates will be favorable. Irrigation will continue to have priority over power production, just as it does at Grand Coulee Dam, another Bureau project for which BPA markets power.

The extension also will enhance the financing of future reclamation projects by making available a much greater revenue base on which to obtain irrigation assistance. Before the order was issued, BPA was obligated to repay $566,033,000 in irrigation assistance. The obligation for this assistance to irrigation in southern Idaho, which BPA will assume, totals $28,802,000. In other words, the assistance which power gives to irrigation in other parts of the Columbia River Basin is 20 times greater than in southern Idaho.

The combined southern Idaho and main U.S. Columbia River power systems would provide a power revenue for irrigation assistance many times larger than is presently available within southern Idaho alone. The main system has a capital investment in Federal generating facilities 70 times that of southern Idaho. Revenues are 30 times as large. Thus the future of new reclamation projects in southern Idaho should be enhanced rather than hindered by the extension of the marketing area to include all of Idaho.

The total investment in the main system to be repaid from BPA revenues now is about $1.6 billion. The repayment obligation which BPA will assume in southern Idaho is less than 1 percent of this total.

"10. There's no magic about Bonneville power. It is an example of the Federal Government in business—replacing taxpaying, investor-owned enterprises."

In other parts of its service area BPA has not replaced the private power companies, but it has made them more profitable and more efficient. Low-cost power from the Federal system has brought private utility rates down. As these rates came down, sales increased—and so did the companies' profits and the values of their stocks. These companies have not suffered one iota in relation to Idaho Power Co. in terms of profits or stock values. It's pretty hard to beat the combination of lower rates for the consumer and more profits for the company and its stockholders. Based on the evidence elsewhere in the Northwest, the only conclusion is that Idaho Power, its stockholders, and its customers will all benefit from bringing BPA power to southern Idaho.

A savings of $2, $3, or $4 a month to the individual residential customer is considerable by itself. But when you consider that private utilities serve 130,000 Idaho homes, the total is tremendous. If private utility customers in Idaho could get their power for the same price as private utility customers in the Bonneville service area, these Idaho customers would save between $3 and $4.5 million a year. In Oregon the two major private utilities today are selling power to homes for much less than in 1938 when BPA power first became available. Idaho Power Co. is not.

Congress and the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, does the Congress have authority in the field of foreign relations, and if so, does the exercise of that authority in disagreement with the President weaken the United States and its image around the world?

Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill a subject was discussed which, in my judgment, requires further elaboration. Does congressional disagreement with a Presidential recommendation harm "the image and authority of our new President around the world," or would it "weaken the President's authority in dealing with other nations and in consequence weaken the United States," or would it impair the authority of the President who "is the sole repository of that responsibility in the field of foreign affairs"?

The Speaker of the House of Representatives addressed the House and urged defeat of the motion to recommit the conference report on foreign aid appropriations with instructions to deny credit in Communist wheat transactions and said the following:

> Mr. Speaker, I shall make my remarks brief. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] very frankly stated the issue when he said that this question goes right to the point of our foreign policy. Let us pause for a moment and realize the responsibility in the field of foreign policy and where that responsibility mainly lies. Under the Constitution the President of the United States is the sole repository of that responsibility in the field of foreign affairs. (Congressional Record, Dec. 20, 1963, p. 25421.)

Similarly, the majority leader, in urging adoption of the rule waiving points of order against the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill, said the following:

> The real issue here is the image and authority of our new President around the world. Are we going to give Communist and free nations alike the impression that he does not have, in the performance of his responsibilities as the respository of American foreign policy, the complete confidence of the Congress and the American people? President Johnson succeeded to office by succession after a base assassination, and the question in all nations is, do the American people have a leader? Would the Congress want to convey the impression that we would want to tie the President's hands or to limit his authority when we did not do this to either of his predecessors, President Eisenhower or President Kennedy? Any such action would weaken the President's authority in dealing with other nations and in consequence would weaken the United States. (Congressional Record, Dec. 24, 1963, p. 25527.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Casey] disagreed with the proposition that a vote against providing credit for transactions with Communist countries indicated any distrust of the President. He said:

> Mr. Speaker, as the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George] stated, you really are not interested in listening to speeches. But there has been the inference on the floor of this House and in the press that anyone who opposes the administration is showing a distrust of President Johnson. Mr. Speaker, I want this House and I want everyone to know that I will take great issue with anyone who distrusts Lyndon B. Johnson. I would also take great issue with anyone who challenges his ability to fill this high office that he now holds.
>
> But, Mr. Speaker, I have faith in this Congress and in this House, and I take issue with anyone who says that this Congress and this House does not have a right to say something about how our money is going to be spent (Congressional Record, Dec. 24, 1963, p. 25526.)

This proposition was likewise challenged by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] and myself as appears on page 25533 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 24, 1963:

> Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the majority leader saw fit to try to define the standards under which Lyndon Johnson will be declared to be either a strong President or a weak President. In my opinion, whatever he may be called by history will be decided by what he does, and not by what the House of Representatives does. In my opinion, he has the capacity to be a strong President and he will be a strong President, but he does not get to be a strong President because the legislative body rolls over and plays dead for him. He does not get to be a strong President because the legislative branch votes against its own convictions and refuses to stand up to tell him that in this instance we think he is wrong. This is all that we are trying to do, and so help me if I thought that my vote today would blacken the escutcheon of Lyndon Johnson as a strong President of the United States, then I would not vote the way I am going to vote. I do not believe it—I think he is a much stronger man, perhaps, than those who have set what I think is a false standard for Presidential strength.
>
> Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I like what the gentleman has just said. It is in line with what the gentleman from Texas said. There are those who seek to make disagreement the equivalent of distrust. If we must agree with everything that the President says or else be disloyal or weaken our country, I think that is a very dangerous doctrine.
>
> Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to analyze the two propositions advanced by the Speaker and the majority leader. In my opinion, they are grossly erroneous and constitute a dangerous doctrine.

These propositions are:

First. The President is the "sole repository of responsibility in the field of foreign affairs."

Second. Refusal by Congress to grant the President requests for power indicates a lack of "confidence," weakens the President "in dealing with other nations," and damages the "image" of the President and the United States.

The President is the "sole repository of responsibility in the field of foreign affairs."

Nothing in the Constitution provides or even suggests that the President is the "sole repository of responsibility in the field of foreign affairs." The President's constitutional authority in this field, article II, section 2, clause 2, is as follows:

> He shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls. * * *

And the provision in article II, section 3, "he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers."

The Congress, on the other hand, is the repository of the great bulk of governmental power in the field of foreign as well as domestic affairs.

Article I, section 1 of the Constitution provides:

> All legislative Power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

Executive authority in the field of foreign affairs is founded on statutes enacted by the Congress. The execution of such congressional policy is possible only through appropriations made by Congress and derived from revenues which only Congress has the power to levy.

Instead of the President being the "sole repository of power," it is more nearly accurate to say that both the President and the Congress have power in the field of foreign affairs but that by far, the greater part of that power is vested in the Congress.

To say otherwise, would be to indicate that instead of a democracy, we are a dictatorship.

To contend that the enactment of legislation in the field of foreign affairs is beyond the scope of congressional authority and constitutes some sort of invasion of the prerogatives of the President, is a dangerous departure from principles of self-government through elected representatives.

It has always been difficult for me to understand how the chief elected officer of the House of Representatives, sometimes referred to as the greatest and most powerful deliberative legislative body in the world, could fail to uphold the power, prerogatives and dignity of the representative body which he heads and, on the contrary, exaggerate the powers of a coordinate branch of the Government in derogation of the powers of the body for which he speaks.

Refusal by Congress to grant the President's requests for power indicates a lack of "confidence," weakens the President "in dealing with other nations," and damages the "image" of the President and the United States.

Coordinate with the first proposition, is the second one; namely, that the conscientious exercise of the powers vested in the Congress according to convictions of individual Congressmen on national policy based on familiarity with the views and wishes of the American people is an affront to a coordinate branch of the Government whose principal duty is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. This proposition is unacceptable.

The majority leader is the second highest officer of the House of Representatives and, no less than the Speaker it seems to me, he should be at all times jealous of the prerogatives, and vigorously uphold the power of the body of which he is a principal officer. The majority leader, however, seems to suggest that any time the Congress disagrees with the President, fails to grant a request he makes, or in any way expresses its own will if that differs from the recommendations the President may make, it is undermining Presidential authority, creating an unfavorable image of the President and weakening the United States.

What kind of doctrine is this? This philosophy smacks of a totalitarian regime where the elected representatives of the people are rubberstamps. Such a Congress, never daring to disagree with the Executive, would be a sham and a pretense. It would be more honest and fairer to simply abolish a Congress so impotent. Have we gone so far along the road toward totalitarian bureaucracy that the principal leaders of the House of Representatives say in one breath that we have no power in the field of foreign affairs and, in the next breath, that if we use such power as we may have to disagree with the Executive, we are undermining the strength of the United States in dealing with other countries?

Report of Activities of the Committee on the District of Columbia, 1st Session, 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on December 19 I presented to the Senate a preliminary report of the activities of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia during the 1st session, 88th Congress. I now desire to supplement that report with a full review in detail of the committee's activities for that period of time.

However, before I do this, may I extend to my colleagues on this committee my appreciation for their helpfulness and assistance in our work. I believe that they are deserving of the gratitude of the entire Congress, the people of the District of Columbia, and the people of the entire country for the hours they spend in tending to the business of the Nation's Capital City while carrying on their other major activities incident to their service in the Congress. May I further express my deep appreciation to my subcommittee chairmen who gave of their time and energy; namely, the very effective and hardworking senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is chairman of the Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety Subcommittee; the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], whose energies and skills and experience in municipal government have been invaluable to our committee as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee; and my warm friend and the capable junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], who has carried a major load of the committee's work as chairman of the Business and Commerce Subcommittee, during his first year as a Member of the Senate. To the other committee members, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], whose long service, both in the Senate and the House, made his work most valuable to the committee; the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], whose past service in the House has been most useful to the committee; and to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], whose experience in the House of Representatives and in the legislature of his home State has done much to assist the committee with its many problems, I wish to express my sincere thanks for the hours they gave to our committee.

I would also like to express my deep appreciation for the cooperation I received personally as committee chairman from the Honorable JOHN MCMILLAN, chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia and the individual members of his committee. Likewise, I wish to commend the cooperation and assistance that the staff members of the House District Committee have extended to the staff members of my committee during this session of Congress.

The Committee on the District of Columbia received for consideration in the 1st session, 88th Congress, the following:

Senate bills	88
Senate resolutions	1
Senate joint resolutions	3
House bills	34
Nominations	3
Grand total	129

During the session, there were reported to the Senate from the committee 18 Senate bills and 12 House bills.

Of the 34 House bills referred to the Senate, 21 are pending before the committee. Seventeen bills and acts have become public law. Twelve Senate-passed bills are pending before the District of Columbia Committee of the House.

Twenty-nine hearings were held by subcommittees on Senate bills, and 13 hearings were held by subcommittees on House bills.

The full committee held 17 hearings on bills and nominations and 6 joint hearings with the District of Columbia Committee of the House.

The full committee met in executive session on four occasions.

Number of bills, resolutions, acts and nominations referred to committee	129
Number of bills, acts and nominations reported to Senate	33
Number of bills and acts in process (hearings held)	12
Number of bills and acts indefinitely postponed within committee, including consolidation	10
Number of bills, resolutions and acts awaiting final action	86

The following is a list, by number and title, of all bills and acts passed by the Senate during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. Those that became law are indicated by the public or private law number:

S. 485, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the annual inspection of all motor vehicles in the District of Columbia," approved February 18, 1938, as amended.

S. 489, to amend the act of March 5, 1938, establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia; Public Law 88–85.

S. 490, to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file on such liens be maintained; Public Law 88–89.

S. 628, to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945.

S. 646, to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia.

S. 933, to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act and for other purposes.

S. 994, to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended.

S. 995, to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes.

S. 999, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925.

S. 1024, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes.

S. 1078, to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act.

S. 1082, to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 1227, authorizing the Association of Universalist Women (a nonprofit corporation in the District of Columbia) to consolidate with the Alliance of Unitarian Women (a nonprofit corporation in the State of Massachusetts); Public Law 88–19.

S. 1401, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, construct, operate, and regulate a public off-street parking facility.

S. 1406, to authorize the establishment of a junior college division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes.

S. 1533, to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.; Public Law 88–212.

S. 1964, to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charged for learners' permits.

S. 2054, to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia; Public Law 88–211.

H.R. 1933, to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration; Public Law 88–81.

H.R. 1937, to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940; Public Law 88–57.

H.R. 2485, to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended; Public Law 88–137.

H.R. 3190, to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will; Public Law 88–192.

H.R. 3191, to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia; Public Law 88–191.

H.R. 3537, to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes; Public Law 88–60.

H.R. 4276, to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia; Public Law 88–218.

H.R. 4330, to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; Public Law 88–111.

H.R. 5081, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes; Private Law 88–67.

H.R. 5338, to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; Public Law 88–243.

H.R. 6177, to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States; Public Law 88–104.

H.R. 7497. to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes; Public Law 88–193.

The following is a list of nominations confirmed by the Senate:

Richard R. Atkinson to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1963 (reappointment).

Orman W. Ketcham, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia for the term of 10 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires May 5, 1963.

Edmond T. Daly, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions for the term of 10 years, vice Randolph C. Richardson, deceased.

Report of the House Majority Leader on the Accomplishments of the 1st Session of the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this has been a long and arduous session. The size of the workload has been tremendous and I commend all of the Members of this House for their diligence and dedication. Legislating has never been a simple, orderly task. As the crises of our times accelerate, it becomes even less so. Our reward lies in the knowledge that we have reached many enduring decisions which reflect the desires of the entire Nation. The Congress was intended to be—and is—the vehicle for the expression of the will of the people. It is the forum of all men, those with whom we personally agree and those with whom we do not. Never has so much effort been expended in a search for points of compromise. Perhaps never have we been so aware that we build for the future, not just for today, that, in truth, we shape the future course of the Nation in these troubled times.

The nature of the days in which we live presents us with both an extraordinary challenge and a heavy burden of responsibility. We dare not be frivolous. Mr. Speaker, we have not been frivolous. If, as I believe, the proper criterion for measuring the accomplishments of a Congress is the manner in which it has attempted to resolve the critical issues of the day, this Congress is a historic one. Several crises have burst upon the national scene in the past year. We have met them. A national railroad strike has been averted. A partial nuclear test ban treaty has been ratified. A turning point in civil rights has been reached. In addition, we have concerned ourselves with the "quiet crises"—the nagging problems which beset any great Nation in its relations with the world and with its citizens.

The record of this session—an excellent record by any measure—will stand as a tribute to the gentleman from Massachusetts and our Presiding Officer, Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK. We and the entire Nation are indeed fortunate to have the benefit of his outstanding ability, experience, and leadership.

We are also fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with an outstanding political leader and a man of unquestioned decency, courage, and dedication. All too brief was the tenure of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. We who worked closely with him knew him well as a statesman and as a person. We respected him equally in both capacities. We shall miss him equally in both capacities.

On January 20, 1961, President Kennedy told his fellow citizens that the "struggle against the common enemies of man: Tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself" would not be finished in the first 100 days, the first 1,000 days, in the life of his administration, "nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet." But, he said, "Let us begin."

Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of President Kennedy, we did begin. From January of 1961 to the present, the Congress has been engaged in a full-scale attack on the myriad, baffling problems of the 1960's. This attack did not cease on that tragic day, the 22d of November 1963. On November 28 President Johnson, in his address to a joint session of Congress, said, "Let us continue." This Congress, under the leadership of a Democratic President and controlled by the Democratic Party, intends to do just that.

The proposals put to us by the late President Kennedy are far reaching in import. He was well aware of that fact. In his last news conference, on November 14, he described the civil rights bill and the tax reform measure as "very complicated and important pieces of legislation; in fact, more significant in their own way than legislation that has been sent up there for a decade." Mr. Speaker, quick and simple answers are both unwise and impossible. We have sought the reasonable, not the sensational. I believe we have found, and will continue in the next session to find, enduring solutions.

It might be noted here that not one of the recommendations made to this Congress by President Kennedy has been rejected. Also, only once during this session did he use his veto power—and then on a private bill. Nor has President Johnson used his veto power. The current practice in some quarters of accentuating the negative—concentrating on what Congress has not done—is most misleading.

I am proud of the record of this session. I am proud of the Democratic majority in this House. We have debated, considered, and pondered the critical issues of our day. We are well on our way toward a solution to many of them. That, Mr. Speaker, can truly be called a job well done.

A Gallup poll published on January 8 of this year concluded:

> As the new Congress convenes, the mandate of the people calls for a legislative program dominated by action on domestic matters.

Our record shows that we have met that challenge.

Without doubt the activities carried on by the Federal Government in the areas of health, education, and welfare are vital to the happiness and well-being of the citizens of the United States. It is essential that the Congress of the United States remain alert to new problems in these areas and seek reasonable solutions to them. At the same time, it must constantly reassess the solutions initiated at an earlier time and continue those which are viable, strike out those which have outlived their usefulness, and place new emphasis where it is needed. The first session of the 88th Congress has done just that.

The appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1964 totaled $5,077,114,500. Included in this figure were $432,793,000 for the Office of Education, $40,271,000 for the Food and Drug Administration, $1,608,723,000 for the Public Health Service, $128,415,000 for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, $2,826,742,000 for the Welfare Administration, and $91,500 for the Social Security Administration, to which last amount should be added $317,900,000 from the trust funds of the Social Security Administration.

This amount was in addition to the amount appropriated for the Department by Public Law 88-25, the supplemental appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1963. The appropriation made there was $214,641,000.

EDUCATION

President Johnson described our accomplishments in the area of education in this manner:

> This Congress is well on its way to doing more for education than any Congress since the Land Grant College Act was passed 100 years ago.

I believe that even if we had not passed any other legislation, our record in the single area of education would have made this a historic session. President Johnson expressed the same view. On December 16 he predicted that "this session of the Congress will go down in history as the 'Education Congress of 1963.' "

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT

Unquestionably one of the major accomplishments of the 1st session of the 88th Congress is the Higher Education Facilities Act. It is the first general college aid program ever enacted and its success after years of bitter controversy is a magnificent triumph for this Democratic-controlled Congress.

As enacted, this measure authorized a 5-year, $1,195 million program of Federal grants and loans as follows:

First, for a 3-year period beginning with the fiscal year 1964, annual appropriations of $230 million for matching grants to the States for the construction, rehabilitation, and improvement of undergraduate academic facilities with 22 percent of the funds—$50,600,000 per year for 3 years—reserved for public junior colleges and public technical institutes.

Second, $25 million in the fiscal year 1964 and $60 million in each of fiscal years 1965 and 1966 for construction grants to graduate schools for cooperative graduate centers, making a 3-year, $145 million program.

Third, $120 million annually for fiscal years 1964 through 1966, or $360 million altogether, for loans to institutions for the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of both undergraduate and graduate academic facilities.

Grants for undergraduate academic facilities and public junior colleges and technical institutes are to be administered by a State agency representing public and private educational institutions and the public. The other funds authorized in the bill are to be allocated directly by the Federal Commissioner of Education to institutions making application. The 22 percent for public junior colleges and public technical institutes is to be allocated to the States on the basis of the number of persons graduating from high school in the most recent school year and the relative per capita income in the respective State. The remaining 78 percent will be allocated according to the following formula: One-half the funds on the basis of the relative college and university enrollments in the States and one-half on the basis of enrollments of students in grades 9 through 12 in all private and public schools in the States. These grants which may be allocated for private as well as public undergraduate facilities, are restricted to the construction of structures designed for the natural or physical sciences, mathematics, modern foreign languages, engineering, or for use as a library. The sums allocated for construction at public junior colleges are not limited to these categories. The Federal Government would pay up to one-third of the construction costs of the former and up to 40 percent of the latter.

This law provides that loans can be made directly to institutions of higher education but limits the amount of loans to any one State to 12.5 percent of the total amount of loans under the program. Excluded from eligibility for both loans and grants are those facilities which are used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, those used primarily for any part of a program of a school or department of divinity, or those intended primarily for events for which admission would be charged to the general public, such as gymnasiums or recreational activities. Facilities used by a school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, or public health are also ineligible. Grants will be recovered if, within 20 years, the applicant or its successor ceases to be a public or nonprofit institution or if the facility ceases to be used for academic purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to enable existing colleges and universities to expand their enrollment and to encourage the establishment of new public colleges. Such expansion is essential. The U.S. Office of Education reported that the Nation's public classrooms shortage was 121,200 when the school year started last fall. Without action, that shortage will become critical. College enrollments in 1970 are expected to be double those in 1960. Approximately 7 million students are expected to be in attendance as compared with 3.6 million in 1960. U.S. population aged 18 to 22 was 11,784,000 in July 1960 and is expected to rise to 17,806,000 in 1970. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, have indicated that in order to meet demands of the additional students colleges must spend an average of $2.3 billion annually on their physical plants. Expenditures currently fall short of this by $1 billion.

The majority of the Members of this body agree with the statement made by the late President in his message on education transmitted to the Congress on January 29 of this year:

> Fundamentally, education is and must always be a local responsibility, for it thrives best when nurtured at the grassroots of our democracy. But in our present era of economic expansion, population growth, and technological advance, State, local, and private efforts are insufficient. These efforts must be reinforced by national support, if American education is to yield a maximum of individual development and national well-being.

The majority also agree with his description of education as "the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress." As such, its increased quality and availability are vital.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

The 1946 Vocational Education Act provided matching grants to the States for vocational education programs in the specific areas of agriculture, trades, and industry, home economics, distribution, fisheries, practical nursing, and technical training. Realizing that there have been technological developments since 1946 which have greatly altered vocational education needs, President Kennedy, in 1961, directed an advisory board to examine the program and to make recommendations. That board advised that the program be geared to the training and retraining of people of all ages and races and that it be directed toward training in the skills and techniques which are necessary to meet changing economic needs in the United States. Accordingly, in his January 29 message on education, President Kennedy requested an expansion of the vocational education program.

In his civil rights message of June 19, the late President, in addition to his proposal for a civil rights bill, renewed his requests for a number of other legislative proposals which would improve the lot of the Negro. Among these requests were proposals for an extension of the National Defense Education Act student loan program and of the "impacted areas" program.

On December 18, President Johnson signed a bill including these three programs. In doing so, he declared that it provides the tools for a major attack on one of the biggest obstacles to the Nation's economic growth.

Part A of this bill is the Vocational Education Act of 1963. This calls for a permanent program and authorizes expenditures of $1,031 million on new programs in this area for the first 5 years in addition to the $57 million per year currently spent on vocational education under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden legislation already in existence. The new act authorizes funds of $60 million for this fiscal year, $108,500,000 for the second year, $177,500,000 for the third year, and $225 million for fiscal year 1967 and each year thereafter. These funds will be used for Federal grants to the States to enable them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs, and to provide part-time employment for youths who need these earnings in order to continue their vocational training. This training is to be available to persons of all ages in all communities of the State—those in high school, those who have completed high school or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps.

The sum of $150 million through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, is authorized for residential training schools and work-study program for youths aged 15 to 21.

The technical education program, now in operation under title VIII of the National Defense Education Act, was given increased authorizations of $15 million for fiscal year 1965 and $60 million each year thereafter.

This act also provided permanent authorization for the practical nurse training program. For fiscal years 1964 through 1966, $5 million is authorized for each year for this program, making a total of $15 million for practical nurse training under this legislation.

To summarize briefly, for fiscal years 1964 through 1968 this important act provides $806 million for the basic program of vocational education, $150 million for residential schools and work-study programs, $60 million for technical education under the National Defense Education Act, and $15 million for practical nurse training—making a grand total of $1,031 million for these 5 years.

Part B of this same act is the extension of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. That historic act had initiated a 7-year, $1 billion program of loans and grants to the Nation's students and schools. We have extended that program for an additional year and increased the college loan fund from $90 million to $125 million in the current fiscal year and to $135 million next year. As a result, the amount any one college may borrow is increased from its present ceiling of $250,000 to $800,000.

Part C of this act extends Federal aid to impacted areas for an additional 2 years and authorizes expenditures of $527,600,000 for this program. This is an important program in which the Federal Government pays part of the costs of constructing and operating schools attended by children whose parents either work or live on Federal property or whose parents are connected with projects which cause a sudden increase in Federal contract activities in the area.

This act is a major addition to the country's vocational education programs. It is a sorely needed attack upon the chronic problems of unemployment, uneducated youth, and the lack of skilled laborers. As such, it is a contribution to the Nation's education, social, and economic health.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

On September 24, President Kennedy signed the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963. Similar legislation has been considered by Congress in every year since 1951 but without enactment. This measure, Public Law 88-129, is a significant piece of legislation from which all the people of this country will ultimately benefit.

Studies have shown that the number of trained physicians who become available each year must be increased 50 percent by 1975 if the present ratio of physicians to population—137 physicians for every 100,000 American people—is to be maintained. Similarly, the number of trained dentists who become available each year must be increased by 100 percent in order to maintain the present ratio—56 dentists for every 100,000 Americans. These ratios are generally accepted as a minimum requirement. In order to meet present needs each year more than 1,500 graduates of foreign medical schools are licensed to practice in this country. One-fourth of the interns and residents in our hospitals are foreign medical graduates. To maintain the present ratio of physicians to population will require an increase of 4,000 new students in schools of medicine each year. Existing schools are unable to accommodate that number of students.

But even increased facilities are not enough. Many qualified young people cannot afford the long, expensive training required to become physicians and dentists. More than 40 percent of the medical students now come from the 12 percent of the Nation's families with annual incomes of $10,000 or more. Only 14 percent come from the 50 percent of the Nation's families with annual incomes below $5,000. As a result of the high cost of training, the number of applicants to medical and dental schools has dropped in recent years. For example, the number of medical school applicants dropped from 22,279 in 1950 to 14,397 in 1960.

On February 7, President Kennedy sent to Congress a special message on improving American health. In it he recommended legislation authorizing Federal grants for the construction of teaching facilities and loans for medical students. We have responded to this need. Specifically, Public Law 88–129 authorizes:

First, a 3-year program, beginning in the 1964 fiscal year, of Federal grants for the construction of teaching facilities for the training of medical, dental, and other health personnel. Grants of $175 million were authorized for fiscal 1964–66. They are to be apportioned as follows: $105 million for teaching facilities for the training of physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, or professional public health personnel, $35 million for dental schools, and $35 million for the replacement or rehabilitation of existing medical and dental teaching facilities.

Second, a loan program for students of medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy to be initiated in the fiscal year 1964–66 and phased out in the following 3 fiscal years. $30,700,000 was authorized for the first 3 years.

MENTAL HEALTH

The scourge of mental illness and mental retardation is one of our most critical problems. The disastrous effects of these conditions were dramatically described by President Kennedy in his message transmitted to Congress on February 5. Speaking of these health problems, he said:

> They occur more frequently, affect more people, require more prolonged treatment, cause more suffering by the families of the afflicted, waste more of our human resources, and constitute more financial drain upon both the Public Treasury and the personal finances of the individual families than any other single condition.

The two major proposals of the President contained in that message have been enacted by this Democratic-controlled Congress.

On October 31, President Kennedy put his signature on Public Law 88–164, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. This act provided:

First, a $26 million authorization, over 4 years, for grants to public and private nonprofit institutions for the construction of centers for research on mental retardation.

Second, a $32.5 million authorization over 4 years for grants to be used for the construction of clinical facilities for the treatment of the mentally retarded, the demonstration of techniques for diagnosis, the treatment, training or care of the mentally retarded, and for training physicians or other specialized personnel.

Third, an authorization of $67.5 million, over 4 years, for grants to the States to pay the costs of constructing public and private nonprofit facilities for the diagnosis, treatment, education, training, and care of the mentally retarded.

Fourth, an authorization of $150 million, over 3 years, for grants to the States for constructing community health centers for the prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation of mentally ill patients in their own communities.

Fifth, an authorization of $45.5 million, over 3 years, to expand two existing programs of grants for the training of teachers of mentally retarded and deaf children. Teachers of visually handicapped, speech impaired, crippled, and emotionally disturbed children were included.

Sixth, an authorization of $6 million, over 3 years, for research and demonstration projects to improve educational opportunities for handicapped children.

Seventh, an authorization of $1.5 million in the fiscal year 1964 for grants to the States for the training of teachers of the deaf.

This is a very necessary program. The population of the United States spends $2 billion annually on mental illness. Half the hospital beds in the country are occupied by mental patients and 1 out of every 10 persons requires psychiatric attention during his lifetime. The number of mentally retarded in this country at the present time is estimated at between 5 and 6 million. Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has rightly stated that—

> The facts regarding mental illness and mental retardation reveal national health problems of tragic proportions compounded by years of neglect.

Present facilities are nowhere near adequate to meet this problem. Large State mental hospitals are primarily institutions for quarantining the mentally ill, not for treating them. In addition, two-thirds of the large public institutions were built before 1900 and are overcrowded and inadequate. New methods of treatment and research on mental retardation and the rehabilitation of the mentally ill are sorely needed. As an editorial in the Washington Post declared:

> It is hard to see any argument against modernizing the Nation's approach to mental affliction. Relief from this scourge and shame is long overdue.

The other half of the program proposed by President Kennedy in his message of February 5 is covered by Public Law 88–156. Recognizing that a major key to the prevention of mental retardation lies in the expansion of preventive medical care for expectant mothers and their infants who, due to low income or other reasons, would not otherwise receive it, this body, in cooperation with the coordinate House, has enacted legislation to amend title V of the Social Security Act. The amendment provides additional Federal assistance to States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through new grant programs and the expansion and improvement of existing maternal and child health and crippled children programs.

This bill increased the $25 million authorized annually for Federal-State matching grants for both maternal and child health services and for crippled children's services to $30 million each for the fiscal year 1964, $35 million each for 1965, $40 million each for 1966 and 1967, $45 million each for 1968 and 1969, and $50 million each for 1970 and subsequent years.

In addition, the bill authorized three new programs: First, a 5-year $110 million program of grants to public health agencies for the prenatal care of low-income expectant mothers who have conditions which could increase hazards to the health of mother and child; second, an $8 million annual program of grants for research relating to maternal, child health, and crippled children's services; and, third, a $2.2 million grant for planning projects to increase public awareness of mental retardation programs and to initiate local action against retardation.

In December, this House passed a bill appropriating $41,886,000 to finance the first year of these two programs. This was in the form of a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Senate approved this amount for the mental health programs but added an additional $216 million for impacted school areas.

This bill is presently in conference.

This is truly a remarkable accomplishment. The initiation of a broad new program in the area of mental health is highly significant in itself. For the same session of a Congress to appropriate funds for the first year of that program is doubly significant.

CLEAN AIR ACT

The Clean Air Act, passed by this session of Congress, will continue for 3½ years the existing program of research and technical assistance by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the research grants to air pollution control agencies. In addition, it strengthens the authority of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and directs him to recommend remedial action. New programs of Federal grants to State, regional, and local air pollution control agencies and new programs of Federal action to abate interstate air pollution are also included. The bill authorizes $5 million for the fiscal year 1964, $25 million for 1965, $30 million for 1966, and $35 million for 1967.

This measure will grant the authority sought by President Kennedy in his message on health transmitted to the Congress on February 7. In that message he noted the overwhelming evidence linking air pollution to the aggravation of heart conditions and to increases in the susceptibility to chronic respiratory diseases. He also pointed out that economic damage from air pollution amounts to as much as $11 billion every year and agricultural losses total $500 million each year. Further industrial growth and the concentration of the population in urban areas would intensify this problem unless appropriate action was taken.

SAFETY: AUTOMOBILE SEAT BELT STANDARDS

This Congress, recognizing that substandard automobile seat belts are a hazard to the safety of the public, has passed a bill requiring that the manufacturers of those belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce meet certain safety requirements. Specifically, the bill directs the Secretary of Commerce, acting on the advice of the Bureau of Standards, to prescribe and publish minimum safety standards for seat belts.

Violations of these standards, if done "knowingly and willfully," are punishable by a fine of up to $1,000, imprisonment for 1 year, or both.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT AMENDMENTS

Last year this Democratic-controlled Congress passed an act which was described by President Kennedy as, "perhaps the most significant legislation in the area of employment since the historic Employment Act of 1946."

He was referring to the Manpower Development and Training Act. Since September 1962 when that program of vocational and on-the-job training went into operation some 17,700 persons have completed courses. Of that number approximately 70 percent have been placed, almost all of them in training-related jobs. Projects involving 87,000 trainees have been approved and it is estimated that some 400,000 unemployed workers will be trained and placed in productive employment during the 3 years of the program. Training is now being offered in more than 300 different occupations and more than one-half of those in the training program have been drawn from the hard-core, long-term unemployed.

This is indeed a creditable record. The success of this program should be of interest to every citizen of the United States for the time has come when the problem of unemployment is everyone's problem. It is estimated that every person who is unemployed, if he is on relief, costs the taxpayers of the country $1,000 per year. Manpower training, then, is not only a stimulant to the economy and an assist to the unemployed worker but also a sound investment.

This year we have amended the Manpower Development and Training Act in order to make this program even more effective. We have lowered the age of youth eligible for training allowances from 19 to 17. The 17-year-olds now eligible will have to have been out of school for at least 1 year.

The amendment permits up to 25 percent of the persons receiving training allowances to be youths under 22 years of age. The original act limited youth training alllowances to 5 percent of the total training allowances.

We have also postponed the requirement, originally due to become effective next July 1, that individual States match Federal funds for manpower training. The amendment requires one-third matching by the States in the fiscal year 1966.

We have also added 20 weeks of basic education in reading and writing to the training allowance period.

In addition, the amendment permits increases in the weekly training allowances to $10 above the State unemployment compensation payment. This provision is designed to motivate unemployed workers to seek training rather than to draw unemployment pay.

Trainees are allowed to work 20 hours a week without any loss in training allowance and they are made eligible for the program with 2 years of prior work experience rather than 3 as required by the basic law.

Finally, we have increased the authorizations for the program. The original act authorized $161 million for each of the fiscal years 1964 and 1965. The amendment authorized $161 million for the fiscal year 1964, $407 million for the fiscal year 1965, and $271 million for the fiscal year 1966.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUNDS

The railroad unemployment insurance system, established in 1938, provides benefits for unemployed railroad employees and maternity benefits for female railroad employees. It is supported by payroll taxes paid by the employers. The railroad retirement system, which provides benefits to retired railroad employees on the basis of both age and disability, is financed by payroll taxes under which employee and employer pay equal amounts. The nature of these programs makes necessary the accumulation of large reserves for future use. However, the reserves in the retirement fund totaled about $4 billion this year and current income to the system had fallen about $77 million a year short of what was needed to pay anticipated future needs. Nor was the unemployment insurance fund in a healthy state. Heavy demands had depleted reserves and required borrowing from the U.S. Treasury and the retirement system.

Public Law 88-133, enacted by this Congress, is intended to restore the finances of the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment systems to a sound condition. Its main provisions provide for an increase in the taxes paid by the employers and employees to support the systems. Other provisions are intended to increase the earnings of the retirement system funds invested in Government securities and to cut the expenses of the insurance system by tightening qualifications for benefits. At the same time, the law provides for gradually raising retirement benefits. Although little increase is expected in the near future, higher benefits are expected eventually to total about $40 million a year.

LABOR LEGISLATION

The activities of the Department of Labor are essential to the promotion of the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, the improvement of their working conditions, and the advancement of their opportunities for profitable employment. Public Law 88-136 appropriated $350,078,000 for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1964. This was in addition to the $25,250,000 appropriated for that Department in the Supplemental Appropriations Act.

Related agencies whose appropriations were made in Public Law 88-136 were the National Labor Relations Board, $22,-460,000; the National Mediation Board, $1,950,000; and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, $5,690,000.

In addition, we have appropriated $200,000 for the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy.

RAIL LABOR DISPUTE

On August 28 the Congress of the United States, by joint resolution, averted a national railroad strike which would have been disastrous in its effects. In his message on the rail dispute submitted to Congress on July 22, President Kennedy dramatically described the effects of a prolonged rail strike:

> Many industries which rely primarily on rail shipment * * * would be forced to close down almost immediately. There would not be enough refrigerated truck capacity to transport all of the west coast fruit and vegetable crop. A substantial portion of these and other perishable products would rot. Food shortages would begin to appear in New York City and other major population centers. Mail service would be disrupted. The delay, cost, and confusion resulting from diverting traffic to other carriers would be extremely costly; and considerable rail traffic would be wholly incapable of diversion.
>
> The national defense and security would be seriously harmed. More than 400,000 commuters would be hard hit.
>
> As more and more industries exhausted their stockpiles of materials and components * * * the idling of men and machines would spread like an epidemic * * * The

> August grain harvest would present a particularly acute problem.
>
> The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that by the 30th day of a general rail strike, some 6 million nonrailroad workers would have been laid off in addition to the 200,000 members of the striking brotherhoods and 500,000 other railroad employees—that unemployment would reach the 15 percent mark for the first time since 1940—and that the decline in our rate of GNP would be nearly four times as great as the decline which occurred in this Nation's worst postwar recession.
>
> At the same time, shortages, and bottlenecks would increase prices * * * thus impairing our efforts to improve our competitive position in foreign and domestic markets and to safeguard our balance of payments and gold reserves. And even if the strike were ended by private or congressional action on the 30th day, at least another month would be required before the economy would be back on its present expansion track. Indeed, a prolonged strike could well break the back of the present expansion and topple the economy into recession before the tax reductions and other measures now before the Congress for reinforcing the expansion have had a chance to take hold.

Without detailing the history of the dispute which made such a disastrous strike imminent, the main outlines of the problem may be recounted. The work rules dispute between railroad management and the railroad brotherhoods dates back to 1959 but did not reach crisis proportions until early 1963. Four years of negotiation, litigation, and attempts to resolve the basic questions at issue had failed.

The dispute arose when, on November 2, 1959, the railroads served notice of proposed work rules changes to the 5 railroad unions representing some 200,000 operating employees. It was estimated that initially the changes would eliminate 40,000 firemen from diesel and yard crews and would ultimately eliminate a total of 68,000 jobs.

On September 7, 1960, the unions served notice on the carriers of their proposed rule changes. Their recommendations concerned the same issues contained in the carrier proposals as well as changes in wage structure and fringe benefits.

On October 7, 1960, because of the vast gulf between the two sets of proposals, all parties agreed to refer the subject to consideration by a special Presidential study commission. The Commission, composed of five representatives of the carriers, five representatives of the unions, and five members representing the public, was appointed by Executive order on November 1, 1960. Neither side was to be bound by the determinations or recommendations of that Commission.

After 13 months of hearings and deliberations, the Commission issued its report on February 26, 1962. This report recommended specific changes in the current rules together with certain suggested employee protection provisions.

Litigation on the proposed changes culminated in a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States that there was no legal barrier to the initiation of the changes in the work rules with appropriate bargaining and recourse to the Railway Labor Act procedures.

Since the parties were still unable to resolve their disputes, the President, on April 3, 1963, established an emergency board pursuant to section 10 of the Railway Labor Act. This Board was unable to mediate the dispute, but its report of May 13, 1963, did contain valuable recommendations designed to aid the parties in further collective bargaining.

In the meantime, the Secretary of Labor continued attempts to bring about a settlement. On July 10, 1963, at the request of the President, the parties agreed to maintain the status quo until July 29 in order that a special subcommittee of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy could review the dispute and report thereon. The President also announced that if the parties were unable to reach a settlement by July 29 he would send a special message and proposed legislation to the Congress. On July 22, when there appeared to be little hope for a settlement by July 29, the President did submit his message.

On August 28, just 6 hours before a nationwide strike was scheduled to begin, President Kennedy signed into law a joint resolution adopted almost unanimously in both Houses of the Congress. This act created an ad hoc seven-member arbitration board to resolve the two primary issues: Firemen on diesel locomotives and manning of train crews. It provided that an arbitral award would be made within 90 days, would take effect 60 days later, and would be in effect for 2 years unless the parties agreed otherwise. The five secondary issues of the dispute were not put within the purview of the commission but, rather, were subjected to further collective bargaining. A strike over any of those issues was prohibited for 180 days.

On August 16 the carriers and the unions had agreed, through the Secretary of Labor, that the two major issues in dispute should be submitted to arbitration. They were unable to agree on arbitration terms or the secondary issues. However, even this incomplete agreement allowed the Congress to implement what was actually a private and voluntary decision. This fact was pointed out by the President in his message accompanying the signing of the joint resolution and serves as an answer to those who fear future congressionally imposed arbitration of labor disputes. An editorial in the New York Times lauded the provisions as "the soundest approach now open for protecting the public against the crippling damage of a nationwide rail strike."

MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

In December, the Congress passed a bill extending the Mexican farm labor program for 1 year. Under this program, initiated in 1951, an agreement is reached with the Republic of Mexico establishing procedures for admitting Mexican laborers for temporary employment in the United States. The Department of Labor recruits and places these workers, assists farmers and workers to establish contracts for work, and requires farmers to pay transportation and to provide adequate housing and working conditions. This program has been extended periodically since that time.

The number of Mexican farm laborers entering the country has drastically declined since 1956. In that year 455,197 entered; in 1962 only 194,978 entered. The act has been renewed over the years because there were insufficient U.S. farm laborers available. Farmers who are unable to mechanize or to carry out expensive recruitment of labor would be greatly harmed if the program were suddenly terminated. In particular, the harvesting of next year's perishable crops would be impossible without the aid of the Mexican farm laborers. Termination of the program must be accomplished in such a way as to enable the users of Mexican farm labor to adjust to the end of the program.

EQUAL PAY ACT

Since 1945, many attempts have been made to enact legislation prohibiting discrimination in wages because of sex. Until 1962, no such bill passed either House. In that year equal pay measures passed both Chambers but never reached conference. That legislation would have established a new structure for the administration of the act and different standards of coverage from those existing under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

On June 10, President Kennedy signed into law the Equal Pay Act of 1963. He praised "those Members of Congress who worked so diligently to guide the Equal Pay Act through" and heralded it as "another structure base to democracy."

This act amends the Fair Labor Standards Act to require an employer of persons working in interstate commerce to grant equal pay "for equal work on jobs the performance of which requires equal effort and responsibility, and which are performed under similar working conditions."

This legislation marks a significant step forward in the drive for full equality of economic opportunity. There are almost 25 million women in the Nation's work force and justice demands that they receive the same compensation as men when they perform the same work. Discriminatory wage rates have an adverse effect upon purchasing power and the general standard of living. Such rates also affect the morale of the female worker and, consequently, her productivity. Nor can the unfair competitive advantage to the discriminating employer be condoned.

This legislation has an advantage over that considered in 1962 in that by amending the Fair Labor Standards Act it simplifies the administration and enforcement of the law. It is preferable to have the law administered by the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor rather than to create an additional administering and enforcing structure within the Department.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

In 1958 Congress enacted the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act which allowed the States to extend the length of time during which unemployment checks could be paid to jobless workers. To finance these extra benefits, the Congress authorized Federal loans to States which took advantage of the act. These loans were to be repaid before January 1, 1963. If they were not repaid, the Government would levy an additional tax of 0.15 percent of the State's taxable wage base each year until the amount of the loan was repaid. By 1963, only the District of Columbia had repaid its loan. Therefore, the act required that the employers in 16 States which had received loans pay an extra 0.15 percent tax on 1963 wages, 0.30 percent on 1964 wages, 0.45 percent on 1965 wages, and 0.60 percent on 1966 wages.

On November 7, 1963, the President signed Public Law 88–173, a measure designed to ease these taxes. It does not reduce the ultimate amount of taxes which must be paid by the employers in the States but it does freeze the rates at 0.30 percent for 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968 and thus extends the payments over a longer period of time.

Three of the 16 States had also received advances from the Federal unemployment trust fund account under title XII of the Social Security Act. Existing law provided for the repayment of these advances in much the same manner as advances under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act. It set an extra tax on employers of 0.15 percent beginning with wages paid in 1961 and increasing 0.15 percent each year through 1970. Public Law 88–173 froze the tax at 0.15 percent for the years 1963 to 1967. Thereafter the tax will increase by 0.15 percent each year until the advance is repaid.

Existing law allowed the States to make repayments of these advances from their unemployment funds. In this way, they could avoid the extra tax on employers. However, the law did not allow repayments on an installment basis. Public Law 88–173 provided that the extra tax for the repayments under both the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act and title XII of the Social Security Act would not go into effect for any one year if a State, prior to November 1 of that year, paid to the U.S. Treasury a specified installment on the advances. All of the provisions of this law are designed to ease the burden on States which were hard hit in the recession years between 1957 and 1960.

A related matter was covered by Public Law 88–31. In 1961, Congress, spurred on by rising unemployment, enacted the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act, a proposal of the Kennedy administration. This measure authorized Federal financial advances to the States to enable them to pay 13 weeks of additional unemployment insurance benefits to jobless workers who had exhausted their benefits under the State programs. To repay the Federal Treasury for the advances thus authorized, the act raised by four-tenths of 1 percent, for calendar years 1962 and 1963, the existing unemployment insurance payroll tax levied on employers to support regular unemployment insurance programs. This year a tax reduction was recommended because the Department of Labor estimated that the retention of the four-tenths of 1 percent tax would produce an excess of $172 million.

By Public Law 88–31, Congress reduced the extra tax from 0.4 to 0.25 percent. This was expected to save employers about $181 million. It also increased by $7,148,000 the fiscal 1963 authorization for grants to the States for the administration of their unemployment compensation laws and for the operation of employment offices.

HOUSING FACILITIES FOR THE ELDERLY

On February 21 President Kennedy sent to Congress a special message on aiding our senior citizens. In this message he pointed out that it has been estimated that nearly one-half of our aged population live in substandard housing or housing unsuited for their special needs. This is not a problem with which the Congress of the United States is unfamiliar. In 1962 the Democratic-controlled 2d session of the 87th Congress passed the Senior Citizens Housing Act. That act authorized a $200 million expansion of Federal programs for the promotion of better housing for the elderly. This year another Democratic-controlled Congress, on the recommendation of a Democratic President, has further expanded that program.

Public Law 88–158 authorized the appropriation of an additional $50 million for aid to the low-income elderly. The Housing Act of 1959, as amended in 1961 and 1962, authorized the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make direct loans, at interest below the market rate, from a special revolving fund. These loans are made to private nonprofit corporations, consumer cooperatives, and public agencies providing low-cost rental housing for the elderly; $225 million had been authorized for this program and of that amount $150 million had been appropriated and committed. The law we have passed this year authorized $50 million to be added to the $75 million authorized but not yet committed.

NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

On August 19 President Kennedy signed into law a bill which extended for 3 years the termination date for the drive for funds to erect a National Cultural Center. Since the original 5-year fund-raising period was scheduled to expire on September 2, 1963, this noteworthy project would have been canceled if Congress had not acted.

This measure gives the trustees more time to raise, through public subscriptions, the estimated $30 million needed to build the Center in the District of Columbia. It also increased the size of the board of trustees from 15 to 30 members, thus permitting both a broader geographical representation and a broader representation of the arts.

In signing the bill, President Kennedy expressed his appreciation to the Members of the Congress for their continued interest. He pointed out that every major capital in the world has a cultural center which serves as a stage for demonstrating the best of the nations' cultural life. The lack of such a center in the Capital of this Nation is felt both by our own citizens and by foreign visitors. Through it, visitors will come to see the lasting benefits of a free society.

HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS

In October this House passed a bill requested by the National Historical Publications Commission and supported by President Kennedy. This measure authorized Federal aid to public and private nonprofit organizations for the collecting, preserving, compiling, microfilming, and publishing of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States.

Under the present system of private financing of these activities with, it is true, occasional Federal help, much material of historical significance is not available to those who have need of it. This bill constitutes a significant contribution to historical scholarship.

TRIBUTES

On four occasions during this session we have had the honor of manifesting our esteem and admiration to a respected citizen of the United States or of the world.

In December this Congress voted to place the likeness of John F. Kennedy on the 50-cent piece. This bill was proposed by President Johnson as a means of honoring the assassinated President and is a fitting memorial.

In a tribute to one of America's most beloved and admired citizens, we have passed a bill granting a Federal charter to the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation. That organization, designed to foster the ideals and activities of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, will have no Federal financial backing. However, the granting of a Federal charter provides, as President Kennedy stated in signing the bill, "a fitting and effective way to carry on the programs to which Mrs. Roosevelt so ably dedicated her life."

The intent of Congress was well expressed by President Kennedy in his remarks at the proclamation ceremonies declaring Sir Winston Churchill a citizen of the United States. That proclamation was made as a result of a bill passed by the Congress of the United States. President Kennedy said:

> We meet to honor a man whose honor requires no meeting—for he is the most honored and honorable man to walk to the stage of human history in the time in which we live. By adding his name to our rolls, we mean to honor him—but his acceptance honors us much more.

The granting of honorary citizenship to a foreign national is unprecedented in our history. By granting it to Sir Winston Churchill, we have recognized one of America's greatest friends and his many contributions to the free world.

This Congress has passed a bill which, I am confident, expresses the wishes of every citizen of the United States. Its purpose is to ease the transition to private life of former First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy. As approved, it will provide $50,000 for temporary secretarial help and office space for 12 months so that she may reply in an appropriate manner to the thousands of letters and telegrams from people throughout the world expressing their sympathy on the tragic death of her husband. The bill also extended free mailing privileges to her for life and authorized the payment of $15,000 for the late President's funeral and burial expenses.

Because it was the unanimous view of Federal law-enforcement experts that an element of danger to Mrs. Kennedy and to her children exists, the bill also extends Secret Service protection for 2 years.

This bill expresses in only a very small way the inspiration which Mrs. Kennedy's example of dignity, courage, and poise has been to every one of us and to people throughout the country.

ASSASSINATION INVESTIGATION

Public Law 88-202 grants full subpena powers to the special seven-member Commission appointed by President Johnson on November 29 to investigate the assassination of the late President Kennedy and the subsequent violent death of the man charged with the assassination. This Commission is directed to discover all of the facts in the case and to report these facts to the President, to the American people, and to the world.

This legislation, which was requested by the Commission, is necessary in order that the Commission may compel witnesses to testify and to produce evidence.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The only civil rights legislation passed since the Civil War was enacted by the 85th and the 86th Congresses, both Democratic controlled. In addition, as President Kennedy pointed out in his special message on civil rights submitted to the Congress on February 28:

> In the last 2 years, more progress has been made in securing the civil rights of all Americans than in any comparable period in our history. Progress has been made—through Executive action, litigation, persuasion and private initiative—in achieving and protecting equality of opportunity in education, voting, transportation, employment, housing, government, and the enjoyment of public accommodations.

The Congress and the Democratic Party can be justifiably proud of their record.

But pride in our progress has not blinded us to the fact that discrimination continues to exist in this country. As the report of the Civil Rights Commission, submitted to the President on February 12, stated, citizenship is not yet "fully realized for the American Negro." This is a problem which is national in scope, and further steps toward the elimination of the injustices and humiliations of racial discrimination must be taken. To the Congress falls the task of working out a constitutional, reasonable, and desirable means to right this wrong.

Aware of the heavy responsibility we bear and the delicate task we face, this body has devoted much thought and time to the best method of accomplishing the desired ends. On November 20, the Judiciary Committee of this body reported a bill described by the majority of the members of that committee "as a reasonable and responsible bill whose provisions are designed effectively to meet an urgent and most serious national problem." This is no small accomplishment, and it is sincerely hoped and anticipated that the early days of the next session of this Congress will witness the passage of a new Civil Rights Act.

The major provisions of the bill reported by the Judiciary Committee may be described in general terms:

Title I concerns voting rights. It is designed to meet the problem of lengthy and often unwarranted delays in judicial proceedings under the prior Civil Rights Acts and the discriminatory use of literacy tests and other devices by registration officials.

Title II would prohibit discrimination on grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin in specified places of public accommodation. Included are hotels and motels, theaters and other places of amusement presenting sources of entertainment which move in interstate commerce, and restaurants, lunchcounters, and gasoline stations which sell food or goods which move in commerce or serve interstate travelers. Discrimination in such establishments is also outlawed if it is supported by State action.

Title III relates to the desegregation of public facilities. It authorizes the Attorney General, under certain circumstances, to bring suit to desegregate public facilities, other than schools, which are owned or operated by State or local governmental units. It would also authorize the Attorney General to intervene in pending actions in the Federal courts where relief from discriminatory practices by State or local governmental units or officers is sought.

Title IV covers the desegregation of schools. It authorizes the Commissioner of Education to provide, upon application by local authorities, technical assistance and financial aid to assist in dealing with problems incidental to desegregation. It also authorizes the Attorney General to initiate suits seeking desegregation of public schools where the student or parents involved are unable to bring suit and where he considers that a suit would materially further the public policy favoring the orderly achievement of desegregation in public education.

Title V effects minor procedural and technical changes in the Civil Rights Commission, makes it a permanent body, and gives it additional authority to serve as a national clearinghouse for information concerning denials of the equal protection of the laws and to investigate allegations as to patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in Federal elections.

Title VI declares it to be the policy of the United States that discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin shall not occur in connection with programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance. It also authorizes and directs the appropriate Federal departments and agencies to take action to carry out this policy.

Title VII seeks to eliminate, through the utilization of formal and informal remedial procedures, discrimination in employment based on race, color, religion, or national origin. It authorizes the establishment of a Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and delegates to it the primary responsibility for preventing and eliminating unlawful employment practices.

Title VIII directs the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a survey to compile registration and voting statistics in those geographic areas recommended by the Civil Rights Commission.

Title IX provides for appeals for higher court review when a Federal court has refused to accept transfer or a civil rights case to it from a State court.

Each of these provisions is designed to meet a form of discrimination presently existing.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

On October 7, the House sent to the President a private bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Mason. To it was appended an amendment extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission to September 30, 1964. Admittedly, this was a stopgap measure. The future of that Commission hinges on the omnibus civil rights bill discussed above.

As noted, the civil rights bill reported by the Judiciary Committee of this body would make the Commission a permanent body and give it additional authority. Since action on that bill is not yet complete, the enactment of Public Law 88-152 assumes a great importance. For without timely action, the Civil Rights Commission, established in 1957 and extended for 2-year periods in 1959 and 1961, would have expired on September 30 of this year, with 60 days following that date to wind up its affairs.

The 1960 platforms of both major parties promised to create a permanent Civil Rights Commission. That remains the hope of the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives. We have insured that the invaluable work of that body will not be interrupted. The experience which it has gained in the 6 years of its existence has enabled it to make a most significant contribution toward the solution of one of the most critical problems of our times. It has investigated deprivations of the right to vote and denials of equal protection of the laws in housing, employment, education, and the administration of justice. Its reports and recommendations have served as the basis for remedial action by the executive branch and by Congress. In debate on the extension of the Commission, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of this body described those reports most eloquently. They are, said Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, "like unto the ringing of a bell to shake the torpor of the American conscience."

In his civil rights message of February 28, President Kennedy enumerated the reasons why it is essential that the Commission be maintained. Despite its remarkable accomplishments, there are other areas of violations of rights which remain to be investigated. But perhaps of even greater importance is the fact that as more and more communities recognize the discrimination existing within their jurisdiction, they must have some impartial agency to which they can turn for guidance and for information on how similar racial problems have been settled in the past. The Civil Rights Commission is eminently qualified to fulfill this function.

AGRICULTURE

The principles and purposes of the Democratic administration relative to a viable agricultural program were perhaps best summarized by President Kennedy in his farm message to the Congress of the United States on January 31:

> Proper management of our resources of food and fiber is a key factor in the economic future of the Nation. Both fiscal necessity and economic commonsense require us to go beyond the gains we have made in the last 2 years. Our capacity to produce still outruns the growth of both domestic and foreign demand for food and fiber. Our abundance must still be harnessed in such a way as to bring supply and demand more nearly into balance. And the benefits of our agricultural progress still need to be translated into improved income to farm families, lower prices to consumers for food and fiber, expanded exports, and reduced expenditures for price support programs.

The net farm income in both 1961 and 1962 was raised to its highest peak since 1953. The substantial decrease in Government surpluses has resulted in a real saving to the taxpayers. But, not content with this admirable record, this body, in conjunction with a Democratic President and a Senate controlled by the Democratic Party, has pushed forward in this area during this session of Congress.

The Department of Agriculture, of course, is the agency primarily concerned with this vital aspect of our economy. It is this Department which performs functions relating to research, education, conservation, marketing, regulatory work, agricultural adjustment, surplus disposal, and rural development. We have appropriated $6,224,370,215 for the fiscal year 1964 for that Department.

This was in addition to $32,610,000 appropriated for the Department of Agriculture in the Supplemental Appropriations Act. A further appropriation to the Department in connection with the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation is discussed below.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Commodity Credit Corporation is directed by law to carry on several important functions. It is the agency established to make loans on and purchase any amounts of commodities offered to it by farmers. It stores surpluses, operates surplus disposals, conduct special feeding, and special export programs, and makes payments under the various cropland retirement programs.

On February 28, the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, reported that only $127.6 million of the Commodity Credit Corporation's $14.5 billion authority to borrow from the Treasury and private sources remained. He described this as a "perilously low level."

The Congress acted quickly to insure that the necessary functions performed by the Corporation would not be interrupted. We passed a supplemental appropriation of $508,172,000 for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1963. This was to meet expenses of the Corporation in providing surplus commodities for sale abroad.

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Most of the State agricultural experiment stations were established as long as 70 years ago and such facilities are inadequate for utilization research. Such research, the finding of new markets and new uses for agricultural products, is essential to the well-being of the Nation's agricultural program. Accordingly, the Congress, during this session, passed a bill authorizing matching Federal grants to the States to assist in the acquisition, construction, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other capital facilities of the State agricultural experiment stations.

FEED GRAINS

When President Kennedy assumed office, feed grains constituted one of the most crucial agricultural problems. The surplus of over 3 billion bushels of feed grains would have multiplied to nearly 4 billion bushels by the end of the crop year if no steps had been taken. The voluntary feed grains program authorized in 1961 and extended in 1962 marked the beginning of the solution to this problem. It was estimated that, because of that program, the surplus would be reduced by 860 million bushels by October of this year. As a result taxpayers would save over $800,000 a day. The Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, estimated that by the end of the 1964 marketing year the entire feed grain surplus will have disappeared, leaving only the supply of feed grains needed for national reserves. This is a spectacular accomplishment and is attributable to the feed grains program. Had we not enacted new legislation this year, unlimited production and low prices would have accompanied the end of the existing program. Such disastrous results were prevented by the signing of Public Law 88–26 on May 20 of this year.

Under the feed grains acreage diversion program, the Government offers incentives, such as land diversion payments and higher price supports, to farmers who take feed grain acreage out of production. The theory upon which this is based and which has been borne out in this program is that in the long run it is less of a burden on the taxpayers of this country to make such payments than it is to buy the surpluses and pay storage costs on them over the year. The bill passed this year differed from the 1962 law in that it left details to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. Without elaboration, the major provisions of this bill may be summarized as follows:

First, it authorized the Secretary of Agriculture, if he determines that the supply of feed grains would otherwise be excessive, to institute a feed grains acreage diversion program in 1964 and 1965 under which price supports would be paid to farmers who voluntarily take out of production up to 50 percent of the average acreage planted in feed grains in 1959 and 1960.

Second, it authorizes the Secretary to set price supports for corn between 65 and 90 percent of parity.

Third, it authorizes the Secretary to issue payment-in-kind certificates to cooperating farmers. These certificates would be equal to a maximum of 50 percent of the price support rate on the normal production of the retired areas.

Fourth, it requires that the retired areas be put to soil conserving uses but permits certain crops, if unsupported and nonsurplus, to be grown in exchange for a minimum 50-percent cut in the diversion payment.

Fifth, it authorizes the Secretary, as an incentive to cooperation, to offer direct payments-in-kind based on the normal production of the actual planted areas.

Sixth, it directs the Commodity Credit Corporation to issue negotiable payment-in-kind certificates to cover the direct portion of price support and the acreage diversion payments.

Seventh, it permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase the certificates from farmers and to market an equivalent amount of grain.

Eighth, it sets the value of grain used in payment at not less than the current support price minus the value of the direct payment plus carrying charges and authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to deduct reasonable carrying and storage charges from the value of certificates presented for redemption after 30 days.

Ninth, it permits the Secretary to make up to 50 percent of the payments in advance, to provide bases for a few farmers who did not grow feed grains during the 1959–60 base period, to make adjustments for hardship or emergency situations, under certain conditions to exempt producers of malting barley from acreage cutbacks, and to provide for sharing of payments among several producers on a farm. This program is based upon the principles embodied in the 1961 and 1962 programs but takes advantage of the knowledge and experience gained from the highly successful operation of those programs.

COTTON

In his farm message, transmitted to the Congress on January 31, President Kennedy said:

> A healthy, growing cotton industry is vital to the strength and prosperity of our Nation.

He went on to enumerate the problems which confront the cotton industry, problems which, as he pointed out, "it alone cannot resolve."

To protect U.S. growers of cotton and to maintain large export market for our raw cotton, the Government supports domestic raw cotton prices and provides exporters with a subsidy to make the supported cotton competitive in world markets. For a combination of reasons, this program has resulted in a decline in cotton sales, an increase in the stockpiles of cotton, and a decrease in the growers' acreage allotments. The major reasons for this situation are the rapid growth of imports and the competition from textiles made with artificial fibers.

Domestic cotton prices are being supported at a level of nearly 32½ cents a pound through acreage allotments and the purchases of surplus stocks by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The world market price of cotton is 24 cents a pound. Therefore, U.S. cotton can be sold on foreign markets for considerably less than it can be purchased in the United States. The program has worked perversely in discriminating against American textile manufacturers and in accentuating the surplus problem by encouraging the substitution of synthetic fibers for cotton. The Commodity Credit Corporation now has more than 8 million bales of surplus cotton and the cost of controlling cotton production, buying up surpluses, storing them, and subsidizing exports is running at a rate of about $1 billion a year.

In December, this body passed a bill, supported by both President Kennedy and President Johnson, which provides for a Federal subsidy which would reduce the cost of raw cotton for domestic textile manufacturers to a level competitive with the low world market price paid by foreign textile manufacturers. This subsidy would be paid in the form of raw cotton withdrawn from the mounting national stockpile and the amount of the subsidy would be at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The bill also directs the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a special program of research to reduce the cost of cotton production in the United States. An appropriation of $10 million annually was authorized for this purpose.

The other provisions of this bill, too complex to enumerate, revised the cotton acreage control and price support laws.

It is anticipated that when this measure is enacted it will make domestic mills more competitive with foreign mills and cotton more competitive with other fibers. A reduction in cotton surpluses and an attendant decrease in the cost to the American taxpayer will result.

SHIPPING

In 1961, Congress passed the dual rate shipping law, which gave the Maritime Commission greater regulatory powers over dual-rate contracts. Under dual-rate contracts, steamship conferences—voluntary associations of ocean carriers which serve common routes—charge two rates, one for shippers who agree to ship exclusively in conference ships and another higher rate for those who do not sign an exclusive agreement. The law set a deadline of April 3, 1963, for Commission action in approving, disapproving, or modifying dual-rate contracts.

Early in 1963 the Commission notified Congress that an extension of the time limit was necessary. In response, Congress enacted Public Law 88-5 by which the time limit for Commission action was extended for 1 year.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The formulation and administration of programs for the management, conservation, and development of our natural resources is the important task performed by the Department of the Interior.

Public Law 88-79 provided appropriations for that Department—except for its power agencies—for the fiscal year 1964. The total appropriation was $612,061,750. Of that amount $595,301,750 is in definite appropriations. Included in this total are the following amounts:

Bureau of Land Management	$45,212,500
Bureau of Indian Affairs	206,623,550
National Park Service	112,524,500
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation	1,900,000
Geological Survey	63,700,000
Bureau of Mines	39,528,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	47,192,400

This is in addition to $33,169,650 appropriated for the Department of the Interior in the supplemental appropriation bill.

OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES

The Democratic-controlled 85th Congress authorized the first inventory of outdoor recreation resources in the Nation's history. It directed an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to survey available play areas and to predict needs for the future. Accordingly, a 15-member Commission was formed. The report of that group was transmitted to Congress in 1962. It urged the Federal Government to coordinate Federal, State, local, and private activities in a massive effort to insure adequate recreation facilities. It noted that over 90 percent of the population of the United States participates in some form of outdoor recreation and found a great need for additional outdoor recreation areas and facilities. It urged that the need be met by the coordination of activities at the various levels of government.

In 1962 a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was established in the Department of the Interior. It was charged with the responsibility of formulating a nationwide outdoor recreation plan, of encouraging regional and intergovernmental cooperation, of sponsoring and engaging in research, and of promoting the public use of outdoor recreation facilities.

In May of this year the Congress of the United States enacted legislation giving statutory authority to that Bureau. Public Law 88-29 directed the Secretary of the Interior to prepare an inventory of outdoor recreation needs, to formulate within 5 years a nationwide plan for future recreation development by Federal, State, and local agencies, to sponsor research and educational plans, and to coordinate all Federal activities concerned with outdoor recreation.

On May 28, President Kennedy signed this measure into law. He stated his belief, shared by Members of this body, that "all Americans will ultimately benefit" from this "recognition of the Congress of the vital need to protect and wisely administer this Nation's great heritage of outdoor recreation resources."

GUAM

In November, President Kennedy signed into law two complementary bills concerned with Guam, our westernmost possession in the Pacific. Because this possession has been rightly described as "the showcase of democracy in the Far East," its position in our national interest cannot be overlooked.

The first of the bills, Public Law 88-170, authorizes the payment of $45 million to the Government of Guam to provide for rehabilitation in connection with damage caused by Typhoon Karen in 1962. That storm totally destroyed or extensively damaged approximately 70 percent of the civilian residential housing and 40 percent of the commercial structures on the island. In April of this year a second storm, Typhoon Olive, leveled many of the temporary housing units erected to house the homeless Guamanians. Of course, much of the rehabilitation required is unrelated to the typhoons. No really permanent effort has yet been made to rehabilitate the island from the ravages of World War II.

Of the $45 million authorized by this bill, over $34 million will be in the form of loans and is repayable to the Federal Government over a 30-year period. The remaining $10,700,000 will be in grants.

The second bill, Public Law 88-171, was passed to clarify and make more certain the authority of the territory of Guam to create a public agency empowered to carry out urban renewal and housing activities and to participate in Federal programs of assistance in this area. No additional expenditure of Federal funds is involved in this measure. It merely defines the authority of the Legislature of Guam to undertake this much-needed program. It should insure a positive program of urban zoning and renewal.

The sacrifices and patriotism of the people of Guam are unquestioned. The passage of these bills is in the best interests both of that island and of the United States.

PUERTO RICO COMMISSION

In October, this body passed a bill establishing a United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico. The Commission was directed to study all factors bearing on the present and future relationship between the

United States and that Commonwealth including existing applicable laws, treaties, constitutions, and agreements. The Commission, made up of seven U.S. members and six to be designated at the option of Puerto Rico, is required to report to the legislatures and heads of Government of the United States and Puerto Rico on the opening day of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, January 1966.

The purpose of this Commission is to clarify the present relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico and to provide the basis for consideration of our future relationship.

In December the Senate passed this bill with minor amendments. Final action is imminent.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT AMENDMENTS

In 1958 Congress initiated a program of Federal incentives for billboard control by the States. The Highway Act of 1956 had prohibited the construction of service stations and rest stops on all future interstate highways but contained no provision for the control of billboard displays. In 1958 a majority of the Members of the Congress agreed that such control would be beneficial in preserving the natural beauty of this richly endowed country, in preventing erosion, and in permitting landscaping and reforestation. Therefore, Congress adopted controls but instituted a bonus program rather than direct Federal regulation.

Under that program a State must pass legislation prohibiting billboard advertising, with certain exceptions, within 660 feet of new rights-of-way acquired after July 1, 1956, along the Interstate Highway System. States passing such legislation receive a one-half of 1 percent bonus on the Federal funds apportioned to them for construction. In 1961 these controls were renewed for 2 years and on June 30 of this year they expired.

On October 24 the Federal Aid Highway Amendments Act of 1963 was enacted. This law extended for 2 years the program of Federal incentives for billboard control. Other provisions were designed to improve the planning and administration of the existing interstate highway program and did not involve any new programs or funds.

PUBLIC WORKS

Public Law 88–25, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1963, included a significant appropriation to finance public works projects under the 1962 Public Works Acceleration Act.

That act had authorized the President to allocate $900 million to initiate or accelerate, in eligible areas, previously authorized Federal public works projects or State or local public works projects for which Federal aid has previously been authorized. In 1962 the Congress appropriated the first $400 million. This supplemental appropriation bill appropriated an additional $450 million for the program.

In addition, the public works appropriation bill passed in December provided for the appropriation of $30 million toward this program which has so successfully stimulated the U.S. economy.

RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT

In December we passed a bill authorizing an appropriation of $816,847,000 for flood control and navigation projects in certain river basins. Of this total, $700 million is an added authorization for projects agreed upon earlier and $116,847,000 will be used for additional projects.

Agreement on this bill came after prolonged debate with our coordinate body. Compromise on the provisions became imperative because some projects had run out of funds and others were about to. This is a reasonable agreement. In fact, as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] said:

> A great new chapter in water resource development is being written by this program.

FINANCE

The basic purpose of the Department of the Treasury, despite the diversification of its activities throughout the years, remains the same as it was in 1789 when that Department was created. That purpose is the management of the financial affairs of the Nation. The import of this activity is so obvious as to require no elaboration.

Public Law 88–39, signed by President Kennedy on June 13, appropriated $1,103,650,000 for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1964. This is in addition to $8,544,900 included in the supplemental appropriation bill.

TAX REDUCTION AND REFORM

In his state of the Union message, delivered before a joint session of Congress, President Kennedy put forth his proposals for the revision of the income tax structure. There he noted that—

> It is increasingly clear—to those in Government, business, and labor who are responsible for our economy's success—that our obsolete tax system exerts too heavy a drag on private purchasing power, profits and employment. Designed to check inflation in earlier years, it now checks growth instead. It discourages extra effort and risk. It distorts the use of resources. It invites recurrent recessions, depresses our Federal revenues, and causes chronic budget deficits.

Thus did he announce the reasons for his tax proposal, reasons to be repeated in his budget message of January 17, his economic report to Congress of January 21, his special message on tax reduction and reform of January 24, and numerous speeches before private groups. On November 15, 1 week before his death, he predicted that if the tax reduction bill was passed promptly—

> We will be sailing by next April on the winds of the longest and strongest peacetime expansion of our Nation's economic history.

Great strides toward economic security were made during that all too brief period when a Democratic-controlled Congress worked with the late President Kennedy. Our national output made a phenomenal rise from $500 to $600 billion. Labor income increased by 16 percent. For the first time in our history 70 million persons were at work in this country. Factory earnings exceeded $100 per week for the first time in history, an average increase of $10 per week in 3 years. The stock market broke all records. This is a record which President Kennedy, the Congress and the Democratic Party were justifiably proud of.

One critical domestic problem which has been attacked but not solved is that of unemployment. If the economy had grown in the past 2½ years at the rate it grew during the previous 2½ years, the unemployment rate today would be up to 8 percent rather than at the present 5½ percent. But even 5½ percent is too high. Some 4 million workers are idle and over 3 times that many experienced some unemployment during this year.

This fact must be considered in relationship to the Nation's unprecedented supply of manpower. The extraordinarily high birth rate in the 1940's and the replacement of men by machines means that we must discover some means of stimulating a demand for manpower equal to the supply. A majority of the Members of this body believe that this stimulation will come from the enactment of a tax reduction and reform program. Accordingly, on September 25, a $11.1 billion tax reduction for individuals and corporations, the largest in the Nation's history, was passed by this House.

As passed, H.R. 8363 would reduce individual tax bills an average of 20 percent over a 2-year period. Some of the reform provisions of the bill would raise taxes, leaving a net average reduction of 18.8 percent. New rates on individual income taxes would range from 14 percent in the lowest bracket to 70 percent in the highest. The present range is 20 to 91 percent. The present 52-percent tax on corporation income would be lowered to 48 percent in 2 years.

In addition to these changes in tax rates, this bill constitutes a broad overhauling of the Federal tax laws. Provisions, much too complex and lengthy to detail here, cover such matters as the rate of payment of corporation taxes, numerous changes in deductions, a drastic revision of the tax rules on capital gains, new limits on immunity, and various other structural changes. These provisions will provide greater equity, a broader tax base, full and efficient flow of capital, the simplification of tax administration and compliance, and the removal of special privileges and hardships.

This measure is a very complex and a very important one. As President Kennedy said in his March 13 speech to the Advertising Council:

> We are talking about, in a sense, something new, and it is appropriate that we talk about it in detail.

This body has talked about it in great detail. The coordinate body is now doing likewise. It is anticipated that final action on this historic bill will be taken early next year.

CORPORATE AND EXCISE TAXES

Many temporary excise taxes were levied during the Korean war. Others have been added since. On June 29 of this year the President signed into public law the 10th annual extension of these taxes.

Extension of these taxes, scheduled to expire on June 30, was expected to result in $2.8 to $2.9 billion for the Federal Treasury during the 1964 fiscal year. It was estimated that expiration of the taxes would cost the Government between $4.1 and $4.2 billion in loss of revenue during a full year of operation.

These extensions were requested by President Kennedy in his budget message, transmitted to Congress on January 17. The majority of the Members approved a flat extension of the rates even though the corporation tax might later be reduced as part of President Kennedy's omnibus tax bill. This bill, therefore, merely prevented a substantial loss of revenue pending consideration of the more inclusive tax bill to be discussed below.

Specifically, Public Law 88–52 extended for 1 year, through June 30, 1964, the existing 52-percent corporation income tax rate and the existing rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, general telephone service, and passenger travel by air.

SILVER PURCHASE REPEAL

In his January 21 Economic Report to the Congress, President Kennedy urged "revision in our silver policy to reflect the status of silver as a metal for which there is an expanding industrial demand." The fact which prompted this request is the soaring demand for silver. Thirty years ago over 90 percent of the silver mined throughout the world went for monetary use, for tableware, and for jewelry. At that time less than 10 percent went for commercial uses. Today, long-established commercial uses have enormously increased and many new uses have accompanied the advent of the space age. In the United States alone, industrial consumption increased tenfold in 30 years.

At the time that demand was increasing the supply of silver was decreasing. The production of silver on this side of the Iron Curtain has declined from 254 million ounces for the yearly average for 1925–29 to 199 million ounces in 1962.

The result was that the Treasury Department ran out of nonmonetary silver which it had, for years, been unloading on the market to make up for the gap between production and consumption of silver in the United States and to prevent an increase in the price of the silver. On November 28, 1961, at the direction of the President, the Secretary of the Treasury suspended sales of silver. It became obvious that a revision of our silver policy was needed. The adverse effects of a failure to do so are well chronicled in an article which appeared in the Economist:

> Relief is sorely needed. If the present antiquated laws on silver remain unchanged, within 2 years the Treasury will have run through its own supplies of the metal and, because America produces only one-sixth of its domestic needs, it would be forced to compete with private purchasers on foreign markets. This would not only imply an unwelcome and unnecessary drain on America's balance of international payment; it would also almost certainly mean a rapid rise in the price of silver above the established monetary price of $1.29 an ounce. This, in turn, would tempt citizens to melt down coins and turn in $1 bills for their value in silver as fast as the Treasury produced them, making a complete farce of the Treasury's efforts to provide Americans with an adequate supply of money in small denominations.

In order to prevent this nightmare, the 1st session of the 88th Congress repealed the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 and certain provisions of the acts of July 6, 1939, and July 31, 1946, relating to silver purchase. This new measure, Public Law 88–36, marks the end to policies adopted in 1933 when the Federal Government began to subsidize silver miners and represents an urgently needed adjustment to vastly changed circumstances.

This law authorizes the issuance of gold-backed $1 and $2 Federal Reserve notes to replace $1 and $2 silver certificates. Thus the silver reserve fund backing these certificates is released for use in coins. It also repealed the silver purchase acts which required the Treasury to buy newly mined domestic silver offered to it at 90.5 cents per ounce and repealed the 50-percent transfer tax on profits made in silver sales. It is estimated that this law will release sufficient silver to satisfy coinage needs for 15 years.

NEW ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

To further expedite the myriad activities of the Department of the Treasury, this Congress has authorized a fourth Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. That Department had fewer Assistant Secretaries than other departments and a member of the classified civil service was performing the duties and accepting the responsibilities of an Assistant Secretary in overseeing the work of the mint and the Secret Service. This bill raised that position to the level of an Assistant Secretary. No increase in salary or other costs were involved.

NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT

On three occasions during the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the national debt limit of the United States has been raised. This was necessary in order to give the Treasury Department the needed flexibility to take advantage of favorable market conditions. In addition, some leeway is needed to handle the immediate and unexpected needs of Government agencies.

In 1962, Congress provided for a temporary fiscal 1963 debt limit of $308 billion from July 1, 1962, through March 31, 1963; $305 billion from April 1 through June 24, 1963; and $300 billion from June 25 through June 30, 1963. On July 1, the debt limit would drop to the legal permanent limit of $285 billion.

In his budget message of January 17, President Kennedy requested prompt extension of the $308 billion limit until June 30. The Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillion, urged Congress not to force him "to resort to an array of unsound financial procedures."

Responding, Congress in May raised the ceiling from $305 billion to $307 billion until June 30 and to $309 billion for July and August. To prevent the limitation from reverting to its permanent level of $285 billion on September 1, Congress extended the temporary $309 billion debt limit from August 31 until November 30, 1963. In November the limit was again raised. The new ceiling established was $315 billion and is to carry the Treasury through June 29, 1964.

DUTY-FREE ALLOWANCE

As part of the administration's program to counter the balance-of-payments deficit, the Congress, in 1961, enacted legislation which reduced from $500 to $100 the total value of articles acquired abroad which might be brought in duty free by a resident returning to the United States. That bill was due to expire on June 30, 1963.

On June 29 the President signed Public Law 88–53. This bill extended the temporary reduction for 2 more years. The Treasury Department reported that the reduction had, in 1962 alone, lowered U.S. expenditures abroad by $123 million. The reduction is obviously a useful means of combating the balance-of-payments deficit.

COMMUNICATIONS: SUSPENSION OF EQUAL TIME REQUIREMENT

In June, this body passed a joint resolution, recommended by President Kennedy, providing for the suspension of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934. Under that section a broadcasting station providing time to a political candidate must offer equal time to all other candidates for the same office. In 1960, the Congress had suspended this requirement to permit the Democratic and Republican presidential and vice presidential candidates to use broadcasting facilities without requiring the broadcaster to provide equal time to minor or splinter-party candidates. This temporary suspension permitted the debates between Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon.

This bill is presently in conference with representatives of the Senate and only very minor differences remain to be settled. The main thrust of the measure will be identical with that passed in 1960.

CAMPAIGN COSTS: PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT

In 1961 President Kennedy established the President's Commission on Campaign Costs to recommend improved ways to finance the expenditures required of nominees for the offices of President and Vice President. On April 18, 1962, that Commission issued its report. Among other recommendations, it proposed that the Government pay the expenses incurred in the transition from one administration to another.

The costs of the transition are essential Government expenses which are pertinent to the offices of President and Vice President and should be borne by the Federal Government. To place this burden on the national committee of the political party or on private individuals or groups is unfair. Also, disruptions during this period of the transfer of executive and administrative power cannot be countenanced.

Accordingly, both houses of the Congress, during this session, have passed bills authorizing the Administrator of the General Services Administration to provide office space, compensation for staff personnel, travel expenses, subsistence allowances, and communications and printing services for the President- and Vice-President-elect. Amendments by the Senate have sent this bill to conference but it is expected that final action will come soon.

VETERANS

The Veterans' Administration was established in 1930 to administer those laws passed by Congress which authorize benefits for former members of the Armed Forces and for the dependents and other beneficiaries of deceased former members of those forces. The supplemental appropriation bill appropriated $46,300,000 to enable the Administration to carry on its valuable work.

The independent offices appropriations bill appropriated $5,384,784,000 for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1964.

In his budget message, transmitted to the Congress on January 17, President Kennedy expressed the theme which has been adopted by the present Democratic-controlled Congress relative to legislation for the welfare of veterans of the Armed Forces. He said:

> This country has recognized that the Government's primary obligation for veterans benefits is to those who incurred disabilities in the defense of our Nation and to the dependents of those who died as a result of military service.

With this fact in mind, this Congress has passed several bills of benefit to veterans. Among them are the following:

Public Law 88-22 provides additional compensation for veterans who are suffering from a complete loss of speech as a result of military service.

Public Law 88-20 provides additional compensation for veterans having a service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears.

Public Law 88-21 provides a 10-percent increase in the monthly payments to children and parents of veterans who died from service-connected causes.

Public Law 88-134, which complements the above, increases from $112 to $120 the basic monthly rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans who have died from service-connected causes.

Public Law 88-3 amends section 904, title 38, of the United States Code, so that burial allowances may be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority from dishonorable to other than dishonorable after the death of the veteran.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

In his state of the Union message, delivered before a joint session of Congress on January 14, 1963, President Kennedy stated:

> This country * * * continues to require the best defense in the world—a defense which is suited to the sixties.

The House of Representatives, in cooperation with its coordinate body, has succeeded in meeting this challenge.

Public Law 88-149 appropriated $47,220,010,000 to the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1964. This bill did not include funds for military assistance abroad, military construction, civil defense, Army Engineers flood control work, or the military pay boost. Included in this figure are $12,850,700,000 for military personnel, both active, and reserve, $11,714,033,000 for the operation and maintenance of our forces, $15,706,047,000 for procurement, and $6,949,230,000 for research and development.

The following provisions were also included in this appropriations bill: First, it provides that the Army National Guard be programed to attain a strength of 400,000 by the end of the fiscal year 1964 and that the Army Reserve be programed to attain a strength of 300,000.

Second, it provides funds for 969,900 Reserve personnel on paid drill status by the end of the fiscal year 1964. This included a National Guard force of 384,400 and Army Reserve force of 281,000.

Third, it requires the Department of Defense to report quarterly to the Appropriations Committees any disbursements made under the $15 million contingency fund. This fund was provided for "emergencies and extraordinary expenses" in connection with "confidential military purposes."

Fourth, it authorizes expenditures for military personnel greater than the appropriated amounts if the President determines that increases are necessary.

Fifth, it continues the President's authority to spend any amount required to institute an airborne alert.

Sixth, it provides that at least 35 percent of the funds made available for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels be allocated for work in private shipyards. However, the Secretary of Defense was given authority to have such work done in Navy shipyards if it is consistent with the public interest.

Seventh, it earmarks $125 million of the Air Force research and development funds for a mach 3 manned aircraft program.

Eighth, it authorizes the Secretary of Defense to transfer up to $150 million from other funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1964 to the emergency fund, provided that no transfer would exceed 7 percent of the appropriation from which it was taken. He is also authorized to transfer an additional $200 million if he deems it necessary to improve readiness and so notifies the Appropriations Committees.

Ninth, it sets a limit of 20 percent of the direct costs on indirect costs associated with Defense Department research grants.

In addition, the supplementary appropriations bill for 1963 allocated $220,162,000 to the Department of Defense.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

In addition to the general Department of Defense appropriation, the military construction appropriation bill appropriated $1,585,880,000 for the fiscal year 1964 for construction at military bases in the United States and abroad and for the construction and maintenance of military family housing. Of the total, $948,474,000 was for construction. The balance, $637,406,000, was appropriated for the general support of the family housing program.

DRAFT EXTENSION

In his budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, President Kennedy requested a 4-year extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act which was due to expire on January 30. Public Law 88-2 is the response of this Congress to that recognized need. In testimony before the Armed Services Committee of this body, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service, said:

> The evaluation of the determination of this Nation by our friends, by neutrals, by our possible enemies, and even by ourselves, depends * * * on how well we seem prepared to mobilize our manpower.

Realizing that the maintenance of draft levels commensurate with the requirements of the Nation's national defense requires the continuation of the draft law, we have extended until July 1, 1967, the induction authority provided by the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, the Dependents Assistance Act providing increased quarters allowances for enlistees with dependents, and the law providing special authority to induct medical, dental, veterinary, and allied specialists and to grant special pay to these inductees.

The personnel ceilings established for the Armed Forces after World War II have been suspended since 1950. This law continued that suspension until July 1, 1967.

ARMED SERVICES: UNIFORM RESERVE PROGRAM

During the 87th Congress, a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of this body, in studying the efficacy of the Reserve program, found that many of the reservists called up during the Berlin conflict of 1961 were inadequately prepared. As a result, 2- and 3-year active-duty enlistees had to be recalled to duty to make up for the lack of training on the part of the reservists. In an effort to eliminate such deficiencies as well as the confusion among reservists as to the exact nature of their reserve obligation, we have enacted Public Law 88-110.

This law amends the Universal Military Training and Service Act by repealing existing Reserve programs and establishing a uniform permanent Reserve program for eligible individuals between 17 and 26 years of age. The duration of the active duty obligation will be determined by the length of time required for the reservist to qualify for the special skill for which he enlisted. This measure will provide additional flexibility, uniformity, and equity within the reserve programs.

MILITARY PAY RAISE

On October 2, President Kennedy, with a good deal of pleasure, signed into law a measure which originated in this body, a bill authorizing military pay increases of an estimated $1,243,084,000 a year; $1,213 million of that amount was for the military forces of the Defense Department, and the remainder was for the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service. A request for a military pay raise was included in the budget message of the President transmitted to the Congress on January 17 of this year. In that message it was noted that the last general military pay raise occurred in 1958. Since that time wage increases in private industry have provided strong inducement for highly trained military personnel to leave the service for higher paying jobs in civilian life.

The majority report of our Armed Services Committee pointed out that military pay has risen only 16.2 percent since 1952 whereas the salaries of professional and technical workers have risen 49 percent in the same period, the salaries of production workers 44.8 percent, and of civil service employees 34.3 percent. The increased combat efficiency resulting from less turnover in the services is essential to our national security. In addition, the high costs of training new personnel will be decreased.

Approximately $1,057,729,000 was authorized for active duty personnel in the Department of Defense; $951,044,000 is for basic pay increases averaging nearly 17 percent in every grade except for personnel with less than 2 years of service. The largest increase was in the basic pay of officers and enlisted men in the middle grades.

There was authorized $42,502,000 for family separation allowances and approximately $77,520,000 a year for terminal leave payments, social security, severance pay, Reserve readjustment pay, death gratuities, and reenlistment bonuses.

Approximately $11,663,000 was authorized for submarine pay, high-pressure chamber duty, double incentive payments for hazardous duty, hostile duty pay, medical and dental incentive pay, and contract surgeon's pay.

This bill also provides an entirely new way of computing retirement pay in the future and thus, as the Washington Post said, "remedied an old injustice." In the future a method based upon increases in the cost of living will be used. This system, currently provided for civil service retirees, provides that whenever the Consumer Price Index rises 3 percent over the preceding year, retirement pay will rise correspondingly.

The provisions for retired personnel in the Department of Defense totaled $82,372,000. Of this, $40,984,000 is for a flat 5 percent increase for all personnel retired between June 1, 1958, and April 1, 1963. Approximately $27,517,000 is intended to allow persons who retired prior to 1958 to recompute their retirement pay on the basis of the pay rates in effect between 1958 and 1963. Persons in this category can, instead, receive a straight 5 percent cost of living increase; $4,400,000 is for retirement benefits for personnel retiring between April 1 and October 1—the effective date of the law—and $9,471,000 for personnel retiring during the balance of the fiscal year 1964.

This law also had the effect of increasing the pension paid to widows of military personnel who die either on active duty or of service-connected causes after leaving the service.

Approximately $73,229,000 is authorized for retirement pay for reserve personnel in the Department of Defense.

CIVIL DEFENSE

The Department of Defense has estimated that between 25 and 65 million lives would be saved by providing reasonable protection against fallout radiation. The majority of the Members of this House have come to believe that civil defense is an integral part of the Nation's military defense. Although nuclear war is unlikely, it is a possibility over the next several decades and its consequences are too grave to be discounted.

Accordingly, in September of this year, we passed a bill authorizing $190.6 million in the fiscal year 1964 to begin new phases of the civil defense program. This bill would authorize $175 million in outright grants for the construction of fallout shelters in public and non-profit institutions. It would also require fallout shelters in all Federal buildings and authorizes $15.6 million for that purpose.

Hearings on this program are underway in the other body.

In addition, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, adopted for fiscal year 1963 in May of this year appropriated $15 million for surveying, stocking, and marking civil defense shelters.

The independent offices appropriations bill, passed in December, also contained appropriations for the civil defense program. It provided $70,319,000 to continue the established civil defense program and $41,250,000 for research, the shelter survey, and the marking of civil defense shelters.

It also made an appropriation of $27,500,000 to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enable it to procure additional emergency civil defense hospitals, to maintain the 2,680 hospitals acquired in prior years, and to continue the emergency health training and preparedness activities of the Department.

NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The national stockpile is composed of goods acquired to meet estimated needs in time of war. The Kennedy administration was consistent throughout in demanding that the stockpile not exceed national emergency requirements. The excessive storage of any material is an unnecessary burden on public funds and a possible source of questionable profits to contractors.

In line with this, the 1st session of the 88th Congress has passed two laws designed to hold down the supply of stockpiled materials.

Because the supply of cadmium, a metal used chiefly in electroplating, chemicals, and alloys, is in excess of our national stockpile objectives and because there is a severe scarcity of cadmium on the domestic market, a scarcity adversely affecting industry, we authorized the sale of 2 million pounds of cadmium of domestic interests. This bill waived the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required by the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpile Act.

Similarly, Public Law 88-154 authorized the disposal of the surplus waterfowl feathers and down now held in the national stockpile. Again, the normal 6-month waiting period was waived.

ATOMIC ENERGY

On July 22 President Kennedy signed into law (Public Law 88-72) a bill authorizing appropriations of $216,271,000 for Atomic Energy Commission construction projects for the fiscal year 1964. Such appropriations are necessary if the program of the development, use, and control of atomic energy for the maximum contribution to the general welfare and to the common defense and security is to be continued.

Included in the total authorization are $172,562,000 for 46 new projects, $7,500,000 added to a previous appropriation of $15 million for cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Community in the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy, $709,000 added to a previous authorization of $3,600,000 for research and development of the last breeder reactor concept, $30 million for the development, design, construction, and operation of a spectral shift nuclear powerplant, and $5,500,000 for a cooperative program with West Germany under which the United States would supply a particle fuel element for testing in Germany.

This law also contains a provision requiring authorization by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee of all Atomic Energy Commission appropriations after January 1, 1964. Currently all authorizations except those for construction are made under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. It is intended that this provision will give Congress authority to exercise a greater degree of legislative control over the atomic energy program.

A supplemental Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill was passed in November. This measure authorized an additional $17,945,000 for the construction of 12 additional new facilities for the nuclear weapons development program. These facilities were intended for use in implementing three of the four safeguards which President Kennedy pledged to adopt if the Senate consented to the ratification of the partial nuclear test ban treaty. These four safeguards were the continuation of comprehensive underground nuclear test programs, the maintenance of nuclear laboratory facilities to attract and retain scientists, the improvement of detection equipment, and the maintenance of the facilities needed for the rapid resumption of atmospheric testing.

This bill did not include an authorization for the improvement of detection equipment, the third safeguard. This is primarily the responsibility of the Department of Defense. However, the 12 construction projects authorized will implement the other three safeguards.

This bill brought the total authorization for the fiscal year 1964 for new construction projects to $190,507,000.

Appropriations for the operation of the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year 1964 were made in the Public Works Appropriations Act passed in December. That act made appropriations of $2,342,669,000 for operating expenses and $400 million for plant and capital equipment for the Agency.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was established in 1961. It is responsible for the conduct, support, and coordination of research for arms control and disarmament policy formulation, the preparation for and management of U.S. participation in international negotiations in the arms control and disarmament field, the dissemination, and coordination of public information concerning arms control and disarmament, and the preparation for, operation of, or direction of U.S. participation in such international control systems as may, under treaty arrangements, become part of U.S. arms control and disarmament activities. Its original appropriation was $10 million.

In November the Congress authorized appropriations of $20 million through the fiscal year 1965 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Such appropriations were recognized as essential to the continued success of that agency. That it has been successful may be attested by two outstanding achievements in the past year—the partial nuclear test ban treaty and the emergency "hot line" link between Washington and Moscow. Long and careful research by the Agency preceded both of these achievements.

In December an appropriation of $7,500,000 was made for the fiscal year 1964.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

In 1958 Congress established the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In carrying out the policy of Congress that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind, that agency was empowered to conduct research for the solution of problems of flight within and outside the earth's atmosphere and develop, construct, test, and operate aeronautical and space vehicles for that purpose; to conduct activities that may be required for the exploration of space with manned and unmanned vehicles; to arrange for the most effective utilization of the scientific and engineering resources of the United States and for cooperation by the United States with other nations in pursuit of peaceful purposes in aeronautical and space activities; and to provide for the widest practicable and appropriate dissemination of information concerning NASA's activities and the results thereof.

To enable that Agency to carry out the tasks which face it in this area of vast potential for the good of all mankind, Congress this year appropriated $5 billion for the fiscal year 1964. As sent to the President, this bill appropriated funds as follows: $3,926 million for research and development, $680 million for the construction of facilities, and $494 million for administrative operations.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS: THE WORLD BANK

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Finance—the World Bank—came into existence on December 27, 1945, when the Articles of Agreement, formulated at the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference at Bretton Woods, N.H., were signed in Washington by representatives of 28 governments. There are now 101 members and the organization has successfully carried out its purpose of assisting in the reconstruction and development of its member countries. As of March 31, 1963, it had made 338 loans amounting to the equivalent of $6,758 million to 61 countries and oversea territories.

In November this Congress enacted legislation authorizing the U.S. Governor of that organization to vote for a $1 billion increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock. No U.S. funds were involved; the bill was necessary only because the Articles of Agreement establishing the Bank required congressional approval for any capital stock increase. Approval was given in order to allow for the admission of new members and to permit special increases in the capital subscriptions of existing members. The rapid increase in membership had left only $210 million of the Bank's total $21 billion capital stock authorization available for subscription by members.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

The Export-Import Bank of Washington was established in 1934 to aid in the financing and facilitation of exports and imports and the exchange of commodities between the United States or any of its territories or insular possessions and any foreign country or the agencies or nationals thereof. It makes long-term loans to help finance the purchase of U.S. exports and also provides guarantees and insurance for the protection of U.S. exporters against political and credit risks.

In his budget message transmitted to Congress on January 17, President Kennedy rightly referred to the Bank's "significant contribution to the expansion of our foreign trade." Aware of this contribution and responding to the requests of the President, this Congress has, by Public Law 88–101, extended the life of the Bank for 5 years. We have also raised the total amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance that the Bank may have outstanding at any one time by $2 billion and increased by $1 billion the total amount of export credit insurance and guarantees that may be outstanding at one time.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Department of State is the chief adviser to the President in the field of foreign policy and has the primary responsibility for initiating and implementing the foreign policy of the United States. We have appropriated $322,696,000 for that Department for the fiscal year 1964.

This is in addition to the $7,870,300 appropriated in the supplemental appropriation bill.

A properly conceived and administered foreign aid program is of great value to the national interest of the United States. As was pointed out in the report of the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World, a 10-member committee appointed by President Kennedy in 1962:

> We live in a world in which poverty, sickness, instability, and turmoil are rife and where a relentless Communist imperialism manipulates this misery to subvert men and nations from freedom's cause. A foreign aid program is one instrument among many which we and other developed countries adequately can afford and vigorously must use in the defense and advancement of free world interests.

To carry out this program, we have appropriated $3,298,705,607 for the fiscal year 1964.

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDING ACT

Public Law 88–94, signed by President Kennedy on August 12, authorized a 2-year, $50 million appropriation for the Department of State in connection with the operation of its 286 oversea diplomatic posts. The authorization covered appropriations for the acquisition, construction, alteration, and leasing of buildings overseas. The bill specifies that the financing is to be made from U.S. owned foreign currencies. This is an important provision. If these funds are used rather than making a further demand upon our gold reserves, a favorable effect upon our balance of payments can be anticipated.

This is a good and reasonable housekeeping bill. Like any wise householder, the Government of the United States must provide for the maintenance and upkeep of its facilities.

PHILIPPINE WAR CLAIMS

The Foreign Service Buildings Act contains provisions relevant to Philippine war claims. These provisions, much debated in both Houses of Congress, are the result of a compromise worked out between the two bodies.

The Philippine War Claims Act of 1962, Public Law 87–616, authorized the payment of $73 million to Philippine corporations and citizens as the unpaid balance of World War II damage claims filed under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. The amendment to the 1962 act, adopted this year, is an equitable compromise by which the United States shall fulfill its obligations to the people of the Philippines while placing restrictions on lobby and claim collecting practices.

This amendment provides:

First, that no payment in excess of $25,000 be made to any individual claimant under the act.

Second, that no former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission or their assigns or associates is eligible to receive remuneration in connection with any claim coming under the act.

Third, that anyone within the jurisdiction of the United States who pays remuneration in violation of the act is subject to a fine of $5,000 and/or imprisonment for 1 year and anyone who receives remuneration is subject to a fine of $5,000 and/or imprisonment for 5 years.

Fourth, that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission recover from anyone receiving remuneration in violation of the act an amount equal to three times the amount received in remuneration.

Fifth, that a claimant's acceptance of a payment will be considered full satisfaction and final settlement of his war damage claims.

Sixth, that a special fund be established in the U.S. Treasury. This fund will consist of the difference between the amount paid in approved claims and the amount that would have been paid if the $25,000 limit had not been placed upon individual claims. This amount—estimated at between $20 and $30 million—will be used for educational exchange programs between the United States and the Philippines.

Seventh, that the difference between the approved claims—paid and placed in the educational fund—and the $73 million appropriated in 1962 will revert to the general fund of the U.S. Treasury.

PEACE CORPS

In my report last year I referred to the Peace Corps as "a new, imaginative, and informal approach to the field of foreign aid to the lesser developed nations." That Corps, established by President Kennedy in 1961, has been an undisputed success.

In 1962 we appropriated $59 million for that agency. This year we have almost doubled its funds by authorizing $102 million for the fiscal year 1964. This will allow it to increase from 6,600 to 11,300 the number of volunteers sent to underdeveloped countries to live and work with the people and to assist them to raise their standard of living. One of the sponsors of the bill, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, described it as "the best investment we have ever made to demonstrate the real spirit of America's desire to help the people of other lands."

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the time to present a fairly complete picture of the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 88th Congress. I have not, of course, discussed all of the measures enacted during this session. But I did wish to document my earlier statement that we have devoted ourselves to the whole spectrum of needs of a diverse country and a diverse people.

There are those who will call this bill important and that bill petty. There are those who scoff at what they call housekeeping bills. There are those who see the extension of an earlier measure as automatically minor and the enactment of a new one as automatically major. All of these are subjective judgments and none of them is entirely true. To a young man in the service the military pay raise is significant. It probably is not to a bachelor in his 68th year. But the extension of the housing for the elderly program is of interest to that gentleman. The appropriation for the operation of diplomatic posts abroad may not seem very dramatic to a housewife but the mental retardation bill will if she has a child so afflicted.

I could go on enumerating examples such as this. I trust I have said enough to make my point: This is a vast country with myriads of problems and the efficient governance of the Nation requires attention to all of them, the large and the small, the dramatic and the tedious, the momentary and the persisting.

A legislative record is made by well ordered, consistent action. This requires time, patience, an open mind, and a willingness to cooperate. The Members of this body have displayed these qualities in high degree. The result is a laudable beginning toward what I truly believe will be a historic Congress.